

INTERGENERATIONAL PARENTING STYLES: THE CONSISTENCY OF
PARENTING STYLES ACROSS GENERATIONS IN A RURAL COMMUNITY

A Thesis
by
ERIN LINDSEY KNIGHT

Submitted to the Graduate School
at Appalachian State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degrees of
MASTER OF ARTS and SPECIALIST IN SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY

December 2017
Department of Psychology

INTERGENERATIONAL PARENTING STYLES: THE CONSISTENCY OF
PARENTING STYLES ACROSS GENERATIONS IN A RURAL COMMUNITY

A Thesis
by
ERIN LINDSEY KNIGHT
December 2017

APPROVED BY:

Pamela Kidder-Ashley
Chairperson, Thesis Committee

Timothy J. Huelsman
Member, Thesis Committee

Sandra Glover Gagnon
Member, Thesis Committee

Rose Mary Webb
Interim Chairperson, Department of Psychology

Max C. Poole
Dean, Cratis D. Williams School of Graduate Studies

Copyright by Erin Lindsey Knight 2017
All Rights Reserved

Permission is hereby granted to the Appalachian State University Belk Library and to the Department of Psychology to display and provide access to this thesis for appropriate academic and research purposes.

Abstract

INTERGENERATIONAL PARENTING STYLES: THE CONSISTENCY OF PARENTING STYLES ACROSS GENERATIONS IN A RURAL COMMUNITY

Erin Lindsey Knight
B.S., Wingate University
M.A., S.S.P., Appalachian State University

Chairperson: Pamela Kidder-Ashley

In the past half-century, research linking parenting styles with various child outcomes has led to a heightened desire to understand how parents acquire the skills and behaviors they use towards their children. Research on the intergenerational continuity of parenting practices, or styles, has produced varied results, such that multiple studies have found evidence of intergenerational continuity, whereas others have not. Accordingly, the purpose of the current study was to examine the relationship between the parenting style that parents report using with their own children and the parenting style they report their parents to have employed. In the present research, 22 participants (16 females, 6 males) were surveyed regarding perceptions of their own parenting styles as well as their perceptions of their parents' parenting behaviors. Due to the low return rate and sample size, it is believed that the results obtained do not accurately reflect intergenerational transmission in parenting styles. Nonetheless, results from the current study suggest that perceived intergenerational continuity from mothers to daughters may exist, but only for permissive parenting. Same-gender continuities in parenting styles were not evident among men, and cross-gender

continuities in parenting styles were not found for men or women. For both men and women, same-gender continuities in parenting style were not significantly different from cross-gender continuities. Although these findings are not generalizable and may not add to the existing literature on intergenerational continuity, this study contributes to the literature by highlighting a key barrier to conducting research in rural communities: participation.

Acknowledgments

I would first like to thank my thesis chair Dr. Pam Kidder-Ashley. I am so grateful for your collaboration on this project, and I cannot thank you enough for your attention to detail, the countless hours you put into this project, and helping me make my dreams become a reality. Never in a million years would I have imagined that we would share the opportunity to present this research at an international conference, yet we did just that! Thank you for your guidance, mentorship, and relentless support. I could not imagine having anyone else as my thesis chair!

In addition to my thesis chair, I would like to express my gratitude to my thesis committee: Dr. Sandy Gagnon and Dr. Tim Huelsman; my “dream team.” I could not have a better committee! Thank you both for your mentorship, unwavering support, always having an open door, and your insightful comments and hard questions, all of which helped make me a better researcher.

This thesis would not have been possible without the financial support provided by Appalachian State University’s Office of Student Research Community-Based Grant and Research Grant, and the WiSE Research Award. Thank you for believing in this project.

I would like to acknowledge my cohort member, and one of my closest friends, Mrs. Emily J. Sturkie. I cannot put into words how appreciative I am for your constant support throughout this project. Thank you for being my voice of reason and hope, keeping me company during my late-night library sessions, and helping me stuff over 1,500 envelopes!

Getting through this project and graduate school, with my sanity, would not have been possible without you!

I must express my profound gratitude to my mother, Tammy Knight, who has been my eternal cheerleader throughout life and this project. Thank you for your never-ending support and continuous encouragement. I love you! I am also grateful for my other family members, friends, and cohort members who have supported me along the way.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iv
Acknowledgments.....	vi
List of Tables	ix
Foreword.....	x
Introduction and Literature Review	2
Method	16
Results.....	21
Discussion.....	23
References.....	34
Appendix A.....	42
Appendix B.....	43
Appendix C.....	45
Appendix D.....	47
Appendix E.....	48
Appendix F.....	50
Vita.....	51

List of Tables

Table 1. G2 Parents' Level of Education.....	32
Table 2. Descriptive Statistics.....	32
Table 3. G1-G2 Pearson Correlations across Parenting Style Factors.....	33

Foreword

This thesis is written in accordance with the style of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (6th Edition)* as required by the Department of Psychology at Appalachian State University.

Running Head: INTERGENERATIONAL PARENTING STYLES

Intergenerational Parenting Styles: The Consistency of Parenting Styles across Generations
in a Rural Community

A Thesis
by
ERIN L. KNIGHT
Appalachian State University

Intergenerational Parenting Styles:

The Consistency of Parenting Styles Across Generations in a Rural Community

Parenting a child is arguably one of the most difficult, yet rewarding, tasks that many people undertake in life. One reason parenting can be arduous is because there exists no handbook that details every possible life event and appropriate response. Thus, parents are left to engage in practices they think will positively influence the actions and character of their children. The practices employed differ from one parent to another, based in part upon how the parent views the child (Baumrind, 1966) and how the parent himself or herself was raised (Campbell & Gilmore, 2007; Conger, Schofield, & Neppl, 2012; Neppl, Conger, Scaramella, & Ontai, 2009; Simons, Whitbeck, Conger, & Wu, 1991). Differences in child rearing practices have been the subject of research for many years (Baumrind, 1966), often with the goal of linking parenting practices to aspects of children's behavioral and psychological development (Bornstein, 2002). Such research has revealed identifiable dimensions of parenting as well as common constellations of those dimensions, referred to as "parenting styles" (Baumrind, 1967, 1989, 1991a). The research also has identified typical child developmental outcomes that are associated with each of those styles (Baumrind, 1966, 2005; Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991; Steinberg, Elmen, & Mounts, 1989). Of particular interest for this study are the findings of a major study by Elder and Conger (2000). After years of examining influences and outcomes for rural farm families in the Midwest, they concluded that the successful development of rural children was heavily reliant on *resourceful pathways*. These pathways referred to the presence and quality of linked social relationships. The social ties that created these pathways were established through the interdependency of family life and connections to relatives beyond the immediate

family, such as grandparents, who lived nearby and provided warmth and moral support.

Unlike many studies of child development, Elder and Conger's examined intergenerational influences; they concluded that grandparents often added richness to the experiences of the child, reinforcing the existing strengths of the immediate family, providing unconditional support, and generally reinforcing the "developmental environment," although they found that grandparents had less influence than did parents.

Parenting styles

Researchers from diverse methodological and theoretical perspectives have investigated parenting practices and have consistently found that parents vary with respect to two distinct attitudinal and behavioral dimensions (Fletcher, Walls, Cook, Madison, & Bridges, 2008). However, the labels assigned to these dimensions vary across researchers and studies. Darling and Steinberg (1993) observed this similarity across various researchers:

For Symonds (1939), these dimensions included acceptance/rejection and dominance/submission; for Baldwin (1955), emotional warmth/hostility and detachment/involvement; for Schaefer (1959), love/hostility and autonomy/control; for Sears et al., (1957), warmth and indulgentness/strictness; and for Becker (1964), warmth/hostility and restrictiveness/[permissiveness]. In retrospect, the similarity of the underlying dimensions proposed by these different researchers is remarkable (p. 489).

Research on these dimensions has linked them to child psychological development and well-being and the overall climate of the parent-child relationship (Baumrind, 1967, 1989, 1991a; Baumrind & Black, 1967; Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Han & Shaffer, 2014;

Peterson & Bush, 2013; Robinson, Mandleco, Olsen, & Hart, 1995). These two overarching dimensions can best be described in terms of responsiveness and demandingness.

Responsiveness refers to “the extent to which parents intentionally foster individuality, self-regulation, and self-assertion by being attuned, supportive, and acquiescent to children’s special needs and demands” (Baumrind, 1996, p. 410). *Demandingness*, on the other hand, refers to “the claims parents make on children to become integrated into the family whole, by their maturity demands, supervision, disciplinary efforts and willingness to confront the child who disobeys” (Baumrind, 1996, p. 411; for a review see Maccoby & Martin, 1983).

Through her work with young children, Baumrind (1967) noticed specific patterns of parenting emerge from the combination of various levels of both responsiveness and demandingness. These multi-dimensional patterns of parenting behavior, expectations, and values led to Baumrind’s conceptualization of three primary styles of parenting: permissive, authoritarian, or authoritative.

Permissive parents are high in responsiveness and low in demandingness. These parents allow the child to have considerable freedom, avoid exercising control, and do not emphasize the importance of obeying externally defined regulations. They are extremely lenient regarding the child’s desires and behavior and seldom require the child to partake in household responsibilities and obedient behavior. When rules are broken, the permissive parent may try to reason with the child (e.g., providing explanations for family rules), or use manipulation, but little else is done to control the child’s behavior (e.g., overt power, such as confrontation). In a sense, permissive parents “...present themselves as resources to be used as their children wish, not as active agents responsible for shaping or altering their children’s ongoing or future behavior” (Baumrind, 1989, p.354; Baumrind, 1967, 1989, 1991c).

