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CHAPTER I REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The role of marital satisfaction and parental style in child and adolescent adjustment has received wide attention during the last decade. Specifically, this area of study suggests that marital conflict and harsh or restrictive parenting styles directly or indirectly are associated with emotional, somatic, or behavioral problems in children (Emery, 1982). In his landmark review, Emery (1982) stated "children from homes where interparental conflict is a common occurrence are a high-risk population" (p. 327). Peterson and Zill (1986) support Emery in their study based on data from the National Surveys of Children. The 1981 national sample consisted of 1,400 children aged 12-16 years. The authors classified the children into 3 broad categories: those living with both biological parents, those living with biological mothers but not with fathers, and those living with biological fathers but not mothers. Peterson and Zill state for children "marital conflict in intact homes, especially if persistent, appears to be as harmful as disruption itself" (p. 306).

Webster-Stratton (1989) addressed the effects of marital conflict on parenting style and parent-child relations. Her study examined 117 clinic families recruited from a parenting clinic that specialized in treatment programs for conduct problems. Clinic
parents were divided into maritally supported (N=42), maritally distressed (N=43), and single parents (N=32). The study children included 80 boys and 37 girls ranging in age 3-7 years (mean = 4 years). Webster-Stratton noted that low marital satisfaction was significantly correlated with increased mother perceptions of child adjustment problems, father and mother high parenting stress, increased father and mother commands, and child noncompliance (Webster-Stratton, 1989).

The aggression between spouses has shown to increase parent-child aggression and child behavior problems (Jouriles, Barling, & O'Leary, 1987). Jouriles et al. (1987) collected data from 22 boys and 23 girls who were referred by their mothers to the Victims Information Bureau of Suffolk County, New York. The mean age of the boys was 8.7 years and the mean age of the girls was 8.2 years. Most of the children (98%) witnessed physical aggression during the last year between their parents. The authors reported that "the witnessing of marital violence may not be as important in influencing child behavior as the occurrence of parent-child aggression" (1989; p. 171).

The theoretical model

This study will investigate the direct effects of marital satisfaction and parenting style on adolescent adjustment. Additionally, the study will examine the indirect effect of marital
satisfaction through parenting style with adolescent adjustment. As well, the study will examine the indirect effects of the endogenous variables of couple communication, couple interaction, and husband/wife positive affect through husband/wife marital satisfaction, and husband/wife parenting style with adolescent adjustment. The theoretical model for the study is presented in Figure 1.

Figure 1. The general theoretical model

Causal connections between the exogenous and endogenous variables result from presumed differences in their malleability or likelihood of change. The first three variables (couple communication, couple interaction, and husband/wife positive affect) are conceptualized in the model as long-term, enduring
qualities or characteristics of the husband, wife, and marital relationship. On the other hand, marital satisfaction and parenting style are conceptualized to change over time in relation to changes in the family life cycle. For example, there is considerable research evidence that marital satisfaction can substantially increase or decrease across the marital life cycle and that parenting style adjusts to different children's ages, temperaments, and birth orders (Belsky, Youngblade, Rovine, & Volling, 1991; Steinberg & Silverberg, 1987).

Schaefer and Burnett (1987) suggest that an individual's adjustment is more stable than specific relationships with others. Their study examined 51 low-income women from intact marriages who were a subsample of a longitudinal study. The original sample consisted of 321 low-income women initially recruited from public health prenatal clinics for a study of mother-infant relationships. Schaefer and Burnett (1987) reported that longitudinal correlations and multiple regression analysis supported their hypothesis that initial marital relationship would predict later "demoralization." They later stated "the somewhat higher stability of demoralization than of quality of marital relationship suggests that an individual's adjustment is more stable than are specific relationships with others" (1987; p. 1137).

Caspi and Herbener (1990) reported that individuals who married another who resembled them in their personality organization and were satisfied with their marriage, maintained a
consistency of personality across middle adulthood. They utilized
data from the Institute of Human Development at the University of
California, Berkeley. The authors focused on two longitudinal
studies: 1) 37 women and 38 men whose birth dates were in 1928-
29 and their spouses (the Berkeley Guidance Study); and 2) 24
women and 27 men whose birth dates were in 1920-21 and their
spouses (Oakland Growth Study). The study participants provided
data in 1970 and 1981. Caspi and Herbener (1990) noted the
important role of environmental conditions one chose as being
correlated with their dispositions, and of the selection of their
partners who were similar to themselves.

Costa and McCrae (1988) reported in their study that
personality was stable after age 30. Their study examined data
from two groups of subjects. The first sample consisted of
participants from the Augmented Baltimore Longitudinal Study of
Aging who completed the Neuroticism, Extraversion, and Openness
Personality Inventory. A subsample was obtained for the spouse
rating study. The second sample was individuals recruited in 1986
for the cross-sectional and sequential analyses. Costa and McCrae
utilized self-reports (N=983) and spouse ratings (N=167) on the NEO
Personality Inventory from men and women aged 21 to 96 years. The
authors reported "unequivocal evidence for the stability of
individual differences" (p. 862). They also noted that all five of the
major domains of personality (Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness
to Experience, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness) showed stability
in self reports of men and women across the adult age range (Costa & McCrae, 1988).

The view that communication and interaction style are relatively enduring qualities of a marital couple was supported in Howes and Markman's (1989) study of premarital and postbirth of a child, and the couple's marital relationship. The authors examined 20 families with children between 1 and 3 years from the Denver Family Development Project. The parents completed measures of marital satisfaction, conflict, and communication at premarriage and postbirth of their child. Their findings suggested that a marital couple's premarital ability to handle differences in their relationship through conflict management and communication skills carried over to their ability after their child's birth. This ability to manage differences contributed to their child's well-being (Howes & Markman, 1989).

Baucom, Sayers, and Duhe (1989) also support the aspect of enduring qualities in marital relationships. Their study examined couples requesting marital therapy and from nonclinic couples. All clinic couples (N=49) were involved in a marital treatment outcome investigation in the University of North Carolina's psychology department. The 225 nonclinic couples were generated from a Chapel Hill community directory. They concluded that the married respondents in their study consistently attributed their partner's behavior largely to the partner and to stable personality aspects of their partner.
In summary, this study expects couple communication style, couple interaction style, and husband/wife positive affect to predict the level of marital satisfaction and parenting style of husbands and wives. The exogenous variables are hypothesized to have an indirect effect on adolescent adjustment. In turn, marital satisfaction and parenting style are hypothesized to have a direct effect on adolescent adjustment. In addition, couple communication, interaction style and husband/wife positive affect are regarded as more enduring, constant characteristics of the marital couple. The following is a presentation of literature supporting the importance of each construct's inclusion in the theoretical model.

Review of the literature

The literature on marital satisfaction, husband/wife parenting style, and adolescent adjustment has flourished in the last decade. Several consistent themes are present in several studies. These themes include the importance of addressing the marital couple's manner of interaction with each other as well as each spouse's level of well-being in determining their level of marital satisfaction, their approach towards parenting, and the adjustment of their adolescent child (Emery, 1982). Another consistent theme is the difference between boys and girls in response to marital and parent-child conflict (Emery, 1982).
Couple communication style

This study's model proposes a direct relationship between couple communication style and husband/wife marital satisfaction and husband/wife parenting style. The model suggests positive couple communication should enhance marital satisfaction and husband/wife parenting style, while negative couple communication would be detrimental. Several studies provide support for this portion of the theoretical model.

Couple communication style and husband/wife marital satisfaction

The link between quality of communication and marital satisfaction has been cited in numerous studies. In this study, the variable husband/wife communication equates communication with clarity, appropriate assertiveness, and responsiveness to others in family interactions. Gottman, Notarius, Markman, Banks, Yoppi, and Rubin (1976) report that increased communicative misunderstandings and misperceptions were associated with marital couples of low marital satisfaction. The quality of communication has also been found to vary according to marital satisfaction even when the family members are allowed to rate themselves while interacting. Callan and Noller's (1986) study of communicative relationships in families with an adolescent allowed the family to rate themselves, and other family members on the communicative dimensions of anxiety, involvement, dominance and friendliness. Their sample consisted of only two-child families. Each family had a 12 year old child and a sibling two years younger
or older. The 54 families were primarily middle-class and intact. The results indicated ratings across all four communication dimensions were influenced by marital satisfaction. In other words, perceived communication of low marital satisfaction couples with daughters was rated as more anxious and less friendly than high marital satisfaction couples. Additionally, low marital satisfaction couples with sons rated higher on levels of dominance and involvement than high marital satisfaction couples, suggesting, issues of power and control (Callan & Noller, 1986). Callan and Noller (1986) also note gender of adolescent was significant in the perceived communicative relationships. Gender differences of the adolescent will be addressed later in this chapter.

The link between communication and marital satisfaction has been summarized in the above studies. The consistent theme was poor communication between spouses decreased marital satisfaction. Next, the link between communication between spouses and parenting of their child is presented.

**Couple communication style and husband/wife parenting style**

Communication between spouses and its influence on their parenting style has been addressed in some studies. For instance, referring again to Howes and Markman (1989), they noted that positive communication of fathers (rated by mothers), and mothers (rated by fathers) was related to higher levels of sociability in their child. The authors later speculated that couple communication may have an indirect effect (as this study is suggesting) with child adjustment.
Howes and Markman (1989) stated: "Parents who are still 'smoldering' from an unresolved conflict with their spouse would likely be withdrawn, distant, and less emotionally available and sensitive in subsequent interactions with their child" (p. 1049). Therefore, as long as there is perceived positive communication between spouses, they are better able to approach their child in a positive manner.

Demo, Small, and Savin-Williams (1987) addressed the role of communication in parent-child interaction. The participants for their study consisted of 139 parent-adolescent dyads who were predominantly white, middle or upper-class. The parents were enrolled in one of five family-oriented summer educational sessions at Cornell University. The adolescents ranged in ages between 10-17 years. Although in some cases both parents filled out questionnaires, only one parent was included in the study. They noted that self-esteem of children (more so for boys) was strongly related to family relations (e.g., marital relationship, parent-child relationship), and positive communication and participation with parents was strongly related to adolescent self-esteem.

**Couple interaction style**

Couple interaction style, in this study, refers to the emotional affect which spouses demonstrate in their transactions. Specifically, this measure addresses the degree to which a couple's interactional exchange escalates positively or negatively. Although
couple interaction style is highly correlated with couple communication style, the important distinction is the emphasis on demonstrations of affective expression (e.g., wife complains, husband sighs; wife smiles, husband kisses wife). Several studies have addressed emotional affect in relation to marital satisfaction and parenting style.

**Couple interaction style and husband/wife marital satisfaction**

In the theoretical model, it is hypothesized that interaction style will have a direct effect on marital satisfaction. Dadds, Sanders, Behrens and James' (1987) results indicated that couples with greater than average marital discord engaged in more aversive interchanges with their spouses (e.g., few supportive behaviors). The authors studied four 2-parent families with marital discord and a child between the ages of 3 and 7 with high rates of oppositional behavior. The four sets of parents were undergoing behavioral parent support training. Trained observers recorded the family interacting in their home during the evening meal and during other settings. Dadds et al. (1987) noted that during the parent support training, aversive behavior decreased and problem solving increased for the majority of the parents.

In summary, marital couples with marital discord engage in negative behaviors (e.g., hitting, arguing, avoidance), and disagree greatly on important issues (e.g., sex, child rearing, money). Negative marital interactions also influence parenting style. This relationship is presented below.
Couple interaction style and husband/wife parenting style

The theoretical model for this study proposes a direct relationship between couple interaction and husband/wife parenting. Several studies address this relationship. Referring again to Peterson and Zill (1986), they reported that negative marital interaction was associated with poorer parent-child relationships. They noted within intact families, the relationship between the child and each parent, particularly the father, suffered as the level of marital conflict increased (Peterson & Zill, 1986). Jouriles et al.'s (1987) study, previously detailed, noted that interspousal aggression was highly associated with parental aggression directed toward their children.

Amato (1986) also reported a linkage between negative marital interaction and deterioration in parent-child relationships. Amato's study examined the association between levels of marital conflict and the self-esteem of 132 children aged 8-9 years, and 142 adolescents aged 15-16 randomly selected from public and private schools in the state of Victoria, Australia. Amato noted younger female children, adolescent males, and adolescent females were increasingly associated with marital conflict and a poor relationship with the father.

Perhaps stated most interestingly, Gottman and Katz (1989) noted that negative marital interaction led couples to "have a parenting style that is cold, unresponsive, angry, and low in limit setting and structuring" (p. 379). The authors base this conclusion
on their study of 56 families from the Champaign-Urbana community. The sample ranged widely in marital satisfaction, and had a 4-5 year old child who participated in several home and laboratory sessions involving marital, parent-child, and peer interactions.

**Husband/wife positive affect**

Positive affect for husbands and wives is defined in this study as their attitude or approach to life in general (e.g., optimistic vs. pessimistic). According to the model, the degree of positive affect has a direct effect on marital satisfaction and husband/wife parenting style. Several studies also support the importance of individual well-being for variations in marital satisfaction and parenting style.

