8-8-2005

The Effect of Parental Congruence on Preadolescent Problem Behavior in African American Families

Alana K. Miller

THE EFFECT OF PARENTAL CONGRUENCE ON PREADOLESCENT PROBLEM BEHAVIOR IN AFRICAN AMERICAN FAMILIES

by

ALANA K. MILLER

Under the Direction of Lisa P. Armistead

ABSTRACT

The current study examined the effects of parenting congruence on child outcome behaviors. Participants were 144 African American families with a child between 9 and 12 years old. Mothers and fathers provided self report on their behavior regarding monitoring, positive parenting, and parental beliefs. Children provided self report regarding child problem behavior, and sexual intentions. Results revealed the more congruent parents were on positive parenting behaviors the more boys thought about sex; however, results for girls were not significant. Additionally, moderation trends suggested when both parents are high on monitoring behaviors girls have thought about sex less, whereas boys think about sex less when both parents are low on monitoring behaviors. Another trend suggested the more conservative both parents are regarding attitudes about dating, the less likely boys are to have thought about sex. Thus, the combined behavior of both parents on specific parenting factors can affect boys and girls differently.

INDEX WORDS: parenting, congruence, African American, preadolescents, monitoring, positive parenting, parental beliefs

THE EFFECT OF PARENTAL CONGRUENCE ON PREADOLESCENT PROBLEM BEHAVIOR IN AFRICAN AMERICAN FAMILIES

by

ALANA K. MILLER

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Georgia State University

2005

THE EFFECT OF PARENTAL CONGRUENCE ON PREADOLESCENT PROBLEM BEHAVIOR IN AFRICAN AMERICAN FAMILIES

by

ALANA K. MILLER

Major Professor:	Lisa P. Armistead
Committee:	Frank J. Floyd
	Martha A. Foster

Electronic Version Approved:

Office of Graduate Studies
College of Arts and Sciences
Georgia State University
August 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Introduction

When a mother and father approach parenting similarly, or in a congruent manner, do children fare better? Although the parental dyad as a subsystem in the family has been extensively discussed theoretically, until recently there were few empirical studies conducted on intact parental dyads, and the effect this system has on child behavioral outcomes (J. McHale et al., 2002). Yet, studies have shown that co-parenting is a unique construct distinctive from other parenting practices, and that the co-parental process is a better predictor of child outcomes than marital quality (Abidin, 1992; Abidin & Brunner, 1995; Gable, Crnic, & Belsky, 1994; McConnell & Kerig, 2002; McHale, Kuersten, & Lauretti, 1996). Specifically, maritial disagreement regarding child rearing, not general marital conflict, has been shown to negatively affect child behavioral outcomes (Jouriles, Murphy, Farris, & Smith, 1991). In particular, several studies have shown that lack of support and agreement between married parents about parenting has a negative effect on children (e.g., Belsky, Putnam, & Crnic, 1996; Gable et al., 1994; McHale, Kuersten-Hogan, Lauretti, & Rasmussen, 2000). Also, the co-parenting process has been shown to be a mediator of the relationship between martial quality and the parent child relationship (Floyd, Gilliom, & Costigan, 1998; Margolin, Gordis, & John, 2001). According to Cowan and McHale (1996), for the parental dyad, childrearing can be characterized by the quality of interactions between parents about parenting issues, differential involvement with the child, and disparity across each parent's interaction with the child in triadic and dyadic environments, as well as other co-parenting circumstances. In order for parents to achieve high efficacy in raising children, they must maintain a congruent relationship regarding child rearing practices and support each other (Brody & Flor, 1996). However, many factors comprise

the co-parenting construct, and in order to develop a better understanding of it's influence on child behaviors, specific aspects of the co-parenting construct should be analyzed within different familial cultures and contexts (McConnell & Kerig, 2002; McHale, Lauretti, Talbot, & Pouquette, 2002).

The present study focuses on congruence between parents, a specific co-parenting factor that has only recently gained researchers' attention. In particular, this study is concerned with whether congruence in parenting behaviors across co-parents can affect child behavioral outcomes. Moreover, the issue of parenting congruence is examined among a sample of African American families of pre-adolescents. African American families are the focus of this study for three reasons. First, the majority of the literature on co-parenting, an umbrella concept which includes parenting congruence, has relied on Caucasian samples (Brody, Flor, & Neubaum, 1998; J. P. McHale et al., 2002). In fact, the majority of the psychological literature devoted to parenting has included only Caucasian participants (Armistead, Forehand, Brody, & Maguen, 2002). Second, studies analyzing parenting influences within African American families have primarily considered data from only single parent mothers. Single mothers are an important group to research, however, not to the neglect of studying parenting effects in intact African American families. Third, fathers participation in childrearing roles has increased over the last few decades, and the limited but increasing amount of father inclusive research shows they provide unique contributions to the parenting processes, especially in African American families (Bean, Bush, McKenry, & Wilson, 2003; McLoyd, Cauce, Takeuchi, & Wilson, 2000; Parke, 2002). Thus, it is important to consider both mother and father behavior as it relates to co-parenting congruence in African American families.

Additionally, understanding the potential influences of parenting factors on child risk behaviors is important for a number of reasons. Taking sexual risks is a significant problem for

preadolescent to adolescent aged children (Huebner & Howell, 2003). A national longitudinal study of preadolescents revealed African American children engage in sexual behaviors at earlier ages when compared to other children (Longmore, Manning, & Giordano, 2001). Thus, the potential risk of exposure to negative outcomes, such as HIV infection and pregnancy, are higher for African American youths (Tinsley, Lees, & Sumartojo, 2004). Furthermore, the presence of problem behaviors at younger ages is often a precursor of future problem behaviors (Jones & Forehand, 2003). In a four year longitudinal study by Goldstein, Davis-Kean, and Eccles (2005) behaviors, such as school problems and delinquent activities, were shown to be higher in early adolescent African Americans compared to other children. However, parent-child relationship factors over time influenced the level of problem behaviors eventually displayed in adolescence.

According to structural family theory, the parental subsystem plays a major role in child socialization, and this governing subsystem must be unified regarding child rearing practices in order to formulate a clear, semi-permeable boundary that is distinct from the offspring (Minuchin, 1974). Importantly, this theory is applicable to varying ethnic and cultural family systems within the United States (Navarre, 1998). When a child receives inconsistent messages from parents, the parental subsystem is undermined, and the child's ability to internalize standards is reduced, resulting in poorer child adjustment (J. McHale et al., 2002; J. P. McHale et al., 2002; Thompson, Raynor, Cornah, Stevenson, & Sonuga-Barke, 2002). Consequently, Minuchin's structural family theory is central to this study of parenting congruence.

While Minuchin's theory illuminates the importance of co-parenting congruence, very little empirical work has occurred in this area. Of the two directly related studies available, one focused on young children, and the second on a sample similar to the one included in the present study. In particular, a racially stratified longitudinal study by Block, Block, and Morrison (1981) utilized a Q-sort method where parental agreement regarding child rearing practices was assessed

when children were 3, 4, 5, and 7 years of age. The results exposed a significant relationship such that low congruence between mothers and fathers predicted poorer child ego control. Based on their results, Block et al. hypothesized that agreement between parents creates the structured, predictable environment important for positive child outcomes. Additional literature reviews have supported this hypothesis (Belsky et al., 1996; Cowan & Cowan, 2002; Gable et al., 1994). The second study conducted by Brody and Flor (1996) focused on two parent African American families with preadolescent children and revealed that when children are exposed to parents who have conflict regarding childrearing practices, they receive contradictory messages from their parents, and their ability to regulate their own thoughts and actions is reduced. Thus, the combination of behaviors from both parents can have a significant effect on child outcomes.

The present study furthers the examination of congruence utilizing two strategies. First, discrepancy scores between parent and co-parent will be used to forecast child functioning. This strategy focuses on the absolute discrepancy between parents. The second strategy is based on research that has shown that parent behaviors can influence child behaviors. More specifically, several studies have shown that parent behaviors may differ depending on the sex of the parent. A study of African American adolescent perceptions of parent behaviors revealed that mothers were perceived as providing higher levels of warmth compared to fathers (Lamborn & Felbab, 2003). Also, fathers tend to spend less time participating in caregiving behaviors with their children and more time in play activities compared to mothers (Parke, 2002). Therefore, in addition to examining the influence of congruence through absolute discrepancy scores, this study examines whether the level of participation of mothers' and fathers' on specific parenting factors results in differences in child outcomes. Parental dyads will be divided into four groups based on where each member of the dyad falls on their parenting score. Therefore, two of the four dyadic groups will have parents with congruent scores (e.g., High mom/High dad and Low

mom/Low dad), and two will have incongruent parents (e.g., High mom/Low dad and Low mom/High dad). This strategy highlights the pattern of discrepancy between parents, and as no previous research could be located on this topic, these analyses are viewed as exploratory.

Typically, studies of parenting have utilized aggregate parenting styles (e.g. authoritative, authoritarian) to analyze the effects of parenting behaviors on child outcomes (Baumrind, 1968; Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991). These summative constructions of parental styles show that parents can influence the extent of internalizing and externalizing child behaviors from early childhood through the adolescent developmental stages, however they do not identify which specific parenting factors influence child outcomes (Belsky, Lerner, & Spanier, 1984; Darling & Steinberg, 1993). Research that isolates various components of parenting, results in a better analysis of the effects of specific parenting behaviors on child outcomes (Bean et al., 2003). As a result, more recent research has shown that specific variables such as monitoring, positive parenting, and parental beliefs can have a direct influence on child behaviors (Fletcher, Steinberg, & Williams-Wheeler, 2004; Richards, Miller, O'Donnell, Wasserman, & Colder, 2004). Thus, the present study will focus on these three components of parenting.

Dishion and McMahon (1998) define parental monitoring as "a set of correlated parenting behaviors involving attention to and tracking of the child's whereabouts, activities, and adaptations" (p. 61). Consequently, effective parental monitoring is critical throughout the life of a child (Crouter & Head, 2002; Dishion & McMahon, 1998). In a prospective nine year longitudinal study of preschool aged children, greater monitoring predicted decreased levels of deviance (Pettit, Laird, Dodge, Bates, & Criss, 2001). Additional studies have shown that parental monitoring of adolescent behaviors over time predicted adolescent substance use, as well as participation in problem behaviors (Fletcher et al., 2004). Children who are monitored

less also tend to exhibit increased levels of sexual activity (Borawski, Ievers-Landis, Lovegreen, & Trapl, 2003; Brown, Mounts, Lamborn, & Steinberg, 1993; Huebner & Howell, 2003). Monitoring can provide guidance to children through the developmental changes that occur during preadolescence (Crouter & Head, 2002; J. McHale et al., 2002; Smetana & Daddis, 2002). The present study will be the first to examine the impact of parental congruence around monitoring on child functioning.

Similar to monitoring, positive parenting has an inverse relationship with negative child behavioral outcomes. Praise and encouragement have been shown to enhance parental control of child behaviors, thus reducing child risk behaviors (Coombs & Landsverk, 1988; Metzler, Biglan, Ary, & Li, 1998). Moreover, Bean et al. (2003) found that supportive parenting practices are significant in the development of positive self-perceptions, particularly for African American adolescents. Additional studies focusing on the effects of positive parenting on African American child outcomes have shown reduced levels of child internalizing and externalizing behaviors as a result of the parents' positive behaviors (Dorsey & Forehand, 2003; Jones, Forehand, Brody, & Armistead, 2002). The relationship between parental congruence in the use of positive parenting strategies and child outcomes has not been examined to date. This relationship and the potential interaction with child gender will be examined here.

The third parenting component of interest is parental beliefs about child outcomes; this study will focus on the relationship between parental beliefs, specifically culpability and attitudes, regarding child outcomes defined as general problem behavior and sexual intentions. No research to date has examined relationships between parental beliefs congruence and child outcomes. Moreover, researchers have not yet considered the potential relationship between parental culpability regarding their child's problem behaviors and the presence of those behaviors. However, the literature on youth sexual activity and substance use provides support

for the presence of this relationship. Liberal parent attitudes regarding sex is positively correlated with child sexual activity (Thornton & Camburn, 1987). Also, mother and father attitudes regarding alcohol use predicts the child's normative standard regarding alcohol use above and beyond child temperament in preadolescence (Brody, Flor, Hollett-Wright, & McCoy, 1998). Parent beliefs may serve as a precursor for deviant behaviors and subsequent riskier behaviors; thus, parental culpability in preventing problem behaviors is considered here.

Parental attitudes regarding issues related to risky sexual behaviors have been shown to be associated with child behavior. During early and mid-adolescence, engagement in risky sexual behaviors is a serious issue for African American youth, who tend to engage in sexual activity earlier than European Americans (Dittus, Miller, Kotchick, & Forehand, 2004). An eighteen year prospective study of children demonstrates the impact of parental attitudes on child attitudes and behaviors. Specifically, parents who had more liberal attitudes regarding premarital sexual behaviors also had children who not only reflected the same attitudes, but were more sexually active (Thornton & Camburn, 1987). Congruence of parental attitudes of child sexual behavior will serve as the third parenting behavior examined in addition to monitoring and positive parenting when child sexual intentions serve as the child outcome variable.

There are also some data indicating that the various components of parenting may be applied differently depending upon the gender of the child (e.g. Longmore et al., 2001). Moreover, male and female children may differentially perceive and react to parental incongruence. Studies have shown that parental disagreements regarding child rearing have a significant, negative impact on young boys (Jouriles et al., 1991), when compared to girls (Gable et al., 1994; Margolin et al., 2001). Thus, the present study also considers the potential moderating impact that child gender may have on the parenting congruence-child functioning relationship.

