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ABSTRACT

This project advanced previous research on romantic relationship conflict through the use of cross-informant data and daily diary methodology to examine conflict frequency and intensity. Additionally, this project extended findings to temporal spillover and relational spillover of conflict. Based on an ecological systems framework, I examined the importance of individual (internalizing and externalizing problems), relationship (conflict resolution tactics, attachment behavior, relationship satisfaction) and interparental and parent-child relationship (conflict resolution tactics) factors in understanding conflict in young adult romantic relationships. Cross-informant cross-sectional and daily diary data from 82 couples in romantic relationships during young adulthood informed the results. Relationship physical assault, anxious attachment and satisfaction predicted conflict frequency, while psychological aggression, negotiation, avoidant attachment and satisfaction predicted conflict intensity. Additionally, most interparental and few parent-child conflict resolution strategies emerged as salient predictors of conflict frequency and intensity, with parental gender differences evident. Many of these predictors also demonstrated crossover effects to temporal and relational spillover of conflict.
CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Conflict occurs in many situations – within different cultures, across time and throughout the life course (Larson & Richards, 1994; Valsiner & Cairns, 1992). Due to its pervasive nature, conflict is central to human development (Valsiner & Cairns, 1992) and plays an essential role within interpersonal relationships, especially romantic relationships (Braiker & Kelley, 1979). Previous research demonstrates that risk factors from multiple domains (i.e., individual, romantic relationship, interparental and parent-child relationship) predict increased rates of conflict frequency and intensity in romantic relationships. This research has, however, been limited to cross sectional and single-informant designs. Therefore, we don’t know (a) what conflict looks like using reports from both individuals in a romantic relationship on a daily basis and (b) whether or not romantic relationship conflict spills over across time or into other relationships. Therefore, the goals of this dissertation are: a) to describe and examine conflict within young adult romantic relationships through the use of multiple methods and a dyadic design, b) to replicate findings from previous studies identifying salient risk factors for conflict, and c) to examine spillover of conflict across both time and into other relationships.

In this first chapter, I will first review the empirical literature to understand the importance of studying conflict, particularly within romantic relationships. In particular, I
will focus on identifying and defining the factors to be studied, including conflict frequency, conflict intensity, temporal spillover of conflict and relational spillover of conflict. Then, I will discuss methodological advances pertinent to this study, specifically dyadic data and daily diaries, and how these advances can be applied to study these types of conflict. Following this discussion, I will describe my theoretical framework, based on ecological systems theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1979), and identify the important risk factors for understanding and predicting conflict in young adult romantic relationships. Brief literature reviews of each risk factor will then follow prior to outlining my aims and hypotheses.

1.1 Conflict

Conflict is central to human development as individuals learn from conflict how others feel, how to interact with others, and how to communicate more effectively (Canary et al., 1995). Thus, individuals can develop styles for how to interact within different social relationships in order to promote their own needs. Conflict also provides opportunities for individuals to practice resolving disagreements within a relationship. If individuals do not learn how to resolve conflict with others, conflict may result in significant negative consequences, such as physical and psychological aggression. As conflict occurs within many relationships, understanding conflict can provide essential information for healthy relationships throughout development.

The defining characteristics of conflict vary dependent on the specific behavior or event in question (Canary, Cupach, & Messman, 1995). Most definitions of conflict
include two basic components: a) an event occurring within an interpersonal relationship as a dyadic interaction, and b) involving behavioral opposition, resistance, interference, or incompatibility (Barki & Hartwick, 2004; Cahn, 1992; Laursen, Coy & Collins, 1998; Peterson, 1983; Shantz & Hartup, 1992). Specifically, conflict includes behaviors such as quarrels, disagreements, interruptions, tension, antagonism and arguments (Canary et al., 1995; Laursen et al., 1998).

Conflict occurs because a problem or solution is seen differently by individuals within a relationship (Sillars, 1998). Conflict may also not occur because individuals avoid disagreements or arguments (Knobloch & Carpenter-Theune, 2004). Although determining occurrence of conflict is critical for studying conflict, most researchers focus on the frequency of conflict. Conflict frequency refers to the amount of conflict that occurs within a specified time period (Burk, Denissen, van Doorn, Branje & Laursen, 2009). Importantly, greater frequency of conflict predicts several poor outcomes in romantic relationships, including lower relationship satisfaction (Karney & Bradbury, 1995), relationship instability (Murray, Holmes & Griffin, 1996) and higher divorce rates (McGonagle, Kessler & Gotlib, 1993).

Besides examining frequency, another critical factor relevant for understanding conflict within close relationships is intensity (Collins & Laursen, 1992). Intensity refers to how emotionally laden an argument may become (i.e., Jones, 2001) and how individuals react within conflict. Individual differences regarding reactions to conflict -
such as constructive or destructive conflict resolution tactics - may stem from the intensity of the conflict (Pietromonaco, Greenwood & Feldman-Barrett, 2004).

Conflict intensity reflects a unique picture of conflict behavior because more intense conflicts may have more damaging effects within a relationship (Laursen, 1996). The level of intensity varies greatly across romantic relationships and can result in several destructive forms of behavior – ranging from negative hostility/affect to controlling the other’s actions and behavior to verbal aggression or threatening physical aggression to physical aggression (Grych & Fincham, 1990; Winstok, 2008). Intense conflict across successive interactions also leads to a higher likelihood of violence during later conflicts (Winstok, 2008). If we limit focus to only the frequency of conflict, we may overlook the important role of intensity (Laursen et al., 1998; Sillars, Canary, & Tafoya, 2004). Therefore, any investigation of conflict should incorporate a broader and more inclusive measurement of several conflict factors, including intensity (Laursen et al., 1998). Additionally, there may be other ways to measure and evaluate conflict in relationships, such as temporal and relational spillover.

Conflict does not occur as one or more isolated incidences, but may spill over across time (temporal spillover) and relationships (relational spillover; i.e., Repetti, Wang, & Saxbe, 2009). Temporal spillover refers to the idea that conflicts do not occur in isolation, but may occur across multiple days or interactions. Serial arguments provide one example of how conflicts may spillover across time. A serial argument refers to the continuation of an argument between two individuals across time (Johnson & Roloff,
1998; Trapp & Hoff, 1985). Benoit & Benoit (1987) demonstrated that at least 50% of individuals report having the same argument with the same individual at different time points. Specifically, serial arguments likely continue when a conflict or argument is unresolved (Bevan, Finan & Kaminsky, 2008).

However, research on serial arguments has been limited in two important ways. First, the majority of serial argument research uses retrospective designs (i.e., Bevan, 2010; Bevan et al., 2008; Malis & Roloff, 2006; Trapp & Hoff, 1985). Use of retrospective measures may lead to biased or inaccurate reports of behavior. Therefore, the need to identify serial arguments as they occur is the next step for understanding conflict. One method to advance conflict research would be through daily diary methodology (Bolger, Davis & Rafaeli, 2003). Additionally, serial argument research has been limited to single informant reports (i.e., Bevan, 2010; Bevan et al., 2008; Malis & Roloff, 2006; Trapp & Hoff, 1985). By limiting collection of data on serial arguments to one participant’s viewpoint, the interpersonal component of relationship conflict is lost. Therefore, to further understand temporal spillover of conflict, I will focus on describing and predicting conflict behavior similar to serial arguing using multi-informant daily diary methodology.

Conflict may also spill over across salient relationships. The spillover of relational conflict, primarily examined within the work-family balance literature (Repetti et al., 2009), suggests that conflict within one domain (i.e., family life) occurs due to conflict or stress from another domain (i.e., work). As each relationship is embedded within a
network of other relationships, behavior within one relationship may also impact other relationships within that network (Hinde, 1988). For example, other close relationships, such as parent-child relationships, sibling relationships and friendships, may be affected by romantic relationship conflict (or vice versa). However, previous research has not examined whether relational spillover of conflict occurs. Therefore, I will also investigate relational spillover of conflict, or the idea that conflict from one relationship domain (i.e., the romantic relationship) may impact conflict within another relationship domain (i.e., friends, parents, siblings) through increased conflict in multiple relationships in young adulthood.

1.2 Conflict in Young Adults

The frequency and intensity of relationship conflict differs across developmental time periods. For example, during adolescence, conflict rates increase within parent and sibling relationships (Collins & Laursen, 2004) with a decline in conflict with parents during young adulthood (Laursen et al., 1998). With this decrease in parent-child conflict, conflict increases within peer relationships, particularly romantic peer relationships (Laursen, Finkelstein, & Betts, 2001). For example, Chen, Cohen, Kasen, Johnson, Ehrensaft, and Gordon (2006) established that conflict within romantic relationships substantially increases between the ages of 19 and 25.

Increases in conflict during young adulthood seem obvious when one also considers the developmental tasks of this age period. According to Arnett (2004), young adults undergo several developmental changes during this time period, including reduced
financial dependence from parents, attending higher education or starting professional careers, and moving away from home for the first time. Additionally, young adults experience greater life instability demonstrated by frequent housing changes, changes in career options and new relationships (Arnett, 2004). Young adults undergo substantial stress with these new responsibilities and life experiences. With this instability comes great uncertainty (Arnett, 2007) – and this uncertainty may impact how one interacts with others. When young adults begin to explore new relationships, they may determine the need to change their interaction style within these relationships. If one is uncertain how to interact within an interpersonal relationship, conflict may arise as individuals define their role within the relationship.

One particular relationship that increases in frequency during young adulthood is the romantic relationship, with young adults engaging in romantic relationships at a higher frequency than younger age groups. National U.S. data suggest that approximately 70% of young adults are involved in romantic relationships compared to 50% of adolescents (Carver, Joyner, & Udry, 2003). These developing relationships come with increased contact which then promotes more opportunities for conflict. For example, as individuals spend more time together, they become more aware of their differences or feel more comfortable disagreeing, thus increasing rates of conflict. Greater instability and higher rates of conflict then accompany romantic relationships in young adulthood (Braiker & Kelley, 1979). Due to the significant changes occurring during young adulthood, particularly in romantic relationships, studying this developmental period
provides an optimal opportunity to understand conflict as it develops in romantic relationships.

1.3 Advancing Methodology

Current research in understanding conflict in romantic relationships primarily draws from three methodologies: retrospective studies (i.e., Cramer, 2002), the observation of conflict resolution (Gottman, 1994), or single informant daily diaries (Simpson et al., 2006). Although these methods provide valuable insight into conflict, they are limited. For example, many researchers focus on conflict frequency through the use of retrospective self-reports. Use of retrospective designs may bias frequency reports because of poor memory of events (Canary et al., 1995). These biased memories in retrospective reports may not always reflect actual behavior, but perceptions of how behavior changed a relationship (Metts, Sprecher & Cupach, 1991). Therefore, retrospective memory reporting may neglect conflicts that did not produce a substantial change in the relationship.

Observation of conflict most often focuses on resolution strategies and often overlooks other factors, such as frequency or intensity. A more optimal method for studying occurrences and intensity of conflict and conflict spillover involves the use of daily diaries (Simpson et al, 2006). Using a daily diary methodology, conflicts within a romantic relationship can be reported on from recent memory and examined for patterns across the current time period and applicable relationships. Daily diary data produce simultaneous and immediate reports of conflict and reduce memory bias from
retrospective reports (Bolger et al., 2003; Kennedy, Bolger, & Shrout, 2002). Daily diaries also reduce systematic and random sources of measurement error and increase the validity and reliability of responses (Bolger et al., 2003). Therefore, I will collect daily diaries to study romantic relationship conflict and conflict spillover.

Another methodological issue in the study of romantic relationship conflict involves the over reliance on data collection from one individual to represent dyadic interactions within a romantic relationship. Although research on romantic relationship conflict typically requires individuals to be currently or previously involved in a romantic or dating relationship, they typically examine the perspective of only one individual (i.e., Linder & Collins, 2005; Martin, 1990; Reese-Weber & Bartle-Haring, 1998; Reese-Weber & Kahn, 2005; Reese-Weber & Marchand, 2002; Simpson et al., 2006). Optimally, relationship research should collect information from both individuals to better capture the dyadic interplay within romantic relationships (i.e., van Dulmen & Goncy, 2011). Consideration of both partners improves relationship research by accounting for relationship interdependence, or the mutual influence of one individual’s behavior in impacting the other’s behavior (Bukowski, Adams & Santo, 2006). Additionally, having two individuals report on events occurring within the relationship may reduce potential bias in remembering events (Canary et al., 1995). Finally, two individual experiences may also provide unique information on romantic relationship conflict and thus the impact of this conflict on both the individual and the relationship.
(Sillars et al., 2004). Therefore, I will investigate romantic relationship conflict from the perspective of two individuals within an exclusive dating relationship.

1.4 Theoretical Framework

Several important aspects related to romantic relationships, including individual, relationship, and family factors, may impact the development of conflict frequency, intensity and spillover in young adult romantic relationships. Therefore, this project (see Figure 1.1) is guided by an ecological, developmental framework (Bubolz & Sontag, 1993) and more specifically Bronfenbrenner’s ecological systems theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). I specifically focused on the microsystem, or the immediate setting, to understand development of romantic relationship conflict in young adulthood. Within the microsystem, individuals are impacted by significant relationships throughout life with the family remaining central to this system. Guided by several assumptions, including that the family is a dynamic and adaptive system that continually changes and adapts to new situations and that all relationships are interrelated and impact each other, this model provides one example of how previous relationships interact to predict future romantic relationship conflict.

This model focuses on an ecological transition within young adults by examining new romantic relationships -of one month or longer- during a time when individuals shift in their perceptions of themselves (i.e., as young adults as opposed to adolescents). Young adults will be examined within three domains that are relevant to the microsystem – the self, the romantic relationship, and the family relationship. Within the individual
Figure 1.1. Model Based on Ecological Systems Theoretical Framework

- **Background Variables:**
  - Life Stress
  - Individual affect
  - Relationship length
  - Relationship contact
  - Family structure

- **Individual Domain**
  - Internalizing Problems
  - Externalizing Problems

- **Temporal/Relational Spillover Conflict**

- **Romantic Relationship Conflict Frequency**

- **Romantic Relationship Conflict Intensity**

- **Temporal/Relational Spillover Conflict Frequency/Occurrence**

- **Relationship Domain**
  - Physical/Psychological Aggression, Negotiation
  - Attachment
  - Satisfaction

- **Family Domain**
  - Interparental/Parent-to-Child Physical & Psychological Aggression, Negotiation, and Non-Violent Discipline

- **Temporal/Relational Spillover Conflict Intensity**
domain, both internalizing and externalizing symptoms will be used to predict romantic relationship conflict frequency, intensity, and spillover. Within the relationship domain, several constructs will be used to predict conflict frequency, intensity and spillover, including romantic relationship physical and psychological aggression and negotiation, anxious and avoidant attachment behavior, and relationship satisfaction. Based on previous research (described below), I expect that each of these constructs will impact the amount and intensity of romantic relationship conflict. This model will also build on romantic relationship conflict frequency and intensity to investigate both temporal and relational spillover of romantic relationship conflict.

Constructs from the family domain, including interparental and parent-to-child physical and psychological aggression and positive conflict resolution tactics, will also be used to predict frequency, intensity, and spillover of romantic relationship conflict. Specifically, this model considers the complex history of interparental and parent-child conflict tactics to understand the impact of this history on the current romantic relationship. Based on the principles of ecological systems theory, I expect that interactions and previous experiences within the family will impact the development of conflict behavior in young adult romantic relationships. This expectation is based on one principle of ecological systems theory that suggests that salient relationships within the microsystem, and particularly the family, remain central in the development of later behavior.

The individual, relationship and family characteristics are critical for understanding romantic relationship conflict in young adults. Additionally, several variables, including
length of romantic relationship/amount of contact within the romantic relationship, negative affect, life stress and family structure, also need to be considered when understanding individual differences in young adult romantic relationship conflict. Empirical evidence for the role of each of these factors in understanding conflict is presented below.

1.5 Individual Characteristics

Conflict and dysfunction in romantic relationships are associated with both internalizing symptoms, such as depression and anxiety, and externalizing problems, such as antisocial behavior, in adolescent and adult romantic relationships. Regarding internalizing problems, individuals who report significant levels of depression often demonstrate poor relationship functioning, particularly during times of conflict or disagreement (Davila, Stroud, & Starr, 2009). The association between internalizing problems and conflict has been well-established in the literature (i.e., Beach, Sandeen, & O’Leary, 1990; Beach, Fincham, & Katz, 1998; Davila, 2001). In some relationships, conflict may serve as the etiology for depression (Beach & Cassidy, 1991), particularly if conflict results in the dissolution of the relationship. On the other hand, individuals with depression often exhibit poor problem-solving tactics, which may lead to more conflict in romantic relationships (Hammen & Brennan, 2002).

Although a majority of this research has focused on marital relationships, some research exists in demonstrating the association between internalizing problems and conflict in young adult samples. For example, in a sample of college students, Londahl,
Tverskoy, & D’Zurilla (2005) demonstrated that interpersonal conflict with a romantic partner significantly related to depression and anxiety symptoms with higher levels of conflict occurring in relationships where individuals reported more anxiety and depression. Additionally, Reese-Weber & Marchand (2002) demonstrated that depression and anxiety also positively related to escalating conflict in young adult romantic relationships.

Externalizing problems, such as aggression, antisocial behavior and deviancy, are also associated with increased conflict in romantic relationships. Because individuals with a history of externalizing problems may be more at risk for displaying aggression within romantic relationship conflict, externalizing symptoms should be considered when examining romantic relationship conflict. For example, in samples of at-risk individuals, history of antisocial behavior predicted greater aggression in their young adult relationships (Capaldi & Clark, 1998; Woodward, Fergusson, & Horwood, 2002). Additionally, early childhood problem behaviors (Magdol, Moffitt, Caspi, & Silva, 1998) and adolescent conduct problems (Ehrensaft, Cohen, Brown, Smailes, Chen, & Johnson, 2003) also predicted later aggression and violence in conflicts during adult romantic relationships.

Antisocial behavior and aggression also predicted young adult romantic relationship conflict that occurs with or without aggression and violence. Andrews, Foster, Capaldi & Hops (2000) demonstrated that if one individual within the relationship has high levels of antisocial behavior, more intense conflict reportedly occurs within that
romantic relationship. Additionally, Adams & Laursen (2007) indicated that both delinquency and aggression relate to increased conflict in adolescent peer relationships, which likely translates into romantic relationships. Based on this previous research, internalizing and externalizing problems in young adulthood were expected to be related to higher frequency, intensity, and spillover of conflict in romantic relationships. Therefore, I included these two constructs to represent individual risk factors for young adult romantic relationship conflict.

1.6 Relationship Characteristics

Similar to the conclusions for externalizing problems, specifically aggression, romantic relationship physical and psychological aggression occur in conjunction with conflict (Adams & Laursen, 2007; Smetana, Campione-Barr, & Metzger, 2006). Based on this connection, it is necessary to consider romantic relationship physical and psychological aggression in the study of conflict. For example, high conflict within romantic relationships predicts higher incidence of interpartner physical aggression (Gryl, Stith, & Bird, 1991; Riggs, O’Leary, & Breslin, 1990), particularly in conflicts that escalate or increase in intensity (Burman, Margolin, & John, 1993). Additionally, individuals who use physical or psychological aggression to manage conflicts with others often also engage in conflicts with a higher intensity compared to those who do not (Winstok, 2008).

Partner psychological aggression is also associated with greater occurrence of conflict within a relationship (Katz, Moore, & May, 2008). In particular, psychological
aggression occurs more frequently with conflict in young adulthood - as young adults seek control in relationships (Laurent, Kim, & Capaldi, 2008). Although some couples use physical or psychological aggression during conflict, others engage in positive conflict resolution styles, such as negotiation. Negotiation of conflict may help assist individuals in resolving conflicts and may also help reduce intensity of conflict (Robin & Foster, 1989). Therefore, these three types of romantic relationship resolution styles – physical aggression, psychological aggression and negotiation - will be included for understanding conflict frequency and intensity.

Although resolution strategies may be outwardly visible during conflict, internal relationship processes, such as attachment, also impact conflict. During times of distress or conflict within a relationship, the attachment system of behavior activates and attachment behavior becomes more salient within these relationship interactions (Simpson, Rholes & Phillips, 1996). Several studies established that attachment behavior relates to perceptions of romantic relationship conflict with anxious (Campbell, Simpson, Boldry, & Kashy, 2005) and avoidant (Cann, Norman, Welbourne, & Calhoun, 2008) attached individuals. For example, individuals with higher levels of insecure (i.e., anxious, avoidant) attachment behavior also report higher frequency and intensity of conflict with their dating partners (i.e., Eberhart & Hammen, 2009). For example, anxiously attached individuals perceived and reported more frequent and severe conflict across both a 14-day daily diary study and during an observed conflict resolution task compared to individuals with low attachment anxiety (Simpson, Campbell, & Weisberg,
Additionally, insecurely attached young adults tend to display more negative affect during conflict, another risk factor for increased frequency and intensity of conflict (Creasey & Hesson-McInnis, 2001). As such, I incorporated both anxious and avoidant attachment as relationship risk factors for conflict.

Finally, previous research indicates a well-established link between romantic relationship satisfaction and conflict behavior. This research shows a strong negative association between conflict frequency and intensity and relationship satisfaction (Cramer, 2006; Kurdek, 1994; Laurent et al., 2008; McGonagle et al., 1993). Couples who engage in less conflict report higher relationship satisfaction compared to high-conflict couples (Cramer, 2006). Relationship satisfaction also negatively relates to frequency of arguments (i.e., Kurdek, 1994; McGonagle et al., 1993), such that couples reporting higher relationship satisfaction also report fewer arguments. Conflicts that intensify or escalate to use of negative conflict resolution strategies, such as physical or psychological aggression, also predict lower relationship satisfaction (Laurent et al., 2008). However, individuals who identify conflicts as either major or minor also report lower relationship satisfaction, suggesting that the occurrence of conflict alone, not necessarily the intensity, predicts lower satisfaction (Cramer, 2002). Based on this literature, I also incorporated romantic relationship satisfaction as the final relationship factor for understanding differences in conflict behavior.
1.7 Interparental and Parent-Child Relationships

Interparental and parent-child conflict provide opportunities to learn adaptive or maladaptive strategies used in later romantic relationship conflict (Shulman, 2003). Children create schemas from interactions within their families of origin which guide them during later romantic relationship conflict (Duggan, O’Brien, & Kennedy, 2001; O’Brien, Balto, Erber, & Gee, 1995; O’Brien & Chin, 1998). If parents provide poor modeling of negotiation and problem solving, children receive few opportunities to develop these skills themselves or learn poor conflict resolution styles (Davies & Cummings, 1994; Grych & Fincham, 1990).

