



among other issues (Chen et al., 2019; Davids et al., 2017; Rodrigo et al., 2010).

Within the framework described, parenting analysis emerges from a positive approach (Rodrigo et al., 2015). From this method, parenting refers to warm affective bonding, non-violence, recognition of sons and daughters' abilities, routines, and environment establishment, and the setting of clear and coherent limits (Rodrigo et al., 2010). This approach promotes the exercise and consolidation of all those parental competencies that enable the development and well-being of children and adolescents (Kyriazos & Stalikas, 2018).

Currently, there is a lack of unanimous consensus when defining parental competencies, finding various definitions. Barudy and Dantagnan (2010) refer to the practical capacity of fathers and mothers to educate their children, providing them with protection and ensuring their healthy development. Furthermore, Rodrigo (2008) suggests that parental competencies are the set of capacities that allow facing parenting flexibly. Finally, Gómez and Contreras (2019) claim that parental competencies are knowledge, attitudes, and skills exemplified in specific parenting practices. According to this theoretical approach, there are four fundamental competencies. (1) bonding parental competencies, associated with sensitivity to understanding the behaviour and communicative signals of the child, becoming emotionally involved and sharing daily life; (2) formative competencies, referring to the ability to stimulate significant learning, progressive autonomy, and children self-regulation through the incorporation of social rules and values; (3) parental protective skills, aimed at protecting and safeguarding the multidimensional development of the child, guaranteeing their rights, structuring their daily routine and making available other sources of social support and, finally, (4) reflective skills, linked to the anticipation and monitoring of conflicts in parenting, reflection on the influence of one's history of parenting and self-care.

Due to the distinct roles, styles, practices, and competencies of parents or caregivers, parenting can differ based on gender (Chuang & Tamis-LeMonda, 2009; Vargas Rubilar et al., 2023). In this context, a recent review (Yaffe, 2023) analyzed the perceived differences in parenting styles between men and women. The reviewed studies indicated that perceived maternal and paternal parenting differences generally align with gender role theories (Yaffe, 2023; Vargas Rubilar et al., 2023). Furthermore, this study (Yaffe, 2023) found that children (primarily adolescents) tend to perceive differences in maternal and paternal parenting. Overall, they perceive their mothers as more authoritative and permissive than their fathers, and their fathers as more authoritarian than their mothers. The evidence supporting the differences between mothers and fathers in perceived parenting was consistent across approximately 14 studies involving parents' and children's perspectives (Yaffe, 2023).

Regarding the evaluation of parental skills, there is currently a scale designed to evaluate this construct from the parent's perspective (Gómez & Contreras 2019), which operationalizes the four parental skills mentioned above in the Chilean population (Gómez et al., 2022). Vargas et al. (2020) adapted, validated and abbreviated this same scale in Argentina. It was designed for fathers, mothers, and caregivers of children from nine to 12 years old. The authors reported adequate psychometric properties for the abbreviated version, both in its multidimensional version, which consists of four factors (bonding competencies, formative competencies, protective competencies, and reflective competencies), and in the second-order model, in which positive parenting is evaluated as a superior factor.

Two other instruments that evaluate parenting skills have also been detected, although they are based on different theoretical models.

The Perceived Parental Competencies Scale (Bayot Mestre & Hernandez-Viadel, 2008) was validated in the Argentine context. It evaluates competencies from the perspective of fathers, mothers or caregivers of school-age children (Azar et al., 2019). The authors reported adequate psychometric functioning for a version of four factors: dedication and orientation, shared leisure, school involvement and role assumption. Finally, Martínez-González et al. (2021) validated the Emotional and Social Parenting Competencies Scale for mothers. This instrument evaluates the dimensions of self-esteem, self-control, verbal aggression, and imposition in mothers of children and adolescents in Spain. According to the authors, this scale makes it possible to self-assess the fundamental skills and competencies for coping with parenting in the current context.

As evident, the instruments available for evaluating parenting from a positive approach and, more specifically, the measurement of parental competencies, were designed to be answered by fathers, mothers, or caregivers (Vargas-Rubilar et al., 2020). No scales have been detected that evaluate this construct from the perspective of adolescent children, which is essential to study the impact of positive parenting from its protagonists.

There are different variables associated with the positive aspects of parenting, among which are perceived parental competencies. For example, it is known that positive parenting experienced during adolescence and, more specifically the parental responsiveness dimension, is related to greater psychological adjustment, greater resilience and greater psychological well-being (Bernal-Ruiz et al., 2018; Kaniuşonytė & Laursen, 2022; Nepper & Chai, 2016). In turn, it is linked to less problematic substance use and fewer externalizing behaviors and symptoms (Kingsbury et al., 2020; Kokkinos et al., 2016). For its part, the demand dimension of parenting has been associated with neuroticism and loneliness, various externalizing problems, and aggressiveness towards peers during adolescence (Mousavi & Dehshiri, 2022; Tehrani et al., 2024). Considering the evidence collected, it would be expected that parenting competencies would be positively and strongly linked to the responsive dimension of parenting.

Regarding the link between parental competencies and flourishing, no research has been detected that addresses this specific relationship, although there is scientific evidence that positive parenting boosts both hedonic (Gallego et al., 2021; Stavroulaki et al., 2021) and eudaemonic (Cordero-López & Calventus, 2022; Francis et al., 2021) aspects of well-being during adolescence.

Adolescence represents the period of life between the ages of 10 and 19 that is characterized as a transitional stage marked by rapid growth, increased autonomy, and identity development (Avedissian & Alayan, 2021). As mentioned, the positive parenting approach suggests that parenting skills should coordinate with the needs of each developmental stage of sons and daughters (Rodrigo et al., 2015). In this sense, it is necessary to comprehend which parental competencies are suitable for promoting the entire development of adolescents. Likewise, empirical evidence (e.g., Korelitz & Garber, 2016; Ratelle et al., 2017) indicates that the impact on adolescents' psychosocial adjustment is not the parental behavior as such but rather the perceptual processes of the child regarding that parental exercise. In this sense, it is currently suggested to assess it from the adolescents' perspective.