**Husband/wife positive affect in relationship to husband/wife marital satisfaction and husband/wife parenting style**

Individual affective state of spouses in relationship to marital satisfaction and husband/wife parenting style has been documented in several studies. Spouse's affect is often viewed as having a direct effect on marital satisfaction which then influences parental approach towards children. For example, Christensen, Phillips, Glasgow, and Johnson (1983) noted a negative relationship between spousal depression and marital adjustment, and between spousal depression and a positive approach with children. Their study included 36 families recruited for a 10 week treatment program for
child behavior problems. Each family included a child between the ages of 4-12 years who was targeted as having a behavior problem. The study also included 9 families whose 4-12 year old child was not demonstrating behavior problems. Christensen et al. noted a direct effect for husband's affect and parental approach toward children. Father's personal discomfort was positively related to intolerance for child negative behavior and negatively related to a positive approach with children.

Dadds (1987), in his review of the relationship between family variables and child behavior, noted an association between maternal depression and marital discord. Specifically, the impact of the mother's depression on the child may be predicted from the satisfaction of the parent's marriage. Billings and Moos (1983) noted that families with a depressed spouse were characterized by more conflict and unsupportive marital relationships. They examined 133 depressed parents (43 men and 90 women) with children 19 years and younger living at home. The participants were drawn from an overall sample of 424 depressed patients seeking treatment at one of five psychiatric facilities. The study also included 135 nondepressed control patients drawn from an overall sample of 424 community members who were sociographically matched to the patient group. Billings and Moos noted that families of depressed families were less organized in planning family activities and allocating individual responsibilities. The authors further state
that the unsupportive marital relationship helped to account for
greater dysfunction among their children (Billings & Moos, 1983).

Individual affect of spouses is also viewed as having a direct
effect on parenting toward their children. Demo et al. (1987)
reported positive parent-adolescent communication was
significantly correlated with fathers' self-esteem, but not with that
of mothers'. However, Small (1988) reported interesting results of
mother's parent-child relationship and her self-esteem.

Small's study consisted of 139 parent-child dyads with
children between the ages of 10-17 years. The families were
enrolled in a week-long summer educational program sponsored by a
large eastern university, and were invited to participate in the study
during an orientation meeting. The parents were predominantly
white, middle or upper-middle class, and highly educated. The
parents filled out questionnaires that addressed aspects of their
relationships with their child, their own self-esteem, and several
aspects of their child's behavior. Small's findings indicated that a
parent's sense of self-worth was related to how he/she interacted
with his/her adolescent child. The author noted a strong positive
relationship between parental self-esteem and parent-child
communication. Specifically for mothers, he found mothers with
higher self-esteem were less worried and concerned if their child
was involved in dangerous, inappropriate, or problematic behaviors,
and more likely to have children who reported satisfaction with the
amount of freedom and decision-making autonomy that their parents gave them (Small, 1988).

**Husband/wife marital satisfaction**

Dadds (1987) summarized well a conclusion drawn from many studies: "children from broken or intact homes characterized by open marital discord are at greater risk to develop a behavioral disorder than children from broken or intact homes that are relatively nondiscordant" (p. 346). Over a decade ago, Frame (1975) boldly stated: "whenever you have a disturbed child, you have a disturbed marriage" (p. 22). However, Frame's bold statement is supported by many studies.

**Husband/wife marital satisfaction and husband/wife parenting style**

This study's theoretical model suggests a direct link between husband/wife marital satisfaction and adolescent adjustment based upon the aforementioned studies. However, the theoretical model also hypothesizes an indirect association between marital satisfaction and adolescent adjustment through parenting style. The literature contains several studies that demonstrate this linkage. Christensen et al. (1983) noted that parental perception of child behavior difficulties was related to marital conflict and negative parenting behavior toward the child. Peterson and Zill (1986) reported that the adolescent's relationship between both parents (especially for the father) suffered as the level of marital conflict increased. They further stated that poor parent-child
relationships led to more negative child behavior (Peterson & Zill, 1986). Moreover, Conger, Lorenz, Elder, Melby, Simons, and Conger (in press) demonstrated that the impact of marital conflict on adolescent adjustment was entirely indirect through parenting behavior for a sample of early adolescent boys.

**Husband/wife marital satisfaction and adolescent adjustment**
Several authors report a strong relationship between marital discord and adolescent maladjustment. Christensen et al. (1983) reported for both fathers and mothers that marital maladjustment accounted for about 25% of the variance in child behavior problems. Conger et al. (in press) reported a robust relationship between hostility in the marriage and adolescent use of alcohol ($b = .41$). The authors examined 76 white, primarily middle-class families with two parents, a seventh grade adolescent and a sibling within 4 years of age of the seventh grader.

Cummings, Vogel, Cummings, and El-Sheikh (1989) noted in their study that children from families with interparental conflict were more distressed than children from families not reporting such conflicts between parents. They studied 20 four-five year olds, 20 six-seven year olds, and 23 eight-nine year olds and their mothers. The authors utilized a nearly identical sample for the replication study. The Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test was administered to assess marital adjustment. Their results indicated that as the child got older, they perceived hostile anger as
increasingly negative. Moreover, angry interactions between adults elicited anger and distress in young children.

Marital satisfaction and its influence on adolescents' emotional reactions has also been documented by others. For instance, Howes and Markman (1989) noted that a child's feelings of security and sociability were related to mother's marital satisfaction, and feelings of dependency were related to the marital satisfaction of fathers. Cummings, Pellegrini, Notarius, and Cummings (1989) stated: "children's history of exposure to conflict between parents influences their emotional reactions and coping strategies when faced with anger between others. Children of parents with a history of physical hostility or unsatisfying marriages evidenced heightened involvement and reactivity in responding to anger" (p. 1042). Cummings et al. (1989) base these conclusions on a sample of children between the ages of 2 and 6 with their mothers at a university research laboratory.

Dadds et al. (1987) reported an interesting link between marital conflict and child behavior difficulties. They noted that when parents (more so for fathers) exhibited aversive behaviors toward their spouse, those behaviors were observed to occur more frequently when the child was misbehaving than when the child was absent or behaving appropriately.
Husband/wife parenting style and adolescent adjustment

The individual parenting style of husbands and wives is presented in this study's theoretical model as having a direct relationship with adolescent adjustment. Specifically, positive parenting styles will be associated with adolescent adjustment, and negative parenting styles will be associated with adolescent maladjustment. Several studies support the relationship between parenting style and adolescent adjustment.

Christensen et al. (1983) noted a negative correlation between parental negative behavior to the child and parental perception of child behavior problems. Jouriles et al. (1987) reported that "parent-child aggression was significantly associated with conduct problems, attention problems, anxiety-withdrawal, and motor excess in boys, and anxiety-withdrawl in girls" (p. 170). Simons and Robertson (1989) stated that direct and indirect parental rejection increased the probability of an adolescent's involvement in a deviant peer group, reliance upon avoidant coping styles, and use of substances (drugs). The authors utilized a sample of adolescents involved in two drug/alcohol treatment programs over several months, plus a random sample of adolescents from the general community. Simons and Robertson (1989) also reported that parental rejection was positively associated with adolescent aggressiveness, and a negative relationship with adolescent self-esteem.

Several studies note the effects of ongoing characteristics of parenting style and child adjustment. Vicary and Lerner (1986) noted
that parental characteristics measured at the time when the adolescents in their sample were 3 years old, could later discriminate which adolescents were using substances at age sixteen and older. Their sample was drawn from the New York Longitudinal Study. The subjects were 133 middle class children (boys = 66; girls = 67) initially involved in 1956 and still involved to the present day. Vicary and Lerner studied four age groups of adolescents: 10-13, 13-16, 16-19, and over 19 years. They stated: "early parental conflict in childrearing attitudes and practices, inconsistency in discipline, restrictive limit-setting, and maternal rejection were implicated in the use of marijuana and alcohol when these subjects were 16 years and older" (p. 120).

Emery (1982) noted in his review that open disagreement between parents concerning discipline produced more inconsistent discipline that created problems of conduct and aggression in their children. Steinberg, Elmen, and Mounts (1989) examined parents who demonstrated an authoritative parenting style (acceptance, psychological autonomy, and behavioral control). Their sample consisted of 120 families with a firstborn child between 11-16 years. The participants were drawn from a large representative sample of 900 adolescents from the Madison, Wisconsin school district. Data was collected from the adolescents at school and through home visits. The families involved in the study were predominantly white and socioeconomically heterogeneous. Steinberg et al. (1989) noted that adolescents who described their
parents as treating them warmly, democratically, and firmly were more likely than their peers to develop positive attitudes toward, and beliefs about their achievement, and as a consequence, were more likely to do better in school.

Likewise, Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiderman, Roberts, and Fraleigh (1987) reported parents who have an authoritative parenting style (expectation of mature behavior from the child, firm enforcement of rules and expectations, encouraging the child's independence and individuality) were most likely to have adolescents with successful high school performance compared to other families with other forms of parenting style (e.g., authoritarian: emphasis on obedience, verbal give and take between parent and child is discouraged, absolute sets of rules; permissive: tolerant and accepting of child's impulses, use little punishments, make few demands for mature behavior).

The source of Dornbusch et al.'s data was a questionnaire completed by 7,836 adolescents enrolled in six high schools in the San Francisco Bay area. They utilized reports of family processes to construct parenting styles, background variables used as controls, and self-reported grades. The authors reported that parenting style generally showed the expected relation to grades across all demographic variables (e.g., gender, age, parental education, ethnicity).

In summary, marital conflict appears to effect parenting negatively which in turn increases the likelihood of adolescent
maladjustment. However, another important factor to consider when examining marital conflict and adolescent adjustment is the gender of the adolescent. The following is a review of gender differences of adolescents in reaction to marital conflict.

**Different effects for boys and girls**

The overwhelming evidence from recent studies suggests that marital conflict has a greater effect on boys than on girls (Dadds, 1987; Emery, 1982; Emery & O'Leary, 1982). The hypothesized explanation for this difference is explained through the different culturally based sex-role expectations of little boys and girls. Stoneman, Brody, and Burke (1989) stated: "As boys mature, behavior associated with active-emotive temperaments, for example, is viewed as being gender-appropriate. Girls, however, are expected to be more passive and less active than boys, and as girls mature, emphasis is placed on teaching girls to control their expressions of anger" (p. 110). Peterson and Zill (1986) stated a similar explanation such that girls are more likely to respond to marital conflict with overcontrolled behaviors, whereas boys will more likely respond with undercontrolled behavior.

Several studies provide support that boys will respond more negatively than girls. Reid and Crisaulli (1990) reported in their meta-analysis of prior research through 1988, the relationship between marital discord (conflict, disharmony, and lack of agreement) and child behavior problems (conduct problems). They
found a strong relationship with behavior problems in boys and marital discord, and little support for girls.

Similarly, Porter and O'Leary (1980) reported significant correlations between marital conflict and many behavior problems for boys but not for girls. They examined 64 two-parent families who applied to the Psychological Center of the State University of New York at Stony Brook in the late 1970s. The children ranged in age from 5 to 16 years with a mean age of 10.45 years. The authors noted that marital unhappiness and overt hostility correlated significantly with many behavior problems of boys. However, neither marital unhappiness or overt marital hostility related to problem behaviors of girls.

In other studies, Webster-Stratton (1989) noted that mothers perceived boys as having more total behavior problems and more difficult temperaments than girls. Cummings et al. (1989) reported that boys responded more angrily to hostility between adults than girls, and that girls would only become slightly more distressed toward anger than boys. Demo et al. (1987) noted that boys' self-esteem was also related more strongly to family relations than girls. In contrast to most studies, Amato (1986) noted no significant differences for boys and girls in regard to marital conflict and child maladjustment.
Hypotheses

Based upon the above discussion, the theoretical model for this study proposes the following hypotheses for investigation.

1. Positive couple communication style, couple interaction style and husband/wife positive affect will facilitate high husband/wife marital satisfaction.
2. Positive couple communication style, couple interaction style and husband/wife positive affect will facilitate positive husband/wife parenting style.
3. High husband/wife marital satisfaction will be directly associated with positive husband/wife parenting style.
4. High husband/wife marital satisfaction will be directly associated with positive adolescent adjustment.
5. High husband/wife marital satisfaction will be indirectly associated with positive adolescent adjustment through positive husband/wife parenting style.
6. Positive husband/wife parenting style will be associated with positive adolescent adjustment.
7. Boys will respond more negatively to low marital satisfaction and negative husband/wife parenting style than girls.
Following, Chapter II will outline the methodological procedures employed to test the hypotheses. These procedures include sampling, instrumentation and operationalization of the variables, and a description of data analysis procedures.
CHAPTER II METHODS

The procedures used to examine the hypotheses developed in Chapter I are presented in this chapter. These procedures include sampling, instrumentation, and operationalization of the variables, and a description of data analysis procedures.

Sample

The sample utilized for this study is from the Iowa Youth and Families Project. This Project is a longitudinal study that follows 451 rural families over four years (1989-1992). For the purposes of this study, information from Wave A (year one) was available for the data analysis. The families are primarily middle-class and consist of a two-parent household, a 7th grade adolescent, and a sibling within four years of age of the 7th grader. The families reside in one of eight adjacent counties in a midwestern state. The area is heavily dependent on an agricultural livelihood and is reflected in this sample as 34% of the families live on farms. Of the remaining families, 12% lived in rural areas but not on a farm, and 54% lived in communities with a population under 6,500.