Preadolescence is an important developmental period on which to focus for a number of reasons. First, during preadolescence, the foundation for future behaviors during adolescence is often established (Dishion & McMahon, 1998; Holden & Miller, 1999). Problem behaviors in preadolescence have been shown to predict an increased vulnerability to problem behaviors in adolescence and adulthood (Kosterman, Hawkins, Spoth, & Haggerty, 1997). Thus, the extent to which parents concur across three critical areas of parenting (i.e. monitoring, positive parenting, and beliefs) during a child's preadolescence may be important as the child approaches the riskier developmental period of adolescence. Preadolescents are approaching a period in their lives where risk behaviors, such as risky sexual behaviors or problem behaviors, could negatively affect their physical health as well as psychological growth (Barkin, Smith, & DuRant, 2002). Unfortunately, despite the importance of the preadolescent period, parental research has typically focused on younger children or adolescents.

While preadolescence sets the stage for behaviors that may occur during adolescence, relatively few 9 to 12 year old youth are sexually active. However, preadolescents' perceptions and intentions to engage in sexual behaviors are significant predictors of their levels of sexual activity during adolescence (Longmore et al., 2001; Staunton, Li, Black, & Ricardo, 1996; Townsend, 2002). Thus this study focuses on children's thoughts about and intentions around engaging in sexual intercourse as a marker of the potential for sexually risky behavior.

Within the framework of structural family theory, this study aims to examine the relationship between parenting congruence (across the areas of parental monitoring, positive parenting, and parents' beliefs) and outcomes for two-parent African American families. Self report, relative to observational data, has been shown to be a more effective measure of parent behavioral influences on child behavior due to the need to understand the influence of parent-child interactions that have occurred over a significantly large period of time (Abidin, 1992).

Therefore, parents' self reports of these specific areas of parenting will be utilized. With respect to the outcome variables, parents tend to be less knowledgeable regarding actual child behaviors (Coombs & Landsverk, 1988; Jaccard, Dittus, & Gordon, 1998), so child reports will be utilized for the outcome variables (i.e., problem behaviors and sexual intentions). For the strategy relying on absolute discrepancy scores between parent and co-parent, parents with lower discrepancy scores (i.e., more congruent parents) are hypothesized to have children who score lower on measures of problem behaviors and sexual intentions. With respect to the second strategy, examining patterns of discrepancy, there is no guiding literature for this question. Thus, these analyses are exploratory in nature and will allow for examination of whether the specific type of the discrepancy is important (i.e., one parent exhibiting higher or lower levels of behavior or beliefs).

Given that previous research has demonstrated some support for differences in children's perception of and reaction to parental disagreements, a second aim of this study is to determine if gender has moderating effects on child outcomes based on parenting behaviors. The moderational role of gender will be examined for the influence on the absolute discrepancy score, as well as for the patterns of discrepancy.

Methods

Participants

Study participants were enrolled in a larger community based, longitudinal intervention program focused on family communication about sexuality, the Parent's Matter Program (PMP). PMP was to designed reduce risky sexual behavior among African American adolescents by promoting positive parenting skills and communication about sexuality (Ball, Pelton, Forehand, Long, & Wallace, 2004). The baseline assessment data were collected from a total of 1109 families enrolled in PMP. These families were recruited from three sites (i.e. Athens, GA,

Atlanta, GA, and Little Rock, AR) in groups of 20-40 families (a cohort). Each of the sites recruited over a three year period (2000-2003) with 12 to 16 cohorts per site.

In order to qualify for inclusion in PMP, the parent had to be the primary and legal caregiver of a child who was in 4th or 5th grade and between the ages of 9 and 12 years old. If more than one child in the household was between 9 and 12 years old, the oldest child was selected as the target participant. Also, the target child must have resided with the primary guardian for a minimum of three years. Co-parents were assessed with the primary parent and target child if they were the opposite sex of the primary parent and had significant, regular influence on the daily life of the target child. Primary parents identified the co-parent's presence and fulfillment of this role. The present study focused on 166 dual parent African American families in which an identified co-parent completed the baseline assessment. For the purposes of the current study, same sex parent and co-parent entries were removed since opposite sex parents were the focus of this study. This resulted in a final sample size of 144 participating families. Of these 144 families, in 73 families the child was male and in 71 families the child was female.

Procedure

Focus groups and piloting were conducted to ensure all assessment measures, procedures, and intervention programs were appropriate for the community of interest in this study. Additionally, an African-American Community Liaison (CL) was selected at each research site to spearhead recruitment efforts, facility coordination, and participant retention. For each site the Principal Investigator and CL worked with a Community Advisory Board (CAB), which aided in the creation of culturally competent measures and interventions and assisted with participant recruitment. The CAB consisted of 8-12 representative leaders from each of the three study sites, who have been involved with PMP from its inception through completion.

The CL recruited participants from public schools, public housing, youth and family community programs, private and public health agencies, and churches. Advertising by posting flyers at housing authorities, local events, and community functions, item distribution (i.e. pens, mugs, and magnets with the program logo), speaking at local events, and door-to-door contact were utilized. Snowball sampling was also used where participants provided referrals of other families that may have been interested in participating.

Prior to being selected for enrollment, participants underwent a screening process conducted by the CL. The process consisted of administering a screening form developed for the program, where participants were notified of the project purpose and the longitudinal commitment (a minimum of three years) that included several assessments and an intervention to which they would be randomly assigned. If eligible, participants were scheduled to report to the designated research site at an appointed time. Upon arrival, participants were greeted by an African-American interviewer who had been trained on the program objectives, obtaining participant informed consent, confidentiality, verbal and computerized administration of the assessment, and debriefing participants. Consent forms for parents and co-parents, a consent form for child participation, and a child assent form were read aloud to participants by the interviewer. After this process, the on-site coordinator assigned the family an identification number, which was used for all assessment materials throughout the study. Next, the interviewer directed the parent to a designated area where laptop computers and headphones utilized for the assessment were in place.

Assessments were conducted via audio-computer assisted technology, also known as audio-CASI software. Participants engaged in a pre and post intervention assessment, as well as 6, 12, 24, and 36 month follow up assessments. Again, only the baseline, or pre-intervention assessment was used in the current study. For each participant, directions and measure items

were simultaneously presented on the computer screen and read aloud by the computer over individual headphones. At the beginning of the assessment, the interviewer entered the parent's ID number and some demographic information into the computer. The interviewer also provided assistance to the participant as needed with regard to the computer and headphone operation, but the participants completed the assessment individually. This same process was utilized for the co-parent and the child; however, the child was directed to an opposite end of a large room or different room in the facility to ensure privacy.

The approximate completion time for the adult assessment was 45 minutes, while the child assessment completion time was approximately 30 minutes. Upon assessment completion, the participant was debriefed, randomly assigned to one of three intervention groups, and presented with their monetary compensation for participating. The primary parent received monetary compensation of $25.00 for transportation and/or child care cost incurred as a result of attending each assessment and intervention session with the target child. When a co-parent participated, an additional $15.00 dollars was provided to the family, as was the case for all current participants. Children were given a small toy as compensation for completing the assessment.

Measures

Outcome Measures: All outcome measures were completed by the participating child.

Child Problem Behavior: Problem behavior was assessed by summing the child's response to two items from the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) Delinquency subscale (Achenbach, 1991). The two items included, "I get into trouble at school" and "I get into trouble at home," which were rated on a 3-point scale (1 = Not at all true, 2 = A little true, 3 = Very true). The two items were correlated at $p < .01$, and thus were used in combination where scores could range from 2 to 6.

Child Sexual Intentions: Due to the young age of the children sampled, sexual intentions were assessed via two separate variables. "How many times have you thought about having sex with a boy/girl?" was utilized as the first predictor of sexual intention. Responses were rated on a 5-point scale (1 = I've never thought about it, 2 = I've thought about it once or twice, 3 = I've thought about it some, 4 = I've thought about it lots of times). Higher responses indicated more thoughts about having sex. "How likely is it that you will or will not have sex in the next year?" assessed the potential of initiating sexual activity within the upcoming year, and was the second variable. Responses ranged from, "I'm sure that I won't have sex in the next year," to "I probably will have sex in the next year." Higher scores indicated increased likelihood of having sex in the coming year. Distributions for the dependent variables measuring whether the child has thought about sex and whether the child is likely to have sex were skewed, thus both of these variables were dichotomized, into "yes" and "no" responses.

Predictor Variables: All predictor variables were completed by both the parent and co-parent.

Parental Monitoring: Four items were used to assess the extent to which the parent monitored and supervised the child's activities away from the home. Sample items included, "How much do you know about who TC is with when s/he is not at home?" and "How much do you know about what TC does when s/he is not at home?" The questions were adapted from the FARBCS assessment (Miller, Forehand, & Kotchick, 1999) and were measured on a 4 point Likert scale where scores could range from 1 to 4, A higher score indicated more monitoring, and total score could range from 4 to 16. Cronbach's alpha based on parent report is .81 and .87 for co-parent report.

Positive Parenting: The Alabama Parenting Questionnaire (Shelton, Frick, & Wootton, 1996) was utilized to develop items for this scale. Three of the six questions from the positive parenting subscale, which measures how the parent responds when the child "does a good job",

were used in an effort to reduce the interview length; however, the internal reliability remained satisfactory (α = .71 for parent measures and α = .67 for co-parents). Sample items were, "When TC behaves or does a good job, how often do you reward or give something extra to him/her?" and "When TC behaves or does a good job, how often do you praise him/her?" Scores could range from 3 to 12 where a higher score was indicative of more positive parenting.

Child Problem Behavior Culpability: This measure assessed parents' sense of responsibility regarding child problem behaviors. There were two questions, "Children's problem behavior is often due to mistakes made by their parents" and "I am responsible for my child's behavior." Responses were based on a 3-point scale (1 = Not at all true, 2 = A little true, 3 = Very true) where higher scores indicated higher levels of personal accountability for child problem behaviors. Both questions were significantly correlated, ($p < .01$), for both parent (r = 0.38) and co-parent (r = 0.37), and thus, summed to create a score for each parent.

Attitudes Regarding Precursors of Sexual Behavior: This measure asked questions concerning parental attitudes towards one's child dating. Parental attitudes about dating were assessed rather than attitudes about sexual intercourse, given the young age of the sample. The questions were "I think it's okay for TC to have a boyfriend/girlfriend now" and "I think it is okay for TC to go on a date by her/himself with a boy/girl now." Questions were rated on a 3-point scale (1 = Not at all true, 2 = A little true, 3 = Very true), and values were reverse coded so that higher scores indicated more conservative views. The two questions were significantly correlated for both parents (r = .51, $p < .01$) and co-parents (r = .44, $p < .01$), and thus, combined. Scores could range from 2 to 6.

Data Analysis

The primary aim of this study was to determine if congruence between parents in selected areas of parenting resulted in more positive outcomes for children in the areas of

problem behaviors and two measures of sexual intentions, as well as whether or not child gender plays a role in these relationships. For the strategy using absolute discrepancy scores, a hierarchical regression equation was used to determine the extent to which parent discrepancy scores predicted child problem behaviors. However, due to the binary nature of each of the sexual intention variables, logistic regression analyses were used to examine the predictive value of the discrepancy scores for these outcome variables. The first logistic regression equation assessed whether the child was likely to have sex, and a second logistic regression equation assessed whether the child had thought about sex. For all of three outcome variables, the main effect of gender was entered in the first step and parent discrepancy score main effects were entered in the second step. Each independent variable was centered, and then the centered gender term was crossed with each centered parent measure discrepancy score. All cross products of a centered gender term and each centered parent discrepancy measure were individually entered as the final step.

The second strategy examined the influence of particular dyad patterns on the same child outcomes. Mothers and fathers were divided into high and low categories for each parent measure based on the median split, and categorically coded as a parent dyad. Parents were assigned one of four possible codes: 1 = low mother and high father, 2 = high mother and low father, 3 = low mother and low father, or 4 = high mother and high father. Three two-way ANOVAs were used to determine if a particular type of mother-father combination significantly predicted child problem behaviors. Logistic regression equations were used to analyze parental dyads in relation to the child thinking about sex and the child being likely to have sex. All cross products of a centered gender term and each centered parent discrepancy measure were individually entered as the final step. All analyses were conducted with SPSS 11.5 software.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

A participants' score for each variable was calculated as the sum of the participants' responses to the questionnaire measuring the variable construct. Reverse coding for specific questions were completed prior to the final score calculation. Once final scores were calculated, the predictor variable scores were converted to standard scores, which is a more consistent representation of informant discrepancy scores compared to raw scores (De Los Reyes & Kazdin, 2004). For the parents, an absolute discrepancy score (|standard score for parent report| - |standard score for co-parent report|) was calculated for each parental dyad based on the following predictor variables: monitoring, positive parenting, culpability regarding child problem behavior and sexual behavior attitudes. Means and standard deviations for parent difference scores are presented in Table 1.

Dependent variables were examined next. The dependent variable measuring child reported problem behaviors was normally distributed. However, distributions for the dependent variables measuring whether the child has thought about sex and whether the child is likely to have sex were skewed. Thus, these two variables were dichotomized based on whether or not the child had thought about sex at all or not and whether the child believed sex was likely or not. The means and standard deviations are presented in Table 1. Demographic variables were analyzed to determine potential covariates with the outcome variables. The Pearson zero order correlations revealed there were no significant relationships between the child problem behavior variable and the demographic variables. However, Spearman zero order correlations revealed child grade, parent age, and years the child has lived with the parent were significantly correlated with whether or not the child has thought about sex. Parent marital status and co-parent education level were significantly correlated with whether the child was likely to have sex.

Other demographic variables, such as family income and persons in the household, were not significantly correlated with any of the dependent variables.

Assumptions for hierarchical and logistic regressions, as well as ANOVA analyses, were assessed. Preliminary analyses of regression and ANOVA assumptions revealed child reported problem behaviors were not significantly correlated with the child sexual outcomes. These correlations are presented in Table 2. All regression assumptions were analyzed (normality, homogeneity of variance, and outliers).