Several empirical studies (Linder & Collins, 2005; Martin, 1990; Reese-Weber & Bartle-Haring, 1998; Reese-Weber & Kahn, 1998) with late adolescent or young adult samples indicated that negative behavior within the interparental relationship (i.e., physical aggression, psychological aggression) impacts conflict resolution in young adult romantic relationships. Using young adult samples, two studies examined the relationship between parent-to-child physical or psychological aggression in understanding conflict resolution behavior (Linder & Collins, 2005; Martin, 1990). In these studies, psychological aggression, but not physical aggression, predicted higher use of negative conflict resolution tactics by young adults in romantic relationships. However, no empirical work exists in demonstrating if parental behavior impacts the frequency and intensity of conflict and spillover of conflict in young adult romantic relationships. One of the goals of the current study is to fill this gap in the literature.
Theoretically, parental use of conflict tactics strategies may predict conflict frequency and intensity. If individuals were exposed to high levels of physical and psychological aggression during their childhood, they may not have learned effective strategies for managing conflict. Individuals may then normalize the use of conflict (i.e., arguments, disagreements) for managing issues in their relationship as opposed to using discussion or compromise. Additionally, if conflict remains unresolved because individuals did not learn appropriate skills for conflict resolution from their parents, conflict may continue on consecutive days (i.e., temporally spillover) or across multiple relationships (i.e., relationally spillover). Similarly, individuals may learn the use of physical or psychological aggression in resolving conflicts. Conflict that results in the use of physical or psychological aggression may be more intense than conflicts resolved through more positive resolution tactics, such as negotiation or compromise. I plan to investigate these possibilities by examining how interparental and parent-to-child conflict tactics predict the occurrence and intensity of romantic relationship conflict and temporal and relational spillover of conflict.

1.8 Additional Background Variables.

Previous empirical research also strongly reports the impact of several other variables, such as the romantic relationship length, the amount of contact within the relationship, negative affect, life stress and the family structure (intact versus divorced families), as related to romantic relationship conflict. Therefore, consideration of these variables is important to truly understand what individual, relationship and family
constructs also predict conflict. Research shows that the length of the relationship is related to intimacy and intimacy prompts conflict. Therefore, as intimacy increases, conflict also increases (Braiker & Kelley, 1979). For example, when predicting romantic relationship conflict, longer romantic relationships predict greater frequency of conflict (Cramer, 2000). Level of conflict also increases as relationships move from casual to serious dating. During young adulthood, relationships often become more serious than earlier relationships and thus create more opportunities for conflict to occur (Braiker & Kelley, 1979).

In addition to the length of the relationship, negative affect, particularly anger and anxiety, predicts increased conflict within romantic relationships. Based on research with early adolescents and daily accounts of conflict, negative affect (i.e., anger) positively relates to the frequency and intensity of conflict (Jensen-Campbell & Graziano, 2000). These findings further emerged within romantic relationship conflict. In particular, anxious affect predicts increases in conflict above and beyond perceptions of conflict (Laurenceau, Troy, & Carver, 2005). In a sample of undergraduate students, negative affect emerged as a predictor of amount of conflict in previous dating relationships (Berry & Willingham, 1997). Additionally, in a study comparing distressed and non-distressed couples, negative affect occurs more frequently during times of conflict in distressed couples (Cahn, 1992).

Life stress, particularly major life stress events, is another known factor for increased conflict frequency and intensity. Zvonkovic, Pennington, and Schimiege (1994)
demonstrated that high college workloads predict higher amounts of conflict within dating college students, particularly for women. As workload demands increase, stress also increases; this higher stress relates to higher conflict. Other times of high stress in relationships – for example, the transition to parenthood (i.e., Kluwer & Johnson, 2007) - also relates to higher conflict rates within romantic relationships. Additionally, stress levels may change patterns of communication within romantic relationships. For example, communication becomes more confrontational and emotional during times of stress (Jones, 2001; Sillars et al., 2004) and this communication may impact conflict intensity. Based on this research, romantic relationship length, negative affect, and life stress all require consideration when examining romantic relationship conflict.

Finally, previous research about the impact of parental marital status, particularly divorce, demonstrates mixed findings with regards to elevated romantic relationship conflict, with some studies demonstrating an association (Chen et al., 2006), while others have not (Cui, Fincham, & Pasley, 2008). However, most evidence suggests that late adolescents from divorced families use greater amounts of conflict within romantic relationships. For example, late adolescents from divorced families, compared to those from intact families, hold more negative attitudes about their own romantic relationships, which breed conflict (Giuliani, Iafrate, & Rosnati, 1998). Additionally, adults, particularly women, from divorced parents demonstrate poorer communication skills which lead to higher rates of conflict (Sanders, Halford, & Behrens, 1999). Therefore,
when examining the impact of interparental and parent-child relationships, I will consider the importance of different family structures for their impact on conflict.

1.9 Aims and Hypotheses

1.9.1 Aim 1

The first aim of this study has three components. First, I plan to replicate findings using the identified constructs from both individual and relationship domains to predict romantic relationship conflict occurrence and intensity using cross-informant daily diaries. Second, I plan to extend these findings to both temporal and relational spillover of conflict. Finally, I intend to use the findings from this aim to inform the Aim 2 models. Aim 1 constructs that demonstrate a statistically significant relationship to the outcome variables will then be included in the Aim 2 models to allow for investigation of family history in predicting conflict above and beyond other variables demonstrated as important in understanding romantic relationship conflict, temporal spillover of conflict and relational spillover of conflict.

Several variables will be included in all Aim 1 analyses. As conflict increases with the length of the romantic relationship (Braiker & Kelly, 1979; Cramer, 2000), amount of contact within the romantic relationship (Sillars et al., 2004), individual negative affect (i.e., Berry & Willingham, 1997; Cahn, 1992; Jensen-Campbell & Graziano, 2000; Laurenceau et al., 2005), and greater life stress (i.e., Jones, 2001; Sillars
et al., 2004; Kluwer & Johnson, 2007; Zvonkovic et al., 1994), these constructs will be included for consideration in all Aim 1 analyses (see proposed analysis plan below).

Because previous research indicates both internalizing symptoms (i.e., Beach et al., 1998; Beach et al., 1990; Davila, 2001; Londahl et al., 2005; Reese-Weber & Marchand, 2002) and externalizing symptoms (Adams & Laursen, 2007; Andrews et al., 2000; Capaldi & Clark, 1998; Ehrensaft et al., 2003; Magdol et al., 1998; Woodward et al., 2002) are related to romantic relationship conflict, I will investigate these two components of psychopathology for predicting frequency and intensity of conflict, temporal spillover and relational spillover. I hypothesize that as internalizing and externalizing symptoms increase, romantic relationship conflict, temporal spillover and relational spillover will occur more frequently and the intensity of conflict will also increase.

Ample evidence exists for the relationship between both physical aggression (i.e., Gryl et al., 1991; Riggs et al., 1990) and psychological aggression (i.e., Katz et al., 2008) within romantic relationship conflict. Therefore, I hypothesize that as levels of both physical and psychological aggression increase, romantic relationship conflict will occur more often. Additionally, as both forms of aggression occur more often during conflicts of high intensity (i.e., Burman et al., 1993), I hypothesize that as rates of physical and psychological aggression increase, so will the intensity of conflict. I expect to replicate these findings for temporal spillover and relational spillover frequency and intensity. I also predict higher rates of negotiation will predict increased conflict frequency and
intensity as negotiation is only happens during times of disagreements or conflict. Again, I expect to replicate this association for both temporal and relational spillover.

As individuals with insecure attachment behavior (i.e., anxious – Campbell et al., 2005; and avoidant – Cann et al., 2008) report greater frequency and intensity of conflict within romantic relationships, I hypothesize that as individuals increase in anxious and avoidant attachment behavior, the likelihood for frequency of conflict, temporal spillover and relational spillover of conflict will also increase. Additionally, I hypothesize that increases in anxious and avoidant attachment behavior will predict increased intensity in romantic relationship conflict, temporal spillover and relational spillover.

As individuals in relationship with low satisfaction may engage in more frequent conflict (i.e., Cramer, 2006; Kurdek, 1994; McGonagle et al., 1993), I hypothesize that as romantic relationship satisfaction decreases, frequency of conflict in romantic relationships will increase. I also expect these findings to replicate for temporal and relational spillover. Due to mixed evidence on intensity of conflict and relationship satisfaction (compare Laurent et al., 2008 and Cramer, 2002), I have no specific a priori hypothesis regarding how romantic relationship satisfaction will predict intensity for isolated conflict and temporal and relational spillover conflict.

1.9.2 Aim 2

The second aim of this study involves understanding how the history of family conflict tactics, including both interparental and parent-to-child conflict tactics (physical aggression, psychological aggression and positive strategies), relates to the frequency and
intensity of romantic relationship conflict, temporal spillover and relational spillover
above and beyond constructs proposed in Aim 1. For both interparental behavior and
parent-to-child behavior, three predictor variables – physical aggression, psychological
aggression and positive conflict tactics (emotional/cognitive negotiation for interparental
and non-violent discipline for parent-to-child) – will be examined for their relationship to
the outcome variables. Based on the above mentioned previous research, I hypothesize
that as levels of interparental and parent-child physical and psychological aggression
increase, so will the frequency and intensity of conflict, temporal spillover and relational
spillover. Conversely, as levels of positive conflict resolution strategies increase (i.e.,
interparental negotiation and parent-to-child non-violent discipline), I hypothesize that
the frequency and intensity of conflict and both temporal and relational spillover of
conflict will decrease.
CHAPTER 2

Method

2.1 Participants

Data were collected from 82 participants and their romantic partners (N = 164 individuals) recruited from the psychology subject pool at Kent State University. Inclusion criteria for eligible participants included two individuals involved in a self-defined, heterosexual romantic relationship for at least 1 month and who were both between the ages of 18 and 25 years. Participants’ partners did not need to be Kent State University students, but needed to meet the other inclusion criteria. Participants were excluded if they were married or had children. These criteria allowed for a homogeneous sample of individuals who share characteristics regarding their romantic relationships and were experiencing similar developmental tasks of young adulthood. The relationship length requirement for this current proposed study was one (1) month to allow examination of relationship patterns across a wider range of relationship lengths rather than focusing only on individuals in more committed relationships.

2.2 Procedure

Data for this project were collected as part of larger research project (Dynamic Understanding of Dyadic Experiences). Only the measures and procedures appropriate to this project are discussed below. Participants were recruited from the SONA Psychology Subject pool and received course credit for their introductory psychology or research
methods course. Participants then recruited their boyfriend or girlfriend for study participation (hereafter referred to as ‘partners’). Each couple chose an assessment time to complete an initial in-lab assessment. Additionally, participants and partners completed a two-week online daily diary immediately following the in-lab assessment. Trained undergraduate research assistants completed the in-lab assessments, whereas an online survey manager (Remark Web Survey 5.0, 2009) was used to collect the two-week online diary data.

The Kent State University’s Institutional Review Board approved this project (#09-315) and the project followed procedures to ensure appropriate use of human participants. Participants signed an informed consent form to participate in the research activities (see Appendix A). After consenting to participate, both participants and partners separately completed a series of questionnaires (described below) followed by a brief audio-taped interview on several relationships (i.e., parents, romantic partner, friends, siblings), their dating history and the members of their household. This project utilized information from portions of this interview. Participants and partners also completed four video-taped interaction tasks together, which are not included in this project. Participants earned 6 credits for their participation as the in-lab assessment took approximately two and a half to three hours (Consent - 15 minutes, Questionnaires - 60-90 minutes, Interview - 30 minutes, and Observation - 30 minutes). Partners received $20 for their participation in the in-lab assessment.
Participants and their partners also completed a 14-day online daily diary about daily activities and relationship interactions immediately following completion of the in-lab assessment. Fourteen days permitted enough time for conflicts to occur and to provide adequate variability for statistical analyses (i.e., Campbell et al., 2005; Knee, Lonsbary, Canevello, & Patrick, 2008; Laurenceau et al., 2005). Researchers encouraged participants to complete the daily diary each day between 8 pm and 10 pm while reflecting on the previous 24 hours. Participants received an additional 6 credits for their participation in the 14-day daily diary study, while partners received another $20. Both participants and partners needed to complete at least 10 of the 14 days to receive full credit or monetary compensation. Additionally, we initiated a raffle for a variety of gift cards to encourage completion of the diary with the number of raffle entries based on the number of daily diaries completed. Initial and daily diary assessments were not collected during the first week of the semester, over holidays (i.e., Thanksgiving, Spring break) or during exam week to capture typical daily interactions and activities.

2.3 Measures

2.3.1 Demographics.

A demographic questionnaire (see Appendix B) asked about the following information: date of participation, birth date (to calculate age), gender, ethnicity, school status (year in school, part-time/full-time), work status, living situation, number of previous romantic relationships and length of current romantic relationship. Additionally,
portions of the individual interview (see Appendix C\(^1\)) captured information regarding current family status and parental marital status. Research assistants reviewed recorded interviews and coded for this information.

Within this sample of 82 couples, males \((M = 20.59, SD = 1.64)\) were older \([t (82) = 4.59, \ p < .001, \ d = 0.47]\) than females \((M = 19.87, SD = 1.39)\). The sample was also predominantly Caucasian (87.8% of females, 78% of males). The remaining females were either bi/multiracial (8.5%) or African American/Black (3.7%), while the remaining males were bi/multiracial (11%), African American/Black (6.1%), Asian American/Pacific Islander (2.4%), and Hispanic/Latino(a) (2.4%). Ninety-four percent of females and 73% of males reported current enrollment in college with the majority either freshmen (56.1%, 32.9% respectively) or sophomores (18%, 22% respectively). Of those enrolled in school, 75% of females and 59% of males reported full-time enrollment. Fifty percent of females and 46% of males reported currently working, primarily part-time jobs (43.9% and 40.2%, respectively). On average, females reported 2.59 \((SD = 1.81)\) previous relationships and males reported 2.67 \((SD = 1.70)\) previous relationships \([t (81) = -0.33, \ p = .74]\).

Living arrangements of participants were diverse with 41.5% living with friends, 31.7% with parents or family, 10.4% alone, 9.8% with their partner and 5.7% in another arrangement. A majority of participants reported their current family status as dual

\(^1\) The entire interview is attached to this document.
biological parents (58.5%), with 10.4% from mother/step-father families, 6.1% from father/step-mother families, 11% from divorced, but not remarried families, 4.9% from divorced and both parents remarried families, 5.5% from single parent families and the remaining from other family constellations.

2.3.2 Control Variables

Length of romantic relationship and contact in relationship.

Participants reported on the length of their current romantic relationship on the demographic questionnaire. Some variability, typically within a few months, existed between the female and male report on length of the relationship (i.e., for one couple, female reported 96 months, and the male reported 100 months). Due to these conflicting reports, romantic relationship length was calculated using an average of both amounts. Romantic relationship length ranged from 1 month to 98 months in length (M = 19.05 months, SD = 19.16 months). Descriptive analyses demonstrated this variable was normally distributed with a skewness of 2.09 (SE = 0.27) and kurtosis of 4.91 (SE = 0.53).

The amount of daily contact between partners was calculated using responses from the daily diary. On average, females and males both reported talking to their partners on 95% of days they completed the daily diary (Range 33%-100% males, 50% - 100% females). Based on the high rates of contact, these variables were both negatively
skewed (-3.11, \(SE = 0.28\); -3.44, \(SE = .30\)) and positively kurtotic (10.28, \(SE = 0.56\); 13.83, \(SE = 0.58\)) for both females and males respectively.

**Negative Affect.**

**Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988).** The PANAS measured positive and negative affect at the initial assessment to reflect affect over the past few weeks (Appendix D). Ten items measured positive affect (i.e., interested) and ten items measured negative affect (i.e., nervous). Participants responded to each word regarding the extent they have felt this way during the past few weeks using a 5-point Likert scale, where 1 = *Very slightly or not at all*, 2 = *A little*, 3 = *Moderately*, 4 = *Quite a lot*, and 5 = *Extremely*.

The PANAS exhibits both high levels of test-retest reliability (Watson et al., 1988) as well as good internal consistency (Crawford & Henry, 2004). The PANAS also demonstrates construct (Crawford and Henry, 2004) and discriminant validity (Watson et al., 1988), as the positive and negative affect scales are largely independent and share only a small portion of variance. Finally, the PANAS exhibits external validity with measures of distress and psychopathology (Crawford & Henry, 2004; Watson et al., 1988).

For this study, only negative affect was used as a control variable. The Negative Affect scale for the initial assessment was constructed using the mean of all ten negative affect items. Higher scores represent higher levels of negative affect. At the initial assessment, females (\(M = 2.05\), \(SD = 0.70\), \(\alpha = .82\)) exhibited equivalent levels of
negative affect \([t(81) = 1.61, p = .11, d = 0.23]\) compared to males \((M = 1.89, SD = 0.68, \alpha = .83)\). This variable was used as a control variable, as appropriate, in all analyses.

Descriptive analyses demonstrated these variables were normally distributed with female skewness of 1.36 \((SE = 0.27)\) and kurtosis of 1.86 \((SE = 0.53)\) and male skewness of 1.38 \((SE = 0.27)\) and kurtosis of 2.65 \((SE = 0.53)\).

*Life Stress.*

**Social Readjustment Rating Scale - Revised (SRRS-R; Hobson, Kamen, Szostek, Nethercut, Tiedmann, & Wojnarowicz, 1998).** The SRRS-R (see Appendix E) assessed current and recent life stress. The SRRS-R contains items about 51 major life events from the last year. Due to eligibility restrictions for participants – never married, no children - only 47 items were included with items regarding children, marriage and divorce excluded.

A composite score of the sum of positive indications of stressful events was calculated for both females and males. The number of stressful events ranged from 0 to 15 for both females \((M = 4.60, SD = 3.17)\) and males \((M = 4.88, SD = 3.74)\), with no significant difference between number of stressful events for females and males \([t(81) = -0.62, p = .54, d = .08]\). Reliability was demonstrated using Cochran’s Q because these variables consisted of binary responses sets (Berry & Miekle, 2003). The Cochran’s Qs were statistically significant for both the female and male composite scores \((p < 0.001)\), demonstrating internal consistency. Descriptive analyses demonstrated these variables
were normally distributed with female skewness of 0.99 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis of 0.74 ($SE = 0.53$) and male skewness of 0.70 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis of -0.33 (0.53).

**Family Structure.**

Participants reported on their current family composition during the interview portion of the initial assessment. Research assistants reviewed the interviews and coded family structure based on participant responses. I constructed family composition based on inclusion in one of the following two groups: dual biological parents (63.4% of females, 53.7% of males) or other [single parents (i.e., divorced, not remarried; 13.4% of females, 19.5% of males), step-families (i.e., mother and step-father or father and step-mother or both; 20.7% of females, 22% of males), and other (i.e., grandparents, LGBT partnership; 2.4% of females and 4.8% of males)].

**2.3.3 Aim 1 Predictor Variables - Individual Characteristic Variables.**

**Internalizing and Externalizing Problems.**

**Adult Self-Report (ASR; Achenbach & Rescorla, 2003).** The Adult Self-Report (ASR) assessed both female and male self-reported psychological functioning with 126 items on a 3-point Likert scale (0 = Not true, 1 = Somewhat true or sometimes true, and 2 = Very often or very true). Based on norms from a national probability sample, the ASR (see Appendix F) has several scales, including one for adaptive functioning (Personal Strengths scale), 8 syndrome scales (Anxious/Depressed, Withdrawn, Somatic Complaints, Thought Problems, Attention Problems, Aggressive Behavior, Rule-
Breaking Behavior, Intrusive), 6 DSM-oriented scales (Depressive Problems, Anxiety Problems, Somatic Problems, Avoidant Personality Problems, Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity problems, and Antisocial Personality Problems), and 5 broad band scales (Substance Use, Critical Items, Externalizing, Internalizing and Total Problems). Reports on test-retest reliability across 1-week and over 2-years and longer intervals are generally high for the ASR with adequate to good internal consistency for all scales (Achenbach & Rescorla, 2003). Additionally, the ASR demonstrates content and criterion-related validity by discriminating between referred and non-referred samples (Achenbach & Rescorla, 2003). Finally, construct validity from several empirical studies has demonstrated associations between the ASR and other measures of psychopathology (see Achenbach & Rescorla, 2003 for details).

For this study, both the internalizing broadband scale and externalizing broadband scales were used to measure individual psychopathology. T-scores above 64 (> 90th percentile) represent high levels of internalizing or externalizing problem behaviors with an average t-score of 50. Although both females and males displayed average levels of internalizing problems, females ($M = 54.60, SD = 11.21, \alpha = .90$) reported higher levels ($t (81) = 2.11, p = .04, d = 0.29$) of internalizing problems than males ($M = 51.49, SD = 10.59, \alpha = .99$). Similarly, females ($M = 53.04, SD = 9.33, \alpha = .99$) and males ($M = 54.76, SD = 8.35, \alpha = .95$) displayed average, but non-different ($t (81) = -1.40, p = .17, d = .19$) levels of externalizing behavior problems. Descriptive analyses demonstrated that both internalizing and externalizing problems were normally distributed for females with
skewness of -0.25 (SE = 0.27) and -0.44 (SE = .27), respectively, and kurtosis of -0.23 (SE = 0.53) and -0.11 (SE = 0.53), respectively and for males with skewness of 0.03 (SE = .27) and 0.09 (SE = .27), respectively, and kurtosis of -0.40 (SE = 0.53) and 0.19 (SE = 0.53).

2.3.4 Aim 1 Predictor Variables - Romantic Relationship Variables

*Physical Aggression, Psychological Aggression and Negotiation.*

The CTS2 (see Appendix G) measures 5 areas of conflict resolution within romantic relationships: physical assault, psychological aggression, sexual coercion, physical injury, and negotiation. For this study, participants only completed three of these scales. Participants completed the five-item Physical Assault scale (i.e., *I pushed or shoved my partner*) to measure romantic relationship physical aggression. The seven-item Psychological Aggression scale (i.e., *I stomped out of the room or house or yard during a disagreement*) assessed romantic relationship psychological aggression. Additionally, positive conflict resolution strategies were measured using the six-item Negotiation scale (i.e., *I showed my partner I cared even though we disagreed*). Participants responded regarding their own behavior using a 8-point Likert scale (0 = *This has not happened in the past year*, 1 = *Once in the past year*, 2 = *Twice in the past year*, 3 = *3-5 times in the past year*, 4 = *6-10 times in the past year*, 5 = *11-20 times in the past year*, 6 = *More than 20 times in the past year*, 7 = *Not in the past year, but it did
Previous research demonstrates that these CTS2 scales demonstrate good internal consistency (Straus et al., 1996) with adequate construct validity for the Physical Assault and Psychological Aggression subscales and discriminant validity for the Negotiation subscale (Straus et al., 1996).

Using scoring criteria outlined by Straus and colleagues (1996), items were recoded to represent an average number of times an event occurred in the past year, with 0 = 0 times, 1 = 1 times, 2 = 2 times, 3 = 4 times, 4 = 8 times, 5 = 15 times, 6 = 25 times and 7 = 0 times (not occurring in past year). For this study, each scale was constructed using the mean of items representing the scale. Higher scores represented higher levels of physical assault, psychological aggression and negotiation.

Physical assault. Descriptive analyses demonstrated that these variables were non-normally distributed for females with a skewness of 2.93 (SE = 0.27) and kurtosis of 8.57 (SE = 0.53) and for males with a skewness of 3.27 (SE = 0.27) and kurtosis of 10.65 (SE = 0.53). Therefore, I transformed these variables using square root transformation to correct for skewness and kurtosis. After transformation, the variables were normally distributed for females with a skewness of 1.72 (SE = 0.27) and kurtosis of 2.18 (SE = 0.53) and for males with a skewness of 1.99 (SE = 0.27) and kurtosis of 3.38 (SE = 0.53). At the initial assessment, there was no difference between female ($M = 0.33, SD = 0.54, \alpha = .63$) and male ($M = 0.37, SD = 0.65, \alpha = .46$) self-reported physical assault [$t (81) = - .48, p = .63, d = .07$].
Psychological aggression. Descriptive analyses demonstrated these variables were normally distributed for females with skewness of 1.76 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis of 2.68 ($SE = 0.53$) and for males with skewness of 1.61 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis of 1.76 ($SE = 0.53$). At the initial assessment, females ($M = 3.00$, $SD = 4.03$, $\alpha = .82$) self-reported greater psychological aggression [$t (81) = 2.51$, $p = .01$, $d = .29$] compared to males ($M = 2.00$, $SD = 2.65$, $\alpha = .69$).

