

Psychometric Properties of Parenting Measures in Indonesia

Yulina Eva Riany^{1-2*}, Monica Cuskelly³, and Pamela Meredith⁴

¹The University of Queensland, Parenting and Family Support Centre, School of Psychology, Brisbane 4072 QLD, Australia.

²Faculty of Human Ecology, Bogor Agricultural University, Bogor 16680, Indonesia.

³School of Education, The University of Tasmania, Private Bag 66 Hobart 7001, Australia.

⁴The University of Queensland, School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, Occupational Therapy, Brisbane 4072 QLD, Australia.

*E-mail: y.riany@uq.edu.au

Abstract

We examined the psychometric properties of two parenting measures, the Parenting Styles and Dimensions Questionnaire (PSDQ) and the Parent-Child Relationships Questionnaire (PCRQ) which were translated into Indonesian for use in Indonesia. The Indonesian versions of these questionnaires were completed by 514 parents and 459 parents, respectively. Participants were parents (mostly mothers) of typically developing children, who completed the measures through an online or paper-based survey. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), parallel analyses, internal and external construct validity, and internal reliability were performed on both measures. Results revealed that the translated version of the PSDQ consisted of three factors. Two of these factors reflected the Authoritative and Authoritarian subscales of the original measure; however, the Permissive subscale was not obtained. A third factor, labelled Reasoning, was extracted. The translated PCRQ was found to have the same structure as the original version of the measure. Some modifications were required for both instruments, and the modified versions of the instruments had acceptable internal consistency. Development of these translated and modified instruments will support parenting research within Indonesia.

Properti Psikometrik Alat Ukur Pengasuhan di Indonesia

Abstrak

Kami melakukan uji psikometri dua alat ukur pengasuhan, yaitu the Parenting Styles and Dimensions Questionnaire (PSDQ) dan the Parent-Child Relationships Questionnaire (PCRQ) yang diterjemahkan ke dalam bahasa Indonesia untuk digunakan di Indonesia. Sebanyak 514 orang tua ikut berpartisipasi dalam penelitian ini dengan melengkapi PSDQ versi Bahasa Indonesia dan 459 orang tua melengkapi PCRQ. Sebagian besar partisipan penelitian adalah ibu, yang melengkapi survei melalui online maupun survei di lapangan. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), parallel analyses, dan analisis reliabilitas dilakukan terhadap dua instrument ini. Hasil analisis Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) menunjukkan bahwa versi terjemahan PSDQ memiliki tiga faktor. Dua faktor mencerminkan subskala yang sesuai dengan alat ukur asli, yaitu Otoritatif dan Otoriter. Namun, subskala Permisif tidak berhasil diidentifikasi. Faktor ketiga yang ditemukan diberi label "Penjelasan". PCRQ versi Bahasa Indonesia menunjukkan struktur yang sama seperti versi Bahasa Inggris. Beberapa modifikasi dibutuhkan untuk kedua instrumen, dan versi modifikasi dari instrumen tersebut memiliki reliabilitas yang baik. Hasil penelitian ini diharapkan dapat mendukung penelitian tentang pengasuhan di Indonesia.

Keywords: instrument, parenting, parent-child relationship, Indonesia.

Citation:

Riany, Y. E., Cuskelly, M., Meredith, P. (2018). Psychometric properties of parenting measures in Indonesia. *Makara Human Behavior Studies in Asia*, 22(2), 75-90. doi: 10.7454/hubs.asia.1160118

1. Introduction

Extensive empirical studies conducted over more than 60 years have identified links between parenting and child outcomes (Bornstein, 2005). Parenting contributes to child development across all the developmental domains and across all the periods of child development. Examples of this influence include impacts on children's linguistic and cognitive development (Dexter & Stacks, 2014); mental health (Bornstein, 2013); self-esteem (Zakeri & Karimpour, 2011); and prosocial behavior (Carlo et al., 2010).

On the basis of parenting behavior, Baumrind (1978, 2013) classifies parenting into three parenting styles: authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive. Authoritative parenting is also known as democratic parenting (Wang, 2014) since this style is both demanding of, and responsive to, the child. Authoritarian parenting is defined as demanding but not responsive parenting, and is characterised by high levels of control, sometimes including verbal hostility and physical punishment. Permissive parenting is characterised as child-centered, with high levels of warmth and low control.

In contrast to Western cultures, in which authoritative parenting is considered the best parenting approach to support optimum child development (see Baumrind, 2013; Bornstein, 2012), it has been suggested that Indonesian families apply different parenting styles depending on the age of children (Riany, Meredith, & Cuskelly, 2016). Indonesian parents tend to be indulgent (permissive) with children under six years of age due to cultural beliefs that young children do not understand behavioural expectations and rules (Mulder, 1992). However, parenting becomes more demanding when children reach six years of age (Mulder, 1992). The reason suggested for this change is that Indonesian parents perceive their major role in parenting an older child to be disciplinary. Restrictive disciplinary strategies are often found in traditional Indonesian parenting practices, although parents also feel compassion and love towards their children (Mulder, 1992).

Research conducted in Western cultures has found that besides having strong associations with child development, parenting styles have been associated with the quality of the parent-child relationship (Karande & Kuril, 2011; Popov & Ilesanmi, 2015). For example, Duncan, Coatsworth, and Greenberg (2009) found that mindful parenting with full awareness of, and attention to, the child (features of authoritative parenting) promoted healthy parent-child relationships. However, the parent-child relationship is understood to be a reciprocally influencing system, rather than one in which only parents are influential (Popov & Ilesanmi, 2015). Parenting and the parent-child relationship are often viewed as jointly influential towards child development (see Berger &

McLanahan, 2015; Dexter & Stacks, 2014; Popov & Ilesanmi, 2015).

Despite the extensive research focusing on parenting, child development, and parent-child relationships conducted in Western countries, very limited research has been conducted among Indonesian families (Sumargi, 2014). One important cause of this gap is the lack of psychometrically sound instruments for use in Indonesia. Sumargi (2014) noted that existing research on parenting in Indonesia often used instruments for which psychometric properties had not been examined in Indonesia. Using instruments that are not psychometrically robust could lead to outcomes which do not reflect the real situation. Therefore, there is a strong need for psychometrically sound instruments to measure aspects of parenting in Indonesia.

The present study was conducted to examine the psychometric properties of two parenting instruments using Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), parallel analyses, internal and external construct validity, and internal reliability, when used with Indonesian parents. These two instruments, the Parenting Styles and Dimensions Questionnaire (PSDQ; Robinson, Mandlco, Olsen & Hart, 2001) and the Parent-Child Relationships Questionnaire (PCRQ; Furman & Giberson, 1995), are widely used in parenting studies in the West. In the following sections, descriptions of these parenting instruments are presented.

Parenting styles and dimensions questionnaire (PSDQ).

The PSDQ was developed by Robinson and colleagues (2001) in the United States. The PSDQ reflects Baumrind's model of parenting styles with three subscales – Authoritative, Authoritarian, and Permissive Parenting – and comprises 32 items. It has good internal consistency with Cronbach's alpha coefficients of 0.86, 0.82, and 0.64 for the Authoritative, the Authoritarian, and the Permissive subscales, respectively (Robinson et al., 2001).

