

CHAPTER 3

Socialization in Adolescence

Judith G. Smetana
Jessica Robinson
Wendy M. Rote

Broadly, *socialization* refers to the process by which youth are helped to acquire the skills necessary to function competently and successfully as members of their social group or culture. Much of the theorizing and psychological research on socialization has focused on early and middle childhood because, depending on one's theoretical predilections, this is when children are seen as most malleable in response to environmental influences, when innate predispositions are manifested, or when, through biopsychosocial processes, trajectories toward different developmental endpoints are firmly established. But socialization continues in the second decade of life and in ways continuous with childhood on many dimensions. At the same time, and as we elaborate below, there are unique aspects to socialization during adolescence. Particularly, parenting increasingly occurs at a distance as children become more independent, as new forms of peer relationships emerge, and as different developmental issues assume prominence.

Before turning to these issues, we address several conceptual and methodological issues. Early theoretical models viewed socialization as a largely unidirectional process whereby parents transmitted cultural norms and standards to their children, with the goal of reproducing them in successive generations. Thus, assessments focused largely on children's compliance with parental expectations or their acquisition of culturally valued goals and behaviors (see Smetana, 2002, 2011). However, most researchers, including those from different theoretical vantage points, now agree that socialization is considerably more complex than this model suggests.

There has been an increasing emphasis on bidirectional processes and children's active role in their own development. For instance, Kuczynski, Parkin, and Pitman (Chapter 6, this volume) have focused on socialization as a reciprocal dynamic process and on

children's agency in parent-child relationships. Grusec (2002) and her colleagues (Grusec, Goodnow, & Kuczynski, 2000) have raised questions about the conditions under which children accept or reject parental messages and the goals beyond compliance that parents have for children. In addition, there is substantial evidence that children and adolescents interpret, negotiate, and respond to adults' (as well as peers') efforts to control, guide, or influence their behavior (Smetana, 2011). Indeed, adolescents do not unthinkingly adopt adult values; they challenge and sometimes resist those that they consider to be inappropriate, immoral, or illegitimate (Smetana, 2011). Thus, effective socialization depends, in part, on adolescents' evaluations of the messages communicated—for instance, whether or not the behavior being prescribed is culturally normative, or whether adolescents believe that adults are acting out of concern or support, as opposed to being intrusive and controlling. As we illustrate in this chapter, there is ample evidence that socialization processes are dynamic and reciprocal and that teens actively participate and exert agency in their development.

In addition, there has been a profound shift over the past few decades in the samples employed in research on adolescent socialization and development. In a relatively short span of time, the field has moved beyond Graham's (1992) observation that "most of the subjects of research were white and middle class" (p. 629) to studying normative processes in much more diverse populations of youth. Initially, this was reflected in studies from the United States focusing primarily on African American adolescents (Steinberg & Morris, 2001) and in studies from other Western societies with selected immigrant groups. Recently, however, research has become more broadly inclusive, giving increased attention to the development of youth from different racial and ethnic backgrounds, as well as different countries and cultures (Chao & Otsuki-Clutter, 2011). There also has been increased recognition of the heterogeneity among adolescents from different ethnic groups and therefore more attention to specifying their national origins or backgrounds (e.g., Mexican Americans or Puerto Ricans rather than the broader category of Latino/Latinas or Chinese Canadians as compared to Mainland Chinese). In addition, reflecting demographic trends around the globe, research has increasingly considered how immigration, acculturation, ethnicity, and social class interact to influence adolescents' developing values, beliefs, and behavior. This has resulted in a dramatic increase over the past decade in studies of immigrant youth and processes of acculturation, ethnic identity development, and experiences of discrimination (Chao & Otsuki-Clutter, 2011; Fuligni, Hughes, & Way, 2009), as well as a much richer and more complex understanding of adolescent socialization in different contexts.

We begin by briefly describing several features that are unique to the second decade of life or that distinguish socialization during adolescence from processes occurring in childhood. Then we turn to different contexts of socialization, which provide the organizational framework for the rest of the chapter. Although researchers have recognized that various agents, including siblings, adult relatives, peers, social institutions, and the media, all are important influences, socialization research has focused heavily on parents. This is because society views parents as primarily responsible for raising children, and parents typically have the most time and opportunity to influence them (Grusec, 2002). Here, we discuss the role of parents, siblings, peers, and very briefly, out-of-school settings, but in keeping with previous scholarship, we focus most heavily on the family.

Adolescence as a Distinct Developmental Period

The second decade of life is a period of enormous growth and change. The transformations of puberty result in a growth spurt that is second only to that in infancy (Archibald, Graber, & Brooks-Gunn, 2003), and this presents significant challenges, not only for adolescents' adaptation, but also for those around them. In addition, teenagers' understanding of their physical and social worlds changes significantly. Adolescents become better able to plan, make decisions, and think about the future; they also face new psychosocial challenges around issues of identity, autonomy, intimacy, and sexuality. As we describe below, these result in major transformations in how much time adolescents spend with parents and peers, and in the quality and type of relationships they have.

Changing Contexts of Adolescent Socialization

How Adolescents Spend Their Time

Research on how and with whom adolescents spend their time provides important insights into the socialization opportunities and developmental contexts that youth experience. Larson and his colleagues (Larson, Richards, Moneta, Holmbeck, & Duckett, 1996; Larson, Richards, Sims, & Dworkin, 2001) have conducted several longitudinal studies using the experience sampling method (ESM), in which adolescents report their activities, interactions, and moods at random moments during the day when contacted by pager or cell phone. These studies demonstrate that there are dramatic changes—at least for some youth—in the amount of time spent with parents versus peers. For instance, there is a sharp decrease from early to late adolescence in how much time European American teens spend with family members (from 35% of waking hours in fifth grade to 14% by 12th grade; Larson et al., 1996). Similar decreases with age have been observed among Mexican American adolescents (as assessed in nightly phone calls to families spread over several weeks; Updegraff, McHale, Whiteman, Thayer, & Crouter, 2006). However, poor and working-class urban African American fifth to eighth graders appear to interact much more with relatives than do European American adolescents (Larson et al., 2001), in part because many African American youth live with extended family. This pattern is much like what has been observed in non-Western cultures such as India (Larson et al., 2001). Thus, for some ethnic minority youth, like youth in non-Western cultures, extended kin are potential sources of socialization and support.

As they grow older, teens spend less leisure time with parents but increase slightly (particularly girls) in the amount of time they spend talking with parents (although more so for mothers than fathers; Larson et al., 1996). They also spend more time alone in their bedrooms and with friends (Larson et al., 1996, 2001). Because the latter frequently occurs in unstructured contexts, it is associated with more problem behavior (Larson, 2001). However, as Larson notes, U.S. teens spend less time on schoolwork and in school than do youth in most other industrialized countries, and they therefore have more time for leisure. Ethnic socialization also has an impact; for instance, youth whose parents have a stronger orientation to Mexican culture spend more time with peers who share their Mexican heritage than with more heterogeneous peers (Updegraff et al., 2006).

Changes in Relationships with Parents during Adolescence

Relationships with parents change during adolescence in ways that may influence adolescents' receptiveness to parental socialization. Numerous studies, both cross-sectional and longitudinal, and employing different methods, have demonstrated that among youth from diverse ethnic backgrounds and cultures, positive aspects of parent-teen relationships, including support, closeness, warmth, cohesion, and intimacy, decline during adolescence (Fuligni, 1998; Furman & Buhrmester, 1985; Shanahan, McHale, Crouter, & Osgood, 2007), although the timing varies (Fuligni, 1998).

These declines appear to level off in late adolescence and become more stable. For instance, in a recent 8-year longitudinal study following a large and diverse sample of U.S. youth, Tsai, Telzer, and Fuligni (2013) found that feelings of cohesion with both mothers and fathers normatively declined during adolescence but then, for mothers, stabilized in young adulthood. There were surprisingly few differences among Latino, Asian, and European American youth in the trajectories of continuity and change over time. Furthermore, Shanahan, McHale, Crouter, and Osgood (2007) found that warmth toward mothers but not fathers increased after age 18, whereas other research indicates that closeness increases in late adolescence, but only after teens leave home for college (Acquilino, 1997). Most researchers agree that normative changes in family relationships during adolescence reflect adolescents' attempts to individuate from the family and develop greater autonomy. This contrasts with young adulthood, in which the orientation is toward maintaining and strengthening family ties (Tsai et al., 2013).

Studies also consistently show that across adolescence and into young adulthood, adolescents are closer and spend more time interacting with mothers than with fathers (Larson et al., 1996, 2001; Tsai et al., 2013); adolescent females also generally report closer relationships with parents, and especially their mothers, than do adolescent males. Although such studies are rare, there is also some evidence pointing to within-family differences in closeness. For instance, Shanahan, McHale, Crouter, and Osgood (2007) found that firstborn offspring reported warmer relationships with mothers across adolescence and with fathers in early adolescence than did second-born offspring. This difference was attributed to older siblings' greater maturity, although other factors, such as the time or attention given to first-born versus later-born offspring, or the latter's greater need to individuate from the family, also could have accounted for these effects.

