

# Assessment

## Psychometric validation of the Parental Bonding Instrument in a UK population-based sample: Role of gender and association with mental health in mid-late life

Journal:	<i>Assessment</i>
Manuscript ID	ASMNT-16-0028.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Manuscript
Keywords:	parenting, adolescence, adolescence, parental bonding instrument, psychometrics, measurement invariance, birth cohort, structural equation modelling

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

Review

Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

Psychometric validation of the Parental Bonding Instrument in a UK population-based  
sample: Role of gender and association with mental health in mid-late life

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review

## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

**Abstract**

The factorial structure of the Parental Bonding Instrument (PBI) has been frequently studied in diverse samples but no study has examined its psychometric properties from large, population-based samples. In particular, important questions have not been addressed such as the measurement invariance properties across parental and offspring gender. We evaluated the PBI based on responses from a large, representative population-based sample, using an exploratory structural equation modelling method appropriate for categorical data. Analysis revealed a three-factor structure representing “care”, “overprotection” and “autonomy” parenting styles. In terms of psychometric measurement validity, our results supported the complete invariance of the PBI ratings across sons and daughters for their mothers and fathers. The PBI ratings were also robust in relation to personality and mental health status. In terms of predictive value, paternal care showed a protective effect on mental health at age 43 in sons. The PBI is a sound instrument for capturing perceived parenting styles, and is predictive of mental health in middle adulthood.

**Keywords:** parenting, adolescence, Parental Bonding Instrument, psychometrics, measurement invariance, birth cohort, structural equation modelling

## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

**Introduction**

Developmental theories of attachment (Bowlby, 1977) and emotion regulation (Sroufe, 1997) maintain that parenting practices influence various aspects of children's emotional and behavioural development. Positive parenting practices (e.g. care, responsiveness, and clear standards; Baumrind, 1991b) are associated with many desirable outcomes such as better adjustment (Thorberg, Young, Sullivan, & Lyvers, 2011), pro-social dispositions (Collins & Steinberg, 2006), and lower risk for the development of internalising (D. Heider, Matschinger, Bernert, Alonso, & Angermeyer, 2006) and externalising (Baumrind, 1991a) symptoms, as well as eating (Swanson et al., 2010) and addictive (Siomos et al., 2012) disorders. Negative parenting practices (e.g. a high level of parental control and a low level of autonomy and warmth; Baumrind, 1967, 1971) are associated with ill adjustment (Rodgers, 1996a, 1996b; Thorberg et al., 2011) including low self-esteem (Milevsky, Schlechter, Netter, & Keehn, 2007), gambling addiction (Villalta, Arévalo, Valdepérez, Pascual, & de los Cobos, 2015), and social hostility (Ladd & Pettit, 2002), as well as worse later life well-being (Huppert, Abbott, Ploubidis, Richards, & Kuh, 2009). The assessment of parenting for very young children is typically conducted through observation. However, for the assessment of parenting style by older children and adults, offspring self-reports are more often used. The parental Bonding Instrument (PBI) is a popular measurement tool for this purpose. The PBI retrospectively measures participants' perceptions of their relationship with their parents before the age of 16, and can be administered retrospectively at any age after the age 16. The instrument assesses these self-perceived relationships separately for the mother and the father, through two dimensions of parenting: care and control (Parker, Tupling, & Brown, 1979). The care dimension measures positive parenting, including parental warmth and affection. The control dimension measures negative parenting, including parental control and constraint.

## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

**Psychometric Properties of the PBI and Methodological Challenges**

Despite its widespread use, there is no consensus regarding the factor structure of the PBI.

While some studies have confirmed the original two-factor structure (Kitamura et al., 2009; Mackinnon, Henderson, Scott, & Duncan-Jones, 1989; Parker et al., 1979), other studies have suggested three- (Cox, Enns, & Clara, 2000; Cubis, Lewin, & Dawes, 1989; Dirk Heider et al., 2005; E. Murphy, Brewin, & Silka, 1997; Sato et al., 1999) or four- (Behzadi & Parker, 2015; Liu, Li, & Fang, 2011; Uji, Tanaka, Shono, & Kitamura, 2006) factor solutions. In most previous studies converging on a three-factor solution, items within the control factor have been shown to form two distinct factors: (1) overprotection, consisting of items such as “[my mother/father] *felt I could not look after myself unless she/he was around*”; and (2) autonomy, consisting of items such as “[my mother/father] *let me decide things for myself*”. In four-factor solutions, items originally measuring the care factor also separated into two dimensions, although this was observed mainly in non-European samples of Japanese (Uji et al., 2006), Chinese (Liu et al., 2011), and Persian respondents (Behzadi & Parker, 2015).

Apart from cultural or linguistic differences, several methodological issues may explain these factor structure inconsistencies. While some studies relied on exploratory factor analytic (EFA) methods or principal component analyses (e.g., Gómez-Beneyto, Pedrós, Tomás, Aguilar, & Leal, 1993; E. Murphy et al., 1997), others utilised confirmatory factor analyses (CFA, e.g., Behzadi & Parker, 2015; Terra et al., 2009; Tsaousis, Mascha, & Giovazolias, 2011). Although traditional EFA methods can be useful for determining the number of factors to retain, they typically do not provide goodness-of-fit information; it is therefore difficult to assess whether the model provides an adequate representation of the data. On the other hand, although confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) methods are able to test theory-driven models and provide goodness-of-fit information, these methods rely on strict assumptions that do not often hold in practice. For instance, CFA relies on the highly

## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

1  
2  
3 restrictive independent cluster assumption, which forces all cross-loadings to be zero. When  
4  
5 non-zero cross-loadings are present in the population, such constraints can inflate the degree  
6  
7 of associations between factors (Marsh, Morin, Parker, & Kaur, 2013; Morin, Marsh, &  
8  
9 Nagengast, 2013). An increasingly popular method, exploratory structural equation modelling  
10  
11 (ESEM), combines features of CFA and EFA, thus overcoming the typical restrictions of  
12  
13 both and allowing the free estimation of all possible cross-loadings between items and non-  
14  
15 target factors (Marsh et al., 2013; Morin et al., 2013). The main advantage of ESEM over  
16  
17 CFA is that it integrates the less restrictive assumptions of EFA with the benefits of structural  
18  
19 equation modelling, such as goodness-of-fit indices, multi-group invariance analyses, and the  
20  
21 ability to combine regression and structural equations within the same model (Asparouhov &  
22  
23 Muthén, 2009; Marsh et al., 2010; Marsh et al., 2009; Marsh, Nagengast, & Morin, 2012).  
24  
25 Furthermore, simulations studies and studies of simulated data showed that ESEM tends to  
26  
27 provide more exact estimates of true population values for factor correlations when cross-  
28  
29 loadings are present in the population model, and to remain unbiased when the population  
30  
31 model corresponds to the CFA assumption (Asparouhov, Muthén, & Morin, 2015).  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 A large body of empirical research (Chen, Liu, & Li, 2000; Cubis et al., 1989; Henry,  
37  
38 Tolan, & Gorman-Smith, 2005; Hoeve, Dubas, Gerris, van der Laan, & Smeenk, 2011;  
39  
40 Lansford, Laird, Pettit, Bates, & Dodge, 2014; Watson, Potts, Hardcastle, Forehand, &  
41  
42 Compas, 2012) suggests that the association between parenting practices and offspring  
43  
44 outcomes is dependent on the gender of the parent and of the offspring. Consistency of  
45  
46 parenting style between both parents has also been investigated (Winsler, Madigan, &  
47  
48 Aquilino, 2005). However, an important prerequisite to these comparisons is the  
49  
50 demonstration that the PBI factors are psychometrically invariant across males and female  
51  
52 offspring's ratings of their mothers and fathers (Byrne, Shavelson, & Muthén, 1989; Cheung,  
53  
54 2008). To our knowledge, no studies have examined the measurement invariance properties  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

of the PBI instrument in relation to the gender of the offspring as well as of the parents.

As with many other instruments relying on self-reported measures, PBI ratings have been shown to be influenced by current depressive states (Eleanor Murphy, Wickramaratne, & Weissman, 2010) or sad mood (Gillham, Putter, & Kash, 2007). Similarly, personality has also been suggested to represent a possible source of bias in PBI ratings due to the subjective ways in which items are interpreted, which itself can be influenced by various respondent personality characteristics (Jakobsen & Jensen, 2015; Randall & Fernandes, 1991). Psychometric methods, such as multiple indicators multiple causes (MIMIC) tests of differential item functioning (DIF), can address this issue by detecting the extent to which item response differs as a function of various characteristics of the respondents over and above the relations between these characteristics and scores on the PBI factors. To our knowledge no such studies have formally studied the response bias of the PBI in relation to personality or depressive state using state-of-the-art psychometric methods.

Furthermore, the PBI items are rated using a four-point, ordered-categorical, Likert-type response scale with a marked tendency towards non-normality (Liu et al., 2011; Tsaousis et al., 2011). Under these conditions, research has shown that it is problematic to model data using an estimator (such as maximum likelihood or robust alternative) that assumes the underlying continuity of the ratings (DiStefano, 2002; Dolan, 1994). To date, no psychometric study of the PBI has properly taken into account the ordinal nature of the PBI items using an estimation method that model data as ordinal variables such as the robust weighted least squares estimator (WLSMV; Asparouhov & Muthen, 2010; Finney & DiStefano, 2006).