In addition, the instrument has been adopted in several different cultures, where it has been found to have acceptable reliability and validity (Olivari, Tagliabue & Confalonieri, 2013). Countries with non-Western cultures in which the instrument has been used include China (Fu et al. 2013; Xu, 2007), Israel (Slone, Shechner & Farah, 2012), Jordan (Al-Khatib & Brophy-Herb, 2005), Lithuania (Kern & Joyniene, 2012), Portugal (Pedro, Carapito & Ribeiro, 2015), and Turkey (Önder & Gülay, 2009). No Indonesian studies using the instrument were able to be located.

Two Chinese studies conducted in different regions of China, and using slightly different translated versions, found that Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) produced the same factorial structure as the original questionnaire

(Fu et al. 2013; Xu, 2007). In addition, the three subscales had limited shared variance, supporting extraction of the three factors (Xu, 2007). Xu (2007) also found that the three subscales had acceptable internal consistencies, with Cronbach's alpha coefficients of 0.91, 0.87, and 0.64 for Authoritative, Authoritarian, and Permissive subscales, respectively. Acceptable, although somewhat lower, internal consistencies were reported by Fu et al. (2013) (alphas = 0.63 to 0.78). The values of kappa for inter-rater reliability of this Chinese version of the PSDQ were between 0.62 and 0.88 and test-retest reliabilities were between 0.54 and 0.83.

A translated version of the PSDQ that was adapted for use in Lithuania also revealed the same factorial structure as the original questionnaire (Kern & Joyniene, 2012). This version showed sufficient internal consistency for two subscales with alpha coefficients of 0.85 for the Authoritative and 0.76 for the Authoritarian subscale (Kern & Joyniene, 2012). The internal consistency of the Permissive subscale was too low to be considered reliable ($\alpha = 0.58$) based on Nunally's criteria (1967).

Using CFA, the Portuguese version was also found to be a good fit to the original structure of the questionnaire (Pedro et al., 2015). Pedro et al. (2015) also found adequate internal consistency of the Portuguese version of the PSDQ with Cronbach's alpha coefficients of 0.88, 0.73, and 0.62 for the Authoritative, Authoritarian, and Permissive subscales, respectively. The Jordanian version of the PSDQ had adequate internal consistencies with Cronbach's alpha coefficients of 0.82, 0.76, and 0.71 for the Authoritative, Authoritarian, and Permissive subscales (Al-Khatib, 2005). Finally, the Turkish version of the PSDQ had adequate internal consistencies for Authoritative and Authoritarian subscales, with Cronbach's alpha coefficients of 0.84 and 0.71, respectively (Önder & Gülay, 2009). However, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient was unacceptably low for the Permissive subscale ($\alpha = 0.38$) (Önder & Gülay, 2009).

In summary, investigations of the PSDQ have consistently found the factor structure to be robust and the Authoritative and Authoritarian subscales to be internally reliable. However, the Permissive subscale has generally produced barely acceptable levels of internal consistency.

Parent-child relationships questionnaire (PCRQ).

Furman and Giberson (1995) developed the PCRQ, a 40 item scale that measures five aspects of the parent-child relationship to measure the quality of said relationship. According to Power, DuPaul, Shapiro, and Kazak (2003), the PCRQ is one of the few available questionnaires that directly measures the dimensions of parent-child relationships. The scale comprises five subscales: Warmth, Personal Relationship, Disciplinary Warmth, Power Assertion, and Possessiveness. Furman and

Giberson (1995) reported that the internal consistency for maternal reports on the five PCRQ subscales were between 0.71 and 0.83.

Although not adopted as extensively as the PSDQ, the PCRQ has been found to have adequate internal consistency across a number of cultural groups. Internal consistencies of the PCRQ when used with African-American participants were between 0.68 and 0.92 for the five subscales (Miller-Clayton, 2010). Siu (2006) reported that a Chinese version of the PCRQ used in Hong Kong showed satisfactory internal consistency with alpha coefficients between 0.68 and 0.88. Another Chinese version of the PCRQ applied in Nanjing, China, found four of the five subscales to have adequate internal consistency, with Cronbach's alpha coefficients between 0.76 and 0.84. Internal consistency of the Possessiveness subscale was inadequate (Xu, 2007).

Xu (2007) also reported that the results of a CFA performed on the Chinese version of the PCRQ showed good fit to the original structure of the instrument with the exception of the Possessiveness subscale. In addition, the PCRQ has been reported to be significantly related to observed parenting behaviours and discipline strategies of parenting of children with ADHD (Johnston, Murray, Hinshaw, Pelham & Hoza, 2002), providing evidence of its external validity.

On the basis of these results suggesting psychometric robustness across varying cultures, the PSDQ and PCRQ were chosen as the measures of parenting style and parent-child relationship to be considered for use in Indonesia. Together, they address two important aspects of family life likely to be important to family functioning in Indonesia. Despite the studies described above, in which these measures have been used in a range of cultures, it must be acknowledged that the majority of research using these two instruments was conducted in Western cultures. There has been limited use of these instruments in Asian cultures, and no Indonesian study using either the PSDQ or PCRQ can be identified. Accordingly, as part of a larger study, the present study aims to investigate the factorial validity and internal consistency of Indonesian versions of the PSDQ and PCRQ with an Indonesian sample. We aim to provide translated and culturally appropriate instruments for use in Indonesia.

2. Methods

Participants. Six hundred and seventeen Indonesian parents with at least one typically developing child between the ages of 3 and 10 years provided data for the study; however, not all respondents completed both questionnaires. Five hundred and fourteen participants completed the PSDQ and 459 parents completed to the PCRQ. Detailed information of participants' demographic information is provided in Table A1 (*See Appendix*).

Measures. Parenting styles and dimensions questionnaire. The PSDQ is a 32-item questionnaire, developed by Robinson et al. (2001), which provides scores for each of Baumrind's (1978) three parenting styles: Authoritative (15 items), Authoritarian (12 items) and Permissive parenting (5 items). Participants report how often they display the behaviours listed in the instrument by responding to each item using a 5-point Likert-scale ranging from 1 = Never to 5 = Always. A total score for each subscale is obtained by calculating the mean score of all items of the subscale. The subscale with the highest mean score reflects the type of parenting style that characterises the style of the respondent. Although calculating the mean scores in each section enables identification of typologies of the parenting style, this instrument also provides continuous scale scores, and the instrument is usually used in this manner, rather than as a means of categorising parents (see, for example, Xu, 2007).

Parent-child relationships questionnaire. The PCRQ (Furman & Giberson, 1995) is a 40-item questionnaire measuring five characteristics of the parent-child relationship: Warmth (6 items), Personal Relationship (10 items), Disciplinary Warmth (6 items), Power Assertion (12 items), and Possessiveness (6 items). The PCRQ requires parents to respond to each item with respect to how often they demonstrate the behaviour on a 5-point Likert scale with response possibilities ranging from 1 = hardly at all, to 5 = extremely much.

