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CHAPTER 1

NATURE AND RATIONALE OF THE DISSERTATION

Explanation of Alternative Dissertation Format

This dissertation uses the publication dissertation format option adopted by the Sociology Department and approved by The Graduate College of Western Michigan University. This alternative format requires as a central element the production of a set of related journal-quality manuscripts, all addressed to a sociological topic, as a means of satisfying the dissertation requirement for the Doctoral degree. The advantage of this approach is to provide a relatively comprehensive, highly integrated examination of a central topic through manuscripts which may subsequently be submitted to professional journals for publication. General theoretical and general conclusions chapters will be included at the beginning and end of the dissertation. Included in this document, as Chapters IV, V, and VI respectively, are the following publication-ready papers about the socialization of adolescents:

1. *Multi-level Analysis and Symbolic Interactionism: A Theoretical Integration and a Model of Parental Socialization of Adolescents*

2. *Parental Socialization of Adolescents: The Effects of Gender and Class*


Official authorization from WMU's Human Subjects Institutional Review Board for this research is documented in Appendices A and B.
Foci and Design of the Present Research, in Brief

The primary foci and purposes of the research are to use symbolic interactionism and other role-sensitive theories: (a) to develop a theoretically integrated multilevel model of parent-teen socialization based on a more general model of social influence (created in this work) of which socialization is one aspect), and (b) to test the efficacy of the model, including an examination of gender-based differences in parent-teen interaction, and an assessment of some new theoretically-derived variables within the context of the model: parent-teen interactive time use, parental interactive subroles (role performance), and teen self-image (defined in interactionist terms of role-identity).

The research design involves primary data collection with 297 families from the greater metropolitan St. Louis area, stratified by the following key variables which allow for a systematic comparison of social-structural constraints: social class, urban and rural residence, age of adolescent, gender of teen and parents, maternal employment level, and family type (married-couple vs. single-parent families). A two-stage process employed an in-depth pilot study of 20 families which included surveys for each parent and the teenager, followed by four nights of telephone interviewing about each day's interaction. The final stage used a two-step cross-sectional survey design with a sample of 297 families. Families were first sent a two-page screening survey to locate families with teenagers who fit a specified sociodemographic profile, and given a 7-day time log form for recording mutual activities. When these were returned, copies of the completed 7-day time log and more detailed surveys were sent for each parent and the selected teenager.

Research documents, as journal manuscripts, (chapters 4-6), are sequenced first to develop a multilevel model of parent-teen socialization, then to examine the effects of gender and class on the socialization process, and finally to present the findings of the
full multilevel model. A conclusions chapter will assess the empirical findings across manuscripts and more globally for the research.

Rationale of the Dissertation

Multilevel modeling is a major trend in sociological research (Alexander, 1988; Boss, Doherty, LaRossa, Schumm & Steinmetz, 1993; Diprete & Forristal, 1994; Garbarino, 1992), and is being used in a variety of substantive areas (see Diprete & Forristal, 1994; Menaghan & Parcel, 1990). Unfortunately, much of this work lacks theoretical rigor, even while displaying great energy and vision (Alexander, 1988; Huber, 1990; Kohn, 1989). Multi-level research about adolescents has included the influence of social class and values (Kohn, 1959a, 1959b, 1963, 1969, 1982; Looker & Pineo, 1983), occupation and modes of parenting (Menaghan, 1991; Piotrkowski, Rapoport & Rapoport, 1987; Ritzer, 1989), and ethnicity (see Peterson & Rollins, 1987), but no study of parent-teen interaction exists which combines most of these variables in one multi-level model. While there are excellent examples of multilevel research, most research which focuses on interaction and behavioral exchange (i.e. social-psychological studies) suffers from significant deficiencies, including a lack of theoretical focus and cohesion, insufficient macro-level variables, small or biased samples, statistical misuses, and inconsistent representation of different levels of analysis (DiPrete & Forristal, 1994; Kohn, 1989; Peterson & Rollins, 1987; Rallings & Nye, 1978).

This research will address these theoretical and methodological deficiencies in several ways. I will first address the lack of emphasis on development of theory for multi-level models in general. Macro and micro-level theories are often considered to hold conflicting premises (Hawley, 1992), and their methodologies have been seen as
largely incompatible (Alexander, 1988; Blumer, 1969; Kohn, 1989). Drawing inspiration from Stryker (1980) and others who believe a macro-micro theoretical integration is possible, and indeed, is even now in progress (Alexander, 1988; DiPrete & Forristal, 1994), this research will attempt to blend aspects of several theories by reconciling compatible views of social roles and system-person influence. Aspects of these theories will be reviewed and integrated into a multi-level model of social influence. These theories include social systems theory (Parsons, 1937, 1951; Robin, 1981), Bronfenbrenner's (1979) social ecological typology of social levels, network analysis (Cook & Whitmeyer, 1992; Emirbayer & Goodwin, 1994), Turner's theories of role-making and role types (1962, 1990), Sewell's (1992) structural transformation theory, and structural symbolic interactionism (McCall & Simmons, 1966; Stryker, 1968, 1980, 1982; Hoelter, 1983, 1985a, 1985b). These theories were selected because social roles are used as central aspects in their perspectives, and because they advance similar conceptions of how system qualities influence persons through interpersonal relationships.

The intention is to create a clearer and more useful view of parent-teen socialization by linking macro and micro-level processes. Many current sociological theories of adolescent socialization are weak on both analysis and explanation because they rely exclusively on social-structural analyses, ignoring the unique choices and attitudes of individuals located within those structures. Or, conversely, micro-level theories articulate dynamic processes of interaction without reference to larger social contexts. By developing a theoretically integrated multi-level model of social influence and then applying it to parent-teen socialization, this research proposes to respond both to the absence of social structural variables in many interaction studies and to the omission of social psychological variables in many social structural studies.
Interaction studies which use only middle class or married-couple families, for instance, ignore the diversification which is perhaps the most visible characteristic of contemporary American families. Key social-structural variables included in this research are social class, family structure, family size, parental employment level and time patterns, and the gender of both parent and adolescent. All of these are hypothesized to have a measurable bearing on the nature of parent-teen interaction. This approach presupposes that socialization does not occur in a closed system, but is embedded in a social network with broad connections to society and specific connections to other people and groups.

There are some methodological justifications for this research, which flow directly from the theoretical ones. There are some studies, of course, which utilize a great number of variables (i.e. those utilizing secondary data from national surveys) and do construct and test multi-level models with variables at many levels of analysis (for recent examples, see Aquilino, 1994; Brayfield, 1995), but these can be criticized for significant measurement bias with respect to the data collection instrument (Peterson & Rollins, 1987). Complex social-psychological processes are often measured with simplistic survey items. Triangulation of methods (e.g. using surveys in combination with other methodologies such as time logs, beepers, videotaping technology, etc.) are desirable, but usually not achieved (Peterson and Rollins, 1987). For positive examples of triangulation, see Nock & Kingston (1988) and Bolger, DeLongis, Kessler & Schilling (1989). This research will combine survey methodology with prior grounded-theory techniques (used in the pilot study), and with time-log methodology (in the full-scale survey). Another related methodological goal is to obtain a high-quality regional random sample which is sufficiently large and
diverse to allow for key comparisons of the macro-level variables, while small enough to manage the use of time logs and alternate variable measurement techniques.

This research creates two new variables, interactive time use and parental subroles, and reconceptualizes two others, social class and teen self-image, from an interactionist perspective. The two new variables of interactive time use and parental subroles are proposed as key intervening variables between social structure and teen outcomes. This strategy of creating interactionist versions of these key variables is directly linked to the use of symbolic interactionism to bring about macro-micro theoretical integration. Thus the overall goal is to develop an interactionist multi-level model of social influence which will be utilized to give a clearer and more holistic picture of parent-teen socialization.
CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

In this chapter, the theoretical and empirical literature will be divided into two sections. First, theories and literature will be presented pertaining to a new multi-level model of social influence. I will then discuss the model, and present a version of the model applied to the topic of parent-teen socialization. Second, I will discuss literature which supports the inclusion of key variables in this new multi-level model of parent-teen socialization. Before we begin the literature review, I will make some general remarks about socialization, the topic of this research.

Socialization refers to the social process whereby an agent of society imparts social skills and perspectives to a child or other societal member. Not only can virtually all parent-child interaction be labeled as socialization, but so can all other encounters the child has with the social world, since all such events stimulate and shape adaptive behavior. Furthermore, socialization continues through life, and every adult experiences socialization in the form of training and indoctrination into new settings and social roles (Peterson & Rollins, 1987). As such, socialization is certainly a pervasive and ubiquitous process. Virtually all social influence could be considered as socialization.

In this sense, understanding socialization requires a prior understanding of the mechanisms of social influence in general. But social influence occurs in an open and expansive social system, where a multiplicity of influences molds and constrains, and numerous "agents of socialization" ply their trade. Accounting for all social influences
is impossible; therefore one must have a model, a selective and symbolic representation of the "real empirical world." This model should be a simplification of the real world, but it should not be simplistic. It cannot include all social influences, but it should strive for comprehensive inclusion of the most potent and significant factors.

I will argue that socialization, as a wide-ranging process of social influence, originates at all levels of society and should therefore be researched via multi-level models. Constructing a completely comprehensive model is certainly impossible, but effective multi-variate, multi-level models should certainly be achievable. In this chapter, I will first discuss desirable characteristics for all multi-level models. I will then begin the literature section with a review of symbolic interactionism, and an explanation of why I chose symbolic interactionism to develop a model of parent-teen socialization.

Multi-level Models

Multilevel modeling is not easy. Reasons for this difficulty involve the complexity of the social system, the various perspectives one might adopt for analyzing it, and the challenges of parsimonious variable selection, measurement, data collection, and analysis. In fact, most of the inherent difficulties of any research project are compounded for multi-level analysis. If doing one's homework for a small model with few variables is difficult, then being well-versed in the measurement and issues pertaining to many variables stretches the limits of professional expertise. Sheer breadth of coverage is one issue; blending qualitatively different macro and micro-level perspectives presents additional problems. Expertise in different specialty areas is also helpful. Many variables in most multilevel models would appear in several of the seven sociological specialty areas reviewed in a recent article on the social organization
of sociological knowledge (Ennis, 1992). Another way to look at the same problem is that, since most specialty areas in sociology focus on either the macro or micro fields, but not both, the micro-to-macro continuum thus spans several specialty areas or "intellectual clusterings," making essential integration more difficult (Cappell & Guterbock, 1992). The features which follow, which were also implemented for the two models in this research, were created in specific response to these stated difficulties.

First, multilevel models should have a clear and integrated theoretical focus. Theory should guide the research by providing an image or perspective of what is to be explained and suggesting the proper system of variables for study, and influencing methodology (Alexander, 1988; Kohn, 1989). Research goals and theory should be clearly related. For this research, the focal point of interest is the parent-teen interactive process, conceptualized as socialization. Secondarily, the focus is the socializee or object of this process, the teenager, and teen outcomes which are proposed as the result of this process. Establishing this focal point of interest is particularly important in multi-level analysis since there are so many potential sources of social influence, and because, as in the present model, the conceptualization of model elements (i.e. variables) often hinges upon this theoretical focus.

Second, variable representation from all system levels must be achieved to include the potent and relevant variables, derived both from the literature and from theoretical formulation. The fact that a variable in the literature is reported to have significant correlations in the literature should not qualify it for automatic inclusion - many such variables have low correlations (Peterson & Rollins, 1987), and should be omitted unless inclusion is required for theoretical reasons. The variable list should be
complete with respect to the research objectives, but parsimonious, and the model should adequately represent and explain proposed variable relationships.

Peterson and Rollins (1987) say that much research in the social mold tradition uses only bivariate data and should move toward multivariate modeling (see also Kohn, 1989). More recently, Gecas (1990) has detected precisely this trend. However, in my own literature search I have noted that many multivariate studies begin at the meso level (e.g. the family system) and encompass the individual level. Typically no macro-level variables are included in these studies except for basic societal roles like gender. Other studies begin with macro-level variables and include micro-level variables, but omit intervening or mediating variables. Perhaps more studies might include more meso-level variables by using the "nested contexts" suggested by Diprete and Forristal (1994). Kohn's work (1963, 1973, 1982) is exemplary, in that it begins with macro-level variables such as social class, includes intervening variables such as the quality and character of the job environment, and micro variables such as values and personality. The point is that a lucid multilevel model must create balance by including variables at every level of analysis.

Third, new and improved variables should be used whenever possible. Social class researchers, for instance, have traditionally considered only the husband while determining status for families, yet new measures, which include characteristics of both, show slightly higher correlations with class related behavior, especially with some families, and these differences seem to be increasing with time (Sørensen, 1994). A viable option in this situation would be to use the "dominance" model of status by Erikson (1984), as this research does, which uses the spouse with the higher status to determine family status. In addition to using the most recent and appropriate versions of old variables, new variables derived from theory, theoretical integration, or from the
complex linkages of the multilevel model, may be created. In this research, the new variables of interaction time use and parental interactive subroles will be developed as candidates for inclusion in interactionist multi-level models of research.

Fourth, *multiple perspectives* of actors should be considered. This suggestion is directly derived from symbolic interactionism, but has been demonstrated to have important empirical effects since attitudes and other variables can differ significantly because of respondents' unique perspectives (Starrels, 1992). This affects methodology, and implies that data should be collected from all significant actors in an interactional field. In this research, data will be collected from the teen and each parent, all actors in the parent-teen interactive system.

Fifth, *appropriate use of data* requires avoiding the ecological fallacy, reductionism, or other errors incurred by using data pertaining to one level of analysis to make inferences at another level (Baker, 1994). Avoiding these types of errors is one of the chief advantages for multilevel research. By collecting data at different levels of analysis, types of data may be paralleled or combined more appropriately without making improper leaps of logic.

Sixth, *effective statistical analysis* involves the utilization of proper statistical techniques. Researchers should take advantage of recent advances when possible (e.g. random effects models), but should realize their limitations. Current software does not handle missing data successfully, and it is better to use older models with fixed regressors if missing data is an issue, rather than introducing bias with newer and more complex methods (DiPrete & Forristal, 1994).

Other issues pertaining to all multi-level research and other research in the "social mold tradition" are reviewed succinctly by Peterson and Olsen (1987), such as the need for multiple data collection methods, the avoidance of small and
unrepresentative samples, and the problem of the tyranny of the data. In chapter 2, the
methods chapter, I will explain how this research incorporates each of these
suggestions into the research design. Before presenting and discussing the multi-level
model, I will explain why I chose symbolic interactionism as a basis for this theoretical
framework.

Symbolic Interactionism and Multi-level Analysis

Some of the most promising theoretical work with multilevel models, and
some of the true innovations found in such models, result from applying key concepts
of symbolic interactionism (Fine, 1993; Matsueda, 1992; Peterson & Rollins, 1987)
and other micro-level theories which include a workable conception of social structure
(Cook & Whitmeyer, 1992; Emirbayer & Goodwin, 1994). In this section I will
argue that symbolic interactionism involves two seemingly incongruous elements:
(1) a focus on micro-level interaction as the place where social structure originates and
is most clearly visible, and (2) an assumption that social influence begins at the more
abstract cultural or macro-systems level. An interactionist multi-level model focuses
on the interactional field but will include conceptions of macro-culture, and will specify
how the two are linked. To justify this interpretation and application of symbolic
interactionism, let us consider the multilevel perspective of George Herbert Mead.

Mead is often considered to be the founder of symbolic interactionism, but the
multilevel implications of Mead's ideas have only recently been articulated by those
with an affinity for the symbolic interactionist tradition (Fine, 1993; Smith, 1984;
Strauss, 1978; Stryker, 1980, 1982). This initial omission was due, in part, to the
enormous influence of Herbert Blumer (1969) and others from the Chicago School
who renounced structuralist ties and proclaimed a strident phenomenology of meaning.
While claiming to be the true interpreter of Mead, Blumer misconstrued the elegant balance of Mead's personal-system dualism, omitting most structural implications. While underdeveloped theoretically, Mead's allowance for the ever-present influence of social structure on interpersonal behavior and self-identity was important. Furthermore, his insightful descriptions of *intentionality*, *role taking* and *generalized other* will serve as effective points of intersection between individual, dyadic, and group phenomena, respectively, and facilitate the construction of a truly multilevel theory.

The title of Mead's (1934) book, *Mind, Self and Society*, is truly an ironic title when one considers that he really considered the order of influence to be Society, Self, and Mind. Mead was placing primacy of influence on society, not on the individual. Thus Rosenberg's (1989) assertion that, to symbolic interactionists, "society and self are twin-born," is partially but not completely accurate. Society and self are intertwined, but society generally predominates in influence. What is truly ironic is that the Chicago school under Blumer seemed to swing energetically in the other direction, disregarding Mead's priority on societal influence, and vigorously arguing for unrestricted human agency and freedom. For many years, symbolic interactionism was associated with a radically anti-structuralist position (Fine, 1993). But while Mead spent a good deal of time discussing the mind and micro-level interaction, he was most curious about how society was involved in micro-interaction and how it became a part of the human mind. Let us explore his ideas at the micro-level, and see how society is inextricably involved.

Mead's (1934) view of human nature was strongly influenced by the pragmatism of American philosopher, William James, and alluded to human agency with his concepts of *intentions*, *gestures*, and *lines of action*. Mead was also strongly
influenced by the psychological behaviorism of John Watson, even to the point of naming his developing theory, *social behaviorism*. Like Watson, he believed in the value of studying overt behavior. But he inferred the existence of *intentionality* from his observations of overt behavior, and did not rule out the scientific value of studying cognition as did Watson. Mead theorized that by observing the way that humans and animals seem to adjust their behaviors during interaction, one can determine their goals for acting. Furthermore, certain gestures (smiling, crouching, snarling, clenching one's fist) seem to indicate incipient action. From these gestures, attitudes as well as likely actions could be inferred. Mead viewed human beings as active agents, creatively interacting with their environments for survival and for the pursuit of secondary objectives. Many contemporary theorists, including most symbolic interactionists (Fine, 1993), many network analysts (Cook & Whitmeyer, 1992; Emirbayer & Goodwin, 1994), and other social theorists (Sewell, 1992), support the concept of human agency, and reason that individuals are fully capable of changing social structures.

To Mead (1934), both human agency and societal influence are constituted in the mind. Mead believed that the human mind consists of two functional components: the "I" and the "me." The "I" is the actor, the creative and volitional self. The "me" is the more passive, socialized self, and consists of all of the attitudes and expectations one understands people to have for oneself. The "I" is the active self; the "me" is the reflective self. Through interaction, the "me," much like Freud's concept of the *superego* or social conscience, progressively develops. One might argue that as the socialized "me" develops, spontaneous, volitional behavior becomes less likely, but one must not forget that despite increasing awareness of social attitudes and expectations, the "I" is never dormant, but seeks goals and implements lines of action. Mead's "I"
and "me" are twin facets of the self, and are part of what modern theorists often call identity. The "me," primarily, has been incorporated into role-identity theories (McCall & Simmons, 1966; Stryker, 1966, 1980; Hoelter, 1984).

The relationship between Mead's "I" and "me" in terms of modern measurement has not been well-specified. I view the "me" in two ways: (1) globally, as the summation of important role identities that a person holds for his or her life in general, and (2) situationally, as the salient role identities a person brings to any specific interactive situation. The "me" is the socialized self and represents the internalized and situational influence of society. Cooley's (1902) "looking-glass self" concept also reflects this emphasis. The "I" can represent human agency, for which I will presently make a defense.

Establishing the relative influence of these two forces on behavior is not critical, for human agency does not need to predominate in order to be pivotal. If culture and structure are all-powerful, there is no human agency. If societal influence allows even a window of opportunity for the socialized individual to exert self, then the possibility opens for an infinitely mutable universe, one which is subject, at least in part, to human volition and design. If human agency is a common occurrence, as Giddens (1976) and Sewell (1992) suggest, then a flexible blueprint for multilevel modeling should have bidirectional capabilities. It should be useable for theorists espousing structural influence, for those favoring human agency, and for synthesists who wish to study person-system reciprocity.

Mead's concept of the self cannot be fully understood without knowledge of the next micro-level process, role taking. To be able to understand the implications of Mead's ideas for social structure and human agency, one must comprehend the peculiar twists of logic Mead (1934) uses to explain this central concept in his theoretical
system. Role taking, or "taking the role of the other," refers to imagining the likely behaviors of another person during interaction by understanding the "role" that the other is playing. Anticipating another's behaviors enables one to initiate behaviors and respond in a logical and coordinated way, in other words, to interact smoothly and with a well-orchestrated "conversation of gestures." Furthermore, through practice and interpretation, a person can come to understand how a partner regards oneself and one's own role. So role taking involves anticipation of another's behavior applied to various courses of action one might take through an appreciation of another's perspective on the situation, including the other's perspective about oneself and one's actions. This focus on micro-level interaction made Mead's interactionism very useable to Blumerian interactionists and to cognitive theorists as well (Fine, 1993). They unfortunately missed most of the social-structural implications of this brilliant concept.

What they chose to ignore or underemphasize was the notion that Mead's role taking is a developmental process which progressively invokes social structure. Mead asserted that children pass through three stages of role taking: imitation, play, and game. In the imitation stage a child simply mimics particular actions of a human model (e.g. a parent), without an understanding of this person's larger role in the social system. The human model may encourage imitative action by the child, thereby participating in an interaction ritual which hastens the role-taking process. During the play stage a child interacts with others while each person plays a particular role, and the child can also rehearse single roles in private. Practice involves not only overt behaviors, but the imagination of attitudes and intentions. During the third stage, the game stage, the group and community become involved. A person operating at the highest level of role taking interacts with several people simultaneously, and can understand their collective viewpoint of many things, including himself or herself. To
the extent that a person takes this collective viewpoint, or *generalized other*, into consideration, social structure has been invoked. At this point one realizes that Mead, far from arguing that human actors are free to behave according to their own whims and idiosyncratic desires, is attempting to show how society's rules get involved in imposing form and substance upon micro-level situations.

Mead makes it clear that society predates individuals, and that persons are gradually drawn into the interactive rituals of their society. Smith (1984) also asserts Mead's antinominalism and stress on the collective order. Conversely, it is clear that individuals can behave in ways which change the expectations of others, and ultimately contribute to the changing of social norms and social structure. Mead's concepts of *role taking* and the *generalized other* both imply the existence of a social system which casts a mold over individual behavior, but the mold or pattern is itself sustained through interaction and is receptive to micro-level influence.

There are four distinct ways in which the present research will borrow from symbolic interactionism: (1) an emphasis on multiple and collective realities based on Mead's concept of the "generalized other," (2) an emphasis on dyadic interaction and interactive "role playing," (3) inclusion of "role-identities" as bridges between micro and macro-level phenomena, and (4) conceptualizing self-image in terms of these role-identities, rather than in terms of some inner psychological self which transcends social situations.

It should be recognized that all of Mead's works were published posthumously by his students. Though not articulated with precision by Mead (or his interpreters), his concepts of *I, me, intentionality, role taking* and *generalized other* seem to imply, or are at least compatible with, an ever-widening circle of social systems. Intentionality exists at the individual level and is confirmed through interaction with others, success at
role taking occurs at the dyadic level, and dyadic relationships lead to awareness of the norms and strictures of the generalized other possessed by the group. Individuality is discovered through interaction, dyads and triads lead to small groups, and small groups lead to communities. Each successive social order can have its own interaction rituals, and its own collective norms and viewpoints. Multilevel modeling assumes a similar structure, and a corresponding interactivity among levels of the social order. These systems presuppose each other. Mead's (1934) self-proclaimed "social behaviorism" gives us an idea of the mechanism whereby social levels influence one another. Through interaction rituals, social structure is continually reborn.

A Multi-Level Model of Social Influence

As a preface to introducing the model of social influence, let us develop a clearer meaning of the term, social influence. Most broadly defined, social influence is any process by which the actual or implied presence, sanction or evaluative judgment of any persons or social unit changes the characteristics or behavior of any other person or social unit. These processes may be triggered by overt stimuli in the immediate environment, or by cognitive representations of social stimuli within the actor or the person who is "influenced." Overt social stimuli must necessarily be a part of the present behavioral field, but covert stimuli (i.e. cognitions) may be related to past and future phenomena also. While material cultural artifacts may alter a person's behavior (such as a hand railing mounted on steps), the primary meaning of social influence in this research refers to the direct or interactive influence of other persons.

Social influence can be unilateral or reciprocal. Research models most commonly examine system-to-person social influence, but social analysts may also examine how individuals, even dependent ones (i.e. children), can influence social
superiors (i.e. parents) or social systems (Peterson & Rollins, 1987). Social influence may also refer to how elements at any level of the social order influence specific behaviors such as voting or the likelihood of membership in a particular organization (as in the work of network analysts, see Cook & Whitmeyer, 1992; Emirbayer & Goodwin, 1994). The model of social influence to be presented can be used for any of these types of social influence, but parental socialization is a special type of social influence, and will refer in this research to the unilateral influence of parents, as specific agents of socialization, on generalized outcomes for adolescent children, as specific objects of socialization.

This socialization process first of all refers to a generalized social outcome – the ability and competency of an individual to perform interactively in a social system, to be a functioning part of a society and its subunits. This general ability will be indicated by more particular competencies, such as language ability or social skills, competency in specific role behaviors, and socially useful internalizations of perceived assessments by others (i.e. self-image or self-esteem). In this research, socialization is analyzed unilaterally, from parent to adolescent, even though it is recognized that teens also influence the social systems of which they are a part. The teen outcome variables to be analyzed in this research represent various types of socialization outcomes within the parent-teen social system: quality of parent-teen relationship (a social skills variable), teen self-image (an internalization variable), and school grades (a role performance variable).

Part of the complexity of social influence, and of socialization, stems also from the many elements in the social order which may be points of origination for socializing influence. In analyzing social influence for a particular unit of analysis, or more specific to this research, parental socialization of teenagers, one beginning point is
to identify common sources of socializing influence in the teenager's social system (i.e. a system of significant variables), and to examine how these variables or sources of influence are located or imbedded within the broader social context.

We have discussed how symbolic interactionism, while focusing on micro-level interaction, incorporates a dynamic conception of social order through role playing and role-identities, and provides a suitable starting point for developing a multi-level theory. But social context *per se*, while essential to Mead's work, is not well developed, nor are the linkages among system levels well-specified. A multilevel sociology should first be well-grounded theoretically (Alexander, 1988; Kohn, 1989), but this should include making "the links" between groups and phenomena at different levels (Kalleberg, 1989). But what are the discrete levels of the social order, and how do they interrelate?

We also need a clearer conception of the macro-level social order. After beginning with a review of symbolic interactionism which emphasizes micro-level interaction, jumping to the discussion of macro-level phenomena may seem like a peculiar strategy. We must remember, however, that Mead implied that social influence upon the individual originates with the larger culture. Thus we will continue our literature review of theories creating and supporting the model with macro-level theories and work our way back down toward the micro-level. Theories will be presented in this order: systems theory, social ecology, role types, structural transformation theory, network analysis, and structural symbolic interactionism, or role-identity theory. As these theories are presented, it may be helpful to refer to Figure 2.1 (next page): A Multi-Level Model of Social Influence. In general, the presentation of theories will proceed from left, most general consideration, to right, most specific application, on this chart.
Figure 2.1. A Multi-Level Model of Social Influence.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE TYPES</th>
<th>SYSTEM-LEVEL VARIABLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Roles</td>
<td>Industrialization, Political Economy, Nation, Region, Community, Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Class, Work force participation, Society-wide affiliations, political party, social action organizations, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Roles</td>
<td>Organizational Types &amp; Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social participation &amp; involvement, Quality &amp; Nature of Work Environment, Satisfaction with Job or Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Roles</td>
<td>Social Cohesion, Boundary Maintenance, Social Control, Perceived Social Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Roles</td>
<td>Interpersonal &amp; Communication, Socialization, Power-assertion, Discipline, Dependence, Equity, Objects &amp; Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Roles</td>
<td>Dyadic Interaction, Behavioral Exchange, Small group processes, Crowd behavior, Communication, Stimulus-response, Socialization, Power-assertion, Discipline, Dependence, Equity, Objects &amp; Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role-Identities</td>
<td>Interactive Time Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification with and evaluation of all salient Social Roles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

is borrowed from Bronfenbrenner's (1979) social ecological model of the social order. Social roles includes basic roles, status roles, group roles, and value roles. Cognitive schemas or cultural templates for social roles which actors can appropriate in the social field for interaction. A red characteristic of dynamic interaction, commonly used for specific types of personal characteristics, All Social Roles Types, Achievement, Intelligence, Self-esteem, Role-Identities, Attitudes, Values, Beliefs, Perceptions.
Social Systems Theory

Social systems theory, sometimes called *structural functionalism*, analyzes the groups, institutions, and elements of society, and specifies their interrelationships (Robin, 1981). Writings from this perspective are so wide-ranging and exhaustive, I will not even pretend to give them a representative summary here. Instead, I will focus on key elements of the following topics which will aid in the construction of the present multi-level model: the social system, the individual, and relations between individual and social system.

The society or social system is the focal point of interest for most systems theorists (Farganis, 1993; Ritzer, 1993). Views of micro-level interaction and individual behavior are certainly a part of this perspective, but they flow from prior assumptions about the social system and its functioning. A social system can be any structure which consists of interrelating social elements, where elements are individuals, small groups, institutions, or entire societies. Monette, Sullivan, and DeJong (1990) list three types of social systems commonly included in research: the individual (conceived of as a system of interrelating elements), the group, and the organization. Parsons (1951) and others would certainly add society as another social system.

The fact that social systems can be differentiated in terms of size and social ecology is the most important point here for our purposes. Our model of social influence includes five types of social systems (see the left-hand column of Figure 2.1): the societal system, the institutional system, the small group system, the interactional system, and the individual system. Each system is comprised of internally interacting elements, and each system interacts with, and constitutes or is constituted by, other systems.
Talcott Parsons, the leading voice of structural-functionalism for over two decades, greatly contributed to the literature on social systems (Ritzer, 1983). Parsons emphasized society as "an entity unto itself," and was perhaps best known for specifying the functions of system elements for the overall society. He believed that all systems are characterized by four system imperatives: adaptations, goal attainment, integration, and latency (Farganis, 1993). Parsons believed that all systems exhibit both structure and functions. Structures are long-lasting and persistent. They are features of social systems which are not easily altered in the context of specific encounters or interactions, but serve as enduring, common reference points. Functions, on the other hand, are more temporary, mutable, and "mediate" between society's structure and contingencies of the "environing system." In this view, socialization is a function of society. There are many ways to do it, and the form of socialization may change from encounter to encounter, but all enduring social systems must include some method of socialization which prepares members for their places in the social system.

This brings us to the systemic viewpoint of the human actor. Actors are seen as elements of the social system, and as such are expected to contribute to the overall functions of system maintenance. Actors have positions or statuses in the system, and social roles with attached behavior expectations (Robin, 1981). Role-differentiation in virtually every society is ascribed by differences of age, sex, class or occupation in a manner which benefits the operation of society (Aberle, Cohen, Davis, Levy & Sutton, 1950). Thus, actors are often viewed in terms of how they affect the composition and functioning of society, not simply as entities to describe for their own sake. Humans are system elements. They contribute to role-differentiation and role-assignment, which of course, is a system initiated activity. Sanctions are used to help people follow
the rules (Aberle, et al., 1950), but sanctions are viewed only as a "second line of defense" (Ritzer, 1983). For some reason not explicitly specified by most systems theorists, persons are assumed to conform to expectations as a matter of course. Parsons, for instance, wrote about actors as physical beings with organic drives (conceptualized as instincts or biological energy), but he placed more stress and analytic attention on their "needs-dispositions," those aspects of personality which can be shaped by the social system. Once in place, needs-dispositions become motivational, giving the actor the energy to perform acceptably in each social situation (Ritzer, 1983).

This view of the human actor consists largely of sociability, passivity and conformity. Some have argued that Parsons did not regard "human beings as oversocialized cultural robots, or that indeed, there ever was any need to bring concrete men and women 'back into' his view of the social universe" (Williams, 1980). Indeed, Parsons said that his views on human agency were "analytic," and not to be taken "concretely" (Parsons, 1951), but the fact remains that, for the purposes of his theoretical model, actors generally conform to expectations. Humans are prone to accept social norms and shared understandings, and to abide by the consensual agreements which constitute rule-following and community living (Farganis, 1993). Even deviance was seen to result from strains and inconsistencies of the social system, not agency or intentionality on the part of the human actor. Parson's conception of the individual is incomplete and underdeveloped, probably because he was never really interested developing a theory of the individual, but of social systems (Ritzer, 1983).

Now let us consider the social systems perspective on how social systems and humans interrelate. Social systems theory implies that organizations have precedence over individuals. In a recent article entitled, The Logic of Macrosociology, Amos Hawley (1992) argues that no civilized individual has ever experienced a solitary
existence; all of us have been born into pre-existing cultural contexts. Being a member of society also implies connectedness. It also implies being responsive to demands made by specific others and to generalized social norms. Macro analyses assume cultural and organizational primacy, and through various methodologies, examine the imputed effects of social structure on individuals (Hawley, 1992). Parsons (1951) believed that social structures "interpenetrate" social fields of interaction and individual actors. In his words, "We wish to state in a preliminary way a fundamental proposition about the structure of social systems - that their structure as treated within the frame of reference of action consists in institutionalized patterns of normative culture. It consists in components of the organisms or personalities of the participating individuals only so far as these 'interpenetrate' with the social and cultural systems, i.e., are 'internalized' in the personality and organism of the individual" (p. 214). This is a fairly good description of the systemic view of socialization. Socialization is a system imperative, functional for survival of the system. Socialization passes from social structure through societal agents to the person being socialized. Let us now consider a more relational viewpoint on the macro-structure of society.

Bronfenbrenner's Social Ecological Model

Bronfenbrenner's (1979) social ecology of human development is an interesting theory for present purposes because, while it is ostensibly a typology of the social order, it has taken its focus to be the development of children. It should serve just as well for adolescents. Bronfenbrenner constructed this model based on what he called the social ecology of human development. If ecology locates organisms within their life-sustaining habitat, and analyzes the interrelationships between elements of that environment which produce and sustain life, so social ecology locates individuals
within the social order of society and identifies the key factors which create human life and sustain its development.

Bronfenbrenner (1979) proposed a four-tier social ecological typology of the social order, including the macro, exo, meso, and micro-system levels. The *macrosystem* consists of the overarching institutional and structural patterns of the broader culture or subculture, including historical and economic trends, social forces, and the legal or political environment. The *exosystem* refers to more general settings which influence children indirectly, such as a parent's workplace, or the stability of the neighborhood. The *mesosystem* is comprised of social contexts where the child directly participates and occupies social roles, such as in the family, at school, in church, or as a member of a friendship clique in the neighborhood. The *microsystem* consists of the parent-child system which contains critical life-giving, life-sustaining relationships. Direct interaction, intimacy, and attachment are key elements of this system. Placement of these levels on the model of social influence (see the left-hand column of Figure 2.1) overlaps the previously described societal systems.

Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) typology is qualitatively different from the systems approach in one key respect. Whereas systems theory starts with a conception of the social system and defines the individual with relation to the system, Bronfenbrenner's scheme defines the social system in relation to the individual. The key aspect of categorizing elements of the environment into macro, exo, meso, or micro levels, respectively, is not any characteristic of the social system such as its size or constitution. Rather, system elements are placed into levels with respect to the individual's mode of interacting with them. Perhaps this perspective stems from the fact that Bronfenbrenner was a psychologist who seemed to view social phenomena from the individual's point of view.
Bronfenbrenner's ideas also have interesting implications for the methodology of data collection and analysis. Accepted methodology often distinguishes between the unit of analysis, or the person, group or entity whose characteristics are being measured, and the unit of observation, the person, group or entity from whom or which information is collected (Babbie, 1990). The units of analysis and observations are often one and the same, as in a teenager self-reporting his grades in school. In multilevel analysis, however, the two are commonly different. For instance, a teenager (unit of observation) might report about the size of his or her family (unit of analysis). In some complex research methodologies (as in this one), there will be more than one unit of observation (in this case, there will be three - teen, mother, and father), and perhaps several units of analysis (the teen, the mother, the father, the parent-teen dyad, the family). Bronfenbrenner's child-oriented typology has stimulated me to introduce a new term for purposes of our present theoretical endeavor, the unit of interest. The unit of interest, in multi-level theory, can be conceptualized as the person, group, or entity in a complex social system whose behavior or characteristics are being studied or explained by the theory as something separate from the unit of analysis or unit of observation.

All theory must first have a focus, an image or perspective of what is to be explained. For the present research, the focal point of discussion, the unit of interest, is the parent-teen interactive process, conceptualized as socialization. Secondarily, the focus is the socializee or object of this process, the teenager, and teen outcomes which are arguably the result of this process. Establishing the unit of interest is particularly important in multi-level analysis since there are so many potential social elements on which one could focus, and because, in the present model, the conceptualization of other model elements hinges upon this focus. The focus of Bronfenbrenner's scheme
is similar in that the child is the focal point of interest. Since the teen is the unit of interest in this study, Bronfenbrenner's levels will apply to him or her, not to the parents. So social participation in the meso-system will refer to the teen's participation in friendship cliques, school groups, and community activities. Features of parental employment and work environment are in the teen's exo-system, since he or she experiences these influences indirectly.

For an interactionist theory of social influence, Bronfenbrenner's typology is very useful. The key focus is not on the system, but on how the system interacts with individuals. The environment itself is defined not in its own terms, but in terms of the individual and the micro-situation. Furthermore, we have the implied concept of intermediary agents. For instance, an individual does not directly participate in his or her exo-system, but a parent often does. Thus we can examine not only direct influence, but influence mediated through significant others. We now turn to Turner's (1990) ideas of social roles, which also suggest a more interactive link between social actors and various levels of their social environment.

**Turner's Theory of Role Types**

Turner (1990) discusses four types of social roles: basic roles, status roles, group roles, and value roles. Basic roles, like gender, age, ethnicity, and in some cases, religion or subculture, are society-wide and have a recognizable effect in virtually every social encounter. Status roles, like being president, janitor, secretary, father, or child, are attached to particular organizational settings or groups and have particular relevance in those groups. Group roles are roles such as facilitator, mediator, or devil's advocate, and are tied to group settings but display temporary functionality. Value roles, like hero, traitor, criminal, and daddy's little angel, embody confirmation or
negation of some social value. These concepts are adaptations and elaborations of Turner's (1962) earlier and highly influential concept of *role-making*, which emphasizes the creative and volitional aspects of role performance. Many systems theorists such as Sewell (1992) agree with Turner that social roles provide guidance for behavior but are not structurally deterministic. Robin and Bosco (1981) describe social roles as prescribing norms for action but not completely predicting behavior, giving orientation to a situation rather than providing an inflexible script.

The middle section of the model (Figure 2.1) lists and illustrates Turner's (1990) types of social roles, and loosely connects them to the system levels from which they originate. Once in existence, these social roles (operating as cultural schemas within the person and in the interactive field) may drift upward and downward through system levels. The cultural templates for age roles exist at the societal level, but a small group (i.e. family) might celebrate a rite of passage (i.e. birthday) and alter an age role for a person. If the event of the birthday is communicated by the family to the school system or to a government office, the form of this role will have been changed at the institutional and societal levels, but its alteration originated with, and its permanence resides within, the family.

Status and group roles relate in similar ways to their corresponding system levels, but value roles, interactive subroles, and role-identities are different. Firstly, these roles may easily originate at any level of the system, but they tend to be most active at the level where they have been placed. For instance, let's consider value roles and how they might be created by different levels of the system. A government might award a soldier with a Purple Heart badge of honor, or label him as a traitor to the state; a school might place a student on probation, or designate him or her as an honor scholar; and a family might view a member as an achiever, a troublemaker, or
"momma's little helper." Even though this is the case with value roles, they are placed at the small group level because it is here that these labels will be most commonly used and perpetuated. A government may award a badge of honor, but a family or peer group will often keep this designation alive long after the rest of society may have forgotten. Furthermore, there are legions of temporary value roles which are created on the spot in small group contexts during interaction (witness children playing and engaging in continual name-calling and altercasting). Nevertheless, the match is not perfect. Yet the including of value roles in the model will retain an awareness of this important source of dynamic social influence.

Sewell's Structural Transformation Theory

Before the final two role types on the model (Figure 2.1) are described, interactive roles/subroles and role-identities, we must consider William Sewell's (1992) theory of structural transformation. Sewell's theory is based on the apparent contradiction between all-pervasive structural influence and effective human agency. Can they co-exist? Does one not negate the other?

Sewell (1992) cogently argues that numerous and often contradictory social influences, coupled with unique situations and individual inconsistencies, provide for human agency. Social structure does not exist concretely in time and space but only in a "virtual" sense, as "memory traces" which are reproducible by human action. Taking Giddens (1976) theory of structuration as a starting point, Sewell concurs that "human agency and structure, far from being opposed, in fact presuppose each other" (p. 4). Social influence is not only reciprocal, in the sense of "structure" and "actor" taking turns in applying influence, but this dualism occurs simultaneously and in a highly
integrated fashion. To both Giddens and Sewell, this is possible due to the nature of culture and structure.

Structure consists of both schemas and resources. Schemas are memory traces, mental representations of culture and past interaction, that each actor brings into each new situation. They are "rules" of conduct which may be replicated precisely (in rare cases), reproduced in adaptive and creative ways (in most situations), or rejected out of hand. In this manner, human creativity is involved (in terms of adaptive innovations) even in situations where cultural patterns are reproduced, and the very process which permits structural reproduction also allows for structural transformation. And one must consider that in most situations, there exists an "overlay" of rules or schemas, a culturally provided repertoire of options from which a person may choose one schema, two or more schemas, or several in combination.

This does not imply total flexibility of behavior, however, for resources also enter the picture. Rejecting Lévi-Strauss's apathy to social power, both Giddens (1976) and Sewell (1992) acknowledge the presence of social power in interactions. To them, power and resources are closely linked. In Sewell's words, "resources are anything that can serve as a source of power in social interaction" (p. 9). There are human resources such as height, strength, humor, fear, knowledge, and authority, and nonhuman resources such as land, factories, guns, and a coveted piece of bubble gum. The existence of actual or perceived power makes enactment of some schemas more beneficial, or more costly, than others. While not completely determining behavior in most situations, the presence of resources does create likelihoods and probabilities. The overlay of structural forces on an individual thus displays a hierarchy of influence.

Since nonhuman resources have a physical presence, one might think of them as being actual (as opposed to schemas being virtual). But Sewell stresses the
"duality" of schemas and resources. First, they both can lead to each other; they demonstrate reciprocity. A schema of a hammer can lead a person to create one; the sight of a hammer creates and reinforces a schema. The second aspect of Sewell's (1992) concept of duality regards the double nature of nonhuman resources. While a hammer is an actual object existing in time and space, it is also a schema. In symbolic interactionist terms, it has meaning. To Sewell, all resources exhibit polysemy, or a multiplicity of meaning. That is, unlike Plato's idealized forms, a hammer, or a chair, or a mailman do not all have the same mental representations for all people at all times. The meanings of resources stem from their use. In this respect Sewell's ideas parallel those of Mead, who believed that the meaning of an object for a person is related to function. Through the process of interaction, shared meanings arise. A person may variably see a hammer as something which has always hung on the wall, something with which an uncle pounds nails, or something arousing sympathy from friends as blunt steel meets thumb.

Through experience, schemas are formed; through shared experience, common schemas are created; through interaction, schemas and resources (that is, social structures, see Sewell, 1992) are reproduced or transformed for all participants in the immediate social situation, and for those indirectly affected as well. Thus schemas and resources sustain each other, and individual behavior shapes and is shaped by social structure. This reciprocity is both marvelous and paradoxical. Knowledge of normative patterns permits choice. Awareness of constraining influences permits both conformity and deviance. And, if Sewell (1992) is correct, even as societal influences become most numerous, so free will can increase proportionally. Other micro-level theorists agree. Emirbayer and Goodwin (1994) assert, "Individual autonomy is only made possible by the sheer multiplicity of structures - societal as well as cultural -
within which social actors are situated at any given moment" (p. 1444). This assumes, of course, that the threat or exercise of social power (a cultural resource) is not a significant inhibitor.

Sewell's (1992) theory of structural transformation can easily be integrated with social systems and symbolic interactionist conceptions of roles. According to Sewell and Giddens (1976) each social role, or idealized script for behavior, is a schema. Schemas are generally provided by the broader social context and are specifically modified and internalized through recurring interaction. Each person brings to any situation the cultural schemas for several social roles which might be played, or several schemas about different ways of playing the same social role. A person enacts a schema for a social role, or enacts several schemas, or creates a novel adaptation. In the act of playing the role, resources are created or manipulated in normative or innovative ways, and the role performance reinforces or alters the schema that others hold for that social role, and that the actor himself holds as he reflects on his own performance. In this manner a person is conforming to the system by utilizing appropriate schemas or templates for behavior, even while exercising human agency and creativity while doing so.

With the explication of Sewell's theory, interactive roles and interactive subroles may be explained as newly created concepts for this model. Consider the social role of "father." In Turner's terms, this is a status role in the family. There are general dimensions of parenting such as expressing love, applying discipline, and providing practical and emotional support. Some of these general dimensions stem from family sex roles (see Parsons, 1950). These are dimensions which transcend many types of specific situations. There are also more specific aspects of being a father, though, which seem to be modeled upon the mental schemas for other social
roles. When a father hires a teen to rake leaves or mow the lawn, one could argue that he is enacting the cultural template of "boss" to organize his interactions with his child. When he drives the teen to baseball practice or swim team, he enacts the role of "chauffeur." There are many such cultural schemas which can be appropriated for use within another major social role.

One might think of the total list of cultural role schemas as a person's role repertoire. A person who enacts a major social role during interaction is playing an interactive role. A person who, while playing a major role, borrows from his role repertoire to enact a minor social role, embedded within the performance of the major role, plays an interactive subrole. Because many situations give conflicting cues as to which role one might play, or because human wishes may be to structure an interaction in one way or another, the performance of interactive roles and subroles is not automatic. By analyzing which interactive roles and subroles a person chooses to perform, and with what frequency, an analyst may differentiate one actor from another with respect to how they conceptualize a social role, or how they wish to play it. Subroles, and constellations of subroles, can then become variables for use within a multilevel research model (see Sanders, 1995a, 1995b, 1995c).

In principle, these variables are traceable from Turner's (1962) concept of role-making. In form, they are based upon Gidden's (1976, 1979, 1984) and Sewell's (1992) concepts of mental schemas which, along with cultural resources, form the social structure. With respect to the present model of social influence, interactive roles and subroles, along with role-identities, can originate at any system level, but they tend to reside and be most influential at the levels where they have been placed. Interactive roles which are enacted during interaction, for instance, may be gender roles which originate in society, or a status role relating to one's job at work, or a value role
imposed by a small group. However, the reason they are called interactive roles or subroles is precisely because, regardless of their point of origination, they have been employed in the behavioral field.

**Network Analysis**

Many network analysts offer similar explanations of the inseparable connections between social structure and human agency. Emirbayer and Goodwin (1994) assert, "Human agency as we conceptualize it, entails the capacity of socially embedded actors to appropriate, reproduce, and, potentially, to innovate upon received cultural categories and conditions of action in accordance with their personal and collective ideals, interests, and commitments." (pp. 1442-1443). Network analysis carries the significance of social roles even further. From this perspective, occupying a social role is an indicator of participation in a social network. In espousing the *anticategorical imperative*, they reject perspectives which claim behavior is simply due to categorical attributes of actors. Rather, they assert that roles are intricately related to actors' involvements with "structured social relations." The concept of "role" is reconceptualized in relational terms.

This view is compatible with Bronfenbrenner's view of social ecology, which defines system levels in terms of social participation (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). For instance, the distinction between *mesosystem* and *exosystem* is largely due to whether or not the actor directly participates. One variant of network analysis, "positional analysis," analyzes the relations of actors to third parties, not to each other (Emirbayer & Goodwin, 1994). In a manner similar to the elaboration model of structuralists, they attempt to define and analyze "blocks" of actors, or persons who are equally positioned in the social system. However, it is not their position in the structure *per se* which...
influences behavior, but the nature of their ties to groups and networks. Network analysis is also highly compatible with multi-level theorizing, because they assert that relevant units of analysis can shift between individuals, dyads, triads, groups of various sizes, and even whole communities. Like Simmel (1955), this perspective claims that one cannot understand either individual or group behavior independent of the other. But, rather than examining each in sequence, the focus should be on the interrelations between person and social structures.

The concepts of roles and role playing thus allow for the convergence of many theoretical formulations. One final theory used in the model, role identity theory, also discusses the impact of social roles. This time the influence of social roles, in a manner reminiscent of Parson's needs-dispositions, is hypothesized to be most active in the individual system, shaping a person's self-image and supplying a basis for action.

Role-Identity Theory

McCall and Simmons (1966), Stryker (1980), and Hoelter (1984), among others, have developed the construct of "role-identities" to explain how the socialized component of the personality Mead (1934) referred to as the "me" becomes structured by society. Stryker (1980) refers to role-identities within a larger theoretical framework he calls, structural symbolic interactionism. He suggests that, in theoretical congruence with all symbolic interactionism, social structure does not influence behavior directly, but only as mediated through the interpretive processes of participating actors. In distinction from some traditions of symbolic interactionism, however, which stress a phenomenological approach (i.e. Blumer, 1969), Stryker's theory also suggests that interaction is not completely fluid and particularistic (as Blumer suggested), but often structured according to the normative constraints of social position and social roles.
Stryker accepts the reality and influence of social structural elements in the behavioral field, but rejects the static determinism which is sometimes implied by such conceptions. The manner in which social class might influence a parent's socializing behavior may not be uniform in degree, nor even in direction. The choices of parents, and the meanings and interpretations they bring to their roles, will moderate and perhaps reverse the influence of social structural factors on parenting styles. However, Stryker rejects the unpatterned particularism implied by some symbolic interactionists. Individual meanings and modes of interaction may be the subject matter, but that does not preclude patterns from emerging, some of which may be related to social class, employment status, and other structural variables. Furthermore, social-structural influences may become more apparent if appropriate intervening variables are employed, intervening variables which are based upon the choices individuals make within the constraints of their social situations (i.e. individual variations in role performance).

As a member of the symbolic interactionism family, structural symbolic interactionism is relatively recent. Stryker (1980) implies that this approach, which seeks to integrate structural and interactional explanations of behavior, is predicated on the following principles.

1. Social structure is an important element in the behavioral field. Stryker asserts that interaction is not completely fluid and particularistic (as Blumer suggested), but often structured according to the normative constraints of social position and social roles.

2. Social structure does not influence behavior directly, but only as mediated through interpretive processes. Social structure is represented by idealized conceptions of behavioral exchange in the minds of participating actors.
3. Complementary roles are important idealized patterns which mutually constrain behavior. (The roles of parent and child are considered to be reciprocal; that is, their very existence is dependent upon the existence of the other.)

4. Socialization is a generalized process involved in virtually every interaction through which perceived roles and idealized patterns serve as reference points for attempts at behavioral altercasting. Symbolic cues manipulated by actors in every interaction tend to shape the behavior of the other in conformity to idealized role patterns.

5. Social structure consequently plays a critical role in interaction, but its role is not determinative. Rather, its role is influential, and subject to the existence of multiple applicable social roles from which actors may choose, and to the numerous and infinitely flexible interpretations of individual actors.

6. A symbolic interactional approach does not preclude traditional research methods such as hypothesis testing and statistical analysis.

Stryker's approach is not representative of all symbolic interactionists, and he freely admits that there are "... varieties of symbolic interactionists" (1980:51). For this research, however, Stryker's role theory is particularly useful because, far from being astructural, family processes are highly structured, at least in the sense of the permanence of status habitation. In many situations of life, the clerk with whom we interact in the store ceases to be a clerk when he or she steps out from behind the counter and takes off the company uniform. No such transformation occurs with the roles of parent and child. In that respect, "... these reflexively applied positional designations, which become part of the 'self,' create internalized expectations with regard to their own behavior" (p. 54). Stryker's focus on interactional patterns then, is a
key factor in not only understanding relationships but also in shaping self-perception, both of which are vital ingredients in any theory of socialization.

The Generalized Model of Social Influence

The generalized model of social influence (Figure 2.1), has already been discussed through the presentation of theories which undergird its integrated approach. Yet there are some other points to make about the organization of the model, pertaining to the three basic elements of the model: system levels, role types, and system-level variables.

System Levels

The theoretical origins of the two overlapping systems typologies have already been noted as coming from systems theory (Monette, et al., 1990; Parsons, 1951) and social ecology (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). However, the relations between the systems have not been well-specified. The relationship between Bronfenbrenner's four ecological levels and the systems view of social structure (society, institutions, groups, individuals) is not isomorphic, although there will usually be substantial overlap. From the systems perspective, for instance, the distinction between small groups and institutions primarily involves size, and perhaps certain group characteristics and contrasts (primary vs. secondary groups, informal vs. formal groups, etc.). While most institutions are related to individuals as "exosystems" (involving indirect influence but not direct participation), and many small groups which affect individuals are "mesosystems" (involving direct participation and influence), the correspondence is not exact. If the unit of interest is a husband, then office associates who regularly eat lunch with him (i.e. small group level) would be in this person's "mesosystem," because he
is a direct participant. But a wife's AA support group, while formally a part of the small group level, would belong to the husband's "exo-system," exerting only indirect influence through his wife.

Level and breadth of participation may also determine the relational status of various groups to the individual. So if a woman is an administrator in a school system (an institution consisting of many small groups), and if she has frequent contact with many classes, teacher's associations, and so forth in this system, the school would serve as part of her "meso-system" since she has direct contact with many elements of this institution. A student in this same school (with minimal contact with various elements of the system, and certainly less contact with the sources of power) would experience the school system as an "exosystem," but any small groups in which she participates (classes, clubs, sports teams) would be in her "meso-system."

Finally, I propose a gradient of influence based on proximity of the levels. Adjacent levels are hypothesized to have greater measurable influence on each other, and more distant levels will have weaker influence. Effects of the macro-level on the micro-level will generally be mediated through intervening levels and variables. This will be more true when system characteristics are measured with the equivalent system as the unit of analysis. For instance, when industrialization is the variable of comparison between two countries, effects on individual behavior (e.g. parenting behavior) will be small or negligible. When a person's social class is the variable of comparison, however, since this is conceptualized not in system-level terms but in terms of how the individual relates to the system, somewhat greater effects may be noticed, but social class effects will still not be as pertinent to individual behavior as will the effects of intervening variables.
Role Types

Turner's (1990) role types have also been previously discussed, but I would like to make a proposition about their interrelationships. I propose that, unlike the gradient hypothesis with system-level variable effects, role-based effects need not diminish with distance in the system hierarchy. This is proposed since the roles a person plays, unlike system variables which become diluted through intervening influences, retain their distinct meaning in all system levels and become more directly incorporated into interactive situations. A person's gender role, for instance, even though it originates in broad form through the larger culture, is still a potent identity at each level of the system hierarchy. This is not to say that all personal roles will have equal effects. On the contrary, work on identity salience (Stryker, 1982; Hoelter, 1983) indicate that some role identities are more important than others to a person, and do indeed have greater effects. Thus gender may have greater cross-level effects than age or job status, but the salience of identities is generally hypothesized to be independent of the sequence of system levels.

System-Level Variables

Pertaining to the first model, because each multilevel research will employ a different theoretical focus, specification of system-level variables is for illustration only. The first variables listed are those for which the units of analysis correspond to system entities (e.g. "industrialization" is a characteristic of the societal system). Variables listed after the double slash (//) and preceded by a small circle (•) are variables which designate the relationship of the individual to those system entities ("social class" locates individuals in the societal class structure). The model shown includes many variables which are fairly common in the literature for each system level, but each
research will contain its own variables based on the goals for the research. In general, there are two credible sources for constructs and concomitant variables which can be used in multi-level modeling: the research literature, and newly created variables. Variables from the research literature may be used without revision if none is deemed necessary, or they may be adapted for theoretical or logistic reasons.

Adapted variables and newly created variables have a special function in multi-level modeling. Each new theoretical formulation, because of its unique perspective, lends itself to variable creation or reformulation. Interactionist multilevel theory (and other new versions of multilevel theories) will suggest their own adaptations and creations. There are several reasons for this. One reason for this is that multilevel models will necessarily involve saturated data collection instruments, and with a great number of variables to study, some lengthy scales and indexes may need to be shortened for practical reasons. This is a common practice in research. Another source of new or revised variables will be new synthetics, emergent variables. Individuals' relationships with various social systems suggest new roles to be studied, new achievement indices, new perceptions of these roles, and new types of consequences. Styled after network analysis, many new interactive settings may be affected by actors' third-party relationships with a variety of social systems and elements (Emirbayer & Goodwin, 1994).

For interactionist versions of multilevel models, some new variables will come from the existence of multiple relations between individuals, or multiple perspectives of the situation. A final source of new variables is the theoretical framework of the research. One variable listed on the model as a "field variable" is "interactive time use." While only a few studies have used even similar variables (Smith, 1986; Nock & Kingston, 1987, 1988), none have operationalized this variable as in this research with...
parents and adolescents. Consistent with the theme of the broader perspective yielded by multi-level modeling, interactive time use was conceptualized in terms of the overall patterns of time use between parents and adolescents, and categories and measurements of this variable were established through prior use of grounded theory techniques (Glaser & Strauss, 1977). Again, departure from tradition was made in the name of theoretical development.

Finally, this model was designed to allow for reciprocal influence between social actors and social systems. These influences can be conceptualized not only as bi-directional, but as multi-directional. System-individual effects will probably remain as the most common perspective. However, there is no reason why research designs, especially longitudinal designs (Huber, 1990), should not be able to use this framework to examine the influence that individuals and micro-systems have on higher-order social structures. Multi-directional system effects should also be examined where possible, such as by considering the entire family-role system (Peterson & Rollins, 1987). In the present research, the model will be used for system-to-person, unidirectional influence, as is most common in family research (Peterson & Rollins, 1987).

The Multi-level Model of Parent-Teen Socialization

Figure 2.2 presents a Model of Parent-Teen Socialization, an applied version of the multi-level model we have previously discussed. The basic form of the model is unaltered, but substantive details of roles and variables have been applied to fit the parent-teen interactive system. These variables, as previously described, have been derived both from the research literature and from the present theoretical integration.
Figure 2.2. A Multi-Level Model of Parent-Teen Socialization.
The remainder of this chapter will present the theoretical and empirical justifications for including key variables at each system level.

Since Bronfenbrenner's typology of macro, exo, meso, and micro-systems was developed to emphasize person-system relationships and is a basic organizing tool for the present model, we will use this scheme to organize the presentation of theories and variables, beginning with the macro-level.

**Macro and Exo-System Variables**

**Social Class**

*Social class* is an important contextual variable to include in macro-micro models (Peterson & Rollins, 1987). As an example of research which indicates the influence of social structural factors on socialization, Melvin Kohn's (1959a) research on the influence of social class and parental occupation on child-rearing values, and attempts to validate his research model, are exemplary (Kohn, 1959a, 1959b, 1963, 1976, 1981; Kohn & Schooler, 1969, 1973; Wright & Wright, 1976; Coburn & Edwards, 1976). The link between Coleman's (1974) historical theory of the decline of family influence and Kohn's studies is clear. If parental influence declines with industrialization, studying the parenting styles of families located at different strata of industrialized society becomes essential for understanding the differential effects of industrialization on family interaction.

While not explicitly tied to time and place (several replications of Kohn's work have occurred in other countries), Kohn's work is intrinsically tied to the structure of industrial society. Not only is his middle-class versus working-class distinction related to the present class structure under industrialism, but so also is the emphasis on
occupation as a determinant of values. The genius of Kohn's work is in suggesting one way in which the larger social structure, through the social class of the family and parental occupation, influences micro-level variables of interaction such as the types of values which are transmitted from parent to child. The factors of social class and occupational environment were found to be significantly related to the qualities parents preferred in their children. Middle-class and working-class parents were found to emphasize, respectively, the values of "self-direction" and "conformity" with their children. The nature of the parent's occupation was also found to be correlated with these value constellations. While Kohn's theory is intriguing and intuitively satisfying, there is recent evidence that his findings (and their theoretical implications) may be less substantial than they first appear.

Kohn discovered that class-related parental values have at least two tangible effects. First, parents' values correspond to values in their children. This relationship was found by Kohn to be even stronger in recent studies than in the past (Kohn, Slomczynski, & Shenbach, 1986). Second, there is at least one indication that differences in parental values might be associated with differences in overt parental behavior, which would constitute direct evidence for differences in socialization techniques.

Kohn found that middle-class parents tend to discipline their children on the presumed intent of their children's actions, while working-class parents have a tendency to punish based on consequences. This does seem to correspond to the value clusters of "self-direction" and "conformity." A middle-class parent emphasizing self-direction applies sanctions if a child deliberately intends to misbehave or cause trouble; a working-class parent valuing conformity will discipline according to consequences - if something gets broken or attracts negative attention. However, Kohn reports an association only between social class and style of discipline, not between parental values and style of
discipline. The relationship between values and discipline style has not been established directly, only implied. We may not infer from two established correlations, A-B and A-C (between social class and values, and social class and discipline style), that B and C are necessarily related (values and discipline style). Yet Kohn's finding is suggestive, and harbors the possibility that class-related differences in parental discipline may lead to class-related differences in other spheres of parent-child interaction.

Kohn's findings of class-related parental values have been replicated on several occasions and in several countries. Unfortunately, the two independent studies which have juxtaposed parental values with the values of children (Looker & Pineo, 1983; Johnson, 1991) have failed to find a significant correlation. In Looker and Pineo's study, while parents showed a preference for class-related values with regard to their children (a simple replication of Kohn's work), middle-class adolescents did not choose "self-directive" value clusters significantly more than their working-class counterparts did. Johnson's study (1991) failed to find a significant correlation even between sets of parental values.

There are two disturbing implications of these findings. First, class-related differences in values may be statistically significant yet not theoretically meaningful or practically important. Kohn's correlations were significant statistically but represent only a negligible difference between middle-class and working-class preferences. Johnson (1991) reports that Kohn's correlations only vary from .06 to .20, a range which spans about 0% to 4% of the variance in responses between middle-class and working-class parents. Significant differences were not reached through marked discrepancies in parental preferences but rather as a function of the large sample sizes used in the research (which accentuated small differences in subpopulation means). This might explain why Kohn, who used extremely large samples, obtained significant
results while Johnson (with an N of 270) did not. It also suggests that class-related value differences between middle-class and working-class parents is a minor statistical artifact only, not an important substantive discovery.

Second, the failure of both Looker & Pineo's (1983) and Johnson's (1991) studies to find value differences between middle-class and working-class children undermines an important part of Kohn's argument. Kohn believes that examining parental values holds the key to understanding a crucial aspect of socialization - how parents are able to shape their children in ways which perpetuate the class structure. Internalization of parental values by the children is a pivotal concept in Kohn's theory. The social class of parents, as moderated by occupational experience, instills differential motivations in the children to attain for themselves the occupational and class statuses similar to those of their parents.