Authoritarian parents are low in responsiveness and high in demandingness. These parents are obedience- and status-oriented, and attempt to shape and control the child's behavior and attitudes through imposing high expectations and strict rules that are to be obeyed without question. To instill respect for authority, work, order, and the traditional structure of the home, this type of parent believes in keeping the child in his or her place, limiting opportunities for independence, and allocating household chores. Authoritarian parents monitor the child's attitudes and behaviors closely. If the parent does not think that the child's actions or beliefs align with their set standards, the parent may use punitive or forceful measures, as opposed to engaging in a discussion (i.e., clearly state his or her values and explaining the reasoning behind his or her rules) with the child (Baumrind, 1967, 1989, 1991c).

Authoritative parents are high in both responsiveness and demandingness and are issue-oriented. These parents value "...both expressive and instrumental attributes, both autonomous self-will and disciplined conformity" (Baumrind, 1989, p.353). Accordingly, they have clearly defined standards of appropriate behavior, and guide and monitor their children's behavior in an assertive, but not invasive or restrictive, manner. Authoritative parents are able instill knowledge while directing the child's behavior through discussions of the reasoning behind their rules. However, when non-compliance does occur, these parents are not afraid to confront the child about the problem and expect the child to respect the set rules. As a means to achieve their objectives, authoritative parents use reason, power, shaping, and do not base their decisions on group consensus or solely on the child's urges. While they acknowledge the inherent privileges they have as adults, they also value the

child's individuality. They are highly supportive of, and committed to, the child and attempt to foster autonomy and self-regulation in a loving environment (Baumrind, 1967, 1989, 1991c).

Parenting styles and child outcomes

Typically, the family provides children with their first social interactions. Through these interactions, children watch what others do, mimic their responses, and learn which behaviors are rewarded and punished. In essence, the family is the first context of socialization that children experience (American Academy of Pediatrics, 2003). Since Baumrind first identified her three styles of parenting (1967), she and other researchers (Baumrind & Black, 1967; Baumrind, Larzelere, & Owens, 2010; Dornbusch, Ritter, Herbert Leiderman, Roberts, & Fraleigh, 1987; Fletcher et al., 2008) have undertaken numerous studies to examine relationships between parenting styles and child outcomes across a wide range of ages and types of families. Results consistently demonstrate that children of authoritative parents display superior outcomes across various domains, including academic and social/behavioral competence and psychosocial development, relative to children with authoritarian and permissive parents (Baumrind, 1996; Lamborn et al., 1991). Some of these findings are summarized below.

Children of permissive parents tend to display under-regulated emotional responses and may be prone to antisocial behaviors. Additionally, they tend to exhibit low persistence on tasks and become defiant when challenged. Baumrind (1971, 1991a) speculated that these outcomes resulted from a lack of self-imposed limits. Specific to preschool students, Baumrind (1971) noted that both boys and girls with permissive parents were less achievement oriented, and girls were less independent, compared to other students.

Authoritarian parents often have children who excel in school but are anxious, withdrawn, and moody. When such children become frustrated, they tend to react poorly and fear new situations because they prefer to follow, rather than lead. When compared to other preschool-age children, girls with authoritarian parents were noticeably more dependent and submissive, while boys were relatively hostile and resistive (Baumrind, 1971, 1989, 1991b).

Children from authoritative households typically display adequate self-confidence (Baumrind & Black, 1967) and independence (Baumrind, 1971), high achievement motivation (Lamborn, et al. 1991), and the ability to regulate their emotions effectively (Baumrind, 1991a). Baumrind and Black (1967) suggested that these various aspects of competence were facilitated by parental practices that were intellectually stimulating and somewhat demanding. Baumrind (1971) also found that preschool-age children with authoritative parents were consistently and significantly more socially competent than other preschool-age children; in particular, girls in her preschool sample exhibited purposive, dominant, achievement oriented behavior, while the boys displayed friendly, cooperative behavior.

Studies examining parenting styles as they relate specifically to behavior problems also have yielded fairly consistent findings. For example, a study that considered gender, grade level, ethnicity, and family income concluded that children with authoritative parents had fewer behavior problems than peers in permissive or authoritarian homes (Kaufmann et al., 2000). Another study suggested that higher levels of punitive discipline used by both permissive and authoritarian parents were associated with externalizing behaviors (Fletcher et al., 2008).

Intergenerational transmission of parenting styles

As noted above, research has consistently associated parenting styles with various child outcomes, such as child competence (Baumrind, 1971; Baumrind & Black, 1967; Lamborn et al., 1991) and child maladjustment (Fletcher et al., 2008; Kaufmann et al., 2000). Increased awareness of the influential role parents have on their children's development over the years has led to a heightened desire to understand how parents acquire the skills and behaviors used towards their children. Bandura's Social Learning Theory (1977) postulates that "most human behavior is learned observationally through modeling: from observing others, one forms an idea of how new behaviors are performed, and on later occasions this coded information serves as a guide for action" (p. 22). Based on this theory, one might hypothesize that, because the family is "the first unit with which children have a continuous contact and the first context in which socialization patterns develop" (Elkin & Handel, 1978, p. 118), individuals would acquire their approaches to parenting through their interactions with their own parents. In fact, findings from several studies (e.g., Belsky, 2005; Schofield, Conger, & Neppl, 2014; Neppl, et al., 2009; Simons et al., 1991; Thornberry, Hops, Conger & Capaldi, 2003; Van IJzendoorn, 1992) demonstrate substantial cross-generational continuity in child rearing practices, providing support for this hypothesis.

A study conducted by Conger, Neppl, Kim, and Scaramella (2003) specifically evaluated the transmission of aggressive parenting across two generations of 75 families in rural Iowa. In this study, parenting behaviors were assessed through observer ratings and interview and questionnaire data. Results of this longitudinal study suggest that when grandparents (G1s) were observed to have engaged in angry and aggressive parenting, their children (G2s) were at an increased risk to engage in aggressive behaviors as adolescents.

When G2s became parents 5 to 7 years later, they were also more likely to adopt angry, aggressive parenting practices with their own children (G3s), which in turn placed the young G3s at increased risk to engage in aggressive behaviors during early childhood. However, aggressive behavior of G2s during adolescence did not predict to their use of harsh parenting practices with their children (G3) nor was it associated with aggressive behavior by their children (G3).

To expand upon Conger et al.'s (2003) findings, Neppel et al. (2009) conducted a similar study with 187 young adults and 151 toddlers. In this study, parenting behaviors were assessed through observer ratings and self-report questionnaires. Results indicated that harsh parenting by G1s (i.e., the grandparents) predicted harsh parenting by G2s, and positive parenting by G1s predicted the same in G2s. Moreover, mediators that accounted for intergenerational continuity in certain types of parent behavior were identified. In particular, the relationship between G1s' and G2s' harsh parenting was mediated by G2s' externalizing behavior, especially when it extended from adolescence into adulthood, whereas the relationship between G1s' and G2s' positive parenting was mediated by the G2s' level of academic attainment. Furthermore, these pathways remained statistically significant "...after taking into account possible G2 effects [e.g., behavioral traits, personality, or temperament] on G1 parenting and G3 effects [e.g., behavioral traits, personality, or temperament] on G2 parenting" (Neppel et al., 2009, p. 1241).

Campbell and Gilmore (2007) also assessed cross-generational continuities of parenting styles, using Baumrind's (1967) typology, but uniquely contributed to the literature by examining the continuity of parenting styles across genders. The sample used for this study was composed of 560 Australian parents of children aged 3 to 16 years. These parents

(G2s) completed surveys about their own parenting styles and about their recollections of the parenting styles used by their parents (G1s). Outcomes of this study further demonstrated significant transmission of parenting styles across generations, specifically in authoritarian and permissive parenting styles, with same-gender continuities (i.e., G1Mothers to G2Daughters, G1Fathers to G2Sons) being strongest, followed by cross-gender continuities (i.e., mothers to sons, fathers to daughters). These findings were statistically significant even though G2s reported themselves to be generally less authoritarian and more permissive than their own parents. It is noteworthy that results for the authoritative parenting style were not significant, although G2s tended to report themselves to be more authoritative than their own parents were. Campbell and Gilmore postulated that these findings could be due to differences in how G2s interpret their own and their parents' authoritative parenting practices.

Lamm, Keller, Yovsi, and Chaudhary (2008) approached parenting from a vastly different point of view than previous studies. Lamm et al. (2008) interviewed 134 mothers and 66 grandmothers of three-month-old infants from four different cultural environments – urban, German, middle-class families; urban, Indian, middle-class families; rural, Cameroonian families; and urban, Cameroonian families. Analysis of their interview data revealed variations, across the cultural/demographic groups, in the intergenerational continuity of essential features of maternal care of infants. The authors concluded that the variations seemed to stem from the differences in the families' cultural/demographic conditions, especially in how fast-changing their conditions were. Accordingly, Lamm et al. (2008) postulated that the strong cross-generational similarities in the essential features of maternal care of infants were prevalent in the rural sample because of the two generations'

shared socio-demographic conditions, which were particularly apparent in their occupations (e.g., rural subsistence farming) and similar levels of educational attainment. Although this study was unique in how parenting was conceptualized, the findings have implications for the current study, given that Lamm et al. (2008) found continuity to be strongest when the cultural/demographic conditions and education levels were similar across generations, which may hold true for the current sample.

Although recent research has provided some evidence supporting the continuity of child rearing practices across generations, many facets of this relationship have yet to be thoroughly explored. One such area that needs further investigation is the impact of mediating and moderating effects on the transmission of parenting practices.