Negotiation. Again, descriptive analyses demonstrated these variables were normally distributed for females with skewness of 0.06 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis of -1.49 ($SE = 0.53$) and for males with skewness of 0.44 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis of -0.80 ($SE = 0.53$). At the initial assessment, females ($M = 13.43$, $SD = 8.04$, $\alpha = .92$) self-reported more negotiation [$t (81) = 2.86$, $p = .005$, $d = 0.35$] compared to males ($M = 10.89$, $SD = 6.52$, $\alpha = .88$).

Attachment behavior.

Experiences in close relationship – revised (ECR-R, Fraley, Waller & Brennan, 2000). The ECR-R (see Appendix H) measured attachment behavior (i.e., *I worry that romantic partners won’t care about me as much as I care about them.*) within young adult romantic relationships through the use of 36 items on a 7-point Likert scale from *Strongly disagree* (1) to *Strongly agree* (7). Although responses to this measure can create categorical attachment styles, this project used two continuous scales (anxious attachment, avoidant attachment) as constructs of attachment behavior. The ECR-R
represents a dual factor (anxious/avoidant) model of adult romantic attachment (Sibley, Fischer, and Liu, 2006; Sibley & Liu, 2004) and demonstrates convergent and discriminant validity for measuring romantic relationship attachment (Sibley et al., 2006; Sibley & Liu, 2004). Research indicates that the ECR-R is stable across a 3-week time period (Sibley et al., 2006; Sibley & Liu, 2004).

**Avoidant attachment.** The avoidant attachment behavior score was calculated using a mean of the 18 items comprising the scale with higher scores representing higher levels of avoidant attachment. Females \((M = 1.32, SD = 0.90, \alpha = .88)\) and males \((M = 1.39, SD = 0.94, \alpha = .87)\) did not differ in their levels of avoidant attachment behavior \([t (81) = 0.51, p = .61, d = .07]\). Descriptive analyses demonstrated these variables were normally distributed for females with skewness of -0.91 \((SE = 0.27)\) and kurtosis of 0.49 \((SE = 0.53)\) and for males with skewness of -0.28 \((SE = 0.27)\) and kurtosis of 0.49 \((SE = 0.53)\).

**Anxious attachment.** The anxious attachment behavior score was calculated using a mean of the 18 items comprising the scale with higher scores representing higher levels of anxious attachment. Females \((M = 1.72, SD = 1.07, \alpha = .90)\) and males \((M = 1.93, SD = 1.17, \alpha = .91)\) did not differ in their levels of anxious attachment behavior \([t (81) = 1.47, p = .15, d = .19]\). Descriptive analyses demonstrated these variables were normally distributed for females with skewness of -0.82 \((SE = 0.27)\) and kurtosis of 0.87 \((SE = 0.53)\) and for males with skewness of -0.28 \((SE = 0.27)\) and kurtosis of 1.01 \((SE = 0.53)\).
Romantic relationship satisfaction.

**Relationship assessment scale (RAS; Hendrick, 1988).** The Relationship Assessment Scale (see Appendix I) assessed relationship satisfaction through a 7-item questionnaire measured on a 5-point Likert scale (i.e., “In general, how satisfied are you with your relationship?”). Higher scores represented greater relationship satisfaction with scores of 4.0 or higher indicating highly satisfied couples (Hendrick, Dicke & Hendrick, 1998). Previous research demonstrated good test-retest reliability and consistency across different ethnic groups (Hendrick et al., 1998). In a previous study using the RAS (van Dulmen, Goncy, & Mata, 2009), internal consistency was acceptable for females ($\alpha = 0.88$) and males ($\alpha = 0.82$).

For this study, romantic relationship satisfaction was computed using a mean of the seven items. Females ($M = 4.42$, $SD = 0.50$, $\alpha = .78$) and males ($M = 4.48$, $SD = 0.47$, $\alpha = .76$) did not significantly differ in their reported levels of romantic relationship satisfaction [$t (81) = -1.11, p = .27, d = 0.12$]. Descriptive analyses demonstrated these variables were normally distributed for females with skewness of -1.15 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis of 1.41 ($SE = 0.53$) and for males with skewness of -0.93 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis of -0.20 ($SE = 0.53$).
2.3.5  Aim 2 Predictor Variables: Interparental and Parent-Child Relationship

Interparental Physical Assault, Psychological Aggression and Negotiation.

Conflicts tactics scale revised (CTS2; Straus et al., 1996). The CTS2 assessed conflict resolution strategies within the interparental relationship. This measure asks about both the mother’s conflict resolution tactics toward the father (Appendix J) and the father’s conflict resolution tactics toward the mother (Appendix K). This measure is appropriate to use with adult children to recall how their mother and father treated each other when they lived at home with minor modifications^2 (Straus, Hamby, Finkelhor, Moore, & Runyan, 1998). Participants completed the following scales: Physical Assault scale (5 items, i.e., My mother threw something at my father that could hurt), Psychological Aggression scale (7 items, i.e., My father called my mother fat or ugly) and Negotiation Scale (6 items, i.e., My mother suggested a compromise to a disagreement). Instructions were revised to represent lifetime occurrences of behavior using the following 7-point scale: 0 = This never happened, 1 = Once, 2 = Twice, 3 = 3-5 times, 4 = 6-10 times, 5 = 11-20 times, 6 = More than 20 times). Information on reliability and validity of the measure is stated above under the CTS2 for romantic relationships section. Using scoring criteria outlined by Straus and colleagues (1996), items were recoded to represent an average number of times an event occurred ever, with 0 = 0 times, 1 = 1

\^2 Dropping the item “Accused partner of being lousy lover” and the sexual coercion scale
times, $2 = 2$ times, $3 = 4$ times, $4 = 8$ times, $5 = 15$ times, and $6 = 25$ times. Each scale was constructed using the mean of items representing the scale.

During the interview, individuals verified which parent (i.e., biological father, step-mother, etc) the participant/partner considered while completing these measures. The interview formant allowed individuals to explain why they did not complete the measure (i.e., death of parent) or explain if they thought about a different caregiver (i.e., grandparent). The constructs described below eliminates answers from individuals with deceased or absent parents. This missing data represents two mother figures and two father figures for females and one mother figure and four father figures for males.

*Physical assault.* Descriptive analyses demonstrated the physical assault variables were non-normally distributed for females and males. For females, maternal physical assault skewness was 2.96 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis was 9.11 ($SE = 0.53$) and paternal physical assault skewness was 4.48 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis was 21.36 ($SE = 0.53$). For males, maternal physical assault skewness was 3.56 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis was 17.76 ($SE = .53$) and paternal physical assault skewness was 5.13 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis was 27.08 ($SE = 0.54$). Therefore, I transformed both variables by adding one to each variable and dividing that by 1. This transformation resulted in normally-distributed data for females and males. For females, maternal physical assault skewness was -1.12 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis was -0.38 ($SE = 0.53$) and paternal physical assault skewness was -2.05 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis was 2.74 ($SE = 0.53$). For males, maternal physical assault
skewness was -1.10 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis was -0.25 ($SE = 0.53$) and paternal physical assault skewness was -2.34 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis was 4.38 ($SE = 0.54$).

Because of the transformation used, scores closer to one represent lower levels of physical assault. At the initial assessment, females ($M = 0.78$, $SD = 0.33$, $\alpha = .68$) reported similar levels of mother-to-father (maternal) physical assault [$t (78) = -1.42$, $p = .15$, $d = 0.17$] to males ($M = 0.83$, $SD = 0.25$, $\alpha = .60$). Similarly, no difference [$t (75) = -0.48$, $p = .63$, $d = .04$] existed between female ($M = 0.88$, $SD = 0.27$, $\alpha = .84$) and male ($M = .89$, $SD = 0.25$, $\alpha = .92$) reports of father-to-mother (paternal) physical assault. Females [$t (79) = -3.68$, $p = .00$, $d = 0.33$] and males [$t (77) = -1.95$, $p = .05$, $d = 0.24$] both reported more maternal physical assault than paternal physical assault.

**Psychological aggression.** At the initial assessment, females ($M = 5.31$, $SD = 5.24$, $\alpha = .80$; $M = 5.06$, $SD = 5.65$, $\alpha = .85$) and males ($M = 4.48$, $SD = 4.76$, $\alpha = .78$; $M = 3.91$, $SD = 4.98$, $\alpha = .79$) did not differ on either maternal [$t (78) = 1.16$, $p = .25$, $d = 0.17$] or paternal [$t (75) = 1.54$, $p = .13$, $d = 0.22$] psychological aggression, respectively. Additionally, female maternal and paternal [$t (79) = 0.56$, $p = .58$, $d = 0.05$] and male maternal and paternal [$t (77) = 1.39$, $p = .17$, $d = 0.12$] psychological aggression did not differ. Descriptive analyses demonstrated these variables were normally distributed for female maternal psychological aggression with skewness of 1.12 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis

---

$^3$ Due to the transformation, the signs in the results were reversed to allow for ease of interpretation.
of 0.59 ($SE = 0.53$) and paternal physical aggression with skewness of 1.20 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis of 0.61 ($SE = 0.53$). These variables were also normally distributed for male maternal psychological aggression with skewness of 1.10 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis of 0.46 ($SE = 0.53$) and paternal psychological aggression with skewness of 1.92 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis of 4.16 ($SE = 0.54$). Higher scores represented higher levels of psychological aggression.

**Negotiation.** Descriptive analyses demonstrated the parental negotiation variables, with the exception of paternal negotiation for males, were normally distributed. For females, maternal negotiation skewness was 0.24 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis was -1.37 ($SE = 0.53$) and paternal negotiation skewness was 0.49 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis was -0.107 ($SE = 0.53$). Therefore, for both female and male maternal and paternal negotiation, I transformed this variable using square root transformation. Following transformation, all four variables were normally distributed with female maternal negotiation skewness of -0.39 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis of -0.73 ($SE = 0.53$) and paternal negotiation skewness of -0.10 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis of -0.72 ($SE = 0.53$) and for males with maternal negotiation skewness of -0.07 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis of -0.61 ($SE = 0.53$) and paternal negotiation skewness of 0.14 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis of 0.30 ($SE = 0.53$).

At the initial assessment, females ($M = 3.18$, $SD = 1.37$, $\alpha = .91$; $M = 3.15$, $SD = 1.20$, $\alpha = .86$) and males ($M = 2.81$, $SD = 1.41$, $\alpha = .92$; $M = 2.76$, $SD = 1.54$, $\alpha = .92$) did not differ on either maternal [$t (78) = 1.60$, $p = .11$, $d = 0.27$] or paternal [$t (75) = 1.89$, $p = .06$, $d = 0.28$] negotiation, respectively. Additionally, female maternal and
paternal \( t(79) = -0.14, p = .88, d = 0.02 \) and male maternal and paternal \( t(77) = 0.68, p = .50, d = .03 \) negotiation did not differ. Higher scores represented higher levels of negotiation.

*Parent-child physical and psychological aggression and non-violent discipline.*

**Parent-Child Conflict Tactics Scale (CTSPC; Straus et al., 1998).** The CTSPC assessed physical and psychological aggression and non-violent means of discipline within the parent-child relationship. All items began with the stem, “*When I did something wrong my mother/father or mother/father figure would ...*”. The measure is appropriate for use with adult children to recall how their mother and father treated them when they lived at home (Straus et al., 1998). Participants completed the following scales: Physical Assault (5 items on minor assault and corporal punishment, i.e., pushed, grabbed, or shoved me, and 4 items on severe assault and physical maltreatment, i.e., spanked me on the bottom with his/her bare hand), Psychological Aggression (5 items, i.e., shouted, yelled, or screamed at me), and Non-Violent Discipline scale (4 items, i.e., explained why something was wrong). Participants reported on both their mother/mother figure (Appendix L) and the father/father figure (Appendix M). Instructions were revised to represent lifetime occurrences of behavior using the following 7-point scale: 0 = *This never happened*, 1 = *Once*, 2 = *Twice*, 3 = *3-5 times*, 4 = *6-10 times*, 5 = *11-20 times*, 6 = *More than 20 times*. The measure demonstrates moderate internal consistency with some evidence of discriminant and construct validity after comparing these subscales with
parental and child age, minority or ethnic group status and gender of the parent (Straus et al., 1998).

Three scales (Corporal Punishment, Psychological Aggression, and Non-Violent Discipline) were calculated for both female and male reports on each scale about mothers and fathers. Using scoring criteria outlined by Straus and colleagues (1996), items were recoded to represent an average number of times an event occurred ever, with 0 = 0 times, 1 = 1 times, 2 = 2 times, 3 = 4 times, 4 = 8 times, 5 = 15 times, and 6 = 25 times. Each scale was constructed using the mean of items representing the scale. Higher scores represented higher levels of corporal punishment, psychological aggression and negotiation. Similar to the measures on interparental aggression, the constructs described below and their use in later analyses eliminates answers from individuals who did not complete these measures.

**Corporal punishment.** Descriptive analyses demonstrated these variables were normally distributed, with the exception of father-to-daughter corporal punishment. For females, maternal corporal punishment skewness was 1.59 (SE = 0.27) and kurtosis was 2.33 (SE = 0.53) and paternal corporal punishment skewness was 2.70 (SE = 0.27) and kurtosis was 10.21 (SE = 0.53). For males, maternal corporal punishment skewness was 1.50 (SE = 0.27) and kurtosis was 2.16 (SE = 0.53) and paternal corporal punishment skewness was 1.95 (SE = 0.27) and kurtosis was 3.73 (SE = 0.54). Therefore, for both females and males, I transformed both mother-to-child and father-to-child corporal punishment variables using square root transformation. Following transformation, female
maternal corporal punishment skewness was 0.48 (SE = 0.27) and kurtosis was -0.70 (SE = 0.53) and paternal corporal punishment skewness was 1.02 (SE = 0.27) and kurtosis was 0.22 (SE = 0.53) and male maternal corporal punishment skewness was 0.38 (SE = 0.27) and kurtosis was -0.71 (SE = 0.53) and male paternal corporal punishment skewness was 0.67 (SE = 0.27) and kurtosis was -0.38 (SE = 0.54). These variables then demonstrated normal distribution.

Females (M = 1.34, SD = 1.09, α = .48; M = 1.07, SD = 1.21, α = .67) and males (M = 1.67, SD = 1.23, α = .59; M = 1.33, SD = 1.00, α = .60) reported no difference in mother-to-child corporal punishment [t (78) = -1.77, p = .08, d = 0.28] and father-to-child corporal punishment [t (75) = -1.32, p = .19, d = 0.23]. Females [t (79) = 2.33, p = .02, d = 0.23] and males [t (77) = 2.45, p = .02, d = 0.30] reported greater mother-to-child corporal punishment compared to father-to-child corporal punishment.

_Psychological aggression._ At the initial assessment, no difference existed between mother-to-female (M = 6.26, SD = 5.14, α = .66) and father-to-female (M = 5.08, SD = 5.51, α = .76) psychological aggression [t (79) = 1.87, p = .07, d = 0.22] or mother-to-male (M = 7.23, SD = 6.92, α = .80) and father-to-male (M = 6.08, SD = 6.63, α = .80) psychological aggression [t (77) = 1.63, p = .11, d = 0.17]. Additionally, no differences existed between mother-to-female and mother-to-male psychological aggression [t (78) = -0.95, p = .34, d = 0.16] and father-to-female and father-to-male psychological aggression [t (75) = -1.27, p = .22, d = 0.16]. Descriptive analyses demonstrated these variables were normally distributed with female maternal
psychological aggression skewness of 0.88 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis of 0.17 ($SE = 0.53$),
female paternal psychological aggression skewness of 1.19 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis of 0.59 ($SE = 0.53$), male maternal psychological aggression skewness of 0.96 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis of -0.34 ($SE = 0.53$) and male paternal psychological aggression skewness of 1.02 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis of -0.14 ($SE = 0.54$).

Non-violent discipline. Females reported more [$t (79) = 6.22, p = .00, d = 0.60$] mother-to-child non-violent discipline techniques ($M = 10.34, SD = 5.25, \alpha = .60$) compared to father-to-child non-violent discipline techniques ($M = 7.27, SD = 5.00, \alpha = .61$). Similarly, males reported greater [$t (77) = 6.05, p < .001, d = 0.54$] mother-to-child non-violent discipline techniques ($M = 10.03, SD = 6.24, \alpha = .75$) compared to father-to-child non-violent discipline techniques ($M = 6.84, SD = 5.54, \alpha = .77$). No differences were reported between female and male mother-to-child techniques [$t (78) = .12, p = .91, d = 0.05$] and father-to-child techniques [$t (75) = 0.20, p = .84, d = 0.08$]. Descriptive analyses demonstrated these variables were normally distributed with female maternal non-violent discipline skewness of 0.05 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis of -1.04 ($SE = 0.53$), female paternal non-violent discipline skewness of 0.56 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis of -0.51 ($SE = 0.53$), male maternal non-violent discipline skewness of 0.28 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis of -1.23 ($SE = 0.53$) and male paternal non-violent discipline skewness of 0.86 ($SE = 0.27$) and kurtosis of 0.03 ($SE = 0.54$).
2.3.6 Outcome Variables

The web-based daily diary included questions about the daily content of their romantic and other close relationships. Web-based survey administration (rather than paper-and-pencil) allowed for greater flexibility in response options (close-ended plus free-response) while maintaining anonymity (Bolger et al., 2003). Additionally, web-based assessments ensured that daily assessments were accurately time stamped to verify when participants complete them. Participants consented to this assessment within the Wave I assessment consent form.

The daily diary measure (see Appendix N), based on previous research with a similar study (van Dulmen & Goncy, 2011), was designed to be short and contain legitimate skips for items not applicable for participants on a given day. The daily diary assessment asked each participant about several relationships (i.e., their partner, their biological and/or step mother and father, same-sex friends, opposite-sex friends, and siblings, as applicable) and interactions within these relationships, including occurrence and type (i.e., in person, telephone, email, text-message) of contact with these individuals. Participants answered questions regarding whether within each of these relationships someone did something to make them upset (i.e., “Did your partner do something to make you upset, today, i.e., Did you have a conflict or disagreement about something with your partner that he/she started?”). Participants also answered a similar question regarding whether they did something to make their partner upset. Participants were prompted by a list of common conflict areas in young adult romantic relationships.
to assist them in responding to these questions (the Partner Issues Checklist; Capaldi, Wilson & Collier, 1994). If participants responded positively to these questions, they were asked these follow-up questions: a) What was the conflict/disagreement about? b) Would you consider this a major or minor event? (Cramer, 2002), c) How much did this event expand beyond the original topic? (Campbell et al., 2005), d) How upset were you by this event? and e) Did you talk about this topic with anyone else?, and If so, who? Additionally, participants answered the following questions on subsequent days regarding the initial conflict or disagreement: a) Is this still an issue in your relationship today? b) Were you still upset by this event today?, and c) How upset are you about today about this event?. Participants continuously received these questions until they replied this event was no longer an issue in their relationship. Finally, participants also completed questions regarding different daily activities in which they may have participated (i.e., watched a movie, grocery shopping, exercising), with whom they participated in these activities, and how they felt about each experience (whether it was a positive, neutral or negative experience).

In order to account for reactivity effects related to participating in the online daily survey, several questions were added to the daily diary on Day 14 (see Appendix O). Individuals who did not complete Day 14 received a follow-up email requesting completion of these items. These items assessed the following areas: a) honesty in response over 14 days, b) awareness of behavior as a result of participating in daily diary, c) perceptions of changes in fighting/conflict over daily diary period, d) consultation
about answers to questions with boyfriend/girlfriend, e) completion of daily diary together with boyfriend/girlfriend, and f) whether they lived with or spent many nights with their boyfriend/girlfriend. These items were only asked of participants who completed the research study in the spring of 2010 (n = 42 romantic couples).

Five females and four males did not complete these questions regarding reactivity, despite sending these items on at least two occasions. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 ‘very honestly’ to 5 ‘not at all honestly’, both females ($M = 1.54, SD = 0.69$) and males ($M = 1.68, SD = 0.63$) reported answering very honestly to honestly [t (34) = -0.89, $p = .38$, $d = 0.18$]. In regards to awareness of behavior from completing the daily diary, on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 ‘not at all aware’ to 5 ‘extremely aware’, both females ($M = 3.11, SD = 1.10$) and males ($M = 3.16, SD = 0.96$) reported being only somewhat more aware of their behavior during the daily diary period [t (34) = -0.52, $p = .61$, $d = 0.05$]. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 ‘much more’, 3 ‘average’, 5 ‘much less’, both females ($M = 3.33, SD = 1.07$) and males ($M = 3.36, SD = 1.02$) reported fighting no more or less than average [t (32) = -0.34, $p = .73$, $d = 0.03$]. Two questions asked about completing the daily diaries together: a) how often the participant consulted with his/her boyfriend or girlfriend across the 14 days and b) how often the participant completed the daily diary with his/her boyfriend or girlfriend. Both questions were answered on a 5-point scale, with 1 ‘Never’, 2 ‘1 to 2 days’ 3 ‘3 to 5 days’ 4 ‘6 to 10 days’ 5 ‘More than 10 days’. On average, both females ($M = 2.82, SD = 1.14$) and males ($M = 3.12, SD = 1.12$) reported consulting their boyfriends or girlfriends between 3 and 5 days [t (34) = -1.35, $p = .19$, $d = 0.27$].
However, this data does not indicate which days (i.e., days with conflict or without conflict) individuals consulted with their partner.

**Daily Contact.**

Participants were asked daily about the amount of contact they had with their partners through a series of questions. Each participant was initially asked if they had talked to their partner that day. If participants responded positively, they were asked follow-up questions about the type of contact: in person, phone, email, and text messaging. Based on the number of days an individual completed the daily diary (xx/14), females and males talked to their partners an average of 95% of the days each (female range 50% - 100%; male range 33% - 100%). Given the high average across individuals, the length of the relationship was chosen instead to represent amount of contact within the relationship in subsequent analyses.

**Romantic relationship conflict.**

Romantic relationship conflict refers to an indication of a conflict or disagreement occurring within the romantic relationships. A dichotomous coding - whether or not conflict occurred each day – was summed throughout the two week time period to create the *conflict frequency* variable. Three females and five males did not complete any of the fourteen days of the diary. Therefore, these individuals were not included in any of the analyses. On average, females reported more male-initiated conflicts ($M = 1.33, SD = 1.48, \text{Range} = 0-8$) than males reported female-initiated conflicts ($M = 0.87, SD = 0.87,$
Females also reported more self-initiated conflicts ($M = 1.25, SD = 0.14, Range = 0-6$) than males reported self-initiated conflicts ($M = 0.95, SD = 0.11, Range = 0-6, [t (75) = 2.26, p = .027, d = 2.39]$). Examination of the agreement between who initiated conflict (i.e., both individuals report the same person initiated the conflict) demonstrated lower average conflict over the daily diary period for females ($M = 0.33, SD = 0.78$) and males ($M = .37, SD = .88$) with no difference between the genders $[t (74) = -0.42, p = .67, d = 0.05]$. Overall, individuals ranged from having 0 to 14 conflicts reported to be initiated by themselves or their partner with no differences $[t (76) = -1.10, p = .28, d = 0.012]$ between females ($M = 1.65, SD = 2.32$) and males ($M = 1.91, SD = 2.18$). Sixty-one percent of females ($n = 48$) and 73% of males ($n = 56$) reported conflict on at least one day over the daily diary period.