In this context, and assuming that parental skills have a substantial impact on the socio-emotional and cognitive development of adolescent children (Azar et al., 2019; Vargas Rubilar et al., 2020), it is required to encourage the study of perceived parenting during adolescence. The purpose of this study is to psychometrically validate two brief scales (mother and father versions) that assess parenting skills

from the perspective of Argentine adolescent children based on the theoretical model offered by Gómez & Contreras (2019).

## Method

### Participants

Eight adept judges specializing in psychological evaluation, psychometrics, and adolescence participated in the initial study of the items. The study also included a pilot sample of 17 school-going adolescents, selected by convenience (7 men, 10 women) between the ages of 13 and 19 ( $M = 15.80$ ;  $DT = 1.90$ ).

Besides, a typing sample was non-probabilistic and randomly subdivided into two subgroups. The first group used to carry out the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) consisted of 271 adolescents (118 men, 149 women, 4 not reported), with a medium socioeconomic level, aged between 12 and 19 years ( $M = 14.97$ ;  $DT = 1.66$ ). The adolescents who participated were enrolled in five different schools, three publicly managed (48.30%) and two privately managed (51.70%). 21% attended the first year, 12.90% the second year, 23.60% the third year, 14.80% the fourth year, 12.90% the fifth year and 14.80% the sixth year. The second subgroup enabled Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) and included 288 adolescents (132 men, 148 women, 8 not reported), with a medium socioeconomic level, aged between 12 and 19 years ( $M = 15.05$ ;  $DT = 1.64$ ). The adolescents in this subsample were enrolled in three public schools (43.10%) and two private schools (56.90%). 14.90% attended the first year, 15.30% the second year, 24.30% the third year, 14.60% the fourth year, 16.70% the fifth year and 14.20% the sixth year. Both groups resided in the provinces of Tucumán, Entre Ríos, and Misiones, Argentina.

For the concurrent validity study, a subsample of the total sample of 380 Argentine adolescents was used (164 males, 206 females, 10 not reported) with a mean age of 14.98 years ( $DT = 1.62$ ). The adolescents attended four of the five schools sampled, three public schools (67.10%) and one private school (32.90%). They completed the scales under analysis and also responded to the Perceived Parental Scale (De la Iglesia, 2020). Likewise, a second subsample of the total sample, composed of 424 adolescents (182 males, 237 females, 5 not reported) responded to the PERMA Profile Scale (Waigel & Lemos, 2023). In this case, the average age of the participants was 14.93 years ( $DT = 1.65$ ). The adolescents attended four of the schools included for sampling, three public schools (60.10%) and one private school (39.90%). The adolescents who participated in the validity studies in all cases were also part of the total typing sample.

As inclusion criteria, the following were considered: (1) that the adolescents were enrolled in school, (2) that they were between 12 and 20 years old, (3) that their parents authorized them, and (4) that they gave their consent for the participation. The exclusion criteria were: (1) that they were less than 12 years old or more than 20, (2) that the parents or guardians had not provided authorization, and (3) that the adolescent had not signed the informed consent.

### Instruments

The present work operated an ad hoc instrument to gather information regarding gender, age, and province of residence.

There was an adaptation for adolescents of the Scale of Perceived Parental Competencies by Gómez & Contreras (2019), which in its original version evaluates four factors that represent the types of parental competencies (bonding, formative, protective, and reflective)

in parents of adolescent children. It includes 56 items answered on a five-point Likert scale (from "Never" to "Always"). Some of the items in the original scale are, for example, *I can recognize when my son/daughter needs to talk to me*, *I know how to recognize situations that stress, distress or overwhelm my child*, *I take care to monitor the development of habits in their hygiene and personal care*. Its internal structure has been studied through confirmatory factor analysis, presenting acceptable fit indices ( $CFI = .98$ ;  $TLI = .98$ ;  $RMSEA = .05$ ;  $SRMR = .06$ ). Regarding internal consistency, the study revealed Cronbach's Alpha coefficients between .89 and .95 for the four subscales (Gómez Muzzio et al., 2022).

Considering that the purpose of this study was to validate two short versions (father and mother versions) to assess the perception of parenting skills by adolescent children, there were discarded those items that studied reflective parenting skills. These have been originally designed to measure the Parents' self-perception regarding their parenting and self-care practices. Likewise, the study included new items to evaluate aspects that the bibliography reports as relevant in the adolescent population, such as sexual education and parental intervention in situations of harassment or bullying (Mier & de la Bandera, 2022). The version of the scale analyzed included 52 items, 42 adapted from the original scale, and the other 10 items drafted and considered for the versions proposed in this study. It is worth noting that this study used two versions of the scale, for the adolescents should respond by assessing the competencies of their mother and father separately.

*Perceived Parental Scale (de la Iglesia, 2020)*. A self-report instrument estimates the parenting perceived by the child through 20 items answered on a three-point scale (from "Never" to "Always"). The psychometric analysis revealed that the items resulted in two large dimensions: response and demand. The authors presented two versions, one for examining the perceived mother's parenting ability and the other one for the perceived father's parenting. The internal structure of the scale for adolescents was confirmed through confirmatory factor analysis, both in its version to assess perceived maternal parenthood ( $CFI = .96$ ,  $NFI = .93$ ;  $IFI = .96$ ;  $RMSEA = .06$ ) and the paternal perceived parenting ( $CFI = .95$ ,  $NFI = .94$ ;  $IFI = .95$ ;  $RMSEA = .07$ ). Regarding internal consistency, Cronbach's Alpha coefficients of .79 and .91 were reported in the subscales of the mother version and of .93 and .83 in those of the father one (de la Iglesia, 2020).

*PERMA Profile Scale (Waigel & Lemos, 2023)*. The Argentine adaptation of the self-report instrument to assess adolescent *flourishing* consists of 23 items answered on an 11-point scale (from 0 to 10). Its reagents enable the assessment of the five PERMA domains (positive emotions, commitment, positive relationships, meaning, and achievement). The scale's internal structure was confirmed through confirmatory factor analysis ( $CFI = .94$ ,  $TLI = .92$ ;  $RMSEA = .08$ ,  $SRMR = .04$ ). The internal consistency, evaluated through Cronbach's Alpha, was between .62 and .87 for the different subscales.