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics for the Variables

Variable	N	Mean	SD
Child age	144	9.97	.80
Child grade	144	4.47	.50
Years child lived with parent	142	9.06	2.52
Parent age	144	35.61	6.87
Parent marital status	111	.84 [a]	.37
Co-parent education level	144	3.61[b]	1.46
Child Reported Problem Behaviors	144	3.54	1.02
Child Thought About Sex	144	.22	.42
Child Likely To Have Sex	144	.08	.27
Parent Difference Scores - Monitoring	144	.96	.91
Parent Difference Scores – Positive Parenting	144	.97	.73
Parent Difference Scores – Problem Behavior	144	1.14	.86
Parent Difference Scores – Sexual Attitude	144	.53	1.10

[a]Possible range:

0=Not married

1=Married

[b]Possible range:

1=never attended high school

2=attended high school but did not finish

3=completed high school or GED

4=some college

5=technical, associates, or 2-year degree

6=4-year college degree

7=completed graduate or professional school

Table 2 Correlations for Variables

Variable	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.
1. Child age	1 (1)	-.09 (-.09)	.17* (.63**)	.14 (.11)	-.14 (-.15)	.06 (.04)	.02 (.03)	.17* (.14)	.11 (.07)	-.03 (-.09)	.00 (.02)	-.05 (.02)	.14 (.15)
2. Child grade		1 (1)	-.04 (-.05)	-.01 (-.11)	.01 (.01)	-.12 (-.11)	.07 (-.08)	-.04 (-.04)	-.01 (-.01)	.08 (.09)	.12 (.10)	.02 (-.01)	-.11 (-.14)
3. Years child lived with parent			1 (1)	-.13 (-.03)	-.04 (-.11)	.03 (.05)	.15 (.10)	.16 (.22*)	.06 (-.09)	-.05 (-.12)	.00 (-.01)	.04 (.00)	.15 (.17*)
4. Parent age				1 (1)	.11 (.09)	-.01 (-.05)	.03 (.05)	.17* (.20*)	.14 (.06)	.05 (-.03)	-.11 (-.13)	-.11 (-.15)	-.01 (-.02)
5. Parent marital status					1 (1)	-.13 (-.10)	-.10 (-.09)	-.09 (-.09)	-.09 (-.09)	.14 (.14)	-.02 (-.04)	.05 (.03)	-.02 (.12)
6. Co-parent education level						1 (1)	-.04 (.08)	.02 (-.09)	-.07 (-.09)	.14 (.14)	-.03 (.03)	.10 (.09)	-.22* (-.20*)
7. Child reported problem behavior							1 (1)	.06 (.08)	.03 (.04)	-.06 (-.04)	-.03 (-.02)	.07 (.07)	.11 (.10)
8. Child thought about sex								1 (1)	.54** (.54**)	-.07 (-.04)	-.19* (-.14)	-.08 (-.08)	-.03 (-.06)
9. Child likely to have sex									1 (1)	.10 (.07)	-.03 (-.05)	.01 (.02)	-.11 (-.09)
10. Parent difference scores – monitoring										1 (1)	-.01 (-.07)	.-.02 (-.08)	-.06 (-.12)
11. Parent difference scores – positive											1 (1)	.15 (.18*)	-.08 (-.02)
12. Parent difference scores – problem behavior												1 (1)	-.09 (-.06)
Variable scores – sexual attitude													1 (1)

Note. Items in parentheses are Spearman rho correlations
* $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$

Primary Analyses

Hierarchical regression analyses were conducted to determine if parent discrepancy scores were significant predictors of child problem behaviors and whether gender was a moderator. Specifically, the centered child gender was entered in Block 1. The centered parent difference scores were entered in Block 2. Block 3 contained the child multiplicative terms of child gender and the parent difference scores. Results indicated there were no main effects for parent discrepancies across monitoring, positive parenting, and child behavior culpability, nor were there child gender moderating effects for child problem behaviors. Results of these analyses are presented in Table 3.

Due to the dichotomous nature of the child sexual intention variables, logistic regression was utilized to determine if parent discrepancy scores predicted whether the child had thought about sex and whether the child was likely to have sex, and moderating effects of gender were also examined. Centered child gender was entered in Block 1. The centered parent difference scores were entered in Block 2. Block 3 contained the multiplicative terms of child gender and parent difference scores. Parent discrepancy scores across monitoring, positive parenting, and parent attitudes about sex, as well as child gender moderating effects, were not significant predictors of the likelihood of a child having sex in the next year. Results are presented in Tables 4 through 6.

Parent discrepancy scores for parent's attitudes about sexual behavior precursors did not significantly predict whether or not the child had thought about sex, and results are presented in Table 8. However, positive parenting discrepancy scores were a significant predictor of whether or not the child had thought about sex and are presented in Table 7. The less discrepant the parents were regarding their positive parenting behaviors, the more likely it was for children to have thought about sex (χ^2 = (1, N = 142) = 4.31, $p < .05$, odds ratio = .46). Additionally, there

Table 3 Hierarchical Regression Model for Predicting Child Problem Behaviors (N=144)

Variable	F	R^2	R^2_{adj}	β
Block 1[a]	2.94	.02	.01	
Gender				-.16
Block 2[a]	1.53	.04	.02	
Parent Difference Scores - Monitoring				-.08
Parent Difference Scores – Positive Parenting				.00
Parent Difference Scores – Problem Behavior Culpability				.12
Model 1				
Block 3	1.22	.04	.01	
Diff Monitor x Gender				.01
Model 2				
Block 3	1.57	.05	.02	
Diff Positive Parent x Gender				-.11
Model 3				
Block 3	1.32	.05	.01	
Diff Problem Beh x Gender				-.06

[a]Values are the same for all models

Table 4 Logistic Regression Model for Predicting Child Sex Likely with Difference Scores for Monitoring and Child Gender Interaction (N=111)

Variable	χ^2	β	SE	OR	95% CI
Block 1					
Parent currently married	1.30	-1.07	.94	.34	.06-2.16
Co-parent education level	.56	-.23	.31	.80	.44-1.45
Block 2					
Gender	.50	1.11	1.57	3.02	.14-65.46
Block 3					
Parent difference scores - monitoring	1.16	-1.16	1.08	.31	.04-2.58
Parent Difference Scores – Positive Parenting	.02	.08	.60	1.08	.33-3.51
Parent Difference Scores – Sex Attitude	.90	-1.05	1.11	.35	.04-3.07
Block 4					
Diff Monitoring x Gender	1.38	2.54	2.14	12.35	.19-817-.80

SE = Standard Error; OR = odds ratio; CI = confidence interval

Table 5 Logistic Regression Model for Predicting Child Sex Likely with Difference Scores for Positive Parenting and Gender Interaction (N=111)

Variable	χ^2	β	SE	OR	95% CI
Block 1					
Parent currently married	.97	-.90	.91	.41	.07-2.43
Co-parent education level	.57	-.24	.32	.79	.42-1.48
Block 2					
Gender	.01	.08	.86	1.09	.20-5.84
Block 3					
Parent difference scores - monitoring	.68	-.49	.59	.61	.19-1.96
Parent Difference Scores – Positive Parenting	.05	.14	.63	1.15	.33-3.97
Parent Difference Scores – Sex Attitude	.70	-.93	1.12	.39	.04-3.52
Block 4					
Diff Positive Parenting x Gender	.14	-.47	1.26	.62	.05-7.34

SE = Standard Error; OR = odds ratio; CI = confidence interval

Table 6 Logistic Regression Model for Predicting Child Sex Likely with Difference Scores for Parent Sex Attitudes and Gender Interaction (N=142)

Variable	χ^2	β	SE	OR	95% CI
Block 1					
Parent currently married	.91	-.87	.91	.42	.07-2.48
Co-parent education level	.62	-.25	.32	.78	.41-1.46
Block 2					
Gender	.00	-3.58	5329.55	.03	.00
Block 3					
Parent difference scores - monitoring	.62	-.47	.60	.63	.20-2.01
Parent Difference Scores – Positive Parenting	.01	.07	.59	1.07	.34-3.42
Parent Difference Scores – Sex Attitude	.00	-4.66	5514.40	.01	.00
Block 4					
Diff Sex Attitudes x Gender	.00	-7.70	11184.14	.00	.00

SE = Standard Error; OR = odds ratio; CI = confidence interval

Table 7 Logistic Regression Model for Predicting Child Thought About Sex with Difference Scores for Positive Parenting and Gender Interaction (N=142)

Variable	χ^2	β	SE	OR	95% CI
Block 1[a]					
Child grade	.05	.10	.45	1.11	.46-2.66
Parent age	4.83	.07	.03	1.08*	1.01-1.15
Years lived with parent	4.45	.29	.14	1.34*	1.02-1.75
Block 2					
Gender	.45	-.33	.49	.72	.27-1.89
	(.45)	(.33)	(.49)	(1.39)	(.53-3.66)
Block 3					
Parent difference scores -	.56	-.20	.27	.82	.48-1.39
monitoring	(.56)	(-.20)	(.27)	(.82)	(.48-1.39)
Parent difference scores – positive	4.31	-.78	.38	.46*	.22-.96
parenting	(.05)	(-.10)	(.44)	(.90)	(.38-2.14)
Parent difference scores – sex	1.63	-.30	.23	.74	.47-1.17
attitude	(3.19)	(-.30)	(.23)	(.75)	(.47-1.17)
Block 4					
Diff positive parenting x gender	3.19	1.34	.75	3.83[b]	.88-16.66
	(3.19)	(-1.34)	(.75)	(.26[b])	(.06-1.14)

Note. Logistic regression values for boys are represented in parentheses

SE = Standard Error; OR = odds ratio; CI = confidence interval

[a]Values are the same for boy and girl odds

[b]$p \leq .10$. * $p \leq .05$.

Table 8 Logistic Regression Model for Predicting Child Thought About Sex with Difference Scores for Parent Sex Attitudes and Gender Interaction (N=142)

Variable	χ^2	β	SE	OR	95% CI
Block 1[a]					
Child grade	.11	.15	.45	1.16	.48-2.78
Parent age	4.71	.07	.03	1.08*	1.01-1.15
Years lived with parent	3.88	.27	.14	1.31*	1.00-1.71
Block 2					
Gender	.00	-5.00	4774.21	.01	.00-
	(.00)	(5.00)	(4774.21)	(148.01)	(.00-)
Block 3					
Parent difference scores -	1.02	-.27	.27	.76	.45-1.29
monitoring	(1.02)	(-.27)	(.26)	(.76)	(.45-1.29)
Parent difference scores –	3.43	-.66	.36	.52[b]	.26-1.04
positive parenting	(3.43)	(-.66)	(.36)	(.52 [b])	(.25-.1.04)
Parent difference scores – sex	.79	-.20	.23	.82	.53-1.28
attitude	(.00)	(-9.72)	(10018.75)	(13573.42)	(.00-)
Block 4					
Diff sex attitude x gender	.00	-9.52	10018.74	.00	.00
	(.00)	(9.52)	(10018.75)	(13573.42)	(.00)

Note. Logistic regression values for boys are represented in parentheses

SE = Standard Error; OR = odds ratio; CI = confidence interval

[a]Values are the same for boy and girl odds

[b]$p \leq .10$. * $p \leq .05$.

was a trend for gender moderating the association between parent discrepancy scores for positive parenting and child thoughts about sex (see Table 7). Moreover, there was also a trend for gender moderating an association between discrepancy scores of parental monitoring and child thoughts about sex (see Table 8). Boys and girls were separately examined in logistic regressions with respect to the relationships between child thoughts about sex and both predictor variables (i.e., parent discrepancy for positive parenting and monitoring). The following relationships were observed. There was an increase in the likelihood of a boy having thought about sex if the parents were less discrepant with regard to either monitoring behaviors (χ^2 = (1, N = 71) = 2.59, p = .10, odds ratio = .49) or positive parenting behaviors (χ^2 = (1, N = 71) = 5.88, p = .02, odds ratio = .19), whereas girls did not yield a significant result (see Table 10).

A second set of analyses was conducted to accomplish the second strategy, examining the impact of the patterns of parent discrepancy on child functioning. Moderating effects of gender were also examined. Each mother and father predictor variable was dummy coded into high and low groups based on a median split of the responses for mother and father dyads. Then each parent dyad was assigned a categorical value of either 1 (low mother and high father), 2 (high mother and low father), 3 (low mother and low father), or 4 (high mother and high father) in order to capture the discrepancy direction of each parental dyad.

A two-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if the parent dyad discrepancy direction was a significant predictor of child problem behaviors. Child gender was the first factor and parenting pattern was the second factor. There were no significant findings, and the results are presented in Table 11.

For child thoughts about sex and likelihood of having sex, logistic regression was used. Parent dyad groups were orthogonally contrast coded. Covariates were entered in Block 1, child

Table 9 Logistic Regression Model for Predicting Child Thought About Sex with Difference Scores for Monitoring and Child Gender Interaction (N=142)

Variable	χ^2	β	SE	OR	95% CI
Block 1[a]					
Child grade	.16	.18	.45	1.20	.49-2.91
Parent age	4.05	.07	.03	1.07*	1.00-1.14
Years lived with parent	3.75	.28	.14	1.32*	1.00-1.75
Block 2					
Gender	.61	-.39	.49	.68	.26-1.79
	(.61)	(-.39)	(.49)	(1.47)	(.56-3.86)
Block 3					
Parent difference scores -	1.16	-.29	.27	.75	.44-1.27
monitoring	(.36)	(.20)	(.33)	(1.22)	(.64-2.33)
Parent Difference Scores –	2.93	-.62	.36	.54[b]	.26-1.10
Positive Parenting	(2.93)	(-.62)	(.36)	(.54[b])	(.26-1.10)
Parent Difference Scores – Sex	1.18	-.25	.23	.78	.49-1.23
Attitude	(1.18)	(-.25)	(.23)	(.78)	(.49-1.23)
Block 4					
Diff Monitor x Gender	3.23	.97	.54	2.63[b]	.92-7.57
	(3.23)	(-.97)	(.54)	(.38)[b]	(.13-1.09)

Note. Logistic regression values for boys are represented in parentheses

SE = Standard Error; OR = odds ratio; CI = confidence interval

[a]Values are the same for boy and girl odds

[b]$p \leq .10$. * $p \leq .05$.