**Predictive Validity of the PBI**

Although the PBI has been recognised to be predictive of future behavioural outcomes, many

## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

1  
2  
3 previous studies exploring parenting effects focus on young children (Cooper-Vince, Chan,  
4 Pincus, & Comer, 2014; Möller, Majdandžić, & Bögels, 2014; StGeorge, Fletcher, Freeman,  
5 Paquette, & Dumont, 2015) or adolescents (Lansford et al., 2014; McKinney & Renk, 2008).  
6  
7 Few studies have followed participants into adulthood (Hoeve et al., 2011). Another  
8  
9 weakness of previous investigations of the PBI is that very few have been conducted based  
10  
11 on population-representative samples, thus rendering findings vulnerable to selection bias. In  
12  
13 the present investigation, we relied on a longitudinal population-based sample from England,  
14  
15 Wales and Scotland to assess the psychometric properties of the PBI and its measurement  
16  
17 invariance in relation to the gender of offspring and the parents, using multiple-group ESEM.  
18  
19 Specifically, we assessed two psychometric properties of the PBI, as well as its predictive  
20  
21 validity. Regarding the psychometric properties of the PBI, we address the following  
22  
23 questions:  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

- 29 1. How many factors are necessary to represent PBI ratings, as assessed by ESEM  
30 analyses conducted separately for maternal and paternal PBI ratings?  
31  
32
- 33 2. Is the PBI underlying measurement model invariant for ratings provided by male and  
34 female offspring of the parenting style of their mothers and fathers?  
35  
36
- 37 3. Are PBI ratings biased (DIF) as a function of respondents' personality (measured at  
38 age 26) and mental health status (measured at age 43)?  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 Regarding the predictive validity of the PBI, we address the following question:

44  
45 What is the unique predictive effect of maternal or paternal PBI factors on  
46  
47 respondents' mental health assessed at age 43 and 53?  
48  
49  
50  
51

## 52 Method

### 53 Sample

54  
55 The study sample was based on the Medical Research Council (MRC) National Survey of  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

1  
2  
3 Health and Development (NSHD), also known as the British 1946 birth cohort, which  
4 originally consisted of 5,362 singleton babies (2,547 girls and 2,815 boys) born in one week  
5 in March 1946 in England, Scotland and Wales (Stafford et al., 2013). Study members were  
6 all classified as white. The data collection received approval from the North Thames Multi-  
7 Centre Research Ethics Committee, and participants gave informed consent to participate in  
8 the MRC NSHD.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

**Measures**

18  
19  
20 *Occupational Social Class.* The socio-economic status of respondents during their childhood  
21 was assessed via the father's occupational social class (based on the UK Registrar General's  
22 classification) when study members were aged 11 years. If this information was missing, it  
23 was replaced by similar information obtained at age 4 or 15, depending on availability. The  
24 adulthood occupational social class was measured at 43 years. If this information was missing,  
25 it was replaced by similar information obtained at age 36 or 26. The occupational social class  
26 variable has six categories (1: Unskilled; 2: Partly skilled; 3: Skilled (Manual); 4: Skilled  
27 (Non-Manual); 5: Intermediate; 6: Professional).  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 *The Parental Bonding Instrument.* At aged 43 years, the survey members rated their  
39 mothers' (24 items) and fathers' (24 items) parenting practices for the period up to the age of  
40 16 years. These items were rated on a 1 to 4 ordered-categorical, Likert-type scale ranging  
41 from "very like this" to "very unlike this". See Table 2 for a list of the PBI items.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 *Maudsley Personality Inventory.* Study members completed six Neuroticism (e.g. "Do  
48 you sometimes feel happy, sometimes depressed, without any apparent reason?") and six  
49 Extraversion (e.g. "Are you happiest when you get involved in some project that calls for  
50 rapid action?") items from the Maudsley Personality Inventory (Eysenck, 1958, 1959) at age  
51 26 years. The items had a binary response format of "no" and "yes". Kuder-Richardson-20  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

(the equivalent of Cronbach's  $\alpha$  for binary items) scale score reliability coefficients are .554 for extraversion and .741 for neuroticism.

*Psychiatric Symptom Frequency scale.* Anxiety and depression at age 43 years were assessed through the interview-based Psychiatric Symptom Frequency scale (Lindelow, Hardy, & Rodgers, 1997). Participants provided ratings ranging from 0 (not in the last year) to 5 (very often) to 18 questions such as “*have you felt on edge or keyed up or mentally tense?*” in the last 12 months ( $\alpha = .896$ ).

*General Health Questionnaire.* Participants completed the 28-item self-administered General Health Questionnaire (GHQ-28; Goldberg & Hillier, 1979) at age 53. The GHQ-28 focuses on symptoms of anxiety and depression in the preceding four weeks (e.g. “*Have you recently been getting scared or panicky for no good reason?*”). Item data were coded on a four-point Likert scale ranging from “not at all” to “much more than usual” ( $\alpha = .926$ ).

### Statistical Analysis

Analyses were carried out using Mplus 7.11 (Muthén & Muthén, 2015). We used the weighted least squares estimator (WLSMV) estimator with theta parameterisation. Data from questionnaire items were modelled as ordered-categorical polytomous ratings through a probit regression link with the corresponding latent variables. This corresponds to a graded response, two-parameter, normal ogive model in item response theory terms (Samejima, 1997).

We used ESEM to determine whether the PBI data structure was invariant across groups formed on the basis of the gender of the offspring (sons and daughters) and their parents (mothers and fathers). Analyses started with the estimation of ESEM models using oblique geomin rotation, with an epsilon value of .5 (Marsh et al., 2009; Morin et al., 2013). Items related to maternal and paternal parenting styles were analysed separately in order to

## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

1  
2  
3 determine the number of factors to retain, and to examine whether the factor structure was  
4  
5 comparable across maternal and paternal measures. Since the wording of the items is  
6  
7 identical for maternal and paternal ratings, *a priori* correlated residuals at the item level were  
8  
9 included between items with parallel wording, as recommended by Marsh and Hau (1996).  
10  
11 Next, measurement invariance was examined using multiple-group ESEM (Marsh et al., 2013;  
12  
13 Meredith & Teresi, 2006) for configural invariance, weak invariance (factor loadings), strong  
14  
15 invariance (loadings and thresholds), and strict invariance (loadings, thresholds and  
16  
17 uniquenesses). Although it was not strictly part of the measurement invariance assessment,  
18  
19 we also assessed the structural invariance of the PBI in terms of factor variances, covariances,  
20  
21 and latent means across groups.  
22  
23

24  
25 To assess DIF in relation to affective symptoms and personality measures, we used a  
26  
27 MIMIC ESEM model (Morin et al., 2013). DIF represents a direct association between the  
28  
29 covariate and a particular item after accounting for the association between the covariate and  
30  
31 the latent factor, which indicates that the covariate influences the response process on a  
32  
33 particular item over and above its influence on the latent factor itself. DIF is thus similar to a  
34  
35 case of threshold non-invariance across levels of the covariate, and suggests the presence of  
36  
37 response bias at the item level (Kaplan, 2000; Morin et al., 2013). Specifically, three models  
38  
39 are tested in a MIMIC analysis. In the MIMIC saturated model, the paths from the covariates  
40  
41 to the latent factors are fixed at zero, but all direct paths from the covariates to the items are  
42  
43 estimated. In the MIMIC invariant model, the paths from the covariates to the items are fixed  
44  
45 at zero, but the paths from the covariates to the latent factors are freely estimated. In the third  
46  
47 MIMIC Null model, all paths from the covariates to the latent factors and items are  
48  
49 constrained to be zero. A goodness-of-fit comparison between the first two models (Invariant  
50  
51 and Saturated) and the last (Null) serves to assess whether the covariates have an effect on  
52  
53 PBI ratings, whereas the comparison between the first two models (Invariant versus saturated)  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

1  
2  
3 serves to assess the presence of DIF.  
4

5 Since the chi-square is known to be highly sensitive to sample size (Marsh, Balla, &  
6  
7 McDonald, 1988; Marsh, Hau, & Grayson, 2005), a variety of sample size independent  
8  
9 goodness-of-fit indices was also examined to assess the fit of the alternative models: the Root  
10  
11 Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), and the  
12  
13 Comparative Fit Index (CFI; Fan, Thompson, & Wang, 1999; Hu & Bentler, 1999; Marsh,  
14  
15 Hau, & Wen, 2004; Yu, 2002). The TLI and CFI vary along a 0-to-1 continuum and values  
16  
17 greater than 0.90 and 0.95 typically reflect an acceptable and excellent fit to the data.  
18  
19

20  
21 RMSEA values of less than 0.06 and 0.08 indicate a close fit and an acceptable fit to the data  
22  
23 respectively. In terms of model comparisons for multiple-group analyses, a restrictive model  
24  
25 is preferred if the change in model fit indices is not significantly inferior to those of the less  
26  
27 restrictive model. For RMSEA, the change should be less than .015 (Chen, 2007). For CFI  
28  
29 and TLI, the change should be less than 0.01 (Chen, 2007; Cheung & Rensvold, 2001). The  
30  
31 WLSMV chi-square difference tests (computed with the DIFFTEST function, Muthén &  
32  
33 Muthén, 2015) compare the model under investigation to less restrictive alternative model.  
34  
35  
36  
37

## 38 Results

### 39 Sample Demographics

40  
41  
42 Of the initial 5362 newborn babies, 2815 were male and 2547 were female. For the main  
43  
44 variables used in the current analysis (parental bonding at age 43, personality at age 26 and  
45  
46 mental health data at ages 43 and 35), there were 1217 participants with complete data,  
47  
48 whereas information was completely missing for 1373 participants (Supplement Table S1). In  
49  
50 comparison to the participants with complete data, the samples with completely missing data  
51  
52 had a higher percentage of males, and came from families of lower occupational social class  
53  
54 at age 11 and had lower occupational social class at age 43.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

**Psychometric Properties**

The results of PBI psychometric properties are presented in relation to number of PBI factors, measurement invariance according to gender, and uniform DIF in relation to personality and mental health measures.