### Procedures for data gathering

First, the Ethical Committee of the Universidad Adventista del Plata assessed and approved the project (Resolution N°32/23). Likewise, all the completed procedures followed the international ethical recommendations for research with human beings (American Psychological Association, 2017).

Through email, the expert judges were invited to participate and evaluate the adaptation of the original item based on the adolescents' perspective, the syntactic and semantic adequacy, and the theoretical coherence of each statement with the corresponding dimension.

Then, a pilot sample of adolescents by convenience was selected. Each indicated in a copy of the scale whether the items and the instructions and response options were intelligible and precise.

The typification sample was selected through the contact made with directors of different secondary schools, explaining the research aims and requesting authorization for the scales usage. In addition, both parents and adolescents should provide their consent. Data collection was carried out in five schools, of which three were publicly managed and two were privately managed. Of the total number of adolescents invited to participate, 38% were authorized by their parents and signed the informed consent. The information provided implied strict confidentiality. Data collection was during school hours under the supervision of the researcher in charge of the study to ensure that the evaluation conditions were standardized.

### Procedures for the adaptation and psychometric study of the scale

First, the present work revised the original scale items to assess parental competencies from the parents' perspective (Gómez & Contreras, 2019). Considering the authors' theoretical definitions regarding the different competencies and their implications, the adolescent's version included the bonding, formative, and protective parental competencies reagents. In addition, and according to the bibliographic review, new items were drafted to include elements relevant to the adolescent population. New items were proposed to evaluate aspects such as sexual education and parental intervention in bullying situations (e.g., Cabrera-García et al., 2018; Mier & de la Bandera, 2022; Silva et al., 2021; Vieira et al., 2020).

Second, expert judges reviewed every item scale under analysis. The item content validity, considered from specialists' points of view and responses, was estimated using Aiken's  $V$  coefficient. Then, a pilot sample of adolescents experienced the resulting scale. The responses of the pilot sample were analyzed qualitatively, seeking to understand in detail the adolescents' understanding of each instruction, item and response option and to identify potential difficulties in the comprehension of the words and used phrases. Finally, the typing sample encountered the revised version based on the previous procedures. It is relevant to note that adolescents responded as regards their perceptions about parenting of their mothers and fathers separately.

The items followed diverse descriptive analyses and were assessed through a  $t$ -test for independent samples to determine their discriminating capacity. For the study of the internal structure of the scale, two EFAs were performed with the IBM Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software. This analysis followed the Principal axes and Oblique rotation procedures. As a prior requirement, the possibility of completing these analyses was proved using the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin sample adequacy measure and the Bartlett's sphericity test. The items that showed good discrimination ability, contribution to internal consistency, biggest factor saturation, and theoretical coherence with the dimension they represented became part of the instrument.

Next, for the verification of the structure, CFA was carried out with JASP version 14.0 (Love et al., 2019). The factors were extracted using the ULS robust estimation method, which starts from polychoric correlation matrices, respecting the ordinal nature of the variables. The model was evaluated using different goodness-of-fit indices: Chi-Square ( $X^2$ ),  $X^2$  on degrees of freedom,  $RMSEA$  ( $< .06$ ),  $SRMR$  ( $< .08$ ),  $CFI$  ( $> .95$ ) (Greiff & Heene, 2017),  $NFI$  and  $TLI$ . For these last indices, values above .90 and .95 respectively indicate an acceptable fit (Escobedo et al., 2016).

In turn, Cronbach's Alpha and McDonald's Omega coefficients (Ventura-León & Caycho-Rodríguez, 2017) were used to assess the internal consistency of each dimension, and the complete scales were calculated based on them. Finally, to study concurrent validity, Pearson's  $r$  correlations were estimated between each factor of the scale and the scores obtained in the dimensions of the Perceived Parental Scale (De la Iglesia, 2020) and the PERMA Scale (Waigel & Lemos, 2023) in SPSS.

## Results

### Content Validity

From the experts' item assessment, except for two ambiguous items (*My father/mother tries to understand why I sometimes behave in a certain way*, *My father/mother supports and motivates me to participate in activities that I like -e.g. playing sports, learning a language or going to art workshops-*), the rest presented an Aiken's  $V$  between .80 and 1. These items were modified according to the suggestions given by the expert judges. These results show acceptable agreement regarding content validity (Ato et al., 2006).

Regarding the scale, the pilot sample did not find difficulties understanding the instructions and response options. However, little modifications were necessary to increase the clarity of the three statements. The versions (for the father and mother) administered in the typing sample consisted of 50 items each.

### Item descriptive analysis

The asymmetry and kurtosis values did not exceed the values of  $\pm 2$ , recommended for parametric analysis (Bandalos & Finney, 2010). Regarding the study of the lost cases, only one item exceeded the threshold, presenting 4.80% of null values. Since the MCAR test did not suggest a significant pattern, the above-mentioned item remained for analysis and the median of the corresponding variable replaced the missing values.

### Items discrimination power

All items, for the mother and the father versions, presented adequate discriminative ability ( $p < .001$ ).

### Exploratory Factor Analysis

Mother's version significant results arose from Bartlett's test ( $X^2 = 2529.95$ ;  $df = 17$ ;  $p < .00$ ), and the KMO was .92. Exploratory factor analysis suggested three factors, which explained 59.26% of the variance. For choosing the items for the scale, there remained those with the highest saturation in each element (see Table 1). Although some items (for example, numbers 29 and 32) did not saturate the expected factor, they remained after analyzing their content and theoretical implications. Although these items were originally proposed to evaluate formative parenting skills related to positive discipline, if the content of both elements is analyzed (see Table 1), it can be seen that they refer to parenting skills to resolve arguments between parents and children positively and calmly. These skills could be part of the emotional "toolbox" that parents have for raising their adolescent children. Thus, factor 1, named bonding parental competencies, included items 29, 16, 32, 37, 10, 46, and 25. In turn, factor 2 included items 5, 47, 3, 2, and 21, referring to training skills. Finally, factor 3,

including items 38, 9, 48, 45, 42, 26, and 50, would be linked to parental protective skills.