Reciprocally, negative affect and conflict with parents increase during adolescence (see Smetana, 2011, for a review). There is some consensus among researchers that moderate levels of conflict with parents in early adolescence are a normative and temporary perturbation that lead to transformations toward greater mutuality in family relationships (Holmbeck, 1996). The frequency of conflict peaks in early adolescence and then declines, whereas conflict intensity increases from early to middle adolescence (Laursen, Coy, & Collins, 1998). As with closeness, these patterns are strikingly similar among youth of different ethnicities and in other cultures (Fuligni et al., 2009). Furthermore, Shanahan, McHale, Osgood, and Crouter (2007) found "spillover" between siblings in the developmental timing of conflict with parents. That is, conflicts between second-born offspring and their parents were found to increase in frequency when firstborns transitioned to adolescence, rather than when second-borns transitioned.

Changes in Adolescents' Relationships with Peers

The changes in relationships with parents during adolescence are paralleled by changes in adolescents' relationships with peers, signaling the increasing importance of peers as a context for adolescent socialization. During childhood, children's play and organized activities are typically adult-supervised and are often at or in close proximity to home. But during adolescence, teenagers become more independent, and their peer interactions increasingly occur away from home and adult supervision (Dijkstra & Veenstra, 2011). Thus, rather than being able to observe their children's activities directly or have other watchful adults keep them informed, parents must supervise and monitor from a distance. In turn, this results in new parental strategies and ways of obtaining information about teenagers' activities and associates (more about this later).

In addition, friendships and the structure of adolescent peer groups change during adolescence. Adolescents' friendships become closer and more intimate, disclosing, and supportive with age (Collins & Steinberg, 2006). Adolescents also congregate in larger groupings of peers, including *cliques*. These are small groups of same-age, same-sex (at least in early adolescence), and similar socioeconomic-status peers that are based on friendship and shared activities (Collins & Steinberg, 2006). Although present in childhood, cliques become particularly prominent in early adolescence, helping to define the social hierarchy (both within and between cliques) and establish certain peers as leaders of the social system. Cliques remain present throughout adolescence and beyond but become more fluid with age, with increasing membership turnover and more individuals not belonging at all or belonging to multiple cliques (Brown & Klute, 2003). In early to midadolescence, youth also begin to affiliate with *crowds*, or loose, reputation-based groupings derived from perceived attitudes, interests, and behaviors (Collins & Steinberg, 2006). Similar to cliques, the shared reputations of crowd members help to locate adolescents in the social hierarchy, channeling them toward different pathways and friendships, and allowing them to "try on" different identities (Brown & Larson, 2009). Although teens may not spend much time with other crowd members, crowd membership is important for friendship and identity formation. Thus, friendships, cliques, and crowds become increasingly central contexts for adolescent socialization.

Changes in Measures of Socialization in Adolescence

There is a great deal of continuity from childhood to adolescence in the behaviors, values, and attitudes that adults view as important for mature, competent functioning and that are used to measure successful socialization. But there are some changes in emphasis as well. For instance, adolescence is widely seen as a developmental period reflecting preparation for adult roles and responsibilities. Consequently, it becomes important to prepare youth to become independent and care for themselves, and autonomy development becomes increasingly important.

Likewise, issues of ethnic identity development and cultural socialization become particularly salient in adolescence (Hughes et al., 2006). A positive ethnic identity and adherence to the values of one's cultural, ethnic, or racial group have been found to enhance well-being and serve a protective function (Fuligni et al., 2009; Hughes et al., 2006). Also, ethnic minority parents typically wait until adolescence to broach more challenging and sensitive issues, such as coping with discrimination and unequal treatment

(Fuligni et al., 2009; Hughes et al., 2006). Thus, there has been increasing emphasis on how parents transmit cultural practices and values, convey information regarding race and ethnicity, and prepare minority youth to cope with the unique ecological challenges that they may face.

Research on socialization also focuses on risky behaviors that are on the rise during adolescence. For instance, experimentation and regular use of alcohol, illegal drugs, abuse of prescription medications, and cigarettes increase during adolescence for U.S. (Johnston, O'Malley, Bachman, & Schulenberg, 2012) and Canadian teens (Leatherdale & Burkhalter, 2012). The incidence of these risky behaviors is extremely low at the onset of adolescence, but by the end of adolescence the vast majority of contemporary U.S. adolescents have tried alcohol, and about 40% have smoked marijuana and cigarettes, although rates of regular use are substantially lower. Among Canadian teens, 51% report having drunk alcohol, 29% have used marijuana, and 16% have used tobacco by 12th grade (Leatherdale & Burkhalter, 2012).

In addition, about 65% of all U.S. teens have had sexual intercourse by the end of high school, much of it unprotected (although estimates vary). By age 15, 25% of European youth have had sexual intercourse, with rates substantially higher in some countries (e.g., 38% in Denmark) and much lower in others (e.g., Slovakia, where 10% of females and 15% of males report having had intercourse; Currie et al., 2012). Furthermore, research suggests that early sexual debut (before age 14) carries substantial risks for maladjustment (Diamond & Savin-Williams, 2009). Thus, researchers have examined these various behaviors as indicators of risk or poor socialization. Likewise, although much antisocial behavior has its roots in childhood, a certain amount of less serious antisocial behavior may be normative during adolescence (Moffitt, 2006). Not surprisingly then, many researchers have focused on both life-course-persistent and "adolescence-limited" antisocial behavior and the socialization of each.

Finally, there has been increased interest over the last decade in studying adolescent civic engagement as a positive indicator of successful socialization during adolescence (Sherrod, Torney-Purta, & Flanagan, 2010). Research on civic engagement focuses on the varying factors that result in adolescents' engagement in their communities and political institutions, as a step toward becoming good adult citizens of their society. During adolescence, this includes becoming politically active (e.g., by voting and staying informed about current events), participating in community organizations, and engaging in volunteering and service. Although these behaviors surely have their origins in childhood, research on civic engagement has focused almost entirely on the emergence and maintenance of these behaviors during adolescence.

Summary

Research reviewed in this section indicates that how much time teens report spending with parents overall or in certain activities, and the quality of parent-child relationships decline during adolescence, resulting in more limited opportunities for parental socialization and less receptivity to parental influence than at earlier ages. Correspondingly, friendships become closer and more intimate, and cliques and crowds become important sources of influence. Finally, research often focuses on risky behaviors that increase during adolescence but in recent years, there also has been more attention paid to positive indicators of socialization, such as ethnic identity and civic engagement.

Parenting as a Context for Adolescent Socialization

Although adolescence is a time of transformation in both social relationships and socialization goals, the contexts of socialization are similar in childhood and adolescence, with parents, siblings, peers, and out-of-school activities serving as important influences. Parenting styles, more specific parenting practices, and the interplay of parenting and adolescent beliefs during adolescence have all received particular attention.

The Influence of Parenting Styles

Baumrind's research on parenting styles has been the most influential approach to parental socialization of social competence and psychological adjustment during adolescence. Baumrind and her colleagues (Baumrind, 1971; Baumrind, Larzelere, & Owens, 2010) have championed the use of pattern-based analyses, arguing that parenting is a gestalt, or "a totality made up of integrated practices that interact in such a way as to confer properties that are not possessed by a sum of its component practices" (p. 185). In her original work, Baumrind classified parenting into various categories, which were grouped into three broad parenting styles: authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive. Subsequently, Maccoby and Martin (1983) characterized parenting styles according to two orthogonal dimensions of demandingness and responsiveness and added a fourth category, rejecting-neglecting parenting, which reflected low levels of both dimensions. Baumrind believes that parenting styles are functionally continuous from childhood to adolescence, although the specific behaviors parents deploy may change as children grow older.

Numerous studies have shown that adolescents raised in authoritative homes (where parents are both highly demanding and responsive) are more competent, as assessed on a wide range of outcomes, than adolescents raised in authoritarian, permissive, or rejecting-neglecting homes (Sorkhabi & Mandara, 2013). Most of the evidence comes from cross-sectional research, or studies focused on the short-term longitudinal effects of parenting across adolescence. This research shows that parenting influences adolescent adjustment, although bidirectional models typically have not been tested (but see Kerr, Stattin, & Ozdemir, 2012, who found that adolescent behavior has a much stronger effect on parenting style than the reverse).

Recently, Baumrind and colleagues (2010) reanalyzed their original data to examine the influence of parenting styles assessed in early and middle childhood on competence (examined in terms of cognitive competence, individuation, self-efficacy, and absence of problem behavior) in middle adolescence. These researchers found that parenting in early childhood had unique effects on early adolescent adjustment, over and above the effects of parenting assessed both in middle childhood and concurrently. Authoritative parenting resulted in the greatest competence, followed by permissive and then authoritarian parenting. These analyses also distinguished between detrimental (e.g., coercive) and positive (e.g., what Baumrind referred to as "confrontive") forms of power assertion as well as between demandingness and responsiveness.

