



Life
Course
Centre

WORKING
PAPER
SERIES

No. 2024-12

April 2024

Understanding the Relationship Between Parenting Styles and the Risk of Sexual Violence Offending and Victimization

Madison Lloyd

The Australian Research Council Centre of Excellence
for Children and Families over the Life Course
Phone +61 7 3346 7477 Email lcc@uq.edu.au
lifecoursecentre.org.au



Australian Government
Australian Research Council



THE UNIVERSITY
OF QUEENSLAND
AUSTRALIA



THE UNIVERSITY OF
SYDNEY



THE UNIVERSITY OF
WESTERN
AUSTRALIA



THE UNIVERSITY OF
MELBOURNE

Research Summary

Why was the research done?

Despite the relationship between parenting behaviour and children's life course outcomes being strongly established within the literature, there is limited research concerning its impact on the risk of sexual violence offending and victimisation. The existing research concerning this relationship lacks a consistent framework and terminology, thereby creating issues when comparing findings and drawing conclusions. The following research paper aims to apply Baumrind's (1971) and Maccoby and Martin's (1983) parenting style typology to the sexual violence context to explore the nature of this relationship, while establishing an easily replicable structure of understanding this relationship.

What were the key findings?

The research revealed that authoritative parenting (a balance of demandingness and responsiveness) acted as a protective factor for both victimisation and offending. Non-authoritative parenting styles acted as a risk factor for victimisation and offending. However, the strength of this relationship differed across different types of sexual violence behaviours. Furthermore, parent and child gender played a significant role in determining the nature of the relationship. Further research into this phenomenon is recommended to explore the nuances of this relationship.

What does this mean for policy and practice?

The research findings suggest prevention programs and support services should consider family dynamics when drafting interventions for vulnerable persons. The research stresses the importance of education programs for expecting parents which explain the potential consequences (both positive and negative) of their parenting behaviours. Furthermore, the current study contributes to discourse about the intergenerational transmission of sexual violence, by highlighting the means through which sexual violence victimisation and offending is transferred from parent to child (Avery et al., 2002; Zuravin, et al., 1996).

Citation

Lloyd, M. (2024). 'Understanding the Relationship Between Parenting Styles and the Risk of Sexual Violence Offending and Victimisation', Life Course Centre Working Paper Series, 2024-12. Institute for Social Science Research, The University of Queensland.

The authors

Ms. Madison Lloyd

ARC Centre of Excellence for Children and Families over the Life Course

Email: madison.lloyd@uq.edu.au

www.lifecoursecentre.org.au

Acknowledgements/Funding Sources

This research was partially supported by the Australian Government through the Australian Research Council's Centre of Excellence for Children and Families over the Life Course. The paper utilised data from the Longitudinal Study of Australian Children (LSAC) data set.

DISCLAIMER: The content of this Working Paper does not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the Life Course Centre. Responsibility for any information and views expressed in this Working Paper lies entirely with the author(s).

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).



Abstract

Despite the pervasiveness and serious harms associated with sexual violence, the underlying causes of sexual violence are largely under-researched. Within the literature, certain parenting styles have been associated with risk of sexual violence victimisation and offending. However, the relationship lacks a consistent theoretical or conceptual framework, creating difficulties in accurately comparing study findings and making generalisability statements. This paper aims to address this by applying Baumrind's (1971) and Maccoby and Martin's (1983) parenting style typology to the context of sexual violence, by utilising data from the Longitudinal Survey of Australian Children (LSAC). Leveraging this data and multivariate regression models, I find statistically significant associations between non-authoritative parenting styles (authoritarian, permissive, and neglectful) in early adolescence and increased risk of sexual violence victimisation and offending during late adolescence. The findings highlight the significance of gender in mediating the impact of parenting styles on victimisation/offending risk. I also consider the impact of other factors on risk of victimisation/offending including peer problems. Considering the current study findings, it is recommended that sexual violence prevention policies consider exploring family dynamics to end the revolving cycle of generational sexual violence.

Chapter 1: Introduction

In the 2022 Personal Safety Survey, 22% of Australian women and 6.1% of men reported experiencing actual, attempted or threatened sexual assault since the age of 15 (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2023). Despite the pervasiveness of sexual violence, it remains underreported, under-researched, and largely misunderstood (Cense, 2019). Concerningly, sexual violence is associated with numerous lifelong psychological, physical, interpersonal, financial, and social harms (McNair & Boisvert, 2021). Sexual violence survivors are more likely to experience anxiety, depression, PTSD, limited self-agency, a lessened sense of self, and low self-esteem (Brown et al., 2013; Cense, 2019). Although definitions differ, for this paper, sexual violence is understood as an umbrella term that captures all forms of unwanted sexual behaviour, including verbal harassment, sexual gestures, unwanted touching, sex trafficking, sexual assault, and rape (Jansen, 2016). Sexual violence is inherently gendered, women are disproportionately affected by sexual violence, constituting the majority of survivors, while men constitute the majority of perpetrators (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2023; Jansen, 2016).

Despite its pervasive harms, there is limited research concerning the precursors to sexual violence offending and in particular, victimisation. The significance of parents in social development is documented and theorised extensively, yet its impact on sexual violence offending and victimisation is under-researched (Sigre-Leirós et al., 2016). The existing research is limited by a lack of a consistent theoretical framework, which limits accurate and reasonable comparison between study findings and the reliability of generalisability statements (Simons & Sutton, 2021). Thus, the primary aim of this paper is to apply an existing theoretical framework to improve understanding of the relationship between sexual violence victimisation and offending and parenting styles. To achieve this, Baumrind's (1971) and Maccoby and Martin's (1983) parenting style typology will be utilised as it aims to understand the influence of parental behaviour through differentiating and categorising patterns of parent behaviour (Baumrind, 1966; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Parenting styles influence a child's development of interpersonal skills, communication, empathy, emotional regulation, and attitudes (including gender and rape attitudes) (Baumrind, 1966; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). These factors may increase or decrease a child's risk of sexual violence offending or victimisation. Existing research has captured the relationship between sexual violence offending and victimisation and elements of the parenting style typology, thus highlighting

the need for further research into this relationship (Abeche et al., 2020; Aziwake et al., 2018; Conley et al., 2017; Maniglio, 2012; McMahon & Farmer, 2011; Sigre-Leirós et al., 2016).

The Longitudinal Study of Australian Children (LSAC) data set will be utilised to explore the impact of Baumrind's (1971) and Maccoby and Martin's (1983) parenting styles on risk of sexual violence victimisation and offending. To explore the relationship between parenting styles and the child's self-reported sexual violence experiences, multivariate regression models are utilised. Furthermore, the models separate parent and child gender, to explore the nuanced impact of gender on the phenomenon. Overall, the paper aims to answer the following research questions:

- (1) How do parenting styles in early adolescence influence risk of sexual violence victimisation and offending in late adolescence?
- (2) How does this relationship change when parent and child gender is considered?
- (3) How do external factors including Indigenous and Torres Strait Islander status, peer problems, family structure, and socio-economic status impact this relationship?

By answering these questions, the following paper aims to begin filling the literature gap concerning the impact of parenting on sexual violence victimisation and offending and provide guidance for meaningful prevention policies. It was hypothesised that authoritative parenting would act as a protective factor and that all non-authoritative parenting styles would increase risk of experiencing both sexual violence victimisation and offending. It was also hypothesised that parents who were the same sex as the study child would have a greater influence on their risk of victimisation/offending.

The following paper is structured as follows. In Chapter 2, I explore Baumrind's (1971) and Maccoby and Martin's (1983) parenting style typology and the existing literature concerning the associated outcomes. I then explore the discourse concerning the influence of parenting on sexual violence victimisation and offending. In Chapter 3, I explain the current study's methodology and the means by which I accomplish my analyses. In Chapter 4, I present and describe my findings. Finally, in Chapter 5, key findings are discussed within the context of the discourse presented in Chapter 2. The chapter concludes by discussing the study's limitations, wider implications, and future directions.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Conceptualising “parenting style”

For over 75 years, parenting and its role in child development has been the subject of extensive research from various scientific and humanitarian disciplines (Akers et al., 1979; Baumrind, 1971; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Since then, researchers have argued how parenting behaviour can be measured most effectively; considering parental practices, dimensions, and styles (Baumrind, 1991; Cummings et al., 2000; Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Parenting practices refer to discrete behaviours expressed by parents to socialise their children (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). In addition to parenting behaviours, other researchers broadened their scope to broader parenting dimensions which model parenting based on grouped behaviours (Cummings et al., 2000). Where academics analyse the relationship between two dimensions, parenting support and parental control. Parenting support consists of the affective nature of the relationship (i.e. parental involvement, acceptance, emotional availability, warmth and responsiveness) (Cummings et al., 2000). The parental control dimension considers both the behavioural and psychological control the parent expresses over the child (Barber, 1996). Behavioural control refers to attempts to regulate child behaviour through rules and discipline, while psychological control refers to attempts to manipulate the child’s feelings (Barber, 1996). High parental support and behavioural control are associated with positive child development (Barber, 1996). High psychological control is associated with negative child development (Barber, 1996). Parenting styles combined aspects of both conceptualisations, thus providing a nuanced lens on parenting behaviour (Baumrind, 1966). For this paper, "parenting style" is defined as the culmination of a parent's attitudes and behaviours expressed towards their child, and the emotional climate by which this is expressed (Darling & Steinberg, 1993).

Parenting style typology

In 1966 Baumrind sought to develop a parenting typology that captured normative parenting. Her typology infers that a specific combination of parenting behaviour is more impactful upon a child’s development than separate parenting practices or dimensions (Baumrind, 1966). Unlike parenting practice and dimensions, parenting styles consider that various behaviour patterns may exist within one parent (Baumrind, 1991). Thus, parenting styles is an individual-focused approach, rather than a variable-centred approach which analyses relationships

between variables across individuals to identify parenting dimensions (Magnusson, 1998). In 1971, Baumrind proposed three parenting styles to describe normative parenting behaviour; authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive (Baumrind, 1971). She proposed authoritarian parents aim to shape, control, and evaluate their child's behaviour based on absolute standards (Baumrind, 1971). Permissive parents are emotionally supportive and more likely to encourage child autonomy rather than implement absolute standards (Baumrind, 1971). Authoritative parenting fell between these two styles, balancing strong standards and adequate emotional support (Baumrind, 1971).

