Differences in Retrospective Perceptions of Parenting Among Adolescents and Young Adults

Szilvia Jámbori and Judit Kőrössy

Institute of Psychology, University of Szeged, Hungary

Abstract

In the present study, the possible differences in parenting perceptions between young people socialised before the political changes in the socialist regime and those born after the regime change were explored. In Study 1 (2002) and Study 2 (2018), adolescents and young adults' retrospective perceptions of parenting were examined. In the first study, the participants included 126 adolescents and 145 young adults, and there were 133 adolescents and 204 young adults in the second study. In both studies, the participants completed the Family Socialisation Questionnaire (Dalbert & Goch, 1997), which is employed to assess parenting practices retrospectively. Second order factor analyses on both occasions revealed that the age groups perceived parenting styles in a similar way. The similarities of the two age groups' perceptions of parenting could be explained by employing the developmental niche theory, which is when the homeostatic functioning of the niche ensures relatively stable parenting styles, despite changing circumstances. On both occasions, young adults perceived parenting as more negative and restrictive. These results are discussed in detail.

The developmental niche framework emphasises that child development is not only determined by the physical and social environment, parents' characteristics, and caregiving and childrearing traditions, but also by the particular society and culture in which it is embedded (Super & Harkness, 1986). The proximal determinants of development ensure the homeostasis of the system; thus, parenting, despite the changing social and economic context, shows relative consistency over time. Nevertheless, the components of the niche transmit social and cultural changes, and through the three subsystems of the niche, different family factors could modify their effects. Holden and Miller's (1999) meta-analysis has shown that although parenting typically varies, it can be considered relatively consistent across time and contexts. Accordingly, we examined how the 1989–1990 regime change in Central and Eastern Europe changed family functioning and parenting attitudes in Hungary.

Until 1989, seven Central and Eastern Europe countries were dependent on communist ideology, which had a strong influence on the family, its characteristics and functioning. Under the old regime, the family functioned as a closed group. Individuals supported each other during critical periods of their lives. In most instances, the revolution in these countries changed their political systems in a very short period (Dunovsky, 1996). The influence of these changes, which were reflected in macrosocial levels relatively rapidly, became very visible on a societal level. For example, radical changes appeared in socioeconomic levels because businesses developed rapidly. People wanted to make as much money as possible, and consequently, moneymaking became the most important facet of their lives while their other interests and inner family life became less important (Dunovsky, 1996). In other areas such as cultural, spiritual and moral aspects of life, for which the family assumed primary responsibility, development was slow (Dunovsky, 1996).

At the same time, several Central European studies reported that family remained an important value that provided stability for its members and lessened societal influences and impacts (Robila, 2004). Childrearing remained a mother's task even though childrearing practices had changed. Beyond obedience and parental authority, parenting styles started to include the acceptance of children's independence, autonomy, freedom and decision making. Even after this change, successful upbringing to raise happy children and provide a quality education were prioritised in parenting values (Robila, 2004).

Role of Parenting in Adolescence and Young Adulthood

Many factors, including parents, peers and institutions, affect adolescent development. The information technology world has also become a factor that forms a dynamic ecosystemic environment in which the development of adolescent autonomy and identity, as well as cognitive and social development, are outlined (Shifflet-Chila, Harold, Fitton, & Ahmedani, 2016).

Although adolescents generally spend less time with family and have fewer interactions with their parents, they are still strongly influenced by them. The context of parenting has an influence on the developmental outcomes of adolescents and young adults (Steinberg & Silk, 2002). Traditionally, parenting has been studied through parents, children and/or adolescents' experiences. Although many studies have revealed that parents and children's perceptions differ widely, parents' self-reports have been shown to be similar to adolescents' representations of parenting (Soenens et al., 2005). Children and adolescents appear to be good informants on parenting. Several studies have identified domains of adolescent development related to children's perceptions of parenting. For example, Hale, Engels, and Meeus (2006) demonstrated that perceived parental alienation and rejection was significantly linked to generalised anxiety disorder scores. Adolescents from four different countries showed that internalising and externalising was positively related to the perception of conflict and negatively related to the perception of support, closeness, communication and monitoring (Vazsonyi, Hibbert, & Snider, 2003). Active coping behaviour was correlated with perceived parental warmth as well as authoritative and permissive parenting styles in 14- to 17-year-old adolescents. However, anxiety and depersonalisation were related to experiencing authoritarian parenting (Wolfradt, Hempel, & Miles, 2003). While hopes for the future were positively related to perceived democratic, accepting and over-protecting parenting styles, experiencing rejection predicted low levels of hope (Kumar, Sharma, & Hooda, 2012).

Emerging adulthood may be differentiated from adolescence and adulthood demographically, subjectively, and with respect to identity formation (Arnett, 2000). According to Arnett, Žukauskienė, and Sagimura (2014), emerging adulthood, the life stage between the ages of 18–30 years, is marked by five features: identity explorations, instability, self-focus, feeling in-between, and possibilities or optimism. In relation to parenting, the most important feature is self-focus, which implies that that the young adults have fewer obligations toward authority figures and fewer social roles than during other life stages. Even though they can be attached to and have a good relationship with their parents, their parents will have much less power and influence on them than they had previously. A second important feature is feeling in between, which is when young people who are no longer adolescents but not yet adults are assessed by the criteria of adulthood and begin to take responsibility for themselves. Both these features enable parents to gradually accept the autonomy and growing independence of their young adult children.