Influential factors in the intergenerational continuity of parenting

Research on the intergenerational continuity of parenting practices, or styles, has produced varied results, such that multiple studies (Baumrind, 1967; Fletcher et al., 2008; Fish, Amerikaner & Lucas, 2007; Simons et al., 1991; Schofield, et al., 2014; Van Ijzendoorn, 1992) have found evidence of intergenerational continuity, whereas others (Belsky, Jaffee, Sligo, Woodward & Silva, 2005; Conger, et al., 2012; Smith & Farrington, 2004; Thornberry et al., 2003) have not. Several studies, in addition to that of Lamm et al. (2008), have found that socio-demographic factors, such as parental educational attainment (Campbell & Gilmore, 2007; Neppl et al., 2009) and access to high paying employment (Scaramella, Neppl, Ontai & Conger, 2008) may be influential on the extent to which child rearing practices are transferred across generations. Individual difference factors that have been implicated include parent personality characteristics (Kitamura, et al., 2009; Tanaka, Kitamura, Chen, Murakami & Goto, 2009) and child temperament (Latzman, Elkovitch &

Clark, 2009; Lee, Zhou, Eisenberg & Wang; 2013). It is beyond the scope of the current study to address each of these factors; of particular interest is the role of educational attainment in the transmission of parenting styles across generations.

Research has suggested that G1-G2 differences in parental educational attainment might be a factor that shapes parenting behaviors and contributes to cross-generational discontinuities found in the literature. For instance, in Campbell and Gilmore's (2007) study, the observed generational shift, wherein G2s rated themselves to be less authoritarian and more authoritative and permissive than their G1 parents, resulted in part because G2s with higher levels of education reported being less authoritarian than their parents. Similarly, Neppl et al. (2009) found that G1 positive parenting predicted G2 adult academic attainment, which mediated the relationship between G1 and G2 positive parenting. Neppl et al.'s findings suggest not only the presence of intergenerational continuity in positive parenting but also the impact of educational attainment as an additional influence on G2 parenting behaviors.

Previous studies, such as that by Campbell and Gilmore (2007), have examined educational attainment through a mediation model in an attempt to explain *why* intergenerational transmission of parenting styles occurs. Results of such studies provide evidence that educational attainment mediates the link between G1 and G2 parenting styles. Although previous research has already established support for educational attainment as a mediator in intergenerational transmission of parenting styles, the researchers conducting the present study were interested in understanding *how* the level of educational attainment amplified or attenuated (i.e., moderated) the intergenerational continuity of parenting styles. The present researchers anticipated that when G2 educational attainment was high, the

continuity between G1 and G2 parenting styles would be weaker than the intergenerational continuity of parenting styles when G2 educational attainment was low. The researchers' interest in examining educational attainment as a moderator was spurred by the fact that these findings, when taken together, also provide some evidence that cross-generational increases in level of education may limit the transmission of parenting styles from one generation to the next. In light of the research linking authoritarian parenting behaviors with child maladjustment (Fletcher et al., 2008; Kaufmann et al., 2000; Neppl et al., 2009), the present researchers' were primarily interested in the impact of educational attainment in regards to the transmission of the authoritarian parenting style. The researchers suspected that when G2 educational attainment was high, the continuity between G1 and G2 authoritarian parenting would be weaker than the intergenerational continuity of authoritarian parenting styles when G2 educational attainment was low. Such a finding might have implications for the development and targeting of future interventions aimed at improving parenting behavior.

Gender as a moderator in intergenerational continuity of parenting

As recently as 20 years ago, rural Appalachian families tended to reflect fairly traditional gender roles, where mothers were the primary caregivers and fathers were the primary income producers (Cox, 1993; Klein, 1995). Furthermore, studies from that time also suggested that rural Appalachian fathers tended to use harsh parenting practices (The Rural and Appalachian Youth and Families Consortium, 1996) and were more actively involved in the parenting of their sons than their daughters (Harris & Morgan, 1991). Somewhat more recent research (Conrade & Ho, 2001; Russell et al., 1998), using non-Appalachian samples, has found that children generally perceived their fathers to be more authoritarian and less authoritative than their mothers.

A recent study (Manoogian, Jurich, Sano & Ko, 2015) investigated how rural, low-income Appalachian women viewed and evaluated their roles as mothers and how having access to limited economic resources influenced mothers' parenting experiences. Through interviews, mothers expressed how motherhood shaped their personal identities, experiences, and decisions about time, finances, and parenting. Many mothers ascribed to a traditional view of motherhood, valuing mothering as their top priority and viewing child outcomes as largely dependent on their mothering efforts. Holding traditional gender expectations also contributed to the mothers' expressed reluctance to gain employment and put their children in daycare even when family economic needs were high. These mothers explained that they would prefer to stay home, spend time with their children, and raise the children themselves, rather than receive outside help or have their children affected by their jobs. To help ease the financial burden, mothers regularly received support (e.g., financial, emotional, and instrumental) from their family members, particularly from G1Mothers. While this study did not examine the role of gender in the intergenerational transmission of parenting styles per se, it provides insight into the value that this sample of mothers placed on their role as parents and suggests that intergenerational transmission of parenting styles may be especially high for mothers in a rural Appalachian community.

Taken together, these findings suggest that there may be gender differences in the transmission of parenting styles across generations. However, research examining whether the intergenerational transmission of parenting styles is more likely for fathers or for mothers has thus far been inconclusive. Several studies have found more evidence of transmission for mothers than fathers (Belsky et al., 2005; Simons et al., 1991; Thornberry et al., 2003; Thornberry, Krohn, & Freeman-Gallant, 2006), while other studies have reported the

opposite (Campbell & Gilmore, 2007; Furstenberg & Harris, 1993). The current study was designed to contribute to our understanding of gender differences in intergenerational transmission.

Research Questions

The present study was designed to address gaps in the research literature and provide a systematic investigation of same-gender and cross-gender intergenerational similarities and differences in the parenting styles that G2 mothers and fathers report for themselves and for their own G1 parents. It was also designed to explore the possible moderating effects G2 educational attainment on intergenerational transmission of parenting styles. To do this, data were collected on mothers' and fathers' educational attainment and their perceptions of their own parenting styles and those of their spouses/partners, together with their recollections of the parenting styles used by each of their own mothers and fathers. The following hypotheses guided the research.

- (1) It was hypothesized that there would be a positive correlation between the reported G1 and G2 parenting styles for both same-gender and cross-gender pairs (H₁).
- (2) It was further hypothesized that same-gender correlations would be stronger than cross-gender correlations, for both G2 sons and daughters (H₂).
- (3) Additionally, the research on the traditional gender roles and family structure of rural Appalachian life (e.g., Manoogian et al., 2015) and the literature suggesting stronger transmission of parenting styles for women than men (e.g., Thornberry et al., 2006) led to the prediction that the reported

intergenerational correlations would be strongest between G1Mothers and G2Daughters (H₃).

- (4) Finally, the research literature also indicates the possible influence of educational attainment (Brown, Copeland, Costello, Erkanli, & Worthman, 2009; Campbell & Gilmore, 2007; Neppel et al., 2009) on parenting and, by extension, on intergenerational transmission, particularly for the authoritarian style of parenting. Thus, it was hypothesized that the intergenerational correlations would be moderated by G2 educational attainment, such that current parents with higher levels of educational attainment would identify themselves as less authoritarian than their own parents (H₄).

Method

Participants

Participants included 22 parents of elementary aged children from five elementary schools in a rural Southeastern school district. Of the 22 parents, 16 were female (73%). The sample was primarily Caucasian (15 female, 5 male; 1 American Indian/Alaskan Native; 1 not reported) with an age range of 31 to 73 years old ($M_{\text{age}} = 44.09$, $SD = 10.23$) and an average annual household income of \$60,936.36 ($SD = \$39,833.15$, Range = \$0 - \$130,000). The majority of the sample (19 parents, 86.3%) reported that they were currently married or in a domestic partnership (1 separated, 1 divorced, 1 single/never married); 12 participants were married to, or in a domestic partnership with, another participant in the study (i.e., the sample included 6 couples). On average, the participants reported first becoming parents when they were 27 years old ($SD = 5.55$, Range = 15 - 36). The distribution of the sample by education level can be seen in Table 1. The majority of parents

(77.3%) reported having obtained an Associate's Degree or higher. It is noteworthy that this sample is not representative of the community from which it was obtained. According to 2016 census data (United States Census Bureau, 2016), the county from which the sample was obtained has a median income level of \$37,777, which is roughly 62% of the median income of the current study's sample. Further indicated by the 2016 U.S. Census Data (United States Census Bureau, 2016), 79.5% of the community's population graduated high school, but only 18.9% obtained a bachelor's degree or higher. As indicated in Table 1, 9 parents (54.5%) in the current study obtained a bachelor's degree or higher.

Measures

Demographics Questionnaire. The Demographics Questionnaire is an 11-item self-report measure of parents' background information. It can be found in Appendix A.

Modified Parenting Styles and Dimensions Questionnaires. The original Parenting Styles and Dimensions Questionnaire (PSDQ) was developed by Robinson et al. (1995). The original PSDQ has three forms—one for mothers, one for fathers, and one for single parents—each containing 32 items. The mother and father forms are the same except for pronoun changes, and both forms ask the parent to rate himself or herself and his or her spouse, whereas the single-parent form only has the parent rate himself or herself. Robinson, Mandlco, Olsen, and Hart (2001) also created the original Intergenerational version of the Parenting Styles and Dimensions Questionnaire (PSDQ-G1), a 32-item retrospective measure of the parenting respondents perceive their parents to have used.