As stated, the families were primarily middle-class and this was reflected in their income and parents' educational levels. The total 1988 income, which included wages, net farm income, and all other sources of income, had a range of values from $-61,474 to
with a median of $33,700 (mean of $38,507). The fathers' education ranged from 8th grade to a Ph.D., while mothers' education ranged from 9th grade to a Master's degree. The median level of education for both fathers and mothers was one year beyond high school. In regard to education beyond high school, 51% of the fathers and 54.7% of the mothers received further training. In addition, 23% of the fathers and 18% of the mothers completed a college education.

The sample used for this study is generally more educated and has a higher income than the average for the State of Iowa, and nationally for the United States of America. Based on figures from the 1980 Census (1990 is not completely compiled until spring of 1992), the mean family income for the State of Iowa was $22,482, and for the United States of America, $23,092.

The median years of school completed for the State of Iowa for both men and women aged 40-44 years was 12.5 years. For women and men 25 years or older in Iowa, 72.7% of women and 70.2% of men received a high school diploma. For men and women 18 years or older in the United States of America, 61% of males completed high school and 11.2% received 4 or more years of college, and 63.1% of women completed high school and 8.4% received 4 or more years of college.

Fathers ranged in age from 31-68 years with a median age of 39 years. Mothers ranged in age from 29-53 years with a median age of 37 years. There were 215 (48%) boys and 236 (52%) girls who were 7th graders and they ranged in age from 12.1 years (41.5%) to
14.7 years (2.9%), with a mean age of 13.2 years. Of the 451 siblings who were in 4th to 11th grades, 213 (47%) were younger siblings, 231 (51%) were older siblings, and 7 (2%) were twins. Siblings ranged in age from 9.4 to 18 years with a mean of 13.5. Forty-eight percent of the siblings were boys.

Procedures

Families for the Project were recruited from 34 school systems in the eight counties. Targeted families were those with a seventh grade student from intact homes in communities of 6,500 or less. Each family was sent a letter explaining the project and were later contacted by telephone and asked to participate. Of all families listed by the schools, approximately 87% were able to be contacted and met the eligibility criterion (intact, a 7th grader, and a sibling within four years of age from the 7th grader). The final response resulted in 78.8% of families agreeing to participate in the study. Each family was compensated for their time at $250 ($75 to each parent and $50 for each child). The compensation was approximately $10.00 per hour, per participant, each of whom spent about six hours completing the measurement process.
Each family was visited in their home twice by project staff. During the first visit, each of the four participating family members completed a series of questionnaires focusing on family processes, individual family member characteristics, and economic circumstances. Each family member was also audiotaped individually concerning a set of structured interview questions concerning beliefs and attitudes about parenting.

Between the first and second visit, each family member completed questionnaires left by the first interviewer. These questionnaires focused on information about grandparents, beliefs about parenting, and plans for the future. In order to protect each family member's confidentiality, they were given envelopes in which they could seal their questionnaires and give them to the second interviewer that would visit their home.

During the second visit which occurred within two weeks of the first, the family members were videotaped as they engaged in several structured interaction tasks. The interviewer began the session by asking each individual to complete a short questionnaire designed to identify issues of concern or disagreement within the family (e.g., chores, money, free-time).

The first task lasted 35 minutes and involved the family answering a series of questions that were printed on cards which related to various family issues such as parenting styles, school
performance, household chores, and important family events. During all tasks, the interviewer was absent from the room to allow the family the most comfort and privacy for their discussion.

The second task involved all family members and lasted 15 minutes. For this task, the interviewer selected three topic areas based on the questionnaires filled out at the beginning of the visit. The family was instructed to try to reach some form of resolution in the problem area. Task three (15 minutes) involved only the siblings. They answered a series of questions related to the way they interacted together, their perceptions of how their parents treat them, and their future plans. The fourth task (25 minutes) involved only the marital couple. They answered questions related to aspects of their relationship, areas of agreement and disagreement (e.g., parenting, finances), and their plans for the future. When family members were not participating in a video task, they were completing questionnaire materials concerning significant life events, attitudes, and reports of personal characteristics.

The materials from the questionnaires and the videotaped interactions were then coded by trained project staff members. A manual of behavioral codes was designed in order to quantify the family interaction processes.
Operationalization of the variables

**Couple communication style**

The variable "couple communication style" was created from observer ratings. Specifically, three variables are used to construct couple communication style: *communication, listener responsiveness*, and *assertiveness*. Internal consistency was .77. The actual definitions of each variable are presented in the Appendix (pp. 84, 88, 90). Communication data for this study were also taken from Task 4. Trained coders then viewed the videotaped interaction and coded the communication variables from a range of "1" - not at all characteristic to "5" - highly characteristic. The observed rating was recorded and entered into the data set as the "score" for both spouses for each communication variable. Scores for husbands and wives were summed to create a couple communication measure. Low scores (1-2) indicate a negative communication style and high scores (4-5) indicate a positive communication style. The interobserver reliabilities for the variables used to construct couple communication style are: communication, husband to wife, .67, wife to husband, .80; assertiveness, husband to wife, .56, wife to husband, .67; and listener responsiveness, husband to wife, .70, wife to husband, .59.

The important distinguishing factor of couple communication style is the omission of affective expression and the emphasis placed upon specific skills as a communicator (e.g., use of
explanations and clarifications, soliciting the other's views, encouraging the other to explain and clarify his/her point of view, responding reasonably and appropriately to the ongoing conversation). For this study, the affective expression is placed within the variable couple interaction style. The separation of the affective qualities of communication from communicative skills in this study is unlike many studies that examine communication in marital dyads (e.g., Callan & Noller, 1986; Demo et al., 1987; Howes & Markman, 1989).

**Couple interaction style**

The variable "couple interaction style" is a reflection of emotional affect expressed by the couple in their interactions. The emphasis of emotional affect is an important distinguishing factor that differentiates couple interaction style from couple communication style. Couple interaction style is taken from observational data. Three variables that are based on reciprocal behaviors of the husband and wife were selected: transactional conflict, transactional positive, and relationship quality. The actual definitions of each variable are provided in the Appendix (pp. 94, 98, 101). The interactional variables are taken from Task 4 (marital task). Trained coders then viewed the videotaped interaction and coded the interactional variables from a range of "1" - not at all characteristic to "5" - highly characteristic. The observed rating was recorded for the couple for each interactional variable. That is,
these scores represent qualities of the relationship, not simply each partner. Low scores (1-2) indicate low positive interaction and high scores (4-5) indicate high positive interaction style. Transactional conflict was recoded in order to have high conflict as low scores and low conflict as high scores. The internal consistency (alpha) for the scale used for this variable equals .86. The interobserver reliabilities for the variables used for couple interaction style are as follows: transactional conflict ,.84; transactional positive, .64; and relationship quality, .77.

**Husband/wife positive affect**

The variable "husband/wife positive affect" is determined for both husband and wife. This variable is created from questionnaire data by a 6-item scale that asks the respondents how they have viewed their lives in general during the past month. The items ask questions such as: "Have you generally enjoyed the things you do? Did you feel relaxed and free of tension? Has living been a wonderful adventure for you?" The responses range from "none of the time" to "all of the time." The reliability coefficient (alpha) for husbands equals .84 and for wives equals .87. The responses were recoded in order to have "1" reflect low positive affect and "6" to reflect high positive affect. The actual items are presented in the Appendix (p. 104). The questions are identical for both husbands and wives but were answered separately and independently of one
another. More specifically, the variables created from the separate scales were "husband positive affect" and "wife positive affect."

**Husband/wife marital satisfaction**

Marital satisfaction is conceptualized as happiness and satisfaction with the marriage, and is determined separately for husbands and wives. This variable is obtained from questionnaire data that both husbands and wives responded to separately. Two questions each create "wife marital satisfaction" and "husband marital satisfaction." The reliability coefficient for husbands equals .80 and for wives equals .86. The two questions are presented in the Appendix (p. 105). The questions are identical but answered separately and independently by each spouse. The second question's ("All in all, how satisfied are you with your marriage.") responses were recoded to have response "1" reflect no satisfaction and "5" to reflect complete satisfaction.

**Husband/wife parenting style**

Parenting style is determined separately for husbands and wives. This variable is created from the observational data. Five parenting variables that reflect positive parenting style were selected: quality time, parental influence, positive reinforcement, encourages independence, and inductive reasoning. The reliability coefficient (alpha) for husbands' parenting style equals .72 and for wives' parenting style equals .72. The definitions for the parenting variables are presented in the Appendix (pp. 105, 108, 110, 112,
Parenting data for this study were taken from Task 1 during which the family was videotaped as they interacted with one another and responded to a series of questions regarding child behavior and parenting issues. The parenting behaviors were coded from a range of "1" - not at all characteristic to "5" - highly characteristic by trained coders using the behavioral definitions. The observed rating was then summed and entered into the data set as the parenting "score" for each parent. Low scores (1-2) indicate a negative parenting style and high scores (4-5) indicate a positive parenting style. The interobserver reliabilities for the variables used to construct husband/wife parenting style are as follows: parental influence, husband to child, .57, wife to child, .57; encourages independence, husband to child, .76, wife to child, .67; inductive reasoning, husband to child, .45, wife to child, .35; quality time, husband to child, .60, wife to child, .61, and positive reinforcement, husband to child, .70, wife to child, .70.

**Adolescent adjustment**

Adolescent adjustment is measured with three different variables: adolescent emotional distress, adolescent delinquency, and adolescent self-esteem. A low rate of response to adolescent emotional distress and delinquency will indicate a high level of adjustment and a high rate of response will indicate a low level of adjustment. Conversely, a low rate of response for self-esteem will
indicate lower levels of adolescent adjustment and a high rate of response will indicate high levels of adjustment.

The variable "adolescent emotional distress" is obtained from questionnaire data. The variable is created from the SCL-90 (The Brief Symptom Inventory) including the subscales for depression, anxiety, hostility and somatization. Each seventh grader indicated how much discomfort each item had caused them during the last week (Derogatis & Melisarators, 1983). Items from the scale ask whether the respondent has experienced discomforts such as headaches, feeling hopeless about the future, thoughts of death or dying, poor appetite, and nervousness or shakiness inside. The reliability coefficient (alpha) for this scale equals .94. The range of responses were from "1" - not at all to "5" - extremely. The actual items are presented in the Appendix (pp. 116-118).

The variable "adolescent delinquency" is taken from questionnaire data. The seventh graders answered 23 items related to violations of laws and rules. The reliability coefficient for this scale equals .63. Of interest for this study is how often the adolescents indicated they engaged in these behaviors during the last year. The actual items are presented in the Appendix (pp. 118-119).

The variable "adolescent self-esteem" is drawn from questionnaire data. The variable is created from 10 items from Rosenberg's measure of self-esteem (1965). Of the 10 items, five items' responses were reverse coded to reflect "1" as being low
self-esteem and "5" as being high self-esteem. The actual items are presented in the Appendix (p. 120). The reliability coefficient for this scale equals .85.

Data analysis

Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSSx). Preliminary analyses involved the computation of descriptive statistics such as frequency distributions, means, and standard deviations. Pearson correlations were then estimated for all variables in the study. Next multiple regressions were utilized to analyze the data and test the empirical validity of the proposed model. Analyses considered husbands and wives separately with all seventh graders and then subdivided the analyses for boys and girls. The probability level of significance for this study was .05.

Multiple regression analysis was selected due to its ability to analyze a given dependent variable that is affected simultaneously by several independent variables. The calculation of the multiple correlation coefficients provides an indication of the extent the independent variables predict the dependent variable, while the $R^2$ provides an explanation of the percent of variance that is explained by the independent variables. As well, multiple regression was selected as it allows a path framework which the theoretical model for this study implies (Babbie, 1983).
Demographic variables including per capita family income, husband's educational level, wife's educational level, and adolescent gender were used as control variables. Adolescent gender was also tested for gender interaction effects with all independent variables. Separate regressions for boys and girls were conducted if any interaction effects involving gender were noted with the regression for boys and girls together.

Multiple regressions were conducted in the following manner based upon the study's model. Regression one entered marital satisfaction as the dependent variable and couple communication style, couple interaction style, and wife/husband positive affect as the independent variables. The demographic variables used as controls and to test for gender interactions were also entered. The regressions were run separately for husbands and wives. Where gender interactions were noted, regression one was then run separately for boys and girls.

Regression two entered husband/wife parenting style as the dependent variable and couple communication style, couple interaction style, husband/wife positive affect, and husband/wife marital satisfaction as the independent variables. Regression two was run separately for husbands and wives. The demographic variables used as controls were entered and tests were conducted for gender interaction effects. As for regression one, if interactions were noted, the regression was run separately for boys and girls.
Regression three was conducted three times for the three separate measures of adolescent adjustment (adolescent distress, adolescent delinquency, and adolescent self-esteem). Each adjustment measure was entered as the dependent variable and couple communication style, couple interaction style, husband/wife positive affect, husband/wife marital satisfaction, and husband/wife parenting style as the independent variables. The control variables were then entered and gender interactions were estimated. If interactions were noted, separate regressions were conducted for boys and girls. Regression three, like regressions one and two were performed separately for husbands and wives.

