The Relationship between Self-Construal and Parenting Practices

Michaela Herbig
michaela_herbig@mymail.eku.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://encompass.eku.edu/ugra

Michaela Herbig

The Relationship between Self-Construal and Parenting Practices

Eastern Kentucky University

Two studies examined the link between participants' physical and relational self-construal, and their physical and relational parenting practices. We predicted that the type of self-construal would correlate with the corresponding type of parenting practices when participants thought about parenting hypothetically (Study 1) and 5n their own lives (Study 2). Participants completed an online survey that assessed their self-construal and their hypothetical or actual parenting practices. For hypothetical parenting, physical self-construal correlated positively with both physical and relational parenting practices. For actual parenting, relational self-construal and parenting practices were correlated positively. Experience in parenting influenced participants to show greater consistency between their relational self-construal and their relational parenting practices than they showed when thinking about parenting hypothetically.

The Relationship between Self-Construal and Parenting Practices

Parents are among the most influential people in a child's life. They are the primary source of love, support, and discipline for young children. Individuals parent in various ways. Two ways that stand out in particular are a physical and a relational style. A *physical style* of parenting can be defined as guidance that uses the physical body, whereas a *relational style* would use guidance toward enhancing the relationship between the parent and child. For example, when a family is at dinner and the child begins standing on his/her chair, a parent could react either physically or relationally. A physical approach of parenting would involve removing the child from the situation and spanking him/her. In contrast, a parent with a relational style of parenting would discuss the problem with the child and try to negotiate with the child to make him/her behave. Also, if a child was being bullied by his/her friends, a parent with a physical approach to parenting would teach the child to fight and not seem inferior, whereas a relational parenting approach would instruct the child to try to rekindle the friendship.

Differences in parental decisions might be linked to how the parent defines him/herself. Cross and Madson (1997) found that the self is a source of human agency and choice, and it negotiates the interaction between person and society. Therefore, the way that someone defines him/herself has implications for the way that one thinks, feels, and believes. The purpose of the current research is to examine the link between *self-construal*, the way that an individual defines him/herself, and child-rearing practices.

A large body of research has examined the various ways in which parents react to situations (for review see Mackler, Kelleher, Shanahan, Calkins, Keane, & O'Brien, 2015). Baumrind's (1971) seminal longitudinal research resulted in a model with three distinct parenting styles: authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive. An *authoritative parent* directs the

child's activities in a rational manner. She/he encourages verbal give and take, and shares the reasoning behind rules. Conversely, an *authoritarian parent* attempts to shape, control, and evaluate the behavior of the child in accordance with a set standard of behavior. The *permissive parent* tries to behave in an acceptant and affirmative manner toward the child's actions. S/he consults with the child about policy decisions and gives explanations for rules.

Gfroerer, Kern, Curlette, White, and Jonyniené (2011) asked both parents to complete the BASIS-A Inventory and the Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ). Each child participant was asked to complete the Psychological Birth Order Inventory (PBOl), the BASIS-A Inventory, and the Parental Authority Questionnaire. Their findings indicated that in order to practice an authoritative style of parenting, it is necessary to feel comfortable with conflict. Adolescents who perceive their mothers as authoritative tend to feel a sense of belonging and connection to others, and tend to be success-oriented.

The authoritarian parenting style values unquestioned obedience and favors forceful measures (Baumrind, 1971). These parents are not perceived as particularly warm or affectionate by their children (Gfroerer et al., 2011).

However, a permissive parent makes few demands for responsibility and orderly behavior, and allows the child to regulate activities with little or no control. Gfroerer et al. (2011) described that parents who view their parenting style as permissive also may feel a sense of isolation at times, avoid conflict, be less success-oriented, have difficulty getting feedback and pleasing others, lack of social skills, and not value rules. The Parent Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) for assessing the parenting styles exercised by both mothers and fathers (Buri, 1991). The PAQ has acceptable test-retest reliability and internal consistency reliability. It also has discriminant-related validity and criterion-related validity.