Four explanations are possible if a transfer of values from parents to children cannot be substantiated. The first we have already mentioned, that the differences in values between middle-class parents and working-class parents are non-existent or inconsequential, making a subsequent comparison of their children's values unnecessary. Second, a social desirability bias may be at work. Middle-class parents, for instance, may simply report different value priorities (than either working-class parents or their own children) because they are more aware of what is expected in a society which stresses individuality. Third, parents may display genuine differences in values which are simply not transmitted to their children, at least not in any immediately measurable way.

The fourth possibility, which is most directly relevant to the intent of the present study, is that parental values influence interaction with children, and children respond accordingly, but these effects may be difficult for children to articulate. Perhaps they
are affected by their parents' attitudes, preferences, and styles of discipline, but at are a loss to express verbally the nature of this influence. In this case, effects of parental preferences may be more easily observed through behavior (i.e. how teens spend time, interact with others, etc.). A teen who has been socialized toward self-direction may not rate its importance any higher on a survey than others (since all teens are prone to exaggerate their own autonomy), yet the diverse nature of their involvements may indicate a high level of internal motivation, reflecting the unarticulated biases and influences of the parent.

I have reviewed several reasons why an examination of differential values, at least as undertaken by Kohn and his replicators, may fail to reveal any important differences in class-specific socialization. Nevertheless, the clarity of Kohn's thesis is appealing and worthy of further exploration. A more fruitful procedure in uncovering constellations of values may lie in examining patterns of behavior and behavioral interaction. Ironically, by examining behavior it may be possible to indirectly ascertain values. One expectation of this research is that, through an examination of reported behavior (and not covert values), the outlines of differential value orientations on the part of parents, or at least strategies for socialization of their adolescent children, and the effects of such biases and inclinations, may be inferred.

**Gender**

Janet Giele (1988), in a review of the gender and sex role literature, claims that "the impact of sex differences on parenthood is probably more visible than in any other social role" (p. 312). Much variation in parenting by gender is attributed to biological causes in early childhood, and to cultural norms in later childhood. Styles of parental socialization of adolescents may be affected either by gender differences in culturally
prescribed parental roles, or because of differences in adolescent roles and self-concepts by gender, by the onset of puberty. Simmons (1979) notes that girls are concerned with healthy self-concepts and proper social adjustment, while aggression and delinquency concerns are more relevant to adolescent boys. These differing orientations of the male or female adolescent to the social environment are likely to elicit different parental responses. The pace, timing, and nature of physical changes of boys and girls, coupled with cultural interpretations of these changes and differential sex roles may well foster variations in parenting styles.

Upon reviewing anthropological evidence of great cultural variety in parenting practices, Giele (1988) also concludes that the social roles of parents "... are surprisingly susceptible to variation in culture and social structure" (p. 313). Examining subcultural variations in parenting roles among social classes, family types, and employment circumstances would appear, then, to hold promise for understanding some of the differences in today's families.

In 1955, Parsons and Bales set forth their influential theory of male (instrumental, task-oriented) and female (expressive, relationship-oriented) roles, and the literature of sex roles began to feverishly examine how children acquire mutually exclusive gender identities (Giele, 1988). Within the last three decades, however, the literature of sex roles has adopted a new focus. Recent theories stress the multidimensionality of gender (Spence, Deaux, & Helmreich, 1985). Males and females do not exhibit exclusively instrumental and expressive behaviors, respectively, but may be located along a continuum of gender-related responses. Gender-related behaviors (if we may call them that) are related both to the predispositions of individuals and to the situational appropriateness of the behavioral response. Males, for
instance, are most likely to display understanding, warmth, and other expressive behaviors when interacting with females.

Parent-teen interaction is likely to be affected both by the interpersonal dynamics of the gender-dyad and by culturally prescribed roles. Systematic variations are evident. For instance, husbands tend not to be as involved in the affairs of the household as their wives are, even when both are employed full-time (Hewlett, 1986). This generalization applies to child-rearing as well, with women bearing the greater share of the responsibility. Women spend twice as much time with children as the men, even when working part-time or full-time (Staines & Pleck, 1983). The gender-related discrepancy of time spent in direct interaction with children may be even more disparate. Barnett and Baruch (1987) found that, while men spent 29.48 total hours per week with their children (compared to 44.45 hours for women), "solo time" with children was only 4.48 hours per week (compared to 19.56 hours for their wives).

Kohn (et al., 1986) provides evidence, however, that the role that fathers play in the lives of their children may have a disproportionate and generally positive influence, at least in the United States. Fathers were found to play "... at least as important a role as do mothers ..." in the transmission of values (p. 73). The reasons for this are unclear. Our inability to speculate may stem from inadequate data concerning what fathers do with their children, and how it is perceived by their children, when they are together. The typical pattern in time use studies has been to measure the extent of time in child-rearing, not the patterns and substance of interaction (e.g. Pleck, 1985; Barnett & Baruch, 1987).

This study hopes to contribute to the sex role literature by examining the substance and patterns of gender-related parent-teen interaction. As the literature portrays an increasingly complex picture of gender-influenced behavior (Spence, et al., 1985),
examining both the nuance and the normative patterns of behavioral interaction would seem to increase in importance. If parenting roles are very sensitive to cultural context as Giele (1988) claims, the rapid changes to family structure and sex-role behavior in general over the past thirty years will influence parenting role as well. There are few significant differences in the way parents report raising sons and daughters (Thomson, McClanahan, & Curtin, 1992). But parental self-reports may reflect a sensitivity to current norms of egalitarianism, and may not present an accurate account of parental behavior. This study will provide an empirical check of their logic, as well as measure for an interaction effect with gender and other social structural factors.

**Age of Teen**

Age roles in society, broadly conceived, are perhaps second in influence only to sex roles. Age roles and sex roles are also interactive, modifying behavior of both actors and responders. Major divisions by age such as infant, child, adolescent, adult, and elder are the most influential, but divisions by year, especially with younger children and adolescents, may have a significant impact. Few studies have used age of adolescent as a variable for family interaction (Peterson & Rollins, 1987). It has been documented, however, that self-esteem increases with the age of adolescent, and teens between the ages of 13-14 have been found to have the most volatile and changeable self-images (see Gecas, 1990). In this study, age of adolescent is included for exploratory purposes, because systematic analysis with adolescent age is not common but may be important, and because it is hypothesized to correlate with themes of adolescent independence and interactive time with parents. Older teens (in this study, teens between the ages of 16-18) are hypothesized to spend less time with parents because of greater independence, and forms of interaction may also be different.
Parental Employment

Occupation is an important part of the lives of most adults in industrialized societies, but it is generally studied with regard to broad economic issues. *Parental employment* and its effects on family interaction processes is part of a "... relatively small body of empirical research that links occupation and family interaction ..." (Menaghan, 1991a, p. 419). Studies in this field include examinations of the amount of self-direction permitted on the job, the amount of work demanded, the quality of interpersonal relationships with supervisors, coworkers, subordinates, clients & customers, and the degree of job uncertainty or insecurity (Kohn & Schooler, 1982, 1983; Miller, Schooler & Kohn, 1985; Naoi & Schooler, 1985; Schooler & Naoi, 1988). Most teens do not have any significant contact directly with their parents' jobs, but the occupational environment is part of their *exo-system* since they are affected by it indirectly through their parents. Although many dimensions of the work environment have been studied, only *time on job* and *regularity of employment pattern* will be included in the present study. I justify the inclusion of these dimensions of parental employment in the model, and especially maternal employment, by way of Coleman's (1974) social-historical theory of adolescence and industrialization.

James Coleman (1974) attributes the emergence of adolescence as a social concept to the inception of industrial society and the triumph of mass education. Adolescence as a life stage is depicted as a modern invention whose midwives were public schools and the modern marketplace, both of which subsequently contribute to a decline and restructuring in association between parents and children. In post-industrial societies, the family is portrayed as a productive unit where family members working in concert has become increasingly rare. In its place stands an institution which typically receives economic support through outside employment for both parents, and
whose basic institutional functions for family interaction are undergoing dramatic re-definition. The primary role of parents in socializing adolescents into adult society has been progressively relinquished to peer groups, schools and other societal agencies (Coleman, 1974). Parent-teen roles may be in the process of being transformed from a traditional and time-intensive mode of master-apprentice relations to modern and more transitory relations of pal-friend, teacher-counselor or coach & team member (LeMasters, 1977).

In my opinion, more time away from home for teenagers and an increase of problem-oriented behavior do not necessarily indicate that parents have abandoned the task of child-rearing. Even when parents are not personally inculcating values and skills in their adolescent children, they may nevertheless play a key role in choosing and securing the surrogate parenting agencies which do so. Parents have a vested interest in the development of their children, and parental aspirations for their children may be channeled into choosing and securing schools, community groups, and extra-curricular activities which affirm their values. Implied by Coleman's theory is the idea that at least some parents may rely less on direct teaching or interaction to inculcate values and skills, and may instead involve the active selection and procuring of surrogate parents. That is, they may seek and enlist schools, churches, and peer groups who are likely to support their family's values and help achieve the goals they hold for their children's development. Identifying the mechanisms of socialization could involve the study of how teens are selectively channeled into various activities and involvements by their parents. This would involve a two-step process: identifying and studying the pattern of activities in which the teen is involved, and analyzing or describing the parental role in the process of selecting, prohibiting, giving or withholding support and credibility to these activities.
The market provides evidence that Coleman's assertions concerning the emergence of male employment, and now female employment, are essentially correct. From 1947 until 1983, maternal participation in the labor force has risen from 10.8% to 49.9% for women with children under 6, and 26.0% to 63.8% for women with children ages 6 to 18 (Giele, 1988). Between 1979 and 1986, work hours for wives who already have jobs have increased annually only 3%, while labor force participation by wives in general increased by 14.5% (Rose & Fasenfest, 1988). Women with children have entered the workforce by the millions, and family roles are being rewritten. The process of consequent role transformation, however, is not proceeding uniformly, since American families display a tremendous diversity in regard to the intrusion of the marketplace. For instance, even though more women have now entered the labor market, the result has been to divide American families roughly into thirds. In approximately equal proportions, family units have mothers who are employed full-time outside of the home, employed half-time or part-time, and mothers who stay at home almost exclusively to raise children (Montemayor, 1983a).

Concerning alleged negative effects of maternal employment, Rallings & Nye (1978) assert that the concerns of the "alarmists" have not been substantiated by empirical research. Montemayor (1983a), however, in a more recent review of the maternal employment literature, lists several areas of concern. He notes that even though many research findings regarding the social, intellectual, or emotional effects on adolescents of maternal employment often fail to substantiate negative consequences for children (Query & Kuruvilla, 1975; Rosenthal & Hansen, 1981), at other times they indicate disturbing trends for at least some adolescents in certain circumstances. Some studies show lower academic performance for boys, but not for girls, when mothers work (e.g. Gold and Andres, 1978; Brown, 1969). Rees and Palmer (1970)
even reported that while boys' IQ scores apparently suffered when their mothers worked, the IQ scores of girls increased. For all adolescents with working mothers, heightened conflict was also indicated in some cases by an increased frequency of running away from home, and by a greater number of disagreements (Douvan & Adelson, 1966; Propper, 1972). Thus the assertion by Railings & Nye (1978) that maternal employment does not affect adolescents, except in regard to more liberal sex role attitudes, and that therefore a social problems perspective is generally unproductive, should be viewed as less than conclusive given available evidence.

Other effects of maternal employment emerge when more careful controls are placed on the independent variables. Cogle, Tasker, and Morton (1982) discovered that curvilinear relationships may exist between maternal employment and some dependent variables. In a study closely related to the intent and focus of the present research, adolescents with mothers who do not work or who work full-time display very similar relationships with their parents, while adolescents with part-time working mothers (i.e. the middle group) reported the closest emotional bonds with their parents, spent the greatest amount of leisure time with their families, and most often chose their mothers as their adult ideal. This curvilinear relationship was not anticipated by earlier researchers, nor was it observable when using either a linear model of maternal employment or a simple dichotomy of work versus non-work.

The majority of research described above focuses on developmental outcomes for children with working mothers, not on the changing nature of dyadic interaction between parent and child. Studying such interaction is a worthy goal irrespective of developmental outcomes for the child, yet ultimately it may also yield insight into differences in outcomes which have been observed (e.g. Cogle, Tasker, and Morton, 1982). Further qualification of the influence of parental employment on family
interaction will involve more than simply measuring whether or not parents work, or even how many hours are spent at work. Nock and Kingston's (1984) study attempts to elaborate on simplistic models of parental employment by monitoring time overlaps between the schedules of various family members. They suggest that not only the extent of parental employment, but the patterns of employment be considered. Logically, whether or not a parent is available for interaction during times when the adolescent is at home will impact not only total time spent together, but also the nature of such interaction.

Employment trends are also related to social class (Gilbert & Kahl, 1993). The collapse of cottage industries as the dominant form of economic activity has elevated the role of individual choice in determining occupation and social status. The tradition of automatic role succession from parent to child has given way to a meritocracy. This new-found freedom of occupational choice has inherent dangers and opportunities for young people. Social class, rather than being perpetuated solely by ascription, now must be passed on increasingly through persuasive and competitive mechanisms. One goal of this study is to study the influence of and control for social class on variations in parental employment, which in turn influences patterns of socializing adolescent children. Parents who spend less time with their adolescent children because of employment obligations may have to select activities which are conductive to value transmission even more carefully as their interactive time decreases.

If parents who have heavy occupational demands become increasingly absent from the home environment, the importance of a child's value-orientations in perpetuating the family's social class position is critical. The parent may not simply hand over a social status to the child, but must insure that the child will seek it for herself. Values must be instilled which serve as a form of covert influence. Thus
parentally-transmitted values, which have been defined as "conceptions of the desirable" (Kohn, 1969), may serve as ideal guides which motivate, deter, attract and repel the adolescent in culturally approved directions. Values which are passed on from parent to teen thus become the hidden voice of the parent, representing the family's viewpoint when the teen is abroad in the world, a point which has been asserted repeatedly by Melvin Kohn.

**Meso-System Variables**

**Family Type**

Galvin & Brommel (1986), in exploring the diversification of today's families, conclude that no serious treatment of family issues can ignore the permutations of family structure which enable and delimit family interaction. The term *family type* in this research will refer to a dichotomy between married-couple and single-parent families, although it is clearly recognized there are blended families and other *family types* which might be examined. This classification, while not exhaustive, will still encompass a majority of American families, and the inclusion of single-parent families represents a substantial improvement over the use of only married-couple units as is commonly practiced by research with many small-scale samples.

**Family Size**

*Family size* is to be included as a social-structural variable in the model, largely for purposes of statistical control. Since the primary focus of the study is on interactional dynamics, the presence or absence of siblings will logically influence such dynamics. It is likely, for instance, that additional dependent children in the household
will reduce the amount of time parents will spend with each individual child. Thus family size, while not functioning as a central focus of interest in the present study, nevertheless represents another social structural variable which should be included in a comprehensive model of parent-teen socialization because of its likely impact on parent-teen interactive time use.

**Interaction Available Time**

As a predictor of parent-teen contact time, *interaction available time* will be operationalized as the number of hours per week when a parent is not sleeping or working, and thus could conceivably spend time with his or her teenager. Since available time may or may not be appropriated for interaction, it does not belong in the interactional field. It is certainly a function of the institutional (i.e. occupational) system, but it is also affected by personal lifestyle and the family environment. While this variable is obviously a function of employment hours, its inclusion in the meso-system with other family-level variables indicates that, as a residual effect of employment, available hours for interaction are a latent family resource.

**Teen’s Social Participation**

The variable of *social participation* for the teenager directly indicates the extent of involvement, as measured by hours spent, in various groups and activities. Social participation can be both *informal* and *formal* in nature, where informal participation would be in informal groups such as friendship cliques, and formal participation requires involvement with groups by institutions such as schools, churches, and hospitals. In this research, only formal involvement will be examined. Social participation is part of the meso-system since, by definition, the meso-system specifies
that subset of social groups and institutions where a person has direct involvement and is subject to direct, face-to-face influence.

**Social Support**

*Social support* has been conceptualized as both a characteristic of the family system and as a dimension of interaction. For our purposes here, we will include it with the meso-system since it is often considered as a key function and property of human groups (Cohen, 1985; Uehara, 1990; Wellman, 1990). Social support from parents, as perceived by adolescents, has also been suggested as a key component of parent-teen relationships (Farrell & Barnes, 1993; Gecas, 1990; Peterson & Rollins, 1987; Rollins & Thomas, 1979; Windle & Milller-Tutzauer, 1993), and has been positively linked with adolescent self-esteem (Demo, 1992a), and inversely linked with adolescent problem behavior (Barnes & Farrell, 1992). Social support has been considered one of the two key dynamic elements of socialization, and tends to have the most beneficial effects in the parent-teen relationships when coupled with social power and high expectations (Gecas, 1990; Rollins & Thomas, 1979). The effects of social support on other variables are generally found to have the same valence, only differing in magnitude (Gecas, 1990). Social support also appears to have a connection to social class, especially for fathers (Grossman, Pollack & Golding, 1988), and differential effects with the gender of the parent (Kalish & Knudtson, 1976), and gender of the adolescent (Farrell & Barnes, 1993).

Weiss (1976) reasons that people are motivated to engage in social relationships, and generally choose to spend more energy cultivating relationships that they perceive as more supportive and personally rewarding. People are assumed to make active attempts to seek out social support from available social resources. Any per-
ceived inadequacy from one source should generate a search for aid from alternate 
sources. Support from mothers was found to be the key factor related to an adoles-
cent's self-esteem, and adolescents were most likely to seek social support from their 
friends when maternal support was absent (Hoffman, Ushpiz & Levy-Shiff, 1988).
Parental support is expected to vary with social class, gender of both teen and parent, 
and to have important consequences for parent-teen relationships and teen self-image 
(Demo, 1992a). Parental support during adolescence is an important interactional 
variable in the parent-teen social system, and should certainly be included in a multi-
level model of parent-teen socialization.

Micro-System Variables in the Interactional Field

The General Approach

Four variables will be reviewed in this section which may be classified as micro-system variables in the field of interaction: parent-teen contact time, activity categories, parental interactive subroles, and parent-teen relationships. The first three of these are conceptualized concretely as dimensions of interactive time use: parent-teen contact time, general forms of interaction, and the nature of time use, respectively. The fourth variable, the quality of parent-teen relationship, is conceptualized as a reflective and symbolically interpretive dimension of parent-teen interaction.

General dimensions of the three aspects of interactive time use will emerge through a creative analysis of the data which uses a methodology suggested by Glaser & Strauss (1979) known as grounded theory. Grounded theory advocates that investigators allow the data to suggest its own proper empirical patterning, abstract conceptualization such as the creation of variables, and even theory construction. With regard to interactive time use, grounded theory was used primarily in the pilot study to gain
insight - how do parents and teens think about time, how do they organize it, use it, and consider it important to their lives or relationships.

**Parent-Teen Contact Time**

The first dimension of interactive time use, parent-teen contact time, is operationalized as *total time spent together*. This variable has been used in very few studies (e.g. Barnett & Baruch, 1987; Nock & Kingston, 1988; Smith, 1986), but is not a commonly used variable of interpersonal interaction. Theoretically, the importance of this variable is probably in its usefulness as an indicator of attachment, dependence, or the potential for social influence. This is likely to vary with each dyadic relationship, so I will examine overall time spent by each teen-parent dyad. Contact time will thus be conceptualized as both a dyadic and a systemic characteristic. *Solo time*, dyadic time without the presence of others, will be another variation of contact time.

In my review of the literature, only two studies measured overall contact time between parents and teenagers. Neither was a true multi-level study. The first by Smith (1986) tallied the hours spent on one Saturday for parents of normal and handicapped children. The second by Nock & Kingston (1988) collected occupational and time data from a subset of a national sample of 1,519 families. In their study, time was the dependent variable, not an intermediary model component as in the present study. Of 620 families they contacted, 226 completed four "time diaries" from two weekdays, one Saturday, and one Sunday, dispersed over a three-month period of time. The data were collected over the phone by an interviewer. Some of their findings indicated that mothers' contact time with children under 20 is less affected by work hours than is true for contact time of husbands. Mothers of preschoolers who work,
however, spend only half as much time with their children as similar mothers who do not work outside the home.

Contact time is certainly a measurable characteristic of interaction, and can lead to an analysis of overall patterns of interaction. This broad view of interaction seems to fit with the rationale of a multi-level model, and is not found in many studies of socialization or parent-teen interaction (Peterson & Rollins, 1987).

**Forms of Parent-Teen Interaction**

The second dimension of interactive time use, *forms of parent-teen interaction*, will refer to *activity categories*. Specific activities (i.e. TV, board games, bowling, soccer, church, arguing, pulling weeds, etc.), may be grouped into more general *activity categories* (such as leisure, work, eating, sports, social participation, talking, and working). Once again, a teen's total participation in these activities will not be measured, but only activity time spent with either or both parents. These figures will therefore not represent total personal time use, but shared experience. Shared activities are a type of self-reported observational data, representing interaction at a concrete and empirical level, interpreted only in the most basic sense of symbolizing the nature of one's activities according to accepted social categories.

Nock & Kingston's (1988) time-diary research with families (mentioned in the section above) uncovered seven broad categories of time use: child care, playing with and educating children, fun, housekeeping, watching T.V., eating meals, and talking (as primary activity). Some of these, such as child care, will probably not pertain to parents and teens. Other new categories may arise. For this reason, a grounded theory or exploratory approach is used in the pilot study to develop commonly used time categories.
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Nature of Parent-Teen Interaction

The nature of parent-teen interaction will be operationalized with a new variable of parental interactive subroles which is based on Sewell's (1992) concept of cultural schemas and Stryker's (1980) role theory, both of which have already been described. Stryker (1980) suggests that much ostensibly spontaneous behavior is actually affected by the social roles people imagine themselves as playing. Within the general status of parent, a number of minor statuses and roles exist within the mind of both the parent and the teenager, and individuals are free to choose the roles they wish to play in coordination with the other. For instance, a parent may choose to perform the role of counselor, teacher, boss, mentor, chauffeur, friend, and companion, to mention a few. Because the possibilities for role creation are many, this examination may be facilitated by a grounded theory approach (Glaser & Strauss, 1979). The pilot study for this research, for instance, using grounded-theory or exploratory techniques (with both surveys and phone interviews), identified common interactive modes of role-playing that parents utilize while performing their duties as parents.

An examination of role playing may appear to properly belong with an analysis of the forms of interaction, and not with examining its nature. After all, roles are typically viewed as derivations of social structure. Yet role performance within families is generally dynamic, being more private and flexible than in many other contexts, and represents a specific orientation to the other which symbolizes the nature of interaction. For instance, if one is playing the subrole of "boss" as parent, then power, a critical dimension of that interaction, is implied. For the roles of counselor, chauffeur, teacher, then emotional support, practical support, and instruction are implied, respectively. Viewed in this light, then parental subroles can be seen as
indicators of the "nature" of the interactive exchange, and indirect reflections of parental values.

It should be noted that there is no direct correspondence between a minor parental role with any given activity pattern. For instance, if the activity pattern is work, parents and teens may play any of numerous possible "role sets" within that activity context, such as those of boss-worker, companion-friend, or mentor-counselee. Conversely, a parent playing a single "minor role" (boss) might perform this role within any of several different activities. Indeed, a teen may perceive a parent to play the role of boss or critic anytime they get together. To complicate matters further, a person may perform a role for many different reasons. That is, various values may support role performance. For instance, a parent playing the role of chauffeur might take a teen to the mall to help him or her shop for clothes (to give practical support for a dependent), or make a similar trip for piano lessons (to facilitate skill development), or drop the teenager off for work (to support his or her growing independence). This research will help determine typical parental interactive subroles played, and will suggest possible meanings or underlying values for these roles.

**Parent-Teen Relationships**

Relationships among family members is a topic of growing interest, as reported by recent reviews (Demo, 1992a; Duck, 1991; Gecas, 1990; Jones, 1991; Keith & Schafer, 1991; Parke & Kellam, 1994; Steinberg, 1991). Some studies and reviews (Keith, 1991; Whitbeck, Hoyt & Huck, 1993) also analyze a variety of relationships over the life course. Along with global measures of relationship quality, critical dimensions of relationships are power or compulsion, and support, which leads to induced compliance and liking (Kemper, 1990). Dimensions of relationships are
explored through the use of Osgood's (1957) semantic-differential method (Kemper, 1990).

Parent-teen relationships are especially important to include in a multi-level model of socialization. Relationships have been examined with respect to social contexts (Gecas, 1990; Parke & Kellam, 1994), social class (Kohn, 1963; Langman, 1987), divorce and disruptive events (Aquilino, 1994; Cooney, 1994), family resources (Holland & Andre, 1994), and self-esteem (Barber, 1992; Clark, 1994; Demo, 1992; Hoffman, et al., 1988). One recent study (Yablonsky, 1990) also examined the relationships of fathers and sons, but the literature regarding how the gender of both parent and teen affects relationships is "surprisingly sparse" (Gecas, 1990). One can also see the advantage of a simultaneous examination of several of these variables in a multi-level model.

Relationships will be measured both globally and dimensionally in this research. Global measures will ask for an overall rating of the relationship. Dimensional measures will assess perceptions of personal cooperation vs. non-cooperation, friendliness vs. hostility, acceptance vs. criticism, ambition vs. laziness, and so on which may vary with each encounter. These also indicate a manner of orientation to the other, and may be employed within different activity categories. The perspectives of teens and parents will be differentiated. This strategy is consistent with the symbolic interactionist viewpoint that there are multiple realities to any situation which are based on the unique viewpoints of each actor. A "collective measure" of the parent-teen relationship will also be developed which is based on Mead's generalized other and the idea that a teen's relationship with both parents, considered simultaneously, is a new and emergent property of the triad and may have important new effects in a multi-level model.
Micro-System Variables at the Individual Level

There are three variables proposed for the applied model at the individual level: *teen self-esteem, teen self-image, and school grades*, which will not be discussed here. The reason for including school grades as an indicator of one socially important outcome of socialization is self-evident and will not be reviewed here, but the distinction between self-esteem and self-image, and the reasons for including both of them in the model, are not obvious and require some explanation.

**Adolescent Self-Esteem**

*Self-esteem* is the most prevalent and well-researched of a number of similar constructs sometimes grouped under the label, *self-concept* (Damon, 1991; Demo, 1992). Perhaps the most commonly used measure of self-esteem is Rosenberg's 10-item index which solicits degrees of agreement with items such as "On the whole, I am satisfied with myself," "I wish I could have more respect for myself," and "I certainly feel useless at times" (Rosenberg, 1965, pages 305-307). The most critical element of self-esteem historically, then, is the element of perceived self-worth (Rosenberg, 1989).

More recent variants of self-esteem include global self-esteem, specific self-esteem, multi-dimensional self-esteem, and trans-situational self-esteem (Openshaw, Thomas, & Rollins, 1988; Rosenberg, Schooler, Schoenbach, & Rosenberg, 1995). Global self-esteem, or overall personal self-evaluation, has been found to be more highly correlated with measures of psychological well-being (depression, anxiety, happiness, etc.), with correlations typically ranging from -.30 to -.50 (Rosenberg, et al., 1995). Measures of "specific self-esteem," esteem related to performance of specific roles, are less correlated with overall well-being, but more highly correlated with corresponding behavioral performance (Marsh, 1990; Rosenberg, et al., 1995).
Multi-dimensional measures often are constructed by using three regions or critical dimensions: the extant self, the desired self, and the presenting self (Demo, 1992; Rosenberg, 1979). The extant self refers to perceptions of self-worth relative to social identities (i.e. about role performance, social dispositions). The desired self consists of an idealized image (fantasies), a committed image (goals), and a moral image. The presenting self presumably refers to evaluations of the ability to publicly present an image consistent with one's internal views of oneself (Demo, 1992). Trans-situational self-esteem research examines temporal fluctuations in self-esteem scores, and variations across situations (Rosenberg et al., 1995).

In this research, Rosenberg's classic self-esteem index (Rosenberg, 1965) will be used as a global measure of personal self-worth, and its performance in the multi-level model will be compared to a newer, theoretically derived measure of self-image based on salient role-identities for teenagers.

**Adolescent Self-Image**

Ever since Cooley's conception of the "looking-glass self" (1902), a focus on self-image has been a common concern of symbolic interactionists. Mead's famous treatise, *Mind, Self and Society* (1934), discusses the important relationship between social context (society), and a person's conception of self. The self is seen to arise through interaction with others. As a person gains an appreciation of cultural symbols, so one develops a conception of "self as object" to others, and to oneself. This research will likewise predict that a teen's interactions and relationships, especially with parents, will have a significant correlation to a teen's self-image. This is hypothesized because the self, from the symbolic interactionist perspective, is seen as the interpretation of
reactions of others which becomes internalized over time. A poor relationship with a parent will thus be seen as evidence that the self is not worth treating well.

In this research, self-image will be operationalized as a global assessment of performance for salient adolescent social roles. The resulting measure is structurally similar to specific self-esteem and functionally similar to global self-esteem, both of which are described in the preceding section. Self-image is similar to specific self-esteem in that both constructs measure self-evaluations of role performance, but specific self-esteem is usually operationalized by using multiple indicators to measure evaluation of one social role (such as Bachman's School Ability Self-Concept Index which uses three items all relating to school performance), while self-image as used here will consist of an index of several items, where each item represents a sole indicator for self-evaluation of a single social role.

The measure of self-image will be functionally similar to global self-esteem in that it is serving as a global measurement of personal self-worth, but this personal assessment will be tied to a system of salient role identities, rather than to psychological dimensions of the self such as the extant, desired, or presenting self. By relying exclusively upon evaluations of role performance for a measure of self-worth, a theoretical statement is also being offered for testing by the model, and that is that self-image, as an indicator of personal self-worth via role identities, will be a more robust performer in the empirical model than will self-esteem, which relies more upon abstract or even unspecified psychological dimensions of the self. This expectation is consistent with historical emphasis of symbolic interactionists on the importance of Cooley's (1902) looking-glass self, and a belief that the self is seen to arise through interaction with others (Fine, 1993). More recently, this emphasis has been extended to include specific attention to role identities, role salience, and role performance (Hoelter,
1983, 1984, 1985, 1987; McCall & Simmons, 1966; Stryker, 1980, 1982), but the present measure is unique in that is has been customized to fit an adolescent population.

Self-esteem and self-image are important variables to include in a model of parent-teen socialization, the first representing a construct well-researched in the literature, and the second representing a theoretical innovation which is appropriate to a role-based multi-level model of socialization. One of the key effects of the nature and quality of parent-teen interaction and relationships may be a significant influence on adolescent self-image or self-esteem (Barber, 1992; Clark, 1994; Demo, 1992; Hoffman, Ushpiz & Levy-Shiff, 1988). For both male and female adolescents, parental appraisals of worth and performance are very important, and for male adolescents, perhaps the most important determinant of self-evaluation (Hoelter, 1984).

Self-appraisal or evaluation can be viewed as the first and foremost result of the socialization process, the culmination and of all macro-level and micro-level social influences, and the internalization of all significant social relationships. To the extent that it defines the evaluation of one's assumed or adopted orientation to the external social world, it can also serve as a hinge upon which many other significant behavioral and societal outcomes rest. As such, self-appraisal serves as an appropriate ending point in a comprehensive model of parent-teen socialization.

A Brief Review of Chapter II

In this chapter, I have suggested that parental socialization of adolescents may be appropriately and productively studied with multi-level modeling. Characteristics for effective multi-level models were enumerated, including the need for greater theoretical integration of model elements. A general model of social influence (Figure 2.1) was developed which locates variables of social influence within four levels of the
social order: the macro system, exo system, meso system, and micro system (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). *Social influence* was described as any process by which the actual, imagined, or implied presence of persons, groups, or culture changes the essence or behavior of the same. This concept was differentiated from the more specific type of social influence we referred to as *parental socialization of adolescents*, which specifies the actors involved in the social influence chain, the direction of influence being analyzed (from the social system and parents, as agents of the system, to teens), and the fact that the broad patterns of interactive influence on general teen outcomes were to be analyzed, not specific behaviors.

An applied model of parent-teen socialization (Figure 2.2) was derived from this more general model of social influence, and variables included in the model were justified from the research literature and by theoretical derivation. To structural variables of social class, family type, and employment were added interactional variables such as parent-teen contact time, parental subroles, activity categories, and quality of parent-teen relationship. Teen outcome variables - self-esteem, self-image, and school grades - were presented as appropriate dependent variables in the socialization model. Research on all of the key model variables was reviewed, and the need for including all of the specified variables within the same multi-level model was stressed as a way to measure differential and interactive effects of model elements, and the combined effect of the overall model, on the dependent variables. The next chapter describes the research design used to test the model and to provide the empirical foundation for all three research papers.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

Overview

A two-stage data collection process was conducted for this research. In the Spring of 1993, 20 families from Greenville, Illinois were involved in a pilot study in which they completed surveys and then were interviewed by phone on four consecutive nights. Single-parent and married-couple families from various economic backgrounds were secured through a local referral system. Some quantitative data were collected, but much of the data were qualitative. Surveys and phone interviews were both structured and unstructured. The data were analyzed with respect to the key dependent variables which had been selected at that time: interactive time use, the nature and forms of interaction, and the quality of parent-teen relationships.

In the Spring of 1994, a stratified random sample of 297 families from the greater St. Louis area (including Greenville and surrounding towns) participated in a two-part survey, the content of which was based upon the findings of the pilot study. The sample was stratified with respect to geographic region, social class, maternal employment, family type, and sex and age of teenager. To secure the sample, a list of eligible families with teenagers was purchased through the Donnelly marketing firm of Chicago, and a systematic random sample of families to contact was taken from that list. Sampled families were sent a "screening survey" two pages in length, a weekly time chart, and the promise of a $10 incentive for participation. One parent was requested to keep a log of parent-teen activities on the provided chart for 7 consecutive nights.
days, starting from the day he or she opened the letter. He or she also completed a short survey which allowed us to make sure the family met our selection criteria, and which permitted us to select a teenager of the appropriate sex and age (when we had a choice) to fulfill our sampling criteria. Eligible families were then sent copies of their completed time charts and a set of new surveys to complete. Of the 297 eligible families, 203 returned the second wave of surveys.

Stage 1 - The Pilot Study

Research Goals and Overview

The goals of the pilot study were to: (a) develop valid conceptualizations of the key variables based directly on the collected data, and (b) to try and compare different methods of measuring these key variables. Quantitative and qualitative data were collected from mothers, fathers, and teenagers about their work and school schedules, time spent together, parent-teen relationships, and various psychological and behavioral "outcome variables" for the teenager (self-image, grades, sexuality and delinquency). Triangulation of survey and interview methods would allow for measuring key variables in several different ways. The strengths and limitations of each method were assessed, and the final survey was to be developed to incorporate insights gleaned from the findings of, and the process of, conducting this pilot study.

Population and Sampling Procedures

A sample of 20 families participated as a pilot group in order to provide an in-depth analysis of parent-teen interactions and relationships. Given the small size of the sample, all desired stratifying criteria could not be used, but an attempt was made to
have at least 5 single-parent families and to split the sample between middle-class and working-class, and by the sex and approximate ages of the teenagers.

Securing a list of families with teenagers through Donnelly was cost-prohibitive for the pilot study (and deemed unnecessary to accomplishing study goals), and school officials, while friendly, felt they could not cooperate in supplying a list of families from their records. A high school English teacher was found to be willing to supply the names of various families with teenagers who would, based on her personal information, meet the selection criteria. Families were contacted by phone and offered twenty dollars for participating. Of 25 families on the provided list, 20 agreed to participate, resulting in a participation rate of 80%. The final sample contained 13 males and 7 females, six 12-13 year olds, seven 14-15 year olds, and seven 16-17 year olds. Nine were working class families, 10 were middle-class (one did not report this information), 5 were single-parent families, and 15 were married-couple families.

**Data Collection Procedures**

College students were recruited to first call and then visit the participating families at a time when they could speak with all participants. During that visit, the first priority was to get acquainted with family members and explain the nature of the research. Students then distributed and collected the surveys, one for each parent and for the teenager (see Appendix E, the two parent surveys are identical except for gender-specific language). They also explained the procedures for the telephone interviews and thanked the families. The students also left a "Phone Interview CUE Sheet" (Appendix F) to facilitate data collection during the phone calls. These visits occurred during normal school weeks of April and May, 1993.

On the weekend following the home visits, families were contacted by phone
each evening, from Friday through Monday. Fifteen families were called by college students, and five were called by myself. I also called some of the 15 families to verify that phone calls had been made by my student helpers. The purpose of calling during that specific four-day period of time was to ensure that both weekends and weekdays were sampled so that all typical activities undertaken by parents and teenagers would appear in the data. During each nightly phone call, each participating family member was greeted, and then asked about the events of the day which involved parent-teen interaction. If a respondent was absent, interviewers were instructed to call back later, or when necessary, to call on the following night and collect data for both days. In two or three cases, a family member was gone from Friday through Saturday and had to be contacted on Sunday or Monday. This was a rare occurrence, however; most respondents were either there each night, or could be contacted on the following day.

Interviewers used the Phone Interview CUE Sheet (Appendix F) for the schedule of questions. They recorded all answers on blank sheets of paper, but were trained to put their names, the family case number, a heading for each day, and numbers (corresponding to the question numbers) by each answer. Respondents were sometimes asked the questions in abbreviated form. For instance, question #5 includes 20 different possible "parental roles" a parent might choose to use in interaction. Instead of reading all 20, since the respondent had the list in front of him or her, the interviewer might simply ask the person to identify which roles the parent played that day, and for which activity. Questions 6 through 10 (about the "nature" of the interaction, passive-active, negative-positive, supportive-not supportive, etc.) were asked for main activities only. Comments to the open-ended questions were also recorded and numbered.
Variable Measurement

Only the measurement of selected variables will be described in this section since: (a) items used in the pilot study which were retained for use in the full survey are described later, (b) items which ended up being dropped are irrelevant, and (c) the purpose of the pilot study was to pre-test the measurement of a small number of key variables, such as parent-teen interactive time use, and was not concerned with analysis of the full research model.

Parent-Teen Interactive Time Use was measured in two ways. First, as described above, events over the four-day period of time were related to interviewers in full detail, structured only by specification of activity, people present, and time taken in hours and minutes. This information was collected from all three participants (or two, in the case of single-parent families), and compared across participants. If one person failed to mention something that another had mentioned, the interviewer would usually give a prompt and ask, for instance, "Did you watch any T.V. with your mom today?", and usually the person would then respond, "Oh, yes. We watched 'Roseanne' for 30 minutes." If discrepancies persisted (usually regarding not the activity undertaken, but the time spent on that activity), a judgment by the interviewer was made (using a protocol with which he or she was trained) about which was the more reliable account. If no basis existed for making this judgment, the time estimates were averaged.

Second, time use was measured by items 61-80 on teen and parent surveys of the pilot study (see Appendix E), with regard to specific categories (eating meals, working, talking, driving, shopping, etc.) and during an average week. For these items, respondents simply estimated. The purpose of including this section was not so much to gain a reliable account of time spent, but to find out which categories
respondents selected as being more often used, and to ascertain how well respondents would follow instructions about recording both hours and minutes in the proper format. There were a number of other items which related indirectly to time use, but they were dropped from the second survey. Items 61-80, however, served as the basis (with revision) for the main categorical analysis of time use on the full survey (N=297) during the spring of 1994.

Parental Interactive Subroles were measured in two ways. First, during the nightly phone interviews, parents described the activities of the day and then discussed which subroles they thought they were playing during those activities by referring to a list of 18 specific subroles provided on the Phone Interview CUE Sheet (see Appendix F). They were also free to invent their own subrole titles if they thought none of the subroles on the list provided applied, or if they could think of a better descriptive title. Then, on the parents' surveys for the pilot study, parents reported their frequency of playing various subroles from a shorter list of subroles which was then expanded and revised for the later cross-sectional survey (Stage 2).

Parental subroles, a conceptual innovation, were created uniquely for this research by the researcher. They were then reviewed by a class of research methods students serving as a focus group, and then tested during the pilot study. The objectives of these reviews were to find subroles which are usual and customary for parents to adopt when interacting with their teens, and to find suitable titles and descriptions for these roles. Roles which were not selected were dropped from the subsequent survey, and two or three write-ins were also incorporated into the final list. On the basis of feedback from student interviewers, it was decided not to record parental subroles for each activity mentioned for the full survey due to the cumbersome nature of this endeavor. Rather, parental subroles were treated as an independent
question set with a response format simply indicating frequency of selection or use for each role (never, rarely, sometimes, often, very often).

Other Variables such as social class, nature of interaction, etc. were judged to be measured with adequacy and were simply transferred to the new stage 2 surveys.

Findings of the Pilot Study

The pilot study's findings were used primarily to refine subsequent data collection procedures. Since they are not included in the research papers, they will be reviewed here, primarily with respect to how they altered Stage 2 design and procedures, or how they served as a benchmark for evaluating Stage 2 findings.

Regarding overall interactive time use during the four days, 25% of the families reported fewer than 10 hours together, 56% between 10 and 20 hours, and 19% more than 15 hours. Time spent together ranged from 4.25 to 27.3 hours. Extrapolating these figures to a week (7 days instead of 4) yields the median interactive time use for similar families of approximately 25 to 30 hours per week.

One important finding emerged regarding the way people conceptualize time use. People sometimes conceive of interactive time use in overlapping "layers." The first layer would consist of an interactive event, such as buying a shirt, hitting a home run, or hearing an insult. The importance of single events is not diminished simply because they do not take long -- some events have enough potency to greatly affect one's perceptions and feelings about interaction with another, or even greatly alter the course of future events. The second layer would seem to be that of the activity, such as shopping at the mall, playing baseball, or arguing. These activities are specific, and perhaps can be theoretically subdivided into smaller categories which are larger than single interactive events (such as the "subactivities" of throwing, pitching, or hitting a
baseball), but are usually not conceptualized in those terms by people when they are summarizing the day’s events and interaction. The third layer is that of the activity category, comprising groups of similar activities which can be labelled as shopping, sports, or talking. Shopping therefore includes all varieties of shopping, such as grocery shopping, buying gardening tools, and browsing at the mall. The sports category includes baseball, soccer, and so forth.

There is a fourth layer of interaction that can be labelled as the activity frame. Sometimes specific activities are grouped into larger conceptual units or events which comprise many disparate activities. For instance, the activity frame of “our shopping trip to the mall” might actually include 45 minutes of driving, an hour in the restaurant, two and a half hours in stores. Other activity frames, some of which occurred in our study, are weddings, camping trips, visiting relatives, and going to a ball game. These labels (which are very real in the minds of respondents) sometimes encompass many separate activities, and are often reported in addition to more specific activities if the respondent is not instructed to report only one or the other. Also, certain subactivities can frequently occur within these larger units, such as talking while driving. Some activities overlap, such as having a 20-minute argument which begins in the car and ends with the purchase of roller blades in the sports shop. By far, the most common overlapping activity reported was talking together while doing other things (eating a meal, driving, working, etc.).

The issues of activity frames and overlapping activities were handled in the following way for the final survey, based on the findings of the pilot study. The problem, of course, is that if people report time in both ways (first as an activity frame, and then as specific activities, or as two activities which actually overlap), significant overestimation of time spent will occur. Regarding activity frames, respondents were
told to ignore the larger conceptual frame, and instead account for the itemized activities within the frame. This allows for separate time figures to be calculated for driving, shopping, and eating out. Examining activity frames seemed appropriate for the pilot study where qualitative data could be easily handled, but unworkable for the cross-sectional survey.

Regarding overlapping activities, the most frequent by far was talking. Other overlapping did occur, such as eating supper and watching T.V., but these were relatively rare. Perhaps they did occur, but respondents tended to think of one of the activities as being more prominent than the other (for instance, eating took priority over the fact that the T.V. was on and was receiving some attention). Regarding the issue of talking, it was decided that this activity is a special case in that, (a) it is an activity which very often does occur within other activities by its very nature, and measuring it only when it occurs in isolation would result in severely underestimating its frequency; and (b) it is an important relationship building and sustaining activity which needs to be measured. For this reason, it was decided that talking should be measured in two ways, as a separate category (on all surveys), and on a percentage basis within other activities (on the parents' surveys only). For instance, for each activity (e.g. eating, driving, shopping), parents were first asked to report the time spent for the main activity, and then asked to report the percentage of that time when they also were engaged in talking or discussion with their teen.

In order of frequency, the following activity categories were reported, and averages were calculated only for families which reported engaging in that activity. For the pilot study, talking within other activities was not measured. Time figures for 4 families were judged to be unreliable because of non-participation by key family
members, or because of significant discrepancies in accounts of different family members. Consequently, times indicated in Table 3.1 are based on only 16 families.

Table 3.1
Times Spent by Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Category</th>
<th>4-day avg (hours)</th>
<th>Non-zero cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Talk</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Meals</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.V. &amp; videos</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating Out</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard work</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housework</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School homework</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General leisure</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Trips</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to measuring time spent within different categories, respondents were asked to identify the "most significant activity" which occurred during the 4-day time period. Two reported "family meals," two report "talk and communication," two said "T.V.," and many other activities were mentioned only once. Since there were so few families involved in the pilot study, it was decided to continue to present the "significant activities" items as open-ended on the final survey, and not confine the universe of significant activities to those revealed in the pilot study.

1 These reasons for data rejection served as the basis for later judgments about the reliability of Stage 2 data.
Discussion of Pilot Study

Findings from the pilot study were considered carefully while preparing for the cross-sectional survey. It was apparent that some respondents were much more accurate in their time estimates than others were. Some people just seemed to have the ability and interest for remembering when activities started and ended, or for estimating time duration based on the whole sequence of the days' events. In general, older teenagers and parents were better at this than were young teens, but there were many individual differences as well.

Men were sometimes very patient and accurate in giving time responses, and sometimes seemed to be in a hurry and would estimate with haste and inaccuracy. Women generally seemed more willing to answer the questions, and often seemed to give the most reliable accounts, yet even they would forget things or bias their estimates. We could detect biased estimates in many cases because one person would be sure when an activity started and ended, and the other two would simply estimate duration. We would also notice that some persons would tend simply to overestimate all activities, giving us reason to rely upon their family members for more accurate accounting.

The most significant methodological decisions regarding the measuring of interactive time use were to: (a) gather data from all participants and compare their accounts, (b) instruct respondents to ignore activity "frames" and simply report time spent within categories, (c) gain as much detail about specific events as possible before asking people to summarize the extent of time spent together, (d) make a clear presentation of "activity categories" for time measurement (since specific activities
would vary so much between one family and the next), and (e) ask about perceptual
and meaning-oriented issues relative to time use in separate items.

Conducting the pilot study was a very good trial-run experience, and I believe it
has contributed greatly to the quality of the final Stage 2 research design. The benefits
of the pilot study included: (a) experimentation with methods of measuring interactive
time use, leading to subsequent refinement of technique; (b) pre-testing individual
survey items for clarity and for establishing patterns of typical responses; (c) gauging
overall instrumentation effects, such as respondent attitudes toward the research, and
the length of time needed to complete each survey; (d) alerting the researcher to
possible difficulties in recruitment and data collection; and (e) general training of the
researcher and student assistants for the Stage 2 cross-sectional survey.

Stage 2 - The Cross-Sectional Survey

Research Goals and Overview

The goals of the cross-sectional survey were to secure a representative sample
of 240 families with teenagers who met certain selection criteria, and to test the
comprehensive model of parent-teen socialization by careful measurement of the key
research variables. A two-stage research process was designed to locate eligible
families and secure some time data before the complete survey packets were mailed.

With regard to the first goal, results were mixed. Return rates at all levels were
good, but because of selection criteria imposed upon the sampling frame and perhaps
other reasons, obtaining sufficient numbers of working-class family responses was
difficult. Obtaining enough single-parent family responses (especially from single-
father families) was nearly impossible. The sample was originally designed to be
stratified with respect to geographic region, social class, family type, maternal
employment, and age and sex of teenager. There were to be approximately 120 families from the city and 120 from rural areas, 120 middle-class families and 120 working-class families, and within each social-class group 90 married-couple families and 30 single-parent families, a third of the sample with full-time working mothers, a third with part-time working mothers, and a third with full-time homemakers, and equal divisions by sex and age group of the teenagers. Many of these goals were achieved, at least approximately, but others had to compromised.

The research was complicated by the fact that 297 eligible families returned the initial survey and time chart, more than the number originally sought, but only 203 families completed the second round of surveys. Original plans did not include using partial cases, but the lack of adequate numbers in certain categories and the obvious usefulness of the data provided in partial responses made it prudent to include them. Statistical manipulations to pro-rate time data were performed on partial cases to make their data comparable to study completers with regard to interactive time use analyses. This procedure produced a sufficient number of families in most of the categories sought, but in some cases the number of families needed for key comparisons on certain variables was still less than anticipated. There were fewer working-class and single-parent families than originally sought, but the number obtained was sufficient to permit necessary comparisons. The only case where this was not true was for single-father families; there were simply not enough of them to permit analysis.

With regard to testing the comprehensive research model, except for the inability to compare single-mother with single-father families, all other analyses originally envisioned were achieved. Since three research papers are included in this report, each with its own section for research design and procedures, the following
explanation of research design and procedures will be abbreviated on points where future elaboration is provided.

**Population and Sampling Procedures**

A sample of 297 families was obtained for this research, divided between 203 complete cases and 94 partial cases. There were no significant demographic differences between partial and complete cases. By region, 129 families were from St. Louis and surrounding urban communities, 80 were from Greenville, Illinois (located approximately 50 miles east of St. Louis and the Mississippi River), and 88 were from surrounding small towns and rural areas. This breakdown will allow for urban-to-rural comparisons, among other macro-level analyses.

By design, the sample was mostly white, with 290 families or 97.6% self-identifying as "White, non-Hispanic," and only 7 families or 2.4% identifying themselves as Black or Afro-American, Hispanic, Asian American, or other race/ethnicity. Teenagers were roughly proportional by sex and age. There were 143 males (48.1%), 153 females (51.5%), and one who did not volunteer this information. There were 109 teens (36.7%) who were 11-13 years old, 87 (29.3%) who were 14-15, and 100 (33.7%) who were 16-18, and again, one missing case.

With regard to social class, 206 families (69.4%) were middle-class, and 91 (30.6%) were working-class. These figures fluctuated somewhat based on different definitions of social class which were applied. The most favorable ratio for balancing middle and working classes was about 60% to 40%, but the most theoretically defensible designation leaves about 69% in the middle class and 31% in the working class. There were 272 married-couple families (91.6%), and 24 single-parent families (8.1%, slightly less than half of the number desired). With regard to maternal
employment, 162 moms (54.9%) were full-time employees, 84 (28.5%) were part-time employees, and 38 (12.9%) were full-time homemakers.

To obtain the sample, a sampling frame of about 3,000 families was purchased from Donnelly, Inc. of Chicago, Illinois. Four selection criteria were imposed: (1) to include only families with dependent children between the ages of 12 and 17; (2) to include only families with telephones (for follow-up purposes); (3) to include only cases from the St. Louis MSA and designated zip code areas within and surrounding Greenville, Illinois; and (4) to eliminate minority block groups of 20% or higher. The final criterion was imposed to keep the sample more ethnically homogeneous, but it also had the adverse effect of eliminating more working-class and single-parent families (including white families) from the population universe.

A systematic random sample of 1,900 cases was taken from the master list. Calculating from the number of returns who were not qualified, not interested, not deliverable, or blank, the conservative estimate of "eligible families" is 581 of 1,900. Eligible families were defined as those with dependent children between the ages of 12 and 17. There were hundreds of other families with children, but in many cases children were just younger than or older than the stated age range. Many of the families we contacted had been eligible recently, for instance, but an 18th birthday had moved them out of the target age range. And many households had only elderly singles, and other not-qualifieds.

Two return rates were calculated. First, of the estimated 581 eligible families, 297 returned the initial survey materials and expressed a willingness to examine the second round of surveys. They represent a 51.1% first-return rate of eligible families. Second, of the 297 families, 203 completed the research, giving a secondary return rate of 68.4%. Based on written and oral feedback from those eligible families who were
unwilling to participate, a disproportionate number of working-class and single-parent families declined participation in the research due to its length and difficulty (according to some), or due to stressful family situations (according to others). Nevertheless, I was generally happy with the return rates, and attribute their success to the intrinsic interest the survey held for many families, and to the incentives.

Recruitment Procedures

There were three parts to the recruitment process. First, we needed to persuade families, whatever their characteristics, to return the initial screening survey, and if "eligible" for the research, to complete the Time Chart as well. Second, we needed to recruit families who fit the sociodemographic profile we desired to complete the research. Third, we needed to select teenagers within those families so that sex and age divisions could be balanced.

For the first stage of the recruitment process, the 1,900 selected families received a cover letter, a short Family Survey printed on one page front to back, a 7-day Time Chart, and a $1.00 bill as a "thank you" for simply examining the materials and promptly returning the Family Survey. They were encouraged to do this even if they were not interested or not eligible. The response was gratifying. There were approximately 480 returns who were either not qualified (368), not interested (46), not deliverable (12), or blank (54). If these are added to the 297 eligible families who returned surveys and charts, there were about 777 total responses, an absolute return rate of 40.9%. Most responders who did not choose to participate, however, declined because they were not qualified (76.7%). If we estimate conservatively and assume that all of the blank surveys were those eligible but not interested, we calculate an overall first-return rate for eligible families of 51.1%. Based on these conservative estimates, it
would appear that the letter of appeal and incentives offered delivered a fairly good recruitment rate of eligible families for the first phase of the Stage 2 research.

In order to complete the second phase of recruitment, eligible families were offered $10.00 for completing and returning the second-wave surveys which, they were told, would be based on the Time Chart they had completed. The original intention was to offer more money to single-parent families for participation, but the HSIRB would not allow this. As eligible responders returned their Family Survey and Time Chart forms, records were kept regarding the number of families and teenagers accumulating in different categories. Some families were interested in participating, but said they had only an 11-year old or an 18-year old. At first these families were excluded, but toward the end of the study the age range was relaxed slightly to permit their participation and boost the sample size. The original plan was to turn down families when we had enough others like them, but to continue recruitment until we had fulfilled the quota in all cells. We ended up keeping all families with children in the appropriate age range, even surplus middle-class families. The rationale was that doing so would increase the size of the sample, and would not diminish our chances of collecting more families in the harder-to-get categories. Since 203 families of the 297 eligible first-returns completed the research, the return rate for this level of recruitment was 68.4%.

The third stage of the recruitment process was the selection of teenagers to participate. Many families had two or more eligible teenagers. Only one teen per family was selected for the research, so procedures were instituted for random selection. First, since we were striving for equal numbers of males and females, and equal divisions between age categories, we would look at the charts and see what we needed, and make a selection on that basis. This procedure was almost always used to
choose the participating teenager. In two or three cases there were two equally viable candidates, and we simply picked the first, then the second, and so on.

This systematic selection process created some problems. From the outset we made it clear that teenagers would be randomly selected if two or more were eligible, yet we received several phone calls asking if we could use a certain teen and not the other. In each case we explained the rationale for random selection, and graciously informed them that while it was their choice to participate or not, we must, by necessity, exercise the obligation of selecting the participating teenager. Even so, some of the teens switched places on us. We know for sure that at least 8 teens switched, because we would select a teen of a certain gender on the screening survey (and write his or her name on the outside of the personal envelope containing the teen survey), but the final survey would indicate that a teen of the opposite gender had completed the survey. This happened for 3 selected males, and 5 selected females. Assuming that teens of the same sex also substituted for their siblings at the same rate, there were perhaps 16 selected teens who let a brother or sister complete their surveys. That left 281, however, where selection was appropriate.

The selection of participating teenagers occurred before second-round surveys were mailed, so there was no guarantee that the chosen teenager (or his parents) would agree to complete the second-round surveys. This meant that our careful procedures in balancing sex and age ratios might be confounded. We did find the attrition rate for males higher than for females. Among the study's completers (N=203), there were only 88 males (43.3%) to 115 females (56.7%), even though they had been selected to achieve gender balance. But after we included the 94 partial cases, the percentages became more equal; we secured, in total, 143 males (48.1%) and 153 females (51.5%), and one missing case. Teens were also distributed well according to age, with
40 or more teens accumulating in each of the *original* target ages (12-17), and about 100 teens in each of the final age categories (i.e. 11-13, 14-15, 16-18).

**Data Sources**

The data come from three sources: (1) a cover sheet, (2) the final collection of individual surveys, and (3) a Time Summary Sheet. The "cover sheet" includes case number, zip code, town and area, and all pertinent information from the two-page Family Survey. The individual surveys include instruments for Either Parent, Mother, Father and Teen (see Appendix D). The Time Summary sheet was devised to construct a composite picture of interactive time use; it represents our best assessment of what really took place between teen and parents over the seven-day period of time, and how long each took to complete. It is based on a summary of time data from the 7-Day Time Chart (for all 297 cases), and on additional information given in Father, Mother, and Teen surveys (for 203 cases only). The Time Summary form itself is simply a copy of page 2 of the Teen Survey, but the data represent a composite estimate of time use.

Some of the major variables were present in simplified form on the Family Survey, permitting a merger of full and partial cases for some analyses. For instance, respondents were asked on the Family Survey to specify the social class of their families. Social class is also measured more objectively and more completely according to a revised scale of Hollingshead (1957) in the final surveys. So we used the full data for families who had completed the research, and simplified data only for partial cases. Other variables, such as the age and sex of the selected teenager, were derived similarly. When available, we cross-checked information among the different survey instruments.
In most families then, data come from three different persons: father, mother, and teenager. The final time data comes from our reconciled judgment of the three different accounts represented in these three surveys.

Data Collection and Follow-up Procedures

For Stage 1, selected families were sent a letter-sized envelope with a cover letter of invitation, a blue 2-page Family Survey, a yellow 7-Day Time Chart, a $1.00 bill, and a postage-paid return envelope. The initial cover letter gave instructions for parents only (and not teens) to complete the Family Survey and Time Chart. This was partly because we felt parents would give more accurate information on family variables such as social class, but also to avoid issues of parental consent until the second stage of data collection. We wanted the first mailing to be as simple and uncomplicated as possible, and stuffing it with consent forms seemed counterproductive. When these materials were returned, a log was kept of eligible families who returned their surveys and charts, and a separate log was kept of not qualifieds, not-interesteds, non-deliverables, and those coming back blank. These were also recorded on the master database.

For Stage 2, a packet was sent to all eligible families who had returned their first-round surveys and Time Charts. The packet contained another cover letter of thanks and instruction, four surveys (Either Parent Survey, Mother Survey, Father Survey, and Teen Survey), three copies of the Time Charts one member of the family (usually the mother) had filled out, four sealable envelopes (each with labels pertaining to the four surveys), consent and assent forms, and a large manila-colored return mailing envelope. Respondents were instructed to read the cover letter, read and sign the appropriate consent and assent forms, complete the appropriate survey privately
without help from other family members, seal the completed survey in the appropriately labelled envelope, and return surveys in the mailing envelope when all surveys had been completed.

Phone follow-up procedures were initiated about 10-14 days after the second mailing went out. The high secondary rate is partially due to this effort. As long as a family member expressed an interest in helping with the research, we would keep calling back from time to time to check on the family's progress. We re-sent many packets to those who claimed they had lost them or hadn't received them. Most data were collected by the end of June, 1995.

Variable Measurement

Only variables contained in the Multi-level Model of Parent-Teen Socialization (see Chapter II, page 43) will be discussed in this section; the discussion begins with variable #1 and proceeds in sequence. Each research variable below is identified by the same number as it has on the research model.

In all cases, variables will first be referenced to those survey items providing the raw data, or to the improvised variable name if data manipulation, or compilation as specified, is involved (see survey item numbers or variable names in parentheses). Measurement of some key variables will also involve specification of two or more dimensions, some of which have been constructed through analysis of the data. Survey items will be coded based on the first letter of the source survey, so Cover Chart item #6 will be coded as C6, and Either Parent, Mother, Father and Teen survey items #6 E6, M6, F6 and T6, respectively.
Var. #1 - Parent's Gender (E1, E6)

Items E1 and E6 describe the relationship of the parent to the teen, but since each parent had his or her own separate survey, keeping parents' gender straight for the analysis was simply a matter of using the appropriate question. That is, to look at the mother's view of the parent-teen relationship, we would use M104; to examine the father's view, F104. Missing cases: 9 mothers, 14 fathers.

Var. #2 - Teen's Gender (T1, SEX, SEX2)

Question T1 was used to establish gender for all cases where the teen filled out his or her survey. This was true for most "full cases." For the rest, the SEX item from the cover sheet was used. In four "full" cases, however, there was a gender mismatch between the teen we had selected for participation (from the Family Survey), and the gender indicated by the teen on question T1 from the teen's survey. We interpreted this situation to mean that a selected teen had given the survey to a sibling of the opposite sex for completion. If we also assume that this many teens (i.e. four) who were selected for participation also gave their surveys to a sibling of the same sex, then there approximately eight selected teens who gave their surveys to a sibling to complete. Because of the different sources of establishing the teen's gender for "full" or "partial" cases, and because of this situation where teens swapped surveys, a new variable was created called SEX2 where the best information for each teen was used to establish the gender of the teen respondent. Missing cases: 1 teen.

Var. #3 - Parent-Teen Gender Dyad (combination)

This variable is a "theoretical variable" which emerges from categorical analysis of the four possible combinations of teens (by gender) with parents (by gender). This
pattern appears when cross-tabulating teen data with data from either parent, or from
time data on mutual interaction. All interactional variables (and many others) can be
examined with reference to the four parent-teen gender dyad combinations: father-son,
father-daughter, mother-son, mother-daughter.

Var. #4 - SES. Social Class (SES3)

Socio-economic status, or social class, is one of the primary macro-level
variables in the research model. In an effort to be consistent with the theoretical bases
of symbolic interactionism, a revision of the Hollingshead two-factor index (scale) of
social class (1957) has been created for this research which combines objective criteria
from the Hollingshead scale and subjective criteria. Objective criteria are used
exclusively for those at the high or low extremes on the Hollingshead scale, but
subjective criteria are considered for those in the middle, whose social class designation
could be considered as "borderline." Those are the most suitable cases for using
symbolic interpretation and lifestyle considerations to direct the assignment toward one
social class designation or another. Other changes to the Hollingshead scale include
using mothers' characteristics as the basis for social class designation in some cases,
and adjustment and, as specified below, the modernization of the categories for each of
the two factors.

The Hollingshead two-factor index of social class (1957) is actually a scale.
That is, it is not simply the cumulation of points (i.e. an index), but differentially
weights parental occupation and education and combines factor scores into a scale in
which each final score is uniquely derived, and can easily be de-coded to identify the
original factor scores. For instance, a final score of 37 can only be earned by a person
with an occupational score of 3 and an educational score of 4. In Hollingshead's
original point system, social class was divided into 7 categories with "1" designating the highest social class and "7" the lowest (after Warner's Index of Status Characteristics, 1949). These numbers were then multiplied by 7 to derive the first factor score. Education was divided into 7 categories with "1" as highest, and each number was multiplied by 4 to derive the second factor. The two factors were added together to obtain the final social class designation on the Hollingshead scale, where scores range from 11 (highest social class) to 77 (lowest social class).