The indirect and direct effects for husband/wife parenting style and for each of the adolescent adjustment variables (distress, delinquency, self-esteem) was also calculated. These findings are presented for husbands and wives with all seventh graders. The results are presented following the presentation of each set of regressions described above.

The following chapters present the results for the analyses just described. The discussion of the results is presented for husbands and wives with all seventh graders and when appropriate separately for boys and girls.
CHAPTER III RESULTS

Correlation matrix

Table 1 contains the zero-order correlations, means, and standard deviations for all study variables. The correlations are presented separately for boys (below the diagonal) and girls (above the diagonal). Couple interaction style and couple communication style are strongly associated, (.63), suggesting the constructs could be conceptualized together. However, this study considers them separately and there are different results present for each variable. For example, in both the boys and girls samples, couple interaction style was more strongly correlated with marital satisfaction for both husbands and wives than for couple communication style (girls: wives, .44 vs. .27; husbands, .30 vs. .10; boys: wives, .35 vs. .28; husbands, .31 vs. .20).

Consistent with the theoretical model, couple communication style, couple interaction style, and wife's positive affect were significantly correlated for both the boys' and girls' samples with wife's marital satisfaction. However, for husbands, couple communication style was not significantly correlated with husband's marital satisfaction in the girls' sample, while couple interaction style and husband positive affect were significantly correlated with husband's marital satisfaction. In the boys' sample, couple communication style, couple interaction style and husband's
Table 1. Correlations, means and standard deviations for all study variables; girls above the diagonal, boys below the diagonal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>.63*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>.63*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>19.47</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>27.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>27.43</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>14.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>13.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>-.50**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>75.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>39.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>13.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>13.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>8082.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05  **p<.01
positive affect were all significantly correlated with husband's marital satisfaction. For both husbands and wives, positive affect was most strongly correlated with marital satisfaction in both the girls' and boys' samples (girls: wives, .45, husbands, .38; boys: wives, .46, husbands, .23).

As the model suggests, couple communication and couple interaction were significantly correlated with husband and wife parenting style for the girls' sample, however, in the boys' sample couple interaction style was not significantly correlated with wife's parenting style. For both the boys' and girls' samples, positive affect for husbands and wives was not significantly correlated with husband or wife parenting style.

Contrary to the postulated model, marital satisfaction for both husbands and wives in both the boys' and girls' sample was not significantly correlated with the three measures of adolescent adjustment (distress, delinquency, and self-esteem). Likewise, the same findings were noted with husband/wife parenting style. One notes however, that correlations were stronger for boys than for girls in regard to both wife's and husband's (with the exception of distress) parenting style with adolescent adjustment. The correlations for the boys' sample were stronger than for the girls' sample in regard to both husband's and wife's marital satisfaction, and the three measures of adolescent adjustment.
An unexpected finding, not placed in the theoretical model, was the influence of wife's positive affect. Specifically, wife positive affect was significantly associated with both girls' and boys' self-esteem. This result was much stronger for boys than girls (.25 vs. .19). Wife positive affect was also strongly correlated with boys distress (−.29) but not for girls (−.11). This result was not present for husbands.

**Summary** The zero-order correlations do not present strong associations between the direct interactions of parenting style and marital satisfaction on the adolescent adjustment variables for either husbands or wives. However, the significant direct relationship between wife positive affect and adolescent adjustment was noted for both boys and girls. Interestingly, this finding was not consistent with husbands.

The theoretical model suggests positive affect to be indirectly associated with adolescent adjustment through husband/wife parenting style and husband/wife marital satisfaction. The results from the zero-order correlations seem to indicate that positive affect was more appropriately directly associated with adolescent adjustment for wives.

Following is the presentation of the standardized regression coefficients for each variable separately as it was presented in the theoretical model. Tests for interaction effects were conducted utilizing the control variable adolescent gender.
Standardized regressions

Husband/wife marital satisfaction

Table 2 presents the standardized regressions for all adolescents run separately for wife's and husband's marital satisfaction. The main effects of couple interaction and husband/wife positive affect were highly significant ($p < .001$) for both wife and husband in regard to marital satisfaction. Interestingly, couple communication was not influential for either wives or husbands with marital satisfaction. One notes that the control variable education was significant at the $p < .01$ level for husbands but not for wives.

The regression coefficients indicated several significant gender interaction effects predicting husband/wife marital satisfaction. Adolescent gender (boys = 1, girls = 0) significantly interacted with marital interaction style and couple communication style for wives but not for husbands. The control variable education significantly interacted with gender for husbands but not for wives. Table 3 more closely examines these interaction effects by separating the adolescent samples into boys and girls.
Table 2. Standardized regression coefficients for husband/wife marital satisfaction: All adolescents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Wife Marital Satisfaction</th>
<th>Husband Marital Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Communication Style</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Interaction Style</td>
<td>.45****</td>
<td>.35****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>.42****</td>
<td>.38****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.17***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent Gender</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender Interaction Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Communication Style X Gender</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Interaction Style X Gender</td>
<td>-.19***</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect X Gender</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income X Gender</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education X Gender</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.16***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² | .35 | .23

** p < .05  *** p < .01  **** p < .001
Table 3. Standardized regression coefficients for husband/wife marital satisfaction: Boys and girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Wife Marital Satisfaction</th>
<th>Husband Marital Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Communication Style</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Interaction Style</td>
<td>.19****</td>
<td>.42****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>.45****</td>
<td>.42****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2$ | .33 | .37 | .17 | .27

** $p < .05$  
*** $p < .01$  
**** $p < .001$

In Table 3, couple interaction for husbands and wives was strongly significant for both boys and girls. One notes a stronger association for girls, and more so with wife's marital satisfaction. Interesting results were obtained for couple communication style. Table 2 indicates no level of significance for couple communication style, however, when the variable was examined separately for boys and girls in Table 3, one notes significance at the $p < .05$ level for boys with wife's marital satisfaction. Strong significance was also obtained for both boys and girls with husband and wife positive
affect. This finding was stronger for wives than for husbands. Lastly, significant results were obtained for girls with husband's education level ($p < .01$).

**Summary** Results for the standardized regression coefficients for husband/wife marital satisfaction indicated that the main effects of couple interaction style, couple communication style, and husband/wife positive affect were stronger for wives than for husbands. The $R^2$ in Table 1, which examined all adolescents, was much stronger for wives than for husbands ($R^2$: wives, .35; husbands, .23). When husband/wife marital satisfaction was examined separately for boys and girls, the $R^2$ was also much stronger for wives than for husbands, and for both wives and husbands, more strong with girls.

The results for husband/wife marital satisfaction were consistent with the theoretical model that couple interaction style and husband/wife positive affect were direct indicators of husband/wife marital satisfaction. Interestingly, although the correlation matrix suggested that couple interaction style and couple communication style should be conceptualized together, results from the standardized regression suggested that couple communication was not a direct indicator of husband/wife marital satisfaction except for wives in regard to their male adolescent child. Therefore, hypothesis 1, which stated that positive couple communication style, couple interaction style, and husband/wife positive affect would facilitate husband/wife marital satisfaction,
was generally supported. Following, the standardized regressions for husband and wife parenting style are presented.

**Husband/wife parenting style**

Table 4 presents the results for husband and wife parenting style with the main effects of couple interaction style, couple communication style, husband/wife positive affect, husband/wife marital satisfaction, income, education and gender. Tests for adolescent gender effects were also conducted. The results indicate that, contrary to the theoretical model, husband/wife marital satisfaction and couple interaction style were not significantly related to husband and wife parenting style. Couple communication was found to be significantly related to parenting for both wives and husbands. The significance for wives (p < .01) was stronger than for husbands (p < .05). Positive affect was significant at p < .05 for husbands but was not significant for wives. Of the three control variables, only education was significant with husband parenting style. The gender interaction effects were not significant with the exception of education and wives' parenting. The $R^2$ values for both wives and husbands were minimal (wives: .09; husbands: .13).
Table 4. Standardized regression coefficients for husband/wife parenting style: All adolescents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Wife Parenting</th>
<th>Husband Parenting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Communication Style</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Interaction Style</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.17***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Gender</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Gender Interaction Effects** | |
| Marital Satisfaction X Gender | .09 | .00 |
| Couple Communication Style X Gender | -.04 | -.05 |
| Couple Interaction Style X Gender | -.02 | .01 |
| Positive Affect X Gender | -.02 | -.05 |
| Per Capita Income X Gender | -.04 | .04 |
| Education X Gender | .11** | .03 |

| R²          | .09 | .13 |

**p < .05  ***p < .01  ****p < .001
Due to the interaction effect noted in Table 4, Table 5 presents the main effects and control variables separately for boys and girls with husband and wife parenting style. The results present an interesting finding in regard to couple communication. Specifically, one notes the significance was only related to girls with both husbands and wives, and was stronger for wives ($p < .01$) than for husbands ($p < .05$). Positive affect was found to be significant only for husbands in Table 4. When examined separately for boys and girls:

Table 5. Standardized regression coefficients for husband/wife parenting style: Boys and girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Variables</th>
<th>Wife Parenting</th>
<th>Husband Parenting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Satisfaction</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Communication</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Interaction</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2$  

|       | .11  | .08  | .13  | .13 |

$** p < .05  *** p < .01$
girls, the significance for husbands' positive affect dropped out. The control variable education was quite significant for husbands and wives with the exception of wives with girls. Like Table 4, the $R^2$ values remained rather minimal for both wives and husbands.

**Summary** Tables 4 and 5 indicated that couple communication, specifically to girls, had a direct significance with husband and wife parenting style. The control variable education was strongly associated with husband and wife parenting style with the exception of wife parenting style with girls. The main effects of husband/wife marital satisfaction, couple communication with boys, husband/wife positive affect (Table 5), and the control variable per capita income received no levels of significance. The results provide partial support for hypothesis 2. With girls, positive couple communication style facilitated positive husband/wife parenting style. Marital satisfaction was not found to be significant for husband/wife parenting in either Table 4 or 5. Therefore, hypothesis 3 which stated that high husband/wife marital satisfaction would be directly associated with positive husband/wife parenting style was not supported. Following, the standardized regression coefficients are presented for the three measures of adolescent adjustment: adolescent distress, delinquency, and self-esteem.
Adolescent adjustment

Adolescent distress Table 6 presents the results for adolescent distress. The results indicate that none of the independent variables entered into the regression equation were significant explanatory variables. Specifically, contrary to the theoretical model, husband/wife marital satisfaction did not influence adolescent distress. As well, husband/wife parenting style did not prove to have a significant association with adolescent distress. All gender interaction effects were nonsignificant, indicating that boys were no differently influenced than girls in regard to the independent variables with adolescent distress. The $R^2$ values were very minimal for both spouses, therefore, explaining very little of the variance for this regression (wives = .07; husbands = .05).

Summary Table 6 does not support that husband/wife parenting style and husband/wife marital satisfaction would be significant explanatory variables for adolescent distress. Therefore, hypothesis 4 which stated high husband/wife marital satisfaction would be directly associated with positive adolescent adjustment was not supported. As well, hypothesis 6 which stated positive husband/wife parenting style would be associated with positive adolescent adjustment was not supported. The results also indicated that gender was not a discriminating factor for
adolescent distress. Therefore, hypothesis 7 was not supported. Boys did not react differently than girls to husband/wife marital satisfaction and husband/wife parenting style with adolescent distress.

Table 6. Standardized regression coefficients for adolescent distress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Wife</th>
<th>Husband</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Style</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Satisfaction</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Communication Style</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Interaction Style</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent Gender</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender Interaction Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Style X Gender</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Satisfaction X Gender</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Communication Style X Gender</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Interaction Style X Gender</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect X Gender</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income X Gender</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education X Gender</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R²</strong></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The indirect effect of husband/wife marital satisfaction through husband/wife parenting style with adolescent distress will be addressed later in Table 10. Next, Table 7 presents the standardized regression coefficients for adolescent delinquency.

**Adolescent delinquency**  The overwhelming result for adolescent delinquency was the significance of gender. Specifically, the finding indicates that boys were much more likely to engage in delinquent behavior than girls ($p < .01$). Contrary to the theoretical model, husband/wife marital satisfaction and husband/wife parenting style did not demonstrate significant associations with adolescent delinquency. Gender interaction effects were not present, therefore, it was not necessary to conduct separate regressions for boys and girls. The independent variables did not influence the boys differently than the girls in regard to adolescent delinquency. The $R^2$ values were not particularly strong (wives: .10; husbands: .09).

**Summary** The results for adolescent delinquency provided strong evidence that early adolescent boys engage in delinquent behavior at a much higher rate than girls. Table 7 demonstrated that the main effects of husband/wife parenting style, husband/wife marital satisfaction, couple interaction style, couple communication style and husband/wife positive affect did not provide any significant explanation for adolescent delinquent behavior. Therefore, hypotheses 4, 6, and 7 were not supported.
Hypothesis 5 will be examined later in Table 11. Following, Table 8 presents the standardized regression coefficients for adolescent self-esteem.