*Number of PBI Factors.* Mother- and father-specific PBI items were separately analysed using ESEM. Models including two, three and four factors were compared, and the results showed that ESEM models including three or four factors provided a satisfactory level of fit to the data (Table 1). Parameter estimates from these models are reported in Tables 2 (mothers) and 3 (fathers). These results show that, in both models, factor one describes the *a priori* “care” dimension of the PBI questionnaire, whereas factors two and three describe the “overprotection”, and “autonomy” dimensions, whose items jointly form the original “control” factor. In both maternal and paternal measures, the “care” factor was negatively correlated with “overprotection” factor but positively correlated with the “autonomy” factor, whereas the “overprotection” factor was negatively correlated with the “autonomy” factor. However, the four-factor solution was not fully equivalent across ratings of mothers and fathers. For ratings of fathers, the fourth factor merely corresponded to a single item (“*wanted me to grow up*”) from the “overprotection” factor. In contrast, in ratings of the mothers, the “overprotection” factor was more cleanly split into two factors. A close examination revealed that the three items corresponding to the third factor in the rating of the mothers had largely parallel wording (i.e., “*gave me as much freedom as I wanted*”, “*let me go out as often as I wanted*”, and “*let me dress in any way I pleased*”). We thus included correlated residuals between these three items and re-ran the analyses for the three-factor model. This revised three-factor model, including correlated residuals, provided a very clear three-factor solution, with similar solutions across ratings of mothers and fathers, and corresponded to the *a priori*

## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

1  
2  
3 “care”, “overprotection”, and “autonomy” factors found in many previous studies. This factor  
4  
5 structure fits the data well and is consistent across ratings of the mothers and fathers.  
6

7  
8 Subsequent analyses are therefore based on this factor structure.

9  
10 *Measurement Invariance across Parents and Offspring Gender.* Six multiple-group  
11  
12 ESEM models were specified (Table 4, m1-m6). Offspring ratings of their mothers and  
13  
14 fathers were both included in the same model, with sons and daughters forming two separate  
15  
16 groups. Hence the tests of measurement invariance conducted here are based on two types of  
17  
18 ratings (mothers vs. fathers) provided by two (sons vs. daughters) groups of offspring. The  
19  
20 baseline model (m1) tests whether the factorial structure is consistent across groups of  
21  
22 offspring ratings of their mothers or fathers, allowing parameters to be freely estimated across  
23  
24 respondents and parents. The baseline model provided an excellent model fit (RMSEA: 0.04,  
25  
26 TLI: 0.971, CFI: 0.966), supporting the configural invariance of the model. In the weak  
27  
28 invariance model (m2), factor loadings were constrained equal across groups of offspring and  
29  
30 parental ratings. The model fitted the data well (RMSEA: 0.033, TLI: 0.979, CFI: 0.977), and  
31  
32 in comparison to model 1, there was improvement in goodness of fit in terms of RMSEA,  
33  
34 CFI, and TLI, indicating equal factor loadings across groups and types of parental ratings. In  
35  
36 the strong invariance model (m3), the focus is the invariance of the item thresholds. In  
37  
38 addition to constraining factor loadings equal, thresholds were held equal across daughters  
39  
40 and sons, as well as across ratings of mothers and fathers. Model 3 fitted the data well, and  
41  
42 showed minimal change in model fit indices, including RMSEA, CFI and TLI, supporting the  
43  
44 strong measurement invariance of the model. In model 4 (m4), strict invariance was imposed  
45  
46 by additionally holding residual variances constant across all groups of offspring and parental  
47  
48 ratings. Again, this model fitted the data well, and showed improved goodness of fit in  
49  
50 comparison to the strong invariance model (m3), supporting the strict invariance of the model.  
51  
52 In model 5, the variances and covariances of all factors were constrained to be equal across  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

1  
2  
3 groups and types of parental ratings. This model again resulted in improved goodness-of-fit  
4  
5 results, thus supporting the invariance of the latent variance and covariance matrix across  
6  
7 groups of offspring and parental ratings. Finally, tests of the invariance of the latent means  
8  
9 across groups of offspring and parental ratings (m6) resulted in a slight decrease in goodness  
10  
11 of fit in comparison to model 5, where latent means were freely estimated. Even though the  
12  
13 decrease in fit remained minimal (less than .01 in RMSEA, TLI and CFI), we decided to  
14  
15 explore latent means differences given their substantive interest. We thus retained model m5  
16  
17 as the final model. The invariant latent correlations were estimated as part of this model, as  
18  
19 well as latent means across all daughters and sons' ratings of their mothers and fathers, and  
20  
21 are reported in Table 4.  
22  
23

24  
25 Factor correlations (Table 5) showed that, for both mothers and fathers, care was  
26  
27 positively correlated with autonomy but negatively correlated with overprotection. There was  
28  
29 a high level of agreement across parenting characteristics of mothers and fathers (correlation  
30  
31 coefficients were .519 for care, .666 for overprotection, and .808 for autonomy). This is  
32  
33 consistent with the observed invariance of the factor variances-covariances.  
34  
35

36  
37 Across the set of models considered here, the latent means are constrained at zero in  
38  
39 one group of offspring rating of one parent (e.g., sons' ratings of their mothers) for  
40  
41 identification purposes, allowing for the free estimation of the latent means for all other  
42  
43 ratings (e.g., sons' ratings of their fathers, and daughters' ratings of both parents). This way,  
44  
45 all freely estimated latent means directly represent deviations, in standard deviation units,  
46  
47 from the referent latent mean constrained at zero. In order to more specifically assess latent  
48  
49 means differences, model m5 was thus re-estimated four times, each time with a different set  
50  
51 of latent means set to zero (the reference point). Examination of these results (see Table 5)  
52  
53 suggests differences in parenting of mothers and fathers according both to sons and daughters.  
54  
55 Compared to maternal measures, both daughters and sons rated fathers to be less caring (-  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

0.532 for sons, -0.258 for daughters) and less overprotective (-0.455 for sons, -0.217 for daughters). Daughters also rated fathers as granting less autonomy (-0.117), although there was no difference for sons (-0.029, ns). There were also differences in how sons and daughters viewed the parenting of their mothers and fathers. There was no difference in how sons and daughters rated their mothers' parenting styles on care and overprotection. However, in comparisons to the sons' perception of their mothers, daughters regarded their mothers as giving less autonomy (-0.251). Daughters also regarded fathers as more caring (0.314), more protective (0.301), and as granting less autonomy (-0.339) compared to sons.

*DIF analysis.* In order to assess whether PBI ratings were subject to DIF in relation to covariates including personality and mental health measures, MIMIC ESEM models were estimated, starting from the model of strict measurement invariance (model m4). These results are reported in Table 4. In comparison to models m7 (MIMIC Saturated) and m8 (MIMIC Invariant), model m9 (MIMIC null) resulted in almost identical goodness-of-fit indices, suggesting that these covariates had no effects on sons and daughters ratings of their parents, thus also evidencing a lack of DIF and measurement biases relate to these covariates.

### **Predictive Validity of PBI Factors**

Starting again from a model of strict measurement invariance (model m4), we first estimated a multiple-group model with both maternal and paternal factors included as predictors of mental health outcomes at age 43 and 53 (model m10, see Table 6). For daughters, none of the parenting style factors predicted mental health outcomes. However, for sons, paternal care predicted fewer mental health symptoms at age 43 (beta=-0.139). It is noteworthy that, although none of the predictions came out as significant in the daughters group, this group evidenced some inflated standardised regression coefficients and standard errors, suggesting the presence of multicollinearity amongst parenting style measures related to mothers and



## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

1  
2  
3 fathers. This implies that for parenting related to overprotection and autonomy there was  
4  
5 limited unique contribution of maternal or paternal parenting effects on later life mental  
6  
7 health (predictions estimated in separate models for paternal and maternal measures are  
8  
9 presented in the supplemental materials, Table S2).  
10

### 11 12 13 14 **Discussion**

15  
16 The present study is the first psychometric investigation of PBI based on a large  
17  
18 representative population-based sample from the UK. Analyses supported a three-factor  
19  
20 structure in the study population, and multiple-group ESEM and MIMIC models  
21  
22 demonstrated the robustness of the psychometric properties of the PBI instrument as a  
23  
24 function of the respondents' and parents' genders, as well as respondents' personality  
25  
26 characteristics and mental health. The PBI was found to predictive of mental health in midlife  
27  
28 in a gender-specific manner.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

### 34 **Psychometric Properties of the PBI**

35  
36 ESEM analyses of the NSHD sample led to a three-factor structure (Tables 1, 2 and 3). The  
37  
38 care factor corresponded to the original factor of this name (Parker, 1979), but the control  
39  
40 factor split into two further factors, overprotection and autonomy, in line with some  
41  
42 psychometric studies of Western samples (Cox et al., 2000; Dirk Heider et al., 2005; Murphy  
43  
44 et al., 1997). Although previous studies in non-Western cultures have found that a four-factor  
45  
46 structure explained the data better (Behzadi & Parker, 2015; Liu et al., 2011; Suzuki &  
47  
48 Kitamura, 2011; Uji et al., 2006), the three-factor solution found in the present investigation  
49  
50 is consistent with several previous studies of English-speaking populations or other Western  
51  
52 cultures (Cubis et al., 1989; Gómez-Beneyto et al., 1993; Kendler, 1996; Mohr, Preisig,  
53  
54 Fenton, & Ferrero, 1999; Murphy et al., 1997). Countries in which the our factor solution was  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