**Father's Version.** First, this work analyzed whether the matrix was factorable through Bartlett's test ( $X^2 = 3387.38$ ;  $df = 17$ ;  $p < .00$ ) and the KMO, which presented a value of .94. Exploratory factor analysis suggested two factors, which explained 59.17% of the variance. As well as in the mother's version, those items with an adequate factorial weight in the factor were maintained, supporting theoretical coherence. Although there is consistency between the items for both versions (father and mother), it is significant to remark that in the case of mothers, items are gathered differently. In this way, factor 1 included items 29, 16, 32, 37, 10, 46, and 25, representing bonding parental competencies. In turn, factor 2 grouped items 5, 47, 3, 2, 21, 38, 9, 48, 45, 42, 26, and 50, grouping the formative and protective parental skills into a single factor (see Table 1).

### Confirmatory Factor Analysis

The scale structure was confirmed with the second subsample. Two models were tested in both versions (mother and father). The first model verified whether the models obtained in the exploratory factor analysis fit the data well. Then, a reduced version was tested. For the short version, the five items with the highest squared correlation, i.e., those that contributed the most significant explained variance to the factor, were selected. It resulted on a scale of 15 items in total. The 15-item model presented higher values and slightly fewer errors (see Table 2 and Table 3).

### Internal Consistency

The brief mother's version (15 items) obtained an *Alpha* value of .88 for the whole scale, observing coefficients between .71 and .83 in

Table 1. Matrix factor and weight of each item in the factor

	Mother's Version			Father's Version	
	1	2	3	1	2
29. My mother/father stays calm when we argue (e.g., she doesn't yell at me or threaten me).	.85	.09	.19	-.84	-.13
16. My mother/father respects me when I feel angry and need to be alone.	.77	-.12	.01	-.76	-.04
32. My mother/father looks for positive ways to solve our arguments (e.g., she talks to me, she offers me second opportunities).	.77	.10	-.04	-.76	.15
37. My mother/father pays attention to me and remains interested when we do something together (e.g., she listens to me carefully and does not look at the cell phone).	.63	.08	-.17	-.80	.05
10. My mother/father tries to understand what I think and feel.	.63	.01	-.19	-.61	.25
46. My mother/father makes me feel important to her/him.	.60	.04	-.32	-.72	.20
25. My mother/father way affectionately speaks to me.	.59	.07	-.18	-.62	.16
5. My mother/father cares I sleep the needed hours (e.g., I don't stay with my cell phone until late).	-.04	.78	-.01	-.01	.63
47. My mother/father ensures we follow the rules we agree on (e.g., the use of electronic appliances and schedules).	.16	.66	.06	-.17	.53
3. My mother/father is attentive to what I do on social networks.	-.08	.52	.02	.13	.64
21. My mother/father cares for my healthy feeding.	.10	.49	-.12	.12	.81
2. My mother/father helps me start the day in an organized way (e.g., getting up on time, having breakfast, organizing my things, leaving on time, etc.).	.11	.47	-.12	-.10	.64
38. My mother/father advises me on how to behave depending on the situation, place, or people I am with.	.00	-.03	-.80	-.14	.71
9. My mother/father teaches me how to protect myself (e.g., she tells me about alcohol use and drugs and how to care for myself when I go to parties).	.02	-.02	-.78	-.04	.72
48. My mother/father protects me or does something for me in situations of bullying or injustice.	-.04	.06	-.69	-.22	.53
45. My mother/father knows my friends and advises me about my relationship with them.	.07	.01	-.66	-.04	.68
42. My mother/father asks me what to do in a dangerous situation (e.g., robbery, physical or sexual violence).	.09	.15	-.63	-.08	.71
26. My mother/father tells me about her experiences so that I can learn.	.13	-.13	-.61	-.31	.50
50. My mother/father asks me to let her know where I am going to be when I am not at home.	-.06	.16	-.53	-.07	.54
Alpha	.91	.75	.87	.92	.91

Table 2. Models Fit Indices (mother's version)

	$X^2$	$X^2 / df$	CFI	NFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR
19 items	435.76	2.92	.98	.96	.97	.08 [.07-.09]	.06
15 items	191.05	2.19	.99	.98	.98	.06 [.05-.07]	.05

Table 3. Models Fit Indices (father's version)

	$X^2$	$X^2 / df$	CFI	NFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR
19 items	536.91	3.55	.99	.99	.99	.09 [.08-.1]	.05
15 items	330.64	3.71	.99	.99	.99	.09 [.08-.1]	.05

Table 4. Internal Consistency

	Mother's Version			Father's Version	
	Bonding competencies	Protective competencies	Formative competencies	Bonding competencies	Protective and Formative competencies
Cronbach's Alpha	.83	.82	.71	.89	.90
McDonald's Omega	.83	.82	.72	.89	.90

Table 5. Correlations for concurrent validity evidence

	Mother's Version			Father's Version	
	Bonding competencies	Protective competencies	Formative competencies	Bonding competencies	Protective and Formative competencies
Demand	.10*	.41**	.53**	.31**	.62**
Response	.87**	.64**	.45**	.90**	.76**
Positive emotions	.40**	.28**	.17**	.36**	.31**
Commitment	.36**	.40**	.16**	.29**	.34**
Positive relationships	.56**	.41**	.24**	.45**	.38**
Meaning	.38**	.35**	.20**	.30**	.33**
Achievement	.44**	.32**	.22**	.37**	.32**

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$

Table 6. Items included in the version of the instrument under study and selected for the 19-item and the 15-item versions