The subscale scores are obtained by deriving the average score of the items from each subscale. High scores indicate high levels of each attribute; thus, high mean scores on Warmth, Personal Relationship, and Disciplinary Warmth and low mean scores on Power Assertion and Possessiveness reflect positive qualities of the parent-child relationship (Furman & Giberson, 1995).

Procedures. Ethical approval was obtained through the appropriate channels at The University of Queensland Australia. The first task was to translate the instruments from English to Indonesian. Permission for translating the instruments was obtained from the first author of both instruments. A translation and back-translation process was used to develop the versions of the instruments used in this study (Brislin, 1970, 1986). These translations were carried out by the first author and another Indonesian researcher in the field of family studies, who was unconnected with the research project reported here. Both translators are bilingual in Indonesian and English. Translation into Indonesian was undertaken using *Ejaan Yang Disesuaikan* (EYD) or formal academic Indonesian.

Initially, the instruments were translated by both researchers independently of each other, resulting in two

translated versions of the instruments. After that, a back-translation was completed independently by the two translators, resulting in two second English versions of the instruments. Having two independent versions of the instruments, a discussion was undertaken by both translators to review the two Indonesian versions and two second English versions of the instruments by comparing these to the original English version. This discussion resulted in corrections made to resolve discrepancies in terms of vocabulary and meanings of the statements until agreement on the final form of all items was reached.

There were three methods of participant recruitment and distribution of the translated versions of the instruments. Firstly, participants were recruited online: the Indonesian version of measures was distributed through the online survey software SurveyMonkey using social media sites and a number of Indonesian community mailing lists in which the first author was registered. Two hundred and fifty Indonesian parents residing in Indonesia and worldwide responded to the online survey, but only 168 respondents completed both questionnaires.

Secondly, a paper-based survey was used to include participants who had limited access to the internet. Two approaches were used to recruit participants to complete the paper-based survey. Initially, the researcher came to health centers and schools within Bandar Lampung, Lampung province, Indonesia and provided information regarding the research to potential participants and invited them to complete the survey. Two hundred and ten parents completed the questionnaires and returned them in person to the researcher at the survey location.

In order to recruit more participants, the researcher approached the Heads of the Local Community in Bandar Lampung, Indonesia. The Heads of Local Community assisted the researcher by distributing a packet of information about the research, consent form, and return envelopes, to potential participants in their areas. Parents who were willing to participate in the study returned the consent form in a sealed envelope to the Head of their Local Community, who passed these on to the researcher. Participants who completed the consent form were then given a package of questionnaires in an envelope by Head of their local community. Participants completed the survey in their own time and returned the questionnaire either to the researcher or to their Head of Local Community in a sealed envelope. All questionnaires were labeled using a code to protect confidentiality. One hundred and fifty-five parents initially completed the consent form; however, only 136 returned the completed PSDQ and 81 returned completed PCRQ questionnaires. Compensation was given to participants who responded to the paper-based survey by providing token gifts (e.g., stationery,

snacks, etc.). This method of compensation could not be given to those who responded online.

In responding to the questionnaires, participants with multiple children aged between 3-10 years were asked to respond to the questionnaires with reference to the oldest child in that age band. In total, 514 participants completed the PSDQ and 459 completed the PCRQ.

Statistical analysis. The data was analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistic 22. Prior to analysis, the data was cleaned by removing incomplete questionnaires (i.e., those with >60% of items missing) from the data set. Any remaining missing values were dealt with by using the exclude cases listwise option while running analyses using SPSS. Examination of the alpha coefficients of the original subscales revealed poor internal consistencies; thus, exploratory factor analysis (EFA; Fabrigar, Wegener, McCallum, & Strahan, 1999) was conducted to establish the factorial structure of the Indonesian versions of the two instruments.

Final item placement on factors was generally determined by examining the factor loadings, with items retained on those factors on which they loaded most heavily. In cases where item loadings were fairly comparable across two factors, consideration of the similarities of content with other items was also taken into account, so that items were placed on the factor they most logically suited.

In order to apply more stringent criteria for establishing factors than merely relying on eigenvalues, parallel analyses were also used. Parallel analysis is a technique that helps determine the number of factors which should be retained from a factorial analysis (Ledesma & Valero-Mora, 2007). Parallel analysis is based on the generation of a random data set in order to determine the number of factors to retain (Fabrigar et al., 1999). In the analysis, this process essentially involves comparing the mean of observed eigenvalues extracted from the correlation matrix to be analysed with those obtained from uncorrelated normal variables from random data sets generated by the program, and based on the collected data (Ledesma & Valero-Mora, 2007). A factor is retained if the eigenvalue is larger than the mean of those obtained from the random uncorrelated data (Fabrigar et al., 1999; O'Connor, 2000).

In performing EFA in this study, oblique rotation was chosen to simplify and clarify the data structure. This generally produces a more accurate and more reproducible solution compared to orthogonal rotation (Costello & Osborne, 2005), because oblique rotation permits correlations among factors/item loadings (Fabrigar et al., 1999). Therefore, oblique rotation was expected to provide a realistic representation of constructs that are likely to be related to one another, as in the case of both instruments under consideration.

The internal consistency of each scale was then determined by calculating the Cronbach's alpha coefficient. Nunally (1967) suggests that a Cronbach's alpha value of 0.60 is the minimally acceptable level for an instrument to be considered reliable.

After establishing the factors and internal consistency for each instrument, correlational analyses among the subscales of both instruments were also performed. These analyses were undertaken to determine if the interrelations of the subscales of the translated instruments reflected those of the original instruments. Correlational analyses among both measures were also undertaken to support the external validity of the two instruments.

MANOVA analyses were then run to ascertain if there were parental differences based on the age of their child. This analysis was seen to contribute to examination of the construct validity of the instruments as the literature (described earlier) indicates that Indonesian parents are more likely to apply authoritarian approaches (and less likely to use permissive approaches) after a child reaches six years of age. Accordingly, two groups of participants were formed. Group 1 consisted of parents of children aged between 3-6 years, and Group 2 comprised parents of children aged between 7-10 years old. In the analyses, subscales of the instruments were set as dependent variables and group as the independent variable. The significance level of $p < 0.05$ was used for the MANOVA and $p < 0.01$ was used as the criterion for significance for other analyses in order to achieve robust results and avoid Type 1 errors (Pallant, 2007).

In a preliminary series of analyses, we examined the factor structure in two ways: (1) using all data, and (2) after excluding data from fathers as there were few fathers in the sample (see Table 1). No substantive differences were found between data with and without fathers. Therefore, we report the results of the complete dataset.

3. Results

Factor analysis. Parenting styles and dimensions questionnaire. Six factors with an eigenvalue greater than 1 were extracted from the items of the PSDQ; however, only the first three had eigenvalues greater than the cut off value established by the parallel analysis. A three factors solution reflected the structure of the original questionnaire; however, not all items loaded on their original factors. Eight items failed to load on these three factors (2, 4, 8, 13, 15, 17, 20 and 24).

