5-23-2011

# The Effects of Parental Nurturance and Involvement on Peer Relationships and Psychosocial Functioning of Young Adults

Maria L. Reid
*Florida International University*, maria.reid@fiu.edu

**DOI:** 10.25148/etd.FI11072801

FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Miami, Florida

# THE EFFECTS OF PARENTAL NURTURANCE AND INVOLVEMENT ON PEER RELATIONSHIPS AND PSYCHOSOCIAL FUNCTIONING OF YOUNG ADULTS

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

PSYCHOLOGY

by

Maria L. Reid

2011

To: Dean Kenneth G. Furton
College of Arts and Sciences

This dissertation, written by Maria L. Reid, and entitled The Effects of Parental Nurturance and Involvement on Peer Relationships and Psychosocial Functioning of Young Adults, having been approved in respect to style and intellectual content, is referred to you for judgment.

We have read this dissertation and recommend that it be approved.

_____
Mary J. Levitt

_____
Gordon E. Finley

_____
Abraham Lavender

_____
Robert Lickliter, Major Professor

Date of Defense: May 23, 2011

The dissertation of Maria L. Reid is approved.

_____
Dean Kenneth G. Furton
College of Arts and Sciences

_____
Interim Dean Kevin O'Shea
University Graduate School

Florida International University, 2011

DEDICATION

For my father, who was brave enough to show me his feet of clay and remained a God amongst men.

And for my mothers, whose love and belief in me made it all possible.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my committee, Drs. Mary J. Levitt, Robert Lickliter and Abraham Lavender, and my major professor Gordon E. Finley.

My deepest gratitude is to my major professor and advisor Gordon E. Finley. I have been amazingly fortunate to have an advisor who guided me with care, patience, and constant needling. You have been a father to me, allowing me to grow and expand my wings while keeping my focus on the bottom line. I will be forever grateful for your mentorship.

A special thanks to the colleagues and friends I have made at FIU, Rachel Ritchie, Beverly McDermott, Sandra Williams, Ivy Campos, and Chrysalis Wright. Thank you for your friendship and support throughout this process. I enjoyed working with you all.

Finally, and I would like to thank and extend my heartfelt appreciation to my family. Zachtan Kwayana, Behanzin Hassubowell, Seti Cetewayo Mzilikhanzie, Metabele Ngola, and Candece Congo, thank you for your love and support. To Osei-Joel, Lana, and Marlon, this is my legacy for you. To my love Keith, this is for your understanding and mine, thank you for your support, and love. For Daddy, Gwen and Elsa, thank you for always encouraging me to learn and to reach my highest potential.

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

THE EFFECTS OF PARENTAL NURTURANCE AND INVOLVEMENT ON PEER RELATIONSHIPS AND PSYCHOSOCIAL FUNCTIONING OF YOUNG ADULTS

by

Maria L. Reid

Florida International University, 2011

Miami, Florida

Professor Robert Lickliter, Major Professor

This study examined peer relationships and psychosocial functioning as a function of maternal and paternal involvement and nurturance along with the moderating effects of gender, family form, and ethnicity. Prior research has shown the influence of mother's involvement on peer relationship quality but not of fathers. Further, previous studies did not examine moderation by family form, gender, or ethnicity. The sample consisted of 1359 students who identified their biological mother and father as the most influential parental figures in their lives. Their ages ranged from 18 to 26; Sixty–one percent of the sample was Hispanic, 13% non-Hispanic Black, 25% non-Hispanic White; 76% female and 70% from intact families. The analytical strategy included using bivariate correlations and structural equation modeling to examine these relationships.

All dimensions of maternal and paternal nurturing and involvement were positively related to positive characteristics of peer relationships, self-esteem and life satisfaction consistent with the multicultural findings of PARTheory (Rohner, Khalique, & Cournoyer, 2005). A structural model was developed that was able to adequately account for the relationship between parental influence, peer relationships, and

psychosocial functioning. These effects of both maternal and paternal influence were strongly moderated by culture, family form, and gender. Finally, a differential effect was found among parental influence with fathers having a greater influence on friendship quality and importance than mothers, despite greater maternal involvement.

These findings have theoretical, clinical, and social implications as they call for a socially based theoretical perspective within which to study these relationships. Such a perspective would better inform clinicians when using impaired social functioning as indicative of axial diagnosis, and for the implementation of social policy to encourage paternal involvement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| CHAPTER | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| I. | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| II. | LITERATURE REVIEW | 3 |
| | Peer relationships | 3 |
| | Parent-child relationships | 9 |
| | Parent-child and child -peer relationships | 12 |
| | Social context of child relationships | 13 |
| | Theoretical perspectives | 18 |
| | The present study | 20 |
| | Research questions and hypotheses | 20 |
| III. | METHODS | 22 |
| | Participants | 22 |
| | Measures | 23 |
| | Procedure | 26 |
| IV. | RESULTS | 27 |
| | Preliminary analysis | 27 |
| | Analysis of scales | 29 |
| | Descriptive statistics | 32 |
| | Bivariate correlations | 34 |
| | Structural equation modeling | 35 |
| V. | DISCUSSION | 38 |
| | Contribution of the present study and implication | 41 |
| | Limitations and future research directions | 43 |
| | Conclusion | 45 |
| REFERENCES | | 46 |
| APPENDICES | | 54 |
| VITA | | 88 |

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES PAGE


1. Friendship Items……...……...55

2. Friendship Scale Development……...…….56

3. Exploratory Factor Analysis of Friendship Subscales…….57

4. Exploratory Factor Analysis of SE/LS Subscale…….57

5. Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Nurturant Mothering Scale.……..58

6. Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Mother Reported Involvement Scales..…59

7. Outcome variables, Means (SD) by Ethnicity……..…...60

8. Outcome variables, Mean Differences (SD) by Ethnicity……...61

9. Outcome variables, Mean differences (SD) by Gender and Family Form…..….62

10. Outcome variables, Means (SD) by Ethnicity, Gender and Family Form ……..63

11. Parental Nurturance, Means (SD) by Ethnicity, Gender and Family Form…..…64

12. Father Involvement, Means (SD) by Ethnicity, Gender and Family Form…….65

13. Mother Involvement, Means (SD) by Ethnicity, Gender and Family Form …...66

14. Summary of Lowest and Highest Means of Parental Involvement……..……..67

15. Correlation of Father Variables with Outcome Variables……...68

16. Correlation of Mother Variables with Outcome Variables……...……...……69

17. Correlation among Psychosocial Outcomes…..……...……...…69

18. Summary of Path Coefficients and Comparisons between Groups for all Structural Models……..……..…….70

19. Differential Parental Influence on Outcome Subscales……....…..……71

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURES PAGE

1. Parental Involvement and Nurturance Measurement Model……..…..72

2. Structural Model of Parental Variables for Psychosocial Functioning …..…..73

3. Structural Model of Parental Variables for Psychosocial Functioning by Gender……...74

4. Structural Model of Parental Variables for Psychosocial Functioning by Family Form……...……...75

5. Structural Model of Parental Variables for Psychosocial Functioning by Ethnicity……81

# Chapter I

## INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this dissertation is to examine the influence of maternal and paternal involvement and nurturance on the characteristics of peer relationships, self-esteem and life satisfaction. Additionally, it seeks to ascertain whether these proposed influences are modified by ethnicity/race, gender, or family form. Finally, this research will take advantage of a framework that highlights the perception of the child and is applicable to a wide range of cultures.

Previous research on this topic has focused on maternal influence and characteristics of the child (Aroian, Hough, Templin, & Kaskiri, 2008; Black, Whittingham, Reardon, & Tumolo, 2007). Few have included paternal influence, either separate from or concurrent with maternal influence. Those that have examined parental effects have found little or no evidence of a substantial relationship between father involvement and this form of psychosocial functioning (Black, Whittingham, Reardon, & Tumolo, 2007). Despite differential maternal and paternal involvement, both are developmentally salient. Mothers may spend considerably more time caring for their children, while fathers interact more as playmates than caretakers but nonetheless fathers are no less effective or developmentally relevant (Amato, 2001; Finley & Schwartz, 2007; Parke, 2004).

Parental influence has also been found to differ by family form, gender and culture (Finley & Schwartz, 2007; Reid & Finley, 2010; Schwartz & Finley, 2005b) Although the role of culture as an influence on relationships is rarely considered in a

developmental context, evidence suggests that different parenting styles are more effective within specific cultures (Serafica & Vargas, 2006).

Peer friendships serve multiple purposes and the quality of these relationships has long lasting impacts on life span development (Aroian, Hough, Templin, & Kaskiri, 2008; Parker, Rubin, Erath, Wojslawowics, & Buskirk, 2006). Indeed poor peer relationships are considered psychopathological and frequently are used as a criterion for many mental disorders (Gifford-Smith & Brownell, 2003; Parker, Rubin, Erath, Wojslawowics, & Buskirk, 2006). As such, it is our social and scientific responsibility to properly define and measure these parental, contextual and peer relationships as well as outline causes within the coummunity that lie outside of the clinical realm.

# Chapter II

# LITERATURE REVIEW

## Peer Relationships

**What are peer-peer relationships?** Peer friendships are an important component of our extended social networks. These relationships lack the sexual component that is inherent in intimate relationships but serve critically important purposes. As defined by Howes and Tonyan (2000), friendship between peers is an "… affective, reciprocated dyadic relationship built on trust, companionship… and self disclosure." Friendships serve multiple purposes: offering emotional support and security outside of the family, validating self-concept, promoting self-esteem, preventing loneliness (Gifford-Smith & Brownell**,** 2003), providing information and advice (Parker, Rubin, Erath, Wojslawowics, & Buskirk, 2006), self reflection, personality development and opportunities for disclosure (Kerns, Contreras, & Neal-Barnett, 2000). Peer relationships start first through social interactions in social contexts created by parents and then shifts through middle childhood and adolescence to less structured activities in a social world that is almost separate from school and family (Gifford-Smith & Brownell**,** 2003). These dyadic interactions move over time from being built on proximity and other convenience factors and overtime develop to eventually supplanting or equaling parental-child relationships in importance, but not necessarily to substitute for parent-child attachments (Gifford-Smith & Brownell**,** 2003).

Peer groups are another important social experience for children but peer friendships are distinguishable from other relationships in the way in which each contributes differentially to "children's socioemotional development" (Gifford-Smith &

Brownell**,** 2003). Although inclusion in peer groups represents a kind of global acceptance, it does not equal the intimacy obtained from dyadic peer relationships. That said, peer groups also have been widely studied particularly for their influence on delinquent behaviors (Gifford-Smith & Brownell**,** 2003). Peer relationships, by contrast, have been studied less extensively, in part because of theoretical difficulty in defining, measuring, and quantifying these relationships (Gifford-Smith & Brownell**,** 2003). Who is a friend? What particular features are important? Do these features change in importance over the lifespan? What benefits are gained from these friendships? Must these features be mutual on both sides of the dyadic pair for the relationship to be a true friendship? What if they are not? How can we (researchers) measure these features?

**Why are peer-peer relationships important?** The quality of peer relationships has wide-ranging and long-lasting impacts on life span development (Aroian, Hough, Templin, & Kaskiri, 2008; Parker, Rubin, Erath, Wojslawowics, & Buskirk, 2006). Peer-peer relationships are often complicated with elements from peer group interactions (Gifford-Smith & Brownell**,** 2003). However, research shows that "group acceptance neither guarantees nor precludes successful friendships" and that peer-peer relationships offer independent experiences that offer both negative and positive resources (Parker, Rubin, Erath, Wojslawowics, & Buskirk, 2006). Inappropriate interaction or the lack of social interactions outside of the family is viewed clinically as a prominent dimension of maladjustment. Success or failure at peer relationships is used as a gauge of personality development and interpersonal skills (Parker, Rubin, Erath, Wojslawowics, & Buskirk, 2006). In DSM IV, poor peer relationships are considered criteria for diagnoses of some

child disorders such as conduct disorder, childhood disintegrative disorder, and Asperger's disorder (Parker, Rubin, Erath, Wojslawowics, & Buskirk, 2006).

Consequently, subscales on peer relationship quality and quantity are included on several diagnostic instruments. For example, the Child Behavior Checklist asks, "about how many close friends does your child have? (Do not include brothers & sisters)" and "about how many times a week does your child do things with any friends outside of regular school hours?" (Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1986). Similar instruments that include the evaluation of peer-peer relationships are The New York Teacher Rating scale, The Autism Diagnostic Interview-Revised, the Children's Depression Inventory, Reynolds Adolescent Depression scale and Anxiety Disorders Interview Schedule (Parker, Rubin, Erath, Wojslawowics, & Buskirk, 2006).

Longitudinal research, such as that conducted by Roff (1961 & 1963), on the relationship between adult functioning and childhood peer relationships show consistent and compelling support for linkages between maladaptive social functioning and adult mental health, adult criminality, and substance abuse (Gifford-Smith & Brownell**,** 2003; Parker, Rubin, Erath, Wojslawowics, & Buskirk, 2006; Roff, 1961; Roff, 1963). But how are adult functioning and childhood peer relationships related? An interactive theory that points to both a causal and a parallel/correlational interpretation is considered here.

**A theoretical perspective on peer-peer relationships.** Parker, Rubin, Erath, Wojslawowics and Buskirk's (2006) transactional model links poor peer relationships to disordered outcomes through the interaction of child and environmental characteristics over time. The Parker et al. model also shows how the processes are themselves influenced by early experiences, called disposing factors, which affect child "behavior

towards peers…, self perception, social outlook, social motivation and social attribution" (Parker, Rubin, Erath, Wojslawowics, & Buskirk, 2006, pp.459). In other words, poor peer relationships are an early symptom of a more global underlying dysfunction. The dysfunction later manifests itself in adult maladjustments, and a wide range of maladaptive developmental trajectories. In addition, poor peer relationships are also considered a cause of these later adult maladjustment (Parker, Rubin, Erath, Wojslawowics, & Buskirk, 2006). Both child and adult maladaptive responses are caused by antecedents that may be biological, environmental or an interaction of both in origin (Parker, Rubin, Erath, Wojslawowics, & Buskirk, 2006).

Parker, Rubin, Erath, Wojslawowics and Buskirk, (2006) describe this transactional model thus;

> …biogenetic and early experiential factors combine to contribute to a behavioral style that is maladaptive to forming friendships and interacting successfully in a peer group…these early experiences influence not only the child's initial maladaptive behavior toward peers but also the child's self-perceptions and social outlook, social motivation, and social attributions. These self-other cognitive processes, in turn, also contribute to initial behavior toward peers. …the transactional model …posits the operation of a dynamic pattern of continuous and reciprocal influence. The end point of this model indicates two, rather than one, sets of disordered outcomes which reflect behavioral referents such as …negative peer behavior, and cognitive/affective referents negative self- and other- cognition (pp. 459).

Transactional models, such as that of Parker et al., provide a comprehensive integration of the most important variables and mechanisms in peer relationships. However, the complexity in defining the exact nature of friendship quality and measuring it remains problematic.

**Measuring friendship quality.** One particularly difficult task has been to identify the unchanging fundamental features of children's relationships as the functions of the relationships change with development. The lack of an overarching theory to generate empirical research in this area has lead to a conflict among researchers as to the relevance of including observable friendship characteristics or *processes*, such as self-disclosure, affection, and conflict, or subjective friendship benefits or *provisions*, such as security, trust and intimacy (Gifford-Smith & Brownell**,** 2003). Both groups of characteristics are important and can be assessed by different methodologies, e.g., adult reports vs. subjective self-reports.