Child-rearing practices are related to the parent's personality. The Five Factor Model of Personality (Neuroticism, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Openness, and Conscientiousness) is a recognized framework for studying personality. Belsky, Crnic, and Woodworth's (1995) findings suggest that mothers and fathers scoring high on Neuroticism have less positive emotions, are less sensitive, and are less cognitively stimulating. Further, the authors suggested that highly neurotic parents are more affectively negative and more intrusive than other parents. Previous research also found that fathers with high Neuroticism scores adopted a more forceful discipline style than did fathers with lower scores (Kochanska, Aksan, Penney, & Boldt, 2007). Extraverted and agreeable mothers and fathers, in contrast, are more positively affective, sensitive, and cognitively stimulating in their interactions with their children. Mothers who scored low on Extraversion adopted a power assertive style of discipline, whereas mothers high on Extraversion did not (Kochanska et al., 2007). Mothers with very high levels of agreeableness exhibited slightly elevated levels of observed *differential negativity*, one child experienced more parental hostility and negative affectivity compared to his/her siblings (Browne, Meunier, O'Connor, & Jenkins, 2012).

Mothering was consistently predicted by Agreeableness, and fathering by Extraversion. For both parents, Neuroticism most consistently influenced mood, hassles, and parenting (Belsky et al., 1995). Mothering processes may be more affected by women's personality traits because mothers usually do most of the parenting. In Western society, men remain more likely to define themselves in terms of their work and women in terms of their family roles, so personality ends up being more predictive of mothering styles than of fathering.

As previously stated, numerous studies have investigated the relationship between parenting styles and personality. Neuroticism is associated with parents that did not display

sensitive responsiveness, while agreeable and extroverted parents are more sensitive to their child's needs. To date, however, no research has examined the link between one's self-construal and parenting style.

The self can be construed, interpreted, or theoretically represented in various ways. Some believe that the individual is the primary unit of consciousness, while others consider that the sense of belongingness to a social relation may become so strong that the relationship is the main unit of conscious reflection. People differ on how others are represented in relation to the self, and the degree to which they see themselves as separate or connected with others (Markus & Kityama, 1991). The idea of the self as an autonomous, expressive person is referred to as the *independent self-construal*, which is common to a majority of the Western cultures. Under this view the self is assumed to be a complete, whole, autonomous entity, without the others (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). For these individuals, standing out, being better than others on self-defining domains will contribute to enhanced self-esteem (Cross, Bacon, & Morris, 2000). On the other hand, a different view of the relationship between the self and others as connected, and the self as less differentiated from others is called the *interdependent self-construal*, which is typically found in most non-Western cultures (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). For *interdependent self-construal*, positive feelings arise from developing and maintaining close relationships with others (Cross et al., 2000). The distinctions made between independent and interdependent construals must be considered as general tendencies between whole cultures (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Self-construal has been shaped and formed through gendered social interactions, gender-typed social roles, and gender-related expectations. Women are more likely to exhibit an interdependent self-construal, whereas men are more likely to display an independent self-construal (Cross & Madson, 1997; Cross, Bacon, & Morris, 2000). Women are more likely than

men in American society to construct an interdependent or relational self-view (Cross, Bacon, & Morris, 2000; Cross & Madson, 1997; Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

However, interdependent and independent self-construals are not the only way that one can define their self. *Physical self-construal* is the tendency to define oneself based on the physical body and its capabilities. This concept has not been studied in depth in past research. The type of self-construal one has affects their life and decision making, such as aggression. Researchers recently began to distinguish between relational and physical aggression. *Relational aggression* focuses on harming others by damaging others' social relationships, and *physical aggression* is physical violence that can be seen through punches, slaps, or kicking (Risser, 2013; Li, Putallaz, & Su, 2011). Studies suggest that males display more physical aggression, and less relational aggression than females (Azam & Aftab, 2012; Crapanzano et al., 2010; Risser, 2013). Aggression is only one aspect in which self-construal affects daily life. Gore and Dean (2015) found that men and athletes have a higher physical self-construal than women and non-athletes.

If a parent with a physical self-construal contracted influenza, s/he would feel no pressure to get better to take care of the family. Physical parents would focus on their body recovering for optimal use. On the other hand, a parent with a relational or interdependent approach would become upset about the situation, and hate being sick because they would not able to take care of their family.