Baumrind's longitudinal sample comprised primarily European American and middle-class participants. But research consistently has demonstrated that European American parents and those from higher socioeconomic statuses are more likely to employ authoritative parenting than are parents from ethnic minority, lower socioeconomic status, and non-Western cultures, where authoritarian parenting prevails. Nevertheless,

some have claimed that in contemporary industrialized societies and because of the nurturance and parental involvement, authoritative parenting benefits most youth (Sorkhabi & Mandara, 2013). Asian American youth experience higher levels of authoritarian parenting but have higher levels of academic achievement than youth from other ethnic backgrounds; this been attributed to the value placed on academic achievement in Chinese culture (Mason, Walker-Barnes, Tu, Simons, & Martinez-Arrue, 2004).

Some have asserted, however, that Baumrind's parenting styles reflect distinctively European American values and that parenting in other groups should be assessed in terms of relevant, more indigenous cultural values. For instance, Chao (2001) has claimed that Chinese parenting is often described as authoritarian, punitive, and adult-centered, whereas she believes it actually reflects a Confucian, child-centered emphasis on the importance of strictness in the service of training (*guan*). Moreover, there is some evidence that the positive effects of authoritative parenting, at least for immigrant Chinese youth, reflect the influence of greater exposure to American society (Chao, 2001). At issue here is how adolescents of different ethnicities interpret parental control, as discussed in the following section.

Dimensional Approaches to Parenting

Researchers have increasingly unpacked parenting styles by employing dimensional approaches, which are seen as providing greater specificity. For instance, rather than viewing parental control as a single dimension, researchers have distinguished between psychological and behavioral control. *Psychological control* refers to parenting behaviors that manipulate adolescents' thoughts and feelings, thereby violating adolescents' sense of self through intrusiveness, guilt induction, and love withdrawal and resulting in poorer adjustment (Barber, Stolz, & Olsen, 2005). In contrast, *behavioral control* refers to parents' attempts to regulate adolescents' behavior by setting high standards, and regulating and enforcing them through supervision and monitoring. It is considered to be a more positive form of control because it provides adolescents with a clear set of parental expectations and the structure and guidance needed for the development of competent, autonomous, and responsible behavior. This distinction in forms of control is particularly relevant for parental socialization in adolescence because psychological control impinges on individuals' sense of self and their ability to develop personal identity, both of which are crucial developmental processes in adolescence.

Parental Psychological Control

Although researchers agree that parental psychological control involves undue socialization pressure, there are disagreements about how best to conceptualize and measure it (Chao & Otsuki-Clutter, 2011). Recently, Barber and his colleagues (2012) identified parental disrespect as the underlying dimension that leads to adverse effects on adolescent adjustment. In contrast, from a self-determination theory perspective, Soenens and Vansteenkiste (2010) have proposed that psychological control needs to be conceptualized narrowly in terms of parenting that pressures internally (e.g., conditional approval by manipulating feelings of guilt, shame, and separation anxiety) rather than externally through the use of threats of physical punishment and contingencies such as controlling rewards or removal of privileges.

Numerous factors have been associated with parental psychological control, including single parenthood, less maternal education, and ethnicity (with greater psychological control found among African American than among European American parents; Laird, 2011). Some personality attributes, including parental neuroticism and maladaptive perfectionism, also have been identified (Laird, 2011), as has parents' use of harsh discipline with young children (Pettit, Laird, Bates, Dodge, & Criss, 2001). High levels of adolescent depression and antisocial behavior are reciprocally associated with feeling psychologically controlled (Laird, 2011; Pettit et al., 2001). Parents are also seen as more psychologically controlling when they control issues that teens believe should be under their personal jurisdiction (Smetana & Daddis, 2002), and feeling overcontrolled, in turn, is associated with greater internalizing distress (Hasebe, Nucci, & Nucci, 2004).

Barber and his colleagues (2005, 2012) claim that parental psychological control has adverse effects on adjustment for all youth and have provided extensive cross-cultural evidence to that effect. However, this has been subject to debate because variations in findings have been observed in different ethnic and racial groups (Chao & Otsuki-Clutter, 2011). There is evidence to suggest that the cultural meaning of psychological control moderates its negative effects. For instance, American adolescents from African, European, and Hispanic backgrounds have been found to vary as to whether they interpret controlling behavior as reflecting parents' love and concern (Mason et al., 2004) or whether, instead, it arouses feelings of anger (Chao & Acque, 2009). More specifically, the latter investigators found that feeling angry moderated the negative effects of psychological control on problem behavior for European American youth but not American youth from various Asian backgrounds. In contrast, interpreting parental psychological control as reflecting love and concern, which was more likely among African American than among European American youth, led to less adverse (but still negative) outcomes (Mason et al., 2004).

Parental Behavioral Control

Behavioral control and the guidance it provides are considered important for socialization. Much research has shown that greater parental behavioral control is associated with higher academic achievement and better adjustment for adolescents of different ethnicities (Lamborn, Dornbusch, & Steinberg, 1996, Pettit et al., 2001).

Behavioral control is a broad construct that has been defined in many different ways. Grolnick and Pomerantz (2009) have proposed that the term *control* should be used only in reference to parental psychological control and that *structure* should replace *behavioral control*. These researchers define structure as "parents' organization of children's environment to facilitate children's competence" (p. 167); this involves providing clear and consistent guidelines, rules, and expectations, as well as predictable consequences and clear feedback for behavior. This distinction between structure and control is important because, according to self-determination theory, children have basic needs for psychological autonomy (which may be violated by parental control) and competence (which may be satisfied by parental structuring), but they do not have a basic psychological need to be regulated. However, Baumrind and colleagues (2010) countered that parenting can be both behaviorally controlling and autonomy-supportive if it is confrontive, or "firm, direct, forceful, and consistent" (e.g., authoritative, p. 158) but not coercive (i.e., peremptory, domineering, arbitrary, and hierarchical—e.g., authoritarian).

In addition to this definitional confusion, many different measures have been employed to assess behavioral control. Monitoring is considered one of the most important practices in parents' toolkit because, as noted earlier, parenting during the adolescent years increasingly occurs at a distance. Monitoring allows parents to keep track of their teens while permitting greater autonomy. Numerous studies have shown that too little parental monitoring is associated with externalizing problems such as drug use, truancy, and antisocial behavior (Collins & Steinberg, 2006). Furthermore, parental monitoring has been found to have beneficial effects among ethnically diverse youth in the United States and elsewhere (Chao & Otsuki-Clutter, 2011).

These positive effects have been attributed to both contextual and cultural factors. For instance, there are clear benefits to strict parental supervision for adolescents living in dangerous neighborhoods (which is more often the case for minority than for majority youth), as this may help to protect adolescents and keep them safe (Lamborn et al., 1996). In addition, supervision, strictness, and protectiveness are part of Latino (e.g., familism) and Chinese (e.g., *guan*) cultural values, as Chao and Otsuki-Clutter (2011) have noted. Indeed, in the study by Chao and Acque (2009) discussed earlier, Chinese adolescents who were immigrants to the United States (but not other Asian immigrant youth) felt less anger in response to parental strictness than did European American adolescents. However, consistent with Grolnick and Pomerantz's (2009) conceptual analysis, Chao and Acque's factor analysis revealed empirical distinctions between "Provides Structure" and "Strictness" (both dimensions of behavioral control). Unlike the findings for strictness, providing structure was more negatively associated with problem behavior in European than in Asian American (particularly Filipino) youth. Indeed, for Filipinos, providing structure was associated with increased internalizing and externalizing symptoms, suggesting that Filipino parents may employ this form of control only when youth exhibit problem behavior. More generally, the findings suggest that parental structure and strictness are conceptually distinct.

Monitoring versus Parental Knowledge

Problems also have been identified in how parental monitoring has been operationalized in research. As Stattin and Kerr (2000) observed, monitoring typically has been assessed in terms of parents' knowledge of adolescents' away-from-home activities rather than parents' active tracking and surveillance. Research has shown that parents have different strategies for learning about teens' activities. Compared to fathers, mothers use more active methods, such as asking their offspring directly or asking informed others (e.g., teachers or spouses), and actively participating in activities, such as driving the child to events (Waizenhofer, Buchanan, & Jackson-Newsom, 2004). In contrast, fathers rely more exclusively on their spouses for information, particularly about their daughters (Crouter, Bumpus, Davis, & McHale, 2005; Waizenhofer et al., 2004). However, Crouter and colleagues (2005) found that a relational style involving high levels of adolescent voluntary disclosure, as well as parental observation and listening, led to greater parental knowledge, which in turn was associated with lower levels of risky behavior, including less involvement with deviant peers, problem behavior, truancy, and drug use. Along with several other risk factors, lower levels of parental knowledge are also associated with an increasing risk of substance use, anxiety, and depression for a range of youth, including those growing up in highly affluent communities.