Certain adaptations were made to the Hollingshead scale. First, for theoretical purposes, the scale was dichotomized for some analyses into middle/professional-class vs. working-class divisions. This also served the practical purpose of allowing for t-tests and other tests where categorization was required. Second, subjective social class was used for borderline cases of finishers (N=62 of 203), as will be described shortly, and for partial cases (N=94) where objective data were not available. Third, mothers were used to determine social class not only for single-mother families, but where the mother had a higher social class status than the father. Fourth, educational and occupational categories were modernized to reflect monetary and economic changes over the past 35 years.

Here are some of the changes to the two factors. Educational categories were adjusted slightly. For instance, the two highest levels changed from the original "some college" and "college grad" (old) to "graduate school experience" and "graduate degree" (new). Occupational categories were left the same, but "gross revenue categories" for farmers and self-employeds were upgraded using Consumer Price Index (CPI) data so that they are now increased by a factor of 4 (approximately) and read as follows:

If you are self-employed or if you are the owner or a partner in a business (including farming), please indicate the approximate gross revenue of your business.
1 _____ Under $20,000
Two other adjustments were made. First, for the 94 partial cases (non-finishers), only preliminary data were available. Their social class designation was determined by self-assessment by this item from the 2-page screening survey:

Based on parental occupation, education, and income, how would you classify your family?
1  Middle or professional class
2  Working class
3  Other, please describe

To assess the suitability of using this item in lieu of the Hollingshead scale of social class, two crosstabular analyses and chi-square tests, one for working-class families and one for middle-class families, were conducted for study finishers between the subjective measure and the calculated Hollingshead measure. Of finishers (N=203) who first reported themselves as "working-class," 83.1% ended up being classified as working class according to my revised Hollingshead scale ($X^2=62.9$, p=.000). Of those describing themselves as "middle-class," 97.2% were classified that way according to the revised Hollingshead scale ($X^2=69.4$, p=.000). There is a good deal of reliability between subjective and objective measures of social class, making the use of the subjective measure appropriate for the partial cases.

Of necessity, mothers were used to determine social class with single-mother families. In married-couple families, the parent with the higher social status is used to determine the family's social class. This is a departure from Hollingshead's procedure (where maternal social status was not considered), but seems justifiable on the follow-
ing grounds. First, one can argue that mothers should be included on ideological
grounds alone (Lady, 1982). Second, past sociological research often excludes moth­
ers' economic contributions to the household, much to its detriment (Lady, 1982). In
the present study, 31 mothers were calculated to have higher social class status (19.4%
of married-couple families where data for both parents is available). Third, some
fathers did not volunteer information about their economic status, making the use of the
mother necessary on practical grounds. In the present study, data from 17 mothers
were used (10.6% of married-couple families) because the fathers did not complete
their surveys. All together, the social status of mothers was used for 29.6% of the
families in the present research (and was equal to the father's status in an additional 5
cases, or 2.5% of the sample). This indicates that mothers make a sizeable contribution
to their family's placement on the social class hierarchy which should not be ignored.

Finally, to add a touch of symbolic interactionism to the scale, certain features
of objective and subjective criteria were mixed to obtain the final social class designa­
tion of study finishers (N=203). Figure 3.1 below illustrates how social class was de­
termined by the Hollingshead two-factor formula, and also indicates the group of fami­
lies in the middle for whom the objective-subjective technique seemed appropriate.

The shaded area in the middle of the figure identifies status-inconsistent
borderline cases who share some characteristics of the middle class and some of the
working class (N=48). For instance, a family might be in this zone because the father
with a college degree is also employed as a carpenter, or has a managerial job with only
a high school diploma. In these cases it was judged that the status orientation of the
family might be slanted in either direction, thus influencing their viewpoints and
lifestyles in ways which might alter the socialization of their teenagers. For these
borderline cases, middle and working-class assignments were resolved on self-categorizations.

![Revised Hollingshead Chart](image)

*Figure 3.1. Revised Hollingshead Chart.*

Where objective criteria give a clear picture of social class status, however, subjective factors are not considered (and, incidentally, are less often at variance with objective factors). The zone on the top left identifies those solidly middle-class according to both objective criteria (N=121), and the zone on the bottom right those who are undeniably middle-class according to objective criteria (N=34). For all of these families, middle-class and working-class families, respectively, social status was assigned based solely on the two factors of education and occupation.

As mentioned earlier, the variable of social class is dichotomized for much of the analysis. This is partly so that "partial cases" might be included (since dichotomous data are all that is available for them), but also for statistical and theoretical reasons. In
some cases, however, where an interval-level variable is desirable, the revised Hollingshead scores were used.

**Var. #5 - Family Type (C7, E1, E6, Famtype)**

Family type was determined first by examining respondents answers to screening survey question #7 (below), and by comparing this information with questions E1 and E6 which asked about how many parents currently reside in the household, and about the best description of the "household situation," respectively.

C7. How would you classify your family?
1. Married-couple family (where married couple lives together)
2. Single-mother family (no male companion present in household)
3. Single-mother family (male companion also present in household)
4. Single-father family (no female companion present in household)
5. Single-father family (female companion also present in household)
6. Other, please describe ________________________________

**Var. #6 - Family Size (C2, C7, E5, Famsize2)**

Family size was determined for complete cases by question E5 (see below), where respondents calculate their own "family size" by adding dependents "still living at home" and residential parents.

E5. FAMILY SIZE. Counting one or two parents (whichever is applicable), and all dependent children still living at home, what is the total number of people currently living in this household? ______

For partial cases, family size was calculated by the researcher by adding the reported number of dependents (C2) with the number of parents indicated by the responses to C7 (where C2 and C7 are items from the screening survey). The variable which merges this information is called "Famsize2."
Var. #7 - Parent's Time on Job (M113, F113)

Question 113 on the parents' surveys (see below) was part of a set of items which first asked about primary and secondary jobs held, time spent for those jobs, and then inquired about time spent at home or outside the home.

**How many** of the "Total Work Hours Per Week" stated above are spent ...?

112. _____ At home
113. _____ Outside the home (at a place of employment, traveling, etc.)

These data are only available for complete cases (N=203) where parents agreed to the surveys which contained these questions.

Var. #8 - Parent's Employment Pattern (M117, F117)

Parent's employment pattern was determined only for complete cases (N=203) by question 117 on the parents' surveys, which reads as follows:

117. How would you describe your normal weekly work schedule?

1  ______ Fairly regular and predictable
2  ______ Somewhat regular and predictable
3  ______ Not at all regular or predictable

Var. #9 - Parent-Teen Interaction Available Time (M22a-g, F22a-g)

This variable was calculated by a summation of the hours and minutes indicated on item 22 on the parents' surveys, which elicited a separate estimate of available time for interaction with the chosen teenager on each day of the week.

Var. #10 - Teen's Age (T2, C4)

When available, item 2 from the teen's survey was used to determine the teen's
age. For partial cases or where this information was missing, the chart from item 4 on the screening survey was used.

**Var. #11 - Teen's Social Participation (T63-70, T143-149)**

Teens' social participation was calculated by summing the hourly values of different items from teens' surveys about community-related activities such as clubs, the arts, lessons, services and volunteering, and other community events and activities where the parent was not expected to be in attendance. Activities such as church attendance were not included since parents and teens often attend such activities together, and the inclusion of this variable in the model was designed to be functionally parallel to the parents' job time. That is, this variable measures the teen's independent social participation time which decreases the amount of time available for parent-teen interaction.

**Var. #12 - Perceived Parental Support (T117a-d to T128a-d, Momsup, Dadsup)**

Parental support was measured separately for mothers and fathers. Scores from twelve items (T117-128) were rescaled and averaged to create three support scores for each parent: support by actions (Momsup1, Dadsup1), support in attitudes (Momsup2, Dadsup2), and an average of these representing overall support (Momsup, Dadsup). Original scales were recoded before averaging to give "opposition ratings" negative values, and "support ratings" positive values. To accomplish this, the middle score of 4 representing "neither," that is, neither support nor opposition, was recoded as a zero. The "oppositions scores" of 1, 2, and 3 were rescored as -3, -2, and -1, respectively. Support scores of 5, 6, and 7 were rescored as +1, +2, and +3, respectively.
The net result of this scaling is that "strong, active opposition" was rescored as a -3, and "strong, active support" was rescored as a +3. Since the twelve items were averaged for each dimension (actions, attitudes, and overall support), each subscale has the numerical range of -3 to +3.

Var. #13 - Parent-Teen Contact Time (C9a-22a, 9ax-22ax, 9b-22b, 9c-22c)

There were many aspects to interactive time use between parents and teenagers. I will first describe the process of collecting and evaluating time data, which was both complicated and time-consuming. Second, I will describe the procedures used for reconciling the time data for partial cases (N=94) to make them more comparable to those from complete cases (N=203), thereby preparing them for use in certain analyses. Finally, I will describe the dimensions of this variable which were measured.

Collecting and Evaluating Time Data

Since interactive time use (ITU) was the pivotal variable in the research model, much care was taken with its measurement. First, a yellow "7-Days Activities Chart" was mailed to prospects with the initial cover letters and screening surveys. Either parent was instructed to put this in a conspicuous location (such as on the refrigerator), and record the "highlights" of interaction for 1 week. They were told that the point was not to record "every little detail" of interaction, but the major activities and daily highlights so that the day could be remembered later by participants and distinguished from many other similar days. The rationale for this procedure was that time estimates would be more accurate if they (a) were made with reference to smaller units of time (e.g. daily, rather than weekly), and (b) if estimates were made with regard to specific activities which occurred, rather than having people consider "a typical Monday," etc.
This technique was an efficient substitute for the nightly call of the pilot study. The disadvantage was that respondents, depending on whether they completed their surveys immediately or later, were sometimes asked to comment about daily events which happened 1-3 weeks in the past (although, based on the timing of returns, about half of the participating families completed their surveys soon after the week had elapsed, as instructed). The key advantages were these: (a) when family members completed their surveys, they each had an identical written record for the same 7 days' of activities; and (b) it was an advantage to have a full week of data, rather than just 4 days (as in the pilot study).

When these time charts were returned, copies were made for each family participant and sent back with the follow-up surveys. Each copy of the time chart was folded with each individual survey so that respondents would have a time chart to refer to while filling out their surveys. Instructions throughout the survey made reference to the "7 Days Time Chart," and one question on the front page (M6, F6, T8) even asked respondents if they had the Time Chart as they prepared to answer questions about time spent together.

Respondents generally did well with this part of the exercise. We went through the Time Charts later and rated them with respect to following instructions (such as reporting starting and ending times), separation of activity categories, and overall apparent quality. Also considered was the degree of researcher judgment needed to ascertain not only the activities undertaken, but also the time spent for each. Table 3.2 shows the figures for this assessment.

As one can see, of 296 cases, 86.8% were rating as "good to excellent," 8.1% were rated as "fair," and only 5.4% were rated as virtually "useless." While we were
sorry to lose 15 cases for the analysis, it was gratifying to see that with such a relatively demanding task, so many families performed well.

Table 3.2
Reliability of Yellow Time Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Estimate</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Excellent</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Very Good</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Good</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Fair</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Useless</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>296</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The completion of the Time Charts was just the first step in the process of measuring interactive time use (ITU). Each participant then estimated the amount of time spent according to the following activity categories.

**ACTIVITIES TOGETHER - LAST 7 DAYS**
- Eating Meals at Home
- Eating Out
- Driving to Get Places
- Shopping
- Watching T.V. or Videos
- Work Activities
- Sports Activities
- Church Activities
- Other Community Events
- Short Trips, Outings
- Other Leisure Activities
- Just Being Together
- *Just Talking* (see footnote below)6

---

6 *Just talking* Please report on this line only talk time not reported elsewhere in this chart, that is, only report "talk time" which is not combined with any other activity.
Each respondent filled out three columns of information with respect to these time categories. Teens categories were: (a) Total Time with either or both parents over 7 days on chart, (b) Time with Mom, and (c) Time with Dad. They were also given instructions about how to record time and what to consider before answering (see p. 2 of all individual surveys). Mothers and fathers also had three columns to complete, which were: (a) Total Time with teenager on the 7 days on chart, (b) Percent of Time Spent "Talking," and (c) Percent of Time Spent "Alone with Teen." A footnote about "just talking" was included because an estimate of "total time spent talking" was desired, and the only way to obtain it was to record time spent just talking (while doing nothing else) separately from time spent in combination with other activities (see mother and father surveys, page 2, column 2).

The technique of measuring ITU first with a time log, and then with three surveys, yielded a substantial amount of information about ITU, but also made it necessary to deal with discrepancies which resulted from the three different accounts. We (that is, I as the primary researcher and two of my best assistants) did two things about this problem. First, we made a copy of the teen's version of the Time Chart (see teen survey, page two) since this was the only version which contained a total time estimate for each activity, and separate totals for mother and father. We called this the Final Time Chart, and completed this form by referring to four sources of data: (1) the original 7-Days Time Chart, (2) the Teen Survey, (3-4) the Mother and Father surveys.

Several quality control procedures were instituted for summarizing data onto the Final Time Charts. First, we did a trial coding of 15 surveys, identified common problems and issues, and then made up a sheet of instructions to deal uniformly with those issues. After this form was devised, we began to evaluate the quality of these...
Final Time Charts as we did the yellow time logs earlier. The criteria for assessing quality were largely related to the issues below. Here were some of the problems we encountered and consensual solutions we devised:

1. *Blank surveys.* In many cases, one or two of a family's surveys would come back blank. Obviously, we would be limited to using only data from the other family members' surveys. In many cases, overlap of time data minimized this problem somewhat. For instance, if the teen's survey came back blank but both parents' surveys were returned, we would not have the teen's viewpoint and estimates of time use, but would still be able to construct all of the data on the Final Chart (combined time, mom time, and dad time) using the mother and father accounts. Actually, if we had any two of the surveys returned, we could reconstruct the Final Chart. If only one survey was returned (usually the mother's), this handicapped our ability to reconstruct the Final Chart, but we still could use the one survey and the original time log. In this case, we would know that some of the time data would be underestimated. No case was judged "excellent" if it was missing a survey, and there was a specific protocol (see Appendix C) for determining the maximum quality rating a survey set could receive with missing surveys. However, other factors were also involved in quality assessment.

2. *Lack of consistency between yellow time charts and family surveys.* In this case, we granted primacy for the time log (if it seemed to be well done) and looked to see if any of the three surveys was consistent with the time log, or if some elements of the surveys supported the picture given by the time log. If so, we relied more heavily upon those elements which were consistent. Overestimates stemming from the surveys were acceptable, within reason, since parents were only instructed to put "highlights" on the time log. We therefore assumed that respondents were reporting all...
time spent for all events or "highlights" appearing on the time log, and some additional
time for activities not recorded (perhaps because they were not "highlights"). In some
cases, surveys were so mismatched with the time logs that we judged that different
weeks were being reported! These were among the cases where the time data was
judged to be "useless."

3. Lack of consistency between surveys. In many cases, one person would
report more time than another family member for a certain activity. If the reports
seemed equally reliable, these estimates were simply averaged. However, if one
account appeared to be more reliable (for instance, more consistent with the time log or
more detailed about time use), figures from that account were used.

4. Obvious overestimation. In some cases we noticed that some respondents,
usually young teens, tended to overestimate nearly all categories (i.e. when compared to
the parents' estimates, and to the time logs). In these cases we tried not to use the
clearly biased figures, but if the biased account contained information that neither of the
other accounts seemed to have (and it if seemed reasonable), we used these figures but
adjusted them downward to the same degree that respondents seemed to be
overestimating everything else. In cases of wild overestimation (one teen reported
spending 200 hours per week eating with his parents!), figures were simply ignored.

Assessment. Based on the preceding quality control procedures, an assessment
of the quality of time data yielded the frequencies shown in Table 3.3 for the overall
sample (N = 297, one case was excluded from the table because it reported no time
data to be rated).

Assessments of time data for complete cases (N=203) and partial cases (N=94)
were derived differently. For partial cases, the figures above represent an assessment
of the weekly time logs, since the time logs were the only time data provided by them.
However, these data were weighted upward to make them comparable to data from complete cases (this procedure will be described in detail shortly).

Table 3.3
Quality Assessment of Time Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Estimates</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Excellent</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Very Good</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Good</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Fair</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Useless</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>296</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For complete cases, since there were multiple sources of time data, the overall assessment above represents the final judgment to occur after two preliminary assessments. The first preliminary assessment rated the quality of all three survey accounts of time use, according to the scheme shown in Table 3.4. As one can see, in less than 10% of the cases were two or more surveys missing, giving a fairly reliably completion rate for most cases.

The second preliminary assessment shown in Table 3.5 rated the internal consistency of the family's different accounts of time use. In 85% of the cases, consistency between family reports was rated from good to excellent, and another 8% was fair. In only 7.4% of the cases were the accounts seriously discrepant with each other.

The third assessment shown in Table 3.6 was the overall judgment of the reliability of the family's final time chart, all things considered. Not only were the two preceding assessments considered (about completion and consistency), but other relevant factors were considered as well, such as the fit between the weekly time logs and the
survey data, and the degree to which instructions were followed by each family member in supplying time data. Unique aspects of each case were considered as well. Even a case with certain problems could be rated highly if there were many strong points in its favor, and a case which did well on the first two assessments could be rated down if there was a glaring omission or problem. For instance, in one case a mother took exhaustive notes regarding everything the family did all week long, but she filled out
her husband's and teen's surveys as well. Judging by handwriting style and exceptional consistency (!), her husband and teenage child made no contributions to the surveys. In this case, the completion and consistency ratings were both low, and the final time chart was rated as "good." Many other variables in that one instance, of course, were not judged as reliable since only one person's viewpoint is represented. Here is the final assessment of time data for complete cases, and with partial cases included.

Table 3.6
Reliability Assessment of Time Charts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability of Final Time Data</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Excellent</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Very Good</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Good</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Fair</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Useless</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>203</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical Reconciliation for Partial Cases

One can see from the final assessment in Table 3.6 chart above that, partly because of the multiple indicators of time use gathered for this study, 96.1% of the final time figures from complete cases were considered useable. But much useful data (in the form of time logs) were available for the 94 partial cases also. The question was how to make partial cases comparable to complete cases.

A comparison of time averages between complete and partial cases indicated that: (a) the total average and subtotal averages for partial cases were both about two-
thirds of the totals for complete cases, and (b) time-log-only totals for complete cases were also about two-thirds of their final totals. It was tempting to simply multiply all of the figures from partial cases by 50% to make them comparable, but a more elaborate procedure was devised in pursuit of greater accuracy. The strategy was to first analyze the history of complete cases; initial time log totals for them would be calculated, by category, and the average increase would be noted. If the average increase for one category of time use, from time log to the final tally, was 33% for complete cases, we would assume a similar increase for partial cases. So rather than increasing all categories by the increase to the overall average, each time category was considered separately. The problem was in analyzing how this average increase occurred for that category, and how it should be assigned to partial cases.

We considered two possible ways of increasing time totals for partial cases to make them comparable to the complete cases. First, we could simply add the average increase from initial time log to final chart to every partial case. In doing so, although we would be right on the average, we would add too little to some cases, too much to others, and give time to some cases where none had occurred. In spite of its deficits, this weighting technique would help give some overall balance.

Second, we could identify those cases who reported time for an activity on their time logs and multiply their times by a numerical factor, derived from an analysis of the complete cases, which would give the desired increase overall. We would still be too high in some cases and low in others, but the chief advantage to this method is in not giving any time to families who didn't report any on their logs (and who may not have spent any time on this activity). With each approach, we risk giving too much or too little to cases since we don't really know what their final answers would be. But with the "average increase" approach, we spread the increase out over all cases to
minimize errors, but may give time to some cases who didn't experience it. With the "factor multiply" approach, we avoid giving fictitious time to those who didn't experience any on that activity, but in doing so we end up putting all of the increase on the remaining cases.

We decided to use a combination of the two approaches. First, we created three labels: starters for those who initially reported time use on their logs, switchers for those who did not report time use initially on their logs, but did later on their final charts, and non-reporters for those who did not report any time for a particular activity, either on the time log or the later chart. When we analyzed the number of each of these by activity, we discovered that many activities (such as eating home meals) contained high numbers of starters, and high numbers of switchers also. To illustrate, most people initially reported time spent eating home meals (174 of 193), and most of those who didn't (15 of 19 remaining) finally did report time on their final charts, leaving only 4 who did not report any time spent eating meals. For this type of activity, we used the "average increase" approach, and added the average increase of 1.5 hours to all partial cases.

For other activities, we discovered that only a minority of cases participated in the activity, and there were very few switchers as well. For instance, less than half of the valid cases (76 of 193) reported time spent on "short trips and outings." Of the 117 who did not report time initially on time logs, only 46 were switchers and 71 were non-reporters. That is, most people who did not initially report time on their logs for this activity still had no time to report on their final charts. Some did of course, but most didn't. That meant that most of the average increase from time logs to final charts for this activity was coming from increased reporting by starters, those who initially reported time on their logs and then increased their estimates on their final charts. For
this type of activity, we used the "factor multiply" approach and multiplied a factor increase only for starters, those partial cases who initially reported time spent for that activity. For trips and outings then, we took those who indicated such activity on their yellow time logs, tallied their time total for this activity, and multiplied by 1.414 for an average increase of 41.4%.

There were two objectives in using these two techniques: (1) to increase time averages for the partial cases so that, as a group, their overall averages were similar to those of complete cases; and (2) to increase time for the whole group in such a way as to minimize error for partial cases, taken individually. The first objective can be demonstrated. A series of t-tests revealed no significant differences between the actual time totals for complete cases and the weighted time totals for partial cases. Regarding the second objective, we made the assumption that the only significant different between partial cases and complete cases with regard to time use was that partial cases did not finish. If they would have finished, we assume their scores would be very similar to those of complete cases who did finish. Since performance for partial and complete cases on the initial time logs was virtually identical, we have some evidence to support our assumption. We know that our techniques created errors in time estimation on a case by case basis, but since we made our weightings specific to how most people reported time for those specific categories, we believe our errors in estimation were minimized, and that the "weighted estimates" were closer to the truth of time spent than time log estimates alone.

Dimensions of Interactive Time Use

On the research model diagram (Chapter II, Figure 2.2), the label reads "P-T Contact Time," referring to interactive time use (ITU). We measured overall ITU for
either or both parents, total time for moms, and total time for dads. We also measured ITU by category (eating meals at home, eating out, driving, shopping, etc.). Some of these categories were combined into common types to create the "forms" of interaction which follow. We also measured "solo time" and "talk time" for each parent and the teen, but these are also considered to be "forms" of ITU. The dimensions of ITU then, are the overall totals for time use, combined and for each parent, and totals for time categories, combined and for each parent.

**Var. #14 - Forms of Parent-Teen Interaction (General Activities, Forms)**

There were two categorizations of forms created: activity forms and interactional forms. Activity forms are specific categories of ITU which have been merged to create larger conceptual categories of "general activities." These activity forms were calculated for each parent separately with respect to the teenager (yielding two dyadic measures, one for mother-to-teen, and one for father-to-teen), and then for both parents combined, with respect to the teenager (a triadic measure, yielding a parents-to-teen measure). Here are the general activity forms:

- EATING
- LEISURE
- WORK
- SOCIAL PARTICIPATION
- OTHER

There was actually another activity form, talking, but it was handled differently and was then included with the following two interactional forms. These were also calculated as dyadic measures (for each parent with respect to the teenager), and as a triadic measure (for both parents combined with respect to the teen). The two interactional forms are
Talking as an interactional form was calculated by adding together the time reported "just talking" (as a separate activity) to time spent talking while doing other activities. To calculate the latter, column B of each parent's survey (% of time spent talking) was multiplied by each activity total, and then summated for all activities. Solo time for each parent was calculated in a similar way, taking column C of each parent's survey (% of time spent "alone with teen") and was multiplied by each activity total, and then summated for all activities.

Forms of parent-teen interaction can thus be viewed as more general dimensions of interaction than the itemization of contact time which precedes it. In the case of activity forms, these forms are combinations of like activities. In the case of interactional forms, talking and solo time, these forms are more specific ways of interpersonal relating which can transcend individual activity forms by being involved in any and all activity types.

Var. #15 - Nature of Parent-Teen Interaction (M56-82, F56-82)

The nature of parent-teen interaction was operationalized in terms of parental subroles such as chauffeur, passive companion, playmate, tutor, and best friend. These are called subroles because they represent interactional roles or minor roles which indicate the manner in which a parent is performing the major social role of parent. By implication, they also signify different basic approaches or ways of relating to teenagers. This is why they are considered to be expressions of the nature of interaction. They can be considered as a way of posturing oneself interactionally to shape the behavior of the other person toward playing complementary social roles.
The frequency of playing these subroles was measured on a scale from 1 (never) to 5 (very often). The complete list of 27 parental subroles was then factoranalyzed separately for each parent with respect to the teen (yielding two sets of dyadic variables), and then for parents combined with respect to the teen (yielding one set triadic variables). Using these procedures, four factor variables emerged for parents together, three emerged for mothers, and four emerged for fathers. The theory supporting the use of parental subroles is more fully described in the first paper (Chapter IV, *Multi-level Analysis and Symbolic Interactionism: A Theoretical Integration and a Model of Parental Socialization of Adolescents*), and methods and results are presented in the final two papers (Chapter V, *Parental Socialization of Adolescents: The Effects of Gender and Class*, and Chapter VI, *Testing a Multi-level Model of Adolescent Socialization: Micro Theory and Macro-Theory Convergence*).

**Var. #16 - Quality of Relationship (T81, T92, M104, F104, other variables)**

Quality of relationship (QOR) between parents and teens was operationalized in several ways, partly reflecting the viewpoints of the different people involved, but also reflecting different levels of conceptualization for this variable.

First, there were four simple dyadic versions of QOR: teen-mother, teen-father, mother-teen, and father-teen, where the first person listed indicates the respondent. Each teen was asked to rate the overall relationship with his or her mother (T81) and father (T92) in a global way, as illustrated in the first example below (mother-version). The second example is the parents' version of the same item.

**T81. Please rate the quality of your overall relationship right now with your MOM.**

  1. Very poor
  2. Poor
  3. Fair
4  ____  Very good  
5  ____  Excellent  

M,F104. Please rate the quality of your overall relationship right now with your teen. 
1  ____  Very poor  
2  ____  Poor  
3  ____  Fair  
4  ____  Very good  
5  ____  Excellent  

QOR was also conceptualized as a function of the parents-to-teen triad. For this and subsequent versions of QOR, triadic measures were created of the relationship of the teenager with both parents, taken as a unit. This procedure is based on Mead's notion of the generalized other (1934), and the idea that higher-order social realities emerge within groups which are qualitatively different from (or at least extensions of) realities within interacting dyads. In this context, there is a possibility that teens may not need two high-quality relationships with parents to function adequately; if a teen has just one good relationship with a parent, the second may be superfluous to adequate psychological development and functioning. Conversely, it may also be that there is a synergistic effect with two good relationships, or two poor relationships. Two triadic measures were created for the above items to allow for the exploration of these concepts, one measure to represent the teen's point of view and one the parents'.  

For the teen measure, single-item questions T81 and T92 were multiplied together. This created a scale from 1 to 25, and a wider dispersion of scores than would have occurred through simple averaging. This technique yields greater dispersion of scores. For instance, if a teen marks "very good" (4) for one parent and "excellent" (5) for the other parent, the resulting score of 20 is five units below a case where both parents were rated with superlatives scores of 5, for a score of 25, or 8 units below a marking of "fair" (3) and "very good" (4), for a score of 12. These are
conceptual differences worth differentiating - differences which are now represented by numerical distance on the triadic scale. A similar procedure yielded a triadic measure based on the parents' single-item judgments of the relationship.

There were also more complex versions of QOR, and both dyadic and triadic forms were created for these. First, a detailed quality-of-relations scale is found in similar form on both the teen's and parents' surveys (M85-96, F85-96, T71-80 for mom, T82-91 for dad). These interpersonal "details" scales include words with emotional overtones such as "negative, stubborn, affection, respect, reliable, sarcastic, calm, accepts me, enjoys being with me," to describe the other's attitudes and behaviors toward oneself. Many of these terms, and affective states they represent, were discovered or refined by data from the pilot study (as intended through the grounded theory approach) which measured the salient interpersonal variables of the relationships between parents and teenagers.

Four scales measuring these interpersonal "details" were developed: the first two were reported by the teenager (one for each parent), the third reported by the mother, and the fourth by the father. A semantic differential scale (Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum, 1957) of 1 to 5 was used for each of these, and was recoded to express negative and positive dimensions. The midpoints of 3 were coded as zeros, the endpoints of 1 and 5 as -2 and +2 (depending on how the statement was phrased), and the interior points of 2 and 4 as -1 and +1. In this way, respondents who gave more negative answers would end up with negative scores, and the more negative the answers or sentiments expressed, the more negative the final scores. Positive scores were similarly expressed in degree. The summated scores were expressed as averages, in each case creating a scale with a range of -2 to +2.
Two other scales were created using general *dimensions* of the relationship (see mothers' and fathers' surveys, items 97-103). The items for this scale and the answer choices are presented below.

**Overall Parent-Teen Relationship**

97-103. Please rate aspects of your relationship with your teen using the scale below. You can also use "in-between" numbers (1, 3, 5, 7).

**Please place a number in each blank.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = very poor</td>
<td>2 = fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = average</td>
<td>6 = good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 = excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How would you rate your relationship with your teen in the following areas?

97. ____ Commitment - being bonded, having an unshakeable attachment to the other
98. ____ Time & Togetherness - spending enough quality time together
99. ____ Love & Affection - being kind, warm & caring toward each other,
100. ____ Communication - having open and meaningful discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = very poor</td>
<td>2 = fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = average</td>
<td>6 = good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 = excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

101. ____ Affirming - being positive with the other person, not overly critical
102. ____ Conflict Management - resolving problems when they happen, fighting fairly
103. ____ Support - being there for the other person, helping when help is needed

The concepts for the first six dimensions or items above were taken from Stinnett's (1980) research on the characteristics of strong families, and the final dimension was suggested by the work of Weiss (1976) and Hoffman, Ushpiz, and Levy-Shiff (1988). Scores above were rescored to range from -5 (very poor) to +5 (excellent), where negative and positive values imply negative and positive sentiments, respectively. Scores on the seven dimensions were averaged to retain original scale characteristics for individual items (i.e. same range of -5 to +5). Like the single-item parental QOR assessment measures (M104, F104), the final averaged score for all dimensions functions as a global measure of the overall dyadic relationship between...
one parent and the teenager. For the parents' triadic measure, the scale scores for each parent were averaged.

So depending on the analysis undertaken, to be described in subsequent chapters, there are various assessments of quality of relationship (QOR), from the teen's point of view and from the perspective of each parent, with both dyadic and triadic expressions in each category. From the teen's perspective, there is one dyadic measure for each parent, one triadic measure for both parents considered simultaneously, and dyadic and triadic versions of a scale which measures "details" of interpersonal interaction. From parent data, three dyadic measures are created (one single-item global measure and two scaled measures), and triadic analogs for each which represent the combined reports of both parents regarding QOR.

Var. #17 - Adolescent Behavior (self-image, grades - T140)

From the standpoint of the research model, the final variable, adolescent behavior, is considered as the "results" variable, being influenced by the individual and combined effects of many model variables. Two dimensions of adolescent behavior were measured: self-image and school grades. The self-image variable was modeled after Stryker's conceptualizations (1980) and Hoelter's (1984) experimentation with this blending of role analysis with self-image assessment. To prepare the way for the newly created self-image scale of this present study, and to give a benchmark for comparison, the much-used Rosenberg (1956) self-esteem scale was replicated.

Self-Esteem

The Rosenberg scale consists of 10 items, as follows.
Feelings About Yourself - in General
94-103. Indicate whether you strongly agree (SA), agree (A), disagree (D), or strongly disagree (SD) with each of these statements.

1. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least equal to others.  SA  A  D  SD
2. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.  SA  A  D  SD
3. I wish I could have more respect for myself.  SA  A  D  SD
4. I certainly feel useless at times.  SA  A  D  SD
5. At times I think I am no good at all.  SA  A  D  SD
6. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.  SA  A  D  SD
7. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.  SA  A  D  SD
8. I am able to do things as well as most other people.  SA  A  D  SD
9. I feel that I do not have much to be proud of.  SA  A  D  SD
10. I take a positive attitude toward myself.  SA  A  D  SD

Rosenburg's original Guttman-type scale (1965) was simplified, as suggested by Brehm and Kassin (1990), to create a simple index where responses are scored from 1 to 4, with 4 representing the most positive response a person can give to any item. The resulting scale ranges from 10 to 40. This scale was revised to a scale in which negative responses are given more weight. Before giving the details of the revised scale, let me explain why the revision seemed necessary. The concept behind the new scale is to compensate, in part, for social desirability bias, assuming that most people examine themselves with a self-serving bias and tend to present themselves to others in a favorable light. Thus an answer of "agree" (rather than strongly agree), might be interpreted as "most of the time I feel positively about myself in this area, but not always. Besides, it's not good to indicate that I sometimes think poorly about myself, so I'll just downgrade the positive response somewhat, but not give a clearly negative one."

Furthermore, if there is a weakness in a person's self-image, even a major one, its proportionate effect on the personality may not be appropriately weighted in a scale.
where the effect of one negative score can get washed out arithmetically by 9 positive responses. In the original index, a person who strongly disagrees with the statement, "I take a positive attitude toward myself," would only lose three possible points (and could still get a 37 out of 40), yet this, by reasonable face validity standards, could indicate serious self-esteem problems. To compensate, a new variable was created where items were scored as -5, -2, 1, and 3, giving greater weight to negative responses. This created a new scale measurement with a range of -50 to +30. A teen who agreed with all positive items, and disagreed with all negatives, but only moderately so, would receive a +10, leaving room for much differentiation from those who gave superlative responses.

The Self-Image Scale which follows is more important theoretically to this study than is the Rosenberg scale. The reason is that this conceptualization of self-image reflects and provides the measurement of the proposition that self-esteem is socially derived (Cooley, 1902; Mead, 1934), and that it relates to conventional social structures known as social roles (Stryker, 1980). The set of roles reflected in the scale is based on a grounded theory analysis which, via the pilot study, identified these dimensions as the most important roles played by most teenagers.

SELF-IMAGE SCALE

Feelings About Yourself - in Specific Areas
104-116. Please rate your self-image in the following areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My Self-Image as a . . .</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Some-what Poor</th>
<th>Average/ Neutral</th>
<th>Mostly Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>104. Student.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105. Person who is liked by other people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106. Important member of my family.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107. Person my parents are happy with.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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118. Friend. 1 2 3 4 5
109. Athlete or physically fit person. 1 2 3 4 5
110. Physically attractive person. 1 2 3 4 5
111. Talented person w. useful skills & abilities. 1 2 3 4 5
112. Worker or employee. 1 2 3 4 5
113. Person who knows how to deal with life. 1 2 3 4 5
114. Person with an important future. 1 2 3 4 5
115. Moral person with strong beliefs & values. 1 2 3 4 5
116. Person who likes myself. 1 2 3 4 5

The phrasing for the items above was designed to be universal, applying to all
teens. For instance, because teens typically have some responsibility for work around
the house, even teens without a paid job can relate to the phrase, "worker or employee."
While some are not employed for pay in a technical sense, almost all teens are assigned
work to do by their parents or others.

For similar reasons explained in the Rosenberg section, scores above were
recoded as -5, -3, -1, +1 and +3 to compensate for social desirability bias, and to yield a
scale with greater differentiation among responses. Item 116, "person who likes
myself," was given a triple weighting to account for its importance or salience across
situations, and the resulting scale, for the present sample, ranged from -45 to +45. The
final score can be seen as an overall assessment of a teen's overall self-image based on
socially important roles.

Data Checking and Cleaning

Systematic procedures were implemented for the coding of time data, including
personal training for each coder. All training was done either by the doctoral
investigator or by a highly trained college student serving as supervisor. After initial
training, student data entry personnel were supervised closely for the first case or two, and then checked periodically.

As data accumulated, the data file was checked for alignment, and some preliminary data cleaning occurred as frequencies were performed to make sure all answer values were appropriate to the questions being asked. When the data file was complete, a systematic error-checking procedure was implemented. Every 15th case was completely checked to measure the error count. The error rate was less than 0.5%. Errors for the set of sampled cases were corrected. In one case, for example, several errors prompted a search and correcting of similar cases done by the same data coder. Other inappropriate values noted while doing analysis were also corrected in the master data file.

**Research Design for Analysis and Presentation of Findings**

The three research papers to follow, chapters 4 to 6, will present in sequence a role-sensitive multi-level model of parental socialization of adolescents, explore the effects of gender and class, and conduct a test of the full model. What follows is the title and topic of each paper, and a brief review of the strategy used for developing and analyzing the topic, including a short description of statistical techniques.

The first research paper (Chapter IV), *Multi-level Analysis and Symbolic Interactionism: A Theoretical Integration and a Model of Parental Socialization of Adolescents*, develops a general multi-level model of social influence which integrates role-sensitive macro- and micro-level theories, with special emphasis on structural symbolic interactionism (Stryker, 1980). It then applies the model to the topic of parent-teen socialization by developing a research strategy based on this theoretical frame-work, and supplies variables for the model from relevant literature and through
theoretical application and creativity. The assignment of variables to "system levels" is explained, and a method of testing the explanatory power of individual variables, of system levels, and of the full model is presented. Selected findings will be presented to illustrate how this type of analysis may be achieved with this and similar multi-level models.

The second research paper (Chapter V), *Parental Socialization of Adolescents: The Effects of Gender and Class*, presents selective findings of gender and class effects within the model, but does not test the complete model. Whereas most studies of gender or class effects on socialization examine only selected aspects of interaction, this paper will focus on overall patterns of parent-teen interaction, by class, based on an analysis of interactive time use and parental subroles. A unique weighting procedure will enable the ranking of parental subroles most frequently employed by mothers and fathers with respect to male and female teens, by subpopulation of social class. Factor analysis of 27 parental subroles will lead to the creation of factor variables for mothers and fathers, which represent different styles or approaches to parenting. A multiple regression which includes these factor variables (serving as indicators of gender-specific socialization strategies by parents), will explore the effects of class and gender on the quality of the parent-teen relationship, and on specific teen outcome variables such as self-image and school grades.

The third research paper (Chapter VI), *Testing a Multi-level Model of Adolescent Socialization: Micro Theory and Macro-Theory Convergence*, will briefly present the multi-level model of parent-teen socialization discussed in Chapter IV, and will test it with a technique called hierarchical linear regression. This procedure performs separate equations for the effects of variables at various system levels of a hierarchical model, examines the separate effects of each level on specified dependent...
variables, presents interactive effects of the system levels, and calculates the total explanatory power of the entire model. This advanced technique will be preceded by a series of zero-order correlations and multiple and stepwise linear regressions which will provide initial assessments of relationships, and serve to eliminate variables with weak associations before they are included in the hierarchical procedure. In all tables included in this dissertation, all multiple R and multiple $R^2$ figures for the equations are "adjusted" R and $R^2$ figures.

The final chapter (Chapter VII) will discuss the major findings of all three research papers, will present some additional findings which relate to the overall model being tested in this dissertation, will conduct a review of the significance of findings for parent-teen socialization in light of the theoretical goals for the dissertation, and will discuss various limitations of the research. Detailed explanations of the relevant statistical analyses will be provided in each of the three papers and then in the final chapter.
CHAPTER IV

MULTI-LEVEL ANALYSIS AND SYMBOLIC INTERACTIONISM: A THEORETICAL INTEGRATION AND A MODEL OF PARENTAL SOCIALIZATION OF ADOLESCENTS

Chapter Abstract

Multi-level theory can effectively utilize symbolic interactionism to bridge the gap between macro and micro levels of analysis. This paper reviews recent multi-level theory and research, and demonstrates how structuralist and interactionist conceptions of roles and role playing may serve as effective points of level cohesion. A general multi-level model of social influence and a version of the model applied to the topic of parent-teen socialization are developed to demonstrate how multi-level theory can inform the approach taken to specific research topics. A three-step procedure for assessing and selecting variables is illustrated with the model of parental socialization, concluding with a hierarchical linear regression which measures the explanatory power of the full model. Illustrative findings are presented for interactional variables and for a new role-based construct of adolescent self-image, and the integrity of system levels is tested, resulting in a reconfiguration of the model.
Multi-level Models in Sociology

Rationale and Recent Uses

The smoking guns of the postwar, macro and micro-theoretical extremists are largely silent. They have given way to an uneasy courtship between younger and more conciliatory structuralists and interactionists who, if not advocating a complete synthesis between the two theoretical poles, are at least willing to engage in petty thievery of each others' ideas. Macro-micro theoretical integration is, therefore, swiftly becoming a powerful new paradigm for research (Alexander, 1988; Diprete & Forristal, 1994; Huber, 1990; Kohn, 1989; Peterson & Rollins, 1987; Ritzer, 1989), has been described as the most central problem for sociological theory (Ritzer, 1989). This perspective was recently underscored by a presidential address to the American Sociological Association (Huber, 1990). One of the driving forces behind this integration is the increasing acceptance and use of symbolic interactionist concepts (such as role playing and role identities) for building bridges to macro-level phenomena (Fine, 1993; Matsueda, 1992; Stryker, 1980).

Recent reviews of the literature reveal that the use of multilevel models is not only increasing (Alexander, 1988; Boss, Doherty; Diprete & Forristal, 1994; Garbarino, 1992), but that such models are being applied to a variety of substantive concerns such as work and occupations (Kalleberg, 1989; Menaghan & Parcel, 1990), marriage market factors (Lichter, McLaughlin), effects of schooling (Coleman, 1982; Crane, 1991; Goldstein, 1987), stratification (Grusky & Hauser, 1984), gender roles in society at large (Huber, 1990), and in a more partial sense, to family relations (e.g. Farrell & Barnes, 1993; Garbarino, 1992; Gecas & Seff, 1990; Hochschild,
Multi-level research with adolescent socialization, however, has been limited. Partial or quasi multi-level research with adolescents has included studies on the influence of social class and values (Kohn, 1959a, 1959b, 1963, 1969, 1982; Looker & Pineo, 1983), occupation and modes of parenting (Menaghan, 1991a; Piotrkowski, Rapoport, and Rapoport, 1987; Ritzer, 1989), ethnicity (see Peterson & Rollins, 1987), and effects of selected aspects of adolescent environments on teen outcomes (Holland & Andre, 1994; Pete-McGadney, 1995). No known research, however, has developed or tested a full multi-level model of parent-teen socialization from an interactionist perspective which includes a wide range of both social-structural variables and micro-interactional variables.

Perhaps this omission in the adolescent socialization literature, and in other areas as well, is based on uncertainty about how a truly multi-level model might be made consistent theoretically, or how it might be tested. In this discussion, the goal of creating a theoretically-driven, testable multi-level model will be pursued first by developing a multi-level model of social influence based on an integration of symbolic interactionism with other role-compatible theories. A multi-level model of parental socialization of teens (including the creation of new theoretically-derived variables) will then be created based on this general theoretical framework. Finally, methods of testing multi-level models will be suggested and their feasibility demonstrated.
Criteria for and Elements in the Construction of Multi-level Models

Architects of multi-level models are confronted with the complexity of social systems, the various perspectives possible for analyzing them, and the challenges of parsimonious variable selection, measurement, data collection, and analysis. In creating the two multi-level models, I have implemented the following imperatives of multi-level model characteristics which I commend to others.

First, multilevel models should be theoretically driven. Theory should guide the research by providing an image of or perspective about what is to be explained, directing the proper system of variables for study, and influencing methodology (Alexander, 1988; Kohn, 1989). For both models presented here, symbolic interactionism has been chosen as the theoretical point of departure because of its appropriateness for studying the topic of parent-teen interaction (i.e. socialization), and because many of the most promising recent innovations with multi-level models have resulted from applying interactionist concepts (Fine, 1993; Matsueda, 1992; Peterson & Rollins, 1987). This choice of theory influences variable selection and operationalization, and will specify the creation of new variables and new approaches to data collection, organization, and analysis.

Second, because of the complexity of multi-level systems, one must establish and maintain a clear analytical focus, or parsimonious set of foci, coupled with a conception of the levels of social order appropriate to the phenomena to be explained. For the applied model, the primary focal point of interest is the parent-teen interactive process, conceptualized as socialization. Even more specifically, the focus is the socializee or object of this process, the teenager, and teen outcomes which result from this process. The view of the social order which has been adopted as most
appropriate for this topic is Bronfenbrenner's (1979) *social ecological model* which designates a four-fold structure of macro, exo, meso, and micro system levels.

Third, *variable representation from all system levels* must be achieved to include a parsimonious sample of potent and relevant variables, derived both from the literature and from unique theoretical formulation. Significant correlations for a variable in the literature should not qualify it for automatic inclusion – many such correlations are significant but negligible (Peterson & Rollins, 1987). Much research in the *social mold tradition* (the process of simple unidirectional linear socialization, confined to interaction phenomena) uses only bivariate data and should move toward multivariate modeling (Gecas, 1990; Kohn, 1989; Peterson & Rollins, 1987).

Fourth, *new variables* and *new conceptualizations of variables* should be used whenever possible. For instance, including status characteristics of women in the measurement of social class is now an empirically relevant consideration, especially for certain families (Sørensen, 1994). New variables may also be derived from theory, theoretical integration, or from the complex linkages of the multilevel model, as illustrated by a number of new and revised variables in the applied model.

Fifth, *multiple perspectives* of actors, and multiple conceptions of the social systems in which they act, should be considered. This is implied in the symbolic interactionist concept of *role taking*, and research suggests that attitudes and other variables can differ significantly because of respondents' unique perspectives (Starrels, 1992). This suggests that whenever possible, data should be collected from all significant actors, and developed for relevant combinations of actors, in an interactional field. For the applied model, data will be collected from the teen and each parent, the key actors in the parent-teen interactive system.
Sixth, effective statistical analysis involves the utilization of proper statistical techniques, including recent techniques when appropriate (DiPrete & Forristal, 1994). For the applied model, for example, hierarchical linear regression, coupled with exploratory correlations and multiple and stepwise regressions, will test the integrity of system levels in the full model.

A Multi-level Model of Social Influence

Elements of the Model

In Figure 4.1, A Multi-Level Model of Social Influence, two integrated typologies of the social order are presented in the left-hand column. One typology, consisting of the societal system, the institutional system, the small group system, the interactional system, and the individual system was adapted from Parson's theory of society (1951), and the division of social levels most frequently used in research (Monette, et al., 1990).

The second typology, the social ecological model Bronfenbrenner (1979) created to guide research on human development, consists of the macro-system, exosystem, meso-system, and micro-system. The macrosystem consists of the overarching institutional and structural patterns of society. The exosystem refers to groups or institutions which influence actors indirectly (e.g. as a parent's workplace would influence a child). The mesosystem is comprised of social contexts where the actor directly participates and occupies social roles (i.e. the family, a friendship clique). The microsystem includes the situational context for interaction and the individual, or in the applied model, the parent-teen interactive system and the teenager.
Figure 4.1. A Multi-Level Model of Social Influence.
In Figure 4.1, the middle column includes Turner's (1990) four basic societal role types: basic roles, status roles, group roles, and value roles. Basic roles, like gender, age, and ethnicity, are society-wide and have a recognizable effect in virtually every social encounter. Status roles, like being president, secretary, father, or child, are attached to particular organizational settings or groups. Group roles are roles such as facilitator, mediator, or devil's advocate, and are tied to group settings and display temporary functionality. Value roles, like hero, traitor, criminal, and daddy's little angel, embody confirmation or negation of some social value. These roles are placed on the diagram to correspond to their point of origination, but they are not confined in influence to one system level; role-based influences may drift upward and downward through system levels. The flexibility and malleability of social roles is extended in the concepts of interactive roles & subroles, which are newly created variables for this research, and role-identities (see lower middle column).

The far right column lists variables commonly found in the literature which pertain to each level of the social order, in two categories. The first variables listed (above the dotted line) are those for which the units of analysis correspond to system entities (e.g. "industrialization" is a characteristic of the societal system). Variables listed below the dotted line and preceded by a small circle are variables which designate the relationship of the individual to those system entities (e.g. "social class" locates individuals in the societal class structure).

The model can be seen as encompassing constructs from all social levels. Moreover, they are organized so that their relationships are specified from general to specific, reading left to right, and from macro to micro when viewed from top to bottom.
Rationale and Literature

The Multi-level Model of Social Influence was developed to achieve three theoretical objectives: (1) a more complete explanation of social influence processes (such as socialization), which are based on both system influences and interactional processes, through an effective integration of macro and micro perspectives; (2) the development of an effective conceptionalization of the structured aspects of the social order, from the micro-level frame of reference, and testable propositions about how these system elements affect micro-level interaction; and (3) the measurement of personal innovations to social roles (e.g. role-making, interactive subroles), which are generally regarded as micro-level phenomenona, to extend the explanatory power of multi-level models in predicting socialization outcomes.

With regard to explaining social influence through an integration of macro and micro elements, I propose a gradient of effects based on proximity of system levels. Proximal elements (i.e. variables) of adjacent levels are hypothesized to have greater measurable influence than distal elements (i.e. variables from more distant levels) upon each of the dependent variables. Effects of the macro-level on the micro-level will generally be mediated through intervening levels and variables. This will be more noticeable when system characteristics are measured (e.g. industrialization) than when status-oriented characteristics of persons are measured (e.g. gender, social class), even though both may originate in the macro-system level. Some symbolic interactionists suggest that the integration between macro and micro-level orientations may be furthered by a focus on social roles, and that symbolic interactionism is an ideal base theory for merging the two orientations (Fine, 1993; Stryker, 1980).
The multilevel implications of the ideas of George Herbert Mead, the founder of symbolic interactionism, have only recently been articulated by those with an affinity for the symbolic interactionist tradition (Fine, 1993; Smith, 1984; Strauss, 1978; Stryker, 1980, 1982). Though not articulated with precision by Mead (or his presenters), his concepts of I, me, intentionality, role taking and generalized other seem to be compatible with an ever-widening circle of social systems. Intentionality exists at the individual level and implies purposeful adaptation of culturally provided social roles. Role taking occurs at the dyadic and interactional level, and dyadic relationships lead to awareness of the behavioral norms and symbolic perspectives (the generalized other) possessed by the group. Each successive social level has its own interaction rituals, properties, and its own collective norms and perspectives. The symbolic content associated with each level is, through role-taking and interaction, progressively incorporated into the individual, and becomes part of the identity construction process, leading to subsequent behavior which typically reinforces the norms of the social order. Micro and macro systems thus presuppose each other. Multilevel modeling assumes a similarly progressive and expansive social structure, and a concomitant interactivity between levels of the social order. Thus through interaction rituals and role-taking, social structure is continually reborn.

There are four distinct ways in which the present model will borrow from symbolic interactionism, primarily with: (1) an emphasis on multiple and collective realities based on Mead's concept of the "generalized other," (2) an emphasis on dyadic interaction and interactive "role playing," (3) inclusion of "role-identities" as bridges between micro and macro-level phenomena, and (4) conceptualizing self-image in terms of these role-identities, rather than in terms of some inner psychological self which transcends social situations.
Before we discuss specific theories and constructs which have been integrated with symbolic interactionism into the model, let us examine the meaning, in this context, of the term, *social influence*. Most broadly defined, social influence is any process by which the actual, implied or symbolic presence or evaluative judgment of any persons or social unit changes the characteristics or behavior of any other person or social unit. The term, *social influence*, has been selected in preference to terms such as *social determinants* or *causal factors* because, from this perspective, social influences are not expected to exert deterministic control which precludes volition, or which obviates the influence of other social elements. There are six elements of social influence included here: agents, subjects, nature, direction, indicators, and the target behaviors or phenomena to be explained.

The Multi-level Model of Social Influence (Figure 4.1) builds with these six elements and represents the integration of symbolic interactionism with selected aspects of several other role-sensitive theories: systems theory and a typology of social levels (Hawley, 1992; Monette, et al., 1990; Parsons, 1951; Robin, 1981), Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) social ecology of human development and a person-to-system relational typology of the social order, Turner’s role making (1962) and role types (1990), aspects of Sewell’s (1992) structural transformation theory, and McCall & Simmon’s (1966) and Stryker’s (1968, 1980) role identity theories. The model is designed for adaptation to many different research problems involving social influence, especially those involving the effects of social context on interaction or human development.
Applying the Model: A Multi-level Model of Parent-Teen Socialization

Elements of the Model

Figure 4.2, *A Multi-level Model of Parent-Teen Socialization*, presents an adapted version of the generalized model for the topic of parent-teen socialization. The middle and right columns display a diagram which links salient variables at each level of the social order with the parent-teen interactive system. Proposed variable relationships are described with arrows and valence symbols which denote the proposed direction of influence.

Variable Selection and Creation: Rationale and Literature

Since each research topic amenable to multi-level analysis will have its own literature tradition and universe of suitable variables, the key function of the present variable list is illustration. Variables such as social class and gender which are commonly found in the literature are reviewed elsewhere (Sanders, 1995b, 1995c) and will not be detailed here, but some new variables derived from theory for this research will be discussed briefly, organized by broad categories of macro-exo levels, and meso-micro levels.

Macro-system and Exo-system Variables

Figure 4.2, the applied model, displays nine macro or exo-system variables. All of these are prominently found in the literature of parent-teen socialization, and are placed at the macro or exo-system level because their influence upon parent-teen socialization originates within the cultural or institutional structures of society. While gender and age may seem to be personal characteristics, in this theoretical model they
A MULTI-LEVEL MODEL OF PARENT-TEEN SOCIALIZATION

SYSTEM LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MACRO-SYSTEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Societal System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Social Roles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXO-SYSTEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent's Occupational System</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MESO-SYSTEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Family System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Teen's Social System</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MICRO-SYSTEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Interactive System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* P-T Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Individual System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Role Identities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VARIABLES & PROPOSED RELATIONSHIPS

- **Gender Dyad**
- **Parent's Gender**
- **Teen's Gender**
- **Parent's Job Time**
- **Interaction-Available Time**
- **Parent-Teen Contact Time**
- **Parent's Support**
- **Parent's Interactive Subroles**
- **Quality of P-T Relationship**
- **Teen's Self-esteem (global)**
- **Teen's Self-image in Social Roles**
- **Teen's Grades in School**
- **Urban-Rural Residence**
- **Ethnicity/Culture**
- **Family Particip.**
- **Family Size**
- **Activity Forms or Categories**

**CODE**

- + positive
- - negative
- V variable or unspecified

**Figure 4.2.** A Multi-Level Model of Parent-Teen Socialization.
are seen as originating at the macro-level in their shared meanings and in their primary functions (see Turner, 1990). All are pictured in proposed relationships with other model elements (via the arrows and valence symbols) except for urban-rural residence and ethnicity-cultural background. These two are proposed as relevant to socialization models, but the data gathered do not allow for a complete analysis using these variables. Each of these variables has been demonstrated by previous research to have a measurable bearing on socialization, but never has this particular constellation of variables been examined as part of a multi-level, interactionist model of parent-teen socialization.

**Meso-system and Micro-system Variables**

The meso-system variables are also included based on their presence in the literature, but the final micro-level variables are newly created variables based on theoretical derivation and will be discussed in greater detail, especially as they serve as examples of how theoretical innovation may function in multi-level models.

**Interactive Time Use**

The overall patterns of parent-teen interactive time use are rarely examined in the literature, and no multi-level research has simultaneously examined the quantity, nature, and patterns of interactive time use with an adolescent population which spans a wide range of ages. Within interactive time use, a general conceptual category,

---

1 Ninety-seven percent of the sample used for model testing (N=297) was white or Anglo, making an analysis by ethnicity impossible. While the sample was stratified by urban-rural residence, the fact that no significant differences emerged for any variables by geographic region, and that the sample was a regional sample only, made it prudent to drop this analysis from consideration. These variables are included in the model diagram for theoretical reasons, however, and their proposed but untested relationships are indicated by broken lines.
there are three model variables: parent-teen contact time, activity forms or categories, and nature of interaction. These variables are at the heart of the theoretical rationale for this research in that they are central to examining how parent-teen interaction patterns vary within the social-structural matrix, and to analyzing how these differences in interaction affect adolescent outcomes.

When measuring interactive time use, and when assessing its function in a multi-level model, methodological issues become critically important. Studies involving social-structural analysis rarely include in-depth interactional variables, and generally rely exclusively upon surveys for data collection; conversely, studies of detailed interactional processes often use innovative methods for observation and data collection, but rarely use samples capable of supporting social-structural analysis. The former are often cross-sectional surveys which use national data sets; the latter are often small-scale studies based on nonrepresentative samples (Kohn, 1989; Peterson & Rollins, 1987).

Parent-Teen Contact Time

The first subvariable, parent-teen contact time, is the one which has been most frequently examined, but it is usually represented by a single summated score, is not sub-analyzed, and is treated as a dependent variable with respect to social-structural

---

2 There are four techniques generally used to measure time use: retrospective accounts and stylized accounts (both often used with surveys and interview methods), time diaries or journals, and electronic "beeper" methods. Robinson (1985) compares these methods and concludes that beeper and time diary methods offer the most accurate accountings of time, and yield data which are highly correlated. Asmussen and Larson (1991), using a version of the beeper method called the Experience Sampling Method, showed that substantive findings concerning time use and family type were altered when using this method, in contrast to several earlier studies using questionnaire methods (Amato, 1987; Greif, 1985; Weiss, 1979a, 1979b).

3 This is typically the case with studies based on large-scale surveys which use national samples, including more recent studies based on the National Survey of Households, the National Child Care Survey, and the National Survey of Youth.
variables such as parent's job time (see Barnett & Baruch, 1987; Smith, 1986; Konstantareas, 1992). The degree of contact time has not been analyzed as an independent variable with possible consequences for interaction and outcomes.

**Categories of Time Use**

Very few studies utilize large samples to study details of time use and interaction, and none have done so in a multi-level model which examines the impact of interaction patterns on other variables (e.g. teen outcomes). One study by Nock and Kingston (1988) examined time diary data with a subsample (N=226) of the 1981 Study of Time Use, but treated time use as the sole dependent variable and did not utilize a multi-level analysis. Another study which utilized the National Survey of Households (Thomson, et al., 1992) examined four categories of time use (i.e. meals, leisure, projects, talks) within a social-structural model, but measured interaction with an ordinal response format and did not measure effects of time use on dependent variables.

**Nature of Interaction - Parental Subroles**

The concept of *interactive parental subroles* is the author's creation, based on Sewell's (1992) concepts of cultural *schema* and on Turner's (1962, 1990) concepts of role-making. This variable is a theoretical innovation created for the applied model, and refers to *role components* or interactive modes of *role-playing* contained within major social roles such as that of parent. The construct of subroles link major social

---

4 Their study was one of the few which actually subdivided time use into categories, but it did not control for the age and gender of the children and youth involved (all were under 20, and were analyzed as a group), and did not simultaneously measure the effects of social-structural variables. Interpretation is also complicated by a low completion rate; of 620 families contacted, only 225 completed the study.
roles, often viewed as somewhat static behavioral scripts for role occupants in the social system (i.e. the role of parent), with the fluid realities of the interactive setting. Within the role of parent, for example, parents may variously enact the subroles of passive or active companion, chauffeur, banker, reminder, boss, employer, supervisor, coach, mentor, best friend, counselor, etc. In the present model, the final subvariable, nature of interaction, refers to individual subroles and combinations of interactive subroles played by mothers and fathers.

The importance of this to a model of socialization stems from the reasoning, common to both the systems, and structural-interactionist perspectives, that role playing is central to the nature of social interaction and vital to the development of a sense of self (which in turn has implications for future role-playing and interaction). From this viewpoint, parents are continually creating and assuming various interactive subroles which provide us with empirical indicators of their conceptions of parenting, their socializing values, and the nature of their interactive exchanges with their teenage children. Since the culture contains the bases for multiple schema for the performance of major roles (see Giddens, 1976; Sewell, 1992), schema which may even conflict with each other, interactive subroles may also provide us with one way of assessing differential role performance. Parental interactive subroles may be seen as novel and potentially useful constructs for understanding socialization behaviors and strategies, and supplement more traditional approaches which focus on specialized instances of interpersonal dynamics.

Teen Self-Esteem and Self-Image

Self-image, self-esteem, or some variable of self-appraisal is posited as one important consequence of parent-teen interaction (Barber, 1992; Clark, 1994; Demo,
Self-image represents a person's general sense of self-worth, but it does so as a function of perceived success at playing several salient roles, not as a more abstract assessment of psychological self-worth without situational referents (i.e. global self-esteem), nor as an evaluation of a single role (i.e. specific self-esteem). For instance, the statement, "At times I think I am no good at all" (Rosenberg, 1965), refers to a person's general sense of self-worth, but does not assess a person's feelings of performing well or poorly at specified social roles.

While self-esteem is the more common variant of self-concept in the literature (Damon, 1991; Demo, 1992), self-image is theoretically the more important construct in this analysis since it is based on the evaluation of social roles, the central integrative concept in this model. While the terms, self-image and self-esteem, are sometimes used interchangeably in the literature, the two constructs may be differentiated. Both self-esteem and self-image are included in this model since including the older measure of self-esteem with known correlates will allow for assessing a parallel analysis with the newer measure of self-image.

The variables described in the preceding section represent the most important variables in the multi-level model portrayed in Figure 4.2. The model was developed to include a wide selection of the most important determinants of parent-teen interaction identified by the literature and developed through theoretical innovation (using interaction-based constructs of time use and role-playing). A preliminary test of a unified version of the model (that is, a model which uses combined variables from both parents) will be conducted to examine the relationships of model variables with each other and with the dependent variables contained in the model, to test the
integrity of system levels, and to assess the predictive power of the full model for parent-teen interaction and adolescent outcomes.

A Preliminary Test of the Model

Sample and Procedures

A probability sample of 297 families from the St. Louis greater metropolitan area, including some nearby rural communities, was surveyed twice in 1994. Techniques of variable measurement, especially of interactive time use, were modeled after an in-depth pilot study of 20 families in 1993 which involved both surveys and nightly phone interviews with all participants (teen, mother, and father - when resident in the home) relative to daily use of time and family relationships. The final sample (N=297) was stratified by social class, urban and rural residence, age of adolescent, gender of teen and parents, maternal employment level, and family type (married-couple and single-parent families). By design, minority block groups of 20% or higher were excluded from sampling, leaving a sample which was 98% white.5 The final sample contained 69% middle-class families and 31% working-class families, 52% female teens and 48% male teens, 55% full-time working mothers and 45% who worked part-time or were full-time homemakers, and about a third of the adolescents in each of three age groups: 11-13, 14-15, and 16-18.