In 1983 Maccoby and Martin combined Baumrind's (1971) parenting typology with the parenting dimensions framework, to create a two-by-two parenting typology. They classified parenting behaviour by measuring the presence of responsiveness and demandingness (Baumrind, 1971; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). In the context of parental typology, responsiveness refers to "the extent to which parents intentionally foster individuality, self-regulation, and self-assertion by being attuned, supportive, and acquiescent to children's special needs and demands" (Baumrind, 1971; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Parenting behaviours that demonstrate high responsiveness are accepting, sensitive, comforting, reasonable, and involved (Baumrind, 1971; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Examples of high parental responsiveness include a receptive conversation with the child, consistent affection, and reasonable responses to sickness and failure (Baumrind, 1971; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Demandingness refers to "the claims parents make on children by their maturity demands, supervision, disciplinary efforts and willingness to confront the child who disobeys" (Baumrind, 1991, pp. 61–62). Behaviours that demonstrate high parental demandingness include child monitoring, setting behavioural standards, and the enforcement of consequences for violating these standards (Simon & Sutton, 2021). When combined, responsiveness and demandingness create a two-by-two typology consisting of four parenting styles; authoritative (high responsiveness, high demandingness), authoritarian (low responsiveness, high demandingness), neglectful (low responsiveness, low demandingness), and permissive (high responsiveness, low demandingness) (Baumrind, 1971; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). This parenting style framework has been used extensively throughout multi-disciplinary research, including exploring BMI, and mental and physical health (Goldman-Mellor, 2012; Surikova et al., 2020; Taylor et al., 2020). Despite the

typology's wide use, it has yet to be applied to understanding sexual violence offending or victimisation.

Figure 1: Maccoby and Martin's (1983) and Baumrind's (1991) parenting style typology.

	High Responsiveness	Low Responsiveness
High Demandingness	Authoritative	Authoritarian
Low Demandingness	Permissive	Neglectful

Authoritative

Of the four parenting styles, authoritative parenting (high responsiveness, high demandingness) has consistently been associated with the most favourable life course outcomes (Baumrind, 1991). These include psychosocial competence (maturity, resilience, optimism, self-esteem) and academic achievement (Baumrind, 1991; Lamborn et al. 1991; Steinberg et al. 1994). Authoritative parenting involves behaviours that balance supportiveness, and responsiveness (Kuppens & Ceulemans, 2019). Authoritative parents control behaviour through reasonable rules and consequences which are communicated to the child (Kuppens & Ceulemans, 2019). Although its advantageous effects on childhood development are consistent across ethnic, socioeconomic and age groups, authoritative parenting is less common in minority and poorer families (Simons et al., 2013; Spera, 2005; Steinberg et al., 2006).

Some scholars suggest that the effect of authoritarian parenting may differ across ethnic groups (Simons et al., 2013; Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2008). American research has consistently demonstrated that Authoritarian parenting is more common among African-American parents versus Euro-American parents (Jennifer et al., 2011; LeCuyer et al., 2011; LeCuyer & Swanson, 2017). Simons and colleagues suggest that for African-American youth, Authoritarian parenting may have a pro-social impact on behaviour, including deterring delinquency (2023). They theorise that authoritarian parenting is normalised within African-American culture, and is perceived by some as an indication of parental care and concern within a racially charged society (Mason et al., 2004; McLloyd & Smith, 2002). It is possible that a similar phenomenon occurs within the Australian context (amongst Indigenous Australians and Asian communities), however, researchers have yet to explore this possibility. It should be noted that this phenomenon is severely under-researched, with some scholars suggesting authoritarian parenting has a consistent effect across African and European

Americans (LeCuyer & Swanson, 2017). Thus, highlighting the necessity of future research into this phenomenon.

Authoritarian

Authoritarian parenting (high demandingness, low responsiveness) is associated with negative developmental outcomes. Authoritarian parenting is driven by the parent, where the parent controls all aspects of a child's behaviour, based on strict expectations (Baumrind, 1991). Authoritarian parents tend to utilise negative reinforcement to discipline the child and are impatient with undesirable behaviour (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Unlike authoritative parenting, communication is one-sided, where the child's social, emotional, and behavioural needs are rarely considered (Baumrind, 1991). Associated life course outcomes include perfectionism, ambition, aggression, delinquency, depersonalisation, low self-esteem, inhibited moral reasoning, and anxiety (Hoeve et al., 2008; Kuppens & Ceulemans, 2019; Steinberg et al. 1994).

Neglectful

Neglectful parenting (low demandingness, low responsiveness) is consistently associated with the poorest life course outcomes for children. Neglectful parenting is characterised by a parent's lack of response to their child's needs, wants and emotions beyond basic physical needs (Baumrind, 1991). Neglectful parents provide limited behaviour expectations or rules, monitoring, or support (Kuppens & Ceulemans, 2019). Consistently, children with neglectful parents demonstrate poor self-regulation, social responsibility, self-reliance and competence, school competence, delinquency, anxiety and depression (Hoeve et al., 2008; Lamborn et al., 1991; Steinberg et al., 1994).

Permissive

Permissive parenting (high responsiveness, low demandingness) is generally associated with poor outcomes (Baumrind, 1991). The parenting behaviour is characterised by warm, supporting, loving parents who lack rules or discipline for their child (Baumrind, 1991). Permissive parenting is associated with internalised (anxiety, depression, withdrawal), externalised (school misconduct, delinquency) problem behaviour and low social skills,

confidence and understanding are observed (Lamborn et al. 1991; Steinberg et al. 1994; Williams et al. 2009; Wolfradt et al. 2003).

Sexual violence offending and parenting styles

The role of parenting on life-course outcomes has been the subject of extensive multi-disciplinary research. Throughout the criminology discipline, it is widely accepted that “poor parenting” is associated with childhood delinquency, thus evolving to criminality in adulthood (Simons & Sutton, 2021). Considering the nuanced circumstances of sexual violence assault offending, applying traditional conceptualisations of offending pathways may not be accurate. Thus, the current study aims to explore other pathways to criminality within the sexual violence context.

Although the relationship between parenting and criminality has been investigated thoroughly, there has been a limited effort to investigate the relationship between parenting and sexual violence offending. Historically, the relationship between parenting and sexual deviance was conceptualised within micro-criminological theories (primarily interested in the individual) (Spraitz, 2011). Thus, sexual deviance was exclusively associated with “bad” parenting (Spraitz, 2011). Adult sexual crime specifically was associated with sexual trauma or unresolved problems in early childhood (Marshall & Barabee, 1990; Ward et al., 1995). Controversial scholar Sigmund Freud suggested children with parents who were overly harsh or indulgent were at greater risk of sexual deviance as they created an anxious and insecure environment, thereby disrupting the normal developmental process (Freud, 1977). Although problematic, Freud's thinking guided future exploration of the relationship between parenting and sexual deviance (Cocks, 2015; Crews, 1998).

Recently, scholars have begun to explore the association between sexual violence offending and aspects of parenting dimensions. However, Baumrind's (1971) and Maccoby and Martin's (1983) parenting typology has not been explicitly utilised. The existing research lacks a consistent theoretical or methodological approach, thus reducing the reliability of generalisability statements (Simons & Sutton, 2021). Concerning the responsiveness dimension, Maniglio (2012) found that poor parental attachment fosters feelings of inferiority, inadequacy, and poor social skills within the child. Maniglio argues these feelings increase the risk of sexual violence offending as they may find greater difficulty in forming genuine intimate relationships thus causing sexual frustration (Maniglio, 2012). They argue

this causes disengagement with reality, and engagement with deviant sexual fantasies to satisfy attachment-related needs (Maniglio, 2012). Similarly, Sigre-Leirós and colleagues (2016) found that rapists and non-paedophilic and paedophilic child molesters were more likely to have experienced a lack of parental warmth (i.e. responsiveness) than their non-offending counterparts. Interestingly, they found that rapists were more likely to have experienced a lack of parental warmth from their father (Sigre-Leirós et al., 2016). Conversely, the paedophile population were more likely to have experienced a lack of parental warmth from their mother (Sigre-Leirós et al., 2016). Concerning the demandingness dimension, Basile and colleagues (2018) found that a sharp decrease in parental monitoring during adolescence increases the risk of sexual violence offending. Furthermore, Aziwake and colleagues (2018) found a strong association between parenting style and attitudes towards rape victims. They found Authoritarian parenting in particular, was a key predictor of attitudes towards rape victims (Aziwake et al., 2018). Although they found that peer pressure was a more significant independent predictor, when combined with parenting behaviour the reaction compounds (Aziwake et al., 2018). Thereby reinforcing the significance of both school and family environments. While research exploring the relationship between parenting styles and sexual violence offending is limited, research exploring its relationship with sexual violence victimisation is even more sparse.

Sexual violence victimisation and parenting styles

Before exploring the relationship between parenting behaviour and sexual violence victimisation, it is important to clarify that this does not equate to “victim-blaming”. No matter the circumstances, a victim is never at fault for their own victimisation. In this paper, all discussions of precursors to victimisation are grounded in the understanding that structural factors (e.g., sexism, misogyny, gender inequalities) and the behaviour of individual perpetrators are the ultimate causes of sexual violence victimisation. All efforts to prevent sexual violence must begin by addressing these root causes. However, the analyses presented in this paper are motivated by the understanding that different levels of the social ecological model—e.g., institutions and norms at the macro level and families, schools, and communities at the meso level—are closely intertwined and interact to shape an individual’s vulnerability to sexual violence victimization. Thus, it is important to examine the correlates

of the sexual violence victimization across all levels of the social to identify additional points of intervention to decrease its incidence.

The relationship between sexual violence victimisation and parenting is severely under-researched. This is particularly concerning when the high risk of repeat victimisation and the intergenerational cycle of violence is considered (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2021). The 2016 personal safety survey revealed 60% of women and 51% of men who experienced sexual assault experienced it more than once (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2021). Research has developed a link between a mother's sexual violence victimisation and the increased risk of their child also experiencing sexual violence victimisation (Avery et al., 2002; Zuravin, et al., 1996). This intergenerational transmission is theorised to be a result of the harms associated with sexual violence victimisation (psychological, physical, interpersonal, financial, and social) which culminate to create a negative environment for children, thus increasing their risk of sexual violence victimisation (Noll et al., 2009). Marshall and colleagues (2022) found that the risk of sexual violence transmission is increased when low levels of parental attachment (i.e. responsiveness) are reported.