Table 7. Standardized regression coefficients for adolescent delinquency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Wife</th>
<th>Husband</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Style</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Satisfaction</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Communication Style</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Interaction Style</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent Gender</td>
<td>.24****</td>
<td>.24****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender Interaction Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Style X Gender</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Satisfaction X Gender</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Communication Style X Gender</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Interaction Style X Gender</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect X Gender</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income X Gender</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education X Gender</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ B^2 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wife</th>
<th>Husband</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ B^2 ]</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**** p < .001
Adolescent self-esteem  Table 8 presents the results for adolescent self-esteem. The findings indicate that with husbands, parenting style and marital satisfaction were found to be significant predictors of self-esteem at the $p < .05$ level. For wives, positive affect was significant at the $p < .05$ level with adolescent self-esteem. Contrary to the theoretical model, the direct effects of parenting style and marital satisfaction with adolescent self-esteem were not supported for wives, but were for husbands. Inconsistent with the proposed theoretical model, the results suggested a direct association with wives' positive affect with adolescent self-esteem.

The control variables of per capita income, education, and target gender were not significant. The gender interaction effects were nonsignificant, therefore, it was not necessary to conduct a separate regression for boys and girls. The $R^2$ values for adolescent self-esteem were rather low for husbands (.06) and wives (.07).

Summary  Adolescent self-esteem was significantly associated with husbands' parenting style and marital satisfaction. Wives' positive affect was significantly associated with adolescent self-esteem. Hypotheses 4 and 6 were supported for husbands with adolescent self-esteem. Specifically, the findings suggested that an adolescent's self-esteem would be higher with a positive parenting style from fathers with high marital satisfaction. Hypotheses 4 and 6 were not supported for wives. Hypothesis 7 was not supported for either husbands or wives. Boys did not react more negatively than
girls in regard to low husband/wife marital satisfaction and negative husband/wife parenting style. Hypothesis 5 will be addressed later in Table 12. Next, the direct and indirect effects for husband/wife parenting style are presented.

Table 8. Standardized regression coefficients predicting adolescent self-esteem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Wife</th>
<th>Husband</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Style</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.15**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Satisfaction</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Communication Style</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Interaction Style</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender Interaction Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Style X Gender</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Satisfaction X Gender</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Communication Style X Gender</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Interaction Style X Gender</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect X Gender</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income X Gender</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education X Gender</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2$                                      | .06     | .07      |

** $p < .05$
Indirect and direct effects

Husband/wife parenting style

Table 9 presents the indirect and direct effects for husband/wife parenting style. An interesting finding from Table 9 was the absence of an indirect effect for couple communication style through husband/wife marital satisfaction. This supported the theoretical model's proposed direct influence of couple communication with husband/wife parenting style.

Couple interaction style has a stronger direct effect with husbands' parenting style than for wives' parenting style. Specifically, the total effect of couple interaction style for husbands (.12) was accounted primarily by the direct effect of couple interaction style with husband parenting style (.13). However, for wives, the total effect of couple interaction style (.03) was explained about equally with the direct effect of couple interaction style with wives' parenting style (.07), and the indirect effect of couple interaction style through wives' marital satisfaction with wives' parenting style (-.04).

The total effects of positive affect were described mainly through the direct effect of positive affect with parenting style for both husbands and wives. The direct association was stronger for husbands than for wives, however. Wives' positive affect demonstrated a small indirect effect through wives' marital satisfaction with wives' parenting style (.03).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wife</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Communication Style</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Interaction Style</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Husband</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Communication Style</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Interaction Style</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In summary, Table 9 indicates that couple communication was the best predictor of parenting style for both husbands and wives in the theoretical model. Positive affect was the weakest predictor for wives' parenting style, yet remained a stronger predictor for husbands' parenting style. Nonetheless, the direct and indirect effects were not particularly large in explaining husband/wife parenting style.

**Adolescent distress**

Table 10 presents the indirect and direct effects for adolescent distress. Couple communication style for both husbands and wives demonstrated indirect effects that explained little in regard to adolescent distress. Couple interaction style for husbands provided a stronger negative effect (-.04) with adolescent adjustment than for wives (.01), however, both are quite small. The indirect effects for positive affect demonstrated similar results to couple interaction style for husbands (-.05) and wives (.01) with adolescent distress.

Table 10 did not provide evidence for hypothesis 5 which stated an indirect effect of husband/wife marital satisfaction through husband/wife parenting style with adolescent distress. The presence of an indirect effect of marital satisfaction through parenting style with adolescent distress was absent for husbands, and only minimally present for wives (.01). Contrary to the
Table 10. Direct and indirect effects predicting adolescent distress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wife</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Communication Style</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Interaction Style</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Satisfaction</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Style</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Husband</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Communication Style</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Interaction Style</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Style</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
theoretical model, the results indicated husband/wife marital satisfaction does not have an indirect effect through husband/wife parenting style with adolescent distress.

Adolescent delinquency

Table 12 presents the indirect and direct effects for adolescent delinquency. The results are similar to those for adolescent distress. The indirect effects for wives in regard to couple communication style (-.02), couple interaction style (.02), and positive affect (.01) are quite small. Husbands' indirect effects with adolescent delinquency were small as well. However, the indirect effect for husbands and couple interaction style through parenting style with adolescent delinquency was stronger (-.04) than with wives. Husbands' positive affect (-.04) also demonstrated a stronger indirect effect with adolescent delinquency than for wives positive affect (.01).

Like adolescent distress, the indirect effect of husband/wife marital satisfaction through husband/wife parenting style with adolescent delinquency was not supported. Husbands' marital satisfaction indirect effect with adolescent delinquency was .02,
Table 11. Direct and indirect effects predicting adolescent delinquency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wife</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Communication Style</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Interaction Style</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Satisfaction</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Style</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Husband</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Communication Style</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Interaction Style</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Style</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
while wives' marital satisfaction indirect effect with adolescent delinquency was only .006. Therefore hypothesis 5 was not supported.

**Adolescent self-esteem**

The indirect and direct effects for adolescent self-esteem are presented in Table 12. The indirect effects of couple interaction style with husbands (.08), and husbands' positive affect (.09) with adolescent self-esteem, were stronger than for wives with couple interaction style (.03) and wives' positive affect (.025). The indirect effects of couple communication style for both husbands (.02) and wives (-.002) with adolescent self-esteem were quite small.

The indirect effects of husband/wife marital satisfaction through husband/wife parenting style with adolescent self-esteem were absent for wives, and minimal for husbands (-.003). Therefore, hypothesis 5 was not supported. Direct effects of husbands' marital satisfaction (.18) and husbands' parenting style (.15) with adolescent self-esteem were notably stronger than wives' marital satisfaction (.06) and wives' parenting style (.00) with adolescent self-esteem.
Table 12. Direct and indirect effects predicting adolescent self-esteem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wife</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Communication Style</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Interaction Style</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Satisfaction</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Style</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Husband</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Communication Style</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple Interaction Style</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Satisfaction</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Style</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Following, Chapter 4 will present a discussion of the results. In addition, limitations of the study and recommendations for further research will be addressed.
CHAPTER IV DISCUSSION

Summary

The effects of husband/wife marital satisfaction and husband/wife parenting style on adolescent adjustment have been addressed in many studies. For example, Christensen et al. (1983) reported that 25% of the variance of child behavior was explained by both fathers and mothers marital maladjustment. Simons and Robertson (1989) noted that the probability of an adolescent's involvement in a deviant peer group, reliance upon avoidant coping styles, and use of substances increased with direct and indirect parental rejection. This study has examined the direct effect of husband/wife marital satisfaction and husband/wife parenting style with adolescent adjustment. Specifically, the study hypothesized that adolescent adjustment would increase with high husband/wife marital satisfaction and positive husband/wife parenting style. Additionally, boys were expected to react more negatively than girls to low husband/wife marital satisfaction and negative husband/wife parenting style.

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 predicted that positive couple communication style, couple interaction style and husband/wife positive affect would facilitate high husband/wife marital satisfaction. The results
indicated support for the hypothesis of couple interaction style with husbands and wives, and with husband/wife positive affect for all adolescents. The same results were obtained when examined separately for boys and girls. However, support was not obtained for the predicted relationship between couple communication style and marital satisfaction, except for wives' marital satisfaction in the boys' sample. Interestingly, the zero-order correlation indicated that couple interaction style and couple communication style had a high association (.63), suggesting that the variables could be conceptualized together. This high multicollinearity, no doubt, reduced the regression weight for couple communication style predicting husband/wife marital satisfaction. Indeed, the zero-order correlations between husband/wife marital satisfaction and couple communication style were almost all significant and in the expected directions.

The results obtained for communication in this study are contrary to many studies that examine the association between husband/wife marital satisfaction and couple communication style. Specifically, low marital satisfaction is typically associated with increased communication misunderstandings, arguments, and misperceptions (e.g., Gottman et al., 1976). However, an important distinguishing factor in the way communication was conceptualized for this study, was the omission of the affective component. Couple communication style placed emphasis on the specific skills as a speaker (e.g., soliciting the other's views, encouraging the other to
explain and clarify his/her point of view, use of explanations and clarifications). Couple interaction style included the affective components of interaction (e.g., tone of voice, frown, smile), and was conceptualized separately from couple communication style. Although couple communication style and couple interaction style were highly correlated, the fact that couple communication style was not significant with husband/wife marital satisfaction provided an interesting distinguishing factor of couple communication. Namely, the affective component of couple interaction style was a better predictor of husband/wife marital satisfaction than was communication skills of the husband and wife.

The same logic seems appropriate when considering the strong associations of husband/wife positive affect with husband/wife marital satisfaction. The emphasis of positive affect is the degree of overall happiness, contentment, and enjoyment the husband and wife experience in their lives. The descriptors place emphasis on the husband's and wife's emotional feelings, similar to couple interaction style.

**Hypothesis 2**

Hypothesis 2 stated that positive couple communication style, couple interaction style and husband/wife positive affect would facilitate positive husband/wife parenting style. The results from Tables 4 and 5 indicated only partial support for hypothesis 2. When all adolescents were examined, the predicted relationship for couple
communication style with parenting style was present for both husbands and wives, and for positive affect with husbands. The results obtained separately for boys and girls presented similar results for couple communication style with husbands and wives, but husbands’ positive affect dropped out. Again, although the zero-order correlations indicated that couple interaction style and couple communication style were highly associated, interesting differences have been noted. It appears that a couple's method of verbal interaction (couple communication style) and their affective interaction (couple interaction style) were notably different in regard to their marital satisfaction and style of parenting. The results seem to indicate that communicative skills are more important than affective expression with husband/wife parenting style. The control variable education demonstrated strong associations with husband/wife parenting style with the exception of wives to adolescent girls. Perhaps this result partially supports the tendency for more educated individuals to delay childbirth, hence, leading to more planned pregnancies and mature parents.

The literature suggests the importance of couple communication style, couple interaction style, and husband/wife positive affect with husband/wife parenting style. However, in this study only couple communication style was significant with husband/wife parenting style. Several studies support this such as Howes and Markman (1989) who suggested that positive communication between spouses enables them the ability to
approach their children more positively as parents. Demo et al. (1987) noted that positive couple communication promoted positive family relations.

However, the results from this study were not consistent with some of the literature in regard to couple interaction style and husband/wife positive affect. For instance, Jouriles et al. (1987) noted as interspousal aggression increased so did the parental aggression towards the children. Amato reported that poorer parent-child relationships when marital conflict was present.

Surprisingly, with the exception of husbands with all adolescents, husband/wife positive affect was not significant with husband/wife parenting style. However, many studies that examine the internalized individual affect for husbands and wives come from a clinical population. For example, Billings and Moos (1983) studied 133 depressed parents seeking treatment at one of five psychiatric facilities. They noted families with a depressed parent were less organized and allocating of individual responsibilities. The sample utilized for this study was not based on a clinical population, therefore husband/wife positive affect would probably not be as dramatically altered as in a clinical population with a parent with an affective disorder.

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 indicated that high husband/wife marital satisfaction would be directly associated with positive
husband/wife parenting style. The hypothesis was not supported for either husbands or wives. Several studies from the literature conclude differently, however. For instance, Peterson and Zill (1986) reported the relationship between an adolescent and both parents suffered as the level of marital conflict increased. Christensen et al. (1983) noted that parents with marital conflict perceived more child behavior difficulties.

Perhaps the manner in which marital satisfaction was defined for this study was not consistent with many other studies. For instance, the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test is often administered to measure marital satisfaction (e.g., Cummings, et al., 1989). However, husband/wife marital satisfaction was determined in this study by two separate items from questionnaire data that asked how happy and satisfied they were with their marriage. These two measures may not be completely comparable to other studies.

**Hypothesis 4**

Hypothesis 4 stated that high husband/wife marital satisfaction would be directly associated with positive adolescent adjustment. The hypothesis was only supported with husbands' marital satisfaction with adolescent self-esteem. Wives' marital satisfaction was not a significant predictor of any adolescent adjustment variable.
The insignificance of husband/wife marital satisfaction was inconsistent with most literature that examines the influence of marital satisfaction with adolescent adjustment. Dadds et al. (1987) reported that when parents were engaged in aversive behaviors with one another, their child was misbehaving more frequently than when parents were not engaged in aversive behaviors. Dadds et al. reflected many conclusions of the literature, namely, that adolescent behavior becomes problematic with the increase of marital conflict.