Because the wording of the original questionnaires reflects a traditional family composition (female mother with male father and their biological children), the current researchers deemed it appropriate to modify the measures to make them more inclusive and

reflective of today's more diverse family compositions. With regards to the PSDQ, the researchers utilized the single-parent form for all parents and simply modified the formatting for clarity and simplicity. For the PSDQ-G1, the researchers added a section that allowed the participant to indicate the nature of his or her relationship with "*Parent 1 (if he or she was not the participant's mother)*" or "*Parent 2 (if he or she was not the participant's father)*." Accordingly, the terms "[*Parent 1*]/[*Parent 2*]" were used in place of "[*Mother*]/[*Father*]" throughout the questionnaire.

Thus, two questionnaires were created for use with all participants: a modified version of the original single-parent form (the PSDQ-Part 1; see Appendix B) and a modified version of the original intergenerational form (the PSDQ-Part 2; see Appendix C). The modified questionnaires contained the same number of items as the originals and retained the basic meaning of each item. Spanish versions of both modified forms were available to participants who requested them.

The original PSDQ was normed on 1,251 parents of preschool and school-age children, including 717 mothers and 534 fathers. To complete this measure, parents respond to items on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*Never*) to 5 (*Always*). The PSDQ contains seven sub-factors that contribute to the three parenting styles. The Connection Dimension sub-factor, the Regulation Dimension sub-factor, and the Autonomy Granting Dimension sub-factor can be averaged individually to obtain a dimension score, or averaged together to acquire an overall Authoritative Parenting Style Score. The Physical Coercion Dimension sub-factor, the Verbal Hostility Dimension sub-factor, and the Non-Reasoning/Punitive Dimension sub-factor can be averaged individually to find a dimension score, or averaged together to achieve an overall Authoritarian Parenting Style score. Items

in the Indulgent Dimension sub-factor can be averaged to achieve a dimension score and an overall Permissive Parenting Style score.

Olivari, Tagliabue, and Confalonieri (2013) examined reliability and validity statistics for the PSDQ across 53 studies conducted in various parts of the world. Results indicated adequate reliability. Results of face, concurrent, and predictive validity tests support PSDQ as an adequate measure of parenting styles.

As noted previously, Robinson et al. (2001) also developed the PSDQ-G1. Items on the original PSDQ-G1 parallel the items on the original PSDQ, but the items are reworded to assess an adolescent or adult's perception of how he or she was parented during childhood. Less is known regarding the psychometric properties of the PSDQ-G1, although three studies conducted by Tagliabue, Olivari, Bacchini, Affuso and Confalonieri (2014) that used a measure purported to be a version of the PDSQ-G1 examined the scale's structure, invariance, and convergent validity using a sample of 1,451 Italian adolescents in high school. The findings suggest that the PSDQ-G1 generally has acceptable psychometric properties, including convergent validity, but that future research is needed to determine the cross-cultural applicability of this instrument.

Procedure

Prior to recruiting participants, written consent was obtained from the school district's superintendent and the elementary school principals (Appendix D). Parents of all children enrolled in the five elementary schools in the district were invited to participate via an informed consent letter (Appendix E) sent home with the youngest child of every household. To have an inclusive sample, Spanish translations of the consent letter were sent to Spanish-speaking households, with the assistance of teachers who knew the household language of

their enrolled students; letters also were addressed not exclusively to “parents” but to any adult in charge of the day-to-day parenting of an enrolled child. (However, for clarity and simplicity, all participants will be referred to subsequently as “parents.”) Interested parents were instructed to sign the letter, place the signed letter in the pre-addressed envelope that was provided, and return the letter to the investigators via the applicable classroom teacher, who was instructed to place all the sealed envelopes in a designated container at the school, where they were picked up by a research assistant. In total, 1,516 informed consent forms were sent to parents in the school district (671 English, 87 Spanish). Only 73 parents (4.8% of all parents; 72 English; 1 Spanish) returned the signed informed consent, indicating a willingness to participate in the current study. A questionnaire packet, labeled with a unique identifying number, was prepared for each parent who indicated a willingness to participate. Each packet contained all of the questionnaires, in counterbalanced order; each questionnaire was labeled with the same unique identifying number. Parents were instructed to complete each questionnaire and then to return the packet via postal mail. Only 22 parents (30% of interested parents; 1.5% of all parents) completed and returned the questionnaires sent to them. Of the 22 packets received, none were from parents who requested Spanish translations of the questionnaires.

In an effort to increase the size of the sample, the researchers provided classroom teachers with reminder slips to send home to parents roughly two weeks after sending out the initial invitation to participate. Additionally, the researchers included pre-addressed and stamped envelopes in the questionnaire packets to reduce the burden associated with returning the questionnaire packets.

This research was conducted in accordance with the ethical standards established by Appalachian State University's Institutional Review Board (IRB) and the American Psychological Association's (APA) Ethical Principles of Psychologist and Code of Conduct. On November 23, 2015, this study was found to be exempt from IRB review. The approval letter can be found in Appendix F.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics were computed to describe the characteristics of the sample ($N=22$), and can be found in Table 2. The Shapiro-Wilk test of normality was used to check all variables for violations that would preclude the use of the statistical techniques chosen to address the research questions. An examination of the descriptive statistics suggests that assumptions of normality were met ($p > .05$) in regards to the education level reported by the mothers and fathers in the study (referred to from this point forward as G2Daughters and G2Sons). The Shapiro-Wilk test also was applied to the variables derived from the PDSQ-Part 1 (referred to from this point forward as the PDSQ) and for the PDSQ-Part 2 (referred to from this point forward as the PDSQ-G1.) For all factor scores obtained from the fathers' (i.e., from the PSDQ and PSDQ-G1), normality can be assumed. For the mothers' variables, normality can be assumed for all factors scores, except for the PSDQ Authoritarian Factor Score ($p = .043$), skewness = 0.989, kurtosis = -0.070) and the PSDQ-G1 Maternal Permissive Factor Score ($p = .028$, skewness = 1.129, kurtosis = 0.648), both of which were moderately to highly skewed and platykurtic.

Test of Hypotheses

Due to the extremely small sample size and limited response rate, the reader is strongly advised to not draw conclusions based upon the analyses presented below. These analyses were conducted and are presented solely as an academic exercise for the purpose of completing the Masters' thesis requirement. It is also noteworthy that while correlations could be computed to examine hypotheses one through three, a moderated multiple regression could not be completed to examine the fourth hypothesis, due to the small sample size. As such, the moderating role of educational attainment in the intergenerational continuity of parenting styles could not be examined.

Twelve Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were computed to describe the relationship between current parents' own parenting styles and those they reported for their own mothers and fathers. More specifically, correlations were computed between mothers' scores on each factor of the PSDQ (i.e., G2Daughters Authoritative factor, G2Daughters Authoritarian factor, and G2Daughters Permissive factor) and their scores on each factor of the PSDQ-G1 for their mothers (i.e., G2Daughter - G1Mother Authoritative factor, G2Daughter - G1Mother Authoritarian factor, and G2Daughter - G1Mother Permissive factor) and for their fathers (i.e., G2Daughter - G1Father Authoritative factor, G2Daughter - G1Father Authoritarian factor, and G2Daughter - G1Father Permissive factor). Likewise, correlations between fathers' scores on each factor of the PSDQ and their scores on each factor of the PSDQ-G1 for their mothers and for their fathers were also computed. Of the 12 Pearson's r correlation coefficients computed, only one was statistically significant. Specifically, there was a significant linear relationship, $r(15) = .51$, 95% CI[0.102,0.801], $p = .023$, one-tailed, between G2Daughters Permissive Factor Score

($M=2.24$, $SD=0.63$, 95% CI[1.91,2.58]) and G1Mothers Permissive Factor Score ($M=2.15$, $SD=0.60$, 95% CI[1.83,2.47]). The 12 r correlation coefficients and their respective p values can be found in Table 2. Ordinarily, post-hoc comparisons, such as the Bonferroni correction to alpha, would be conducted. However, given the extremely small size of this non-representative sample and consequently ungeneralizable results, the researchers did not conduct post-hoc analyses.

The G*Power application was used to complete a post-hoc power analysis for the significant correlation between mothers' PSDQ Permissive Factor Score and the PSDQ-G1 Permissive Factor Score for their mothers. A power of 0.72 was obtained using an effect size ρ of 0.51, α error probability of .05, and a total sample size of 16. (This outcome suggests that there is a relatively high chance of failing to detect a real relationship.)

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to determine whether there is a relationship between the parenting style that parents report using with their own children and the parenting style they report their parents to have employed. Specifically, it was hypothesized that, within a rural Appalachian community, there would be a positive correlation and, further, that the correlation would be strongest for same-gender pairs (i.e., mothers and maternal grandmothers would tend to use the same parenting style and fathers and paternal grandfathers would tend to use the same parenting style). Further, it was hypothesized that the reported intergenerational similarities in parenting would be moderated by the mothers' and fathers' (G2) educational attainment, such that participants with higher levels of educational attainment would identify themselves as less authoritarian than they would report their own parents to have been. Despite the fact that the existing literature provides some

support for these hypotheses, only one significant correlation was observed.

It is notable that the participant response rate was significantly smaller than expected. Due to the extremely small size and unrepresentativeness of the current sample, interpretation of the obtained results is unwarranted. The small sample size yields low power and inaccurate effect size estimation, and the sample's unrepresentativeness renders the results generalizable.