Some early developmental models of friendship have generated attempts at constructing measurement scales to operationally define and quantify these characteristics. The Sharabany Intimacy scale (Mayless, Sharabany, & Sag, 1997) identifies eight dimensions or characteristics of friendship, including both provisions and processes: frankness and spontaneity, sensitivity, attachment/connection, exclusivity, giving/sharing, imposition, common activities, trust and loyalty. Confirmatory factor analysis, however, shows high correlations among many of these elements. Thus, broader domains such as those outlined by Bukowski, Hoza and Boivins (1994) appear more promising than the Sharabany Intimacy scale. These domains are companionship, conflict, help/aid, security, and intimacy. The later scale was designed specifically to minimize subscale overlap and to represent the perception of the relationship and friendship provisions as opposed to direct observation of processes. This is similar to the difference between PARTheory (Rohner, Khalique, & Cournoyer, 2005) and Attachment theory (Bowlby, 1982), where the former is based on the child's perception of the parent-

child relationship, and the later on direct observation of parent-child interaction. This difference is further explored below when discussing theoretical perspectives.

The Bukowski et al. (1994) domains reflect provisions that have been identified as being important functions within friendships: voluntarily spending time together, the ability to transcend conflict, being comfortable enough to disagree, exchanging information, and protection from discrimination, unguarded self-disclosure, reflected appraisal, and self-reflective validation. The present study focuses on the security domain of the instrument, which asserts that friendships can survive conflict and friends are trustworthy and reliable. The security domain measured in two subscales called Reliable Alliance and Transcending Problems. This particular domain was chosen because of the consensus that Security is a central feature of peer-peer relationships (Bukowski, Hoza, & Boivins, 1994). Additionally, the Bukowski et al. instrument was designed to be used in "conjunction with or independent of other sociometric assessments" (pp.472). Consequently, this instrument would be appropriate to use when observing other psychosocial functions and parental variables as in this study.

**Psychosocial functioning.** Peer –peer relationships are important social constructs. As noted by the Parker et al. (2006) transactional model, one of the outcomes of poor peer relationships is negative self- and other- cognition. It is then reasonable to suppose that there would be a relationship between peer relationships and self- and other-cognition. Self-cognition is defined as self-regard and self-evaluation of social competencies- children's positive and negative evaluation and expectations of their abilities; by contrast others-cognition or social cognition is the expectations and predictions of relationships determined by knowledge of social rules and responsibilities

(Parker, Rubin, Erath, Wojslawowics, & Buskirk, 2006). In this study self-cognition is indexed by the common concepts of self-esteem and life satisfaction. Self-esteem is a general feeling of self-worth and provides motive and regulation for interpersonal and achievement contexts (Robins, Hendin, & Trzesniewski, 2001). Life satisfaction is an evaluative estimation of one's satisfaction with life (Finley & Schwartz, 2007; Makinen & Pychyl, 2001).

These indicators of personal goals, self-reflection, and achievement are commonly used, easily defined, and soundly measured indices of psychosocial functioning. Single-item scales of both self-esteem and life satisfaction have been found to capture reasonably well the cognitive and social components of these concepts without sacrificing the reliability and validity of the measures. These single-item scales are used in this study to explore the expected correlation to peer-peer relationship.

**Parent-Child relationships**

The parent-child relationship is the first social relationship in which a child is involved and is often viewed by developmental psychologists as a "working model" for all future relationships including peer relationships (Bowlby, 1982). Evolving from an association of physiological needs to be met, the parent-child relationship quickly moves to one of a biological and emotional basis (Khaleque & Rohner, 2002). There is a consensus on the importance of this initial relationship. In fact, some developmental perspectives and theories are propounded solely on this: for example Freud's psychoanalysis and Bowlby's attachment theory.

**Maternal Involvement**. The differential effects of maternal and paternal involvement have been extensively researched. The view of mothers as the primary

caretakers is strongly reflected in our culture. Within the last three decades, however, there have been incremental increases in paternal involvement with childcare. Mothers nonetheless still spend considerably more time caring for their children than do fathers (Finley & Schwartz, 2007; McBride, Schoppe, & Rane, 2002). A complementary division of labor in intact families usually ensures that mothers maintain the highly involved managerial role of supervising daily activities (Parke, 2000). This role is vastly increased in fragile and divorced families where the mother has the additional role of being the gatekeeper for paternal involvement of nonresident fathers (Gaunt, 2008).

**Paternal Involvement.** The examination of the mother-child dyad encompasses a vast body of empirical research. Indeed, there are few areas of this dyad that have not been investigated in detail. By contrast, the father-child dyad has traditionally been ignored in the world of empirical research and the paternal role as an essential and developmentally salient caregiver often disregarded. Historically, the role of fathers in the home has been viewed as primarily instrumental, determined mainly by the father's ability to provide income (Finley & Schwartz, 2006). However, within the last 2-3 decades, findings by researchers in the field of paternal involvement have found that although fathers interact more as a playmate than a caretaker (Lamb, 1999), paternal parenting is no less effective or developmentally relevant (Amato, 2001; Finley & Schwartz, 2007; Mandara, Murray, & Joyner, 2005; Parke, 2004; Phares, Field, & Kamboukos, 2009, Schwartz & Finley, 2009).

Father non-involvement also has been found to have profound negative effects on psychosocial well being (Finley & Schwartz, 2007), academic outcomes (Amato, 2000; Mandara, Murray, & Joyner, 2005), internalizing and externalizing behaviors (Langsford,

2009), temperament (Phares, Field, & Kamboukos, 2009) and gender role development (Mandara, Murray, & Joyner, 2005). In a review of the literature, Rohner and Veneziano (2001) show that father-child interactions are more effective and influential than mother-child interactions at predicting psychological and personality adjustments, conduct problems and delinquent behavior, and academic and cognitive performance. Fathers also have a more powerful effect than mothers on attenuating high-risk behavior in young adults (Schwartz et al., 2009) and in adolescence (Antecol & Bedard, 2007). Thus many of the psychopathological outcomes associated with divorce can be directly linked to father absence (mothers retain sole physical custody in about 85-90% of all divorce cases; Kelly, 2007; Schwartz & Finley, 2009).

Parke (2004) in his essay on the changing role of fathers argued that fathers were essential socializing agents. This role is especially important for minorities, where racial socialization prepares children for disparaging experiences with the general population (Lesane, 2002; Brown, Linver, Evans, & DeGennaro, 2009; Serafica & Vargas, 2006). Finley & Schwartz (2007, pp.582) showed that "father involvement was positively related to subjective well being (self-esteem, life satisfaction, and future expectations)" in intact families but not in divorced families. The main difference between these family forms is father presence/absence. Because of these findings, family form is an important context to consider when studying parental influence.

Paternal involvement is as developmentally vital as maternal involvement and both need to be taken into consideration when investigating developmental outcomes. The research paradigm employed in the present study has the advantage of enabling separate examination of the influence of maternal and paternal involvement on

psychosocial functioning with the addition of family form as a moderating variable, in contrast to other studies that have been focused on maternal influence within the two-parent nuclear family. Using Structural Equation Modeling furthers leverages this advantage by making it possible to view the effects of paternal and maternal involvement simultaneously, as opposed to looking at isolated correlations.

**Use of Self-report.** There are concerns regarding the source of the parental involvement data. Conflicting evidence has called into question the reliability of reports from either parent (Wical & Doherty, 2005). To circumnavigate this issue, the present study uses young adult retrospective reports of parental involvement. The advantages of such a source are many. Young adults are old enough to be able to accurately articulate their own feelings and perceptions of their parents' involvement and enough removed from the parental yoke to freely express them (Finley, Mira, & Schwartz, 2008). Additionally, these reports would be tainted only by the perceptions and personal characteristics of the child, which are "uniquely associated with these individuals' psychological and behavioral adjustment" (Schwartz & Finley, 2005a). The use of retrospective report is also reflective of a focus on children's perception of parental acceptance or rejection that will be discussed in more detail further on.

**Parent-child and child-peer relationships**

Evidence for both direct and indirect parental influence on peer relationships has been reported (O'Neil & Parke, 2000; McDowell & Parke, 2009). Parke et al. (1994) propose a tripartite model where child-peer interactions are influenced by: "parent-child interactions, parents as instructors and parents as providers of opportunities" (pp.117) in three separate bidirectional relationships. This was further investigated by Mounts (2000)

who examined how parents mediate peer relationships through the design and supervision of the social environment of their children. As noted before, by middle childhood and adolescence, peer-peer relationships operate in a social world separate from the family and the school (Gifford-Smith & Brownell**,** 2003). Does this then negate the influence of parents in this realm?

Kerns, Contreras and Neal-Barnett (2000) have considered parent-child interactions and peer relationships as separate social worlds in insular environments with varying degrees of interaction as outlined in their edited text, aptly named Family and Peers. In this book, several researchers look at mediating mechanisms for the influence of family functioning on peer relationships, from emotional regulation (Contreras & Kerns, 2000, O'Neil & Parke, 2000), and physical maturation (Dishion, Poulin, & Skaggs, 2000) to cultural mechanism (Hart et al., 2000) and social learning (O'Neil & Parke, 2000; Mize, Pettit, & Meece, 2000). Although the present research does not address mediating mechanisms, it does examine the moderating role of culture, family form, and gender in directing the influence of parental involvement on peer relationships.

**The social context of child relationships**

**Culture.** The role of culture as an influence on relationships is rarely considered in a developmental context despite a long tradition of cross-cultural research (Coll, 2001). However, the dearth of culturally focused research in this area does not detract from its importance (Aroian, Hough, Templin, & Kaskiri, 2008). Cultural diversity is very salient to the present research.

First, culture has been found to have profound effects on parenting styles and outcomes. Evidence suggests that different parenting styles have different efficacies

within specific cultures (Quintana et al., 2006; Rothbaum, Rosen, Ujie, & Uchida, 2002). Additionally, variations in parental involvement also appear to be culturally driven, which is an example of culturally defined social roles.

Schwartz and Finley (2005b), in their study on ethnic differences in fathering, found differences in involvement and nurturing among White, African American and Caribbean islanders, Cuban and Non-Cuban Hispanics and Asians, with Cuban fathers having the highest levels of involvement. In a continuation of this research, Reid & Finley (2010) found trends indicating differences in the involvement of African American, Jamaican and Haitian fathers. Althought these differences did not attain statistical significance, they could not be attributed to differences in family form or social economic status and are most probably a cultural phenomenon. Rothbaum, Rosen, Ujie and Uchida, (2002) found that, in contrast to American families, Japanese mothers are more involved with their children and fathers are distant authority figures with limited interaction. The authors note that these relationships are normative within the Japanese culture and provide a secure model of family relationships.

Second, research finds that peer relationships are used and viewed differently by different cultures. Specifically, Bronfenbrenner (Hart et al., 2000) found that peer groups were used in Soviet culture to "increase group obligation…and maintain standards of excellence". In a similar examination of a collectivistic society, Shin (2007) found that compromise and conflict resolution were highly valued aspects among Korean peer groups. Similarly, in Japan where "the goal of social harmony is highly valued" (pp. 334), the overt expression of conflict is frowned upon (Rothbaum, Rosen, Ujie, & Uchida, (2002). Other differences in the importance of friendships and in the

characteristics in friendships can be explained by the differences in the values and beliefs in each culture (Serafica & Vargas, 2006). For example, in cultures where extended family networks are expected and maintained, such as within African American, Asian and Hispanic cultures, the function and importance of peer relationships may differ as these may be performed within the larger network of familial relationships. One intention of the present research was to look at the differing characteristics of peer relationships within different cultures as defined by ethnicity and/or race.

**Gender.** Another important social construct and context relevant to development is gender. As opposed to sex determined by biological features, gender roles are culturally defined (Mandara, Murray, & Joyner, 2005). Fathers are especially influential in gender role development. Specifically, they openly enforce and direct gender role stereotypes and expectations, in comparison to mothers. The mere physical presence of the biological father within the home is enough to alter gender specific behaviors, e.g., delay of menarche (Ellis & Garber, 2000), early sexual behavior in girls (Antecol & Bedard, 2007; Ellis et al., 2003), decreased likelihood of physical chores for girls (Mandara, Murray, & Joyner, 2005) and more physically demanding environments for boys (Mandara, Murray, & Joyner, 2005). Mandara, Murray and Joyner (2005) hypothesize that fathers tend to socialize children toward more traditional gender role orientations than do mothers.

Although gender is one of the defining lines within friendships, i.e., same sex relationships are the most common preference (Parker, Rubin, Erath, Wojslawowics, & Buskirk, 2006), no consistent variations in friendship can be noted (Parker, Rubin, Erath, Wojslawowics, & Buskirk, 2006). For instance, some studies suggest girls indulge in

more self-disclosure and experience greater levels of emotional support and intimacy than do boys (Rose & Asher, 2000; Rubin et al., 2004; Zarbatany, McDougall, & Hymel, 2000). However, others note reversed differences in levels of emotional support and intimacy and assert that characteristic sex differences may be exaggerated (Lansford & Parker, 1999).

Hence, the question of whether there are significant gender differences in peer characteristics that rise to the level of theoretical significance remain? Interpretations of the Parker, Rubin, Erath, Wojslawowics and Buskirk (2006) transactional model would say that any differences may be caused by both biological sex differences and gender defined stereotypes, initiated by differential parental involvement, and then systematically enforced by the social context within which they reside.

**Family form.** Family form has proven to be an important part of the social context of child development as it pertains to parental efficacy. Parental effectiveness is often diminished by family disruptions such as parental psychopathology or divorce and these effects are well documented (Amato, 2003; Lansford 2009). Children from divorced families have substantially higher levels of substance abuse (Neher & Short, 1998), depressive symptoms (Larson, Kigin, & Holman, 2008), earlier sexual behavior and promiscuity (Antecol & Bedard, 2007), are at a higher risk for sexual abuse (Nelson et al., 2002), have lower reading and math scores (Teachman, Day, Paasch, Carver, & Call, 1998), and have lower academic achievements and more conduct problems (Amato & Keith, 1991) when compared to children from intact families. Although many of these consequences are extremely psychopathologic, even the so-called successful children of

low conflict divorces suffer deep psychological scars that influence important aspects of their lives, such as spirituality and their own intimate relationships (Marquardt, 2005).

The decreased effectiveness found in disrupted families is easily accounted for by family system theory. Rothbaum, Rosen, Ujie and Uchida, (2002) defined family systems as patterns of interrelated behaviors where all family members are responsible for maintaining family relationships. Family System theory hypothesizes that one of the penalties of divorce is the breakdown in this system (Timmer & Veroff, 2000). A decrease or change in one parent's behavior should be compensated for by an increase in or change in the other parent, to maintain family equilibrium (Timmer & Veroff, 2000). However, in divorced families, the collapse in the family system is clearly visible in the substantial decrease in both parental influences as each struggles to create new family systems (Finley & Schwartz, 2010).