EFA was repeated after deleting these 8 items. Three factors were extracted (see appendix Table A2). Factor 1 comprised ten items and accounted for 25.13% of the variance. This first factor was interpreted as reflective of

the Authoritative parenting style. Factor 2 consisted of nine items and accounted for 11.96% of the variance. This second factor was labelled Authoritarian parenting style. Five items contributed to the third factor, accounting for 5.76% of the variance. This factor was not able to be interpreted using the original label but was determined to reflect a parenting approach using explanation or reasons with the child; thus, the factor was labelled “Reasoning”.

Reliability analysis showed adequate Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for all subscales of PSDQ, with all coefficients >0.70 (see Table 1). A MANOVA with age group as the independent variable and the subscales of the PSDQ as the dependent variables found a significant effect for age group, $F(3, 501) = 2.92, p = 0.03, \eta^2 = 0.02$. The univariate analyses revealed that this was the result of a significant difference on the Authoritative subscale, with parents of younger children more likely to be authoritative than parents of older children.

Correlations between parenting style and parent-child relationship. Correlation analyses between the two measures found the expected pattern of relationships. Positive correlations were found among positive parenting style subscales and variables indicating positive parent-child relationships, and negative correlations were indicated among negative parenting style subscales and variables indicative of positive parent-child relationships (see Table 3).

EFA performed on the PCRQ extracted nine factors from the data set. Follow up parallel analysis indicated that the first five factors were acceptable. These factors were somewhat similar to those of the original questionnaire. Nevertheless, not all items of the original questionnaire loaded well on each factor. Ten items did not load on the retained factors (4, 7, 8, 9, 11, 23, 27, 32, 33, and 37).

A second EFA analysis was run excluding the ten items that did not load on the first five factors. Five factors were extracted and all item loadings were consistent with the original questionnaire (see Table A3.). Factor 1 (eight items) accounted for 27.33% of the variance and was able to be interpreted as Personal Relationship. Factor 2 (six items) accounted for 8.09% of the variance. It reflected the Power Assertion subscale. Factor 3, Disciplinary Warmth (five items), contributed to 6.72% of the variance. Factor 4, Possessiveness (six items) contributed to 5.29% of the variance. Factor 5 (five items) accounted for 4.2 % of the variance and was called Warmth.

Internal consistency of the subscales of the PCRQ showed satisfactory results with Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of each factor above 0.60 (see Table 2). A MANOVA with age group as the independent variable and the subscales of the PCRQ as the dependent variables was performed. There was a significant effect for age group, $F(5, 329) = 2.557, p = 0.03, \eta^2 = 0.04$. The univariate analysis showed this was the result of a significant difference between groups on the Personal Relationship and Disciplinary Warmth subscales in which parents of younger children reported higher Personal Relationship and lower Disciplinary Warmth compared to those of older children (see Table 2).

Correlations between parenting style and parent-child relationship. Correlation analyses between the two measures found the expected pattern of relationships. Positive correlations were found among positive parenting style subscales and variables indicating positive parent-child relationships, and negative correlations were indicated among negative parenting style subscales and variables indicative of positive parent-child relationships (see Table 3).

Table 1. Group Means (SD), MANOVA and Reliability analysis results of Indonesian PSDQ^a

Dependent Variables	Independent Variable (Group)		MANOVA Results				Cronbach’s Alpha (α)
	Group 1 N = 254	Group 2 N = 251	F	df	p	Partial eta squared	
Authoritative	3.71** (0.84)	3.52** (0.78)	6.65	(1,503)	0.01	0.01	0.85
Authoritarian	1.99* (0.73)	2.13* (0.77)	4.01	(1,503)	0.05	<0.01	0.81
Reasoning	3.98* (0.87)	3.83* (0.79)	4.04	(1,503)	0.05	<0.01	0.70

Note.

Group 1 (Parents of children with age 3–6 years old)

Group 2 (Parents of children with age 7–10 years old)

^aPSDQ (Parenting Style and Dimension Questionnaire) (Robinson et al., 2001)

Table 2. Group Means (SD), MANOVA and Reliability analysis results of Indonesian PCRQ^a

Dependent Variables	Independent Variable (Group)		MANOVA Results				Cronbach's Alpha (α)
	Group 1 N = 155	Group 2 N = 180	F	df	p	Partial eta squared	
Warmth	3.87 (0.79)	3.74 (0.822)	2.25	(1,333)	0.13	<0.01	0.70
Personal Relationship	3.48** (0.64)	3.29** (0.67)	7.11	(1,333)	<0.01	0.02	0.77
Disciplinary Warmth	3.51** (0.74)	3.25** (0.74)	10.54	(1,333)	<0.01	0.03	0.70
Power Assertion	2.33 (0.93)	2.28 (0.79)	.25	(1,333)	0.62	<0.01	0.68
Possessiveness	3.77 (0.73)	3.66 (0.84)	1.60	(1,333)	0.21	<0.01	0.63

Note.

Group 2 (Parents of children with age 7-10 years old)

Group 1 (Parents of children with age 3-6 y.o)

^aPCRQ (Parent-Child Relationship Questionnaire) (Furman & Giberson, 1995)**Table 3. Summary of the correlations between the subscales of the PSDQ and the PCRQ**

Variables	1A	1B	1C	2A	2B	2C	2D	2E
Parenting Style								
Authoritative (1A)	1							
Authoritarian (1B)	-0.24**	1						
Reasoning (1C)	0.55**	-0.38**	1					
Parent-child Relationship								
Warmth (2A)	0.37**	-0.27**	0.28**	1				
Personal Relationship (2B)	0.23**	-0.29**	0.24**	0.72**	1			
Disciplinary Warmth (2C)	0.25**	-0.31**	0.27**	0.62**	0.75**	1		
Power Assertion (2D)	-0.26**	0.22**	-0.23**	-0.31**	-0.27**	-0.17*	1	
Possessiveness (2E)	0.19**	-0.37**	0.15**	0.58**	0.57**	0.51**	-0.20**	1

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level ($p < 0.05$)** The mean difference is significant at the 0.01 level ($p < 0.01$)

4. Discussion

This study examined the psychometric properties of two instruments used in research on parenting after they had been translated into Indonesian. Discussion of these two instruments are presented below, followed by consideration of their interrelationships.

Parenting styles and dimension questionnaire. The original PSDQ reflects Baumrind's (1978) theory of parenting styles, which classifies parenting style into three types: Authoritative, Authoritarian, and Permissive. In this study with Indonesian parents, EFA identified three scales, two of which reflect the original Authoritative and Authoritarian constructs of Baumrind's theory. The third scale was interpreted as "Reasoning" as the majority of items were concerned with parental explanations of their behavior on the consequences of child behavior. Chao (1994) argued that Baumrind's three classifications of

parenting style did not reflect important features of child rearing activities of Asian parents, particularly Chinese parents. Chao (1994) proposed a "training" parenting style that captures Asian cultural approaches to support children's achievement. Chao (1994) found that Chinese mothers scored higher on an instrument consisting of items related to teaching behaviour; however, there was no analysis of whether the items in the scale were actually a separate dimension from authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles. Indeed, in commenting on this new concept of parenting style, Baumrind (2013) suggested that the items measuring "training" parenting reflect the authoritative parenting style. This argument is supported by research conducted with Chinese parents (Fu et al., 2013; Xu, 2007), which found three factors reflecting the original structure of the PSDQ.