Much research has now confirmed that adolescents' willing disclosure is more strongly associated with parental knowledge than is parental monitoring (e.g., parents' solicitation of information or behavioral control) (Crouter et al., 2005; Kerr, Stattin, & Burk, 2010; Stattin & Kerr, 2000). These findings highlight the importance of considering adolescents' agency in their development because adolescents actively manage the information they permit parents to have. Even when relationships are warm, close, and trusting, adolescents' disclosure to parents and parents' knowledge of adolescents' activities normatively decline from childhood levels (Smetana & Daddis, 2002), and secrecy and concealment increase. Information management has been described as a way of gaining greater autonomy from parents while maintaining positive relationships (Marshall, Tilton-Weaver, & Bosdet, 2005). But some forms of information management have positive functions, while others do not. Laird and Marrero (2010) have shown that telling parents only if asked is associated with better family relationships and adjustment, whereas concealment strategies generally have adverse effects, although less so for acts of omission, such as omitting details and avoidance, than for outright lying (Marshall et al., 2005).

While adolescents clearly control the flow of information to parents, good parenting can contribute to adolescent disclosure. Parenting that is authoritative, responsive, accepting, and trusting and low in levels of psychological control all have been found to increase adolescents' willingness to keep parents informed about their activities (Darling, Cumsille, Caldwell, & Dowdy, 2006; Smetana, Villalobos, Tasopoulos-Chan, Gettman, & Campione-Barr, 2009). Furthermore, when parents respond to disclosure negatively or punitively, adolescents report feeling more controlled and less connected to parents, which in turn results in increased secrecy and decreased disclosure over time (Tilton-Weaver et al., 2010). In addition, there is some evidence that parental solicitation of information in early adolescence (as reported by teens) reduces antisocial behavior, but only for adolescents who are likely to be noncompliant and uncooperative because they spend more time unsupervised and tend to challenge the legitimacy of their parents' authority (Laird, Marrero, & Sentse, 2010). Because unsupervised time and low legitimacy beliefs are predictors of antisocial behavior, it appears that parental solicitation may work for teens who need it most.

Perceptions of Parenting and Judgments of the Legitimacy of Parental Authority

Legitimacy of Parental Authority

Despite claims that behavioral and psychological control are distinct parenting dimensions, research also has demonstrated that they may become blurred for some youth and under certain conditions, such as when behavioral control is applied at high levels or used to control issues that adolescents view as personal. For instance, teens do not differentiate between psychological control and high levels of behavioral control (parents' prohibiting behaviors) as assessed in hypothetical vignettes; both were seen as reflecting greater parental intrusiveness and beliefs that teens matter less to parents than was moderate behavioral control (setting limits and conditions; Kakihara & Tilton-Weaver, 2010). And high levels of parental control—of different types—are interpreted negatively when applied to personal issues (Kakihara & Tilton-Weaver, 2010; Smetana & Daddis, 2002).

Personal issues have been defined within social domain theory (Smetana, 2011; Turiel, 1983) as issues that are outside of the realm of legitimate external regulation and up to the individual to decide because they pertain to privacy, control over one's body, and personal preferences and choices regarding friends, appearance, and leisure time pursuits. Control over personal issues satisfies psychological needs for autonomy, agency, and self-efficacy; therefore, its existence is seen as universal (Nucci, 1996). However, the breadth and content of the personal domain may vary both within and between cultures. For instance, for many North American youth, career choices and eligible dating and marriage partners are treated as personal issues, but for some North American ethnic minority youth or youth in other cultures, these behaviors are not.

The findings of research on conceptions of parental authority are important for adolescent socialization because they indicate that adolescents' willingness to endorse parental values and expectations varies by domain. A great deal of research has shown that teens and parents agree that parents have the legitimate authority to regulate *moral* concerns regarding others' welfare and rights (although parents are not seen as having the right to make rules that inflict harm or cause injustice to others), and *social-conventional* norms, and throughout much of adolescence, *prudential* issues of health, comfort, and safety, including risky behaviors (Smetana, 2011). Additionally, the personal domain expands during adolescence, with issues that are seen as legitimately regulated by parents in early adolescence increasingly coming under teens' control with age (see Smetana, 2002, 2011). However, for a variety of reasons—for instance, because parents are concerned about their child's welfare or believe that he or she is not yet responsible or competent enough to make independent decisions—parents may not grant their teen as much personal jurisdiction as he or she desires (Smetana, 2011).

Discrepancies between adolescents' and parents' views of legitimate parental authority lead to conflicts in their relationships and potentially to adolescents' nondisclosure and secrecy with parents (Smetana, 2011). Conflicts and nondisclosure often occur over multifaceted issues (e.g., issues that teens view as personal but that parents treat as conventional or prudential; Smetana, 2011). Indeed, research suggests that there may be an inverse association between the extent to which open disagreement is tolerated or permitted in different cultures and ethnic groups (Fuligni, 1998), and the extent to which teens resort to secrecy and information management to get their way (Yau, Tasopoulos-Chan, & Smetana, 2009).

There are also individual differences in adolescents' beliefs about parents' legitimate authority. Studying transitions to adolescence, Kuhn and Laird (2011) found that relative to same-age peers, preadolescents who were European American rather than African American, less advanced in their pubertal development, less resistant to parental control, less autonomous in their family's decision making, and who experienced less psychologically controlling parents had stronger beliefs in parents' legitimate authority over personal and friendship issues.

Other studies have shown that there are normative changes in levels of and beliefs about parental authority, and that they have implications for healthy adjustment. Too much autonomy over personal issues in early adolescence is maladaptive (Wray-Lake, McHale, & Crouter, 2010) and leads to greater involvement in antisocial behavior (Darling et al., 2006; Laird & Marrero, 2010), more depression, and lower self-worth in late adolescence (Smetana, Campione-Barr, & Daddis, 2004). Indeed, premature autonomy combined with the belief that parents do not have legitimate authority has been associated with trajectories

of antisocial behavior (Dishion, Nelson, & Bullock, 2004). The most adaptive pattern for adolescent well-being appears to involve increased autonomy over personal and multifaceted issues between middle and late adolescence (Smetana et al., 2004).

Normative Context of Parenting

The varying effects of psychological control for some groups of youth (Chao & Acque, 2009; Mason et al., 2004) discussed previously suggest that when harsh, coercive, or psychologically controlling parenting is more normative, its negative effects may be reduced. Indeed, the cultural normativeness of different disciplinary practices (e.g., spanking or slapping, grabbing, shaking, and beating), examined in diverse countries, has been found to moderate the link between parenting practices and adjustment (e.g., Gershoff et al., 2010; Lansford et al., 2005). This research clearly shows that physical discipline, particularly in its more extreme forms, has adverse effects. But when physical discipline is perceived as more normative in a particular setting, children and teens are more likely to attribute it to good and caring parenting, and its adverse effects on outcomes are less extreme. Although the normativeness of psychological control has not been examined as a moderator, psychological control is more common among Asian and African American parents and is more likely to be viewed as indicating love and concern (Mason et al., 2004; Ng, Pomerantz, & Deng, 2014). This suggests that cultural or ethnic differences in the effects of psychological control on adjustment are at least in part due to the context of parenting. Thus, this research, like the research on conceptions of the legitimacy of parental authority, highlights the importance of considering how the meaning adolescents give to different socialization practices alters their effects.

Cultural, Ethnic, and Racial Socialization

As noted earlier, there has been a dramatic increase over the past decade in studies of the practices parents use to transmit cultural values and teach youth about their ethnic and racial background. In response to the conceptual confusion in how cultural, racial, and ethnic socialization have been defined, Hughes and colleagues (2006), in their comprehensive review, have proposed that researchers employ the term *cultural socialization* to refer to parental practices that are intended to teach youth about their history and cultural heritage, their cultural customs and traditions, and to instill cultural, ethnic, or racial pride. The majority of U.S. parents from ethnic minority groups report using these types of practices (Fuligni et al., 2009; Hughes et al., 2006); U.S. parents who are recent immigrants are more likely to engage in cultural socialization, focusing on their native language, customs, and traditions, than are more acculturated parents or those who have been in the United States longer. We know of very little comparable research on immigrants to other countries.

Some evidence also suggests that parents who are better educated and have higher socioeconomic status engage in more cultural socialization than their less educated, lower socioeconomic status counterparts (Hughes et al., 2006). This may be partly due to neighborhood context because minority families with higher socioeconomic status are more likely to reside in more heterogeneous communities and may therefore feel a greater need to engage in cultural socialization with their offspring. Cultural socialization has been consistently associated with a range of positive developmental outcomes among

youth of different ethnicities, including more exploration and achievement of ethnic identity, greater self-esteem, more positive ingroup attitudes, and less externalizing behavior (Berry, Chapter 22, this volume; Fuligni et al., 2009), although the effects of cultural socialization on academic achievement are inconsistent (Hughes et al., 2006).