Table 10 Logistic Regression Model By Gender for Predicting Child Thought About Sex with Parent Difference Scores for Monitoring (Girls, N = 71 and Boys, N = 71)

Variable	χ^2	β	SE	OR	95% CI
Block 1					
Child grade	1.13	.71	.66	2.02	.55-7.42
	(.21)	(-.32)	(.69)	(.73)	(.19-2.79)
Parent age	3.45	.09	.05	1.09[a]	1.00-1.20
	(1.94)	(.08)	(.05)	(1.57)	(.96-2.56)
Years lived with parent	1.37	.18	.15	1.20	.89-1.62
Block 2					
Parent difference scores -	.40	.21	.33	1.24	.64-2.38
monitoring	(2.59)	(-.72)	(.44)	(.50[a])	(.21-1.17)
Parent difference scores –	.04	-.08	.44	.92	.39-2.18
positive parenting	(5.88)	(-1.68)	(.69)	(.19*)	(.05-.72)
Parent difference scores – sex	.00	-12.63	16181.75	.00	.00-
attitude	(2.11)	(-.35)	(.24)	(.70)	(.44-1.13)

Note. Logistic regression values for boys are represented in parentheses

SE = Standard Error; OR = odds ratio; CI = confidence interval

[a]$p \leq .10$. * $p \leq .05$.

Table 11 Summary of ANOVA Analyses Examining Parent Dyads Predicting Child Problem Behaviors to Predict if Child Sex Likely and Gender Interaction (N = 144)

Variable	df	F	η_p^2
Model 1			
Main Effect Child Gender	1	2.77	.02
Main Effect Parent Monitoring Dyads	3	.64	.01
Monitoring Dyad x Child Gender	3	.25	.01
Model 2			
Main Effect Child Gender	1	3.38 [a]	.02
Main Effect Parent Positive Parenting Dyads	3	.52	.01
Positive Parent Dyad x Child Gender	3	1.20	.03
Model 3			
Main Effect Child Gender	1	3.02 [a]	.02
Main Effect Parent Problem Behavior Culpability Dyads	3	1.94	.04
Problem Behavior Culpability x Child Gender	3	.73	.02

[a] $p \leq .10$

gender was entered in Block 2, the coded parent dyads were entered in the Block 3, and child gender interactions with each coded variable were entered separately in Block 4. There were no significant effects of parent dyad levels on the likelihood that a child will have sex in the next year, and the results are presented in Tables 12 through 14.

With respect to thoughts about sex, monitoring patterns were a significant predictor of a child's thoughts about sex and the results are presenting in Table 15. Parents who were more discrepant in monitoring patterns yielded worse child outcomes. However, this effect was qualified by an interaction with gender. Compared to the remaining three parent dyad combinations, there was a trend suggesting girls were less likely to have thought about sex when both parents were high on monitoring (χ^2 = (1, N = 71) = 2.32, $p \leq .10$, odds ratio = .66). Additionally, there was a trend that suggested boys who have a mother and father who are high on monitoring have thought about sex more than boys who have a mother and father who are both low on monitoring (χ^2 = (1, N = 71) = 2.99, $p \leq .08$, odds ratio = 2.25). These results are presented in Table 16.

Regarding parental attitudes about sex, there was also a significant gender interaction (see Table 18). Further analysis revealed a trend suggesting that boys whose parents were both conservative regarding attitudes about precursors to sexual behavior thought about sex less than boys whose parents held more liberal attitudes about precursors to sex (χ^2 = (1, N = 71) = 1.83, $p \leq .10$, odds ratio = 1.42), and girls analyses were not significant. The results are presented in Table 19. The remaining parent measure, positive parenting, was not a significant predictor, and the results are presented in Tables 17.

Table 12 Summary of Logistic Regression Analyses Examining Parent Dyads on Monitoring to Predict if Child Sex Likely with Child Gender Interaction (N=111)

Variable	χ^2	β	SE	OR	95% CI
Model 1					
Block 1					
Parent currently married	.35	-.55	.94	.58	.09-3.60
	(.64)	(-.74)	(.92)	(.48)	(.08-2.91)
	[.73]	[-.79]	[.93]	[.45]	[.07-2.79]
Co-parent education level	1.20	-.32	.29	.73	.41-1.29
	(1.20)	(-.33)	(.30)	(.72)	(.40-1.30)
	[1.27]	[-.34]	[.31]	[.71]	[.39-1.29]
Block 2					
Child Gender	.68	.79	.95	2.19	.34-14.09
	(.47)	(.59)	(.86)	(1.81)	(.34-9.73)
	[.63]	[.72]	[.90]	[2.05]	[.35-11.98]
Block 3					
X_1	.99	.23	.23	1.25	.80-1.95
	(1.04)	(.22)	(.22)	(1.24)	(.82-1.90)
	[1.11]	[.23]	[.22]	[1.26]	[.82-1.93]
X_2	.35	-.24	.41	.79	.36-1.74
	(.44)	(-.31)	(.47)	(.73)	(.29-1.83)
	[.58]	[-.55]	[.72]	[.58]	[.14-2.36]
X_3	.33	-.37	.64	.69	.20-2.44
	(.35)	(-.38)	(.64)	(.69)	(.20-2.39)
	[.69]	[1.20]	[1.44]	[3.32]	[.20-56.16]
Block 4					
Child Gender x X_1	.70	-.37	.45	.69	.29-1.65
Child Gender x X_2	.24	.45	.93	1.57	.26-9.72
Child Gender x X_3	.69	1.20	1.44	3.32	.20-56.16
Model 2					
Block 1					

Parent currently married	.56	-.67	.92	.50	.08-3.03
	(.37)	(-.57)	(.94)	(.57)	(.09-3.53)
	[.73]	[-.79]	[.93]	[.45]	[.07-2.79]
Co-parent education level	1.17	-.32	.30	.72	.40-1.30
	(1.22)	(-.32)	(.29)	(.73)	(.41-1.28)
	[1.27]	[-.34]	[.31]	[.71]	[.39-1.29]
Block 2					
Child Gender	.00	4.76	2409.56	117.04	.00-
	(.59)	(.70)	(.91)	(2.01)	(.34-11.95)
	[.63]	[.72]	[.90]	[2.05]	[.35-11.98]
Block 3					
X_1	.00	-2.37	1221.51	.09	.00-
	(.56)	(-.21)	(.29)	(.81)	(.46-1.41)
	[.48]	[-.20]	[.29]	[.82]	[.47-1.44]
X_2	.40	.20	.30	1.21	.67- 2.17
	(.51)	(.23)	(.32)	(1.25)	(.67-2.33)
	[.58]	[.24]	[.32]	[1.28]	[.68-2.38]
X_3	.35	-.38	.64	.69	.20-2.40
	(.33)	(-.37)	(.64)	(.69)	(1.98-2.44)
	[.58]	[-.55]	[.72]	[.58]	[.14-2.36]
Block 4					
Child Gender x X_1	.00	4.55	2409.56	94.20	.00-
Child Gender x X_2	.46	-.42	.62	.66	.19-2.23
Child Gender x X_3	.69	1.20	1.44	3.32	.20-56.16
Model 3					
Block 1					
Parent currently married	.49	-.65	.93	.52	.08-3.23
	(.73)	(-.79)	(.93)	(.45)	(.07-2.80)
	[.35]	[-.55]	[.93]	[.58]	[.09-3.59]
Co-parent education level	1.23	-.33	.30	.72	.40-1.29
	(1.27)	(-.34)	(.31)	(.71)	(.39-1.29)
	[1.18]	[-.32]	[.29]	[.73]	[.41-1.29]

Block 2					
Child Gender	.41	.53	.83	1.71	.34-8.70
	(.63)	(.72)	(.90)	(2.05)	(.35-11.98)
	[.83]	[1.01]	[1.11]	[2.74]	[.31-23.89]
Block 3					
X_1	.00	.01	.45	1.01	.42-2.42
	(.01)	(-.04)	(.47)	(.96)	(.39-2.39)
	[.10]	[.15]	[.49]	[1.17]	[.45-3.01]
X_2	.33	.37	.64	1.45	.41-5.05
	(.58)	(.55)	(.72)	(1.73)	(.42-7.07)
	[.33]	[.37]	[.64]	[1.44]	[.41-5.05]
X_3	1.10	.64	.61	1.90	.58-6.19
	(1.12)	(.64)	(.61)	(1.90)	(.58-6.26)
	[1.39]	[.91]	[.78]	[2.49]	[.55-11.39]
Block 4					
Child Gender x X_1	.05	.19	.84	1.21	.23-6.30
Child Gender x X_2	.69	-1.12	1.44	.30	.02-5.11
Child Gender x X_3	.94	-1.48	1.53	.23	.01-4.55

Note. Values in parentheses are based on the X_2 interaction and values in brackets are based on the X_3 interaction

SE = Standard Error; OR = odds ratio; CI = confidence interval

Model 1

X_1= Hi mom/Hi dad vs. Lo mom/Lo dad, Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_2= Lo mom/Lo dad vs. Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_3= Hi mom/Lo dad vs. Lo mom/Hi dad

Model 2

X_1= Lo mom/Lo dad vs. Hi mom/Hi dad, Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_2= Hi mom/Hi dad vs. Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_3= Hi mom/Lo dad vs. Lo mom/Hi dad

Model 3

X_1= Lo mom/Lo dad, Hi mom/Hi dad vs. Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_2= Hi mom/Lo dad vs. Lo mom/Hi dad

X_3= Hi mom/Hi dad vs. Lo mom/Lo dad

Table 13 Summary of Logistic Regression Analyses Examining Parent Dyads on Positive Parenting to Predict if Child Sex Likely with Child Gender Interaction (N = 111)

Variable	χ^2	β	SE	OR	95% CI
Model 1					
Block 1					
Parent currently married	1.10	-1.00	.96	.37	.06-2.39
	(.80)	(-.85)	(.95)	(.43)	(.07-2.75)
	[.88]	[-.89]	[.95]	[.41]	[.06-2.65]
Co-parent education level	1.17	-.36	.33	.70	.37-1.34
	(1.28)	(-.36)	(.32)	(.70)	(.38-1.30)
	[1.22]	[-.35]	[.32]	[.70]	[.38-1.32]
Block 2					
Child Gender	.00	4.87	2405.91	130.54	.00-
	(.31)	(.49)	(.88)	(1.63)	(.29-9.16)
	[1.19]	[1.31]	[1.21]	[3.72]	[.35-39.47]
Block 3					
X_1	.00	-.88	1425.54	.41	.00-
	(.00)	(1.27)	(740.70)	(3.57)	(.00-)
	[.00]	[1.29]	[684.78]	[3.65]	[.00-]
X_2	.00	3.09	1475.91	21.86	.00-
	(.00)	(3.06)	(1481.41)	(21.27)	(.00-)
	[.00]	[3.17]	[1369.57]	[23.76]	[.00-]
X_3	.00	9.71	4427.73	16447.48	.00-
	(.00)	(9.69)	(4444.21)	(16207.82)	(.00-)
	[.00]	[10.01]	[4108.70]	[22240.65]	[.00-]
Block 4					
Child Gender x X_1	.00	4.53	2405.91	92.33	.00-
Child Gender x X_2	.29	.33	.62	1.39	.42-4.65
Child Gender x X_3	.77	-1.58	1.80	.21	.01-6.99
Model 2					
Block 1					
Parent currently married	.83	-.83	.91	.44	.07-2.61

	(1.13)	(-.99)	(.93)	(.37)	(.06-2.31)
	[.87]	[-.85]	[.92]	[.43]	[.07-2.57]
Co-parent education level	1.24	-.35	.32	.70	.38-1.31
	(1.19)	(-.36)	(.33)	(.70)	(.36-1.34)
	[1.07]	[-.34]	[.33]	[.71]	[.38-1.35]
Block 2					
Child Gender	.27	.45	.86	1.57	.30-8.53
	(.93)	(1.19)	(1.24	(3.30)	(.29-37.34)
	[.54]	[.66]	[.89]	[1.93]	[.34-11.12]
Block 3					
X_1	.56	.16	.22	1.18	.77-1.81
	(1.25)	(.31)	(.28)	(1.37)	(.79-2.36)
	[.67]	[.18]	[.22]	[1.19]	[.78-1.82]
X_2	.39	-.25	.40	.78	.36-1.70
	(.93)	(-.75)	(.77)	(.48)	(.10-2.60)
	[.44]	[-.26]	[.40]	[.77]	[.35-1.68]
X_3	.40	.40	.62	1.47	.20-2.44
	(.50)	(.46)	(.65)	(1.58)	(.44-5.66)
	[.53]	[.49]	[.68]	[1.64]	[.44-6.18]
Block 4					
Child Gender x X_1	.27	.22	.42	1.25	.55-2.83
Child Gender x X_2	1.08	1.74	1.68	5.71	.21-152.30
Child Gender x X_3	.46	-.86	1.28	.42	.04-5.14
Model 3					
Block 1					
Parent currently married	.88	-.89	.95	.41	.06-2.65
	(.88)	(-.89)	(.95)	(.41)	(.06-2.65)
	[.90]	[-.91]	[.96]	[.40]	[.06-2.63]
Co-parent education level	1.22	-.35	.32	.70	.38-1.32
	(1.22)	(-.35)	(.32)	(.70)	(.38-1.32)
	[1.27]	[-.36]	[.32]	[.70]	[.37-1.31]
Block 2					

Child Gender	.33	.52	.90	1.68	.29-9.84
	(1.19)	(1.31)	(1.21)	(3.72)	(.35-39.47)
	[.58]	[.69]	[.91]	[2.00]	[.34-11.93]
Block 3					
X_1	.00	-4.29	2220.51	.01	.00-
	(.00)	(-4.46)	(2054.35)	(.01)	(.00-)
	[.00]	[-4.34]	[2206.00]	[.01]	[.00-]
X_2	.00	-9.67	4441.02	.00	.00-
	(.00)	(-10.01)	(4108.70)	(.00)	(.00-)
	[.00]	[-9.73]	[4411.99]	[.00]	[.00-]
X_3	.92	-.58	.61	.56	.17-1.83
	(.92)	(-.58)	(.61)	(.56)	(.17-1.83)
	[.87]	[-59]	[.63]	[.56]	[.16-1.92]
Block 4					
Child Gender x X_1	.77	-.79	.90	.45	.08-2.64
Child Gender x X_2	.77	1.58	1.80	4.87	.14-166.31
Child Gender x X_3	.03	.22	1.20	1.25	.12-13.24