For the final cross-sectional survey, families first completed a brief screening survey and a 7-day time log form for recording daily parent-teen interactive time use. When these were returned, copies of their completed time logs and more detailed
surveys were sent for each parent and the selected teenager, so that time data could be collected from each family member relative to the same 7-day period of time. Of the 297 eligible families, 203 returned the second wave of surveys, a return rate of 68.4%. Because there was only one minor demographic difference between the partial cases (94) and finishing cases (203), time data from the time logs and other data were used for the partial cases when available.

**Variable Measurement**

In this section, only key variables of the model with complex measurements are discussed, or those with special features relating to the theory of testing multi-level models; variables with simple measurements (e.g. for gender, age, family type, etc.) are not described. In addition, some variables have separate versions for the mothers and fathers which were combined to indicate the joint effects of mothers and fathers within the model. Each parent reported work time on job, quality of the parent-teen relationship, and frequency of playing parental subroles from his or her own perspective. Teens also reported some variables (e.g. parental support, quality of relationship) first for mothers and then for fathers. From these parallel sets of data, it was possible to construct parallel models for mothers and fathers with respect to their socialization of their teens, but this analysis is beyond the scope of the present paper (for a more complete gender-based analysis, see Sanders, 1995b). Instead, parental variables were combined for mothers and fathers, often by averaging but sometimes using other weighting methods, to create one overall model of parental socialization.

---

6 There were no significant differences by social class or age of teenager, but there were significantly more male teenagers (58%) among the "partial cases" who did not complete the research.

7 This procedure is a logical extension of Mead's view of the generalized other, where social systems can exert collective influence on interactive systems.
For each of the following variables where a procedure was used to merge mother and father data, a brief description is given of the merger process.

**Social Class**

In this study, social class was measured with an adapted version of Hollingshead's (1957) two-factor index of social position, adjusted to fit the "dominance model" developed by Erikson (1984) and advocated by Sørenson (1994), which measures family social class by the status of either the husband or the wife, depending on who has the higher status.

**Job Time and Employment Pattern**

Parental job time was measured by several items on the parents' surveys about primary and secondary jobs and time spent at those jobs during a typical week. Employment pattern was measured by one question on each parent's survey about the regularity and predictability of his or her employment schedule. Combined scores for each measure were created by averaging the mother's and father's separate scores.

**Interaction-Available Time**

Time available for interaction was measured by a simple summation of each parents' reporting of the time available for interaction (when parent and teen were both home or in the same location, but not sleeping) on each day during the specific 7-day period of time covered by the family time log. A combined variable was created by averaging.
**Parental Support**

Two indexes measuring parental support were developed, one for parental attitudes and the other for instrumental support, as perceived and reported by the teenager. Index scores were averaged to create a total score for each parent, and these final figures were averaged to create the combination variable.

**Parent-Teen Contact Time / Activity Forms**

Time data from the family time log, and reports from all surveys which supplemented the time log, were assessed and evaluated to create a master account of parent-teen interactive time use, by category, which recorded all time the selected teenager spent with the mother, the father, or with both parents. Items on the parents' surveys also allowed for recording percent of time, for each category, spent "talking" or in "solo interaction" with the teen. The master account combined the time log and family accounts and screened out obvious errors and over-estimation (usually on the part of the teenager). Time logs and survey accounts were rated relative to the completion rate, for consistency between the time log and accounts, consistency between the accounts of different respondents, the following of instructions, and overall reliability. A reliability rating was given, and 11 cases with serious and evident inaccuracies were excluded from analysis. The 286 remaining time accounts were rated as "fair" to "excellent," and were retained for analysis. While the time log was relatively unstructured, the sets of survey questions pertained to 14 categories of time use, producing figures for categorical use of time, and an overall total of interactive time.
Quality of Parent-Teen Relationship

There were several measures of the quality of the parent-teen relationship. The teen answered a single-item global measure and a 10-item index rating the quality of interaction between the teen and each parent. Each parent answered the same global measure, and completed two indexes, one regarding interactional quality (similar to the teen measure), and the other summarizing the relationship in terms of 7 dimensions identified with strong relationships by Stinnett (1980) and others (Weiss, 1976; Hoffman, et al., 1988).

Parent's Interactive Subroles

Twenty-seven parental subroles (from chauffeur to best friend), suggested by the findings of the pilot study, were rated by each parent with respect to the frequency with which the parent enacted each. Factor analysis of the entire set of subroles produced four useable factors for fathers, three for mothers, and four the parents combined (see Sanders, 1995b, 1995c, for results of this analysis by gender of both parent and teen).

Teen's Self-Esteem and Self-Image

Teen's self-esteem was measured with the Rosenberg (1965) 10-item index. Teen self-image was measured with a 13-item scale including a Likert-type evaluation of salient roles played and identities commonly held by teenagers.8 This technique corresponds to the ideas of network analysts (Cook & Whitmeyer, 1992; Emirbayer

---

8 The 13 items include roles identities such as student, athlete or physically fit person, physically attractive person, worker or employee, important member of my family, person my parents are happy with, person liked by others, moral person with strong beliefs and values, person who likes myself, etc.
& Goodwin, 1994) who assert that different "blocks" of actors (those similarly positioned with respect to social structure) will have unique sets of ties to their social environment. Thus the list of role identities included in the self-image measure is not a general list, but is specifically adapted to fit the sample of adolescents. As a corrective for social desirability bias, the 5-point scale was rescored to give greater weight to negative responses, creating an overall scale from -45 to +45.

**Model Testing Procedure**

The research model of parent-teen socialization (Figure 4.2) was tested using combined variables for mothers and fathers wherever possible, thus allowing examination of the collective influence of parents on parent-teen interaction and adolescent outcomes. A complete matrix of zero-order correlations was developed for all variables and subvariables to indicate likely performers in the model. All dependent variables in the model were then used for both multiple and stepwise regressions with all independent variables which preceded them in the model hierarchy. Through these regressions, the independent variables were screened for use in a final hierarchical regression by including only regressors which displayed significant betas at the .05 level with any dependent variables in the model. Hierarchical regressions were performed with five micro-level dependent variables as the final step of testing the model.

---

9 These exploratory correlations were not used for screening variables for regression, but were treated as preliminary findings. It was discovered, for instance, that the new variable of self-image in social roles was more highly correlated with the quality of the parent teen relationship ($r = .55$) than was Rosenberg's self-esteem measure ($r = .37$), a difference which proved to be significant at the .05 level in a one-tailed $z$ test for the difference between two Pearson's $r$ coefficients.

10 Tolerance levels for the stepwise regression were altered to .10 for entering variables, .20 for exclusion of variables, and .02 for tolerance. This permitted variables significant at the .10 level (but not at the .05 level) to be included in the stepwise equation as controls for the variables which were significant. Only variables significant at the .05 level, however, were passed on to the hierarchical regression.
Some Findings

Table 4.1 presents some selected findings for the multiple and stepwise regressions with model dependent variables. Although standardized coefficients for only three dependent variables are shown, twelve sets of regressions were conducted with a corresponding number of dependent variables. There were four purposes for these regressions: (1) to screen regressor variables for use in the subsequent hierarchical regressions, (2) to provide a preliminary view of the effects of each system level by producing betas for level-specific regressors, (3) to test the hypothesis of greater proximal influence, and (4) to enable a review of the most influential predictor variables with respect to the key micro-level dependent variables. The dependent variables were chosen because, of the five micro-level dependent variables (grades and self-image are the two not included in Table 4.1), they displayed the strongest and most numerous connections to regressor variables in the model and were the most important variables, theoretically speaking, of the five. Stepwise regressions were conducted after the multiple regressions to allow significant regressors to emerge after the iterative procedures had eliminated non-significant ones.

With regard to the first objective, the 19 regressor variables shown for Table 4.1 represent only independent variables (or subvariables) which yielded at least one significant beta at the .05 level in either the multiple regression or stepwise regression procedures, and the column to the far right indicates the number of significant betas produced by each as predictors of some or all of the twelve possible dependent variables.
Table 4.1

Multiple and Stepwise Regression Effects of Model Variables on Teen's Role-Image and on Relationship with Parents

**Selected Micro-Level Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Regressors</th>
<th>Multiple Regression</th>
<th>Stepwise Regression</th>
<th>Total of Sig. Betas in Model&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Macro-Exo Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen's Gender</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Class</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen's Age</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interact-Available Time</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meso-Level Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Support</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen's Social Participation</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Contact Time</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Micro-Level Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Time Categories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk Time</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solo Time</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Time</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Time</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Participation Time</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. or Other Time</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Parental Subroles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac1: Controller</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac2: Developer</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac3: Friend &amp; Guide</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen's View</td>
<td>.890***</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents' View - Index 1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.497</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents' View - Index 2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted Multiple R<sup>2</sup> | .411 | .672 | .860 | .548 | .713 | .865 |

Adjusted Multiple R<sup>2</sup> | .462 | .515 | .739 | .599 | .818 | .748 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Type</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solo Time</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Time</td>
<td>1.777*</td>
<td>.346**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Time</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Participation Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. or Other Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Parental Subroles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac1: Controller</td>
<td>-.369</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac2: Developer</td>
<td>.414*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac3: Friend &amp; Guide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen's View</td>
<td>.890***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents' View - Index 1</td>
<td>-.497</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents' View - Index 2</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Multiple R</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Multiple R²</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F value &amp; sig.</td>
<td>1.476</td>
<td>3.037**</td>
<td>5.680***</td>
<td>5.208***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: N = 203. Betas shown but not marked with one or more asterisks are significant at the .10 level; these were included in the stepwise regressions only as control variables. Regression results for only three dependent variables are given above, but 12 regressions were conducted with the given list of regressors - one for each dependent variable (and key subvariables) which were specified by the model. For each equation, only variables which preceded the dependent variable in the model hierarchy were used as regressor variables.

a An index of the quality of the parent-teen relationship, as viewed by the teenager.
b The second index of the quality of the parent-teen relationship, as viewed by parents (combined responses).
c Self-image scale, a new 13-item scale of teens' self-evaluations of performance in salient adolescent social roles.
d This column indicates the total number of significant betas at the .10 level or higher for each regressor variable, including coefficients with dependent variables in the model but not shown above. When a beta was significant in both the multiple regression and step regression equations, it was only counted once.
variables. Predictors originating in the meso and micro-level variables, however, had fewer dependent variables down the line in the hierarchical chain with which to be regressed. The quality-of-relationship variables, for instance (the last three listed in the first column) were regressed with only three dependent variables. Eight regressor variables yielding only non-significant betas are not listed in Table 4.1, nor were they used for the subsequent hierarchical analysis.

The testing of the levels indicated that the exo level should be combined with the macro level. In fact, the exo level was almost dropped out entirely. Of the three exo-system variables -- job time, regularity of employment schedule, and interaction-available time -- the first two had no significant regressors and were dropped from the model; interaction-available time had only one significant beta, so it was added to the macro-level variables as reported in Table 4.1, and for the hierarchical regressions.

With regard to the hypothesis of greater proximal influence, results indicate that regressors from adjacent levels of the social order generally had stronger and more numerous ties to proximal dependent variables. Predictors from the macro and exo levels, for instance, had more significant coefficients to relationship variables (and to other proximal variables not shown) than to teen outcome variables such as the teen's self-image in social roles (role-image in Table 4.1). Micro-level and interactive variables similarly had more significant associations with role-image than did variables from the macro, exo, or meso levels. Combining the multiple and stepwise regression results for role-image, for example, yields only one beta significant at the .05 level from the meso level or above (and one more at .10 level),

---

11 With respect to common dependent variables, betas significant in both the multiple regression and stepwise regression equations were counted only once.
but five significant betas (and three more at the .10 level) from variables in the micro level.

Significant betas in the model indicate that females report higher quality of relationships with parents, but slightly lower self-image for social roles. Older teens report somewhat poorer relationships with parents, but parents do not reciprocate this view. Effects of time spent in different categories are mixed, but more leisure time is associated with teen perceptions of better relationships with parents and higher self-image in social roles. More solo time between parents and teen is correlated with parents, but not teens, reporting stronger relationships. Parents who report playing the subrole of "controller" more frequently tend to evaluate their relationships more poorly, but parents playing the subroles of "developer" and "friend-guide" report stronger relationships. Teens with "developer" parents do not, in general, report higher relationships, but they report a higher self-image for role performance.

Table 4.2 displays the results of the hierarchical regressions which test the effects of the three remaining system levels. These level-specific effects were compared with two relationship variables, one from the teen's perspective and another from the parents' perspective, and three outcome variables: school grades, self-esteem, and role-image. The macro-exo level yielded a significant $R^2$ only for school grades, and for that variable the macro-exo level was the only level which had a significant effect. This does not indicate that there are no variables within those levels with significant correlations with school grades (exploratory correlations indicate that there are several which do), but rather that, when variables are grouped, they do not explain significantly more variance of the dependent variable.

The meso and micro-levels displayed significant effects for each of the relationship variables, and for teen's self-image in social roles, but no levels displayed
Table 4.2

Teen Developmental Outcomes With Parents, Hierarchical Regression Effects\(^a\) on Five Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level Effects</th>
<th>Quality of Relationship</th>
<th>Teen Outcome Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teen's View</td>
<td>Parents' View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macro-Exo Level</td>
<td>(R^2) change</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. of F change</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meso Level</td>
<td>(R^2) change</td>
<td>.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. of F change</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. of F</td>
<td>.023 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro Level</td>
<td>(R^2) change</td>
<td>.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. of F change</td>
<td>.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. of F</td>
<td>.036 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Levels</td>
<td>overall (R^2)</td>
<td>.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.070</td>
<td>3.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. of F</td>
<td>.036 *</td>
<td>.000 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(* p < .05 \quad ** p < .01 \quad *** p < .001\)

Note: Variables were entered in blocks specific to their system level, and were the same for all dependent variables.

\(^a\) Independent variables were included for hierarchical regression if they had significant betas at the .05 level when regressed by multiple regression or stepwise regression with any of nine dependent variables in the model.

\(^b\) Rosenberg's (1965) self-esteem scale, a 10-item instrument assessing psychological sense of self-worth.

\(^c\) Self-image scale, a new 13-item scale of teens' self-evaluations of performance in salient adolescent social roles.
significant effects for Rosenberg's (1965) self-esteem measure. Levels collectively explain 45.6% of the variance in teen's evaluation of the parent-teen relationship, and 58.9% of the parents' view. For self-image, a subsequent hierarchical regression collapsed the macro-exo level with the meso level, yielding a significant $R^2$ of .346, and a significant $R^2$ for the micro-level of .412. The overall variance explained for teen's self-image in social roles was 75.8%. Thus the $R^2$ values of the model were substantial.

The last step of model building was to reconfigure the visual model of parent-teen socialization presented earlier according to the new data from the multiple, stepwise, and hierarchical regressions. Figure 4.3 presents a model merging of the macro, exo, and meso-system levels, and reflects the final set of empirical relationships demonstrated between model variables. Three variables were excised from the model because they displayed no significant and theoretically meaningful correlations with other model variables when examined in a multi-variate system (i.e. in the multiple and stepwise regressions), and family type was omitted due to deficiencies in the obtained sample. Other tests of significance were conducted for parent's gender\(^{12}\), and for other variables which displayed mixed valences\(^3\) in the multiple and stepwise regressions. When resulting relationships were too complicated to be represented with a plus or minus symbol to indicate a positive or negative linear relationship, they are represented with a "V" symbol which indicates a

\(^{12}\) Paired and independent t-tests, and one-way and two-way analysis-of-variance tests were conducted. These additional tests were essential for testing parent's gender (and gender dyadic relationships) since parent's gender was not a separate variable which could be used as a dummy variable for regression, but was only testable in the model by comparing mother and father data on parallel questions (e.g. for job time, reporting of parental subroles, etc.).

\(^{13}\) These were categorical variables such as teen's gender, and variables with both interval and ordinal operationalizations such as social class and teen's age.
NOTES: Positive valences for parent's or teen's gender indicates stronger values for females. The two arrowheads labeling Self-image represent positive relationships from both the teen's and parents' subvariables or versions of the parent-teen relationship.

Figure 4.3. Revised Model of Parent-Teen Socialization.
Gender indicates stronger values for females. The two arrows at the bottom leading to Teen's from both the teen's and parents' subvariables or versions (i.e. perspectives) of the quality of Teen Socialization.
varying or complex relationship. This was especially common with parental subroles and activity categories which had numerous dimensions or subvariables.

Discussion

Multi-level models are powerful tools for exploring multivariate relationships (Diprete & Forristal, 1994), but no model of socialization has been previously developed which includes a wide range of variables commonly regarded by the research literature as significant predictors for parent-teen relations and adolescent outcomes. Moreover, simply amassing a list of researchable variables is insufficient for the development of an effective multi-level model -- theoretical focus and integration are also essential. This paper has provided the rationale for concluding that symbolic interactionism, when synthesized with key constructs from other theoretical traditions, can effectively extend the theoretical, methodological, and epistemological dimensions of multilevel modeling. An initial test of the model has been presented.

Findings About Multi-level Model Testing

This study demonstrated techniques for testing an applied multi-level model derived from macro-micro theoretical integration, for assessing model-specific findings, and for simplifying and reconfiguring the research model for further testing. This strategy appears to be highly effective. When Figure 4.3, the revised model of parent-teen socialization, is compared with Figure 4.2, the theoretical model, one sees both a simpler and more complex picture of parent-teen relations than originally envisioned. While system levels were merged and simplified, and some variables and hypothesized relationships were eliminated through non-significance, many
unanticipated (and sometimes multiple) relationships among model variables emerged. This further model specification was partly a result of the multi-dimensionality of certain interaction-based variables such as interactive time use and parental subroles. Nevertheless, the reconfiguration of the model represents a theoretical advance, summarizes remaining variables and relationships, and provides a template for further research. Consecutive use of multiple, stepwise, and hierarchical regressions facilitated analysis by allowing for the performance of individual variables to be measured, together with an assessment of the explanatory power of system levels and of the full model, which proved to be substantial.

Certain model effects were somewhat complex. For instance, our hypothesis of proximal effects, which stated that proximal levels and elements (i.e. variables) should have greater impact on specified dependent variables than distal levels or elements, received moderate but not unqualified support. Macro-to-meso level regressors had a greater number of significant coefficients to relationship variables (and to other proximal variables), and interaction and role-playing variables had more significant coefficients to role-image (a proximal variable) than did macro-meso level regressors. However, these effects supporting the hypothesis were not seen for all dependent variables. Of the four dependent variables where system levels had significant effects, role-image and the two relationship variables did show greater significant ties to proximal levels (i.e. micro and meso levels) than to the distal level (i.e. macro-exo level), but school grades was affected significantly by the macro-exo level (i.e. a distal level) but not by proximal levels. Thus the explanatory power and effects of the model varied by the choice of dependent variable for analysis. Clearly this calls for further theoretical specification, modeling configuration and testing.
Findings About the Applied Model and Limitations

In general, results indicate that the application of symbolic interactionism resulted in useful concepts and appropriate methodologies for testing the applied model of parent-teen socialization. First, the variables created through theoretical innovation, parental subroles and teen's role-image, demonstrated strong, significant and theoretically useful links to other model variables. Further studies are needed in which more detailed analysis of interactive time use, parental subroles, and their effects on parent-teen relationships and adolescent outcomes are addressed. Second, the combined parents' variables, based on Mead's concept of the generalized other, created a model which explained from 36.0% (Table 4.1) to 75.8% (Table 4.2) of the overall variance in key dependent variables, demonstrating the viability of examining multiple perspectives and collective influence in interactive systems. Whether or not similar results would be obtained through examination of models utilizing mother and father variables separately is another researchable topic.

Third, the interactionist focus on the primacy of interaction for developmental outcomes was operationalized by measuring parent-teen contact time and various forms of activity. While overall parent-teen contact time had no significant links with the quality of the parent-teen relationship or to teen's role-image, activity forms in this theoretical model did display significant effects. Fourth, the interactionist perspective

---

14 The parental subrole of developer, for instance, displayed strong links to the quality of parent-teen relationships and to teens' self-image in social roles (role-image). Teen's role-image also compared favorably to Rosenberg's (1965) self-esteem scale, displaying a significantly higher zero-order correlation to quality of relationship measures, and displaying stronger and more significant links in regressions to the meso and micro-system levels.
15 See Sanders (1995a) for other research based on these data which describe the creation of factor-analyzed parental subroles and examine their performance in the model, and which simultaneously control for the effects of social class, parents' gender, and teen's gender.
16 See Sanders (1995b) for research which conducts model analysis separately by gender of parent.
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of the *multiple realities* experienced by different actors was justified by the finding that model variables do not have isomorphic effects on interactive time use and relationship variables as differentially perceived by teens and parents. This analysis, however, was only achieved through the interactionist-based methodology of collecting data from teens and parents, as suggested by others (Gecas & Seff, 1990).

Confirming the theoretical macro-micro link proved difficult in this study, but including more single-parent and working-class families, and using a larger selection of macro or exo level variables would permit a more complete test of the proposition that variables from all system levels should be included in micro-level research.

**Conclusion**

This research supports the utility of multi-level modeling for the study of interaction-based phenomena (e.g. socialization), and demonstrates effective techniques for model testing and revision. Before multi-level modeling can maximize benefits for research, however, it must attain a greater degree of theoretical focus and cohesion (Alexander, 1988; Huber, 1990; Kohn, 1989). This can only be accomplished through effective macro-micro theoretical integration and through the iterative testing of model structures and elements. In this regard, this study represents a first step. Whereas this research has found symbolic interactionism to provide a suitable platform for theory integration and model development for parent-teen socialization, other research may find additional points of departure for this and other topics which lend themselves to multi-level modeling. This research will stimulate new efforts in multi-level analysis and provide a template for research, especially in the promising field of parent-teen relationships and socialization.
CHAPTER V

PARENTAL SOCIALIZATION OF ADOLESCENTS:
THE EFFECTS OF GENDER AND CLASS

Chapter Abstract

A regional sample of 297 families with adolescents (ages 11-18) was used to examine gender and class differences in parental socialization of teenagers. Survey data were collected from parents and their teenagers selected for the sample about interaction patterns, parent-teen relationships, and teen outcomes of school grades, teen's self-image, and parent-teen relations. Symbolic interactionism served as the theoretical basis for developing new constructs of parental subroles and teen's self-image in social roles; these were suggested as new and effective ways of conceptualizing socialization. Parental subroles were ranked by frequency for the overall population and by subgroup of gender and class, and salient differences were compared. Modes of parental interaction, or themes of role playing, were then identified through a factor analysis of 27 parental subroles, yielding three factors for mothers and four for fathers. Multiple regression analysis indicates that some paternal as well as maternal subrole factors are moderately strong predictors, with interactive effects for social class and gender, of three role-based developmental outcomes in teenagers: school grades, teen's self-image, and parent-teen relations.

Socialization, Gender and Class: An Incomplete Picture

This study will first examine the combined effects of social class and gender on parent-teen interaction and parental role-playing behavior; the effects of these
variables will subsequently be measured on three indicators of role-playing ability by adolescents: teen's self-image in salient social roles, school grades, and relationships with parents. Parental socialization is a universal process whereby parents, as agents of society, represent social reality and cultivate values, attitudes and competencies in their children. In its broadest sense, socialization begins with societal structures and patterns and, through structured interaction culminates in an acculturated member of society, newly equipped to play designated social roles. Indeed, much research on parent-teen socialization studies the influence of parents on the developing aspirations or abilities of teens to occupy present or future social roles, or on the cultivation of attitudes conducive to successful role performance. Recent research on adolescent socialization has focused on educational and occupational aspirations of adolescents (Gecas & Seff, 1990), gender-role modeling and behavior (Booth & Amato, 1994; Crockett, 1991), values transmission from parents to teens (Beutel & Marini, 1995; Kohn, 1959b, 1969, 1976; Kohn, et al., 1986), and the nature and effects of parental support and social control (Barber & Thomas, 1986; Barnes & Farrel, 1992; Farrell & Barnes, 1993; Rollins & Thomas, 1979).

Two of the most salient social roles which affect the socialization process are roles pertaining to social class and gender (Giele, 1988; Langman, 1987; Kohn, 1989). These exert powerful influence on the socialization process because they are indicators of basic cultural values, are reflected in all levels of social structure, and are incorporated into personality structures. However, very few studies have examined the interactive effects of these variables, such as same-sex and cross-sex interaction between parents and adolescents (Gecas & Seff, 1990; Welsh & Powers, 1991), gender-specific socialization within social class groupings (Kohn, 1989), or class and gender-influenced interaction and its links to the development of teen role-
playing abilities. These omissions and deficiencies in the literature may stem from the infrequent interaction of macro and micro-level methodologies, or be related to the assumption that child socialization findings apply to all adolescents, although the age of children is apparently a factor in parent-child interaction, especially for fathers (Demo, 1992a; Welsh & Powers, 1991).

Social class and gender are considered as two key parental characteristics which influence socialization (Peterson & Rollins, 1987). This review of the literature will reveal that, while both are understudied, this hiatus is most vivid when these variables are considered in combination.

**Gender Effects on Socialization**

Some have suggested that differences in parental gender roles are narrowing (although not disappearing) in modern society (Hoffman, 1977; Peterson & Rollins, 1987); others claim the effects of gender roles on parenting are still more pronounced than for perhaps any other social role (Giele, 1988). In American society, selected effects of parents' gender on parenting are well-documented, such as the observation that fathers' participation in households, including time spent with children, is between half to two-thirds of mothers' participation (Amato, 1994; Barnett & Baruch, 1987; Brines, 1994). This is true despite mothers' increasing involvement in the paid labor force, and even fully employed mothers almost invariably have primary care of their children (Amato, 1994; Barnett & Baruch, 1987; Hochschild, 1989). Mothers have been found to spend an average of almost four times as much "solo time" with grade-school children (Barnett & Baruch, 1987). Early assertions about mothers playing expressive roles in families and fathers playing instrumental roles (Parsons & Bales, 1955) have also been substantiated to some extent. Mothers, for instance, are
more likely to give and receive familial support, and to engage in "gendered kin-keeping" within and outside of the nuclear family (Marks & McLanahan, 1993).

The most visible effects of gender roles on parenting, however, are seen for mothers with very young children, where childbirth, bonding, and lactation often dictate social roles (see Giele, 1988). Effects of gender on the parenting of older children and adolescents are both less studied and less clearly understood. Peterson and Rollins (1987: 485) assert that "substantial confusion reigns" in the literature regarding the socialization by parents of older children and youths, noting that male and female children are often reported to be treated similarly by parents with respect to levels and types of interaction, autonomy-granting behavior, and parental affection. Nevertheless, some gender and age effects have been reported, many of which are similar to effects reported with younger children. Some report that mothers spend significantly more time with adolescents, just as they do with younger children (Asmussen & Larson, 1991; Nock & Kingston, 1988), but others have reported that mothers and fathers report equal amounts of time with adolescents (Montemayor, 1982). Mothers are also usually found to have somewhat closer relationships with teens (Youniss & Ketterlinus, 1987), but most teens also report having good relations with fathers (Steinberg, 1991; Wel, 1994).

Literature on the importance of fathers' involvement for child outcomes is ambiguous (Amato, 1994). One branch of research claims that a father's interest and involvement can contribute positively to offspring outcomes, and that evidence of these effects persists even when children are full-grown (Amato, 1994; Snarey, 1993); another claims that when economic factors are controlled, "father effects" vanish or are revealed as peripheral (Crockett, Eggebeen & Hawkins, 1993). Furthermore, few studies treat the effects of offsprings' relationships with fathers and
with mothers simultaneously; those that do present contradictory results (Amato, 1994). These contradictions might exist because different studies variously use teens and parents as respondents, and that this may lead to different conclusions (Gecas & Seff, 1990; Starrels, 1992).

Beyond studies which examine parenting differences between mothers and fathers, there are three additional types of studies of gender effects in parent-teen interaction: (1) studies which focus on teen's gender, (2) studies which consider the interplay of parent's and teen's gender (i.e. parent-teen gender dyads), and (3) research which considers the differential effects of family interaction patterns on male and female teenagers (Welsh & Powers, 1991). The second of these, in particular, pertains to this research, since any general pattern differences detected in mothers' or fathers' modes of parenting may be qualified by, or interactive with, teen's gender. Research in the area of parent-teen dyads gives evidence that father-teen interaction displays more gender-specific differences than interaction with mothers (Powers, Jacobson & Noam, 1987). Mothers treated teens of either gender similarly, while fathers displayed more overtly supportive interaction with daughters and more competitive behaviors with sons.

Studies of interaction effects on teen outcomes, however, have yielded contradictory results. Powers and colleagues (1987) found that daughters display higher adaptive functioning in a noncompetitive family atmosphere with affectionately supportive behaviors, while boys displayed higher outcomes in a highly competitive atmosphere. According to this literature, these are considered to be gender-consistent effects (Welsh & Powers, 1991). Cooper and Grotevant (1987), however, reported virtually the opposite results. In their study, identity exploration was heightened for males who had connecting interactions with parents, especially
with fathers (relationship-enhancing functions normally associated with females),
while separating interactions increased identity exploration for females (distancing
functions normally associated with males). Others report gender-specific outcomes.
For males, academic achievement has been found to be facilitated by higher levels of
parental support and control (Rollins & Thomas, 1979). Farrell & Barnes (1993)
observed that when family systems had greater cohesion and adaptability, girls but
not boys experienced better outcomes.

The volume of current research devoted to the important topic of gender-
related socialization is thus inadequate and their findings somewhat inconsistent. In a
recent review of family and adolescent research, Gecas and Seff (1990) identified
gender research, especially same-sex and cross-sex parent-adolescent relations, as one
of the key areas in studies of adolescents requiring further research. This review of
the literature suggests that we have only sketchy knowledge and ambiguous
understandings into potential gender-specific and differential interaction with sons
and daughters, and about the manner in which gender-influenced interaction affects
teen outcomes.

Social Class Effects on Socialization

According to Peterson and Rollins (1987), there are at least three theories or
major studies which have examined the relationships of social class on parent-child
socialization. First, Bronfenbrenner's (1958) review of child-rearing research found
that middle class parents displayed tendencies toward permissiveness in discipline
and independence-training. Although this is an older study, its conclusions were
often echoed in the class-socialization literature of the 1960s and 1970s. Second, a
theory by Basil Bernstein (1964, 1973) asserted that middle-class families have more
flexible family roles and more complex communication, although this theory has limited empirical support (Peterson & Rollins, 1987). Third, Kohn's (1959, 1969, 1977, 1980) research on class-specific parental values found that social class and occupational environments exert independent influence on parental values, and that middle-class parents seem to favor self-direction as a parental value in raising adolescents, while working-class parents emphasize conformity. While Kohn's research on parental values has been supported, extensions of his research are needed to examine how parental values affect parental modes of interaction with teens, and how parent-teen interaction affects adolescent outcomes (Peterson & Rollins, 1987).

In an extensive review of research of the 1960s and 1970s, Peterson and Rollins (1987) show that most research has supported Kohn's basic theory. Middle-class parents emphasize happiness, creativity, self-control, and achievement, while working-class parents emphasize obedience, respect, and staying out of trouble (p. 482). It is noteworthy that most of this research is now 20 years old or more, that social class effects are less studied with respect to socialization now than formerly, and that none of the social class research reviewed accommodated the possible effects of gender. A review by Langman (1987) exhibited a similar pattern regarding the waning popularity of social class analysis with respect to socialization.

One of the more promising trends in the field of socialization (and other fields) is work with multi-level models (Alexander, 1988; Gecas & Seff, 1990; Huber, 1990; Peterson & Rollins, 1987; Kohn, 1989), some of which include social class. Recent studies, often based on large national survey data, have developed structural models which link social class with family interaction and developmental outcomes for offspring. Research of this type by Garrett and associates (1994) found that the quality of the home environment mediated the effects of social class (i.e.
family income) on children's developmental status. Marks and McLanahan (1993), in examining family support structures with a large national sample (N=5,686), utilize family income as a control variable, but do not highlight its effects. Perhaps based partly on the success of Kohn and Schooler's work with occupational environments (Kohn & Schooler, 1969, 1973, 1982), most recent research linking family interaction with economic factors more frequently examines work experiences and occupational environments, not social class per se (Menaghan, 1991a, 1991b). Whether social class effects have disappeared within modern families, or whether they are simply under-studied by the academic community, is one of the questions we hope to address with this research. We also hope to address an issue which has even fewer precedents in the literature by studying the combined and possibly interactive impact of social class with parent-teen gender dyads.

**Intervening and Dependent Variables**

The influence of gender and social class will be measured on several teen outcome variables serving as dependent variables, and as mediated by one primary intervening variable, parental subroles.

Parental subroles, developed as theoretical innovations for a new multi-level model of socialization (Sanders, 1995a), are specific modes of role-playing (such as chauffeur, moral teacher, teacher-instructor, couch potato, best friend) based loosely on structural symbolic interactionist constructs of role-identities (see Hoelter, 1983, 1985a, 1987; Fine, 1993; Stryker, 1980). Other studies have examined the nature and effects of more narrowly defined constructs such as parental support (Barber & Thomas, 1986; Barnes & Farrel, 1992; Farrell & Barnes, 1993; Rollins & Thomas, 1979), but parental subroles are designed as indicators of overall patterns of parental...
socialization. Parental subroles may also be grouped together into interactive orientations, or role-playing themes (i.e. factors), which may be analyzed as intervening variables which mediate the effects of social-structural variables (i.e. social class, gender) on salient teen outcomes.

The teen outcomes serving as dependent variables are school grades, teen's self-image in salient social roles (role-image), and quality-of-relationship measures with mothers and fathers as viewed by the teen and each parent. All of these are primarily role-centered variables, with major reflections of current social functioning, and with implications for the future of the adolescent in society. School grades indicate success in an academic role, role-image serves as a global indicator for the teen's self-evaluation of competence in currently relevant social roles, and quality-of-relationship measures indicate success in relational roles with significant others. Teen's role-image, the primary dependent variable, is a variable modeled after the work of role-identity theorists (Hoelter, 1983, 1985a, 1985b, 1987; McCall & Simmons, 1968; Stryker, 1980, 1982), but uses role-identities which are customized to the adolescent population. Role-image is a new theoretical construct (see Sanders, 1995a, 1995c) which measures important personal consequences and internalization of the role-playing process (the "looking-glass self," Cooley, 1902), and represents a logical culmination of the parent-teen socialization process which prepares adolescents for present and future societal roles.

The Current Research

This study examines the effects of social class and parent-teen gender dyadic combinations on parental socialization and teen outcomes, where parental socialization is operationalized as parental subroles used in interaction with
teenagers. These subroles will be analyzed by subpopulation of class and gender to see if mothers and fathers differentially play these subroles with sons and daughters, and to indicate and measure any social class effects. Factor analysis of all 27 parental subroles for mothers and fathers will create new factor variables which will allow for an comparative analysis of themes of interaction used by mothers and fathers with their teens.

For the final stage of analysis, a series of multiple regressions will utilize social class, teen's gender, parental subrole factors and various controls as regressors, and teen's grades, self-image, and parent-teen relationship quality as dependent variables. Teen's success-in-role performance underlies each teen-outcome variable: school grades (an academic role), quality of relationship (a relational role), and self-image in salient social roles (the looking-glass self, Cooley, 1902). The intent is to see if parental role-playing themes mediate the effects of social class and gender on salient, role-based outcomes for teenagers. It should be noted that parallel data from mothers, fathers, and teenagers will be used to measure parent-teen relationship quality, addressing a deficiency noted by Gecas and Seff (1990) regarding the paucity of studies which utilize data from parents as well as offspring.

Research Design

Sample

The subjects for this study were 297 teenagers, 295 mothers, and 276 fathers.1 A systematic random sample of families was drawn from a regional database

---

1 Two hundred ninety-seven families were surveyed, including all teens and all resident parents as participants. Most of the families included married couples with two biological parents. However, three of the 295 mothers were stepmothers; the rest were biological mothers. Two of the father figures were unmarried male companions. And two "parents" were actually grandparents serving as guardians.
purchased from Donnelly, Inc., a marketing research firm, and minority block areas of 20% or higher were excluded to produce a more culturally homogeneous sample for purposes of stratification. The final sample (N=297) was stratified by social class, urban and rural residence, age of adolescent, gender of teen and parents, maternal employment level, and family type.2 Families were sampled from the St. Louis metropolitan area (N=129) and from several surrounding rural communities (N=168).3 The final sample contained 69% middle-class families and 31% working-class families,4 52% female teens and 48% male teens, 55% full-time working mothers and 45% who did not work or worked only part-time outside the home, 275 married-couple families and 22 single-parent families, and teens in roughly equal proportions in each of three age groups: 11-13, 14-15, and 16-18.

Data Collection and Procedures

To test and refine measures of interactive time use, parental subroles, teen's role-image and other measures, a pilot study of 20 families was conducted in 1993 during which subjects were interviewed during nightly phone interviews with each participant (teens, and each resident parent) regarding daily use of time and family relationships. They were then given individual surveys to complete with prototypes of the variable measures which were refined and used in the final survey. In the spring of 1994, the larger sample of families was contacted by mail and given two items: a brief screening survey and a 7-day time log form for recording daily parent-

---

2 Although an dedicated attempt was made to recruit a much larger number of single-parent families, the final sample contained only 22 single-mother families and 2 single-father families, an insufficient number to enable some of the anticipated analyses to be performed.

3 Preliminary analyses contrasting urban and rural residence revealed no significant or noteworthy findings.

4 According to a revised version of Hollingshead's (1957) two-factor index of social position, to be described.
teen interactive time use. Families who returned these items were screened with respect to the stratifying variables, and special attention was given to randomly selecting one teenager from the household (if two or more were candidates) needed to achieve the desired gender and age criteria. Copies of the completed time log and more detailed surveys were then sent for each parent and the selected teenager. Of the 297 eligible families, 203 returned the second wave of surveys, yielding a return rate of 68.4%. The 94 partial cases and 203 finishing cases were almost identical socio-demographically, so log time data and other available variables were used from the partial cases.

**Variable Measurement**

This study measured a wide range of variables, some of which are included and described for other analyses (Sanders, 1995a, 1995c). Parent-teen interactive time use, for instance, while a pivotal variable in the design of the overall research, is used only peripherally in the analysis here and will not be described. All key variables used in the ranking procedures and multiple regressions, however, are included, with more attention given to the measurement of parental subroles and teen's self-image in social roles.

---

5 There were no significant differences by social class or age of teenager, but there were slightly more (and significantly more) male teenagers (58%) among the "partial cases" who did not complete the research.

6 Time log data were combined with survey reports from each participant to create one overall report of categorized and overall interactive use between parents and teens. Time log data from partial cases were adjusted upward by formula to make them useable. See Sanders (1995a) for further details of the procedures.
**Independent Variable: Social Class**

Social class was measured with a revision of Hollingshead's (1957) two-factor index of social position, adjusted to fit the "dominance model" developed by Erikson (1984) and advocated by Sørenson (1994), which measures family social class by the status of either the husband or the wife, depending on who has the higher status. The two factors utilized are parental education and occupation, producing scores on a scale from 11 to 77, where 11 denotes the highest social class. For multiple regression procedures, this quasi-interval variable was used in its original form. For the ranked categorical analysis of parental subroles, social class was dichotomized into middle-class and working class groups by a two-step procedure. First, all scores from 11-33 and from 45 to 77 were blocked as middle and working-class groups, respectively. Secondly, for families with scores from 34-44 who had occupational and educational characteristics of both classes, an earlier measure of subjective social class determined their class rank.7

**Independent Variable: Parental Gender**

The gender of parent was considered as the second primary independent variable, but its measurement was a bit unusual. Most variables have only one value per case, but with the exception of the 22 single-parent families in the sample, most families studied (275 of 297) had two parents. Thus parents' gender was a variable with two values in the majority of cases, and was not available as a nominal variable which varied from case to case. However, parental gender was implied by parallel

---

7 This procedure was undertaken not only as a practical measure for determining rank for those displaying status inconsistency, or those in the middle zone for whom rank designation was a toss-up, but also as a gesture towards a symbolic interactionist methodology which places more emphasis on subjectivity. One might imagine that Max Weber might also approve of using subjective social class as a rough indicator of class-specific lifestyle choice, especially for hard-to-determine cases.
mother and father variables for each family case (e.g. relationship measures, factor variables, etc.). Consequently, the effects of parental gender for socialization were measured by comparing the differences in the ways mothers and fathers played parental subroles, and by comparing the performance of mother and father variables in regressions on teen outcomes.

Control Variables

Other variables used as controls for the subsequent analyses were teen's gender and age, and family size. Teen's gender was measured by a single-item measure for the teen. Family size included one or both resident parents (whichever applied), and all dependent children under age 19 who were still living at home.

Parental Subroles / Factor Variables

There were twenty-seven parental subrole variables, first presented during the pilot study and revised based on those preliminary results. All subroles are listed on Tables 5.1-5.4, but they were not presented to subjects in that order. Both parents were asked to report, in general, how often they played each subrole on a 5-point scale from 1 (never) to 5 (very often). Subroles were based on analytic categories of practical support, emotional support, instrumental accomplishment, companionship, development, etc., but they were sequenced irregularly on the surveys. Through factor analysis, parental subrole factor variables were created separately for mothers and fathers and used as independent variables in the multiple regression analysis, but the model and our theory specify that we understand them as intervening variables between social-structural variables and teen outcomes. Since parental subrole factors
were created through factor analysis and represent significant findings, their measurement will be described in the analyses and results section.

**Dependent Variable: Quality of Parent-Teen Relationship**

There were four quality-of-relationship measures: two from the teen's point of view (relative to each parent), and two from the mother's and father's point of view regarding their separate relationships with the teen. Teens completed a 10-item index which assessed the quality of their relationships with each parent. A semantic-differential scale (Osgood et al., 1957) from 1 to 5 was used to connect two statements, each expressing opposite meaning or sentiment. One statement of each statement pair is listed below. Items are based on fundamental issues of interest, love, respect, communication, or interaction, and each is expressed in simple English or adolescent jargon. Corresponding negative or positive statements listed to the right are not shown.

1. She is interested in me and what I care about.
2. She is too strict and not fair with her discipline.
3. She understands me.
4. She displays warmth & affection toward me.
5. She does not lose her temper with me.
6. She cuts me down verbally.
7. She respects me.
8. We argue a lot.
9. I feel I can really talk to her if I need to.
10. She loves me.

Each of the 10 items above were rescored and summated. The old scale of 1 to 5 became -2, -1.5, -1, +1, and +2, yielding an overall scale from -20 to +20, where negative and positive scores indicate troubled or stable relationships, respectively. The scale is slightly skewed toward negative scores; a teen marking a middle
response, for instance, is viewed as acknowledging at least occasional problems in the area in question and so receives a -1. This adjustment was undertaken to compensate for social desirability bias.

Parents responded to a different index, requiring somewhat greater complexity of analytic reasoning, which included evaluations on a scale from 0 (very poor) to 8 (excellent) for the following dimensions identified with strong relationships by Stinnett (1980) and others (Weiss, 1976; Hoffman et al., 1988): commitment, time and togetherness, love and affection, communication, affirmation, conflict management, and support. As before, the original scale was rescored to reflect positive and negative relationships, only in this case, because of a larger range of original scores, each item was rescored from -5 to +5, yielding a final scale of -35 to +35. As before, designations of "average" received a negative score (-1) to compensate for effects of social desirability.9

Dependent Variable: Teen's Role-Image

Teen role-image, or self-image in salient social roles, was measured with a 13-item scale including a Likert-type evaluation of salient roles played and identities commonly held by teenagers, such as those of student, friend, family member, and physically attractive person. The list of role identities included in the self-image measure is not generalized, but is specifically adapted to fit the sample of adolescents, in sympathy with the views of network analysts (see Cook & Whitmeyer, 1992; Emirbayer & Goodwin, 1994) who assert the need for "blocking" categories of persons who share similar relationships with their environment. The items also reflect the influence of symbolic interactionism and the "looking-glass self" (Cooley,

---

9 This item outperformed a one-item quality-of-relationship measure in various analyses.
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As before, a corrective for social desirability bias was executed by rescoring the original 5-point scale with the values of -5, -3, -1, +1, and +3 to give greater weight to negative responses, thereby creating an overall theoretical scale from -75 to +45.

**Dependent Variable: School Grades**

Teens reported their grades on an ordinal scale from 1, "almost all A's" to 8, "mostly D's and F's." The numbers were rescored from 8 to 1 for the regression analyses so that positive betas would signify higher grades.

**Analyses and Results**

**Rankings of Parental Subroles and Parental Involvement**

Table 5.1 lists the 27 parental subroles and indicates their ranks by frequency of reported performance for the overall population and for six separate subpopulations, by category and subgroup of parent's gender, teen's gender, and social class. Parents reported their frequency of playing subroles from 1 (never) to 5 (very often); they did not rank the 27 subroles. Observed ranks for the population and each subpopulation were obtained from a ranking of weighted scores for groups and subgroups. Weighted scores were calculated by multiplying a weighted factor (where factors were 0, 2, 4, 8, 10), by the proportion of each subpopulation's respondents who indicated one of the five frequency responses (never, rarely,

---

10 The 13 items were included based on interviews with teens, and the author's experience in working full-time with teenagers. The list of 13 role identities are as follows: student, person who is liked by other people, important member of my family, person my parents are happy with, friend, athlete or physically fit person, physically attractive person, talented person with useful skills and abilities, worker or employee, person who knows how to deal with life, person with an important future, moral person with strong beliefs and values, and person who likes myself.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental Subroles</th>
<th>ALL TEENS</th>
<th>PARENTS' GENDER</th>
<th>TEENS' GENDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Weighted</td>
<td>Subgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Reg Adj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moral teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>1 814 2 667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banker-financier</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>4 750 1 688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fan/cheerleader</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>2 785 3 655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decision-maker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>3 774 4 640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reminder</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>5 734 9 539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lawmaker</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>8 673 5 601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chauffeur</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>6 694 11 532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motivator</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>11 619 6 590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monitor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>9 658 8 542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilitator</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>7 673 13 513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guidance counselor</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>10 646 10 535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authority figure</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>12 602 7 554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>referee</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>13 594 14 511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher/instructor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>15 573 12 515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>therapist</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>14 590 20 425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sound board</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>16 565 19 447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>couch potato</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>19 513 15 495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public relations advisor</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>18 527 17 484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fellow-worker</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>17 536 18 455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tutor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>20 501 21 403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employer/boss</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>22 447 23 391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sports trainer</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>26 338 16 465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive companion</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>23 440 24 364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active comp./playmate</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>24 403 22 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arts patron</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>21 473 26 320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>best friend</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>25 341 25 352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adversary</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>27 327 27 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Means ——&gt;</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>495 -82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.1
Subroles for All Teens and for Three Primary Subpopulations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Reg</th>
<th>Adj</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Reg</th>
<th>Adj</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Reg</th>
<th>Adj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>667</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>688</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>-50</td>
<td>-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>-90</td>
<td>-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>-62</td>
<td>-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-53</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>-73</td>
<td>-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>542</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>-46</td>
<td>-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>-45</td>
<td>-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-64</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>-37</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>-67</td>
<td>-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>-47</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465</td>
<td>-127</td>
<td>-209</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>-56</td>
<td>-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-81</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>-34</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-93</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-55</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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sometimes, often, very often). The scale was constructed with a theoretical range of 0 - 1,000, where zero indicates that all members of the analysis group indicated "never" for their frequency of playing the subrole, and 1,000 indicates that all respondents marked "very frequently." Thus the ranks and weighted scores reflect frequencies of role-playing for designated groups, not for individuals.

In the far left column of Table 5.1, moral teacher is ranked first for the population. That is, this role is reported to be played with the greatest frequency by the greatest number of respondents. The next most frequently played parental subrole is that of banker-financier. (Closely following morality comes money! Doesn't one of the sacred books mention God and Mammon competing for man's attention?) The banker role is actually ranked higher than moral teacher for fathers, and also for parents of the working class with their teens. Authority roles such as decision-maker, lawmaker, monitor, and referee appear near the top of the list, mixed in an apparently random fashion with practical support roles such as banker, fan, reminder, and chauffeur. Roles denoting specific types of interaction (i.e. therapist, fellow-worker, tutor, sports trainer, arts patron) appear near the bottom of the list, with relational roles such as companion and playmate. Of interest also is that best friend and adversary are the two lowest ranked subroles. Egalitarian relationships denoting status of friend or foe are apparently not the norm for parents and teens; rather, a certain social distance accompanies measures of warmth and support.

Weighted scores presented in Tables 5.1 (and Tables 5.2-5.4) also serve as indicators of involvement for groups and subgroups in playing parental subroles. Below each column of weighted scores, a mean is displayed as an indicator of overall role-playing involvement for that subgroup. Within each section of all four tables, two columns of "subgroup differences" were calculated. The first of these, regular
differences, is a subtraction of the second subgroup's weighted score from the first subgroup's score. Because mothers (and female teens) are listed first in Tables 5.1-5.4, positive difference scores indicate greater role-playing frequency for mothers (or sometimes, girls); negative scores indicate higher involvement of men (or sometimes, male teens). The second column, adjusted differences, are scores which have been adjusted for the average difference between the two subgroups. For instance, the column means in Table 5.1 for all mothers and all fathers are 577 and 495, respectively, indicating that fathers have a mean involvement score which is 82 points lower. The adjusted differences column subtracts these additional 82 points, facilitating a quick comparison of how fathers' scores compare to mothers' scores, relative to the normal involvement level for fathers.

Tables 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4 display ranks and weighted scores for subpopulations, with Table 5.2 comparing subroles for parent-teen gender dyads, and Tables 5.3 and 5.4 comparing subrole playing by gender dyad first for the middle class (Table 5.3) and then the working class (Table 5.4). Both tables begin with the master list of rankings for reference purposes. Both ranks and weighted scores facilitate comparison between subpopulations, but they are interpreted somewhat differently.11

These are descriptive data, so significance tests were not conducted to evaluate the strength or salience of rank differences. However, we suggest a rule of thumb. Since there are 27 subroles (almost 30), a rank difference of 10% or greater would translate to a "critical value" of plus or minus 3 units. A similar rule-of-thumb

---

11 It should be noted that ranks and weighted scores may both be compared between subpopulations, but rank scores are relative to each subgroup's distribution of scores; a higher rank will not always indicate a higher corresponding weighted score. Weighted scores, on the other hand, are absolute measures of role-playing involvement. Additionally, sometimes rank differences between subpopulations, or between columns of a subpopulation, do not always "average" to equal the combined scores the way one might think they should. This is caused by the way these scores were calculated, and seeming discrepancies do not reflect errors. In a particular subpopulation, an item rank of 8 for males, for instance, and 12 for females, may not equal an overall rank of 10.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental Subroles</th>
<th>All Teens</th>
<th>Females with Mothers</th>
<th>Females with Fathers</th>
<th>Males with Mothers</th>
<th>Males with Fathers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moral teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banker-financier</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fan/cheerleader</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decision-maker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reminder</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lawmaker</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chauffeur</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motivator</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monitor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilitator</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guidance counselor</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authority figure</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>referee</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher/instructor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>therapist</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sound board</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>couch potato</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public relat. advisor</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fellow-worker</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tutor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employer/boss</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sports trainer</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive companion</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active comp./playmate</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arts patron</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>best friend</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adversary</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean—> 534  576  476 -100  579  518
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Table 5.2

Parental Subroles for Gender of Teen and Parent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Males with Mothers</th>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Males with Fathers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score Reg Adj Rank Score</td>
<td>Score Reg Adj Rank Score</td>
<td>Score Reg Adj Rank Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>186 86</td>
<td>3 800 2 697 103 40</td>
<td>826 800 26 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>90 -10</td>
<td>5 726 1 698 28 -35</td>
<td>769 726 43 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>137 37</td>
<td>1 809 3 684 125 62</td>
<td>787 809 -42 -39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>172 72</td>
<td>4 763 4 674 89 26</td>
<td>783 763 20 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>161 61</td>
<td>2 803 9 564 239 176</td>
<td>679 803 -124 -121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>58 -42</td>
<td>7 713 5 623 90 27</td>
<td>640 713 -73 -70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>146 46</td>
<td>6 714 12 537 177 114</td>
<td>678 714 -36 -33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>103 3</td>
<td>9 663 13 534 129 66</td>
<td>651 663 -12 -9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>187 87</td>
<td>10 661 14 531 130 67</td>
<td>683 661 22 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>172 72</td>
<td>4 763 4 674 89 26</td>
<td>783 763 20 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>161 61</td>
<td>2 803 9 564 239 176</td>
<td>679 803 -124 -121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>58 -42</td>
<td>7 713 5 623 90 27</td>
<td>640 713 -73 -70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>146 46</td>
<td>6 714 12 537 177 114</td>
<td>678 714 -36 -33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>103 3</td>
<td>9 663 13 534 129 66</td>
<td>651 663 -12 -9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>187 87</td>
<td>10 661 14 531 130 67</td>
<td>683 661 22 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>172 72</td>
<td>4 763 4 674 89 26</td>
<td>783 763 20 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>161 61</td>
<td>2 803 9 564 239 176</td>
<td>679 803 -124 -121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>58 -42</td>
<td>7 713 5 623 90 27</td>
<td>640 713 -73 -70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>146 46</td>
<td>6 714 12 537 177 114</td>
<td>678 714 -36 -33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>103 3</td>
<td>9 663 13 534 129 66</td>
<td>651 663 -12 -9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>187 87</td>
<td>10 661 14 531 130 67</td>
<td>683 661 22 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>172 72</td>
<td>4 763 4 674 89 26</td>
<td>783 763 20 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>161 61</td>
<td>2 803 9 564 239 176</td>
<td>679 803 -124 -121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>58 -42</td>
<td>7 713 5 623 90 27</td>
<td>640 713 -73 -70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 5.3
Ranking and Subgroup Differences of Parental Subroles for Middle-Class Teens and Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental Subroles</th>
<th>All Middle-Class Teens</th>
<th>Middle-Class Teens with Mothers</th>
<th>Middle-Class Teens with Fathers</th>
<th>Subgroup Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group Rank</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moral teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banker-financier</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fan/cheerleader</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decision-maker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reminder</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lawmaker</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chauffeur</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motivator</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monitor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilitator</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guidance counselor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authority figure</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>referee</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher/instructor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>therapist</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sound board</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>couch potato</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public relations adviso</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fellow-worker</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tutor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employer/boss</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sports trainer</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive companion</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active comp./playmat</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arts patron</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adversary</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean—> | 537 | 571 | 501 | -70 | 559 | 4 |
Table 5.3
Subgroup Differences of Parental Subroles for Middle-Class Teens and Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup Differences</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Reg</th>
<th>Adj</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Reg</th>
<th>Adj</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Reg</th>
<th>Adj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teens with Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>585</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>685</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>593</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td></td>
<td>693</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>677</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>767</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>638</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>768</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td>642</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>600</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td></td>
<td>690</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>518</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td>608</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>510</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-58</td>
<td></td>
<td>610</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-58</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>527</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>627</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>526</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td>626</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>557</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>657</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>572</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-41</td>
<td></td>
<td>672</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-41</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>506</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>606</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>543</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-41</td>
<td></td>
<td>643</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-41</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>436</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td>536</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>461</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>561</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>478</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-45</td>
<td></td>
<td>578</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-45</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>461</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td></td>
<td>561</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>481</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td></td>
<td>581</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>421</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>521</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>381</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td></td>
<td>481</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>490</td>
<td>-162</td>
<td>232</td>
<td></td>
<td>590</td>
<td>-162</td>
<td>232</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>364</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>464</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>404</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>-99</td>
<td></td>
<td>504</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>-99</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>335</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td>435</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>338</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-79</td>
<td></td>
<td>438</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-79</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>279</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>379</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>501</td>
<td>-70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>551</td>
<td>-70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>559</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>-68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 5.4
Ranking and Subgroup Differences of Parental Subroles for Working-Class Teens and Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental Subroles</th>
<th>All Middle-Class Teens</th>
<th>Middle-Class Teens with Mothers</th>
<th>Middle-Class Teens with Fathers</th>
<th>Subgroup Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group Rank Score</td>
<td>Rank Score Rank Score Reg Adj</td>
<td>Rank Score Rank Score Reg Adj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moral teacher</td>
<td>3 700</td>
<td>1 828 4 605 223 152</td>
<td>1 839 7 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banker-financier</td>
<td>1 734</td>
<td>3 796 1 668 128 57</td>
<td>3 826 2 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fan/cheerleader</td>
<td>6 647</td>
<td>6 724 7 578 146 75</td>
<td>11 670 6 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decision-maker</td>
<td>2 718</td>
<td>2 820 2 647 173 102</td>
<td>2 839 3 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reminder</td>
<td>7 628</td>
<td>4 760 9 527 233 162</td>
<td>5 729 8 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lawmaker</td>
<td>9 571</td>
<td>5 724 3 605 119 48</td>
<td>6 716 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chauffeur</td>
<td>4 658</td>
<td>7 720 6 579 141 70</td>
<td>4 760 1 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motivator</td>
<td>10 566</td>
<td>13 612 10 526 86 15</td>
<td>17 587 10 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monitor</td>
<td>5 648</td>
<td>8 704 5 590 114 43</td>
<td>7 710 5 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilitator</td>
<td>11 552</td>
<td>9 684 14 469 215 144</td>
<td>9 691 15 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guidance counselor</td>
<td>15 524</td>
<td>11 644 15 458 186 115</td>
<td>8 703 13 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authority figure</td>
<td>12 552</td>
<td>14 604 12 495 109 38</td>
<td>16 594 12 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>referee</td>
<td>8 612</td>
<td>10 660 11 526 134 63</td>
<td>10 684 11 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher/instructor</td>
<td>18 475</td>
<td>16 576 17 420 156 85</td>
<td>13 619 18 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>therapist</td>
<td>17 503</td>
<td>12 640 21 390 250 179</td>
<td>12 652 21 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sound board</td>
<td>19 466</td>
<td>15 576 18 405 171 100</td>
<td>15 594 16 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>couch potato</td>
<td>14 530</td>
<td>19 540 8 548 -8 -79</td>
<td>19 542 9 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public relations advisor</td>
<td>16 520</td>
<td>17 572 13 474 98 27</td>
<td>14 600 14 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fellow-worker</td>
<td>20 447</td>
<td>18 540 24 368 172 101</td>
<td>18 555 24 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tutor</td>
<td>22 400</td>
<td>21 480 26 343 137 66</td>
<td>22 465 26 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employer/boss</td>
<td>13 539</td>
<td>23 460 16 421 39 -32</td>
<td>23 439 19 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sports trainer</td>
<td>24 388</td>
<td>26 368 22 378 -10 -81</td>
<td>26 336 20 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive companion</td>
<td>23 392</td>
<td>22 468 23 369 99 28</td>
<td>21 497 25 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active comp./playmat</td>
<td>21 410</td>
<td>20 480 20 400 80 9</td>
<td>20 510 23 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arts patron</td>
<td>26 330</td>
<td>24 436 27 270 166 95</td>
<td>25 381 27 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>best friend</td>
<td>25 357</td>
<td>25 372 19 400 -28 -99</td>
<td>24 432 22 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adversary</td>
<td>27 329</td>
<td>27 320 25 368 -48 -119</td>
<td>27 323 17 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>526 597</td>
<td>475 -121</td>
<td>603 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subgroup Differences</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Reg</td>
<td>Adj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teens with Mothers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Middle-Class Females with Mothers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Middle-Class Males with Mothers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Middle-Class Fathers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>668</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>578</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>647</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>579</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>526</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>469</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>458</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>526</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-79</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-81</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>-99</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368</td>
<td>-48</td>
<td>-119</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>475</td>
<td>-121</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>-169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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might be adopted for weighted score differences. Even though the theoretical range for weighted scores for "all teens" is 0 to 1,000, the actual spread is 308 to 739, yielding a range of 431. A difference of 10% means critical value differences of about 40 points or greater. The figures under subgroup differences make it easy to identify when point differences of 40 or greater occur, and adjusted scores facilitate comparison for the norm of that group.

For both ranks and weighted scores, comparisons may be made between a subgroup and the population, or between subgroups. To facilitate communication, the language of significance will be used for commenting on certain observed critical differences, but lesser differences which approach this level may also be mentioned, particularly if they help create a pattern with other observations which are significant. We will also temporarily devise a convention of referring to point differences between groups, where (d=55*) signifies a "difference" of 55 points, with the asterisk (*) denoting a significant difference using the 40-point rule.

Using this rule of thumb, we have already noted a significant difference between mothers' and fathers' involvement in overall role-playing (see weighted means, Table 5.1). The point difference is 82 (that is, d=82*). This is the only significant "main effect" noted for overall involvement in Table 5.1. While male teens received slightly more overall role-playing involvement from parents than females (d=17), and middle-class parents were slightly more involved than working-class parents (d=11), these differences are not significant. Knowing the general overall difference between groups, however, helps to evaluate the differences noted for individual subrole items.

For instance, given the main parents' gender difference of 82 points, it is noteworthy that fathers are slightly ahead of mothers for best friend, and are 127
points ahead for sports trainer! Examining the negative numbers in the adjusted differences column indicates other subroles where fathers, while not ahead of mothers in most cases, are far ahead of their normal involvement pattern. Our rule of thumb of 40 points for the adjusted scores, for instance, indicates that fathers are significantly more involved than normal in the roles of motivator, couch potato, sports trainer, active companion, best friend, and adversary. These roles seem to center around the themes of leisure, activity, and companionship. With dads, it seems, teens can be either lazy or very active, on great terms or somewhat at odds. Mothers, however, are significantly more likely (see adjusted scores) to play developer roles such as moral teacher, cheerleader, facilitator, and arts patron, practical support roles such as reminder, chauffeur, and decision-maker, and communication roles such as facilitator and therapist.

For teens' gender, adjusted scores indicate parents report playing the roles of therapist, sounding board, banker-financier, and arts patron significantly more often with female teens. These are all roles relating to gender-specific themes of nurture, dependency and cultural pursuits. With male teens, on the other hand, parents are more likely to play the roles of reminder, lawmaker, motivator, and fellow-worker. Male teens seem to need more rules and more prodding. Parents also play the role of sports trainer more with males than females (d=-56, see Table 5.1), but as Table 5.2 indicates, this is interactive with parents' gender. Fathers are more likely to give sports training to female teens than mothers are (d=-112), but they play this subrole even more often with males (d=-140).

Space does not permit a review of all significant differences in Tables 5.1-5.4, but a few noteworthy findings and patterns are as follows. In Table 5.2, other interaction effects are noted between parents' and teens' gender. As an example,
whereas parents played "fellow-worker" more often with males in Table 5.1 (d = -67),
we note an interaction effect in Table 5.2; mothers play this role slightly more with
daughters than with sons, but fathers are much more likely to play this role with sons
(d = -123).