Previous research has not yet studied the link between self-construal and child-rearing practices. Studies also have not investigated the extent to which physical self-construal guides a person's attitudes, emotions and behaviors. The current study will measure one's self-construal and follow up with hypothetical statements in which participants will make important parental decisions. This could help to explain why fathers are more engaged in physical play, want their

children to be active in sports, and are more accepting of violent videogames than mothers. It

could also assist in explaining mothers' relational, less physical interactions. The current

research hypothesizes that physical self-construal will be positively correlated with physical

practices in child rearing, and relational self-construal will be positively associated with

interpersonal practices in child-rearing. This research consisted of two studies that had different

types of participants. Participants in the first study were college students, most of which were not

parents. The second study consisted of a sample of all parents.

Study 1

Method

Participants

One hundred-twenty psychology students (N =120) at Eastern Kentucky University, a

rural state university, participated in the study. All of the students were over the age of 18 in

order to give informed consent (Appendix A). The students received course credit through the

SONA program online.

Materials

Relational Self-Construal. The 11-item Relational Interdependent Self-Construal

(RISC) scale (Cross, et al., 2000) was used to measure an individual's tendency to include close

relationships in one's self-definition (Appendix B). The scale correlates moderately with the

Clark, Ouellette, Powell, and Millberg (1987) Communal Orientation Scale ($r = .41$), Singelis'

(1994) Interdependent Self-Construal Scale ($r = .41$), and Davis' (1980) Empathic Concern Scale

($r = .34$) (Cross et al., 2000). Cross et al. (2000) also found the RISC scale to have acceptable

test-retest reliability (r's > .70 over one month, r's > .60 over two months), and discriminant

validity with other measures, such as the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne &

Marlowe, 1960). Previous research using the RISC scale showed positive correlations with measures of social support and relationship closeness, but little or no association with measures of self-esteem and psychological well-being (Cross, Gore, & Morris, 2003; Cross & Morris, 2003). Although the RISC is related to other measures of collectivism, it is not identical to the measures. It only shows moderate correlations with other scales and appropriate discriminant validity with other measures. The response format will on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree).

Physical Self-Construal. The 20-item Physical Self-Construal scale was used to measure an individual's tendency to define oneself based on the physical body and its capabilities (Appendix C). This scale has acceptable reliability, and is distinct from the other forms of self-construal (for review see Gore & Dean, 2015). The response format will be on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree).

Parenting Practices. This measure consisted of 10 hypothetical parenting scenarios in which the participant chose between a relational, physical, and neutral option for each question (Appendix D).

Demographic Form. This form asked some background questions on the participant (Appendix E).

Procedure

Participants voluntarily completed the survey online. They read the consent form and if they wished to consent to the conditions of the study, they will clicked "I consent." The participants were first exposed to the 10-item parental practices, and selected the option that best described him/her for each. Then participants were given both self-construal measures and

instructed to select the option that best defined him/her for each. This concluded the survey, and the participants were given a debriefing form (Appendix F).

Study 2

Method

Participants

One hundred-seventy parents (N =170), participated in the study. All of the participants were over the age of 18 in order to legally give informed consent (Appendix A). The participants were recruited through Mechanical Turk and each were given $0.50 for completing the study.

Materials

Relational Self-Construal. The 11-item Relational Interdependent Self-Construal (RISC) scale (Cross, et al., 2000) was used to measure an individual's tendency to include close relationships in one's self-definition (Appendix B). The scale correlates moderately with the Clark, Ouellette, Powell, and Millberg (1987) Communal Orientation Scale ($r = .41$), Singelis' (1994) Interdependent Self-Construal Scale ($r = .41$), and Davis' (1980) Empathic Concern Scale ($r = .34$) (Cross et al., 2000). Cross et al. (2000) also found the RISC scale to have acceptable test-retest reliability (r's > .70 over one month, r's > .60 over two months), and discriminant validity with other measures, such as the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). Previous research using the RISC scale showed positive correlations with measures of social support and relationship closeness, but little or no association with measures of self-esteem and psychological well-being (Cross, Gore, & Morris, 2003; Cross & Morris, 2003). Although the RISC is related to other measures of collectivism, it is not identical to the measures. It only shows moderate correlations with other scales and appropriate discriminant

validity with other measures. The response format will on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree).