Note. Values in parentheses are based on the X_2 interactions and values in brackets are based on the X_3 interactions

SE = Standard Error; OR = odds ratio; CI = confidence interval

Model 1

X_1= Hi mom/Hi dad vs. Lo mom/Lo dad, Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_2= Lo mom/Lo dad vs. Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_3= Hi mom/Lo dad vs. Lo mom/Hi dad

Model 2

X_1= Lo mom/Lo dad vs. Hi mom/Hi dad, Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_2= Hi mom/Hi dad vs. Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_3= Hi mom/Lo dad vs. Lo mom/Hi dad

Model 3

X_1= Lo mom/Lo dad, Hi mom/Hi dad vs. Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_2= Hi mom/Lo dad vs. Lo mom/Hi dad

X_3= Hi mom/Hi dad vs. Lo mom/Lo dad

Table 14 Summary of Logistic Regression Analyses Examining Parent Dyads on Sex Attitudes to Predict if Child Sex Likely with Child Gender Interaction (N = 111)

Variable	χ^2	β	SE	OR	95% CI
Model 1					
Block 1					
Parent currently married	1.34	-1.08	.93	.34	.06-2.11
	(.54)	(-.69)	(.93)	(.50)	(.08-3.15)
	[1.17]	[-.99]	[.92]	[.37]	[.06-2.24]
Co-parent education level	1.25	-.37	.33	.69	.36-1.32
	(1.16)	(-.34)	(.32)	(.71)	(.38-1.33)
	[1.28]	[-.36]	[.32]	[.70]	[.37-1.30]
Block 2					
Child Gender	.00	4.75	2888.74	115.80	.00-
	(.29)	(.55)	(1.01)	(1.73)	(.24-12.60)
	[.51]	[.65]	[.91]	[1.91]	[.32-11.46]
Block 3					
X_1	.00	-2.27	1464.43	.10	.00
	(.10)	(.08)	(.26)	(1.08)	(.66-1.79)
	[.01]	[.02]	[.23]	[1.02]	[.65-1.62]
X_2	.00	.00	.34	1.00	.52-1.93
	(.02)	(-.07)	(.44)	(.94)	(.39-2.23)
	[.06]	[.09]	[.36]	[1.09]	[.54-2.19]
X_3	.76	.56	.64	1.75	.50-6.15
	(.93)	(.63)	(.65)	(1.88)	(.52-6.75)
	[.97]	[.71]	[.72]	[2.03]	[.50-8.29]
Block 4					
Child Gender x X_1	.00	4.85	2888.74	127.18	.00
Child Gender x X_2	1.17	-1.04	.96	.35	.05-2.32
Child Gender x X_3	.40	-.91	1.45	.40	.02-6.86
Model 2					
Block 1					
Parent currently married	.66	-.75	.92	.47	.08-2.89

	(1.28)	(-1.05)	(.92)	(.35)	(.06-2.15)
	[1.08]	[-.94]	[.91]	[.39]	[.07-2.31]
Co-parent education level	1.10	-.32	.32	.73	.39-1.35
	(1.23)	(-.35)	(.32)	(.70)	(.38-1.31)
	[1.05]	[-.32]	[.32]	[.72]	[.39-1.35]
Block 2					
Child Gender	.00	-3.60	2767.10	.03	.00-
	(.35)	(.53)	(.89)	(1.70)	(.30-9.77)
	[.38]	[.56]	[.90]	[1.75]	[.30-10.17]
Block 3					
X_1	.00	-2.16	1363.34	.12	.00
	(.01)	(.03)	(.24)	(1.03)	(.64-1.64)
	[.00]	[-.01]	[.24]	[.99]	[.63-1.57]
X_2	.00	-.01	.33	1.00	.52-1.88
	(.07)	(-.11)	(.41)	(.90)	(.41-1.99)
	[.01]	[.02]	[.33]	[1.02]	[.54-1.94]
X_3	.16	.22	.57	1.25	.41-3.80
	(.15)	(.24)	(.62)	(1.27)	(.38-4.28)
	[.30]	[.35]	[.65]	[1.43]	[.40-5.08]
Block 4					
Child Gender x X_1	.00	-4.99	2767.10	.01	.00-
Child Gender x X_2	.51	.60	.84	1.81	.35-9.78
Child Gender x X_3	.46	-.87	1.28	.42	.03-5.19
Model 3					
Block 1					
Parent currently married	.77	-.82	.94	.44	.07-2.75
	(1.17)	(-.99)	(.92)	(.37)	(.06-2.24)
	[.80]	[-.85]	[.95]	[.43]	[.07-2.75]
Co-parent education level	1.25	-.35	.32	.70	.38-1.31
	(1.28)	(-.36)	(.32)	(.70)	(.37-1.30)
	[1.08]	[-.34]	[.33]	[.71]	[.38-1.35]
Block 2					

Child Gender	.39	.53	.85	1.70	.32-9.01
	(.51)	(.65)	(.91)	(1.91)	(.32-11.46)
	[.40]	[.83]	[1.31]	[2.29]	[.17-30.05]
Block 3					
X_1	.03	-.07	.43	.94	.40-2.16
	(.06)	(-.11)	(.45)	(.90)	(.38-2.16)
	[.00]	[4.45]	[1986.32]	[85.80]	[.00-]
X_2	.84	-.59	.65	.55	.16-1.96
	(.97)	(-.71)	(.72)	(.49)	(.12-2.01)
	[.84]	[-.59]	[.65]	[.55]	[.16-1.97]
X_3	.00	.01	.57	1.01	.34-3.07
	(.01)	(-.04)	(.56)	(.96)	(.32-2.87)
	[.00	[-.41]	[55.18]	[.67]	[.00-]
Block 4					
Child Gender x X_1	.12	.31	.87	1.36	.25-7.46
Child Gender x X_2	.40	.91	1.45	2.50	.15-42.69
Child Gender x X_3	.00	19.04	7945.29	$1.9x10^8$	.00-

Note. Values in parentheses are based on the X_2 interactions and values in brackets are based on the X_3 interactions

SE = Standard Error; OR = odds ratio; CI = confidence interval

Model 1

X_1= Hi mom/Hi dad vs. Lo mom/Lo dad, Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_2= Lo mom/Lo dad vs. Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_3= Hi mom/Lo dad vs. Lo mom/Hi dad

Model 2

X_1= Lo mom/Lo dad vs. Hi mom/Hi dad, Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_2= Hi mom/Hi dad vs. Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_3= Hi mom/Lo dad vs. Lo mom/Hi dad

Model 3

X_1= Lo mom/Lo dad, Hi mom/Hi dad vs. Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_2= Hi mom/Lo dad vs. Lo mom/Hi dad

X_3= Hi mom/Hi dad vs. Lo mom/Lo dad

Table 15 Summary of Logistic Regression Analyses Examining Parent Dyads on Monitoring to Predict if Child Thought About Sex with Child Gender Interaction (N = 142)

Variable	χ^2	β	SE	OR	95% CI
Model 1					
Block 1					
Child grade	.03	-.08	.45	.92	.38-2.22
	(.07)	(-.12)	(.44)	(.89)	(.37-2.12)
	[.11]	[-.15]	[.44]	[.86]	[.36-2.06]
Parent age	4.18	.07	.03	1.07*	1.00-1.14
	(5.63)	(.08)	(.03)	(1.08**)	(1.01-1.16)
	[5.88]	[.08]	[.03]	[1.08**]	[1.02-1.16]
Years lived with parent	3.84	.25	.13	1.29*	1.00-1.66
	(3.65)	(.25)	(.13)	(1.28*)	(.99-1.66)
	[3.32]	[.24]	[.13]	[1.27*]	[.98-1.64]
Block 2					
Child Gender	.56	-.36	.48	.70	.27-1.79
	(.63)	(-.36)	(.46)	(.70)	(.28-1.70)
	[.65]	[-.36]	[.45]	[.70]	[.29-1.68]
Block 3					
X_1	.52	-.11	.16	.89	.66-1.21
	(.02)	(-.02)	(.12)	(.98)	(.77-1.25)
	[.02]	[-.02]	[.12]	[.99]	[.77-1.25]
X_2	3.81	-.40	.21	.67*	.45-1.00
	(4.14)	(-.44)	(.22)	(.65*)	(.42-.98)
	[4.00]	[-.42]	[.21]	[.66*]	[.44-.99]
X_3	.01	-.02	.29	.98	.56-1.72
	(.02)	(-.04)	(.29)	(.96)	(.54-1.69)
	[.03]	[-.05]	[.29]	[.95]	[.54-1.69]
Block 4					
Child Gender x X_1	3.56	-.60	.32	.55*	.30-1.02
Child Gender x X_2	.05	-.09	.43	.91	.39-2.12
Child Gender x X_3	.77	-.52	.59	.60	.19-1.89

Model 2					
Block 1					
Child grade	.08	-.13	.44	.88	.37-2.10
	(.03)	(-.08)	(.45)	(.93)	(.39-2.24)
	[.11]	[-.15]	[.44]	[.86]	[.36-2.06]
Parent age	6.32	.08	.03	1.09**	1.02-1.60
	(3.8)	(.07)	(.03)	(1.07*)	(1.00-1.14)
	[5.88]	[.08]	[.03]	[1.08**]	[1.02-1.16]
Years lived with parent	3.62	.24	.13	1.28*	.99-1.64
	(3.89)	(.26)	(.13)	(1.30*)	(1.00-1.14)
	[3.32]	[.24]	[.13]	[1.27 [a]]	[.98-1.64]
Block 2					
Child Gender	.37	-.27	.45	.76	.31-1.85
	(.70)	(-.40)	(.48)	(.67)	(.26-1.72)
	[.65]	[-.36]	[.45]	[.70]	[.29-1.68]
Block 3					
X_1	3.23	-.27	.15	.76[a]	.57-1.03
	(2.58)	(-.24)	(.15)	(.78)	(.58-1.06)
	[3.32]	[-.28]	[.15]	[.76[a]]	[.56-1.02]
X_2	1.04	-.17	.17	.84	.06-1.17
	(1.71)	(-.26)	(.20)	(.77)	(.52-1.14)
	[.89]	[-.16]	[.17]	[.85]	[.61-1.19]
X_3	.03	-.05	.29	.95	.54-1.67
	(.00)	(-.02)	(.29)	(.98)	(.56-1.73)
	[.03]	[-.05]	[.29]	[.95]	[.54-1.69]
Block 4					
Child Gender x X_1	.38	.19	.30	1.20	.67-2.17
Child Gender x X_2	3.44	-.77	.41	.47 [a]	.21-1.04
Child Gender x X_3	.77	-.52	.59	.60	.19-1.89
Model 3					
Block 1					
Child grade	.04	-.09	.45	.92	.38-2.20

	(.11)	(-.15)	(.44)	(.86)	(.36-2.06)
	[.06]	[-.11]	[.45]	[.89]	[.37-2.15]
Parent age	4.11	.07	.03	1.07*	1.00-1.15
	(5.88)	(.08)	(.03)	(1.08**)	(1.02-1.16)
	[5.57]	[.08]	[.03]	[1.08**]	[1.01-1.15]
Years lived with parent	3.84	.26	.13	1.30*	1.00-1.68
	(3.32)	(.24)	(.13)	(1.27*)	(.98-1.64)
	[3.72]	[.24]	[.13]	[1.28*]	[1.00-1.64]
Block 2					
Child Gender	.87	-.44	.47	.65	.26-1.62
	(.65)	(-.36)	(.45)	(.70)	(.29-1.68)
	[.23]	[-.22]	[.46]	[.80]	[.33-1.98]
Block 3					
X_1	4.24	.49	.24	1.64*	1.02-2.62
	(3.62)	(.44)	(.23)	(1.55*)	(.99-2.42)
	[4.28]	[.49]	[.24]	[1.64*]	[1.03-2.61]
X_2	.01	.02	.29	1.02	.58-1.80
	(.03)	(.05)	(.29)	(1.05)	(.59-1.86)
	[.02]	[.04]	[.29]	[1.04]	[.59-1.83]
X_3	1.25	.39	.35	1.48	.75-2.92
	(1.29)	(.39)	(.34)	(1.48)	(.75-2.90)
	[.71]	[.30]	[.36]	[1.35]	[.67-2.74]
Block 4					
Child Gender x X_1	1.92	.67	.48	1.95 [a]	.76-5.00
Child Gender x X_2	.77	.52	.59	1.68	.53-5.32
Child Gender x X_3	2.79	-1.24	.74	.29[a]	.07-1.24

Note. Values in parentheses are based on the X_2 interactions and values in brackets are based on the X_3 interactions

SE = Standard Error; OR = odds ratio; CI = confidence interval

[a]$p \leq .10$. * $p \leq .05$. **$p \leq .01$.