Ethnic minority parents, and particularly African American parents, also consciously socialize their adolescents to cope with discrimination and unequal treatment (Hughes et al., 2006). These efforts focus on teaching children about racial bias in the broader society and “pre-arming” them with strategies to cope with prejudice (see Chapter 8 in Smetana, 2011, for qualitative examples from middle-class African American parents). As with cultural socialization, parents with more schooling, higher incomes, or more professional or managerial jobs are more likely to prepare their adolescents for bias. Socialization regarding bias also increases in frequency as teens grow older, but girls are more likely to receive messages regarding racial pride, whereas boys more often are prepared for discrimination and given messages about barriers (Chao & Otsuki-Clutter, 2011). This is no doubt because, at least among African Americans, males are more often victims of discrimination than are females.

Preparation for bias has been distinguished from more negative parental practices that are designed to promote wariness and distrust in interactions with other groups or cautions about barriers to success (Chao & Otsuki-Clutter, 2011; Fuligni et al., 2009; Hughes et al., 2006). Adolescents whose parents prepare them for bias have been found to use more proactive strategies in their coping and have better mental health outcomes than those of parents who do not address these issues with their teens. There is some evidence, however, that there can be negative effects (e.g., greater depression and conflict with parents) when parents stress the potential for discrimination (Hughes et al., 2006). Studies examining links between these two aspects of racial socialization (preparation for bias and promotion of distrust) and adolescent development have yielded mixed results depending on the socialization measures employed and the particular adjustment measures studied (Chao & Otsuki-Clutter, 2011; Hughes et al., 2006). Fuligni and colleagues (2009) suggest that this is partly because research has not adequately distinguished between the positive aspects of preparing for bias and the negative aspects of instilling distrust. Furthermore, relatively few studies have examined how ethnic minority and cultural groups other than African Americans socialize their adolescents to handle experiences with discrimination. Thus, there is a need for more research on diverse samples of youth.

A further positive racial socialization strategy that parents of different ethnic groups have been found to employ is referred to as *egalitarianism* (Hughes et al., 2006). These messages orient youth away from their minority status or native culture to emphasize the development of skills and abilities needed to thrive in the dominant or mainstream culture. Research also suggests that a small percentage of ethnic minority parents are silent about race or ethnicity and do nothing to teach their children about these issues (Hughes et al., 2006). This can be considered a socialization strategy in that it communicates values and perspectives about race.

Summary

While authoritative parenting generally has beneficial effects on adolescent adjustment, debate continues about the meaning and role of different parenting styles for diverse

youth, leading to a focus on dimensional approaches to parenting. Psychological control is seen as having adverse effects on adjustment, whereas behavioral control has beneficial effects. But these findings are complicated because these two parenting dimensions may overlap under certain conditions, and the negative effects of harsh parenting and psychological control may be lessened when they are culturally normative. Furthermore, recent research demonstrates the importance of adolescent disclosure (rather than parenting) in influencing adjustment through its effect on parental knowledge. These findings, as well as research on teens' evaluations of legitimate parental authority, point to the importance of adolescents' interpretations of parenting and their agency in socialization. Ethnic minority parents also seek to prepare their offspring to cope with discrimination and unequal treatment.

Sibling Relationships as a Context for Adolescent Socialization

Interest in the role of older siblings as socialization influences has increased substantially over the past decade. This increased attention is due to both the greater prominence of family systems theories (e.g., Minuchin, 2002), with their focus on how different subsystems of the family interact to influence behavior, and to increased research on how the role of shared versus nonshared environmental influences in the family affect adolescents' attitudes and behavior. Moreover, sibling relationships are highly salient in adolescence, as early adolescents have more conflicts with siblings than with anyone else (e.g., fathers, grandparents, friends, or teachers; Furman & Buhrmester, 1985) except maybe mothers (Laursen & Collins, 2009). Sibling conflicts occur primarily over invasions of siblings' personal domains and moral issues of fairness and equality (Campione-Barr, Greer, & Kruse, 2013). Conflicts over the former are associated with poorer quality sibling relationships, but both types of conflicts are longitudinally associated with poorer emotional adjustment (Campione-Barr et al., 2013). Beyond conflict, however, relationships with brothers and sisters are also important sources of companionship, affection, and intimacy (see Dunn, Chapter 8, this volume).

Siblings are often similar in their involvement in various risky behaviors such as alcohol and substance use, delinquency, and sexual attitudes and behavior, and these similarities cannot be attributed only to shared parenting or genetics (see McHale, Updegraff, & Whiteman, 2012). Accordingly, different socialization processes have been examined. For instance, older siblings may serve as role models for younger siblings, but only if younger siblings perceive their older siblings as likable and nurturing, so that younger siblings want to be around and learn from them (Whiteman & Buchanan, 2002). Siblings can also influence each other through shared friends and introduction to deviant peer networks (McHale et al., 2012); this, as well as modeling and siblings' shared genetic background, can account for convergence between siblings.

In contrast, sibling deidentification accounts for potential divergence. The notion is that siblings respond to parents' differential treatment by defining themselves as different from each other. They pursue different domains of competence and interest to avoid comparison and rivalry. Sibling deidentification is more frequent and intense among siblings who are more similar in gender, age, and birth order (Schachter & Stone, 1987), and it has been found to influence risky behaviors, adjustment, and psychosocial development.

Sibling differentiation is seen as especially relevant during adolescence because of the developmental salience of identity development (McHale et al., 2012).

A recent study that compared modeling, introduction to peer networks, and sibling deidentification in a sample of sibling pairs who were, on average, 15 and 17 years of age, found that different profiles involving combinations of all three processes emerged (Whiteman, Jensen, & Maggs, 2014). Similarities in alcohol use and delinquency were found in two groups of siblings: one group that reported high levels of shared friends and mutual modeling, and another group characterized by younger siblings' high levels of admiration for and modeling of the older siblings' behavior and low levels of differentiation (the latter pattern was more likely among siblings characterized by larger age differences). Differences in alcohol use and delinquency were found in members of a third group of siblings with high differentiation processes. Another study also employing person-centered analyses of siblings of roughly similar ages (14- and 16-year-olds) also obtained deidentification and modeling groups (peer influences were not examined), but their third cluster reflected an apparent lack of investment in the sibling relationship (Whiteman, McHale, & Crouter, 2007).

Siblings also have been found to influence parent–adolescent relationships. That is, parents' childrearing experiences with their firstborns influence their expectations for their younger child's adolescence, even when researchers controlled for temperament (Whiteman & Buchanan, 2002). Furthermore, parents have less conflict with and greater knowledge of daily activities for later-born than for firstborn adolescents (Whiteman, McHale, & Crouter, 2003), and, as we noted earlier, changes in conflict with second-born children correspond to the firstborn child's entry into adolescence (Shanahan, McHale, Osgood, & Crouter, 2007). These studies highlight the importance of considering the broader family social system. Not only do siblings have unique effects on adolescent behavior and values over and above the effects of parents, but parents also learn from their experiences, modifying and fine-tuning their parenting practices with subsequent children. This fine-tuning also varies according to sibling gender constellation (Shanahan, McHale, Crouter, & Osgood, 2007; Shanahan, McHale, Osgood, & Crouter, 2007; Wray-Lake et al., 2010), demonstrating the complexity of sibling relationships as socialization contexts.

Summary

Older siblings serve as socialization influences. Modeling and introduction to older siblings' friends and deviant peer networks may lead to similarities between siblings, whereas sibling deidentification accounts for divergence. Siblings also influence parent–teen relationships because parents' experiences with their firstborn influence how they parent subsequent offspring.

Peer Relationships as a Context for Adolescent Socialization

Research on peer socialization has largely emphasized the negative effects of peers in encouraging teen deviance and involvement in risky activities. But, as we discuss in the following section, peers also may have positive effects. Additionally, although teens

increasingly identify with peers, there is also considerable evidence that parents remain influential overall in socialization, as well as in adolescents' peer relationships.

Peer Selection and Socialization

Both peer selection (adolescents' tendency to befriend individuals who are similar to themselves; Dishion, Patterson, Stoolmiller, & Skinner, 1991), and peer socialization (increases in similarity between friends over time; Dishion & Owen, 2002) have been posited to account for peer influence on adolescent behavior. Research comparing these processes has focused heavily on delinquency. For instance, peer selection approaches highlight the fact that risk-taking youth seek each other out, whereas peer socialization emphasizes the role of deviancy training. Evidence suggests that the two processes are complementary. For example, Dishion and colleagues (1991) found that substance use in early adulthood is a joint product of socialization and peer selection processes throughout adolescence, although parenting also may moderate some of these effects: Parental monitoring reduced selection of delinquent friends in early adolescence, but only for teens who did not feel overcontrolled by parents (Tilton-Weaver, Burk, Kerr, & Stattin, 2013).