As previously stated, it would seem that husband/wife marital satisfaction may not be adequately defined in this study. Perhaps due to the nature of the items utilized to create husband/wife marital satisfaction, the responses are inflated. Specifically, the questions ask each spouse how generally happy and how satisfied they are with their marriage. The respondents may have answered in an inflated manner, therefore not truly reflecting their level of satisfaction. If that occurred, the likelihood would be less that husband/wife marital satisfaction would be a good predictor of adolescent adjustment.

Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis 5 indicated that high husband/wife marital satisfaction would be indirectly associated with positive adolescent adjustment through positive husband/wife parenting. The hypothesis was not supported for any of the adolescent adjustment
variables. Previous research has indicated, however, the importance of the indirect effect of husband/wife marital satisfaction through husband/wife parenting style with adolescent adjustment. For instance, Conger et al. (in press) demonstrated that the impact of marital conflict on adolescent adjustment was entirely indirect through parenting behavior for a sample of early adolescent boys.

Again, perhaps there was some error in how husband/wife marital satisfaction was conceptualized for this study. As marital satisfaction is often an important indicator of adolescent adjustment, the level of insignificance of husband/wife marital satisfaction would seem to indicate that the conceptualization of the variable may only be partially measuring marital satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 6**

Hypothesis 6 stated that positive husband/wife parenting style would be associated with positive adolescent adjustment. The hypothesis was supported for husbands' parenting style with adolescent self-esteem. The literature demonstrates much support that parenting style is an important indicator of adolescent adjustment. Simons and Robertson (1989) indicated that parental rejection was positively associated with aggressiveness and a negative relationship with adolescent self-esteem. Jouriles et al. (1987) reported parent-child aggression was significantly associated with a number of child behavior problems for boys and girls.
Husband/wife parenting style in this study was conceptualized to emphasize positive components of parenting. Low scores for the various parenting behaviors would indicate negative parenting behaviors, while high scores would indicate positive parenting behaviors. This study conceptualized parenting behavior in such a way that its comparison with other studies may be misleading. Many studies report parenting behavior in an aversive manner (e.g., coercive or angry approaches toward children). If husband/wife parenting style were conceptualized utilizing negative parenting behaviors in which low scores would indicate positive parenting and high scores would indicate negative behaviors, the results may have been more consistent with other studies.

**Hypothesis 7**

Hypothesis 7 stated that boys would respond more negatively to low marital satisfaction and negative husband/wife parenting style than girls. The hypothesis was not supported. The only gender difference noted was boys engage in delinquent behaviors much more than girls. The literature notes differences for boys and girls in regard to marital satisfaction and parenting style quite conclusively. Boys react more negatively than girls with marital conflict and negative parenting behaviors (e.g., Reid & Crisafulli, 1990). This conclusion has been long-standing and repeatedly replicated. For instance, Porter and O'Leary (1982) nearly a decade
ago reported significant correlations between marital conflict and many behavior problems for boys but not for girls.

The lack of significance of boys reacting differently than girls in this study is puzzling. The manner in which the variables of husband/wife marital satisfaction and husband/wife parenting style are conceptualized may in part be an explanation. However, the results are consistent with one study by Amato (1986) in which he noted no significant differences for boys and girls in regard to marital conflict and child maladjustment. It would seem that further research would be beneficial to explore the exceptions noted by Amato (1986) and this study.

Limitations and recommendations

There are, of course, several limitations to this research study. For instance, the design is cross-sectional. This research design places limitations on the generalizability of the present findings. The generalizability of the results must be extended to other adolescents in varied family structures (e.g., single-parent households), other geographic locales, and urban populations. Additionally, the causal directions of interest must be studied across time to assure the validity of the proposed directions of effects.
Given the high multicollinearity between couple communication style and couple interaction style, it may be beneficial to conceptualize the variables together if this study were to be replicated. Although interesting differences were noted between the two variables, it would be worth noting if conceptualizing them together would produce different findings.

The conceptualization of husband/wife marital satisfaction has demonstrated that perhaps further clarification is needed. Replication of this study utilizing husband/wife marital satisfaction with another population would help clarify how appropriate the variable was conceptualized for this study.
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APPENDIX

Selected variables from the Iowa Youth and Families Project

1. Couple Communication Style

A. Communication

Rate: All (Dyadic)

This scale measures the ability of the focal as a speaker (verbal expressive skills and content of statements). It assesses the focal's ability to communicate in a neutral or positive manner his/her needs and wants, rules and regulations, as well as to clearly convey information that may be useful to others. Communication entails the use of explanations and clarifications, soliciting the other's views, encouraging the other to explain and clarify his/her point of view, and responding reasonably and appropriately to the ongoing conversation. This scale is likely to be associated with warmth/support since it involves demonstrations of interest in the other's point of view, as well as responding appropriately to the ongoing conversation.

1 = Not at all characteristic:

Communication skills are almost entirely absent. The focal rarely uses reasoning, explanations, and clarifications to make himself/herself understood; the focal does not solicit the other's view, does not give the other appropriate feedback, and does not respond appropriately to the ongoing conversation. If all statements
are hostile or coercive, code '1' (even if the focal uses explanations and reasoning).

2 = Mainly uncharacteristic:

Poor communication predominates, but not exclusively. The focal occasionally uses appropriate reasoning, explanations, clarifications, and/or solicitations, but verbalization may be infrequent or ineffective. Some solicitation of the other's views may be evident.

3 = Between the two extremes:

The focal intermittently uses appropriate reasoning, explanations, and clarifications, and may solicit the other's views.

4 = Mainly characteristic:

Good communication predominates but not exclusively. The focal frequently uses appropriate reasoning, explanations, and clarifications, as well as soliciting other's views yet there may be a few instances of poor communication displayed.

5 = Highly characteristic:

Good communication predominates. The focal virtually always uses appropriate reasoning, explanations, and clarifications to make him/herself understood; the focal solicits the other's views and gives the other appropriate feedback.

Clarifications: Communication

1. "Explanation" means the focal: a) seeks to tailor comments to cognitive level of the other; b) expands upon own statement;
c) identifies own position clearly; and d) asks open-ended vs. closed questions.

2. "Reason" means the focal has logical comments and/or arguments that follow the other's comments.

3. "Solicitation" means the focal solicits the other's views, asks other to explain or clarify his/her point of view, and/or asks follow-up questions.

4. "Appropriate" means the focal's comments are related to the topic, are positive or neutral (vs. hostile, defensive, blaming) in content and emotional affect.

5. When direct communication between a dyad in the family task is low, consider the skills displayed: do they respond appropriately to the ongoing conversation, even if most communication is directed to another person(s)? Score each based on the skills you observe, regardless of the amount of interaction.

6. If the focal merely uses nonverbal assents or dissents to convey information with no accompanying verbalizations, consider this as evidence of low scores on communication and assertiveness.

7. Do not confuse a high score on verbally involved or lecture/moralize with a high score on communication. Communication is the speaker's expressive skill in conversation with others. Someone may score high on verbally involved and/or lecture/moralize and be a poor communicator.
8. The following contents that indicate the presence of communication:
   a. expresses feelings about other person
   b. expresses feelings about a person
   c. expresses feelings about relatives, friends
   d. expresses opinions in clear and direct manner
   e. reacts positively or neutrally to other person's negative statements or negative affect
   f. summarizes mutual opinion or decision
   g. comments about the communication process, i.e., makes statements about the ways both partners are interacting
   h. asks other person for information
   i. is assertive
   j. displays appropriate humor, laughs

9. The focal may have an idiosyncratic manner of communication which appears unclear to the coder, yet is understandable to the listener in the interaction. The focal should still display reasoning and clarifications, and respond appropriately to ongoing conversation in order to be rated high on communication.

10. Interruptions do not necessarily indicate poor communication. Consider the outcome of the interruption and code down only for bad outcomes. For example: a) for good outcomes the focal may expand on his/her own views, clarify other's position, clarify his/her own position, agree with the other, or disagree with the other and b) for
bad outcomes the focal may disrupt the conversation or prevent the resolution of a problem.

B. Listener Responsiveness

Rate: All (Dyadic)

This scale measures the tendency of the focal to attend and respond to the verbalizations or actions of the other person (the speaker) and assesses the extent to which nonverbal backchannels and verbal assents are used by the focal.

1 = Not at all characteristic:

Focal is not oriented to the speaker; looking down or away (e.g., looking around the room, looking at one's lap, staring at the wall).

2 = Mainly uncharacteristic:

Focal occasionally is responsive, attentive, and oriented to the speaker. However, listener responsiveness is more absent than present.

3 = Moderately characteristic:

Focal is intermittently (e.g., about half the time) responsive, attentive, and oriented to the speaker.

4 = Mainly characteristic:

Focal frequently is responsive, attentive, and oriented to the speaker. However, some evidence of lack of responsiveness exists.

5 = Highly characteristic:

Focal is highly responsive, attentive, and oriented to the speaker. Backchannels and assents are very frequently used.
Clarifications: Listener Responsiveness

1. In coding listener responsiveness, note the gaze pattern of the focal. When the focal is actively watching (attending to) the speaker most of the time, vs. looking around the room or in his/her lap, score higher on listener responsiveness. However, to score at the highest levels, additional behaviors (e.g., backchannels, assents, echoes, laughter) must also be present.

2. The presence of backchannels indicates listener responsiveness. Backchannels nonverbally communicate an interest in what the speaker is saying or doing. They include: nod or tilt of head, leaning toward the speaker, smile or frown, gestures of the arms or hands.

3. Often a listener will emit an assent (a brief verbal response, such as "Yeah," "Uh-huh," "Mm-hmm") while the other person is speaking. The function of these responses is to acknowledge that the speaker's comments are being listened to rather than to indicate explicit agreement with the content of the speaker's comments. Code this type of behavior under listener responsiveness.

4. If the focal merely uses nonverbal assents or dissents to convey information, with no accompanying verbalizations, consider this as evidence of low scores on communication and assertiveness. Do not consider this as evidence of listener responsiveness.

5. Code as Listener Responsiveness instances when a listener echoes or repeats short portions of the other person's statements in a neutral tone of voice.
6. Laughter in response to what the other person is saying or doing would be coded under listener responsiveness as well as humor/laugh.

7. Behavioral cues that indicate the presence of listener responsiveness include: attentive to partner while partner is speaking (high level of eye-contact), face is responsive to what partner is saying (e.g., head-nod, smile, eyebrow movements), assents while partner is speaking, body relaxed, open (without arms akimbo or fidgeting), body (head, shoulders, and trunk) oriented toward partner, and torso leaning toward partner.

8. There will be some overlap in coding facial movement and listener responsiveness if facial movements are directed to and provide feedback to the speaker (see examples 1-3 below).

Examples: Listener Responsiveness

1. a smile that says, "I like your idea."
2. a perplexed look that says, "I don't understand what you mean."
3. raised eyebrows that say, "Wow!" or "You're kidding."
4. laughter in response to the other person's statements or actions.
5. a brief verbal response such as "Yeah" or "Mm-hmm" while the other person is speaking.

C. Assertiveness

Rate: All (Dyadic)

This scale assesses the degree to which the focal displays self-confidence and forthrightness while expressing him/herself through
clear, appropriate, and neutral or positive avenues; exhibiting self-confidence, persistence, and patience with the responses of the other. Take into account the manner in which one presents his/her viewpoint; how the focal responds when his/her assertions are opposed by the other; and nonverbal communication such as not averting gaze, eye contact, body oriented toward the other. In general, the highly assertive person will express his/her views in an open, straightforward, nonthreatening, and nondefensive style.

1 = Not at all characteristic:

Throughout the interaction, the focal virtually never demonstrates signs of assertiveness. At no time may he/she take the initiative in expressing his/her needs, wants, or opinions even when asked. The focal may be unsure of self, shy, cautious, and may wait for directions, or the focal may be coercive.

2 = Mainly uncharacteristic:

Throughout the interaction, the focal occasionally demonstrates signs of assertiveness. The focal may also avert gaze when making a statement, may give up easily when his/her opinions are opposed by the other, or display negative affect.

3 = Between the two extremes:

Throughout the interaction, the focal demonstrates moderate signs of assertiveness. Although the focal intermittently expresses self in a positive, nonthreatening fashion, he/she may not elaborate on or support his/her arguments. There is still an element of a lack of self-confidence in the way the focal asserts self.
4 = Mainly characteristic:
Throughout the interaction, the focal frequently demonstrates signs of assertiveness. The focal frequently expresses self in a clear, appropriate, positive, and self-confident manner. He/she generally conveys patience with respect to the other's responses; persists positively in the face of opposition by elaborating on or supporting his/her arguments; looks directly at the other when making a statement; but may vacillate on a few positions.

5 = Highly characteristic:
Throughout the interaction, the focal is virtually always open and straightforward in expressing him/her self. Under appropriate circumstances, he/she virtually always conveys needs, wants, or opinions in a legitimate, positive, self-confident, and patient fashion; elaborates on or supports his/her arguments; and persists positively in the face of opposition; does not avert gaze when making statements. Note: The focal must display both assertive content and positive body orientation to be scored a '5'.