Continuity in Parenting Styles

Given the limitations of the data, the results do not provide meaningful evidence regarding intergenerational continuity in parenting styles. Nonetheless, there was a positive correlation between G2Daughters' and G1Mothers' permissive parenting styles, meaning that G2Daughters who reported engaging in permissive parenting techniques tended to also report having mothers who engaged in permissive parenting behaviors, consistent with the expectation of same-gender continuity in parenting style, at least for women's permissive scores. Same-gender continuities were not found among men, and cross-gender intergenerational similarities in parenting styles were not evident for either men or women in this sample; however, as noted earlier, the small sample size precludes meaningful discussion of these outcomes.

Previous research on the intergenerational continuity of parenting styles has produced varied results, such that multiple studies (Baumrind, 1967; Fletcher et al., 2008; Fish et al., 2007; Simons et al., 1991; Schofield, et al., 2014; Van Ijzendoorn, 1992) have found evidence of intergenerational continuity, whereas others (Belsky et al., 2005; Conger et al., 2012; Smith & Farrington, 2004; Thornberry et al., 2003) have not. Given that several prior studies have found evidence of intergenerational continuity, coupled with the types of family

contexts often found in rural communities (e.g., close familial ties, substantial grandparent involvement) (Elder & Conger, 2000), the current results were somewhat surprising, even in light of the small sample size. However, because the sample was so limited, the present findings provide negligible evidence to either support or refute the intergenerational transmission of parenting styles in rural Appalachian communities.

Educational Attainment

Given the current study's sample size, the analyses required to determine whether G2 educational attainment is a moderator in the intergenerational transmission of parenting styles could not be undertaken. Accordingly, the fourth hypothesis that G2 parents with higher levels of educational attainment would identify themselves as less authoritarian than their own parents was unexplored.

While this hypothesis could not be statistically examined in the current study, previous studies have suggested that G1-G2 differences in parental educational attainment might contribute to cross-generational discontinuities in parenting behavior (Campbell & Gilmore, 2007; Lamm et al., 2008; Neppl et al., 2009). As noted in the literature review, in Campbell and Gilmore's (2007) study, there was an observed generational shift wherein G2s rated themselves to be less authoritarian and more authoritative and permissive than their G1 parents, in part because G2s with higher levels of education reported being less authoritarian than their parents. With these findings in mind, it is noteworthy that the majority of the current sample of G2 parents reported having an Associate's Degree or higher. Thus, future researchers attempting to examine educational attainment as a moderator in the intergenerational transmission of parenting styles in rural populations must take care that their samples are representative with respect to educational attainment. With samples like

the current one, uncharacteristically high educational attainment might attenuate the correlations between G1 and G2 parenting styles.

Summary of Findings

As noted above, these results shed little light on the intergenerational transmission in parenting styles, due to the low return rate and resulting small sample size. For the purposes of completing this master's thesis, the planned correlational analyses were carried out, and one correlation was significant, indicating a positive relationship between G1 Mothers' and G2 Daughters' permissive parenting styles. However, no examination of educational attainment as a potential moderator in the intergenerational continuity of parenting styles could be undertaken. Because of the inconclusive nature of the current study, future studies that re-examine these variables, using larger, more representative samples, may be worthwhile.

Limitations

The most obvious limitations are the study's small sample size and its lack of representativeness in relation to the community from which it was drawn. The low return rate experienced with this study highlights a key barrier to conducting research in rural communities: participation. The researchers were advised by school district personnel not to conduct the study via the Internet, because of limited family access to both computers and the Internet. Thus, it was expected that distributing the initial letters of invitation via classroom teachers and conducting follow-up communications via postal mail would yield a good sample. However, given the nature of the community in which this study was conducted, it may have been better to conduct the research face-to-face, in order to engender greater trust among the potential participants.

Owens, Richerson, Murphy, Jagelewski, and Rossi (2007) conducted focus groups with parents in a rural Appalachian community aimed at identifying barriers to participation in community-based parenting groups. Among the barriers the parents identified were fear of being judged for how they disciplined their children and distrust of others in the group (e.g., they suspected some were “confederates” who might report them to social services). Based on their findings, the low response rates in the present study may have stemmed from parental fear and distrust, which might have been attenuated had we taken steps to communicate personally with potential participants. Thus, future researchers are urged to maximize opportunities for face-to-face contact, by establishing a timeline that would afford them contact with parents early in the school year, during back-to-school events. Ideally, future researchers would obtain IRB approval and permission from the school district’s superintendent and principals during the spring or summer preceding the academic school year during which data would be collected. They also might host informational sessions for school principals, psychologists, counselors, and interested teachers and parents, to explain the purpose and potential benefits of the study in order to build trust and identify potential “champions” for the project, especially among parent and teacher leaders. Having the support of key parents and teachers may engender positive word-of-mouth communication about the study, which can be especially valuable in small communities. Larsson, Butterfield, Christopher, and Hill (2006) identified “insider leadership” and word-of-mouth communication as keys to successful engagement with rural communities. When parents hear positive information related to the study, for example, that other parents have completed the study and perhaps obtained compensation from the study, there is potential to create a

bandwagon effect, resulting in other parents being more apt to agree to participate in the study.

Furthermore, with the help of parent and teacher leaders, the nature of the school's population could be better understood and more effective recruitment strategies and materials could be developed. For example, researchers might gain permission to speak to parents before a parent-teacher association meeting or a student play or concert. They also might set up booths to solicit participation at kindergarten registration days, back-to-school nights, open house events, parent-teacher conference nights, fall festivals, or other school-based events. Parents in the study by Owens et al. (2007) reported "time constraints" to be a significant barrier to participation. Thus, it would be advantageous to recruit study participants at an event that is well-attended by parents. Furthermore, meeting the researchers face-to-face and receiving reassurances about how their data would be handled might encourage more parents to consent to participate. Giving parents the opportunity to complete the questionnaires in the booth, either on paper or online, also might both increase participation and yield a more representative sample, as might offering some form of compensation.

One potential barrier to having parents complete the questionnaires at a school event would be childcare. It would be important for future researchers to arrange for supervision of the parents' children while the parents complete the questionnaires. If setting up a booth at school events or attending PTA meetings were not possible, researchers might consider sending invitations to participate home with key back-to-school information such as bus route information, school supply lists, etc. Additional outlets that might be helpful in disseminating information about the study include parent newsletters, the school's weekly

automated phone call or email message from the principal. However, the less personal nature of these options might be disadvantageous.

Of the many barriers experienced when conducting this study, the need for additional resources—specifically a larger research team and additional funding--was crucial. The current research team was very small. Data collection was primarily accomplished through the efforts of one professor and one graduate student, which significantly limited efforts to establish buy-in and precluded identification of teacher and parent leaders at the five schools and recruitment through face-to-face communication. Having a larger research team would allow the team to build relationships, establish greater buy-in, identify “champions” at the school level for all participating schools, and recruit via more personal communication, all which have been found to enhance success when working in rural communities (Larsson et al., 2006; Owens et al., 2007). Procuring additional funding, to compensate research assistants and participants would help to ensure a larger sample that is more representative of its community.

The relative homogeneity of the current sample and its limited representation of the community from which it was drawn represent further limitations of this study. Most participants were Caucasian females, who were married or in a domestic partnership and who had obtained an Associate’s Degree or higher. According to 2016 census data (United States Census Bureau, 2016), it is clear that, while the sample obtained is similar to the rural Appalachian population in terms of race, it does not reflect that population in terms of education and income. As stated previously, a larger, more diverse sample would increase the likelihood of obtaining significant results and enhance the generalizability of the findings.

Reporter bias is another possible barrier associated with the current study, due to the retrospective nature of some of the data obtained. It is possible that the participants (G2) may have inaccurately reported the parenting styles their parents (G1) actually used. In future studies, it may be helpful to assess G1s' parenting styles by having G1 grandparents complete the PDSQ instead of utilizing G2s' retrospective reports.

Future Research Directions

As previously mentioned, there were multiple barriers within the present study that warrant explicit consideration in future research endeavors. Future researchers would be wise to obtain funding to support their efforts in obtaining a larger, more representative sample that includes participants from a variety of economic, racial, ethnic, geographic, and educational backgrounds. Researchers interested in conducting future studies in rural communities also should be mindful of the characteristics of rural communities that might impact their success. Of particular importance are the establishment of buy-in, the identification of "insider" champions, and the use of face-to-face and word-of-mouth communication (Larsson et al., 2006; Owens et al., 2007). By building relationships, trust, and buy-in with key stakeholders and champions, the research team might gain entry into the schools and their events, learn the characteristics of their sample and how to best disseminate information, and cultivate additional avenues that might increase participation (e.g., face-to-face and word-of-mouth communication). Future research should heavily focus on in-person communication and ways to quickly and easily obtain the data. As discussed previously, it would be worthwhile to attend school events with printed copies or electronic versions of both the informed consent and the questionnaires.

Researchers with limited resources might choose to focus their efforts on establishing buy-in and identifying parent and teacher leaders at just one school rather than several. This would allow the research team the opportunity to focus their efforts on identifying leaders at each grade level and cultivating face-to-face communication with these leaders, which might result in a larger, more representative sample.

Conclusion

The primary purpose of this study was to determine whether there was a relationship between the parenting style that parents report using with their own children and the parenting style they report their parents to have employed. However, due to the low return rate and limited sample size, the results obtained were largely inconclusive. The current study did not contribute to the literature as intended; however, it did highlight some of the obstacles faced in research conducted in rural communities and, perhaps more importantly, the need for a more “personal touch” when conducting research in rural settings. Despite the limited findings and barriers associated with this study, it does present a compelling case for additional exploration and investigation.