Historically, scholars predicted that learned social norms and gender attitudes passed from parent to child may increase vulnerability to sexual violence victimisation (Flood & Pearse, 2009; Paolucci et al., 2001). Research has demonstrated the intergenerational transmission of rigid gender roles and attitudes, including relationship power dynamics, respect, and the role of sex within relationships (McMahon & Farmer, 2011; Perales et al., 2021). Within relationships, these attitudes can increase vulnerability to sexual violence victimisation by creating norms and an environment that facilitates it (McMahon & Farmer, 2011). For example, attitudes towards female vulnerability (which implies women are responsible for their safety by maintaining modesty and chastity), are associated with an increased risk of sexual violence victimisation when deviation from these expectations occurs (McMahon & Farmer, 2011). Historical beliefs about male entitlement and "sexual conquest" reinforced the notion that men have the right to exert control over women, thereby justifying and trivialising sexual violence (McMahon & Farmer, 2011). Some scholars argued that modelling these traditional beliefs in front of children increases their likelihood of victimisation (Flood & Pearse, 2009; Paolucci et al., 2001).

Recently, theorists have begun exploring beyond the role of a "bad parent" in understanding sexual violence victimisation. Similarly to research understanding sexual

violence offending, only parallel aspects of Baumrind's (1971) and Maccoby and Martin's (1983) parenting typology have been used. Neglectful parenting has been consistently associated with an increased risk of sexual violence victimisation among women (Conley et al., 2017). Interestingly, Conley and colleagues (2017) found that amongst men, peer deviance was identified as a greater predictor of sexual violence victimisation than neglectful parenting. Contrarily, Abeche and colleagues (2021) later found that male sexual violence victims were more likely to experience “riskier” parenting styles than their non-victimised peers. Thus, highlighting the necessity of future research into this relationship before making generalisations (Abeche et al., 2020; Conley et al., 2017). Some scholars theorise that children who are raised by neglectful parents are more susceptible to sexual violence victimisation due to a lack of guidance, support, and protection (Abeche et al., 2020; Ferguson et al., 2008). Meanwhile, other scholars argue that children with parents who are emotionally available but fail to enforce rules or boundaries are more likely to experience sexual violence victimisation (McMahon and Farmer, 2011). They link the lack of guidance and structure within the parent-child relationship affects the child’s ability to recognise and establish appropriate boundaries within intimate relationships (McMahon & Farmer, 2011).

Protective parenting styles have also been explored within the literature, especially those styles that encourage open conversations (i.e. authoritative and permissive). Conversations between parent and child about consent, self-empowerment, self-worth, sexual boundaries, and promoting sexual agency have been identified as protective factors for sexual violence victimisation (Jozkowski et al., 2014; Ulamn & Najdowski, 2011). The conversations act as protective factors as they equip the child with the necessary tools to recognise and avoid potential victimisation risks (Senn et al., 2015). Those parenting styles that do not encourage open conversations about sexuality and boundaries (i.e. authoritarian and neglectful) fail to offer the child this protective factor, thereby increasing their likelihood of victimisation when compared to their peers (Jozkowski et al., 2014).

Child and parent gender interactions

Parent and child gender is a key mediator of the impact of parenting styles on life-course outcomes. The existing literature concerning parenting styles has identified different interactions depending on the child’s gender (Shek, 2002; Zhang et al., 2006). Shek (2002) found an association between parental negativity and adolescent conflict only within the

daughter sample. They theorise this interaction reflects the differing socialisation goals for girls and boys. Where girls are more family-oriented (thus more cohesion with parenting style), and boys are more oriented towards autonomy and self-reliance (Shek, 2002; Zhang et al., 2006). However, some researchers argue this difference is insignificant (Xinwen et al., 2018). Instead, it suggests that the interactions between daughter and mother/father, and son and mother/father are more descriptive (Bi et al., 2018). When exploring the relationship between parenting styles and child autonomy, Bi and colleagues (2018) found that the interactions between same-sex parents and children are stronger than those with the opposite-sex child. They found that this relationship was particularly strong for mothers and daughters (Bi et al., 2018). The current study seeks to explore the relationship between the risk of sexual violence offending/victimisation and parent/child gender. Considering the gendered aspect of sexual violence, it is expected that a gendered trend may emerge, where same-sex parent/child relationships will have a greater impact on sexual violence risk.

My review of the existing literature has highlighted a clear knowledge gap concerning the influence of parenting on the risk of sexual offending and victimisation. My paper aims to address these gaps by applying Baumrind's (1971) and Maccoby and Martin's (1983) parenting style framework to the sexual violence context. Considering what was explored in the literature, it is hypothesised that authoritative parenting will act as a protective factor against both sexual violence offending and victimisation, and non-authoritative parenting will act as a risk factor. As supported by the literature, it is also hypothesised this interaction will be strengthened when parent and child are of the same gender. The application of the parenting typology will ideally provide an easily replicable structure of understanding how parenting impacts the risk of sexual violence offending and victimisation.

Chapter 3: Method

Sample

To investigate the relationship between parenting styles and sexual violence offending/victimisation, a sample was drawn from the 'Longitudinal Study of Australian Children' (LSAC). LSAC explores children's development and life trajectories through questions about family, education, childcare, well-being, and health (Department of Social Services, 2022). Study children were randomly selected (using postcode clustered sampling) for participation using the Health Insurance Commission Medicare enrolment database (Sanson et al., 2002). LSAC utilises a multi-method approach to collecting data, however household face-to-face interviews with the participating families are the cornerstone of the data collection process. For each study child multiple respondents are asked to participate, including the study child, their primary and secondary caregiver, and childcare providers. Additional data sources including administrative records from government agencies is utilised to provide supplementary information on education, health care utilisation, and social services receipt (Department of Social Services, 2022). The sample is comprised of 10,000 Australian children and their close relatives. The sample involves two cohorts, birth cohort (B) which comprises those who were 0-1 years old during the first wave of data collection, and kindergarten cohort (K) who were 4-5 years old (Department of Social Services, 2022). Due to the relevance of the questions asked of each cohort, only cohort K, comprising 4,983 children, was used for the current study.

Constructing independent and dependent variables

Constructing parenting styles

The LSAC has previously been utilised to explore the relationship between Baumrind's (1971) and Maccoby and Martin's (1983) parenting styles and life course outcomes, including BMI (Taylor et al., 2011). Taylor and colleagues explored the longitudinal relationship between parenting and BMI utilising LSAC. The current study was inspired by Taylor and colleagues' and replicated their construction of parenting style scale, including the LSAC survey questions used to comprise the parenting dimensions.

Although the impact of parenting on the study child is a gradual process, spanning the entire length of childhood and adolescence, sociologists argue that early adolescence (ages 10-13) is a key turning point in shaping attitudes towards sexuality, consent, and relationships

(Goldberg & Carlson, 2014). As children are particularly malleable at this point, it is expected that parenting styles will impact the development of these attitudes, thus affecting the likelihood of risky sexual behaviours (Goldberg & Carlson, 2014). Considering this, parenting style data is observed when the study child is 11-12 years old. The intersection of reported parenting behaviour at study child ages 11-12 and victimisation/offending experience at study child ages 16-19 allows an accurate chronological depiction of the impact of parenting in early adolescence on risk of sexual violence victimisation/offending during late adolescence.

The two-by-two parenting style typology was created by dichotomising two parenting dimensions; responsiveness and demandingness. These dimensions were created by consideration of items relating to existing parenting scales. Responsiveness was assessed based on item means from the parental warmth scale of the child-rearing questionnaire (Sanson et al., 2002). The parental warmth scale measures the frequency parents express warm or affectionate behaviour to their child. Questions involved included “How often do you express affection by hugging, kissing and holding your eldest child?”. The demandingness dimension was developed by a single-item measure; “If you make a request of (child), how often do you make sure that he/she follows through on that request?”. The item was picked from the parenting “control” scale, other items in the scale were excluded due to the equation of control and punishment. Which is irrelevant to the parenting dimension. Although single-item measures are often critiqued for unreliability, they have been previously successfully utilised for exploring discrete behaviours (Gardner et al., 1988; Wanous et al., 1997). All the parenting response items were measured on a 1-5 Likert scale, where 1 inferred (never/almost never) and 5 inferred (always, almost always). It should be noted that all parenting items are self-reported by the parents, thus social desirability bias may affect its’ accuracy. Within the victimisation sample (study child age 18-19), 95.81% of fathers and 96.44% of mothers self-reported demonstrating high demandingness, and 93.61% of fathers and 98.10% of mothers reported high responsiveness. Within the offending sample (study child age 16-17) 95.92% of fathers and 96.4% of mothers self-reported demonstrating high demandingness, and 93.47% of fathers and 98% of mothers reported high responsiveness. The four parenting styles were created by dichotomising the responsiveness and demandingness dimensions at value ‘3’ to produce high/low scores. The parenting style

variables were then labelled according to Baumrind's (1971) and Maccoby and Martin's (1983) framework.

Unfortunately, the parenting style variables contained a large quantity of missing data, particularly concerning fathers (28.32% of victimisation sample fathers and 27.86% of offending sample fathers were missing). This missing data is likely due to the LSAC data collection method, which requires only the primary caregiver (overrepresented by mothers) to complete survey questions (Zubrick et al., 2014). The secondary caregiver is encouraged to complete the survey but is required to complete and return the survey autonomously ((Zubrick et al., 2014). To avoid losing all observations where one parent was missing, missing data were included within the parenting style variables as a fifth category (missing mothers and missing fathers). To qualify for this category one parent must have completed parenting behaviour data, and the other must have left the survey incomplete. With caution, this category could be interpreted as a fifth parenting style, where the parent is not present (due to work or personal issues) or is uninterested or unmotivated in completing the LSAC.

Measuring victimisation and offending

As part of the respectful relationships section, LSAC explored nine questions about the study child's experience of sexual violence, both victimisation and offending over the last 12 months. Although all nine types of sexual violence were initially explored, due to the limited scope of the project only the more serious forms of offending are reported upon. To model victimisation, three items were used. The captured items are persistent unwanted requests to hook up, pressure to have sex, and attempted rape/rape/sexual assault. Two items were used to model offending, verbal harassment, and persistent requests to hook up. Although the survey questions asked about the frequency of sexual violence experience, the variables were collapsed to a binary, where experience was measured by never or at least once.

Likely due to ethical constraints, questions about sexual violence victimisation and offending were asked during different waves. Questions regarding sexual violence victimisation were asked during wave 8 (study child age 18-19), and questions regarding offending were asked during wave 7 (study child age 16-17). These demographics support the existing research which suggests men aged 18-24 have the highest rates of sexual violence victimisation, while men aged 15-19 have the highest perpetration rates (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2023; Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, 2020). Due to the age difference

between the variables, two separate analytic samples were created: the victimisation sample and the offending sample. To qualify for each, the study child must have complete parenting behaviour data (collected during wave 4), sexual violence victimisation or offending data (waves 7 or 8), and control variables (wave 4). The samples were considered separately during the analysis.