Although both parental monitoring and physical contact with parents is reduced for young adults (Arnett, 2000), parenting and the achievements of young adults are related. The results of a longitudinal study revealed that the stronger college students perceived parental control, the less they made committed choices and identified with them. At the same time, much exploration predicted increased parental control, which contrary to the parents' intentions, hindered making commitments (Luyckx, Soenens, Vansteenkiste, Groossens, & Berzonsky, 2007). Nelson, Padilla-Walker, Christensen, Evans, and Carroll (2011) found that the most positive developmental outcomes occurred when parenting was perceived as warm and responsive and not controlling. Moreover, lack of parental involvement was associated with fewer adjustment issues. In young adulthood, helicopter parenting was found to have a positive effect on self-worth and lowered risk behaviours when parents exhibited high levels of warmth (Nelson, Padilla-Walker, & Nielson, 2015). In contrast, children's prosocial behaviour influenced parenting style in that parents responded with more warmth and gave their children autonomy when their children displayed positive behaviours toward family (Padilla-Walker, Nelson, Fu, & McNamara, 2018).

Distortions in the Perception of Parenting

Childhood parenting is generally studied by interviewing adolescents and young adults. Consequently, the validity of those retrospective answers many years after experiencing the family events is questionable. Retrospective perceived parenting may be distorted by several factors (Gerlsma, Emmelkamp, & Arrindell, 1990). Deliberate false reporting is usually employed to make a favourable impression. However, unintentional false reporting also occurs because of poor attention and memory that includes an altered perception of the past in the light of present events. Individuals tend to forget previous negative experiences if they currently have no problems. Dalton, Frick-Horbury, and Kitzmann (2006) revealed that young people who viewed their relationship with their parents and romantic partner as positive rated the parenting they experienced in childhood more positively. Further distorting influences include love or hostility toward parents as well as the rater's own personality (Gerlsma et al., 1990). Furthermore, several studies have reported the influence of mood on the perception of parenting styles (Gerlsma et al., 1990; Gillham, Putter, & Kash, 2007).

In essence, these studies have revealed that adolescents and young adults' perception of childhood parenting is not an accurate picture of early parenting styles. Because retrospective perceived parenting is influenced by mood and the quality of social relationships, judgments on childhood parenting reflect the actual mental state of the children and quality of their relationships to some degree.

The Effects of Divorce on Parenting

Divorce is usually preceded by permanent conflict between the spouses. This may alter parenting routines and negatively affect children's behaviour. Because of the conflict or divorce between the father and mother, family management practices such as setting rules, monitoring and providing contingent circumstances may become less efficient (Patterson, 1982). Conflicts before or after a divorce change the affective environment within the family and thus have a direct impact on children and adolescents' school performance and social competence (Barber & Eccles, 1992). During a divorce, parenting is less authoritative, parental support decreases, and conflicts with children become more frequent (Amato, 2000). Lansford (2009) noted that in instances of conflict and divorce, parents are less likely to monitor and supervise their children effectively. They also discipline inconsistently. As divorce is a stress factor that weakens effective parenting, the parent-child relationship may become conflict-ridden. Custodial mothers often display irritability, poor monitoring and control, and inconsistent and punishing discipline (Hetherington & Stanley-Hagan, 2002). Custodial fathers' parenting differs from that of mothers in numerous ways. Although fathers are worse in monitoring their children, they have fewer discipline and control problems. While their interaction with their children involves fewer praises and hugs, it is characterised by more skill training and education. Fathers also tend to focus less on the emotional well-being and social relationships of their children (Hetherington &

Stanley-Hagan, 2002). The absence of the father has a long-lasting effect on the development and well-being of children and adolescents, which is evident in adulthood as well (East, Jackson, & O'Brien, 2006).

In the present study, the possible differences in parenting perceptions between young people socialised before the political changes and those born after the regime change were explored. In 2002, in the first study, we investigated the retrospective perception of parenting of young adults who were raised in the socialist era and of those adolescents who were socialised mostly in the new societal, political regime. We hypothesised that young adults raised in the socialist culture would perceive family life as more conflict-ridden and parenting as more restrictive and conformist than adolescents who were raised in the new regime that was characterised by open-minded, permissive, autonomy-granting parenting and school education. However, it has been suggested that the difference between the perceptions of the two age groups was influenced by factors such as their actual social relationships and family structure. Consequently, we repeated the study in 2018. In this second study, both age groups were socialised in new societal and political system institutions.

Our first hypothesis was that in the first measurement, in comparison to adolescents, young adults would view parenting as less autonomy-granting, more restrictive and goal-oriented because their school and family socialisation included stricter regulations and authoritarian control. Our second hypothesis was that young adults in comparison to adolescents in the second measurement would perceive more autonomy and fewer restrictions in retrospect because currently, parents grant more independence in accordance with the new societal values and the adult-forming status. In relation to the stability of parenting, our third hypothesis was that at the two measuring times, both age groups would display the same structure of parenting representations; that is, adolescents and young adults would construct their parenting-related experiences along the same dimensions, despite the large time differences. Finally, regarding the impact of family status, we assumed that while individuals who were raised in one-parent families would perceive their family climate as more conflict-ridden, those from intact families would characterise their family atmosphere as more rule-oriented and their parents' parenting style as more consistent.