1  
2  
3 supported, such as Iran or Asian countries, are often characterised by a male-dominated  
4  
5 culture in familial and societal environments, which may lead to differences in parenting  
6  
7 styles when assessed using an instrument initially developed for Western cultures (Behzadi &  
8  
9 Parker, 2015). Another possibility is the effect of cultural differences on the individual's  
10  
11 response to the wordings of questionnaire items. The items that form further additional  
12  
13 factors of the PBI are often items that score in the same direction towards either positive  
14  
15 parenting, or negative parenting. It has been suggested that responses to questionnaire items  
16  
17 with mixed wordings (positive and negative) can be subject to cultural influences. In  
18  
19 particular, negatively-worded items are often interpreted differently across cultures (Schmitt  
20  
21 & Allik, 2005). It has been suggested that additional factors due to positive/negative wording  
22  
23 of items are interpreted as artefactual (Greenberger, Chen, Dmitrieva, & Farruggia, 2003) .  
24  
25  
26

27  
28 Our study is the first to demonstrate the measurement invariance of the PBI (models 1-  
29  
30 6, Table 3) in relation to parental and offspring gender, utilising sophisticated psychometric  
31  
32 methods to verify the factor structure and measurement invariance across distinct gender  
33  
34 groups. Under multiple-group ESEM analysis, the three-factor structure in the current sample  
35  
36 was found to be fully invariant in these respects, which enables valid comparison of analyses  
37  
38 involving maternal and paternal parenting practices, and in male and female offspring.  
39  
40

41 Both male and female participants rated their fathers to be less caring and less  
42  
43 overprotective than their mothers, which is in line with previous findings that mothers tend to  
44  
45 adopt warmer parenting styles compared to fathers (Murphy et al., 1997; Russell et al., 1998).  
46  
47 This is in line with the gender role theory that women are socialised to be warmer and more  
48  
49 care-giving compared to their male counterparts, whereas men are perceived as more  
50  
51 authoritarian (Hosley & Montemayor, 1997). However, this result may potentially also reflect  
52  
53 cohort effects, as participants from the present study were born in the 1940s.  
54  
55

56 The psychometric properties of the PBI ratings were also shown to be robust in relation  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

1  
2  
3 to external covariates (Table 4, models 7-8). This finding lends stronger support to the  
4  
5 validity of associations reported in previous studies investigating the relations between  
6  
7 parental styles and personality/mental health outcomes. Although previous studies also  
8  
9 looked at the potential bias of PBI ratings due to factors such as concurrent depressive mood  
10  
11 (Duggan, Sham, Minne, Lee, & Murray, 1998; Gotlib, Mount, Cordy, & Whiffen, 1988;  
12  
13 Rodgers, 1996a also based on the NSHD sample), the present study is the first to rely on a  
14  
15 psychometric approach that allows for the assessment of DIF in relation to individual items.  
16  
17 This makes possible a more comprehensive examination of the measurement properties in  
18  
19 relation to key covariates that are often studied as outcomes of parenting styles.  
20  
21  
22  
23

**Predicative Validity of PBI Factors**

24  
25  
26  
27 In the present investigation, we did not find a unique effect of maternal or paternal parenting  
28  
29 style factors for mental health outcomes in daughters. However, fathers' care predicted fewer  
30  
31 mental health symptoms in sons. Although we are not able to find other studies with follow-  
32  
33 up going well into adulthood, Lanford et al. (2014) reported the unique effect of father's  
34  
35 autonomy on sons' externalising behaviours. An earlier review (Pleck & Masciadrelli, 2004)  
36  
37 also showed evidence of the father's involvement in longer-term child outcomes. This might  
38  
39 be explained from the perspective of role theory (Hosley & Montemayor, 1997) that sons are  
40  
41 traditionally encouraged to be more independent and take more risks. Indeed, children tend to  
42  
43 copy behaviour from parents of the same sex (Laible & Carlo, 2004). Here, the results  
44  
45 suggest that caring parenting from fathers predicts positive mental health in sons.  
46  
47  
48

49  
50 The lack of a unique parental style association for daughters is likely due to substantial  
51  
52 confounding of maternal and paternal measurements, given the high correlation among  
53  
54 maternal and paternal measures observed in the present study ( $r = .519$  to  $.808$ ). The separate  
55  
56 results of maternal and paternal predictions (Table S5) confirmed that the gender-specific  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

1  
2  
3 effect of the PBI was highly comparable for both sons and daughters. Studies with  
4  
5 adolescents have also reported a moderate to high level of concordance between perceptions  
6  
7 of mothers and fathers (Hoeve et al., 2011; Lansford et al., 2014). This indicates that it might  
8  
9 be sufficient to measure PBI from one rather than from both parents.  
10

**Limitations and Future Directions**

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16 Sample attrition was found to relate to gender and occupational social class, indicating the  
17  
18 missing at random (MAR) mechanism. To account for this limitation, the analyses included  
19  
20 occupational social class as a covariate, and the analyses were also stratified by gender. The  
21  
22 WLSMV estimator used in the current analysis employs a pairwise-present strategy for  
23  
24 dealing with missing data, which has been shown to produce unbiased estimates under MAR  
25  
26 assumptions in relation to observed covariates (Asparouhov & Muthen, 2010).  
27  
28

29  
30 A feature of the current study design is that the parenting styles for prior to the age of  
31  
32 16 were assessed while the participants were 43 years old. Although our study is unable to  
33  
34 assess test-rest stability, as it is limited to only one wave of measurement, previous  
35  
36 recollections of parenting styles have been shown to remain stable even when re-assessed  
37  
38 after a 20-year period (Eleanor Murphy et al., 2010; Wilhelm, Niven, Parker, & Hadzi-  
39  
40 Pavlovic, 2005). Nevertheless, it would be interesting to study how parenting styles measured  
41  
42 at different stages predict future outcomes.  
43  
44

45  
46 The current study is based on a British sample for which English is the native language.  
47  
48 Since the PBI has also been studied across a diverse range of countries (Spain: Gómez-  
49  
50 Beneyto et al., 1993; China: Liu et al., 2011; Australia: Mackinnon et al., 1989; France: Mohr  
51  
52 et al., 1999; E. Murphy et al., 1997; Pakistan: Qadir, Stewart, Khan, & Prince, 2005; Brazil:  
53  
54 Terra et al., 2009; Japan: Uji et al., 2006), it would be interesting to assess whether this  
55  
56 property studied in the current study holds true for other cultures.  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

1  
2  
3 Another limitation of the current study is that all participants were white, therefore  
4  
5 future cross-cultural studies are needed to address the lack of cultural diversity in the current  
6  
7 sample.  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review

**References**

- Asparouhov, T., & Muthén, B. (2010). Weighted Least Squares Estimation with Missing Data (Technical Report). Retrieved 6 Dec 2010  
<http://www.statmodel.com/download/GstrucMissingRevision.pdf>
- Asparouhov, T., & Muthén, B. (2009). Exploratory structural equation modeling. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 16, 397-438.
- Asparouhov, T., Muthén, B., & Morin, A. J. (2015). Bayesian Structural Equation Modeling with Cross-Loadings and Residual Covariances: Comments on Stromeyer et al. *in Journal of Management*, 41, 1561-1577.
- 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*, 4(1p2), 1.
- 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). Parenting styles and adolescent development. In J. Brooks-Gunn, R. Lerner & A. C. Petersen (Eds.), *The Encyclopedia of adolescence*. New York: Garland.
- Behzadi, B., & Parker, G. (2015). A Persian version of the parental bonding instrument: Factor structure and psychometric properties. *Psychiatry research*.
- Bowlby, J. (1977). The making and breaking of affectional bonds. I. Aetiology and psychopathology in the light of attachment theory. An expanded version of the Fiftieth Maudsley Lecture, delivered before the Royal College of Psychiatrists, 19 November 1976. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 130, 201-210.
- Byrne, B. M., Shavelson, R. J., & Muthén, B. O. (1989). Testing for the equivalence of factor

## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

- 1  
2  
3 covariance and mean structures: The issue of partial measurement invariance.  
4  
5 *Psychological bulletin*, 105, 456-466.  
6  
7  
8 Chen, F. F. (2007). Sensitivity of goodness of fit indexes to lack of measurement invariance.  
9  
10 *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 14, 464-504.  
11  
12 Chen, X., Liu, M., & Li, D. (2000). Parental warmth, control, and indulgence and their  
13  
14 relations to adjustment in Chinese children: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Family*  
15  
16 *Psychology*, 14, 401-419.  
17  
18  
19 Cheung, G. W. (2008). Testing equivalence in the structure, means, and variances of higher-  
20  
21 order constructs with structural equation modeling. *Organizational Research Methods*,  
22  
23 11, 593-613.  
24  
25  
26 Cheung, G. W., & Rensvold, R. B. (2001). The effects of model parsimony and sampling  
27  
28 error on the fit of structural equation models. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4,  
29  
30 236-264.  
31  
32  
33 Collins, W. A., & Steinberg, L. (2006). Adolescent development in interpersonal context. In  
34  
35 W. Damon & N. Eisenberg (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology* (Vol. 4, pp. 1003-  
36  
37 1067). New York: Cambridge University.  
38  
39  
40 Cooper-Vince, C. E., Chan, P. T., Pincus, D. B., & Comer, J. S. (2014). Paternal autonomy  
41  
42 restriction, neighborhood safety, and child anxiety trajectory in community youth.  
43  
44 *Journal of applied developmental psychology*, 35, 265-272.  
45  
46  
47 Cox, B. J., Enns, M. W., & Clara, I. P. (2000). The Parental Bonding Instrument:  
48  
49 confirmatory evidence for a three-factor model in a psychiatric clinical sample and in  
50  
51 the National Comorbidity Survey. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*,  
52  
53 35, 353-357.  
54  
55  
56 Cubis, J., Lewin, T., & Dawes, F. (1989). Australian adolescents' perceptions of their parents.  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