As these studies suggest, risk taking (e.g., drinking, driving, and delinquency) during adolescence occurs primarily in the presence of peers rather than when the adolescent is alone or in the company of parents. Researchers (Albert, Chein, & Steinberg, 2013; Casey, Jones, & Somerville, 2011; Steinberg, 2008) have marshaled neurodevelopmental evidence to account for these contextual effects. They have focused on the maturational gap between structural changes in the dopaminergic system that occur at puberty and lead to increases in sensation seeking, and the prolonged amount of time it takes for the brain's cognitive control system to strengthen and mature. This research has shown that over time, increased coordination between these affective and cognitive processes results in better self-regulation in affectively arousing situations and, accordingly, increased capacity to resist peer influence.

Apart from the extensive focus on delinquency and risk taking, research also suggests that peers may have positive effects on adolescent development, especially for majority youth (e.g., European Americans in the United States), who spend more time with peers than do ethnic minority youth. Positive peer pressure, or peers' perceived efforts to encourage positive behavior, has been linked with positive outcomes such as empathic responding. This is especially true when peers' positive values indirectly influence teens' behavior (Padilla-Walker & Bean, 2009).

Peers also have been shown to influence adolescents' autonomy development, serving as a metric by which adolescents measure acceptable or normative levels of autonomy (Daddis, 2008). Friends are seen as influencing adolescents' views as to how much autonomy they should have. When they perceive their friends as having more autonomy than they do, adolescents desire increased autonomy, specifically, over issues that are not clearly within the personal domain (Daddis, 2011). Peer selection effects have also been demonstrated. Adolescents have been shown to be more similar to friends than to non-friends in their beliefs about the acceptable boundaries of personal authority and in their justifications regarding the legitimacy of parental authority. Indeed, supporting selection more than socialization effects, similarities between friends were greater among younger than among older adolescents, and direct discussion of autonomy issues between friends was related to less agreement (Daddis, 2008).

Parental Influence and Management of Peer Relationships

Current research suggests that parents continue to play an important role in influencing peer relationships. Such influence comes through two avenues: directly, through parenting behaviors designed to affect peer relationships, and indirectly, through structuring teens' environments. Direct influences include monitoring, mediating teens' peer relationships, and consulting (giving advice). Mounts (2008) has shown that parents' greater use of monitoring and consulting promotes adolescents' selection of less delinquent peers, as well as more positive peer relationships. On the other hand, certain consulting behaviors (e.g., forbidding adolescents to associate with delinquent peers), make adolescents more likely to select delinquent peers as friends (Keijsers et al., 2012). Indirect parental influences on peer relationships include the selection of neighborhoods and afterschool activities. Safer neighborhoods with higher quality extracurricular activities facilitate interaction with nondelinquent peers (Mounts, 2008). In addition, parenting styles influence adolescent–peer relationships directly, through their links with specific parenting practices, and indirectly, by creating an emotional climate that affects how teens interpret such behaviors (Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Mounts, 2002). Both authoritative and authoritarian parents display high levels of monitoring, but only authoritative parents offer more support for teens' peer relationships (Mounts, 2002). In turn, for youth with authoritative parents, high levels of monitoring were found to be linked with lower levels of drug use 1 year later. However, among teens with authoritarian parents, high levels of monitoring did not have this salutary effect, perhaps because monitoring is seen as more intrusive in the absence of the warmth that accompanies authoritative parenting (Mounts, 2002).

The effects of culture and ethnicity on parents' management of peer relationships have also been examined. Updegraff, Killoren, and Thayer (2007) found that generational differences in Mexican American parents' identification with traditional Mexican values were associated with their parental peer management practices. Parents who more strongly identified with traditional Mexican values placed more restrictions on adolescents' peer relationships and encouraged relationships with the family more than those with peers (perhaps accounting for the differences in time spent with peers noted earlier). Ethnicity is also associated with the types of goals parents endorse and the practices they use to achieve them. In a study of European American, African American, and Latino parents, Mounts and Kim (2007) found that African American parents were more concerned with peer management goals related to preventing problem behavior—and used more mediating and consulting strategies, and granted teens less autonomy over their peer relationships—than did other parents. Latino parents also engaged in more mediating but in less consulting behaviors than did European American and African American parents. Additionally, as might be expected, ethnic minority parents were more likely to have ethnically oriented peer management goals, and, for example, to worry about their child being exposed to racist peers or encourage the child to choose same-ethnicity friends.

Parents often worry that their teen will hang out with “the wrong crowd” or with friends of whom they disapprove. However, research shows that parenting behaviors indirectly influence crowd affiliation through adolescent behavior. In a study examining a large, diverse sample of U.S. youth, Brown, Mounts, Lamborn, and Steinberg (1993) demonstrated that specific parenting practices such as monitoring and encouragement

of achievement were positively associated with adolescents' self-reliance and academic achievement, and negatively associated with their drug use, all of which in turn were associated with adolescents' membership in different peer crowds. As noted earlier, peer crowds channel teens in different directions (e.g., joining a "druggie" crowd may lead to increasing drug use). Although the links need to be tested longitudinally, this research shows the importance of parents' values and parenting practices relative to these pathways.

Summary

Peers influence adolescent attitudes and behavior both through peer selection and peer socialization. The focus has been mostly on negative influences, including increased deviance and risk-taking. The maturational gap between the brain's reward system and the cognitive control system, which predisposes adolescents to sensation seeking through risky behavior and which occurs primarily in the company of peers, has been identified as a potential explanation for these negative effects. Although less studied, friends also have positive effects on adolescent competence and serve as metrics for teens' autonomy seeking. Parents influence peer relationships both directly and indirectly, and this varies as a function of culture and ethnicity.

Adolescents' Out-of-School Activities

How adolescents spend their time outside of school has a considerable impact on their development (Mahoney, Vandell, Simpkins, & Zarrett, 2009). Out-of-school activities include those that lack adult supervision, as well as teens' involvement in organized activities, which have been found to offer significant opportunities for positive youth development (Mahoney et al., 2009). The success of youth programs has been attributed partially to the positive influence of adult mentors, who may provide some of the structure and responsiveness that may be missing from adolescents' home environments (Mahoney et al., 2009).

However, mentoring in youth programs has uneven and quite modest effects, due to substantial variability in the quality of programs (Rhodes & Lowe, 2009). More structured programs with clear expectations, support for mentors, and instrumental goals fared best in yielding positive outcomes for vulnerable youth (Rhodes & Lowe, 2009). Thus, there is reason to be optimistic about the potential of such programs to enhance important developmental outcomes. Indeed, the characteristics of programs that produce positive developmental outcomes—opportunities for belonging, skills building, appropriate structure, positive social norms, and supportive relationships with adults and peers—mirror the types of parenting that facilitate positive trajectories in adolescent development.

Conclusions

Against a backdrop of significant continuity between childhood and adolescence, we have described some of the distinctive features of socialization during adolescence,

including changes in time spent with parents versus peers, more parenting at a distance, changes in the structure of peer relationships and their influence, and risky behaviors that increase during adolescence. Adolescent socialization must be considered in the context of adolescents' interpretation of their social world and social relationships. Teens begin to move into a world where they are less under the control of their parents, and where their conceptions of acceptable parental behavior and control change rapidly. Adolescents push for more autonomy, resulting in increased conflict, nondisclosure, and secrecy in adolescent–parent relationships and normative declines in closeness. On the bright side, however, closeness rebounds during young adulthood, as youth seek to reestablish family ties. And although the world of peers looms large for adolescents and poses risks for deviant behaviors, parents continue to exert both direct and indirect effects on peer relationships. Furthermore, adolescents may obtain the support and mentoring they need in other contexts, such as in their out-of-school activities. Indeed, among researchers there is an emerging consensus as to the parenting, peer management practices, and out-of-school programs that facilitate better outcomes for youth of diverse ethnicities. Positive socialization experiences with family and peers can help facilitate adolescents' involvement and engagement in the broader society as they become competent, mature young adults and citizens of diverse societies.

REFERENCES

- Acquilino, W. S. (1997). A prospective study of parent–child relations during the transition to adulthood. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *59*, 670–686.
- Albert, D., Chein, J., & Steinberg, L. (2013). The teenage brain: Peer influences on adolescent decision-making. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *22*, 114–120.
- Archibald, A., Graber, J., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2003). Pubertal processes and physiological growth in adolescence. In G. R. Adams & M. D. Berzonsky (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of adolescence* (pp. 24–47) Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Barber, B. K., Stolz, H. E., & Olsen, J. A. (2005). Parental support, psychological control, and behavioral control: Assessing relevance across time, method, and culture. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, *70*(4), 1–137.
- Barber, B. K., Xia, M., Olsen, J. A., Stolz, H. E., McNeely, C. A., & Bose, K. (2012). Feeling disrespected by parents: Refining the measurement and understanding of psychological control. *Journal of Adolescence*, *35*, 273–287.
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology Monographs*, *4*(I, Pt. 2), 1–103.
- Baumrind, D., Larzelere, R. E., & Owens, E. B. (2010) Effects of preschool parents' power assertive patterns and practices on adolescent development, *Parenting: Science and Practice*, *10*, 157–201.
- Brown, B. B., & Klute, C. (2003). Friendships, cliques, and crowds. In G. R. Adams & M. D. Berzonsky (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of adolescence* (pp. 330–348). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Brown, B. B., & Larson, J. (2009). Peer relationships in adolescence. In R. L. Lerner & L. Steinberg (Eds.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology* (3rd ed., Vol. 2, pp. 74–103). New York: Wiley.
- Brown, B. B., Mounts, N., Lamborn, S., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting practices and peer group affiliation in adolescence. *Child Development*, *64*, 467–482.
- Campione-Barr, N., Greer, K. B., & Kruse, A. (2013). Differential associations between domains of sibling conflict and adolescent emotional adjustment. *Child Development*, *84*, 938–954.
- Casey, B. J., Jones, R., & Somerville, L. (2011). Braking and accelerating of the adolescent brain. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *21*, 21–33.