Clarification: Assertiveness

1. The assertiveness person is reasonable, not pig-headed, nor overly complaining or demanding. Those behaviors are assessed in Guilty Coercion and/or Angry Coercion.

a. It is not possible to have a focal be both highly assertive ('4' or '5') and highly coercive ('4' or '5'). The highest score that can be rated for both these scales together is a '3'.
b. Assertive statements must not only be reasonable, but they must also be stated in a positive, nonthreatening, and nonconfrontational manner. However, a contrary or disagreeing opinion is not necessarily a lack of assertion. The manner used to express opinions is straightforward and matter-of-fact. The person can be assertive while presenting a contrary opinion as long as he/she isn't accusing, derogatory, threatening, or coercive.
c. The use of qualifiers need not be an indication that the focal is backing off. The focal may use qualifiers like, "it seems to" or "but don't you think" to mediate tension and to keep the conversation going.

2. This scale measures the technique or method of getting what is desired, not the success of that method. For example, it is possible to have an adolescent be highly assertive, yet not diminish the parent's control.

3. Assertive behavior is indicated by:
   a. statements describing a given situation in a neutral or positive manner without blame or accusation,
   b. straightforward presentation of issue-oriented factual statements concerning the past, present, or future.

4. If the focal merely uses nonverbal assents or dissents to convey information, with no accompanying verbalizations, consider this as evidence of low scores on communication and assertiveness.
Examples: Assertiveness
1. Direct gaze when making a point
2. Content of verbalization: a) "one way you could deal with the
problem you are having with your teacher is to . . . "(statement); b)
"I don't think I have enough allowance.", C) "This situation with your
teacher is bad. What do you think you are going to do about it?"
(question)
Nonexamples: Assertiveness
1. Crying which ends the focal's persistence
2. Saying, "I give up."
3. Saying, "I don't know" or "I don't care."
4. Downcast eyes

II. Couple Interaction Style

A. Transactional Conflict

Rate: All (Dyadic Relationships)

This scale measures the degree to which members of the dyad
demonstrate hostile, conflictual, coercive and disapproving behavior
and whether the interaction becomes progressively more negative.
Conflict behaviors include elements of hostility and/or coercion,
verbal and nonverbal. Look at the extent to which the members of
the dyad initiate and/or reciprocate conflict ("add to the heat").
1 = Not at all characteristic:

No conflict is present in the dyad.
2 = Mainly uncharacteristic:

One person in the dyad being rated must initiate conflict and the other person must immediately attempt to de-escalate the conflict. For example, one person may always put the other down, yet the other deals with the criticism by using humor or ignoring the other's comments. Negative nonverbal behaviors such as pushing or making faces may also initiate a conflict. The result must be an absence of reciprocated negative behaviors. Either person may behave negatively toward the other, but the other does not respond in kind. Any hostility by either member of the dyad would be coded at least a '2' for Transactional Conflict.

3 = Between the two extremes:

Both participants occasionally engage in negative, hostile or coercive comments or other behaviors toward the other, although their comments do not lead to a heated disagreement; both parties may engage in diffusing conflict. Negative responses by one party must closely follow those of the other, i.e., they must be reciprocal. A nonverbal action or gesture may take the place of a reciprocating verbal comment. For example, a facial expression of disgust in response to another's remarks may initiate or reciprocate conflict. The reciprocation of negative acts should take place within 30-60 seconds, not necessarily immediately. The negative response could involve a different topic of discussion.
4 = Mainly characteristic:

Both participants more frequently engage in negative, hostile, or coercive comments or other behaviors that may result in heated disagreement, and they frequently either do not attempt to diffuse the conflict or make unsuccessful attempts to diffuse the conflict. There may be instances, however, when the conflict is diffused.

5 = Highly characteristic:

Both participants engage in negative, hostile, or coercive comments or other behaviors to each other that result in the interaction being almost entirely negative, as an attack-counterattack interaction. There may be no instances in which either participant makes an attempt to diffuse conflict. Hostility and/or coercion are evident throughout the task.

Clarification: Transactional Conflict

1. This scale assesses the negative process of the interaction, not the individual displays of hostility.
2. If disagreement is mild or neutral and not disparaging of the other, do not code as transactional conflict. There must be some negativism to code disagreement as transactional conflict.
3. Attend only to the degree of conflict achieved by the members of the dyad together. Do not be concerned with who started the argument, or with whose judgment appears to be correct.
4. Conflictual interactions include elements of Hostility, Angry Coercion, or Guilty Coercion. Consider both verbal content and nonverbal behaviors such as actions, gestures, or nonverbal affect.
It is sometimes more difficult to determine the affect of laughter, smiles, etc. which may appear positive but involve sarcasm or cynicism. Look to both the content of comments and nonverbal affect to determine the negativity of behavioral interactions.

5. The score on Transactional Conflict is a relationship score. Both interactors in a dyad receive the same score, regardless of who appeared to initiate or mediate the conflict.

6. Think of Transactional Conflict as a sequential pattern in which a negative behavior of one partner is followed by a negative behavior of the other person and so forth, creating a "snowball" effect. Consecutive negative chains of behavior are the essential ingredient that must be observed. To be rated high on Transactional Conflict, both partners would not only display a high frequency of negative verbal and nonverbal behaviors, but also give the impression of triggering each other's negative behavior unceasingly.

7. Occurrence of frequent instances of Transactional Conflict which alone would warrant a '3' level score would raise the Transactional Conflict score to a '4'.

8. Observing evidence of mediational strategies in response to initiation of conflictual behavior would be scored a '2' if that was the only response to an escalation by one of the interactors. If negative behavior follows negative behavior, even with some mediation occurring in the interaction, a minimum of '3' must be scored.
Examples: Transactional Conflict

1. Examples of negative behaviors:
   a. name calling
   b. swearing
   c. mocking
   d. non-constructive criticisms
   e. physical threats
   f. yelling
   g. facial gestures: scowling, frowning, disgust

2. Examples of mediational or conflict-diffusing strategies:
   a. offering a compromise
   b. making a statement that allows both people to be right
   c. humor
   d. ignoring the other's comments
   e. apologizing

B. Transactional Positive

Rate: All (Dyadic Relationship)

This scale measures the degree to which members of the dyad demonstrates the ability to reinforce, support, or facilitate mutual approval, and whether the interaction becomes progressively more positive and enjoyable. Supportive behaviors include elements of endearment, warmth, humor, listener responsiveness. Look at the extent to which the members of the dyad initiate and/or reciprocate approval/support for each other.
1 = Not at all characteristic:
   No approval/support is present in the dyad.

2 = Mainly uncharacteristic:
   One person in the dyad being rated must initiate approval/support, but the other person does not immediately respond in like manner. Minimal approval/support is shown by either of the interactors. For example, one person may frequently show approval/support to the other, yet the other deals with the approval/support by ignoring the other's comments or responding in a neutral or negative manner. Positive nonverbal behaviors such as smiling or physical affection may also initiate approval/support. The result must be the absence of reciprocated positive behaviors. Either person may behave positively toward the other, but the other does not respond in kind. Any approval/support by either member of the dyad would be coded at least a '2' for Transactional Positive.

3 = Between two extremes:
   Both participants occasionally engage in approving/supporting comments on other behaviors toward the other, although their comments do not lead to a very warm exchange. Positive responses by one party must closely follow those of the other, i.e., they must be reciprocal. A nonverbal action or gesture may take the place of a reciprocating verbal comment. For example, a facial expression of warmth in response to another's remark may initiate or reciprocate approval/support. The reciprocation of positive acts should take
place within 30-60 seconds, not necessarily immediately. The positive response could involve a different topic of discussion.

4. Mainly characteristic:
Both participants frequently engage in endearing, warm, approving or supporting comments or behaviors that may result in a fairly positive interaction, and they frequently continue for a period of time in a positive manner. There may be instances, however when approval/support is not reciprocated.

5. Highly characteristic:
Both participants engage in endearing, warm, approving, or supporting comments or other behaviors to each other that result in the interaction being almost entirely positive, as in a positive reciprocated positive interaction. There may be no instances in which either participant makes an attempt to diffuse the warmth. Warmth, approval and/or support are evident throughout the task.

Clarification: Transactional Positive

1. This scale assesses the positive process of the interaction, not the individual display of positive behavior.

2. Attend only to the degree of warmth or positive behaviors achieved by the members of the dyad together. Do not be concerned with who initiated the positive interaction.

3. Do not code agreement about something or someone outside the immediate interaction as Transactional Positive. To count as evidence of Transactional Positive, the positive statement or action
must be directed toward the characteristics or actions of the other interactor.

4. Positive interactions include elements of warmth, endearment, approval, and support. Consider both verbal content and nonverbal behaviors such as actions, gestures, or nonverbal affect to determine the positiveness of behavioral interactions.

5. The score on Transactional Positive is a relationship score. Both interactors in a dyad receive the same score, regardless of who appeared to initiate the positive interaction.

6. Transactional Positive is defined as a sequential pattern in which a positive behavior of one partner is followed by a positive behavior of the other person and so forth, creating a "snowball" effect. Consecutive positive chains of behavior are the essential ingredient that must be observed. To be rated very high on Transactional Positive both partners would not only display a high frequency of positive verbal and nonverbal behaviors, but also give the impression of triggering each other's positive behavior unceasingly.

C. Relationship Quality

Rate: All (Dyadic)

The observer's subjective evaluation of the quality of the dyad's relationship. Code as '3' if there is no evidence concerning the quality of the relationship.

1 = Very negative:

The dyad's relationship is characterized as very unhappy, conflicted, and brittle, or dyad is uninvolved (emotionally divorced).
In a sibling dyad, this type of relationship would be characterized by high conflict, lack of interest in the other, or few indications of warmth along with a high level of antisocial behaviors.

2. Somewhat negative:

The dyad's relationship is characterized as somewhat unhappy or conflicted. The relationship is more negative than neutral or positive.

3. Between the two extremes:

The dyad members are involved with each other, but the relationship is neither excessively negative nor excessively positive. They may avoid some issues important to the dyad/relationship. There also may be some areas in the relationship in which they avoid unhappiness, or conflict. This relationship would be described as a good relationship but the relationship could use improvement in some areas to increase its quality. Code as '3' if there is no evidence concerning the quality of the relationship.

4 = Somewhat positive:

The dyad's relationship is characterized as generally somewhat positive and warm. The relationship is more positive than neutral or negative. The relationship could be described as being a quality relationship that is more positive than neutral or negative, although there may be one or two indicators of low level negative behavior.

5 = Very positive:

The dyad's relationship is characterized as open, satisfying, pleasing, communicative, and warm. The individuals have a positive
outlook on their relationship. There are few, if any, incidents of negative behaviors.

Clarification: Relationship Quality

1. Look for the combinations of the following scales in assessing Relationship Quality:
   a. Warmth/Support (high)
   b. Communication (high)
   c. Positive Mood (high)
   d. Escalate Positive (high)
   e. Listener Responsiveness (high)
   f. Transactional Positive (high)
   g. Hostility (low)
   h. Angry or Guilty Coercion (low)
   i. Verbal/Physical Attack (low)
   j. Escalate Negative (low)
   k. Transactional Conflict ('1' - '3' range)
   l. Prosocial (high)
   m. Antisocial (low)
   n. Silence/Pause (low)

2. Look for incidents in which communication is high and there is a willingness to discuss important issues. The dyad that appears to avoid talking about important issues would be rated lower on Relationship Quality. An unwillingness to discuss important issues could be indicated by changing the subject, going on to next card prematurely, denying the issue is important to the other interactor.
and hostile behavior exhibited by the focal when a subject is discussed.

3. The Relationship Quality scale differs from most other scales in that it goes from very negative to very positive with the midpoint being neutral.

III. Husband/Wife Positive Affect

Both husbands and wives answered the following questionnaire information:

Indicate how you have viewed your life in general during the past month.

1 = none of the time
2 = a little of the time
3 = some of the time
4 = a good bit of the time
5 = most of the time
6 = all of the time

1) Have you generally enjoyed the things you do?
2) Have you felt that the future looks hopeful and promising?
3) Has your daily life been full of things that were interesting to you?
4) Did you feel relaxed and free of tension?
5) Were you a happy person?
6) Has living been a wonderful adventure for you?
IV. Husband/Wife Marital Satisfaction

Husbands and wives answered the following questionnaire items to measure their marital satisfaction:
1) The numbers represent different degrees of happiness in your marital relationship. Indicate how happy you are, all things considered, with your marital relationship.
0 = extremely unhappy
1 = fairly unhappy
2 = a little unhappy
3 = happy
4 = very happy
5 = extremely happy
2) All in all, how satisfied are you with your marriage?
1 = not at all satisfied
2 = not very satisfied
3 = somewhat satisfied
4 = very satisfied
5 = completely satisfied

V. Husband/Wife Parenting Style

A. Quality Time

Rate: Parents (Dyadic)

This scale assesses the extent or quality of the parent's involvement in the child's life. Of particular interest is a sense of time "well-spent" vs. merely superficial involvement. Please note
that this scale differs from Child Monitoring (knowledge and information) in that it measures the quality of the time parent and child spend together. Quality of time relates to opportunities for conversation, companionship, and mutual enjoyment.