	Item	Source	Status
1	My mother/father notices when I need to have a conversation with her/him.	Original scale for parents	Deleted item (AFE)
2	My mother/father helps me start the day in an organized way (e.g., getting up on time, having breakfast, organizing my things, leaving on time, etc.).	Original scale for parents	Present in 15-item version
3	My mother/father is attentive to what I do on social networks.	Original scale for parents	Present in 15-item version
4	My mother/father notices when there is something that worries or distresses me.	Original scale for parents	Deleted item (AFE)
5	My mother/father cares if I sleep the needed hours (e.g., I don't stay with my cell phone until late).	Original scale for parents	Present in 15-item version
6	My mother/father is involved and knows how I am doing in school (e.g., goes to meetings, knows how I am doing).	Original scale for parents	Deleted item (AFE)
7	My mother/father realizes what's wrong with me and what I need when I'm different or weird.	Original scale for parents	Deleted item (AFE)
8	My mother/father makes sure that when I come home from school, I can eat something, rest and study.	Original scale for parents	Deleted item (AFE)
9	My mother/father teaches me how to protect myself (e.g., she tells me about alcohol use and drugs and how to care for myself when I go to parties).	Original scale for parents	Present in 15-item version
10	My mother/father tries to understand what I think and feel.	Original scale for parents	Present in 15-item version
11	My mother/father gives me her opinion regarding my appearance, but respects what pleases me (e.g., clothing style, haircut or hair color).	Original scale for parents	Deleted item (AFE)
12	My mother/father respects my things and personal space (e.g., she knocks on the door before entering my room).	Original scale for parents	Deleted item (AFE)
13	My mother/father helps me feel better when I am sad or angry.	Original scale for parents	Deleted item (AFE)
14	My mother/father helps me decide what to do in my free time.	Original scale for parents	Deleted item (AFE)
15	My mother/father wants us to treat each other well (e.g. not to yell at each other, insult each other).	Original scale for parents	Deleted item (AFE)
16	My mother/father respects me when I feel angry and need to be alone.	Original scale for parents	Present in 19-item version
17	My mother/father gives me advice on how to handle my problems with others (e.g. teacher, friend) when I ask her for it.	Original scale for parents	Deleted item (AFE)
18	My mother/father is interested in having my opinion heard and taken into account in my family.	Original scale for parents	Deleted item (AFE)
19	My mother/father helps me to have confidence in myself when I feel insecure.	Original scale for parents	Deleted item (AFE)
20	My mother/father supports me to participate in activities that I like.	Original scale for parents	Deleted item (AFE)
21	My mother/father cares for my healthy feeding.	Original scale for parents	Present in 15-item version
22	My mother/father enjoys sharing activities with me.	Original scale for parents	Deleted item (AFE)
23	My mother/father helps me understand what I don't understand (e.g. things about school and life).	Original scale for parents	Deleted item (AFE)

	Item	Source	Status
24	My mother/father supervises my hygiene and personal care habits.	Original scale for parents	Deleted item (AFE)
25	My mother/father way affectionately speaks to me.	Original scale for parents	Present in 15-item version
26	My mother/father tells me about her experiences so that I can learn.	Original scale for parents	Present in 19-item version
27	My mother/father is concerned about my health and takes me to the doctor when necessary.	Original scale for parents	Deleted item (AFE)
28	My mother/father shows me that she/he loves me (e.g. she hugs me, smiles at me, writes me on Whatsapp)	Original scale for parents	Deleted item (AFE)
29	My mother/father stays calm when we argue (e.g., she doesn't yell at me or threaten me).	Original scale for parents	Present in 19-item version
30	My mother/father makes time for us to have special moments as a family (e.g. eating together, celebrating birthdays).	Original scale for parents	Deleted item (AFE)
31	My mother/father spends time with me doing things that I like.	Original scale for parents	Deleted item (AFE)
32	My mother/father looks for positive ways to solve our arguments (e.g., she talks to me, she offers me second opportunities).	Original scale for parents	Present in 15-item version
33	My mother/father asks me to help with housework (e.g. help with shopping, cooking, cleaning).	Original scale for parents	Deleted item (AFE)
34	My mother/father makes time during the day to be with me.	Original scale for parents	Deleted item (AFE)
35	My mother/father wants us to come to an agreement when she/he sets rules (e.g., regarding arrival times, cell phone use).	Original scale for parents	Deleted item (AFE)
36	My mother/father helps me so that I can continue with my activities, even when she/he is sick or has a problem at work.	Original scale for parents	Deleted item (AFE)
37	My mother/father pays attention to me and remains interested when we do something together (e.g., she listens to me carefully and does not look at the cell phone).	Original scale for parents	Present in 15-item version
38	My mother/father advises me on how to behave depending on the situation, place, or people I am with.	Original scale for parents	Present in 15-item version
39	My mother/father makes sure that someone she trusts is available for me (e.g. family, friends) if she/he is feeling unwell or is away from home.	Original scale for parents	Deleted item (AFE)
40	My mother/father recognizes and tells me the good things she sees in me.	New	Deleted item (AFE)
41	My mother/father is a good example for me (e.g. she/he doesn't throw garbage in the street, is caring, treats people well).	Original scale for parents	Deleted item (AFE)
42	My mother/father asks me what to do in a dangerous situation (e.g., robbery, physical or sexual violence).	New	Present in 15-item version
43	My mother/father is proud of me.	New	Deleted item (AFE)
44	My mother/father teaches me how to treat people well (e.g. to say thank you, to apologize).	Original scale for parents	Deleted item (AFE)
45	My mother/father knows my friends and advises me about my relationship with them.	New	Present in 15-item version
46	My mother/father makes me feel important to her/him.	New	Present in 15-item version
47	My mother/father ensures we follow the rules we agree on (e.g., the use of electronic appliances and schedules).	New	Present in 15-item version
48	My mother/father protects me or does something for me in situations of bullying or injustice.	New	Present in 15-item version
49	My mother/father is giving me more freedom as I get older (e.g., buying my clothes, arriving late if I give notice).	New	Deleted item (AFE)
50	My mother/father asks me to let her know where I am going to be when I am not at home.	New	Present in 19-item version

the different subscales. The brief father's version (15 items) presented an *Alpha* coefficient of .93 for the whole scale, with values of .89 and .90 in the dimensions that comprise it (see Table 4).

### Concurrent Construct Validity

As expected from a theoretical point of view, positive and significant correlations were observed between the response and demand dimensions of perceived parenthood and parental competencies. In addition, the link between parenting skills and the pillars of flourishing also revealed positive and significant relationships (see Table 5).

### Discussion

Despite the boom in the study of positive parenting and its proven impact on the socio-emotional and cognitive development of adolescent children (Vilugrón et al., 2022), most known research has focused on the evaluation and knowledge of attachment and parenting styles. Thus, the study of family support and strengths has been relegated to second place. Taking the above into account, the purpose of this study was to psychometrically validate two brief scales (mother and father versions) that allow the evaluation of parenting skills from the perspective of Argentine adolescents.