Conflicts were coded using topics listed in the Partner Issues Checklist (Capaldi et al., 1994). The most frequent female-reported conflicts were communication (29.6%), unspecified interpersonal problems (20.4%), and listing multiple conflicts (10.9%). The most frequent male-reported conflicts were communication (20%), other/miscellaneous topics (14%) and behavior specific interpersonal problems (12%). A complete list of conflicts reported within the romantic relationship, as well as their frequency and percent, are listed in Table 2.1.
Table 2.1.

Female-Reported and Male-Reported Conflict Topics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Female Reported</th>
<th>Male Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol/Drugs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Problems: Attitude Specific</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Problems: Behavior Specific</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Problems: Mood Specific</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Problems: NOS</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jealousy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morals/Ethics/Religion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Topics Listed</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation/Activities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Topics are missing for 38 total conflicts.

NOS = Not Otherwise Specified

To determine the intensity of each conflict, three items were considered: a) whether the individuals considered the conflict as major or minor (dichotomous response), b) how much the conflict expanded beyond the original topic (on a scale from 1-7 with higher numbers representing greater escalation), and c) how upset the conflict made each individual (on a scale from 1-7 with higher numbers representing higher levels of emotional distress). Preliminary correlation analyses of these three intensity items indicated statistically significant relationships among the three constructs. Conflict escalation positively correlated to both negative emotion ($r = 0.13$, $p = .08$) and major/minor event ($r = .50$, $p = .000$) and negative emotion positively correlated with major/minor event ($r = .25$, $p = .001$). Exploratory factor analysis provided further evidence that these three items were best represented by a one-factor solution (eigenvalue = 2.13) with item loadings of 0.91 for major/minor event, 0.68 for escalation and 0.66 for negative emotion. Therefore, an aggregate of these items, guided by the inter-correlations and factor analysis, was calculated to represent intensity. As items were measured on different scales, all three items were standardized and summed to create the final intensity variable. For individuals reporting partner-initiated conflict, intensity ranged from -0.74
to 4.74 ($M = 0.00, SD = 0.73$). For reported self-initiated conflict, intensity ranged from -3.09 to 5.70 ($M = 0.00, SD = 2.47$). These variables were then recoded to provide an intensity score for female-initiated conflict and male-initiated conflict. The highest intensity score was used and created a gender-specific intensity variable based on whether the initial conflict was reported by the female or the male. Of the 49 female-initiated conflicts ($M = 0.03, SD = 0.64$) and the 56 male-initiated conflicts ($M = 0.09, SD = 0.88$), no difference existed by gender for the level of intensity [$t (40) = -.82, p = .42, d = 0.08$].

**Temporal spillover of conflict.**

Temporal spillover of conflict was coded if individuals endorsed conflicts or disagreements on consecutive days. Two variables were coded specified by whether the spillover occurred with different topics (i.e., time on Day 1 and jealousy on Day 2) or with the same topic (i.e., dating issues on both Day 1 and Day 2). The frequency of temporal spillover for both different topics and the same topic was measured by summing a dichotomized variable specifying whether or not conflict spilled over across two days within the romantic relationship across the 14 days.

Nine percent of females and 5% of males reported temporal spillover of the same topic and 16% of females and 14% of males reported temporal spillover of different topics with greater occurrence of both types of temporal spillover for females [$\chi^2(1) = 8.40, p = .004; \chi^2(1) = 32.13, p = .04$; respectively]. Overall, 20.7% of females and 14.6% of males reported having any temporal spillover occur regardless of whether the
conflict was about the same or a different topic. Due to the high rate of different topic and same topic temporal spillover occurring within the same couples, I summed the same-topic and different-topic temporal spillover of conflict variables for both females and males. A total of 62 incidents of temporal spillover occurred across all days and participants with 28 same topic spillovers and 34 different topic spillovers. Interpersonal problems-not otherwise specified (n = 8) and listing multiple conflict topics (n = 8) were the most common topics for temporal spillover of the same topic. Conflicts about communication (n = 13) on day one more often spilled over into a different topic on the proceeding day, with the most common different topic on the second day interpersonal problems not otherwise specified.

A composite of several questions represented intensity of temporal spillover. These questions included: a) how long the temporal spillover lasted (number of days), b) how upset (an) individual(s) was/were across days, and c) whether both individuals reported consecutive days of conflict. Because only two individuals reported conflict spilling across more than two days (3 days each), the length of temporal spillover was eliminated from the temporal spillover intensity score because of low variability. Instead, the number of times temporal spillover occurred was utilized to represent one component of temporal spillover intensity \( (M = 1.48, SD = 0.92; \text{Range 0 – 4}) \). On average, females (n = 15) reported an average of 1.40 \( (SD = 0.83) \) temporal spillovers of conflict, while males (n = 11) reported an average of 1.54 \( (SD = 1.04; t (24) = -3.98, ns) \). For females, the average level of how upset they were following temporal spillover of conflict was
3.39 ($SD = 1.13$), whereas for males the average level was 2.84 ($SD = 1.45$; $t (24) = 1.085, ns$). Across temporal spillover occurrence, six couples (7.3%) agreed on the occurrence of temporal spillover (range 0 – 3). Thus, the intensity scores were weighted to represent the number of times agreement occurred (0 = 0 times, 1 = 1 time, etc). The three items were standardized and averaged to create the final intensity variable because these items were measured on different scales. For females, the intensity of temporal spillover ranged from -1.04 to 2.16 ($M = 0.00, SD = 0.79$), and for males, the intensity of temporal spillover ranged from -0.82 to 1.63 ($M = 0.00, SD = 0.86$).

**Relational spillover of conflict.**

If an individual endorsed conflict within the romantic relationship and with another individual on the same day (i.e., conflict with multiple people including partner), relational spillover of conflict was coded. This variable was coded for occurrence through a dichotomized variable specifying whether or not relational spillover occurred. Seventeen percent of females ($n = 14$) and 4.9% of males ($n = 4$) indicated the occurrence of relational spillover over the course of the daily diary period, with females reporting marginally more relational spillover [$\chi^2(1) = 4.83, p = .085$]. Of all reported partner-initiated conflicts ($n = 88$), conflict spilled over into other relationships 15 (17%) times. For all reported self-initiated conflicts ($n = 67$), conflict spilled over into other relationships 10 (15%) times. A total of 20 incidents of relational spillover occurred across all days and participants. Having conflict on multiple topics with one’s partner ($n = 5$) led to the most occurrences of relational spillover.
Intensity of relational spillover included a composite of the number of people the conflict involved in subsequent conflicts and whether both individuals in the relationship were involved in relational conflict spillover for the same event. Relational spillover occurred on no more than 2 occasions for any individual, independent of whether the original conflict was partner-initiated or self-initiated. The number of relationships conflict spilled over into ranged from one relationship to three relationships. Only one couple reported engaging in relational spillover of conflict on the same day. Therefore, this variable was not included in the intensity score. Finally, given the small number of individuals who engaged in relational spillover, bivariate and multivariate follow-up analyses of relational spillover intensity were not pursued due to the small sample size.

2.4 Analysis Plan

2.4.1 Non-Independence of Dyadic Data.

All data collected for this project involved dyadic-level data. Collecting data from couples provides a unique opportunity to understand how interactions within a couple affect both individuals within the couple. Dyadic-level data, however, violates the independence assumption - one assumption common to most statistical techniques - because scores from two individuals within a romantic relationship are linked in a meaningful way, or are interdependent (Kenny & Judd, 1986). Failure to account for interdependence in dyadic data analyses may create biased standard error estimates (Acock, van Dulmen, Allen, & Piercy, 2004). Therefore, all analyses from a sample of
dyads must be adjusted to account for this violation to avoid biases in tests of statistical significance (Kenny, 1996). The APIM technique allows for analysis of the dyadic data by accounting for the interdependence of data within a dyad (Kenny, 1996). The dyadic nature of this sample was handled by incorporating data from both the female and the male into models using the Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (see Figure 2.1) and to account for interdependence (APIM; Kenny et al., 2006).

Figure 2.1 Actor-Partner Interdependence Model.

![Actor-Partner Interdependence Model Diagram]

Note: A refers to actor-line; P refers to partner-line

The APIM technique is well-suited for examining both individual and couple effects within dyads (Kenny et al., 2006). Specifically, the APIM technique can identify whether romantic relationship conflict (and temporal and relational spillover of conflict), occurs because of one’s own characteristics (actor effect), one’s partner’s characteristics (partner effect), or the combined characteristics of both individuals within a dyad (couple effect). An actor-oriented model suggests that individual outcomes are more likely due to an individual’s own functioning compared to their partner’s functioning. A partner-
oriented model suggests that individual outcomes are more likely due to the partner’s functioning compared to one’s own functioning. A couple-oriented model suggests that an individual outcome is due to both one’s own functioning as well as the functioning of one’s partner. Importantly, these models then differentiate effects for both females and males. Additionally, these models can be extended to incorporate cross-informant data as appropriate (van Dulmen & Goncy, 2011; see Figure 2.2). By incorporating cross-informant data, this model then captures both individual’s perspective on both self and partner functioning, which may increase the reliability of information about the dyadic interactions (Achenbach, Krukowski, Dumenci, & Ivanova, 2005; Caspi, Taylor, Smart, Jackson, Tagami & Moffitt, 2001). Additionally, cross-informant data can help disentangle whether associations occur because of shared method variance (i.e., same individual reporting on both predictor and outcome) or if associations are more stable (i.e., demonstrated with both self and partner data; van Dulmen & Goncy, 2011).

2.4.2 Missing Data.

Given the length of the daily diary, many individuals missed completing one or more days of the diary. Therefore, I corrected for this missing data by controlling for the number of days an individual completed the daily diary in my analyses. As stated above, three females and five males completed zero days of the daily diary and were subsequently removed from all analyses.
Figure 2.2 Extension of the Actor-Partner Interdependence Model.

Note: A/A’ refer to actor-lines; P/P’ refer to partner-lines

Dashed lines refer to extension of the APIM framework with multi-informant data.

For all other missing data, multiple imputation is preferred to case-deletion strategies, particularly for small samples (Little & Rubin, 1987). As this sample involves 82 couples, case deletion of one couple would result in deleting more than 1% of the sample and thus produce an unacceptable loss of power. Therefore, I used Maximum Likelihood estimation in LISREL (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2006) to estimate for missing data using the expectation-maximization algorithm, which is more accurate in calculating standard errors compared to more traditional methods (Dempster, Laird, & Rubin, 1977).
Missing outcome data (i.e., missing daily diary data) was controlled for in analyses, so these variables were not included in the imputation procedures. Only predictive and baseline data were imported into LISREL and used for imputation. All values imputed to equal impossible values (negative numbers) were recoded to equal the lowest possible value for the given scale.

2.4.3 Preliminary Analyses

Several preliminary analyses were conducted prior to running the Aim 1 and 2 models. These analyses include examining for reactivity of the daily diary, investigating patterns of conflict and conducting bivariate analyses to inform my models.

Reactivity of Daily Diary Completion.

I considered potential reactivity from items asked on the daily diary. Reactivity refers to the idea that the frequency or intensity of a reported behavior or event may change as a result of being observed or monitored by oneself or another (Nelson, 1977). Importantly, reactivity adds a source of unwanted variance into the outcome variable (Hufford, Shields, Shiffman, Paty & Balabanis, 2002). Therefore, in order to capture the degree of reactivity from completion of daily diaries, I investigated both female and male perceptions of the daily diary’s impact on reporting of behavior and the effect of repeated measures across several days. Several items determined how honestly participants responded, awareness of behavior due to participating in daily diary, changes in levels of conflict, and completing diaries together with partner. Bivariate correlations determined
if there were any significant relationships between these items and the outcome variables. The reactivity of repeated measures was tested by examining the slope of the outcome variables across the fourteen day daily diary period. A flat slope (i.e., non-significant) indicates that reactivity did not occur from completing repeated measures. A positive slope indicates that individuals may have become more aware of their behavior and thus reported more occurrences or higher intensity of conflict within their relationship. A negative slope indicates that individuals were reporting fewer instances due to fatigue of completing the daily diary.

Because temporal spillover and relational spillover of conflict are new constructs, they were also evaluated in relation to the daily diary, cross-informant methodology. Conflict, temporal spillover, and relational spillover were compared by several factors related to completing the daily diary: a) week day versus weekend completion, b) who completed on a specific day (female, male or both), and c) if completion directions were followed (completed between 8pm and 10pm). Additionally, I tested for timing effects related to when individuals completed the daily diary including comparing: a) beginning of diary period versus remaining days, b) end of the daily diary period versus remaining days, c) beginning and end completion, and d) number of days an individual completed the diary.

Descriptive and Correlation Statistics.

In order to best understand the variability of the data, descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations) were reported above on all predictor and outcome variables.
Additionally, all variables were screened for outliers ($z$-score > 3.29; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007), skewness and kurtosis prior to inclusion in analyses. Variables that demonstrated skewness greater than ±2 and kurtosis greater than ±7 were transformed as appropriate. All outcome variables were also examined for patterns of common conflict topics. Finally, all predictor and outcome variables were tested for significant bivariate correlations prior to multivariate analyses. Significant bivariate correlations then justified inclusion of variables in the Aim 1 and 2 models.

2.4.4 Aim 1 Analyses

The first aim of this project involved illustrating what individual and relationship characteristics predict frequency and intensity of romantic relationship conflict and temporal spillover and relational spillover. To understand romantic relationship conflict frequency and intensity, several different models were analyzed. For each outcome variable, the frequency (continuous count variable) and intensity (composite variable) was analyzed with individual and relationship characteristics as predictors. All models were analyzed using the APIM framework due to the dyadic design (Kenny, 1996). Data were structured as dyad data, where each line represented one dyad with variables for both members of the dyad. Statistical analyses were conducted in Mplus 5.0 (Muthén & Muthén, 2007).
Path Analysis.

A common data-analytic strategy used to estimate models within the APIM framework is path analysis (Kenny et al., 2006). The path analysis approach has several advantages over other data analytic techniques, particularly the simultaneous testing of how two individuals affect one another. Additionally, path analysis allows for statistical comparison of model parameters by groups (i.e., males and females). Through the use of a chi-square difference test, I can determine whether the strength of the association between a predictor and outcome variable are stronger for males or females. A statistically significant chi-square result will indicate that the effects are statistically different from each other and stronger for one gender, while a non-statistically significant chi-square indicates no difference between females and males.

Models were examined using several fit indices to determine model fit. Based on recommendations from Hu & Bentler (1999), two standard fit indices, the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) and the comparative fit index (CFI) were used to determine model fit. The following rules were applied for the above fit indices: CFI values greater than 0.90 and 0.95 represent acceptable and good fits of the model, respectively and RMSEA values of less than 0.08 and 0.05 represent acceptable and good fits of the model, respectively. Additionally, a non-significant chi-square test also demonstrated adequate fit. Model estimation methods were implemented dependent on the outcome variable, with maximum likelihood estimation for the frequency/intensity outcomes and weighted least squares estimation for relational spillover occurrence.
In order to allow for model overidentification, a requirement for path analysis, I included equality constraints on the intercorrelations among the outcome variables in models with cross-informant data on the outcome variables. For models without cross-informant data, equality constraints were added on the inter-correlation between the two predictor variables and on the inter-correlation between the two outcome variables. Finally, retention of both female and male predictor variables is critical for model specification in the APIM framework. Therefore, all variables that displayed significant correlations for either females or males were retained for the multivariate models.

2.4.5 Aim 2 Analyses

The second aim of this project is to understand how the use of conflict tactics in the family of origin may predict romantic relationship conflict, temporal spillover or relational spillover above and beyond those variables demonstrating a significant relationship in Aim 1. For each outcome variable, history of family conflict tactics was added to analyses for understanding the frequency and intensity of conflict and both temporal spillover and relational spillover of conflict. Analyses similar to Aim 1 were conducted with the addition of these predictor variables to understand the role family conflict tactics plays in understanding romantic relationship conflict. However, when power became a problem and/or model fit was poor, the Aim 1 predictor variables were dropped from subsequent multivariate models.
2.4.6 Power Analysis

Power refers to the probability of a statistical test finding statistically significant results when they exist (Cohen, 1977). Considering power is essential for making decisions regarding sample size and the complexity of analyses to be conducted. Power analysis is calculated based on four criteria – a) alpha level, b) power, c) the expected effect size and d) sample size (Cohen, 1992). Consideration of alpha and power in the power analysis reduces the risk of a Type I and II error, respectively (Cohen, 1992). Traditionally, alpha equals 0.05 (Cohen, 1990) and power is 0.80 (Cohen, 1992). The expected effect size should be determined based on values expected for small, medium and large effects for a statistical technique. Given that the most complex analyses for this proposed project involved path analysis, the following standard effect sizes were used: small = 0.02, medium = 0.15 and large = 0.35 (Cohen, 1992).

Power analyses were calculated using results presented by Cohen (1992) for the most complex model to be run (Aim 2). I estimated power with seven Aim 1 variables and one predictor variable from the family conflict tactics variables. To my knowledge, no research exists regarding young adult conflict spillover; therefore, power was estimated using a standard medium effect size (0.15). Based on the estimated total number of predictor variables (eight), a sample of 107 individuals or more should provide sufficient power. In this power analysis, I was conservative in estimating the total number of predictor variables to be included in one analysis. Models were re-considered based on the final number of participants (n = 82 couples).
CHAPTER 3
Results

3.1 Preliminary Analyses

3.1.1 Reactivity of Daily Diary.

Bivariate correlations were calculated to determine if there were any statistically significant relationships among the reactivity items (i.e., honesty, awareness, consultation, days completed) and the outcome variables. Females reported more partner-initiated conflicts as their self-reported level of honesty decreased ($r = -.34, p = .038$). No statistically significant correlations occurred between the reactivity questions and female self-initiated conflicts. Additionally, males report of honesty and both female and males report of awareness of completing the survey and completing the survey together did not relate to the frequency of conflict across the daily diary. Finally, the number of days of completion of the daily diary did not statistically correlate with either self-initiated or partner-initiated conflict frequency for males or females.

For the level of intensity, females, but not males, reported they answered less honestly as their reported intensity of self-initiated conflicts increased ($r = -.62, p = .013$). However, it is unclear whether these individuals under- or over-reported the level of intensity within the conflict. Therefore, the results on female self-initiated conflict intensity should be interpreted with caution. The other reactivity questions were not
related to the level of intensity in either partner-initiated or self-initiated conflicts for males and females.

For females and males, bivariate correlations and chi-square difference tests demonstrated no differences in the frequency of temporal spillover and the reactivity questions. These results remained when the correlations were investigated separately by either the same topic or a different topic. Additionally, no relationship occurred between the reactivity questions and the intensity of temporal spillover in females and males. Bivariate correlations and chi-square difference tests also demonstrated no difference in the frequency of relational spillover with the reactivity question for both females and males. In general, based on the individual questions asked of participants about their awareness of behavior, these results suggest that the daily report of conflict behavior was not greatly impacted by daily completion of the daily diary, with the possible exception of the frequency of female-reported male-initiated conflict frequency and the intensity of self-initiated female conflict with honesty.

The reactivity of repeated measures was also tested by examining the slope of the conflict variables across the fourteen day daily diary period. This analysis was completed using an unconditional growth curve model with 14 time points. Growth curve models account for missing data (Duncan, Duncan & Strycker, 2006) and therefore all individuals with at least one time point were included in this analysis. The slope is demonstrated in Figure 3.1. The slope demonstrated a trend toward statistical significance.
(p = .07), demonstrating that change across days may not have been random and conflict was reported less frequently in later days of the diary.

Figure 3.1.

Unconditional Growth Model of Conflict Across Days.

I also tested for differences in conflict and temporal spillover and relational spillover by several factors related to the daily diary, cross-informant methodology. These factors include comparing conflict frequency and temporal spillover and relational spillover by: a) week day versus weekend completion, b) who completed the daily diary, and c) whether individuals followed instructions to complete the daily diary between 8 and 10 pm. As these analyses were completed across 14 days, a more conservative alpha level was used though a Bonferroni correction (Cohen, 1994). Thus the corrected alpha for these analyses equaled 0.003 (0.05/14).
Conflict did not occur more often whether the participants were reporting on a week day versus weekend (all $p$’s ns). Of the 39 partner-initiated temporal spillover of conflicts, 30 occurred during the week, while 9 occurred during the weekend. Of the 23 self-initiated temporal spillover of conflicts, 17 occurred during the week and 6 occurred during the weekend. Finally, of the 20 incidents of relational spillover, 10 each occurred during the week and the weekend.

Conflict did not differ based on whether the female only, the male only or both completed the diary on a given day (all $p$’s ns). For partner-initiated temporal spillover of conflict, on 31 of the 39 occurrences both individuals completed the diary; while for self-initiated temporal spillover of conflict, on 17 of the 23 occurrences both individuals completed the diary. For relational spillover of conflict, on all but three occurrences, both individuals completed the diary for that day.

Both partner-initiated and self-initiated conflict frequency did not differ whether or not participants followed directions and completed the daily diary between 8pm and 10pm each night or at a different time during the day (all $p$’s ns). For temporal spillover of partner-initiated conflicts, 15 were reported when individuals completed both days between 8-10 pm, 14 were reported when individuals completed one of the two days between 8-10 pm, and 10 were reported when individuals completed neither of the diaries between 8-10 pm. For relational spillover of self-initiated conflicts, 7 were reported when individuals completed both days between 8-10 pm, 9 were reported when individuals completed one of the two days between 8-10 pm, and 7 were reported when
individuals completed neither of the diaries between 8-10 pm. For relational spillover of conflicts, 8 were reported when individuals completed the diary as instructed between 8-10 pm and 11 were reported when individuals completed the diary outside the instructed time of 8-10 pm.

Additionally, I tested for timing-effects related to when individuals completed the diary based on a) the beginning of the diary period (Days 1 – 4) versus other days (Days 5 – 14), b) the end of the diary period (Days 11 – 14) versus other days (Days 1 – 10), c) the beginning (Days 1 – 4) and end (Days 11 – 14) completion, and d) how many days an individual completed the diary. For both partner-initiated \( t(163) = -1.58, p = .12, d = 0.17 \) and self-initiated conflicts \( t(163) = -0.71, p = .48, d = 0.07 \), individuals reported conflict no more or less often when comparing the beginning versus other days. However for both partner-initiated \( t(163) = -6.18, p < .001, d = 0.65 \) and self-initiated \( t(163) = -6.60, p < .001, d = 0.66 \) conflicts, conflicts were reported more often the first 10 days compared to the last four days. For both partner-initiated conflicts \( t(163) = 3.20, p = .002, d = 0.30 \) and self-initiated conflicts \( t(163) = 3.83, p < .001, d = 0.37 \), more conflicts were reported in the first 4 days of the daily diary compared to the last 4 days. Female and male diary completion rates were unassociated with both self-initiated and partner-initiated female and male conflict frequency (all \( r’ s < .12, ns \)).