The marriage rate is currently at its lowest point in the last 10 years, whereas the divorce rate has stabilized to ~ 50% and cohabitation ~10% (Tejada-Vera & Sutton, 2010). Along with the high rise of out-of-wedlock births (41%; Martin et al, 2010), these changes have given a prominent rise to other family forms such as reconstituted families and single parent families. The term fragile families was coined to denote the inherent instability of the family relationships within these later family forms which are associated with negative outcomes for children (Mclanahan, Garfinkel, Reichman, & Teitler, 2001). These families are at an even greater risk for disruption and the accompanying effects on child development. Although it is prudent to include these other family forms in any research examining family context, this was not possible here because of the low incidence of fragile families within the sample used.

## Theoretical perspectives

Several theoretical perspectives provide links between parent-child interactions and peer relationships. However, the only two that specifically cite parent-child relationships as fundamental building blocks for social interactions will be discussed here: Attachment theory and PARTheory.

**Attachment theory.** In this theoretical perspective, attachment relationships with caregivers become affective-cognitive "working models" for peer relationships (Bowlby, 1982). In this light, children with secure attachment are more socially competent and have better peer relationships than do children with insecure attachments. Although nothing in the widely accepted attachment theory suggests that fathers are inadequate or lacking as caregivers, research in this area has centered on the mother-child dyad, neglecting the father-child dyad and any interaction between the two (Bowlby, 1982).

However, in an attachment theory based study, Black, Whittingham, Reardon, & Tumolo, (2007) studied the association between mother- and father- child interactions and peer interactions. They found that positive mother-child interactions were linked to responsive peer relationships but that there were no significant findings for father-child interactions. Their results are in sharp contrast to previously cited works that have found considerable influence in the father-child interactions (Finley & Schwartz, 2007; Mandara, Murray, & Joyner, 2005; Schwartz & Finley, 2009). Additionally, Black et al. used a small uniform sample and did not consider social context such as family form as contributing factors. However, Black et al. provides a theoretical foundation upon which the current study can expand and elaborate.

**PARTheory.** Perceived Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory (PARTheory) has been widely accepted as a predictor of psychological and behavioral adjustments in children (Rohner, Khalique, & Cournoyer, 2005). It has been tested multiculturally, across age and gender, and found to be reliable in predicting negative affect, adjustments, and worldviews amongst children who perceive themselves to have been rejected by their parents (Rohner, Khalique, & Cournoyer, 2005). PARTheory conceptualized parenting as consisting of several dimensions of behaviors including: warmth/affection, hostility/aggression, indifference/ neglect, and undifferentiated rejection. The behaviors represent a continuum from perceived acceptance to perceived rejection. The perception of these behaviors by the child is paramount, because PARTheory argues that only the child's perception is important. This concept can explain why some children feel neglected by observably loving and attentive parents or contrastingly do not feel neglected or rejected by observably abusive parents.

Children's self-reported responses to perceived parental rejection include hostility, aggression, impaired self-esteem, adequacy and worth, emotional unresponsiveness, emotional instability, dependence, defensive independence, and negative world views (Rohner, Khalique, & Cournoyer, 2005). Similar to the parental behaviors, these psychological adjustments to perceived parental rejection exist along a continuum. Impaired self-esteem, worth, and adequacy are seen as an impaired reflection of their perceived image in the eyes of the child. In other words if their parents do not love them, they must be unlovable or worthless.

PARTheory posits a biological approach for the effect of parental-child relationships on peer relationships. Neurological changes associated with parental

acceptance/rejection may affect psychosocial development and hence children's interpersonal relationships (Donoghue, 2010).In terms of the current study, PARTheory supports the premise that both maternal and paternal influence would have a considerable effect on friendship quality and importance, regardless of social context. Additionally, considering the socializing role of fathers and their demonstrated effect on psychological functioning, it would be reasonable to expect that their influence on friendships could be equal to or greater than that of mothers. By looking at the differential effect of parental involvement, this should be discernable.

**The present study**

Expanding on the research of Black, Whittingham, Reardon, & Tumolo, (2007), the present study looks at the influence of parental involvement and nurturance, as proposed by PARTheory, on peer relationships and psychosocial functioning. The present study also takes advantage of a large existing dataset that is more representative of the diverse cultures within the US. The Black, Whittingham, Reardon, & Tumolo study (2007) focused on gender as an individual characteristic that influenced friendship interactions. In the present study, ethnicity/race and family form were also examined along with gender and were expected to have considerable influence on both parental variables and psychosocial outcomes.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

Question #1: Are dimensions of parental involvement and nurturance linked to differences in the characteristics of peer relationships, self-esteem and life satisfaction?

Question #2: Are these relationships moderated by culture, gender, and family form?

Question #3: Do fathers and mothers have a differential influence on friendship importance and quality and can this be demonstrated in a Structural Equation Model?

Hypothesis #1: Parental nurturance and involvement will correlate positively with beneficial characteristics of peer relationships, self-esteem and life satisfaction.

Hypothesis #2: The effects of parental nurturance and involvement will vary as a function of culture, gender and family form.

Hypothesis #3: Fathers will have a greater influence on friendship quality, importance and other psychosocial functioning than mothers will.

# Chapter III

# METHODS

## Participants

Participants in this study were 1359 university students (76% female; mean age 19.86 years with 91% between the ages of 18 and 26). They were gathered from two large public universities in Florida; specifically 81% were from Florida International University, which has a predominantly Hispanic student population, and 19% were from Florida State University, which has a predominantly non-Hispanic student population. Of these, 49% were freshmen, 20% sophomores, 17% juniors, 12% seniors and less than 3% graduates or other. In terms of ethnicity, 61% were Hispanic, 13% non-Hispanic Black and 25% non-Hispanic White.

Although the majority of the students were born in America (76%), the majority of the parents were not (mothers 34% and fathers 33%). The main countries of origin for both participants and parents were Cuba (17% and 40%, respectively), Nicaragua (11% and 7%, respectively), Colombia (14% and 10%, respectively), Haiti (4% and 5%, respectively), and Jamaica (5% and 5%, respectively). Participants also reported parental income during adolescence with 48% claiming between $30,000 and $100,000 (10% below and 20% above this) and on parental educational status, more than 70% of both parents had some college education with 19% of fathers and 15% of mothers having professional or graduate degrees. Fewer than 30% of parents had only a high school education or less.

Participants were asked to name the most influential father and mother figures in their lives. For the purposes of this study, only participants who listed their biological mother and father were used.

**Measures**

**Nurturant Fathering and Mothering Scales.** Retrospective reports of paternal and maternal nurturant were obtained from the participants (Finley & Schwartz, 2004; Finley, Mira, & Schwartz, 2008). The mother scale was created by replacing the word "father" with "mother" for each item (Finley, Mira, & Schwartz, 2008). The Nine-item scale measured closeness, support, enjoyment, activities, influence, and overall quality of the relationship with the identified parent figure on a 5-point Likert scale. Sample items from the scale read "How much do you think your father enjoyed being a father "and "When you needed your mother's support was she there for you?"

The Nurturant Fathering scale has a well established psychometric history with high correlations to other well established scales such as the Adult Perceived Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ, Khalique & Rohner, 2002) which measures similar constructs ($r = 0.88$; Doyle, 2007). The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for this scale was .95 (Finley & Schwartz, 2004). In the development of the Nurturant Mothering scale, Finley, Mira and Schwartz (2008) found no significant variance from the Nurturant Fathering scale. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the Nurturant Mothering scale was reported as .90 (Finley, Mira, & Schwartz, 2008). The Nurturant Mothering scale, however, does not have the same statistical history as the Nurturant Fathering scale. Consequently, this scale was analyzed using the present sample and compared with previously reported results. This analysis is reported in the results section.

**Father and Mother Involvement Scales.** The Father Involvement scale lists 20 domains of paternal involvement (Finley & Schwartz, 2004), which include social, intellectual, and career development as well as others. Participants reported how much their father had been involved on a linear response scale from 1 (not at all) to 5 (very involved). Exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis extracted three subscales of father involvement. These were expressive involvement (caregiving, companionship, sharing activities, emotional development, social development, spiritual development, physical development, and leisure), instrumental involvement (discipline, protecting, providing income, monitoring schoolwork, moral development, developing responsibility, career development, and developing independence), and mentoring/advising involvement (intellectual development, developing competency, mentoring and giving advise). The latter subscale represented domains that empirically overlapped between expressive and instrumental involvement (Finley & Schwartz, 2004). The Cronbach's alpha coefficients were .93, .91 and .92, respectively (Finley & Schwartz, 2004).

As with the Nurturance scales, the mother involvement scale was created by replacing the word "father" with "mother". All of the domains and the rating scales remained the same. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient ranged from .80 to .86 (Finley, Mira, & Schwartz, 2008). As before, the mother involvement scale was analyzed for comparison to previously reported results.

**Friendship measures.** There were five friendship outcome measures analyzed for this study: the satisfaction with friendship item (rated on a 1 to 5 scale, from very low to very high), the importance of friendships in the participant's life (rated on a 1 to 4 scale,

from not at all important to extremely important), and three questions relating to conflict, support and disclosure within friendships (rated on a 1 to 5 scale, from strongly agree to strongly disagree). These later items correspond to the two subscales of the security domain of friendship quality outlined by Bukowski, Hoza and Boivins (1994) in their friendship quality scale. The security domain is identified as a "salient feature of children's friendships" in several age groups (Bukowski, Hoza, & Boivins, 1994). It is a multidimensional construct that encompasses two features, 1) the impression that the friendship can transcend problems and conflicts, and 2) that friends are trustworthy and reliable. The factor loading for the subscales, transcending problems and reliable alliance, were .80 and .83, respectively and were not found to be highly correlated with items from the other domains ($r<.30$, Bukowski, Hoza, & Boivins, 1994). The internal consistency of the Bukowski the scale, using Cronbach's alpha, was .74 for the adolescent sample of that study.

**Psychosocial functioning.** Two of the three items in Finley & Schwartz's (2007) scale of psychosocial functioning were included to measure subjective well-being. These items were assessed by asking participants to indicate their overall life satisfaction and self-esteem on a scale of 1 (Very Low) to 5 (Very High). The third item on the scale, future expectations, was not used as it was found to be consistently high in college student samples (Reid & Finley, 2010). The Cronbach's alpha coefficient on the original scale was .75. The revised scale was analyzed for internal consistency.

**Demographics.** Additional demographic items were gathered from the participants including living arrangements, and grade point average. Participants were also asked to provide demographic information on their parents during their adolescence

including ethnicity and country of birth, educational attainment, work history, family income, and family form.

**Procedure**

All of the scales were administered together in either in a classroom or research laboratory setting. In the research laboratory, participants completed the assessments individually in small groups. The average completion time of the assessment was 30 minutes. The data were collected between September 2004 and January 2006.

# Chapter IV

# RESULTS

## Preliminary Analyses

All analyses were performed with either SPSS 17.0 or Amos 17.0 for Windows. In the preliminary analyses, the data were evaluated for the following statistical concerns.

**Excluded cases.** As stated in the method section, only participants who identified their biological father and mother as the influential parental figures in their life were included in this dataset. This step excluded 172 participants. Also excluded were individuals who gave no information on their parents' nurturance or involvement (24 cases), or gender (2 cases). Family forms other than intact and divorced (68 cases – 33 none given, 5 never married, 30 widowed), and ethnicities other than non-Hispanic White, non-Hispanic Black, and Hispanic (82 cases – 65 Asian, 17 mixed) were also excluded because these cells were found to be too small to be analyzed statistically. These excluded cases were not found to have any demographic characteristics that were different from the included cases. The resulting sample of 1359 participants represented 80% of the original sample.

**Analysis of Missing Data.** Initial analysis of the data revealed that less than 2% of the data were missing. The missing data were analyzed and found to be missing completely at random (MCAR). Therefore, a simple mean substitution imputation method was used (Kline, 2005).This method involves replacing the missing data with the overall mean value for the variable. While there is the possibility of distorting the distribution of the data, it had no detectable effect on this dataset, i.e. the distribution of the data was the same before and after the imputation.

**Outliers.** Leverage scores were calculated for each variable and none were found to be four times greater than the mean centered leverage. Therefore, no cases were excluded as being outliers.

**Normality.** One of the primary assumptions of most statistical tests is that there is a normal distribution of data. Non-normality can decrease statistical power and increase the probability of Type I errors (Wilcox, 2002). As such, the extent of normality in distribution of the parental variables was ascertained. Lei and Lomax (2005) ascribe univariate normality as having absolute skewness and kurtosis values of 2.3 and lower. All of the paternal nurturance and involvement items were within normal range. However, several maternal items were not normally distributed. Three of the maternal nurturance items (enjoyment, support and overall rating) and two of the maternal involvement items (caregiving and being protective) had kurtosis values greater than three. Additionally, this non-normal distribution appears to affect only specific groups. Specifically, maternal instrumental involvement was non-normal for females in general and for Black and White males from intact families but not for males in general. Further, mother nurturance was abnormally distributed for intact families in general and specifically for White and Hispanic females, but not for divorced families nor for any of the specific divorced gender/ethnicity groups.

Multivariate normality was assessed with Mardia's index using Amos 17.0. In all cases, the Mardia's index was found to be non-significant ($p > 0.05$) for all groups indicating multivariate normality. However, because of the abnormal distributions among the maternal variables, all of the modeling was performed twice, first using Maximum

Likelihood Estimators (MLR) and the second using bootstrapping. The two results were found to be similar and consequently only the conventional results are reported here.

**Indices of fit.** Because a single index only reflects a particular aspect of a model, a variety of global fit indices were used. The indices chosen for this analysis were the traditional overall chi-square test of model fit, the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) and the Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI). The criteria of good model fit for the chi-square test of model fit is a small chi-square statistic that is statistically non-significant. However, the chi-square statistic is sensitive to the size of both the correlations and the sample and can thus lead unnecessarily to the rejection of the null hypothesis (Kline, 2005). On the other hand, it is useful when analyzing invariance across groups and as such is generally reported (Kline, 2005).

The CFI is an incremental fit index where values greater than .90 indicate adequate fit of the data (Schwartz & Finley, 2010). The RMSEA index is a parsimonious index of fit that penalizes for increased complexity of models. The criteria for a satisfactory fit for RMSEA is a value of .10 or lower (Kline, 2005). The differences in CFI and RMSEA of fit were used along with NNFI for model comparison. The NNFI is a sample-based, parsimonious index of fit that is sensitive to differences between models (Kline, 2005; Schwartz & Finley, 2010). The criteria for model invariance are given in the next section.

**Analysis of Scales**

Confirmatory and exploratory factor analysis was used to confirm internally consistent subscales for select variables. For Exploratory Factor analysis, the extraction method used was Principal Component Analysis with Variance Maximization (Varimax)

rotation that increases the interpretability of the extracted factors (Finley, Mira, & Schwartz, 2008).

**Friendship scales**. A variety of solutions was sought for the development of a friendship scale using the five items listed in Table 1. Many of the solutions with 3 or fewer items gave higher reliability coefficients than the five item scale with 2-subscales, but these tended to be dominated by one or two specific items (Table 2). The 2-subscale model fit the data adequately, $\chi^2$ (4) = 38.28, p<.001, CFI = .98, and RMSEA = .08. As such, this final solution was used, and the decision was made to report both the subscales and the individual item for some statistics. The subscale containing the three friendship quality measures was called the Friendship Quality subscale and had a Cronbach's alpha of .71. The internal consistency and factor loading was similar to that of the Bukowski, Hoza and Boivins (1994) Security domain subscales. The second subscale named Friendship I/S subscale contained the items: the Importance of and satisfaction of friendship and has a Cronbach's alpha of .58. The factor loadings for the subscales are given in Table 3.