Firstly, the study assesses the validity of the content and the functioning of the items that resulted from the adolescents' perspective providing empirical evidence in each case. Furthermore, there was an evaluation of the discriminative ability of the statements. It was noticed that each announcement facilitates the distinction between those adolescents who perceive a greater or lesser degree of competence in their fathers, mothers, or caregivers.

When analyzing the internal structure of the scales, differences appeared between the mother and father versions. Specifically, in the mother's version, the number of resulting factors agrees with that expected from the theoretical approach. However, their arrangement is barely distinct from the original scale for parents. In the father's version, the protective and training competencies were grouped into a single factor, resulting in a two-dimensional scale. This distinction in the structure of the scales could be because parents tend to play different roles in parenting, with mothers being the principal caregivers. Thus, children may perceive this difference in interaction and involvement during parenthood (Chuang & Tamis-LeMonda, 2009). It would result in a more evident and differentiated perception of maternal competencies than paternal ones.

Besides, there is evidence that the mother's influence is independent of that of the father. Therefore, it is necessary to differentiate the maternal and paternal contributions to upbringing (Ratelle et al., 2017). This is consistent with other recent studies that assert men and women exercise their parenting through different roles, styles, practices, and skills, influenced by the culture in which they are situated (Vargas Rubilar et al., 2023; Yaffe, 2023). In this sense, the present study provides two scales that allow the assessment, in a differentiated way, of parenting skills perceived by adolescents.

Regarding the validity of the structure of both scales (19-item version and 15-item brief version), the goodness indices suggest satisfactory adjustments in mother's and father's versions. In both, the error presents marginal values to those currently recommended (Greiff & Heene, 2017); although the literature argues that, they would indicate an acceptable adjustment (Cupani, 2012). The adjustment indices obtained in the present study for the brief versions of both scales (mother and father) are higher than those indices reported in the original Chilean ranking (Gómez & Contreras, 2019). Likewise, the adjustment of the brief scale is similar to those of the Argentine adaptation made for parents of school-age children (Vargas Rubilar et al., 2020). Regarding the internal consistency of the scales, both Cronbach's Alpha and the Omega coefficients yielded values within adequate limits (González & Pazmiño, 2015).

The items discussed below are based on the results obtained by the brief version of the scales (see Table 6). The present work analyzed the evidence of the concurrent validity of the instrument. As expected, perceived parenting competencies were positively associated with all pillars of adolescent flourishing. More specifically, there was a high association between maternal and paternal bonding skills, the cornerstone of relationships, and positive emotions and achievement. These results are in line with what the positive parenting approach sets. This is because bonding skills are parental knowledge, attitudes, and daily practices that favor psychological and emotional connection with adolescent children, protect their mental health, promote secure attachment, and, therefore, an adequate socio-emotional development throughout the entire life cycle (Gómez & Contreras, 2019).

In turn, the dimensions of mothers' protective competencies and parenting training and protective competencies were mainly associated with the pillars of positive relationships and commitment. In addition, it becomes relevant that although maternal training skills

positively correlated to flourishing, this relationship was moderate. These could result from the nature of this type of competence, which connects with the stimulation of learning, positive discipline, the transmission of social rules, and the accompaniment towards autonomy (Gómez & Contreras, 2019).

Finally, the results agree with that observed by Chen et al. (2019), who argue that mothers' parenting behavior would be more highly related to indicators of emotional well-being than that of parents. These findings are in line with other studies, which have suggested that positive parenting is associated with adolescent well-being, quality of life, flourishing, and psychosocial adjustment (Chen et al., 2019).

On the other hand, the connection between parental competencies and the dimensions of perceived parenthood proposed by De la Iglesia (2020), namely, response and demand, was evaluated. According to the author, the response dimension is positively associated with the well-being of adolescents and implies affectionate bonding with their sons and daughters, characterized by emotional support, encouragement, and listening. As expected, the perception of all parental competencies was positively and strongly associated with this dimension.

In turn, the demand dimension refers to setting limits, establishing demands, and pursuing parental control. Although this dimension was positively related to the competencies, the associations were moderate. It becomes relevant its relationship with the formative and protective competencies that refer to parental skills to provide positive discipline, socialization, adequate autonomy, and the provision of care for adolescent children to ensure physical, emotional, and psychosexual safety (Gómez & Contreras, 2019).

For a long time, research and intervention in the family environment have focused on identifying and correcting deficiencies. In this sense, the fact that the detection, development, and promotion of parenting skills would allow for preventing problematic situations, mobilizing personal resources, fostering resilience, and promoting the well-being of all family members has been disregarded (Rodrigo et al., 2015). In this sense, the scales validated in the present study are promising for at least two reasons. Firstly, they are the first scales available in the Spanish-speaking population that assess the construct of parenting skills from adolescent's perspective. Secondly, through them, it would be feasible to notice those competencies with the highest impact on the healthy development of adolescents and design strategies that promote more positive parenting. On the other hand, having a brief (15 items) and sparing version with adequate validity and reliability indices would favor the evaluation process (Cupani et al., 2019), both in clinical and research contexts.

### Limitations and recommendations for future research

The present study shows some limitations. The sample was selected for convenience, which limits the possibility of generalizing the results. It is suggested for future studies to use random sampling, with the aim of increasing the generalizability of the results. Likewise, it would be advisable for future studies to include adolescents from the entire age range of adolescence (10 to 19 years), since lower ages were not represented in the present study.

Concerning the analyses, future studies should evaluate the scores' stability and include new validity tests, such as discriminant and predictive validity. Furthermore, considering the existing evidence that different parenting styles during adolescence can vary depending on the gender of the adolescent, it would be valuable to comprehend whether parents trigger diverse skills depending on the gender of their children (Kingsbury et al., 2020).



In addition, it would be enriching for future studies to evaluate parental competencies from the perspective of fathers and mothers, to compare these perceptions with those of the children. In this way, the impact of both perceptions on adolescent development could be analyzed.