Overall, these analyses demonstrate that generally no differences occurred in conflict, temporal spillover and relational spillover of conflict related to the methodology. The one exception is that fatigue may have occurred throughout the course of the study,
thus reducing the potential number of total conflicts. This finding is further evidenced by the trend demonstrated in the unconditional growth model (see Figure 3.1). As a result, the findings below may be underestimates of the true effects. However, I can generally assume that this methodology appears to demonstrate adequate validity allowing greater confidence in my results.

3.1.2 Bivariate Analyses.

Bivariate correlations for all predictor and outcome variables were calculated and are discussed below. Female and male age were not associated with most predictor variables (exceptions: female age and male anxiety attachment; male age and female negative affect) and most outcome variables (exception: female age and male relational spillover-initiated by females).

Aim 1 and 2 Predictor Variables.

Bivariate correlations of all Aim 1 predictor variables for both females and males are presented in Table 3.1. These correlations ranged from $r = .00$ (length of romantic relationship and female life stress; length of romantic relationship and female negative affect) to $r = .68$ (female internalizing problems and female externalizing problems). Bivariate correlations of all Aim 2 predictor variables for both females and males are presented in Table 3.2. These correlations ranged from $r = .00$ (female paternal physical assault and female maternal negotiation; female paternal negotiation and female maternal
Table 3.1. Female and Male Bivariate Correlations of Aim 1 Predictor Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Length</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
<td>0.31*</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalizing</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>-.68**</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>-.50**</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externalizing</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-0.42**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Stress</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.58**</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>-.56**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety Attachment</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>-.57**</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant Attachment</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR Satisfaction</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR Negotiation</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR Psychological Aggression</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR Physical Assault</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Female-to-female correlations are above the diagonal. Male-to-male correlations are below the diagonal. Female-to-male correlations are on the diagonal and are bolded. RR = Romantic relationship

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01
psychological aggression) to $r = .75$ (male maternal negotiation and male paternal negotiation).

*Daily Diary Completion Rate and Conflict Frequency/Intensity.*

Diary completion (i.e., number of days completed) by females and males was unrelated to female-reported partner-initiated and self-initiated conflicts and male-reported partner-initiated and self-initiated conflicts. Similarly, female diary completion was unrelated to reported conflict intensity of female-reported partner initiated conflicts, but was marginally related to female-reported self initiated conflict intensity [$r (34) = -.33, p = .06$], where increased female diary completion was associated with decreased female self-initiated conflicts. Female diary completion was unrelated to male-reported partner-initiated and self-initiated conflict intensity. Finally, male diary completion was unrelated to both male-reported partner-initiated and self-initiated conflict intensity and female-reported partner-initiated and self-initiated conflict intensity. Temporal spillover in both females and males was unrelated to female diary completion or male diary completion. For relational spillover, both female and male diary completion rates were unassociated to both female and male relational spillover.
### Table 3.2.

**Female and Male Bivariate Correlations of Aim 2 Predictor Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Maternal</th>
<th>Paternal</th>
<th>Mother-to-Child</th>
<th>Father-to-Child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Maternal Negotiation</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Maternal Psych Aggression</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.59**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Maternal Physical Assault</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Maternal NV Discipline</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Maternal Psych Aggression</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Maternal Physical Assault</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Paternal Negotiation</td>
<td>0.75**</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Paternal Psych Aggression</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Paternal Physical Assault</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Paternal NV Discipline</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.71**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.43** .28** .11 .30** .52** .37** .37** .42** .31** .47**</td>
<td>.10 .52**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.37** .07 .11 .19 .22 .39** .29** .07 .19 .42**</td>
<td>.51** -.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Female-to-female correlations are above the diagonal. Male-to-male correlations are below the diagonal. Female-to-Male correlations are on the diagonal and are bolded. Psych = psychological; NV = non-violent

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01
Conflict Frequency and Intensity.

Bivariate correlations of conflict frequency and conflict intensity are presented in Table 3.3. For conflict frequency, the number of self-report and partner-report female-initiated conflicts \([r (76) = .68, p = .00]\) and male-initiated conflicts \([r (76) = .60, p = .00]\) were positively related. Additionally, female-reported and male-reported self-initiated conflicts \([r (76) = .56, p = .00]\) and partner-initiated conflicts \([r (76) = .58, p = .000]\) were positively correlated. Finally, self-initiated and partner-initiated female-reported conflicts \([r (79) = .72, p = .00]\) and male-reported conflicts \([r (77) = .65, p = .00]\) were also positively related.

Table 3.3.
Female and Male Bivariate Correlations: Conflict Frequency and Intensity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Female Initiated (Self Report)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.72**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Male Initiated (Self Report)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.60*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Female Initiated (Partner Report)</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.58**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Male Initiated (Partner Report)</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Conflict frequency correlations are above the diagonal. Conflict intensity correlations are below the diagonal.
* p < .05, ** p < .01

Self-report and partner-report female-initiated and male-initiated conflict intensity were unrelated. Additionally, self-reported female and male conflict intensity
and partner-reported female and male conflict intensity was also unrelated. Finally, self-initiated compared to partner-initiated female-reported and male-reported conflict intensity was unrelated. Only one statistically significant correlation -and one statistical trend- emerged between conflict frequency and conflict intensity. Both higher male-reported female-initiated conflict intensity were related to higher rates of male-reported female-initiated conflicts \( r(50) = .29, p = .04 \) and male-reported self-initiated conflicts \( r(31) = .34, p = .06 \).

Temporal Spillover Frequency and Intensity and Relational Spillover Occurrence.

Bivariate correlations indicated a positive relationship between the frequency of temporal spillover in females and males \( r(76) = .39, p = .00 \). Greater female temporal spillover frequency was related to greater female temporal spillover intensity \( r(15) = .92, p = .00 \). Similarly, greater male temporal spillover frequency was related to greater male temporal spillover intensity \( r(11) = .92, p = .00 \). Female and male relational spillover occurrence was positively related \( r(76) = .25, p = .03 \).

Aim 1 Control Variables with Conflict Frequency and Intensity.

Bivariate correlations between conflict frequency and intensity and the Aim 1 control variables are presented in Table 3.4. Romantic relationship length, female negative affect, and female life stress, were unrelated to female- and male-reported self-initiated and partner-initiated conflicts. Male negative affect was related to self-reported female conflict \( r(79) = .26, p = .02 \), partner-reported female conflict \( r(77) = .33, p = .004 \) and marginally to partner-reported male conflict \( r(79) = .19, p = .09 \), while male
life stress was related to self-reported female conflict \([r (79) = .32, p = .005]\), partner-reported female conflict \([r (77) = .25, p = .03]\), self-reported male conflict \([r (77) = .21, p = .07]\) and partner-reported male conflict \([r (79) = .22, p = .05]\).

Table 3.4.

**Bivariate Correlations of Female & Male Aim 1 Control & Predictor Variables with Conflict Frequency & Intensity.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict Frequency</th>
<th>Conflict Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RR Length</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td><strong>.26</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Stress</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>.32</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalizing</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems</td>
<td><strong>.06</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externalizing</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems</td>
<td><strong>.07</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td><strong>.29</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For conflict intensity, romantic relationship length and female and male life stress were unrelated to self-initiated or partner-initiated conflict regardless of informant. Female negative affect was related to self-reported female conflict intensity \([r (34) = .36, p = .04]\), but not self-reported male conflict intensity and partner-reported female and male conflict intensity. Also, male negative affect was related to self-reported male conflict intensity \([r (31) = .45, p = .01]\) and partner-reported female conflict intensity \([r (39) = .32, p = .05]\).

Due to no statistically significant bivariate relationship correlation between romantic relationship length and both female and male conflict frequency and intensity, this variable was removed from all subsequent analyses. Both female and male life stress
were retained for subsequent conflict frequency analyses because of the statistically significant correlation between female and male life stress \( r(82) = .30, p = .007 \).

Because no statistically significant relationship occurred between either female or male life stress and conflict intensity, this variable was not included in subsequent conflict intensity analyses. No statistically significant relationship occurred between female and male negative affect and only male negative affect statistically correlated to conflict frequency. Therefore, only male negative affect was retained as a control variable for conflict frequency. However, as both female and male negative affect were statistically correlated with conflict intensity, both female and male negative affect were retained for conflict intensity multivariate analyses.

**Aim 1 Predictor Variables with Conflict Frequency and Intensity.**

Bivariate correlations between all Aim 1 predictor variables with female-reported and male-reported self-initiated and partner-initiated conflict frequency and conflict intensity are presented in Table 3.4. For conflict frequency, female externalizing behavior problems, both female and male avoidant attachment, and female anxious attachment were unrelated to female- and male-reported self-initiated and partner-initiated conflicts. Male internalizing behavior problems, male externalizing behavior problems (for male-reported self-initiated only), and male anxious attachment were positively related to male-reported self-initiated and male-reported female-initiated conflict frequency. For both female and males, romantic relationship satisfaction was negatively related to female-reported partner-initiated and male-reported self-initiated and partner-initiated conflict frequency \( (r\text{'s range} = -.19 \text{ to } -.34 \). Regarding the conflict resolution variables
(i.e., romantic relationship physical assault, psychological aggression, negotiation),
several variables were positively related to both self-reported and partner-reported female and male conflict frequency ($r$’s range = .04 to .35).

Several variables were unrelated to conflict intensity of either female- or male-reported self- or partner-initiated conflicts (see Table 3.4), including female internalizing problems, female externalizing problems, male physical assault, female psychological aggression, male negotiation, female avoidant attachment, female and male anxiety attachment, and female romantic relationship satisfaction. Female romantic relationship negotiation was positively related to male-reported self-initiated conflict [$r (31) = .36, p = .049$]. Male avoidant attachment was negatively related to male-reported self-initiated conflict [$r (31) = -.41, p = .023$]. Five variables were related to female-reported self-initiated conflict, four positively – male internalizing problems [$r (34) = .37, p = .033$], male externalizing problems [$r (34) = .34, p = .05$], female physical assault [$r (34) = .29, p = .09$], male psychological aggression [$r (34) = .31, p = .07$] - and one negatively - male romantic relationship satisfaction [$r (34) = -.34, p = .047$].

These preliminary analyses suggest that several Aim 1 predictor variables for males, and fewer for females, were related to conflict frequency and intensity. Given the high positive correlations between the predictor variables for females and males, all Aim 1 predictor variables, with the exception of avoidant attachment behavior, were retained for subsequent analyses on conflict frequency and intensity.
Aim 2 Control Variables with Conflict Frequency and Intensity.

One-way ANOVAs demonstrated that both female and male family structures (i.e., dual biological parents, single parents/divorced, step-family and other) were unrelated to conflict frequency and conflict intensity (all p’s non-significant). Therefore, family structure was not retained as a control variable in subsequent Aim 2 analyses on conflict frequency and intensity.

Aim 2 Predictor Variables with Conflict Frequency and Intensity.

Bivariate correlations between the Aim 2 predictor variables (i.e., maternal/paternal physical assault, psychological aggression, negotiation and mother-to-child/father-to-child corporal punishment, psychological aggression and non-violent discipline) with conflict frequency and intensity are presented in Table 3.5. Female-reported male-initiated conflict frequency was positively related to female paternal negotiation \( r(77) = .22, p = .054 \). No other female Aim 2 variables were statistically correlated to self-initiated or partner-initiated female or male conflict frequency. Male maternal physical assault and male maternal psychological aggression were both positively related to male-reported self-initiated \( r(76) = .24, p = .03; r(76) = .30, p = .01 \); respectively] and male-reported female-initiated conflict frequency \( r(76) = .24, p = \)
Table 3.5.

Bivariate Correlations of Female and Male and Aim 2 Predictor Variables with Conflict Frequency and Intensity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Conflict Frequency</th>
<th></th>
<th>Conflict Intensity</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female(^a)</td>
<td>Male(^b)</td>
<td>Female(^b)</td>
<td>Male(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Physical Assault</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.24(^*)</td>
<td>.24(^*)</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.28(^+)</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Psychological Aggression</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.30(^*)</td>
<td>.22(^+)</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Negotiation</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Physical Assault</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.34(^*)</td>
<td>-.04(^*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Value 1</td>
<td>Value 2</td>
<td>Value 3</td>
<td>Value 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Psychological Aggression</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Negotiation</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother to Child Corporal Punishment</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother to Child Psychological Aggression</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother to Child Non-Violent Discipline</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father to Child Corporal Punishment</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father to Child Psychological Aggression</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father to Child Non-Violent Discipline</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Female correlations are on top and male correlations are on bottom and bolded.

\[ a \text{ n} = 79; \ b \text{ n} = -77; \ c = 50; \ d \text{ n} = 39; \ e \text{ n} = 34; \ f \text{ n} = 31 \]

+ p < .10, * p < .05, ** p < .01
Male paternal negotiation was positively related to male-reported self-initiated conflict frequency \( r(73) = .21, p = .07 \). Male mother-to-child psychological aggression was negatively related to female-reported male-initiated conflict frequency \( r(78) = -.24, p = .04 \). The remaining male Aim 2 variables (i.e., maternal negotiation, paternal physical assault, paternal psychological aggression, mother-to-child corporal punishment, mother-to-child non-violent discipline, father-to-child corporal punishment, father-to-child psychological aggression, father-to-child non-violent discipline) were unrelated to conflict frequency.

Both female maternal negotiation \( r(31) = .31, p = .09 \) and female mother-to-child non-violent discipline \( r(31) = .50, p = .004 \) were positively related to male-reported self-initiated conflict intensity. No other female Aim 2 variables were related to conflict intensity. Male-reported female-initiated conflict intensity was negatively related to male maternal physical assault \( r(39) = -.28, p = .085 \), male paternal physical assault \( r(38) = .34, p = .039 \), and male mother-to-child psychological aggression \( r(39) = -.45, p = .004 \). No other male Aim 2 variables were related to conflict intensity.

These preliminary analyses suggest that some, but not all, interparental and parent-child conflict resolution strategies were related to conflict frequency and intensity. Therefore, based on above statistically significant correlations, the following variables for both females and males were retained for subsequent conflict frequency analyses: maternal physical assault, maternal psychological aggression, paternal negotiation, and mother-to-child psychological aggression. Additionally, the following variables for both
females and males were retained for subsequent conflict intensity analyses: maternal physical assault, maternal negotiation, paternal physical assault, paternal psychological aggression, mother-to-child psychological aggression, and mother-to-child non-violent discipline.

Aim 1 Control Variables with Temporal Spillover Frequency and Intensity.

Bivariate correlations between Aim 1 control variables and temporal spillover frequency and intensity are presented in Table 3.6. Length of romantic relationship was unrelated to both temporal spillover frequency and intensity. Female \( r (79) = .22, p = .06 \) and male \( r (79) = .21, p = .07 \) negative affect was marginally related to female-reported temporal spillover frequency, but not to male-reported temporal spillover frequency. Female life stress was unrelated to both female and male temporal spillover, but male life stress was positively associated with both female-reported \( r (79) = .27, p = .02 \) and male-reported \( r (77) = .23, p = .05 \) temporal spillover frequency.

Only male negative affect \( r (15) = .50, p = .06 \) was marginally related to female-reported temporal spillover intensity, but neither female nor male negative affect was related to male-reported temporal spillover intensity. Female life stress was unrelated to temporal spillover intensity, but male life stress was marginally related to female-reported temporal spillover intensity \( r (15) = .50, p = .06 \). Based on these bivariate correlations, both negative affect and life stress, but not length of the romantic relationship, were retained as control variables for subsequent analyses for temporal spillover frequency and intensity.
Table 3.6.

Bivariate Correlations of Female and Male Aim 1 and 2 Control and Predictor Variables with Temporal Spillover Frequency and Intensity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Temporal Spillover Frequency</th>
<th>Temporal Spillover Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female (^a)</td>
<td>Male (^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of relationship</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>.22(^+)</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(\textbf{.21}^+)</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Stress</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(\textbf{.27}^*)</td>
<td>.23(^*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalizing Problems</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.23(^*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(\textbf{.05})</td>
<td>.31(^**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externalizing Problems</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(\textbf{.13})</td>
<td>.23(^*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Assault</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(\textbf{.30}^{**})</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Aggression</td>
<td>.20(^+)</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(\textbf{.19}^+)</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>Avoidant Attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.22+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.20+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.20+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aim 1 Predictor Variables with Temporal Spillover Frequency and Intensity.

Bivariate correlations between the Aim 1 predictor variables and temporal spillover frequency and intensity are also presented in Table 3.6. Female externalizing behavior problems, physical assault, and avoidant attachment and male negotiation and avoidant attachment were unrelated to both female-reported and male-reported temporal spillover frequency. Female internalizing \([r(77) = .23, p = .05]\), male internalizing \([r(77) = .31, p = .01]\) and male externalizing \([r(77) = .23, p = .05]\) behavior problems were positively related to male-reported temporal spillover frequency. Male physical assault \([r(79) = .30, p = .01]\), female psychological aggression \([r(79) = .20, p = .08]\), male psychological aggression \([r(79) = .19, p = .09]\) and female negotiation \([r(79) = .30, p = .01]\)
.01] were positively related to female-reported temporal spillover frequency. Female \[ r (79) = .25, p = .03 \] and male \[ r (79) = .25, p = .03 \] anxious attachment behavior were positively related female-reported temporal spillover frequency, whereas only male anxious attachment behavior \[ r (77) = .22, p = .06 \] was positively related to male-reported temporal spillover frequency. Both female \[ r (77) = -.23, p = .05 \] and male \[ r (77) = -.29, p = .01 \] relationship satisfaction were negatively related to male-reported, but not female-reported, temporal spillover frequency. Again because of the high correlations between female and male predictor variables and either a female or male statistically significant correlation with temporal spillover frequency, all Aim 1 variables, except for avoidant attachment, were retained for further analyses regarding temporal spillover frequency.

Both female and male externalizing behavior problems, avoidant attachment behavior, anxious attachment behavior, and romantic relationship satisfaction were unrelated to female-reported and male-reported temporal spillover intensity. Male internalizing problems were positively related to female-reported temporal spillover intensity \[ r (15) = .52, p = .05 \]. Female physical assault \[ r (15) = .45, p = .09 \] was positively related to female-reported temporal spillover intensity, while male physical assault \[ r (11) = .57, p = .07 \] was positively related to male-reported temporal spillover intensity. Male psychological aggression was positively related to female-reported temporal spillover intensity \[ r (15) = .54, p = .04 \], while female negotiation was related to male-reported temporal spillover intensity \[ r (11) = .70, p = .02 \]. Based on these bivariate correlations, internalizing behavior problems, physical assault, psychological
aggression and negotiation were retained for the temporal spillover intensity path analyses.

**Aim 2 Control Variable with Temporal Spillover Frequency and Intensity.**

One-way ANOVAs demonstrated that female family structure was unrelated to female temporal spillover frequency and intensity. However, male family status was related to male-reported temporal spillover frequency \(F (3, 73) = 3.29, p = .025\), where males from step-families reported higher temporal spillover frequency compared to males from dual biological families \((p = .004)\). Male family status was unrelated to female-reported temporal spillover frequency and both female-reported and male-reported temporal spillover intensity. Therefore, only male family structure for temporal spillover frequency was retained as a control variable in subsequent Aim 2 analyses.

**Aim 2 Predictor Variables and Temporal Spillover Frequency and Intensity.**

The bivariate correlations of the Aim 2 predictor variables and temporal spillover frequency and intensity are also presented in Table 3.6. Both female and male maternal and paternal physical assault, maternal negotiation, paternal psychological aggression, mother-to-child/father-to-child corporal punishment, mother-to-child/father-to-child psychological aggression and mother-to-child/father-to-child non-violent discipline strategies were all unrelated to temporal spillover frequency. Only male maternal psychological aggression was marginally related to male-reported temporal spillover frequency \(r (77) = .20, p = .08\), while male paternal negotiation was negatively related to male-reported temporal spillover frequency \(r (77) = -.20, p = .09\). Therefore, only
maternal psychological aggression and paternal negotiation were retained for the subsequent multivariate temporal spillover frequency analyses.

Paternal physical assault, mother-to-child/father-to-child corporal punishment, mother-to-child/father-to-child psychological aggression, and father-to-child non-violent discipline were unrelated to female-reported or male-reported temporal spillover intensity. Male maternal physical assault \( r (15) = .55, p = .03 \) and maternal psychological aggression \( r (15) = .70, p = .00 \) were positively related to female-reported temporal spillover intensity. Female maternal \( r (11) = -.54, p = .09 \) and female paternal \( r (11) = -.71, p = .01 \) psychological aggression were negatively related to male-reported temporal spillover intensity. Male maternal \( r (11) = .63, p = .04 \) and paternal \( r (11) = .80, p = .00 \) negotiation and female paternal negotiation \( r (11) = .63, p = .04 \) were positively related to male-reported temporal spillover intensity. Also, female mother-to-child non-violent discipline was marginally related to male-reported temporal spillover intensity \( r (11) = .56, p = .07 \). Based on these correlations, maternal physical assault, maternal and paternal psychological aggression, maternal and paternal negotiation, and mother-to-child non-violent discipline were included in subsequent multivariate temporal spillover intensity analyses.

Aim 1 Control Variables with Relational Spillover Occurrence.

Point-biserial correlations for the Aim 1 control variables and relational spillover occurrence are presented in Table 3.7. The length of the relationship was unrelated to female and male relational spillover occurrence. Greater occurrence of female relational spillover was related to higher female negative affect \( r (79) = .37, p = .00 \) and male
negative affect \( r(79) = .23, p = .04 \), but neither were related to male relational spillover occurrence. Female life stress was unrelated to female or male relational spillover occurrence, but male life stress was positively related to both female \( r(79) = .26, p = .02 \) and male relational spillover occurrence \( r(77) = .19, p = .09 \). Therefore, female and male negative affect and male life stress were included as control variables in subsequent multivariate analyses for relational spillover occurrence.

**Aim 1 Predictor Variables with Relational Spillover Occurrence and Intensity.**

The point-biserial correlations for the Aim 1 predictor variables and relational spillover occurrence are also presented in Table 3.7. Female internalizing behavior problems were positively related to both female \( r(79) = .20, p = .08 \) and male relational spillover occurrence \( r(77) = .27, p = .02 \), whereas male internalizing behavior problems were only related to male relationship spillover \( r(77) = .33, p = .00 \). Female externalizing behavior problems were positively, but marginally, related to female \( r(79) = .21, p = .07 \) and male \( r(77) = .21, p = .08 \) relational spillover occurrence, and male externalizing behavior problems were only related to male externalizing problems \( r(77) = .33, p = .00 \).
Table 3.7.

Point Biserial Correlations of Female and Male Aim 1 and 2 Control and Predictor Variables Relational Spillover Occurrence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Relational Spillover Occurrence</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 79</td>
<td>n = 77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of relationship</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Stress</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>19+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalizing Problems</td>
<td>.20+</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externalizing Problems</td>
<td>.21+</td>
<td>.21+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Assault</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Aggression</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant Attachment</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxious Attachment</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>-.43**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Physical Assault</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Psychological Aggression</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Negotiation</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Physical Assault</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Psychological Aggression</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Negotiation</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother to Child Corporal Punishment</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother to Child Psychological Aggression</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother to Child Non-Violent Discipline</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father to Child Corporal Punishment</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father to Child Psychological Aggression</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father to Child Non-Violent Discipline</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Female correlations are on top and male correlations are on bottom and bolded.

\[ n = 79; c n = 77 \]

+ \( p < .10 \), * \( p < .05 \), ** \( p < .01 \)

Both female \( r(79) = .30, p = .01 \) and male \( r(79) = .23, p = .04 \) physical assault were positively related to female, but not male relational spillover occurrence. Only female psychological aggression was related to female relational spillover occurrence \( r(79) = .27, p = .02 \). Neither female nor male negotiation was related to female or male relational spillover occurrence.