- 1  
2  
3 DiStefano, C. (2002). The impact of categorization with confirmatory factor analysis.  
4  
5 *Structural Equation Modeling, 9*, 327-346.  
6  
7 Dolan, C. V. (1994). Factor analysis of variables with 2, 3, 5 and 7 response categories: A  
8  
9 comparison of categorical variable estimators using simulated data. *British Journal of*  
10  
11 *Mathematical and Statistical Psychology, 47*, 309-326.  
12  
13  
14 Duggan, C., Sham, P., Minne, C., Lee, A., & Murray, R. (1998). Quality of parenting and  
15  
16 vulnerability to depression: results from a family study. *Psychological Medicine, 28*,  
17  
18 185-191.  
19  
20  
21 Eysenck, H. J. (1958). A short questionnaire for the measurement of two dimensions of  
22  
23 personality. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 42*, 14-17.  
24  
25 Eysenck, H. J. (1959). *Manual of the Maudsley Personality Inventory*. London: University of  
26  
27 London Press.  
28  
29  
30 Fan, X., Thompson, B., & Wang, L. (1999). Effects of sample size, estimation methods, and  
31  
32 model specification on structural equation modeling fit indexes. *Structural Equation*  
33  
34 *Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 6*, 56-83.  
35  
36  
37 Finney, S. J., & DiStefano, C. (2006). Non-normal and categorical data in structural equation  
38  
39 modeling. In G. R. Hancock & R. O. Mueller (Eds.), *Structural equation modeling: A*  
40  
41 *second course* (pp. 269-314). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing, Inc.  
42  
43  
44 Gillham, J. E., Putter, P., & Kash, V. M. (2007). The effects of sad mood on reports of  
45  
46 parents' caregiving behaviors. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral*  
47  
48 *Assessment, 29*, 125-133.  
49  
50  
51 Goldberg, D. P., & Hillier, V. F. (1979). A scaled version of the General Health  
52  
53 Questionnaire. *Psychological Medicine, 9*, 139-145.  
54  
55  
56 Gómez-Beneyto, M., Pedrós, A., Tomás, A., Aguilar, K., & Leal, C. (1993). Psychometric  
57  
58 properties of the parental bonding instrument in a spanish sample. *Social Psychiatry*  
59  
60



## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

- 1  
2  
3 *and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 28, 252-255.
- 4  
5 Gotlib, I. H., Mount, J. H., Cordy, N. I., & Whiffen, V. E. (1988). Depression and perceptions  
6  
7 of early parenting: a longitudinal investigation. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 152,  
8  
9 24-27.
- 10  
11 Greenberger, E., Chen, C., Dmitrieva, J., & Farruggia, S. P. (2003). Item-wording and the  
12  
13 dimensionality of the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale: do they matter? *Personality and*  
14  
15 *individual differences*, 35, 1241-1254.
- 16  
17 Heider, D., Matschinger, H., Bernert, S., Alonso, J., & Angermeyer, M. C. (2006).  
18  
19 Relationship between parental bonding and mood disorder in six European countries.  
20  
21 *Psychiatry Research*, 143, 89-98.
- 22  
23 Heider, D., Matschinger, H., Bernert, S., Vilagut, G., Martínez-Alonso, M., Dietrich, S., &  
24  
25 Angermeyer, M. C. (2005). Empirical evidence for an invariant three-factor structure  
26  
27 of the Parental Bonding Instrument in six European countries. *Psychiatry Research*,  
28  
29 135, 237-247.
- 30  
31 Henry, D. B., Tolan, P. H., & Gorman-Smith, D. (2005). Cluster analysis in family  
32  
33 psychology research. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 19, 121.
- 34  
35 Hoeve, M., Dubas, J. S., Gerris, J. R. M., van der Laan, P. H., & Smeenk, W. (2011).  
36  
37 Maternal and paternal parenting styles: Unique and combined links to adolescent and  
38  
39 early adult delinquency. *Journal of adolescence*, 34, 813-827.
- 40  
41 Hosley, C., & Montemayor, R. (1997). Fathers and adolescents. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The*  
42  
43 *role of the father in child development* (pp. 162-178). New York: Wiley.
- 44  
45 Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis:  
46  
47 Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A*  
48  
49 *Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6, 1-55.
- 50  
51 Huppert, F. A., Abbott, R. A., Ploubidis, G. B., Richards, M., & Kuh, D. (2009). Parental  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

- 1  
2  
3 practices predict psychological well-being in midlife: life-course associations among  
4  
5 women in the 1946 British birth cohort. *Psychological Medicine*, 40, 1507–1518.  
6  
7 Jakobsen, M., & Jensen, R. (2015). Common method bias in public management studies.  
8  
9 *International Public Management Journal*, 18, 3-30.  
10  
11 Kaplan, D. (2000). *Structural equation modeling: Foundations and extensions* (Vol. 10).  
12  
13 Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.  
14  
15 Kendler, K. S. (1996). Parenting: A genetic-epidemiologic perspective. *American Journal of*  
16  
17 *Psychiatry*, 153, 11.  
18  
19  
20 Kitamura, T., Shikai, N., Uji, M., Hiramura, H., Tanaka, N., & Shono, M. (2009).  
21  
22 Intergenerational Transmission of Parenting Style and Personality: Direct Influence or  
23  
24 Mediation? *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 18, 541-556.  
25  
26  
27 Ladd, G. W., & Pettit, G. S. (2002). Parenting and the development of children's peer  
28  
29 relationships. In M. H. Borenstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting* (2 ed., Vol. 5, pp.  
30  
31 269-309). Mahwah, N. J.: Erlbaum.  
32  
33  
34 Laible, D. J., & Carlo, G. (2004). The differential relations of maternal and paternal support  
35  
36 and control to adolescent social competence, self-worth, and sympathy. *Journal of*  
37  
38 *Adolescent Research*, 19, 759-782.  
39  
40  
41 Lansford, J. E., Laird, R. D., Pettit, G. S., Bates, J. E., & Dodge, K. A. (2014). Mothers' and  
42  
43 fathers' autonomy-relevant parenting: Longitudinal links with adolescents'  
44  
45 externalizing and internalizing behavior. *Journal of youth and adolescence*, 43, 1877-  
46  
47 1889.  
48  
49  
50 Lindelow, M., Hardy, R., & Rodgers, B. (1997). Development of a scale to measure  
51  
52 symptoms of anxiety and depression in the general UK population: the psychiatric  
53  
54 symptom frequency scale. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 51, 549-  
55  
56 557.  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

- 1  
2  
3 Liu, J., Li, L., & Fang, F. (2011). Psychometric properties of the Chinese version of the  
4  
5 Parental Bonding Instrument. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 48, 582-589.  
6  
7 Mackinnon, A. J., Henderson, A. S., Scott, R., & Duncan-Jones, P. (1989). The Parental  
8  
9 Bonding Instrument (PBI): an epidemiological study in a general population sample.  
10  
11 *Psychological Medicine*, 19, 1023-1034.  
12  
13  
14 Marsh, H. W., Balla, J. R., & McDonald, R. P. (1988). Goodness-of-fit indexes in  
15  
16 confirmatory factor analysis: The effect of sample size. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103,  
17  
18 391-410.  
19  
20  
21 Marsh, H. W., & Hau, K. T. (1996). Assessing goodness of fit: Is parsimony always desirable?  
22  
23 *Journal of Experimental Education*, 64, 364-390.  
24  
25 Marsh, H. W., Hau, K. T., & Grayson, D. A. (2005). Goodness of fit evaluation in structural  
26  
27 equation modeling. In A. Maydeu-Olivares & J. J. McArdle (Eds.), *Contemporary*  
28  
29 *psychometrics* (pp. 225-340). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.  
30  
31  
32 Marsh, H. W., Hau, K. T., & Wen, Z. (2004). In search of golden rules: Comment on  
33  
34 hypothesis-testing approaches to setting cutoff values for fit indexes and dangers in  
35  
36 overgeneralizing Hu and Bentler's (1999) Findings. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 11,  
37  
38 320-341.  
39  
40  
41 Marsh, H. W., Lüdtke, O., Muthén, B., Asparouhov, T., Morin, A. J. S., Trautwein, U., &  
42  
43 Nagengast, B. (2010). A New Look at the Big Five Factor Structure Through  
44  
45 Exploratory Structural Equation Modeling. *Psychological Assessment*, 22, 471-491.  
46  
47  
48 Marsh, H. W., Morin, A. J. S., Parker, P. D., & Kaur, G. (2013). Exploratory Structural  
49  
50 Equation Modeling: An Integration of the Best Features of Exploratory and  
51  
52 Confirmatory Factor Analysis. *Annual review of clinical psychology*, 10, 85-110  
53  
54  
55 Marsh, H. W., Muthén, B., Asparouhov, T., Lüdtke, O., Robitzsch, A., Morin, A. J. S., &  
56  
57 Trautwein, U. (2009). Exploratory structural equation modeling, integrating CFA and  
58  
59  
60

## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

- 1  
2  
3 EFA: Application to students' evaluations of university teaching. *Structural Equation*  
4  
5 *Modeling*, 16, 439-476.  
6  
7 Marsh, H. W., Nagengast, B., & Morin, A. J. S. (2012). Measurement invariance of Big-Five  
8  
9 factors over the life span: ESEM tests of gender, age, plasticity, maturity, and La  
10  
11 Dolce Vita effects. *Developmental Psychology*, 49, 1194-1218  
12  
13 McKinney, C., & Renk, K. (2008). Differential parenting between mothers and fathers:  
14  
15 Implications for late adolescents. *Journal of Family Issue*, 20, 806-827  
16  
17 Meredith, W., & Teresi, J. A. (2006). An essay on measurement and factorial invariance.  
18  
19 *Medical Care*, 44, S69-S77.  
20  
21 Milevsky, A., Schlechter, M., Netter, S., & Keehn, D. (2007). Maternal and paternal  
22  
23 parenting styles in adolescents: Associations with self-esteem, depression and life-  
24  
25 satisfaction. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 16, 39-47.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
- Mohr, S., Preisig, M., Fenton, B. T., & Ferrero, F. (1999). Validation of the French version of  
the parental bonding instrument in adults. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 26,  
1065-1074.
- Möller, E. L., Majdandžić, M., & Bögels, S. M. (2014). Parental Anxiety, Parenting Behavior,  
and Infant Anxiety: Differential Associations for Fathers and Mothers. *Journal of*  
*Child and Family Studies*, 1-12.
- Morin, A. J. S., Marsh, H. W., & Nagengast, B. (2013). Exploratory Structural Equation  
Modeling. In G. R. Hancock & R. O. Mueller (Eds.), *Structural equation modeling: A*  
*second course* (2 ed.), pp. 395-438. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Murphy, E., Brewin, C. R., & Silka, L. (1997). The assessment of parenting using the  
Parental Bonding Instrument: two or three factors? *Psychological Medicine*, 27, 333-  
342.
- Murphy, E., Wickramaratne, P., & Weissman, M. (2010). The stability of parental bonding

## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

- 1  
2  
3 reports: A 20-year follow-up. *Journal of affective disorders*, 125, 307-315.
- 4  
5 Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (2015). *Mplus user's guide*. Los Angeles: Muthen & Muthen.
- 6  
7 Parker, G. (1979). Parental characteristics in relation to depressive disorders. *British Journal*  
8  
9  
10 *of Psychiatry*, 134, 134-147.
- 11  
12 Parker, G., Tupling, H., & Brown, L. B. (1979). A parental bonding instrument. *British*  
13  
14 *Journal of Medical Psychology*, 52, 1-10.
- 15  
16 Pleck, J. H., & Masciadrelli, B. P. (2004). Paternal Involvement by US Residential Fathers:  
17  
18 Levels, Sources, and Consequences. In M. E. Lamb (Eds), *The role of the father in*  
19  
20 *child development (4th ed.)*, (pp. 222-271). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- 21  
22 Qadir, F., Stewart, R., Khan, M., & Prince, M. (2005). The validity of the Parental Bonding  
23  
24 Instrument as a measure of maternal bonding among young Pakistani women. *Social*  
25  
26 *Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 40, 276-282.
- 27  
28  
29 Randall, D. M., & Fernandes, M. F. (1991). The social desirability response bias in ethics  
30  
31  
32 research. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 10, 805-817.
- 33  
34 Rodgers, B. (1996a). Reported parental behaviour and adult affective symptoms. 1.  
35  
36 Associations and moderating factors. *Psychological Medicine*, 26, 51-62.
- 37  
38 Rodgers, B. (1996b). Reported parental behaviour and adult affective symptoms. 2.  
39  
40 Mediating factors. *Psychological Medicine*, 26, 63-78.
- 41  
42  
43 Russell, A., Aloa, V., Feder, T., Glover, A., Miller, H., & Palmer, G. (1998). Sex-based  
44  
45 differences in parenting styles in a sample with preschool children. *Australian Journal*  
46  
47 *of Psychology*, 50, 89-99.
- 48  
49 Samejima, F. (1997). Graded response model *Handbook of modern item response theory* (pp.  
50  
51 85-100). New York: Springer.
- 52  
53  
54 Sato, T., Narita, T., Hirano, S., Kusunoki, K., Sakado, K., & Uehara, T. (1999). Confirmatory  
55  
56 factor analysis of the Parental Bonding Instrument in a Japanese population.  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

- 1  
2  
3 *Psychological Medicine*, 29, 127-133.
- 4  
5 Schmitt, D. P., & Allik, J. (2005). Simultaneous administration of the Rosenberg Self-Esteem  
6  
7 Scale in 53 nations: exploring the universal and culture-specific features of global  
8  
9 self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89, 623.
- 10  
11  
12 Siomos, K., Floros, G., Fisoun, V., Evaggelia, D., Farkonas, N., Sergentani, E., . . .  
13  
14 Geroukalis, D. (2012). Evolution of Internet addiction in Greek adolescent students  
15  
16 over a two-year period: the impact of parental bonding. *European Child and*  
17  
18 *Adolescent Psychiatry*, 21(4), 211-219.
- 19  
20  
21 Sroufe, L. A. (1997). *Emotional development: The organization of emotional life in the early*  
22  
23 *years*: Cambridge University Press.
- 24  
25 Stafford, M., Black, S., Shah, I., Hardy, R., Pierce, M., Richards, M., . . . on behalf of the  
26  
27 NSHD scientific & data collection teams. (2013). Using a birth cohort to study ageing:  
28  
29 representativeness and response rates in the National Survey of Health and  
30  
31 Development. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 10, 145-157.
- 32  
33  
34 StGeorge, J., Fletcher, R., Freeman, E., Paquette, D., & Dumont, C. (2015). Father-child  
35  
36 interactions and children's risk of injury. *Early Child Development and Care*, 185,  
37  
38 1409-1421.
- 39  
40  
41 Suzuki, H., & Kitamura, T. (2011). The Parental Bonding Instrument: A Four-Factor  
42  
43 Structure Model in a Japanese College Sample. *Open Family Studies Journal*, 4, 89-  
44  
45 94.
- 46  
47 Swanson, H., Power, K., Collin, P., Deas, S., Paterson, G., Grierson, D., . . . Taylor, L. (2010).  
48  
49 The relationship between parental bonding, social problem solving and eating  
50  
51 pathology in an anorexic inpatient sample. *European Eating Disorders Review*, 18,  
52  
53 22-32.
- 54  
55  
56 Terra, L., Hauck, S., Fillipon, A. P., Sanchez, P., Hirakata, V., Schestatsky, S., & Ceitlin, L.

## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

- 1  
2  
3 H. (2009). Confirmatory factor analysis of the Parental Bonding Instrument in a  
4  
5 Brazilian female population. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, *43*,  
6  
7 348-354.  
8  
9  
10 Thorberg, F. A., Young, R. M., Sullivan, K. A., & Lyvers, M. (2011). Parental bonding and  
11  
12 alexithymia: A meta-analysis. *European Psychiatry*, *26*, 187-193.  
13  
14 Tsaousis, I., Mascha, K., & Giovazolias, T. (2011). Can Parental Bonding Be Assessed in  
15  
16 Children? Factor Structure and Factorial Invariance of the Parental Bonding  
17  
18 Instrument (PBI) Between Adults and Children. *Child Psychiatry & Human*  
19  
20 *Development*, *43*, 238-253.  
21  
22  
23 Uji, M., Tanaka, N., Shono, M., & Kitamura, T. (2006). Factorial Structure of the Parental  
24  
25 Bonding Instrument (PBI) in Japan: A Study of Cultural, Developmental, and Gender  
26  
27 Influences. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development*, *37*, 115-132.  
28  
29  
30 Villalta, L., Arévalo, R., Valdepérez, A., Pascual, J. C., & de los Cobos, J. P. (2015). Parental  
31  
32 Bonding in Subjects with Pathological Gambling Disorder Compared with Healthy  
33  
34 Controls. *Psychiatric Quarterly*, *86*, 61-67.  
35  
36  
37 Watson, K. H., Potts, J., Hardcastle, E., Forehand, R., & Compas, B. E. (2012). Internalizing  
38  
39 and externalizing symptoms in sons and daughters of mothers with a history of  
40  
41 depression. *Journal of child and family studies*, *21*, 657-666.  
42  
43  
44 Wilhelm, K., Niven, H., Parker, G., & Hadzi-Pavlovic, D. (2005). The stability of the  
45  
46 Parental Bonding Instrument over a 20-year period. *Psychological Medicine*, *35*, 387-  
47  
48 393.  
49  
50 Winsler, A., Madigan, A. L., & Aquilino, S. A. (2005). Correspondence between maternal  
51  
52 and paternal parenting styles in early childhood. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*,  
53  
54 *20*, 1-12.  
55  
56  
57 Yu, C.-Y. (2002). *Evaluating cutoff criteria of model fit indices for latent variable models*  
58  
59  
60

Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

*with binary and continuous outcomes.* University of California Los Angeles.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28
- 29
- 30
- 31
- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

For Peer Review



## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

Table 1

Summary of goodness-of-fit statistics for whole sample ESEM models

	Mother measures; n=3175;					Father measures; n =3071;				
	$\chi^2$	DF	RMSEA	CFI	TLI	$\chi^2$	DF	RMSEA	CFI	TLI
2 factor ESEM	11368.038	229	0.124	0.862	0.833	12069.940	229	0.130	0.895	0.873
3 factor ESEM	3939.085	207	0.075	0.954	0.938	4269.616	207	0.080	0.964	0.952
4 factor ESEM	2337.030	186	0.060	0.973	0.960	2606.764	186	0.065	0.979	0.968
3 factor ESEM, CU	3082.005	204	0.067	0.964	0.952	3641.108	204	0.074	0.970	0.959
* CU = correlated residuals.										
4 factor ESEM, CU	2086.701	183	0.057	0.976	0.964	2170.735	183	0.059	0.982	0.973

\* CU = correlated residuals. Residual variances were specified for three items: “gave me as much freedom as I wanted”, “let me go out as often as I wanted”, and “let me dress in any way I pleased”.

## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

Table 2

Factor loadings from the ESEM models for maternal measures

	Mother measure factor structure									
	Three Factor			Four Factor				Three factor with correlated residuals*		
	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Care	Overprotection	Autonomy
Spoke to me with a warm and friendly voice	<b>0.842</b>	-0.007	-0.021	<b>0.830</b>	-0.068	0.014	-0.033	<b>0.817</b>	-0.034	0.019
My father helped me as much as I needed	<b>0.872</b>	0.031	-0.015	<b>0.856</b>	-0.013	-0.001	0.001	<b>0.832</b>	0.013	0.046
Appeared to understand my problems and worries	<b>0.832</b>	-0.012	0.084	<b>0.816</b>	0.025	0.030	0.168	<b>0.735</b>	-0.002	0.208
Was affectionate to me	<b>0.867</b>	0.081	0.012	<b>0.849</b>	0.022	0.033	-0.029	<b>0.830</b>	0.052	0.056
Enjoyed talking things over with me	<b>0.792</b>	0.052	0.004	<b>0.777</b>	0.075	-0.047	0.128	<b>0.729</b>	0.052	0.097
Frequently smiled at me	<b>0.764</b>	0.018	-0.025	<b>0.751</b>	-0.042	0.007	-0.043	<b>0.763</b>	-0.022	-0.025
Seemed to understand what I needed or wanted	<b>0.769</b>	-0.028	0.065	<b>0.755</b>	0.018	0.007	0.178	<b>0.681</b>	-0.017	0.183
Made me feel I wasn't wanted	<b>-0.471</b>	0.325	0.156	<b>-0.486</b>	<b>0.375</b>	0.075	0.047	<b>-0.556</b>	<b>0.373</b>	0.230
Could make me feel better when I was upset	<b>0.785</b>	0.006	-0.011	<b>0.773</b>	-0.026	-0.004	0.018	<b>0.763</b>	-0.020	0.021
Talked to me often	<b>0.803</b>	-0.008	-0.034	<b>0.792</b>	-0.042	-0.024	0.017	<b>0.798</b>	-0.044	-0.022
Praised me	<b>0.766</b>	0.080	0.027	<b>0.751</b>	0.008	0.059	-0.067	<b>0.740</b>	0.048	0.048
Let me do those things I liked doing	<b>0.511</b>	-0.015	<b>0.350</b>	<b>0.490</b>	-0.005	<b>0.337</b>	0.091	0.342	0.006	<b>0.502</b>
Tried to control everything I did	-0.057	<b>0.638</b>	-0.088	-0.082	<b>0.681</b>	-0.228	0.052	-0.108	<b>0.666</b>	-0.013
Invaded my privacy	-0.127	<b>0.663</b>	-0.035	-0.157	<b>0.680</b>	-0.156	0.009	-0.184	<b>0.692</b>	0.034
Tended to baby me	0.269	<b>0.753</b>	0.038	0.234	<b>0.551</b>	0.089	-0.408	0.271	<b>0.715</b>	-0.011
Tried to make me dependent on him	0.044	<b>0.711</b>	0.013	0.013	<b>0.602</b>	-0.007	-0.238	0.009	<b>0.711</b>	0.033
Felt I could not look after myself unless he was around	-0.006	<b>0.760</b>	0.004	-0.037	<b>0.601</b>	0.022	-0.350	-0.013	<b>0.748</b>	-0.016
Was overprotective of me	0.232	<b>0.747</b>	-0.098	0.204	<b>0.545</b>	-0.051	-0.415	0.268	<b>0.715</b>	-0.153
Liked me to make my own decisions	<b>0.310</b>	-0.253	<b>0.403</b>	0.283	0.008	0.241	<b>0.571</b>	0.003	-0.130	<b>0.761</b>
Wanted me to grow up	0.121	-0.082	<b>0.213</b>	0.099	0.181	0.019	<b>0.531</b>	-0.097	0.021	<b>0.484</b>
Let me decide things for myself	0.271	-0.302	<b>0.389</b>	0.254	-0.126	0.287	<b>0.408</b>	0.036	-0.227	<b>0.636</b>
Gave me as much freedom as I wanted*	0.002	-0.020	<b>0.868</b>	-0.021	-0.029	<b>0.866</b>	0.038	-0.010	-0.111	<b>0.571</b>
Let me go out as often as I wanted*	-0.017	0.066	<b>0.904</b>	-0.046	0.031	<b>0.915</b>	-0.022	0.006	-0.047	<b>0.532</b>
Let me dress in any way I pleased*	0.121	0.029	<b>0.629</b>	0.098	0.013	<b>0.635</b>	0.014	0.065	-0.019	<b>0.485</b>
Factor correlation										
Factor 1 (Care)	1.000			1.000				1.000		
Factor 2 (Overprotection)	-0.291	1.000		-0.133	1.000			-0.228	1.000	
Factor 3 (Autonomy)	0.408	-0.317	1.000	0.415	-0.165	1.000		0.591	-0.372	1.000
Factor 4				0.222	-0.230	0.337	1.000			

\* Residual variances were specified for three items: "gave me as much freedom as I wanted", "let me go out as often as I wanted", and "let me dress in any way I pleased".

## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

Table 3

Factor loadings from the ESEM models for paternal measures

	Father measure factor structure									
	Three Factor			Four Factor				Three factor with correlated residuals*		
	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Care	Overprotection	Autonomy
Spoke to me with a warm and friendly voice	<b>0.838</b>	-0.011	0.054	<b>0.833</b>	-0.036	0.077	-0.202	<b>0.802</b>	-0.062	0.083
My father helped me as much as I needed	<b>0.836</b>	-0.011	0.047	<b>0.846</b>	-0.008	0.019	0.038	<b>0.779</b>	-0.017	0.129
Appeared to understand my problems and worries	<b>0.820</b>	0.008	0.100	<b>0.834</b>	0.019	0.034	0.204	<b>0.735</b>	0.028	0.218
Was affectionate to me	<b>0.867</b>	0.040	0.003	<b>0.864</b>	0.023	0.017	-0.155	<b>0.845</b>	-0.013	0.025
Enjoyed talking things over with me	<b>0.872</b>	0.029	-0.041	<b>0.888</b>	0.029	-0.097	0.122	<b>0.851</b>	-0.006	0.001
Frequently smiled at me	<b>0.815</b>	-0.002	-0.005	<b>0.810</b>	-0.024	0.016	-0.196	<b>0.803</b>	-0.063	0.000
Seemed to understand what I needed or wanted	<b>0.795</b>	0.008	0.113	<b>0.808</b>	0.022	0.043	0.233	<b>0.708</b>	0.029	0.229
Made me feel I wasn't wanted	<b>-0.407</b>	<b>0.422</b>	0.083	<b>-0.414</b>	<b>0.441</b>	0.072	0.160	<b>-0.434</b>	<b>0.469</b>	0.109
Could make me feel better when I was upset	<b>0.845</b>	0.057	0.007	<b>0.854</b>	0.052	-0.023	0.029	<b>0.812</b>	0.025	0.054
Talked to me often	<b>0.852</b>	-0.023	-0.043	<b>0.864</b>	-0.028	-0.077	0.038	<b>0.839</b>	-0.070	-0.018
Praised me	<b>0.809</b>	0.012	0.035	<b>0.814</b>	0.001	0.026	-0.061	<b>0.779</b>	-0.031	0.062
Let me do those things I liked doing	<b>0.498</b>	-0.063	<b>0.439</b>	<b>0.498</b>	-0.058	<b>0.429</b>	0.020	<b>0.311</b>	0.013	<b>0.629</b>
Tried to control everything I did	-0.049	<b>0.601</b>	-0.147	-0.049	<b>0.625</b>	-0.183	0.243	-0.012	<b>0.592</b>	-0.172
Invaded my privacy	-0.056	<b>0.686</b>	-0.045	-0.058	<b>0.710</b>	-0.079	0.247	-0.050	<b>0.688</b>	-0.049
Tended to baby me	<b>0.373</b>	<b>0.730</b>	0.001	<b>0.357</b>	<b>0.719</b>	0.034	-0.158	<b>0.371</b>	<b>0.700</b>	-0.008
Tried to make me dependent on him	0.093	<b>0.769</b>	0.035	0.080	<b>0.773</b>	0.040	0.029	0.063	<b>0.781</b>	0.066
Felt I could not look after myself unless he was around	0.014	<b>0.791</b>	0.047	-0.001	<b>0.794</b>	0.056	0.017	-0.009	<b>0.799</b>	0.062
Was overprotective of me	<b>0.321</b>	<b>0.696</b>	-0.118	0.309	<b>0.682</b>	-0.100	-0.111	<b>0.351</b>	<b>0.660</b>	-0.145
Liked me to make my own decisions	<b>0.349</b>	-0.242	<b>0.438</b>	<b>0.356</b>	-0.206	<b>0.382</b>	0.320	0.128	-0.111	<b>0.688</b>
Wanted me to grow up	0.056	-0.087	<b>0.244</b>	0.063	-0.035	0.184	<b>0.407</b>	-0.084	0.014	<b>0.415</b>
Let me decide things for myself	0.245	-0.288	<b>0.448</b>	0.246	-0.261	<b>0.411</b>	0.216	0.030	-0.171	<b>0.678</b>
Gave me as much freedom as I wanted*	-0.013	0.026	<b>0.926</b>	-0.024	0.033	<b>0.934</b>	-0.006	-0.084	-0.013	<b>0.734</b>
Let me go out as often as I wanted*	-0.047	0.029	<b>0.938</b>	-0.062	0.034	<b>0.955</b>	-0.041	-0.090	-0.032	<b>0.691</b>
Let me dress in any way I pleased*	0.086	0.007	<b>0.695</b>	0.076	0.011	<b>0.706</b>	-0.032	-0.010	0.008	<b>0.625</b>
Factor correlation										
Factor 1 (Care)	1.000			1.000				1.000		
Factor 2 (Overprotection)	-0.245	1.000		-0.233	1.000			-0.187	1.000	
Factor 3 (Autonomy)	0.367	-0.344	1.000	0.404	-0.360	1.000		0.522	-0.434	1.000
Factor 4				0.048	-0.172	0.107	1.000			

\* Residual variances were specified for three items: "gave me as much freedom as I wanted", "let me go out as often as I wanted", and "let me dress in any way I pleased".

Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

Table 4

Summary of goodness-of-fit statistics for ESEM measurement invariance analysis

		n	$\chi^2$	degree of freedom	free parameter	Model of comparison	$\chi^2$ Difference Test	p (degree of freedom)	RMSEA	CFI	TLI
Configural invariance	m1	3208	6872.021	1902	642		NA	NA	0.040	0.971	0.966
Weak invariance	m2	3208	5777.900	2091	453	m1	490.271	0.000(189)	0.033	0.979	0.977
Strong invariance	m3	3208	6993.026	2226	318	m2	820.107	0.000 (135)	0.037	0.972	0.972
Strict invariance	m4	3208	6912.728	2298	246	m3	364.053	0.000 (72)	0.035	0.973	0.974
Var-cov invariance	m5	3208	5726.835	2325	219	m4	178.175	0.000 (27)	0.030	0.980	0.981
Latent mean invariance	m6	3208	7207.481	2334	210	m5	580.267	0.000 (9)	0.036	0.972	0.973
MIMIC Saturated	m7	2153	5200.654	1107	357				0.041	0.966	0.959
MIMIC Invariant	m8	2153	5760.336	1275	189	m7	754.710	0.000 (168)	0.040	0.962	0.961
MIMIC Null model	m9	2153	6116.799	1299	165	m7	1132.176	0.000 (192)	0.042	0.96	0.959
						m8	308.955	0.000 (24)			
Path model	m10	3422	7162.506	2466	280				0.033	0.973	0.974
Path model father	m11	3420	2910.727	624	178				0.046	0.98	0.98
Path model mother	m12	3422	2552.116	624	178				0.042	0.978	0.977

## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

Table 5

Factor correlations and means based on variance-covariance invariant model (m5)

		Latent means (s.e.)					
		Mother Care	Mother Overprotection	Mother Autonomy	Father Care	Father Overprotection	Father Autonomy
Sons		0	0	0	<b>-0.532</b> ( <b>0.028</b> )	<b>-0.455</b> ( <b>0.031</b> )	-0.029 ( 0.029 )
Daughters		0.049 ( 0.037 )	0.063 ( 0.039 )	<b>-0.251</b> ( <b>0.040</b> )	<b>-0.209</b> ( <b>0.038</b> )	<b>-0.154</b> ( <b>0.040</b> )	<b>-0.368</b> ( <b>0.042</b> )
Sons		<b>0.523</b> ( <b>0.028</b> )	<b>0.455</b> ( <b>0.031</b> )	0.029 ( 0.029 )	0	0	0
Daughters		<b>0.572</b> ( <b>0.039</b> )	<b>0.518</b> ( <b>0.043</b> )	<b>-0.222</b> ( <b>0.043</b> )	<b>0.314</b> ( <b>0.039</b> )	<b>0.301</b> ( <b>0.042</b> )	<b>-0.339</b> ( <b>0.043</b> )
Sons		-0.049 ( 0.037 )	-0.063 ( 0.039 )	<b>0.251</b> ( <b>0.040</b> )	<b>-0.572</b> ( <b>0.039</b> )	<b>-0.518</b> ( <b>0.043</b> )	<b>0.222</b> ( <b>0.043</b> )
Daughters		0	0	0	<b>-0.258</b> ( <b>0.030</b> )	<b>-0.217</b> ( <b>0.029</b> )	<b>-0.117</b> ( <b>0.027</b> )
Sons		<b>0.209</b> ( <b>0.038</b> )	<b>0.154</b> ( <b>0.040</b> )	<b>0.368</b> ( <b>0.042</b> )	<b>-0.314</b> ( <b>0.039</b> )	<b>-0.301</b> ( <b>0.042</b> )	<b>0.339</b> ( <b>0.043</b> )
Daughters		<b>0.258</b> ( <b>0.030</b> )	<b>0.217</b> ( <b>0.029</b> )	<b>0.117</b> ( <b>0.027</b> )	0	0	0
		Factor correlations					
		Mother Care	Mother Overprotection	Mother Autonomy	Father Care	Father Overprotection	Father Autonomy
Mother Care		<b>1.000</b>					
Mother Overprotection		<b>-0.263</b>	<b>1.000</b>				
Mother Autonomy		<b>0.464</b>	<b>-0.376</b>	<b>1.000</b>			
Father Care		<b>0.519</b>	<b>-0.127</b>	<b>0.261</b>	<b>1.000</b>		
Father Overprotection		<b>-0.165</b>	<b>0.666</b>	<b>-0.248</b>	<b>-0.263</b>	<b>1.000</b>	
Father Autonomy		<b>0.283</b>	<b>-0.190</b>	<b>0.808</b>	<b>0.464</b>	<b>-0.376</b>	<b>1.000</b>

Note: All values in bold were statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$

## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

Table 6

Mental health outcomes at age 43 and 53 predicted by PBI factors (model m10)

	Mental Health Outcomes	
	43	53
<i>Male Offspring</i>		
Maternal Care up to 16	0.080	0.008
Maternal Overprotection up to 16	0.085	0.018
Maternal Autonomy up to 16	-0.130	-0.042
Paternal Care up to 16	<b>-0.139</b>	-0.029
Paternal Overprotection up to 16	0.005	0.013
Paternal Autonomy up to 16	0.025	-0.029
Mental Health 43		<b>0.354</b>
<i>Female Offspring</i>		
Maternal Care up to 16	-0.140	-0.094
Maternal Overprotection up to 16	0.063	0.169
Maternal Autonomy up to 16	0.146	0.280
Paternal Care up to 16	0.000	0.055
Paternal Overprotection up to 16	0.080	-0.038
Paternal Autonomy up to 16	-0.100	-0.267
Mental Health 43		<b>0.326</b>

Note: Regression paths are presented in standardised metric. Values in bold are statistically significant at  $P < 0.05$ .

The measurement specification is based on multiple-group analysis for sons and daughters with strict invariance specification. Mental health outcome at age 53 was adjusted for mental health outcome at age 43. The results are adjusted for occupational social class at ages 11 and 43.

## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

Table S1

## Demographics and Sample Attrition

	Complete Data*	Complete Missing**	p-value
	(n=1217)	(n=1229)	
	ratio (count)		chi-square test
Male/Female	1.102 (638/579)	1.373 (711/518)	<0.007
	Means		t test
Occupational Social Class 11	3.593	3.370	<0.001
Occupational Social Class 43	4.127	3.588	<0.001

Note: \*samples with complete information on parental bonding (age 43), personality (age 26) and mental health data (ages 43, 35); \*\*samples with complete missing on parental bonding (age 43), personality (age 26) and mental health data (ages 43, 35).

## Psychometric Evaluation of the Parental Bonding Instrument

Table S2.

Mental health outcomes at ages 43 and 53 predicted by maternal and paternal PBI factors in separate models

	Father Measure (Model m11)		Mother Measure (Model m12)	
	Mental Health Outcomes		Mental Health Outcomes	
	43	53	43	53
<i>Male Offspring</i>				
Maternal Care up to 16			0.03a 5	0.014
Maternal Overprotection up to 16			<b>0.093</b>	0.024
Maternal Autonomy up to 16			<b>-0.132a</b>	-0.081
Paternal Care up to 16	-0.058	-0.001		
Paternal Overprotection up to 16	<b>0.065</b>	0.025		
Paternal Autonomy up to 16	<b>-0.091</b>	-0.074		
Mental Health 43		<b>0.357</b>		<b>0.358</b>
<i>Female Offspring</i>				
Maternal Care up to 16			<b>-0.119a</b>	-0.014
Maternal Overprotection up to 16			<b>0.095</b>	<b>0.100</b>
Maternal Autonomy up to 16			0.038a	-0.001
Paternal Care up to 16	<b>-0.093</b>	-0.040		
Paternal Overprotection up to 16	<b>0.131</b>	<b>0.091</b>		
Paternal Autonomy up to 16	0.016	-0.009		
Mental Health 43		<b>0.332</b>		<b>0.336</b>

Note: Regression paths are presented in standardised metric. Values in bold are statistically significant at  $P < 0.05$ .

The measurement specification is based on multiple-group analysis for sons and daughters with strict invariance specification. Mental health outcome at age 53 was adjusted for mental health outcome at age 43. The results are adjusted for occupational social class at ages 11 and 43.

a. parameters were statistically different across male and female groups at  $p < 0.05$ .