**Self-esteem/Life satisfaction scale (SE/LS scale).** The revised scale for subjective well-being was analyzed using only the self-esteem and life satisfaction items. These items loaded evenly onto this scale (Table 4). The Cronbach's alpha was .72, which compares favorably to the original scale (Finley & Schwartz, 2007).

**Nurturance scales.** The reliability of the nurturance scales was calculated and compared to previously reported values (Finley & Schwartz, 2004; Finley, Mira, & Schwartz, 2008). The Cronbach's alpha for the Nurturant Fathering scale was .93 and that for the Nurturant Mothering scale was.90, both identical to the previous values. As

before, a one-factor solution was indicated for both scales. As the Nurturant Mothering scale does not have the same psychometric history as the Nurturant Fathering scale, the reliability and confirmatory analysis results are reported here in Table 5.

**Involvement scales.** Consistent with previous work, analysis of the Father Involvement scale indicated a 3-subscale model with Cronbach's alphas of .89 for instrumental involvement, .91 for expressive involvement and .88 for mentoring and advising involvement (Finley & Schwartz, 2004). The reliability and structure of the Maternal Involvement scale was calculated and compared to previously reported values (Finley, Mira, & Schwartz, 2008). A three factor solution also was indicated for mother involvement ($\chi^2$ (133) = 1460.9, p<.001; Table 6). Cronbach's alphas were .79 for instrumental mother involvement, .85 for expressive mother involvement, and .81 for mentoring/advising mother involvement.

**Parental Latent Variables.** For Confirmatory Factor Analysis, a measurement model with the proposed factor structure for the Nurturance and involvement scales were analyzed for adequate model fit. One latent variable was created for the all of the mother involvement subscales and the mother nurturance scale and another created for the corresponding father nurturance and involvement scales. These latent variables were allowed to co-vary. Modification indices additionally suggested allowing some of the mother and father subscales to co-vary, for instance the father instrumental and the father mentoring involvement. These suggestions made theoretical sense and were included in the final model. The resulting model fit the data adequately, $\chi^2$ (13) = 42.09, CFI = .99, and RMSEA = .04. All factor pattern coefficients were .72 or higher (see Figure 1).

The measurement model was also tested to determine the extent to which it was consistent across gender, family form (intact and divorced) and ethnicity (Hispanics, Whites and Blacks). A series of multi-group invariance analyses was conducted to achieve this. The fit statistic for the unconstrained model compared to those for the constrained models indicating the extent to which the null hypothesis of invariance should be retained or rejected. Invariance was assumed across groups if two of the following three criteria were met: non-significant $\Delta\chi^2$, $\Delta$CFI < .01, and $\Delta$NNFI<.02. Results of this analysis indicated that the parental measurement model was invariant across gender, $\Delta\chi^2$ (6) = 11.92, p =.06, $\Delta$CFI = 0, and $\Delta$NNFI = -0.001; family form, $\Delta\chi^2$ (6) = 78.85, p <.05, $\Delta$CFI = .007, and $\Delta$NNFI =.009; and ethnicity, $\Delta\chi^2$ (12) = 17.16, p = .14, $\Delta$CFI = 0, and $\Delta$NNFI = -0.001.

**Descriptive Statistics**

**Outcome variables.** The main effects of ethnicity, gender and family form were examined using ANOVA. Examining ethnicity only, the means for all variables except self-esteem were higher for Whites than for Hispanics or Blacks (Table 7). Least Significant Difference (LSD) Post hoc tests revealed highly significant mean differences between Blacks and Whites for most friendship variables, modestly significant differences between Blacks and Hispanics and few significant differences between Whites and Hispanics. This was not the case for self-esteem (F (2, 1356) = 1.59, p = .21) or friendship conflict (F (2, 1356) = 1.97, p = .14). Within the subscales, only the Friendship I/S subscale (F (2, 1356) = 4.64, p<.001) and Friendship Quality subscale (F (2, 1356) = 8.18, p<.001) were significantly different according to ethnicity. The

standardized effect sizes were relatively small for the significantly different relationships. Mean differences, effect sizes and other statistics are reported on Table 8.

The main effect of gender was small, with mean differences ranging from .16 to .03. The strongest effect was in self-esteem, $\Delta M = .15$, $F(1, 1358) = 8.62$, $p<.01$. Mean differences for all of the subscales were not significant. The effect for family form was even smaller than that of gender. The mean differences for gender and family form and their effect sizes are shown in Table 9.

There was a significant interaction effect when examining all three demographic factors at once for Friendship I/S subscale ($\chi^2(11) = 38.2$, $p<.001$) and Friendship Quality subscale ($\chi^2(11) = 23.64$, $p<.05$) but not for SE/LS subscale ($\chi^2(11) = 17.95$, $p = .08$). White females from intact families scored higher than all other groups on all variables with two notable exceptions, Black males from Divorced families and Hispanic males from intact families in self-esteem. Conversely, Black females from both family forms scored consistently lower. These data are shown in Table 10. Unfortunately, the small sample size in some of these groups, e.g. N = 19 for Black males from divorced families and N = 19 from intact families, made it inappropriate to further investigate the interaction effect (S. Schwartz, personal communication, September, 2010).

**Nurturance.** Father nurturance showed some effects of gender, family form, and ethnicity. The main effects of family form and ethnicity were significant ($F(1, 1357) = 178.07$, $p<.001$ and $F(2, 1356) = 32.06$, $p<.05$, respectively), but that of gender was not. However, there was an interaction, with females of all ethnicities from divorced families having significantly lowered father nurturance ($\chi^2(3) = 247.6$, $p<.001$) when compared to males from both family forms and females from intact families. This was particularly

evident for Black females (M = 2.50 ± .12). While the means for all of the mother nurturance measures were higher than that of father nurturance, similar significant patterns of main effects emerged for family form ($F(1, 1357) = 18.2$, $p<.001$), ethnicity ($F(2, 1356) = 4.95$, $p<.001$) and non-significant for gender. All of these means are presented in Table 11.

**Involvement.** Parental involvement also showed some effects of gender, family form and ethnicity (Table 12 and 13). All three domains of father involvement were significant for the three main effects ($3.75< F > 124.16$, $p<.01$). However for mother involvement only expressive involvement showed a significant gender effect ($F(1, 1347) = 11.426$, $p<.01$) and instrumental involvement showed a significant ethnicity effect ($F(21, 1347) = 7.46$, $p<.01$). Family form had no effect on mother involvement.

As with paternal nurturance, there was an interesting interaction effect with Black females from divorced families having significantly lower father involvement in all three domains ($2.13< M > 2.48$) compared to Hispanic ($3.55< M > 4.16$) and White ($3.59< M > 4.14$) females from intact families who had the highest ranges of involvement. In contrast, for maternal involvement, this pattern was seen between White males from intact families ($3.59< M > 3.96$) and Hispanic females from intact families ($4.17< M > 4.31$). These highlighted differences are summarized in Table 14.

**Bivariate correlations**

As predicted, both father and mother nurturance and involvement correlated positively with characteristics of peer relationships, self-esteem and life satisfaction. Pearson correlation coefficients ranged from .07 to.33 for mother variables and from .07 to.28 for father variables. All coefficients were significant ($p<.01$, Tables 15 and 16).

Using Fisher's Z-transformation, the correlations between the mother and father variables with the outcome variables were compared (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003). The differences were only significant for the correlations between importance of friendships and nurturance, $Z = 2.03$, $p<.05$, and life satisfaction and mentoring involvement, $Z = 2.37$, $p<.05$. The pattern of correlation was in sharp contrast to what was found when these variables were examined simultaneously in a Structural equation Model. SEM is discussed further in the next section.

The psychosocial variables were also positively correlated with each other. Pearson correlation coefficients ranged from.15 to.36 and were all significant ($p<.01$). Relationships between these variables were further specified by modification indices during the formation of the structural model, as is discussed below. These correlations are given in Table 17.

**Structural Equation Models**

Following analysis of the raw data correlations, a structural equation model was created to test the extent to which the parental variables contributed mutually or differentially to psychosocial functioning, using the measurement model given in Figure 1 and the correlated psychosocial outcome subscales. The purpose of this analysis was to establish a common model form across all of the data. Initial analysis of the *a priori* model yielded modification indices larger than 1.96, suggesting allowing the outcome variables to co-vary. Since the Friendship subscales correlated with LS/SE scale (Table 17) this suggestion was considered theoretically meaningful and the co-varying between the outcome variables was included in the model. The resultant model yielded a good fit to the data. The overall chi-square of model fit was statistically significant, $\chi^2(29) =$

58.29 $p < .001$. The RMSEA was 0.009 and the CFI was .997. The path coefficients from the latent parent variables to the psychosocial variables ranged from .10 to .26 and between the psychosocial outcomes from .09 to.30. All of these path coefficients were statistically significant. The model is shown in Figure 2.

As with the measurement model, a series of multi-group invariance analyses were conducted to test the extent to which the model was consistent across gender, family form (intact and divorced) and ethnicity (Hispanic, Whites, and Blacks). The same criteria discussed above were used and results of this analysis indicated that the model was variant across family form, $\Delta\chi^2 (6) = 548.6$, $p < .05$, $\Delta$CFI = .053, and $\Delta$NNFI =.037, gender, $\Delta\chi^2 (6) = 2242$, $p < .05$, $\Delta$CFI = .209, and $\Delta$NNFI =.227, and ethnicity, $\Delta\chi^2 (12) = 2533$, $p < .05$, $\Delta$CFI = .238, and $\Delta$NNFI =.244. As such, the null hypothesis of equal path coefficients within the different groups was rejected.

Figures 3-5 present relevant coefficients for the structural models for the different groups: gender, family form, and ethnicity. The effect of maternal and paternal variables was consistently higher for males, intact families, and Blacks. For instance, it can be seen that the effect of father nurturance and involvement on friendship quality was stronger for males (path = .72, $p<.01$) than it was for females (path = .18, $p<.01$; Figure 3). A summary of these data along with Z-score statistics are shown in Table 18.

Significant differences were also noted in the correlations between the maternal and paternal variables and the outcome scales. Fathers had significantly higher influence on males, participants from intact families and Blacks in friendship quality and importance/satisfaction but not for life satisfaction and self-esteem. Mothers had significantly higher influence on life satisfaction and self-esteem for participants from

divorced families only. There was no significant difference in the parental influence for the other groups: females, Whites and Hispanics. These data are presented in Table 19.

# Chapter V

## Discussion

The most important finding of this study is that males, Blacks and children from intact families received considerably more influence from both parents for all of the psychosocial outcomes examined. Secondarily to this, fathers had a greater influence on friendship quality and importance but not on self-esteem and life satisfaction than did mothers. The difference between paternal and maternal influences highlights the detrimental effects of underpinning past and current social trends that exclude fathers and underestimate their impact in their children's lives. These findings are of social significance to the way children are treated clinically and viewed generally.

The present study examined the role of gender, family form, and ethnicity in the differential influence of parental involvement and nurturance in friendship characteristics and psychosocial functioning. This dissertation is important because peer relationships serve developmentally salient roles pointing to healthy psychosocial functioning (Parker, Rubin, Erath, Wojslawowics, & Buskirk, 2006; Kerns, Contreras, & Neal-Barnett, 2000; Gifford-Smith & Brownell**,** 2003). Peer relationship quality is used diagnostically in both clinical and subclinical populations, and it is important to account for the parental contexts that contribute to quantifiable differences that are usually attributed to psychopathology (Parker, Rubin, Erath, Wojslawowics, & Buskirk, 2006; Gifford-Smith & Brownell**,** 2003).

The initial goal of this study was to show that all of the measured parental nurturing and involvement behaviors were positively related to the characteristics of peer friendships, life satisfaction, and self-esteem. The second goal of this study was to

ascertain if these relationships varied as a function of gender, family form, or culture. Finally, the third goal was to develop a model of mutually contributing parental variables and to see if these variables had a significant different influence on friendship outcomes, and psychosocial functioning. An addition to this goal was to see if this model was consistent across gender, ethnicity, and family form.

**Relationship between variables**

As expected, reports of both maternal and paternal nurturance and involvement were positively linked with all of the friendship characteristics and psychosocial outcomes. The results correspond with those results reported in previous research (Schwartz & Finley, 2010). The correlation between friendship characteristics, self-esteem and life satisfaction is not surprising given that these are all linked to mental health difficulties, personality development and interpersonal skills (Gifford-Smith & Brownell**,** 2003; Makinen & Pychyl, 2001; Parker, Rubin, Erath, Wojslawowics, & Buskirk, 2006).

**Moderation variables**

**Effect of family form.** Consistent with previous research, a considerable family form effect was seen in all aspects of psychosocial functioning (Finley & Schwartz, 2010). Across the board, paternal involvement and nurturance was lower in divorced families. A similar pattern was the same for maternal involvement and nurturance, which was also lower than that of intact families, with two notable exceptions, Black females and White males received more maternal attention than did the other groups. However, although both of these groups received higher maternal attention, the mean values of friendship quality, self-esteem, and life satisfaction were not appreciably different from

those of intact families and the other divorced family groups. Although interesting, these findings are eclipsed by the notably greater relationships between parental variables and outcome variables in intact families compared to divorced families. Collectively these results point toward a collapse in parental influence or the family system when the family does not remain intact.

**Effect of gender.** The results of gender moderation were also consistent with previous research on paternal involvement and nurturance (Finley & Schwartz, 2007). Surprisingly, these results were similar for maternal variables. The difference between parental involvements for the genders was most pronounced when maternal and paternal involvements were examined simultaneously in the model, with both parents being significantly more involved in their sons' lives.

**Effect of culture.** Mean differences in the friendship security domain between the three ethnic groups point to a cultural difference in the functionality of friendships. Ethnic differences were also noted in the differences between the importance and satisfaction of friendships, with Blacks reporting significantly lower satisfaction with their friendships and placing less importance on these relationships. It was proposed that this difference would be expected for both Hispanics and Blacks because of the possibility of extended kinship networks preferentially filling these functions. However, this has not been the case, suggesting that this is not necessarily an effect of extended kinship ties but one specific to Black cultures.

When parental involvement was examined simultaneously within the model, all path coefficients for Blacks were significantly higher than for Whites and Hispanics. As this is not reflected in corresponding variations in parenting quantity, it does reflect

possibilities of differences in parental content. Specifically it may be that Black parents place more emphasis on influencing the quality and importance of their children's relationships but these children place less importance on them but also derive less satisfaction from them.

**Contribution of the present study and implication**

This study has the following potential theoretical, social, and clinical contributions and implications.

**Theoretical implications.** The findings here give support for both Rohner's PARTheory and Bowlby's Attachment theory (Rohner, Khalique, & Cournoyer, 2005; Bowlby, 1982). While parents may initially direct and influence children's friendship, culture appears to play a more dominant role in transmitting the importance of and the salient features of friendships as children grow older. The results here extend those of Black et al, indicating that social context is indeed developmentally salient. Gender, family form and ethnicity all moderated the relationship, indicating that a socially derived theoretical perspective may be necessary when examining variables such as parental involvement, peer relationships and psychosocial functioning.