Physical Self-Construal. The 20-item Physical Self-Construal scale was used to measure an individual's tendency to define oneself based on the physical body and its capabilities (Appendix C). This scale has acceptable reliability, and is distinct from the other forms of self-construal (for review see Gore & Dean, 2015). The response format will be on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree).

Parenting Practices. This measure consisted of 10 hypothetical parenting scenarios in which the participant chose between a relational, physical, and neutral option for each question (Appendix D). They were instructed to choose the option that they would be most likely to implement in their own children.

Demographic Form. This form asked some background questions on the participant (Appendix E).

Procedure

Participants voluntarily completed the survey online through Mechanical Turk. They read the consent form and if they wished to consent to the conditions of the study, they will clicked "I consent." The participants were first exposed to the 10-item parental practices, and selected the option that best described his/her parenting actions for each. Then participants were given both self-construal measures and instructed to select the option that best defined him/her. This concluded the survey, and the participants were given a debriefing form (Appendix F).

Results

An average rating across items was computed to create a Relational Self-Construal score and a Physical Self-Construal score. The number of relational and physical options selected for

Relational Parenting and Physical Parenting were totaled. T-tests, bivariate correlational tests and partial correlational tests were used to interpret the four different scores. Sex of the parent, parenthood, age, and sex of the children were also taken into account.

Study 1

Analyses involved separate independent samples t-tests for males and females compared to self-construal, and scenario choices. Females made a relational choice in the parenting scenarios more (M = 3.53, SD = 1.43) than males (M = 2.64, SD = 1.61), $t(118) = -2.80$, $p < .01$. Males had higher physical self-construal scores ($M = 3.34$, $SD = 0.51$) compared to females ($M = 3.12$, $SD = 0.48$), $t(118) = 2.06$, $p < .05$. Males also made a physical choice in the parenting scenarios more often (M = 3.89, SD = 1.47) than females (M = 3.29, SD = 1.28), $t(118) = 2.09$, $p < .05$.

Another independent samples t-test was analyzed for parents and nonparents compared to self-construal, and scenario choices. Nonparents had higher physical self-construal scores ($M = 3.24$, $SD = 0.50$) compared to parents ($M = 2.98$, $SD = 0.40$), $t(117) = 2.62$, $p \leq .01$. Nonparents also made a physical choice in the parenting scenarios more often (M = 3.62, SD = 1.34) than parents (M = 2.93, SD = 1.26), $t(117) = 2.46$, $p < .05$.

To examine the association between relational and physical self-construal, and relational and physical choices, bivariate correlation analyses were conducted among the four variables. The results showed that relational self-construal and physical self-construal were positively associated with each other ($r = .25$, $p < .01$). Physical self-construal was also positively linked to physical choices ($r = .40$, $p < .001$), whereas physical self-construal was negatively correlated with relational choices ($r = -.15$, $p < .05$). Although we hypothesized that relational self-

construal would be correlated to relational choices, we found that it was not ($r = .08$, ns),

however, relational self-construal was correlated with physical choices ($r = .22$, $p < .01$).

To test the hypothesis that physical self-construal is positively associated with physical

choices controlling for sex, a partial correlation analysis was conducted. The results showed that

physical self-construal and physical choices were significantly associated while accounting for

sex ($r = .38$, $p < .001$). Another partial correlation analysis was conducted for the same link

while controlling for parenthood. The results showed that physical self-construal and physical

choices were significantly associated while accounting for parenthood ($r = .36$, $p < .001$). A final

partial correlation analysis was conducted for the same relationship while controlling for sex and

parenthood. The results showed that physical self-construal and physical choices were

significantly related while accounting for sex and parenthood ($r = .34$, $p < .001$).