In the present study, the first factor to be extracted was very similar to the original Authoritative subscale as all

items in this subscale were also in the original subscale, and the retained items reflected both responsive and demanding parenting. The second factor was consistent with the Authoritarian subscale, although three original items were discarded. The third factor to emerge comprised five items that had been part of the original Authoritative subscale. There was a moderate positive correlation between the Reasoning and Authoritative subscales; however, the analysis clearly indicated these were separate factors. Providing explanations to children might be an important feature of Indonesian parenting as mean scores for this subscale were higher than either of the other two subscales. Further examination of Indonesian parenting is required to determine if reasoning is a particular feature of the way in which Indonesian parents fulfill their parenting role.

As discussed earlier, permissive parenting as a separate aspect of the PSDQ has been something of a weak link in the usefulness of the instrument, cross-culturally. The failure to find a third factor that measured permissive parenting supported the studies conducted among the Indonesian (Abubakar, Van de Vijver, Suryani, Handayani, & Pandia, 2015), Lithuanian (Kern & Joyniene, 2012) and Turkish (Önder & Gülay, 2009) groups, which also found that the items for measuring the permissive style did not perform well.

Finally, reliability analysis performed on the three subscales of PSDQ found that the internal consistency was adequate with Cronbach's alpha coefficients above 0.70 for all subscales. Overall, findings of the study suggest that the translated version of the PSDQ, in a modified form, is an internally consistent and valid tool to measure parenting style in Indonesia.

Parent-child relationships questionnaire. The Indonesian version of the PCRQ resulted in five factors reflecting the original structure of the measure, although 10 items of the original measure were excluded. Associations between the subscales were similar to those of the original versions with one exception (discussed below).

Positive correlations were found between the three positive factors of the translated version of the PCRQ (Personal Relationship, Disciplinary Warmth, and Warmth). In addition, there were negative correlations between the Power Assertion subscale and the three positive subscales. However, different patterns were found for the Possessiveness subscale, which was positively correlated with the three positive factors and negatively related to the Power Assertion subscale. Meanwhile, in the original PCRQ, Possessiveness was correlated negatively with the three positive factors and positively linked to Power Assertion. The patterns of associations found in this study are similar to those reported by Xu (2007) whose study of Chinese parents

also found that the Possessiveness subscale performed in an opposite way to the original instrument. The relationships between the Possessiveness subscale and the other four factors indicate that Possessiveness is seen as a positive parenting dimension in Indonesian and Chinese cultures. Possessiveness might be considered a positive dimension of the parent-child relationship in cultures with collectivist characteristics, where inter-relationships between family and community members is highly valued (Riany et al. 2016). Parents' (over) protection and possessiveness may be seen as helpful for building strong parent-child relationships in Indonesian culture. Further research is needed to understand the role of possessiveness in Indonesian parenting.

As with the PSDQ, parents of children of different ages responded somewhat differently to the PCRQ Indonesian version. Parents of younger children reported more positive personal relationship characteristics (e.g., nurturance, prosocial, companionship, similarity, and intimacy) than parents of older children did. Moreover, parents of older children were more likely to report using more disciplinary strategies. These findings are in line with the small amount of literature on parenting in Indonesia suggesting that parents have more positive relationships with young children than with older ones, and take a more disciplinarian role with older children. They are the first known to demonstrate this observation empirically.

Interrelationship between parenting style and parent-child relationship. Positive correlations among two positive parenting styles (i.e., Authoritative and Reasoning) and four dimensions of positive parent-child relationships (i.e., Warmth, Personal Relationship, Disciplinary Warmth, and Possessiveness) were found in the present study. Negative associations were also indicated between Authoritarian parenting style and four positive dimensions of parent-child relationship. These findings have strengthened the external validity of these two measures. Parents with more positive parenting styles have more positive parent-child relationships compared to those with negative parenting style. Indonesian parents who reported being more Authoritarian in parenting have more negative parent-child relationships with their children. In terms of internal consistency, acceptable results were achieved with Cronbach's alpha coefficients above .60 for all five subscales on the translated version of the PCRQ. Taken together, the results of this study indicate that the translated version of PCRQ may be used to contribute to studies of the parent-child relationship within Indonesian society.

Although the findings of this study demonstrated satisfactory reliability and some evidence of validity of the translated versions of both questionnaires, there are a number of limitations to this study. First, the participants of this study were predominantly mothers; thus, the findings related to parenting styles and behaviour may not

apply to fathers. This is particularly so as mothers and fathers in Indonesia typically take different roles with respect to their children (Riany et al., 2016). Second, the participants who completed surveys online generally had high levels of education and some may not have been residing in Indonesia when they completed the survey (although information on their location was not collected). They might have had different views about parenting and parent-child relationships from those who lived in the country; therefore, they might not represent the views of Indonesian parents. Third, participants who responded to the paper-based survey were recruited only in Bandar Lampung. Residents of this city might not represent the Indonesian population generally. Therefore, a larger sample size with more diverse participants from other provinces in Indonesia might provide more comprehensive and nationally representative findings than were found in this study. Fourth, the translation process in which the translated and back-translated versions of the instruments were conducted by two translators independently varied from the typical translation process. Swapping the translated versions between the two translators before back-translation might have resulted in a more accurate version. Fifth, the reliability analysis was limited to internal consistency; a range of reliability analyses need to be employed in further studies in order to strengthen the results found in this study. Sixth, in the present study, the items of the questionnaires were translated as faithfully as possible to reflect the original items. No cultural adaptation was employed. There may be benefits in undertaking cultural modifications in future research in order to ensure that the instruments are culturally appropriate to use within Indonesia.

5. Conclusion

The present study supports the factorial, external, and construct validity, and internal reliability of slightly modified Indonesian versions of brief versions of the PSDQ and PCRQ. Although modifications were needed for both measures, this study demonstrated that these new versions of the instruments are appropriate for research related to parenting in Indonesian society. These findings may open a door to quantitative research on parenting in Indonesia.

References

- Abubakar, A., Van de Vijver, F.J., Suryani, A.O., Handayani, P., & Pandia, W.S. (2015). Perceptions of parenting styles and their associations with mental health and life satisfaction among urban Indonesian adolescents. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 24(9), 2680–2692. doi:10.1007/s10826-014-0070-x.
- Al-Khatib, A., & Brophy-Herb, Holly. (2005). *Parenting styles used with preschool children in Jordan*. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. Retrieved from

<http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/docview/305459632?pq-origsite=summon>.

Baumrind, D. (1978). Parental disciplinary patterns and social competence in children. *Youth & Society*, 9(3), 239–267. doi:10.1177/0044118x7800900302.

