**Exploring Conceptual and Empirical Links Between Maternal Personality, Maternal
Parenting Styles, and Child Well-Being.**

**Julie Wilson
Carleton University**

**A thesis
presented to Carleton University
in partial fulfilment of the
thesis requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
in
Psychology**

Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, 2004

March 11th, 2004

© copyright, 2004 Julie Wilson

**RUNNING HEAD: MATRENAL PERSONALITY, PARENTING AND CHILD
OUTCOMES**

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

ISBN: 0-612-93927-8

Our file Notre référence

ISBN: 0-612-93927-8

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this dissertation.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de ce manuscrit.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the dissertation.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

PAGINATION ERROR.

ERREUR DE PAGINATION.

TEXT COMPLETE.

LE TEXTE EST COMPLET.

Abstract

The goal of this study was to explore the relation between maternal personality, maternal parenting styles, and child outcomes. The participants were 95 children (46 females, 49 males, $M_{age} = 9.60$ years, $SD = 1.90$ years) and their mothers. Children were interviewed to assess internalizing problems and positive adjustment. Mothers also completed measures of behavioural activation system (BAS), behavioural inhibition system (BIS), and parenting. Among the results, child positive adjustment was positively related to maternal restrictiveness and mother BAS was positively related to maternal nurturance. Furthermore, results indicated a main effect of parenting group only for BAS. Specifically, mothers who were high in BAS were significantly more likely to be either authoritarian or neglectful. Finally, significant interactions were found between mother BAS and nurturance in the prediction of child internalizing problems and positive child outcomes, and mother BAS and restrictiveness in the prediction of positive child outcomes.

Acknowledgements

This study would not have been possible without the help of many people and I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude. I would especially like to thank Rob Coplan for his continual support, motivation, and guidance. I have learned so much from him over the years and I was fortunate to have such a wonderful advisor.

I would also like to thank my husband, Marc for being so supportive and understanding. Even when I lost faith in myself, he was always there to encourage me and build my confidence. Thank you. I would also like to thank Shauna and Sherri for their help collecting the data. As well, I would like to thank my good friend Julia for reading over my drafts, encouraging me, and listening to me. I could never have done this without her.

Finally, I would like to thank my mom, and Mr. and Mrs. Desjardins. I truly appreciate your support and faith in me. Thank you for believing in me.

Table of Contents

Title Page	i
Acceptance Page	ii
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgments	iv
Table of Contents	v
List of Tables	vi
List of Illustrations	vii
List of Appendices	viii
Introduction	1
Method	24
Results	28
Discussion	38
References	50
Appendices	60

List of Tables

Table 1: Summary Scores of all Variables	29
Table 2: Factor Component Matrix	31
Table 3: Correlations Between Demographic Variables and All Measures	32
Table 4: Correlation Matrix	33
Table 5: Means and Standard Deviation of Parental Personality and Child Outcomes as a Function of Parenting Style Group	35
Table 6: Prediction of Child Outcomes from Measures of Personality and Parenting	37

List of Illustrations

Figure 1: Darling and Steingberg's Integrative Model.	20
Figure 2: Conceptual models linking adult personality, parenting and child well-being.	23

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Information and consent letter	60
Appendix B: Background Questionnaire	63
Appendix C: BIS/BAS Scales	64
Appendix D: Child Rearing Practices Report Questionnaire	65
Appendix E: Child Depression Inventory	68
Appendix F: The Positive Affect and Negative Affect Schedule for Children	73
Appendix G: The Self-perception Profile for Children	74
Appendix H: The Social Anxiety Scale for Children –Revised	76
Appendix I: Child Well-Being	77
Appendix J: Child Well-Being	78

Exploring Conceptual and Empirical Links Between Maternal Personality, Maternal Parenting Styles, and Child Well-Being.

As social interaction is essential in establishing relationships between individuals, understanding the underlying roots of social interaction is fundamental to the study of human behaviour. The study of personality is particularly salient as it influences almost every aspect of adults' social functioning. Personality has been explored as it relates to many aspects of human behaviour, but surprisingly little is known about how maternal personality influences children. One mechanism that could potentially explain how maternal personality influences children is via parenting styles. Although parenting styles are clearly linked to child outcomes (Aquilino, 1986; Clark & Ladd, 2000), results from research suggest that parental personality may also contribute to a child's development and well-being (Rickman & Davidson, 1994; Furnham & Cheng, 2000). Thus, the goal of this study was to investigate the potentially complete inter-associations between maternal personality, maternal parenting, and child well-being. An overview is first presented of the literature on personality and how it relates to child well-being and parenting, followed by a review of parenting styles. Subsequently, three conceptual models are explored that link maternal personality and child outcomes. First, a linear model posits direct relations between maternal personality, maternal parenting styles, and child outcomes. Second, a mediated model suggests that maternal personality influences mothers' parenting styles, which in turn influences child outcomes. Finally, the moderated model speculates that the relation between maternal personality and child well-being is different depending on parenting styles.

Personality: Theoretical Approaches and Assessments

Personality can be defined as a specific display of behaviours that is typical to a particular person across time and place (Carlson, Buskist, Enzle, & Heth, 2002). To better understand personality theories, it is important to differentiate between personality traits and types. A personality *trait* is a behaviour that is displayed in a variety of situations, whereas a personality *type* is a category to which a person is assigned based on a variety of personality traits (Carlson et al., 2002). Major studies on the theory of personality examine traits and types from both lexical and biological approaches. A description of these approaches as well as influential studies in this area will now be briefly reviewed and discussed.

Lexical approach. According to the lexical approach, the most salient personality characteristics have been encoded in our daily language and are readily used to offer descriptions of personal attributes. It was based on this assumption that researchers began to investigate a shared descriptive taxonomy in our natural description of personality (e.g., Allport & Odbert, 1936). These researchers used dictionaries to define a finite list of descriptors, which are known as a scientific taxonomy. Arguably, the most prominent study was conducted by Allport and Odbert (1936), in which they examined the 1925 edition of the Webster's New International Dictionary and found 18,000 descriptors of personality. From that extensive list, Allport and Odbert (1936) sorted those words into four distinct categories: potential personality traits, temporary states and activities, evaluative judgements of personal conduct and reputation, and miscellaneous terms (physical qualities, capacities, and talents). Although this compilation provided insightful and valuable understanding to the general description of personality, it failed to provide a systematic framework for distinguishing and naming individual differences in behaviour.

In an attempt to fill this gap, Cattell (1943) reduced the number of terms used by Allport and Odbert (1936) and performed factor analysis on the remaining terms. These new clusters allowed for individual differences and similarities. Although Cattell's (1943) structure proved poor in tests of independent replication (Golberg, 1981), his work inspired other researchers to examine lexical factors associated with personality. For example, using Cattell's scales, Fiske (1949) discovered five major factors. Although unsure of the true nature of these factors, Fiske interpreted them similarly to explanations we use today. Like Fiske, Tupes and Christal (1961) were also unable to come up with the complex systems found by Cattell and reinforced Fiske's five factor conclusion. They found that personality can be categorized in five major components: Surgency, Agreeableness, Dependability, Emotional Stability, and Culture. Unfortunately, the work of Tupes and Christal (1961) was published in a secure document, therefore, most personality psychologists were unaware of their findings and the work of Cattell and Eysenck dominated the literature. Although the factors vary, Tupes and Christal (1961) introduced what was later referred to as the Big Five (Goldberg, 1981). The Big Five is a model of personality based on the assumption that human behaviour is composed of the following five dimensions: Extraversion (gregarious, assertive, and warm), Agreeableness (altruistic, innocent, and modest), Conscientiousness (organized, self-disciplined, and compliant), Neuroticism (anxious, depressed, and self-conscious), and Openness to Experience (curious, creative, and artistic) (McCrae & John, 1992). These factors are believed to represent the highest echelon of the hierarchy of personality in which traits and behaviours represent the lower levels (McCrae & John, 1992).

Costa and McCrae (1985) created an inventory that demonstrates the consistency and reliability of the Big Five. The effort to develop an inventory of five

factors began with an attempt to account for more than Eysenck's (1967) model of Extraversion and Neuroticism. Originally, the investigation of the clusters suggested that there were three meaningful groups: Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Openness to Experience. This led to the creation of the NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI) (Costa & McCrae, 1985). Subsequently, agreeableness and conscientiousness were added to better account for a representation of personality.

Each factor appears to be related to a variety of positive and negative outcomes and some theories have been offered to better understand the relation between personality and subjective well-being. One well-known concept is the "top-down model," which argues that well-being is directly derived from personality, and personality is associated with tendency to interpret life events in either a negative or positive manner (Diener, 1984). Therefore, according to this theory, certain personalities are more likely to experience a better overall subjective well-being than others. Another popular notion regarding personality and subjective well-being is the "dynamic equilibrium model" (Heady & Wearing, 1989). This theory suggests that everyone has an equilibrium of subjective well-being which is predicted by personality. Although stressful or euphoric life events may diverge well-being from its equilibrium, personality will direct it back to its original state.

Both models propose that certain personality types are associated with subjective well-being which can be mapped onto personality factors of the Big Five. In a meta-analysis, DeNeve and Cooper (1998) found that neuroticism was negatively correlated with life satisfaction and happiness. In addition, although most research suggests that Extraversion is the personality factor most related to positive affect (Costa & McCrae, 1980, 1991), DeNeve and Cooper (1998) found that Agreeableness also contributes to positive affect. Therefore, it appears that positive affect comes

from pleasant social interactions. They also found that Conscientiousness was the strongest predictor of life-satisfaction, and Openness to Experience was the factor least associated with any form of subjective well-being.

Although Costa and McCrae have confirmed the presence of the five-factor model in the Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI; Eysenck & Eysenck, 1964), the grounds upon which these theories are based are quite different. Like Cost and McCrae, many psychologists have attempted to understand personality via the lexical approach, however, there have been numerous researchers that have looked at it from a biological perspective.

Biological approach. According to some theorists such as Eysenck, biology and genetics are essential to understanding personality. Results from twin studies have indicated that identical twins have more similar personality traits than fraternal twins, suggesting a strong biological component to personality (e.g. McCrae et al., 2000). Eysenck's (1967) three-factor model is a biologically based paradigm of temperamental dimensions of individual differences. This model offers three independent dimensions of personality: extraversion, neuroticism, and psychoticism. Although Eysenck's three factor model and the Big Five are often confused because they apply the same label to two of their factors (neuroticism and extraversion), they are in fact distinct. The main difference between these two models is their roots: Eysenck's model is biologically based whereas the Big Five is a lexical approach to understanding personality (John, 1990). According to Eysenck, extraversion consists of descriptors such as active, assertive, venturesome, lively, and sociable; neuroticism consists of anxious, depressed, emotional, guilt feelings, shy, and low self-esteem; and psychoticism consists of aggressive antisocial, cold, egocentric, unempathetic, creative, and impulsive (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1985). As maintained by Eysenck

(1967), these traits all stem from biological foundations. Although little research has looked at the fundamentals of psychoticism, it appears that extraverts have low physiological arousal whereas neurotics have an increased activation of the limbic system.

Extraversion is generally positively related to person well-being. For example, Francis (1999) has defined happiness as stable extraversion. Extraversion is strongly correlated with positive affect and positive emotionality (Tellegen, 1985). The strong association between positive affect and extraversion has lead researchers to believe that extraversion is the personality trait most typically associated with happiness (Hills & Argyle, 2001). Hills and Argyle (2001) argue that one of the main characteristics of extraverts is their sociability. The positive affect observed in extraverts appears to be related to easy sociability and a natural, pleasant interaction with others (Francis, 1999). They engage in more leisure activities because it allows them the opportunity to socialize and to be surrounded by others. Extraverts have a lower level of arousal and therefore seek stimulation by being around others (Eysenck, 1967). They crave excitement, engage in physical activity and like to laugh and talk to others. These social encounters are major sources of happiness for extraverts (Hills & Argyle, 2001). Argyle, Martin, and Lu (1995) have concluded that extraverts are happier than others because they have better social skills, are more assertive, more co-operative, and use a more positive verbal and nonverbal response style. These factors allow extraverts to appraise social interactions in a positive manner and encourage them to enjoy a range of social situations. It appears that gregariousness is the primary component of extraversion related to happiness (Argyle et al., 1995).