Male avoidant attachment was positively related to male relational spillover occurrence \( r(77) = .31, p = .01 \). Both female and male anxious attachment were positively related to both female \( r(79) = .28, p = .01 \); \( r(79) = .31, p = .01 \); respectively] relational spillover occurrence, but only female anxious attachment was related to male relational spillover occurrence \( r(77) = .30, p = .01 \). Female relationship satisfaction was
negatively related to both female \( r(79) = -.32, p = .00 \) and male \( r(77) = -.25, p = .03 \) relational spillover occurrence. Similarly, male relationship satisfaction was negatively related to female \( r(77) = -.34, p = .01 \) and male \( r(77) = -.43, p = .01 \) relational spillover occurrence. Because both female and male negotiation were unrelated to relational spillover occurrence, only this variable was not included in the multivariate analyses.

_Aim 2 Control Variables with Relational Spillover Occurrence._

One-way ANOVAs showed that female family status was unrelated to female or male relational spillover occurrence. Male family status was related to female relational spillover occurrence \( [F(3) = 3.83, p = .01] \), where males from dual biological parent families were dating females who reported greater relational spillover than males from other families. Therefore, male family status was retained as a control variable in subsequent Aim 2 multivariate analyses.

_Aim 2 Predictor Variables with Relational Spillover Occurrence._

Point-biserial correlations for the Aim 2 predictor variables with relational spillover occurrence are presented in Table 3.7. Only male maternal physical assault \( r(76) = .31, p = .01 \) was positively related to male relational spillover occurrence. Additionally, only female father-to-child psychological aggression was positively related to male relational spillover occurrence \( r(75) = .23, p = .04 \), whereas male father-to-child non-violent discipline was negatively related to female relational spillover \( r(75) = -.25, p = .03 \). The following variables, for both females and males, were unrelated to
relational spillover occurrence and therefore were not included in subsequent analyses on relational spillover occurrence: paternal physical assault, maternal and paternal psychological aggression, maternal and paternal negotiation, mother-to-child and father-to-child corporal punishment, mother-to-child and father-to-child psychological aggression, and mother-to-child non-violent discipline. Therefore, only maternal physical assault and father-to-child non-violent discipline were retained for subsequent multivariate analyses.

3.2 Aim 1 Multivariate Results

3.2.1 Conflict Frequency and Intensity

The following analyses were conducted following procedures described by Kenny and colleagues (2006) for testing path analysis models within the actor-partner interdependence model (APIM) framework. These procedures were described in the analysis plan and results below are described in terms of actor-effects, partner-effects and couple-effects, as appropriate. For the conflict intensity analyses, only individuals reporting any conflict frequency (i.e., female- or male-reported self-initiated or partner-initiated) were included in these models. If an individual category represented conflict frequency of zero, but conflict occurred in another category, the conflict intensity scores were recoded to represent the floor level of conflict intensity. As the conflict intensity scores were means based on standardized scores, a score of 0 was inappropriate. Therefore, these individuals received a score lower than the lowest conflict intensity score to best represent absence of conflict.
Based on the low rates of conflict and subsequently smaller samples (i.e., intensity), some complex models could not be calculated. Output warning errors suggested that the standard error of parameter estimates may not be trustworthy because the parameters exceeded the sample size. In these situations, control variables were removed to allow for model estimation. For all conflict intensity models, the untrustworthy parameters remained an issue and thus only the main predictors were included in those models.

Model fit indices for the conflict frequency models were inconclusive. All of the chi-square statistics were statistically non-significant and the confirmatory fit index (CFI) were good (range .98 - .99), which both suggest good fit. However, the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) suggested unacceptable fit (range .10 to .17) for all models. Both the chi-square statistic and CFIs are comparisons made from a null model, whereas the RMSEA reflects parsimony and adjusts for model complexity (Hancock & Mueller, 2011). The RMSEA only improves toward acceptable and good model fits when useful contributors are added to models. Some variables in these models likely do not add much to understanding conflict frequency and thus result in poorer RMSEA values.

Model fit indices for the conflict intensity models were also inconclusive. Again, although all of the chi-square statistics were statistically non-significant, not all of the CFI values were acceptable (range .82 to .95). Similarly, RMSEA values all suggested unacceptable fit (range .13 to .18). Again, these values reflect poor parsimony in the models and likely some variables do not contribute much to the overall models.
Internalizing Problems.

Bivariate correlation analyses demonstrated a positive relationship between male-reported self-initiated and male-reported female-initiated conflict frequency with male internalizing problems. However, after considering negative affect, life stress, and diary completion, these relationships between conflict frequency and internalizing problems were no longer statistically significant (see Table 3.8). For conflict intensity, internalizing problems were unrelated to intensity of conflicts.

Externalizing Problems

Bivariate correlation analyses demonstrated a positive relationship between male-reported self-initiated and partner-initiated conflict frequency and male externalizing problems. However, path analysis results (see Table 3.9) suggested that male and female externalizing behavior problems were unrelated to self-reported or partner-reported female-initiated or male-initiated conflict frequency after controlling for male negative affect, life stress and diary completion. Similarly, the path analysis results for externalizing problems and conflict intensity suggested that externalizing problems were unrelated to female or male conflict intensity despite a statistically significant bivariate relationship between female-reported self-initiated conflict intensity and male externalizing problems.
Table 3.8.

*Internalizing Problems Predicting Conflict Frequency and Intensity.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-Reported</th>
<th>Partner-Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict Frequency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Internalizing Problems</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Internalizing Problems</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Negative Affect</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Life Stress</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Life Stress</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Diary Completion</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Diary Completion</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict Intensity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Internalizing Problems</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Internalizing Problems</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 (1) = 3.16, p = .08; \) CFI = .99; RMSEA = .16

\( \chi^2 (1) = 2.72, p = .10; \) CFI = .83; RMSEA = .17

+ \( p < .10, \) * \( p < .05, \) ** \( p < .01 \)
Table 3.9.

Externalizing Problems Predicting Conflict Frequency and Intensity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-Reported</th>
<th>Partner-Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Externalizing Problems</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Negative Affect</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Life Stress</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Life Stress</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Diary Completion</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Diary Completion</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conflict Intensity  \( \chi^2 (1) = 2.82, p = .09; CFI = .82; RMSEA = .17 \)

| Male Externalizing Problems | .17   | .13   | .08    | .13 | .08    | .13  |

\( + p < .10, * p < .05, ** p < .01 \)

Physical Assault

Following bivariate analysis results and the proposed hypotheses (see Table 3.10), greater female-reported self-initiated conflict frequency was related to greater male physical assault (\( \beta = .33, p = .01 \)). After inclusion of equality constraints on the actor and
partner paths for female-reported self-initiated conflict frequency, a strong partner effect was evident for the association between both female and male physical assault and self-reported female-initiated conflict frequency [$\chi^2 (1) 13.73, p = .00$]. Marginally, greater female-reported male-initiated conflict frequency was positively related to greater male physical assault ($\beta=.24, p = .07$); however there were no differences between the impact of female physical assault compared to male physical assault in understanding female-reported male-initiated conflict frequency [$\chi^2 (1) = 5.09, p = .17$]. Neither female nor male use of physical assault in the romantic relationship was related to conflict intensity (see Table 3.10).

Romantic Relationship Psychological Aggression

Although correlation analyses demonstrated a positive relationship between male psychological aggression with female-reported and male-reported self-initiated and male-reported female-initiated conflict frequency, the path analysis results demonstrated no statistically significant relationship after considering male negative affect, life stress and diary completion (see Table 3.11). Similarly, despite marginal bivariate correlations for conflict intensity and male psychological aggression, both female and male psychological aggression were unrelated to conflict intensity in the multivariate analyses.
Table 3.10.

Romantic Relationship Physical Assault Predicting Conflict Frequency and Intensity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-Reported</th>
<th>Partner-Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Physical Assault</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Physical Assault</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Negative Affect</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Life Stress</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Life Stress</td>
<td>.21+</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Diary Completion</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Diary Completion</td>
<td>.33+</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Intensity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Physical Assault</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Physical Assault</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 (1) = 1.96, p = .16; \text{CFI} = .99; \text{RMSEA} = .11 \)

\( \chi^2 (1) = 2.04, p = .15; \text{CFI} = .92; \text{RMSEA} = .13 \)

+ p < .10, * p < .05, ** p < .01
Table 3.11.

Romantic Relationship Psychological Aggression Predicting Conflict Frequency and Intensity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self- Reported</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Partner- Reported</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict Frequency</strong></td>
<td>β² (1) = 2.55,</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Psychological Aggression</td>
<td>p = .11; CFI =</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Psychological Aggression</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Negative Affect</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.20+</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Life Stress</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Life Stress</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Diary Completion</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.31+</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Diary Completion</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict Intensity</strong></td>
<td>β² (1) = 2.56,</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Psychological Aggression</td>
<td>p = .10; CFI =</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Psychological Aggression</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+p < .10, * p < .05
**Romantic Relationship Negotiation.**

Similar to bivariate correlations, higher female negotiation predicted higher female-reported male-initiated conflict frequency ($\beta = .29, p = .01$). However, with the inclusion of equality constraints on female-reported male-initiated conflict frequency, there were no differences in the impact of female and male negotiation [$\chi^2 (1) = 0.91, p = .34$], suggesting a weak partner effect. Female and male negotiation were unrelated to female-reported self-initiated conflicts and male-reported self-initiated and partner-initiated conflicts after controlling for negative affect, life stress and diary completion. Both female and male negotiation were unrelated to conflict intensity for self-reported and partner-reported female and male conflicts.

**Attachment Behavior.**

Female anxious attachment increased as female-reported self-initiated conflict frequency increased ($\beta = .21, p = .06$; see Table 3.13). This finding was not evident in the bivariate analyses, suggesting the importance of considering information from both individuals in a couple, as well as the control variables. However, after inclusion of equality constraints on female-reported self-initiated conflict frequency for female and male anxious attachment, no difference occurred [$\chi^2 (1) = 2.37, p = .12$]; therefore, female anxious attachment demonstrated only a weak actor effect. Female and male anxious attachment behavior was also unrelated to female-reported male-initiated and male-reported self- and partner-initiated conflicts, contrary to the bivariate correlation.
results. Avoidant attachment was not included in the multivariate analyses due to the statistically non-significant bivariate relationships with conflict frequency.

Table 3.12.

Romantic Relationship Negotiation Predicting Conflict Frequency and Intensity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-Reported</th>
<th>Partner-Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Negotiation</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Negotiation</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Negative Affect</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Life Stress</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Life Stress</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Diary Completion</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Diary Completion</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Intensity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Negotiation</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Negotiation</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$+p < .10$, $*p < .05$, $**p < .01$
Table 3.13.

Attachment Behavior Predicting Conflict Frequency and Intensity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-Reported</th>
<th></th>
<th>Partner-Reported</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict Frequency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Anxious Attachment Behavior</td>
<td>.21+</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Anxious Attachment Behavior</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Negative Affect</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Life Stress</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Life Stress</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Diary Completion</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Diary Completion</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict Intensity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Avoidant Attachment Behavior</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Avoidant Attachment Behavior</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.22+</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 (1) = 2.96, p = .09; \text{CFI} = .99; \text{RMSEA} = .16$

$\chi^2 (1) = 3.01, p = .08; \text{CFI} = .87; \text{RMSEA} = .18$

$+ p < .10, * p < .05, ** p < .01$

For conflict intensity, multivariate results matched the bivariate results, but were contrary to the proposed hypothesis for self-reported male-initiated conflict intensity. Male-reported self-initiated conflict intensity increased as male avoidant attachment behavior decreased ($\beta = -.22, p = .09$), suggesting a marginal actor effect. After inclusion
of the equality constraints on self-reported male-initiated conflict intensity, a statistical trend was evident between female and male avoidant attachment behavior in understanding male-initiated conflict intensity \( \chi^2 (1) = 3.36, p = .07 \). Additionally, as the bivariate correlations demonstrated no statistically significant relationship between anxious attachment and conflict intensity, no multivariate models were analyzed to investigate the association between anxious attachment and conflict intensity.

**Romantic Relationship Satisfaction.**

Consistent with the some bivariate analyses and my hypothesis, female relationship satisfaction increased as male-reported self-initiated conflict frequency decreased \( (\beta = -.25, p = .03) \), suggesting a partner effect for male-reported self-initiated conflict frequency (see Table 3.14). However, chi-square difference tests after inclusion of the equality constraints on male-reported self-initiated conflict frequency demonstrated no difference between female and male relationship satisfaction in understanding male self-initiated conflicts \( \chi^2 (1) = 0.67, p = .41 \). Relationship satisfaction was also unrelated to female-reported self-initiated and partner-initiated conflicts and male-reported partner-initiated conflicts, contrary to my hypotheses and the preliminary bivariate analyses.
**Table 3.14.**

**Romantic Relationship Satisfaction Predicting Conflict Frequency and Intensity.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-Reported</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Partner-Reported</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict Frequency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β SE</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Relationship Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Relationship Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Negative Affect</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Life Stress</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Life Stress</td>
<td>.27+</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.21+</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Diary Completion</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Diary Completion</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict Intensity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Relationship Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Relationship Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ $p < .10$, * $p < .05$

Consistent with preliminary bivariate analyses, as male relationship satisfaction increased, both self-reported ($\beta = -.35$, $p = .01$) and partner-reported ($\beta = -.35$, $p = .02$) female conflict intensity decreased. Chi-square difference tests following inclusion of equality constraints demonstrated that the effects of male satisfaction were stronger than...
those for female satisfaction for self-reported female conflict intensity $[\chi^2 (1) = 4.69, p = .03]$ and marginally for partner-reported female conflict intensity $[\chi^2 (1) = 2.76, p = .09]$. These results suggest partner effects for both self-reported and partner-reported female conflict intensity and male relationship satisfaction. However, as the bivariate relationship between partner-reported female initiated conflict intensity and male relationship satisfaction was not statistically significant, this finding should be interpreted with caution. Additionally, female relationship satisfaction was unrelated to conflict intensity.

### 3.2.2 Temporal Spillover of Conflict and Temporal Spillover Intensity.

These analyses were also conducted following procedures outlined by Kenny and colleagues (2006) for analyzing dyadic data within the APIM framework. Again, results are described in terms of actor-effects, partner-effects, and couple-effects, as appropriate. To avoid just-identified models, equality constraints were included on the inter-correlations of the female and male predictor variable and the female and male outcome variable. For the intensity analyses, only individuals reporting a frequency of temporal spillover of 1 or more were included in the multivariate models. Also, inclusion of all control variables in the intensity models created untrustworthy standard errors of the model parameters. Thus, control variables were removed from temporal spillover intensity multivariate analyses.

For temporal spillover frequency, indices provided contradictory evidence for model fit. For externalizing problems, attachment, and relationship satisfaction, chi-square statistics and CFI demonstrated good fit, while RMSEA did not (range .13 to .18).
Again, these models may not be the most parsimonious and thus impact RMSEA. Additionally, the fit indices for internalizing problems, psychological aggression and negotiation indicate poor fit across all fit indices (Hancock & Mueller, 2011). Therefore, these multivariate models should be interpreted with caution. For temporal spillover intensity multivariate models, all models represented good fit across the chi-square statistics, the CFIs and the RMSEAs.

*Internalizing Problems.*

Both female and male internalizing problems were unrelated to temporal spillover of conflict after considering the impact of negative affect, life stress and diary completion (Table 3.15). For temporal spillover intensity, even after removing all control variables, the standard errors remained untrustworthy. Thus the model for internalizing problems and temporal spillover intensity is not presented.
Table 3.15.

Internalizing Problems Predicting Temporal Spillover Frequency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Temporal Spillover Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Internalizing Problems</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Internalizing Problems</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Negative Affect</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Negative Affect</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Life Stress</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Life Stress</td>
<td>.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Diary Completion</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Diary Completion</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05; χ²(1) = 5.19, p = .02; CFI = .94; RMSEA = .23

Externalizing Problems.

After including the control variables, both female and male externalizing behavior problems were no longer related to female- or male-initiated temporal spillover conflict frequency (see Table 3.16). Additionally, the standard errors of the multivariate model were untrustworthy when including negative affect in the model and thus this variable was removed from the presented model. Finally, for temporal spillover intensity, even after removing all control variables, the standard errors remained untrustworthy. Thus the model for externalizing problems and temporal spillover intensity is not presented.
Table 3.16.

*Externalizing Problems Predicting Temporal Spillover Frequency.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Temporal Spillover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Externalizing Problems</td>
<td>.06  .12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Life Stress</td>
<td>.00  .12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Life Stress</td>
<td>.25* .11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Diary Completion</td>
<td>.07  .20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Diary Completion</td>
<td>-.06 .18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ *p < .10, *p < .05; \( \chi^2 (1) = 3.54, p = .06; \) CFI = .96; RMSEA = .18

*Romantic Relationship Physical Assault.*

Female temporal spillover frequency was positively related to male physical assault \((\beta = .29, p = .02)\), after controlling for negative affect, life stress, and diary completion (see Table 3.17). However, after including equality constraints on female and male physical assault in predicting female temporal spillover frequency, no difference occurred \([\chi^2 (1) = 1.30, p = .26]\), suggesting a weak partner effect. Male temporal spillover frequency was unrelated to either female or male physical assault after considering the control variables. These results were consistent with the bivariate
analyses and with the proposed hypotheses. Although the multivariate relationships 
between female and male physical assault and female and male temporal spillover 
intensity did not reach statistical significance, these variables demonstrated small effect 
sizes for female temporal spillover intensity (see Table 3.17).

**Romantic Relationship Psychological Aggression.**

Contrary to the proposed hypotheses but similar to the bivariate findings, female 
and male temporal spillover frequency were unrelated to both female and male 
psychological aggression (see Table 3.18). For temporal spillover intensity, increased 
male psychological aggression related to increased female temporal spillover intensity ($\beta = .54, p = .00$). A marginal effect was evident after including equality constraints such 
that male psychological aggression demonstrated a stronger impact than female 
psychological aggression [$\chi^2 (1) = 2.71, p = .09$] suggesting a weak partner effect for 
female temporal spillover intensity. Similar to the bivariate relationships, female and 
male psychological aggression were not related to male temporal spillover intensity.
Table 3.17.

Romantic Relationship Physical Assault Predicting Temporal Spillover of Conflict and Temporal Spillover Intensity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Temporal Spillover Frequency $^a$</th>
<th>Temporal Spillover Intensity $^b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Physical Assault</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Physical Assault</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Negative Affect</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Negative Affect</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Life Stress</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Life Stress</td>
<td>.18+</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Diary Completion</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Diary Completion</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^+$ $p < .10$, $^*$ $p < .05$, $^{**} p < .01$

$^a$: $\chi^2 (1) = 0.24, p = .62; CFI = 1.00; RMSEA = .00$

$^b$: $\chi^2 (1) = .11, p = .74; CFI = 1.00; RMSEA = .00$
Table 3.18.

**Romantic Relationship Psychological Aggression Predicting Temporal Spillover**

**Frequency and Intensity.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Temporal Spillover Frequency</th>
<th>Temporal Spillover Intensity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Psych Aggression</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Psych Aggression</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Negative Affect</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Negative Affect</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Life Stress</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Life Stress</td>
<td>.21+</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.19+</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Diary Completion</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.34*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Diary Completion</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* + $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$; Psych = Psychological

\[ \chi^2(1) = 20.945, p = .00, CFI = .70; RMSEA = .50 \]

\[ \chi^2(1) = 0.67, p = .41, CFI = 1.00; RMSEA = .00 \]

**Romantic Relationship Negotiation.**

After controlling for negative affect, life stress and diary completion (see Table 3.19), female temporal spillover was positively related to female negotiation ($\beta = .21, p =$
Inclusion of equality constraints on female and male negotiation in predicting female temporal spillover frequency, however, indicated no difference in the impact of female and male negotiation $[\chi^2 (1) = 1.07, p = .30]$. This weak actor effect demonstrated that as female negotiation increased, so did female temporal spillover frequency. This finding supports the proposed hypothesis for female temporal spillover frequency. However this relationship did not occur in the bivariate analyses and thus should be interpreted with caution, particularly in light of the substantially poor fit indices. Female and male negotiation were unrelated to male temporal spillover frequency after controlling for negative affect, life stress and diary completion.

Female temporal spillover intensity was positively related to female negotiation ($\beta = .46, p = .01$), meaning that as female negotiation increased, females reported greater temporal spillover intensity (see Table 3.19). Similar to temporal spillover frequency, this finding demonstrates a weak actor effect for females $[\chi^2 (1) = 1.29, p = .26]$, as the effect of negotiation was not different between females and males after the inclusion of equality constraints. Also, the bivariate relationship between female temporal spillover intensity and female negotiation was statistically non-significant; therefore, this finding should be interpreted with caution. Both female and male negotiation were unrelated to male temporal spillover intensity.
Table 3.19.

Romantic Relationship Negotiation Predicting Temporal Spillover Frequency and Intensity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Temporal Spillover Frequency $^a$</th>
<th>Temporal Spillover Intensity $^b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Negotiation</td>
<td>.21+</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Negotiation</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Negative Affect</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Negative Affect</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Life Stress</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Life Stress</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Diary Completion</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Diary Completion</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+$p < .10$, *$p < .05$

$^a\chi^2 (1) = 14.01, p = .00$; CFI = .81, RMSEA = .40

$^b\chi^2 (1) = 0.29, p = .59$; CFI = 1.00, RMSEA = .00
Attachment Behavior.

As predicted, after controlling for negative affect, life stress and diary completion (see Table 3.20), male temporal spillover frequency was positively related to male anxious attachment ($\beta = .21, p = .09$). However, the chi-square difference test after equality constraint inclusion demonstrated no difference in the impact of female and male anxious attachment on male temporal spillover frequency [$\chi^2 (1) = 1.34, p = .25$]. This result demonstrated a weak actor effect for males in understanding anxious attachment and male temporal spillover frequency. Female temporal spillover frequency was unrelated to female or male anxious attachment. As avoidant attachment demonstrated no bivariate relationship with temporal spillover frequency, multivariate analyses were not conducted. Additionally, temporal spillover intensity was unrelated to both avoidant and anxious attachment behavior in bivariate analyses. Thus temporal spillover intensity was also not included in the subsequent multivariate analyses.

Romantic Relationship Satisfaction.

Female and male relationship satisfaction was unrelated to female temporal spillover frequency after considering the control variables (Table 3.21). Male temporal spillover was negatively related to female relationship satisfaction ($\beta = -.28, p = .05$), with females reporting less romantic relationship satisfaction when males reported greater temporal spillover frequency. This finding demonstrated a weak partner effect for males based on the chi-square difference test as no difference occurred between female and
Table 3.20.

Attachment Behavior Predicting Temporal Spillover Frequency and Intensity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Temporal Spillover Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Anxious Attachment</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Anxious Attachment</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Negative Affect</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Negative Affect</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Life Stress</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Life Stress</td>
<td>.21+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Diary Completion</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Diary Completion</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[+ p < .10, * p < .05; \chi^2 (1) = 2.26, p = .13, CFI = .98, RMSEA = .13\]

Male satisfaction \([\chi^2 (1) = 0.37, p = .54]\). This finding follows the bivariate analyses and the proposed hypotheses for males. As the bivariate correlations between relationship satisfaction and temporal spillover intensity were statistically non-significant, these multivariate analyses were not conducted.
Table 3.21.