Baumrind, D. (2013). Is a pejorative view of power assertion in the socialization process justified?. *Review of General Psychology*, 17(4), 420–427. doi:10.1037/a0033480.

Berger, L. M., & McLanahan, S. S. (2015). Income, relationship quality, and parenting: Associations with child development in two-parent families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 77(4), 996–1015. doi: 10.1111/jomf.12197.

Bornstein, M., H. (2005). *Handbook of parenting (4th ed.) social conditions and applied parenting*. New Jersey: Erlbaum.

Bornstein, M., H. (2012). Cultural approaches to parenting. *Parenting*, 12, 212–221. doi: 10.1080/15295192.2012.683359.

Bornstein, M. H. (2013). Parenting and child mental health: A cross-cultural perspective. *World Psychiatry*, 12(2), 258–265. doi:10.1002/wps.20071.

Brislin, R. W. (1970). Back-translation for cross-cultural research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 1(3), 185–216. doi: 10.1177/135910457000100301.

Brislin, R. W. (1986). The wording and translation of research instruments. In W. J. Lonner & J. W. Berry (Eds), *Field methods in cross-cultural research* (pp. 137–164). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Carlo, G., Mestre, M. V., Samper, P., Tur, A., & Armenta, B. E. (2010). Feelings or cognitions? Moral cognitions and emotions as longitudinal predictors of prosocial and aggressive behaviour. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 48(8), 872–877. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2010.02.010.

Chao, R. (1994). Beyond parental control and authoritarian parenting style: Understanding Chinese parenting through the cultural notion of training. *Child Development*, 65(6), 1111–1119. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.1994.tb00806.x.

Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. W. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, research and evaluation*, 10(1), 1–9. Retrieved from <http://pareonline.net/pdf/v10n7.pdf>.

- Dexter, C. A., & Stacks, A. M. (2014). A preliminary investigation of the relationship between parenting, parent-child shared reading practices, and child development in low-income families. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 28(3), 394–410. doi:10.1080/02568543.2014.913278.
- Duncan, L. G., Coatsworth, J. D., & Greenberg, M. T. (2009). A model of mindful parenting: Implications for parent-child relationships and prevention research. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 19(3), 255–270. doi:10.1007/s10567-009-0046-3.
- Fabrigar, L. R., Wegener, D. T., MacCallum, R. C., & Strahan, E. J. (1999). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods*, 4(3), 272–299. doi:10.1037/1082-989X.4.3.272.
- Fu, Y., Hou, X., Qin, Q., Meng, H., Xie, P., Huang, Y., . . . Li, T. (2013). Can parenting styles and dimensions questionnaire (PSDQ) be used in China?. *Psychology*, 4(6), 535–540. doi:10.4236/psych.2013.46076.
- Furman, W., & Giberson, R. S. (1995). Identifying the links between parents and their children's sibling relationships. In S. Shulman (Ed.), *Human development, Vol. 7. Close relationships and socioemotional development* (pp. 95-108). Westport, CT, US: Ablex Publishing.
- Johnston, C., Murray, C., Hinshaw, S. P., Pelham Jr, W. E., & Hoza, B. (2002). Responsiveness in interactions of mothers and sons with ADHD: Relations to maternal and child characteristics. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 30(1), 77–88. doi:10.1023/A:1014235200174.
- Karande, S., & Kuril, S. (2011). Impact of parenting practices on parent-child relationships in children with specific learning disability. *Journal of Postgraduate Medicine*, 57(1), 20–30. doi:10.4103/0022-3859.75344.
- Kern, R. M., & Jonyniene, J. (2012). Psychometric properties of the Lithuanian version of the parenting styles and dimensions questionnaire (PSDQ): Pilot study. *The Family Journal*, 20(2), 205–214. doi:10.1177/1066480712439845.
- Ledesma, R. D., & Valero-Mora, P. (2007). Determining the number of factors to retain in EFA: An easy-to-use computer program for carrying out parallel analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 12(2), 1–11. retrieved from <http://www.pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=12%26n=2>.
- Miller-Clayton, A., 2010. *Effects of sexual abuse and cultural coping on African American parent-child relationships: Implications for intervention*. Doctoral Dissertation. Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia, US. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/docview/760092534?pq-origsite=summon.j>
- Mulder, N. (1992). *Individual and society in Java: A cultural analysis (2nd Ed.)*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Nunally, J. C. (1967). *Psychometric theory*. New York; McGraw Hill.
- O'Connor, B. P. (2000). SPSS and SAS programs for determining the number of components using parallel analysis and Velicer's MAP test. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments and Computers*, 32, 396–402. doi:10.3758/BF03200807.
- Olivari, M. G., Tagliabue, S., & Confalonieri, E. (2013). Parenting style and dimensions questionnaire: A review of reliability and validity. *Marriage and Family Review*, 49(2), 465–490. doi:10.1080/01494929.2013.770812.
- Önder, A., & Gülay, H. (2009). Reliability and validity of parenting styles & dimensions questionnaire. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1(1), 508–514. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2009.01.092.
- Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for windows*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Pedro, M. F., Carapito, E., & Ribeiro, T. (2015). Parenting styles and dimensions questionnaire - the Portuguese self-report version. *Psicologia, Reflexão e Crítica*, 28(302). doi:10.1590/1678-7153.201528210.
- Popov, L. M., & Ilesanmi, R. A. (2015). Parent-child relationship: Peculiarities and outcome. *Review of European Studies*, 7(5), 253–263. doi:10.5539/res.v7n5p253.
- Power, T. J., DuPaul, G. J., Shapiro, E. S., & Kazak, A. E. (2003). *Promoting children's health: Integrating school, family, and community*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Riany, Y. E., Meredith, P., & Cuskelly, M. (2016). Understanding the influence of traditional cultural values on Indonesian parenting. *Marriage & Family Review*, 53(3), 207–226. doi:10.1080/01494929.2016.1157561.
- Robinson, C. C., Mandleco, B., Olsen, S. F., & Hart, C. H. (2001). The Parenting styles and dimensions questionnaire (PSDQ). In B. F. Perlmutter, J. Touliatos, & G. W. Holden (Eds.), *Handbook of family measurement techniques: Vol. 3. Instruments & index* (pp. 319–321). CA: Sage.
- Siu, F. Y. A., 2006. *Internalizing problems among*

primary school children in Hong Kong: Prevalence and treatment. Doctoral Dissertation. The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/304909497?accountid=14723>.

Slone, M., Shechner, T., & Farah, O. K. (2012). Parenting style as a moderator of effects of political violence: Cross-cultural comparison of Israeli Jewish and Arab children. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 36*(1), 62–70. doi:10.1177/0165025411406856.

Sumargi, A. (2014). Promoting parenting practices and child behaviour with an evidence-based program: A survey and triple P-positive parenting program trials with Indonesian parents. Doctoral Dissertation. The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia. Retrieved from <http://espace.library.uq.edu.au/view/UQ:332987>.

Wang, H. (2014). The relationship between parenting styles and academic and behavioral adjustment among urban Chinese adolescents. *Chinese Sociological Review, 46*(4), 19–40. doi:10.2753/CSA2162-0555460402.