Neuroticism is the opposite of emotional stability. Those who score high on the neuroticism subscale tend to worry and feel guilty, and they are also typically moody and unstable. Though most research related to personality and subjective well-being investigates extraversion, some studies have demonstrated that neuroticism is a personality trait associated with negative affect and discontent. For example, Francis, Brown, Lester, and Philipchalk (1998) found that neuroticism was the only personality trait found to be negatively associated with happiness. These findings were also found in Britain and China (Furham & Cheng, 1999). Furthermore, Neto (2001) found that happiness was most closely related to sociability, satisfaction with life, and positive states; characteristics that are often absent in neurotics (e.g. Teasdale, 1985). Therefore, it appears that those high in neuroticism are unhappy because they lack all three components most significantly associated with happiness.

People who score high in psychoticism are generally high in aggression, and are egocentric and antisocial (Eysenck, 1967). The opposite of psychoticism is self-control in which a person is kind, considerate, and respectful of rules. Although very little research has focused on psychoticism, some studies have demonstrated that it is unrelated to happiness and well-being. However, there appears to be a cultural trend. While in North America psychoticism was found to be unrelated to happiness (Francis, et al., 1998), in Britain it was negatively related to happiness (Furham & Cheng, 1999). The cultural difference may be due to the judicial policies and the outcomes associated with certain delinquent and antisocial behaviours. Although this study provides insight to cultural differences, more studies are needed to support these findings and to identify the true source of this differentiation. Nonetheless, psychoticism does not appear to play a role in the well-being of North Americans.

Despite Eysenck's effort to explain human behaviour, many are dissatisfied with his model because there are too few factors to adequately represent human behaviour and personality (e.g. Tellegen, 1985). Furthermore, many have criticized Eysenck's theory, arguing that a better understanding of the biological components associated with personality is needed (e.g. Larsen & Ketelaar, 1989).

Whereas the Big Five accounts for more factors than Eysenck's three factor model, it neglects to consider biological factors which may influence personality. Therefore, an amalgamation of both models may provide a more accurate description of personality. However, even a combination of both models overlooks key components to the understanding of human behaviour. Although these models have been very useful in describing personality, the BIS and BAS model may offer a better explanation of the nature and roots of behaviour.

BIS and BAS Approach to Personality

Gray (1982) proposed that there are two independent motivational systems that explain disinhibition in humans: *the behavioural inhibition system* (BIS) and *the behavioural activation system* (BAS). According to Gray (1982), fear and anxiety stem from different roots. Activation of the fight-flight system will result in fear whereas anxiety is caused by the behavioural inhibition system (BIS). When this system is activated, there is an increase in non-specific arousal and attention is directed to environmental stimuli (Chorpita & Barlow, 1998). This system, also referred to as the "stop, look, and listen system", is activated by innate fears as well as novelty (Gray, 1982). It is associated with the potential for punishment or the cessation of reward. The BIS has been found to correlate with neuroticism, a behavioural factor negatively correlated with happiness (Larsen & Ketelaar, 1991).

The behavioural activation system is a neurological system that is important in rewarding behaviour. In contrast with the BIS, it is stimulated only by conditioned signals of reward and non-punishment. The BAS system promotes approach and active avoidance behaviour (Gray, 1981). Those who have a high BAS are more likely to be goal oriented and have positive affect than those who have a low BAS (Gray, 1981).

The BIS and the BAS function in different ways: the checking mode and the control mode (Avila, Parcet, Ortet, & Ibanez, 1999). The checking mode involves the activation of these systems when searching the environment for possible rewards or punishments. Those with an overactive BIS detect more punishment than those with an underactive BIS; whereas those with an overactive BAS detect more rewards than those with an underactive BAS. The control mode occurs when an individual is faced with a punishment cue or a reward cue. Individuals with an overactive BIS would be more inclined to avoid punishment than those with an underactive BIS, whereas individuals with an overactive BAS would be more likely to approach potential rewards than those with an underactive BAS.

The BIS and the BAS are independent systems and are associated with different personality factors. According to Carver and White (1994), those who have overactive BIS are also high in neuroticism and high in negative affect. Negative affect (NA) is a dimension of distress subjectively reported by an individual and involves a number of negative moods such as anger, fearfulness, and depression (Tellgen, 1982). Those high in NA are more likely to experience more distress and dissatisfaction in any situation (Watson & Clark, 1984). On the other hand, according to this theory, an overactive BAS is associated with extraversion, whereas an underactive BAS is associated with introversion. As mentioned above, these

behavioural systems are independent and operate in distinct ways; therefore, an individual can be high or low on both systems.

Although Gray's (1982) argument appears promising, most research has utilized other biological approaches such as Eysenck's (1967) PEN theory as previously described. Therefore, until recently, it seemed difficult to generalize previous findings associated with personality. Zelenski and Larsen (1999) compared Gray's and Eysenck's personality taxonomies to investigate the relationship and similarities between both theories. They found that traits associated with negative affect such as neuroticism and harm avoidance (BIS) were similar and co-varied in human behaviour. They also found that traits associated with positive affect such as extraversion and BAS similarly congregate into one factor. These findings suggest that results associated with affect found in previous studies using Eysenck's (1967) PEN theory can also be applied to Gray's (1982) model. Therefore, despite the lack of literature to directly support the motivational systems, Gray's (1982) model of personality can be substantiated by Eysenck's (1967) PEN theory. In a modern study, Gray's (1982) theory would provide optimal investigation because it is a more prevailing version of the PEN theory and it maintains all its strengths.

Most studies have examined subjective well-being as it relates to Eysenck's theory or the Big Five (Argyle et al., 1995). Although many insightful findings have surfaced, there is little research that has investigated the association between well-being and the BIS and BAS. Kasch, Rottenberg, Arnow, and Gotlib (2002) found that deficient BAS and overactive BIS are more likely to be associated with depression and negative outcomes; nevertheless, the investigation between BIS/BAS and well-being has yet to be studied. Due to the significant overlap between Eysenck's model and the BIS and BAS, relations can be assumed. However, more studies are needed

to investigate the direct link between behavioural motivation systems and subjective well-being.

Parental Personality and Child Well-Being

There are well-established links between personality and well-being in adulthood (Hills & Argyle, 2001). However, the question arises as to whether adults' personality may be related to their *children's* well-being. There is some evidence to suggest that there is an inherent component to personality and therefore, children might have a genetic predisposition to experience life in a particular manner. For example, Kagan and his colleagues (1988) have found physiological indicators of inhibition such as high, stable heart rate, laryngeal muscle tension, high norepinephrine levels, high salivary cortisol levels, and pupillary dilation. They have also argued that the physiological characteristics of inhibition may suggest a greater than normal sympathetic nervous system (Kagan et al., 1988). Many researchers claim that these physiological markers may be due to the fact that there is a genetic predisposition to inhibition (e.g. Rosenbaum, Biederman, Hirshfeld, Bolduc, & Cahloff, 1991). Furthermore, according to Eysenck's model, as well as the Behavioural Motivation Theory (which is now known as the Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory), personality stems from a biological foundation that children may inherit (Eysenck, 1967; Gray, 1982). Therefore, parental personality may be related to their child's well-being because they share a similar biological make-up. Thus, due to the genetic component associated with personality, children might inherit their parents' personality making them more susceptible to experience life events in either a negative or positive manner.

Although very little research has been conducted to test this idea, it appears conceptually plausible that parental personality would be associated with child well-

being. Thus, the primary goal of this study was to explore associations between maternal personality and indices of child well-being. Personality may effect child well-being both directly (i.e. genetics) and indirectly (i.e. through parenting styles). If there is an indirect or mediated relation (through parenting) in the association between maternal personality and child well-being, then (1) maternal personality would be related to child well-being, (2) maternal personality would be related to mothers' parenting styles, and (3) mothers' parenting styles would to be related to child well-being. In the following sections, links between maternal personality and parenting styles, and between mothers' parenting and child well-being are reviewed.

Personality and Parenting

Theoretical links. Theoretically, there are at least two different conceptual mechanisms that can potentially account for the link between personality and parenting. First, parenting may be an expression of personality in a specific context. For example, parents who are neurotic may be overprotective with their children because they fear something negative will happen. Neurotics are high in negative affect (Francis, et al.1998), and this negative affectivity could be expressed when dealing with a situation related to their children. If their child wants to play on a play structure or engage in similar activities, parents high in neuroticism may object because of their perception of potential risks. In such an instance, parents are not parenting to suit their child's needs because they are expressing emotions and actions specifically related to their personality. Thus, parental personality can have a direct impact on parenting styles by influencing parental behaviours when interacting with children.

A second conceptualization is also plausible. A child's temperament might influence parenting behaviours, with parents responding to different children with

different kinds of parenting styles. Many personality theorists believe that personality is based on biological components and thus the relation between parents and children depends largely on the chemistry between their biological make-ups (e.g. Eysenck, 1967). For example, a neurotic parent will most likely have an overactive behavioural inhibition system and will express the physiology of an anxious person (Gray, 1982). Due to shared genetics, children may also have this type of physiology. Assuming they inherit this trait from their parent, these children are more likely to be behaviourally inhibited. Therefore, the way in which a parent high in neuroticism behaves towards their child may be in part due to their child's biological make-up or temperament. This particular type of parent might be more warm and overprotective because their child requires such affection to feel secure. Thus, child characteristics (inherited from parents and thus related to parental personality traits) may evoke specific parental behaviours and responses. This would create an indirect link between parent personality and parenting styles.

There is a surprising gap in the literature surrounding the link between parental personality and parenting styles. As Clark, Kochanska, and Ready (2000) point out, influential texts such as the *Handbook of Personality Psychology* (Hogan, Johnson, & Briggs, 1997) only briefly discuss parental personality. Although more research is needed in this area, there have been a small number of studies that offered insight into the understanding of parental personality and parenting styles.

Empirical links. In the few studies where researchers have explored links between personality and parenting, either the Big Five or Eysenck's model has been used to assess personality. However, to date there has been no research utilizing the BIS and BAS to investigate this matter. Belsky, Crnic, and Woodworth (1995) measured neuroticism, extraversion, and agreeableness in mothers and fathers using

the NEO personality Inventory (McCrae & Costa, 1984). They found that parents high in neuroticism were less likely to be sensitive, stimulating, and showed less positive affect than those who were not. Conversely, parents who scored high in extraversion and agreeableness demonstrated more positive parenting styles.

Results from a number of other studies have also demonstrated that parents high in neuroticism are less competent and show little warmth and responsiveness (Clark, Kochanska, & Ready, 2000; Kendler, Sham, & MacLean, 1997), whereas parents high on extraversion and agreeableness have been found to be more sensitive, caring, and warm with their children (Belsky, Crnic, & Woodworth, 1995). Although these results are relatively consistent, there has also been some suggestion that extraversion is potentially associated with negative parenting styles. For example, Clark, Kochanska, and Ready (2000) found that mothers who were either high in neuroticism or extraversion used a forceful disciplinary style (high in control and low in responsiveness). Clark et al. (2000) speculate that the association between extraversion and power assertion may be due to extravert characteristics such as dominance and assertiveness.

In an attempt to better understand the relation between parental personality and parenting, Metsäpelto and Pulkkinen (2003) examined whether measures of the Big Five would predict parenting styles in mothers and fathers three years later. They found that openness to experience, low neuroticism, and extraversion were related to parental nurturance, openness to experience was associated with restrictiveness, and low neuroticism was associated with little knowledge of their child's activities.

Although these studies aid in understanding the association between parental personality and parenting styles, they have not investigated parenting styles as they

relate to BIS and BAS. Furthermore, they neglect to consider child well-being related to these particular variables.

Parenting and Child Outcomes

There is a large body of research linking aspects of parenting to child outcomes (i.e. Parke & Buriel, 1998; Coplan, Hastings, Lagacé-Séguin, & Moulton, 2002). Many researchers and theorists have debated the nature of this link (e.g. Perris & Andersson, 2000). For the current study, the link between parenting and child outcomes was of interest particularly with respect to its role within a larger model linking parental personality with child outcomes. As such, the literature on parenting is only briefly reviewed with a specific focus on parenting styles.