**Social implications.** The results point to significant ethnicity, gender, and family form differences in how parents influence friendship quality and psychosocial functioning. An unpredicted pattern of maternal influence was discovered with the evidence showing mothers are as preferential toward their sons as are fathers but have less influence on both groups of children compared to fathers. This is in spite of having greater involvement in all aspects of care and nurturing. Mothers cannot replace fathers.

With this in mind, it cannot be stated strong enough that the current trend of

father's absence, whether deliberate or otherwise, is detrimental to children's healthy development and that all efforts should be made to reverse this trend. These results provide additional support for the advocating of changes in family policy, family legislation, and legal practice in the continued encouragement of involved fathers in their children's lives.

Additionally, research on emerging dominant family forms such as the reconstituted families is called for to determine if these findings are replicable in such a population. This is important as it behooves social policy to be informed by empirical research.

**Clinical implications.** Currently, there is "no formal diagnostic category for disturbed peer relationships…in the DSM IV", (Parker, Rubin, Erath, Wojslawowics, & Buskirk, 2006). However, assessment of interpersonal relations is included in many diagnostic tools such as The Autism Diagnostic Interview, The Children's Depression Inventory, and Anxiety Disorders Interview. While rarely versed in the current research on peer – peer relationships, clinical professionals clearly view impaired social functioning in this area as a current or predictive indicator of clinical and subclinical psychopathology (Parker, Rubin, Erath, Wojslawowics, & Buskirk, 2006). Consequently, premorbid development of problematic peer relationships should be properly assessed, so that clinicians can determine if reported functioning is indicative of an axial diagnosis or simply a reflection of differential parenting. The current findings provide evidence-based information for the influence of parents on subclinical populations and the moderation of these relationships by gender, family form, and ethnicity demographics.

**Limitations and future research directions**

Although the results in this study show significant ethnic, family form and gender differences, they need to be considered in light of several limitations. First, the population was a college sample and as such inherited certain limiting characteristics, such as having a high percentage of female participants. This is a common limitation when using such samples, as the general college population is 60% female. The use of this sample also excludes disadvantaged individuals who, for a variety of reasons, do not attend college. Second, the majority of the participants lived off campus at home and in two parent families in a middle socioeconomic bracket. This is characteristic of the population of Florida International University, but does not reflect the high single parenting rate endemic in the national population.

Third, these nonstandard characteristics were further enhanced by the restriction of the sample to include only reports on biological parents. While implemented to enhance analysis and improve the overall cohesion of the data, the effect of this limitation was to exclude a significant group of parents, i.e. stepparents and single, never-married parents. Schwartz and Finley (2006) found significant difference in the involvement and nurturance of stepfathers, adoptive fathers and adoptive stepfathers in their analysis on fathering across family forms. An examination of other non-traditional families forms would have added ecological validity to this study. These observations would be important because with the high rate of divorce, remarriage, and unwed parenting, the reconstituted and single parent families are fast becoming the new dominant family forms (Finlay, Mira, & Schwartz, 2008). Future research should endeavor to replicate this study

with a community sample to enhance the applicability of the present findings by including groups excluded not represented in college samples.

Fourth, the sample sizes for the three ethnic groups were sufficient to do overall analyses, but were inadequate to do finer grain analysis such as with-in group analyses for Caribbean Blacks, Africans, Mexicans, Cubans, and South Americans etc. Other minority groups such as Asian Americans and Native Americans were present but excluded because the sample sizes were too small to be analyzed statistically. Additionally, this sample was obtained in a highly Hispanic population, one that is specific to Miami. While this reflects the expected increased minorities in the national population, it does not represent the current US population (Humes, Jones, & Ramirez, 2011). Replicating this study in other populations that have higher densities of Whites, Blacks, Asians, and immigrants would be beneficial for building a sound research base.

Initially, it was hypothesized that the existence of strong extended families ties in two ethnicities would affect the contributions of parents, the overall cohesion of the family unit, and as a consequence, the characteristics of friendships in Blacks and Hispanics. However, this has not been the case in the Hispanic group, which was similar to the White group, despite similarities with Blacks in family network ties. One suggested reason for this is the high percentage of persons of Cuban nationality in this sample (4% of participants and 25 % of parents were born in Cuba, 30% overall of Cuban descent). According to the Pew Hispanic Center (2006), Cuban households, more than any other Hispanic group, resemble non-Hispanic White households in educational attainment, earnings, employment rates, rate of home-ownership and family structure.

## Conclusion

In conclusion, the current study identified a model of similar as well as differential parental influences on friendship quality and importance and psychosocial functioning that was moderated by gender, family form, and ethnicity. Maternal influence was either the same or significantly lower than paternal influence in all of the measured characteristics except for self-esteem in divorced families. Ethnic differences between paternal and maternal influences were significant for Blacks in friendship importance and satisfaction, and for all ethnicities in friendship quality, with fathers being significantly more influential.

Despite limitations, this research contributes to the growing body of research showing the crucial value to society of parental involvement and nurturance within intact families. Critically it also shows the importance of fathers to the social and emotional development of their children. It has important implications for established theories on childhood development, for social policy on children's living arrangements, and for clinical applications in both diagnosing and treating psychopathology.

## REFERENCES


Achenbach, T. M., & Edelbrock, C. S. (1986). *Manual for the Teacher's Report Form and teacher version of the Child Behavior Profile.* Burlington, VT: University of Vermont/Dept Psychiatry.

Amato, P. R. (2000). The consequences of divorce for adults and children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 62* (4), 1269-1287.

Amato, P. R. (2001). Children of divorce in the 1990s: An update of the Amato and Keith (1991) meta-analysis. *Journal of Family Psychology, 15*, 355–370.

Amato, P. R. (2003). Reconciling divergent perspectives: Judith Wallerstein, quantitative family research, and children of divorce. *Family Relations,* 52, 332–339.

Amato, P. R., & Keith, B. (1991). Parental divorce and the well-being of children: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 110*, 26–46.

Antecol, H., & Bedard, K. (2007). Does single parenthood increase the probability of teenage promiscuity, substance use, and crime? *J Popul Econ, 20,* 55–71.

Aroian, K. J., Hough, E.S., Templin, T.N., & Kaskiri, E.A. (2008). Development and psychometric evaluation of an Arab version of the family peer relationship. *Questionnaire Research in Nursing & Health, 31,* 402–416.

Black, K.A., Whittingham, C.L., Reardon, L.E., & Tumolo, J.M. (2007). Associations between young adults' recollections of their childhood experiences with parents and observations of their interaction behavior with best friends. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 31*(1), 28–37.

Bowlby, J. (1982). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment* (2 ed.) NY: Basic Books.

Brown, T.L., Linver, M.R., Evans, M., & DeGennaro, D. (2009). African–American parents' racial and ethnic socialization and adolescent academic grades: teasing out the role of gender. *J Youth Adolescence, 38*, 214–227.

Bukowski, W., Hoza, B., & Boivin, M. (1994). Measuring friendship quality during pre- and early adolescence: the development and psychometric properties of the friendship qualities scale. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships,* 11, 471-484.

Coll, C.G. (2001). Cultural influences on children's and families' well-being. In A. Thornton (Ed.), *The well-being of children and families: Research and data needs.* (pp. 244-261). Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S.G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/ correlation. Analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Contreras, J.M., & Kerns, K.A. (2000). Emotion regulation processes: Explaining links between parent-child attachment and peer relationships. In K.A. Kerns, J.M. Contreras, & A.M. Neal-Barnett (Eds.), *Family and Peers: Linking Two Social Worlds.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Dishion, T. J., Poulin, F., & Skaggs, N.M. (2000). The ecology of premature autonomy in adolescence: Biological and social influences. In K.A. Kerns, J.M. Contreras, & A.M. Neal-Barnett (Eds.), *Family and Peers: Linking Two Social Worlds.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Donoghue, J. M. (2011).Clinical application of parental acceptance-rejection theory (PARTheory) measures in relational therapy, assessment and treatment. *ProQuest Information & Learning, 7*(11-A), 1-164

Ellis, B. J., Bates, J. E., Dodge, K. A., Fergusson, D. M., Horwood, L. J., Pettit, G. S., & Woodward, L. (2003). Does father absence place daughters at special risk for early sexual activity and teenage pregnancy? *Child Development*, *74,* 801–821.

Ellis, B. J.**,** & Garber, J. (2000). Psychosocial antecedents of variation in girls' pubertal timing: Maternal depression, stepfather presence, and marital and family stress. *Child Development*, 71(2), 485-501.

Finley, G. E., Mira, S.D., & Schwartz, S. J. (2008). Perceived paternal and maternal involvement: factor structures, mean differences, and parental roles. *Fathering, 6* (1), 62-82.

Finley, G. E., & Schwartz, S. J. (2004). The father involvement and nurturant fathering scales: Retrospective measures for adolescent and adult children. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 64*(1), 143-164.

Finley, G. E., & Schwartz, S. J. (2006). Parsons and Bales revisited: Young adult children's characterization of the fathering role. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 7*(1): 42–55.

Finley, G. E., & Schwartz, S. J. (2007). Father involvement and long-term young adult outcomes: The differential contributions of divorce and gender. *Family Court Review, 45*(4), 573-587.

Finley, G.E., & Schwartz, S. J. (2010). The divided world of the child: divorce and long-term psychosocial adjustment. *Family Court Review, 48*(3), 516–527.

Fisher, C. B., Jackson, J.F., & Villarruel, F.A. (1998).The study of African American and Latin American children and youth. In W. Damon & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 1: Theoretical models of human development* (5th ed.) (pp. 1145-1207). NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Gaunt, R. (2008). Maternal Gatekeeping: antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Family Issues, 29,* 373.

Gifford-Smith, M.E., & Brownell, C.A. (2003). Childhood peer relationships: social acceptance,friendships, and peer networks. *Journal of School Psychology, 41*, 235–284.

Hart, C.H., Nelson, D.A., Robinson, C.C., Olsen, S.F., McNeilly-Choque, M.K., Porter, C.L., & McKee, T.R. (2000). Russian parenting styles and family processes: Linkages with subtypes of victimization and aggression. In K.A. Kerns, J.M. Contreras, & A.M. Neal-Barnett (Eds.), *Family and Peers: Linking Two Social Worlds.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Howes, C., & Tonyan, H. (2000). Links between adult and peer relations across four developmental periods. In K.A. Kerns, J.M. Contreras, & A.M. Neal-Barnett (Eds.), *Family and Peers: Linking Two Social Worlds*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Humes, K.R., Jones, N.A., & Ramirez, R.R. (2011). Overview of race and Hispanic origin: 2010. *2010 Census briefs. U.S Census Bureau.* Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-02.pdf.

Kelly, J. B. (2007). Children's Living Arrangements Following Separation and Divorce: Insights from Empirical and Clinical Research. *Family Process, Special Issue: Divorce and Its Aftermath, 46*(1), 35-52.

Kerns, K.A., Contreras, J.M., & Neal-Barnett, A.M. (Eds). (2000). *Family and Peers: Linking Two Social Worlds.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Khalique, A., & Rohner, R. (2002). Perceived parental acceptance-rejection and psychological adjustment: A meta-analysis of cross cultural and intracultural studies. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 64*, 54-64.

Kline, R.B. (2005). *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling*. NY: The Guildford Press.

Lamb, M.E. (1999). Noncustodial fathers and their impact on the children of divorce. In R.A Thompson & P.R Amato (Eds.), *The postdivorce family: children, parenting and society* (pp 105-125). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.

Lamb, M.E., & Sternberg, K. J. (1992). Sociocultural perspectives on nonparental child care. In M.E. Lamb, K.J. Sternberg, C. Hwang, & A.G. Broberg (Eds.), *Child care in context: Cross-cultural perspectives.* NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lansford, J.E. (2009). Parental divorce and children's adjustment. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 4*(2), 140-152.

Lansford, J.E., & Parker, J.E. (1999). Children's interactions in triads: Behavioral profiles and effects of gender and patterns of friendships among members. *Developmental Psychology, 35*(1), 80-93.

Larson, J., Kigin. M.L., & Holman, T.B. (2008). Increasing the awareness of risks and needs for premarital interventions of individuals at risk for relationship dysfunction: an exploratory study. *Journal of Couple & Relationship Therapy: Innovations in Clinical and Educational Interventions, 7*(4), 281–296.

Lei, M., & Lomax, R.G. (2005). The effect of varying degrees of nonnormality in structural equation modeling. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 12* (1), 1 – 27.

Lesane, C. (2002). Race socialization in black families: A selective review of the literature. *African American Review Prospectives, 8*(1), 27-34.

Makinen, J.A., & Pychyl., T.A. (2001). The differential effects of project stress on life-satisfaction. *Social Indicators Research, 53*, 1-16.

Mandara, J., Murray, C., & Joyner, T.N. (2005). The impact of fathers' absence on African American adolescents' gender role development. *Sex Roles, 53*(3/4), 207-219.

Martin J.A., Hamilton, B.E., Sutton, P.D.,Ventura, S.J., Mathews, T.J., & Osterman, M.J. (2010). Births: Final data for 2008. *National vital statistics reports, 59*(1), 1-72.

Marquardt, E. (2005). *Between two worlds: The inner lives of children of divorce*. NY: Crown Publishers.

Mayseless, O., Sharabany, R., & Sag, A. (1997). Attachment concerns of mothers as manifested in parental, spousal, and friendship relationships. *Personal Relationships, 4*, 255-269.

McBride, B.A., Schoppe, S.J., & Rane, T.R. (2002). Child characteristics, parenting stress, and parental involvement: fathers versus mothers source. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 64* (4), 998-1011.

McDowell, D.J., & Parke, R.D. (2009). Parental correlates of children's peer relations: An empirical test of a tripartite model. *Developmental Psychology, 45*(1), 224-235.

McLanahan, S., Garfinkel, I., Reichman, N., & Teitler, J. (2001). Unwed parents or fragile families? Implications for welfare and child support policy. In L. Wu & B. Wolfe (Eds.), *Out of wedlock: trends, causes, and consequences of nonmarital fertility*. (pp. 202-228). NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Mize, J., Pettit, G.S., & Meece, D. (2000). Explaining the link between parenting behavior and children's peer competence: A critical examination of the "mediating-process" hypothesis. In K.A. Kerns, J.M. Contreras, & A.M. Neal-Barnett (Eds.), *Family and Peers: Linking Two Social Worlds*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Mounts, N.S. (2000). Parental management of adolescent peer relationships: What are its effects on friend selection? In K.A. Kerns, J.M. Contreras, & A.M. Neal-Barnett (Eds.), *Family and Peers: Linking Two Social Worlds.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Neher, L.S., & Short, J.L. (1998). Risk and protective factors for children's substance use and antisocial behavior following parental divorce. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 68*(1), 154-161.

Nelson, E.C., Heath, A.C., Madden, P.A.F., Cooper, M.L., Dinwiddie, S.H., Bucholz, K.K., Glowinski, A., McLaughlin, T., Dunne, M.P., Statham, D.J., & Martin, N.G. (2002). Association between self-reported childhood sexual abuse and adverse psychosocial outcomes: results from a twin study. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*, 59(2), 139-145.