Model 1

X_1= Hi mom/Hi dad vs. Lo mom/Lo dad, Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_2= Lo mom/Lo dad vs. Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_3= Hi mom/Lo dad vs. Lo mom/Hi dad

Model 2

X_1= Lo mom/Lo dad vs. Hi mom/Hi dad, Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_2= Hi mom/Hi dad vs. Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_3= Hi mom/Lo dad vs. Lo mom/Hi dad

Model 3

X_1= Lo mom/Lo dad, Hi mom/Hi dad vs. Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_2= Hi mom/Lo dad vs. Lo mom/Hi dad

X_3= Hi mom/Hi dad vs. Lo mom/Lo dad

Table 16 Summary of Logistic Regression Analyses By Gender Examining Parent Dyads on Monitoring to Predict if Child Thought About Sex (Girls, N = 71 and Boys, N = 71)

Variable	χ^2	β	SE	OR	95% CI
Model 1					
Block 1					
Child grade	.41	.43	.67	1.54	.41-5.74
	(1.08)	(-.68)	(.65)	(.51)	(.14-1.83)
Parent age	.90	.05	.05	1.05	.95-1.15
	(4.51)	(.11)	(.05)	(1.12*)	(1.01-1.24)
Years lived with parent	1.37	.18	.16	1.20	.38-1.13
	(2.65)	(.36)	(.22)	(1.44[a])	(.93-2.23)
Block 2					
X_1	2.32	-.42	.28	.66[a]	.38-1.13
	(.94)	(.16)	(.16)	(1.17)	(.85-1.60)
X_2	1.83	-.39	.29	.68[a]	.38-1.19
	(2.43)	(-.50)	(.32)	(.61[a])	(.32-.1.14)
X_3	.33	-.23	.39	.80	.37-1.73
	(.27)	(.24)	(.46)	(1.27)	(.52-3.11)
Model 3					
Block 1					
Child grade	.41	.43	.67	1.54	.41-5.74
	(1.08)	(-.68)	(.65)	(.51)	(.14-1.83)
Parent age	.90	.05	.05	1.05	.95-1.15
	(4.51)	(.11)	(.05)	(1.12*)	(1.01-1.24)
Years lived with parent	1.37	.18	.16	1.20	.88-1.63
	(2.65)	(.36)	(.22)	(1.44[a])	(.93-2.23)
Block 2					
X_1	4.42	.82	.39	2.26*	1.06-4.84
	(.97)	(.34)	(.35)	(1.41)	(.71-2.80)
X_2	.33	.23	.39	1.25	.58-2.71
	(.27)	(-.24)	(.46)	(.79)	(.32-1.93)
X_3	.50	-.45	.64	.64	.18-2.24
	(2.99)	(.81)	(.47)	(2.25[a])	(.90-5.65)

Note. Logistic regression values for boys are represented in parentheses

SE = Standard Error; OR = odds ratio; CI = confidence interval

[a]$p \leq .10$. * $p \leq .05$.

Model 1

X_1= Hi mom/Hi dad vs. Lo mom/Lo dad, Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_2= Lo mom/Lo dad vs. Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_3= Hi mom/Lo dad vs. Lo mom/Hi dad

Model 3

X_1= Lo mom/Lo dad, Hi mom/Hi dad vs. Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_2= Hi mom/Lo dad vs. Lo mom/Hi dad

X_3= Hi mom/Hi dad vs. Lo mom/Lo dad

Table 17 Summary of Logistic Regression Analyses Examining Parent Dyads on Positive Parenting to Predict if Child Thought About Sex with Child Gender Interaction (N = 142)

Variable	χ^2	β	SE	OR	95% CI
Model 1					
Block 1					
Child grade	.01	-.05	.44	.95	.41-2.25
	(.00)	(.01)	(.45)	(1.01)	(1.01-1.16)
	[.01]	[-.04]	[.44]	[.96]	[.41-2.28]
Parent age	4.95	.07	.03	1.08*	1.01-1.15
	(5.23)	(.08)	(.34)	(1.08*)	(1.01-1.16)
	[5.07]	[.08]	[.33]	[1.08*]	[1.01-1.15]
Years lived with parent	4.47	.29	.14	1.33*	1.02-1.73
	(4.78)	(.31)	(.14)	(1.36*)	(1.03-1.79)
	[4.52]	[.29]	[.14]	[1.34*]	[1.02-1.75]
Block 2					
Child Gender	.24	-.22	.44	.81	.34-1.91
	(.02)	(-.06)	(.46)	(.94)	(.39-2.30)
	[.21]	[-.20]	[.44]	[.82]	[.35-1.94]
Block 3					
X_1	.00	.00	.12	1.00	.79-1.27
	(.00)	(.00)	(.12)	(1.00)	(.79-1.27)
	[.01]	[.01]	[.12]	[1.01]	[.80-1.28]
X_2	1.93	.24	.18	1.28	.91-1.80
	(1.54)	(.22)	(.18)	(1.25)	(.88-1.78)
	[2.11]	[.26]	[.18]	[1.30]	[.91-1.85]
X_3	.13	.14	.38	1.15	.55-2.42
	(.25)	(.19)	(.38)	(1.21)	(.57-2.56)
	[.12]	[.13]	[.38]	[1.14]	[.54-2.42]
Block 4					
Child Gender x X_1	.03	.04	.23	1.04	.66-1.63
Child Gender x X_2	1.15	-.43	.36	.65	.32-1.31
Child Gender x X_3	.32	-.44	.79	.64	.14-3.01

Model 2					
Block 1					
Child grade	.01	.04	.45	1.04	.43-2.49
	(.00)	(-.01)	(.44)	(.99)	(.42.2.33)
	[.00]	[-.01]	[.44]	[.99]	[.42-2.33]
Parent age	5.34	.08	.03	1.08*	1.01-1.16
	(5.21)	(.08)	(.03)	(1.08*)	(1.01-1.15)
	[5.11]	[.08]	[.03]	[1.08*]	[1.01-1.15]
Years lived with parent	4.69	.31	.14	1.36*	1.03-1.79
	(4.46)	(.29)	(.14)	(1.34*)	(1.02-1.76)
	[4.50]	[.29]	[.14]	[1.34*]	[1.02-1.76]
Block 2					
Child Gender	.08	-.13	.44	.88	.37-2.10
	(.47)	(.59)	(.86)	(1.81)	(.34-9.73)
	[.22]	[-.20]	[.43]	[.82]]	[.35-.91]
Block 3					
X_1	1.66	.16	.12	1.17	.92-1.48
	(2.15)	(.17)	(.12)	(1.19)	(.94-1.50)
	[2.21]	[.18]	[.12]	[1.19]	[.95-1.51]
X_2	.13	.07	.18	1.07	.75-1.53
	(.15)	(.07)	(.18)	(1.07)	(.75-1.53)
	[.16]	[.07]	[.18]	[1.07]	[.75-1.54]
X_3	.26	.17	.34	1.19	.61-2.32
	(.36)	(.20)	(.34)	(1.23)	(.63-2.38)
	[.37]	[.20]	[.34]	[1.23]	[.63-2.38]
Block 4					
Child Gender x X_1	1.07	-.24	.24	.78	.49-1.25
Child Gender x X_2	.04	-.07	.35	.93	.47-1.85
Child Gender x X_3	.07	.17	.66	1.19	.33-4.33
Model 3					
Block 1					
Child grade	.00	-.03	.44	.98	.41-2.31

	(.01)	(-.04)	(.44)	(.96)	(.41-2.28)
	[.00]	[-.02]	[.44]	[.98]	[.41-2.32]
Parent age	5.27	.08	.03	1.08*	1.01-1.15
	(5.07)	(.08)	(.03)	(1.08*)	(1.01-1.15)
	[4.96]	[.07]	[.03]	[1.08*]	[1.01-1.15]
Years lived with parent	4.65	.30	.14	1.35*	1.03-1.77
	(4.52)	(.29)	(.14)	(1.34*)	(1.02-1.75)
	[4.59]	[.29]	[.14]	[1.34*]	[1.03-1.75]
Block 2					
Child Gender	.68	.79	.95	2.19	.34-14.09
	(.21)	(-.20)	(.44)	(.82)	(.35-1.94)
	[.21]	[-.20]	[.44]	[.82]	[.35-1.93]
Block 3					
X_1	.01	-.05	.47	.95	.38-2.36
	(1.29)	(-.27)	(.24)	(.76)	(.48-1.22)
	[1.03]	[-.24]	[.23]	[.79]	[.50-1.25]
X_2	1.03	-.24	.24	.79	.50-1.25
	(.12)	(-.13)	(.38)	(.88)	(.41-1.86)
	[.14]	[-.14]	[.38]	[.87]	[.41-1.82]
X_3	.80	-.24	.27	.79	.47-1.33
	(.82)	(-.24)	(.27)	(.79)	(.47-1.32)
	[.73]	[-.23]	[.27]	[.80]	[.47-1.35]
Block 4					
Child Gender x X_1	.95	.46	.47	1.58	.63-3.95
Child Gender x X_2	.32	.44	.79	1.56	.33-7.28
Child Gender x X_3	.54	.39	.53	1.48	.52-4.20

Note. Values in parentheses are based on the X_2 interactions and values in brackets are based on the X_3 interactions

SE = Standard Error; OR = odds ratio; CI = confidence interval

[a]$p \leq .10$. * $p \leq .05$.

Model 1

X_1= Hi mom/Hi dad vs. Lo mom/Lo dad, Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_2= Lo mom/Lo dad vs. Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_3= Hi mom/Lo dad vs. Lo mom/Hi dad

Model 2

X_1= Lo mom/Lo dad vs. Hi mom/Hi dad, Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_2= Hi mom/Hi dad vs. Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_3= Hi mom/Lo dad vs. Lo mom/Hi dad

Model 3

X_1= Lo mom/Lo dad, Hi mom/Hi dad vs. Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_2= Hi mom/Lo dad vs. Lo mom/Hi dad

X_3= Hi mom/Hi dad vs. Lo mom/Lo dad

Table 18 Summary of Logistic Regression Analyses Examining Parent Dyads on Sex Attitudes to Predict if Child Thought About Sex with Child Gender Interaction (N = 142)

Variable	χ^2	β	SE	OR	95% CI
Model 1					
Block 1					
Child grade	.01	.05	.44	1.05	.44-2.52
	(.01)	(.05)	(.46)	(1.05)	(.43-2.58)
	[.00]	[-.03]	[.44]	[.97]	[.41-2.32]
Parent age	4.89	.07	.03	1.08*	1.01-1.15
	(6.78)	(.09)	(.04)	(1.10**)	(1.02-1.18)
	[4.54]	[.07]	[.03]	[1.07*]	[1.01-1.14]
Years lived with parent	4.00	.29	.14	1.33*	1.01-1.77
	(4.99)	(.30)	(.14)	(1.35*)	(1.04-1.76)
	[4.04]	[.28]	[.14]	[1.32*]	[1.01-1.74]
Block 2					
Child Gender	.87	-.44	.47	.65	.26-1.62
	(.50)	(-.37)	(.53)	(.69)	(.25-1.94)
	[.63]	[.72]	[.90]	[2.05]	[.35-11.98]
Block 3					
X_1	.76	.11	.12	1.11	.88-1.41
	(2.14)	(.19)	(.13)	(1.21)	(.94-1.58)
	[.42]	[-.29]	[.44]	[.75]	[.31-1.79]
X_2	.01	.02	.19	1.02	.71-1.46
	(.73)	(-.23)	(.27)	(.80)	(.47-1.35)
	[.05]	[.04]	[.19]	[1.04]	[.72-1.50]
X_3	.82	.34	.37	1.40	.68-2.89
	(.65)	(.30)	(.37)	(1.35)	(.65-2.81)
	[.73]	[.32]	[.32]	[1.37]	[.66-2.84]
Block 4					
Child Gender x X_1	1.27	.27	.24	1.31	.82-2.08
Child Gender x X_2	5.10	-1.33	.59	.26*	.08-.84
Child Gender x X_3	.53	-.54	.74	.58	.14-2.47

Model 2					
Block 1					
Child grade	.06	.11	.46	1.11	.45-2.74
	(.00)	(.01)	(.44)	(1.01)	(.43-2.41)
	[.00]	[.00]	[.44]	[1.00]	[.42-2.37]
Parent age	7.01	.10	.04	1.10**	1.03-1.18
	(5.06)	(.07)	(.03)	(1.08*)	(1.01-1.15)
	[5.08]	[.07]	[.03]	[1.08*]	[1.01-1.15]
Years lived with parent	4.56	.29	.14	1.34*	1.02-1.76
	(3.90)	(.27)	(.14)	(1.31*)	(1.00-1.72)
	[3.98]	[.27]	[.14]	[1.31*]	[1.01-1.71]
Block 2					
Child Gender	.00	-4.86	2460.21	.01	.00-
	(.53)	(-.33)	(.46)	(.72)	(.29-1.76)
	[.46]	[-.30]	[.44]	[.74]	[.31-1.76]
Block 3					
X_1	.00	-2.39	1213.02	.09	.00-
	(.03)	(-.02)	(.12)	(.98)	(.77-1.25)
	[.03]	[-.02]	[.12]	[.98]	[.77-1.25]
X_2	.50	.13	.18	1.13	.80-1.60
	(.92)	(.17)	(.18)	(1.18)	(.84-1.67)
	[.98]	[.17]	[.98]	[1.19]	[.85-1.67]
X_3	.14	.12	.33	1.13	.59-2.15
	(.26)	(.17)	(.33)	(1.18)	(.62-2.28)
	[.26]	[.17]	[.33]	[1.19]	[.62-2.28]
Block 4					
Child Gender x X_1	.00	-5.30	2460.21	.01	.00-
Child Gender x X_2	.09	.10	.34	1.11	.57-2.16
Child Gender x X_3	.01	.06	.66	1.06	.29-3.86
Model 3					
Block 1					
Child grade	.00	-.01	.45	.99	.41-2.36

	(.00)	(-.03)	(.44)	(.97)	(.41-2.32)
	[.08]	[.13]	[.45]	[1.13]	[.47-2.76]
Parent age	5.57	.08	.03	1.08*	1.01-1.16
	(4.54)	(.07)	(.03)	(1.07*)	(1.02-1.14)
	[5.65]	[.08]	[.04]	[1.09**]	[1.01-1.16]
Years lived with parent	4.59	.29	.13	1.33**	1.03-1.73
	(4.04)	(.28)	(.14)	(1.32*)	(1.01-1.74)
	[4.17]	[.30]	[.15]	[1.35*]	[1.01-1.80]
Block 2					
Child Gender	.14	-.17	.46	.84	.34-2.08
	(.42)	(-.29)	(.44)	(.75)	(.31-1.79)
	[1.10]	[-.53]	[.51]	[.59]	[.22-1.59]
Block 3					
X_1	.36	-.14	.23	.87	.55-1.37
	(.47)	(-.16)	(.23)	(.85)	(.54-1.34)
	[.00]	[.02]	[.25]	[1.02]	[.62-1.67]
X_2	.68	-.30	.37	.74	.36-1.52
	(.73)	(-.32)	(.37)	(.73)	(.35-1.51)
	[.78]	[-.33]	[.37]	[.72]	[.35-1.49]
X_3	.87	.27	.29	1.31	.74-2.30
	(.51)	(.20)	(.28)	(1.22)	(.71-2.11)
	[.99]	[.32]	[.33]	[1.38]	[.73-2.61]
Block 4					
Child Gender x X_1	1.75	.62	.48	1.86	.74-4.69
Child Gender x X_2	.53	.54	.74	1.71	.41-7.24
Child Gender x X_3	4.50	1.50	.70	4.46*	1.12-17.72

Note. Values in parentheses are based on the X_2 interactions and values in brackets are based on the X_3 interactions

SE = Standard Error; OR = odds ratio; CI = confidence interval

[a]$p \leq .10$. * $p \leq .05$. **$p \leq .01$.