When researchers began investigating how parents may affect children, they were particularly interested in psychodynamics. Psychodynamic theorists argue that the emotional relationship between parent and child affects psychosexual, psychosocial, and personality development. Of particular interest to these theorists are the attitudes expressed by parents because, according to this theory, attitudes determine parental practices. However, psychodynamic theories rely on attitudes and do not account for behaviour. Therefore, these limitations have led researchers to investigate other theories.

According to Aquilino (1986), three parenting factors are consistently related to child outcomes: (1) positive vs. negative affect; (2) psychological control regarding achievement demands; and (3) punitive discipline. In general, children who have warm, loving parents exhibit better social skills and are more liked by their peers. On the other hand, parents who are controlling and use harsh discipline have children who are rated less liked by their peers (Clark & Ladd, 2000). Therefore, positive parenting styles are thought to lead to a child's social success and perhaps overall

happiness. Though many other factors may contribute as well, child rearing appears to play an important role in the psychological well-being of children.

Parenting Styles. Parenting styles can be defined as a “constellation of attitudes toward the child that are communicated to the child and that, taken together, create an emotional climate in which the parent’s behaviours are expressed” (Darling & Steinberg, 1993, p.488). Parenting styles are patterns of childrearing depicted by parents’ standard practices and responses to child behaviours (Coplan, et al., 2002). Baumrind (1989) has outlined distinct dimensions of parenting that account for a significant proportion of child outcomes. The first dimension, responsiveness, refers to the degree of parental nurturance, warmth, emotional expression, and positive reinforcement associated with their child’s articulation of opinions. The second dimension, demandingness, refers to disciplinary practices, control, and level of demands and expectations. There are three prominent types of parenting styles that are defined by the degree of parental responsiveness and demandingness: authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive. Each type of parenting is believed to differentially influence child outcomes.

Authoritative parents have control while being flexible with their children. They explain the logic as to why the child should comply with their requests. However, they are generally accepting of their child’s autonomy and encourage critical thinking. They are also more likely to focus on empathetic goals. These parents tend to be demanding, yet accepting and responsive (Coplan et al., 2002). Children of authoritative parents are likely to have high cognitive and social competences. They are cheerful, responsible, self-reliant, achievement oriented, and cooperative with adults and peers (Baumrind, 1967, 1978; Lambourn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991). Children whose parents were closer to them and

more positive had a better social self-esteem, more interaction with peers and better social competence, were more expressive and less shy, and had less difficulty with others (Bell, Avery, Jenkins, Feld, & Schoenrock, 1985). During adolescence, these children generally have high self-esteem, outstanding social skills, strong moral and prosocial concern, and high academic achievement (see Parke & Buriel 1998 for a complete review).

Authoritarian parenting is conceptualized as a restricting pattern of parenting. Such parents are strict and impose many rules. They often use power to obtain compliance and rarely, if ever, explain why their child's behaviours upset them. Authoritarian parents also attribute negative child behaviours to the child and blame wrong doing on internal causes (Coplan et al., 2002). The child is expected to abide by their rules without questioning them. These parents are described as aloof, unresponsive, and controlling. According to Baumrind (1978), these children demonstrate average cognitive and social competences, but they are moody and generally viewed as unhappy. They are unfriendly, intolerant, somewhat aimless, and generally unpleasant. The same characteristics are present during adolescence with the addition of conformity (see Parke & Buriel 1998 for a complete review).

Permissive parents are viewed as accepting and responsive, but uncontrolling. These parents rarely make demands and allow their child to do just about anything without closely monitoring his or her activities. Children of permissive parents are described as impulsive and aggressive. This is especially true in boys. They are also self-centred, bossy, dependent of others, and have low achievement motivation. In adolescence, they demonstrate poor academic attainment and are more susceptible to drugs and alcohol (Lambourn, et al., 1991; see Parke & Buriel 1998 for a complete review).

Recently, a fourth type of parenting style has been identified as *uninvolved* (or neglectful) parenting. This is viewed as the least successful parenting style, as children often suffer severe negative repercussions. Uninvolved parents are negligent and have a 'laissez-faire' attitude. Parents who draw on this particular type of parenting style often reject their child for some reason, or are too involved in their own success or problems. Children of such parents are generally more aggressive and display more externalizing behaviours (Miller et al., 1993). They also are more likely to become hostile, selfish, rebellious, and are more likely to commit antisocial acts (Weiss & Schwarz, 1996; see Parke & Buriel 1998 for a complete review).

Many researchers assume that childhood experiences with parental rearing lead to internal working models of the self and others in relationships (e.g. Perris & Andersson, 2000). These models are believed to influence the quality of future relationships (Rodriguez Vega et al. 1993). For example, Perris and Andersson (2000) found a positive relation between warmth and secure attachment, and a negative relation between dysfunctional parenting and insecure attachment. These results support previous findings in the attachment literature.

In addition to the consequences of parental rearing for attachment, it has also proved to be associated with coping strategies. Wolfradt, Hempel, and Miles (2003) found that, retrospectively, adults who perceived their parents as warm (authoritative or permissive) engaged in more active coping and had less anxiety in adolescence than those who were reared by authoritarian parents. Although permissive parenting styles are predominant, authoritative styles is the most effective parenting style based on measures of school interaction and mental well-being (Shucksmith, Hendry, & Glendinning, 1995). The positive relationship obtained through authoritative parenting promotes psychological resources such as self-esteem and cognitive

abilities, which enable children to effectively cope with difficult situations and stressful events (Baumrind, 1991).

In an attempt to integrate several theories, Darling and Steinberg (1993) created a model to explain the process by which parents influence child development. According to this model, child outcomes are a result of three specific factors: goals toward which socialization is directed, parenting practices, and parenting styles. This model suggests that parenting goals and values influence parenting styles. Parenting practices have a direct effect on child outcomes, whereas parenting styles effects child development when moderated by parenting practices or child openness to be socialized. Darling and Steinberg's model is illustrated in figure 1.

Parenting styles are considered a trait rather than state because they tend to remain relatively consistent across time (Grusec & Goodnow, 1994). Although many support the traditional views of distinct categories of parenting styles, some researchers have argued that they are not as clear-cut as suggested. Furthermore, Grusec and Goodnow (1994) have claimed that parents sometimes use different parenting styles depending on the situation, the place, and the child. When studying parenting styles, parental personality variables may offer a glimpse into the mind of the parent when dealing with difficult situations. Furthermore, personality variables may also affect child outcomes. As such, a second goal of this thesis was to investigate whether parenting style mediates the relation between adult personality and child well-being.

Personality, Parenting, and Child Well-Being: Moderated Relations

Direct and mediated models linking adult personality, parenting styles, and child well-being assume linear relations between these constructs. However, there is also the possibility that parental personality and parenting interact to affect child well-being. There is substantial evidence demonstrating that parental personality can affect

Figure 1. Darling and Steingberg's integrative model.

parenting (Belsky, et al., 1995), and parenting can affect child well-being (Lambourn, et al., 1991). Nevertheless, there has not been any published research examining a moderated relation between parental personality and parenting to predict child well-being. A relevant poster presentation at the Society for Research in Child Development conference was found. In this study, Kovacs and Kim (2003) explored moderated links between parental personality, parenting styles, and child social reticence. Seventy children were selected at age four based on their reticent scores at age two. Parents were asked to complete the Child Rearing Practices Report (Block, 1981), Cheek and Buss Shyness Scale (1981), Leary Social Anxiousness Scale (1983), and Eysenck's Extroversion Scale (1985)-reverse scored. A significant interaction was found between maternal personality and parenting in the prediction of social reticence. Specifically, punitiveness was related to social reticence for mothers low in neuroticism, but not for mothers high in neuroticism.

The results from this study provide a first step in understanding moderated relations between parental personality, parenting styles, and child outcomes. However, there are a few limitations. As the researchers themselves pointed out, different measures should be employed when assessing parental personality. Furthermore, Kovacs and Kim (2003) focused solely on neuroticism and shyness and therefore suggest that other types of personality should be studied as they apply to child outcomes. Another caveat to this particular study is that the researchers examined only social reticence as the outcome of children. Although social reticence is potentially associated with many negative consequences, there are other types of outcomes that are equally important to consider such as: social competence, depression, anxiety, and well-being. As such, the third goal of this thesis was to

examine the interaction between maternal personality and parenting in the prediction of child well-being.

The Present Study

The primary goal of the present study was to investigate how maternal personality might be related to child well-being. In adulthood, subjective well-being refers to a person's affective and cognitive evaluation of his/her life and is typically operationalized in terms of life satisfaction, satisfaction with important domains, positive affect, and low levels of negative affect (Diener, 2000). Drawing upon this literature, child well-being was assessed through self-esteem, depression, negative and positive affect, social anxiety, and overall well-being. Three potential conceptual models linking maternal personality and child well-being were explored. These pathways are illustrated in Figure 2.

Linear model. It was hypothesised that child outcomes would be directly related to maternal personality. Specifically, mothers who have an overactive BIS were expected to have children who reported more internalizing problems. Mothers who have an overactive BAS were predicted to have children who reported higher self-esteem and overall well-being.

Mediated Model. It was predicted that maternal personality would predict parenting, which would in turn predict child outcomes. More specifically, mothers who had an overactive BIS would be more likely to be restrictive and controlling, which would in turn be associated with more internalizing problems in children. As well, mothers with an overactive BAS would be more warm and nurturing, which in turn will be associated with higher child self-esteem and overall well-being.

Moderated model. At the present time, there has been no research investigating the interaction between behavioural motivation systems and maternal

Figure 2. Conceptual models linking adult personality, parenting, and child well-being.

I. Linear Model:

II. Mediated Model:

III. Moderated Model:

parenting as they relate to child outcomes. As such, predictions in this area are primarily exploratory in nature. However, it was speculated that among mothers who were highly restrictive, negative outcomes might be expected for children of parents who have an overactive BAS. Due to shared genetics, these children may also have an overactive BAS, therefore, they will seek rewards and feel constrained and limited if their parents are restrictive. In contrast, among mothers who are low in restrictiveness, BAS might be related to more positive outcomes.

Methods

Subjects. The participants for this study were 95 children (46 females, 49 males, $M_{age} = 9.60$ years, $SD = 1.90$ years) ranging in ages from 6 to 14 years, attending local day camps and after school programs in the Ottawa region. Their mothers also participated in the study.

Children were recruited through a package of information and consent letters (see Appendix A) and questionnaires sent home to the parents. The day camps and after school programs were selected based on their location to ensure a moderate range of diversity. Seventy-three percent of mothers were Caucasian, 9% Asian, 2% Black, 7% Hispanic, 2% aboriginal, and 7% identified 'other'. In terms of education, 43% of mothers graduated from university, 30% graduated from college, 26% had graduated from high school, and 1% completed elementary school. Sixty-four percent of all mothers were married or common law.

Measures

Overview. In addition to the variables mentioned in this study, other variables were collected; however, only those relevant to the present study will be described. Data were collected from mother reports and through small group interviews with

children. Mothers completed questionnaires at home and children were invited to participate in a group interview. During free play, groups of three to five children were asked to go into another room where they were asked to sit far apart from each other. An interviewer asked questions from several questionnaires and the children were instructed to write their answers on the corresponding answer sheet. Two interviewers were present for each group interview and each played a different role. One interviewer was at the front and read each question aloud while the other interviewer walked around and answered questions privately. Children were instructed to keep their answers to themselves and not to ask questions to other children.

Demographics. Mothers were asked to complete a background questionnaire, which included information about parental education, parental marital status, parental ethnicity, and child's age (see Appendix B).

Personality. In order to assess maternal personality, the *BIS/BAS Scales* (Carver & White, 1994) questionnaire was used (see Appendix C). Participants were asked to rate how much they agreed or disagreed with a number of items on a 4-point likert scale. The BAS subscale items assessed orientation towards drive, reward, and fun (e.g., "when I get something I want, I feel excited and energized"). The BIS subscale items assessed orientation towards punishment (e.g., "criticism or scolding hurts me quite a bit"). The BIS/BAS Scales has been shown to have good psychometric properties (Carver & White, 1994). In the current study, Cronbach's alpha for BIS was $\alpha = .67$, and for BAS it was $\alpha = .82$.