Study 2

Analyses involved separate independent samples t-tests for males and females compared

to self-construal, and scenario choices. Contrary to our prediction, females had higher physical

self-construal scores ($M = 3.34$, $SD = 0.58$) compared to males ($M = 3.15$, $SD = 0.61$), $t(168) = $ -

2.01, $p < .05$. There were no other differences.

To examine the relationship between relational and physical self-construal, and relational

and physical choices, bivariate correlation analyses were conducted among the four variables.

The results showed that relational self-construal and physical self-construal were positively

associated with each other ($r = .23$, $p = .001$). Physical self-construal was positively correlated

with physical parenting choices ($r = .13$, $p < .05$) which supports the hypothesis. Physical self-

construal was also positively correlated with relational choices ($r = .23$, $p = .001$) which conflicts

with the hypothesis. Relational self-construal was positively correlated with relational parenting

choices ($r = .26$, $p < .001$), and negatively correlated with physical choices ($r = -.15$, $p < .05$) which supports the hypothesis.

To examine the relationship between relational self-construal, physical self-construal, relational parenting choices, physical choices, and age bivariate correlation analyses were conducted. The analyses showed that age and physical self-construal are negatively correlated ($r = -.20$, $p < .01$).

Bivariate analyses were conducted to examine the relationship between relational self-construal, physical self-construal, relational parenting choices, physical choices, and male and female children. These revealed that relational self-construal is negatively correlated with male children ($r = -.13$, $p < .05$). It also indicated that physical parenting choices are positively correlated with male children ($r = .14$, $p < .05$).

To test the hypothesis that physical self-construal is positively associated with physical choices controlling for sex, a partial correlation analysis was conducted. The results showed that physical self-construal and physical choices were positively associated while accounting for sex ($r = .13$, $p < .05$). Another partial correlation analysis was conducted to test the hypothesis that relational self-construal is positively associated with relational choices while controlling for sex ($r = .26$, $p < .001$), which supports the hypothesis.

A partial correlation analysis was implemented for the self-construal and parenting choices variables while controlling for age. The analysis showed that relational self-construal and relational choices were positively associated while accounting for age ($r = .26$, $p < .001$). Relational self-construal was negatively associated with physical parenting choices while accounting for age ($r = -.15$, $p < .05$). Physical self-construal and physical parenting choices did not stay significantly correlated when controlling for age ($r = .12$, ns).

Discussion

These studies examined the association between self-construal and child-rearing practices. The studies examined the relations between both types of self-construal and both types of parental choices on a newly formed measure. These studies also assessed parental, gender, ethnicity, and age differences in these relationships. It was hypothesized that relational self-construal and relational parenting choices would be positively correlated and that physical self-construal would be positively correlated with physical parenting choices.

Consistent with our hypothesis, analyses from this study found that physical self-construal was positively associated with physical parenting choices, and negatively associated with relational parenting choices. The associations were still significant when controlling for sex and parenthood of the participant. This means that people with a high physical self-construal, when thinking of themselves as parents, expected to be more likely to raise their child using values focusing on control of the child's body and disciplining their child based on such physical values, than with interpersonal child-rearing practices. For example, people high in physical self-construal would recommend that their child participate in a physical chore, such as raking leaves, rather than a relational chore, such as setting the table for the family dinner.

Inconsistent with our hypothesis, however, we found that relational self-construal also positively correlated with physical parenting choices. However, this study consisted of mostly nonparents. This made a difference in the responses in the participants because analyses showed that nonparents were more likely to choose physical practices compared to the participants that were parents. We believe that individuals may plan on being more physical to their future, hypothetical children than they actually are when they have their own children. Apparently,

when imagining a hypothetical parenthood, participants thought they would engage in physical parenting practices regardless of whether their self-construal was physical or relational.

Given the somewhat contradictory findings when participants thought about parenting practices hypothetically, we examined whether or not parents would show congruence between self-construal and parenting practices (study 2). We found that physical self-construal was positively associated with physical parenting choices and relational parenting choices.

Relational self-construal was positively linked with relational parenting choices and negatively associated with physical parenting choices. Thus, for example, parents high in relational self-construal will be more likely to advise their children to rekindle a friendship with a friend after a fight than advise them to participate in physical violence with the friend.