Model 1

X_1= Hi mom/Hi dad vs. Lo mom/Lo dad, Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_2= Lo mom/Lo dad vs. Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_3= Hi mom/Lo dad vs. Lo mom/Hi dad

Model 2

X_1= Lo mom/Lo dad vs. Hi mom/Hi dad, Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_2= Hi mom/Hi dad vs. Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_3= Hi mom/Lo dad vs. Lo mom/Hi dad

Model 3

X_1= Lo mom/Lo dad, Hi mom/Hi dad vs. Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_2= Hi mom/Lo dad vs. Lo mom/Hi dad

X_3= Hi mom/Hi dad vs. Lo mom/Lo dad

Table 19 Summary of Logistic Regression Analyses By Gender Examining Parent Dyads on Sex Attitudes to Predict if Child Thought About Sex (Girls, N = 71 and Boys, N = 71)

Variable	χ^2	β	SE	OR	95% CI
Model 1					
Block 1					
Child grade	.70	.58	.69	1.79	.46-6.94
	(.30)	(-.36)	(.66)	(.70)	(.19-2.54)
Parent age	3.71	.10	.05	1.11*	1.00-1.22
	(3.02)	(.09)	(.05)	(1.09[a])	(1.00-1.21)
Years lived with parent	1.51	.20	.17	1.23	.89-1.69
	(3.55)	(.43)	(.23)	(1.53[a])	(.98-2.39)
Block 2					
X_1	.00	1.77	830.83	5.84	.00
	(.01)	(.06)	(.20)	(1.06)	(.72-1.57)
X_2	.00	-6.71	3323.32	.00	.00
	(1.83)	(.35)	(.26)	(1.42[a])	(.85-2.36)
X_3	.12	.05	.48	1.05	.42-2.68
	(1.37)	(.75)	(.64)	(2.13)	(.60-7.51)
Model 3					
Block 1					
Child grade	.70	.58	.69	1.79	.46-6.94
	(.30)	(-.36)	(.66)	(.70)	(.19-2.54)
Parent age	3.71	.10	.05	1.11	1.00-1.22
	(3.02)	(.09)	(.05)	(1.09[a])	(1.00-1.21)
Years lived with parent	1.51	.20	.17	1.23	.89-1.69
	(3.55)	(.43)	(.23)	(1.53[a])	(.98-2.39)
Block 2					
X_1	.00	4.94	2492.49	139.68	.00
	(1.25)	(-.41)	(.37)	(.66)	(.32-1.36)
X_2	.01	-.05	.48	.95	.37-2.41
	(1.37)	(-.75)	(.64)	(.47)	(.13-1.66)
X_3	.00	10.24	4984.99	27866.76	.00-
	(.31)	(-.23)	(.41)	(.80)	(.36-1.77)

Note. Logistic regression values for boys are represented in parentheses

SE = Standard Error; OR = odds ratio; CI = confidence interval

[a]$p \leq .10$. * $p \leq .05$.

Model 1

X_1= Hi mom/Hi dad vs. Lo mom/Lo dad, Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_2= Lo mom/Lo dad vs. Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_3= Hi mom/Lo dad vs. Lo mom/Hi dad

Model 3

X_1= Lo mom/Lo dad, Hi mom/Hi dad vs. Hi mom/Lo dad, Lo mom/Hi dad

X_2= Hi mom/Lo dad vs. Lo mom/Hi dad

X_3= Hi mom/Hi dad vs. Lo mom/Lo dad

Discussion

The present study addressed an aspect of parental behaviors believed to be important with respect to child outcome behaviors. Specifically within two-parent African American families, the present study examined congruence between parenting in the domains of monitoring, positive parenting, and parental beliefs. The direct impact of congruence on two areas of child functioning was examined, as well as the impact of patterns of congruence/incongruence. In the interest of creating a coherent picture of study findings, results of the absolute discrepancy analyses will be discussed simultaneously with results of the patterns of congruence analyses.

First, it is important to note that the number of significant findings in the current study is limited, particularly given the number of analyses conducted. Beginning with analyses where significant results were noted, those utilizing absolute discrepancy scores revealed that congruence between parents regarding positive parenting was directly related to whether or not the child had thought about sex. Additionally, trends toward significance for gender moderation with both positive parenting and monitoring difference scores suggested that increased absolute parental discrepancy scores for monitoring and positive parenting were associated with lesser likelihood of boys having thought about sex. There were no significant relationships for girls regarding these absolute discrepancy scores (i.e., monitoring and positive parenting) and child thoughts about sex.

One potential reason for this difference could be due to child personality factors interacting with parenting behaviors. Studies have shown that child motivational levels directly effect how the child experiences rewards or praise. Children who are intrinsically motivated tend to respond positively to praise, whereas children who are extrinsically motivated tend to view praise as a means of control and are negatively affected (Danner & Lonky, 1981).

Furthermore, when rewards or praise are either frequently given or done in a controlling manner, the child learns to expect these behaviors and the effects are deleterious to intrinsic motivation (Deci, Koestner, & Ryan, 1999). Parents who display similar positive parenting behaviors may foster an environment that is too predictable. Consequently, children may become more prone to external motivating factors, which may influence their susceptibility to later risk behaviors. The current results suggest this relationship is potentially applicable to positive parenting behaviors of two parent families, and that potential negative effects of predictable positive parenting may be more salient for boys than for girls.

Additionally, parents of at-risk preadolescents tend to develop parental coalitions and will often place blame on the child regarding undesired child behaviors and decrease displays of warmth and praise (Vuchinich, Wood, & Vuchinich, 1994). Thus, even though parents may be consistent in their behaviors, congruence across positive parenting does not always yield a positive result if the parents are reacting negatively to unwanted child behaviors.

Similar to these absolute discrepancy analyses, there were significant findings when child thoughts about sex served as the outcome variable and patterns of congruence/incongruence were examined. Specifically, parents who were similar in their monitoring behaviors had children who were less likely to have thought about having sex. However, this finding was also qualified by gender of the child which moderated the relationship between monitoring patterns and whether the child thought about sex. Girls whose parents were both high on monitoring thought about sex less than did children who had parents who were both low or discrepant on monitoring. This finding supports past research that has shown consistency across mother and father behaviors yields better child outcomes (Block, Block, & Morrison, 1981), and that increased levels of monitoring result in a decrease in risky sexual behaviors for girls (Huebner & Howell, 2003).

There were no significant findings for positive parenting dyad behaviors predicting whether the child has thought about sex. Thus, the significance of the positive parenting discrepancy scores findings is consistent regardless of a specific parent dyad combination.

In contrast to the findings with girls, boys thought about sex more when both parents were high on monitoring behaviors. Additionally, lower absolute discrepancy scores of positive parenting were associated with more thoughts about sex for boys. These two findings are inconsistent with previous research and the study hypotheses. Specifically, previous research has suggested that consistency in parenting behaviors, is associated with fewer problem and risk behaviors among children (Bean et al., 2003; Tucker, Herman, Pedersen, Vogel, & Reinke, 2000), particularly for boys (Belsky et al., 1996).

One potential explanation for the difference between boys and girls with respect to the parenting discrepancy-thoughts about sex relationships may be found in the ways in which socialization around sexual behavior occur. More specifically, girls are typically socialized to be more innocent with regard to sex than boys, whereas boys are often expected to be more sexually rapacious (Scher, 1979). In fact, African American boys have been shown to be more likely to have thought about or had sex at an earlier age than African American girls and other peers (Longmore et al., 2001). This relatively greater frequency of sexual thoughts among boys is indicative of these thoughts being more socially normative. Thus, perhaps for boys, thoughts about sex do not necessarily reflect being on a developmentally problematic trajectory. In the context of this explanation, thoughts about sex may not be an appropriate indicator of future sexual risk for boys.

Additionally, boys are more likely than girls to exhibit problem behaviors and sexual risk taking activities (Simons, Lin, Brody, & Conger, 2002; Townsend, 2002). Thus, for boys

parental coalitions may develop around monitoring in response to undesired child behaviors, such as sexual intentions. Therefore, the observed parenting congruence for boys may be more of a reaction to negative child behaviors rather than congruence as a predictor of child behavior.

An alternative explanation specific to the findings around discrepancies in monitoring is related to differences in the effectiveness of monitoring for boys versus girls. Specifically, previous longitudinal research has shown that increased levels of parental monitoring are less effective in delaying sexual activities in preadolescent boys compared to preadolescent girls (Longmore et al., 2001). This explanation assumes that thoughts about sex are indicative of a risky developmental trajectory for boys and girls but that more monitoring by both parents is less effective as reducing risk for boys than for girls. Given that it is easier to prevent the onset of risky sexual behavior than it is to stop it once it has begun (Dittus, Miller, Kotchick & Forehand, 2004), future research focusing on the role of consistently high monitoring and identifying useful markers of risky developmental trajectories will be valuable.

There was only one significant finding regarding parent attitudes about precursors to sexual behavior. Child gender moderated the relationship between the dyad patterns of parents' attitudes about sex precursors and whether the child had thought about sex. Specifically, this trend suggested boys were less likely to have thought about sex if both parents held conservative views about whether or not their child may date. This finding is in the expected direction and is consistent with previous research. Similar to the previous research concerning parents' general attitudes about sexual behaviors (Thornton & Camburn, 1987), parents who held conservative attitudes about sexual behaviors had boys who were less likely to think about sex. This finding also illustrates that boys' outcomes can be different, based on which parenting behavior (i.e., monitoring or attitudes) is examined. More specifically, in the case of monitoring and positive

parenting, the study hypotheses were not confirmed, with boys reporting more thoughts about sex, despite congruent patterns of behavior among parents. In the case of parental attitudes about sex, when both parents held conservative attitudes about their boys engaging in precursors to sexual behaviors (e.g., dating), boys were less likely to have thought about sex. This pattern of findings appears contradictory and may be explained in a number of ways.

The first explanation is again related to the usefulness of child thoughts about sex as an indicator of later sexual risk, particularly for boys. It is possible that this variable is not a conceptually sound marker of subsequent risk, and, thus, findings are not consistent with previous research or the theoretically driven hypotheses. The second explanation is related to boys' willingness to conform to parental expectations. Previous studies have shown that boys between the ages of 7 and 10 years of age were more willing, than girls, to engage in risk behaviors, despite overt parental rebuke (Morrongiello & Dawber, 2004). However, with respect to less overt control of behavior, conservative parental attitudes tend to forecast less risky sexual behavior. Thus, perhaps, boys are more receptive to indirect parental influences, such as conveyance of parental attitudes, than more directive behaviors, such as monitoring. The final explanation for the different patterns of boys' thoughts about sex across parental congruence in monitoring, positive parenting, and parental attitudes is about the more direct relationship between parental attitudes about sex precursors and boys' thoughts about sex, relative to parental monitoring and use of positive parenting and thoughts about sex. Presumably, at the preadolescent stage, parents are using monitoring and positive parenting more for addressing child disciplinary issues and less for addressing behaviors related to sex. In contrast, attitudes about sex are likely more directly related to the child's thoughts about sex.

For both the absolute discrepancy analyses and the patterns of congruence analyses, there were no significant findings for the outcomes of child problem behavior or likelihood of having sex. The lack of findings with respect to child problem behaviors might be explained in the following way. Measurement of this variable was quite limited relative to most previous studies. Specifically, only two items were used to assess this complex construct. Assessment of problem behaviors in the current study was limited by the fact that this construct was not the primary outcome variable in the larger Parents Matter study and many constructs were assessed, thereby decreasing the extent to which non-primary constructs could be assessed.

A potential reason why effects were not revealed for whether or not the child is likely to have sex could be due to sample characteristics. African American girls are less likely to engage in sexual behavior if they have not experienced puberty (Townsend, 2002). Given the young age of the sample, there is a strong possibility that most of the females had not reached puberty. Moreover, given the gender differences in timing of puberty, the boys in this sample were even further from this developmental milestone than the girls. So, although for young African American males and females, intentions of engaging in sex are significantly predictive of their behavior (Staunton et al., 1996), the majority the children in this sample did not endorse intentions to engage in sex in the coming year. Thus, the limited range of this outcome variable decreased the chance of finding significant effects.

As discussed above in the explanation of this study's limited findings, there were several limitations of the study. The majority of the study limitations are related to measurement of constructs. First, several of the parent and child measures consisted of only one or two items. Consequently, there may be complexity within the variables assessed that was not accounted for in this study. Second, the measures regarding child outcome behaviors were from the

perspective of the child only, as some research suggests that children provide the most accurate reports of their thoughts and behaviors. However, the use of multiple informants of child outcomes (i.e., parents and teachers), particularly for the problem behaviors variable would have strengthened the study. Third and with respect to measurement of sexual risk, thoughts about sex for boys and girls are not in and of themselves necessarily predictive of future risk. The monitoring and positive parenting results seem to emphasize this point for boys. Future studies might benefit from a more complex measure of pre-adolescent sexual risk. Third and unrelated to measurement per se, other family dynamics that may be influential, such as sibling influences were not assessed. Siblings have been shown to have significant effects on child problem and sexual behaviors (Steinberg & Morris, 2001; Tinsley et al., 2004). This may potentially moderate parent influences and would be an area for future study. Finally, the data are cross sectional and not longitudinal, so causality cannot be inferred.