When constructing the analytic samples, missing data were noted. Within wave 7 (study child age 16-17), 5.08% of the sample had missing offending data. Within wave 8 (study child age 18-19) a larger quantity of missing data were noticed, 19.91% of the sample had missing victimisation data. A larger quantity of missing data were expected due to the sensitivity of the victimisation questions.

Controls

Several variables within the LSAC are hypothesised to have independent contributions towards the risk of sexual violence victimisation and offending. To ensure a nuanced understanding of the unique impact of parenting styles, these items were included as controls within the analysis. The controls were observed at study child age 11-12, to demonstrate the accurate chronological depiction of the impact of parenting in early adolescence on later risk of sexual violence victimisation/offending. As informed by the literature, Indigenous and Torres Strait Islander status was included to determine potential differences in parenting styles (Simons et al., 2013). Family structure (measured by one- or two-parent household) was included to explore potential differences in the impact of single parents. Socioeconomic status (SES) was also considered through the inclusion of the SES scale created by the Australian Institute of Family Studies (Baker et al., 2017). In determining socioeconomic status, the SES scale considers household weekly income, parents' school completion, parents' highest qualification, parents' occupational status, and family structure (one- or two-parent household) (Baker et al., 2017). The peer problems scale was also included to compare the significance of parenting styles (Aziwake et al., 2018). The peer problems scale measures the extent of self-reported peer problems by providing a mean of a series of questions about the SC's experiences with peers. The questions were measured on a Likert scale of 1-10, where 10 infers extreme peer problems. The questions asked to what extent each statement reflects their experiences over the last six months. Statements include "other children or young people pick on me or bully me". When combined, the questions provide an insightful

look into the SC's extent of peer socialisation. Within wave 4 (ages 10-11), missing control data ranged from 0.05% to 1.82%.

Analysis

All analyses were conducted using StataSE (version 17). To explore the impact of parenting styles on the risk of sexual violence victimisation/offending, a series of multivariate logistic regression models were conducted. Analyses were separated by victimisation/offending type and were only conducted within the created analytic samples. Analyses for the mother and father were conducted within the same model, whilst adjusting for the listed controls. Statistical significance was determined at equal to or less than alpha level 0.05.

Chapter 4: Results

Relationship between parenting styles and victimisation

Victimisation descriptive statistics

2,530 respondents within the study sample qualified for the victimisation sample. Within this sample, 50.40% were boys, 49.6% were girls, 58.34% were 18 years old, 41.34% were 19 years old, and 0.32% were 20 years old. 85.87% of the victimisation sample reported having two parents living within the household, 46.90% reported having an above-average socio-economic status, and 8.09% reported as high (scored 5 or above) on the peer problems scale. Unfortunately, due to sampling limitations within the LSAC data set, Indigenous and Torres Strait Islander (TSI) peoples were underrepresented within the study. Indigenous and TSI peoples constituted only 1.74% of the victimisation sample.

The mothers within the sample were overwhelmingly authoritative (92.57%), followed by permissive (3.08%), authoritarian (1.50%), and neglectful (0.40%). 2.50% of mothers were missing from the sample. Similarly, 64.47% of fathers were authoritative, followed by authoritarian (4.23%), permissive (2.65%), and neglectful (0.36%). 28.3% of fathers were missing from the sample. A chi-squared test was completed to determine the frequency of parenting style combinations within the victimisation sample. Pearson's chi-squared statistic determined there was a significant association between mother and father's parenting style (81.78). The most common combination was authoritative mother and father (59.96%),

followed by authoritative mother and missing father (26.05%), and authoritative mother and authoritarian father (3.99%).

Table 1: Frequency of parenting style combination within the victimisation sample.

Mother parenting style	Father parenting style					Total
	Authoritative	Authoritarian	Permissive	Neglectful	Missing	
Authoritative	1,517 (59.96%)	101 (3.99%)	59 (2.33%)	6 (0.24%)	659 (26.05%)	2,342 (92.57%)
Authoritarian	17 (0.67%)	4 (0.16%)	2 (0.08%)	0 (0.00%)	14 (0.55%)	37 (1.46%)
Permissive	38 (1.50%)	1 (0.04%)	5 (0.20%)	2 (0.08%)	32 (1.26%)	78 (3.08%)
Neglectful	3 (0.12%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.04%)	6 (0.24%)	10 (0.40%)
Missing	56 (2.21%)	1 (0.04%)	1 (0.04%)	0 (0.00%)	5 (0.20%)	63 (2.49%)
Total	1,631 (64.47%)	107 (4.23%)	67 (2.65%)	9 (0.36%)	716 (28.30%)	2,530 (100%)

Pearson chi2(16) = 81.7829 Pr = 0.000

Within the victimisation sample, there were 1,035 separate reports of experiencing forms of sexual violence victimisation (note respondents could report more than one form of victimisation). 22.72% of the victimisation sample reported experiencing at least one form of sexual violence victimisation. The most common form of victimisation was persistent unwanted hook-up requests, which 19.41% of the sample had experienced, followed by pressure to have sex (13.68%), other unwelcome sexual conduct (9.25%), and attempted rape/rape (7.83%).

Aligning with the existing literature, the results demonstrate the gendered nature of sexual harassment victimisation, as women consistently reported greater rates of victimisation when compared to the male sample (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2023; Cense, 2019). 31.18% of women and 14.36% of men within the victimisation sample reported experiencing at least one form of sexual violence victimisation. Aligning with the existing literature, the high correlation coefficients indicate those who have experienced a form of sexual harassment previously are more likely to be victimised again (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2021). This relationship was particularly strong between pressure to have sex and attempted rape/rape victimisation ($p = .011$, $\rho = .613$). The relationship between experiencing persistent requests to hook up and attempted rape/rape ($p = .303$) was slightly smaller yet remains statistically significant.

Table 2: Percentage of the sample who have experienced sexual violence victimisation at least once according to type of victimisation.

	Female	Male	Total
Persistent unwanted hook-up requests	331 (26.37% of women)	160 (12.55% of men)	491 (19.41% of sample)
Pressured to have sex	208 (16.57% of women)	138 (10.82% of men)	346 (13.68% of sample)
Attempted rape/rape	112 (8.92% of women)	86 (6.75% of men)	198 (7.83% of sample)
Total responses	651	384	1,035

Multivariate regression analysis

The relationship between parenting styles and sexual violence victimisation was explored through numerous logistic regression models. The models were stratified by sex to understand the influence of child and parent gender on the risk of victimisation. Due to the limited sample of neglectful parents, some observations were automatically omitted when the model was being estimated. Overall, there were more significant findings for daughters than sons, which may be a reflection of the larger sample of daughters or that a daughter's risk of victimisation is more vulnerable to mediation by parenting behaviour.

The first model revealed that daughters with permissive mothers were less likely than those with authoritative mothers to experience persistent requests to hook up (OR = .37, $p = .041$). Daughters who had fathers with missing parenting data were at 1.358 greater odds ($p = .031$) of experiencing persistent requests to hook up victimisation than those with authoritative fathers, holding the mother's parenting style constant. These results held when control variables were added to the models. None of the control variables were significantly associated with persistent requests to hook up victimisation once parenting styles were accounted for.

Table 3: Exploring the association between parenting styles and risk of persistent requests to hook-up victimisation.

	Model 1: Daughters		Model 2: Sons	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Mother's parenting style (reference = authoritative)				
Authoritarian	1.5621	0.6103, 3.9978	0.4510	0.0592, 3.4335
Permissive	0.3696*	0.1426, 0.9587	1.5152	0.6480, 3.5427
Neglectful	1.4508	0.3331, 6.32	1	Omitted
Missing	0.8762	0.3710, 2.0696	0.9577	0.3309, 2.7722
Father's parenting style (reference = authoritative)				
Authoritarian	0.5277	0.2311, 1.2048	0.8803	0.3900, 1.9866

Permissive	1.2291	0.5556, 2.7190	0.6037	0.1807, 2.0166
Neglectful	1.0820	0.1022, 11.4529	4.2241	0.6887, 25.9079
Missing	1.3580*	1.0278, 1.7944	0.9726	0.6677, 1.4168

Statistical significance: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table 4: Exploring the impact of controls on the association between parenting styles and risk of persistent requests to hook-up victimisation.

	Model 1: Daughters		Model 2: Sons	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Mother's parenting style (reference = authoritative)				
Authoritarian	1.5741	0.6113, 4.0535	0.4269	0.0558, 3.2649
Permissive	0.3577*	0.1374, 0.9312	1.5322	0.6482, 3.6218
Neglectful	1.4759	0.3372, 6.4604	1	Omitted
Missing	0.9707	0.3983, 2.3660	1.1201	0.3679, 3.4098
Father's parenting style (reference = authoritative)				
Authoritarian	0.5396	0.2352, 1.2379	0.8616	0.3810, 1.9488
Permissive	1.2436	0.5610, 2.7569	0.5766	0.1718, 1.9358
Neglectful	1.0690	0.0987, 11.5788	4.1460	0.6737, 25.5139
Missing	1.4253*	1.0116, 2.0082	1.1289	0.7205, 1.7688
Control variables				
Indigenous and TSI status	1.1652	0.4696, 2.8917	1.1234	0.3180, 3.9688
Peer problems scale	1.0608	0.9816, 1.1465	0.9629	0.8761, 1.0584
SES	1.0499	0.9205, 1.1975	0.8915	0.7467, 1.0645
Family structure (two parents)	1.0742	0.6894, 1.6736	1.6272	0.8714, 3.0384

Statistical significance: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

When exploring the impact of parenting styles on the risk of being pressured to have sex, associations were significant for daughters only. When holding the supporting parent constant, among daughters, authoritarian mothers increased the odds of victimisation by a factor of 2.76 ($p = .034$) and missing fathers increased the odds of victimisation by a factor of 1.42 ($p = .037$) when compared to respective authoritative parents. When controlled, the significance of authoritarian mothers remained but slightly decreased (OR = 2.548, $p = .053$). Once controlled the influence of missing fathers on daughters victimisation escaped statistical significance ($p = .208$). The peer problems scale was just statistically significant in predicting the daughter's victimisation. For every one-point increase in a daughter's score on the peer problems scale, her odds of being victimized increased by a factor of 1.09 ($p = .05$).

Table 5: Exploring the association between parenting styles and risk of being pressured to have sex victimisation.