The somewhat paradoxical findings might be explained by remembering that the same measure was used to determine participants' physical and relational parenting practices. Participants chose across 10 scenarios from one of three types of parenting practices: relational, physical, and neutral. It may have been that as a participant chose more physical parenting options, the less he or she chose relational parenting options, and vice versa. Thus, when participants were hypothetical parents, they tended to imagine using physical parenting practices independent of their self-construal. However, when participants were actually parents their self-construal kicked in: parents who have a physical self-construal engage in both physical and relational parenting practices (interpersonal relations are necessary for parenting), whereas parents who have a relational self-construal are more constrained in choosing relational parenting practices.

The present research had several limitations, mostly related to methodology. Both of the studies were posted online and were anonymous, so the participants could have falsified their

responses or misinterpreted the questions. Data that are self-reported present a problem for empirical research because of potential misrepresentations, so it would be best to collect data in a more objective way. The measure of parental practices was created for this study and has not been used or validated by previous research. This may have presented a problem because some of the options for the scenarios on the questionnaire could have been rated differently by various researchers, so this measure might be improved in future studies.

Future researchers should address replication of this data with a more objective mean of measurement. A suggestion would be to observe child and parental interactions or to participate in interviews with parents to gain actual responses on the scenarios that parents make in their decisions on a daily basis. Another goal for future research in this area is explaining the relationship between self-construal with other contexts of life.

Two contexts in particular that we think should be assessed are people's interest areas in particular subjects and their orientation to other people. Previous research has found sex differences in occupational interests and educational programs (Su, Rounds, & Armstrong, 2009). Men and women differed on the Things–People dimension; men prefer working with things, compared to women who prefer working with people. They also discovered that men show stronger Realistic, Investigative, and science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) interests, compared to women who show stronger Artistic, Social, and Conventional interests. Future research should investigate the role of self-construal on these findings, rather than explaining by sex only.

The findings from these studies are especially pertinent for parents and parental educators. Once people understand the effect of their self-construal on their parenting style, they will be able to change. Some may come to understand why they resort to physical or corporal

punishment after understanding how they define themselves. Parental educators will be able to work with these parents to alter their parental style by providing better options, while being consistent with their self-construal. Childcare workers in many fields should be educated about the effects of their self-definition on the interactions and decisions that they make for children regularly.

In conclusion, the current study contributes to the existing literature by demonstrating that one's self-construal can affect their child-rearing practices. Parents' physical self-construal influences them to show more physical parenting practices than do parents with relational self-construal, though both parents show relational parenting practices. These findings compound the urgency to research this topic in depth to see how one's self-construal influences many other life decisions within other contexts.

References

Azam, S., & Aftab, R. (2012). Social problem solving styles, acting-out tendencies, and

aggression in boys and girls. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, *27*, 121-134.

Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology*, *4*, 1-103.

Belsky, J., Crnic, K., & Woodworth, S. (1995). Personality and parenting: Exploring the

mediating role of transient mood and daily hassles. *Journal of Personality*, *63*, 905-929.

Browne, D. T., Meunier, J. C., O'Connor, T. G., & Jenkins, J. M. (2012). The role of parental

personality traits in differential parenting. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *26*, 542-553.

Buri, J. R. (1991). Parental Authority Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *57*,

110-119.

Clark, M. S., Oullette, R., Powell, M. C., & Milberg, S. (1987). Recipient's mood, relationship

type, and helping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *53*, 94-103.

Crapanzano, A. M., Frick, P. J., & Terranova, A. M. (2010). Patterns of physical and relational

aggression in a school-based sample of boys and girls. *Journal of Abnormal Child

Psychology*, *38*, 433-445.

Cross, S. E., & Madson, L. (1997). Models of the self: Self-construals and gender. *Psychological

Bulletin*, *122*, 5-37.

Cross, S. E., Bacon, P. L., & Morris, M. L. (2000). The relational-interdependent self-construal

and relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *78*, 791-808.

Cross, S. E., Gore, J. S., & Morris, M. L. (2003). The relational-interdependent self-construal,

self-concept consistency, and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social

Psychology*, *85*, 933-944.