The effect of higher education is clearly noticed between the middle and
working classes (see Table 5.1). The middle class is significantly more likely to play
the roles of moral teacher (d = 50), guidance counselor (d = 76), teacher (d = 85), and
patron of the arts (d = 73). A different pattern and exercise of power and authority
roles is also noted as a main effect for class. The middle class plays lawmaker and
authority figure more often, but the working class plays the roles of decision-maker,
monitor, referee, and employer/boss. Both classes emphasize parental authority, but
middle class parents seem to more often make rules which they expect teens to follow
without constant monitoring, while working class parental use of hierarchical
authority is more supervisory. This observation supports Kohn's thesis (1959a, 1969)
that the middle class emphasizes values of self-direction and the working class
stresses values of obedience and conformity. Other class differences, differentiated
by gender dyad, can be observed in Table 5.3 and 5.4.

Table 5.5 recomposes the parental subrole data in another form, to enable a
comparison of involvement in role playing for the overall sample and subgroups.
Group averages were calculated from parents' individual frequency responses to the
27 parental subrole items. Scores were weighted to create an overall scale with a
theoretical range of 0 (for 27 "never" responses) to 1,000 (for 27 "very frequently"
responses) to make them comparable to the weighted scores in Tables 5.1-5.4. In
fact, though derived differently, with one average created from group scores and the
other created from individual scores, both have an overall average of 534.
Table 5.5

Overall Parental Involvement With Teenagers, Group Averages by Gender and Class for Frequency of Playing Parents' Interactive Subroles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall Sample</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Moms</td>
<td>Dads</td>
<td>Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Teens</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>576*</td>
<td>492*</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(165)</td>
<td>(195)</td>
<td>(158)</td>
<td>(123)</td>
<td>(145)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Teens</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>575*</td>
<td>475**</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(85)</td>
<td>(109)</td>
<td>(88)</td>
<td>(65)</td>
<td>(78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Teens</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>576*</td>
<td>511**</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(73)</td>
<td>(86)</td>
<td>(76)</td>
<td>(58)</td>
<td>(67)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p ≤ .002 in paired t-tests, by parent's gender
** p ≤ .002 in paired t-tests, by parent's gender
† p < .10, paired t-tests, by parent's gender

Notes: Numbers in parentheses represent sample sizes for the overall population and each subgroup. The averages marked with at least one asterisk (*) represent significant differences (p < .002) between averages for mothers and fathers - mothers' averages are consistently higher. That is, mothers as a group are significantly more likely to report a greater frequency of playing many of the 27 parental subroles, for the overall population and for each subgroup. The greatest absolute difference in this regard (605 to 426, a 179 point difference) was noted for working-class parents with their daughters: mothers display much greater involvement with daughters than fathers do.

** In 2-way ANOVA tests which used social class and teen's gender as independent variables, a significant main effect was noted at the .05 level for fathers and teen's gender; fathers are significantly more involved in playing parental subroles with their teenage sons than with their daughters. The greatest absolute difference in this regard (520 to 426, a 94 point difference) was noted for working-class fathers.

Group averages were calculated from parents' individual frequency responses to the 27 parental subrole items. Scores were weighted to create an overall scale with a theoretical range of 0 (for 27 "never" responses) to 1,000 (for 27 "very frequently" responses) to make them comparable to the weighted scores in Table 1. In fact, though derived differently, the two sets of scores both have an overall average of 534, and subpopulation averages which are also identical or within a few points of each other.
Notes: Numbers in parentheses represent sample sizes for the overall population and each subgroup. The averages marked with at least one asterisk (*) represent significant differences (p<.002) between averages for mothers and fathers - mothers' averages are consistently higher. That is, mothers as a group are significantly more likely to report a greater frequency of playing many of the 27 parental subroles, for the overall population and for each subgroup. The greatest absolute difference in this regard (605 to 426, a 179 point difference) was noted for working-class parents with their daughters: mothers display much greater involvement with daughters than fathers do.

** In 2-way ANOVA tests which used social class and teen's gender as independent variables, a significant main effect was noted at the .05 level for fathers and teen's gender; fathers are significantly more involved in playing parental subroles with their teenage sons than with their daughters. The greatest absolute difference in this regard (520 to 426, a 94 point difference) was noted for working-class fathers.

Group averages were calculated from parents' individual frequency responses to the 27 parental subrole items. Scores were weighted to create an overall scale with a theoretical range of 0 (for 27 "never" responses) to 1,000 (for 27 "very frequently" responses) to make them comparable to the weighted scores in Table 1. In fact, though derived differently, the two sets of scores both have an overall average of 534, and subpopulation averages which are also identical or within a few points of each other.
Subpopulation averages, calculated by both measures, are also identical or within a few points of each other. Each parent had a separate involvement score\textsuperscript{13} enabling ANOVAs and t-tests to be executed. Results indicate that mothers are significantly more involved in role-playing than fathers for all subgroups. A two-way ANOVA test also highlighted one interactive effect; fathers were significantly more likely to be involved in interaction (via parental subroles) with sons than with daughters.

Table 5.6 displays selected Spearman rank-order correlation coefficients between the rankings of parental subroles between different subpopulations. In all cases, the correlations are significant at the .01 level, but of greater interest are the coefficient magnitudes which indicate the extent of similar and dissimilar frequency rankings of parental subroles between parental subpopulations. Low coefficients indicate subpopulations for which parents display substantially different patterns of interaction with teens. When male and female teens are compared (rows D through G), low coefficients serve as indicators of gender-specific parental subrole rankings, in these instances revealing sex-typed dyadic interaction.

In general, Table 5.6 suggests the powerful interactive effects of gender dyads. For instance, row A, "Correlations for All Teens," which does not break comparisons down by gender of teens, shows substantial similarity of modes of parenting. In this case, the highest correspondence is between mothers of both classes ($r_s=.968$), while the greatest dissimilarity occurs between middle-class moms and working-class dads ($r_s=.788$). When teen's gender is considered, however, the picture changes considerably, especially for certain subgroupings. Female teens (row B) receive very different socializing interactions via subroles, for instance, from

\textsuperscript{13} In a combined measure of role-playing involvement which utilized data from both parents, involvement scores were somewhat correlated with total time spent with teenagers ($r=.44$, $p=.000$). This correlation gives additional evidence that the term involvement is appropriate to use in this context.
Table 5.6
Comparison of Spearman's Rank Order Correlation Coefficients for Subrole Rankings for Different Subgroups of Social Class and Gender

A. Sample 1: All Teens (both genders combined)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison Groups:</th>
<th>All Moms/w Middle Class/w</th>
<th>MC Moms/w MC Dads/w</th>
<th>MC Moms/w WC Moms/w WC Dads/w</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Dads Working Class</td>
<td>.892</td>
<td>.859</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Sample 2: Females Teens Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison Groups:</th>
<th>All Moms/w Middle Class/w</th>
<th>MC Moms/w WC Moms/w WC Dads/w</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Dads Working Class</td>
<td>.858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Sample 3: Males Teens Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison Groups:</th>
<th>All Moms/w Middle Class/w</th>
<th>MC Moms/w WC Moms/w WC Dads/w</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Dads Working Class</td>
<td>.892</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Mixed-Sample Comparison #1: Male Teens compared with Female Teens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent Samples:</th>
<th>All Parents</th>
<th>All Moms</th>
<th>All Dads</th>
<th>MC Parents</th>
<th>MC Moms</th>
<th>MC Dads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.948</td>
<td>.918</td>
<td>.938</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>.874</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Mixed-Sample Comparison #2: Cross-Parent, Cross-Teen Combinations (Social Class Held Constant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent/Teen Dyads:</th>
<th>MC Moms for females/w MC Dads for males/w</th>
<th>WC Moms for females/w WC Dads for males/w</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.694</td>
<td>.870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Mixed-Sample Comparison #3: Cross-Class, Cross-Teen Combinations (Parents' Gender Held Constant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent/Teen Dyads:</th>
<th>MC Moms for females/w MC Dads for males/w</th>
<th>WC Moms for females/w WC Dads for males/w</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>.876</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. Mixed-Sample Comparison #4: Cross-Class, Cross-Parent, Cross-Teen Combinations (Three-Variable Mix)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent/Teen Dyads:</th>
<th>MC Moms for females/w MC Dads for males/w</th>
<th>MC Moms for females/w MC Dads for males/w</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>.809</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Symbols: MC = Middle Class, WC = Working Class. The number of parental subrole ranks is 27 (N = 27, df=25). All coefficients are significant at the .001 level, and all but one at the .001 level. All values are r.<ref>Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.</ref>
Table 5.6
Rank Order Correlation Coefficients for Parental Subgroups of Social Class and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>me-Class</th>
<th>Cross-Class</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>WC Moms/w</td>
<td>MC Moms/w</td>
<td>MC Dads/w</td>
<td>MC Moms/w</td>
<td>MC Dads/w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC Dads</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>.842</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| v              | WC Moms/w            | MC Moms/w  | MC Dads/w  | MC Moms/w  | MC Dads/w  |
| WC Dads        | .800                 | .808       | .800       | .659       | .811       |

| v              | WC Moms/w            | MC Moms/w  | MC Dads/w  | MC Moms/w  | MC Dads/w  |
| WC Dads        | .668                 | .941       | .642       | .647       | .642       |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teens</th>
<th>Middle-Class</th>
<th>Working-Class</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC Parents</td>
<td>MC Moms</td>
<td>MC Dads</td>
<td>WC Parents</td>
<td>WC Moms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>.874</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>.868</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

r:-sex interactions (Social Class Held Constant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Working-Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r males /w females</td>
<td>WC Moms for females /w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WC Dads for males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WC Moms for males /w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WC Dads for females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.811</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

r:sex interactions (Parents' Gender Held Constant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fathers Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r males /w females</td>
<td>MC Dads for females /w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC Dads for males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC Dads for females /w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WC Dads for males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teen Combinations (Three-Variable Mix)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MC Dads, WC Moms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r males /w females</td>
<td>MC Dads for females /w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WC Moms for males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC Dads for males /w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WC Moms for females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.713</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ubole ranks is 27 (N = 27, df=25). All coefficients are significant at the .01 level.
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middle-class moms and working-class dads (\(r_s=.659\)), and male teens (row C) receive
dissimilar interactions from several groups, especially from middle-class and
working-class dads (\(r_s=.642\)). While correlations of this magnitude indicate some
similarities of role-playing behavior, they also explain less than half of the variance
and reflect substantial dissimilarity (\(r_s^2\)).

Column D indicates that males and females appear to be treated almost
identically (in terms of parental subroles) when class or parents' gender, or both, are
not considered (\(r_s=.948\) overall, and .937 and .919 for the middle and working class,
respectively), but some dissimilarities appear when class and parents' gender are
selected, comparing male and female teens within, such as with middle-class mothers
(\(r_s=.781\)) and working-class fathers (\(r_s=.798\)). One interpretation of this observation
is that male and female teens are subject to similar patterns of interactive subroles
when the collective influence of both parents is considered, but interaction with
individual parents is subject to some sex-typing, especially for some subroles. Even
greater differences, however, are found in columns E-G, where the effects of two or
three variables are combined. In general, coefficients in those columns appear to be
the lowest when gender dyads are the most dissimilar (i.e. cross-parent, cross-teen
effects), especially when fathers interacting with males is one of the subgroups.
Social class also has an effect, as is evidenced by the dissimilarities between working-
class fathers with males and middle-class mothers with females (\(r_s=.483\)). It is clear
from the variation in magnitude, socialization differences are greatest when class and
gender differences among socializing parents are combined with cross-gender parent-
teen combinations.
Factor Analysis and Subrole Themes by Gender and Class

Given the differences noted between mothers' and fathers' frequencies of role-playing, with some of them interacting with gender of teen, a separate factor analysis was conducted for the subroles of mothers and fathers which used principal components analysis, varimax rotation, and listwise deletion of missing cases. Table 5.7 displays the factors derived from this procedure, factor labels, and the factor loadings for subrole items which met the item-loadings inclusion criteria (see "cut-off values") and were therefore included in each factor.

The resulting gender-specific factors fit nicely with the previous analysis of subrole rankings and weighted scores in Tables 5.1-5.4. For mothers, the moral authority factor combines power and supervision with a moral teaching and guidance motif. The second maternal factor, accepting partner, combines passive acceptance and listening skills with an exclusion of referee, boss and adversary functions. Driver and fan combines only two subroles, but the two items seem to reveal an important dimension of mothers' role obligations. The first factor for fathers, guide and teacher, fuses the moral authority motif of mothers with guidance, listening, and motivating functions. The fact that this factor is stronger than the control and conformity factor which follows is an interesting finding. The third paternal factor, buddy/chum, is a consistent blend of items indicating passive and fun-loving companionship. The fourth factor, trainer and fan, gives the active paternal analog for the driver/fan factor seen for mothers. Even with only two items and an eigenvalue of 1.36, this factor performed well in the subsequent analysis.
### Table 5.7

Factor Analysis of Parents' Interactive Subroles for Mothers and Fathers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental Subroles</th>
<th>Mothers' Factors</th>
<th>Fathers' Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eigen Values (EV)</strong></td>
<td>EV=7.06</td>
<td>EV=3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cut-off Values (CV)</strong></td>
<td>CV=.60</td>
<td>CV=.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Chauffeur</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Passive Companion</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Playmate</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tutor</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reminder</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Motivator</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lawmaker</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Monitor</td>
<td>.635</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Referee</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>-.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Fan/Cheerleader</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Arts Patron</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Moral Teacher</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Adversary</td>
<td>-.596</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Fellow-worker</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Couch Potato</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Decision-maker</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Facilitator</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Sound Board</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Authority Figure</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Therapist</td>
<td>.602</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Employer/Boss</td>
<td>-.459</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Teacher</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Referee</td>
<td>Sports Trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>- .472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sports Trainer</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Fan/Cheerleader</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Arts Patron</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Banker-Financier</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Moral Teacher</td>
<td>.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Adversary</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Fellow-worker</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Couch Potato</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Decision-maker</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>.606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sound Board</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Authority Figure</td>
<td>.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Therapist</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Employer/Boss</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Guidance Counselor</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Best Friend</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  ** p < .01  *** p < .001

Notes: N = 195 for mothers and 158 for fathers.
Effects of Parental Subroles on Teen Outcomes

For each parental factor, a quasi-interval variable was created for use in a series of multiple regressions, with the parent-teen relationship and teen outcomes serving as dependent variables. Table 5.8 displays the results of the primary regression analysis with the complete sample, with footnotes indicating significant variations for parallel analyses conducted with separate subpopulations. Demographic variables, especially class and age, show weak but significant effects with school grades and teen relationships with their mothers, from both parties' perspectives. In this case, negative valences signify that working-class parents and teens both report somewhat poorer relationships than their middle-class counterparts.

Maternal subrole factors, especially the role of accepting partner, indicate moderately strong relationships to teen's self image, one weak but significant relationship to school grades, and strong relationships to relationship variables (especially for the mother's view of the relationship). Paternal subrole factors show fewer ties to self-image and grades, but strong ties to relationship variables. It might be assumed that, since subrole factors are based on parental reports, regression coefficients would be higher for the parents' views of the relationship (which they are), but the fact that teens report significantly better relationships under certain conditions of parental role-playing provides independent evidence that differential role-playing does have an effect on relationships. In this regard, it is interesting to observe that fathers' reported playing of control and conformity roles has a negative effect on the parent-teen relationship from their perspective, but a much stronger negative effect from the teen's perspective. This is the only case where reported role-playing has a stronger effect according to the teen than according to the parent, providing evidence that role-playing reports are fairly reliable indicators of behavior.
Table 5.8
Regression Effects of Control and Factor Variables on Teen-Parent Relationships and on Teen's Developmental Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Regressors</th>
<th>Outcome Variables</th>
<th>Quality of Parent-Teen Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teen's Self-Imagea in Social Roles</td>
<td>Teen's View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Grades</td>
<td>Relat w Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Classb</td>
<td>-.1081</td>
<td>-.1807 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen's Genderc</td>
<td>-.0855</td>
<td>.1488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen's Age</td>
<td>-.1384</td>
<td>-.1983 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Size</td>
<td>-.0514 d</td>
<td>-.0783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers' Factor Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Moral Authority</td>
<td>.2815 **</td>
<td>.0387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Accepting Partner</td>
<td>.3617 ***</td>
<td>.1964 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Driver &amp; Loyal Fan</td>
<td>-.0718</td>
<td>.1323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers' Factor Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Guide &amp; Teacher</td>
<td>-.0566</td>
<td>-.0864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Control &amp; Conformity</td>
<td>-.0000</td>
<td>-.0596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Buddy / Chum</td>
<td>-.0196</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Trainer &amp; Fan</td>
<td>.3009 **</td>
<td>.1318 e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Multiple R</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Multiple R²</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F value &amp; sig.</td>
<td>4.287 ***</td>
<td>3.693 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: N = 203. Betas shown are standardized regression coefficients. Betas shown but not marked with any symbol are not significant at the .10 level. For equations using relationship factors as the dependent variables, only factors from the involved parent were included as regressors.

a Self-image scale, a new 13-item scale of teens' self-evaluations of performance in salient adolescent social roles.

b Hollingshead's (1957) Two-Factor Index of Social Class which combines education and occupational scores for one parent to derive family social class, yielding a quasi-interval scale of 11-77, where 11 denotes the highest class.

c Teen's gender is included as a dummy variable, where positive valences imply higher values for females.

d In a separate equation for males only, family size was a significant predictor of role-image (b=-.2832 **).

e While the father subrole of Trainer & Fan was not a significant predictor of grades for all teens or for females, it was
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Buddy / Chum</th>
<th>Trainer &amp; Fan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>-.0196</td>
<td>.3009 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.1318 c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted Multiple R

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>457</th>
<th>.409</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Adjusted Multiple R²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>.209</th>
<th>.167</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

F value & sig.

|  | 4.287 *** | 3.693 *** |

Notes: N = 203. Betas shown are standardized regression coefficients. Betas shown but not marked with any symbol are not significant at the .10 level. For equations using relationship factors as the dependent variables, only factors from the involved parent were included as regressors.

- **Self-image scale**, a new 13-item scale of teens’ self-evaluations of performance in salient adolescent social roles.
- **Hollingshead’s (1957) Two-Factor Index of Social Class** which combines education and occupational scores for one parent to derive family social class, yielding a quasi-interval scale of 11-77, where 11 denotes the highest class.
- **Teen’s gender** is included as a dummy variable, where positive valences imply higher values for females.
- In a separate equation for males only, family size was a significant predictor of role-image (b=.2832 **).
- **While the father subrole of Trainer & Fan was not a significant predictor of grades for all teens or for females, it was significant for males only (b=.3646 **).**
- **The effect of fathers’ Control & Conformity subrole here was significant for all teens and for females, but not for males.**
- **The fathers’ Buddy / Chum subrole had a significant effect for working class females (b=1.142 *).**
- **The fathers’ Trainer & Fan subrole was not significant for females and for middle-class males, but it was significant for working-class males (b=.8627 **).**
- **This beta was not significant for females, implying that fathers generally do not regard the playing of controlling or authoritative subroles as detrimental to their relationships with their adolescent daughters. Footnote “f” makes it clear, however, that female teens are even more likely to rate their relationships with fathers lower if controlling subroles are frequently played.**
(as supported by these empirical outcomes), and that parents may overestimate the positive effects of positive role-playing on their part and underestimate the negative effects.

All six equation coefficients presented in Table 5.8 are significant at the .001 level, and the variances explained are substantial. As indicated by their relative beta weights, parents' role factors have a much greater effect on teen's self-image than socio-demographic variables; together, both account for 20.9% of the explained variance. Socio-demographic variables had a stronger effect on school grades, but the effect of the mothers' accepting partner role was as strong as the effect of age, and the role of trainer and fan for fathers was not only significant but fairly strong ($\beta=.36$) for male teens. The variance explained for grades was 16.7%. For the parent-teen relationship from the teen's perspective, variances explained ranged from 21.8% to 25.1%, but from the parents' perspective, variances explained ranged from 46.1% to 55.6%.

Discussion

Class and gender appear to have important interactive effects on relations between parents and adolescents, with additional consequences for teen outcomes such as grades and self-image. The research community, however, is not in agreement about the relative importance of macro and micro-level factors on interaction and individual outcomes. In the past, researchers have variously reported that structural demographic factors such as social class are both significant and important (Kohn, 1989; Peterson & Rollins, 1987), while others have asserted that statistically significant class effects on interaction, especially if generated by dubious
virtue of having massive sample sizes, are usually inconsequential in practical terms (Looker & Pineo, 1983).

This research has re-examined the differential effects of class and gender on interaction patterns and adolescent outcomes by: (a) utilizing symbolic interactionism to create new variables of role-playing and role-identities which are designed to effectively link macro and micro-level phenomena; (b) executing systematic analyses by combining categories of social class, parental gender, and teen gender; and (c) measuring and controlling for the effects of parent-teen interaction, via parental subroles (and the variables obtained by their factor analysis) on dependent variables in the parent-teen interactive system.

Results indicate that this strategy has great promise for unraveling some of the interactive effects of social structure with micro-level behavior. Kohn's thesis (1959b, 1969) of class-specific values, for instance, is strongly supported by the sub-categorical analysis of parental subroles shown in Tables 5.1-5.4. Middle-class parents were likely to play subroles with their teenagers which are more facilitative and advisory, while working-class parents were more likely to supervise their teens more closely and play the subroles of monitor and referee. This corresponds to a different view and exercise of authority which is characteristic of each class. Nevertheless, final consequences may depend on how individual parents choose to interact with their teens, though group tendencies exist. The regression results in Table 8 show that, when social class is held constant statistically, parental subroles of accepting partner, moral authority, guide and teacher, and control and conformity, can have important consequences for grades and teens' sense of competency in social roles, even from the standpoint of the teenager.
This study also supports the assertion that effects of class and gender are interactive. Fathers' assertion of power and control appears to negatively influence daughters much more than sons (see Table 5.8), though they tend to underestimate these negative effects on the quality of relationship (note that fathers' control and conformity factor variable has a negative beta almost twice as strong to the daughters' assessment of the relationship than to their own). When fathers play the role of sports trainer and fan with sons, sons' grades improve; this relationship, however, was not evident for females. Additionally, though parents report playing the "working" subrole more frequently with same-sex teens, working class parents play this subrole with much greater frequency than do middle class parents. Though middle-class parents report playing teaching and guidance roles more frequently than working-class parents, fathers tend to play these roles more frequently with sons, and practical-supportive and emotional-supportive roles more frequently with daughters. Most of these findings are consistent with gender-role research on parent-child interaction (Giele, 1988), but they illustrate new and important ways of providing evidence for these patterns, and of further detailing findings.

The regression results (Table 5.8) provide mixed support in the debate about fathers' independent impact on child or adolescent outcomes. In the first two columns, the simultaneous influence of mother and father subrole factors may be compared on two important developmental outcomes: teen's role image and school grades. In this regard, it is noteworthy that two mother factors (accepting partner and moral authority) have a positive and significant effect, along with one father factor (trainer and fan), on teen's role-image. For school grades, only the maternal subrole of accepting partner has a significant effect for all teens; however, the paternal subrole of trainer and fan had both a strong and significant effect ($\beta=.365 \ p<.05$) for
males. It is also obvious that for both mothers and fathers, the frequency of role-playing for two or more parental subroles have significant effects, both on the parents' view of the relationship and on the teen's view.

One might conclude from these data that mothers are generally more involved in interacting with teens of either gender in a variety of role-playing situations. However, fathers involvement exceeds that of mothers for particular subroles, and in many other cases it almost equals that of mothers. Also, while the data indicate that mothers have a somewhat greater impact on salient teen outcomes, fathers' influence is not completely eliminated when the influences of both parents are measured simultaneously. While maternal roles of acceptance, support, and moral authority have the greatest positive effects on teens, paternal roles of guidance, companionship, sports training, and support for teen activities (i.e. fan-cheerleader) also have significant effects. The evidence indicates that fathers' role-playing involvement and developmental influence is somewhat greater for boys, and that sex-typed interaction is more prominent with all fathers (see Powers et al., 1987), especially in the working-class.

This study is the first to utilize symbolic interactionism to derive and test interactive subroles and population-specific role identities within a model of socialization which controls for gender and class. As such, it has not met all of its objectives, and certain shortcomings of the research became obvious as the study progressed. While a diversity of families existed in the sample, further studies should employ more general samples beyond regional samples, and more working-class families and single-parent families should be recruited as participants (for example, what becomes of the gender-specific array of parental subroles when only one socializing parent is present?). Other studies may wish to employ the constructs of
interactive subroles for adolescents as well as for parents, or study the teens’ perceptions of their parents’ subroles, or compare related data (such as time data) with the playing of parental subroles. This study may serve to launch new research which considers how micro-level interaction, even while displaying patterns systematically influenced by gender and class, powerfully mediates developmental outcomes for adolescents produced by the parental socialization process.
CHAPTER VI

TESTING A MULTI-LEVEL MODEL OF ADOLESCENT SOCIALIZATION:
MICRO THEORY AND MACRO THEORY CONVERGENCE

Chapter Abstract

A multi-level model (with four levels) of parental socialization of adolescents, integrating macro-level and micro-level theory via the symbolic interactionist construct of role-playing, was tested with a random sample of 297 adolescents and their parents. Data collection methods utilized a weekly time log, two family surveys, and individual surveys for the teen and each resident parent. Mother and father versions of the model were developed to assess the model workings on four teen outcome variables: school grades, self-esteem, self-image in salient social roles (role-image), and quality-of-relationship measures with each parent. A three-step procedure involving zero-order correlations, multiple and stepwise regressions, and hierarchical linear regressions was used to tested the integrity of the four system levels, measure linear relationships, and assess the explanatory power of the full model. Results indicated that the model worked well in predicting its teen outcomes, that the integrity of all system levels but one remained intact, and that qualified support was given to a hypothesis of proximal level effects. Other findings indicate that macro-level elements have greater relevance for fathers than for mothers, and counter to reported findings in some literature, that fathers had greater impact in some cases than mothers on the role-based teen outcomes of school grades, quality of parent-teen relationships, self-esteem, and teen's self-image in social roles.

201
Multi-level Modeling and Parent-Teen Socialization

Accounting for the effects of social contexts on adolescent development has been described as one of the major trends of the past decade in the literature on adolescence (Gecas, 1990), yet there are still very few theoretically integrated models of adolescent socialization which contains an attempt to link macro and micro-level phenomena (Gecas, 1990; Peterson & Rollins, 1987; Sanders, 1995a). Such models are becoming more common in the general sociological literature, and are often referred to as macro-micro, contextual, systemic, social ecological, and synthetic models (Alexander, 1988; Boss et al., 1993; Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Cappell & Guterbock, 1992; Collins, 1981; Fine, 1993; Jacobson, 1994; Peterson & Rollins, 1987).

Urie Bronfenbrenner (1979, 1986), a psychologist, developed an insightful multilevel model of child development which has potential for linking macro and micro-level phenomena in various areas of family research (Peterson & Rollins, 1987), but few studies of adolescents have explicitly used this or any similar theoretical framework (Kohn, 1989). Systems of variables used in adolescent research seem to have been selected based on the intuitive recognition among researchers that social-structural variables have too often been neglected in the past (Parke & Kellam, 1994), but these selections often lack theoretical rationale, leading to questionable and inadequate representation of macro-level structures (Kohn, 1989).

In this study, Bronfenbrenner's (1979) social ecological model of the macro, exo, meso, and micro levels is used to conceptualize system levels of the social order. In our model symbolic interactionism is used and synthesized with conceptions of role-making (e.g. Turner, 1962, 1990), to create a unified theoretical focus on role-playing as a central dynamic in the socialization process. In this model, the performance of
new variables derived from the role-playing construct will be compared to other, more traditional variables such as Rosenberg's (1965) measure of self-esteem. A hypothesis of proximal effects will be tested which states that the model levels adjacent to the dependent variable being examined will display greater explanatory power than distal levels which are non-adjacent. The integrity of system levels and the functionality of model elements (i.e. variables) will be tested with a three-stage iterative testing procedure, followed by a reconfiguration of the mother and father submodels.

Socialization is the pervasive social process whereby societal members, primarily through social interaction, develop the values, attitudes and abilities to perform as acculturated members of society. Socialization and role-playing are twin bedfellows in the preparation of members of society to occupy roles which may be expected of him or her (Parsons, 1951, 1955). Socialization research can particularly benefit from multilevel modeling since socialization content and forms originate within the broader societal context, yet are continually maintained within family units in the form of role relations and interpersonal interaction, thereby shaping individual outcomes. Macro-level conditions which affect parent-child relationships can be ethnic, historical, socioeconomic, political, and cultural (Peterson & Rollins, 1987). These conditions are theorized to affect children principally through parents; the roles parents occupy in the broader social structure (e.g. occupations) lead them to transmit particular perceptions of reality to their children (Berger & Luckman, 1967), thereby creating semblances of those realities within the family through values and personality expression, family patterns and relationships, and techniques of adolescent discipline (Bronfenbrenner, 1958; Menaghan, 1991a; Kohn, 1959a).

Aside from the substantial research of Melvin Kohn (Kohn, 1959a, 1959b, 1963, 1969, 1982, 1986), few recent studies are found in the socialization literature.
which include social-structural variables such as social class (Langman, 1987; Peterson & Rollins, 1987). Kohn examined how social class tendencies emerge when parents are asked about the virtues and attributes they desire for their adolescent children (e.g. obedience, curiosity, creativity, etc.), and discovered that middle-class and working-class parents are more likely to emphasize self-direction and conformity, respectively, with their children. Parents' occupational experience, especially the self-directed and conformity-reinforcing aspects of this experience, was suggested by Kohn and associates as a possible explanation of how social class helps to shape parental values. Their research also shows that social class and occupational experience have both independent and combined effects on parental values (Kohn & Schooler, 1969, 1982).

Kohn's work was pivotal in establishing the links between social structure and parental values for parenting, but it stopped short of examining the full chain of influences involved in the parental-adolescent system. Socialization studies which examine the effects of social-structural variables must go beyond an examination of parents' values; they should also study parental behavior, parent-teen interaction as mechanism, and teen behavior or outcomes which may be considered as the culmination of socializing influence within the individual. Certainly parents are pivotal agents in the process of socializing adolescents, but Kohn's research was primarily concerned with how social structure is a factor in modes of parenting; it did not measure teen socialization outcomes, nor did it study the process whereby values affect parenting behavior. The linkages between parental values and parental behavior, and between parental behavior and teen outcomes were only implied. Nevertheless, Kohn's research performed the valuable service of focusing attention on the effects of social class for the socialization process.
One important task of a multi-level theory of socialization then, is to link micro-level processes within the family with macro elements and structures of the social order. One micro-level theory which has been suggested as capable of doing this, and of providing the theoretical capacity for multi-level research, is symbolic interactionism (Fine, 1993; Kleinman & Fine, 1979; Prendergast & Knottnerus, 1993). Beginning with classical formulations by Cooley (1902) and Mead (1934), symbolic interactionism has historically explained and acknowledged ties between human development and social relations, but more recent work on structured role-identities has accelerated attempts at theoretical integration (Hoelter, 1983, 1985a, 1985b; Fine, 1993; McCall & Simmons, 1966; Stryker, 1968, 1980, 1982).

Symbolic interactionism holds promise for more clearly specifying the mechanisms and processes whereby macro-level patterns become incorporated into routine interaction. The macro-micro theoretical merger will be facilitated here through application of a particular understanding of the flexibility of role-playing which occurs within primary social roles (e.g. the role of parent). Various perspectives such as Turner's views on role-making (1962, 1990), structural symbolic interactionism (Stryker, 1980, 1982), and Sewell's structural transformation theory (1992) have propounded the flexible and adaptable nature of social roles and role performance, even while affirming the ways in which social roles are structured by society.

In this study, parental subroles, a newly formulated operationalization of parental role-playing, will be used to indicate how parents variously interact with their teenagers while playing the primary role of parent. The construct of parental subroles makes use of commonly accepted labels such as tutor, chauffeur, guidance counselor, boss-employer, and banker-financier to measure interactive modes of behavior between parents and teens. These are powerful constructs to include in a symbolic
interactionist multi-level model because: (a) they serve as empirical indicators of the variation in parents' performance of the parenting role with their adolescents; (b) they imply complementary behavioral responses by the partner in interaction (i.e. the teenager), thereby serving as an efficacious indicator of interaction; (c) by studying the frequency with which subroles are played, and examining how they are used singly or in combination by parents, they also provide for a convenient yet powerful method for studying overall patterns of interaction between parents and adolescents, thereby permitting the study of linkages between themes of interaction and social-structural variables; and (d) they are likely candidates (via Cooley's looking-glass self, 1902) for significantly influencing the development of teen identity structures.

Parental interactive subroles and other new role-based constructs are included in a recently developed multi-level model of parent-teen socialization (see Sanders, 1995a) which will be tested in this research. The attempt at macro-micro theoretical integration via symbolic interactionism, and the testing of the model, proceeds as follows. First, the model fulcrum is the symbolic interactionist construct of role-playing. Role-playing is used to create new micro-level variables which incorporate this concept into their measurement and capture some of the dynamic of role-playing into their conception. The model then links role-playing on the micro-level with socio-structural roles such as social class, ethnicity, family type, family size, parental gender, and teen's gender and age.

The primary dependent variable in the model is teen's self-image in salient social roles (role-image) -- a newly formulated measure of teens' self-evaluations of their role-playing abilities, as developed and influenced through interaction with others. Teen's role-image represents the primary outcome of the role-playing process described by Cooley (1902) in his explication of the "looking-glass self" (Cooley, 1902), and is
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based loosely on structural symbolic interactionist constructs of role identities (see Hoelter, 1983, 1985a, 1987; Fine, 1993; Stryker, 1980). The role-image scale asks teen's to evaluate their self-image in playing salient social roles, such as student, friend, family member, and physically attractive person. The list of role identities, and the language used to describe them, is not generalized but is customized to fit a population of adolescents. This technique is based on the ideas of "blocking" different populations with respect to how they interact with their environments (see the work of network analysts, Cook & Whitmeyer, 1992; Emirbayer & Goodwin, 1994). Role-image, as a new theoretical construct which represents important outcomes of the parent-teen socialization process (i.e. personal consequences for the teen's self-concept and internalization of the role-playing process), provides an alternative to other commonly used global indicators of adolescent well-being such as self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1965; Rosenberg, et al., 1995).

School grades and quality-of-relationship variables, as secondary dependent variables, will similarly be based on the concept of success in social roles (i.e. the academic role, the family-relational role, respectively). School grades measure success in the academic role, which in modern society is one of the primary avenues of youthful achievement, and holds promise for future economic opportunity and social status. In a sense, school grades might be seen as early indicators of a process of status succession, thereby linking the end of this model (i.e. success in social roles, school grades) with its beginning (i.e. social class status). The quality of parent-teen relationships, as indicators of success in relational roles, may also have important implications for a teen's well-being and future (Demo, 1992; Gecas, 1990; Parke & Kellam, 1994), and are therefore important consequences of the parent-teen socialization process. In this model, relationship variables will be measured from the
teen's and the parents' perspectives, and will be utilized both as dependent variables, and as intervening variables which broker social-structural influence on teen's role-image. Self-esteem, while not properly a role-based construct, will also serve as a dependent variable for one set of regressions to allow for comparisons with teen's role-image, and will be based on a revision of Rosenberg's classic scale of self-esteem (1965).

Symbolic interactionism will also affect the methods of data collection and analysis. The interactionist concept of multiple realities, for instance, which is involved each time a person engages in interactive role-playing, is used to create parallel models for mothers and fathers, and to stimulate the measurement of mother-teen and father-teen relationships from the perspectives of each specified parent and the teenager. This research, in testing a multi-level model based on the functioning of social roles at both the macro and micro levels, will thus complete the chain of influence from social-structural factors, through parents, to interaction and teen outcomes. In doing so, this research will not exhaust all possible ways by which multi-level research of this nature, or research on adolescent socialization, might be accomplished, but will test this particular model and will seek to provide a template for future research.

The Model

Figure 6.1 displays a multi-level model of parent-teen socialization, adapted from a more general model of social influence recently formulated (Sanders, 1995a). While a full explanation of the genesis and rationale for this model is found elsewhere (Sanders, 1995a), a brief explanation of theoretical background and model format will orient the reader to the testing procedures and findings which follow.

The model is based on the integration of several role-sensitive theories or constructs: a structuralist version of societal levels loosely based upon Parson's work
NOTES: Positive valences for parent's or teen's gender indicates stronger values for females. The two Self-image variables represent positive relationships from both the teen's and parents' subvariables or variables of the parent-teen relationship.

Figure 6.1. Revised Model of Parent-Teen Socialization.
gender indicates stronger values for females. The two arrows at the bottom leading to Teen's Socialization from both the teen's and parents' subvariables or versions (i.e. perspectives) of the quality of Teen Socialization.
with social systems (1951) and, more directly, on Urie Bronfenbrenner's (1979) ecological view of system levels (macro, exo, meso, micro-systems), Turner's (1990) role types (basic, status, group, and value roles) which aid in the specification of relevant variables to be included in the model, and Sewell's (1992) structural transformation theory which, in combination with symbolic interactionism, serves as the theoretical foundation for the creation of interactive parental subroles, and symbolic interactionist conceptions of role-identities (McCall & Simmons, 1966; Stryker, 1968, 1980) which led to the creation of teen's self image in social roles (role-image) as the key dependent variable.

In this diagram, model variables are located at each level of the social order and the hypothesized nature of variable interrelationships are specified via valence symbols. The far left column presents the levels of the social order, and briefly specifies the system boundaries for each level (e.g. societal system, occupational system, family system, etc.). Toward the middle and right, a diagram is displayed which links salient variables at each level of the social order with variables in adjacent levels, or with elements of the parent-teen interactive system. Proposed variable relationships are described with arrows and valence symbols which denote the proposed direction of influence.

This model suggests, through an integration of macro and micro-level constructs and perspectives, how macro and micro-level influences are interrelated in their effects on the socialization process. Due to the intrinsic progression from macro-level structures to micro-level structures, and the interlocking nature of system levels, a hypothesis of proximal effects is proposed for the model. This hypothesis states that adjacent or proximal levels and level elements (i.e. variables), will have stronger and more numerous significant linkages to each other than those of non-adjacent, or distal
levels. Therefore, the micro level as a unit, and micro-level variables individually, were proposed to have the greatest impact on the primary dependent variables (i.e. teen outcomes), followed by influences from the meso, exo, and macro levels, in descending order of influence.

Research Design

In order to provide a test for the socialization paradigm, a general research design was developed which includes two waves of self-administered questionnaires, structured time logs, and telephone follow-up contacts.

Sample

A regional sample of 297 adolescents and parents\(^1\) served as participants for this study. A systematic random sample was derived from a regional database purchased from Donnelly, Inc., where selection criteria included families with children between the ages of 12 and 17, those in specified zip code zones in both urban and rural areas in the St. Louis region, and an exclusion on minority block areas of 20% or higher. This final criterion was imposed to produce a more culturally homogeneous sample for the purpose of stratifying the sample by social class, age of adolescent, gender of teen and parents, maternal employment level, and family type.\(^2\) Families

---

1 Teens and their resident parents in 297 families were surveyed. Only one teen per family was surveyed. If there were two or more teens in a family, one was selected at random for participation. Most families were composed of married couples with two biological parents. However, three of the 295 mothers were stepmothers; the rest were biological mothers. Two of the father figures were unmarried male companions. And two "parents" were grandparents serving as guardians.

2 Although an dedicated attempt was made to recruit a much larger number of single-parent families, the final sample contained only 22 single-mother families and 2 single-father families, an insufficient number to enable some of the anticipated analyses to be performed. Some of this sample bias may have been caused by the exclusion of minority block areas.
were sampled from the St. Louis metropolitan area (N=129) and from several surrounding rural communities (N=168). The average family size was 4.1, with 74.1% of the sample having a total household size of 4 or fewer persons. The final sample contained 52% female teens and 48% male teens, 69% middle-class families and 31% working-class families, 55% full-time working mothers and 45% part-time employees and homemakers, and adolescents in approximately equal proportions in each of three age groups: 11-13, 14-15, and 16-18.

**Data Collection and Procedures**

In the spring of 1993, a pilot study of 20 families was used to create and refine certain key measures of the model (namely, those of interactive time use, parental subroles, and teen's role-image). Each teen and their resident parents were interviewed by phone on four consecutive nights with respect to parent-teen interaction during the day, interpretations of interactions, and family relationships. Pilot study participants also completed a family survey and individual surveys with prototypes of model variables.

The full sample of 297 families was contacted by mail in the spring of 1994 and asked to complete a screening survey and a weekly time log. An incentive of $10 per family was offered to those who completed this and subsequent stages of the research. When these materials were returned, duplicates of the time log were sent with a second set of surveys to each family, with instructions for completing surveys and sealing them in individual envelopes to protect the confidentiality of responses. In addition to one family survey, surveys were collected from each teen and each parent.

---

3 Preliminary analyses contrasting urban and rural residence revealed no significant or noteworthy findings.
4 Measured with a revision of Hollingshead's (1957) two-factor index of social position.
Teen and parent views of many relational and interactional variables were obtained, including estimates of time use based on the seven days of interaction covered by the time log. A set protocol was established for dealing with missing data, discrepancies, biases, failure to follow directions, or obvious errors. From the time logs and participant accounts collected, one master account of time use was constructed which synthesized the best and most reliable information from the multiple sources. Family time data, in order to be used for analysis, had to measure up to an established standard of quality, including the display of reasonable consistency between respondents, and consistency between surveys and the time log.

Variable Measurement

Because this multi-level model contains many variables, many of which are simple in measurement or commonly used in the literature (e.g. gender, age, family size, etc.) only those with complex measurements or special theoretical significance will be reviewed here.

Social Class

This study used Hollingshead's (1957) two-factor index of social position which combined education and occupation by using weightings of 4 and 7 for each factor, respectively. However, this index was adjusted to conform to the "dominance model" of Erikson (1984) in order to reflect the economic contribution of women to many households (see Sørenson, 1994). The revised procedure measured family social class by the status of either the husband or wife, depending on who had the higher status. In 75% of the cases, fathers had the higher social status; in 20% the mothers had the higher status, and for 5% of the cases the mother's and father's statuses...
were equal. Certain income categories for farmers and self-employed were also adjusted for inflation. The final scale ranged from 11 for the highest class, to 77 for the lowest class.\(^5\)

**Job Time and Employment Pattern**

*Parent's job time* was measured by a series of survey items which asked parents to first list the primary jobs they performed each week (up to three, with an "other" category), and then to report the average amount of time they spent for each per week. The regularity of employment schedule was measured by a one-item measure which offered choices from *fairly* to *not at all regular/predictable*.

**Time Use Variables**

There were several variables which related to parent-teen interaction. *Interaction-available time* was measured for parents by asking them to individually report for each day of the week (the 7 days on time chart), the number of wakeful hours and minutes they had available for interaction after employment hours and other obligations. A similar but slightly different variable for the teen measured *social participation* by asking them to report time spent working, with friends, or at various school and community events where parents would be unlikely to attend.

*Parent-teen contact time* was calculated from the master time chart which included family time log data and information from the various surveys. While the time log data was unstructured, the survey data was initially structured into 14 categories: eating meals at home, eating out, driving, shopping, watching T.V. or

\(^5\) The signs of valences symbols were then changed after analysis so that positive correlations would indicate higher social class.
videos, work, sports, church, other community events, short trips or outings, other leisure activities, just being together, just talking (talking as primary activity), and all other activities. While referring to copies of their families' time logs, teens and parents individually completed time charts with these categories. Teens reported the total time spent for each category, and then for each parent. Parents also reported time spent figures, and then gave the percent of time for each category spent alone with the teenager, or talking. *Solo time* and *talk time* for each parent and teen were calculated from these parental reports. *Talk time* included time spent talking as primary activity, and time spent talking as included with other activities. *Total contact time* for each parent and parents was calculated by summing category totals.

**Parental Support**

 Teens were asked to rate the support they received from each parent on a scale from 1 to 7 in twelve areas: studying, sports and activities, chores and duties, appearance, lifestyle, regarding friends, during illness, for problems and concerns, for basic values and beliefs, for ideas and personal decisions, for "your future," and for "yourself as a person." Teens provided two ratings for each of these items -- one for a parent's actions and another for attitudes. Item scores were rescored to range from -3 (active opposition) to +3 (active support), with the score of 0 (zero) representing "neither." The final support measure was obtained by averaging the action and attitude scores for all 12 items, and then dividing by the number of items.

**Interactive Parental Subroles**

 For the newly formulated measure of *interactive parental subroles*, parents were asked to report the frequency of playing each of 27 *parental subroles* on a scale
from 1 (never) to 5 (very often). Subroles included roles of practical support such as chauffeur, tutor, reminder, banker-financier, emotional support roles such as sounding board, therapist, guidance counselor, companionship roles such as passive companion, playmate, best friend, couch potato, authority roles such as lawmaker, monitor, referee, employer or boss, and development roles such as motivator, moral teacher, sports trainer, and arts patron. Factor analysis, using principal components analysis, varimax rotation, and listwise deletion of missing cases, produced three factor variables for mothers and four for fathers used in subsequent regressions.

**Quality-of-Relationship Measures**

Each respondent evaluated the quality of the parent-teen relationship with a one-item global summary measure which asked for a rating from 1 to 5 (very poor to excellent) for the overall relationship, and a scale which focused on different dimensions of the relationship. Teens completed a 10-item index using a semantic-differential scale (Osgood et al., 1957) with items such as "she is interested in me," "she understands me," and "she displays warmth and affection toward me," with a final scale range from -20 to +20 including a mild correction factor\(^6\) for social desirability bias. Parents gave evaluations on a scale from 0 (very poor) to 8 (excellent) for 7 relational dimensions: commitment, time and togetherness, love and affection, communication, affirming, conflict management, and support, identified as characteristics of strong relationships by Stinnett (1980) and others (Weiss, 1976; Hoffman et al., 1988). The parents' scale, beginning with a larger range of original scores, had a final range from -35 to +35 with a similar correction factor.

---

\(^6\) Values of "average" were given a -1, not a zero. Intermediary negative scores received slightly higher weights than intermediary positive scores.
Self-esteem

Rosenberg's original 10-item scale (1965) was used to measure self-esteem with the teenagers in the study, but the scoring scheme was simplified as suggested by Brehm and Kassin (1990), with items being scored from 1 to 4. Items were then rescored as -5, -2, 1 and 3 to give somewhat greater weight to negative responses. This resulted in a wide dispersion of scores on a scale with a theoretical range of -50 to +30.

Role-image

The newly developed construct of teens' self-image in salient social roles, or role image, was measured with a 13-item scale comprised of roles commonly played by adolescents such as student, friend, family member, worker or employee, athlete or physically fit person, talented person, physically attractive person, and moral person with strong beliefs and values. Teens rated their "self-image" in each role from 1 (very poor) to 5 (very good). These role-identities, and the words which presented them to teens, were specifically tailored to fit a population of adolescents. The original 5-point scale was rescored with values of -5, -3, -1, +1 and +3, producing a theoretical scale of -75 to +45.

School Grades

Teens reported their grades on an ordinal scale from 1, "almost all A's" to 8, "mostly D's and F's." Scores were inverted so that positive scores would reflect higher grades.
Findings

Some Descriptive Univariate Findings and Bivariate Relationships

Macro-Meso Variables

Table 6.1 presents a brief review of univariate distributions and other statistics for macro, exo, and meso-level variables which will facilitate later interpretation of multivariate findings. Social class figures reveal a bias toward the middle class. There was, however, a workable representation of working-class families (N=91). In most analyses, however, social class was not dichotomized but was used as an interval variable, with values ranging from 11 to 73. As expected, mothers reported fewer hours per week working outside the home, and more contact time with teens than fathers. However, the bivariate correlation between employment hours and interaction-available time was surprisingly low (for mothers, r=-.14, p<.05; for fathers, r=-.20, p<.05).

The parent-teen contact time figures were higher than expected, but it must be remembered that these figures represent times when parents and teens defined themselves as joint participants in an activity; they do not imply anything about the level or intensity of interaction. Still, based on the quantity of interaction time reported, most parents apparently had ample opportunity to interact with their teens during the course of a normal week. Working-class parents and teens reported about 5 more hours per week together. The lower portion of Table 6.1 reports the times that parents and teens spent for various types of activities.

---

7 The theoretical scale of the social class data ranges from 11-77 as a function of the two factors of occupation and education, making it equivalent in range to Hollingshead's (1957) original scale.
Table 6.1
Univariate and Bivariate Distributions for Key Macro, Exo, and Meso-Level Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Social Class</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Partial Cases Only b N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle class</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>27.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working class</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Average family income was $56,800, with 70.8% reporting annual earnings of $40,000+.
b Partial cases are those who completed the first family survey and supplied time data, but did not return the second and final wave of surveys with measurements for dependent variables.
* Denotes a significant difference between groups at the .05 level ($x^2 = 6.20, p=.013$).

Variable Comparison by Parents' Gender and Social Class

Average Hours Per Week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Both Mothers</th>
<th>Fathers</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outside Employment</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction-Available Time</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Time with Teen</td>
<td>32.6*</td>
<td>22.2*</td>
<td>31.0*</td>
<td>35.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Time with Sons</td>
<td>33.1*</td>
<td>23.4***</td>
<td>31.6*</td>
<td>36.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Time with Daughters</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>20.7***</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance levels for two-tailed t-tests. † p ≤ .10  * p ≤ .05  ** p ≤ .01  *** p ≤ .001

Weekly Hours Spent in Different Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Categories</th>
<th>Total Time</th>
<th>Time with Mom</th>
<th>Time with Dad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Meals</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating Out</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.V. or videos</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing Homework</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Activities</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Activities</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Events</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Trips, Outings</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Activities</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just Being Together</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just Talking</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Activities</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weekly Totals 32.6  28.0  22.2

Notes: N = 203, but time figures are based on 285 families, since those with unreliable time data were excluded.
Parents' Interactive Subroles

For this study, differential responses to 27 individual parental subroles were not detailed, but may be found elsewhere (Sanders, 1995b). Role-playing themes, however, were identified through factor analysis procedures conducted separately for mothers and fathers. Table 6.2 displays the results of the factor analysis with the 27 parental subroles, and shows three salient subrole factors produced for mothers and four for fathers. Maternal factors were moral authority, accepting partner, and driver and fan. Paternal factors were guide and teacher, control and conformity, buddy/chum, and driver/fan. These subrole factors are listed in order of their strength, and indicate that mothers and fathers display different modes of interaction with their teenagers. Parental subroles included in each factor were then summed to create new factor variables for use within subsequent regression analyses.

Teen Outcome Variables

Table 6.3 presents univariate statistics for the five teen-outcome (i.e. dependent) variables. Teens and parents in general reported very favorable relationships with each other, which coincide with the findings of other studies of parent-teen relations (Steinberg, 1991; Wel, 1994). However, about 20% to 25% of teens and parents defined their relationships as "fair" to "very poor" with the global relationship measure, and approximately this same percentage received negative scores on the relationship indices, where scales were constructed so that negative scores would reflect negative relationships.

Both the revised Rosenberg Self-Esteem Index and the new Teen Role-Image Scale yielded negatively skewed distributions, with most teens reporting high or moderately positive self-concepts. About 20% of teens, however, received negative
Table 6.2
Factor Analysis of Parents' Interactive Subroles for Mothers and Fathers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental Subroles</th>
<th>Factor Variables</th>
<th>Mothers' Factors</th>
<th>Fathers' Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>Factor 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Authority</td>
<td>EV=7.06</td>
<td>CV=.60</td>
<td>.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting Partner</td>
<td>EV=3.34</td>
<td>CV=.45</td>
<td>.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver &amp; Control</td>
<td>EV=1.81</td>
<td>CV=.45</td>
<td>.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide &amp; Teacher</td>
<td>EV=8.11</td>
<td>CV=.55</td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control &amp; Conformity</td>
<td>EV=2.86</td>
<td>CV=.50</td>
<td>.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddy/Chum</td>
<td>EV=1.96</td>
<td>CV=.50</td>
<td>.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer &amp; Fan</td>
<td>EV=1.36</td>
<td>CV=.50</td>
<td>.654</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Chauffeur
2. Passive Companion
3. Playmate
4. Tutor
5. Reminder
6. Public Relat. Advisor
7. Motivator
8. Lawmaker
9. Monitor
10. Referee
11. Sports Trainer
12. Fan/Cheerleader
13. Arts Patron
14. Banker-Financier
15. Moral Teacher
16. Adversary
17. Fellow-worker
18. Couch Potato
19. Decision-maker
20. Facilitator
21. Sound Board
22. Authority Figure
23. Therapist
24. Employer/Boss
25. Teacher
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>.635</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referee</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>-.472</td>
<td>.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Trainer</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan/Cheerleader</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td></td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Patron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banker-Financier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Teacher</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td></td>
<td>.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adversary</td>
<td>-.596</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellow-worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couch Potato</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-maker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Board</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td></td>
<td>.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority Figure</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist</td>
<td></td>
<td>.602</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer/Boss</td>
<td>-.459</td>
<td></td>
<td>.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td>.741</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Friend</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  ** p < .01  *** p < .001

Notes: N = 195 for mothers and 158 for fathers.
Table 6.3
Univariate Distributions and Descriptive Statistics for Teen Outcome Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings</th>
<th>Teen's View with Mother</th>
<th>Teen's View with Father</th>
<th>Parents' Views with Mother</th>
<th>Parents' Views with Father</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Cases</td>
<td>* 190</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Valid Cases, of a possible 203 who completed the second wave of surveys containing these items.

Quality-of-Relationship Descriptives - Parent-Teen Indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Range</th>
<th>Actual Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen-Mother Index</td>
<td>6.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen-Father Index</td>
<td>6.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent-View Indices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Teen Index</td>
<td>8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Teen Index</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive Statistics for Teen's Self-Esteem and Teen's Self-Image

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Range</th>
<th>Actual Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem Index a</td>
<td>11.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role-Image Scale b</td>
<td>16.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Adapted from Rosenberg's (1965) Index of Self-Esteem
b New construct for this research, Self-Image in Social Roles, or Role Image.

Distribution of School Grades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Descriptive Statistics for Teen's Self-Esteem and Teen's Self-Image

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Concept Measures</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Valid N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem Index a</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>12.74</td>
<td>-50.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>-29.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role-Image Scale b</td>
<td>16.87</td>
<td>19.14</td>
<td>-75.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>-45.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Adapted from Rosenberg's (1965) Index of Self-Esteem
b New construct for this research, *Self-Image in Social Roles, or Role Image.*

### Distribution of School Grades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost All A's</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly A's and B's</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly B's</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly B's and C's</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly C's</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly C's and D's</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly D's</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly D's and F's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Cases</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>203</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Possible N = 203. Data from partial cases (N=94) for all outcome variables were not available.
scores on both scales, and about one-third scored either negative or very low positive scores (i.e. < 10). The correlation between the Rosenberg self-esteem measure and the self-image measure was .748 (p<.001), reflecting fair correspondence between the two constructs, yet indicating qualitative differences ($r^2$ is .560). Bivariate correlations indicated that self-image was more highly correlated to key model variables than was self-esteem. For instance, the correlation between self-esteem and the teen's index for the quality of the parent-teen relationship was .37; for role-image it was .55.8

Most teens in the sample reported doing well in school, with three-quarters reporting "mostly B's" or better. These figures are conceivably valid, but the likelihood is that they are somewhat inflated. Perhaps we should have also asked the parents this question!

Testing the Model With Multiple and Stepwise Regressions

Table 6.4 provides the results for the multiple and stepwise regressions with dependent variables for mother and father submodels. For both submodels in Table 6.4, 12 preliminary multiple and stepwise regressions were conducted with key model dependent variables: interaction-available time, parent-teen contact time, quality of relationship, self-esteem, and role-image. On this basis, certain non-significant variables were excluded from the mother model: teen's gender, mothers' job time, mothers' employment schedule, and teen's social participation. The only non-significant father variable excluded was family size. Non-significant regressors have either been excluded from the table, or in a few cases, have a zero (0) displayed in the right-hand column entitled, "Total of Significant Betas in Model." Macro and exo-level variables merged based on the observation that while neither of the two parental

---

8 This difference is significant at the .05 level with a 1-tailed test for differences between Pearsons' r.
Regression Effects on Teen Outcomes for Mothers and Father

### Table 6.4

**MOTHERS’ SUBMODEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Micro-Level Variables</th>
<th>Multiple Regression</th>
<th>Stepwise Regression</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Modeld</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relat.- Teena</td>
<td>Relat.- Motherb</td>
<td>Role- Imagec</td>
<td>Relat.- Teen</td>
<td>Relat.- Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Regressors</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Macro-Exo Variables

- **Teen’s Gender**
  - β
- **Social Class**
  - .250
- **Teen’s Age**
  - .620
- **Interact-Available Time**
  - .680

#### Meso-Level Variables

- **Family Size**
  - .243*
- **Mother’s Support**
  - .241*
- **Teen’s Social Participation**
  - .242*
- **Mother-Teen Contact Time**
  - .229*

#### Micro-Level Variables

- **Interactive Time Categories**
  - **Talk Time**
    - -.364
  - **Solo Time**
    - -.193
  - **Eat Time**
    - -.288**
  - **Work Time**
    - -.216
  - **Social Participation Time**
    - -.393
  - **Misc. or Other Time**
    - -.344***

- **Interactive Parental Subroles**
  - **Fac1: Moral Authority**
    - .472***
  - **Fac2: Accepting Partner**
    - .627***
  - **Fac3: Driver & Fan**
    - -.216

- **Quality of Relationship**
  - **Teen’s View (T81)**
    - .415***
  - **Parents’ View - Index 2**
    - .313***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjusted Multiple R</th>
<th>Adjusted Multiple R²</th>
<th>F value &amp; sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.588</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.346</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.041***</td>
<td>3.872***</td>
<td>2.624**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

- N = 203. Betas are standardized regression coefficients. Betas shown but not marked with one or more asterisks are significant at the .10 level or higher for which results are shown above only as control variables. Regression results for only three dependent variables are given above, but dependent variable (and key subvariables) which were specified by the model. For each equation, only variables which preceded the dependent variable (and key subvariables) which were specified by the model. For each equation, only variables which preceded the dependent variable in the multiple regression and step regression equations, it was only counted once.

- An Index of the quality of the parent-teen relationship, as viewed by the teenager.
- The second Index of the quality of the parent-teen relationship, as viewed by the father.
- Self-Image scale, a new 13-item scale of teens' self-evaluations of performance in salient adolescent social roles.
- This column indicates the total number of significant betas at the .10 level or higher for each regressor variable, including coefficients with dependent variable (and key subvariables) which were specified by the model. For each equation, only variables which preceded the dependent variable (and key subvariables) which were specified by the model. For each equation, only variables which preceded the dependent variable in the multiple regression and step regression equations, it was only counted once.

* p < .05  ** p < .01  *** p < .001
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Table 6.4

Effects on Teen Outcomes for Mothers and Fathers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Multiple Regression</th>
<th>Stepwise Regression</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>t.- Role-</td>
<td>image</td>
<td>Relat.- Relat.- Role-</td>
<td>Relat.- Relat.- Role-</td>
<td>Sig.β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faLier</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>Model</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-2.52***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Class</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-2.79***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Time</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularity/Employment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interact-Available Time</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-3.50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Support</td>
<td>3.82*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.420***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen's Social Participation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Teen Contact Time</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen's View (T92)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents' View - Index 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Multiple R</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Multiple R²</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>.312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marked with one or more asterisks are significant at the .05 level; these were included in the final series of multiple and stepwise regressions for only three dependent variables are given above, but 12 regressions were conducted with the given list of regressors — one for each of the 12 equations, only variables which preceded the dependent variable in the model hierarchy were used as regressor variables.
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occupational variables which belonged to this level were significant predictors in the mothers' model, both variables displayed some moderate influence in the father model.

For the mother submodel (see Table 6.4), the strongest predictor for both the teen's and mother's view of their relationship was the maternal subrole factor of accepting partner, which displayed betas of .627 and .653 for quality-of-relationship measures. For both types of regressions on both relationship variables, accepting partner showed higher coefficients than mother's support. For the mothers' version of the quality-of-relationship variable, the subrole of moral authority also had significant betas ($\beta=.472$, $\beta=.469$), and also outperformed mother's support ($\beta=.241$, $\beta=.188$). For teen's role-image, the strongest predictor in the mother-teen model was the teen's view of the mother-teen relationship ($\beta=.415$, $p<.001$), followed by the mother's view of the relationship ($\beta=.313$, $p<.001$). Mother-teen contact time and social class were both positively but weakly related, and teen's age demonstrated a weak negative relationship. The highest explained variance for the mother-teen submodel occurs for teen's role image ($R^2=.469$, stepwise). For both relationship variables, the variances explained for the stepwise regressions ($R^2=.399$, $R^2=.445$) are also substantial and similar in magnitude. For mothers then, the model's explaining power for all dependent variables is substantial.

For the father model (also see Table 6.4), several interesting observations may be made. For the teen's view of the parent-teen relationship, the teen's perception of the father's support is the most important predictor in both sets of equations ($\beta=.382$, $\beta=.420$), followed by a significant negative relationship to gender (signifying that daughters rate the relationships less favorably) which was only significant for multiple regression. For the father's view of the relationship, the paternal subrole factor, guide and teacher had the strongest and most consistent positive relationship ($\beta=.402$,
\( \beta = .514 \), *buddy/chum* had a moderately positive but consistent effect (\( \beta = .311 \)), and *control & conformity* had a negative impact which was only revealed in the stepwise regressions (\( \beta = -.241 \)). Overall father-teen contact time and numerous time categories had a mixed but sizeable relationship in the multiple regressions, but these betas were not confirmed by the stepwise regressions. This observation supports the stepwise procedure as perhaps being an important parallel procedure to conduct when screening variables for hierarchical analysis. For both sets of equations, the highest explained variance again occurs for *teen's role image* (\( R^2 = .571 \), regular; \( R^2 = .478 \), stepwise). In the father submodel, variance explained in both multiple and stepwise regressions for the father's view of the relationship (\( R^2 = .462, .412 \)) is substantially higher than for the teen's view (\( R^2 = .222, .312 \)). Thus the explaining power of the father model for *teen's role image* (both equations) and *father's view* (one equation) exceeds even the substantial explanatory power of the mothers' model, a surprising finding.

For *teen's role-image* in the father submodel, as in the mother-teen submodel, the strongest and most consistent predictor was the teen's view of the parent-teen relationship (\( \beta = .572, \beta = .550 \), father-teen model). The father's view of the relationship, unlike that of the mother, is not significantly related to *role-image*. Fathers' *interaction-available time* was negatively related in both equations (\( \beta = -.350, \beta = -.386 \)), and the *regularity of employment* was negatively related, but only in the multiple regression. It is noteworthy that the paternal subrole, *guide and teacher*, had a significant positive impact on *teen's role image* (\( \beta = .253 \)) in the stepwise regressions -- the only subrole factor for either parent which had a significant impact on *role image*. *Father-teen solo time* had a strong positive effect on *role image* (\( \beta = .681 \)), and *talk time* a negative effect (\( \beta = -.416 \)), but these betas were not confirmed by the stepwise regressions.
Probably the most noteworthy findings in both submodels are that the explained variances are so strong for all dependent variables, that parental subrole factors have powerful effects on the quality of parent-teen relationships (even for the teen in the case of the mother-teen relationship), and that perceived strength of relationship in turn has a strong positive effect on teen's self-image in social roles. Regarding the hypothesis of proximal influence which will be more clearly tested in the subsequent analysis, we have seen evidence that more variables in the meso and micro-levels (that is, proximal levels) have significant (and generally stronger) effects on key dependent variables.