Xu, C. (2007). *Direct and indirect effects of parenting style with child temperament, parent-child relationship, and family functioning on child social competence in the Chinese culture: Testing the latent models*. Doctoral Dissertation. University of North Texas, Denton, Texas, US. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/304830248?accountid=14723> (304830248).

Zakeri, H., & Karimpour, M. (2011). Parenting styles and self-esteem. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 29* (1), 758–761. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.302

Appendices

Table A1. Summary of respondents' demographic information for each parenting measures.

Variable	PSDQ ^a (N=514)		PCRQ ^b (N=459)	
	N	%	N	%
Gender				
Female	439	85.4	389	84.7
Male	75	14.6	70	15.3
Marital Status				
Married	487	94.8	432	94.1
Divorced	14	2.7	14	3.1
Widowed	9	1.8	9	2.0
Single	4	0.8	4	0.8
Ethnic Group				
Javanese	257	50	231	50.3
Sundanese	109	21.2	94	20.5
Sumatranese/ Melayu	111	21.6	105	22.9
Other	36	7	29	6.3
Highest Level of Education				
Elementary School	44	8.6	42	9.2
Junior Secondary School	98	19.1	91	19.8
Secondary School/ Vocational Secondary School	180	35	167	36.4
Undergraduate degree	91	17.7	75	16.3
Postgraduate degree	101	19.6	84	18.3
Working Status				
Employed	259	50.4	225	49
Unemployed	255	49.6	234	51
Location of current home/ living area				
Urban/ large city	391	76.0	344	75.6
Small city/ Rural/ country	123	24.0	115	25.4
Monthly Gross Income (IDR) ^d				
< IDR. 2.000.000	294	57.2	265	57.7
IDR 2. 000.000 – IDR 5.000.000	112	21.8	98	21.4
IDR 5. 000.001 – IDR 10.000.000	53	10.3	45	9.8
IDR 10.000.001 – IDR 50.000.000	46	8.9	43	9.4
>IDR. 50.000.001	9	1.8	8	1.7

Note: IDR = Indonesian Rupiah

^aPSDQ (Parenting Style and Dimension Questionnaire) (Robinson et al., 2001)

^bPCRQ (Parent-Child Relationship Questionnaire) (Furman & Giberson, 1995)

Table A2. Factorial analysis results of the Indonesian PSDQ^a (N=514)

Original Item Number	Factor Loadings		
	1	2	3
PS18. I take into account my child's preferences in making plans for the family. (Saya mempertimbangkan keinginan anak saya dalam membuat sebuah rencana keluarga.)	0.77		
PS12. I give comfort and understanding when my child is upset. (Saya menghibur dan memberikan pemahaman kepada anak saya ketika dia marah.)	0.71		
PS22. I allow my child to give input into family rules. (Saya mengizinkan anak saya untuk memberikan masukan ke dalam aturan keluarga.)	0.67		

Table A2. Continued

PS25.	I give my child reasons why rules should be obeyed. (Saya memberikan alasan kepada anak mengapa aturan yang telah ditetapkan harus ditaati.)	0.64	
PS3.	I take my child's desires into account before asking the child to do something. (Saya menumbuhkan minat anak saya terlebih dahulu sebelum memintanya untuk melakukan sesuatu hal.)	0.62	
PS7.	I encourage my child to talk about his/her troubles. (Saya mendorong anak saya untuk mengutarakan masalahnya kepada saya.)	0.59	
PS11.	I emphasize the reasons for rules. (Saya memberikan penjelasan tentang alasan ditetapkannya sebuah aturan.)	0.56	
PS14.	I give praise when my child is good. (Saya memberikan pujian ketika anak melakukan hal yang baik.)	0.47	-0.32
PS9	I encourage my child to freely express himself/herself even when disagreeing with parents. (Saya mendorong anak saya untuk bebas mengekspresikan dirinya sendiri bahkan ketika dia tidak setuju dengan pendapat orang tuanya.)	0.44	
PS1.	I am responsive to my child's feelings and needs. (Saya peka terhadap perasaan dan kebutuhan anak saya.)	0.40	
PS28.	I punish by putting my child off somewhere alone with little, if any, explanations. (Saya menghukum dengan menempatkan anak saya ke suatu tempat sendirian dengan sedikit atau tidak ada penjelasan.)	0.73	
PS10.	I punish by taking privileges away from our child with little, if any, explanations. (Saya menghukum anak saya dengan mengambil haknya tanpa memberikan penjelasan mengapa saya melakukannya.)	0.69	
PS16.	I explode in anger towards my child. (Saya melampiaskan kemarahan kepada anak saya.)	0.69	
PS6.	I spank when my child is disobedient. (Saya memukul anak ketika dia tidak patuh.)	0.65	
PS26.	I use threats as punishment with little or no justification. (Saya menggunakan ancaman sebagai hukuman dengan sedikit atau tanpa memperdulikan pembenaran dari anak saya.)	0.63	
PS32.	I slap my child when the child misbehaves. (Saya menampar anak saya ketika anak berperilaku buruk.)	0.62	
PS29.	I help my child to understand the impact of behavior by encouraging my child to talk about the consequences of his/her own actions. (Saya membantu anak saya untuk memahami dampak dari perilaku dengan memberikan kesempatan anak untuk menjelaskan konsekuensi dari tindakannya sendiri.)		0.68
PS27.	I have warm and intimate times together with my child. (Saya memiliki waktu yang hangat dan intim bersama-sama dengan anak saya.)	0.54	
PS5.	I explain to my child how I feel about the child's good and bad behavior. (Saya memberitahu perasaan saya kepada anak saya mengenai perilakunya yang baik dan buruk.)	-0.37	0.50
PS31.	I explain the consequences of the child's behavior. (Saya menjelaskan konsekuensi dari perilaku yang anak saya lakukan.)		0.49
PS21.	I show respect for my child's opinions by encouraging my child to express them. (Saya menghormati pendapat anak saya dan mendorongnya untuk mengungkapkan pendapatnya.)		0.48

Table A2. Continued

PS30. I scold or criticize when my child's behavior doesn't meet my expectations. (Saya memarahi atau mengkritik anak saat perilakunya tidak memenuhi harapan saya.)	0.35		0.34
PS23 I scold and criticize to make my child improve. (Saya memarahi dan mencela anak saya untuk membuatnya berperilaku baik.)	0.35		
PS19. I grab my child when being disobedient. (Saya berlaku kasar terhadap anak saya ketika dia tidak patuh.)	0.31		
% Variance	24.21	12.12	5.50

Note: Factor loadings are in bold.