Romantic Relationship Satisfaction Predicting Temporal Spillover Frequency and Intensity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Temporal Spillover Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Relationship Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Relationship Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Negative Affect</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Negative Affect</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Life Stress</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Life Stress</td>
<td>.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Diary Completion</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Diary Completion</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+p < .10, * p < .05; \( \chi^2 (1) = 3.28, p = .07, CFI = .97; \) RMSEA = .17

3.2.3 Relational Spillover Occurrence and Intensity.

For the path analyses model involving relational spillover occurrence, an additional command was included to represent the categorical nature of these outcome variables. Additionally, the latent variable covariance matrix was not positive definite in some models. This event can occur for several reasons, including linear dependency
(Jöreskog & Yang, 1996), missing data, or having one variable held constant (Wothke, 1993). The preponderance of zeros (i.e., no relational spillover) may explain the not positive definite matrix issue. In these situations, control variables were removed to allow for model termination; however, this modification did not always work and therefore, the model is not presented (i.e., internalizing behavior, externalizing problems, and psychological aggression). Also, as the bivariate correlations were statistically non-significant for negotiation and relational spillover conflict occurrence, this model was not conducted. Similar to the temporal spillover models, the presented relational spillover models have equality constraints upon the inter-correlations between the female and male predictor variables and the female and male outcome variables to allow for model over-identification. Finally, all relational spillover conflict intensity models were not included due to small sample sizes (all n’s ≤ 11).

In general, the fit indices for the following models indicated good fit. The only exception is for the physical assault model. In this multivariate model, although the chi-square statistic was statistically non-significant, the CFI (.87) and RMSEA (.15) did not reach acceptable levels. Thus, this model should be interpreted with caution.

**Romantic Relationship Physical Assault.**

Female physical assault was positively related to female relational spillover occurrence ($\beta = .30, p = .05$), suggesting an actor effect (see Table 3.22). However, after inclusion of equality constraints on female and male physical assault with female
Table 3.22.

*Romantic Relationship Physical Assault Predicting Relational Spillover Occurrence.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relational Spillover Occurrence</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>β</strong></td>
<td><strong>SE</strong></td>
<td><strong>β</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Physical Assault</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Physical Assault</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05; \( \chi^2(1) = 2.88, \ p = .09, \text{CFI} = .87; \text{RMSEA} = .15*

relational spillover, no difference occurred \( \chi^2(1) = 0.42, \ p = 0.52 \). This result demonstrated a weak actor effect, such that as females reported engaging in more physical assault toward their partner, they also reported increased relational spillover. Male physical assault was unrelated to both female and male relational spillover occurrence and female physical assault was unrelated to male relational spillover occurrence.

*Attachment Behavior.*

Male avoidant attachment behavior increased as males demonstrated increased relational spillover (\( \beta = -.52; \ p = .00 \); see Table 3.23). However, chi-square difference tests after inclusion of equality constraints on female and male avoidant attachment and male relational spillover demonstrated no difference between female and male avoidant attachment.
attachment on relational spillover occurrence, suggesting a weak actor effect $[\chi^2 (1) = 2.67, p = .10]$. Female avoidant attachment behavior was unrelated to both female and male relational spillover occurrence and male avoidant attachment behavior was unrelated to male relational spillover occurrence.

For anxious attachment behavior, a couple effect occurred for females $[\chi^2 (1) = 0.001, p = .97]$ and a weak partner effect occurred for males $[\chi^2 (1) = .37, p = .54]$. For females, as both female ($\beta = .30, p = .02$) and male ($\beta = .32, p = .02$) anxious attachment increased, female relational spillover also increased. For males, as female anxious attachment increased, male relational spillover also increased ($\beta = .44, p = .00$).

**Romantic Relationship Satisfaction.**

Male relationship satisfaction (see Table 3.24) was negatively related to female relational spillover occurrence ($\beta = -.38, p = .03$) and male relational spillover occurrence ($\beta = -.69, p = .00$). Male satisfaction decreased as both female and male relational spillover increased. These results demonstrated a weak partner effect for females $[\chi^2 (1) = 0.100, p = .75]$ and a weak actor effect for males $[\chi^2 (1) = 3.12, p = .08]$ as female and male romantic relationship satisfaction did not differentially predict female and male relational spillover after inclusion of equality constraints.
Table 3.23.

Attachment Behavior Predicting Relational Spillover Occurrence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relational Spillover Occurrence</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant Attachment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Avoidant Attachment</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxious Attachment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Anxious Attachment</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Anxious Attachment</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² (1) = .82, p = .37, CFI = 1.00, RMSEA = .00
χ² (1) = .04, p = .85, CFI = 1.00, RMSEA = .00

* p < .05; ** p < .01

3.3 Aim 2 Path Analyses

Because of previous model parameter issues (i.e., untrustworthy standard errors of the model parameters), which is likely related to sample size, the following analyses only focused on Aim 2 predictors without inclusion of the Aim 1 predictors. Ideally, these models should include the statistically significant Aim 1 predictors, as proposed, but instead these models focus only on interparental and parent-child variables.
Table 3.24.

*Romantic Relationship Satisfaction and Relational Spillover Occurrence.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Relational Spillover Occurrence</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Relationship Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.24 .16</td>
<td>-.05 .25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Relationship Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.37* .17</td>
<td>-.69** .12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01

\( \chi^2 (1) = 0.42, p = .52; CFI = 1.00; RMSEA = .00 \)

### 3.3.1 Conflict Frequency and Intensity

Only those variables that demonstrated statistically significant bivariate correlations with conflict frequency and intensity were included in these analyses. However, when some variables were included in path analyses, the standard errors of the model parameters were untrustworthy. Therefore, both maternal physical assault and maternal negotiation, although demonstrating a statistically significant bivariate relationship with conflict frequency, are not presented below for conflict frequency.

Fit indices for conflict frequency models demonstrated good fit when examining the chi-square fit statistic and CFI. However, examination of the RMSEAs indicated unacceptable fit. As such, these models may not represent the most parsimonious models
Fit indices for the conflict intensity models were less conclusive. Although these models met criterion for the chi-square fit statistic, none of the models demonstrated adequate model fit when examining the CFI (range .78 to .92) and RMSEA (range .15 to .20). Thus, those models require cautious interpretation.

Maternal Physical Assault, Psychological Aggression and Negotiation.

Path analysis results demonstrated that both female-reported and male-reported self- and partner-initiated conflict intensity were unrelated to both female and male maternal physical assault (see Table 3.25). Maternal psychological aggression was unrelated to self-reported and partner-reported female and male conflict frequency (see Table 3.25). As maternal psychological aggression was unrelated at the bivariate level to conflict intensity, path analysis models were not conducted. Maternal negotiation was unrelated to self-reported or partner-reported female and male conflict intensity (see Table 3.25).

Paternal Physical Assault, Psychological Aggression and Negotiation.

No statistically significant bivariate relationships occurred between female and male paternal physical assault and paternal psychological aggression and female and male conflict frequency and between female and male paternal psychological aggression and paternal negotiation; therefore, multivariate analyses were not conducted. For conflict intensity, contrary to the predictions, male-reported female-initiated conflict
Table 3.25.

Maternal Physical Assault, Psychological Aggression and Negotiation Predicting Conflict Frequency and Intensity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict Frequency/Intensity</th>
<th>Self Report</th>
<th>Partner Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conflict Intensity**

$\chi^2 (1) = 2.83, p = .09; \text{ CFI} = .86; \text{ RMSEA} = .17$

Maternal Physical Assault

- **Female**
  - β: 0.10
  - SE: 0.13
- **Male**
  - β: 0.12
  - SE: 0.13

**Conflict Frequency**

$\chi^2 (1) = 2.41, p = .12; \text{ CFI} = .99; \text{ RMSEA} = .13$

Maternal Psychological Aggression

- **Female**
  - β: 0.07
  - SE: 0.11
- **Male**
  - β: 0.06
  - SE: 0.11

**Conflict Intensity**

$\chi^2 (1) = 3.47, p = .06; \text{ CFI} = .81; \text{ RMSEA} = .20$

Maternal Negotiation

- **Female**
  - β: -0.12
  - SE: 0.12
- **Male**
  - β: -0.20
  - SE: 0.12
intensity was negatively related to female, but not male, paternal physical assault ($\beta = - .21$, $p = .08$; see Table 3.26). Female paternal physical assault increased as male report of female conflict intensity decreased; however this actor effect was not statistically different after inclusion of equality constraints on female and male paternal physical assault for male-reported conflict intensity [$\chi^2 (1) = .02$, $p = .88$]. Female and male paternal physical assault were unrelated to self-reported female or male conflict intensity and partner-reported male conflict intensity.

Contrary to predictions, female paternal negotiation predicted higher frequency of female-reported male-initiated conflict ($\beta = .19$, $p = .09$; see Table 3.26). However, the chi-square difference test after the inclusion of equality constraints indicated no difference between the impact of female paternal negotiation and male paternal negotiation [$\chi^2 (1) = .90$, $p = .34$], demonstrating a weak partner effect. Also contrary to predictions, male paternal negotiation predicted higher frequency of male-reported self-initiated conflicts ($\beta = .19$, $p = .10$; see Table 3.26). Again, the chi-square difference test indicated no difference between the impact of female and male paternal negotiation [$\chi^2 (1) = .89$, $p = .35$], showing a weak actor effect.
Table 3.26.

Paternal Physical Assault Predicting Conflict Intensity and Paternal Negotiation

Predicting Conflict Frequency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict Frequency/Intensity</th>
<th>Self Report</th>
<th>Partner Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conflict Intensity**

χ² (1) = 2.40, p = .12; CFI= .92; RMSEA = .15

Paternal Physical Assault

- Female: β = .04, SE = .13
- Male: β = -.12, SE = .13

**Conflict Frequency**

χ² (1) = 1.94, p = .16; CFI= .99; RMSEA = .11

Paternal Negotiation

- Female: β = .03, SE = .12
- Male: β = .06, SE = .12

+ p < .10

Mother-to-Child Corporal Punishment, Psychological Aggression and Non-Violent Discipline.

Both female and male mother-to-child corporal punishment were not statistically correlated with conflict frequency and intensity; therefore, multivariate analyses were not
calculated. For mother-to-child psychological aggression, self-reported and partner-reported female and male conflict frequency were unrelated to psychological aggression (see Table 3.27). As hypothesized, higher mother-to-daughter psychological aggression predicted increased self-reported male-initiated conflict intensity ($\beta = .27; p = .03$). After inclusion of equality constraints on female and male mother-to-child psychological aggression, female mother-to-child psychological aggression demonstrated a strong partner effect $[\chi^2 (1) = 4.35, p = .03]$. Mother-to-daughter psychological aggression was unrelated to self-reported female conflict intensity and female and male partner-reported conflict intensity. Contrary to predictions, mother-to-son psychological aggression was negatively related to male-reported female-initiated conflict intensity ($\beta = -.21, p = .08$). Chi-square difference tests did not demonstrate statistically significant difference between mother-to-daughter and mother-to-son psychological aggression for male-reported female conflict intensity $[\chi^2 (1) = 1.55, p = .21]$. This weak partner effect showed that as mother-to-son psychological aggression increased, male-reported female-initiated conflict intensity decreased.

Mother-to-child non-violent discipline was unassociated with female-reported and male-reported self- and partner-initiated conflict frequency; therefore mother-to-child non-violent discipline was not included in the multivariate analyses for conflict frequency. Mother-to-child non-violent discipline was unrelated to self-reported and partner-reported female and male conflict intensity (see Table 3.28).
Table 3.27.
Mother-to-child Psychological Aggression Predicting Conflict Frequency and Intensity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-Reported</th>
<th></th>
<th>Partner-Reported</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict Frequency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[χ^2 (1) = 2.524, p = .11; CFI= .99; RMSEA = .14]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-to-Female Psychological Aggression</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-to-Male Psychological Aggression</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conflict Intensity**

[χ^2 (1) = 3.31, p = .07; CFI= .87; RMSEA = .19]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-Report</th>
<th>Partner-Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-to-Female Psychological Aggression</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-to-Male Psychological Aggression</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ p < .10, * p < .05

Table 3.28. Mother-to-Child Non-Violent Discipline and Conflict Intensity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-Report</th>
<th>Partner-Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-to-Female Non-Violent Discipline</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-to-Male Non-Violent Discipline</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: χ^2 (1) = 3.36, p = .07; CFI=.78; RMSEA = .20*
None of the father-to-child conflict resolution tactics were related to female-reported and male-reported self-initiated and partner-initiated conflict frequency and intensity in the bivariate analyses. Therefore, these multivariate models were not conducted.

3.3.2 Temporal Spillover Frequency and Intensity.

Temporal spillover frequency models only included the following predictor variables that were related at the bivariate level: maternal psychological aggression and paternal negotiation. For both of these models, family status was entered as a control variable. For temporal spillover intensity, the following predictor variables were included based on the bivariate correlations with temporal spillover intensity: maternal physical assault, psychological aggression, and negotiation, paternal psychological aggression and negotiation, and mother-to-child non-violent discipline. To avoid just-identification, equality constraints were included on the inter-correlations between predictor variables and outcome variables to test model fit. Generally, model fit was acceptable to good when examining all three fit indices (chi-square fit statistic, CFI, RMSEA); however there were two exceptions. The model for paternal psychological aggression and temporal spillover intensity demonstrated poor model fit across all indices; thus this model should be interpreted with caution. Also, the model for paternal negotiation and temporal spillover intensity demonstrated adequate fit when examining the chi-square fit statistic.
and CFI; however the RMSEA was greater than .10 and thus suggestive that this model is not parsimonious (Hancock & Mueller, 2011).

Maternal Physical Assault, Psychological Aggression, and Negotiation.

Both female ($\beta = .21, p = .05$) and male ($\beta = .25, p = .02$) temporal spillover was positively related to male maternal psychological aggression (see Table 3.29), with higher frequencies of female and male temporal spillover related to higher rates of male maternal psychological aggression, even after controlling for the male family status ($\beta = .24, p = .02$; i.e., dual biological family versus other). After inclusion of equality constraints on the inter-correlations, these findings further suggested a strong actor effect for males [$\chi^2 (1) = 6.01, p = .01$] and a weak partner effect for females [$\chi^2 (1) = 2.97, p = .08$] for understanding temporal spillover frequency with maternal psychological aggression. Both maternal physical assault and negotiation were unassociated at the bivariate level and thus were not included in the subsequent multivariate models.

For temporal spillover intensity (see Table 3.29), greater male maternal physical assault related to greater female temporal spillover intensity ($\beta = .53, p = .01$), demonstrating a strong partner effect for females [$\chi^2 (1) = 4.99, p = .03$] after inclusion of the equality constraints. Female maternal physical assault was unrelated to either female or male temporal spillover intensity.
Table 3.29. Maternal Physical Assault, Psychological Aggression, and Negotiation

Predicting Temporal Spillover Frequency and Intensity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Temporal Spillover Frequency</th>
<th>Temporal Spillover Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Physical Assault</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Psychological Aggression(^a)(^b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.21+</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Family Status</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Negotiation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)\(\chi^2 (1) = 0.16, p = .69;\) CFI= 1.00, RMSEA = .00 for temporal spillover frequency

\(^b\)\(\chi^2 (1) = 0.35, p = .55;\) CFI= 1.00, RMSEA = .00 for temporal spillover intensity

Dashes indicate that the bivariate correlations were not significant and thus these models were not tested.
As expected, greater male maternal psychological aggression related to greater female temporal spillover intensity ($\beta = .42$, $p = .04$). As the chi-square difference test demonstrated no difference between female and male psychological aggression in predicting female temporal spillover intensity [$\chi^2 (1) = 2.11$, $p = .15$], this finding suggested a weak partner effect for female temporal spillover intensity. Conversely, as females reported greater maternal psychological aggression, males reported less temporal spillover intensity ($\beta = -.70$, $p = .00$). The chi-square difference test after inclusion of equality constraints demonstrated a marginal difference between female and male maternal psychological aggression for male temporal spillover intensity [$\chi^2 (1) = 2.82$, $p = .09$], suggesting a weak partner effect.

Finally, contrary to the hypothesis, female maternal negotiation marginally increased with greater female temporal spillover intensity ($\beta = .37$, $p = .07$), demonstrating a weak actor effect for females as the chi-square difference test was statistically non-significant [$\chi^2 (1) = .58$, $p = .45$]. Additionally, this finding was not evident in the bivariate analyses; therefore this finding should be interpreted with caution. Neither female nor male maternal negotiation was related to male temporal spillover intensity.

*Paternal Physical Assault, Psychological Aggression, and Negotiation.*

Neither female nor male paternal physical assault were related at the bivariate level to female or male temporal spillover frequency and intensity. Additionally, neither female nor male paternal psychological aggression were related to female or male
temporal spillover frequency in the bivariate analyses. Female and male paternal psychological aggression were both unrelated to both female and male temporal spillover intensity in the multivariate analysis (see Table 3.30).

After controlling for male family status, only male paternal negotiation was marginally and positively, related to female temporal spillover frequency ($\beta = .21$, $p = .06$; see Table 3.30). This result demonstrated a weak partner effect as the chi-square difference test for female and male paternal negotiation was statistically non-significant [$\chi^2(1) = 0.00$, $p = .99$]. After controlling for male family status, female and male paternal negotiation was unrelated to male temporal spillover frequency. Female temporal spillover intensity increased as male paternal negotiation increased ($\beta = .47$, $p = .02$), but the chi-square difference test demonstrated a statistically non-significant difference between female and male paternal negotiation in understanding female temporal spillover intensity [$\chi^2(1) = .01$, $p = .92$]. Therefore, this result demonstrated a weak partner effect. Also, female paternal negotiation was positively related to male temporal spillover intensity ($\beta = .66$; $p = .01$). Similarly to the results for female temporal spillover, however, the chi-square difference test demonstrated a statistically non-significant difference between female and male paternal negotiation in understanding male temporal spillover intensity [$\chi^2(1) = 0.72$, $p = .39$], suggesting a weak partner effect.
Table 3.30. Paternal Psychological Aggression and Negotiation Predicting Temporal Spillover Frequency and Intensity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paternal Psychological Aggression</th>
<th>Temporal Spillover Frequency</th>
<th>Temporal Spillover Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Psychological Aggression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Paternal Negotiation**

| Female | .17  | .10  | .13  | .11 | .23  | .21  | .66** | .26 |
| Male   | .21+ | .11  | .11  | .11 | .47* | .19  | -.08  | .18 |
| Male Family | .18+ | .11  | .34**| .10 | -    | -    | -     | -   |

Dashes indicate that the bivariate correlations are not significant and thus these values are not included as the models were not tested.

+ p < .10; * p < .05; ** p < .01

\[ \chi^2(1) = 0.15, p = .69; \text{CFI} = 1.00; \text{RMSEA} = .00, \text{for temporal spillover frequency} \]

\[ \chi^2(1) = 1.44, p = .23; \text{CFI} = .91; \text{RMSEA} = .16, \text{for temporal spillover intensity} \]
Mother-to-Child and Father-to-Child Corporal Punishment, Psychological Aggression and Non-Violent Discipline.

Mother-to-child non-violent discipline was unrelated to both female and male temporal spillover intensity (see Table 3.31). Also, bivariate correlations did not demonstrate statistically significant relationships between the other maternal and paternal parent-child variables (i.e., corporeal punishment, psychological aggression) for both females and males; therefore the multivariate analyses were not conducted.

Table 3.31.

Mother-to-Child Non-Violent Discipline Predicting Temporal Spillover Intensity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Temporal Spillover Intensity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-to-Female Non-Violent Discipline</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-to-Male Non-Violent Discipline</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ²(1) = 0.20, p = .66, CFI = 1.00; RMSEA = .00

3.3.3 Relational Spillover Occurrence.

Relational spillover occurrence models only include the following predictor variables that were bivariately related: maternal physical assault and father-to-child non-violent discipline. When running these models, the categorical nature of relational
spillover occurrence was incorporated. Finally, inter-correlations were included on the predictor variables and outcome variables to allow for model over-identification.

*MATERNAL PHYSICAL ASSAULT.*

As expected, male maternal physical assault was positively related to male relational spillover ($\beta = .55, p = .00$), such that as males reported more maternal physical assault, they also reported greater occurrence of relational spillover (see Table 3.32). However, chi-square difference tests demonstrated no difference between female and male maternal physical assault in predicting male relational spillover [$\chi^2 (1) = 1.23, p = .27$], suggesting only a weak actor effect. Female maternal physical assault was marginally related to female maternal physical assault ($\beta = .28, p = .09$), such that as females reported more maternal physical assault, they also reported greater relational spillover occurrence. Again, chi-square difference tests demonstrated no difference between female and male maternal physical assault in predicting female relational spillover [$\chi^2 (1) = .04, p = .84$], again suggesting only a weak actor effect. The model fit indices, however, do not suggest a good model fit; thus these results should be interpreted with caution.
Table 3.32.

Maternal Physical Assault and Relational Spillover Occurrence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relational Spillover Occurrence</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Physical Assault</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.28+</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ p < .10; * p < .05

$\chi^2 (1) = 3.76, p = .05; CFI = 0.62; RMSEA = .18$

Father-to-Child Non-Violent Discipline.

Male father-to-child non-violent discipline (see Table 3.33) was negatively related to female relational spillover ($\beta = -.45, p = .02$); whereas female father-to-child non-violent discipline was positively related to male relational spillover ($\beta = .46, p = .06$). For females, a strong partner effect occurred [$\chi^2 (1) = 4.01, p = .04$], demonstrating that as male father-to-child non-violent discipline strategies decreased, female relational spillover increased. Conversely, as female father-to-child non-violent discipline strategies increased, male relational spillover also increased. However, the chi-square difference test indicated no difference between female and male father-to-child non-violent discipline strategies for understanding male relational spillover [$\chi^2 (1) = 1.20, p = .27$],
suggesting only a weak partner effect for male relational spillover occurrence. Model fit indices for this model suggested a good fit for the data.

*Table 3.33.*

*Father-to-Child Non-Violent Discipline and Relational Spillover Occurrence.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Relational Spillover Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-to-child non-violent discipline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-.45*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ p < .10; * p < .05

$\chi^2 (1) = .10, p = .76, CFI = 1.00; \text{RMSEA} = .00$
CHAPTER 4

Discussion

In summary, this study demonstrated that conflict is normative in young adult romantic relationships. However types of conflict that may be worse (i.e., spillover) occur fairly infrequently. Additionally many predictors that were useful for understanding conflict demonstrated crossover effects to both temporal and relational spillover of conflict. Specifically, some constructs better predicted frequency of conflict, such as relationship physical assault, negotiation, anxious attachment and satisfaction, whereas psychological aggression, negotiation, avoidant attachment, and satisfaction predicted intensity. Also, many gender differences appeared that were not readily evident in previous studies that utilized only single informants. These gender differences were evident in understanding both what predicts female and male conflict and also which constructs predicted conflict. Interestingly, these gender differences occurred both in constructs based on the current romantic relationship and in what occurred in the previous interparental and parent-child relationships of these young adults. This study provides an initial step to continue understanding how cross-informant data may provide clearer knowledge of the dyadic interplay that occurs in heterosexual romantic relationships during young adulthood.
In the remainder of this chapter I will discuss the findings in terms of both the rate and intensity of conflict in these relationships. Furthermore, I will revisit the study aims and hypotheses. Following, I will evaluate the daily diary methodology in terms of reactivity and methodology. Finally, I will discuss clinical implications and study limitations.