Testing the Model With Hierarchical Linear Regression

Hierarchical linear regression measured the relative influence of level elements (i.e. variables), and enabled us to test the integrity of system levels for inclusion or exclusion from our revised theoretical model. Table 6.5 displays results for testing the effects of system levels on five micro-level dependent variables: quality-of-relationship (two versions), school grades, self-esteem, and role-image. No system level, not even the micro level, showed significance in all 10 regression equations. Levels will be included or excluded for the subsequent model reconfiguration based on their performance in the equation with teen's role-image as the dependent variable. The rationale for this decision is that, theoretically speaking, teen's role-image is the most important dependent variable in the model, and should provide the litmus test for the performance of system levels.

Let us first discuss model effects for the four dependent variables of secondary importance: quality of relationship (2 measures), school grades, and self-esteem. None of these are significantly influenced by the macro-exo level. For the meso level,
Table 6.5
Teen Developmental Outcomes With Mothers and Fathers, Hierarchical Regression Effects on Five Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level Effects</th>
<th>Quality of Relationship</th>
<th>Teen Outcome Variables</th>
<th>Quality of Teen's View</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teen's Parents' View</td>
<td>School Grades</td>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macro-Exo Level</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of 1</td>
<td>School Grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² change</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. of F</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meso Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² change</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. of F change</td>
<td>.001 ***</td>
<td>.000 ***</td>
<td>.007 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. of F</td>
<td>.001 ***</td>
<td>.000 ***</td>
<td>.004 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² change</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. of F change</td>
<td>.000 ***</td>
<td>.000 ***</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. of F</td>
<td>.000 ***</td>
<td>.000 ***</td>
<td>.004 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall R²</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>7.273</td>
<td>11.374</td>
<td>2.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. of F</td>
<td>.000 ***</td>
<td>.000 ***</td>
<td>.004 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05   ** p<.01   *** p<.001

Note: Variables were entered in blocks specific to their system level, and were the same for all dependent variables.

a Independent variables were included for hierarchical regression if they had significant betas at the .05 level when regression with any of nine dependent variables in the model.
b Rosenberg's (1965) self-esteem scale, a 10-item instrument assessing psychological sense of self-worth.
c Self-image scale, a new 13-item scale of teens' self-evaluations of performance in salient adolescent social roles.
### Table 6.5

#### Teen Outcomes With Mothers and Fathers, Hierarchical on Effects on Five Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Role-Image</th>
<th>Outcome Variables</th>
<th>Quality of Relationship</th>
<th>Teen Outcome Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Role-Teen's Parents' School Grades Esteem</td>
<td>Teen's View</td>
<td>Parents' View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>0.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>0.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.608</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>0.443</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td>0.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.460</td>
<td>4.467</td>
<td>1.811</td>
<td>3.736</td>
<td>2.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Level, and were the same for all dependent variables.
2. Significant if they had significant betas at the .05 level when regressed by multiple regression or stepwise model.
4. Performance in salient adolescent social roles.
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however, we note the effects of parental gender. All four dependent variables in the mother model were significantly influenced by the meso-level, which included the variables of family size, parental support, teen's social participation, and mother-teen contact time. However, for the father model, three of the four dependent variables were not significantly influenced by the meso level, but the influence on the teen's view of the relationship is not only significant, but displays a higher variance explained (21.7%) than for the mother model (15.0%). This comparison suggests that meso or family-level variables are generally more influential in the mother-teen system. However, meso-level variables, especially father's support, appear to have significant influence on the teen's perception of the father-teen relationship.

The micro-level was the most influential level for most of these four secondary dependent variables, explaining from 14.3% to 44.7% of the variances. There was only one non-significant relationship (for teen's view of father-teen relationship). The micro-level contains many subcategories of interactive time use, and also parental subrole variables denoting parents' behavior. Hence it should probably be no surprise that the variances explained for parents' perceptions of the parent-teen relationship were higher than for the teen's view. In the father's case, for instance, the explained variance for the teen's view of the relationship was only 11.4% (and was not significant), while the variance explained for the father was 44.7%. The variances explained were higher with the father model in three of the four cases. Micro-level variables in the father system explained 34.5% of the variance in school grades, and 35.9% for self-esteem, figures more than double the 14.3% and 17.1% noted in the mother model. The "all levels" section indicates meaningful and significant predictive strength of the entire model on four dependent variables, but not for the teen's view of the relationship.
Because the examination of model effects for teen's role-image, as the primary dependent variable, and the testing of level integrity are intertwined, they will be reviewed together. The discussion will be organized by addressing the effects of each system level.

The macro-exo level is significant (p≤.05) for role-image in both submodels and therefore will be retained in both model reconfigurations. The macro-exo level exerts greater influence in the father submodel, explaining 23% of the variance in role-image (compared to only 7.4% in the mother submodel). Note the importance of hierarchical regression in determining this effect; it would not be obvious from examining effects of individual macro-exo level regressors in Table 6.4 that they would have greater influence in the father model. While there were more macro-exo variables which were included (by virtue of their significance) in the father model, and while the fathers' single macro-exo level regressor was stronger than those in the mother model (interaction-available time, β=-.386), there were two significant regressors in the mother model, making a comparison of level efficacy between the submodels complex, requiring further analysis.

Table 6.5 indicates that the meso-level also exerts significant influence for role-image in both the mother and father models. In this case, the prediction power of the levels is nearly the same (18.7% to 16.7%). The micro-level is also significant in both cases, predicting 18.2% of the variance in the mother model for role-image, and 30.6% of the variance in the father model. The overall variance explained of model effects on role-image is 44.3% for the mother model and 70.3% for the father model. So the hierarchical regressions indicate that, at least for the dependent variable of teen's self-image in salient social roles, all three system levels should be retained for our model reconfiguration.
In Table 6.5, the regressions with teen's role image as the dependent variable provide mixed support for the hypothesis of proximal effects. For each submodel, the micro-level had an equal or stronger effect than distal levels (i.e., the macro and exo levels). This supports the hypothesis. However, in the father submodel, macro level influences were clearly stronger than those of the meso level; in the mother submodel, the influences on teen's role-image of the meso and micro levels were equal ($R^2 = .187, .182$). Neither of these observations support the hypothesis of proximal effects.

**Discussion**

As a primary objective, this paper has tested a multi-level model of parent-teen socialization which links social-structural influences with interactional dynamics, and interaction with adolescent outcomes. The macro-exo, meso, and micro-system levels all retained their integrity (through demonstrating statistically significant effects) on the primary dependent variable of teen's self-image in social roles. System levels also displayed significant, but more inconsistent, effects on the other dependent variables: school grades, self-esteem, and quality-of-relationship measures. In general, the strategy suggested by structural symbolic interactionists (Fine, 1993; Stryker, 1980) of using role-playing as an integrative construct has worked well with this multi-level model, serving to strengthen ties between system levels, and providing new ways of conceptualizing both parental behavior and teen outcomes in the socialization process.

Even more important to the theoretical development underlying the model testing was the proposition that variables from all system levels must be considered in a complete model of socialization, and that social-structural variables which have often been omitted from consideration in micro-level research (Kohn, 1989) might profitably be included. In this regard, it was evident that social class, occupation, family size,
gender, teen's age, and other social-structural variables were important in the parent-teen socialization system, especially when these influences were examined within unique interactional systems (i.e. mother and father submodels), and when they were linked to broad patterns of socializing behaviors and outcomes (i.e. interactive time use, patterns of parental subroles, teen's self-image in social roles) rather than to more specific phenomena.

This research applied a new technique for testing and revising multi-level models which, although used specifically to test a model of parent-teen socialization, may profitably be used for other topics of research. The demonstrated techniques appear to have been highly effective. Using a three-step testing procedure with bivariate correlations, multiple and stepwise regressions, and finally hierarchical regressions, we built and tested separate empirical submodels for mothers' and fathers' socialization systems. This process might be regarded as a type of symbolic interactionist methodology, which separately examines the perspectives of different actors in the interactional system. These procedures permitted the elimination of non-functioning variables, the merger of macro and exo levels, the creation of a system of model elements (i.e. variables) which displays high predictive power, and reconfigurations of the model for mothers and fathers. Model revisions confirm the value of studying interactive role-playing as a mediative process.

A secondary goal of this study was to test a hypothesis of proximal effects, which asserted that proximal levels (those adjacent to the dependent variable) should have more influence than distal levels on dependent variables. This hypothesis received mixed support. The micro-level, in general, exhibited greater influence on the five dependent variables (see Table 6.3), but there were notable exceptions, including one case of non-significance at the micro level where the meso-level retained significance.
In two cases, the macro level had more influence than the meso level; in one case the meso level had more influence than the micro-level; in one case the meso and micro levels had equal influence.

Finally, important conclusions are that mothers and fathers have different levels of involvement and different ways of interacting with teenagers. We found that fathers spend about three-fourths as much time (22.2 hours) with teenagers as mothers (28.0 hours), a higher figure than previous studies have indicated (Amato, 1994; Barnett & Baruch, 1987; Brines, 1994). Factor analysis also revealed that mothers and fathers employ qualitatively different themes of interaction with their teenagers, and these data show that these role-playing motifs of both parents have powerful positive effects on parent-teen relationships, and in turn, quality-of-relationship perceptions have strong positive effects on teen's role-image. Mothers' acceptance and moral authority seem most conductive to positive teen outcomes; for fathers, guidance and companionship are positively related both to good relationships, and also to teens' evaluations of their abilities at success in social roles.

Factor variables, derived from interactive parental subroles, appear to be important determinants of teen outcomes, and offer a new and powerful way of representing styles of interaction. In fact, in both types of regressions, the maternal factor of accepting partner showed higher coefficients than mothers' support on the mother-teen relationship, even though parental support has been considered one of the most robust in the socialization literature (Peterson & Rollins, 1987).

Model Revision

Figure 6.2 displays reconfigurations of the theoretical model presented in Figure 6.1. Whereas the theoretical model applied to parents in general, subsequent
Figure 6.2. Revised Models of Parental Socialization for Mothers and Fathers.
model of the social order.

Mothers and Fathers.
analysis suggested the need for building separate revised models for mothers and fathers.

The two submodels look very different from each other, and indeed, contain different configurations of variables with different displayed relationships and effects. Beta weights are not displayed, for in some cases the arrows of influence indicate connections with multiple dimensions or subcategories of another variable. Instead of displaying weights of influence, Figure 6.2 identifies operative and salient variables within each parental subsystem, and indicates the general direction of system influences with valence symbols.

One initial impression gained is that the father submodel is much more "cluttered" than the mother submodel, partly because of more macro-exo level variables which remained significant in the father-teen system. Social class, for instance, displays six significant links to model variables or subvariables in the father model, and reflects differences between middle-class and working-class fathers. Employment variables are also a significant part of the father-teen system, where in the mother system they were excluded through non-significance. Teen's gender and age also makes a significant difference for fathers with respect to interaction-available time, contact time, and the quality of the father-teen relationship.

Conspicuously absent from the mother's model, on the other hand, is teen's gender. The lack of relationship between teen gender, mother-teen contact time, and mothers' interactive subroles, establishes that mothers tend to have similar styles of interaction with teens of both genders. Also absent are occupational variables, indicating that time on the job does not make a significant difference in the amount of time mothers spend interacting with their teens, or in their styles of interaction. Family size, however, is a part of the mother-teen interactional system, and is associated with
both an increase in total time spent with mothers, but a decrease in solo time and perceived maternal support by the teenager. In both submodels, parental subroles have a significant influence on quality of the parent-teen relationship, and in the father submodel they also display a significant link to teen’s self-image.

There is a close connection between the regressions in Tables 6.4 and 6.5, and the model reconfiguration in Figure 6.2. Because the same variables were used for the final multiple and stepwise regressions, and for the hierarchical regressions, it is first of all possible to juxtapose Tables 6.4 and 6.5 and examine which specific variables help create the level-specific influences noted on Table 6.5. This enables us to make the observation, for instance, that the paternal subrole of guide and teacher helps to create the substantial explained variance noted at the micro-level on teen’s role image. It also allows us to infer that the arrow of influence drawn from father’s subroles to teen’s self-image in Figure 6.2 was a result of the specific effects of the guide and teacher subrole. Similar observations may be made concerning other variables and system levels.

Observations about fathers’ influences on teen interaction and outcomes both support and contradict previous research. First, as already mentioned, fathers are less involved in terms of time spent with teens. However, perhaps the most surprising finding of this research is that, despite a lower level of involvement, the influence of fathers is highly significant on teen development, even displaying higher levels of influence than mothers for selected variables. The overall variance explained in the father submodel (Table 6.3) was also higher than that for the mother. Further research may extend this analysis by studying the interactive influence of mothers and fathers on adolescents, and examining how parental influence operates in mother-only and father-only families, where the opposite-sexed parent is not present for providing
compensatory socialization (that is, where no parental division of labor, gender-specific or otherwise, is possible).

Fathers may, however, be less attuned to the dynamics of their relationships with their teens than mothers, and less aware of the outcomes of their relationships with teens. According to the evidence presented here, mothers' and teen's views of their relationships similarly predict teen's role-image (Table 6.2), but the fathers' view is not significantly correlated in the father-teen submodel. Furthermore, the data suggest fathers may under-estimate the negative effects of power display in relationships with their daughters. Perhaps fathers are prone to believe the cultural dogma which asserts that mothers have primary responsibility for raising children, and thereby under-estimate their own influence. Social-structural variables also functioned quite differently in the mother-teen and father-teen interactional systems, implying that the influence of gender roles for parenting in society begins at the level of macro-level influence, and penetrates even to the fashioning of interactional patterns and developmental outcomes for teenagers. For fathers, job time and employment schedule had significant model influence, implying that occupational involvement is still considered the primary male role in society, even if it significantly lessens involvement in child-rearing. This effect was not noted for mothers, implying that childcare responsibilities are still of primary importance to most mothers, irrespective of outside employment.

Caveats and Future Research

Teens and parents in this study generally reported strong relationships, high levels of interaction, and functional parents who not only reported that relationships with their youth were important to them, but demonstrated interaction patterns consistent with such commitment. These findings may partly reflect a de-selection
effect caused by working-class families or families experiencing difficulties who declined to participate in the research, or who did not finish the research. Although working-class families were represented fairly well in the overall sample, their completion rate was lower. This may have been an adverse side effect of the complexity of the research.

Furthermore, some families actually contacted us directly to say they could not participate in the research due to busy schedules or family difficulties. Omitting families such as these has undoubtedly inflated the figures for interaction time and relationship quality. However, the time log method of measurement used in this study has been found to be one of the most reliable methods of time measurement (Asmussen & Larson, 1991; Robinson, 1985) and we believe the time figures to be fairly reliable, especially for families like those in the sample. On the other hand, the time figures for this study were for one week only, even though they were correlated with more permanent variables. Other studies should measure interactive time use over a longer period of time to more reliably establish family patterns of time use.

Further studies of parental socialization should make greater efforts to obtain more adequate representation from working-class and single-parent families, and those with stressful schedules or deteriorative personal relationships. Also, studies which use enhanced versions of variables measured at all system levels are needed. For instance, some studies may choose to measure occupational environments of parents as determinants of interaction styles with children (see Menaghan, 1991a; Menaghan & Parcel, 1990). More research using the new variables of interactive parental subroles and teen's role-image are also needed to refine these measures and test their effects, and new dependent variables may be incorporated such as achievement or delinquency.
Multi-level models are effective means of studying parental socialization of adolescents. We anticipate that others will soon realize the advantages of this approach.
CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

Socialization is a ubiquitous process which, for lucid study, requires a refinement of focus. This research is confined to examining parental socialization of teenagers, even though there are many socializing influences for teenagers, such as peer groups, school and community groups and environments, and the media (Bryant, 1990; Peterson & Rollins, 1987). Even confining the research to parents as a socializing source involves an elaborate complex of variables. One objective of this research has been to further the development of a "comprehensive" model of socialization by examining and clarifying some of the ways parents interact with their teenagers, and to measure certain teen outcomes which may be regarded as products of parental socialization.

Socialization is also a complex and bewildering process which invites theory building and the use of new methodologies. This research used symbolic interactionism and other role-sensitive theories and developed a theoretically integrated multilevel model of parent-teen socialization based on a general model of social influence (see Chapter IV), tested the efficacy of the model (Chapter VI), examined class and gender-based differences in parent-teen interaction (Chapter V), and assessed some new theoretically-derived variables within the context of the model: parent-teen interactive time use, parental interactive subroles (role performance), and teen self-image (defined in interactionist terms of role-identity). The purpose for the development of these new variables was not simply to promote macro-micro theoretical integration, but to see if dynamics of parent-teen interaction are usefully
seen as intervening influences between social structure and teen socialization outcomes. Toward this end, a variety of methodologies were used in combination, including the use of time logs in conjunction with surveys, data collection from all participants in the parent-teen interactive system, and model building from the perspectives of each parent.

The following section will review some of the major findings of the research, and offer some additional information about the nature of influence of parents on teen outcomes. For reasons that will become clear, the major discussion of theoretical meanings will be deferred until after the "Other Findings" section of this chapter.

Findings

Paper Findings

There were actually two types of findings from this research. First, there were metatheoretical findings which pertained to the testing of the multi-level model. Second, there were substantive findings relevant to the parental socialization of teenagers. This section will organize its discussion of both types of findings around Figure 7.1, the theoretical model of parent-teen socialization, and Figures 7.2 and 7.3, the revised models which incorporated the findings of the three research papers (for figures, see next three pages).

Chapter IV

Chapter IV developed the theory of multi-level modeling and proposed Figure 7.1 as a testable model of parent-teen socialization. Variables were labelled and located within levels of Bronfenbrenner's (1979) typology of the social order. Model
Figure 7.1. A Multi-Level Model of Parent-Teen Socialization.
NOTES: Positive valences for parent's or teen's gender indicates stronger values for females. The two arrows at the bottom leading to Teen's Self-image represent positive relationships from both the teen's and parents' subvariables or versions (i.e. perspectives) of the quality of the parent-teen relationship.

Figure 7.2. Revised Model of Parent-Teen Socialization.
System levels are based on Bronfenbrenner's (1979) social ecological model of the social order.

Figure 7.3. Revised Models of Parental Socialization for Mothers and Fathers.
model of the social order.

others and Fathers.
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testing involved a three-step procedure which combined zero-order correlations, multiple and stepwise regressions, and hierarchical linear regressions. Because the chain of influence flows from the top of the diagram toward the bottom, with various relationships proposed along the way, the series of regressions was organized around several dependent variables, with micro-level variables (i.e. teen outcome variables) representing the end-of-line dependent variables which were used to assess the predictive power of the entire model.

Figure 7.2 represents the revised model used in Chapter IV to demonstrate the technique of model testing with combined parental variables which synthesized data from both parents. For instance, parent-teen contact time represented the total time that either or both parents spent with the teenager and did not differentiate between the interactive time spent with each parent. Figure 7.2 represents the combined findings of the hierarchical regressions which tested level integrity, and the series of regressions which used various sets of independent and dependent variables. It shows the merger of the macro, exo, and meso-systems, and presents variable relationships which proved significant in multivariate analysis, with the effects of other variables in proximal levels being controlled statistically through their inclusion in the regression equations.

In general, the proposition that dynamics of parent-teen interaction serve as intervening or intermediate influences in the model was supported, as represented in the revised model in Figure 7.2. Most links from macro-level variables were to interaction variables in the meso-system or the first tier of the micro-system rather than to teen outcome variables. Interaction variables then completed the chain of relationship to micro-variables in the individual system. The macro variable of social class had a significant relationship to parent-teen contact time, and numerous links to
categories of time use. Teen's gender was linked to interaction-available time, quality-of-relationship, and teen's age was linked to quality-of-relationship and to parental subroles. Parental gender and parent-teen gender dyads also displayed numerous links to meso-level variables. So while there were many links from macro-exo to intermediate levels, and from intermediate to micro levels, there were only a very few direct macro-to-individual links: e.g. social class to grades, and teen's gender to grades and self-image.

The number and location of variable linkages serves as one piece of evidence for the hypothesis of proximal effects, which predicts that adjacent levels (and included elements) will have greater influence on dependent variables than more distal levels of elements. The greater explained variances for system levels shown in Table 7.1 presents additional evidence for the proximal effects hypothesis. With four of the five variables included, there is a progression in magnitude of explained variance from the macro-exo level to the micro-level, with the effect being most clearly noted in the final regression which utilizes teen's role-image as the dependent variable. In that case, the explained variances progressed from 8.4%, to 26.3%, to 41.2% for the macro-exo, meso, and micro levels, respectively. The exception to this effect was noticed for school grades, where the meso-level did not display any significant variance explained, and the explained variances of the macro and micro levels were nearly equal.

There were many substantive findings relating to Figure 7.2 which are presented in Chapter IV -- only the highlights of theoretical import will be reviewed here. Table 7.2 displays another way to look at the findings of Chapter IV, this time focusing on the strengths and significances of variable relationships rather than on the overall pattern created by system levels and elements. One observed pattern was that
Table 7.1
Teen Developmental Outcomes With Parents, Hierarchical Regression Effects<sup>a</sup> on Five Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level Effects</th>
<th>Quality of Relationship</th>
<th>Teen Outcome Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teen's View</td>
<td>Parents' View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macro-Exo Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² change</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. of F</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Meso Level     |                         |                        |              |                        |
| R² change     | .152                    | .199                   | .028         | .116                    | .263  |
| Sig. of F change | .063                    | .013 <sup>*</sup>      | .799         | .186                    | .007 <sup>**</sup> |
| Sig. of F     | .023 <sup>*</sup>       | .006 <sup>**</sup>    | .175         | .225                    | .010 <sup>**</sup> |

| Micro Level    |                         |                        |              |                        |
| R² change     | .166                    | .262                   | .176         | .289                    | .412  |
| Sig. of F change | .225                    | .007 <sup>**</sup>    | .528         | .109                    | .000 <sup>***</sup> |
| Sig. of F     | .036 <sup>*</sup>       | .000 <sup>***</sup>  | .344         | .089                    | .000 <sup>***</sup> |

| All Levels     |                         |                        |              |                        |
| overall R²    | .456                    | .589                   | .360         | .466                    | .758  |
| F             | 2.070                   | 3.818                  | 1.155        | 1.696                   | 5.226 |
| Sig. of F     | .036 <sup>*</sup>       | .000 <sup>***</sup>  | .344         | .088                    | .000 <sup>***</sup> |

* <sup>p</sup>< .05  ** <sup>p</sup>< .01  *** <sup>p</sup>< .001

Note: Variables were entered in blocks specific to their system level, and were the same for all dependent variables.

<sup>a</sup> Independent variables were included for hierarchical regression if they had significant betas at the .05 level when regressed by multiple regression or stepwise regression with any of nine dependent variables in the model.

<sup>b</sup> Rosenberg's (1965) self-esteem scale, a 10-item instrument assessing psychological sense of self-worth.

<sup>c</sup> Self-image scale, a new 13-item scale of teens' self-evaluations of performance in salient adolescent social roles.
Table 7.2
Multiple and Stepwise Regression Effects of Model Variables on Teen's Role-Image and on Relationship With Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Regressors</th>
<th>Multiple Regression</th>
<th>Stepwise Regression</th>
<th>Total of Sig. Betas in Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relat. Teen (a)</td>
<td>Relat. Parents (b)</td>
<td>Role-Image (c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macro-Exo Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen's Gender</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.296*</td>
<td>1.987*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Class</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen's Age</td>
<td>-.326**</td>
<td>.301*</td>
<td>.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interact-Available Time</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meso-Level Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Support</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>301*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen's Social Participation</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Contact Time</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>1.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro-Level Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Time Categories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk Time</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>-.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solo Time</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Time</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>1.777*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Time</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>-.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Participation Time</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. or Other Time</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Parental Subroles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac1: Controller</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac2: Developer</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.414*</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac3: Friend &amp; Guide</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen's View</td>
<td>.890***</td>
<td>.523***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents' View - Index 1</td>
<td>-.497</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.857***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents' View - Index 2</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted Multiple R | .411 | .672 | .860 | .548 | .713 | .865
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Beta 1</th>
<th>Beta 2</th>
<th>Beta 3</th>
<th>Beta 4</th>
<th>Beta 5</th>
<th>Beta 6</th>
<th>Beta 7</th>
<th>Beta 8</th>
<th>Beta 9</th>
<th>Beta 10</th>
<th>Beta 11</th>
<th>Beta 12</th>
<th>Beta 13</th>
<th>Beta 14</th>
<th>Beta 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solo Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Participation Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. or Other Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Parental Subroles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac1: Controller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac2: Developer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac3: Friend &amp; Guide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen's View</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents' View - Index 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents' View - Index 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Multiple R</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>.886</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td>.865</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Multiple R^2</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F value &amp; sig.</td>
<td>1.476</td>
<td>3.037</td>
<td>5.680</td>
<td>5.208</td>
<td>8.680</td>
<td>26.469</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: N = 203. Betas shown but not marked with one or more asterisks are significant at the .10 level; these were included in the stepwise regressions only as control variables. Regression results for only three dependent variables are given above, but 12 regressions were conducted with the given list of regressors—one for each dependent variable (and key subvariables) which were specified by the model. For each equation, only variables which preceded the dependent variable in the model hierarchy were used as regressor variables.

a An index of the quality of the parent-teen relationship, as viewed by the teenager.
b The second index of the quality of the parent-teen relationship, as viewed by parents (combined responses).
c Self-image scale, a new 13-item scale of teens' self-evaluations of performance in salient adolescent social roles.
d This column indicates the total number of significant betas at the .10 level or higher for each regressor variable, including coefficients with dependent variables in the model but not shown above. When a beta was significant in both the multiple regression and step regression equations, it was only counted once.
teen and parental perceptual systems seemed to display a type of internal cohesiveness -- parents' perceptions of parental subroles were strongly predictive of their own views of the parent-teen relationship; teens' views of the parent-teen relationship strongly predicted their own self-images in social roles. Therefore, it is noteworthy that one parentally reported subrole, that of developer, had a significant relationship to the teen's perception of role-image ($\beta=.458$, $p<.001$). Three time subcategories also influenced teens' role-image. Of the macro variables, however, only teen's gender influenced role-image, and its link was moderately weak ($-.211$, $p<.05$).

These empirical findings provide evidence for the proposition that parent-teen interaction not only shapes the nature and quality of their relationship, but significantly influences the formation of teen identity, and the confidence with which teens perform social roles which are important to them at this point in their lives. Furthermore, this particular revised model provides evidence of synergy between the influences of mothers and fathers with respect to adolescent development.

**Chapter VI**

Findings from Chapter VI will be discussed before findings from Chapter V, since Chapter VI is a logical extension of Chapter IV, representing further empirical testing of the theoretical model initially presented in Chapter II. Chapter V findings will then be presented since those findings do not test the full model, but rather help to detail its inner workings. Chapter V findings represent a magnification of the midsection of the model, a detailed examination of the nature of parent-teen interaction, the effects of class and gender (macro-level variables) on parent-teen interaction.
interaction, and only a very limited analysis of interaction effects on micro-level variables.

Figure 7.3 presents the revised models for mothers and fathers. Note that when parental influences are separated by parental gender (that is, in each parental submodel) that the meso-level retains its integrity in both of the models. The meso-level was merged with the macro and exo-levels in Figure 7.2 (from Chapter IV) because the only meso-level variable exerting significant influence on teen's role-image was parent-teen contact time, a "boundary" variable between the meso and micro levels; other meso-level variable variables were not significant. However, when separate models were made for mothers and fathers (Figure 7.3), other meso-level variables retained significance such as family size, social support from both parents, and teen's social participation. Some of these had up to four significant betas (of 12 total) in the model, thereby demonstrating the importance of controlling for parents' gender. The number of variables excluded from the submodels but only the variable of family size from the fathers' submodel. So while the integrity of levels was isomorphic for mother and father submodels, the variables included and the variable relationships indicated were much different.

The hypothesis of proximal effects was less clearly supported by the mother and father submodels in Figure 7.3 than it was previously true in the combined-parents model in Figure 7.2. The results of the hierarchical linear regression in Table 7.3 show that variance explained figures progressively increase from macro-exo to the micro level for 4 of the 5 mother-submodel equations, but only for 2 of the 5 father-submodel equations. Furthermore, an examination of Figure 7.3 in contrast to Figure 7.2 shows that there are more relationships between macro and micro levels for both submodels than for the undifferentiated model. Nevertheless, the general pattern is
### Table 7.3

Teen Developmental Outcomes With Mother and Father, Hierarchical Regression Effects<sup>a</sup> on Five Dependent Variables in Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level Effects</th>
<th>Quality of Relationship</th>
<th>Teen Outcome Variables</th>
<th>Quality of Relationship</th>
<th>Teen's Parents' View</th>
<th>Parents' View</th>
<th>School Grades</th>
<th>Self-Esteem&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Role-Image&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Teen's View</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Macro-Exo Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; change</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>  0.144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. of F</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.018 *</td>
<td>  0.140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meso Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; change</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>  0.217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. of F change</td>
<td>  0.001 ***</td>
<td>  0.000 ***</td>
<td>  0.007 **</td>
<td>  0.038 *</td>
<td>  0.000 ***</td>
<td>  0.000 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. of F</td>
<td>  0.001 ***</td>
<td>  0.000 ***</td>
<td>  0.004 **</td>
<td>  0.039 *</td>
<td>  0.000 ***</td>
<td>  0.006 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Micro Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; change</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>  0.114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. of F change</td>
<td>  0.000 ***</td>
<td>  0.000 ***</td>
<td>  0.090</td>
<td>  0.014 *</td>
<td>  0.003</td>
<td>  0.608</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. of F</td>
<td>  0.000 ***</td>
<td>  0.000 ***</td>
<td>  0.004 **</td>
<td>  0.004 **</td>
<td>  0.000 ***</td>
<td>  0.059</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Levels</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall R&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.469</td>
<td>0.573</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>0.443</td>
<td>  0.475</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>7.273</td>
<td>11.374</td>
<td>2.396</td>
<td>2.460</td>
<td>4.467</td>
<td>1.811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. of F</td>
<td>  0.000 ***</td>
<td>  0.000 ***</td>
<td>  0.004 **</td>
<td>  0.004 **</td>
<td>  0.000 ***</td>
<td>  0.059</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* <sup>p</sup>< .05
** <sup>p</sup>< .01
*** <sup>p</sup>< .001

Note: Variables were entered in blocks specific to their system level, and were the same for all dependent variables.

<sup>a</sup> Independent variables were included for hierarchical regression if they had significant betas at the .05 level when regression with any of nine dependent variables in the model.

<sup>b</sup> Rosenberg's (1965) self-esteem scale, a 10-item instrument assessing psychological sense of self-worth.

<sup>c</sup> Self-image scale, a new 13-item scale of teens' self-evaluations of performance in salient adolescent social roles.
Table 7.3

Teen Outcomes With Mother and Father, Hierarchical effectsa on Five Dependent Variables in Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teen Outcome Variables</th>
<th>with Mother</th>
<th>Quality of Relationship</th>
<th>Teen Outcome Variables with Father</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Grades</td>
<td>Self-Esteemb</td>
<td>Role-Imagec</td>
<td>Teen's View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.018 *</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 **</td>
<td>.038 *</td>
<td>.000 ***</td>
<td>.006 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 **</td>
<td>.039 *</td>
<td>.000 ***</td>
<td>.066 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>.014 *</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 **</td>
<td>.004 **</td>
<td>.000 ***</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.443</td>
<td>.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.460</td>
<td>4.467</td>
<td>1.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 **</td>
<td>.004 **</td>
<td>.000 ***</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In level, and were the same for all dependent variables.
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that proximal influences are still stronger and more numerous; there are simply more exceptions to the rule with the parents' submodels than for the combined-parents' model.

Certain univariate and bivariate findings from Chapter VI were important and necessary for understanding the full model. For instance, the fact that the sample was somewhat restricted in terms of social class and family type may help explain why atypically positive results were obtained for school grades and quality-of-relationship variables. The dispersion of scores for grades, relationship variables, teen's self-image, and teen's self-esteem is undoubtedly less than it would be with a more diverse sample.

Most mothers in the sample reported outside employment, but worked an average of 18 hours less than their husbands (34 to 52 hours), thereby permitting them more time for interaction with teens. Final time figures indicated that teens spent about 22.2 hours with fathers and 28.0 hours with mothers over the week's period of time covered by the time logs. These figures are similar to the 4 to 5 hours a day reported by Barnett and Baruch (1987), but the surprising thing is that these figures apply to teenagers, not to the grade-school children in their study. And the fathers in this sample, while spending less time than mothers for almost every time category, spent about three-fourths as much time as the mothers did, a significantly higher figure than the half to two-thirds figure reported by other studies (Amato, 1994; Barnett & Baruch, 1987; Brines, 1994).

Perhaps the most noteworthy variable to drop out of the mothers' submodel was teen's gender. While this variable retained three significant links in the fathers' submodel, mothers apparently treat male and female children very much the same. Teen's gender had no significant effects on time mothers said they had available for
interaction, or on the quality of the relationship, both of which varied by gender in the fathers' submodel. On the other hand, the mothers' gender (that is, compared to fathers) was significant in the model. Mothers reported more time for interaction, spent more time in contact with their teens, provided more parental support, and played different parental subroles.

Chapter V

Chapter V extends the process of differentiating between maternal and paternal influences in the socialization process even further, and contains an in-depth analysis of interactive parental subroles. Several tables were presented to show how subroles were ranked by the overall population and by various subpopulations, broken down by parents' gender, teens' gender, and social class. The most striking differences were noted when all three primary variables were varied simultaneously, with the greatest discrepancy noted, for instance, between the parenting styles (i.e. ranking of subroles) of working-class fathers with males, compared to middle-class mothers with females.

A technique of weighted scores, based on frequency figures for the playing of parental subroles, was used to measure the "involvement" of different parental populations with respect to teens of either gender. Using these measures, fathers were less involved overall with their teens, but were significantly more involved with male teens. For mothers, involvement figures were approximately equal for males and females. Both parents, however, played more authoritative and achievement-oriented roles with male teenagers, such as the roles of reminder, lawmaker, motivator, sports trainer, and fellow-worker. With female teens, both parents played the subroles of therapist, sounding board, banker-financier, and arts patron "significantly" more
often. For the whole sample, fathers' involvement was greater than for mothers not only for sports trainer, but also for best friend. Examining the adjusted scores, we noted that fathers were significantly more involved in roles centering on leisure or companionship, such as couch potato, active companion, best friend, motivator, and adversary. Mothers showed a greater likelihood of playing developer subroles, practical support subroles, and communication subroles.

Social-class differences were also noted in our parental subroles analysis. Middle-class parents were more likely to play the subroles of moral teacher, guidance counselor, teacher, and patron of the arts, all subroles which might be associated with higher education. While the middle class also played lawmaker and authority figure more often, the working class engaged in the roles of decision-maker, monitor, referree, and employer/boss, all roles associated with a more supervisory view of authority. I concluded that to some extent, these findings support the thesis of Melvin Kohn (1959a, 1969) that middle-class parents emphasize values for their adolescent children of self-direction and working-class parents are more likely to emphasize obedience and conformity. The important point about this evidence is that more than a difference in parental values is displayed; here we see a difference in reported parental behavior, which takes the analysis a step further than Kohn did. Parental involvement scores were also calculated and compared using analysis-of-variance tests. This analysis showed that working-class parents display the greatest differences in their interaction with male and female teens; working-class mothers and fathers had involvement scores of 605 and 426, respectively, with that group of adolescents. Working-class fathers had the lowest involvement scores with teens of both genders, but all fathers were involved significantly more with male teens than with females.
The factor analysis of parental subroles then created variables of these subroles which could be used to test the effects of parental role-playing on parent-teen relationships and teen outcomes. Theoretically, the importance of this analysis is that it would complete the link for social-class influence, demonstrating a connection among social structure (i.e. social class position, gender of parent and teen), through intervening variables (i.e. parental subroles), to socialization outcomes (i.e. teen self-image, self-esteem, and grades). The factor analysis produced maternal subrole factor variables of *moral authority*, *accepting partner*, and *driver and fan*. Paternal subrole factor variables were *guide and teacher*, *control and conformity*, *buddy/chum*, and *trainer and fan*.

Regression analysis indicated that three of these factor variables were significantly related to teen's role-image: the maternal factors of *accepting partner* ($\beta=0.362$), *moral authority* ($\beta=0.282$), and the paternal factor of *trainer and fan* ($\beta=0.301$). Furthermore, a series of regressions indicated that these subrole factors were significantly related to parent-teen relationships from both teen and parents' perspectives, with several interactive effects by gender and social class. For instance, the father subrole factor of *buddy/chum* had a significant effect on the teen's perception of the parent-teen relationship, but only for working-class females. The father subrole factor of *trainer and fan* was a significant positive predictor of school grades for male teens, but not for females. For working-class males, this subrole had a sizeable effect on the teen's view of the father-teen relationship ($\beta=0.8627$). In these same equations, the macro variables of social class, teen's gender, and teen's age displayed significant but weak effects. The effects of subrole variables were far stronger, and were more consistently significant throughout the series of equations.
Integration of Paper Findings

Each of the three research papers shed some light on the theoretical model of parent-teen socialization (Figure 7.1), and on many of the specified variable relationships. Of the three revised models, the first with combined parents' variables (Table 7.2) comes closest to resembling the theoretical model (Figure 7.1). Only three variables, family type, parent's job time, and employment pattern, dropped out of the model. Many of the variable connections were confirmed, but a hypothesized curvilinear relationship between parent-teen contact time and quality-of-relationship measures was not significant for any subgroups or variable variations.\(^1\) This rejection of the curvilinearity hypothesis opened the door for us to conduct linear regressions with these variables included in the model. An unanticipated link was also discovered between social class and activity forms, and school grades. Teen's age did not have the anticipated effect in the regression analysis on interaction time,\(^2\) but it did display a new link to the quality of the parent-teen relationship. Both parental subroles and activity forms also displayed unanticipated links to teen's self-image.

Many of these links were confirmed with Figure 7.3 which displayed the mother and father submodels, but there were many differences as well. The overall appearance of the mother and father submodels is one of contrast, not similarity. Many variables are located in the same positions, but the linkages between many

---

\(^1\) A series of tests was conducted to test the curvilinear prediction, using three measures of parent-teen contact time (one for mothers, fathers, and both parents), and each of the primary measures of the parent-teen relationship. In each case, the relationship variable was split at the median, and a Pearson's product moment correlation coefficient was calculated between the specified time variable and each component of the relationship variable. In one case, we were looking for a significant positive relationship; in the other case, we were looking for a significant negative relationship. None of these tests proved significant.

\(^2\) However, in a chi-square test, a significantly lower amount of parent-teen contact time was discovered for the oldest teen group (16-18 year olds). This effect was not significant in the regressions.
variables are strikingly different. As noted earlier, perhaps the greatest general
difference is that macro-level variables had a greater effect on interaction patterns in
the father submodel (i.e. social class, occupational variables), and family-level
variables (i.e. family size) had greater effects in the mothers' submodel.

Another way to compare these three revised models is to examine the related
hierarchical linear regressions which were conducted using the same variables and
level groupings (see Tables 7.1 and 7.3). It was interesting that the mother submodel
explained less of the variance in almost every equation than either the father
submodel or the combined model. Furthermore, for four of the five equations, the
father's submodel explained more total variance than the combined model, but for the
critical variable of teen's role-image, the combined-parents' model explained the most
(R^2=.758).

The most important function of Chapter V, perhaps, was to elucidate the
relationships between gender, social class, and parental socialization which are only
partially reflected in the revised models of Chapters IV and VI. For instance, only on
the father submodel (Figure 7.3) did the link between social class and parental
subroles emerge as significant, but in the detail of the subrole ranking tables (Tables
5.1-5.4 of Chapter V), many differences clearly emerged. Of course, in that case
specific subroles were being compared, while subrole factors (each involving several
subroles) were employed in the regression analyses.

Other Findings

When I finished the analyses for the three research papers, I still had some
questions about the relative influence of mothers and fathers on teen outcomes within
the entire multi-level model. Chapter IV had used combined parental variables to test
the model, while all of the analyses in Chapter VI were of mothers and fathers separately (pertaining to the mother and father submodels). Only one table in Chapter V had compared mother and father variables in their effects on teens, but this analysis only examined a limited set of variables -- a few control variables, all parental subrole factors, and the teen outcomes of grades and role-image. It did not include any interactive time-use variables, or quality-of-relationship variables. Doing a comparative analysis using the full model is important for the following reasons: (a) mothers and fathers are interactive players in the process of parental socialization, and their relative influence should be assessed simultaneously, (b) some have suggested that the effects of fathers that some have noted are spurious since they often disappear when controlling for maternal influence (Giele, 1988), and (c) because the superior performance of the father submodel in Chapter VI relative to teen outcome variables was a surprising outcome which deserves further attention.

Table 7.4 displays the results of 10 similar equations that I conducted with the full model, but including mother and father parallel variables when possible. I had discovered earlier (partly through mistakes), that leaving one variable in or out of an equation entry list, or using a different form of the variable, often has subtle but measurable effects on the significances and strengths of other variables in the equation. So for this series of regressions, I executed several variations of the complete variable list with the teen outcome variable of role-image as the dependent variable in all cases. In the first column, the strongest beta appearing for each variable in any of the 10 equations is listed, and in the final column, the number of significant betas for each variable is given for all 10 equations.

The equations were set up to differ only in minor ways. In some of the equations, I decided to exclude the perceptually-based variables of "available time for
Table 7.4
Full Model Stepwise Regression Effects on Teen’s Self-Image in Social Roles:
Comparing Effects of Mother and Father Variables

**Results of Four Selected Equations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Variables</th>
<th>without Avail. Times</th>
<th>without Father Fac. #4</th>
<th>Total of 10 Equations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significant Model Regressors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 10 Equations</td>
<td>Eq. #1</td>
<td>Eq. #2</td>
<td>Eq. #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Macro-Exo Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Class</td>
<td>.228 **</td>
<td>.186 *</td>
<td>.175 †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen’s Age</td>
<td>-.292 ***</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Available Time</td>
<td>-.223 *</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>NA/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meso-Level Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Support</td>
<td>-.309 **</td>
<td>-.309 **</td>
<td>-.259 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Teen Contact Time</td>
<td>.244 *</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Micro-Level Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Time Categories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Solo Time</td>
<td>.215 *</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Solo Time</td>
<td>.333 **</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother’s Interactive Subroles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac1: Moral Authority</td>
<td>.363 **</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac2: Accepting Partner</td>
<td>.363 ***</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac3: Driver &amp; Fan</td>
<td>.220 *</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father’s Interactive Subroles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac1: Guide &amp; Teacher</td>
<td>.446 ***</td>
<td>.381 ***</td>
<td>.380 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac4: Trainer &amp; Fan</td>
<td>.348 ***</td>
<td>.371 ***</td>
<td>.364 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teen’s View of Relationship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Mother (T81)</td>
<td>.697 ***</td>
<td>.534 ***</td>
<td>.635 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Father (T92)</td>
<td>.338 **</td>
<td>.200 †</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Multiple R</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.794</td>
<td>.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Multiple R²</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F value &amp; sig.</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>16.743 ***</td>
<td>15.709 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† p ≤ .10
* p ≤ .05
** p ≤ .01
*** p ≤ .001
### Mother's Interactive Subroles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fac1: Moral Authority</th>
<th>Fac2: Accepting Partner</th>
<th>Fac3: Driver &amp; Fan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.363 **</td>
<td>0.363 **</td>
<td>0.220 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Father's Interactive Subroles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fac1: Guide &amp; Teacher</th>
<th>Fac4: Trainer &amp; Fan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.446 ***</td>
<td>0.348 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.381 ***</td>
<td>0.371 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.380 ***</td>
<td>0.364 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.307 **</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.418 **</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teen's View of Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With Mother (T81)</th>
<th>With Father (T92)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.697 ***</td>
<td>0.338 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.534 ***</td>
<td>0.200 †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.635 ***</td>
<td>0.338 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.327 *</td>
<td>0.248 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.449 ***</td>
<td>0.248 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adjusted Multiple R**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adjusted Multiple R</th>
<th>F value &amp; sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>16.743 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>15.709 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td>12.948 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td>12.482 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adjusted Multiple R^2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>.631</th>
<th>.591</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: N = 203. Betas are standardized regression coefficients. Mother and father available-time-for-interaction variables were omitted from equations 2 and 3. Father factor variable #4, the weakest paternal subrole factor, was omitted from equations 3 and 4. Other similar variations were noticed, especially when view-of-the-relationship variables were excluded. In that case, subrole factors, especially maternal subrole factors, were more pronounced.

This column indicates the total number of significant betas at the .10 level or higher for each regressor variable, for all four equations shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p ≤ .10</th>
<th>p ≤ .05</th>
<th>** p ≤ .01</th>
<th>*** p ≤ .001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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interaction" since I had so many concrete indicators of actual reported interaction (i.e. the categorized time variables), and since it was included in the model largely as a predictor of contact time, not as an influencer of micro-level variables. I also omitted the fourth paternal factor of trainer and fan which, although it had been a strong performer in the equations, was a weaker factor emerging from factor analysis (it was based on only two parental subroles with a marginal eigenvalue), to see what effects might be revealed for other paternal factors or other variables. For some of the equations not shown, I also used one of the subvariables of parental support (the one pertaining to parental "attitudes") which had been a stronger correlate (in some cases) during the preliminary correlation analysis than the overall measure of parental support which I eventually used.

The result was a series of equations which all test the full model, albeit in slightly different ways. Findings show that some variables appeared as consistent performers in all or almost all equations, and some marginal variables became significant in one or more cases (up to 5). The more significant betas a variable displayed in the 10 equations, and the stronger the demonstrated beta weights, the more reliable I judged it to be in the overall model. Table 7.4 shows for instance, that the mother-teen relationship is a strong predictor of teen's role-image which usually (but not always) displayed a higher beta than the father-teen relationship. On the other hand, it is noteworthy, given others' skepticism about fathers' influence, that the father-teen relationship remains a significant predictor even when considered simultaneously with maternal factors. Furthermore, while two of the father subrole factor variables were significant and moderately strong predictors in the majority of equations, the two strongest maternal subrole factors were significant for only 3 of the 10, and were generally weaker in strength than the paternal factor of guide and
teacher. Father's solo time was also significant in 2 of the 10 equations ($\beta=.333$) while mother's solo time was significant, but weaker, in 1 equation ($\beta=.215$). However, mother-teen contact time and mother's support each had 3 significant links in the equations, while the corresponding father variables did not emerge as significant.

It appears then that fathers' influence, at least on teen's role-image, is not spurious; father variables retain their influence even in a multivariate system where they contended with maternal factors. In fact, the predictive power of this combined model is substantial, accounting for 63.1% of the variance in teen's role image for the full model. The relative effects of maternal and paternal factors, however, are complex. The mothers' relationship variable was stronger, but the fathers subrole factors were stronger. However, mothers had more subrole factors as significant.

Table 7.5 shows how I attempted to resolve the issue of the relative influence of maternal and paternal variables through the technique of hierarchical linear regression, with father and mother sets of variables entered in blocks. The first block contains various control variables such as social class, teen's gender and age, family size, etc. (see Table 7.5 notes). The second and third blocks were alternately the mother and father blocks of variables. Alternation was necessary because I found that, while the overall $R^2$ and significance levels for the equation do not change if the variables entered remain the same, the $R^2$ and significance levels for the block entered first will generally be higher. Thus I alternately entered the mother block first, then the father block, with two variations -- one set without quality-of-relationship variables (measured from the teen's perspective), and one set which included these variables.
Table 7.5

Hierarchical Block Regression Effects on Teen's Self-Image in Social Roles: Comparing the Strength of Overall Mother and Father Influences

Results of Four Equations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quality-of-Relationship Variables Excluded</th>
<th>Quality-of-Relationship Variables Included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equat. #1</td>
<td>Equat. #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order of Block Entry</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² change</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. of F</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order of Block Entry</td>
<td>2nd ††</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² change</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. of F change</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order of Block Entry</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2nd ††</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² change</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>.475 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. of F change</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.023 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Effects of All Blocks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall R²</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td>.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.731</td>
<td>1.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. of F</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†† Indicates the first parental block entered. * p ≤ .10  ** p ≤ .05  *** p ≤ .01

Note: Control variables entered were social class, teen's sex and age, family size and teen's social participation. Mother and father variable sets were parallel, both including job time, employment schedule, parental support, time categorical variables (talking, solo time, eating, leisure, working, social participation), all parental subrole factor variables (3 for the mother and 4 for the father), and quality-of-relationship variables (for the last two equations only).
Table 7.5 provides more evidence that the father variables do not lose their influence when considered in tandem with mother variables, and it also allows us to compare the relative impact of the parental variable blocks on teen's role-image. In fact, father influences explain more variance than mother variables in each pair of equations. For the first pair of equations, for instance, the explained variance for mothers when their block is entered first (equation #1) is .323 (p=.251) which is not significant, but fathers' explained variance (equation #2) is .475 (p=.023) which is significant at the .05 level. For the second pair of equations which include quality-of-relationship measures, the explained variance for mothers when their block is first (equation #3) is .442 (p=.048) which is significant at the .05 level, but fathers' explained variance (equation #4) is .558 (p=.004) which is a stronger beta. The secondary variances explained are also higher for fathers in each case. These findings indicate that not only do paternal factors survive when maternal variables are examined in the same multivariate regression, but paternal influences may even be stronger.3

An additional set of analyses were conducted to respond to questions posed in Chapters I and II about how parent-teen interaction might serve as intervening influences between social structure and adolescent outcomes. The analyses in Chapters IV through VI addressed selected aspects of this question, but I was still unclear about the predictive power which macro-level variables would display without interaction variables being in the model. Additionally, there were also two types of interaction variables in this study: interactive time-use variables and parental subrole factors. These two ways to view parent-teen interaction raised additional

3 In another regression, I eliminated the intervening variables of time use and subrole factors entirely, leaving only social-structural controls and quality-of-relationship measures. In this regression, the father-teen relationship variable had a beta of .571 (p =.000), but the mother-teen relationship variable was not significant (B=.162, p=.140).
questions. What relative influence did each of these sets of variables, time use and parental subroles, have with respect to quality-of-relationship variables and teen's role-image? Is one set of these interaction variables more potent than another? When used in combination, do they add more predictive power than when used singly?

Eleven equations were conducted with three alternating dependent variables: teen's role-image, quality of the mother-teen relationship, and quality of the father-teen relationship. These equations used alternating blocks of regressor variables: macro-meso variables, time-use variables, and parental subrole factors. For three equations, each dependent variable was used with the block of macro-meso level variables. For four equations, teen's role image was the dependent variable for blocks of time-use and then subrole variables, in two conditions, with and without quality-of-relationship variables added as regressors. For four final equations, time-use variables and subrole factors (in turn) were used as regressors for the mother-teen and then the father-teen relationship. In all cases where time-use or subrole factors were used as regressors, key macro-level variables were retained in the equation as controls.

Table 7.6 gives moderate support to the hypothesis of intervening effects. Let us first consider this hypothesis with respect to the end-of-line dependent variable in the model: teen's role-image. The first section of the table shows that the macro-level had very slight independent influence on teen's role image ($R^2 = .030$), and social class was not a significant predictor in the equation. However, when social class was considered in conjunction with interactive time-use (second section of Table 7.6), social class emerged as a significant predictor for the first equations ($\beta=.23$, $p=.03$). This influence remained in the second equation, when parent-teen relationship variables were added to the equation ($\beta=.20$, $p=.04$). For the examination
Table 7.6
Time-Use Variables and Parental Subrole Factors as Intervening Influences Between Macro-Level Structures and Selected Teen Outcomes

**Macro-Level Effects Only**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Adj. R</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Significant Regressors¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teen's Role Image</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>Teen's Age (-.19, .03)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Teen Relationship</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>Teen's Age (-.15, .04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Teen Relationship</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>11.16</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Teen's Age (-.28, .00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interactive Time-Use Effects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Adj. R</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Significant Regressors¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teen's Role Image³</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Dad Solo (.33, .00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Teen Relationship</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>Teen's Age (-.30, .00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Teen Relationship</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Teen's Age (-.32, .00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parental Subrole Effects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Adj. R</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Significant Regressors¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teen's Role Image³</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>12.06</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>MomFac2 (.33, .00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen's Role Image⁴</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>12.06</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Dad-Teen (.26, .01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Subrole Effects</td>
<td>Adj. R</td>
<td>Adj. R²</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>Significant Regressors¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teen's Role Image³</strong></td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>12.06</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>MomFac2 (.33, .00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DadFac4 (.28, .00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MomFac1 (.27, .00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teen's Role Image⁴</strong></td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>12.06</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Dad-Teen (.26, .01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MomFac1 (.21, .01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DadFac4 (.20, .01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mom-Teen (.19, .06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MomFac2 (.18, .05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother-Teen Relationship</strong></td>
<td>0.519</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>13.95</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>MomFac2 (.53, .000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teen's Age (-.20, .01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MomEmploy (-.14, .07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MomFac1 (.14, .10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father-Teen Relationship</strong></td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>DadFac4 (.26, .00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MomFac2 (.25, .00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teen's Age (-.16, .06)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Control variables entered for time-use and subrole factor blocks are social class, teen's sex and age, and family size.

¹ Regressors were included in level assessment if significant at the .10 level.
² The first value reported in parenthesis is the beta, the second is the p-value.
³ Without relationship variables (teen's perspective) as regressors.
⁴ With relationship variables (teen's perspective) as regressors.
of parental subrole factors only, however, (third section of Table 7.6), social class effects were not significant. But when time use and subrole factors were considered in the full model (Table 7.4), social class retained a significant but moderately weak effect, remaining significant in 5 of the 10 stepwise regressions, but achieving only a beta of .23 (p≤.05). However, evidence for intervening effects is found in the fact that only when simultaneously measuring the relationships of time use or parental subroles did social class effects emerge as significant.

There is a second way in which interaction variables might serve as intervening influences, by way of a chain of effects. For instance, if macro-level variables have many significant ties to intermediary variables in the model, and if these mid-level variables in turn have influence on role-image or other dependent variables, we could say that the effects of macro variables on adolescent socialization outcomes are mediated. In that, we could say that macro-level variables have a direct effect on the process of socialization (i.e. time-use and parental subroles, etc.), but mostly an indirect effect on teen outcomes (through influencing the process of interaction).

Table 7.6 does not give strong support to this second interpretation of intervening effects. Macro-level effects were not strong for the father-teen relationship (R²=.058, p≤.00), and had only a slight effect on the mother-teen relationship (R²=.012, p≤.05). Furthermore, when macro variables were regressed against other more proximal variables (job time, interaction-available time, time-use variables, subrole factors), only once did the R² rise above .08 (results not shown). For the combined parental subrole factor of social control and conformity, the R² was .163, which still exhibited relatively weak explanation. It would seem then, that this second examination of intervening effects was not as plausible as the first. We
conclude that hypothesis of intervening effects has received moderate but not strong support: the effects of social class, teen's gender, and teen's age are somewhat stronger on socialization outcome variables when the intervening variables of time-use and parental subroles are applied. However, these results were obtained only through regression techniques, and we will discuss momentarily how other analyses indicated more substantive effects of these variables on interaction.

Another Look at Interactive Time Use

When I began this research, I had not thought of interactive subroles or teen's role-image — those were later innovations. My original focus was on what parents and teenagers do together, and how much time they spend doing it. The complexity of measurement for interactive time use (i.e. time logs, etc.) also indicates how central a variable this was in my research. The title of this dissertation specifies the antecedents and consequents of interactive time use. Of course, interactive time use, broadly interpreted, also includes parental interactive subroles, and I have dealt with those extensively. Furthermore, within the full model testing, the antecedents and consequents of both time use and subroles were examined. Nevertheless, the analysis up to this point has only reported broad correlational patterns between time use and other variables; it did not address the details of differential parent-teen time use for different activities (except for giving a univariate distribution in Table 6.1, Chapter VI), nor has it reported time use as differentially affected by social class and gender, the two primary antecedents for time use in the model.

Tables 7.7 and 7.8 present this time data, as influenced by teen's gender, parental gender, and social class. Table 7.7 presents the data in all 15 original time categories, and Table 7.8 collapses the data into 7 time categories. Table 7.8 also
Table 7.7
Parent-Teen Activities, by Parental Gender, Teen's Gender, and Social Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Categories</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th><strong>Middle Class</strong></th>
<th><strong>Working Class</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mothers with</td>
<td>Fathers with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Meals</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating Out</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>1.4*</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.V. or videos</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>2.6**</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing Homework</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Activities</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.5**</td>
<td>2.5**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Activities</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Events</td>
<td>1.2*</td>
<td>1.5**</td>
<td>.8**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Trips, Outings</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Activities</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just Being Together</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just Talking</td>
<td>1.4*</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Activities</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weekly Totals       | 31.0**      | 35.8**  | 26.3   | 26.4   | 21.7   | 23.3   | 32.3   | 30.1   | 18.8*  | 23.4* |

Significance levels for two-tailed t-tests. * p < .10   ** p < .05
Notes: N = 203, but time figures are based on 285 families, since those with time data judged to be unreliable were excluded.
Table 7.8

Parent-Teen Categorical Time Use, by Parental Gender, Teen's Gender, and Social Class

Average Contact Hours Per Week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Categories</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th>Middle Class</th>
<th>Working Class</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mothers with</td>
<td>Fathers with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk Time</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solo Time</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.3 **</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating Time</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Time</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Time</td>
<td>4.9 **</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Participation</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Time</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Totals</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance levels for two-tailed t-tests. * p ≤ .10  ** p ≤ .05

Notes: N = 203, but time figures are based on 285 families, since those with time data judged to be unreliable were excluded.
presents one new category, *solo time* (a computed figure), and a revision of *talk time* which includes talking within other activities (which was computed from parents' data), in addition to talking as *primary activity* which is included in Table 7.7. In the first two columns of each table, overall figures for the working and middle classes are presented and compared with two-way t-tests. In all other columns, the primary comparisons (and the corresponding t-tests) are between males and female teens, broken down by parents' gender and social class. It should also be noted that while the weekly column totals in Table 7.7 are for non-overlapping categories, the column totals in Table 7.8 are for non-exclusive categories, sometimes summing to over 50 and 60 hours.

Allow me to comment on the most noteworthy observations. First, the overall pattern of interactive time use between the social classes, between parents, and between teens of each gender, is marked by *similarity*. For most time activities, parents and teens in different categories spent similar amounts of time together. Furthermore, about one-third of the total time spent together was spent *talking*, and about one-half of the time was spent in *solo time* with one parent or the other.

There are some differences in time use, however, some of which are similar to findings of the parental subrole analysis. Let us first discuss social-class differences. In both tables, working-class parents spent about five additional hours per week with their teens, a significant difference. Also, true to their name, working-class parents spent more time *working* with their teenagers. Also, working-class fathers spent about three times as long working with their sons. The working class also spent more time shopping or "just talking," while the middle class spent more time for community events.
Besides time spent working, several other gender differences may also be noted. Table 7.7 indicates that for the middle-class, mothers and fathers spent more time in sports activities with their sons; mothers spent more time in community activities with their daughters, and fathers spent significantly more time with their sons eating out and doing homework. Table 7.8 indicates that middle-class fathers spent 7.7 hours in solo time with their sons, compared to 3.3 hours with daughters, representing perhaps the most striking observation of all the time data. For the working class, Table 7.7 indicates that mothers spent more time with daughters shopping and taking short trips, and watching T.V. and videos with sons; working-class fathers spent more time with sons working, and engaging in leisure activities.

As we noted earlier with our parental subrole analysis, while there is much similarity in time-use patterns, several general observations may be made. Mothers spent more time than fathers with their teens, and fathers generally spent more of their time with their sons than with their daughters, and this difference is invested in specifiable activities. Mothers spent their overall time more equally between sons and daughters, but more time with sons or daughters, variously, at different activities. Tables 7.7 and 7.8 clearly show that the primary social-structural antecedents, gender and social class, have both main and interactive effects on interactive time use, just as they did on interactive parental subroles.

One related finding is worth mentioning, especially since it both supports and qualifies other gender effects we have observed. When conducting a series of t-tests to compare the amount of available time parents said they had to spend with teens of both genders, mothers reported having approximately equal time available for sons and daughters; fathers reported having 38.0 hours to spend with sons, but only 29.2 hours to spend with their daughters (p<.001).
The Usefulness and Flexibility of Multi-level Modeling

Six propositions were advanced relative to multi-level modeling at the beginning of this document, that multi-level modeling should have or incorporate: (a) an integrated theoretical focus, (b) adequate variable representation from various system levels, (c) new and improved variable measurement, (d) multiple perspectives of actors in interactional systems, (e) appropriate use of data, and (f) proper statistical techniques. Let us address each of these propositions in light of this research, though our discussion will not proceed in exact sequence.

This work has taken the position that variable representation from all levels of the social order is essential to constructing an adequate model of parent-teen socialization. To test this proposition, we have defined the social order in terms of Bronfenbrenner's (1979) social ecological model which specifies the macro, exo, meso, and micro-system levels as being critical influences on children and youths. The stated rationale for this proposition was that many social processes (e.g. socialization) entail a complex system of interlocking macro and micro-level influences, and that exclusively micro-level research and macro-level research are diminished in their predictive power.

Given the empirical findings of this research, this proposition was not fully supported. At least for the regression procedures, if our model had included only meso and micro-system levels, for instance, we would have explained the great majority of the variance in interactive processes and in teen outcomes. Both the macro and exo levels seemed to be relatively unimportant influences, but this conclusion is highly related to the techniques used to test our multi-level model. Let us discuss possible reasons for the apparent unimportance of the macro and exo
levels, and see whether or not we can make a case for including variables from these levels in a model of socialization.

Certainly, for this research at least, the *exo-system level* did not appear to be of critical importance for either the process of interactive socialization or for any adolescent outcomes contingent upon it. The exo-system level was defined as the stratum of the social order in which the teen does not directly participate, but which contains influential elements of local culture or organization which significantly affect parents or other significant players in the teen's life. A parent's commitment and experience in the workplace, for instance, is one possible manifestation of this concept. While *regularity/predictability of employment schedule* would appear in a minor role from time to time during the analysis, *parent's job time* was significant only for influencing the "available time" fathers felt they had to spend with their teenagers. Neither variable was significant in the mothers' submodel, and neither was a strong influence for fathers. On the other hand, the exo-system variables were probably the least developed variables, theoretically and operationally speaking, of any in the model. Both Kohn and Schooler (1969), and Menaghan (1991b) indicate that job time, per se, is not nearly as influential as the nature of a parent's occupational *experiences*, which was not measured in this study. Perhaps if it would have been included, the exo-system level would have exerted more influence.