Parenting. Maternal parenting styles were assessed via the *Child Rearing Practices Report Questionnaire* (Rickel & Biasatti, 1982) (see Appendix D). This instrument is a questionnaire version of the *Child Rearing Practices Report* (CRPR,

Block, 1981), a well-known and frequently used measure (e.g. Rubin, Nelson, Hastings, & Asendorpf, 1999). This scale assesses child-rearing attitudes, beliefs, and behaviours, and is divided into two major subgroups: nurturance items and restrictiveness items. Example questions from the nurturance subscale include “I feel a child should be given comfort and understanding when he or she is scared or upset” and “I express affection by hugging, kissing, and holding my child.” Examples from the restrictiveness subscale include “I try to keep my child away from children or families who have different ideas or values from our own” and “I prefer my child not try things if there’s a chance he or she might fail.” In the current sample, Cronbach’s alpha for the nurturance scale was $\alpha = .81$ and for the restrictiveness scale it was $\alpha = .64$.

Depression. Child depression was measured via the *Child Depression Inventory*, a scale known to have acceptable psychometric properties (CDI, Kovacs, 1980; 1981) (see Appendix E). The CDI is a self-report measure which consists of 27 items related to thoughts, feelings, or behaviours associated with depression; however, for the present study, the question related to suicidal ideation was omitted for ethical purposes and thus only 26 items were used. This scale is a widely used measure for children and adolescents between the ages of 7-17 years. The CDI has five subsections: negative mood (e.g. “I feel like crying everyday”), interpersonal problems (e.g. “I do not like being with people many times,”), ineffectiveness (e.g. “I do many things wrong”), negative self-esteem (e.g. “I do not like myself”), and anhedonia (e.g. “I never have fun at school”). Participants were asked to select a sentence that best describes them within the past two weeks and items are scored from 0 (no depression) to 2 (high depression). In the current study, Cronbach’s alpha for the CDI was $\alpha = .85$.

Affect. The Positive Affect and Negative Affect Schedule for Children

(PANAS-C; Laurent et al., 1999) measures both positive and negative state affect for children in grades 4-8 (see Appendix F). Fifteen items on *Positive Affect* (PA) and 15 items on *Negative Affect* (NA) are rated on a scale of 1 (very slightly) to 5 (extremely). Children were asked to rate how they have been feeling for the past 2 weeks. Examples of the positive subscale include “interested”, “excited”, and “happy” and examples of the negative subscale include “upset”, “guilty”, and “sad”. Laurent et al., (1999) found that the alpha-coefficient for the NA scale was .92 and .89 for the PA scale. In the current study, the alpha coefficients were $\alpha = .68$ for the positive subscale and $\alpha = .88$ for the negative subscale. The PANAS-C demonstrates good convergent and discriminate validity with self-report measures of anxiety and depression (Laurent et al., 1999).

Self-worth. Self-perception Profile for Children (Harter, 1985) was used to assess domain specific judgements of competence (see Appendix G). This instrument is a 24-item questionnaire designed for children from grades three to nine. There are four subscales: cognitive competence (e.g. “good at school”), social competence (e.g. “have a lot of friends”), physical competence (e.g. “do well at all sports”), and general self-worth (e.g. “happy the way I am”). In order to reduce time demands, general self-worth was the only subscale included in the study. This measure has demonstrated good reliability, ranging from .73 to .84 (Harter, 1985). However, in the current study, the reliability was only $\alpha = .49$.

Anxiety. Child anxiety was measured through the Social Anxiety Scale for Children – Revised (La Greca & Stone, 1993). (See Appendix H). The social anxiety scale for children-revised is an 18-item scale with three subscales: fear of negative evaluation, social avoidance and distress, and generalized social avoidance and

distressed. Children were asked to rate the items on a scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (all the time). This measure has established good psychometric properties (La Greca & Stone, 1993). In the current study, Cronbach's alpha was $\alpha = .85$.

Child well-being. Although most studies generally assess well-being as a combination of multiple factors, Allison and Furstenberg (1989) developed a measure to assess overall well-being (see Appendix I & Appendix J). They conducted their research with children between the ages of 7-11 years. To assess dissatisfaction, children were asked how satisfied they were with their friends, family, themselves, being a boy (or girl), and their nationality. They also rated children's distress by asking them whether the following statements were how they felt: "I am lucky," "I often wish I were someone else," "I'm easy to like," "I can do many things well," and "I like being the way I am." These questions were created for the purposes of their research; therefore, psychometric properties have not been established. Although the alpha reliability was moderate for dissatisfaction ($\alpha = .71$) and less for distress ($\alpha = .42$), this study used these questions in an attempt to have a more complete representation of child well-being. In the current study, Cronbach's alpha was $\alpha = .70$ for satisfaction and $\alpha = .62$ for distress. However, when both scales were combined, Cronbach's alpha was $\alpha = .74$. Therefore, both measures were combined for statistical analyses. The correlation between the two subjective well-being scales was $r = .41$, ($p < .01$).

Results

Preliminary Analysis

Summary scores of all variables are displayed in Table 1.

Data reduction. Child well-being variables were aggregated to make broader summary variables, which were empirically derived through factor analysis. Results from factor analyses indicated two factors with Eigenvalues greater than 1. These

Table 1

Summary Scores of all Variables

	Mean (SD)	Range
Age	9.6 yrs (1.9)	6-14
Child Depression	.30 (.24)	0-1
Child Positive Affect	3.78 (.49)	2-5
Child Negative Affect	1.80 (.66)	1-4
Child Self-Worth	3.33 (.45)	2-4
Child Subjective Well-Being	8.71 (1.06)	4.8-10
Child Anxiety	2.48 (.82)	1-5
Mother BAS	2.98 (.44)	2-4
Mother BIS	3.00 (.47)	2-4
Mother Nurturance	5.45 (.39)	4-6
Mother Restrictiveness	3.33 (.53)	2-5

factors were labelled: (1) internalizing problems (anxiety, depression, and negative affect) which had an Eigenvalue of 3.0 and accounted for 50.8% of the variance; and (2) positive adjustment (positive affect, self-worth, and well-being)¹ which had an Eigenvalue of 1.0 and accounted for 16.9% of the variance. Factor loadings are displayed in Table 2. Summary scores were created by aggregating the relevant z-scored measures and then re-standardizing.

Demographic variables. Correlations between demographic variables (child age and parental education) and all other variables were performed to determine if they would need to be controlled for statistically in subsequent analyses. Age was significantly and negatively related to internalizing problems, however no other significant effects emerged. When controlling for age in subsequent analyses, results were virtually the same; therefore, age was not statistically controlled for. Results are displayed in Table 3. In addition, t-tests were performed on all child variables for sex. No significant relations surfaced.

Linear Associations

Linear associations between all variables were examined with a correlation matrix (see Table 4). Child positive adjustment was significantly and negatively related to child internalizing problems. It was also significantly and positively related to maternal restrictiveness. Furthermore, mother BAS was found to be significantly and positively related to parental nurturance. No other significant associations were found.

Parenting styles groups. To further explore the relation between maternal parenting styles and maternal personality, the two parenting scales (nurturance and restrictiveness) were dichotomized into “high” and “low” categories in order to create

¹ It could be argued that self-worth should not be factored into positive adjustment since it had such a weak Cronbach's alpha ($\alpha = .49$). However, statistical analyses were performed without social self-worth and the results were virtually the same.

Table 2

Factor Component Matrix

	Factor 1: <u>Internalizing problems</u>	Factor 2: <u>Positive adjustment</u>
Depression	.79	-.43
Positive Affect	-	.82
Negative Affect	.87	-
Self-Worth	-.43	.54
Subjective Well-Being	-	.73
Anxiety	.86	-

Notes: (1) Factor loadings above .30 are displayed

(2) Although some variables cross-loaded to a certain degree, the two aggregate variables were created (consistent with previous theory) in order to reduce the number of later analyses.

Table 3

Correlations Between Demographic Variables and All Measures

Variable	Age	Parental education
Child Positive Adjustment	.02	.03
Child Internalizing Problems	-.26*	-.16
Mother BAS	-.22	-.05
Mother BIS	-.02	.14
Mother Nurturance	.20	.12
Mother Restrictiveness	-.03	.01

** $p < .001$ * $p < .05$

Table 4

Correlation Matrix

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Positive Adjustment	-	-.50**	-.15	-.13	-.06	.26*
2. Internalizing Problems	-	-	.04	.12	-.05	-.10
3. Mother BAS	-	-	-	.04	.24*	-.01
4. Mother BIS	-	-	-	-	.13	.18
5. Nurturance	-	-	-	-	-	-.04
6. Restrictiveness	-	-	-	-	-	-

** p<.01

* p<.05

groups of mothers reflecting different parenting “styles”. Mothers who were high in nurturance (i.e., above the median) and high in restrictiveness were labelled ‘authoritarian’ parenting style ($n=27$); the combination of high nurturance and low restrictiveness was labelled ‘permissive’ ($n=27$); low nurturance and high restrictiveness was labelled ‘authoritative’ ($n=22$); and low nurturance and low restrictiveness was labelled ‘neglectful’ ($n=19$). A series of one-way analyses of variance were conducted to explore possible group differences in maternal personality (BIS/BAS) as well as child outcomes (internalizing/ positive) (see Table 5). Results indicate a main effect of parenting group only for BAS [$F(3, 94) = 5.19, p < .01$]. Specifically, follow-up post hoc tests (LSD) revealed that mothers who were high in BAS were significantly more likely to be either authoritarian or neglectful. Means are displayed in Table 5.

Mediated Relations

In order to investigate a mediated model, specific requirements related to the linear model had to be fulfilled (Baron & Kenny, 1986). Specifically, the linear model required significant direct relations between (1) maternal personality and child well-being, (2) maternal personality and their parenting, and (3) mothers’ parenting and child well-being. However, these relations were not found in the present data. Mother personality was not directly associated with child well-being. Although BAS was associated with certain maternal parenting styles and maternal parenting was related to child outcomes, not all of the conditions were met in order to satisfy the requirements to investigate a mediated relation. Therefore, statistical analyses of a mediated model would be erroneous. Although there is no indication of a mediated model, a moderated model can still be explored because it does not depend on direct associations.

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviation of Maternal Personality and Child Outcomes as a Function of Parenting Style Group

<u>Dependent Variable</u>	<u>Parenting Style Group</u>				<u>F value</u>
	<u>Neglectful</u>	<u>Authoritarian</u>	<u>Permissive</u>	<u>Authoritative</u>	
Mother BIS	2.85 (.43)	3.05 (.47)	2.95 (.48)	3.13 (.45)	1.49
Mother BAS	3.16 _a (.38)	2.78 _b (.43)	2.90 _b (.45)	3.17 _a (.37)	5.19**
Child Internalizing Problems	.35 (1.1)	.06 (.98)	.17 (1.02)	.02 (.89)	1.08
Child Positive Adjustment	-.41 (1.16)	.11 (1.01)	.00 (.93)	.23 (.88)	1.60

- ** $p < .01$

- means with different subscripts differ at the .05 level.

Moderated Relations

The goal of these analyses was to explore whether the relation between maternal personality and child well-being is different for distinct parenting styles. A series of hierarchical multiple regressions was performed. To begin with, main effects variables (BIS or BAS, and nurturance or restrictiveness) were entered in Step One and relevant interactions created by multiplicative product (personality x parenting styles) were entered in Step Two. Separate equations were performed for each combination of maternal personality and mothers' parenting for each child outcome variable (internalizing and positive). This resulted in 8 equations. Results are displayed in Table 6. Significant interactions were found between maternal BAS and nurturance in the prediction of child internalizing problems ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .08$, $p < .01$) and positive child outcomes ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .08$, $p < .05$), and maternal BAS and restrictiveness in the prediction of positive child outcomes ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .05$, $p < .01$). Simple effects analyses were performed to further explore these interactions. Nurturance and restrictiveness were divided into two categories: high (i.e., above the median) and low (i.e., below the median). Regressions were then re-run for each group. Among children with mothers low in nurturance, BAS was significantly and negatively related to child positive outcomes ($\beta = -.34$, $p < .05$); however, among mothers high in nurturance, these variables were not related ($\beta = .05$, *ns*). For children with mothers high in nurturance, BAS was negatively but not significantly related to child internalizing problems ($\beta = -.11$, *ns*); whereas for mothers low in nurturance, this relation was positive ($\beta = .19$, *ns*). Finally, for mothers low in restrictiveness, BAS was negatively related to positive outcomes ($\beta = -.24$, *ns*), but unrelated among mothers with higher restrictiveness ($\beta = -.04$, *ns*).