O'Neil, R., & Parke, R.D. (2000). Family-peer relationships: The role of emotion regulation, cognitive understanding, and attentional processes as mediating processes. In K.A. Kerns, J.M. Contreras, & A.M. Neal-Barnett's (Eds*.), Family and Peers: Linking Two Social Worlds.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Parke, R.D. (2000). Father Involvement. *Marriage & Family Review, 29*(2), 43-58

Parke, R.D. (2004). Fathers, families, and the future: A plethora of plausible predictions. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 50*(4), 456-470.

Parke, R. D., Burks, V. M., Carson, J. L., Neville, B., & Boyum, L. A. (1994). Family-peer relationships: A tripartite model. In R. D. Parke & S. G. Kellam (Eds.), *Exploring family relationships with other social contexts* (pp. 115–145). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Parker, J.G., Rubin, K.H., Erath, S.A., Wojslawowicz, J.C., & Buskirk, A.A. (2006). Peer relationships, child development, and adjustment: A developmental psychopathology perspective. In D. Cicchetti & D. J. Cohen (Eds), *Developmental Psychopathology, Vol.1, Theory and Method*, (2Ed). NY: Wiley & sons.

Pew Hispanic Center (2006). Cubans in the United States. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from http://pewhispanic.org/files/factsheets/23.pdf

Phares, V., Fields, S., & Kamboukos, D. (2009). Fathers' and mothers' involvement with their adolescents. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 18*, 1–9.

Quintana, S.M., Aboud, F.E., Chao, R.K., Contreras-Grau, J., Cross, Jr. W.E., Hudley, C., Hughes, D., Liben, L.S., Nelson-Le Gall, S., & Vietze, D.L. (2006). Race, ethnicity, and culture in child development: Contemporary research and future directions. *Child Development*, *77*(5),1129-1141.

Reid, M.L., & Finley, G.E. (2010). Trends in African American and Caribbean fathers' nurturance and involvement. *Culture, Society and Masculinities 2* (2): 107-120.

Robins, R.W., Hendin, H.M., & Trzesniewski, K.H. (2001). Measuring global self-esteem: construct validation of a single-item measure and the Rosenberg self-esteem scale. *Pers Soc Psychol Bull 27,* 151-171.

Roff, M. (1961). Childhood social interactions and young adult bad conduct. *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 63*, 333–337.

Roff, M. (1963). Childhood social interactions and young adult psychosis. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 19*, 152–157.

Rohner, R., Khalique, A., & Cournoyer, D.E. (2005). Parental acceptance-rejection: Theory, methods, cross cultural evidence and implications. *Ethos, 33*(3), 299-334.

Rohner, R., & Veneziano, R.A. (2001). The importance of father love: History and contemporary evidence. *Review of General Psychology, 5*(4), 382-405.

Rose, A. J., & Asher, S. R. (2000). Children's friendships. In S. S. Hendrick & C. Hendrick (Eds.), *Close relationships: A sourcebook* (pp. 47–57). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rothbaum F., Rosen, K., Ujiie, T., & Uchida, N. (2002). Family Systems Theory, Attachment Theory, and Culture. *Family Process, 41* (3), 328–350.

Rubin, K.H., Dwyer, K.M., Booth-LaForce, C., Kim, A.H., Burgess, K.B., & Rose-Krasnor, L. (2004). Attachment, friendship, and psychosocial functioning in early adolescence. *The Journal of Early Adolescence 24*, 326-356.

Schwartz, S. J., & Finley, G. E. (2005a). Divorce-related variables as predictors of young adults' retrospective fathering reports. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage, 44*(1/2), 145-162.

Schwartz, S. J., & Finley, G. E. (2005b). Fathering in intact and divorced families: Ethnic differences in retrospective reports. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 67*, 207-215.

Schwartz, S.J., & Finley, G.E. (2009). Mothering, fathering, and divorce: the influence of divorce on reports of and desires for maternal and paternal involvement. *Family Court Review*, *47* (3), 506-522.

Schwartz, SJ., Zamboanga, B., Ravert, R., Kim, S.Y., Weisskirch, R., Williams, M., Bersamin, M., & Finley, G.E. (2009). Perceived parental relationships and health risk behaviors in college-attending emerging adults. *Journal of Marriage and Family. 71*(3), 727-740.

Serafica, F.C., & Vargas, L.A. (2006). Cultural diversity in the development of child psychopathology. In D. Cicchetti & D. J. Cohen (Eds), *Developmental Psychopathology, Vol.1, Theory and Method, 2Ed.* NY: Wiley & sons.

Shin, Y. (2007). Peer relationships, social behaviors, academic performance and loneliness in Korean primary school children. S*chool Psy Int, 28,* 220.

Teachman, J., Day, R., Paasch, K., Carver, K., & Call, V. (1998). Sibling resemblance in behavioral and cognitive outcomes: The role of father presence. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 60*(4), 835-848.

Tejada-Vera, B., & Sutton, P.D. (2010). Births, marriages, divorces, and deaths: Provisional data for 2009. *National vital statistics reports, 58* (25).

Timmer, S.G., & Veroff, J. (2000). Family Ties and the Discontinuity of Divorce in Black and White Newlywed Couples. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 62*(2), 349–361.

Wical, K.A., & Doherty, W.J. (2005). How reliable are fathers' reports of involvement with their children? A methodological report. *Fathering, 3*(1), 81-91.

Wilcox, R.R. (2002). Understanding the practical advantages of modern ANOVA methods. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 31*(3), 399–412.

Zarbatany, L., McDougall, P. and Hymel, S. (2000). Gender-differentiated experience in the peer culture: links to intimacy in preadolescence. *Soc Development, 9*, 62–79.

# APPENDICES

**Table 1**

*Friendship Items*

| Item | Mean (SD) |
|---|---|
| How would you describe your overall satisfaction with your friendships | 3.83 (.94) |
| If my closest friend and I have a fight or argument, we can apologize and everything will be OK. | 3.56 (.68) |
| I can be completely open with my closest friend. | 3.51 (.75) |
| How important are the friendships in your life? | 3.45 (.70) |
| I can always count on my closest friend. | 3.44 (.77) |

**Table 2**

*Friendship Scale Development*

| # items | Included items | Factors extracted | Cronbach's Alpha |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5 items[a] | Importance of and Satisfaction with friendships, Friendship Conflict, Disclosure and Reliability | 2 | .69 |
| 4 items[b] | Importance of Friendships, Friendship Conflict, Disclosure and Reliability | 1 | .67 |
| 4 items[cd] | Importance of and Satisfaction with Friendships, Friendship Disclosure and Reliability | 2 | .67 |
| 3 items[c] | Friendship Conflict, Disclosure and Reliability | 1 | .71 |
| 3 items[c] | Importance of and Satisfaction with Friendships, Friendship Conflict | 1 | .50 |
| 2 items[c] | Disclosure and Reliability | 1 | .77 |
| 2 items[ce] | Importance of and Satisfaction with Friendships | 1 | .58 |
| 2 items[c] | Disclosure and Conflict | 1 | .56 |

*Note*. Extraction method: Principal Component Analysis, Varimax rotation.

[a]$\chi^2$ (1) = 2.85. [b]$\chi^2$ (2) = 21.18. [c]Goodness of fit indices could not be calculated.

[d]Friendship Quality subscale. [e]Friendship I/S subscale

**Table 3**

*Exploratory Factor Analysis of Friendship subcales*

| Item | Friendship Quality subscale | Friendship I/S subscale | η2 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Satisfaction with Friendships | .15 | .82 | .69 |
| Importance of Friendships | .09 | .84 | .72 |
| Friendship Conflict | .72 | .01 | .52 |
| Friendship Reliability | .77 | .31 | .69 |
| Friendship Disclosure | .85 | .12 | .74 |

**Table 4**

*Exploratory Factor Analysis of SE/LS subscale*

| Item | Factor | η2 |
|---|---|---|
| Self-esteem | .89 | .78 |
| Life Satisfaction | .89 | .73 |

**Table 5**

*Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Nurturant Mothering scales*

| Item | Factor Pattern Coefficient | η2 |
|---|---|---|
| Overall, how would you *rate* your mother? | .84 | .71 |
| When you needed your mother's *support*, was she there for you? | .84 | .70 |
| How emotionally *close* were you to your mother? | .79 | .63 |
| How much do you think your mother *enjoyed* being a mother? | .72 | .51 |
| Did you feel that you could *confide* in your mother? | .71 | .50 |
| When you were a teenager, how well did you *get along* with your mother? | .69 | .47 |
| Did your mother have enough *energy* to meet your needs? | .66 | .44 |
| Was your mother available to spend *time* with you in activities? | .64 | .41 |
| As you go through your day, does your mother influence your daily thoughts and feelings? | .60 | .36 |

*Note*. N = 1359, $\chi^2$ (27) = 608.8, p<.001

**Table 6**

*Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Mother Reported Involvement scale*

| Item | Instrumental | Expressive | Mentoring/ Advising | η2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Responsibility Involvement | 0.70 | 0.17 | 0.35 | 0.58 |
| Career Involvement | 0.27 | 0.31 | 0.62 | 0.47 |
| Ethical/Moral Involvement | 0.62 | 0.34 | 0.20 | 0.47 |
| Independence Involvement | 0.69 | 0.30 | -0.04 | 0.51 |
| School/Homework Involvement | 0.53 | 0.31 | 0.22 | 0.37 |
| Being Protective Involvement | 0.18 | 0.12 | 0.74 | 0.45 |
| Discipline Involvement | 0.52 | -0.08 | 0.50 | 0.31 |
| Providing Income Involvement | 0.41 | 0.08 | 0.23 | 0.15 |
| Companionship Involvement | 0.21 | 0.71 | 0.34 | 0.64 |
| Sharing Activities/Interests | 0.16 | 0.40 | 0.64 | 0.67 |
| Emotional Involvement | 0.29 | 0.75 | 0.16 | 0.57 |
| Social Involvement | 0.28 | 0.67 | 0.19 | 0.50 |
| Leisure/Fun/Play Involvement | 0.24 | 0.66 | 0.34 | 0.58 |
| Caregiving Involvement | 0.21 | 0.75 | 0.13 | 0.55 |
| Physical Involvement | 0.36 | 0.45 | 0.21 | 0.35 |
| Spiritual Involvement | 0.05 | 0.27 | 0.54 | 0.23 |
| Advising Involvement | 0.70 | 0.38 | 0.09 | 0.59 |

**Table 6 (continued)**

*Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Mother Reported Involvement scale*

| Item | Instrumental | Expressive | Mentoring/ Advising | η2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mentoring/Teaching Involvement | 0.45 | 0.51 | 0.34 | 0.55 |
| Competence Involvement | 0.38 | 0.43 | 0.50 | 0.62 |
| Intellectual Involvement | 0.59 | 0.39 | 0.17 | 0.48 |

*Note.* $\chi^2$ (133) = 1460.9, p<.001

**Table 7**

*Outcome variables, means (SD) by ethnicity*

| Variable | White (N=344) | Hispanic (N=833) | Black (N=182) | Total (N=1359) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **SE/LS subscale** | **3.74 (.71)** | **3.73 (.75)** | **3.70 (.77)** | **3.73 (.74)** |
| Self-esteem | 3.61 (.82) | 3.67 (.82) | 3.75 (.83) | 3.66 (.82) |
| Life Satisfaction | 3.87 (.79) | 3.79 (.86) | 3.66 (.89) | 3.79 (.85) |
| **Friendship I/S subscale** | **3.77 (.63)** | **3.62 (.70)** | **3.45 (.78)** | **3.63 (.70)** |
| Satisfaction with Friendships | 3.87 (.87) | 3.85 (.95) | 3.66 (1.0) | 3.83 (.94) |
| Importance of Friendships | 3.67(.58) | 3.41 (.71) | 3.25 (.79) | 3.45 (.70) |
| **Friendship Quality subscale** | **3.58 (.54)** | **3.51 (.57)** | **3.36 (.71)** | **3.50 (.58)** |
| Conflict | 3.58 (.65) | 3.57 (.68) | 3.47 (.78) | 3.56 (.68) |
| Disclosure | 3.60 (.68) | 3.51 (.74) | 3.32 (.93) | 3.51 (.75) |
| Reliability | 3.55 (.71) | 3.43 (.76) | 3.30 (.90) | 3.44 (.77) |

*Note.* Subscales in boldface

**Table 8**

*Outcome variables, Mean Differences (SD) by Ethnicity*

| Variable | Black-White | Black-Hispanic | White - Hispanic | F - ratio | η2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **SE/LS subscale** | **-.04(.07)** | **-.02(.06)** | **-.02(.05)** | **.17** | **.02** |
| Self-esteem | .13(.08) | .08(.07) | -.05(.05) | 1.59 | .05 |
| Life Satisfaction | -.21(.08)* | -.13(.07) | .08(.05) | 3.78 | .07 |
| **Friendship I/S subscale** | **-.30(.06)*** | **-.15(.06)*** | **.15(.05)** | **4.64** | **.08** |
| Satisfaction with Friendships | -.21(.09)* | -.19(.08)* | .02(.06) | 3.40 | .07 |
| Importance of Friendships | -.41(.06)** | -.15(.06)* | .26(.04)** | 25.93 | .19 |
| **Friendship Quality subscale** | **-.21(.05)*** | **-.15(.06)*** | **-.07(.05)** | **8.18** | **.11** |
| Conflict | -.11(.06) | -.11(.06) | .00(.04) | 1.97 | .05 |
| Disclosure | -.28(.07)** | -.19(06)* | -.09(.05) | 8.48 | .11 |
| Reliability | -.26(.07)** | -.13(.06)* | -.12(.05)* | 6.86 | .10 |

*Note.* Subscales in boldface
*p<.05, **p<.01

**Table 9**

*Outcome variables, Mean Differences (SD) by Gender and Family Form*

| | Gender | | | Family Form | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Variable | Male-Female | F-ratio | η2 | Intact-Divorced | F-ratio | η2 |
| **SE/LS subscale** | **.04(.05)** | **.82** | **.03** | **.09(.03)** | **4.40** | **.06** |
| Self-esteem | .15(.07)** | 8.62 | .08 | .06(.07) | 2.37 | .04 |
| Life Satisfaction | -.07(.03) | 1.60 | .03 | .03(.07) | 4.70 | .60 |
| **Friendship I/S subscale** | **.08 (.04)** | **2.37** | **.03** | **.10 (.04)** | **6.68** | **.08** |
| Satisfaction with Friendships | .16(.08)** | 7.46 | .06 | .06(.08) | 8.04 | .08 |
| Importance of Friendships | .03(.06) | .37 | .02 | .04(.06) | 1.73 | .04 |
| **Friendship Quality subscale** | **.06 (.04)** | **2.74** | **.05** | **.03 (.02)** | **.89** | **.03** |
| Conflict | .03(.06) | .50 | .02 | -.05(.06) | .43 | .02 |
| Disclosure | -.09(.06) | 3.92 | .05 | -.02(.06) | .11 | .01 |
| Reliability | -.12(.07)** | 6.13 | .01 | .02(.07) | 1.58 | .03 |

*Note.* Subscales in boldface
*p<.05, **p<.01

**Table 10**

*Outcome variables, Means (SD) by Ethnicity, Gender and Family Form*

| Variable[a] | | Blacks | | Hispanics | | Whites | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SE/LS subscale | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | Intact | **3.92** | **(.77)** | **3.80** | **(.78)** | 3.61 | (.76) | 3.77 | (.78) |
| | Divorced | **4.00** | **(.71)** | 3.69 | (.84) | 3.58 | (.02) | 3.73 | (.85) |
| Female | Intact | 3.63 | (.76) | 3.76 | (.71) | 3.79 | (.65) | 3.75 | (.70) |
| | Divorced | 3.65 | (.77) | 3.58 | (.77) | 3.75 | (.70) | 3.64 | (.75) |
| Friendship I/S subscale | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | Intact | 3.58 | (.58) | 3.68 | (.70) | 3.79 | (.58) | 3.70 | (.67) |
| | Divorced | 3.74 | (.73) | 3.64 | (.73) | 3.76 | (.65) | 3.68 | (.71) |
| Female | Intact | 3.44 | (.83) | 3.64 | (.69) | **3.81** | **(.60)** | 3.66 | (.70) |
| | Divorced | 3.35 | (.76) | 3.53 | (.68) | **3.64** | **(.71)** | 3.52 | (.71) |
| Friendship Quality subscale | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | Intact | 3.26 | (.79) | 3.47 | (.65) | 3.46 | (.62) | 3.45 | (.66) |
| | Divorced | 3.49 | (.74) | 3.48 | (.57) | 3.44 | (.50) | 3.47 | (.58) |
| Female | Intact | 3.37 | (.72) | 3.53 | (.55) | **3.62** | **(.53)** | 3.53 | (.57) |
| | Divorced | 3.33 | (.67) | 3.49 | (.54) | **3.58** | **(.53)** | 3.48 | (.56) |

*Note*. Highest means in boldface.