Cross S, Morris M. Getting to know you: The relational self-construal, relational cognition, and

        well-being. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* [serial online]. April 2003; *29*,

        512-523

Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of

        psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, *24*, 349-354.

Davis, M. H. (1980). A multidimensional approach to individual differences in

        empathy. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology*, *10*, 85.

Gfroerer, K. P., Kern, R. M., Curlette, W. L., White, J., & Jonyniene, J. (2011). Parenting style

        and personality: Perceptions of mothers, fathers, and adolescents. *The Journal of*

        Individual Psychology, *67*, 57-73.

Kochanska, G., Aksan, N., Penney, S. J., & Boldt, L. J. (2007). Parental personality as an inner

        resource that moderates the impact of ecological adversity on parenting. *Journal of*

        Personality and Social Psychology, *92*, 136-150.

Li, Y., Putallaz, M., & Su, Y. (2011). Interparental conflict styles and parenting behaviors:

        Associations with overt and relational aggression among Chinese children. *Merrill-*

        Palmer Quarterly, *57*, 402-428.

Mackler, J. S., Kelleher, R. T., Shanahan, L., Calkins, S. D., Keane, S. P., & O'Brien, M. (2015).

        Parenting stress, parental reactions, and externalizing behavior from ages 4 to 10. *Journal*

        Of Marriage And Family, *77*, 388-406.

Markus, H., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion,

        and motivation. *Psychological Review*, *98*, 224-253.

Risser, S. D. (2013). Relational aggression and academic performance in elementary school.

        Psychology in the Schools, *50*, 13-26.

Singelis, T. M. (1994). The measurement of independent and interdependent self-

  construals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *20*, 580-591.

Su, R., Rounds, J., & Armstrong, P. I. (2009). Men and things, women and people: A meta-

  analysis of sex differences in interests. *Psychological Bulletin*, *135*(6), 859-884.

Appendix A

Informed Consent form:

Self-Construal and Parenting Situations

Faculty Advisor: Jonathan Gore

E-Mail: Jonathan.gore@eku.edu

I, Michaela Herbig, am an undergraduate student in the Psychology Department at Eastern Kentucky University. Today you will be asked to complete a survey about yourself and hypothetical parenting decisions. Your participation should take around 30 minutes and you will receive 0.5 SONA credits for your participation in this study. Your participation is voluntary and your responses are anonymous. Also, if you feel uncomfortable at any time, you can stop the study without penalty. Please answer all questions honestly. There is no right or wrong answers. If you have any questions or concerns please contact me at michaela_herbig@mymail.eku.edu.

If you wish to continue, please click the link below.

Appendix B

Relational Self-Construal Scale

Please rate each statement on a scale of 1-5 (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree).

1. My close relationships are an important reflection of who I am.

2. When I feel close to someone, it often feels to me like that person is an important part of who I am.

3. Overall, my close relationships have very little to do with how I feel about myself.

4. I think one of the most important parts of who I am can be captured by looking at my close friends and understanding who they are.

5. My close relationships are unimportant to my sense of the kind of person I am.

6. When I think of myself, I often think of my close friends and family also.

7. When I establish a close relationship with someone, I usually develop a strong sense of identification with that person.

8. If a person hurts someone close to me, I feel hurt as well.

9. I usually feel a strong sense of pride when someone close to me has made an important accomplishment.

10. In general, my close relationships are an important part of my self-image.

11. My sense of pride comes from knowing who I have as close friends.

Appendix C

Physical self-construal scale

Please rate each statement on a scale of 1-5 (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree).

1. My physical body is an important part of who I am.

2. What I can accomplish with my hands is the way of showing what I can do.

3. My happiness depends on what I have accomplished with my physical body.

4. I value what my physical body is capable of achieving.

5. I see physical tasks as something to do, but I feel little pride when I accomplish them.

6. I respect people who are concerned about how well they can use their body to complete a task.

7. Being able to get the job done with my own hands is important to me.

8. My sense of pride comes from knowing what I can do with my body.

9. Some people think of their body when they think of themselves, but I am not one of those people.

10. When I think of myself, I often think of my physical body.

11. If I can't use a part of my physical body, I feel worthless.

12. Even when my body can't give any more, I still keep pushing.

13. Physical labor is what I was made to do.

14. I try to take into consideration what my body is capable of doing when trying to complete a task.

15. My hands are the tools to most of my work.

16. In general, what I've created with my hands is an extension of who I am.

17. I trust myself to take on any level of physical labor.

18. If a person can't complete a physical task on their own, I feel like it is my responsibility

to help.