Table 6

Prediction of Child Outcomes from Measures of Maternal Personality and Parenting

Dependent Variable	Main effects (β)		Interaction term (R^2)
	<u>BIS</u>	<u>Nurturance</u>	<u>BIS x Nurturance</u>
Internalizing Problems	.13	-.07	1.84
Positive Outcomes	-.12	-.05	.01
<hr/>			
	<u>BIS</u>	<u>Restrictive</u>	<u>BIS x Restrictive</u>
Internalizing Problems	.15	-.13	.01
Positive Outcomes	-.18	.29	.01
<hr/>			
	<u>BAS</u>	<u>Nurturance</u>	<u>BAS x Nurturance</u>
Internalizing Problems	.05	-.06	.08**
Positive Outcomes	-.14	-.03	.08*
<hr/>			
	<u>BAS</u>	<u>Restrictive</u>	<u>BAS x Restrictive</u>
Internalizing Problems	.03	-.10	.02
Positive Outcomes	-.14	.26*	.05*

** $p < .01$ * $p < .05$

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate relations between maternal personality, mothers' parenting styles, and child outcomes. The ensuing results add to the existing body of empirical evidence suggesting that parental personality is related to parenting styles (Belsky et al, 1995; Clark et al, 2000; Metsäpelto & Pulkkinen, 2003). However, certain linear relations were not established. Specifically, no direct relations were found between mother personality and child outcomes. Since all linear associations were required to further investigate a mediated model, the mediated model was therefore inadmissible. Results suggest a complex set of relations between maternal personality, parenting, and child outcomes. For example, some aspects of maternal personality related to some aspects of maternal parenting styles (e.g. BAS and nurturance) and other aspects of maternal parenting styles related to child outcomes (e.g. restrictiveness and child positive outcomes).

Also, to further complicate matters, several interactions were found. At the present time, there has been no published research investigating the interaction between behavioural motivation systems and parenting as they relate to child outcomes. As such, predictions in this area were primarily exploratory in nature. Results from this study suggest that maternal personality and child outcomes were different for different parenting styles. For example, among mothers low in nurturance, BAS was significantly and negatively associated with child positive outcomes. The following section will further elaborate on findings of each of the 3 models. Although the present data do not allow for causal explanations between maternal personality, parenting styles, and child outcomes, possible interpretations will be speculated.

Linear Associations

Three distinct linear associations were investigated: (1) maternal personality and maternal parenting styles, (2) maternal personality and child outcomes, and (3) maternal parenting styles and child outcomes. Results indicated a complex pattern of associations.

Personality and parenting styles. Although no previous research has examined behavioural motivation systems as they relate to parenting, some studies have investigated the relation between parental personality as measured by the Big Five and parenting styles (e.g. Clark et al, 2000; Metsäpelto & Pulkkinen, 2003). Past studies have demonstrated that parents high on extraversion and agreeableness are more sensitive, caring, and warm with their children than parents who scored high on other personality traits (Belsky et al., 1995). According to Zelenski and Larsen (1999), extraversion and BAS congregate into one factor. Therefore, results from the present study were partially consistent with previous findings.

It was hypothesized that maternal personality, as measured by the behavioural motivation systems, would predict parenting styles. This prediction was supported as significant relations between maternal personality and parenting styles surfaced. Mothers who reported high BAS were significantly more likely to be nurturing. BAS is important in rewarding behaviour. In contrast with the BIS, it is stimulated only by conditioned signals of reward and non-punishment. The BAS system promotes approach and active avoidance behaviour (Gray, 1981). When a child experiences a crisis, the situation can be perceived as challenging. Since mothers with a high BAS tend to approach situations, they may be more inclined to come close to their children and nurture them. In contrast, mothers low in BAS might be more hesitant to approach their children in a time of need because they perceive the situation as taxing

and difficult. Therefore, mothers low in BAS may choose to avoid dealing with challenging situations rather than nurturing their children. Furthermore, since BAS is important in rewarding behaviour, mothers high in BAS may feel rewarded for nurturing their children. Consequently, this finding might also be explained by the self-gratification that a mother with a high BAS receives when nurturing a child. On the other hand, mothers low in BAS are not as motivated by seeking rewards and therefore might not interpret difficult situations the same way as mothers high in BAS.

In addition, results revealed that mothers who were high in BAS were either more likely to be authoritative (high nurture and high control) or neglectful (low nurture and low control). Past studies have suggested that children of authoritative parents are more likely to have high cognitive and social competences. They are cheerful, responsible, self-reliant, achievement oriented, and cooperative with adults and peers (Lambourn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991). On the other hand, children of neglectful parents are generally more aggressive and display more externalizing behaviours (Miller et al., 1993). They also are more likely to become hostile, selfish, rebellious, and are more likely to commit antisocial acts (Weiss & Schwarz, 1996). This is an interesting finding because it suggests that a mother high in BAS has the potential to become either the optimal kind of parent (authoritative), or the 'worst' kind of parent (neglectful). This was an unexpected and somewhat provocative finding.

As previously mentioned, mothers who have a high BAS are more likely to approach situations and seek rewards (Gray, 1981). Therefore, they may be more likely to be drawn towards situations that will allow them the opportunity to accomplish their life goals. It can be speculated that if a mother feels satisfied with

what she has accomplished in life, she might be more inclined to focus her attention on her children and encourage them to pursue their own goals. In contrast, if she is not satisfied with her life, she might be more likely to focus on her own goals rather than her children's. Therefore, it can be speculated that mothers who are high in BAS and have a good SWB would be more likely to be authoritative; whereas mothers who are high in BAS but have a poor SWB were more likely to be neglectful. Although not a focus for this thesis, additional data were collected in this study related to maternal subjective well-being. As such, it was possible to conduct several additional analyses.²

Results revealed that mothers high in BAS who had a positive subjective well-being were significantly more likely to be authoritarian, whereas mothers high in BAS who had a negative subjective well-being were significantly more likely to be neglectful. Conversely, no significant differences were found in mothers low in BAS.

Two logical arguments can attempt to explain these findings. First, since mothers with a high BAS seek rewards (Gray, 1981), their perception of how many rewards they have achieved may be responsible for their parenting style. If a mother feels that she has achieved all of her goals, she might be more inclined to re-channel her focus towards her children and encourage them to achieve their own goals. On the other hand, if a mother high in BAS feels that she has not achieved all of her goals, she might be too focussed on her own life and consequently be neglectful towards her children. Second, some mothers might express their BAS in more (or less) adaptive ways. For example, some mothers might choose to pursue short-term rewards like drugs or risky sex, whereas others might choose more long-term rewards

² Chi square tests were performed to investigate these relations. In order to perform these analyses, 4 distinct groups were created: (1) high (above median) BAS and positive (above median) SWB ($n=27$), (2) high BAS and negative SWB ($n=22$), (3) low BAS and positive SWB ($n=22$), and (4) low BAS and negative SWB ($n=24$).

like academic or professional accomplishment. Therefore, it may be that the more conscientious mothers are happier because they have made more responsible choices. Furthermore, they might be better parents because they are more responsible (less neglectful) parents.

Personality and child outcomes. No published research has examined the relation between maternal behavioural motivation systems and child outcomes. However, theoretically, logical association between these variables can be drawn. The BIS is activated by innate fears as well as novelty (Gray, 1982). It is also associated with the potential for punishment or the cessation of reward. Furthermore, the BIS has been found to correlate with neuroticism, a behavioural factor negatively correlated with happiness (Larsen & Ketelaar, 1991). Therefore, mothers high in BIS might be more inclined to express their worries and concerns of potentially dangerous situations. This may encourage their children to be more neurotic and more afraid of approaching situations. On the other hand, since mothers high in BAS are more likely to approach situations (Gray, 1982), they might be more likely to encourage their children to explore and to do what is necessary to satisfy their quest for adventure. Although the research investigating parental personality and child well-being is limited, it was hypothesised that child outcomes would be directly related to maternal personality. Specifically, mothers who have an overactive BIS were expected to have children who report more internalizing problems. Mothers who have an overactive BAS were predicted to have children who report higher self-esteem and overall well-being. Results did not support predictions. No significant results emerged when investigating the direct relation between maternal personality and child outcomes. Two possibilities can potentially explain this finding.

First, there may not be a direct association between maternal personality and child outcomes. It may be that other variables such as child personality are required in order for that association to emerge. For example, some parents might rely on different parenting styles for different children. If the child is very aggressive, the mother might be more authoritarian; however, if the child is reasonable, the mother might be more authoritative. Although certain personality types, such as high BAS, might want to be more authoritative because it allows them the opportunity to approach a situation or potentially seek a reward, their child might make it very difficult to do so. Therefore, the relation between maternal personality and child outcomes might be better explained as an indirect association.

Second, there may indeed be a direct relation between maternal personality and child outcomes, but it was not found in this study. Although the sample size was relatively large, more participants would have allowed us the opportunity to make categories of high and low BAS and BIS. This would have enabled us to reject those in the mid-range making our results clearer and more precise. Furthermore, although this study investigated positive adjustment and negative child outcomes (i.e. internalizing behaviours), it did not assess externalizing behaviours. Therefore, maternal personality may be associated with overt and aggressive behaviours, but not with positive or internalizing behaviours.

Parenting and child outcomes. In the present study, maternal restrictiveness was significantly related to child positive outcomes. Although past research has found that in general, parenting styles are related to child outcomes (Lambourn et al., 1991; Parke & Buriel, 1998; Clark & Ladd, 2000), the findings from this study were somewhat surprising. Logically, high restrictiveness would not be expected to be associated with positive outcomes. Restrictiveness was assessed via the *Child*

Rearing Practices Report Questionnaire (Rickel & Biasatti, 1982). This instrument is a questionnaire version of the *Child Rearing Practices Report* (CRPR, Block, 1981), a well-known and frequently used measure (e.g. Rubin, Nelson, Hastings, & Asendorpf, 1999). However, specific questions from this questionnaire might be tapping into another factor such as willingness to comply with social norms. For example, this questionnaire includes items such as: "I do not allow my child to say bad things about his/her teacher," and "I expect my child to be grateful and appreciate all the advantages he/she has." If a parent strongly agrees with these statements, the child may have a more positive adjustment because the parent provides their child with the ability to socialize more effectively which in turn protects their child from public criticism.

Although these findings were somewhat surprising, other studies have found similar results. For example, Pettit, Laird, Dodge, Bates, and Criss (2001) found that higher levels of parental control are associated with lower levels of externalizing problems in adolescents. Furthermore, Galambos, Barker, and Almeida (2003) found that low levels of behavioural control are related to internalizing problems in adolescents. Mothers who have high control and high nurturance are characterized as 'authoritative.' Authoritative mothers explain the logic as to why the child should comply with their requests (Parke & Buriel, 1985). Therefore, children of authoritarian mothers understand why their mother is being restrictive and are probably more likely to feel cared for, loved, and valued. If children feel cared for, they are more likely to have secure attachments, which ultimately lead to positive outcomes (Belski & Casidy, 1994).

Although the present study found associations between restrictiveness and positive child outcomes, no other associations were found between maternal parenting

and child outcomes. It may be that the variables used to assess child well-being in this particular study were not sufficient to fully understand child well-being. Since the literature is limited in terms of questionnaires to assess child well-being, a variety of measures which parallel measures in the adult literature were used to assess child well-being. Children have limited attention spans and many questionnaires were already utilized in this study; therefore, it would have been difficult to include more questionnaires. Future studies are needed to validate measures that will allow us to better understand and measure child well-being in a more efficient manner. However, although there were limited direct linear associations between maternal personality, parenting, and child outcomes, several interactions emerged.