[a]For each ethnic group listed above, the sample sizes were as follows: Male, intact =18, 161, 48, 227; Male, divorced = 19, 62, 19, 100; Female, intact = 90, 451, 196, 737; female, divorced = 55, 159, 81, and 295.

**Table 11**

*Parental nurturance, Means (SD) by Ethnicity, Gender and Family Form*

| Variable[a] | | Black | Hispanic | White | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Father nurturance | | | | | |
| Male | Intact | 3.84(.21) | 3.89(.07) | 3.79(.13) | 3.87(.02) |
| | Divorced | 3.34(.20) | 3.42(.11) | 3.49(.20) | 3.42(.11) |
| Female | Intact | 3.33(.10) | 3.90(.04) | 3.99(.06) | 3.86(.03) |
| | Divorced | **2.51(.12)** | **3.09(.07)** | **3.30(.10)** | **3.04(.08)** |
| Mother nurturance | | | | | |
| Male | Intact | 4.25(.18) | 4.26(.06) | **4.01(.10)** | 4.21(.04) |
| | Divorced | 4.17(.17) | 4.18(.09) | 4.15(.17) | 4.17(.06) |
| Female | Intact | **4.03(.08)** | 4.34(.04) | 4.28(.05) | 4.28(.02) |
| | Divorced | 4.11(.10) | **4.04(.06)** | **4.08(.08)** | 4.07(.05) |

*Note*. Lowest means in boldface.

[a] For the ethnic groups listed above, the sample size was as follows: Male, intact =18, 161, 48, 227; Male, divorced = 19, 62, 19, 100; Female, intact = 90, 451, 196, 737; female, divorced = 55, 159, 81, and 295.

**Table 12**

*Father involvement, Means (SD) by Ethnicity, Gender and Family Form*

| Variable[a] | | | Black | Hispanic | White | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Instrumental | Male | Intact | 3.96 (.70) | 4.04 (.67) | 3.98 (.12) | 4.02 (.67) |
| Involvement | | Divorced | 3.51 (1.0) | 3.47 (1.0) | 3.44 (.92) | 3.48 (1.0) |
| | Female | Intact | 3.95 (.70) | 4.16 (.69) | 4.14 (.68) | 4.13 (.70) |
| | | Divorced | 2.49 (1.2) | 3.13 (1.1) | 3.32 (1.2) | 3.07 (1.2) |
| Expressive | Male | Intact | 3.30 (.92) | 3.46 (.86) | 3.22 (.88) | 3.40 (.88) |
| Involvement | | Divorced | 3.09 (.91) | 3.02 (1.0) | 3.36 (.91) | 3.10 (.98) |
| | Female | Intact | 3.04 (.10) | 3.55 (.90) | 3.59 (.87) | 3.50 (.92) |
| | | Divorced | 2.13 (1.1) | 2.66 (1.0) | 2.96 (1.1) | 2.64 (1.1) |
| Mentoring | Male | Intact | 3.94 (.88) | 3.94(.83) | 3.87(.89) | 3.93 (.85) |
| Involvement | | Divorced | 3.66(.97) | 3.33(1.2) | 3.68(.99) | 3.46 (1.1) |
| | Female | Intact | 3.64(1.0) | 3.88(.92) | 4.02(.88) | 3.89 (.93) |
| | | Divorced | 2.38(1.3) | 3.01(1.2) | 3.28(1.3) | 2.97 (1.3) |

[a]For the ethnic groups listed above, the sample size was as follows: Male, intact =18, 161, 48, 227; Male, divorced = 19, 62, 19, 100; Female, intact = 90, 451, 196, 737; female, divorced = 55, 159, 81, and 295.

**Table 13**

*Mother involvement, Means (SD) by Ethnicity, Gender and Family Form*

| Variable[a] | | | Black | Hispanic | White | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Instrumental | Male | Intact | 4.31(.59) | 4.15(.58) | 3.96(.76) | 4.12(.63) |
| Involvement | | Divorced | 4.35(.66) | 4.02(.76) | 3.98(.77) | 4.07(.75) |
| | Female | Intact | 4.24(.63) | 4.31(.55) | 4.24(.59) | 4.28(.57) |
| | | Divorced | 4.37(.62) | 4.11(.76) | 3.91(.89) | 4.10(.79) |
| Expressive | Male | Intact | 3.86(.61) | 3.85(.63) | 3.59(.80) | 3.79(.67) |
| Involvement | | Divorced | 3.86(.80) | 3.78(.66) | 3.76(.66) | 3.79(.68) |
| | Female | Intact | 3.99(.81) | 4.17(.65) | 4.14(.67) | 4.14(.68) |
| | | Divorced | 3.95(.85) | 3.83(.81) | 3.84(.91) | 3.85(.84) |
| Mentoring | Male | Intact | 4.19(.64) | 4.06(.72) | 3.90(.85) | 4.03(.75) |
| Involvement | | Divorced | 4.27(.75) | 3.90(.80) | 4.06(.60) | 4.00(.76) |
| | Female | Intact | 4.05(.89) | 4.29(.82) | 4.26(.74) | 4.25(.75) |
| | | Divorced | 4.16(.88) | 3.95(.90) | 3.99(.97) | 4.00(.92) |

[a] For the ethnic groups listed above, the sample size was as follows: Male, intact =18, 161, 48, 227; Male, divorced = 19, 62, 19, 100; Female, intact = 90, 451, 196, 737; female, divorced = 55, 159, 81, and 295.

**Table 14**

*Summary of Lowest and Highest Means of Parental Involvement*

| Father Variables | $\chi^2$ | Black Female Divorced [a] | Hispanic Female Intact[b] | White Female Intact[b] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nurturance | | 2.51 (.12) | - | 3.99 (.06) |
| Instrumental | 348.93** | 2.49 (1.1) | 4.16 (.69) | - |
| Expressive | 218.43** | 2.13 (1.1) | - | 3.59 (.87) |
| Mentoring | 223.10** | 2.38 (1.3) | - | 4.02 (.88) |
| | | | | |
| Mother Variables | | White Male Intact [a] | Hispanic Female Intact[b] | Black Female Divorced[b] |
| Nurturance | | 4.01 (.10) | 4.34 (.04) | - |
| Instrumental | 44.26 ** | 3.96 (.76) | - | 4.37 (.62) |
| Expressive | 38.4** | 3.59 (.85) | 4.17 (.65) | - |
| Mentoring | 66.78** | 3.90 (.76) | 4.29 (.82) | - |

[a]Lowest values. [b]Highest values

** $p < .01$

**Table 15**

*Correlation of Father Variables with Outcome Variables*

| | | | Involvement | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Outcome Variable | Nurturance | Instrumental | Expressive | Mentoring |
| **SE/LS subscale** | **.28**** | **.20**** | **.28**** | **.24**** |
| Life Satisfaction | .28** | .20** | .28** | .21** |
| Self-esteem | .21** | .16** | .22** | .22** |
| **Friendship I/S subscale** | **.20**** | **.16**** | **.22**** | **.17**** |
| Satisfaction with Friendships | .19** | .15** | .21** | .15** |
| Importance of Friendships | .14** | .11** | .15** | .13** |
| **Friendship Quality subscale** | **.13**** | **.11**** | **.13**** | **.12**** |
| Friendship Reliability | .13** | .11** | .11** | .11** |
| Friendship Disclosure | .10** | .08** | .10** | .08** |
| Friendship Conflict | .07** | .07** | .09** | .09** |

*Note.* Subscales in boldface

**p<.01

**Table 16**

*Correlation of Mother Variables with Outcome Variables*

| | | | Involvement | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Outcome Variable | Nurturance | Instrumental | Expressive | Mentoring |
| **SE/LS subscale** | **.33**** | **.25**** | **.31**** | **.28**** |
| Life Satisfaction | .33** | .26** | .32** | .30** |
| Self-esteem | .25** | .19** | .23** | .21** |
| **Friendship I/S subscale** | **.14**** | **.15**** | **.15**** | **.15**** |
| Satisfaction with Friendships | .16** | .15** | .15** | .16** |
| Importance of Friendships | .07** | .10** | .08** | .08** |
| **Friendship Quality subscale** | **.12**** | **.12**** | **.12**** | **.14**** |
| Friendship Reliability | .13** | .12** | .13** | .15** |
| Friendship Disclosure | .08** | .08** | .08** | .09** |
| Friendship Conflict | .07** | .08** | .08** | .09** |

*Note.* Subscales in boldface

**p<.01

**Table 17**

*Correlation among Psychosocial Outcomes*

| | SE/LS subscale | Friendship Quality subscale |
|---|---|---|
| Friendship I/S subscale | .36** | .33** |
| Friendship Quality subscale | .15** | |

** P<.01

**Table 18**

*Summary of Path Coefficients Comparisons between Groups for all Structural Models*

| | Father subscale to | | | Mother subscale to | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Group (n) | Friendship I/S subscale | Friendship Q subscale | LS/SE subscale | Friendship I/S subscale | Friendship Q subscale | LS/SE subscale |
| Male(327) | **.72** | **.69** | **.60** | **.34** | **.49** | **.55** |
| Female(1032) | **.18** | .09 | **.20** | **.12** | **.12** | **.25** |
| Z Score | 18.90** | 19.73** | 12.77** | 6.08** | 10.82** | 9.45** |
| Intact (964) | **.62** | **.62** | **.49** | **.31** | **.44** | **.54** |
| Divorced(395) | .15 | .08 | .15 | .16 | .07 | **.31** |
| Z Score | 14.94** | 16.79** | 10.02** | 4.14** | 10.47** | 7.38** |
| Blacks (182) | **.69** | **.68** | **.57** | **.38** | **.50** | **.55** |
| Whites (344) | **.19** | .07 | **.21** | .07 | .08 | **.25** |
| Hispanics (833) | **.16** | .06 | **.22** | .07 | .08 | **.29** |
| Z Score[a] | 17.07** | 19.76** | 11.31** | 8.59** | 12.22** | 9.45** |
| Z Score[b] | 17.88** | 20.02** | 11.04** | 8.59** | 12.22** | 8.33** |
| Z Score[c] | .81 | .26 | -.27 | .00 | .00 | -1.12 |

*Note*. Path coefficients in boldface are significant, p<.001

[a] Z score comparing correlation between Blacks and Whites, [b] between Blacks and Hispanics, and [c] between Whites and Hispanics

**p<.01

**Table 19**

*Differential Parental Influence on Outcome Subscales, Path Coefficients (Z score)*

| Group (n) | Friendship I/S subscale | | Friendship Q subscale | | LS/SE subscale | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total (1359) | **.18/.10** | (2.13**) | **.10/.10** | (0.00) | **.21/.26** | (-1.38) |
| Male (327) | **.72/.34** | (7.05**) | **.69/.49** | (3.97**) | **.60/.55** | (0.95) |
| Female (1032) | **.18/.12** | (1.39) | **.**09/**.12** | (-0.69) | **.20/.25** | (-1.19) |
| Intact (964) | **.62/.31** | (8.87**) | .**62/.44** | (5.54**) | .**49/.54** | (-1.49) |
| Divorced (395 | .15/.16 | (-0.12) | .08/.07 | (0.12) | .15/**.31** | (-2.05**) |
| Blacks (182) | **.69/.38** | (4.24**) | **.68/.50** | (2.65**) | **.57/.55** | (0.28) |
| Whites (344) | .**19**/.07 | (1.60) | .07/.08 | (-0.13) | **.21/.25** | (-0.54) |
| Hispanics (833) | **.16**/.07 | (1.86) | .06/.08 | (-0.41) | **.22/.29** | (-1.53) |

*Note.* Path coefficients in boldface are significant, p<.001; Listed with father path coefficient first, followed by mother path coefficient

**p<.01,

**Figure 1**

*Parental Involvement and Nurturance Measurement Model*




*** P<.001

**Figure 2**

*Structural Equation Model of Parental Variables for Psychosocial Functioning*




*** P<.001

**Figure 3**

*Structural Equation Model of Parental Variables for Psychosocial Functioning by Gender*




*Note.* Males are listed first; significant path coefficients in boldface,
***p<.001

**Figure 4**

*Structural Equation Model of Parental Variables for Psychosocial Functioning by Family Form*




*Note.* Intact families listed first; significant path coefficients in boldface
***p<.001

**Figure 5**

*Structural Equation Model of Parental Variables for Psychosocial Functioning by Ethnicity*




*Note.* Blacks are listed first, followed by Whites and then Hispanics; Significant path coefficients in boldface
*** p<.001

**FATHER QUESTIONNAIRE**

This short, anonymous questionnaire will help us to understand how college students feel about their fathers. Please complete the entire questionnaire. Basically, we want to know how you felt about your father when you were growing up during childhood and adolescence.

Today, some children grow up with the same father throughout their lives while others have more than one father. If you had only one father, the choice below is simple. However, if you had more than one father, please answer the questionnaire for the father who had the most influence on you during childhood and/or adolescence. Please check the box below for the father you will be completing the questionnaire for.

___ biological father
___ adoptive father
___ stepfather
___ adoptive stepfather
___other father figure (please specify) _____

Please answer the following questions from your perspective as a young adult (considering both childhood and adolescence) unless a particular age is specified in the question. Please answer for the father checked above.