19. Having to do a job that involves physical labor is important to me.

20. I will sacrifice my leisure time for the sake of getting physical tasks done.

Appendix D

Hypothetical Parental Practices

Please select the option that best fits how you would respond to each hypothetical statement.

This may not necessarily be exactly what you would choose in the situation, but choose the

option that best fits you.

1. Your child fell off of the playground at school and slightly hurt his/her leg, you:

    a. Tell him/her to rest until full recovery

    b. Hold and comfort him/her

    c. Tell him/her to keep playing

2. Your child is hungry and incessantly asks when dinner will be ready, you:

    a. Ask him/her to set the table for the family

    b. Ask him/her to work on homework

    c. Ask him/her to rake the leaves in the yard

3. Your child is throwing a tantrum inside of a restaurant, you tell him/her to:

    a. Calm down immediately

    b. Stop or you will give him/her a spanking

    c. Explain his/her problem, and negotiate with you

4. Your child has misplaced his/her shoes before school, you:

    a. Help him/her find them

    b. Buy him/her new ones

    c. Tell him/her to walk around the house to the place that s/he last saw the shoes

5. Your child is being bullied by a friend at school recommend him/her to:

    a. Ignore the friend

  b. Try to rekindle the friendship

  c. Fight back

6. Your child is bored, you advise him/her to:

  a. Write a letter to grandma

  b. Play on the computer

  c. Play on the trampoline

7. Your child is having trouble making friends, you encourage him/her to:

  a. Join a sport

  b. Invite two classmates to your house

  c. Not worry about it, s/he will make friends soon

8. One of the most important values you want to teach your child is:

  a. Cherishing the relationships with others

  b. Honesty, and integrity

  c. His/her body should remain healthy to carry out activities

9. Your child is having trouble with his/her homework you advise him/her to

  a. Search the Internet for the answer

  b. Ask a friend for help

  c. Manipulate the problem with his/her hands to help him/her understand

10. Your child has recently joined the soccer team at school, you inspire him/her to:

  a. Treat the team as a family

  b. Pushing to reach his/her body's full potential

  c. Have fun

Appendix E

Demographic Form

1. Age: _____

2. Gender:

    a. Male

    b. Female

3. Ethnicity:

    a. White

    b. Hispanic/Latino

    c. Black/African American

    d. Native American/American Indian

    e. Asian/Pacific Islander

    f. Other

4. Do you have children?

    a. Yes

    b. No

Appendix F

Debriefing Statement

"Self-Construal and Parenting Practices"

Thank you for contributing to this study. The purpose of this study was to explore how self-construal, one's self-definition, is associated with parenting decisions. This study tests the hypothesis that individuals with a physical self-construal will be positively correlated with physical practices in child rearing, and individuals with a relational self-construal will be positively associated with interpersonal practices in child-rearing.

With this information, we hope to gain more about how physical and relational self-construal determines one's decision-making. We hope participating in this study made you consider how people make choices in parenting based on the way they define themselves. The design type was correlational, with measures including the Relational-Interdependent Self-Construal scale (Cross, Bacon, & Morris, 2000). With this information, we hope to learn more about how people's self-definitions lead them to interact and influence their social environments.

If you have any questions please contact Dr. Jonathan Gore at 622-1115, or jonathan.gore@eku.edu. To learn more about the concepts of this study read the following:

Cross, S. E., Bacon, P. L., & Morris, M. L. (2000). The relational-interdependent self-construal and relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *78*, 791-808.

Cross, S. E., & Madson (1997). Models of the self: Self-construals and gender. *Psychological Bulletin*, *122*, 5-37.