Table 1

G2 Parents' Level of Education

<u>Highest Level of Education Completed</u>	<u>Parents (<i>N</i> = 22)</u>
Some High School, No Diploma	1
Some College, No Degree	3
Trade/Technical/Vocational Training	1
Associate's Degree	5
Bachelor's Degree	6
Master's Degree	3
Professional or Doctoral Degree	3

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics

<u>Parenting Style Factor</u>	<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>Completed Questionnaire</u>	<u><i>N</i></u>	<u><i>M</i></u>	<u><i>SD</i></u>
Authoritative	G2 Daughter	PSDQ (Self)	16	4.28	0.34
		PSDQ-G1 (Mother)	16	3.30	1.01
		PSDQ-G1 (Father)	16	3.03	1.07
	G2 Son	PSDQ (Self)	6	4.14	0.47
		PSDQ-G1 (Mother)	6		
		PSDQ-G1 (Father)	6		
Authoritarian	G2 Daughter	PSDQ (Self)	16	1.75	0.43
		PSDQ-G1 (Mother)	16	2.23	0.82
		PSDQ-G1 (Father)	16	2.40	0.85
	G2 Son	PSDQ (Self)	6		
		PSDQ-G1 (Mother)	6		
		PSDQ-G1 (Father)	6		
Permissive	G2 Daughter	PSDQ (Self)	16	2.24	0.63
		PSDQ-G1 (Mother)	16	2.15	0.60
		PSDQ-G1 (Father)	16	2.11	0.86
	G2 Son	PSDQ (Self)	6		
		PSDQ-G1 (Mother)	6		
		PSDQ-G1 (Father)	6		

Table 3

G1-G2 Pearson Correlations across Parenting Style Factors

Parenting Style Factor	G1-G2 Relationship	<i>N</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>
Authoritative	G2Daughter – G1Mother	16	.33	.104
	G2Daughter – G1Father	16	.12	.329
	G2Son – G1Mother	6	.21	.346
	G2Son – G1Father	6	.28	.299
Authoritarian	G2Daughter – G1Mother	16	.33	.106
	G2Daughter – G1Father	16	-.06	.414
	G2Son – G1Mother	6	.33	.106
	G2Son – G1Father	6	.69	.066
Permissive	G2Daughter – G1Mother	16	.51	.023*
	G2Daughter – G1Father	16	.35	.095
	G2Son – G1Mother	6	.31	.274
	G2Son – G1Father	6	.01	.492

Note: *p* values are based on a one-tailed test.

References

- American Academy of Pediatrics. (2003). Family pediatrics report of the task force on the family. *Pediatrics*, 111, 31-1541.
- Baldwin, A. L. (1955). *Behavior and development in childhood*. New York: Dryden Press.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of authoritative parental control on child behavior. *Child Development*, 37, 887-907.
- Baumrind, D. (1967). Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 75, 43-88.
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology Monographs*, 4, 1-103.
- Baumrind, D. (1989). Rearing competent children. In W. Damon (Ed.), *Child Development Today And Tomorrow* (pp. 349-378). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Baumrind, D. (1991a). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 11, 56-95.
- Baumrind, D. (1991b). Effective parenting during the early adolescent transition. In P. A. Cowan & E. M. Hetherington (Eds.), *Family transitions* (pp. 111-163). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Baumrind, D. (1991c). Parenting styles and adolescent development. In R. M. Lerner, A. C. Peterson, & J. Brooks-Gunn (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Adolescence* (pp. 746-758). New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Baumrind, D. (1996). The discipline controversy revisited. *Family Relations*, 45, 405-414.

- Baumrind, D. (2005). Taking a stand in a morally pluralistic society: Constructive obedience and responsible dissent in moral/character education. In L. Nucci (Ed.), *Conflict, contradiction, and contrarian elements in moral development and education* (pp. 21-50). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Baumrind, D., & Black, A. E. (1967). Socialization practices associated with dimensions of competence in preschool boys and girls. *Child Development*, 38, 291-327.
- Baumrind, D., Larzelere, R. E., & Owens, E. B. (2010). Effects of preschool parents' power assertive patterns and practices on adolescent development. *Parenting: Science and Practice*, 10, 157-201.
- Becker, W. C. (1964). Consequences of different kinds of parental discipline. In M. L. Hoffman & L. W. Hoffman (Eds.), *Review of child development research* (Vol. I, pp. 169-208). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Belsky, J. (2005). Differential susceptibility to rearing influence: An evolutionary hypothesis and some evidence. In B. J. Ellis & D. F. Bjorklund (Eds.), *Origins of the social mind: Evolutionary psychology and child development* (pp. 139-163). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Belsky, J., Jaffee, S. R., Sligo, J., Woodward, L., & Silva, P. A. (2005). Intergenerational transmission of warm-sensitive-stimulating parenting: A prospective study of mothers and fathers of 3-year-olds. *Child Development*, 76, 384-396.
- Bornstein, M. H. (Ed.). (2002). *Handbook of parenting: Children and parenting* (Vol. 1, 2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

- Brown, R., Copeland, W. E., Costello, J. E., Erkanli, A., & Worthman, C. M. (2009). Family and community influences on educational outcomes among Appalachian youth. *Journal of Community Psychology, 37*, 795-808.
- Campbell, J., & Gilmore, L. (2007). Intergenerational continuities and discontinuities in parenting styles. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 59*, 140-150.
- Conger, R. D., Neppel, T., Kim, K. J., & Scaramella, L. (2003). Angry and aggressive behavior across three generations: A prospective, longitudinal study of parents and children. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 31*, 143-160.
- Conger, R. D., Schofield, T. J., & Neppel, T. K. (2012). Intergenerational continuity and discontinuity in harsh parenting. *Parenting: Science and Practice, 12*, 222-231.
- Conrade, G., & Ho, R. (2001). Differential parenting styles for fathers and mothers: Differential treatment for sons and daughters. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 53*, 29-35.
- Cox, A. J. (1993). Black Appalachian families. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, 10*, 312-325.
- Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin, 113*, 487-496.
- Dornbusch, S. M., Ritter, P. L., Herbert Leiderman, R. P., Roberts, D. F., & Fraleigh, M. J. (1987). The relation of parenting style to adolescent school performance. *Child Development, 58*, 1244-1257.
- Elder, G. H., & Conger, R. (2000). *Children of the land: Adversity and success in rural America*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Elkin, K., & Handel, G. (1978). *The child and society: The process of socialization*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Fish, M., Amerikaner, M. J., & Lucas, C. J. (2007). Parenting preschoolers in rural Appalachia: Measuring attitudes and behaviors and their relations to child development. *Parenting: Science and Practice, 7*, 205-233.
- Fletcher, A. C., Walls, J. K., Cook, E. C., Madison, K. J., & Bridges, T. H. (2008). Parenting style as a moderator of associations between maternal disciplinary strategies and child well-being. *Journal of Family Issues, 29*, 1724-1744.
doi:10.1177/0192513X08322933
- Furstenberg, F. J., & Harris, K. M. (1993). When fathers matter/why fathers matter: The impact of paternal involvement on the offspring of adolescent mothers. In A. Lawson & D. L. Rhode (Eds.), *The politics of pregnancy: Adolescent sexuality and public policy* (pp. 189-215). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Han, Z., & Shaffer, A. (2014). Maternal expressed emotion in relation to child behavior problems: Differential and mediating effects. *Journal of Child Family Studies, 23*, 1389-1402. doi:10.1007/s10826-10309796-0
- Harris, K. M., & Morgan, S. P. (1991). Fathers, sons, and daughters: Differential paternal involvement in parenting. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 53*, 531-544.
- Kaufmann, D., Gesten, E., Santa Lucia, R. C., Salcedo, O., Rendina-Gobioff, G., & Gadd, R. (2000). The relationship between parenting style and children's adjustment: The parents' perspective. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 9*, 231-245.

Kitamura, T., Shikai, N., Uji, M., Hiramura, H., Tanaka, N., & Shono, M. (2009).

Intergenerational transmission of parenting style and personality: Direct influence or mediation?. *Journal of Child & Family Studies, 18*, 541-556.

Klein, H. A. (1995). Urban Appalachian child in Northern schools: A study in diversity.

Young Children, 50, 10-16.

Lamborn, S. D., Mounts, N. S., Steinberg, L., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1991). Patterns of

competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. *Child Development, 62*, 1049-1065.

Lamm, B., Keller, H., Yovsi, R. D., & Chaudhary, N. (2008). Grandmaternal and maternal

ethnotheories about early child care. *Journal of Family Psychology, 22*, 80-88.

Larsson, L. S., Butterfield, P., Christopher, S., & Hill, W. (2006). Rural community leaders'

perceptions of environmental health risks: Improving community health. *AAOHN Journal: Official Journal of the American Association of Occupational Health Nurses, 54*, 105-112.

Latzman, R. D., Elkovitch, N., & Clark, L. A. (2009). Predicting parenting practices from

maternal and adolescent sons' personality. *Journal of Research in Personality, 43*, 847-855. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2009.05.004

Lee, E. H., Zhou, Q., Eisenberg, N., & Wang, Y. (2013). Bidirectional relations between

temperament and parenting styles in Chinese children. *International Journal Of Behavioral Development, 37*, 57-67. doi: 10.1177/0165025412460795

Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-

child interaction. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology* (Vol. 4, pp. 1-101). New York: Wiley.

Manoogian, M. M., Jurich, J., Sano, Y., & Ko, J. L. (2015). "My kids are more important than money": Parenting expectations and commitment among Appalachian low-income mothers. *Journal of Family Issues, 36*, 326-350.

Neppl, T. K., Conger, R. D., Scaramella, L. V., & Ontai, L. L. (2009). Intergenerational continuity in parenting behavior: Mediating pathways and child effects. *Developmental Psychology, 45*, 1241-1256.