1 = Not at all characteristic:

Spends no quality time with the child. It appears that the parent spends no time with the child that is of significant quality.

2 = Mainly uncharacteristic:

It appears that the parent infrequently spends time with the child that is of significant quality.

3 = Moderately characteristic:

It appears that the parent intermittently spends time with the child that is of significant quality.

4 = Mainly characteristic:

It appears that the parent frequently spends time with the child that is of significant quality.

5 = Highly characteristic:

The parent is regularly involved with the child in a high-quality manner. It appears that the parent regularly and routinely spends time with the child that is of significant quality.

Clarification: Quality Time

1. To evaluate the quality of time the parent and child spend together, take note of the opportunities for conversation, companionship, and mutual enjoyment, as well as the extent to which these opportunities are used to enhance the parent-child
relationship. For example, merely watching T.V. together is not an indicator of quality time. However, discussing T.V. programs that have been viewed would indicate quality time.

2. Other opportunities for quality time include:
   a. shared participation in community activities
   b. family trips planned and taken together
   c. after dinner game playing
   d. participation in shared hobbies
   e. mutual involvement in meal preparation
   f. reading and discussing books together
   g. regular meal times with opportunities for conversation

3. To score above a '3' on Quality Time there must be evidence that the parent and child regularly (bi-weekly for a '4'; weekly for a '5') set aside or spend time together in a meaningful way. Although it is not necessary for this time to be spent in the same activity each week, it is important that both parent and child view the time together as important, place special significance on the time, and look forward to this time.

Examples: Quality Time
1. "I really enjoy spending time with you. It's just fun to talk with you."
2. "I like talking with you about your day at school."
3. "It's fun for us to spend time together playing softball."
B. Parental Influence

Rate: Parents (Dyadic)

This scale measures the parent's direct and indirect attempts to influence the child, not his/her success. The scale reflects parental expectations for age-appropriate behavior. Take into account the degree to which the parent attempts to regulate or control the child's life according to commonly-accepted standards, e.g., setting standards for conduct at home (manners, chores, homework, T.V.), developing and overseeing daily routines (brushing teeth, eating regular meals), setting standards for behavior away from home (friends, social, school), or directing the child's behavior in the task.

1 = Not at all characteristic:

The parent virtually never attempts to regulate, control or influence the child's behavior. The parent does not provide expectations for age-appropriate behavior.

2 = Mainly uncharacteristic:

The parent infrequently attempts to regulate, control, or influence the child's behavior. The parent infrequently provides expectations for age-appropriate behavior.

3 = Moderately characteristic:

The parent intermittently attempts to regulate, control, or influence the child's behavior. The parent intermittently provides expectations for age-appropriate behavior.
4 = Mainly characteristic:

The parent frequently attempts to regulate, control or influence the child's behavior. The parent frequently provides expectations for age-appropriate behavior.

5 = Highly characteristic:

The parent consistently attempts to control, and regulate the child's behavior. The parent virtually always provides expectations for age-appropriate behavior.

Clarification: Parental Influence

1. Parental Influence assesses the parent's actual behavior, and what the parent is attempting to accomplish, not his/her success at influencing the child.

2. Examples of areas of child's life the parent may attempt to control: a) homework strategies, b) health habits (bedtime, eating manners), c) T.V. shows watched or amount of time spent watching T.V., d) style of dress, e) hair style or length, f) choice of friends, g) relationship with sibling(s), h) how time is spent between arrival home from school and the time the parent arrives home from work, i) whereabouts and activities when away from home, j) participation in particular school, athletic, or social activities, k) tobacco, alcohol, or drug use, and l) dating.

3. Examples of ways parent may attempt to influence the child: a) acknowledges responsibility for setting guidelines for child, b) initiates discussion even if the topic is likely to cause the child to become upset or angry, c) requires the child to pay attention to
him/her, d) indicates that he/she expects to be obeyed, e) deals straightforwardly with child's attempts to manipulate him/her, and f) confronts the child when the child misbehaves.

4. A parent who changes his/her mind to a coercive, angry, badgering child cannot be scored higher than a '4' on Parental Influence.

5. A parent scored a '5' may change his/her mind in response to a reasonable child, but never changes his/her mind in response to a demanding child.

C. Positive Reinforcement

Rate: Parents (Dyadic)

This scale assesses the extent to which the parent responds positively to "appropriate behavior" or behavior that meets specific parental standards (stated or implied rules, regulations, and expectations). Positive reinforcement includes the use of praise, approval, rewards, special privileges, or smiles in response to behavior approved by the parent. For positive responses by the parent to a child's behavior during the video task, also code as Warmth/Support.

1 = Not at all characteristic:

Parental discipline is never affirming or positively reinforcing.
2 = Mainly uncharacteristic:

Parental discipline is occasionally, but not usually affirming or positively reinforcing. May be mildly positive, e.g., occasionally offering praise and positive reinforcement.

3 = Moderately characteristic:

Parental discipline is intermittently affirming and positive (about half the time). A moderate level of positive discipline, e.g., intermittently praising and positively reinforcing.

4 = Mainly characteristic:

Parental discipline is frequently, but not always, affirming and positive. More intensive affirmation is evident and displayed to a fairly high degree (e.g., frequently praising).

5 = Highly characteristic:

Parental discipline is extremely affirming and positive. All discipline is extremely affirming and positive.

Clarification: Positive Reinforcement

1. Evidence of Positive Reinforcement includes any of the following used in response to child behavior that the parent approves of or desires: a) praise, b) approval, c) rewards, d) special privileges, and e) smile.

2. "Appropriate behavior" refers to behaviors that comply with specific parental standards (stated or implied rules, regulations, and expectations).
D. Encourages Independence

Rate: Parents (Dyadic)

This scale assesses the extent to which the parent encourages the child's independence in thought and actions. The parent reinforces the child's initiative, demonstrations of competence, and capabilities by encouraging the child to make decisions or do things on his/her own. The parent demonstrates confidence in the child's ability to solve problems, accomplish goals, and make decisions that are appropriate to the child's age.

1 = Not at all characteristic:
   No evidence of encouragement of child's independence.

2 = Mainly uncharacteristic:
   Parent occasionally, but not usually, encourages the child's independence.

3 = Moderately characteristic:
   Parent intermittently encourages the child's independence.

4 = Mainly characteristic:
   Parent frequently encourages the child's independence, but not at the highest level.

5 = Highly characteristic:
   Parent demonstrates a high level of encouragement of the child's independence.
Clarification: Encourages Independence

1. The parent demonstrates trust in the capability of the child and promotes the child's involvement in decisions regarding the child's behavior.

2. Included here are verbal statements expressing confidence in the child's abilities and competencies, for example, the child's physical skill or ability to perform an activity.

3. The parent is sensitive to age-appropriate expectations for the child's behavior and encourages independence for the child's well-being, not to relieve the parent of responsibility for the child.

Examples: Encourage Independence

1. "I know you'll be able to make the right choice."

2. "What do you think we should set as your bedtime?"

3. "Well, you buy some of your own clothes now. Perhaps next year you'll be able to buy more of them."

4. "Splitting up the chores so you do the cooking once a week seems to work out well."

E. Inductive Reasoning

Rate: Parents (Dyadic)

Extent to which the parent tries to guide the behavior of the child through an exchange of information with the child. The parent encourages the child to understand the possible consequences of the child's behavior, seeks voluntary compliance, avoids a direct conflict of wills (power assertion), and uses reasoning to encourage
the child to consider the feelings of others with whom they interact. Explanations and discussions are presented in a neutral or positive manner. There is evidence of good communication skills and an allowance for verbal give and take. The parent encourages the child's thought and consideration regarding the reason for rules, etc., and promotes the child's thought regarding the child's behavior.

1 = Not at all characteristic:
Parent does not use reasoning or display induction in dealing with the child. Power assertion is used to control the child or else the parent is neglecting/distancing.

2 = Mainly uncharacteristic:
Parent occasionally or infrequently uses induction. However his/her interaction is primarily lacking in induction. Parent tends to use other means (i.e., coercion, power assertion) to control the child's behavior or to ignore the child's behavior.

3 = Moderately characteristic:
Parent is as likely to use induction as to use some other approach in interacting with the child.

4 = Mainly characteristic:
Parent frequently uses induction. However, there is some evidence of lack of induction to control the child's behavior.

5 = Highly characteristic:
Parent characteristically uses inductive reasoning with the child.
Clarification: Inductive Reasoning

1. The parent who scores high on Inductive Reasoning effectively uses "teachable moments" in interacting with the child.
2. The parent asks questions not just for information but to encourage the child's thinking and reasoning about the possible consequences of his/her behavior.
3. Do not interpret Interrogation as indicating the presence of Inductive Reasoning. Interrogation is asking questions to which the focal already knows the answer in order to exert influence on the other person or to make a point.
4. Do not confuse the parent's skill at logically explaining his/her point of view (giving reasons) with the parent's encouragement of the child's thinking and reasoning about the possible consequences of his/her own behavior ("inducing reasons"). Merely giving reason would score a lower level, no higher than a '3'.
5. To score a '4' or above there must be definite evidence of the parent actively encouraging the child's involvement in thinking and reasoning about the possible consequences of his/her own behavior.
6. To score a '5', the parent must encourage the child to think through the reasons for particular rules or parental decisions.

VI. Adolescent Adjustment

Adolescent adjustment is measured by questionnaire data in three separate categories: self-esteem, distress, and delinquency.
A. Adolescent Distress

Indicate how much discomfort that each problem has caused you during the past week including today. During the past week, how much were you distressed or bothered by:

1 = not at all
2 = a little bit
3 = a moderate amount
4 = quite a bit
5 = extremely

1) headaches
2) nervousness or shakiness inside
3) faintness or dizziness
4) the idea that something is wrong with your mind
5) feeling easily annoyed or irritated
6) pains in heart or chest
7) feeling low in energy or slowed down
8) thoughts of ending your life
9) trembling
10) poor appetite
11) crying easily
12) feelings of being trapped or caught
13) suddenly scared for no reason
14) temper outbursts that you could not control
15) blaming yourself for things
16) pains in lower back
17) feeling lonely
18) feeling blue
19) worrying too much about things
20) feeling no interest in things
21) feeling fearful
22) heart pounding or racing
23) nausea or upset stomach
24) soreness of your muscles
25) trouble falling asleep
26) trouble getting your breath
27) hot or cold spells
28) numbness or tingling in parts of your body
29) a lump in your throat
30) feeling hopeless about the future
31) feeling weak in parts of your body
32) feeling tense or keyed up
33) heavy feelings in your arms or legs
34) thoughts of death or dying
35) overeating
36) having urges to beat, injure, or harm someone
37) awakening in the early morning
38) sleep that is restless or disturbed
39) having urges to break or smash things
40) feelings everything is an effort
41) spells of terror or panic
42) getting into frequent arguments
43) feeling so restless you couldn't sit still
44) feelings of worthlessness
45) the feeling that something bad is going to happen to you
46) shouting or throwing things
47) thoughts and images of a frightening nature
48) feelings of guilt

B. Adolescent Delinquency

We'd like to know whether you've done any of the behaviors related to laws and rules. How often have you done this behavior in the last year?
0 = never
1 = once in the last year
2 = 2-3 times in the last year
3 = 4-5 times in the last year
4 = 6 or more times in the last year
1) run away from home
2) taken something worth less than $25 that didn't belong to you?
3) taken something worth $25 or more that didn't belong to you?
4) driven a car when drunk?
5) beat up on someone or fought someone physically because they made you angry (other than just playing around)?
6) gone to court or been placed on probation for something you did?
7) been placed in detention or jail?
8) snatched someone's purse or wallet without hurting them?
9) been drunk in a public place?
10) purposely damaged or destroyed property that did not belong to you?
11) broke in or tried to break into a building just for fun or to look around?
12) Broke in or tried to break into a building to steal or damage something?
13) thrown objects such as rocks or bottles at people to hurt or scare them?
14) attacked someone with a weapon, trying to seriously hurt them?
15) sold illegal drugs such as pot, grass, hash, LSD, cocaine, or other drug?
16) used a weapon, force or strong arm methods to get money or things from someone?
17) been picked up by the police for something you did?
18) set fire to a building or field or something like that just for fun?
19) sneaked into a movie, ballgame or something like that without paying?
20) gotten into trouble for driving a car without a license?
21) gotten a ticket for speeding or other traffic violations in a car?
22) gone to court or been placed on probation for something you did?
23) been placed in detention or jail?
C. Adolescent Self-Esteem

1 = strongly agree
2 = agree
3 = neutral/mixed
4 = disagree
5 = strongly disagree

1) I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal.
2) I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
3) All in all, I am inclined to feel that I'm a failure.
4) I am able to do things as well as most other people.
5) I feel that I do not have much to be proud of.
6) I take a positive attitude toward myself.
7) On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
8) I certainly feel useless at times
9) I wish I could have more respect for myself.
10) At times I think I am no good at all.

Items 1, 2, 4, 6, and 7 were reverse coded.