	Model 1: Daughters		Model 2: Sons	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Mother's parenting style (reference = authoritative)				
Authoritarian	2.7649*	1.0801, 7.0777	1	Omitted
Permissive	0.6864	0.2629, 1.7920	1.4709	0.5946, 3.6386

Neglectful	1.3987	0.2680, 7.3002	1	Omitted
Missing	1.1092	0.4174, 2.9476	1.4573	0.5506, 3.8569
Father's parenting style (reference = authoritative)				
Authoritarian	0.9590	0.4143, 2.2199	1.2106	0.5573, 2.6300
Permissive	1.0566	0.3964, 2.8166	0.7250	0.2162, 2.4309
Neglectful	1.8897	0.1817, 19.6593	5.0111	0.8157, 30.7852
Missing	1.4161*	1.0216, 1.9631	0.9000	0.5971, 1.3565

Statistical significance: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table 6: Exploring the impact of controls on the association between parenting styles and risk of being pressured to have sex victimisation.

	Model 1: Daughters		Model 2: Sons	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Mother's parenting style (reference = authoritative)				
Authoritarian	2.5481*	0.9882, 6.5706	1	Omitted
Permissive	0.6139	0.2329, 1.6183	1.4255	0.5664, 3.5873
Neglectful	1.3418	0.2513, 7.1656	1	Omitted
Missing	1.0420	0.3768, 2.8817	1.6790	0.5923, 4.7590
Father's parenting style (reference = authoritative)				
Authoritarian	0.8887	0.3817, 2.0694	1.1619	0.5327, 2.5346
Permissive	1.0283	0.3846, 2.7492	0.6578	0.1933, 2.2390
Neglectful	1.7195	0.1595, 18.5354	4.9704	0.8048, 30.6978
Missing	1.2978	0.8648, 1.9476	1.0101	0.6200, 1.6459
Control variables				
Indigenous and TSI status	1.5004	0.5766, 3.9043	1.9437	0.6211, 6.0820
Peer problems scale	1.0932*	0.9999, 1.1953	0.9386	0.8469, 1.0401
SES	0.9132	0.7815, 1.0671	0.8370	0.6930, 1.0109
Family structure (two parents)	0.9688	0.5819, 1.6129	1.6864	0.8554, 3.3248

Statistical significance: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

The models exploring the significance of parenting styles on the risk of rape/attempted rape revealed fathers were most significant in influencing the risk of victimisation. The analysis revealed that sons with neglectful fathers have 8.85 odds ($p = .019$) greater risk of experiencing attempted rape/rape victimisation when compared to sons with authoritative fathers, holding the mother's parenting style constant. Similarly, daughters with fathers whose data were incomplete/missing were 1.69 ($p = .013$) times more likely to experience victimisation compared to those with authoritative fathers. When controls were included within the model, the relationship between missing fathers and daughter's risk of victimisation escaped statistical significance ($p = .269$). However, the relationship between neglectful fathers and sons' risk of victimisation remains (OR = 8.83, $p = .02$). Notably, the peer problems scale was a strong statistically significant control for the daughter's victimisation risk, with each one-point increase in the scale increasing the odds of

victimisation by a factor of 1.2 ($p = .001$). For sons, above-average SES acted as a protective factor (OR = .74, $p = .013$) for sons' victimisation, with the risk of victimization decreasing as socioeconomic status increased.

Table 7: Exploring the association between parenting styles and risk of attempted rape/rape victimisation.

	Model 1: Daughters		Model 2: Sons	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Mother's parenting style (reference = authoritative)				
Authoritarian	1.0693	0.2422, 4.7203	1	Omitted
Permissive	0.4657	0.1086, 1.9963	1.0016	0.2909, 3.4480
Neglectful	0.9498	0.1038, 8.6892	1	Omitted
Missing	1.3079	0.3870, 4.4206	0.8646	0.2024, 3.6929
Father's parenting style (reference = authoritative)				
Authoritarian	1.5208	0.5764, 4.0125	1.1878	0.4572, 3.0857
Permissive	0.8479	0.1975, 3.6403	1.2442	0.3673, 4.2144
Neglectful	4.8640	0.4473, 52.8893	8.8465*	1.4290, 54.7656
Missing	1.6935*	1.1156, 2.5706	0.8355	0.4971, 1.4043

Statistical significance: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table 8: Exploring the impact of controls on the association between parenting styles and risk of rape/attempted rape victimisation.

	Model 1: Daughters		Model 2: Sons	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Mother's parenting style (reference = authoritative)				
Authoritarian	0.9932	0.2233, 4.4179	1	Omitted
Permissive	0.3612	0.0828, 1.5746	0.9181	0.2567, 3.2838
Neglectful	0.8485	0.0820, 8.7767	1	Omitted
Missing	1.1675	0.3255, 4.1879	0.9762	0.2104, 4.5292
Father's parenting style (reference = authoritative)				
Authoritarian	1.3639	0.5092, 3.6531	1.1036	0.4217, 2.8877
Permissive	0.8015	0.1850, 3.4731	1.0892	0.3145, 3.7716
Neglectful	4.5142	0.3847, 52.9635	8.8325*	1.4010, 55.6866
Missing	1.3519	0.7921, 2.3075	0.9610	0.5254, 1.7580
Control variables				
Indigenous and TSI status	2.2523	0.7940, 6.3891	2.2742	0.6241, 8.2870
Peer problems scale	1.2008**	1.0769, 1.3390	0.9160	0.8044, 1.0431
SES	0.9121	0.7443, 1.1177	0.7423*	0.5872, 0.93833
Family structure (two parents)	0.7774	0.4123, 1.4661	2.1965	0.8768, 5.5023

Statistical significance: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Relationship between parenting styles and offending

Offending sample descriptive statistics

2,821 respondents qualified for the offending sample population, which was 291 children greater than the victimisation sample. This sample difference was expected as study children

naturally desist from participating over the life course. As the offending sample was younger than the victimisation sample, it was expected that the offending sample would be larger than the victimisation sample. Within this sample, 50.76% were boys, 49.24% were girls, .04% were 15 years old, 55.30% were 16 years old, and 44.59% were 17 years old, and 0.07% were 18 years old at the time of offending reporting. 86.53% of the sample reported having two parents living within the household. 46.51% reported having an above-average socio-economic status and 8.54% reported as high (scored 5-10) on the peer problems scale. Similar to the victimisation sample, Indigenous and TSI peoples were underrepresented, constituting only 1.95% of the sample.

Much like the victimisation sample, authoritative parenting was the most common style for both mothers (92.34%) and fathers (64.84%). The second most common parenting style differed by parent gender; authoritarian for fathers (6.36%) and permissive for mothers (3.19%). The third most common parenting style for mothers was authoritarian (1.63%) and permissive (2.59%) for fathers. The least common parenting style for both genders is neglectful. Due to the limited sample of neglectful parents, many of the observations were omitted as they predicted the outcome perfectly. Due to the LSAC data collecting method, a large portion of fathers (27.86%) are counted as missing. When exploring the frequency of parenting style combinations within parenting couples, the most common combination is authoritative mother and father (60.12%). Followed by authoritative mother and missing father (25.63%), authoritative mother and authoritarian father (4.11%), and authoritative mother and permissive father (2.23%). Pearson’s chi-squared test (83.13) highlighted the significant association between the mother and father's parenting styles.

Table 9: Frequency of parenting style combination within the offending sample.

Mother parenting style	Father parenting style					Total
	Authoritative	Authoritarian	Permissive	Neglectful	Missing	
Authoritative	1,696 (60.12%)	116 (4.11%)	63 (2.23%)	7 (0.25%)	723 (25.63%)	2,605 (92.34%)
Authoritarian	23 (0.82%)	5 (0.18%)	2 (0.07%)	0 (0.00%)	16 (0.57%)	46 (1.63%)
Permissive	45 (1.60%)	1 (0.04%)	5 (0.18%)	2 (0.07%)	37 (1.31%)	90 (3.19%)
Neglectful	3 (0.11%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.04%)	5 (0.18%)	9 (0.32%)
Missing	62 (2.20%)	1 (0.04%)	3 (0.11%)	0 (0.00%)	5 (0.18%)	71 (2.52%)
Total	1,829 (64.84%)	123 (4.36%)	73 (2.59%)	10 (0.35%)	786 (27.86%)	2,821 (100%)

Pearson chi2(16) = 84.1282 Pr = 0.000

Within the offending sample, there were 2,821 independent reports of sexual violence offending (note that study child could report more than one type of offending). 9.36% of the sample reported experiencing at least one type of offending. An obvious gender divide in offending behaviour is demonstrated, where men were consistently at greater risk of offending than women. 11.36% of men and 7.34% of women reported experiencing at least one type of offending. This gender divide is especially noticeable within the unwanted sexual gestures/remarks and persistent unwanted requests to hook-up variables, where men were twice as likely than women to report offending. Interestingly, the gender divide was less noticeable within the verbal harassment variable. A correlation test between offending types revealed that those who had reported one type of offending were more likely to report the other type. Although the correlation was statistically significant ($p = .000$), the strength of the correlation was relatively weak ($\rho = .336$).

Table 10: Percentage of the sample who have experienced sexual violence offending at least once by offending type.

	Female	Male	Total
Verbal harassment	93 (6.70% of women)	126 (8.80% of men)	219 (7.76% of sample)
Persistent unwanted requests to hook up	32 (2.3% of women)	60 (4.19% of men)	92 (3.26% of sample)
Total responses	125	186	311

Multivariate regression analysis

Numerous logistic models were analysed to determine the influence of mothers' and fathers' parenting styles on the risk of child sexual violence offending. The first model revealed that daughters with permissive mothers were 2.55 times ($p = .029$) more likely than those with authoritative mothers to experience verbal harassment offending, when holding fathers constant. Conversely, sons with authoritarian mothers were 2.90 times ($p = .039$) more likely than those with authoritative mothers to experience verbal harassment offending. No interaction was observed concerning the impact of fathers. These interactions remained when tested with controls, only slightly decreasing in statistical significance (permissive mothers and daughters $p = .035$, authoritarian mothers and sons $p = .045$). Peer problems were a statistically significant control for boys throughout all the types of offending. However, this interaction was not replicated within the female sample.

Table 11: Exploring the association between parenting styles and risk of verbal harassment perpetration.

	Model 1: Daughters		Model 2: Sons	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Mother's parenting style (reference = authoritative)				
Authoritarian	0.7033	0.0927, 0.3359	2.8967*	1.0527, 0.9710
Permissive	2.5549*	1.0995, 5.9368	0.7168	0.2170, 2.3672
Neglectful	1	Omitted	1	Omitted
Missing	1.0259	0.2396, 4.3928	0.8907	0.2690, 2.9487
Father's parenting style (reference = authoritative)				
Authoritarian	0.6226	0.1468, 2.6400	1.0412	0.4362, 0.4850
Permissive	0.9414	0.2184, 4.0575	1.1927	0.4118, 0.4542
Neglectful	1	Omitted	2.8891	0.3157, 26.4423
Missing	1.4020	0.8921, 2.2033	1.0791	0.7138, 1.6315

Statistical significance: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table 12: Exploring the impact of controls on the association between parenting styles and risk of verbal harassment perpetration.