Method

Participants

In Study 1 in 2002, the participants included 271 students (123 males). Of these, 126 and 145 were high school students and university students respectively. The participants were classified into two main age groups, namely adolescents ($M = 16.6$ years; $SD = .57$) and young adults ($M = 21.5$ years; $SD = 1.9$). While 96 adolescents lived in intact families, 30 lived in one-parent families. Of the young adults, 119 lived in intact families and 19 in one-parent families. The participants completed a questionnaire voluntarily, as part of a larger study. Data were missing for seven participants.

The participants in Study 2 in 2018 included 337 students (149 males). The participants were classified into two age groups, namely 14–19 years ($N = 133$, mean age: 16.8 years, $SD = 1.36$) and 20–26 years ($N = 204$, mean age: 21.8 years, $SD = 1.7$). While 89 of the adolescents lived in intact families, 22 lived in one-parent families. Data were missing for 22 of the adolescents. While 138 young adults lived in intact families, 43 lived in one-parent families. Data were missing for 23 of the young adults.

Method

Study 1 (2002)

Young adults and adolescents' perceptions of parenting practices were measured retrospectively by employing the Family Socialisation Questionnaire (Dalbert & Goch, 1997). The questionnaire assesses the family climate and education aims, attitudes and styles. The participants were asked to recall when they were approximately 12–14 years of age and complete the questionnaire based on their personal memories of their family. With the exception of the climate dimensions (rule-orientation vs. conflict-ridden), each scale included the same number and types of questions about their mother and father. In one-parent families, we considered the items only for the mother because in all cases the participants lived with their mother. The following 13 dimensions were measured: *Rule-Oriented Family Climate* ($M = 3.14$, $SD = 1.02$, 4 items, $\alpha = .78$, e.g., 'In our family rules should be kept relatively strictly'); *Conflict-Ridden Family Climate* ($M = 3.24$, $SD = 0.98$, 5 items, $\alpha = .80$, e.g., 'There have been a lot of hassles in our family'); *Parenting Aim Autonomy* ($M = 3.44$, $SD = 0.96$, 6 items, $\alpha = .77$, e.g., 'My mother/father wanted me to decide myself how to spend my pocket money'); *Parenting Aim Conformity of the Father* ($M = 3.11$, $SD = 0.92$, 4 items, $\alpha = .69$, e.g., 'My father wanted me to write nicely'); *Parenting Aim Conformity of the Mother* ($M = 3.22$, $SD = 0.98$, 4 items, $\alpha = .51$, e.g., 'My mother wanted me to write nicely'); *Consistent Parenting Attitude of the Father* ($M = 3.44$, $SD = 1.02$, 2 items, $r = .354$, $p = .01$; e.g., 'When my father forbid me something, I could do whatever I wanted, he insisted on his opinion'); *Consistent Parenting Attitude of the Mother* ($M = 3.42$, $SD = 0.88$, 2 items, $r = .273$, $p = .01$; e.g., 'When my mother forbid me something, I could do whatever I wanted, she insisted on her opinion'); *Manipulative Parenting Attitude* ($M = 2.24$, $SD = 0.98$, 6 items, $\alpha = .82$, e.g., 'Sometimes my mother/father complained that I made her/his life too hard'); *Inconsistent Parenting Attitude* ($M = 2.74$, $SD = 0.87$, 4 items, $\alpha = .74$, e.g., 'My father/mother punished me without knowing why'); *Supportive Parenting Attitude of the Father* ($M = 4.24$, $SD = 0.98$, 3 items, $\alpha = .80$, e.g., 'My father/mother also listened to my opinion as an adult'); *Supportive Parenting Attitude of the Mother* ($M = 4.14$, $SD = 0.87$, 3 items, $\alpha = .73$); *Restrictive Parenting Attitude of the Father* ($M = 2.64$, $SD = 0.91$, 2 items, $r = .779$, $p = .01$, e.g., 'My father/mother was angry when I answered cheekily'); and *Restrictive Parenting Attitude of the Mother* ($M = 2.56$, $SD = 0.88$, 2 items, $r = .544$, $p = .01$). The items were assessed on a 6-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (*not typical at all*) to 6 (*absolutely typical*). Items were presented in random order. Demographic data were collected at the end of the sessions.

Study 2 (2018)

Again, the young adults and adolescents were required to complete the Family Socialisation Questionnaire (Dalbert & Goch, 1997). The reliability parameters of the used measurements are presented in Table 1.