Interactive Associations

At the present time, there has been no research investigating the interaction between maternal behavioural motivation systems and parenting as they relate to child outcomes. As such, the present study provides some of the first results suggesting that parenting styles may moderate the relation between maternal personality and child outcomes.

Among children with a mother low in nurturance, BAS was significantly and negatively related to child positive outcomes. These results are consistent with previous research (e.g., Wolfradt, Hempel, & Miles, 2003). Perris and Andersson (2000) found a positive relation between warmth and secure attachment. Therefore, it can be argued that children of mothers who are low in nurturance have less positive outcomes because they do not have secure attachments. Although significant results emerged between BAS and child positive outcomes among mothers low in nurturance, these variables were not related among mothers high in nurturance.

For children with mothers high in nurturance, BAS was found to be negatively related to child internalizing problems, whereas for mothers low in nurturance, this relation was positive. Wolfradt, Hempel, and Miles (2003) found that, retrospectively, adults who perceived their parents as warm engaged in more active coping and had less anxiety in adolescence than those who were reared by parents who showed less warmth. Therefore, there is evidence to support that children of parents high in nurturance are more likely to have less internalizing problems because they are better able to cope with difficult situations and have less anxiety.

Finally, for mothers low in restrictiveness, BAS was found to be negatively related to positive adjustment, but unrelated among mothers with high restrictiveness. Previous research suggests that low levels of behavioural control are related to negative outcomes in adolescents (Galambos, Barker, & Almeida, 2003). Therefore, positive child outcomes might depend on having higher levels of restrictiveness in the parenting style of the mother.

Although many interesting findings emerged relating to BAS, no significant interactions were found for BIS. According to Carver and White (1994), those who have an overactive BIS are also high in neuroticism and high in negative affect. This implication suggests that they might be hyper-sensitive to their parenting styles and overly concerned about their children's well-being. Therefore, they might try hard not to let their personality influence their parenting or their children's well-being. More research is obviously needed to better understand parenting styles of parents high in BIS.

Caveats and Future Directions

The present study provided some of the first empirical data investigating the relation between maternal personality as measured by the behavioural motivation

systems, parenting styles, and child outcomes. Although the results from this study offer insight into the understanding of these associations, several caveats must be considered.

This study was conducted over the summer, and required both parents and children to participate. Information packages were sent home to all parents, however recruiting was problematic. Many parents expressed interest, but simply did not have the time to participate. Furthermore, since this study offered no incentive, consent rate was low. Originally, both mothers and fathers were asked to participate; however, since the number of fathers who completed the questionnaires was so small ($n = 40$), they were excluded from this study.

Although this study was complex and investigated many variables, a limited range of outcome variables was assessed. Therefore, in future research, a broader array of variables could be included such as externalizing behaviours and academic outcomes.

Another potential limitation related to measures was the omission of subscales of the *Self-Perception Profile for Children* (Harter, 1985). This instrument was used to assess domain specific judgements of competence. There are four subscales: cognitive competence (e.g. “good at school”); social competence (e.g. “have a lot of friends”); physical competence (e.g. “do well at all sports”); and general self-worth (e.g. “happy the way I am”). In order to reduce time demands, general self-worth was the only subscale included in the study. This measure has demonstrated good reliability (Harter, 1985). However, in the current study, the reliability was only $\alpha = .49$. Since this scale usually demonstrates good reliability, we can only assume that the children in our particular sample had more difficulty understanding the task because they did not have as much practice as other children (i.e. they did not

complete the other subscales). Therefore, children should have completed all subscales. This clearly needs to be replicated using all subscales of the Self-Perception Profile for Children.

Results from this study revealed that mothers high in BAS were more likely to be nurturing than mothers low in BAS. Although this is an interesting finding, it does not explain how mothers high in BAS are different from mothers low in BAS. Since the investigation of behavioural motivation systems is relatively new, future research should concentrate solely on understanding how individuals high in BAS differ from those low in BAS. It would also be noteworthy to investigate which factors are related to BIS as it would aid in the understanding of its association with other variables such as parenting.

Furthermore, this research focused on maternal personality. Although historically mothers have been the primary caregivers, roles and responsibilities are now changing and fathers contribute a great deal to the psychological development and well-being of their children. Originally, both mothers and fathers were asked to participate in this study; however, only 40 fathers participated and were therefore excluded. Future research should examine the interaction between mothers' personality and fathers' personality and how it relates to their children's well-being.

In addition, results from this study are correlational and do not imply causality. Therefore, all of the implications drawn from the results of this study are speculative. For example, mothers who have a high BAS are also more likely to be nurturing. It was speculated that mothers high in BAS are more inclined to come close to their children and nurture them because they are more likely to approach situations. However, the opposite may be true. Mothers who are more likely to nurture their children might also be more likely to approach situations because they

put the needs of their children first. Longitudinal research would offer a better understanding of the true nature of the association between parental personality and parenting styles. For example, it would be interesting to assess parental personality, parental beliefs, and parental SWB before the child is born. This would enable us to better understand the true nature of the association between parental personality, parenting styles, and child outcomes.

Although this study had certain limitations, it is a first step towards a better understanding of the relation between maternal personality, parenting styles, and child outcomes. Results from this study are important contributions both empirically and theoretically, and provide evidence of a complex set of inter-associations. Clearly a more integrative theoretical model is required to account for these associations. Future studies are also needed to replicate these results to ensure reliability and to answer many of the new questions that arose in the course of these findings.

References

- Allison, P. D., & Furstenberg, F. F. (1989) How marital dissolution affects children: Variations by age and sex. *Developmental Psychology*, 25(4), 540-549.
- Allport, G. W. & Odbert, H. S. (1936). Trait-names: A psycho-lexical study. *Psychological Monographs*, 47 (211).
- Aquilino, W. S. (1986). Children's perceptions of marital interaction. *Child Study Journal*, 16, 159-172.
- Argyle, M., Martin, M., & Lu, L. (1995). Testing for stress and happiness: The role of social and cognitive factors. In Spielberger, C. D. & Sarason, I. G. (Eds), *Stress and emotion*, 15, (pp. 173-187). Washington, D.C.: Taylor & Francis.
- Avila, C., Parcet, M. A., Ortet, G., & Ibanez, M. I. (1999). Anxiety and counter-conditioning: The role of the behavioural inhibition system in the ability aversive stimuli with future rewards. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 27, 1167-1179.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173-1182.
- Baumrind, D. (1978). Parental disciplinary patterns and social competence in children. *Youth and Society*, 9, 239-276.
- Baumrind, D. (1989). Rearing competent children. In W. Damon (Ed.), *Child development today and tomorrow* (pp. 349-378). San Fransico, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 11(1), 56-95.

- Bell, N. J., Avery, A. W., Jenkins, D., Feld, J., & Schoenrock, C. J. (1985). Family relationships and social competence during late adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 14, 109-119.
- Belsky, J. (1984). The determinants of parenting: A process model. *Child Development*, 55, 83-96.
- Belsky, J. & Barends, N. (2002). Personality and parenting. In M. C. Bornstein (Ed.) *Handbook of parenting* (2nd edn, vol. 3, pp. 415-438). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Belsky, J. & Casidy, J (1994). Attachments and close relationships: An individual difference perspective. *Psychological Inquiry*, 5, 27-30.
- Belsky, J., Crnic, K., & Woodworth, S. (1995). Personality and parenting: exploring the mediating role of transient mood and daily hassles. *Journal of Personality*, 63, 905- 929.
- Carlson, N. R., Buskist, W., Enzle, M. E., & Heth, C. D. (2002). Personality. In (Eds.) D. Stover. *Psychology: The Science of Behaviour*, p. 448-482. Toronto, On.: Pearson Education Canada Inc.
- Carver & White (1994), Behavioural inhibition, behavioural activation, and the affective responses to impending reward and punishment: The BIS/BAS scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(2), 319-333.
- Cattell, R. B. (1943). The description of personality: basic traits resolved into clusters. *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology*, 38, 476-506.
- Cheek, J. M., & Buss, A. H. (1981). Shyness and sociability. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 41, 330-339.
- Chorpita, B. F. & Barlow, D. H. (1998). The development of anxiety: The role of control in early environment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124, 3-21.

- Clark, K. E. & Ladd, G. W. (2000). Connectedness and autonomy support in parent-child relationships: Links to children's socioemotional orientation and peer relationships. *Developmental Psychology*, 36, 485-498.
- Clark, L. A., Kochanska, G., & Ready, R. (2000). Mothers' personality and its interaction with child temperament as predictors of parenting behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(2), 274-285.
- Coplan, R. J., Hastings, P. D., Lagacé-Séguin, D. G., & Moulton, C. E. (2002). Authoritative and authoritarian mothers' parenting goals, attributions, and emotions across different childrearing contexts. *Parenting: Science and Practice*, 2(1), 1-26.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1980). Influence of extraversion and neuroticism on subjective well-being: Happy and unhappy people. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38, 668-678.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1985). *The NEO Personality Inventory*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 113, 487-496.
- Davies, P. T., & Cummings, E. M. (1994). Marital conflict and child adjustment: An emotional security hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 116, 387-411.
- DeNeve, K. M., & Cooper, H. (1998). The happy personality: A meta-analysis of 137 personality traits and subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124(2), 197-229.
- Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95, 542-575.
- Diener, E. (2000). Subjective well-being: The science of happiness and a proposal for a national index. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 34-43.

- Erikson, E. H. (1963) *Childhood and society*, (2nd ed.). New York: Norton.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1967). *The biological basis of personality*. Springfield IL: C. C. Thomas.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, M. W. (1985). The scientific description of personality. In *Personality and individual differences: A natural science approach* (pp. 3-41). New York: Plenum.
- Fiske, D. W. (1949). Consistency of the factorial structures of personality ratings from different sources. *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology*, 44, 329-344.
- Francis, L.J., Brown, L.B., Lester, D., & Philipchalk, R. (1998). Happiness as stable extraversion: A cross-cultural examination of the reliability and validity of the Oxford Happiness Inventory among students in the UK, USA, Australia and Canada. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 24, 167-171.
- Francis, L. J. (1999). Happiness is a thing called stable extraversion: A further examination of the relationship between the Oxford Happiness Inventory and Eysenck's dimensional model of personality and gender. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 26, 5-11.
- Furnham, A., & Cheng, H. (1999). Personality and predictors of mental health and happiness in the East and West. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 27, 395-403
- Furnham, A., & Cheng, H. (2000). Perceived parental behaviour, self-esteem and happiness. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 35, 463-470.
- Galambos, N. L., Barker, E. T., & Almeida D. M. (2003). Parents do matter: Trajectories of change in externalizing and internalizing problems in adolescents. *Child Development*, 74, 578-594.

- Goldberg, L. R. (1981). Language and individual differences: the search for universals in personality lexicons. In *Review of Personality and Social Psychology*, ed. L. Wheeler, 2: 141-165. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Gray, J. A. (1981). A critique of Eysenck's theory of personality. In H.J. Eysenck (Ed.), *A model of personality* (pp. 246-276). New York: Springer.
- Gray, J. A. (1982). The neuropsychology of anxiety: An enquiry in the functions of the septo-hippocampal system. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Grusec, J.E., & Goodnow, J.J. (1994). Impact of parental discipline methods on the child's internalization of values: A reconceptualization of current points of view. *Developmental Psychology*, 30, 4-19.
- Harter, S. (1985). Manual for the Self-Perception Profile for Children. Denver, CO: University of Denver.
- Heady, B. & Wearing, A. (1989). Personality, life events, and subjective well-being: Toward a dynamic equilibrium model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 731-739.
- Hills, P. & Argyle, M. (2001) Happiness, introversion-extraversion and happy introverts. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 30, 595-608.
- Hogan, R., Johnson, J., & Briggs, S. (1997). *Handbook of Personality Psychology*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- John, O. P. (1990). The "Big Five" factor taxonomy: Dimensions of personality in the natural language and in questionnaires. In LA Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*. New York: Guilford.
- Kagan, J., Reznick, J., & Snidman, N. (1988). Biological bases of childhood shyness. *Science*, 240, 167-171.