	Model 1: Daughters		Model 2: Sons	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Mother's parenting style (reference = authoritative)				
Authoritarian	0.65041	0.0851, 4.9706	2.8437*	1.0235, 7.9010
Permissive	2.5304*	1.0669, 6.0015	0.6280	0.1862, 2.1177
Neglectful	1	Omitted	1	Omitted
Missing	1.2656	0.2831, 5.6584	0.8603	0.2425, 3.0523
Father's parenting style (reference = authoritative)				
Authoritarian	0.5916	0.1384, 2.5280	1.0219	0.4266, 2.4478
Permissive	0.9592	0.2225, 4.1345	1.2037	0.4142, 3.4984
Neglectful	1	Omitted	2.8887	0.3126, 26.6976
Missing	1.6413	0.9597, 2.8071	1.0269	0.6186, 1.7048
Control variables				
Indigenous and TSI status	2.0324	0.6618, 6.2418	0.7315	0.1682, 3.1812
Peer problems scale	1.0136	0.8949, 1.1480	1.1380**	1.0379, 1.2477
SES	0.9583	0.7608, 1.2071	1.0159	0.8335, 1.2381
Family structure (two parents)	1.6931	0.8135, 0.5236	0.9216	0.4708, 1.8042

Statistical significance: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Of the perpetration models, the risk of persistent requests to the hook-up model was the most statistically significant. Potentially indicating that parenting styles are more significant in influencing the risk of more serious types of sexual violence offending. For sons, those with authoritarian mothers were 3.8 times ($p = .037$) more likely than those with authoritative mothers to perpetrate, holding fathers constant. Sons with permissive parents were 3.25 odds ($p = .019$) more likely than those with authoritative mothers to perpetrate. Interestingly, sons with missing data for the mother's parenting style were 3.29 odds ($p =$

.032) more likely than those with authoritative mothers to perpetuate. Daughters with permissive fathers were 4.14 odds ($p = .03$) more likely than those with authoritative fathers to perpetrate.

When controls were considered, the influence of authoritarian mothers on sons' (OR = 3.89, $p = .036$) perpetration and permissive fathers on daughters' perpetration (OR = 4.31, $p = .025$) was slightly strengthened. The impact of permissive mothers on the son's perpetration was weakened when controls were considered (OR = 2.79, $p = .046$). When controls were included, the influence of missing mothers on son perpetration escaped statistical significance ($p = .083$). Suggesting that the controls may explain the son's perpetration more meaningfully than the mother's behaviour. The only statistically significant control was again, the peer problems scale. For every one-point increase in the son's score on the peer problems scale, his odds of offending increased by a factor of 1.14 ($p = .042$).

Table 15: Exploring the association between parenting styles and risk of persistent requests to hook-up perpetration.

	Model 1: Daughters		Model 2: Sons	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Mother's parenting style (reference = authoritative)				
Authoritarian	2.3417	0.2955, 18.5543	3.8033*	1.0855, 13.3255
Permissive	2.9962	0.8620, 10.4140	3.2471*	1.2171, 8.6628
Neglectful	1	Omitted	1	Omitted
Missing	1	Omitted	3.2864*	1.1106, 9.7245
Father's parenting style (reference = authoritative)				
Authoritarian	1	Omitted	1.2931	0.3847, 4.3463
Permissive	4.1374*	1.1501, 14.8840	1.1957	0.2725, 5.2471
Neglectful	1	Omitted	1	Omitted
Missing	0.9987	0.4484, 2.2241	1.4274	0.8086, 2.5197

Statistical significance: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table 16: Exploring the impact of controls on the association between parenting styles and risk of unwanted persistent requests to hook-up perpetration.

	Model 1: Daughters		Model 2: Sons	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Mother's parenting style (reference = authoritative)				
Authoritarian	2.1969	0.2713, 17.7871	3.8930*	1.0943, 13.8492
Permissive	2.6472	0.7381, 9.4949	2.7935*	1.0201, 7.6499
Neglectful	1	Omitted	1	Omitted
Missing	1	Omitted	2.8930	0.8696, 9.6248
Father's parenting style (reference = authoritative)				
Authoritarian	1	Omitted	1.2304	0.3650, 4.1474
Permissive	4.3113*		1.0881	0.2430, 4.8725

Neglectful	1	Omitted	1	Omitted
Missing	0.9572	0.3473, 2.6380	1.2672	0.6410, 2.5049
Indigenous and TSI status	3.3559	0.6975, 16.1459	1.3214	0.2920, 5.9801
Peer problems scale	1.0595	0.8701, 1.2901	1.1418*	1.0047, 1.2977
SES	0.9157	0.6190, 1.3547	0.8882	0.6779, 1.1638
Family structure (two parents)	1.2841	0.3244, 5.0833	1.0013	0.4301, 2.3313

Statistical significance: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Chapter 5: Discussion

The current paper sought to understand the relationship between Maccoby and Martin's parenting styles and sexual violence victimisation and offending. Considering the existing literature, it was hypothesized that authoritative parents (high responsiveness, and high demandingness) would act as a protective factor against risk of sexual violence victimisation and offending. It was also hypothesized that that non-authoritative parenting would act as a risk factor. To explore this hypothesis, utilising authoritative parenting as a reference, various models were analysed to determine the effects of each parenting style.

Explication of results

Parenting styles and victimisation

As hypothesised, parenting styles in early adolescence were highlighted as significant in influencing risk of sexual violence victimisation during late adolescence. Consistent with the existing literature when compared to authoritative parenting, authoritarian and permissive parenting increased the risk of different types of victimisation. It is hypothesised that these parenting styles increase victimisation risk due to their inability to model healthy boundaries, which are imperative for navigating consent and intimacy (Jozkowski et al., 2014; Ulamn & Najdowski, 2011). Parenting styles lacking demandingness (permissive and neglectful) implicitly teach the child that boundaries are insignificant, and due to a lack of practice, they have difficulty implementing personal boundaries later in life (Sigre-Leirós et al., 2016). Parenting styles that lack responsiveness (authoritarian and neglectful) may implicitly teach the child the insignificance of their own boundaries when they contradict another's expectations. These extremes may translate into sexual encounters where the child is unable or struggles to confidently express their own boundaries, thus increasing the risk of victimisation (Sigre-Leirós et al., 2016). It should be noted that this hypothesis does not

translate to all sexual violence victimisation, specifically those perpetrated by a stranger (stranger rape, cat-calling).

As hypothesised, the analysis found that all the statistically significant interactions concerned only those of same-gender parent/study child combinations. For daughters, authoritarian mothers increased the risk of pressure to have sex victimisation and for sons, neglectful fathers increased risk of rape/attempted rape victimisation. These findings align with existing literature concerning the significance of same-gender parent/study child combinations (Bi et al., 2018; Shek, 2002; Zhang et al., 2006). The impact of parenting styles is likely strengthened when the parent and child share the same gender as children are more likely to model the behaviour of the same-sex parent (Shek, 2002). For daughters, having a "missing" father increased risk of victimisation in all three uncontrolled victimisation models. However, these effects escaped statistical significance once the controls were considered. Suggesting that the significance of a "missing" father may be a reflection of other external circumstances.

Notably, five of six of the observed significant trends concerned the daughters, suggesting that the impact of parenting styles on risk of victimisation is moderated by study child gender. These trends may be a reflection of the large population difference between gendered victim samples, where women were approximately twice as likely to report victimisation than the male sample. Thus, observing a statistically significant trend within the female population is more likely. However, the literature has demonstrated that daughters are often more malleable to parenting styles as they tend to be more involved with the family unit (Shek, 2002; Zhang et al., 2006). Suggesting that the findings represent daughters' increased vulnerability to parenting style, thus increasing their risk of victimisation depending on parenting style type. Further research into this phenomenon is required to understand the nuanced impact of gender on the influence of parenting on victimisation.

Also of note, peer problems were a consistent statistically significant control for daughters' mediation for pressure to have sex, and rape/attempted rape. Suggesting that experiencing peer problems is significantly associated with daughter's risk of victimisation. This contributes to existing research that found a strong connection between peer deviance and men's sexual violence victimisation (Conley et al., 2017). The current study demonstrates that this effect translates to female sexual violence victims. Interestingly, in the current study, there was no observed link between men's victimisation and peer problems. However, it is

unclear whether this was a result of the limited male victimisation sample or a genuine missing association.

Parenting styles and offending

The analysis revealed the significance of parenting styles during early adolescence in influencing risk of sexual violence offending during late adolescence. Supporting the existing literature concerning parenting styles, when compared to authoritative parenting, authoritarian and permissive parenting increased risk of offending (Aziwake et al., 2018; Maniglio, 2012; Sigré-Leirós et al., 2016). Aligning with the literature, the findings imply that authoritative parenting acts as a protective factor against offending (Jozkowski et al., 2014). Unfortunately, due to sampling issues, no interactions concerning the impact of neglectful parenting were observed. Similar to victimisation, it is hypothesised that authoritarian and permissive parenting increase risk of sexual violence offending due to their failure to model healthy boundaries to their child (Sigré-Leirós et al., 2016). A lack of demandingness (permissive and neglectful styles) implicitly teaches children that boundaries are insignificant, thus leading to an inability to successfully set personal boundaries. Parenting styles characterised by overexertion of demandingness (authoritarian style) implicitly teach the child that boundaries are unreasonable, and can be rebelled against. Healthy boundary setting is imperative when navigating consent and intimacy, it is hypothesised that lacking healthy boundaries or respect for boundaries increases risk of sexual violence offending (Jozkowski et al., 2014; Ulam & Najdowski, 2011).

When the father's parenting style was held constant, the findings revealed that mothers were more significant in affecting risk of offending. Mothers constituted four of five statistically significant observations. Overall, permissive parenting was highlighted as a risky parenting style for both mothers and fathers. Permissive mothers increased risk of verbal harassment offending for daughters, and persistent unwanted requests to hook up offending for sons. Permissive fathers increased risk of persistent unwanted requests to hook up offending for daughters. Authoritarian parenting was also highlighted as a risky parenting style; authoritarian mothers increased the risk of verbal harassment and the risk of persistent unwanted requests to hook up offending for sons. Neglectful fathers were also highlighted as increasing the risk of daughters' persistent request to hook up offending. A significant interaction between "missing" mothers and sons' persistent requests to hook-up offending

was observed, however similar to the victimisation models, when controls were added the interaction escaped statistical significance.