Data Collection and Statistical Procedures

We received permission from headmasters and parents before collecting data from the high school students. The students completed the questionnaires during their school hours, supervised by teachers. University students filled in the questionnaire

Table 1. Reliability Analyses of the Used Measurements (Study 2)

Measurements/subscales		Items	Mean (SD)	Cronbach's alpha
Family Socialisation Questionnaire (FSQ)		47	NA	NA
Rule-oriented family climate		4	3.19 (1,03)	0.88
Conflict-ridden family climate		5	3.12 (0.75)	0.81
Parenting aim conformity	Father	4	3.12 (1.23)	0.80
	Mother	4	3.28 (1.04)	0.70
Parenting aim autonomy	Father	3	3.97 (1.30)	0.71
	Mother	3	3.69 (1.07)	0.67
Consistent parenting attitude	Father	2	3.48 (1.40)	0.69
	Mother	2	3.42 (1.19)	0.60
Inconsistent parenting attitude	Father	2	2.24 (1.48)	0.85
	Mother	2	2.34 (1.38)	0.71
Manipulative parenting attitude	Father	3	2.27 (1.00)	0.75
	Mother	3	2.50 (1.27)	0.78
Supportive parenting attitude	Father	3	4.21 (1.37)	0.82
	Mother	3	4.71 (1.15)	0.78
Restrictive parenting attitude	Father	2	4.22 (1.47)	0.83
	Mother	2	4.11 (1.28)	0.77

Note: NA, not adaptable.

voluntarily as a part of a university course and were not given extra credit for it. For Study 2, the Hungarian Ethical Committee gave approval for this study (ethical approval number: 2017/125). IBM SPSS Statistics were used for the data analysis.

Results

Second Order Factor Analysis of Parenting: Examination of the Structure of Perceived Parenting

In the first analysis before the hypotheses were tested, the similarity of factor structures in the four subsamples was examined. A comparison of perceived parenting structures across the four student groups provides information on whether the differences between the answers were real differences with similar construction of experiences or whether the questionnaire measured different constructions in the groups (Russell, Graham, Neill, & Weems, 2016).

In Study 1, a second order factor analysis was conducted on parenting dimensions for both adolescents and young adults to reveal their interconnectedness. With respect to adolescent participants from nuclear families, a 3-factor solution emerged, explaining 63% of the variance. The first factor (eigenvalue: 4.12), which explained 23% of the variance, described a rule-oriented family climate where the father and mother's parenting was characterised by conformity and a reproving attitude. The second factor (eigenvalue: 2.14), which explained 22% of the variance, described a family climate where the mother and father's consistent attitude and the lack of the father's support could be observed. The parents' aim of autonomy was denied in this family type. The third factor (eigenvalue: 1.48), which explained an additional 17% of the variance, described a

conflict-ridden family climate where the father and mother's manipulative attitude and the lack of the mother's support were dominant (see Table 2).

In relation to young adults raised in intact families, a 4-factor solution emerged that explained 66% of the variance. The first factor (eigenvalue: 4.14), which explained 18% of the variance, described a rule-oriented family climate where mothers' parenting aim was conformity, characterised by a reproving parenting style. However, the fathers' parenting aim, which was the same, was less important. The second factor (eigenvalue: 2.15), which explained 16% of the variance, described a family type where the parenting aim was autonomy, a supportive parenting attitude that described both parents (see Table 2). The third factor (eigenvalue: 2.07), which explained 16% of the variance, described a conflict-ridden family climate where parents' manipulative and inconsistent attitude was observed. The fourth factor (eigenvalue: 1.41), which explained an additional 15% of the variance, described a family type where the father's parenting aim of conformity and a consistent and reproving attitude were observed (see Table 2).

In Study 2, a second order factor analysis was conducted on parenting dimensions for both adolescents and young adults to reveal their interconnectedness (see Table 3).

In relation to adolescents, a 4-factor solution emerged that explained 62% of the variance. The first factor (eigenvalue: 4.04), which explained 21% of the variance, described a conflict-ridden, nonsupportive family climate, where parents were manipulative and mothers had an inconsistent and nonsupportive parenting attitude. The second factor (eigenvalue: 2.16), which explained 16% of the variance, described only the fathers' inconsistent, less supportive and restrictive parenting attitude. It was noteworthy that in this family climate, fathers' consistent and inconsistent parenting attitudes were observed simultaneously. The third factor (eigenvalue: 2.08), which explained an additional 14% of the variance, described a rule-oriented family climate that was characterised by mothers' reproving, consistent parenting attitude, and the parenting aim of conformity. The fourth factor (eigenvalue: 1.58), which explained an additional 9% of the variance, described an autonomy support family climate, where fathers and mothers' support for autonomy was dominant.

In relation to young adults, a 4-factor solution also emerged that explained 63% of the variance. The first factor (eigenvalue: 4.01), which explained 22% of the variance, described a rule-oriented family climate, which characterised mothers and fathers' reproving, consistent parenting attitude, and the parenting aim of conformity. The second factor (eigenvalue: 2.74), which explained 20% of the variance, described a conflict-ridden family type, which was characterised by mothers' inconsistent and lack of supportive attitudes as well as both parents' manipulative attitude The third factor (eigenvalue: 1.94), which explained an additional 22% of the variance, described a family climate where the inconsistent parenting attitude of the father could be observed. The fourth factor (eigenvalue: 1.40) described an autonomy support family climate, where mothers and fathers' autonomy support attitude could be observed.

A comparison of the two age groups in Study 2 revealed that adolescents' fathers' consistent and inconsistent parenting attitudes could occur in the same family climate, but young adults' fathers' inconsistent parenting attitudes resulted in a separate family atmosphere. This result reflects the changing parenting patterns from adolescence to young adulthood and how perceptions of parents, especially fathers, can vary during these periods.