- Kasch, K. L., Rottenberg, J., Arnow, B. A., & Gotlib I. H. (2002). Behavioural activation and inhibition systems and the severity and course of depression. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 111* (4), 589-597.
- Kendler, K. S., Sham, P. C., & MacLean, C. J. (1997). *The determinants of parenting: an epidemiological, multi-informant, retrospective study*. *Psychological Medicine, 27*, 549-563.
- Kochanska, G., Clark, L. A., Goldman, M. S. (1997). Implications of mothers personality for their parenting and their young children's developmental outcomes. *Journal of Personality, 65*, 387-420.
- Kovacs, M. (1980/1981). Rating scales to assess depression in school-aged children. *Acta Paedopsychiatrica, 46*, 305-315.
- Kovacs, S. M., & Kim, A. H. (2003). Parent personality, parenting styles, and children's social reticence. Poster presentation, *Social Research in Child Development Conference*, Tampa, Fl.
- Ladd, G. W. (1991). Family-peer relations during childhood: Pathways to competence and pathology. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 8*, 307-314.
- Ladd, G. W., Profilet, S. M. & Hart, C. H. (1992). Parents' management of children's peer relations: Facilitating and supervising children's activities in the peer culture. In R. Parke & G. W. Ladd (Eds.) *Family-peer relationships: Modes of linkage* (pp. 215-253). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- La Greca, A. M., & Stone, W. L. (1993). Social anxiety scale for children-revised: Factor structure and concurrent validity. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 23*(1), 17-27.

- Lambourn, 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.
- Larsen, R. J. & Ketelaar, T. (1989). Extraversion, neuroticism, susceptibility to positive and negative mood induction procedures. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 10, 1221-1228.
- Larsen, R. J., & Ketelaar, T. (1991). Personality and susceptibility to positive and negative emotional states. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 61, 132-140.
- Laurent, J., Catanzaro, S., Joiner, T., Rudolph, K., Potter, K., Lambert, S., Osborne, L. & Gathright, T. (1999). A measure of positive and negative affect for children scale development and preliminary validation. *Psychological Assessment*, 11(3), 326-338.
- McCrae, R. P., & Costa, P. T. (1984). *Emerging lives, enduring disposition: Personality in adulthood*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1991). Adding liebe and arbeit: The full five-factor model and well-being. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 17, 227-232.
- McCrae R. R., Costa, P. T., Ostendorp, F., Angleitner, A., Hrebickova, M., Avia, M. D., Sanz, J., Sanchez-Bernardos, M. L., Kusdil, M. E., Woodfield, R., Saunders, P. R., & Smith, P. B. (2000). Nature over nurture: Temperament, personality, and life span development. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 173-186.

- McCrae, R. R., & John, O. P. (1992). An introduction to the five-factor model and its applications. *Journal of Personality*, 60, 175-215.
- Metsäpelto, R. L., & Pulkkinen, L. (2003). Personality traits and parenting: Neuroticism, Extraversion, and Openness to Experience as discriminative factors. *European Journal of Personality*, 17, 59-78.
- Miller, N. B., Cowan, P. A., Cowan, C. P., Hetherington, E. M., & Clingempeel, W. G. (1993). Externalizing in preschoolers and early adolescents: A cross-study replication of a family model. *Developmental Psychology*, 29, 3-18.
- Mize, J., & Petit, G. S. (1997). Mothers' social coaching, mother-child relationship style, and children's peer competence: Is the medium the message? *Child Development*, 68, 312-332.
- Neto, F. (2001). Personality predictors of personality. *Psychological Reports*, 88, 817-824.
- Parke, R. D., & Buriel, R. (1998). Socialization in the family: Ethnic and ecological perspectives. In W. Damon & N. Eisenberg (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology*, (5th ed), (pp. 463-552).
- Perris C., Andersson P. (2000) Perceptions of parental rearing and dysfunctional attitudes: The link between early experiences and individual vulnerability? *Nordic Journal of Psychiatry*, 54, 405-409
- Pettit, G. S., Laird, R. D., Dodge, K. A., Bates, J. E., & Criss, M.M. (2001). Antecedents and behaviour-problem outcomes of parental monitoring and psychological control in early adolescence. *Child Development*, 72, 583-598.
- Rickel, A. U. & Biasatti, L. I. (1982). Modification of the Block Child Rearing Practices Report. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 38, 129-134.

- Rickman, M. & Davidson, R. (1994). Personality and behaviour in parents of temperamentally inhibited and uninhibited children. *Developmental Psychology*, 30(3), 346-354.
- Rosenbaum, J., Biederman, J., Hishfeld, D., Bolduc, E., & Cahloff, J. (1991). Behavioral inhibition in children: A possible precursor to panic disorder or social phobia. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, 52, 5-9.
- Rubin, K. R., Nelson, L. J., Hastings, P., & Asendorpf, J. (1999). The Transaction between parent's perceptions of their child's shyness and their parenting styles. *International Journal of Behavioural Development*, 23(4), 937-957.
- Shucksmith J., Hendry L., & Glendinning A. (1995). Lifestyle, health, and social class in adolescence. *Social Science and Medicine*, 41, 235-248
- Teasdale, J. D. (1985). Psychological treatments for depression: How do they work? *Behavior Research Therapy*, 23(2), 157-165.
- Tellegen, A. (1985). Structures of mood and personality and their relevance to assessing anxiety, with an emphasis on self-report. In A. H. Tuma, & J. D. Maser, *anxiety and anxiety disorders*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Tupes, E.C. & Christal, R.E. (1961). *Recurrent Personality Factors Based on Trait Ratings* (ASD-TR-61-97). Lackland Air Force Base, TX: Aeronautical Systems Division, Personnel Laboratory.
- Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1984). Negative affectivity: The disposition to experience aversive emotional states. *Psychological Bulletin*, 96, 465-490.
- Watson, D., Clark, L.A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(6), 1063-1070.

- Weiss, L. H., & Schwarz, J. C. (1996). The relationship between parenting types and older adolescents' personality, academic achievement, adjustment, and substance use. *Child Development*, 67, 2101-2114.
- Wolfradt U., Hempel S., & Miles J.N., (2003). Perceived parenting styles, depersonalisation, anxiety and coping behaviour in adolescents. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 34, 521-532
- Zelenski, J. M. & Larsen, R. J. (1999). Susceptibility to affect: A comparison of three personality taxonomies. *Journal of Personality*, 67, 761-791.

Appendix A

THE CHILD AND FAMILY STUDY: Summer, 2003

Dear Parents,

We are writing to ask for your permission to have you and your child participate in a research project being conducted by researchers at Carleton University. The purpose of this study is to explore how different kinds of parents relate to different kinds of children. We are particularly interested in parents' attitudes and beliefs towards parenting, and how children with different characteristics might respond differently to parents.

Attached you will find a consent form and a packet of questionnaires. This includes a form for demographics information, as well as a series of short questionnaires asking about yourself and your thoughts about parenting. We estimate it will take about 20 minutes to complete the questionnaires. **If at all possible, we would like both mothers and fathers to complete the questionnaires.** However, if this is not feasible, we will be glad even to have only one of you complete the questionnaires.

Your son/daughter may also be asked to attend a group interview session at camp. Groups of up to 10 children will be brought into a separate room (with a female University student) and asked to write down answers to a series of questions concerning how they feel about going to school, other children in their classes, and interacting with their friends. For example, children will be asked whether they like to play with other kids, and whether they feel shy around kids they don't know. The interviewer will read the questions aloud and the child will follow along with the same questionnaire and circle the appropriate answer. The interview will take about 30 minutes. Of course, your child does not have to answer any questions they don't want to, and is free to end the interview at any time, or simply not to participate in this phase of the study. If the child wishes to end the interview, he or she can simply stop writing or can leave the room (whichever they feel most comfortable doing).

The data collected are strictly confidential and are made available only to researchers associated with this project. You (and your child should he/she participate) will be given an

identification number. This number will be used instead of names to ensure confidentiality. All questionnaires will be used only to extract data for study and data analysis. This study has been approved by the Carleton University Research Ethics Committee for Psychological Research. You and your child are free to refrain from answering certain questions or to withdraw from the study at any time. If you have any questions related to this study, you can contact me directly (731-0845) or Dr. Rob Coplan at 520-2600 ext. 8691. If you have any questions related to ethics, you can contact Dr. M. Gick (Chair, Carleton University Research Ethics Committee for Psychological Research, 520-2600 ext. 2664). Should you have any others questions or concerns, feel free to contact Dr. J. Logan (Chair, Department of Psychology, 520-2600 ext. 2690).

It is anticipated that results from this study will be available in January of 2004. If you would like a summary of our findings, please contact me at this time at the number listed above. However, individual feedback regarding your child will not be provided. I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for you time and I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Julie Wilson
Department of Psychology
Carleton University

CONSENT FORM – The Child and Family Study: Summer-2003

date: _____

(name of child - please print)
print

(name of parent or guardian - please

Please check one:

_____ I give my permission for my child and I to participate in the Child and Family Study.

_____ I do not give my permission for my child and I to participate in the Child and Family Study.

(signature of parent or guardian)

Please return the signed consent form and questionnaires (in the enclosed envelope) to your child's camp counsellor as soon as possible even if you are not going to be participating in the study.

Appendix B

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Child name: _____

Boy____ Girl____

Child date of birth: _____
 month day year

Child's age (in years) _____

 Mother's occupation: _____

Mother's formal education completed (check one):

elementary school _____
 high school diploma or equivalent _____
 community college or equivalent _____
 university degree _____
 graduate school degree _____

Mother's ethnic group: Caucasian____ Asian____ Black____
 Hispanic____ Aboriginal____ Other____

 Father's occupation: _____

Father's formal education completed (check one):

elementary school _____
 high school diploma or equivalent _____
 community college or equivalent _____
 university degree _____
 graduate school degree _____

Father's ethnic group: Caucasian____ Asian____ Black____
 Hispanic____ Aboriginal____ Other____

Appendix C

Tell us about yourself...

Different people can respond to situations in different ways. The following statements are about some of the characteristic ways that you may deal with events in your life. Please read each statement carefully and indicate how much you agree that it reflects your character.

1	2	3	4
very true of me	somewhat true	somewhat false	very false
for me			

1. ___ A person's family is the most important thing in life.
2. ___ Even if something bad is about to happen, I rarely experience fear or nervousness.
3. ___ I go out of my way to get things I want.
4. ___ When I'm doing well at something, I love to keep at it.
5. ___ I'm always willing to try something new if I think it will be fun.
6. ___ How I dress is important to me.
7. ___ When I get something I want, I feel excited and energized.
8. ___ Criticism or scolding hurts me quite a bit.
9. ___ When I want something, I usually go all-out to get it.
10. ___ I will often do things for no other reason than that they might be fun.
11. ___ Its hard for me to find the time to do things such as get a haircut.
12. ___ If I get a chance to get something I want I move on it right away.
13. ___ I feel pretty worried or upset when I think or know someone is angry with me.
14. ___ When I see an opportunity for something I like, I get excited right away.
15. ___ I often act on the spur of the moment.
16. ___ If I think something unpleasant is going to happen, I usually get pretty 'worked-up'.
17. ___ I often wonder why people act the way they do.
18. ___ When good things happen to me it affects me strongly.
19. ___ I feel worried when I think I have done poorly at something important.
20. ___ I crave excitement and new sensations.
21. ___ When I go after something I use a 'no-holds-barred' approach.
22. ___ I have very few fears compared to my friends.
23. ___ It would excite me to win a contest.
24. ___ I worry about making mistakes.

Appendix D

CHILD-REARING PRACTICES REPORT QUESTIONNAIRE

The following statements represent matters of interest and concern to parents. Not all parents feel the same way about them. Read each statement carefully and circle the number at the right which most closely reflects YOUR degree of agreement or disagreement. Please consider each statement in relation to your child who is participating in the study. Try to answer all statements without skipping or looking back.