Contrarily to the victimisation sample, sons were overrepresented among the significant interactions, constituting four of the total five interactions. Similar to the victimisation sample, it is unclear whether this finding is a representation of the sex more likely to offend or whether parenting has a greater impact on sons offending than daughters.

Throughout both models, peer problems were highlighted as a significant control for sons offending. This supports existing literature that has demonstrated the significance of peers in moderating deviance risk (Conley et al., 2017).

Acknowledging limitations

Despite successfully achieving the paper goals, limitations within the study persisted. When exploring the relationship between parenting styles and the risk of victimisation/offending, the parenting style trends were largely inconsistent and lacked consistency between victimisation types. This is likely due to the limited sample size for each parenting style, despite the relatively large total population sizes. There are several reasons why each parenting style except authoritative (92% of mothers, 64% of fathers) was largely underrepresented within the samples (see Table 1 and 9). The small parenting style sample sizes may have been a result of social desirability bias, where parents were more likely to report parenting practices that are desirable according to societal expectations, rather than practices that reflect reality. Previous research has demonstrated that parents consistently utilise social desirability reporting when reflecting on their own parenting behaviour, thus impacting the accuracy of self-reported parenting data (Bornstein et al., 2015; Hofferth, 2006; Runge & Soellner, 2022). Considering that authoritative has been illustrated as the "ideal" parenting style both in literature and also in the shared consciousness, it is likely this social norm enticed parents to inaccurately report their parenting behaviour (Bornstein et al., 2015; Simons et al., 2013). This phenomenon may explain why permissive parenting was reported as protective against risk of experiencing persistent requests to hook up victimisation (see Table 3). Contrarily, the parenting style distribution may be a natural reflection of the sample; either that authoritative parents are more likely than other parenting types to participate in the LSAC, or that within the Australian population, authoritative parents constitute the majority of parents. The small sample of parenting styles other than authoritative limited the

accuracy of statements made about its impact. This restricting effect was compounded when the small sample of study children who reported victimisation or offending was considered. Many model outcomes were omitted due to perfect prediction where no study child reported both the independent and dependent variables. This means that for some parenting styles (particularly neglectful parents), no observations concerning its impact on risk on some types of sexual violence victimisation/offending were captured. The observed findings should be considered with caution, considering that all the problem parenting style samples constituted less than 5% of the total sample.

It should also be noted that inherently the LSAC fails to accurately capture minorities, such as Australians living in poverty, Indigenous and TSI peoples, same-sex parenting couples, and study children who identify as a non-binary gender. Research has previously demonstrated the immense impact of intersectionality on risk of sexual violence victimisation and offending (Armstrong et al., 2018). Failing to capture this within the LSAC data set is a missed opportunity, but provides an avenue for future research. Finally, it must be noted that the parenting style typology is a Westernised social construct that inherently fails to reflect the parenting practices of all cultures (Febiyanti & Rachmawati, 2021). Different cultural values shape different understandings of parenting, and thus different parenting styles. Where “authoritative” parenting may reflect different behaviours (Febiyanti & Rachmawati, 2021; Jennifer et al., 2011; LeCuyer et al., 2011). Thus, applying the typology to a multicultural population is inaccurate and potentially misleading. The LSAC sample is predominately white children, as reflected within the created analytic samples. Thus the findings are only accurately applicable to white Australians, and application to the broader multi-cultural Australian context is ill-advised. However, this limitation offers a literature gap for future research.

Future directions and wider implications

The findings are significant in that they establish associations between parenting styles and sexual violence victimisation and offending. The unprecedented application of Baumrind’s (1971) and Maccoby and Martin’s (1983) parenting style typology to the sexual violence context has successfully created a simple, replicable methodology for understanding the tangible impacts of parenting behaviour. However, in doing so, the study has highlighted many needed avenues for future research. Throughout the study, sampling has been noted

as a limitation, it is recommended that future research utilises a sample with a larger percentage of non-authoritative parents. To develop a more nuanced understanding of the interactions between risky parenting styles and sexual violence victimisation/offending. It is also recommended that future study explores the impact of co-existing parenting styles within one parental couple. Existing research has highlighted the unique, differential, or interactional effects of differential parenting styles within a parental pair (Kuppens & Ceulemans, 2019). An analysis of co-existing parenting styles was attempted within the current study, however, the limited sampling created issues where many observations were omitted. Understanding the effect of co-existing parenting styles on risk of sexual violence victimisation/offending would provide further insight into the protective/risky nature of the parenting styles.

Beyond the immediate scope of this study, the findings hold broader implications for interventions and preventive measures aimed at reducing rates of sexual violence. Recognising the impacts of parenting styles on risk of sexual violence victimisation and offending suggests that prevention programs and support services should consider family dynamics when drafting interventions for vulnerable persons. Education programs should directly target expecting parents and parents explaining the consequences (both positive and negative) of utilising each parenting style. Authoritarian and permissive parents are not inherently "bad" or mean-spirited parents (Baumrind, 1966; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Most are not aware of the consequences of imbalanced parenting and believe they are doing what is best for their child (Baumrind, 1966; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Thus providing information about the potential consequences of these parenting styles will be beneficial in preventing future sexual violence victimisation/offending.

Furthermore, the current study contributes to discourse about the intergenerational transmission of sexual violence, by highlighting the means by which sexual violence victimisation/offending is transferred from parent to child (Avery et al., 2002; Zuravin, et al., 1996). Although the current study does not demonstrate the transmission of sexual violence, it highlights the significance of parenting in affecting risk of sexual violence victimisation/offending. All parents, but especially those with sexual violence victimisation/offending experience should be aware of (Marshall et al., 2022).

Conclusion

This paper explored the relationship between parenting styles and risk of sexual violence victimisation and offending using data obtained from the LSAC. Understanding the underlying reasons for sexual violence is imperative to develop lasting effective prevention policies and reduce rates of sexual violence victimisation. The paper aimed to begin filling the existing literature gap concerning the impact of parenting behaviour, through the unprecedented application of Baumrind's (1971) and Maccoby and Martin's (1983) parenting style typology to the sexual violence context. The application of this typology aimed to provide a tangible and replicable structure to discourse about the impacts of parenting on sexual violence. The findings supported existing literature concerning parenting styles and poor life course outcomes (Hoeve et al., 2008; Kuppens & Ceulemans, 2019). By revealing significant associations between poor parenting styles (authoritarian, permissive, and neglectful) and risk of victimisation and offending. The significance of parent and child gender interactions on the type and risk of sexual violence victimisation/offending was also highlighted. Despite the limited sample, the findings prompt future exploration into the underlying life-course causes of sexual violence. Additionally, the paper aimed to establish the importance of exploring causes in the fight against generational sexual violence.

References

- Abeche, C. V., Khafif, T. C., Belizario, G. O., Da Silva, T. F., Harkaly, G., Gomide, P. I. C., & Serafim, A. D. P. (2021). Personality traits and parenting styles in boys victims of sexual abuse: A pilot study. *Revista de Psiquiatria Clínica*, 48(2), 105–111.
<https://doi.org/10.15761/0101-60830000000288>
- Armstrong, E., Gleckman-Krut, M., & Johnson, L. (2018). Silence, power, and inequality: an intersectional approach to sexual violence. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 44, 99-122.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-073117-041410>
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2021). *Sexual violence – victimisation*.
<https://www.abs.gov.au/articles/sexual-violence-victimisation#:~:text=60%25%20of%20women%20and%2051,w%20as%20not%20a%20family%20member.>
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2022). *Sexual assault in Australia: A statistical overview*
<https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/people/crime-and-justice/sexual-assault-australia-statistical-overview>
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2023). *Sexual violence*.
<https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/people/crime-and-justice/sexual-violence/2021-22>
- Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. (2020). *Sexual assault in Australia*.
[https://www.aihw.gov.au/getmedia/0375553f-0395-46cc-9574-d54c74fa601a/aihw-fdv-5.pdf.aspx?inline=true#:~:text=According%20to%20ABS%20Recorded%20Crime,\(based%20on%20ABS%202020a\)](https://www.aihw.gov.au/getmedia/0375553f-0395-46cc-9574-d54c74fa601a/aihw-fdv-5.pdf.aspx?inline=true#:~:text=According%20to%20ABS%20Recorded%20Crime,(based%20on%20ABS%202020a))
- Avery, L., Hutchinson, D., & Whitaker, K. (2002). Domestic violence and intergenerational rates of child sexual abuse: A case record analysis. *Child & Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 19, 77–90.
- Aziwake, J. C., Daodu, W. O., Aroso, S. O., & Akeredolu, A. Y. (2018). Peer pressure and parenting style as predictors of undergraduate attitudes towards rape. *Nigerian Journal of Social Psychology*. 1(1), 91-98.
<https://www.nigerianisp.com/index.php/NJSP/article/view/10>
- Baker, K., Siphthorp, M., & Edwards, B. (2017). *A longitudinal measure of socioeconomic*

- position in LSAC* (18). Australian Institute of Family Studies.
<https://nla.gov.au/nla.obj-571991763/view>
- Barber, B. K. (1996). Parental psychological control: revisiting a neglected construct. *Child Development, 67*(6), 3296–3319. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1131780>
- Basile, K. C., Rostad, W. L., Leemis, R. W., Espelage, D. L., & Davis, J. P. (2018). Protective factors for sexual violence: understanding how trajectories relate to perpetration in high school. *Prevention Science, 19*(8), 1123–1132. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-018-0940-3>
- Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of authoritative parental control on child behaviour. *Child Development, 37*(4), 887–907. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1126611>
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology, 4*, 1-103. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0030372>
- Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance abuse. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 11*(1), 56–95.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431691111004>
- Bi, X., Yang, Y., Li, H., Wang, M., Zhang, W., & Deater-Deckard, K. (2018). Parenting styles and parent-adolescent relationships: the mediating roles of behavioral autonomy and parental authority. *Frontiers in Psychology, 9*, 2187–2187.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02187>
- Bornstein, M. H., Putnick, D. L., Lansford, J. E., Pastorelli, C., Skinner, A. T., Sorbring, E., Tapanya, S., Uribe Tirado, L. M., Zelli, A., Alampay, L. P., Al-Hassan, S. M., Bacchini, D., Bombi, A. S., Chang, L., Deater-Deckard, K., Di Giunta, L., Dodge, K. A., Malone, P. S., & Oburu, P. (2015). Mother and father socially desirable responding in nine countries: Two kinds of agreement and relations to parenting self-reports. *International Journal of Psychology, 50*(3), 174–185.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12084>
- Brown, R., Dumont, J., Macdonald, S., & Bainbridge, D. (2013). A comparative analysis of victims of sexual assault with and without mental health histories: acute and follow-up care characteristics. *Journal of Forensic Nursing, 9*(2), 76–83.
<https://doi.org/10.1097/JFN.0b013e31828106df>
- Campo, M. (2015). *Children's exposure to domestic and family violence: Key issues and*