Olivari, M. G., Tagliabue, S., & Confalonieri, E. (2013). Parenting style and dimensions questionnaire: A review of reliability and validity, *Marriage & Family Review, 49*, 465-490. doi:10.1080/01494929.2013.770812

Owens, J. S., Richerson, L., Murphy, C. E., Jagelewski, A., & Rossi, L. (2007). The parent perspective: Informing the cultural sensitivity of parenting programs in rural communities. *Child Youth Care Forum, 36*, 179-194.

Peterson, G. W., & Bush, K. R. (2013). Parent-child relationships in diverse contexts. In G. W. Peterson & K. R. Bush (Eds.), *Handbook of marriage and the family* (3rd ed., pp. 275-302). New York, NY, US: Springer Science + Business Media. doi:10.1007/978-1-4614-3987-5

Robinson, C. C., Mandleco, B., Olsen, S. F., & Hart, C. H. (1995). Authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting practices: Development of a new measure. *Psychological Reports, 77*, 819-830.

Robinson, C. C., Mandleco, B., Olsen, S. F., & Hart, C. H. (2001). The Parenting Styles and Dimensions Questionnaire (PSDQ). In B. F. Perlmutter, J. Touliatos, & G. W. Holden (Eds.), *Handbook of family measurement techniques* (Vol. 3, pp. 319-321). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

- The Rural and Appalachian Youth and Families Consortium. (1996). Parenting practices and interventions among marginalized families in Appalachia: Building on family strengths. *Family Relations, 45*, 387-396. doi:10.2307/585168
- Russell, A., Aloa, V., Feder, T., Glover, A., Miller, H., & Palmer, G. (1998). Sex-based differences in parenting styles in a sample with preschool children. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 50*, 89-99.
- Scaramella, L. V., Neppl, T. K., Ontai, L. L., & Conger, R. D. (2008). Consequences of socioeconomic disadvantage across three generations: Parenting behavior and child externalizing problems. *Journal of Family Psychology, 22*(5), 725-733.
doi:10.1037/a0013190
- Schofield, T. J., Conger, R. D., & Neppl, T. K. (2014). Positive parenting, beliefs about parental efficacy, and active coping: Three sources of intergenerational resilience. *Journal of Family Psychology, 28*, 973-978.
- Sears, R. R., Maccoby, E., & Levin, H. (1957). *Patterns of child rearing*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.
- Shaefer, E. S. (1959). A circumplex model for maternal behavior. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 59*, 226-235.
- Simons, R. L., Whitbeck, L. B., Conger, R. D., & Wu, C. (1991). Intergenerational transmission of harsh parenting. *Development and Care, 50*, 159-171.
- Smith, C. A., & Farrington, D. P. (2004). Continuities in antisocial behavior and parenting across three generations. *Journal of Child Psychology, 45*, 230-247.

- Steinberg, L., Elmen, J. D., & Mounts, N. S. (1989). Authoritative parenting, psychosocial maturity, and academic success among adolescents. *Child Development, 60*, 1424-1436.
- Symonds, P. M. (1939). *The psychology of parent-child relationships*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Tagliabue, S., Olivari, M. G., Bacchini, D., Affuso, G., & Confalonieri, E. (2014). Measuring adolescents' perceptions of parenting style during childhood: Psychometric properties of the parenting styles and dimensions questionnaire. *Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa, 30*, 251-258.
- Tanaka, M., Kitamura, T., Chen, Z., Murakami, M., & Goto, Y. (2009). Do parents rear their children as they were reared themselves? Intergenerational transmission of parental styles (warmth and control) and possible mediation by personality traits. *The Open Family Studies Journal, 2*, 82-90.
- Thornberry, T. P., Hops, H., Conger, R. D., & Capaldi, D. M. (2003). Replicated findings and future directions for intergenerational studies: Closing comments. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 31*, 201-203.
- Thornberry, T. P., Krohn, M. D., & Freeman-Gallant, A. (2006). Intergenerational roots of early onset substance use. *Journal of Drug Issues, 36*, 1-28.
- United States Census Bureau. (2016). *QuickFacts*. U.S. Department of Commerce. Retrieved [August 1, 2017] from <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts>.
- Van IJzendoorn, M. H. (1992). Intergenerational transmission of parenting: A review of studies in nonclinical populations. *Developmental Review, 12*, 76-99.

Appendix A

Demographics Questionnaire – Please provide the following information:

Check (v) your gender: Male Female Other Prefer not to report gender

Check (v) your relationship status:

Single, never married Separated Widowed
 Married/domestic partnership Year of marriage/partnership
 Divorced Year of divorce Prefer not to report status

Check (v) your race/ethnicity:

White, Non-Hispanic Hispanic or Latino
 Black or African-American Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
 Asian American Indian or Native American or Alaskan Native
 Bi-racial or multi-racial Other or prefer not to report ethnicity

What is your approximate annual household income? _____

In what year were you born? _____

In what year was your first child born? _____ **How many children are in your household?** _____

Check (v) your highest level of education completed:

Some high school, no diploma
 High school graduate, diploma or the equivalent (for example: GED)
 Some college credit, no degree
 Trade/technical/vocational training
 Associate degree
 Bachelor’s degree
 Master’s degree
 Professional or Doctoral degree **In what year did you complete this level of education?** _____

Check (v) your current employment status:

Not employed for pay, not looking for employment (includes stay-at home parents)
 Not employed for pay, looking for employment
 Employed fewer than 10 hours per week (including self-employment)
 Employed 10 – 29 hours per week (including self-employment)
 Employed 30 or more hours per week (including self-employment)
 Retired
 Disabled, not able to work

For how many years has this been your employment status? _____

Appendix B

PARENTING STYLES & DIMENSIONS QUESTIONNAIRE – PART 1

[Project ID: _____]

This questionnaire is designed to measure *how often* **you** exhibit certain behaviors towards **your child**, _____ (name).

Please carefully read each item and circle the number that best reflects how often you exhibit the behavior toward your child.

1 = Never **2** = Once in a while **3** = About half of the time **4** = Very often **5** = Always

	My behavior toward my child				
1. I am responsive to my child’s feelings and needs.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I use physical punishment as a way of disciplining my child.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I take my child’s desires into account before asking him/her to do something.	1	2	3	4	5
4. When my child asks why he/she has to conform, I state: “Because I said so,” or “I am your parent and I want you to.”	1	2	3	4	5
5. I explain to my child how I feel about the child’s good and bad behavior.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I spank when my child is disobedient.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I encourage my child to talk about his/her troubles.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I find it difficult to discipline my child.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I encourage my child to freely express (himself)(herself) even when disagreeing with me.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I punish by taking privileges away from my child with little if any explanations.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I emphasize the reasons for rules.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I give comfort and understanding when my child is upset.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I yell or shout when my child misbehaves.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I give praise when my child is good.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I give in to my child when my child causes a commotion about something.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I explode in anger towards my child.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I threaten my child with punishment more often than actually giving it.	1	2	3	4	5
18. I take into account my child’s preferences in making plans for the family.	1	2	3	4	5
19. I grab my child when he or she is being disobedient.	1	2	3	4	5

20. I state punishments to my child but do not actually do them.	1	2	3	4	5
21. I show respect for my child's opinions by encouraging my child to express them.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I allow my child to give input into family rules.	1	2	3	4	5
23. I scold and criticize to make my child improve.	1	2	3	4	5
24. I spoil my child.	1	2	3	4	5
25. I give my child reasons why rules should be obeyed.	1	2	3	4	5
26. I use threats as punishment with little or no justification.	1	2	3	4	5
27. I have warm and emotionally intimate times together with my child.	1	2	3	4	5
28. I punish by putting my child off somewhere alone, with little or no explanation.	1	2	3	4	5
29. I help my child to understand the impact of behavior by encouraging my child to talk about the consequences of his/her own actions.	1	2	3	4	5
30. I scold or criticize when my child's behavior doesn't meet my expectations.	1	2	3	4	5
31. I explain to my child the consequences of his or her behavior.	1	2	3	4	5
32. I slap my child when my child misbehaves.	1	2	3	4	5

The Spanish version of the PSDQ-Part 1 is available upon request.

Appendix C

PARENTING STYLES & DIMENSIONS QUESTIONNAIRE – PART 2

[Project ID: _____]

This questionnaire is designed to measure *how often* **your parent(s)** exhibited certain behaviors **toward you when you were a child**, using the ratings below.

1 = Never **2** = Once in a while **3** = About half of the time **4** = Very often **5** = Always

Please indicate the nature of each person's relationship to you. If you were raised by one parent, just rate that person.