One strength of this study is that it is the first to analyze the potential impact of parent discrepancy in two parent African American families, which is a population that has been largely neglected in family research. The results also provide support for the application of traditional family systems models to specific parenting behaviors, where discrepant behaviors across parents on some of the variables did result in negative child outcomes. An additional strength is the knowledge gained regarding specific parenting behavior effects on preadolescents. The parenting years just prior to adolescence are critical for establishing positive outcomes in the adolescent years. Therefore, it is important to understand the familial influences on child behavior to aid in reducing negative child outcomes within a population that is at higher risk for engaging in risk behaviors at an earlier age compared to majority populations (Tinsley et al., 2004).

In summary, the implications from this study are important for educating two parent African American families about the potential effect of the parental dyad on their child. Behaviors such as monitoring produce better child outcomes for girls when the parents are consistent with one another. Findings for boys are more difficult to interpret and certainly require additional study before conclusions can be drawn.

REFERENCES

Abidin, R. R. (1992). The determinants of parenting behavior. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 21*(4), 407-412.

Abidin, R. R., & Brunner, J. F. (1995). Development of a Parenting Alliance Inventory. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 24*(1), 31-40.

Achenbach, T. (1991). *Manual for the Child Behavior Checklist and 1991 profile*. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont Department of Psychiatry.

Armistead, L., Forehand, R., Brody, G., & Maguen, S. (2002). Parenting and child psychosocial adjustment in single-parent African American families: Is community context important? *Behavior Therapy, 33*(3), 361-375.

Ball, J., Pelton, J., Forehand, R., Long, N., & Wallace, S. A. (2004). Methodological overview of the Parents Matter! Program. *Journal of Child & Family Studies, 13*(1), 21-34.

Barkin, S. L., Smith, K. S., & DuRant, R. H. (2002). Social skills and attitudes associated with substance use behaviors among young adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 30*(6), 448-454.

Baumrind, D. (1968). Authoritarian vs. authoritative parental control. *Adolescence, 3*(11), 255-272.

Bean, R. A., Bush, K. R., McKenry, P. C., & Wilson, S. M. (2003). The impact of parental support, behavioral control, and psychological control on the academic achievement and self-esteem of African American and European American adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 18*(5), 523-541.

Belsky, J., Lerner, R. M., & Spanier, G. B. (1984). *The child in the family.*: Addison-Wesley/Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

Belsky, J., Putnam, S., & Crnic, K. (1996). Coparenting, parenting, and early emotional development. In J. P. McHale & P. A. Cowan (Eds.), *Understanding how family-level dynamics affect children's development: Studies of two-parent families.* (pp. 45-55). San Francisco, CA, US: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer.

Block, J. H., Block, J., & Morrison, A. (1981). Parental agreement-disagreement on child-rearing orientations and gender-related personality correlates in children. *Child Development, 52*(3), 965-974.

Borawski, E. A., Ievers-Landis, C. E., Lovegreen, L. D., & Trapl, E. S. (2003). Parental monitoring, negotiated unsupervised time, and parental trust: the role of perceived parenting practices in adolescent health risk behaviors. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 33*(2), 60-70.

Brody, G. H., & Flor, D. L. (1996). Coparenting, family interactions, and competence among African American youths. In J. P. McHale & P. A. Cowan (Eds.), *Understanding how family-level dynamics affect children's development: Studies of two-parent families.* (pp. 77-91). San Francisco, CA, US: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer.

Brody, G. H., Flor, D. L., Hollett-Wright, N., & McCoy, J. K. (1998). Children's development of alcohol use norms: Contributions of parent and sibling norms, children's temperaments, and parent-child discussions. *Journal of Family Psychology, 12*(2), 209-219.

Brody, G. H., Flor, D. L., & Neubaum, E. (1998). Coparenting processes and child competence among rural African-American families. In M. Lewis & C. Feiring (Eds.), *Families, risk, and competence.* (pp. 227-243): Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Brown, B. B., Mounts, N., Lamborn, S. D., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting practices and peer group affiliation in adolescence. *Child Development, 64*(2), 467-482.

Coombs, R. H., & Landsverk, J. (1988). Parenting styles and substance use during childhood and adolescence. *Journal of Marriage & the Family, 50*(2), 473-482.

Cowan, P. A., & Cowan, C. P. (2002). Interventions as tests of family systems theories: Marital and family relationships in children's development and psychopathology. *Development & Psychopathology, 14*(4), 731-759.

Crouter, A. C., & Head, M. R. (2002). Parental monitoring and knowledge of children. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Vol. 3: Being and becoming a parent (2nd ed.).* (pp. 461-483): Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Danner, F. W., & Lonky, E. (1981). A Cognitive-developmental Approach to the Effects of Rewards on Intrinsic Motivation., *Child Development* (Vol. 52, pp. 1043): Blackwell Publishing Limited.

Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin, 113*(3), 487-496.

De Los Reyes, A., & Kazdin, A. E. (2004). Measuring Informant Discrepancies in Clinical Child Research. *Psychological Assessment, 16*(3), 330-334.

Deci, E. L., Koestner, R., & Ryan, R. M. (1999). A Meta-Analytic Review of Experiments Examining the Effects of Extrinsic Rewards on Intrinsic Motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 125*(6), 627-668.

Dishion, T. J., & McMahon, R. J. (1998). Parental monitoring and the prevention of child and adolescent problem behavior: A conceptual and empirical formulation. *Clinical Child & Family Psychology Review, 1*(1), 61-75.

Dittus, P., Miller, K. S., Kotchick, B. A., & Forehand, R. (2004). Why parents matter!: The conceptual basis for a community-based HIV prevention program for the parents of African American youth. *Journal of Child & Family Studies, 13*(1), 5-20.

Dorsey, S., & Forehand, R. (2003). The relation of social capital to child psychosocial adjustment difficulties: The role of positive parenting and neighborhood dangerousness. *Journal of Psychopathology & Behavioral Assessment, 25*(1), 11-23.

Fletcher, A. C., Steinberg, L., & Williams-Wheeler, M. (2004). Parental Influences on Adolescent Problem Behavior: Revisiting Stattin and Kerr., *Child Development* (Vol. 75, pp. 781-796): Blackwell Publishing Limited.

Floyd, F. J., Gilliom, L. A., & Costigan, C. L. (1998). Marriage and the parenting alliance: Longitudinal prediction of change in parenting perceptions and behaviors. *Child Development, 69*(5), 1461-1479.

Gable, S., Crnic, K., & Belsky, J. (1994). Coparenting within the family system: Influences on children's development. *Family Relations: Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies, 43*(4), 380-386.

Goldstein, S. E., Davis-Kean, P. E., & Eccles, J. S. (2005). Parents, Peers, and Problem Behavior: A Longitudinal Investigation of the Impact of Relationship Perceptions and Characteristics on the Development of Adolescent Problem Behavior. *Developmental Psychology, 41*(2), 401-413.

Holden, G. W., & Miller, P. C. (1999). Enduring and different: A meta-analysis of the similarity in parents' child rearing. *Psychological Bulletin, 125*(2), 223-254.

Huebner, A. J., & Howell, L. W. (2003). Examining the relationship between adolescent sexual risk-taking and perceptions of monitoring, communication, and parenting styles. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 33*(2), 71-78.

Jaccard, J., Dittus, P. J., & Gordon, V. V. (1998). Parent-adolescent congruency in reports of adolescent sexual behavior and in communications about sexual behavior. *Child Development, 69*(1), 247-261.

Jones, D. J., & Forehand, G. (2003). The Stability of Child Problem Behaviors: A Longitudinal Analysis of Inner-City African American Children., *Journal of Child & Family Studies* (Vol. 12, pp. 215): Kluwer Academic Publishing.

Jones, D. J., Forehand, R., Brody, G. H., & Armistead, L. (2002). Positive parenting and child psychosocial adjustment in inner-city single-parent African American families: The role of maternal optimism. *Behavior Modification, 26*(4), 464-481.

Jouriles, E. N., Murphy, C. M., Farris, A. M., & Smith, D. A. (1991). Marital adjustment, parental disagreements about child rearing, and behavior problems in boys: Increasing the specificity of the marital assessment. *Child Development, 62*(6), 1424-1433.

Kosterman, R., Hawkins, J. D., Spoth, R., & Haggerty, K. P. (1997). Effects of a preventive parent-training intervention on observed family interactions: Proximal outcomes from preparing for the drug free years. *Journal of Community Psychology, 25*(4), 337-352.

Lamborn, S. D., & Felbab, A. J. (2003). Applying ethnic equivalence and cultural values models to African-American teens' perceptions of parents. *Journal of Adolescence, 26*(5), 605-622.

Lamborn, S. D., Mounts, N. S., Steinberg, L., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1991). Patterns of competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. *Child Development, 62*(5), 1049-1065.

Longmore, M. A., Manning, W. D., & Giordano, P. C. (2001). Preadolescent parenting strategies and teens' dating and sexual initiation: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Marriage & the Family, 63*(2), 322-335.

Margolin, G., Gordis, E. B., & John, R. S. (2001). Coparenting: A link between marital conflict and parenting in two-parent families. *Journal of Family Psychology, 15*(1), 3-21.

McConnell, M. C., & Kerig, P. K. (2002). Assessing coparenting in families of school-age children: Validation of the Coparenting and Family Rating System. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 34*(1), 44-58.

McHale, J., Khazan, I., Erera, P., Rotman, T., DeCourcey, W., & McConnell, M. (2002). Coparenting in diverse family systems. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Vol. 3: Being and becoming a parent (2nd ed.).* (pp. 75-107): Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

McHale, J. P., Kuersten, R., & Lauretti, A. (1996). New directions in the study of family-level dynamics during infancy and early childhood. In J. P. McHale & P. A. Cowan (Eds.), *Understanding how family-level dynamics affect children's development: Studies of two-parent families.* (pp. 5-26). San Francisco, CA, US: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer.

McHale, J. P., Kuersten-Hogan, R., Lauretti, A., & Rasmussen, J. L. (2000). Parental reports of coparenting and observed coparenting behavior during the toddler period. *Journal of Family Psychology, 14*(2), 220-236.

McHale, J. P., Lauretti, A., Talbot, J., & Pouquette, C. (2002). Retrospect and prospect in the psychological study of coparenting and family group process. In J. P. McHale & W. S. Grolnick (Eds.), *Retrospect and prospect in the psychological study of families.* (pp. 127-165): Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

McLoyd, V. C., Cauce, A. M., Takeuchi, D., & Wilson, L. (2000). Marital processes and parental socialization in families of color: A decade review of research. *Journal of Marriage & the Family, 62*(4), 1070-1093.

Metzler, C. W., Biglan, A., Ary, D. V., & Li, F. (1998). The stability and validity of early adolescents' reports of parenting constructs. *Journal of Family Psychology, 12*(4), 600-619.

Miller, K. S., Forehand, R., & Kotchick, B. A. (1999). Adolescent behavior in two ethnic minority samples: the role of family variables. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 61*(1), 85-98.

Minuchin, S. (1974). *Families & family therapy.*: Harvard U. Press.

Morrongiello, B. A., & Dawber, T. (2004). Identifying Factors that Relate to Children's Risk-Taking Decisions. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 36*(4), 255-266.

Navarre, S. E. (1998). Salvador Minuchin's structural family therapy and its application to multicultural family systems. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing, 19*(6), 567-570.

Parke, R. D. (2002). Fathers and families. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Vol. 3: Being and becoming a parent (2nd ed.).* (pp. 27-73): Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Pettit, G. S., Laird, R. D., Dodge, K. A., Bates, J. E., & Criss, M. M. (2001). Antecedents and behavior-problem outcomes of parental monitoring and psychological control in early adolescence. *Child Development, 72*(2), 583-598.

Richards, M. H., Miller, B. V., O'Donnell, P. C., Wasserman, M. S., & Colder, C. (2004). Parental monitoring mediates the effects of age and sex on problem behaviors among African American urban young adolescents. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence, 33*(3), 221-233.

Scher, M. (1979). On Counseling Men., *Personnel & Guidance Journal* (Vol. 57, pp. 252): American Counseling Association.

Shelton, K. K., Frick, P. J., & Wootton, J. (1996). Assessment of parenting practices in families of elementary school-age children. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 25*(3), 317-329.

Simons, R. L., Lin, K., Gordon, L. C., Brody, G. H., & Conger, R. D. (2002). Community differences in the association between parenting practices and child conduct problems. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 64*(2), 331-345.

Smetana, J. G., & Daddis, C. (2002). Domain-specific antecedents of parental psychological control and monitoring: The role of parenting beliefs and practices. *Child Development, 73*(2), 563-580.

Staunton, B. F., Li, X., Black, M. M., & Ricardo, I. (1996). Longitudinal stability and predictability of sexual perceptions, intentions, and behaviors among early adolescent African-Americans. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 18*(1), 10-19.

Steinberg, L., & Morris, A. S. (2001). Adolescent development., *Annual Review of Psychology* (Vol. 52, pp. 83): Annual Reviews Inc.

Thompson, M. J. J., Raynor, A., Cornah, D., Stevenson, J., & Sonuga-Barke, E. J. S. (2002). Parenting behaviour described by mothers in a general population sample. *Child: Care, Health & Development, 28*(2), 149-155.

Thornton, A., & Camburn, D. (1987). The influence of the family on premarital attitudes and behavior. *Demography, 24*(3), 323-340.

Tinsley, B. J., Lees, N. B., & Sumartojo, E. (2004). Child and Adolescent HIV Risk: Familial and Cultural Perspectives. *Journal of Family Psychology, 18*(1), 208-224.

Townsend, T. G. (2002). The impact of self-components on attitudes toward sex among African American preadolescent girls: The moderating role of menarche. *Sex Roles, 47*(1), 11-20.

Tucker, C. M., Herman, K. C., Pedersen, T., Vogel, D., & Reinke, W. M. (2000). Student-generated solutions to enhance the academic success of African American youth. *Child Study Journal, 30*(3), 205-224.

Vuchinich, S., Wood, B., & Vuchinich, R. (1994). Coalitions and family problem solving with preadolescents in referred, at-risk, and comparison families. *Family Process, 33*(4), 409-424.