This indicates one of the features of multi-level modeling: the results are highly dependent upon the specific variables chosen to represent system levels. If I had chosen different variables to represent the exo-system level, perhaps it would have been retained in the final revised model. This, however, is actually a strength of the testing technique employed for this multi-level model. If level variables do not
collectively represent significant influence, then multi-level testing will clearly reveal this weakness.

There is a caveat to this generalization, however. The macro-system level, while displaying significant effects in the hierarchical regressions, did not display predictive power that was strong and consistent, especially not when compared to the influences of the micro-system level. This is how the macro-level was assessed by our regression techniques, but our subrole ranking and time-use tabular analyses revealed more substantial social-class effects. These techniques are certainly multivariate, but they are not multi-level in the same way as the hierarchical regression procedure. This implies that explicitly multi-level techniques such as hierarchical analysis should be combined with other univariate, bivariate, and multivariate analysis techniques for enhanced understanding. The combined use of advanced statistics with more elementary approaches should thus be included in any thorough testing of multi-level models.

The discussion thus far has addressed two of the six propositions about multi-level models: variable representation, and an issue which arose in addressing the first, statistical techniques. Let us now consider the other propositions: theoretical focus, new and improved variables, multiple perspectives of actors, and appropriate use of data.

This research has been well served by the integration of symbolic interactionism with other theoretical orientations. In this study, the heart of the multi-level model involved the interactionist construct of role-playing, interpreted liberally to apply to broad categories of interaction, and many profitable insights were gleaned from the analysis. Perhaps the usefulness of this approach lies in the ability of role-playing to bridge the gap between macro and micro-level theory. Macro theory, of
course, attempts to get the "big picture," examining rates of behavior and characteristics across groups, trying to establish broad patterns and generalizations. In the past, micro-theory has so often focused on narrowly defined phenomena that it has not been easily able to fit into the broad, general categorical analysis of macro-level theory. Role-playing however, while a concept deriving its meaning from micro-level settings, is also amenable to broad categorical analysis and multi-level modeling techniques. Furthermore, all interaction may be conceptualized to involve role-playing, and the new concepts utilized here of interactive time-use and interactive subroles may be similarly used by other research which examines interactive processes or outcomes.

The function of these new variables in this model is hard to underestimate. While relationship variables (more standard fare) were also highly influential in the model, the great majority of the variance explained was due to the significant explanatory power of interactive time use and parental subroles. These concepts also exhibit great flexibility, and it is hard to conceive of a study of interaction which could not create its own list of interactive subroles, or its own salient categories of interaction or time use.

Finally, we consider the use of multiple perspectives, and the appropriate use of data in multi-level modeling. The comparative examination of quality-of-relationship measures from the teen's and parents' points of view makes it clear that variables function differently when measured from the perspectives of different respondents. This model also made extensive use of data obtained from fathers and mothers, respectively. The separate submodels for mothers and fathers created in Chapter VI could not have occurred without these two sets of parallel data. Regarding the appropriate use of data, I believe that only proper inferences between
levels of data have been made. We collected data beginning at the individual level, addressed questions to respondents who would be most able to supply an accurate answer, and derived conclusions based on proper categorical comparisons. In the one case where group data was used (for parental subrole rankings), I went back and calculated a similar measure based on individual parents' assessments of subrole playing in order to compare their involvement scores (Table 5.5, Chapter V).

In general, I have found multi-level modeling to be extremely useful and flexible for the study of parent-teen socialization, and believe it can be well utilized by other research endeavors as well. There are, of course, several caveats which must be expressed with regard to this research and to the conclusions which have been reached.

Theoretical Implications of This Research for Socialization

This dissertation initially proposed that a good theory should have a cohesive image of the subject matter to be explained, and a clear focus or set of foci. Nevertheless, the theoretical basis for this research, in integrating multiple theories and constructs into the central model of parent-teen socialization, has been complex. Is there one theoretical basis for this research, or are there many? While there are many subtleties and secondary aspects, I submit that the basic theory utilized for this research, in its synthesized rather than extended form, is relatively parsimonious.

I will begin this section with some general comments on the nature of the subject matter and the theoretical perspective I have used to study it, and then I will comment on the implications of this research and its findings for the two foci of interest: the parent-teen interactive system, and socialization outcomes for the adolescent.
General Comments

Before discussing confirmations of changes to our theory of socialization which might be suggested by this research, let us review the nature of the subject matter, as seen from our multi-level, interactionist theoretical perspective.

Socialization was defined as the process of teaching new members of society the skills and perspectives needed to play social roles successfully which are or will be expected of them. One primary mechanism of this social influence process for teenagers is interactive role-playing with parents, where the broad normative patterns of parental roles are established by society. Social class, parents' gender, and teen's gender are proposed to invoke powerful cultural templates for role-playing behavior, but other influences such as family type, family size, job time, and other factors also apply. However, even while being influenced significantly by cultural influences and normative patterns, parents innovate upon cultural patterns and serve to mediate the effects of social-structure on their children. Furthermore, the theory proposes that parent-teen interactive time use and role-playing, which are presented as the primary mechanisms of socialization, must be studied in a multi-level system where social-structural elements may be isolated and controlled. Finally, one positive outcome of the socialization process is proposed to be a teen's assessment of his or her ability to perform salient social roles successfully.

I began this research by describing the different assumptions present in macro-level and micro-level theory regarding human behavior. Systems theory claims that macro-level system influences on behavior are predominant (Hawley, 1992); micro theory contains the assumption that the key processes of interest are those which can be observed on the micro-level. I then attempted to integrate these two positions by
claiming that micro-level processes of socialization, especially when conceptualized as role-playing, serve as intervening influences between social structure and socialization outcomes for adolescents. The emphasis on role-playing as a link between macro and micro levels was based on Stryker's (1980, 1982) structural symbolic interactionism, which first articulated this position.

Thus macro structure is seen to have an effect on individual outcomes (i.e. for teenagers), but an effect which is mediated by interaction. This position was portrayed as similar to Sewell's (1992) concept of cultural schemas which exist for most social phenomena, including social roles and their constituent parts. Individuals do not simply play their social roles mindlessly; they do so by appropriating cultural images and lines of action chosen from a large repertoire of possible cultural schemas. Furthermore, akin to the "blocking technique" used by network analysts (Cook & Whitmeyer, 1992; Emirbayer & Goodwin, 1994), I have asserted that patterns of socializing interaction will be more clearly visible when macro variables are controlled; that is, patterns of interaction will more clearly emerge when social-structural categories are compared which are heterogeneous with respect to social class and gender. The research results support the usefulness of these theoretical underpinnings of my model development.

In interpreting the findings of this research, I believe the results indicate that the studied variables of interaction had profound predictive value on all dependent variables: quality of the parent-teen relationship, teen's self-esteem, school grades, and teen's self-image in social roles. Their influence on the variable of self-image in social roles was particularly strong, reinforcing the central theoretical proposition that the parental socialization process, when conceptualized primarily as interaction and role-playing behavior, has significant meaning for a teen's ability to succeed in salient
social roles. These effects were noted through the number of significant links from predictor variables in the model, and through the impressive magnitude of the explained variance figures.

The concept of *intervening influence*, which was often represented in the research by the more formal hypothesis of *proximal effects*, received moderate but not strong support. There were two reasons why, perhaps, it did not receive stronger support: (1) macro-level effects were generally present but not strong, regardless of which intervening variables were or were not used in the equation; and (2) regression techniques which were used to test the model did not reveal some of the complex effects of these variables.

The support which the hypothesis of intervening influence did have was based on the following observations. First, the macro-level variables in the model, which included social class, parents' gender, and teen's gender, had few independent effects on adolescent outcomes, and none which were strong. When interaction variables were controlled statistically, more social class effects on adolescent outcomes were observed, even though they were still relatively weak. While not visible through regression analyses, macro variables had more numerous and substantial effects on interactive processes (i.e. interactive time use and parental subroles) than on adolescent outcomes directly. These were observable through the tabular analysis of interactive time use and through the ranking analysis of parental subroles. Not only were social class and gender dyadic effects noted for individual time categories or parental subroles, but patterns emerged which gave indication of different modes of interaction for these groups.

When one considers that, at least in this model, parents were the key agents of socializing influence, we may interpret these findings to say that social class and
gender are significant influences on parents, and parents in turn, mediate these influences in dealing with their adolescents. If social class effects were even more constraining, we would not see the powerful effects of interaction and quality-of-relationship variables. It appears that macro variables serve to provide normative patterns for parents in their parenting, but parents make choices about which cultural patterns to follow in parenting. Macro-level variables thus establish broad patterns which undergird and support interaction, but a second-order of patterns emerges in the sphere of interaction. That is, while groups display tendencies toward certain patterns established by the broader culture, individual parents may conform or deviate from the group patterns, and sets of parents who behave similarly within social-structural contexts thereby establish interactional patterns of their own.

Middle-class parents, for instance, were more likely to exercise authority by playing teaching roles with their adolescents and giving general guidance; working-class parents were more likely to exercise authority by playing the roles of monitor or supervisor. But some working-class parents played guidance roles very often; some middle-class parents were strict supervisors and perhaps a bit authoritarian. Mothers, as a group, spent more time with their adolescents and interacted with them in a wider variety of role-playing modes, but 25% of fathers spent more time with their teens than the mothers did in those families. Thus we see that parents are influenced by the patterns of their macro-cultural niches, but they appropriate cultural schemas and exercise options which seem good to them at the time, with differential effects on adolescents.

Having argued for human agency, I now admit to the noticeable effects of macro-level variables, especially in combination. One of the implied propositions of the multi-level model has been that interaction processes must be understood within
multivariate systems -- that many patterns will not be seen until social-structural influences are controlled. In this regard, the analysis of parental subroles was very revealing. When the three macro-level variables of social class, parents' gender, and teen's gender were examined individually with respect to parental playing of subroles, few differences were observed (see Table 5.1, Chapter V). When two of these variables were examined simultaneously, some differences were visible. But when the permutations of all three variables were examined simultaneously (see Tables 5.3 and 5.4, Chapter V), the greatest differences were seen between heterogeneous pairs of groups, and the effects of cultural patterns of interaction were easily inferred.

There is one additional theoretical observation to be made relative to macro-level influences. This research was confined to parental socialization. It is recognized that the effects of macro-level social structural variables may be distributed among various socializing agencies; they may be invested in education, mass media, peer groups, and other groups or institutions. This may help explain the relatively low level of influences from macro-exo variables in this specific model to teen outcomes, while at the same time substantiating the importance of these effects in the parent-teen interactional system.

The Parent-Teen Interactive System

As earlier chapters of this dissertation made clear, the key unit of interest in this multi-level theory has been the dyadic relationship of parent and adolescent. This has been conceptualized in three ways: as parent-teen interactive time use, as parental interactive subroles which involve complementary role-playing by the teenager, and as the perceived quality of the parent-teen relationship. We have found that the
The nature, intensity and content of parent-teen interaction is affected by factors external to the dyadic relationship such as the gender of the parent, the gender and age of the adolescent, the family's social class, and other key factors in complex family and social-structural systems which surround the parent-teen dyad. Furthermore, factors within the dyadic relationship such as time use, role-playing, and relationship quality are interconnected. Let us examine some of the factors we originally proposed as influential to the dyadic relationship, and see on the basis of the study's findings, what role each factor should still play in our theory.

First of all, let us examine the place of gender in our theory of socialization. We have found that cultural templates for gender are so powerful that no theory of socialization can afford to ignore them. Gender norms begin by exhibiting main effects on the parent's behavior, but are then modified when interacting with the gender of the teenager. They also include much more than gender-typed interaction which is so commonly discussed. Parents' gender also is seen to affect the overall level of parental involvement with teens, with fathers spending only about two-thirds as much time with teens, and also involving themselves less often in role-playing situations.

The patterns of interaction we have observed also indicate that parental gender interacts with teens' gender. Fathers are, for instance, more involved with males than with females, often spend much more "solo time" with males, and tend to play different "roles" with teens of either gender. Our analysis of role-playing subroles indicated that fathers' relationships with males did not experience adverse effects when fathers played the subrole of control and conformity, but this control-oriented
subrole tended to have adverse effects on father-daughter relationships. Conversely, when fathers played the subrole of buddy and chum more often, working-class females reported better relationships with their fathers. When fathers played the subrole of trainer and fan with males, probably for sporting events, the grades of male teenagers were higher. The fathers' subrole of guide and teacher, furthermore, was the only parental subrole to have a positive impact on teen's role-image. Mothers, on the other hand, appeared to have more favorable influence on teens when they played the role of accepting partner. Mothers also play individual subroles such as therapist and sounding board much more than fathers with both males and females, but when fathers play these roles, they are more likely to play them with their daughters. As our subrole analysis of Chapter V indicated, fathers are also more likely to play both active and low-key companionship roles with teens of both genders, but especially with sons.

What do these gender differences imply for our theory of socialization? It appears that we have found both support and qualification for Parsons' and Bales' (1955) theory of gender, which stated that males play more instrumental roles in society and females play more expressive or socio-emotional roles. Our findings, however, go beyond these two logical polarities. Fathers may be achievers, but they are not usually cold and harsh with their children, nor are they all work and no fun. To the instrumental role we need to add the roles of teacher and guide and companion. For some families, the role of teacher becomes "sports trainer." For others, it becomes instructor, motivator, or guidance counselor. Our findings for mothers should also diversify the theory. Beyond playing socio-emotional roles (i.e. acceptance, listening, etc.), mothers often play the role of moral authority in the family, as well as the practical support role. Mothers also contribute to teen
achievement. When mothers spend more contact time with teens, and more solo time, teen's self-image in social roles is enhanced. Solo time with fathers also has this effect, and fathers spend much more solo time with males.

So understanding socialization theories should not be unilateral, considering only the role of mothers, at least in two-parent families. Even in socio-emotional dimensions, fathers play a role. It was true in our research that positive relationships with mothers had the single most powerful effects on teen self-esteem and teen's role image, but positive father-teen relationships also enhanced role-image; when mother and father variables were blocked to assess comparative influence, father variables displayed an even stronger effect than mothers.

Other parental characteristics had some effects on interaction, but not as much as gender. When considering the influence of macro-level variables directly on parent-teen relationships (Table 7.6), social class had some small influence, but when parental styles of interaction were controlled (i.e. subroles) these differences disappeared. An irregular work schedule appeared as a negative influence on parent-teen interaction and relations in a few equations, but parents' job time was generally not significant as a predictor. The method of analysis, however, made a big difference with regard to assessing the impact of macro-level variables, especially social class. While the influence of class in the regressions was consistently non-significant or weak, the analysis of subroles in Chapter V showed social class to be a much more significant factor, especially when gender dyads were controlled.

These data tended to support Kohn's thesis of self-direction as a middle-class value and conformity as a working-class value. Middle-class parents were more likely to emphasize their authority through guiding and motivating subroles; working-class parents were more likely to emphasize their authority through
monitoring or supervising subroles. Working-class fathers, in particular, seemed to have very different styles of parenting. I certainly agree with Kohn (1989) that social class should remain a studied variable in social-psychological research. We might also propose a related theoretical possibility. In this research we have noted that fathers exercise more sex-typed interaction than mothers do, and working-class fathers more so than middle-class fathers. Perhaps we might propose that the greater the differentiation of gender roles in the adult world (i.e. of moms and dads, for instance, in their occupational or domestic roles), the greater the differentiation parents will make in subrole playing with their adolescents.

Adolescent Socialization Outcomes

The second major focus of our socialization theory has been the developmental outcomes for the teenager of the socialization process. This focus is based on the realization that teenagers are the object of the socialization process, and teen outcomes represent the effects of both system-level and interactional influences, the culmination of the chain of influence. The position taken in this research, similar to Turner's (1990), is that salient teen outcomes are partly a function of ascribed social roles such as teen's gender, age, and social class, and partly a function of assumed or negotiated roles such as the teen's social participation in groups (and the role positions which accompany such involvement), and interactional roles within the family.

Originally, there were other additional dependent variables we wished to examine: drug use, delinquency, and premarital sexual activity. However, Western Michigan University's Internal Review Board (IRB) raised insurmountable barriers with all of these items, claiming grave risks to adolescents if these items were
retained on the survey instruments. We have therefore studied only five dependent variables which have served as indicators of teen outcomes: the quality of the parent-teen relationship from the teen's perspective, the relationship from the parent's perspective, teen's self-esteem, school grades, and teen's role-image. This research represents a first try at linking these variables with system-based and interaction influences in a multi-level model. I believe we have been successful at pointing out the significant influences of these factors for these teen outcomes. Are these variables appropriate for representing at least some important outcomes of socialization? I believe so, and the fact that the dependent variables were dissimilar from each other in many respects, and that parent-teen model effects were substantial for each, is supportive evidence that these variables are both salient and meaningful for teens.

Probably the most behaviorally-oriented outcome was school grades. It was also the most narrowly focused dependent variable, assessing only role-performance for one specialized area. With this in mind, it was interesting that, for the combined model (Table 7.1), overall effects were weaker for grades than for other teen outcomes, with only 36% of the variance being explained. For mother and father submodels (Table 7.3), effects were lower for the mothers' model (31.4%) but higher for the fathers' model (59%). Nevertheless, all of these are substantial figures! I will not go through all of the explained variance figures again for each of the dependent variables, but I will summarize them by saying that the lowest of them was 28.2% (self-esteem, mother's submodel, Table 7.3), and the highest was 75.8% (role-image, combined model, Table 7.1). These are impressive R² figures, and it makes one wonder why these figures are so high. I have two explanations.

First, perhaps there are some instances of circularity where we are partially measuring the same thing with both our independent and dependent variables. For
instance, when measuring model effects on role-image, we include relationship measures as independent variables. One of the 13 items on the role-image scale, however, asks about the teen's self-image as a family member. This is the only situation like this that I can think of, however, and it is only one item on a multiple-item scale. It also does not duplicate the quality-of-relationship measure, but simply alludes to it in a different way.

The second explanation is that parents' behavior and relationships to the teenager are critically important for the development of healthy attitudes and competencies in the adolescent, and these influential effects are being measured in our model. In other words, guided by the research findings and theories, we included the relevant variables in the model and measured them adequately. After all, adolescents are in the process of becoming young adults, and parents may serve not only as role models, but as persons who support and give direct guidance. Findings also suggest a critical role played by fathers in adolescent development, with father variables, taken as a set, explaining more variance of every one of the five teen outcome variables than was true for the mothers' submodel. For role-image, however, the combined effect of mother and father variables was greater than for either parental submodel alone.

Teen's self-image in social roles (role-image), was a central variable in this study, and should remain a central component of this socialization theory. First, the fact that role-image was so highly correlated with Rosenberg's (1965) self-esteem measure (.748, p<.05) indicates that this new measure is an important indicator of overall adolescent well-being. Second, while most adolescents have relationships with their parents, receive school grades, and can be measured for self-esteem (the dependent variables in this study), there are few other dependent variables which can
be argued to be salient to all teenagers. Success in sports, good looks, success on the job, or in relationships with boyfriends or girlfriends -- all of these apply to only particular subsets of the teen population. In that regard, teen's role-image, being a generalized measure (for teens) of perceived ability in social roles, is a useful construct for measuring end-line effects of a model of adolescent socialization.

Parent-teen relationships have also played important functions in the model. First, earlier elements in the model are influential in predicting the quality of relationship for both mothers and fathers with their teens. So if you agree that favorably-rated family relationships are important outcomes for teenagers, these variables should remain in the model. There is a second reason, perhaps even more important, for retaining relationship variables in the model. Quality-of-relationship variables were the most powerful predictors of other teen outcomes: grades, self-esteem, and role-image. We must remember that parents represent only one set of influences out of many in the socialization process, and the possibility exists that their influence becomes insignificant when children become teens. This is obviously not the case, and any "comprehensive" theory of socialization should obviously consider the highly potent influences of both mothers and fathers. Another alternative is that parental influence could be more instrumental or practical in nature, with emotional ties having less effect. These data suggest, however, that from the teen's perspective, having parents who play the roles of chauffeur, banker, and cheerleader (as measures of practical support), while influential, is less important than the subjective sense of having a good relationship with one's parent.

To summarize, teen outcome variables appear to have a useful place in theories of socialization. They complete the chain of theoretical influence from
system structures through parents to adolescents, and allow us to measure the effects of different modes of socialization.

Limitations of This Research

Some of the weaknesses of this research were related to its strengths. The inclusion of working-class families permitted an important examination of social class effects, but the fact that there were only 91 working-class families, and that only 53 of those families completed the research, signals caution for generalizing the results of this study too broadly. More working-class families, and a higher return rate among them, would have strengthened the research. The problem of low numbers was exacerbated by the type of subcategorical analysis used. When the discovery was made that working-class fathers played fewer interactional subroles with their daughters, the immediate question became, can we feel secure about generalizing this finding? I'm afraid the answer is "no." Especially regarding the subcategorical analysis of gender dyads in the working-class, what we appear to have are suggestive findings only.

Another apparent strength is the large number of teens and parents who indicated strong relationships, high levels of interaction, giving us the impression that we were studying many functional parents and teenagers. On the other hand, this intimated that dysfunctional families were underrepresented in this research, again leading to problems of generalization. Several families contacted us directly to express regrets concerning their inability or unwillingness to participate in the study, citing family troubles or overly hectic schedules as their reasons. So while we were able to study normal interactional factors in strong families more adequately (so much social-science research has a pronounced social-problems orientation), we were
missing the needed contrast of families experiencing difficulties. Fortunately (for our research purposes), there were families who reported poor relationships and little interaction time together, allowing enough variability of these critical variables for analysis to occur.

However, most univariate distributions of critical variables were skewed. This generalization applies to all of the key dependent variables: relationship quality, self-esteem, self-image, and grades. Having skewed distributions creates problems with inferential procedures such as regression analysis which is based on the logic of linear correlation. Again, even though 297 families is a respectable overall number, a sample size of 500 to 1,000 is desirable, and higher and more even return rates among subpopulations would permit critical comparisons to be made with greater confidence.

There were other methodological issues which occurred. Evidence indicates that approximately 6 to 8 teens "switched places" with a brother or sister who had been randomly chosen to participate in the research. This, of course, violated our assumption of randomness, and could have created severe problems for the research, especially if the problem had been more widespread. What we wished to avoid, of course, is having families choose their own "showcase relationships" for study.

Another problem, potentially more serious, was possible overestimation of time use for many families given our methods of calculation. When responding to a survey item about how many hours they spent weekly with each parent, teens reported an average of 17 hours. This figure was substantially lower than the 22.2 hours for fathers and the 28.0 hours for mothers than we eventually calculated on the basis of time charts and survey responses. Because we typically used time logs as a "minimum" figure, and added more interaction time to the minimum as individuals
reported other interactions on their surveys, it is likely that many persons reported some activities which actually occurred during other weeks. This is especially true for families who may have delayed answering the surveys. In a few cases, we received surveys from families 8 weeks or more after we mailed them to them. In many cases, two of the family members completed their sections promptly, but the other respondent (usually the teen or father) would take several weeks to complete the instrument. Since we would add time to the master chart mentioned by only one person which seemed reasonable, on the assumption that this person might be reporting an actual event that the partner had forgotten, it is possible in some cases that some imaginative estimation took place.

All research is a compromise with perfection. Ideals must be balanced with available resources, but most social research makes valuable and reliable contributions to sociological knowledge and theoretical insight despite its limitations. In the present research, while some of the specific hourly statistics for time use and other specific statistics may not be reliable in estimating population parameters, the strengths of the research permit supportable conclusions about patterns of time use, the importance of interactive subroles, and other major findings of the research.

Future Research

One important goal of this research project has been to lay a foundation for further research -- to provide either positive or negative examples of how to gain insight and gather data, and to stimulate new ways of thinking about parent-teen socialization. I will address the discussion of future research around the topics of parent-teen socialization, multi-level modeling, and compensating for the limitations of this research.
Research on Parent-Teen Socialization

There is much unfinished business for this research endeavor on socialization. In fact, for almost everything accomplished, several more things suggested themselves as needing further study. Many aspects of future study revolve around the central questions which were only partially answered by this research. What are the major influences of macro-level variables on the socialization process? How do macro variables affect the opportunity structures of subrole playing and modes of interaction? (For instance, what aspects of macro culture facilitate the parental playing of banker-finance more with daughters than sons? The subrole of sports trainer or worker more with sons than daughters?) What are the major ways parents spend time with their adolescents, and with what results? What are common parental subroles played by mothers and fathers? What modes or themes of interaction do these subroles suggest, and how do they affect parent-teen relationships and teen outcomes? What other teen outcome variables are important for measuring the major effects of differential socialization? How does parent-teen interaction differ cross-culturally?

Regarding macro-level influences on socialization, future research should attempt to diversify the sample with respect to social class. Comparative research is needed not only with more working-class families, but with lower-class families and upper-class families as well. It is likely that different research methodologies are needed to contact and recruit participants from some of these subpopulations. Research is also needed to better determine how valid and accurate this study's methods of measuring interactive time use have been, and time use should be measured over a longer period of time, or at least sampled from a longer time span.
From this study's own data, we might compare how teen accounts of time use differ from parental accounts, or how fathers' accounts differ from mothers' accounts. We might also suggest a study which examines our gender-role differentiation hypothesis we alluded to earlier. Another study might explore how the differentiation of gender roles for adults, either at work or at home or both, affects how parents play gender-related subroles with their adolescent children.

Interactive parental subroles are newly developed constructs, and as such there is much study which might be done to test their usefulness, or to apply them in other settings. We have measured frequency of parental subroles from the viewpoint of parents. Other research might do the same from the viewpoint of teens, or compare the viewpoints of teens and parents. Laboratory or observational research might also be utilized to measure teen and parent consistency in defining and categorizing interactive subroles, or to measure how they determine the frequency of subrole playing over a period of time. Much may also be done with analyzing exactly what subroles are behaviorally, and whether or not subroles are mutually exclusive or tend to occur in overlapping patterns. Can a parent serve as a chauffeur and counselor at the same time?

Observational research might also help determine how subroles are initiated or maintained. Which subrole routines do teens initiate? Which subroles do parents most often initiate? How do we determine which subroles are most often played by different populations of parents and teens? By older teens? By younger teens? Are parents aware of when they are playing a "subrole?" Can participants be trained to recognize the subroles they play without noticeably changing their behavior? Should a study be done using time log methods for parent-teen subroles and routines, just as we measure interactive time use? And how do subroles and interactive time use...
correspond? These are all empirical questions which might be answered by future research.

This study has focused on a few key dependent variables. Other studies should further refine these measures. For instance, the test reliability of the Teen Self-Image Scale (role-image) developed for this study should be undertaken, and the salience of different role items contained in the scale might be measured. Other studies might introduce new dependent variables, such as delinquency, extraordinary achievement, high school completion, or premarital sexual activity. Other studies might study the links between parental values, as Kohn did, and parent-teen interaction, and teen values. We did not measure parental values in this study -- only reported parental behavior. Perhaps adolescent values might also be examined as a possible outcome of socialization.

Multi-level Modeling

This study represents the only attempt thus far at multi-level modeling with the topic of parent-teen socialization. During the course of research, certain key questions came to light which might be addressed by future research. Is Bronfenbrenner's typology of the social order the best one to use for multi-level modeling with adolescents? Are there alternative conceptualizations of social structure which might be even more productive? What are the criteria for knowing when a model has adequate variable representation at different levels of the social structure? Are there more useful variables which could be added to the model? Finally, are these statistical procedures adequate for testing level integrity, and for assessing the functionality of multi-level models?
Regarding Bronfenbrenner's typology, I believe the door is open for others to utilize different views of social structure. To my way of thinking, Bronfenbrenner's scheme makes perfect sense, and is flexible enough to allow for many new sets of variables to be utilized. Regarding the adequacy of variable representation, I believe that the exo-system level in the present research did not have enough variables. In particular, I would like to see future research incorporate parental occupational experience as others have suggested (Menaghan, 1991b). There is certainly more room for new variables on the macro-level as well, such as race or ethnicity, nationality, region of the country, or various subcultural variables such as occupational groups, religious groups, or immigrant groups. I believe that this type of research methodology would be very interesting to apply, for instance, to groups of home-schooling families, or to the Amish (if they would let themselves be studied in this manner), or to adolescents whose parents are all line-workers in a factory, or busy professionals such as doctors and high-ranking executives. I also propose that a study be undertaken which compares the variance in time parents spend with children or adolescents within the same family (of the subroles they play), and compares quality-of-relationship and other variables.

Regarding statistical testing procedures, the combining of hierarchical linear regression in this study with multiple and stepwise regressions, and with more elementary tests such as Spearman's rank-order correlations, tabular analysis, and analysis of variance tests seemed to work well. I believe future research should test some of the assumptions of linearity for variables used in multi-level modeling, and perhaps use more recent techniques such as random effects modeling when appropriate (Diprete & Forristal, 1994). There is also much research which could be done with multi-level models which combine an examination of parental socialization
with other influences such as those from peer groups, schools, churches, and community groups. Or multi-level models could be developed to study separate influences of these systems on teens.

Study Limitations

There are several suggestions for future research which arise from the sampling limitations of the present research. Certainly more working-class families should be included in a follow-up study. I believe that if a higher rate of completion is desired with this group, either the complexity of the research should be lessened, or the incentives offered to families should be increased. Many working-class families seemed to look at the opportunity of research participation either suspiciously (and perhaps as unduly intrusive), or in a utilitarian fashion, often judging that the incentive to be gained was not worth the effort. I believe that the problems of sample bias and skewed distributions of key variables are interrelated. If a study could diversify the sample, then I believe the distributions of primary variables would normalize.

Perhaps a better-financed study could also increase follow-up procedures to delinquent families, or even conduct a study which utilizes only phone surveys. Nightly interviews, as this study conducted during the pilot study, might improve the quality of time data, and allow for other types of information to be collected. I had also conceived of a study where one member of a family might be paid to be an "authentic time keeper," using a beeper method or a time clock of some kind to keep more accurate accounting of interactive time, while other family members used the current time log and survey response method. Perhaps this method would allow for an examination of the validity of time use measures.
Conclusion

This research began with the ambitious goal of developing and testing a comprehensive model of parent-teen socialization. I very quickly discovered that no one else had undertaken such a task, nor had any similar works been published in the literature. To accomplish the primary goal of developing a comprehensive model, several similarly ambitious strategies were adopted (many of them developed as the research progressed) including merging macro and micro-level theories of socialization, developing and testing a model based upon this theoretical integration, designing and utilizing new symbolic interactionist modes of research (e.g. the parallel mother and father submodels of socialization), and developing some useful new interactionist constructs (such as interactive time use, parental subroles, and teen's role-image) to be used in this study and in future research. Not only were these major objectives realized, but the results of model testing and theory development far exceeded initial expectations.

For instance, when I embarked upon this formidable endeavor, I anticipated learning some things about how parents and teens spend time together, and perhaps uncovering some possible consequences of time use for teens' grades and self-esteem. The development of subroles and role-image came about as I wrestled with the theoretical commonalities and divergences of macro and micro-level theories of role-playing. In my opinion, the incorporation of these innovations into the multi-level model has been enormously successful. The predictive power of each version of the model (the combined parents' model, the mother submodel, the father submodel) is very strong indeed, with high multiple correlations seldom seen in the social-psychological literature.
In particular, the innovations of interactive subroles and role-image might be regarded as theoretical break-throughs, not only proving useful for research on parent-teen socialization, but having great potential for studying the role-playing behavior of many social actors in a variety of situations. After all, one of the great dilemmas for symbolic interactionists has been the difficulty in developing methods of testing their insightful but somewhat slippery ideas. These new constructs seem to not only build on social-structural concepts (i.e. roles) which are amenable to patterned analysis, but also seem to capture much of the critical dynamic of micro-interaction (i.e. the fluidity of perception and shared meanings about interaction, the dynamic of volitional behavior). This pragmatic and necessary fusion of social structure and social process is a time-worn yet elusive objective of the discipline, hearkening back to Auguste Comte’s ideas of the interplay between social statics and social dynamics. Certainly the long-term usefulness of this model of parent-teen socialization and its theoretical contributions cannot be fully assessed at this time, but early indications from model testing and analysis signal a very good beginning and a promising future.
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Human Subjects Institutional Review Board Approval for Full-Sample Survey
Date: March 9, 1994
To: Greg Sanders
From: M. Michele Burnette, Chair
Re: HSIRB Project Number 93-12-04

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project entitled "What parents and teens do together: A cross-sectional survey" has been approved under the full category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

You must seek reapproval for any changes in this design. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: March 7, 1995

xc: Robin, Sociology
Appendix B

Human Subjects Institutional Review Board Approval for Pilot Study
To: Greg Sanders

From: M. Michele Burnette, Chair

Re: HSIRB Project Number 93-03-07

Date: May 7, 1993

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project entitled "Toward a comprehensive model of adolescent socialization: Examining the structural antecedents and social consequents of parent-teen interactive time use" has been approved under the full category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the approval application.

You must seek reapproval for any changes in this design. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date.

The Board would like to thank you for working with us so cooperatively. The Board also wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: May 7, 1994

xc: Robin, SOC
Appendix C

Protocol for Assessing Interactive Time Use Data
Protocol for Assessing Interactive Time Use Data

Yellow Time Chart
1) Take the yellow Time Chart for each family, and calculate the number of hours and minutes the parents and teen would spend for each activity if the only data we had were on this chart. Keep a separate accounting of time spent between teen-mom, teen-dad, and teen and both parents.

2) Evaluate the quality of the yellow time chart with regard to following instructions (that is, recording duration of activities in hours and minutes, recording specifiable activities, etc.), and rate the chart according to the following code.

Quality of Yellow Time Charts
1 - Excellent
2 - Very Good
3 - Good
4 - Fair
5 - Poor

Information from Surveys
1) Examine page 2 of each survey. Add any time figures given on these surveys to your Master Time Chart which were not on the yellow charts which appear to be reasonable. If time figures are over 20 hours for any one category, check the reported figures with the family's yellow chart to see if the estimate seems reasonable. If it is, add it to the Master Chart. If it is not reasonable, use only estimates given on the yellow chart or by other members of the family. When all figures from all surveys have been integrated on your master chart, rate the consistency of the survey reports with the yellow time chart and with each other according to the following code.

Consistency of Family Reports - same scale as above 1 - excellent, to 5 - poor.

Then account for missing surveys by giving each family a score from the following list of choices, and assess the reliability of Final Time Data according to the same 5-point scale (but where 5 = useless). If any survey is missing, do not assign the score of excellent for final time data reliability.

Quality of Time Charts
1 - All complete and OK
2 - Complete with some problems
3 - No father list
4 - No teen list
5 - No mother list
6 - No father or teen list
7 - No mother and father list
8 - Other
Appendix D

Full-Sample Surveys
SURVEY for EITHER PARENT

NOTE: This survey may be filled out by EITHER parent, or by BOTH parents. Also, any time "the teenager" is mentioned, this refers to the teenager participating in this study. Thanks!

Family Background Questions

1. PARENTS. How many parents or adult guardians does the teenager in this study currently live with in this household? (PLEASE CHECK THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER)
   1. one
   2. two
   3. other number of adults, please describe number & relationship to child ____________________

2. BROTHERS & SISTERS. How many of the following brothers and sisters does your teenager have who currently live in this household? (WRITE IN A NUMBER FOR EACH BLANK)
   (1) ______ Full brothers and sisters (add them together) 2-3
   (2) ______ Half brothers and sisters 4-5
   (3) ______ All other children in household, unrelated to teen except by living situation or marriage. 6-7

3. AGES OF CHILDREN. How many dependent children in the age ranges specified are currently living in this household? (WRITE IN A NUMBER FOR EACH BLANK)
   1. ______ 5 or under 8
   2. ______ 6-11 9
   3. ______ 12-17 10
   4. ______ 18 or older 11

4. TOTAL CHILDREN. How many total children would you consider to be a part of this family, whether or not they are still at home, away at college, or living on their own? ______ 12

5. FAMILY SIZE. Counting one or two parents (whichever is applicable), and all dependent children still living at home, what is the total number of people currently living in this household? ______ 13

6. HOUSEHOLD SITUATION. How would you best describe the current household living situation for the teenager in this study?
   0. lives in this household with both biological parents who are married
   1. lives with biological mother and a stepfather
   2. lives with biological mother and her companion
   3. lives with biological mother only
   4. lives with biological father and a stepmother
   5. lives with biological father and his companion
   6. lives with biological father only
   7. lives with two adoptive parents
   8. other, please describe ____________________________________________
7. **TIME WITH PARENTS.** How long has the teenager lived with the above combination of parents or adults?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>less than 3 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 months to 11 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5-6 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7-10 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11 years or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. **STATUS OF BIOLOGICAL PARENTS.** What is the current marital status between the "biological parents" of the teenager in this study? (you may answer even if you are not a biological parent yourself)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>married</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>never married</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>divorced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>separated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>one biological parent is deceased</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>both biological parents are deceased</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>other, please describe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. **BIOLOGICAL FATHER.** If the biological father does not currently live in this household, which of the following applies? (CHECK ONLY ONE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>not applicable, biological father does live in this household</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>biological father visits household occasionally, but teen does not often go to visit him</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>biological father visits household regularly, but teen does not often go to visit him</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>biological father rarely visits household, but teen regularly goes to see him</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>biological father visits household sometimes, and teen also goes sometimes to see him</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>biological father and teen never or rarely see each other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>biological father is deceased</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>other, please describe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. **BIOLOGICAL MOTHER.** If the biological mother does not currently live in this household, which of the following applies? (CHECK ONLY ONE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>not applicable, biological mother does live in this household</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>biological mother visits household occasionally, but teen does not often go to visit her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>biological mother visits household regularly, but teen does not often go to visit her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>biological mother rarely visits household, but teen regularly goes to see her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>biological mother visits household sometimes, and teen also goes sometimes to see her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>biological mother and teen never or rarely see each other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>biological mother is deceased</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>other, please describe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. **TIME WITH ABSENT FATHER.** If teen does not not live with biological father, **how many days a month** would you estimate that the teen is under the care of the biological father? "

12. **TIME WITH ABSENT MOTHER.** If teen does not not live with biological mother, **how many days a month** would you estimate that the teen is under the care of the biological mother?

13. **TIME IN CURRENT RESIDENCE.** How long has the teenager lived in this current house or apartment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>less than 3 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 months to 11 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5-6 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7-10 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11 years or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. **NUMBER OF MOVES.** How many times has this teenager moved from one house or apartment to another during the course of his or her lifetime? ______ 24-25

15. **NUMBER OF COMMUNITIES.** How many times has this teenager moved from one city, town, or community to another during the course of his or her lifetime? ______ 26-27

16. **TEEN'S AGE.** How old is the teenager in this study at the present time? ______ 28-29

17. **SCHOOL.** What type of school does your teenager currently attend?
   1  _____ Special public school (magnet school, etc.) 30
   2  _____ General public school
   3  _____ Private Catholic school
   4  _____ Private Protestant school
   5  _____ Private non-religious school or Military school
   6  _____ Home school
   7  _____ Does not attend school
   8  _____ Other, please specify ________________________________

18. **UPBRINGING.** In general, how hard or easy has this teenage child been to raise? ______ 31
   1  _____ Very easy to raise
   2  _____ Somewhat easy to raise
   3  _____ Of average difficulty to raise
   4  _____ Somewhat hard to raise
   5  _____ Very hard to raise

*How Often True?*

*Using the code below, please write a number in blank to answer the questions.*

1 = never  2 = rarely  3 = sometimes  4 = often  5 = very often

19. ______ at home  32
20. ______ at school  33
21. ______ elsewhere in the community  34
22. ______ with the law  35

*How often would you say your teen "gets into trouble" . . .*

23. ______ Drinks alcohol  36
24. ______ Uses illegal or non-prescription drugs  37
25. ______ Is sexually active  38
26. ______ Receives psychological counseling  39

27. **HOUSEHOLD INCOME.** Please estimate your family’s Total Annual Household Income. 40-41
   01  _____ Under $5,000
   02  _____ $5,000 - $9,999
   03  _____ $10,000 - $14,999
   04  _____ $15,000 - $19,999
   05  _____ $20,000 - $24,999
   06  _____ $25,000 - $29,999
   07  _____ $30,000 - $34,999
   08  _____ $35,000 - $39,999
   09  _____ $40,000 - $49,999
   10  _____ $50,000 - $59,999
   11  _____ $60,000 - $74,999
   12  _____ $75,000 - $99,999
   13  _____ $100,000 - $149,999
   14  _____ $150,000 - $249,999
   15  _____ $250,000 & over
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28. RELIGION. What is your family or household's primary religious affiliation?
   1 ______ Protestant
   2 ______ Catholic
   3 ______ Jewish
   4 ______ Non-religious
   5 ______ Other, please describe _____________________________________

29. CHURCH. What is the official name of your family's primary church, denomination or religious group?
   (examples: American Baptist, Southern Baptist, Orthodox Jewish, 7th Day Adventist, United Methodist, etc.)

30. RELIGIOSITY. In general, how religious would you consider your family to be?
   1 _____ Not at all religious
   2 _____ Not very religious
   3 _____ Somewhat religious
   4 _____ Very religious
   5 _____ Extremely religious

31. HOUSING. What arrangements does your family have for the home in which you now live?
   1 ______ Rent or lease
   2 ______ Own with bank or private mortgage
   3 ______ Own free and clear, no mortgage
   4 ______ Other, please specify _______________________________________

32. HOME COMMUNITY. Where does your family currently live? (CHECK ONLY ONE)
   Rural Area (45 miles or farther from major city)
   0 _____ Rural area or country town (fewer than 1,000 people), 45+ miles from major city
   1 _____ Small town of 1,000 to under 10,000 people, 45+ miles from major city
   2 _____ Mid-sized to large town, 10,000 to fewer than 50,000 people, 45+ miles from major city
   3 _____ Small city (not suburb), 50,000 to fewer than 100,000 people, 45+ miles from major city
   Major Metropolitan Area (within 45 miles of major city)
   4 _____ Newer outlying suburb of large city (100,000 people or more)
   5 _____ Older suburb of major city
   6 _____ Fixed-up or renovated older neighborhood in major city
   7 _____ Inner-city or downtown neighborhood
   8 _____ Small town or rural area close to major city

33. NEIGHBORHOOD. How would you describe the immediate housing & neighborhood type where you live? (CHECK ONLY ONE)
   1 _____ Poor and some working class
   2 _____ Mostly working class
   3 _____ Working class & Middle class mix
   4 _____ Middle class
   5 _____ Upper middle class / professional
   6 _____ Upper class
   7 _____ Mostly farm & rural
   8 _____ Other, please specify _______________________________________

34. SURVEY RESPONDENT. Who participated in filling out this survey?
   1 _____ Female adult of household completely
   2 _____ Male adult of household completely
   3 _____ Female adult of household mostly
   4 _____ Male adult of household mostly
   5 _____ Both equally
SURVEY for MOTHER
or Female Guardian

To Mothers: Please remember the following as you answer this survey:
1) Please work privately - by yourself.
2) Please use the yellow Activity Chart to remind you of the 7 days the questions will ask you about.
3) All answers will be completely anonymous - please answer openly and honestly!
4) When finished, please seal your survey and consent form in the envelope for prompt return. THANKS!

You & Your Teenager
1. What is your relationship to the teen in your household who is taking this survey?
   1. Biological mother
   2. Stepmother, teenager legally adopted
   3. Stepmother, teenager not legally adopted
   4. Adoptive mother, but not stepmother
   5. Female companion to teen's biological father
   6. Other, please specify ______________________;

2. How important is it to you to have a good relationship with this teenager?
   1. Not at all important
   2. Not very important
   3. Somewhat important
   4. Very important
   5. Extremely important

3. How involved would you say you are right now in the everyday life of this teenager?
   1. Not at all involved
   2. Not very involved
   3. Somewhat involved
   4. Fairly involved
   5. Very involved

4. How satisfied are you with the amount of quality time you spend with your teen?
   1. Not at all satisfied
   2. Not very satisfied
   3. Somewhat satisfied
   4. Fairly satisfied
   5. Very satisfied

Using the Activity Chart
5. How often did you participate in filling out your family's "7 Days Activities" Chart (either by writing things down yourself or by telling others what to write)?
   1. I did not participate
   2. I helped once or twice
   3. I helped three or more times

6. Do you have the "7 Days Activity Chart" (the yellow sheet) with you now? If not, please go and get it to help you answer the questions on the next page. Do you have it now?
   1. Yes
   2. No . . . if not, where is it? ______________________
**REMINDER!!**  Please get the "7 DAYS CHART" your family filled out over this past week. Please answer the questions below with those particular 7 days in mind. Please look over the chart before you begin to refresh your memory of those 7 days, and refer to the chart as you answer the questions. Thanks!

**ACTIVITIES CHART - INSTRUCTIONS:**
1) Please record below the Total Time (far left column) you have spent over the 7 days mentioned on the Chart doing the listed activities with your teenager. Report hours and minutes for each activity (examples, 1 hour & 15 minutes should be recorded as 1:15, and 45 minutes as 0:45.)
2) Report the percent of the total time during each activity you spent Talking (middle column), and the percent of total time during each activity spent Alone With Teen (right column) with no one else present.
3) Only report activity time once. For instance, when you report time Shopping or Eating Out, then later when you report time spent on Short Trips please do not include "shopping time" or "eating out" time again. For later questions, only report time for activities you did not yet mention or give the time for earlier.

**QUESTION:** HOW MUCH TIME OVER THE 7 DAYS ON THE CHART have you spent doing these activities with your teen? (Fill in hours and minutes for each column.)

**ACTIVITIES TOGETHER- LAST 7 DAYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL TIME in ACTIVITIES TOGETHER and % of Activity Time Spent... on the 7 days listed on the chart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hrs : Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Just Talking* Please report on this line only talk time not reported elsewhere in this chart. That is, only report "talk time" which is not combined with any other activity.
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LAST 7 DAYS - Continued

How Typical?
21. Regarding the chart you just completed on page 2 of activities and time spent with your teen, how typical were those 7 days compared to other weeks?
   1. very typical  2. somewhat typical  3. not very typical  4. not at all typical

Interaction Available Time, 7 Days on Chart
22. We are interested in finding out which days of the week you had the most time available to do things with your teenager. Over the 7 days listed on the chart, please estimate the time that you and your teenager were awake at the same location at the same time. Don't count sleep time! This is not necessarily time when you did things together (although it can be), just when you were at the same place (for instance, at home, in a shopping mall, church, etc.). Please report this time below (in hours & minutes) for each of those 7 days.

7 Days on Chart: AWAKE TIME at home or elsewhere with teenager (Hours: Minutes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tues</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thurs</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
<th>Sun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three Most Important Activities - 7 Days on Chart
23-25. As you think about those 7 days, what in your opinion were the three most meaningful, important or memorable things you did with your teen during that week? Also estimate the time you spent during the whole week for this activity, and briefly describe why these activities were important to you or your teen.

Three Most Meaningful Activities: 7 Days on Chart |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>TIME SPENT for the Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xx. ___ : ___ (Hours:Min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why important?</td>
<td>___________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>TIME SPENT for the Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xx. ___ : ___ (Hours:Min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why important?</td>
<td>___________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>TIME SPENT for the Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xx. ___ : ___ (Hours:Min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why important?</td>
<td>___________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three Most Time-Consuming Activities - Typical Week
26-28. The 7 days on the chart may or may not have been typical or usual for you. Please list the three most time-consuming things you do with your teenager during a typical week. Then estimate the time (in hours & minutes) you usually spend per week on each activity.

Most Time-Consuming Activities: Typical Week |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>TIME in an Average Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xx. ___ : ___ (Hours:Min.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Nature of Interaction - 7 Days on Chart
29-38. For each of the next three questions, please fill in percents in each blank to indicate how much of the time you spent with your teen over those 7 days could be described in the following ways: (Note: percents in each category should add to 100%).

Over the 7 days on the chart, what percent of your time with your teen would you say was . . .

Of These Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Companionable</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>just being together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-Oriented</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>working together, getting required things done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>actively doing things together for enjoyment or fun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100 %

Active-Passive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very active</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>both of you were actively interacting together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat active</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>low-level interaction, or mixed active &amp; passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>we were mostly &quot;just there together&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100 %

Cooperative-Conflictual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>where you and your teen were getting along well together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflictual</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>where you or the teen were at odds with each other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100 %

Enjoyable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyable</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>where you and teen were both enjoying the experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Mutually Enjoyable</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>where you or teen did not enjoy the experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100 %

Specific Types of Interaction - In General
39-55. Using the code below, please write in a number for each blank to answer the questions.

1 = never 2 = rarely 3 = sometimes 4 = often 5 = very often

Generally speaking, how often do you find yourself doing these things with your teen . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>watching teen participate in organized events of any kind (sports, musical, etc.)</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actively playing sports with teen (softball, volleyball, tennis, etc.)</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exercising or engaging in active recreation (aerobics, jogging, swimming, etc.)</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>camping, fishing, hiking or doing similar outdoor activities</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>playing or performing music together</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working on another craft or hobby together</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working in a family business together (retail sales, service, farming, etc.)</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doing chores around the house or working in the yard</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sitting together in church, mass or synagogue together</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>going to other community events (concerts, dinners, club meetings, etc.)</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reading the Bible (or holy book) together, or having times of prayer</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arguing</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complimenting teen, or praising teen for a job well done</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being critical, or reprimanding teen</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reading books or magazines together, or discussing them</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talking about the news, or discussing social or political issues</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Parental Roles Taken - Normal Week

56-82. In general, how often do you find yourself taking these roles with your teen? Please place a number in the blank which corresponds to the frequency code below.

1 = never      2 = rarely      3 = sometimes      4 = often      5 = very often

When interacting with your teen, how often do you find yourself taking the role of . . .

56. ______ chauffeur . . plays taxi cab and drives teen where he or she needs to go
57. ______ passive companion . . a friend just to be with, to hang around with
58. ______ playmate . . who does active things with teen, has fun, goes off, etc.
59. ______ tutor . . helps with school homework & other learning enterprises
60. ______ reminder . . reminds teen of duties to perform, calendar events, etc.
61. ______ public relations advisor . . advises teen in how to get along with others
62. ______ motivator . . imparts energy & push teen to set higher goals
63. ______ lawmaker . . gives guidelines, makes rules, sets curfews, lays down the law
64. ______ monitor . . supervises teen and makes sure the rules are being followed
65. ______ referee . . deals with teen when he or she is out-of-line, disciplines misbehavior
66. ______ sports trainer . . helps teen succeed athletically, giving advice & support
67. ______ fan/cheerleader . . watches teen's activities & gives encouragement
68. ______ arts patron . . develops teen's latent artistic or musical abilities
69. ______ banker-financier . . pays for teen's activities, clothes, gives loans, etc.
70. ______ moral teacher . . discusses right & wrong, values, and life's important lessons
71. ______ adversary . . argues with teen, and plays "tug-of-war" games for power
72. ______ fellow-worker . . works with teen on household, a family business, projects
73. ______ couch potato . . watches TV with teen, unwinds with a good movie or program
74. ______ decision-maker . . considers teen's requests, grants permission or denial
75. ______ facilitator . . talks about important topics with teen, discusses significant issues
76. ______ sounding board . . lets teen try out ideas, discusses but leaves decisions to teen
77. ______ authority figure . . makes final decisions regarding teen, gets the final word
78. ______ therapist . . gives a listening ear to problems, helps teen put life back together
79. ______ employer or boss . . gives teen work to do, says to teen, "do what I say"
80. ______ teacher or instructor . . tries to teach teen new skills and knowledge
81. ______ guidance counselor . . helps teen consider options for future (job, college . .)
82. ______ best friend . . where teen would rather do things with you than anyone else

83. How often do you have significant conflict in your relationship with your teen?

1 ______ Never
2 ______ Rarely
3 ______ Sometimes
4 ______ Quite Often
5 ______ Almost continually

84. How would you rate the intensity or severity of conflict right now in your relationship with your teen?

1 ______ Very intense conflict
2 ______ Somewhat intense conflict
3 ______ Moderate conflict
4 ______ Very slight conflict
5 ______ No conflict at all
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Details of Parent-Teen Relationship
85-96. Circle the number closest to the emotional word choice which best describe how your teen usually responds to you or behaves toward you.

85. Is negative, complaining 1 2 3 4 5 Is positive, happy
86. Is very stubborn, resists me 1 2 3 4 5 Easy-going, cooperates with me
87. Is nearly always obedient 1 2 3 4 5 Is often disobedient, rebellious
88. Loves me, shows affection 1 2 3 4 5 Dislikes me, displays hostility
89. Is often disrespectful to me 1 2 3 4 5 Is always very respectful
90. Can be trusted, is reliable 1 2 3 4 5 Can seldom be trusted, isn't reliable
91. Discusses things agreeably 1 2 3 4 5 Needlessly argues with me
92. Is often cutting or sarcastic 1 2 3 4 5 Is always kind & constructive
93. Is not open, does not disclose 1 2 3 4 5 Is very open with me
94. Gets angry with me, explosive 1 2 3 4 5 Remains calm, doesn't lose control
95. Completely accepts me 1 2 3 4 5 Does not accept me for who I am
96. Always enjoys being with me 1 2 3 4 5 Usually avoids being with me

Overall Parent-Teen Relationship
97-103. Please rate aspects of your relationship with your teen using the scale below. You can also use "in-between" numbers (1, 3, 5, 7). Please place a number in each blank.

0 = very poor 2 = fair 4 = average 6 = good 8 = excellent

97. _____ Commitment - being bonded, having an unshakeable attachment to the other
98. _____ Time & Togetherness - spending enough quality time together
99. _____ Love & Affection - being kind, warm & caring toward each other
100. _____ Communication - having open and meaningful discussions, fair arguments
101. _____ Affirming - being positive with the other person, not overly critical
102. _____ Conflict Management - resolving problems when they happen, fighting fairly
103. _____ Support - being there for the other person, helping when help is needed

104. Please rate the quality of your overall relationship right now with your teenager.
1 ____ Very poor
2 ____ Poor
3 ____ Fair
4 ____ Very good
5 ____ Excellent
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Employment & Education

105-107. **Primary Occupation & Other Jobs.** Most of the time "primary occupations" are *paid* positions, but sometimes they are *unpaid* (such as with a full-time homemaker). In the chart below, please list your primary occupation (paid or unpaid) and any paid jobs you currently do for money. Also give a short description along with the job title (e.g. teacher at high school, clerk in grocery store, owner of 3 restaurants, janitor for hospital, insurance agent, full-time homemaker, etc.).

108-111. **Hours on Job per Week.** To the right of each occupation listed, estimate the number of hours per week you work at this job. Please include all commuting time, work-related reading, take-home office work, etc. in your estimates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job or Employment</th>
<th>Work Hours Per Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Title / Task Description</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Primary Job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Second Job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. All Other Jobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Work Hours Per Week** | 111

**How many** of the "Total Work Hours Per Week" stated above are spent . . . ?

112. _____ At home
113. _____ Outside the home (at a place of employment, traveling, etc.)

114. Do you consider yourself as *primarily*?

1. self-employed for profit
2. working for an employer for pay
3. not employed for pay
4. other, please describe ___________________________

115. If you are "self-employed" or if you are the owner or a partner in a business (including farming), please indicate the approximate gross revenue of your business.

1. under $20,000
2. $20,000 to $49,999
3. $50,000 to $99,999
4. $100,000 to $249,999
5. $250,000 to $999,999
6. $1,000,000 or more

116. If you are employed by an employer, how many full-time employees (or their equivalent) work for the firm, company or organization you work for?

1. Fewer than 5 employees
2. 5-14 employees
3. 15-49 employees
4. 50-200 employees
5. Over 200 employees
6. None of the above - I'm self-employed for pay
7. None of the above - I'm presently not employed for pay
8. Other, please explain, ___________________________________
117. How would you describe your normal weekly work schedule?
   1  ___ Fairly regular and predictable
   2  ___ Somewhat regular and predictable
   3  ___ Not at all regular or predictable

118. Please check the highest level of education you have completed
   1  ___ 8th grade or less
   2  ___ 10th grade
   3  ___ 12th grade (high school graduation)
   4  ___ At least one full year of college, or graduation from a two-year college
   5  ___ Four-year college or university graduation, or from professional school
   6  ___ Graduate school experience, but not completion.
   7  ___ Masters degree completion or equivalent, describe if other ____________
   8  ___ PhD completion or equivalent, describe if other ________________

THANK YOU TREMENDOUSLY! I CAN'T THANK YOU ENOUGH!!
To Fathers: Please remember the following as you answer this survey:
1) Please work privately - by yourself.
2) Please use the yellow Activity Chart to remind you of the 7 days the questions will ask you about.
3) All answers will be completely anonymous - please answer openly and honestly!
4) When finished, please seal your survey and consent form in the envelope for prompt return. THANKS!

You & Your Teenager
1. What is your relationship to the teen in your household who is taking this survey?
   1   Biological father
   2   Stepfather, teenager legally adopted
   3   Stepfather, teenager not legally adopted
   4   Adoptive father, but not stepfather
   5   Male companion to teen’s biological mother
   6   Other, please specify ____________________________________________

2. How important is it to you to have a good relationship with this teenager?
   1   Not at all important
   2   Not very important
   3   Somewhat important
   4   Very important
   5   Extremely important

3. How involved would you say you are right now in the everyday life of this teenager?
   1   Not at all involved
   2   Not very involved
   3   Somewhat involved
   4   Fairly involved
   5   Very involved

4. How satisfied are you with the amount of quality time you spend with your teen?
   1   Not at all satisfied
   2   Not very satisfied
   3   Somewhat satisfied
   4   Fairly satisfied
   5   Very satisfied

Using the Activity Chart
5. How often did you participate in filling out your family’s “7 Days Activities” Chart (either by writing things down yourself or by telling others what to write)?
   1   I did not participate
   2   I helped once or twice
   3   I helped three or more times

6. Do you have the “7 Days Activity Chart” (the yellow sheet) with you now? If not, please go and get it to help you answer the questions on the next page. Do you have it now?
   1   Yes
   2   No . . . if not, where is it? ____________________________________________

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
**REMEMBER!!** Please get the "7 DAYS CHART" your family filled out over this past week. Please answer the questions below with those particular 7 days in mind. Please look over the chart before you begin to refresh your memory of those 7 days, and refer to the chart as you answer the questions. Thanks!

ACTIVITIES CHART - INSTRUCTIONS:

1) Please record below the Total Time (far left column) you have spent over the 7 days mentioned on the Chart doing the listed activities with your teenager. Report hours and minutes for each activity (examples, 1 hour & 15 minutes should be recorded as 1:15, and 45 minutes as 0:45).

2) Report the percent of the total time during each activity you spent Talking (middle column), and the percent of total time during each activity spent Alone With Teen (right column) with no one else present.

3) Only report activity time once. For instance, when you report time Shopping or Eating Out, then later when you report time spent on Short Trips please do not include "shopping time" or "eating out" time again. For later questions, only report time for activities you did not yet mention or give the time for earlier.

**QUESTION:** HOW MUCH TIME OVER THE 7 DAYS ON THE CHART have you spent doing these activities with your teen? (Fill in hours and minutes for each column.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES TOGETHER - LAST 7 DAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TIME in ACTIVITIES TOGETHER, and % of Activity Time Spent...</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>on the 7 days listed on the chart</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hrs : Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Just Talking* Please report on this line only talk time not reported elsewhere in this chart. That is, only report "talk time" which is not combined with any other activity.
LAST 7 DAYS - Continued

How Typical?
21. Regarding the chart you just completed on page 2 of activities and time spent with your teen, how typical were those 7 days compared to other weeks?

1. very typical 2. somewhat typical 3. not very typical 4. not at all typical

Interaction Available Time, 7 Days on Chart
22. We are interested in finding out which days of the week you had the most time available to do things with your teenager. Over the 7 days listed on the chart, please estimate the time that you and your teenager were awake at same location at the same time. Don't count sleep time! This is not necessarily time when you did things together (although it can be), just when you were at the same place (for instance, at home, in a shopping mall, church, etc.). Please report this time below (in hours & minutes) for each of those 7 days.

7 Days on Chart: AWAKE TIME at home or elsewhere with teenager (Hours : Minutes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tues</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thurs</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
<th>Sun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three Most Important Activities - 7 Days on Chart
23-25. As you think about those 7 days, what in your opinion were the three most meaningful, important or memorable things you did with your teen during that week? Also estimate the time you spent during the whole week for this activity, and briefly describe why these activities were important to you or your teen.

Three Most Meaningful Activities: 7 Days on Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>TIME SPENT for the Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>xx. ____ : ____ (Hours:Min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why important?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>xx. ____ : ____ (Hours:Min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why important?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>xx. ____ : ____ (Hours:Min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why important?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three Most Time-Consuming Activities - Typical Week
26-28. The 7 days on the chart may or may not have been typical or usual for you. Please list the three most time-consuming things you do with your teenager during a typical week. Then estimate the time (in hours & minutes) you usually spend per week on each activity.

Most Time-Consuming Activities: Typical Week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>TIME in an Average Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>xx. ____ : ____ (Hours:Min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>xx. ____ : ____ (Hours:Min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>xx. ____ : ____ (Hours:Min.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nature of Interaction - 7 Days on Chart

29-38. For each of the next three questions, please fill in percents in each blank to indicate how much of the time you spent with your teen over those 7 days could be described in the following ways: (Note: percents in each category should add to 100%).

Over the 7 days on the chart, what percent of your time with your teen would you say was . . .

Of These Types

1. _____% Companionable (just being together) 29
2. _____% Task-Oriented (working together, getting required things done) 30
3. _____% Recreational (actively doing things together for enjoyment or fun) 31

100%

Active-Passive

1. _____% Very active . . . both of you were actively interacting together 32
2. _____% Somewhat active . . . low-level interaction, or mixed active & passive 33
3. _____% Passive . . . we were mostly "just there together" 34

100%

Cooperative-Conflictual

1. _____% Cooperative (where you and your teen were getting along well together) 35
2. _____% Conflictual (where you or the teen were at odds with each other) 36

100%

Enjoyable

1. _____% Enjoyable (where you and teen were both enjoying the experience) 37
2. _____% Not Mutually Enjoyable (where you or teen did not enjoy the experience) 38

100%

Specific Types of Interaction - In General

39-55. Using the code below, please write in a number for each blank to answer the questions.
1 = never 2 = rarely 3 = sometimes 4 = often 5 = very often

Generally speaking, how often do you find yourself doing these things with your teen . . .