Table 2. Second Order Factor Analysis of Parenting Practices, Study 1, 2002

Parenting practices	1st factor Adolescent	Adult	2nd factor Adolescent	Adult	3rd factor Adolescent	Adult	4th factor Adolescent	Adult
Rule-oriented family climate	.53	.60						
Restrictive parenting attitude: Mother	.78	.69						
Restrictive parenting attitude: Father	.73	.45						.80
Parenting aim conformity: Mother	.80	.66						.42
Parenting aim conformity: Father	.87	.42						.71
Consistent parenting attitude: Mother		.76	.76					
Consistent parenting attitude: Father	.58		.69					.79
Parenting aim autonomy: Mother	-.35		-.65		.79			
Parenting aim autonomy: Father			-.91	.88				
Supportive parenting attitude: Mother		-.33		.56	-.68	-.46		
Supportive parenting attitude: Father			-.59	.65	-.57	-.37		
Inconsistent parenting attitude: Father		.40			.74	.66		
Inconsistent parenting attitude: Mother	.36		.65	-.32	.31	.50		.54
Manipulative parenting attitude: Mother					.65	.83		
Manipulative parenting attitude: Father	.51				.65	.75		.37
Conflict-ridden family climate			.30		.68	.71		

Note: Factor loadings > .30.

Table 3. Second Order Factor Analysis of Parenting Practices, Study 2, 2018

Parenting practices	1st factor Adolescent	Adult	2nd factor Adolescent	Adult	3rd factor Adolescent	Adult	4th factor Adolescent	Adult
Manipulative parenting attitude: Mother	.86			.85				
Inconsistent parenting attitude	.80			.82				
Conflict-ridden family climate	.73			.66				
Supportive parenting attitude: Mother	-.65			-.54				
Manipulative parenting attitude: Father	.64					.52		
Restrictive parenting attitude: Father		.56						
Consistent parenting attitude: Father		.62	.77					
Inconsistent parenting attitude: Father			.75			.88		
Supportive parenting attitude: Father			.72			-.66		
Parenting aim conformity: Mother		.66			.82			
Consistent parenting attitude: Mother		.72			.72			
Parenting aim conformity: Father		.71			.59			
Rule-oriented family climate		.70			.49			
Restrictive parenting attitude				.56	.43			
Parenting aim autonomy: Mother							.87	.82
Parenting aim autonomy: Father							.85	.79

Note: Factor loadings > .30.

Table 4. Age Differences in the Perception of Parenting

Parenting	Adolescents ($n = 133$) Mean (SD)	Young adults ($n = 204$) Mean (SD)	Group comparison
Parenting aim of conformity: Mother	3.11 (0.95)	3.38 (1.08)	$F_{(1,336)} = 5.43^*$
Parenting aim of conformity: Father	2.94 (1.18)	3.23 (1.26)	$F_{(1,336)} = 6.63^*$
Restrictive parenting aim: Mother	3.92 (1.28)	4.23 (1.27)	$F_{(1,336)} = 4.64^*$
Restrictive parenting aim: Father	3.87 (1.46)	4.44 (1.43)	$F_{(1,336)} = 12.13^{**}$
Supportive parenting attitude: Father	4.53 (1.26)	4.00 (1.40)	$F_{(1,336)} = 12.05^{**}$

Note: $^* p < .05$, $^{**}p < .01$.

Table 5. The Effect of Family Structure on the Perception of Parenting

Parenting	One-parent families ($n = 65$) Mean (SD)	Intact families ($n = 227$) Mean (SD)	Group comparison
Conflict-ridden family climate	3.48 (0.84)	3.02 (0.70)	$F_{(1,298)} = 20.78^{**}$
Inconsistent parenting attitude: Mother	2.70 (1.58)	2.21 (1.27)	$F_{(1,298)} = 7.12^{**}$
Manipulative parenting attitude: Mother	2.87 (1.37)	2.36 (1.21)	$F_{(1,298)} = 9.01^{**}$
Manipulative parenting attitude: Father	2.52 (1.12)	2.16 (0.95)	$F_{(1,298)} = 7.09^{**}$
Supportive parenting attitude: Father	3.74 (1.56)	4.35 (1.33)	$F_{(1,298)} = 10.57^{**}$
Consistent parenting attitude: Father	3.13 (1.51)	3.56 (1.38)	$F_{(1,298)} = 10.20^*$

Note: $^*p < .05$, $^{**}p < .01$.

Mean Differences Between Age Groups

Age differences Study 1 (2002). A two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA; age × family structure) revealed possible differences in parenting dimensions. With reference to a rule-oriented family climate, a significant main effect for age groups was observed, $F_{(2259)} = 11.222$; $p \leq .001$. Young adults considered their family climate as more rule-oriented ($M = 3.24$, $SD = 1.07$) in comparison to adolescents ($M = 2.79$, $SD = .96$). Mothers' consistent parenting style was also evaluated differently by the different age groups, $F_{(1.261)} = 5.87$; $p \leq .016$. Young adults perceived their mothers' parenting as more consistent ($M = 3.55$, $SD = 1.04$) than adolescents did ($M = 3.19$, $SD = 1.06$). Furthermore, young adults evaluated their mothers' parenting aim of conformity as more typical, $F_{(1.257)} = 7.48$, $p \leq .007$ ($M = 3.22$, $SD = .95$) in comparison to adolescents ($M = 2.91$, $SD = .92$). In relation to mothers' restrictive parenting style, a significant main effect of age could be revealed, $F_{(1.261)} = 10.787$, $p \leq .001$. Young adults evaluated their mothers' parenting as more restrictive ($M = 4.42$, $SD = 1.01$) in comparison to adolescents ($M = 3.98$, $SD = 1.35$).