- Chao, R. (2001). Extending research on the consequences of parenting style for Chinese Americans and European Americans. *Child Development*, 72(6), 1832–1843.
- Chao, R., & Acque, C. (2009). Interpretations of parental control by Asian immigrant and European American youth. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 23, 342–354.
- Chao, R., & Otsuki-Clutter, M. (2011). Racial and ethnic differences: Sociocultural and contextual explanations. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 21, 47–60.
- Collins, W. A., & Steinberg, L. (2006). Adolescent development in interpersonal context. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.) & W. Damon (Series Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 3. Social, emotional, and personality development* (6th ed., pp. 1003–1067). New York: Wiley.
- Crouter, A. C., Bumpus, M. F., Davis, K. D., & McHale, S. M. (2005). How do parents learn about adolescents' experiences?: Implications for parental knowledge and adolescent risky behavior. *Child Development*, 76, 869–882.
- Currie, C., Zanotti, C., Morgan, A., Currie, D., de Looze, M., Roberts, C., et al. (2012). *Social determinants of health and well-being among young people: Health Behaviour in School-Aged Children (HBSC) Study: International Report from the 2009/2010 survey* (Health Policy for Children and Adolescents, No. 6). Copenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe.
- Daddis, C. (2008). Influence of close friends on the boundaries of adolescent personal authority. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 18, 75–98.
- Daddis, C. (2011). Desire for increased autonomy and adolescents' perceptions of peer autonomy: "Everyone else can; why can't I?" *Child Development*, 82, 1310–1326.
- Darling, N., Cumsille, P., Caldwell, L. L., & Dowdy, B. (2006). Predictors of adolescents' disclosure to parents and perceived parental knowledge: Between- and within-person differences. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 35, 667–678.
- Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 113, 487–496.
- Diamond, L., & Savin-Williams, R. (2009). Sexuality. In B. Brown & M. Prinstein (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of adolescence* (Vol. 2, pp. 314–321). New York: Academic Press.
- Dijkstra, J. K., & Veenstra, R. (2011). Peer relations. In B. Brown & M. Prinstein (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of adolescence* (Vol. 2, pp. 255–259). New York: Academic Press.
- Dishion, T., Patterson, G., Stoolmiller, M., & Skinner, M. (1991). Family, school, and behavioral antecedents to adolescent involvement with antisocial peers. *Developmental Psychology*, 27, 172–180.
- Dishion, T. J., Nelson, S. E., & Bullock, B. M. (2004). Premature adolescent autonomy: Parent disengagement and deviant peer process in the amplification of problem behavior. *Journal of Adolescence*, 27, 515–530.
- Dishion, T. J., & Owen, L. D. (2002). A longitudinal analysis of friendships and substance use: Bidirectional influence from adolescence to adulthood. *Developmental Psychology*, 38, 480–491.
- Fuligni, A. J. (1998). Authority, autonomy, and parent–adolescent conflict and cohesion: A study of adolescents from Mexican, Chinese, Filipino, and European backgrounds. *Developmental Psychology*, 34, 782–792.
- Fuligni, A. J., Hughes, D. L., & Way, N. (2009). Ethnicity and immigration. In R. M. Lerner & L. Steinberg (Eds.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology* (Vol. 2, 3rd ed., pp. 527–569). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Furman, W., & Buhrmester, D. (1985). Children's perceptions of the personal relationships in their social networks. *Developmental Psychology*, 21, 1016–1024.
- Gershoff, E. T., Grogan-Kaylor, A., Lansford, J. E., Chang, L., Zelli, A., Deater-Deckard, K., et al. (2010). Parent discipline practices in an international sample: Associations with child behaviors and moderation by perceived normativeness. *Child Development*, 81, 487–502.
- Graham, S. (1992). Most of the subjects were white and middle class: Trends in published research on African-Americans in selected APA journals, 1970–1989. *American Psychologist*, 47, 629–639.

- Grolnick, W., & Pomerantz, E. M. (2009). Issues and challenges in studying parental control: Toward a new conceptualization. *Child Development Perspectives*, 3, 165–170.
- Grusec, J. E. (2002). Parental socialization and children's acquisition of values. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Vol. 5. Practical issues* (2nd ed., pp. 143–167). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Grusec, J. E., Goodnow, J. J., & Kuczynski, L. (2000). New directions in analyses of parenting contributions to children's acquisition of values. *Child Development*, 71, 205–211.
- Hasebe, Y., Nucci, L., & Nucci, M. S. (2004). Parental control of the personal domain and adolescent symptoms of psychopathology. *Child Development*, 75, 815–828.
- Holmbeck, G. N. (1996). A model of family relational transformations during the transition to adolescence: Parent–adolescent conflict and adaptation. In J. A. Graber, J. Brooks-Gunn, & A. C. Petersen (Eds.), *Transitions through adolescence: Interpersonal domains and context* (pp. 167–199). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hughes, D., Rodriguez, J., Smith, E. P., Johnson, D. J., Stevenson, H. C., & Spicer, P. (2006). Parents' ethnic–racial socialization practices: A review of research and directions for future study. *Developmental Psychology*, 42, 747–770.
- Johnston, L. D., O'Malley, P. M., Bachman, J. G., & Schulenberg, J. E. (2012). Monitoring the future: 2012 overview: Key findings on adolescent drug use. Retrieved from www.monitoringthefuture.org/pubs/monographs/mtf-overview2012.pdf.
- Kakihara, F., & Tilton-Weaver, L. (2010). Adolescents' interpretations of parental control: Differentiated by domain and types of control. *Child Development*, 80, 1722–1738.
- Keijsers, L., Branje, S., Hawk, S. T., Schwartz, S. J., Frijns, T., Koot, H. M., & Meeus, W. (2012). Forbidden friends as forbidden fruit: Parental supervision of friendships, contact with deviant peers, and adolescent delinquency. *Child Development*, 83(2), 651–666.
- Kerr, M., Stattin, H., & Burk, W. J. (2010). A reinterpretation of parental monitoring in longitudinal perspective. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 20, 39–64.
- Kerr, M., Stattin, H., & Ozdemir, M. (2012). Perceived parenting style and adolescent adjustment: Revisiting direction of effects and the role of parental knowledge. *Developmental Psychology*, 48, 1540–1553.
- Kuhn, E. S., & Laird, R. D. (2011). Individual differences in early adolescent' beliefs in the legitimacy of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology*, 47, 1353–1365.
- Laird, R. D. (2011). Correlates and antecedents of parental psychological control in early adolescence. *Parenting: Science and Practice*, 11, 72–86.
- Laird, R. D., & Marrero, M. D. (2010). Information management and behavior problems: Is concealing misbehavior necessarily a sign of trouble? *Journal of Adolescence*, 33, 297–308.
- Laird, R. D., Marrero, M. D., & Sentse, M. (2010). Revisiting parental monitoring: Evidence that parental solicitation can be effective when needed most. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 39, 1431–1441.
- Lamborn, S. D., Dornbusch, S. M., & Steinberg, L. (1996). Ethnicity and community context as moderators of the relations between family decision making and adolescent adjustment. *Child Development*, 67, 283–301.
- Lansford, J. E., Chang, L., Dodge, K. A., Malone, P. S., Oburu, P., Palmerus, K., et al. (2005). Physical discipline and children's adjustment: Cultural normativeness as a moderator. *Child Development*, 76, 1234–1246.
- Larson, R. W. (2001). How U.S. children and adolescents spend time: What it does (and doesn't) tell us about their development. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 10, 160–164.
- Larson, R. W., Richards, M. H., Moneta, G., Holmbeck, G., & Duckett, E. (1996). Changes in adolescents' daily interactions with their families from ages 10 to 18: Disengagement and transformation. *Developmental Psychology*, 32, 744–754.
- Larson, R. W., Richards, M. H., Sims, B., & Dworkin, J. (2001). How urban African American young adolescents spend their time: Time budgets for locations, activities, and companionship. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 29, 565–597.