	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree
1. I respect my child's opinions and encourage him/her to express them.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. I feel a child should be given comfort and understanding when he/she is scared or upset.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. I try to keep my child away from children or families who have different ideas or values from our own.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. I believe that a child should be seen and not heard.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. I express affection by hugging, kissing, and holding my child.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. I find some of my greatest satisfactions in my child.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. I prefer that my child not try things if there is a chance he/she will fail.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. I encourage my child to wonder and think about life.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. I usually take into account my child's preferences in making plans for the family.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. I feel a child should have time to think, daydream, and even loaf sometimes.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. I do not allow my child to say bad things about his/her teachers	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. I teach my child that in one way or another punishment will find him/her when she is bad.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. I do not allow my child to get angry with me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. I am easygoing and relaxed with my child.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. I talk it over and reason with my child when he/she misbehaves.	1	2	3	4	5	6

16. I trust my child to behave as he/she should, even when I am not with him/her.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. I joke and play with my child.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. My child and I have warm, intimate moments with each other.	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. I encourage my child to be curious, to explore and question things.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. I expect my child to be grateful and appreciate all the advantages he/she has.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. I believe in praising a child when he/she is good and think it gets better results than punishing him/her when he/she is bad.	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. I make sure my child knows that I appreciate what he/she tries to accomplish.	1	2	3	4	5	6
23. I encourage my child to talk about his/her troubles.	1	2	3	4	5	6
24. I believe children should not keep secrets from their parents.	1	2	3	4	5	6
25. I teach my child to keep control of her feelings at all times.	1	2	3	4	5	6
26. When I am angry with my child, I let him/her know about it.	1	2	3	4	5	6
27. I think a child should be encouraged to do things better than others.	1	2	3	4	5	6
28. I believe that scolding and criticism makes my child improve.	1	2	3	4	5	6
29. I believe my child should be aware of how much I sacrifice for him/her.	1	2	3	4	5	6
30. I do not allow my child to question my decisions.	1	2	3	4	5	6
31. I let my child know how ashamed and disappointed I am when he/she misbehaves.	1	2	3	4	5	6
32. I want my child to make a good impression on others.	1	2	3	4	5	6
33. I find it interesting and educational to be with my child for long periods.	1	2	3	4	5	6
34. I instruct my child not to get dirty while he/she is playing.	1	2	3	4	5	6
35. I control my child by warning him/her about the bad things that can happen to her.	1	2	3	4	5	6
36. I don't want my child to be looked upon as different from others.	1	2	3	4	5	6
37. I often feel angry with my child.	1	2	3	4	5	6
38. I feel my child is a bit of a disappointment to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6

39. I help my child understand the impact of his/her behavior by encouraging him/her to talk about the consequences of his/her actions.	1	2	3	4	5	6
40. I sometimes tease and make fun of my child.	1	2	3	4	5	6
41. There is a good deal of conflict between my child and me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
42. I make sure I know where my child is and what he/she is doing.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix E

CDI

Kids sometimes have different feelings and ideas.

This form lists the feelings and ideas in groups. From each group of three sentences, pick one sentence that describes you *best* for the past two weeks. After you pick a sentence from the first group, go onto the next group.

There is no right or wrong answer. Just pick the sentence that best describes the way you have been recently. Put a mark like this ☐ next to your answer. Put the mark in the box next to the sentence that you pick.

Here is an example of how this form works. Try it. Put a mark next to the sentence that describes you best.

Example:

- ☐ I read books all the time.
- ☐ I read books once in a while.
- ☐ I never read books.

When you are told to do so, turn to the next page. Then, pick the sentences that describe you best on the first page. After you finish the first page, continue to work through to the last page.

Remember, pick out the sentences that describe you best in the PAST TWO WEEKS.

Remember, describe how you have been in the past two weeks.

Item 1

- ☐ I am sad once in a while.
- ☐ I am sad many times.
- ☐ I am sad all the time.

Item 2

- ☐ Nothing will ever work out for me.
- ☐ I am not sure if things will work out for me.
- ☐ Things will work out for me O.K.

Item 3

- ☐ I do most things O.K.
- ☐ I do many things wrong.
- ☐ I do everything wrong.

Item 4

- ☐ I have fun in many things.
- ☐ I have fun in some things.
- ☐ Nothing is fun at all.

Item 5

- ☐ I am bad all the time.
- ☐ I am bad many times.
- ☐ I am bad once in a while.

Item 6

- ☐ I think about bad things happening to me once in a while.
- ☐ I worry that bad things will happen to me.
- ☐ I am sure that terrible things will happen to me.

Item 7

- ☐ I hate myself.
- ☐ I do not like myself.
- ☐ I like myself.

Remember, describe how you have been in the past two weeks.

Item 8

- ☐ All bad things are my fault.
- ☐ Many bad things are my fault.
- ☐ Bad things are not usually my fault.

Item 9

- ☐ I feel like crying every day.
- ☐ I feel like crying many days.
- ☐ I feel like crying once in a while.

Item 10

- ☐ Things bother me all the time.
- ☐ Things bother me many times.
- ☐ Things bother me once in a while.

Item 11

- ☐ I like being with people.
- ☐ I do not like being with people many times.
- ☐ I do not want to be with people at all.

Item 12

- ☐ I cannot make up my mind about things.
- ☐ It is hard to make up my mind about things.
- ☐ I make up my mind about things easily.

Item 13

- ☐ I look O.K.
- ☐ There are some bad things about my looks.
- ☐ I look ugly.

Item 14

- ☐ I have to push myself all the time to do my schoolwork.
- ☐ I have to push myself many times to do my schoolwork.
- ☐ Doing schoolwork is not a big problem.

Remember, describe how you have been in the past two weeks.

Item 15

- ☐ I have trouble sleeping every night.
- ☐ I have trouble sleeping many nights.
- ☐ I sleep pretty well.

Item 16

- ☐ I am tired once in a while.
- ☐ I am tired many days.
- ☐ I am tired all the time.

Item 17

- ☐ Most days I do not feel like eating.
- ☐ Many days I do not feel like eating.
- ☐ I eat pretty well.

Item 18

- ☐ I do not worry about aches and pains.
- ☐ I worry about aches and pains many times.
- ☐ I worry about aches and pains all the time.

Item 19

- ☐ I do not feel alone.
- ☐ I feel alone many times.
- ☐ I feel alone all the time.

Item 20

- ☐ I never have fun at school
- ☐ I have fun at school only once in a while.
- ☐ I have fun at school many times.

Item 21

- ☐ I have plenty of friends.
- ☐ I have some friends but I wish I had more.
- ☐ I do not have any friends.

Remember, describe how you have been in the past two weeks.

Item 22

- ☐ My schoolwork is alright.
- ☐ My schoolwork is not as good as before.
- ☐ I do very badly in subjects I used to be good in.

Item 23

- ☐ I can never be as good as other kids.
- ☐ I can be as good as other kids if I want to.
- ☐ I am just as good as other kids.

Item 24

- ☐ Nobody really loves me.
- ☐ I am not sure if anybody loves me.
- ☐ I am sure that somebody loves me.

Item 25

- ☐ I usually do what I am told.
- ☐ I do not do what I am told most times.
- ☐ I never do what I am told.

Item 26

- ☐ I get along with people.
- ☐ I get into fights many times.
- ☐ I get into fights all the time.

APPENDIX F

Feelings and Emotions (PANAS-C)

This scale consists of a number of words that describes different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then circle the appropriate answer next to that word. Indicate the extent you have felt this way during the past few weeks.

Feeling	Very slightly not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
Interested	1	2	3	4	5
Sad	1	2	3	4	5
Frightened	1	2	3	4	5
Alert	1	2	3	4	5
Excited	1	2	3	4	5
Ashamed	1	2	3	4	5
Upset	1	2	3	4	5
Happy	1	2	3	4	5
Strong	1	2	3	4	5
Nervous	1	2	3	4	5
Guilty	1	2	3	4	5
Energetic	1	2	3	4	5
Scared	1	2	3	4	5
Calm	1	2	3	4	5
Miserable	1	2	3	4	5
Jittery	1	2	3	4	5
Cheerful	1	2	3	4	5
Active	1	2	3	4	5
Proud	1	2	3	4	5
Afraid	1	2	3	4	5
Joyful	1	2	3	4	5
Lonely	1	2	3	4	5
Mad	1	2	3	4	5
Fearless	1	2	3	4	5
Disgusted	1	2	3	4	5
Delighted	1	2	3	4	5
Blue	1	2	3	4	5
Daring	1	2	3	4	5
Gloomy	1	2	3	4	5
Lively	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix G
Self-Perception Profile for Children

Please check the appropriate box.

Really True For me	Sort of True For me				Sort of True For me	Really True For me
☐	☐	Some kids find it hard to make friends.	BUT	Other kids find it's pretty easy to make friends.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids often do not like the way they behave.	BUT	Other kids usually like the way they behave.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids are often unhappy with themselves.	BUT	Other kids are pretty pleased with themselves.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids have a lot of friends.	BUT	Other kids don't have very many friends.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids usually do the right thing.	BUT	Other kids often don't do the right thing	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids don't like the way they are leading their life.	BUT	Other kids do like the way they are leading their life.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids would like to have a lot more friends.	BUT	Other kids have as many friends as they want.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids usually act the way they know they are supposed to.	BUT	Other kids often don't act the way they are supposed to.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids are happy with themselves as a person.	BUT	Other kids are often not happy with themselves.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids are always doing things with a lot of kids.	BUT	Other kids usually do things by themselves.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids usually get in trouble because of things they do.	BUT	Other kids usually don't do things that get them in trouble.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids like the kind of person they are.	BUT	Other kids often wish they were someone else.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids wished that more people their age liked them.	BUT	Other kids feel that most kids their age do like them.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids do things they know they shouldn't do.	BUT	Other kids hardly ever do things they know they shouldn't do.	☐	☐

☐	☐	Some kids are very happy being the way they are.	BUT	Other kids wish they were different.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids are popular with others their age.	BUT	Other kids are not very popular.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids behave themselves very well	BUT	Other kids often find it hard to behave themselves.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids are not very happy with the way they do a lot of things.	BUT	Other kids think they way they do things is Fine.	☐	☐

Appendix H

(SASC-R) Use these numbers to show HOW MUCH YOU FEEL something is true for you:

- 1 = Not at all
- 2 = Hardly ever
- 3 = Sometimes
- 4 = Most of the time
- 5 = All the time

1. I worry about doing something new in front of other kids...	1	2	3	4	5
2. I like to play with other kids.....	1	2	3	4	5
3. I worry about being teased.....	1	2	3	4	5
4. I feel shy around kids I don't know.....	1	2	3	4	5
5. I only talk to kids I know really well.....	1	2	3	4	5
6. I feel that other kids talk about me behind my back.....	1	2	3	4	5
7. I like to read.....	1	2	3	4	5
8. I worry about what other kids think of me.....	1	2	3	4	5
9. I'm afraid that others will not like me.....	1	2	3	4	5
10. I get nervous when I talk to kids I don't know well.....	1	2	3	4	5
11. I like to play sports.....	1	2	3	4	5
12. I worry about what others say about me.....	1	2	3	4	5
13. I get nervous when I meet new kids.....	1	2	3	4	5
14. I worry that other kids don't like me.....	1	2	3	4	5
15. I'm quiet when I'm with a group of kids.....	1	2	3	4	5
16. I like to do things by myself.....	1	2	3	4	5
17. I feel that other kids make fun of me.....	1	2	3	4	5
18. If I get into an argument with another kid, I worry that he or she
will not like me.....	1	2	3	4	5
19. I'm afraid to invite other kids to do things with me because they might
say no.....	1	2	3	4	5
20. I feel nervous when I'm around certain kids.....	1	2	3	4	5
21. I feel shy even with kids I know well.....	1	2	3	4	5
22. It's hard for me to ask other kids to do things with me	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix I

Please answer these questions accurately and honestly. Choose only one response for each statement from the following five responses:

- 1 = Not at all
- 2 = a little
- 3 = Somewhat
- 4 = moderately so
- 5 = very much so

How satisfied are you with:

- a. Your friends? _____
- b. Your family? _____
- c. Yourself? _____
- d. Being a boy (or girl)? _____
- e. Being a Canadian? _____

Appendix J

Use these numbers to show HOW MUCH YOU FEEL something is true for you.

- 1 = Not at all
- 2 = Hardly ever
- 3 = Sometimes
- 4 = Most of the time
- 5 = All the time

- 1. ____ I am lucky
- 2. ____ I often wish I were someone else
- 3. ____ I'm easy to like
- 4. ____ I can do many things well
- 5. ____ I like being the way I am