Finally, this scale can contribute to the evaluation of intervention programs aimed at promoting parental competencies. The design of evidence-based interventions focused on strengthening positive parenting would ensure better psychosocial adjustment in adolescent children. Specifically, schools and community organizations could design programs aimed at improving parenting skills, thereby enhancing the support system for adolescents. Ultimately, the findings from these studies could be used to design public policies that support family well-being.

## Funding

This work was supported by the Universidad Adventista del Plata (Project 20.49 “Diseño de una escala para evaluar las competencias parentales positivas desde la percepción del hijo adolescente”).

## Acknowledgements

The authors thank the educational institutions that allowed the collection of the research sample.

## Conflict of Interest

The authors of this work declare that there is no conflict of interest.

## References

- American Psychological Association. (2017). Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct. <https://www.apa.org/ethics/code>
- Ato, M., Benavente, A., & Lopez, J. (2006). Análisis comparativo de tres enfoques para evaluar el acuerdo entre observadores. *Psicothema*, *18*(3), 638 – 645.
- Avedissian, T., & Alayan, N. (2021). Adolescent well-being: A concept analysis. *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing*, *30*(2), 357-367. <https://doi.org/10.1111/inm.12833>
- Azar, E., Vargas-Rubilar, J., & Arán-Filippetti, V. (2019). Adaptación de la escala de competencia parental percibida a una población de padres argentinos. *Anuario de Investigaciones*, *25*, 393-401.
- Bandalos, D., & Finney, S. (2010). Factor analysis: Exploratory and confirmatory. In G.R. Hancock & R.O. Mueller (Eds.), *The reviewer's guide to quantitative methods in the Social Sciences* (pp. 93-114). Routledge.
- Barudy, J. & Dantagnan, M. (2010). *Los desafíos invisibles de ser madre o padre. Manual de evaluación de competencias y resiliencia parental*. Gedisa.
- Bayot-Mestre & Hernández-Viadet, J. (2008). *Evaluación de la competencia parental*. CEPE.
- Bernal-Ruiz, F., Rodríguez-Vera, M., González-Campos, J., & Torres-Álvarez, A. (2018). Competencias parentales que favorecen el desarrollo de funciones ejecutivas en escolares. *Revista Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales, Niñez y Juventud*, *16*(1), 163-176. <https://doi.org/10.11600/1692715x.16109>
- Cabrera-García, V., Docal-Millán, M. D. C., Manrique-Mora, L. M., Cortés-Piraquive, J. M., & Tobón-Aguilar, C. M. (2018). Familia y escuela: contextos asociados al inicio de la actividad sexual de los adolescentes colombianos. *Revista de Salud Pública*, *20*, 279-285. <https://doi.org/10.15446/rsap.v20n3.60386>
- Chen, Y., Haines, J., Charlton, B., & VanderWeele, T. (2019). Positive parenting improves multiple aspects of health and well-being in young adulthood. *Nature human behaviour*, *3*(7), 684-691. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-019-0602-x>
- Chuang, S., & Tamis-LeMonda, C. (2009). Gender roles in immigrant families: Parenting views, practices, and child development. *Sex Roles*, *60*(7), 451-455. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-009-9601-0>
- Cordero-López, B., & Calventus, J. S. (2022). Modelos predictivos del bienestar adolescente: Estilos y prácticas parentales. *Límite (Arica)*, *17*, 1-15.
- Cupani, M. (2012). Análisis de Ecuaciones Estructurales: conceptos, etapas de desarrollo y un ejemplo de aplicación. *Revista tesis*, *1*(1), 186-199.
- Cupani, M., Lorenzo-Seva, U., Korzeniowski, C., & Azpilicueta, A. (2019). Elaboración de la versión breve del cuestionario de personalidad IPIP-Revisado: control del sesgo de respuesta aquiescencia. *Acta Colombiana de Psicología*, *22*(1), 248-260. <https://doi.org/10.14718/acp.2019.22.1.12>
- Davids, E. L., Roman, N. V., & Leach, L. (2017). The link between parenting approaches and health behavior: A systematic review. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, *27*(6), 589-608. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10911359.2017.1311816>
- De la Iglesia, G. (2020). Escala de Parentalidad Percibida (EPP): medir psicométricamente en las configuraciones familiares actuales. *Revista psicodebate: psicología, cultura y sociedad*, *20*(2), 40-58. <https://doi.org/10.18682/pd.v20i2.3289>
- Escobedo, M., Hernández, J., Estebané, V., & Martínez, G. (2016). Modelos de ecuaciones estructurales: Características, fases, construcción, aplicación y resultados. *Ciencia & trabajo*, *18*(55), 16-22. <https://doi.org/10.4067/s0718-24492016000100004>
- Francis, A., Pai, M. S., & Badagabettu, S. (2021). Psychological well-being and perceived parenting style among adolescents. *Comprehensive Child and Adolescent Nursing*, *44*(2), 134-143. <https://doi.org/10.1080/24694193.2020.1743796>
- Gallego, A. G., Pérez, A. M., Fernández, V. F., Alcántara-López, M., & Sáez, M. C. (2021). Life satisfaction in adolescents: relationship with parental style, peer attachment and emotional intelligence. *Electronic Journal of Research in Education Psychology*, *19*(53), 51-74. <https://doi.org/10.25115/ejrep.v19i53.3425>
- Gamble, W. C., Ramakumar, S., & Diaz, A. (2007). Maternal and paternal similarities and differences in parenting: An examination of Mexican-American parents of young children. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *22*(1), 72-88.
- Gómez, E., & Contreras, L. (2019). *Manual escala de parentalidad positiva E2P v2*. Ediciones Fundación América por la Infancia.
- Gómez, E., Contreras, L., & Sandoval, J. (2022). Positive Parenting Scale: Evidence of Validity and Reliability in a Chilean Sample. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *31*(12), 3372-3384. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-022-02410-1>
- González, J., & Pazmiño, M. (2015). Cálculo e interpretación del Alfa de Cronbach para el caso de validación de la consistencia interna de un cuestionario, con dos posibles escalas tipo Likert. *Revista Publicando*, *2*(1), 62-67. <https://doi.org/10.5209/rced.53721>
- Greiff, S., & Heene, M. (2017). Why psychological assessment needs to start worrying about model fit. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, *33*, 313-317. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000450>