Age differences Study 2 (2018). There were significant age differences between adolescents and young adults regarding both parents' parenting aim of conformity. Young adults evaluated their mothers and fathers' parenting aim of conformity as typical when compared to adolescents. A significant main effect of age was revealed for restrictive parenting style. Young adults evaluated their mothers and fathers' parenting as more restrictive in comparison to adolescents. A significant age effect was revealed in relation to fathers' supportive parenting. Adolescents perceived their fathers' parenting as more supportive than young adults did (see Table 4.).

Statistical analyses revealed no significant differences between the two databases. In both studies, the perception of parenting in retrospective descriptions showed similar patterns after 10 years. Only in one case were there changes. This indicates that in comparison to young adults, adolescents perceive a higher level of support from their father.

Differences in family constellation Study 1. (2002). An ANOVA revealed significant differences between the participants with respect to family structure (intact vs. one-parent families) and rule-oriented family climate, $F_{(1.256)} = 11.457$, $p \leq .001$. Young adults growing up in intact families perceived their family climate as more rule-oriented ($M = 3.21$, $SD = 1.06$) than those growing up in one-parent families ($M = 2.77$, $SD = .993$).

Differences in family constellation Study 2. (2018). Significant differences were revealed between the participants in relation to family structure and conflict-ridden family climate. The participants who were raised in one-parent families perceived their family climate as more conflict-ridden than those from intact families. A significant family structure effect was revealed in relation to mothers' inconsistent and manipulative parenting attitude. Furthermore, young adults and adolescents who were raised in one-parent families perceived their mothers' parenting attitude as more manipulative and more inconsistent than those who grew up in intact families. Fathers' supportive parenting was more typical among the participants who were brought up in intact families (see Table 5).

We created two groups based on family constellation. The first group comprised adolescents who were raised in one-parent families ($N = 22$) and the second group, young adults from one-parent families ($N = 43$). Statistical analyses revealed significant differences between adolescents and young adults from one-parent families regarding perceived family climate. Young adults perceived their mothers and fathers' parenting aim as more

Table 6. Family Structure Differences in the Perception of Parenting

Parenting	Adolescents from one-parent family ($n = 22$) Mean (SD)	Young adults from one-parent family ($n = 43$) Mean (SD)	Group comparison
Parenting aim of conformity: Mother	3.23 (1.11)	3.72 (1.10)	$F_{(2,335)} = 4.62$**
Restrictive parenting aim: Mother	4.31 (1,13)	4.66 (1,10)	$F_{(2,335)} = 5,21$**
Restrictive parenting aim: Father	3.95 (1,52)	4.89 (1,06)	$F_{(2,335)} = 5,45$**

restrictive. Furthermore, the mothers' parenting aim of conformity was also more dominant in this group in comparison to adolescents with a divorce family structure (see Table 6).

Discussion

In this study, young adults and adolescents' parenting experiences were examined by employing a novel comparative method. We attempted to explore children's perceptions of the effects of societal, economic and political changes on parenting.

First, our data revealed that at both measuring times, both age groups perceived parenting along the same dimensions, which supports our third hypothesis. The factor of a rule-oriented family atmosphere emerged for both adolescents and young adults in both studies. This factor included the aim of conformity, a restrictive attitude, and a consistent attitude. A conflict-ridden family climate together with fathers and mothers' manipulative, inconsistent parenting and nonsupportive attitudes were similar in the four groups. The two groups of young adults and adolescents of the second study perceived the factor of parenting aim autonomy similarly. The factor of fathers' negative parenting, including the related inconsistent, restrictive and nonsupportive attitudes, were also congruent among these three groups. However, adolescent factors of the first study differed. Besides the rule-oriented and conflict-ridden family climate, a third factor of fathers and mothers' consistent parenting and parenting aim of conformity emerged. This specific factor structure may be the result of missing answers for items related to the father. The similarity of the factor structure in the other three groups indicated that despite political and societal changes, adolescents and young adults' retrospective perceptions of parenting was constructed in a similar way. This supports our third hypothesis. The importance of this finding is twofold. First, it appears that the long-term similarity of parenting contexts is verifiable. This is in accordance with Holden and Miller's (1999) meta-analysis, which concluded that parenting style in a family in the long term and even in different contexts is relatively consistent. According to the developmental niche theory (Super & Harkness, 1986), the homeostatic functioning of the niche ensures relatively stable parenting styles, despite changing circumstances. This explains why children perceive various important dimensions of parenting that remain rather stable. Second, Russell et al. (2016) noted that the differences revealed in parenting questionnaires are often evident because the individuals completing the survey construct their experiences differently. We found a similar secondary factor structure at both measuring times and in both age groups. Consequently, the differences and similarities of the subgroups reveal real disparity, thus indicating that the Family Socialisation Questionnaire demonstrated relatively good measurement invariance across the groups. This indicates the reliability of the findings.