Parent 1 (if he or she was not your mother)	Check one (√)	Parent 2 (if he or she was not your father)	Check (√) one
Stepmother		Stepfather	
Grandmother		Grandfather	
Other (specify):		Other (specify):	

	My mother's (or Parent 1's) behavior toward me					My father's (or Parent 2's) behavior toward me				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
1. My parent was responsive to my feelings and needs.										
2. My parent used physical punishment as a way of disciplining me.										
3. My parent took my desires into account before asking me to do something.										
4. When I asked why I had to conform, my parent stated, "Because I said so," or "I am your parent and I want you to."										
5. My parent explained to me how she/he felt about my good and bad behavior.										
6. My parent spanked me when I was disobedient.										
7. My parent encouraged me to talk about my troubles.										
8. My parent found it difficult to discipline me.										
9. My parent encouraged me to freely express myself even when I disagreed with her/him.										
10. My parent punished me by taking privileges away from me, with little or no explanation.										
11. My parent emphasized the reasons for rules.										
12. My parent gave comfort and understanding when I was upset.										
13. My parent yelled or shouted when I misbehaved										
14. My parent praised me when I was good										
15. My parent gave in to me when I caused a										

commotion about something.										
16. My parent exploded in anger towards me.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
17. My parent threatened me with punishment more often than actually giving it.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
18. My parent took into account my preferences in making plans for the family.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
19. My parent grabbed me when I was being disobedient.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
20. My parent stated punishments to me but did not actually do them.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
21. My parent showed respect for my opinions by encouraging me to express them.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
22. My parent allowed me to give input into family rules.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
23. My parent scolded or criticized me to make me improve.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
24. My parent spoiled me.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
25. My parent gave me reasons why rules should be obeyed.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
26. My parent used threats as punishment with little or no justification.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
27. My parent had warm and emotionally intimate times with me.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
28. My parent punished by putting me off somewhere alone, with little or no explanation.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
29. My parent helped me to understand the impact of my behavior by encouraging me to talk about the consequences of my own actions.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
30. My parent scolded or criticized me when my behavior didn't meet her or his expectations.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
31. My parent explained the consequences of my behavior.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
32. My parent slapped me when I misbehaved.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

The Spanish version of the PSDQ-Part 2 is available upon request.

Appendix D

Letter of Agreement

October 19, 2015

To the Appalachian Institutional Review Board (IRB):

We are familiar with Dr. Pam Kidder-Ashley's research project entitled *Intergenerational Parenting Styles: Consistency of Parenting Styles across Generations in a Rural Community*. We understand Avery County Schools' involvement to be to facilitate the distribution and collection of data collection materials, such as having teachers at each elementary school who agree to do so (1) receive (from the research team) and send home (via students) parent consent letters and questionnaire packets and (2) having those same teachers receive parent consent letters and questionnaires (all in sealed envelopes), which will in turn be picked up by members of the research team.

As the research team conducts this research project, we understand and agree that:

- This research will be carried out following sound ethical principles and that will be approved by the IRB at Appalachian State University, prior to the start of the project.
- Employee assistance with this project is strictly voluntary and not a condition of employment at Avery County Schools. There are no contingencies for employees who choose to assist or decline to assist with this project. There will be no adverse employment consequences as a result of an employee's assistance with this study.
- The research team will not disclose to principals which teachers *agree/do not agree* to assist with this project.
- To the extent that confidentiality may be protected under State or Federal law, the data collected will remain confidential, as described in the protocol. The name of our agency or institution will not reported in the results of the study.

Therefore, as a representative of Avery County Schools, we agree that Dr. Kidder-Ashley's research project may be conducted in Avery County Schools, and that Dr. Kidder-Ashley may assure Avery County teachers that they may assist with activities related to (1) obtaining parent consent to participate and (2) sending home/receiving questionnaire packets to/from parents without adverse employment consequences.

Sincerely,



 David Burlison, Superintendent, Avery County Schools



 Tracy Grit, Principal, Bahner Elk Elementary



 Ruth Shirley, Principal, Crossnore Elementary



 Brenda Reese, Principal, Freedom Trail Elementary



 Tammy Beach, Principal, Newland Elementary



 Jamie Johnson, Principal, Riverside Elementary

Appendix E

Consent to Participate in Research

Information to Consider about this Research

Title of the Research Study: *Parenting Styles in a Rural Community*

Principal Investigator: Dr. Pam Kidder-Ashley

Department: Psychology

Contact Information: Dr. Pam Kidder-Ashley

Smith-Wright Hall, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC, 28608; 828-262-2272, ext. 426

You are being invited to take part in a research study that will examine factors that might affect how people parent their children. By doing this study, we hope to learn whether styles of parenting are passed from one generation to the next and whether parenting is influenced by various demographic and personality characteristics of parents.

You may not volunteer for this study if you are less than 18 years of age. You *may* volunteer if you are a parent/guardian/adult who is responsible for the day-to-day parenting of a child enrolled in one of Avery County's elementary schools. If you do volunteer, you will be one of about 200 people to do so. We will send you a packet of questionnaires for you to complete and send back to us. The questionnaires are described below:

- The *Parenting Styles and Dimensions Questionnaire, Parent Form*, which will ask you about the type of behaviors you use when parenting your child. This questionnaire should take you about 5 minutes to complete.
- The *Parenting Styles and Dimensions Questionnaire, First Generation Form*, which will ask you about the behaviors your parent(s) used when parenting you. This questionnaire should take you about 10 – 15 minutes to complete.
- A personality questionnaire, which will ask you to rate how accurately multiple statements describe you. This questionnaire should take you about 5 – 10 minutes to complete.
- A demographics questionnaire, which will ask you questions about such factors as your age, gender, ethnicity, and income. This questionnaire should take you about 3 – 5 minutes to complete.

What are possible harms or discomforts that I might experience during the research?

To the best of our knowledge, the risk of harm for participating in this research study is no more than you would experience in everyday life.

What are the possible benefits of this research? One potential benefit of participating in this research is that you may gain insight into the types of parenting practices you use with your child(ren) and why you use them. Another general potential benefit is that the findings of this study may help current and future parents and educators better understand how parenting practices are passed down from one generation to the next.

Will I be paid for taking part in the research? We will not pay you for the time you volunteer while being in this study.

How will you keep my private information confidential? This study is anonymous. That means that no one, not even members of the research team, will know that the information you gave came from you. Your questionnaires will be identified only by a number, not by your name or your child’s name. Therefore, it will not be possible for anyone to link your answers on the questionnaires to you or your child.

Whom shall I contact if I have questions? The people conducting this study will be available to answer any questions concerning this research, now or in the future. You may contact Dr. Pam Kidder-Ashley at 828-262-2272, ext. 426. If you have questions about your rights as someone taking part in research, contact the Appalachian Institutional Review Board Administrator at 828-262-2692 (days), through email at irb@appstate.edu or at Appalachian State University, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, IRB Administrator, Boone, NC 28608.

Do I have to participate? What else should I know? Your participation in this research is completely voluntary. If you choose not to volunteer, there will be no penalty, and you will not lose any benefits or rights you would normally have. If you decide to take part in the study, you still have the right to decide at any time that you no longer want to continue. There will be no penalty and no loss of benefits or rights if you decide at any time to stop participating in the study.

On November 23, 2015, this study was found to be exempt from review by the Institutional Review Board at Appalachian State University.

If you agree to participate, please sign one copy of this consent form, place it in the enclosed envelope and return it to your child’s classroom teacher. Please keep the other copy of this form for your own records.

After we receive your letter, we will send you a packet containing the questionnaires for you to complete and send back to us.

Please **print** your name here Signature Date

Please **print** your CHILD’S name here Please **print** that child’s TEACHER’s name here
(Please choose one child, if you have more than one child enrolled.)

Please indicate the nature of your relationship to the child:
_____ Mother/Father
_____ Stepmother/Stepfather
_____ Grandparent
_____ Other (please specify): _____

Please carefully print your ADDRESS here (so that we may mail you your questionnaires):
Street address: _____ Apt. number: _____
City/town: _____ State and Zip code: _____

Appendix F**INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD**

Office of Research Protections

ASU Box 32068

Boone, NC 28608

828.262.2692

Web site: <http://researchprotections.appstate.edu/>Email: irb@appstate.edu

To: Dr. Pam Kidder-Ashley
Psychology
CAMPUS EMAIL

From: IRB Administration

Date: November 23, 2015

RE: Notice of IRB Exemption

Study #: 16-0107

Study Title: Intergenerational Parenting Styles: Consistency of Parenting Styles across Generations in a Rural Community

Exemption Category: 2

This study involves minimal risk and meets the exemption category cited above. In accordance with 45 CFR 46.101(b) and University policy and procedures, the research activities described in the study materials are exempt from further IRB review.

Study Change: Proposed changes to the study require further IRB review when the change involves:

- an external funding source,
- the potential for a conflict of interest,
- a change in location of the research (i.e., country, school system, off site location),
- the contact information for the Principal Investigator,
- the addition of non-Appalachian State University faculty, staff, or students to the research team, or
- the basis for the determination of exemption. Standard Operating Procedure #9 cites examples of changes which affect the basis of the determination of exemption on page 3.

Investigator Responsibilities: All individuals engaged in research with human participants are responsible for compliance with University policies and procedures, and IRB determinations. The Principal Investigator (PI), or Faculty Advisor if the PI is a student, is ultimately responsible for ensuring the protection of research participants; conducting sound ethical research that complies with federal regulations, University policy and procedures; and maintaining study records. The PI should review the IRB's list of PI responsibilities.

To Close the Study: When research procedures with human participants are completed, please send the Request for Closure of IRB Review form to irb@appstate.edu.

If you have any questions, please contact the Research Protections Office at (828) 262-2692 (Robin).

Best wishes with your research.

Vita

Erin Lindsey Knight was born in Reidsville, North Carolina, to Tammy and David Knight. She graduated from Reidsville High School in North Carolina in June 2010. The following autumn, she began her studies at Wingate University, majoring in Psychology and minoring in Family Studies. In June 2014, she was awarded a Bachelor of Science degree. In the fall of 2010, she was accepted into Appalachian State University's School Psychology Program and began her study towards obtaining both her Master of Arts and Specialist degrees. During her time at Appalachian State University, Ms. Knight was a graduate teaching assistant, member of the Psychology Graduate Student Organization, and involved with several additional research endeavors.

Ms. Knight is a member of Alpha Xi Delta and remains an active in several professional organizations such as the National Association of School Psychologists. She currently resides in Richmond, Virginia.