- Kaniušonytė, G., & Laursen, B. (2022). Perceptions of positive parenting predict increases in resilience for low neurotic and high agreeable adolescents. *Personality and Individual Differences, 185*, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2021.111272>
- Kingsbury, M., Sucha, E., Manion, I., Gilman, S. E., & Colman, I. (2020). Adolescent mental health following exposure to positive and harsh parenting in childhood. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 65*(6), 392-400. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0706743719889551>
- Kokkinos, C. M. & Voulgaridou, I. (2016): Links between relational aggression, parenting and personality among adolescents. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 14*(3), 249-264. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2016.1194265>
- Korelitz, K., & Garber, J. (2016). Congruence of parents' and children's perceptions of parenting: A meta-analysis. *Journal of youth and adolescence, 45*(10), 1973-1995. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-016-0524-0>
- Kyriazos, T., & Stalikas, A. (2018). Positive parenting or positive psychology parenting? Towards a conceptual framework of positive psychology parenting. *Psychology, 9*(07), 1761. <https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2018.97104>
- Love, J., Selker, R., Marsman, M., Jamil, T., Dropmann, D., Verhagen, J., Ly, A., Gronau, Q., Smira, M., Epskamp, S., Matzke, D., Wild, A., Knight, P., Rouder, J., Morey, R., & Wagenmakers, E. (2019). JASP: Graphical statistical software for common statistical designs. *Journal of Statistical Software, 88*(1), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v088.i02>
- Martínez González, R. A., Iglesias García, M. T., & Pérez Herrero, M. D. H. (2021). Validación de la escala de competencias parentales emocionales y sociales para madres (ECPES-M). *Pedagogía Social, 37*, 69-82. [https://doi.org/10.7179/psri\\_2021.37.04](https://doi.org/10.7179/psri_2021.37.04)
- Mier, M., & de la Bandera, F. (2022). Los estilos de socialización parental y su relación con el uso problemático de internet en adolescentes. *Ciencia Latina Revista Científica Multidisciplinar, 6*(3), 1324-1341. [https://doi.org/10.37811/cl\\_rcm.v6i3.2299](https://doi.org/10.37811/cl_rcm.v6i3.2299)
- Mousavi, S. F., & Dehshiri, G. R. (2022). The predictors of Loneliness in Adolescents: The role of Gender, Parenting Rearing Behaviors, Friendship Quality, and Shyness. *Journal of Woman and Family Studies, 9*(4), 1-20.
- Nepper, M. J., & Chai, W. (2016). Parents' barriers and strategies to promote healthy eating among school-age children. *Appetite, 103*, 157-164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2016.04.012>
- Ratelle, C., Duchesne, S., & Guay, F. (2017). Predicting school adjustment from multiple perspectives on parental behaviors. *Journal of Adolescence, 54*, 60-72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2016.11.008>
- Rodrigo, M., Máiquez, M., & Martín, J. (2010). Parentalidad positiva y políticas locales de apoyo a las familias. Orientaciones para favorecer el ejercicio de las responsabilidades parentales desde las corporaciones locales. Ministerio de Sanidad y Política Social.
- Rodrigo, M., Máiquez, M., Martín, J., & Rodríguez, B. (2015). La parentalidad positiva desde la prevención y la promoción. *Manual práctico de parentalidad positiva, 2*, 25-43. <https://doi.org/10.55414/ap.v34i2-3.601>
- Silva, G. R. R., Lima, M. L. C. D., Acioli, R. M. L., & Barreira, A. K. (2021). A influência da violência familiar e entre pares na prática do bullying por adolescentes escolares. *Ciência & Saúde Coletiva, 26*, 4933-4943. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1413-812320212611.3.20632019>
- Simaes, A. C., Gómez, F. N., Caccia, P. A., & Mancini, N. A. (2021). Parentalidad Positiva y Competencias Parentales en cuidadores primarios de niños y niñas de 0 a 3 años. *Psicología del Desarrollo, (2)*, 37-48.
- Stavroulaki, E., Li, M., & Gupta, J. (2021). Perceived parenting styles, academic achievement, and life satisfaction of college students: the mediating role of motivation orientation. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 36*, 693-717. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-020-00493-2>
- Tehrani, H. D., Yamini, S., & Vazsonyi, A. T. (2024). Parenting styles and Big Five personality traits among adolescents: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences, 216*, 112-142. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2023.112421>
- Vargas-Rubilar, J., Lemos, V., & Richaud, M. (2020). Adaptación y validación argentina de una versión breve de la Escala de Parentalidad Positiva (E2p). *Liberabit, 26*(2), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.24265/liberabit.2020.v26n2.08>
- Vargas-Rubilar, J., Richaud, M.C., Balabanian, C., & Lemos, V. (2023). Parenting, Gender, and Perception of Changes in Children's Behavior during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 20*, 6452. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20156452>
- Ventura-León, J., & Caycho-Rodríguez, T. (2017). El coeficiente omega: un método alternativo para la estimación de la confiabilidad. *Revista Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales, Niñez y Juventud, 15*(1), 625-627. <https://doi.org/10.11600/1692715x.1520102082016>
- Vieira, F. H. M., Alexandre, H. P., Campos, V. A., & de Sousa Leite, M. T. (2020). Impactos do bullying na saúde mental do adolescente. *Ciência et Praxis, 13*(25), 91-104. <https://revista.uemg.br/index.php/praxys/article/view/4354>
- Vilugrón, G., Hernández, R., Arriagada, M., & Melo, R. (2022). Influencia de los estilos de crianza en el desarrollo emocional y aprendizaje de los adolescentes. *Revista Infancia, Educación y Aprendizaje, 8*(2), 17-33. <https://doi.org/10.55777/rea.v8i15.1025>
- Waigel, N., & Lemos, V. (2023). Psychometric Properties of PERMA Profiler Scale in Argentinian Adolescents. *International Journal of Psychological Research, 16*(1), 78-87. <https://doi.org/10.21500/20112084.5737>
- Yaffe, Y. (2023). Systematic review of the differences between mothers and fathers in parenting styles and practices. *Current Psychology, 42*(19), 16011-16024. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-020-01014-6>