^aPSDQ (Parenting Style and Dimension Questionnaire) (Robinson et al., 2001)

Table A3. Factor analysis results of Indonesian PCRQ^a (N=459)

Original Item Number	Factor Loadings				
	1	2	3	4	5
PCRQ14. How much do you show this child how to do things that he or she doesn't know how to do? (Seberapa banyak Anda menunjukkan contoh kepada anak Anda ketika dia tidak tahu bagaimana melakukan sesuatu?)	0.67				
PCRQ12. How much does this child admire and respect you? (Seberapa besar anak Anda mengagumi dan menghormati Anda?)					0.61
PCRQ24. How much do you and this child give each other a hand with things? (Seberapa banyak Anda dan anak Anda saling memberikan bantuan?)	0.59				
PCRQ3. How much do you and this child care about each other? (Seberapa besar Anda dan anak Anda peduli tentang satu sama lain?)					0.59
PCRQ10. How much do you spank this child when he or she misbehaves? (Seberapa sering Anda memukul anak Anda ketika dia melakukan kesalahan?)	-0.43	0.44			
PCRQ5. How much do you and this child do nice things for each other? (Seberapa banyak Anda dan anak Anda melakukan hal-hal yang baik untuk satu sama lain?)	0.45		-0.34		
PCRQ18. How much do you make this child feel ashamed or guilty for not doing what he or she is supposed to do? (Seberapa sering Anda membuat anak Anda merasa malu atau bersalah karena melakukan apa yang tidak seharusnya dilakukan?)		0.77			
PCRQ15. How much do you yell at this child for being bad? (Seberapa sering Anda berteriak kepada anak Anda akibat perilaku buruknya?)		0.61			0.30
PCRQ13. Some parents take away privileges a lot when their children misbehave, while other parents hardly ever take away privileges. How much do you take away this child's privileges when he/she misbehaves? (Beberapa orang tua mengambil hak istimewa anak ketika mereka berkelakuan buruk, sementara orangtua lain hampir tidak pernah mengambil hak istimewa tersebut dari anak. Seberapa sering Anda mengambil hak anak Anda ketika dia berkelakuan buruk?)		0.58			
PCRQ29. How much do you hit this child when he or she has been bad? (Seberapa banyak Anda memukul anak Anda ketika ia berperilaku buruk?)	-0.38	0.51			

Table A3. Continued

PCRQ21. How much do you not let this child do something he or she wants to do because you are afraid he or she might get hurt? (Seberapa sering Anda tidak membiarkan anak Anda melakukan sesuatu yang dia ingin lakukan karena Anda takut dia akan terluka?)					-0.77
--	--	--	--	--	--------------

PCRQ34.	How much do you nag or bug this child to do things? (Seberapa sering Anda mencereweti atau mendikte anak Anda untuk melakukan sesuatu?)		0.34	
PCRQ2.	How much do you not let this child go places because you are afraid something will happen to him or her? (Seberapa banyak Anda tidak membiarkan anak Anda untuk pergi ke berbagai tempat karena adanya kekhawatiran Anda akan terjadinya sesuatu terhadapnya?)			0.77
PCRQ1.	Some parents want their children to spend most of their time with them, while other parents want their children to spend just some of the time with them. How much do you want this child to spend most of his/her time with you? (Beberapa orang tua ingin anak-anak mereka menghabiskan sebagian besar waktu mereka bersama dengan mereka, sementara orang tua lain ingin anak-anak mereka untuk menghabiskan hanya beberapa waktu bersama mereka. Seberapa banyak Anda menginginkan anak Anda untuk menghabiskan sebagian besar waktunya dengan Anda?)			0.55
PCRQ39.	How much do you want this child to be around you all of the time? (Seberapa banyak Anda ingin anak Anda berada di sekitar Anda sepanjang waktu?)			0.40
PCRQ20.	How much do you want this child to do things with you rather than with other people? (Seberapa banyak Anda ingin anak Anda melakukan hal-hal dengan Anda dibanding dengan orang lain?)	0.30		0.37
PCRQ36.	How much do you play around and have fun with this child? (Seberapa sering Anda bermain dan bersenang-senang dengan anak Anda?)	-0.77		
PCRQ30.	How much do you feel proud of this child? (Seberapa besar Anda merasa bangga akan anak Anda?)			-0.67
PCRQ17.	How much do you and this child go places and do things together? (Seberapa sering Anda dan anak Anda pergi ke berbagai tempat dan melakukan hal-hal bersama?)	-0.63	-0.36	
PCRQ31.	Some children feel really proud of their parents, while other children don't feel very proud of their parents. How much does this child feel proud of you? (Beberapa anak merasa sangat bangga terhadap orang tua mereka, sementara anak-anak lain tidak merasa bangga terhadap orang tua mereka. Seberapa besar anak Anda merasa bangga pada Anda?)			-0.57
PCRQ25.	Some parents and children have a lot of things in common, while other parents and children have a little in common. How much do you and this child have things in common? (Beberapa orang tua dan anak-anak memiliki banyak kesamaan, sementara orang tua dan anak-anak memiliki sedikit kesamaan. Seberapa banyak Anda dan anak Anda memiliki hal-hal yang sama satu sama lain?)	-0.49	-0.36	
PCRQ22.	How much do you and this child love each other? (Seberapa besar Anda dan anak Anda saling mencintai?)	0.33		-0.49
PCRQ19.	Some parents talk to their children a lot about why they're being punished, while other parents do this a little. How much do you talk to this child about why he or she is being punished or not allowed to something? (Beberapa orang tua sering berkomunikasi dengan anak-anak mereka tentang alasan mengapa mereka dihukum, sementara orang tua lain jarang melakukannya. Seberapa banyak Anda berbicara dengan anak Anda tentang alasan mengapa dia dihukum atau tidak diizinkan untuk melakukan sesuatu?)		-0.44	-0.40
Table A3. Continued				
PCRQ40.	How much do you and this child have strong feelings of affection (love) toward each other? (Seberapa besar Anda dan anak Anda memiliki perasaan kasih sayang (cinta) yang kuat terhadap satu sama lain?)	0.31	0.44	-0.43
PCRQ26.	How much do you tell this child that he or she did a good job? (Seberapa sering Anda memberitahu anak Anda bahwa ia melakukan pekerjaan yang baik?)		0.36	-0.41

PCRQ28.	How much do you and this child share secrets and private feelings with each other? (Seberapa banyak Anda dan anak Anda berbagi rahasia dan perasaan pribadi dengan satu sama lain?)	-0.45	0.35			
PCRQ16.	How much do you ask this child for his or her opinion on things? (Seberapa sering Anda meminta pendapat anak Anda tentang sesuatu hal?)		-0.70			
PCRQ35.	How much do you listen to this child's ideas before making a decision? (Seberapa sering Anda mendengarkan ide-ide anak Anda sebelum membuat keputusan?)		-0.56			
PCRQ6.	How much do you and this child like the same things? (Seberapa banyak Anda dan anak Anda menyukai hal-hal yang sama?)	0.45	-0.50			
PCRQ38.	How much do you give this child reasons for rules you make for him or her to follow? (Seberapa banyak Anda memberikan alasan kepada anak Anda untuk penetapan aturan yang Anda buat untuk ditaati olehnya?)		-0.39			
% Variance		27.44	8.08	6.65	5.34	4.24

Note: Factors loading are in bold. ^aPCRQ (Parent-Child Relationship Questionnaire) (Furman & Giberson, 1995)