In our first hypothesis, we stated that at the first measurement, in comparison to the adolescents, the young adults would view parenting as more restrictive and goal-oriented, and less autonomy-granting because obedience and parental authority — specifically, an authoritarian parenting style — was characteristic of the parenting context of family and school education before the political system changed. Our results showed that at the first measurement, young adults in comparison to adolescents saw family climate as more rule-oriented and mothers as more consistent, restrictive and conformity-emphasising. At the second measurement, there was a similar disparity between the two age groups: Young adults perceived both parents as more restrictive and more emphasising of conformity. Therefore, the differences in restriction and conformity in the perception of parenting could be better explained by age-related differences, as the effects of the societal changes could not be supported reliably. However, at the first measurement, adolescents perceived parenting as less rule-oriented and consistent; this difference was not present in the second study. This result could indicate that adolescents socialised after the political change viewed parenting as less rule-oriented, which concurs with the literature that has shown that after the changes a free atmosphere was created, where alongside parental authority, children acquired more independence (Robila, 2004).

Our second hypothesis was not supported. In fact, the results revealed the exact opposite. In comparison to adolescents, adults perceived the parenting aim of conformity and viewed the father and mother's parenting attitude as more restrictive. Because there was only a five-year age difference between the two groups, it is unlikely that parenting aims and methods changed significantly in such a short period of time. Thus, it is not plausible that we measured substantial differences in the perception of parenting. Because characteristically similar differences were found in the first study, this may indicate that age differences are instrumental in young adults' perceptions, thus emphasising conformity and restrictions. In order to evaluate this finding, the distortions in the judgment of parenting should be considered. Gerlsma et al. (1990) found that several factors modify retrospective perception of parenting. Besides unintentional false reporting and forgetting, retrospective perception is influenced by the quality of individuals' present social relationships (Dalton et al., 2006), intensity of depressive symptoms, and mood changes (Gerlsma et al., 1990; Gillham et al., 2007). This evokes more than one possible explanation. It is feasible that the relationship between young adults and their parents is not entirely positive, which may be partly due to value differences. Young adults may project this current problem to a previous time when asked to evaluate childhood parenting. Furthermore, parents may be restrictive and

authoritarian with young adults who represent new values and lifestyles, and accordingly, they may project this present parenting style to their childhood experiences. Luyckz et al. (2007) found that young adults' wider exploration resulted in parents' restrictive behaviour. Thus, the reciprocal, bidirectional nature of the parent-child relationship is evidenced in this age group too. It is also possible that adolescents' mood and emotional state are not fully balanced because of partial independence, school problems and feeling in between (Arnett, 2014). Consequently, their particular moods are reflected in more negative evaluations. Young adults often have fewer obligations and social roles than adults. At the same time, parents only gradually accept their children's pursuit of independence and autonomy. This may result in a build-up of permanent tension between parents and young adults. It offers an additional explanation, considering that in many cases, young adults study in university environments where they have more decisive freedom and possibilities to cultivate autonomy. Compared to this freedom, they may perceive childhood parenting as more restrictive and conformist. Further studies are needed to reveal the causal network of factors underlying the special patterns of parenting perception.

Differences between divorced and intact families emerged along the expected dimensions, supporting our fourth hypothesis. Children from divorced families perceived their childhood family climate as more conflict-ridden in both studies. In the second study, this was complemented with seeing the mother and father as manipulative and less consistent, as well as the father being seen as less supportive. These results concur with findings of Amato (2000), Lansford (2009), and Hetherington and Stanley-Hagan (2002), which revealed that divorce brings more conflict, less parental support, less consistent parental discipline, and less guidance. We also checked differences between the two age groups of children in divorced families. The results reflected the already known disparity that young adults assigned more conformist aims to the mother and perceived both parents as more restrictive than adolescents. Although this perceptual difference of young adults and adolescents is demonstrated in divorced families as well, we could not find any other disparities.

Because of various limitations of the study, the results cannot be generalised. First, the overall number of participants included in these studies limits the generalisability of the results. In both studies, the number of participants who lived in divorced or intact families was not equal, thus lowering the power of the analyses. Furthermore, the young adult group comprised university students. As a result of their specific family status, they may have perceived childhood parenting as being more conformist and restrictive than young adults of another type of population.

The specific differences may have resulted not only from the structure of the data, but also from the dimensions of the questionnaires. It is possible that the items and dimensions of the Family Socialisation Questionnaire were not sensitive enough to measure the effects of societal and economic changes. At the same time, similar age-related differences in both studies could indicate that families were able to compensate for the negative societal influences effectively. Consequently, problematic tendencies in parenting that appear in poorer classes may not be manifest on the addressed levels of perception.

Based on the results, recommendations for future studies can be made. First, it may be beneficial to investigate whether young adults' perceptions of restrictions and conformity in childhood parenting is a general phenomenon across cultures and countries. It is also recommended that factors that influence

young adults' retrospective perceptions be examined. Based on the results, which indicated age-related differences, it is recommended that a longitudinal study to monitor the changes in parenting experiences and the emergence of influencing factors be conducted.

Conflict of interest. None.

Ethical standards. The authors assert that all procedures contributing to this work comply with the ethical standards of the relevant national and institutional committees on human experimentation and with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975, as revised in 2008.