1. _______ watching teen participate in organized events of any kind (sports, musical, etc.) 39
2. _______ actively playing sports with teen (softball, volleyball, tennis, etc.) 40
3. _______ exercising or engaging in active recreation (aerobics, jogging, swimming, etc.) 41
4. _______ engaging in semi-active recreation (bowling, golf, archery, etc.) 42
5. _______ camping, fishing, hiking or doing similar outdoor activities 43
6. _______ playing or performing music together 44
7. _______ working on another craft or hobby together 45
8. _______ working in a family business together (retail sales, service, farming, etc.) 46
9. _______ doing chores around the house or working in the yard 47
10. _______ sitting together in church, mass or synagogue together 48
11. _______ going to other community events (concerts, dinners, club meetings, etc.) 49
12. _______ reading the Bible (or holy book) together, or having times of prayer 50
13. _______ arguing 51
14. _______ complimenting teen, or praising teen for a job well done 52
15. _______ being critical, or reprimanding teen 53
16. _______ reading books or magazines together, or discussing them 54
17. _______ talking about the news, or discussing social or political issues 55
Parental Roles Taken - Normal Week

56-82. In general, how often do you find yourself taking these roles with your teen? Please place a number in the blank which corresponds to the frequency code below.

1 = never 2 = rarely 3 = sometimes 4 = often 5 = very often

When interacting with your teen, how often do you find yourself taking the role of . . .

56. _____ chauffeur . . . plays taxi cab and drives teen where he or she needs to go
57. _____ passive companion . . . a friend just to be with, to hang around with
58. _____ playmate . . . who does active things with teen, has fun, goes off, etc.
59. _____ tutor . . . helps with school homework & other learning enterprises
60. _____ reminder . . . reminds teen of duties to perform, calendar events, etc.
61. _____ public relations advisor . . advises teen in how to get along with others
62. _____ motivator . . imparts energy & push teen to set higher goals
63. _____ lawmaker . . gives guidelines, makes rules, sets curfews, lays down the law
64. _____ monitor . . supervises teen and makes sure the rules are being followed
65. _____ referee . . deals with teen when he or she is out-of-line, disciplines misbehavior
66. _____ sports trainer . . helps teen succeed athletically, giving advice & support
67. _____ fan/cheerleader . . watches teen's activities & gives encouragement
68. _____ patron . . develops teen's latent artistic or musical abilities
69. _____ banker-finance . . pays for teen's activities, clothes, gives loans, etc.
70. _____ moral teacher . . discusses right & wrong, values, and life's important lessons
71. _____ adversary . . argues with teen, and plays "tug-of-war" games for power
72. _____ fellow-worker . . works with teen on housework, a family business, projects
73. _____ couch potato . . watches TV with teen, unwinds with a good movie or program
74. _____ decision-maker . . considers teen's requests, grants permission or denial
75. _____ facilitator . . talks about important topics with teen, discusses significant issues
76. _____ sounding board . . lets teen try out ideas, discusses but leaves decisions to teen
77. _____ authority figure . . makes final decisions regarding teen, gets the final word
78. _____ therapist . . gives a listening ear to problems, helps teen put life back together
79. _____ employer or boss . . gives teen work to do, says to teen, "do what I say"
80. _____ teacher or instructor . . tries to teach teen new skills and knowledge
81. _____ guidance counselor . . helps teen consider options for future (job, college . . .)
82. _____ best friend . . where teen would rather do things with you than anyone else

83. How often do you have significant conflict in your relationship with your teen?

1 = Never 2 = Rarely 3 = Sometimes 4 = Quite Often 5 = Almost continually

84. How would you rate the intensity or severity of conflict right now in your relationship with your teen?

1 = Very intense conflict 2 = Somewhat intense conflict 3 = Moderate conflict 4 = Very slight conflict 5 = No conflict at all

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
**Employment**

**Time at Work**

Please estimate the number of hours per week you currently spend working

48. ______ for pay in a business that your family runs
49. ______ without getting paid in a business that your family runs
50. ______ for pay at any other job or jobs outside of the home
51. ______ without getting paid (volunteering) at other jobs outside of the home

**Type of Job**

52. If you currently work for pay (during school year, don't count summer), what type of job do you have? If you have more than one job, please place check the job where you spend the most time. (CHECK ONLY ONE)

1 ______ fast-food service
2 ______ clerk or general help in retail store
3 ______ lawnmowing, lawn & garden services
4 ______ babysitting or childcare services
5 ______ construction or remodeling (carpentry, roofing, etc.)
6 ______ house cleaning
7 ______ other, please specify __________________________

**Activities & Involvements**

53-62. Please make a list of all of the main extra-curricular or community activities in which you participate right now (such as sports, school newspaper, church, etc.). Be specific about each activity. For instance, putting "basketball" is better than putting "sports." Only record activities you are now involved in (for instance, if you play a sport during another season, do not list it). For each activity, report the average time you spend at this activity during a typical week.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Activities (in order of time spent)</th>
<th>TIME in an Average Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. _________________________________</td>
<td>xx. ___ : ___ (Hours:Min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. _________________________________</td>
<td>xx. ___ : ___ (Hours:Min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. _________________________________</td>
<td>xx. ___ : ___ (Hours:Min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. _________________________________</td>
<td>xx. ___ : ___ (Hours:Min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. _________________________________</td>
<td>xx. ___ : ___ (Hours:Min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. _________________________________</td>
<td>xx. ___ : ___ (Hours:Min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. _________________________________</td>
<td>xx. ___ : ___ (Hours:Min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. _________________________________</td>
<td>xx. ___ : ___ (Hours:Min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. _________________________________</td>
<td>xx. ___ : ___ (Hours:Min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. All Other Activities</td>
<td>xx. ___ : ___ (Hours:Min.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employment & Education

105-107. **Primary Occupation & Other Jobs.** Most of the time "primary occupations" are paid positions, but sometimes they are unpaid (such as with a full-time homemaker). In the chart below, please list your primary occupation (paid or unpaid) and any paid jobs you currently do for money. Also give a short description along with the job title (e.g. teacher at high school, clerk in grocery store, owner of 3 restaurants, janitor for hospital, insurance agent, full-time homemaker, etc.).

108-111. **Hours on Job, per Week.** To the right of each occupation listed, estimate the number of hours per week you work at this job. Please include all commuting time, work-related reading, take-home office work, etc. in your estimates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job or Employment</th>
<th>Work Hours Per Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Primary Job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Second Job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. All Other Jobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Work Hours Per Week**

**How many** of the "Total Work Hours Per Week" stated above are spent . . . ?

112. ______ At home

113. ______ Outside the home (at a place of employment, traveling, etc.)

114. Do you consider yourself as *primarily*?

1. _____ self-employed for profit
2. _____ working for an employer for pay
3. _____ not employed for pay
4. _____ other, please describe __________________________

115. If you are "self-employed" or if you are the owner or a partner in a business (including farming), please indicate the approximate gross revenue of your business.

1. _____ under $20,000
2. _____ $20,000 to $49,999
3. _____ $50,000 to $99,999
4. _____ $100,000 to $249,999
5. _____ $250,000 to $999,999
6. _____ $1,000,000 or more

116. If you are employed by an employer, how many full-time employees (or their equivalent) work for the firm, company or organization you work for?

1. _____ Fewer than 5 employees
2. _____ 5-14 employees
3. _____ 15-49 employees
4. _____ 50-200 employees
5. _____ Over 200 employees
6. _____ None of the above - I'm self-employed for pay
7. _____ None of the above - I'm presently not employed for pay
8. _____ Other, please explain, __________________________
117. How would you describe your normal weekly work schedule?
   1  __   Fairly regular and predictable
   2  __   Somewhat regular and predictable
   3  __   Not at all regular or predictable

118. Please check the highest level of education you have completed
   1  __  8th grade or less
   2  __  10th grade
   3  __  12th grade (high school graduation)
   4  __  At least one full year of college, or graduation from a two-year college
   5  __  Four-year college or university graduation, or from professional school
   6  __  Graduate school experience, but not completion.
   7  __  Masters degree completion or equivalent, describe if other __________
   8  __  PhD completion or equivalent, describe if other ________________

THANK YOU TREMENDOUSLY! I CAN'T THANK YOU ENOUGH!!
SURVEY for TEEN

To the Teenager: Please remember the following as you answer this survey:
1) Please work privately - by yourself.
2) Please use the yellow Activity Chart to remind you of the 7 days the questions will ask you about.
3) All answers will be completely anonymous - please answer openly and honestly!
4) When finished, please seal your survey and consent form in the envelope for prompt return. THANKS!

Please check or write in the correct answer

1. Are you:
   1 ___ Male  2 ___ Female

2. Please write in your current age: ______

3. How important is it to you to have a good relationship with your MOM (who is participating in this study)?
   1 ___ Not at all important
   2 ___ Not very important
   3 ___ Somewhat important
   4 ___ Very important
   5 ___ Extremely important

4. How important is it to you to have a good relationship with your DAD (who is participating in this study)?
   1 ___ Not at all important
   2 ___ Not very important
   3 ___ Somewhat important
   4 ___ Very important
   5 ___ Extremely important

Time Doing Things with Parents (the ones participating in this study): Typical Week

5-6. How many hours in a typical week do you spend interacting (doing things) with your parents (who are participating in this study)? Do not count "sleep time" or time when you are both in the location but not really together. Only count time when you are doing something together or when you are really "being together" (maybe not doing anything specific, but you both are in the same place and aware of each other's presence).

Time Spent in a Typical Week Interacting with . . .

   DAD: Typical Week  MOM: Typical Week
   : ___ (Hours:Min.)  : ___ (Hours:Min.)

Using the Activity Chart

7. How often did you participate in filling out your family's "7 Days Activity Chart" (either by writing things down yourself or by telling others what to write)?
   1 ___ I did not participate
   2 ___ I helped once or twice
   3 ___ I helped three or more times

8. Do you have the "7 Days Activities" chart with you now? If not, please go and get it to help you answer the questions on the next page. Do you have it now?
   1 ___ Yes
   2 ___ No . . . if not, where is it? __________________________________________
**REMINDER!!** Please get the "7 DAYS CHART" your family filled out over this past week. Please answer the questions below with those particular 7 days in mind. Please look over the chart before you begin to refresh your memory of those 7 days, and refer to the chart as you answer the questions. Thanks!

### ACTIVITIES CHART - INSTRUCTIONS:

1. Please record below the Total Time (far left column) you have spent over the 7 days mentioned on the Chart doing the listed activities with your either or both of your parents. Report hours and minutes for each activity (examples, 1 hour & 15 minutes should be recorded as 1:15, and 45 minutes as 0:45.)

2. Please decide how much of the total time with parents (that you recorded on the left) your MOM was present. Report that time in the middle column. Then decide how much of the total time with parents your DAD was present. Report that time in the far right column.

3. **Only report activity time once.** For instance, when you report time Shopping or Eating Out, then later when you report time spent on Short Trips please do not include "shopping time" or "eating out" time again. For later questions, only report time for activities you did not yet mention or give the time for earlier.

### QUESTION: HOW MUCH TIME OVER THE 7 DAYS ON THE CHART did you spend doing these activities with your parents? (Fill in hours and minutes for each column.)

### ACTIVITIES TOGETHER - LAST 7 DAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Time with Either or Both Parents (over the 7 days on chart)</th>
<th>Time with MOM</th>
<th>Time with DAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hrs : Min</td>
<td>Hrs : Min</td>
<td>Hrs : Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.       Eating Meals at Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.      Eating Out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.      Driving to Get Places</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.      Shopping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.      Watching T.V. or Videos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.      Work Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.      Sports Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.      Church Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.      Other Community Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.      Short Trips, Outings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.      Other Leisure Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.      Just Being Together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.      <em>Just Talking</em> <em>(see below)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.      All Other Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* **Just Talking** * Please report on this line only talk time not reported elsewhere in this chart. That is, only report "talk time" which is not combined with any other activity.
7 DAYS ON CHART - Continued

How Typical?
23. Regarding the chart you just completed on page 2 of *activities and time spent* with your parents, how typical were those 7 days compared to other weeks?
   1. ______ very typical   2. ______ somewhat typical   3. ______ not very typical   4. ______ not at all typical

24-25. Interaction Available Time. 7 Days on Chart
   We are interested in finding out which days of the week you had the most time available to do things with your PARENTS. Over the 7 days listed on the chart, please estimate the time that you and each parent were awake at the same location at the same time. *Don’t count sleep time!* This is not necessarily time when you did things together (although it can be), just when you were at the same place (for instance, at home, in a shopping mall, church, etc.). Please report this time below (hours & minutes) for each of those 7 days.

WITH DAD
7 Days on Chart: **AWAKE TIME** at home or elsewhere **WITH DAD** (Hours : Minutes)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tues</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thurs</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
<th>Sun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WITH MOM
7 Days on Chart: **AWAKE TIME** at home or elsewhere **WITH DAD** (Hours : Minutes)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tues</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thurs</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
<th>Sun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACTIVITIES WITH MOM

Three Most Important Activities with MOM - 7 Days on Chart
26-28. As you think about those 7 days, what in your opinion were the three most meaningful, important or memorable things you did with your MOM during that week? Also estimate the time you spent during the whole week for this activity, and briefly describe why these were important to you or your mom.

Three Most Meaningful Activities with MOM; 7 Days TIME spent for the Week
1. Activity ____________________________ xx. _____ : ____ (Hours:Min.)
   Why important? _______________________________________________________________________

2. Activity ____________________________ xx. _____ : ____ (Hours:Min.)
   Why important? _______________________________________________________________________

3. Activity ____________________________ xx. _____ : ____ (Hours:Min.)
   Why important? _______________________________________________________________________
Three Most Time-Consuming Activities with MOM - Typical Week
29-31. The 7 days on the chart may or may not have been typical or usual for you. Please list the three most time-consuming things you do with your MOM during a typical week. Then estimate the time (in hours & minutes) you usually spend per week on each activity with your mom.

Most Time-Consuming Weekly Activities with MOM

1. ____________________________________________ xx. ____ : ____ (Hours:Min.)
2. ____________________________________________ xx. ____ : ____ (Hours:Min.)
3. ____________________________________________ xx. ____ : ____ (Hours:Min.)

32. In general, how do you regard the time you spend with your MOM?
1. _____ Enjoy very much
2. _____ Enjoy quite a bit
3. _____ Enjoy somewhat
4. _____ Do not enjoy very much
5. _____ Do not enjoy at all

ACTIVITIES WITH DAD

Three Most Important Activities with DAD - 7 Days on Chart
33-35. As you think about those 7 days, what in your opinion were the three most meaningful, important or memorable things you did with your DAD during that week? Also estimate the time you spent during the whole week for this activity, and briefly describe why these were important to you or your dad.

Three Most Meaningful Activities with DAD: 7 Days

1. Activity ____________________________________ xx. ____ : ____ (Hours:Min.)
   Why important? __________________________________________________________________________

2. Activity ____________________________________ xx. ____ : ____ (Hours:Min.)
   Why important? __________________________________________________________________________

3. Activity ____________________________________ xx. ____ : ____ (Hours:Min.)
   Why important? __________________________________________________________________________

Three Most Time-Consuming Activities with DAD - Typical Week
36-38. The 7 days on the chart may or may not have been typical or usual for you. Please list the three most time-consuming things you do with your DAD during a typical week. Then estimate the time (in hours & minutes) you usually spend per week on each activity with your dad.

Most Time-Consuming Weekly Activities with DAD

1. ____________________________________________ xx. ____ : ____ (Hours:Min.)
2. ____________________________________________ xx. ____ : ____ (Hours:Min.)
3. ____________________________________________ xx. ____ : ____ (Hours:Min.)
39. In general, how do you regard the time you spend with your DAD?
   1. _____ Enjoy very much
   2. _____ Enjoy quite a bit
   3. _____ Enjoy somewhat
   4. _____ Do not enjoy very much
   5. ____ Do not enjoy at all

**TIME with FAMILY**

**Family Meals**
40-42. How many of the following meals during the 7 days on the chart did you eat with your mother, father, or your whole family? WRITE IN A NUMBER (from 0 - no meals, to a maximum of 7 meals on each line).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEALS in past 7 days</th>
<th>With Mom</th>
<th>With Dad</th>
<th>With Both Mom &amp; Dad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40. Breakfasts</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Lunches</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Suppers</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other questions about your family**
43-45. What would you say are the three most important things you have ever done or experienced with your family?

1. _______________________________________________________________________
2. _______________________________________________________________________
3. _______________________________________________________________________

46. In general, how do you regard the time you spend with your FAMILY?
   1. _____ Enjoy very much
   2. _____ Enjoy quite a bit
   3. _____ Enjoy somewhat
   4. _____ Do not enjoy very much
   5. ___ Do not enjoy at all

**About your Parents**
47. Please describe the quality of the relationship between your "parents" (or the adults who serve as your parents who now live with you)

0 ___ not applicable, one parent deceased or divorced or never visits
1 ___ "excellent," they get along exceptionally well almost all the time
2 ___ "good," they get along fine
3 ___ "average," they get along OK, but have some conflict or problems
4 ___ "fair," they tolerate each other pretty well, but have many significant problems
5 ___ "poor," they can't stand each other, and have a very troubled relationship
6 ___ OTHER, please describe ____________________________________________
Employment

Time at Work

Please estimate the number of hours per week you currently spend working

48. ______ for pay in a business that your family runs
49. ______ without getting paid in a business that your family runs
50. ______ for pay at any other job or jobs outside of the home
51. ______ without getting paid (volunteering) at other jobs outside of the home

Type of Job

52. If you currently work for pay (during school year, don't count summer), what type of job do you have? If you have more than one job, please place check the job where you spend the most time. (CHECK ONLY ONE)

1. ______ fast-food service
2. ______ clerk or general help in retail store
3. ______ lawnmowing, lawn & garden services
4. ______ babysitting or childcare services
5. ______ construction or remodeling (carpentry, roofing, etc.)
6. ______ house cleaning
7. ______ other, please specify __________________________

Activities & Involvements

53-62. Please make a list of all of the main extra-curricular or community activities in which you participate right now (such as sports, school newspaper, church, etc.). Be specific about each activity. For instance, putting "basketball" is better than putting "sports." Only record activities you are now involved in (for instance, if you play a sport during another season, do not list it). For each activity, report the average time you spend at this activity during a typical week.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Activities (in order of time spent)</th>
<th>TIME in an Average Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ------------------------------------</td>
<td>xx. ____ : ____ (Hours:Min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ------------------------------------</td>
<td>xx. ____ : ____ (Hours:Min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ------------------------------------</td>
<td>xx. ____ : ____ (Hours:Min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ------------------------------------</td>
<td>xx. ____ : ____ (Hours:Min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ------------------------------------</td>
<td>xx. ____ : ____ (Hours:Min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ------------------------------------</td>
<td>xx. ____ : ____ (Hours:Min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ------------------------------------</td>
<td>xx. ____ : ____ (Hours:Min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ------------------------------------</td>
<td>xx. ____ : ____ (Hours:Min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. ------------------------------------</td>
<td>xx. ____ : ____ (Hours:Min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. All Other Activities</td>
<td>xx. ____ : ____ (Hours:Min.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hours Spent - By Category of Activity
Please estimate the number of hours per week you currently spend in a normal week participating in the following extracurricular activities. (WRITE IN HOURS for each)

63. ______ Sports
64. ______ Creative Arts (music, art, drama, etc.)
65. ______ Specialized Academic Clubs (computer club, Spanish club, etc.)
66. ______ School services or government (newspaper, student council, etc.)
67. ______ Private lessons & practice time (music, tennis, ballet, karate, etc.)
68. ______ In church, at church activities, or doing church volunteer work
69. ______ Volunteering for other community or service organizations
70. ______ Other community events or activities (not yet mentioned)

About You & Your Mother

71-80. Circle the number closest to the emotional word choice which best describe how your mother currently responds to you or behaves toward you.

71. She is not interested in me or what I care about 1 2 3 4 5 She is interested in me and in what I care about
72. She is too strict and not fair with her discipline 1 2 3 4 5 She is not overly strict and very fair with her discipline
73. She understands me 1 2 3 4 5 She doesn't understand me at all
74. She displays warmth & affection toward me 1 2 3 4 5 She does not display warmth & affection toward me
75. She does not lose her temper with me 1 2 3 4 5 She often gets very angry with me
76. She cuts me down verbally 1 2 3 4 5 She compliments me often
77. She respects me 1 2 3 4 5 She doesn't think much of me
78. We argue a lot 1 2 3 4 5 We agree about most things
79. I feel I can really talk to her if I need to 1 2 3 4 5 I do not feel like I can talk to her if I need to
80. She loves me 1 2 3 4 5 She doesn't love me

81. Please rate the quality of your overall relationship right now with your MOM.
   1 ______ Very poor
   2 ______ Poor
   3 ______ Fair
   4 ______ Very good
   5 ______ Excellent
### About You & Your Father

82-91. Circle the number closest to the emotional word choice which best describe how your father currently responds to you or behaves toward you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82. He is not interested in me or what I care about</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>He is interested in me and in what I care about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. He is too strict and not fair with his discipline</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>He is not overly strict and very fair with his discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. He understands me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>He doesn't understand me at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. He displays warmth &amp; affection toward me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>He does not display warmth &amp; affection toward me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. He does not lose her temper with me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>He often gets very angry with me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. He cuts me down verbally</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>He compliments me often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. He respects me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>He doesn't think much of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. We argue a lot</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>We agree about most things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. I feel I can really talk to him if I need to</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>I do not feel like I can talk to him if I need to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. He loves me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>He doesn't love me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 92. Please rate the quality of your overall relationship right now with your DAD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 93. Whom do you feel you have a closer relationship with - your mother or your father?

_I feel like I have a closer relationship with_...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Much closer to my mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Somewhat closer to my mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Equal relationship with with mom &amp; dad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Somewhat closer to father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Much closer to father</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feelings About Yourself - in General
94-103. Indicate whether you strongly agree (SA), agree (A), disagree (D), or strongly disagree (SD) with each of these statements.

1. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least equal to others. SA A D SD
2. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself. SA A D SD
3. I wish I could have more respect for myself. SA A D SD
4. I certainly feel useless at times. SA A D SD
5. At times I think I am no good at all. SA A D SD
6. I feel that I have a number of good qualities. SA A D SD
7. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure. SA A D SD
8. I am able to do things as well as most other people. SA A D SD
9. I feel that I do not have much to be proud of. SA A D SD
10. I take a positive attitude toward myself. SA A D SD

Feelings About Yourself - in Specific Areas
104-116. Please rate your self-image in the following areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My Self-Image as a...</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Mostly Good</th>
<th>Average/Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Poor</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>104. Student.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105. Person who is liked by other people.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106. Important member of my family.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107. Person my parents are happy with.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108. Friend.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109. Athlete or physically fit person.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110. Physically attractive person.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111. Talented person w. useful skills &amp; abilities.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112. Worker or employee.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113. Person who knows how to deal with life.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114. Person with an important future.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115. Moral person with strong beliefs &amp; values.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116. Person who likes myself.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Parental Support**

117-128. For the items below, consider:

1. **Actions**: specific things parents do to help you out, like driving you to events, paying for schoolbooks, caring for you when you are sick, or helping with homework.

2. **Attitudes**: what you perceive that parents *think* about you and your activities. They let you know by what they say, or by indications of their attitudes, that they support (or oppose you) in various areas.

3. **Support or Opposition**: Parents can also support you or oppose you, either in attitude or by direct action. And they can do so *actively* (by doing things directly) or *passively* (by saying things or just making clear their attitudes clear). For instance, for category "1" below, *strong and active support*, a parent would both *do things* and *say things* firmly in support of the activity in question.

4. **Question**: How much SUPPORT or OPPOSITION do you get in actions or in attitudes from each parent?

Using the scale from 1 to 7 which follows, please give a support score to each parent for each of the areas listed. **WRITE A NUMBER IN EACH BLANK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Father Actions</th>
<th>Father Attitudes</th>
<th>Mother Actions</th>
<th>Mother Attitudes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In studying &amp; schoolwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In sports &amp; things you participate in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For chores, duties, responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your appearance (hair, clothes ...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your lifestyle (music, activities ...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regarding friends, dating, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When you are sick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For your problems and concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For your basic values &amp; beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For your ideas &amp; personal decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For your future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a person in general</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Things You Argue About
129-139. How often do you argue about the following things with your mother or father. Using the code below, please write a number in each blank to indicate the frequency of arguments.

How Often Do You Argue About...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With</th>
<th>With</th>
<th>Argument Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mom</td>
<td>Dad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Curfews, when you have to be in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Activities, what you are allowed to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Preferences in fashion or lifestyle (hair, clothes, music, movies, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Keeping room clean or things picked up around the house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Homework - when to do it, or how to do it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Work or employment issues (how long you work, when, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Friends you choose to hang around with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Boyfriend, girlfriend, or &quot;dating&quot; issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conversation, how you say things or respond to parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Basic beliefs or values that you have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other topic, please specify _________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions About Yourself
140. What kind of grades are you now making in school? If you no longer attend, what kind of grades were you making before you graduated or stopped going to school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions About Yourself - Continued

141. Which child are YOU in the family line-up? (check only one)
   0 ___ the only child
   1 ___ the first or eldest child (with at least one brother or sister)
   2 ___ a middle child
   3 ___ the last or youngest child

142. Do you live in this home all of the time, or do you live in another home or household at least sometimes?
   1 ___ I live in this home ALL OF THE TIME.
   2 ___ I sometimes live in another household. Please describe the other household you sometimes live in and describe how often you go there (for instance, you might go to see your natural father two weeks a month)

Time Spent at Different Activities - 7 Days on the Chart
How much time (in hours and minutes) have you spent over the 7 days on the chart at these activities? For this question, it does not matter whether or not your parents were there. Report all time for each activity done by yourself, with friends, with parents, or with anyone else.

143-149. How much total time did you spend for those 7 days at the following activities?

   Hrs : Min

143. ____ : ____ Watching T.V. or videos
144. ____ : ____ Listening to the radio, cassette, or CD player
145. ____ : ____ Playing Nintendo, Sega, and other video games
146. ____ : ____ Studying or doing school homework
147. ____ : ____ Reading (not required for school)
148. ____ : ____ Going out on dates, or being with a boyfriend or girlfriend
149. ____ : ____ Being with other friends (not boy/girlfriend)

THANK-YOU! I CAN'T THANK YOU ENOUGH!!
Appendix E

Pilot Study Surveys
Hi! This survey may be filled out by EITHER parent. Or if you would like, work on it together so that your responses may be more accurate and complete. Also, any time "the teenager" is mentioned, this refers to the teenager participating in this study.

**Family Background Questions**

1. Including one or both parents (whichever is applicable) and all dependent children, what is the current family size, or total number of people living in this household? _______

2. How many dependent children in the age ranges specified are still living in this household? (please write in the number of children for each age category)
   - 1 ____ 5 or under
   - 2 ____ 6-11
   - 3 ____ 12-17
   - 4 ____ 18 or older

3. How many total children would you consider to be a part of this family, whether or not they are still at home, away at college, or living on their own? _______

4. How many parents or adult guardians does the teenager in this study currently live with in this household? (please check the appropriate number)
   - 1 ____ one
   - 2 ____ two
   - 3 ____ other number of adults, please describe ____________________________

5. How would you best describe the current household living situation for the teenager in this study?
   - 1 ____ lives in this household with both natural parents who are married
   - 2 ____ lives with natural mother and a stepfather
   - 3 ____ lives with natural mother and her boyfriend
   - 4 ____ lives with natural mother only
   - 5 ____ lives with natural father and a stepmother
   - 6 ____ lives with natural father and his girlfriend
   - 7 ____ lives with natural father only
   - 8 ____ other, please describe ____________________________

6. How long has the teenager lived in the above household situation, with the combination of parents or adults specified?
   - 1 ____ less than 3 months
   - 2 ____ 3 months to 11 months
   - 3 ____ 1-2 years
   - 4 ____ 3-4 years
   - 5 ____ 5-6 years
   - 6 ____ 7-10 years
   - 7 ____ 11 years or more

7. What is the current marital status between the "natural parents" of the teenager in this study? (you may answer even if you are not a natural parent yourself)
   - 1 ____ married
   - 2 ____ never married
   - 3 ____ divorced
   - 4 ____ separated
   - 5 ____ one natural parent is deceased
   - 6 ____ both natural parents are deceased
   - 7 ____ other, please describe ____________________________
8. If the natural father does not live in this household, which of the following applies?
   1. not applicable, natural father does live in this household
   2. natural father visits household occasionally
   3. natural father visits household regularly
   4. natural father rarely visits, but teen typically goes to see him
   5. other, please describe ____________________________________________

9. If the natural mother does not live in this household, which of the following applies?
   1. not applicable, natural mother does live in this household
   2. natural mother visits household occasionally
   3. natural mother visits household regularly
   4. natural mother rarely visits, but teen typically goes to see her
   5. other, please describe ____________________________________________

10. If teen does not live with natural father, how many days a month would you estimate that teen is under the care of the father? _____

11. If teen does not live with natural mother, how many days a month would you estimate that teen is under the care of the mother? _____

12. How old is the teenager in this study at the present time? ______

13. How long has the teenager lived in this current house or apartment?
   1. less than 3 months
   2. 3 months to 11 months
   3. 1-2 years
   4. 3-4 years
   5. 5-6 years
   6. 7-10 years
   7. 11 years or more

14. How many times has this teenager moved from one house or apartment to another during the course of his or her lifetime? ______

15. How many times has this teenager moved from one city, town, or community to another during the course of his or her lifetime? ______

16. How old is the teenager in this study at the present time? ______

17. What type of school does your teenager currently attend?
   1. Special public school (magnet school, etc.)
   2. General public school
   3. Private Catholic school
   4. Private Protestant school
   5. Private non-religious school
   6. Military school
   7. Home school
   9. Other, please specify ____________________________________________

18. List three of your teenager's most significant or time-consuming activities outside of school (these might be school extra-curriculars, paid/volunteer work, church youth group, etc.)
   1. ________________________________________________
   2. ________________________________________________
   3. ________________________________________________
19. What is your family or household's primary religious affiliation?
   1 ___ Protestant
   2 ___ Catholic
   3 ___ Jewish
   4 ___ Muslim
   5 ___ Non-religious
   6 ___ Other, please describe ________________________________

20. What is the official name (as best you can remember it) of your family's primary church, denomination or religious group? (examples: American Baptist, Southern Baptist, Orthodox Jewish, 7th Day Adventist, New Age, Presbyterian, United Methodist, etc.)

21. What arrangements does your family have for the place where you stay?
   1 ___ Rent
   2 ___ Lease, either monthly or seasonal payments
   3 ___ Own with mortgage (are making payments to buy)
   4 ___ Own free and clear, no mortgage
   5 ___ Live with relatives, no housing payment
   6 ___ Housing provided by church, company, etc.
   7 ___ Other, please specify ____________________________________

22. Please give your best estimate of your family's Total Household Annual Income.
   (01) ___ Under $5,000
   (02) ___ $5,000 - $9,999
   (03) ___ $10,000 - $14,999
   (04) ___ $15,000 - $19,999
   (05) ___ $20,000 - $24,999
   (06) ___ $25,000 - $29,999
   (07) ___ $30,000 - $34,999
   (08) ___ $35,000 - $39,999
   (09) ___ $40,000 - $49,999
   (10) ___ $50,000 - $59,999
   (11) ___ $60,000 - $74,999
   (12) ___ $75,000 - $99,999
   (13) ___ $100,000 - $199,999
   (14) ___ $200,000 - $499,999
   (15) ___ $500,000 & over

23. Where does your family currently live?
   1 ___ Rural area or country town (fewer than 500 people)
   2 ___ Small town, 500 to 10,000 people
   3 ___ Mid-sized to large town, 10,000 to fewer than 50,000 people
   4 ___ Small city (not suburb), 50,000 to fewer than 100,000 people
   5 ___ Major suburb of large city (100,000 people or more)
   6 ___ Poor inner-city neighborhood
   7 ___ Affluent central city neighborhood
   8 ___ Transitional neighborhood
   9 ___ Other, please specify ________________________________

24-26. Estimate how many of the following relatives live within an hour's drive of your home?
   24 ___ grandparents
   25 ___ brothers & sisters living independently from you
   26 ___ aunts & uncles, cousins, and other extended family members

27. Who participated in filling out this survey?
   1 ___ Mother completely
   2 ___ Father completely
   3 ___ Mother mostly
   4 ___ Father mostly
   5 ___ Both father & mother equally - we did it together for most of the survey

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
To Fathers: Thanks for volunteering to answer this brief survey! Some questions pertain to your relationship or involvement with your teenager, and some are more personal. Remember, you are encouraged to take this survey privately, the same advice we have given to your other family members. This will make it easier to be completely honest and confident in the way you answer the questions. Be assured that all answers will be kept strictly confidential. After your family's data files are linked, your answers will then be stripped of all names & identification and your data will become completely anonymous.

You & Your Teenager

1. What is your relationship to the teen in your household who is taking this survey?
   1 ___ Natural mother
   2 ___ Stepmother, teenager legally adopted
   3 ___ Stepmother, teenager not legally adopted
   4 ___ Live-in girlfriend to teen's natural father
   5 ___ Other, please explain ___________________________

2-15. During a normal week, how often do you find yourself playing these roles with your teen? Please place a number in the blank which corresponds to the frequency code below.

   1 = almost never  2 = rarely  3 = occasionally  4 = sometimes  5 = very often

How often do you find yourself being a . . .

2. ___ chauffeur . . who plays taxi cab and drives teen around to events
3. ___ companion . . a friend, a buddy to have fun with
4. ___ tutor for school . . to help with homework & getting good grades
5. ___ motivator . . to push teen to set high goals and achieve success
6. ___ policeman . . who gives warnings & disciplines misbehavior, keeps law & order
7. ___ cheerleader . . who watches teen's activities & gives encouragement
8. ___ moral teacher . . who discuss life's important lessons with my teenager
9. ___ antagonist . . who always seems to be arguing with teen, struggling for power
10. ___ fellow laborer . . who works in the trenches, shoulder to shoulder with teen
11. ___ counselor . . who listens to problems, gives advice, or gives a shoulder to cry on
12. ___ lawmaker . . who makes rules, sets guidelines
13. ___ couch potato . . watches TV with teen, unwinds with a good movie or program
14. ___ instructor . . who's always trying to teach teen something new
15. ___ best friend . . who spends time and really gets to know my teenager as a person

16. Please rate the quality of your overall relationship right now with your teenager.
   1. ___ horrible
   2. ___ poor
   3. ___ O.K.
   4. ___ good
   5. ___ very good
   6. ___ excellent

CONTINUED ON BACK - - - - - >
17-31. Circle the number closest to the emotional word choice which best describe how your teen currently responds to you or behaves toward you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Love-affection</th>
<th>Conflictual</th>
<th>Mean-sarcastic</th>
<th>Openness-disclosure</th>
<th>Irritable</th>
<th>Trustful-disclosure</th>
<th>Not angry-calm</th>
<th>Physically aggressive</th>
<th>Controlled</th>
<th>Verbally abusive</th>
<th>Models-imitates me</th>
<th>Tension-strain</th>
<th>Argumentative</th>
<th>Critical</th>
<th>Respect-admiration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dislike-hostility</td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>Kind-constructive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mistrustful-unreliable</td>
<td>Tries to be different from me</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Agreeable</td>
<td>Encouraging</td>
<td>Lack of respect, scorn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. List the three most common activities you do with your teenager during a typical week.

1. ____________________________________________________________
2. _________________________________________________________________________________________
3. __________________________________________________________________________

Employment & Education

33-39. Regarding present employment & work hours, please do the following:

1) Please list all JOBS where you are currently "working" or "performing a task for money?" Include professional education (being a student) as part of any job that requires or encourages this education, or as a separate "job" if the schooling is your choice, perhaps to prepare you for additional job opportunities. Try to give each job both a job title and a description (i.e. master electrician for large company, manager of small business, college student, clerk in grocery store, legal secretary with 10 years seniority, farmer - raise hogs & manage corn on 300 acres .. etc.).

2) Figure up how many "work hours" per week (work hours = time when you are working at a task for the ultimate goal of making money) do you spend at these jobs or tasks? Please consider all commuting hours, work-related reading, take-home office work, etc. in your estimates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job or Employment</th>
<th>Job Title / Task Description</th>
<th>Employed Hours Per Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Primary Job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Second Job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. All Other Jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Work Hours Per Week

40-41 How many of the "Total Work Hours Per Week" stated above are spent . . . ?

40. ______ At home
41. ______ Outside the home (at a place of employment, traveling, etc.)
42. Do you consider yourself as primarily?
   1 ___ self-employed
   2 ___ working for an employer
   3 ___ not employed for pay
   4 ___ other, please describe __________________________

43. If you are "self-employed" or if you are the owner or part-owner of a business
   (including farming), please indicate the approximate annual net income of your business.
   1 ___ under $20,000
   2 ___ $20,000 to $49,999
   3 ___ $50,000 to $99,999
   4 ___ $100,000 to $249,999
   5 ___ $250,000 to $999,999
   6 ___ $1,000,000 or more

44. If you are employed by an employer, how many full-time employees (or their
   equivalent) work for the firm, company or organization you work for?
   1 ___ Fewer than 5 employees
   2 ___ 5-14 employees
   3 ___ 15-49 employees
   4 ___ 50-200 employees
   5 ___ Over 200 employees
   6 ___ None of the above - I'm self-employed
   7 ___ None of the above - I'm presently unemployed
   8 ___ Other, please explain, ________________________________________

45-50. For the following set of questions, please report on how many of the following time
   periods do you currently spend "working" during a normal month? (Write in an
   estimate of times working per month)

   HOW MANY INSTANCES PER MONTH DO YOU WORK . . .
   45. _____ Early mornings on weekdays when my child is preparing for school.
   46. _____ Late afternoons on weekdays when students return from school.
   47. _____ Early evenings on weekdays, (say from about 6 p.m. to 8 p.m.)
   48. _____ Later evenings on weekdays, (say from about 8 p.m. until 11:00 p.m.)
   49. _____ Saturdays for at least half of the day
   50. _____ Sundays for at least half of the day

51. How would you describe your normal weekly work schedule?
   1. _____ Fairly regular and predictable
   2. _____ Somewhat regular and predictable
   3. _____ Not at all regular or predictable

52. Please check the last level of education you have completed
   1. ___ 6th grade or less
   2. ___ 7th grade
   3. ___ 10th grade
   4. ___ 12th grade (high school graduation)
   5. ___ At least one full year of college, or graduation from a two-year college
   6. ___ Four-year college or university graduation, or from professional school
   7. ___ Graduate school experience, but not completion.
   8. ___ Masters degree completion or equivalent, describe if other __________
   9. ___ PhD completion or equivalent, describe if other _______________
53-60. **Interaction Available Time, Per Week**

Please estimate the *number of hours* on each weekday on a typical week *when you and your teenager are home at the same time and awake* (so don't count sleep time!) This isn't necessarily time when you actually do things together, but just *when you are home at the same time*. I know it may change a lot from week to week, but try to think of a typical week. Make sure to include time you are together in the morning, afternoons, evenings, etc. (subtract time when you have to leave again for work, for evening classes, etc.)

**REMEMBER!** This isn't necessarily time when you actually do things together, but just *when you are home at the same time and awake* (again, don't count sleep time)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day of Week</th>
<th>HOURS at home with TEENAGER</th>
<th>NOTES to yourself (do this first to help you figure your time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXAMPLES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>5 hrs</td>
<td>1 hour a.m., <em>we're both home from 5 p.m. on</em> --&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>1 hr.</td>
<td><em>1 hour in morning, my night to work</em> . . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**YOUR TURN!**

53. Monday
54. Tuesday
55. Wednesday
56. Thursday
57. Friday
58. Saturday
59. Sunday

60. **TOTAL HRS** <--- Add up the total number of hours when you are both home at the same time during a typical week.

Continued on Next Page ----->
61-80. **Interaction Time, Per Week**

61. **How much time per week** do you spend on an average doing the following activities **with your teen?** (Note: others may also be present)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Eating meals together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Working around the house together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Working in a family business together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Talking or having a discussion (other than at meal times)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Working on school homework or projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Driving in a car or vehicle together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Events where you participate and parent watches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Doing sports together, exercise or recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Watching school or community athletic events together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Watching T.V., videos, or movies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Playing games, reading, or having quiet recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Shopping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Attending religious services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Attending other community activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Praying together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Reading the Bible, Torah, Koran, etc., or having a time of spiritual reflection together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Working together on a hobby, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

81-87. Please estimate **the number of hours per week** you currently spend at the following non-work community activities.

| 81.   | _____   | Sports events                                 |
| 82.   | _____   | School activities other than sports           |
| 83.   | _____   | Church or religious activities and volunteer work |
| 84.   | _____   | Volunteering for other service organizations (other than church) |
| 85.   | _____   | Club activities                               |
| 86.   | _____   | Community concerts or musical events          |
| 87.   | _____   | Other community events or activities          |

82-84. What are the **three things** you most frequently argue with your teen about?

1. _____________________________________________________________________
2. _____________________________________________________________________
3. _____________________________________________________________________

85-87. What are the **three things** you enjoy most doing with your teen?

1. _____________________________________________________________________
2. _____________________________________________________________________
3. _____________________________________________________________________

THANK YOU!
SURVEY for FATHER
or Male Guardian

To Fathers: Thanks for volunteering to answer this brief survey! Some questions pertain to your relationship or involvement with your teenager, and some are more personal. Remember, you are encouraged to take this survey privately, the same advice we have given to your other family members. This will make it easier to be completely honest and confident in the way you answer the questions. Be assured that all answers will be kept strictly confidential. After your family's data files are linked, your answers will then be stripped of all names & identification and your data will become completely anonymous.

You & Your Teenager

1. What is your relationship to the teen in your household who is taking this survey?
   1  ___ Natural father
   2  ___ Stepfather, teenager legally adopted
   3  ___ Stepfather, teenager not legally adopted
   4  ___ Live-in boyfriend to teen's natural mother
   5  ___ Other, please explain ____________________________

2-15. During a normal week, how often do you find yourself playing these roles with your teen? Please place a number in the blank which corresponds to the frequency code below.

   1 = almost never   2 = rarely   3 = occasionally   4 = sometimes   5 = very often

   How often do you find yourself being a . . .
   2. ___ chauffeur . . who plays taxi cab and drives teen around to events
   3. ___ companion . . a friend, a buddy to have fun with
   4. ___ tutor for school . . to help with homework & getting good grades
   5. ___ motivator . . to push teen to set high goals and achieve success
   6. ___ policeman . . who gives warnings & disciplines misbehavior, keeps law & order
   7. ___ cheerleader . . who watches teen's activities & gives encouragement
   8. ___ moral teacher . . who discuss life's important lessons with my teenager
   9. ___ antagonist . . who always seems to be arguing with teen, struggling for power
  10. ___ fellow laborer . . who works in the trenches, shoulder to shoulder with teen
  11. ___ counselor . . who listens to problems, gives advice, or gives a shoulder to cry on
  12. ___ lawmaker . . who makes rules, sets guidelines
  13. ___ couch potato . . watches TV with teen, unwinds with a good movie or program
  14. ___ instructor . . who's always trying to teach teen something new
  15. ___ best friend . . who spends time and really gets to know my teenager as a person

16. Please rate the quality of your overall relationship right now with your teenager.

   1. ___ horrible
   2. ___ poor
   3. ___ O.K.
   4. ___ good
   5. ___ very good
   6. ___ excellent

CONTINUED ON BACK - - - - - - - >
17-31. Circle the number closest to the emotional word choice which best describe how your teen currently responds to you or behaves toward you.

17. Love-affection 1 2 3 4 5 Dislike-hostility
18. Confictual 1 2 3 4 5 Cooperative
19. Mean-sarcastic 1 2 3 4 5 Kind-constructive
20. Openness-disclosure 1 2 3 4 5 Not open-withdrawn
21. Irritable 1 2 3 4 5 Controlled
22. Trustful-reliable 1 2 3 4 5 Mistrustful-unreliable
23. Not angry-calm 1 2 3 4 5 Angry-explosive
24. Physically aggressive 1 2 3 4 5 Not aggressive-calm
25. Controlled 1 2 3 4 5 Out of control
26. Verbally abusive 1 2 3 4 5 Verbally respectful
27. Models-imitates me 1 2 3 4 5 Tries to be different from me
28. Tension-strain 1 2 3 4 5 Relaxation-comfort
29. Argumentative 1 2 3 4 5 Agreeable
30. Critical 1 2 3 4 5 Encouraging
31. Respect-admiration 1 2 3 4 5 Lack of respect, scorn

32. List the three most common activities you do with your teenager during a typical week.
1. ____________________________________________________________
2. ____________________________________________________________
3. ____________________________________________________________

Employment & Education
33-39. Regarding present employment & work hours, please do the following:
1) Please list all JOBS where you are currently "working" or "performing a task for money?" Include professional education (being a student) as part of any job that requires or encourages this education, or as a separate "job" if the schooling is your choice, perhaps to prepare you for additional job opportunities. Try to give each job both a job title and a description (i.e. master electrician for large company, manager of small business, college student, clerk in grocery store, legal secretary with 10 years seniority, farmer - raise hogs & manage corn on 300 acres ... etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job or Employment</th>
<th>Employed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Title / Task Description</td>
<td>Hours Per Week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Primary Job
2. Second Job
3. All Other Jobs

Total Work Hours Per Week

40-41. How many of the "Total Work Hours Per Week" stated above are spent ... ?
40. _____ At home
41. _____ Outside the home (at a place of employment, traveling, etc.)
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42. Do you consider yourself as primarily?
1. self-employed
2. working for an employer
3. not employed for pay
4. other, please describe ___________________________

43. If you are "self-employed" or if you are the owner or a partner in a business (including farming), please indicate the approximate gross revenue of your business.
1. under $20,000
2. $20,000 to $49,999
3. $50,000 to $99,999
4. $100,000 to $249,999
5. $250,000 to $999,999
6. $1,000,000 or more

44. If you are employed by an employer, how many full-time employees (or their equivalent) work for the firm, company or organization you work for?
1. Fewer than 5 employees
2. 5-14 employees
3. 15-49 employees
4. 50-200 employees
5. Over 200 employees
6. None of the above - I'm self-employed
7. None of the above - I'm presently unemployed
8. Other, please explain, ___________________________

45-50. For the following set of questions, please report on how many of the following time periods do you currently spend “working” during a normal month? (Write in an estimate of times working per month)

HOW MANY INSTANCES PER MONTH DO YOU WORK . . .
45. ______ Early mornings on weekdays when my child is preparing for school.
46. ______ Late afternoons on weekdays when students return from school.
47. ______ Early evenings on weekdays, (say from about 6 p.m. to 8 p.m.)
48. ______ Later evenings on weekdays, (say from about 8 p.m. until 11:00 p.m.)
49. ______ Saturdays for at least half of the day
50. ______ Sundays for at least half of the day

51. How would you describe your normal weekly work schedule?
1. ______ Fairly regular and predictable
2. ______ Somewhat regular and predictable
3. ______ Not at all regular or predictable

52. Please check the last level of education you have completed
1. 6th grade or less
2. 7th grade
3. 10th grade
4. 12th grade (high school graduation)
5. At least one full year of college, or graduation from a two-year college
6. Four-year college or university graduation, or from professional school
7. Graduate school experience, but not completion.
8. Masters degree completion or equivalent, describe if other _______________
9. PhD completion or equivalent, describe if other _______________
53-60. **Interaction Available Time, Per Week**

Please estimate the **number of hours** on each weekday on a typical week **when you and your teenager are home at the same time and awake** (so don't count sleep time!) This isn't necessarily time when you actually do things together, but just **when you are home at the same time**. I know it may change a lot from week to week, but try to think of a typical week. Make sure to include time you are together in the morning, afternoons, evenings, etc. (subtract time when you have to leave again for work, for evening classes, etc.)

**REMEMBER!** This isn't necessarily time when you actually do things together, but just **when you are home at the same time and awake** (again, don't count sleep time)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day of Week</th>
<th>HOURS at home</th>
<th>NOTES to yourself (do this first to help you figure your time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>5 hrs</td>
<td>1 hour a.m., + we're both home from 5 p.m. on --&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>1 hr.</td>
<td>1 hour in morning, my night to work . . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**YOUR TURN!**

53. Monday  
54. Tuesday  
55. Wednesday  
56. Thursday  
57. Friday  
58. Saturday  
59. Sunday  

60. **TOTAL HRS**  

<--- Add up the total number of hours when you are both home at the same time during a typical week.

Continued on Next Page ---->
61-80. **Interaction Time, Per Week**

61. How much time per week do you spend on an average doing the following activities with your teen? (Note: others may also be present)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eating meals together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Working around the house together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Working in a family business together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Talking or having a discussion (other than at meal times)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Working on school homework or projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Driving in a car or vehicle together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Events where you participate and parent watches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Doing sports together, exercise or recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Watching school or community athletic events together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Watching T.V., videos, or movies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Playing games, reading, or having quiet recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shopping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attending religious services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attending other community activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Praying together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading the Bible, Torah, Koran, etc., or having a time of spiritual reflection together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Working together on a hobby, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

81-87. Please estimate the number of hours per week you currently spend at the following non-work community activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>Sports events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>School activities other than sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>Church or religious activities and volunteer work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>Volunteering for other service organizations (other than church)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>Club activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>Community concerts or musical events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>Other community events or activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

82-84. What are the three things you most frequently argue with your teen about?

1. __________________________
2. __________________________
3. __________________________

85-87. What are the three things you enjoy most doing with your teen?

1. __________________________
2. __________________________
3. __________________________

THANK YOU!
Hi! Thanks for agreeing to fill out this survey. I hope you find it interesting and enjoyable. Please take your time and answer each question carefully.

Please check or write in the correct answer
1. Are you:
   1  ____ Male
   2  ____ Female

2. Please write in your current age: ______

3. Which child are YOU in the family line-up? (check only one)
   0  the only child
   1  ____ the first or eldest child (with at least one brother or sister)
   2  ____ a middle child
   3  ____ the last or youngest child

4. Do you stay in this home/household all of the time, or do you stay in another home/household at least sometimes?
   1  ____ I live in this household ALL OF THE TIME.
   2  ____ I sometimes live or visit another household. Please describe which other household you sometimes visit (for instance, you might go to see your natural mother, natural father, etc.) and describe how often you go there

Time per Week with Your Mother
5. How many hours per week would you say you and your mother are usually home at the same time (and awake! - do not count "sleep time") during a normal week? ______ hours.

6. How many hours per week would you say you and your mother are usually at a location other than home at the same time (for instance, at church, at a sports events, lessons, driving around, in a family business, etc.) during a normal week? ______ hours.

7-8 How many of the above hours per week when you are both awake and at the same location (home or elsewhere) do you spend with your mother
   7. _____ interacting together (that is, doing things together such as eating, studying, talking, watching T.V., arguing, playing games, etc.)
   8. _____ not interacting, even though you are both at the same location

CONTINUED ON BACK ->
Time per Week with Your Father

9. How many hours per week would you say you and your father are usually home at the same time (and awake! - do not count "sleep time") during a normal week? _____ hours.

10. How many hours per week would you say you and your father are usually at a location other than home at the same time (for instance, at church, at a sports events, lessons, driving around, in a family business, etc.) during a normal week? _____ hours.

11-12. How many of the above hours per week when you are both awake and at the same location (home or elsewhere) do you spend with your father

11. _____ interacting together (that is, doing things together such as eating, studying, talking, watching T.V., arguing, playing games, etc.)

12. _____ not interacting, even though you are both at the same location

Time with Your Friends

13. On an average, from after school until suppertime, how many afternoons in a 5-day school week do you spend with friends? (doing things other than organized sports or school events)

0. ___ Less than once a week
1. ___ One afternoon per week
2. ___ Two afternoons per week
3. ___ Three afternoons per week
4. ___ Four afternoons per week
5. ___ Five afternoons per week

14. On an average, how many evenings in a 5-day school week do you spend with friends? (doing things other than sports or organized school events)

0. ___ Less than one per week
1. ___ One evening per week
2. ___ Two evenings per week
3. ___ Three evenings per week
4. ___ Four evenings per week
5. ___ Five evenings per week

15. On an average, how much time on weekends do you spend with friends? (doing things other than sports or organized school events)

1. ___ Very little
2. ___ Not too much
3. ___ Some
4. ___ Quite a bit
5. ___ A great deal
Time with Your Parents

16. On an average, from after school until suppertime, how many afternoons in a 5-day school week do you spend with parents?
0. ___ Less than once a week
1. ___ One afternoon per week
2. ___ Two afternoons per week
3. ___ Three afternoons per week
4. ___ Four afternoons per week
5. ___ Five afternoons per week

17. On an average, how many evenings in a 5-day school week do you spend with parents?
0. ___ Less than one per week
1. ___ One evening per week
2. ___ Two evenings per week
3. ___ Three evenings per week
4. ___ Four evenings per week
5. ___ Five evenings per week

18. On an average, how much time on weekends do you spend with parents?
1. ___ Very little
2. ___ Not too much
3. ___ Some
4. ___ Quite a bit
5. ___ A great deal

Time at Work, School or Community Events

19-21. Please estimate the number of hours per week you currently spend
19. _____ working for pay in a business that your family runs
20. _____ working without getting paid in a business that your family runs
21. _____ working for pay at any other job or jobs outside of the home

22-29. Please estimate the number of hours per week you currently spend at the following school or community activities.
22. _____ Extra-curricular school sports
23. _____ Extra-curricular school musical groups or events
24. _____ Extra-curricular school activities other than sports or music
25. _____ Church activities or church volunteer work
26. _____ Volunteering for other service organizations
27. _____ Community clubs
28. _____ Community concerts or musical events
29. _____ Other community events or activities
30-36. **Interaction Available Time Per Week**

Please estimate the number of hours on each weekday on a typical week when you and your mother and father are home at the same time and awake (so don't count sleep time!) This isn't necessarily time when you actually do things together, but just when you are home at the same time.

**REMEMBER!** This isn't necessarily time when you actually do things together, but just when you are home at the same time and awake (do not count sleep time).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day of Week</th>
<th>HOURS at home with MOM</th>
<th>HOURS at home with DAD</th>
<th>NOTES to yourself (do this first to help you figure your time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXAMPLES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>5 hrs</td>
<td>1 hr</td>
<td>Dad works in the evening on Mondays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>2.5 hrs</td>
<td>4 hrs</td>
<td>Mom has aerobics in the evening</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**YOUR TURN!**

30. Monday
31. Tuesday
32. Wednesday
33. Thursday
34. Friday
35. Saturday
36. Sunday

37-45. How many of the following meals per week do you eat with your mother, father, or your whole family? (Write in a number per week on each line)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meals</th>
<th>With Mom</th>
<th>With Dad</th>
<th>With Whole Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37-39. Breakfasts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-42. Lunches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-45. Suppers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-48. TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Things you like to do with your family**

49. What are some things you enjoy doing with your family that you do with them on a regular basis?
50. What are some things you enjoy doing with your family that you do on an occasional basis? (that is, from time to time, such as every few week, months, during summers, etc.)

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

Things you do not like to do with your family
51. What are some things you do not enjoy doing with your family that you do with them on a regular basis?

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

52. What are some things you do not enjoy doing with your family that you do on an occasional basis? (that is, from time to time, such as every few week, months, during summers, etc.)

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

Other questions about your family
53-55. What would you say are the three best examples of quality family time you have ever done or experienced with your family?

1. _______________________________________________________________________

2. _______________________________________________________________________

3. _______________________________________________________________________

56. In general, how do you regard the time you spend with your family?

1. _____ Enjoy very much
2. _____ Enjoy somewhat
3. _____ Not sure
4. _____ Do not enjoy very much
5. _____ Dislike greatly
About your Parents

57. Please describe the quality of the relationship between your "parents" (or the adults who serve as your parents who now live with you)

0 ____ not applicable, one parent deceased or divorced and never visits
1 ____ "excellent," they get along great almost all the time
2 ____ "good," they get along fine, with occasional but minor problems
3 ____ "average," they get along OK, but have moderate conflict or problems
4 ____ "fair," they tolerate each other somewhat, but have many significant problems
5 ____ "poor," they can't stand each other, and have a very troubled relationship
6 ____ OTHER, please describe

About You & Your Mother

58-60. List the three most common activities you do with your mother during a typical week.

1. ____________________________________________________________________________
2. ____________________________________________________________________________
3. ____________________________________________________________________________

61. How much time per week do you spend on an average doing the following activities with your mother? (Note: others may also be present)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eating meals together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Working around the house together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Working in a family business together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talking or having a discussion (other than at meal times)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Working on school homework or projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Driving in a car or vehicle together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Events where you participate and parent watches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doing sports together, exercise or recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Watching school or community athletic events together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Watching T.V., videos, or movies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Playing games, reading, or having quiet recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shopping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attending religious services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attending other community activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Praying together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading the Bible, Torah, Koran, etc., or having a time of spiritual reflection together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Working together on a hobby, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
81-83. What are the **three things** you most frequently argue with your **mother** about?

1. ____________________________________________________________________________

2. ____________________________________________________________________________

3. ____________________________________________________________________________

84-86. What are the **three things** you enjoy most doing with your **mother**?

1. ____________________________________________________________________________

2. ____________________________________________________________________________

3. ____________________________________________________________________________

87-100. Circle the number closest to the emotional word choice which best describe how your **mother** currently responds to you or behaves toward you.

87. **She loves me**

   1. She doesn’t love me

88. **She is too strict and not fair with her discipline**

   1. She is not overly strict and very fair with her discipline

89. **She understands me**

   1. She doesn’t understand me at all

90. **She is mean**

   1. She is kind toward me

91. **She displays affection toward me**

   1. She does not display affection toward me

92. **She does not lose her temper with me**

   1. She often gets very angry with me

93. **She cuts me down verbally**

   1. She compliments me often

94. **She hits me or gets too physical sometimes**

   1. She never hits me or gets too physical

95. **She respects me**

   1. She doesn’t think much of me

96. **We argue a lot**

   1. We agree about most things

97. **I feel I can really talk to her if I need to**

   1. I do not feel like I can talk to her if I need to

98. **We do not get along well**

   1. We get along together just fine

99. Please rate the quality of your overall relationship right now with your **mother**.

   1. _____ horrible

   2. _____ poor

   3. _____ O.K.

   4. _____ good

   5. _____ very good

   6. _____ excellent

100-102. If you had to list **three things about your mother** which have had the **greatest influence on your relationship** to her, what would they be?

1. ____________________________________________________________________________

2. ____________________________________________________________________________

3. ____________________________________________________________________________
103-105. If you had to list three events which have had the greatest influence on your relationship to your mother, what would they be?

1. __________________________________________________________________________

2. __________________________________________________________________________

3. __________________________________________________________________________

106. In general, how do you regard the time you spend with your mother?

1. ___ Enjoy very much
2. ___ Enjoy somewhat
3. ___ Not sure
4. ___ Do not enjoy very much
5. ___ Dislike greatly

About You & Your Father

107-109. List the three most common activities you do with your father during a typical week.

1. __________________________________________________________________________

2. __________________________________________________________________________

3. __________________________________________________________________________

110-129. How much time per week do you spend on an average doing the following activities with your father? (Note: others may also be present)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eating meals together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Working around the house together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Working in a family business together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talking or having a discussion (other than at meal times)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Working on school homework or projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Driving in a car or vehicle together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Events where you participate and parent watches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doing sports together, exercise or recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Watching school or community athletic events together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Watching T.V., videos, or movies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Playing games, reading, or having quiet recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shopping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attending religious services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attending other community activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Praying together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading the Bible, Torah, Koran, etc., or having a time of spiritual reflection together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Working together on a hobby, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
130-132. What are the **three things** you most frequently argue with your **father** about?
1. ____________________________________________
2. ____________________________________________
3. ____________________________________________

133-135. What are the **three things** you enjoy most doing with your **father**?
1. ____________________________________________
2. ____________________________________________
3. ____________________________________________

136-147. Circle the number closest to the emotional word choice which best describe how your 
**father** currently responds to you or behaves toward you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>136. He loves me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137. He is too strict and not fair with his discipline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138. He understands me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139. He is mean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140. He displays affection toward me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141. He does not lose her temper with me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142. He cuts me down verbally</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143. He hits me or gets too physical sometimes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144. He respects me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145. We argue a lot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146. I feel I can really talk to him if I need to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147. We do not get along well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

148. Please rate the quality of your overall relationship right now with your **father**.
1. _____ horrible
2. _____ poor
3. _____ O.K.
4. _____ good
5. _____ very good
6. _____ excellent
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149-151. If you had to list three things about your father which have had the greatest influence on your relationship to him, what would they be?

1. 

2. 

3. 

152-154. If you had to list three events which have had the greatest influence on your relationship to your father, what would they be?

1. 

2. 

3. 

155. In general, how do you regard the time you spend with your father?

1. _____ Enjoy very much
2. _____ Enjoy somewhat
3. _____ Not sure
4. _____ Do not enjoy very much
5. _____ Dislike greatly

THANK-YOU!
Appendix F

Phone Interview Cue Sheet
Phone Interview CUE Sheet
For Weekend Interviews

Weekend Interview Questions
1. Please tell me about each activity you did with your parent/teen today.
2. Describe to me (in hours or minutes) about how long each activity took.
3. Who was the primary person you did this activity with? Who else was there?
4. For each activity, what other kinds of things did you do within that activity? (For instance, during a meal, or a drive in the car, you might have a conversation about local politics, school activities, etc.) What percent of the activity did you devote each of these things? Describe a little bit about each activity.

5. LIST OF ROLES. Assign to yourself and to your parent/teen one of the following roles for each activity you did together, by percent.
   1. _____ passive companion .. a friend to be with, relax and hang out with
   2. _____ active companion .. a friend to do things with, a buddy to have fun with
   3. _____ chauffeur .. who plays taxi cab and drives the other around to events
   4. _____ tutor for school .. to help with homework & getting good grades
   5. _____ dreamer .. who imagines with the other all of life's possibilities
   6. _____ motivator .. to push the other to set high goals and achieve success
   7. _____ servant .. who takes care of the others' needs
   8. _____ boss .. who tells the other what to do
   9. _____ lawmaker .. who makes rules, sets guidelines
   10. _____ policeman .. who gives warnings & disciplines misbehavior, keeps law & order
   11. _____ cheerleader .. who watches activities & gives encouragement
   12. _____ moral teacher .. who discusses life's important lessons
   13. _____ fellow laborer .. who works in the trenches, shoulder to shoulder
   14. _____ counselor .. who listens to problems, gives advice, or gives a shoulder to cry on
   15. _____ instructor .. who's always trying to teach teen some new idea, skill or ability
   16. _____ best friend .. who spends time and really gets to know my teenager as a person
   17. _____ OTHER? Please describe __________________________________________
   18. _____ OTHER? Please describe __________________________________________

Please rate this activity in regard to the following concepts or qualities.

6. Passive interaction 1 2 3 4 5 Very active interaction
7. Very negative 1 2 3 4 5 Very positive
8. Not at all supportive 1 2 3 4 5 Very Supportive
9. Didn't get along at all 1 2 3 4 5 Got along very well
10. Not Very Important 1 2 3 4 5 Very Important

11. Were there any type of strong emotions communicated or felt during this activity, such as happiness, sadness, anger, fear, irritation, gentleness, love, etc.? Explain.

12. In your view, what exactly was significant or important about this activity, if anything?
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