- Laursen, B., & Collins, W. A. (2009). Parent-child relationships during adolescence. In R. L. Lerner & L. Steinberg (Eds.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology* (3rd ed., Vol. 2, pp. 3–42). New York: Wiley.
- Laursen, B., Coy, K., & Collins, W. A. (1998). Reconsidering changes in parent-child conflict across adolescence: A meta-analysis. *Child Development*, 69, 817–832.
- Leatherdale, S. T., & Burkhalter, R. (2012). The substance use profile of Canadian youth: Exploring the prevalence of alcohol, drug, and tobacco use by gender and grade. *Addictive Behaviors*, 37, 318–322.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In E. M. Hetherington (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4. Socialization, personality, and social development* (pp. 1–102). New York: Wiley.
- Mahoney, J. L., Vandell, D. L., Simpkins, S., & Zarrett, Z. (2009). Adolescents' out-of-school activities. In L. Lerner & L. Steinberg (Eds.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology* (3rd ed., Vol. 2, pp. 228–269). New York: Wiley.
- Marshall, S. K., Tilton-Weaver, L. C., & Bosdet, L. (2005). Information management: Considering adolescents' regulation of parental knowledge. *Journal of Adolescence*, 28, 633–647.
- Mason, C., Walker-Barnes, C. J., Tu, S., Simons, J., & Martinez-Arrue, R. (2004). Ethnic differences in the affective meaning of parental control behaviors. *Journal of Primary Prevention*, 25, 59–79.
- McHale, S. M., Updegraff, K. A., & Whiteman, S. D. (2012). Sibling relationships and influences in childhood and adolescence. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 74, 913–930.
- Minuchin, P. (2002). Looking toward the horizon: Present and future in the study of family systems. In S. McHale & W. Grolnick (Eds.), *Retrospect and prospect in the psychological study of families* (pp. 259–278). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Moffitt, T. (2006). Life-course persistent versus adolescence-limited antisocial behavior. In D. Cichetti & D. Cohen (Eds.), *Developmental psychopathology* (2nd ed., pp. 570–598). New York: Wiley.
- Mounts, N. S. (2002). Parental management of adolescent peer relationships in context: The role of parenting style. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 16, 58–69.
- Mounts, N. S. (2008). Linkages between parenting and peer relationships: A model for parental management of adolescents' peer relationships. In M. Kerr, H. Stattin, & R. Engels (Eds.), *What can parents do?: New insight into the role of parents in adolescent problem behavior* (pp. 163–189). West Sussex, UK: Wiley.
- Mounts, N. S., & Kim, H. S. (2007). Parental goals regarding peer relationships and management of peers in multiethnic samples. In B. B. Brown & N. S. Mounts (Eds.), *Linking parents and family to adolescent peer relations: Ethnic and cultural considerations* (pp. 17–34). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ng, F. F.-Y., Pomerantz, E., & Deng, C. (2014). Why are Chinese mothers more controlling than American mothers?: “My child is my report card.” *Child Development*, 85(1), 355–367.
- Nucci, L. P. (1996). Morality and personal freedom. In E. S. Reed, E. Turiel, & T. Brown (Eds.), *Values and knowledge* (pp. 41–60). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Padilla-Walker, L. M., & Bean, R. A. (2009). Negative and positive peer influence: Relations to positive and negative behaviors for African American, European American, and Hispanic adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence*, 32, 323–337.
- Pettit, G. S., Laird, R. D., Bates, J. E., Dodge, K. A., & Criss, M. M. (2001). Antecedents and behavior-problem outcomes of parental monitoring and psychological control in early adolescence. *Child Development*, 72, 583–598.
- Rhodes, J. E., & Lowe, S. R. (2009). Mentoring in adolescence. In R. M. Lerner & L. Steinberg (Eds.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology* (Vol. 2, 3rd ed., pp. 152–190). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Schachter, F. F., & Stone, R. K. (1987). Comparing and contrasting siblings: Defining the self. *Journal of Children in Contemporary Society*, 19, 55–75.
- Shanahan, L., McHale, S. M., Crouter, A. C., & Osgood, D. W. (2007). Warmth with mothers

- and fathers from middle childhood to late adolescence: Within- and between-families comparisons. *Developmental Psychology*, 43, 551–563.
- Shanahan, L., McHale, S. M., Osgood, D. W., & Crouter, A. C. (2007). Conflict frequency mothers and fathers from middle childhood to late adolescence: Within- and between-families comparisons. *Developmental Psychology*, 43, 539–550.
- Sherrod, L. R., Torney-Purta, J., & Flanagan, C. A. (2010). *Handbook of research on civic engagement in youth*. New York: Wiley.
- Smetana, J. G. (2002). Culture, autonomy, and personal jurisdiction in adolescent–parent relationships. *Advances in Child Development and Behavior*, 29, 51–87.
- Smetana, J. G. (2011). *Adolescents, families, and social development: How teens construct their worlds*. West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Smetana, J. G., Campione-Barr, N., & Daddis, C. (2004). Developmental and longitudinal antecedents of family decision-making: Defining health behavioral autonomy for African American adolescents. *Child Development*, 75, 1418–1434.
- Smetana, J. G., & Daddis, C. (2002). Domain-specific antecedents of psychological control and parental monitoring: The role of parenting beliefs and practices. *Child Development*, 73, 563–580.
- Smetana, J. G., Villalobos, M., Tasopoulos-Chan, M., Gettman, D. C., & Campione-Barr, N. (2009). Early and middle adolescents' disclosure to parents about activities in different domains. *Journal of Adolescence*, 32, 693–713.
- Soenens, B., & Vansteenkiste, M. (2010). A theoretical upgrade of the concept of parental psychological control: Proposing new insights on the basis of self-determination theory. *Developmental Review*, 30, 74–99.
- Sorkhabi, N., & Mandara, J. (2013). Are the effects of Baumrind's parenting styles culturally specific or culturally equivalent? In R. E. Larzelere, A. S. Morris, & A. W. Harrist (Eds.), *Authoritative parenting: Synthesizing nurturance and discipline for optimal child development* (pp. 113–135). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Stattin, H., & Kerr, M. (2000). Parental monitoring: A reinterpretation. *Child Development*, 71, 1072–1085.
- Steinberg, L. (2008). A social neuroscience perspective on adolescent risk-taking. *Developmental Review*, 28, 78–106.
- Steinberg, L., & Morris, A. S. (2001). Adolescent development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 83–110.
- Tilton-Weaver, L., Kerr, M., Pakalniskeine, V., Tokic, A., Salihovic, S., & Stattin, H. (2010). Open up or close down: How do parental reactions affect youth information management? *Journal of Adolescence*, 33, 333–346.
- Tilton-Weaver, L. C., Burk, W. J., Kerr, M., & Stattin, H. (2013). Can parental monitoring and peer management reduce the selection or influence of delinquent peers?: Testing the question using a dynamic social network approach. *Development Psychology*, 49(11), 2057–2070.
- Tsai, K. M., Telzer, E. H., & Fuligni, A. J. (2013). Continuity and discontinuity in perceptions of family relationships from adolescence to young adulthood. *Child Development*, 84, 471–484.
- Turiel, E. (1983). *The development of social knowledge: Morality and convention*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Updegraff, K., Killoren, S., & Thayer, S. (2007). Mexican-origin parents' involvement in adolescent peer relationships: A pattern analytic approach. In B. Brown & N. S. Mounts (Eds.), *Linking parents and family to adolescent peer relations: Ethnic and cultural considerations* (pp. 51–65). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Updegraff, K. A., McHale, S. M., Whiteman, S. D., Thayer, S. M., & Crouter, A. C. (2006). The nature and correlates of Mexican-American adolescents' time with parents and peers. *Child Development*, 77, 1479–1486.
- Waizenhofer, R. N., Buchanan, C. M., & Jackson-Newsom, J. (2004). Mothers' and fathers' knowledge of adolescents' daily activities: Its sources and its links with adolescent adjustment. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 18, 348–360.

- Whiteman, S. D., & Buchanan, C. M. (2002). Mothers' and children's expectations for adolescence: The impact of perceptions of an older sibling's experience. *Journal of Family Psychology, 16*, 157–171.
- Whiteman, S. D., Jensen, A. C., & Maggs, J. L. (2014). Similarities and differences in adolescent siblings' alcohol-related attitudes, use, and delinquency: Evidence for convergent and divergent influence processes. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 43*(4), 687–697.
- Whiteman, S. D., McHale, S. M., & Crouter, A. C. (2003). What parents learn from experience: The first child as a first draft? *Journal of Marriage and Family, 65*, 608–621.
- Whiteman, S. D., McHale, S. M., & Crouter, A. C. (2007). Competing processes of sibling influence: Observational learning and sibling deidentification. *Social Development, 16*, 642–661.
- Wray-Lake, L., McHale, S., & Crouter, N. (2010). Developmental patterns in decision-making autonomy across middle childhood and adolescence: European American parents' perspectives. *Child Development, 81*, 636–651.
- Yau, J. Y., Tasopoulos-Chan, M., & Smetana, J. G. (2009). Disclosure to parents about everyday activities among American adolescents from Mexican, Chinese, and European backgrounds. *Child Development, 80*, 1481–1498.