References

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

Arnett, J.J. (2000). Emerging adulthood. The theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist*, **55**, 469–480.

Arnett, J.J., Žukauskienė, R., & Sagimura, K. (2014). The new life stage of emerging adulthood at ages 18–29 years: Implications for mental health. *Lancet Psychiatry*, **1**, 569–576.

Barber, B.L., & Eccles, J.S. (1992). Long-term influence of divorce and single parenting on adolescent family- and work-related values, behaviors, and aspirations. *Psychological Bulletin*, **111**, 108–126.

Dalbert, C., & Goch, J. (1997). Gerechtigkeitserleben und familiale Socialisation. In. H.P. Langfeldt (Ed.), *Informationen, Programm, Abstracts* (p. 60.). London: Verlag Empirische Pädagogik.

Dalton W.T., III, Frick-Horbury, D., & Kitzmann, K.M. (2006). Young adults' retrospective reports of parenting by mothers and fathers: Associations with current relationship quality. *The Journal of General Psychology*, **133**, 5–18.

Dunovsky, J. (1996). Family in society in transition. In S. Nakou & S. Pautelakis (Ed.), *The child in the world of tomorrow: The next generation* (pp. 38–48). New York: Guilford Press.

East, L., Jackson, D., & O'Brien, L. (2006). Father absence and adolescent development: A review of the literature. *Journal of Child Health Care*, **10**, 283–295.

Gerlsma, C., Emmelkamp, P.M., & Arrindell, W.A. (1990). Anxiety, depression, and perception of early parenting: A meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology Review*, **10**, 251–277.

Gillham, J.E., Putter, P., & Kash, V.M. (2007). The effects of sad mood on reports of parents' caregiving behavior. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, **29**, 125–133.

Hale, W.W., Engels, R., & Meeus, W. (2006). Adolescent's perceptions of parenting behaviours and its relationship to adolescent generalized anxiety disorder symptoms. *Journal of Adolescence*, **29**, 407–417.

Hetherington, E.M., & Stanley-Hagan, M. (2002). Parenting in divorced and remarried families. In M.H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting*. (2nd ed., vol. 3, pp. 287–315). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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

Kumar, A., Sharma, M., & Hooda, D. (2012). Perceived parenting styles as a predictor of hope among adolescents. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, **38**, 174–178.

Lansford, J. (2009). Parental divorce and children's adjustment. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, **4**. 10.1111/j.1745-6924.2009.01114.x

Luyckx, K., Soenens, B., Vansteenkiste, M., Groossens, L., & Berzonsky, M.D. (2007). Parental psychological control and dimension of identity formation in emerging adulthood. *Journal of Family Psychology*, **21**, 546–550.

Nelson, L.J., Padilla-Walker, L.M., Christensen, K.J., Evans, C.A., & Carroll, J.S. (2011). Parenting in emerging adulthood: An examination of parenting clusters and correlates. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, **40**, 730–743.

Nelson, L.J., Padilla-Walker, L.M., & Nielson, M.G. (2015). Is hovering smothering or loving? Parental warmth as a moderator of relations between helicopter parenting and emerging adults' indices of adjustment. *Emerging Adulthood*, **3**, 282–285.

Padilla-Walker, L.M., Nelson, L.J., Fu, X., & McNamara, B.C. (2018). Bidirectional relations between parenting and prosocial behavior for Asian and European-American emerging adults. *Journal of Adult Development*, **25**, 107–120.

Patterson, G.R. (1982). *Coercive family process*. Eugene, OR: Castalia

Robila, M. (2004). Families in Eastern Europe: Context, trends and variations. In M. Robila (Ed.), *Families in Eastern Europe: Contemporary perspectives in family research* (vol. 5, pp. 1–14). Emerald Group Publishing.

Russell, J.D., Graham, R.A., Neill, E.L., & Weems, C.F. (2016). Agreement in youth-parent perception of parenting behaviors: A case for testing measurement invariance in reporter discrepancy research. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, **45**, 2094–2107.

Shifflet-Chila, E., Harold, R.D., Fitton, V.A., & Ahmedani, B.K. (2016). Adolescent and family development: autonomy and identity in the digital age. *Children and Youth Services Review*, **70**, 364–368.

Soenens, B., Elliot, A.J., Goossens, L., Vansteenkiste, M., Luyten, P., & Duriez, B. (2005). The intergenerational transmission of perfectionism: Psychological control as an intervening variable. *Journal of Family Psychology*, **19**, 358–366.

Steinberg, L., & Silk, J.S. (2002). Parenting adolescents. In M.H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting* (2nd ed., vol. 1., pp. 103–133). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Super, C.M., & Harkness, S. (1986). The developmental niche: A conceptualization at the interface of child and culture. *International Journal of the Behavioral Development*, **9**, 545–569.

Vazsonyi, A.T., Hibbert, J.R., & Snider, J.B. (2003). Exotic enterprise no more? Adolescent reports of family and parenting processes from youth in four countries. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, **13**, 129–160.

Wolfradt, U., Hempel, S., & Miles, J.N.V. (2003). Perceived parenting styles, depersonalisation, anxiety and coping behaviour in adolescents. *Personality and Individual Differences*, **34**, 521–532.