1. How much do you think your father enjoyed being a father?
_____ a great deal
_____ very much
_____ somewhat
_____ a little
_____ not at all

2. When you needed your father's support, was he there for you?
_____ always there for me
_____ often there for me
_____ sometimes there for me
_____ rarely there for me
_____ never there for me

3. Did your father have enough energy to meet your needs?

_____ always
_____ often
_____ sometimes
_____ rarely
_____ never

5. Was your father available to spend time with you in activities?
_____ always
_____ often
_____ sometimes
_____ rarely
_____ never

6. How emotionally close were you to your father?
_____ extremely close
_____ very close
_____ somewhat close
_____ a little close
_____ not at all close

7. When you were an adolescent (teenager), how well did you get along with your father?
_____ very well
_____ well
_____ ok
_____ poorly
_____ very poorly

4. Did you feel that you could confide in (talk about important personal things with) your father?

_____ always
_____ often
_____ sometimes
_____ rarely
_____ never

8. Overall, how would you rate your father?
_____ outstanding
_____ very good
_____ good
_____ fair
_____ poor

9. As you go through your day, does your father influence your daily thoughts and feelings?
_____ always
_____ often
_____ sometimes
_____ rarely
_____ never

**FATHER INVOLVEMENT IN CHILDHOOD AND ADOLESCENCE**

How involved was your father in the following aspects of your life and development?

Please place the appropriate number on the line before each of the following items.

5. always involved
4. often involved
3. sometimes involved
2. rarely involved
1. never involved

What did you want your father's level of involvement to be compared to what it actually was?

Please place the appropriate number on the line after each of the following items.

5. much more involved
4. a little more involved
3. it was just right
2. a little less involved
1. much less involved

10. _____ intellectual development _____

11. _____ emotional development _____

12. _____ social development _____

13. _____ ethical/moral development _____

14. _____ spiritual development _____

15. _____ physical development _____

16. _____ career development _____

17. _____ developing responsibility _____

18. _____ developing independence _____

19. _____ developing competence _____

20. _____ leisure/fun/play _____

21. _____providing income _____

22. _____ sharing activities/interests _____

23. _____ mentoring/teaching _____

24. _____ caregiving _____

25. _____ being protective _____

26. _____ advising _____

27. _____ discipline _____

28. _____ school/homework _____

29. _____ companionship _____

**MOTHER QUESTIONNAIRE**

This short, anonymous questionnaire will help us to understand how college students feel about their mothers. Please complete the entire questionnaire. Basically, we want to know how you felt about your mother when you were growing up during childhood and adolescence.

Today, some children grow up with the same mother throughout their lives while others have more than one mother. If you had only one mother, the choice below is simple. However, if you had more than one mother, please answer the questionnaire for the mother who had the most influence on you during childhood and/or adolescence. Please check the box below for the mother you will be completing the questionnaire for.

___ biological mother
___ adoptive mother

___ stepmother
___ adoptive stepmother
___other mother figure (please specify)_____

Please answer the following questions from your perspective as a young adult (considering both childhood and adolescence) unless a particular age is specified in the question. Please answer for the mother checked above.

1. How much do you think your mother enjoyed being a mother?
   _____a great deal
   _____very much
   _____somewhat
   _____a little
   _____not at all

2. When you needed your mother's support, was she there for you?
   _____ always there for me
   _____ often there for me
   _____ sometimes there for me
   _____ rarely there for me
   _____ never there for me

3. Did your mother have enough energy to meet your needs?
   _____ always
   _____ often
   _____ sometimes
   _____ rarely
   _____ never

4. Did you feel that you could confide in (talk about important personal things with) your mother?
   _____ always
   _____ often
   _____ sometimes
   _____ rarely
   _____ never

5. Was your mother available to spend time with you in activities?
   _____ always
   _____ often
   _____ sometimes
   _____ rarely
   _____ never

6. How emotionally close were you to your mother?
   _____ extremely close
   _____ very close
   _____ somewhat close
   _____ a little close
   _____ not at all close

7. When you were an adolescent (teenager), how well did you get along with your mother?
   _____ very well
   _____ well
   _____ ok
   _____ poorly
   _____ very poorly

8. Overall, how would you rate your mother?
   _____ outstanding
   _____very good
   _____ good
   _____ fair
   _____ poor

9. As you go through your day, does your mother influence your daily thoughts and feelings?
   _____ always
   _____ often

_____ sometimes
_____ rarely
_____never

**MOTHER INVOLVEMENT IN CHILDHOOD AND ADOLESCENCE**

How involved was your mother in the following aspects of your life and development?

Please place the appropriate number on the line before each of the following items.

5. always involved
4. often involved
3. sometimes involved
2. rarely involved
1. never involved

What did you want your mother's level of involvement to be compared to what it actually was?

Please place the appropriate number on the line after each of the following items.

5. much more involved
4. a little more involved
3. it was just right
2. a little less involved
1. much less involved

10. _____ intellectual development _____
11. _____ emotional development _____
12. _____ social development _____
13. _____ ethical/moral development _____
14. _____ spiritual development _____
15. _____ physical development _____
16. _____ career development _____
17. _____ developing responsibility _____
18. _____ developing independence _____
19. _____ developing competence _____
20. _____ leisure/fun/play _____
21. _____providing income _____
22. _____ sharing activities/interests _____

23. _____ mentoring/teaching _____

24. _____ caregiving _____

25. _____ being protective _____

26. _____ advising _____

27. _____ discipline _____

28. _____ school/homework _____

29. _____ companionship _____

**SELF QUESTIONNAIRE**

Directions: The questionnaire will now focus on questions about you. Where questions refer to "mother" and "father,"please respond for the mother and father you completed the questionnaire for.
Again, we are now shifting from your mother/father to yourself, how would you describe your:

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Very Low | Low | Moderate | High | Very High |

1. _____ overall self-esteem
2. _____ overall satisfaction with life
3. _____ overall satisfaction with your friendships
4. _____ overall satisfaction with your romantic relationships
5. _____overall satisfaction with your relationship with your mother
6. _____overall satisfaction with your relationship with your father
7. _____ overall satisfaction with your academic work
8. _____ overall satisfaction with your physical appearance

How important are the following in your life:

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Not at all Important | Somewhat Important | Important | Extremely Important |

9. _____ Academics

10. _____ Friendships
11. _____ Romantic Relationships
12. _____ Family
13. _____ Religion/Spiritual Beliefs
14. _____ Sports/Physical Exercise
15. _____ In life, I have very clear goals and aims for myself.
16. _____ I have discovered clear-cut goals and a satisfying life purpose.
17. _____ There are lots of things about myself that I would change if I could.
18. _____ I have a low opinion of myself.
19. _____ I often can't relax or calm down.
20. _____ I often feel scared.
21. _____ I often feel nervous and uncomfortable around people.
22. _____ I often worry.
23. _____ I feel sad a lot.
24. _____ I frequently have trouble sleeping.
25. _____ I find it hard to get started doing things.
26. _____ I often feel that life is not worth living.
27. _____ I often feel worthless.
28. _____ I have frequent ups and downs in my mood.
29. _____ I easily fall apart under stress.
30. _____ I often get easily upset.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree
Does Not Apply

31. _____ If my closest friend and I have a fight or argument, we can apologize and everything will be OK.
32. _____ I can be completely open with my closest friend.
33. _____ I can always count on my closest friend.
34. _____ My romantic partner(s) generally meet my emotional needs.
35. _____ I often wish I hadn't gotten into most of my romantic relationship(s).
36. _____ I have a lot of problems in my romantic relationship(s).
37. _____ I get taken advantage of in my romantic relationship(s).
38. _____ My romantic relationship(s) have not lasted very long.
39. _____ My father caused most of the pain in my family.
40. _____ I wish my father had spent more time with me when I was younger.
41. _____ There have been times when I wondered if my father even loved me.
42. _____ I feel that my father wanted to spend more time with me.
43. _____ My mother caused most of the pain in my family.
44. _____ I wish my mother had spent more time with me when I was younger.
45. _____ There have been times when I wondered if my mother even loved me.
46. _____ I feel that my mother wanted to spend more time with me.
47. _____ A lot of my parents' problems were because of me.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

Please circle the appropriate answers below and fill in the relevant information.

1. Sex: Male Female 2. Current age: _____

3. Where do you live now? With both parents With my Mother With my Father On Campus Other (please specify) _____

4. What is your current level? FR SO JR SR Other (please specify) _____

5. High School GPA: _____ 6. College GPA (if applicable): _____

7. In college, I am (or expect to be) mostly: an "A" student a "B" student a "C" student a "D" student

8. In high school, mostly I was: an "A" student a "B" student a "C" student a "D" student

9. What is your Race/Ethnicity? American Indian or Native Alaskan Asian or Pacific Islander Black (Not of Hispanic Origin) Hispanic White (Not of Hispanic Origin)

10. Were you born in the United States? Yes No. If no, where were you born? _____

11. Was your father born in the United States? Yes No. If no, where was he born? ___

12. Was your mother born in the United States? Yes No. If no, where was she born? ____

13. What was the highest level of education that your father completed?
Some High School or less High School Graduate Some College/Vocational College Graduate Graduate or Professional Degree

14. What was the highest level of education that your mother completed?
Some High School or less High School Graduate Some College/Vocational College Graduate Graduate or Professional Degree

15. During childhood and adolescence, my father worked mostly:
Full-time plus nights or weekends Full-time Part-time Did not Work

16. During childhood and adolescence, my mother worked mostly:
Full-time plus nights or weekends Full-time Part-time Did not Work

17. What was your family's approximate income when you were a teenager?

Below $30,000 $30,000 - $50,000 $50,000 - $100,000 $100,000 - $150,000
$150,000 - $250,000 More than $250,000 Don't know

**FATHER**

18. Please place a check on all lines which apply below and fill in the information where there are blank lines (___) for the father you completed the questionnaire for. Please leave blank all sections that do not apply to you.

**Biological Father**

__ Married to mother during childhood and adolescence
__ Died and I lived with my single mother from ages _____ to _____
__ Divorced and I lived with my single mother from ages _____ to _____
__ Divorced and I lived with my single father from ages _____ to _____
__ Divorced and I lived with my father and stepmother from ages _____ to _____
__ Divorced and I lived with my mother and stepfather from ages _____ to _____

If divorced, how often did you see the parent not living with you? (Please specify)

_____

**Adoptive Father**

__ Married to mother during childhood and adolescence
__ Died and I lived with my single mother from ages _____ to _____
__ Divorced and I lived with my single mother from ages _____ to _____
__ Divorced and I lived with my single father from ages _____ to _____
__ Divorced and I lived with my father and stepmother from ages _____ to _____
__ Divorced and I lived with my mother and stepfather from ages _____ to ____

If divorced, how often did you see the parent not living with you? (Please specify)

_____

**Stepfather/Adoptive Stepfather**

___ I lived with my mother and stepfather from ages _____ to _____
___ Adopted by my stepfather at age _____

If divorced, how often did you see the parent not living with you? (Please specify)

_____

Other ___ (Please specify who) _____ Had a fatherly impact on me from ages _____ to _____

**MOTHER**

19. Please place a check on all lines which apply below and fill in the information where there are blank lines (___) for the mother you completed the questionnaire for. Please leave blank all sections that do not apply to you.

**Biological Mother**

__ Married to father during childhood and adolescence
__ Died and I lived with my single father from ages _____ to _____
__ Divorced and I lived with my single mother from ages _____ to _____
__ Divorced and I lived with my single father from ages _____ to _____
__ Divorced and I lived with my mother and stepfather from ages _____ to _____
__ Divorced and I lived with my father and stepmother from ages _____ to _____

If divorced, how often did you see the parent not living with you? (Please specify)

_____

**Adoptive Mother**

__ Married to father during childhood and adolescence
__ Died and I lived with my single father from ages _____ to _____
__ Divorced and I lived with my single mother from ages _____ to _____
__ Divorced and I lived with my single father from ages _____ to _____
__ Divorced and I lived with my mother and stepfather from ages _____ to _____
__ Divorced and I lived with my father and stepmother from ages _____ to _____

If divorced, how often did you see the parent not living with you? (Please specify)

_____

**Stepmother/ Adoptive Stepmother**

___ I lived with my father and stepmother from ages _____ to _____
___ Adopted by my stepmother at age _____

If divorced, how often did you see the parent not living with you? (Please specify)

_____

Other ___ (Please specify who) _____ Had a motherly impact on me from ages _____ to _____

**FAMILY**

Directions: Finally, please answer the following questions for the family you lived with during most of your childhood and adolescence.

1 2 3 4
Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

1. _____We fight a lot in our family.
2. _____ In our family, family members rarely show anger.
3. _____ In my family, family members often criticize each other.
4. _____ I often see my parents arguing.
5. _____When my parents have an argument, they say mean things to each other.
6. _____ Family members in my family feel very close to each other.
7. _____ Family togetherness is very important in my family.
8. _____ Family members in my family like to spend free time with each other.

VITA

Maria L. Reid

| | |
|---|---|
| November 3rd, 1969 | Born, Birmingham, England, UK |
| December, 1988 – January, 1998 | Product Specialist,<br>Sears, Roebuck and Co., NY |
| 1988 - 1991 | A.Sc., Liberal Arts Science<br>Bronx Community College, Bronx, NY |
| May, 1991- August, 1991 | Research Intern,<br>Brandeis University, Boston, MA |
| 1991 – 1993 | B.Sc., Biochemistry<br>Manhattan College, Bronx, NY |
| 1993 | Phi Theta Kappa International Society, NY |
| 1993 | Batts Biochemistry Award,<br>Manhattan College, NY |
| 1994 - 1997 | M.S., Environmental Engineering<br>Manhattan College, Bronx, NY |
| April, 1997 – October,1997 | Volunteer,<br>Montefiore Medical Center, Bronx, NY |
| October, 1997 – January, 2000 | Laboratory Technician,<br>Montefiore Medical Center, Bronx, NY |
| January, 2000 – January, 2005 | Research Assistant,<br>Montefiore Medical Center, Bronx, NY |
| May, 2000 – August, 2000 | Enumerator,<br>U.S. Census Bureau, Bronx, NY |
| January, 2001 – October, 2001 | Tutor<br>H.E.L.P. Harlem, Manhattan, NY |
| 2002 – 2004 | B.Sc., Psychology<br>Herbert H. Lehman College, Bronx, NY |
| 2003 – 2004 | Dean's List, Lehman College, NY |

| | |
|---|---|
| 2004 | PSI CHI National Honor Society,<br>Presidential Scholar Award,<br>Lehman College, NY |
| January, 2005 – September, 2006 | Research Associate III,<br>The Miami Project to Cure Paralysis,<br>University of Miami, Miami, FL |
| August, 2006 – August, 2011 | Doctoral Candidate,<br>Life Span Developmental Psychology<br>Florida International University, Miami, FL |
| 2007 – Present | APS RiSE-UP Research Reviewer<br>APS Student Competition Reviewer |
| 2008 - Present | M.S., Mental Health Counseling<br>Florida International University, Miami, FL |
| May 2010 – October 2010 | Mental Health Intern<br>American Therapeutic Corporation,<br>Ft Lauderdale, FL |
| November, 2010 – Present | Mental Health Intern<br>William Penzer PhD & Associates,<br>Ft Lauderdale, FL |

PUBLICATIONS

Reid, M. (2011). The effects of parental involvement on young adult friendship quality: ethnicity differential. Poster accepted at Caribbean Regional Conference of Psychology, Bahamas

Reid, M. & Finley, G.E. (2011). The effects of parental involvement on young adult friendship quality: gender differential. Poster presented at Association for Psychological Science 23rd annual Convention, Washington DC.

Reid, M.L. & Finley, G.E. (2010). Trends in African American and Caribbean fathers' nurturance and involvement. *Culture, Society and Masculinities, 2* (2), 107-120