- responses (36). Child Family Community Australia.
<https://aifs.gov.au/resources/policy-and-practice-papers/childrens-exposure-domestic-and-family-violence#this>
- Cense, M. (2019). Rethinking sexual agency: proposing a multicomponent model based on young people's life stories. *Sex Education, 19*(3), 247–262.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14681811.2018.1535968>
- Cocks, G. (2015). *Freud and the Sexual: Essays 2000-2006*. Fordham University Press.
- Conley, A. H., Overstreet, C. M., Hawn, S. E., Kendler, K. S., Dick, D. M., & Amstadter, A. B. (2017). Prevalence and predictors of sexual assault among a college sample. *Journal of American College Health, 65*(1), 41–49.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2016.1235578> -
- Crews, F. (1998). *The Memory Wars: Freud's Legacy in Dispute*. New York Review of Books.
- Febiyanti, A., & Rachmawati, Y. (2021). Is authoritative parenting the best parenting style? *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, 538*, 94-99.
- Flood, M., & Pease, B. (2009). Factors influencing attitudes to violence against women. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 10*(2), 125-142.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838009334131>
- Freud, S. (1977). *On sexuality: three essays on the theory of sexuality, and other works*. Penguin.
- Gardner, D. G., Cummings, L. L., Dunham, R. B., & Pierce, J. L. (1998). Single-item versus multiple-item measurement scales: An empirical comparison. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 58*(6), 898–915.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164498058006003>
- Goldberg, J. S., & Carlson, M. J. (2014). Parents' relationship quality and children's behavior in stable married and cohabiting families. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 76*(4), 762–777. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12120>
- Goldman-Mellor, S. J. (2012). *Early-life adversity and adulthood psychological distress: The role of biological stress reactivity*. eScholarship, University of California.
- Hofferth, S. L. (2006). Response bias in a popular indicator of reading to children. *Sociological Methodology, 36*(1), 301–315. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9531.2006.00182.x>
- Jansen, H. A. F. M. (2016). *Measuring prevalence of violence against women: Key*

terminology. kNOwVAWdata. <https://asiapacific.unfpa.org/en/publications/violence-against-women-key-terminology-knowvawdata>

Jozkowski, K. N., Peterson, Z. D., Sanders, S. A., Dennis, B., & Reece, M. (2014). Gender differences in heterosexual college students' conceptualizations and indicators of sexual consent: Implications for contemporary sexual assault prevention education. *Journal of Sex Research, 51*(8), 904-916.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2013.820222>

Kuppens, S., & Ceulemans, E. (2019). Parenting styles: A Closer Look at a Well-Known Concept. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 28*(1), 168–181.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-018-1242-x>

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

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.1991.tb01588.x>

Lansford, J.E., Bornstein, M.H., Dodge, K.A., Skinner, A.T., Putnick, D.L., & Deater-Deckard, K. (2011). Attributions and attitudes of mothers and fathers in the United States. *Parenting Science and Practice, 11*, 199–213.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/15295192.2011.585567>

LeCuyer, E., Swanson, D., Cole, R., & Kitzman, H. (2011). Effect of African- and European-American maternal attitudes and limit-setting strategies on children's self-regulation. *Research in Nursing and Health, 34*, 468–482. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nur.20460>

Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In Mussen, P. H. & Hetherington, E. M., *Handbook of Child Psychology: Vol. IV. Socialization, Personality and Social Development*.

Mandara, J. (2003). The typological approach in child and family psychology: a review of theory, methods, and research. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review, 6*(2), 129–146. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023734627624>

Maniglio, R. (2012). The role of parent–child bonding, attachment, and interpersonal problems in the development of deviant sexual fantasies in sexual offenders. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse, 13*(2), 83–96.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838012440337>

Marshall, C., Fernet, M., & Langevin, R. (2022). Intergenerational continuity of child sexual

- abuse: Comparison of mother and emerging adult dyads. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 32(1), 40-59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10538712.2022.2147888>
- Marshall, W. L., & Barbaree, H. E. (1990). An integrated theory of the etiology of sexual offending. In W. L. Marshall, D. R. Laws, & H. E. Barbaree (Eds.), *Handbook of sexual assault: Issues, theories, and treatment of the offender*. Plenum Press.
- Martin, A., Ryan, R.M., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2007). The joint influence of mother and father parenting on child cognitive outcomes at age 5. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 22(4), 423–439. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2007.07.001>
- McKinney, C., & Renk, K. (2008). Differential parenting between mothers and fathers: Implications for late adolescents. *Journal of Family Issues*, 29(6), 806–827. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X07311222>
- McMahon, S., & Farmer, G. L. (2011). Gender norms and sexual violence perpetration. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26(14), 2758-2778. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260510390954>
- McNair, S. M., & Boisexual violenceert, L. (2021). Prevalence of adult female genital trauma after acute sexual assault the need for a universal definition of genital trauma. *Journal of Forensic Nursing*, 17(3), 140–145. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JFN.0000000000000325>
- Moylan, C. A., Javorka, M., Maas, M. K., Meier, E., & McCauley, H. L. (2021). Campus sexual assault climate: toward an expanded definition and improved assessment. *Psychology of Violence*, 11(3), 296–306. <https://doi.org/10.1037/vio0000382>
- Noll, J. G., Trickett, P. K., Harris, W. W., & Putnam, F. W. (2009). The cumulative burden borne by offspring whose mothers were sexually abused as children: Descriptive results from a multigenerational study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24, 424–449.
- Paolucci, E. O., Genius, M. L., Violato, C., & Chikritzhs, T. (2001). A meta-analysis of the published research on the effects of child sexual abuse. *Journal of Psychology*, 135(1), 17-36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980109603677>
- Perales, F., Hoffmann, H., King, T., Vidal, S., & Baxter, J. (2021). Mothers, fathers and the intergenerational transmission of gender ideology. *Social Science Research*, 99, 102597–102597. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2021.102597>
- Pereira, A.I., Canavarro, C., Cardoso, M.F., & Mendonça, D. (2008). Patterns of parental

- rearing styles and child behaviour problems among Portuguese school-aged children. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 18, 454–464. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-008-9249-3>
- Runge, R. A., & Soellner, R. (2022). Cultural bias in parent reports: the role of socialization goals when parents report on their child's problem behavior. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10578-022-01464-y>
- Sanson, A., Nicholson, J., Ungerer, J., Zubrick, S., Wilson, K., Ainley, J., Berthelsen, D., Bittman, M., Broom, D., Harrison, L., Rodgers, B., Sawyer, M., Silburn, S., Strazdins, L., Vimpani, G., & Wake, M. (2002). *Introducing the Longitudinal Study of Australian Children*. Australian Institute of Family Studies.
- Schroeder, R. D., Bulanda, R. E., Giordano, P. C., & Cernkovich, S. A. (2010). Parenting and adult criminality: An examination of direct and indirect effects by race. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 25(1), 64–98.
- Senn, C. Y., Eliasziw, M., Barata, P. C., Thurston, W. E., Newby-Clark, I. R., Radtke, H. L., & Hobden, K. L. (2015). Efficacy of a sexual assault resistance program for university women. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 372(24), 2326-2335. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMsa1411131>
- Shek, D. T. L. (2002). Parenting characteristics and parent-adolescent conflict. *Journal of Family Issues*, 23(2), 189–208. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X02023002002>
- Simons, L. G., & Conger, R. D. (2007). Linking mother-father differences in parenting to a typology of family parenting styles and adolescent outcomes. *Journal of Family Issues*, 28, 212–241. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X06294593>
- Simons, L. G., & Sutton, T. E. (2021). The long arm of parenting: How parenting styles influence crime and the pathways that explain this effect. *Criminology (Beverly Hills)*, 59(3), 520–544. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9125.12285>
- Sigre-Leirós, V., Carvalho, J., & Nobre, P. J. (2016). Early parenting styles and sexual offending behavior: A comparative study. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 46, 103–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlp.2016.02.042>
- Spraitz, J. D. (2011). *Parenting styles and criminal involvement: A test of Baumrind's typology*. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
- Steinberg, L., Lamborn, S. D., Darling, N., Mounts, N. S., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1994). Over-

- time changes in adjustment and competence among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. *Child Development*, 65(3), 754–770. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1131416>
- Surikova, J., Payne, A., Miller, K. L., Ravaei, A., & Nolan, R. P. (2020). A cultural and gender-based approach to understanding patient adjustment to chronic heart failure. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes*, 18(1), 1–238. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12955-020-01482-1>
- Taylor, A., Wilson, C., Slater, A., & Mohr, P. (2011). Parenting and child body mass index: Longitudinal investigation of maternal and paternal influence. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 63(4), 198–206. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1742-9536.2011.00024.x>
- Ullman, S. E., & Najdowski, C. J. (2011). Vulnerability and protective factors for sexual assault. In *Violence against women and children, Vol 1: Mapping the terrain*. American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/12307-007>
- Wanous, J. P., Reichers, A. E., & Hudy, M. J. (1997). Overall job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(2), 247–252. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.2.247>
- Ward, T., Hudson, S., Marshall, W., & Siegert, R. (1995). Attachment styles and intimacy deficits in sexual offenders: A theoretical framework. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 7(4), 317–335. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02256835>
- Wolfradt, U., Hempel, S., & Miles, J. N. (2003). Perceived parenting styles, depersonalisation, anxiety and coping behaviour in adolescents. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 34(3), 521–532. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(02\)00092-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(02)00092-2)
- Worthman, C. M., Tomlinson, M., & Rotheram-Borus, M. J. (2016). When can parents most influence their child's development? Expert knowledge and perceived local realities. *Social Science & Medicine*, 154, 62–69. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.02.040>
- Zhang, W. X., Wang, M. P., and Fuligni, A. J. (2006). Expectations for autonomy, beliefs about parental authority, and parent-adolescent conflict and cohesion. *Acta Psychologica Sinica*, 38(6), 868–876.
- Zubrick, S. R., Lucas, N., Westrupp, E. M., & Nicholson, J. M. (2014). *Parenting measures in*

the longitudinal study of australian children: construct validity and measurement quality. Department of Social Services.

<https://growingupinaustralia.gov.au/sites/default/files/tp12.pdf>

Zuravin, S., McMillen, C., DePanfilis, D., & Risley-Curtis, C. (1996). The intergenerational cycle of child maltreatment: Continuity versus discontinuity. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 11*, 315–334.