4.1 Conflict, Temporal Spillover and Relational Spillover Frequency and Intensity

An initial objective of this study was to understand the rate and intensity of conflict in young adult romantic relationships. On average, conflict occurred on less than 10% of days, suggesting that conflict was generally a low base rate interaction in these young adult couples. Many other studies have reported higher rates of conflict. However those studies (Linder & Collins, 2005; Martin, 1990; Reese-Weber & Bartle-Haring, 1998; Reese-Weber & Kahn, 2005; Reese-Weber & Marchand, 2002) generally have examined conflict through retrospective reports of resolution strategies without specifically inquiring about or measuring conflict, which may or may not be resolved. In another daily diary study of conflict (Campbell et al., 2005), couples reported higher rates of conflict across 14 days (on average, 6.5 conflicts for females and 7.7 conflicts for males). The substantial differences in overall rates of conflict may be due to the assessment of conflict, as Campbell and colleagues asked about any “conflict”, implying an open-ended definition, whereas I used a more specific question about whether a partner did something to make the individual upset, which initially avoids use of the word ‘conflict’.
Although this study demonstrated that conflict occurred at a low daily frequency, conflict affected many romantic relationships, as 61% of females and 73% of males reported conflict on at least one day. However, individuals frequently disagreed that conflict occurred, with couples agreeing about an incident of conflict on less than 2.5% of the days. This discrepancy may best be explained through individual interpretations of dyadic interactions, as other research has demonstrated that individuals often construct different interpretations of the same event, specifically conflict (Sillars et al., 2004). Perceptions of dyadic interactions may also be biased by many other factors that individuals bring into the intimate situation, such as affect or stress.

Interestingly, the frequency of isolated conflicts was not directly related to the reported intensity of conflicts with the exception of male-reported female-initiated conflicts. Perhaps couples who engaged in more frequent conflict have incorporated positive conflict resolution strategies into their conflicts leading to lower intensity of these conflicts. In fact, the positive relationship between conflict frequency and romantic relationship negotiation supported this notion, which suggested that individuals who engaged in more conflict also reported using more negotiation skills. Statistically significant associations were evident, however, for temporal spillover frequency and intensity, suggesting that as conflict spilled across multiple days, intensity increased. Unresolved conflicts have greater intensity (Bevan et al., 2008), and because temporal spillover involves subsequent days of conflict, these conflicts may be unresolved.

Participants most frequently reported conflict about communication issues for both isolated incidents of conflicts and temporal spillover of conflict. Examples of
communication problems included: not talking to the partner, mis-communication about plans, and not communicating well. Additionally, other common conflict topics included interpersonal problems (i.e., “taking problems out on me”, “saying something that offended me”), multiple topics (i.e., communication and interpersonal problems) and miscellaneous topics (i.e., thanksgiving party invitations, semantics). Thus, these findings suggested that young adult couples reported the greatest disagreements as involving poor communication and interpersonal interactions as opposed to individual factors (i.e., culture, personality).

Additionally, this study investigated additional forms of conflict, namely temporal spillover and relational spillover. Again, both temporal and relational spillover occurred within a small (17%, 11%, respectively) sub-set of this sample. Similar to conflict frequency, only a small percentage of individuals (6 couples) agreed on the occurrence of temporal spillover and only one couple reported having conflicts with both their romantic partner and another person on the same day. Again, different interpretations of situations may explain these discrepancies (Sillars et al., 2004). Finally, males reported fewer instances of relational spillover and only reported relational spillover after a female-initiated conflict. Thus, relational spillover may be more prevalent for females. To explain this discrepancy, females may have more opportunities for relational spillover as females tend to discuss relationship experiences more frequently with others (Aries, 1996).
4.2 Aim 1

4.2.1 Conflict Frequency

For both females and males, higher rates of male, but not female, physical assault history predicted higher rates of female and male-initiated conflicts. These findings matched other empirical conclusions where higher rates of physical aggression predicted higher rates of conflict in romantic relationships (i.e., Gryl et al., 1991; Riggs et al., 1990). The findings from the current study demonstrated that rates of daily conflict, as opposed to retrospective self-defined conflict interactions, as measured in the studies by both Gryl and colleagues (1991) and Riggs and colleagues (1990), were directly related to male physical assault history. Additionally, my study highlighted the greater impact of male physical aggression in understanding conflict after considering female contributions of physical aggression and other important variables (i.e., negative affect, stress). An explanation for this gender discrepancy could be that perhaps females who date more physically aggressive males may more easily identify conflict because conflict is more apparent in their relationship, particularly if it is accompanied by physical aggression.

Higher rates of female negotiation predicted greater frequency of female-reported male-initiated conflict frequency, but not female-initiated or self-reported male-initiated conflict. Negotiation commonly occurs as a common strategy to resolve conflict in early romantic relationships (i.e., Laursen, 1996); therefore, negotiation may occur as a resolution strategy for conflict. However, female negotiation was only associated to their own reporting on partner initiated-conflict. Perhaps females who regularly engaged in negotiation were better equipped at identifying conflicts initiated by their partner because
they had greater experience using positive coping strategies to resolve those conflicts and thus they identified conflicts as less innocuous.

Although avoidant attachment was unrelated to conflict frequency, higher levels of female anxious attachment predicted greater female-reported self-initiated conflict frequency. This finding is consistent with the conclusion of Simpson and colleagues (2006) that anxiously attached individuals reported higher frequency of conflict compared to individuals with lower levels anxious attachment. Importantly, this finding extends that of Simpson and colleagues as they demonstrated this association using a single informant design. This study further demonstrated that this association may be more salient for females after examination of the dyadic interplay of attachment and conflict frequency and consideration of male behavior.

Females who reported higher levels of relationship satisfaction dated males who reported initiating fewer conflicts, whereas the same was not true for male level of satisfaction. This finding is consistent with previous research on the association between relationship satisfaction and conflict frequency (i.e., Cramer, 2006; Kurdek, 1994; McGonagle et al., 1993). At the same time, the findings from the current study extend previous research by highlighting that this association differs for males and females.

4.2.2 Conflict Intensity

Contrary to expectations, as male avoidant attachment increased, the intensity in self-initiated conflicts decreased. This finding is contrary to previous findings (Cann et al., 2008; Eberhart & Hammen, 2009) which revealed increased conflict intensity in individuals with greater avoidant attachment behavior. However, Cann and colleagues
(2008) examined one individual involved in a dating relationship, as opposed to examining the concurrent impact of both individuals and their attachment history in predicting conflict intensity. Additionally, Cann and colleagues focused on intense conflict styles, such as dominating and obliging styles, as opposed to conflict intensity. Additionally, Eberhart & Hammen (2009) utilized a female-only sample involved in a current romantic relationship to reach their conclusion, whereas the current study illustrated the importance of male history for predicting intensity of conflict.

Similar to conflict frequency, conflict intensity for both self-reported and partner-reported female conflict intensity increased when male, but not female, romantic relationship satisfaction decreased. Specifically, these findings suggested that male satisfaction, more than female satisfaction, predicted female conflict intensity through both self-report and partner-report. This conclusion followed some previous research (i.e., Laurent et al., 2008), but not other (i.e., Cramer, 2002) in demonstrating the importance of relationship satisfaction for understanding conflict intensity.

In the Laurent and colleagues study, they demonstrated that increased observed female psychological aggression during a conflict resolution task, a proxy for intensity of conflicts, predicted lower male relationship satisfaction, similar to the findings in this study. Laurent and colleagues inferred that perhaps males become more distressed during conflicts with higher intensity because they rely on their partners to guide resolution during conflict as they also demonstrated that females who displayed greater positive engagement during conflict had partners who reported greater satisfaction. Although Laurent and colleagues focused on an at-risk sample of boys (Oregon Youth Study) and
my sample represented a more typical sample, my findings demonstrated that this relationship remains relevant across a more inclusive sample of young adult romantic relationships. Although the Cramer (2002) study demonstrated that both major and minor conflicts predicted lower satisfaction, suggesting that conflict of any intensity level predicts reduced satisfaction, his study utilized single informants in past or current relationships. This study expanded his research by examining the cross-informant impact of conflict intensity on current relationship satisfaction, particularly how intensity impacts male satisfaction.

4.2.3 Temporal Spillover Frequency.

In line with predictions and the findings with isolated conflict, I found that as males reported greater physical assault, females reported higher rates of temporal spillover frequency. This finding demonstrated a crossover effect of physical assault from conflict frequency to temporal spillover of conflict. Again, higher rates of male physical assault history predicted increased frequency of female reported temporal spillover, whereas female physical assault history was unrelated to temporal spillover frequency. Additionally, these findings are consistent with previous research demonstrating the importance of physical assault in understanding conflict (i.e., Gryl et al., 1991; Riggs et al., 1990). In this current study, similar gender differences with conflict frequency emerged for temporal spillover.

Also consistent with predictions, males, but not females, reported a greater occurrence of temporal spillover when they reported greater anxious attachment behavior. This result is consistent with previous research demonstrating a positive
relationship between conflict and anxious attachment behavior (i.e., Campbell et al., 2005). Importantly, this study expanded on the results by Campbell and others by disentangling gender differences as their conclusions were based on a combined sample of both female and male anxiously attached individuals. Perhaps male anxious attachment behavior may be more impacted by repeated conflicts in subsequent days, whereas females are more impacted by a cumulative effect of conflict across longer lengths of time.

Similar to findings for conflict frequency and in line with previous research (Cramer, 2006; Kurdek, 1992; McGonagle et al., 1993), males reported initiating more temporal spillover of conflict when females reported lower romantic relationship satisfaction. Again, perhaps female, more so than male, level of satisfaction decreased when males repeatedly initiated conflicts that spillover across time. Importantly, this interesting gender difference only became evident after inclusion of dyadic information.

4.3 Temporal Spillover Intensity.

When males reported higher levels of psychological aggression, females reported initiating temporal spillover conflicts of greater intensity. Interestingly, psychological aggression predicted temporal spillover intensity, whereas it was unrelated to conflict frequency, conflict intensity and temporal spillover frequency. These current results provide an important contribution by demonstrating that male psychological aggression may specifically predict female-initiated conflicts that intensify across time. This finding extended previous qualitative results that illustrated that conflicts escalate when individual control of a situation feels challenged (Winstok & Eisikovits, 2007). Conflict
initiated by females, who are in relationships with more psychologically aggressive males, may perpetuate and intensify conflicts in an attempt to gain control of the conflict or disagreement. On the other hand, psychological aggression by males may also intensify conflict that is already occurring.

Also supporting predictions and following results with temporal spillover frequency, temporal spillover intensity was related to female negotiation; as female temporal spillover intensity increased, females also reported greater use of negotiation. These findings were not supported in the preliminary analyses, so this conclusion should be considered cautiously. However, perhaps examination of both female and male negotiation use was necessary to best understand the impact of female negotiation. In understanding conflict resolution strategies that impact temporal spillover intensity, perhaps females use more negotiation and males use more psychological aggression as temporal spillover conflict intensifies. Although this discrepancy has not uniformly been supported in research on earlier adolescent romantic relationship conflict (i.e., Feldman & Gowen, 1998), this study may demonstrate one specific type of conflict (temporal spillover) that differentially intensifies based on female versus male use of conflict resolution strategies in young adulthood.

4.3.1 Relational Spillover Occurrence.

Findings from physical assault and conflict frequency were replicated in results on relational spillover occurrence. Similar to the results for both conflict and temporal spillover conflict frequency, increased physical assault use predicted greater occurrence of relational spillover. With increased likelihood of female relational spillover
occurrence, females also reported using greater physical assault tactics in conflicts. Interestingly, this conclusion focused on the impact of female use of physical assault in predicting relational spillover occurrence, whereas male use better predicted conflict and temporal spillover of conflict frequency. This conclusion advanced previous research on physical assault use (i.e., Gryl et al., 1991; Riggs et al., 1990) by demonstrating that gender may differentially predict types of conflict (i.e., isolated conflict and temporal spillover for males, and relational spillover for females). Perhaps females, who generally report more extensive social networks (Moore, 1990; Walker, 1994), may be more emotionally reactive (i.e., engage in conflict) in other relationships after engaging in romantic relationship conflict, particularly if they are predisposed to engage in physical assault. Importantly, however, negative affect and stress, which were related to female physical assault, could not be included in the multivariate models. These variables may have also offered important contributions to the explanation of the relationship between physical assault and female relational spillover.

Higher avoidant attachment behavior predicted a higher likelihood of relational spillover. The likelihood for male relational spillover increased as males reported higher avoidant attachment behavior. Specifically, these results suggested that avoidant attachment may impact relational spillover of males and not females. Avoidant attachment reflects beliefs about how other people provide support or comfort to oneself (Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998; Fraley & Shaver, 2000; Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994). Therefore, males who reported more avoidant attachment behavior, and thus feel less secure in their relationships, may have less supportive or close relationships with others.
After their partners initiate conflicts, males may be more likely to engage in conflict with other individuals, particularly if they turn to others for support.

Females reported a greater likelihood for the occurrence of relational spillover as both female and male anxious attachment behavior increased. Additionally, increased female anxious attachment predicted an increased likelihood for male relational spillover. These findings extended initial findings linking female anxious attachment behavior to female conflict frequency and male anxious attachment behavior to male temporal spillover frequency. Individuals with anxious attachment styles often are fearful of being abandoned or rejected by their romantic partners (Hazan & Shaver, 1994). Therefore, the occurrence of relational spillover may work as a mechanism for individuals to work through conflicts (i.e., continue engaging in conflict) with other close individuals without adding strain to the romantic relationship.

Finally, as male satisfaction decreased, the likelihood of female and male relational spillover occurrence increased demonstrating a crossover effect from both conflict and temporal spillover frequency. However, female relationship satisfaction did not predict the occurrence of relational spillover, suggesting that male relationship satisfaction may be more important in understanding relational spillover. Importantly, this study expanded previous research (Cramer, 2006; Kurdek, 1992; McGonagle et al., 1993) linking relationship satisfaction with conflict by demonstrating that satisfaction is important in understanding many types of conflict.

In summary, different romantic relationship conflict tactic strategies predicted conflict frequency and intensity, as well as temporal spillover and relational spillover.
Specifically, physical assault predicted frequency of conflict, temporal spillover and relational spillover, whereas negotiation predicted only conflict frequency and psychological aggression predicted only temporal spillover intensity. Attachment style also predicted conflict, with anxious attachment predicting conflict frequency, temporal spillover frequency, and relational spillover occurrence and avoidant attachment predicting both conflict intensity and relational spillover occurrence. Finally, romantic relationship satisfaction most consistently predicted all outcome variables, with the exception of temporal spillover intensity. Importantly, female and male history differentially predicted outcomes, providing support for continued inclusion of cross-informant data in the study of romantic relationships.

Surprisingly, individual psychopathology - both internalizing and externalizing problems - did not demonstrate relevance to any of the outcome variables. These constructs were measured using a broad-band scale encompassing many issues, such as depression and anxiety for the internalizing scales, and rule-breaking and aggression for the externalizing scales. Previous research linked specific factors, such as depression or anxiety, to conflict (i.e., Beach et al., 1998; Beach et al., 1990; Davila, 2001; Londahl et al., 2005; Reese-Weber & Marchand, 2002). The broad-band scales used in this study may have masked important independent contributions for understanding conflict. Perhaps narrow-band measures (i.e., depression, anxiety, withdrawal, aggressive behavior) may have demonstrated unique relationships with the outcome variables.
4.4 Aim 2

4.4.1 Conflict Frequency

Contrary to predictions, greater paternal negotiation use toward mothers predicted increases in both self-reported and partner-reported male conflict frequency. Males reported higher rates of self-initiated conflict frequency when they also reported greater paternal use of negotiation in conflicts. Similarly, as females reported greater paternal use of negotiation, they also reported males initiated more conflict. This study was the first to my knowledge to examine interparental conflict resolution strategies to predict young adult romantic relationship conflict. These findings suggested that perhaps only paternal negotiation predicts conflict frequency and only for males, similar to the positive relationship between male negotiation use and female-reported male conflict frequency. Perhaps males learned negotiation behavior from their fathers and maintained this behavior into later romantic relationships. Additionally, from a mate selection perspective, females may choose to date males who engage in similar negotiation styles to their own fathers. Finally, negotiation, although not a negative behavior per se, reflects at a minimum the occurrence of conflict or disagreement. Conflict may have occurred more in these families of origin, thus predisposing these young adults to a belief that higher rates of conflict are normative.

4.4.2 Conflict Intensity.

Mother-to-child psychological aggression predicted conflict intensity for both females and males. For females, higher mother-to-son psychological aggression predicted
lower male-reported female-initiated conflict intensity, whereas for males, higher female mother-to-child psychological aggression predicted higher self-reported male-initiated conflict intensity. Interestingly, young adult psychological aggression was not directly related to conflict intensity. These initial findings on the importance of mother-to-child psychological aggression in understanding romantic relationship conflict suggested that perhaps individuals are more directly impacted by psychological aggression inflicted by their mothers. Furthermore, these results extended previous empirical findings that demonstrated that parent psychological aggression predicted negative conflict resolution strategies (Linder & Collins, 2005; Martin, 1990) by demonstrating that parental, specifically maternal, use of psychological aggression predicted conflict intensity.

Important gender differences also emerged such that higher mother-to-child psychological aggression decreased female intensity, but increased male intensity. Perhaps male intensity increased because of the female response to conflict, which may be mirrored from interactions females experienced with their mother. If mothers were more psychologically aggressive toward their daughters, daughters may have internalized this interaction and thus may utilize a similar style with their partner. This style then may lead to greater conflict intensity by males. Because this study was the first to demonstrate this conclusion, further replication is necessary to understand this connection. Individuals can also reject models of conflict resolution utilized within the family of origin (Sillars et al., 2004). Perhaps males react differently with their partners than how their mothers interacted with them which may lead to reduced intensity of female conflict.
4.4.3 Temporal Spillover Frequency.

To my knowledge, this is the first study to demonstrate the importance of interparental psychological aggression and negotiation history in understanding its impact on temporal spillover of conflict. Therefore, the presented findings are preliminary and require further study to strength these conclusions. Both males and females reported greater frequency of self-initiated temporal spillover when males reported greater history of maternal psychological aggression use toward fathers. Therefore, males exposed to higher levels of maternal psychological aggression were more likely to have greater temporal spillover of conflict in their relationships. Similar to the findings for conflict intensity, young adult psychological aggression use was unrelated to temporal spillover frequency, but maternal history of psychological aggression to fathers, but not their children, predicted temporal spillover frequency. Additionally, these current findings demonstrated that only male family history specifically mattered for understanding temporal spillover frequency. This conclusion differs from previous research which found that both female and male interparental history predicted conflict behavior (i.e., Martin, 1990; Reese-Weber & Kahn, 1998). However, these previous studies examined this association using single informants and did not dissect these associations by gender. Furthermore, this study extended these previous findings by demonstrating the importance of interparental psychological aggression in predicting temporal spillover of conflict.

Males reported a greater history of paternal negotiation when females reported greater temporal spillover frequency. This finding extended the finding between male
paternal negotiation and female conflict frequency, demonstrating another crossover effect for conflict frequency to temporal spillover. Although I predicted a greater history of paternal negotiation would be related to less temporal spillover of conflict, this relationship followed trends demonstrated with both young adult and interparental negotiation and conflict. Importantly, these findings are an initial step in clarifying the importance of interparental relationship history on conflict in young adult romantic relationships, specifically in conflicts that spill over across time.

4.4.4 Temporal Spillover Intensity.

This study was also the first to demonstrate which maternal and paternal conflict resolution strategies were relevant for understanding temporal spillover intensity. Males reported greater maternal use of physical assault and psychological aggression and females reported increased use of maternal negotiation as temporal spillover intensity increased for females. These findings demonstrated how the history of maternal conflict resolution tactics differentially impacted what females and males bring into their current romantic relationship, particularly in conflicts that spillover across time and increase in intensity. These associations showed that specific maternal conflict resolution techniques may uniquely predict gender differences for temporal spillover. Additionally, and somewhat surprising, higher rates of female maternal psychological aggression predicted lower rates of male temporal spillover intensity. In the examination of paternal strategies, only paternal use of negotiation predicted both female and male temporal spillover intensity. Females reported their fathers used more negotiation tactics when male
intensity increased. Males reported their fathers used more negotiation tactics as female intensity increased.

Based on theoretical work that interparental conflict creates learning opportunities for offspring to model in later romantic conflict (Duggan, O’Brien, & Kennedy, 2001; O’Brien, Balto, Erber, & Gee, 1995; O’Brien & Chin, 1998; Shulman, 2003), these findings were generally expected, with the exception of the positive associations between negotiation and temporal spillover intensity and the association between female maternal psychological aggression and male intensity. However, the gender differences were somewhat surprising, as previous research examining the impact of interparental conflict resolution strategies on young adult romantic relationships has not found gender differences (i.e., Linder & Collins, 2005; Martin, 1990; Reese-Weber & Bartle-Haring, 1998; Reese-Weber & Kahn, 1998). Importantly, these previous studies differed markedly from the current study by examining young adult use of conflict resolution strategies as opposed to temporal spillover intensity which may or may not incorporate conflict resolution strategies.

Regarding the unexpected findings with maternal and paternal negotiation, this finding extended other conclusions on the history of interparental negotiation with conflict frequency and temporal spillover frequency. What is more interesting is the unexpected conclusion that increased maternal psychological aggression in female families of origin predicted lower temporal spillover intensity in males. This finding has not been previously documented, and thus, further research is necessary to document the validity of this finding.
4.4.5 Relational Spillover Occurrence.

For both females and males, their own maternal physical assault history best predicted relational spillover. Females and males reported a greater likelihood of relational spillover when they reported higher rates of maternal physical assault. These results demonstrated that physical assault conflict resolution strategies of one’s family of origin may more greatly impact one’s own relational spillover compared to physical assault by mothers of one’s partners. Specifically, maternal physical assault emerged as a predictor only of relational spillover. It is unclear why maternal, and not paternal, physical assault related to relational spillover. Additionally, as relational spillover was a construct new to this study, previous research was limited to help interpret this association. Further study of this association is necessary.

Partner history of paternal non-violent discipline impacted the occurrence of both female and male relational spillover. Females reported a greater likelihood of the occurrence of relational spillover when males reported more paternal non-violent discipline strategies. Similarly, greater use of paternal non-violent discipline strategies by fathers of females predicted a greater likelihood of male relational spillover occurrence. These findings demonstrated that what partners bring into the romantic relationship from their fathers’ behavior toward them may more greatly impact the occurrence of relational spillover of their partner. Perhaps, individuals who were exposed to paternal use of appropriate discipline strategies may have learned how to resolve conflict within their relationships making it unnecessary to bring conflict into other relationships. However, it
is unclear why the same relationship did not exist for maternal use of non-violent discipline strategies.

4.5 Reactivity of Daily Diary

This current study extended previous research on romantic relationships by utilizing daily diary methodology. Daily diaries provide many advantages to the study of behavior compared to more traditional methods, such as retrospective reports. First, individuals report on events and behavior as they occur in their natural environment (Reis, 1994). Additionally, diaries reduce poor memory and can improve accuracy of behavior counts (Bolger et al., 2003). Despite these advantages, daily diary studies often are subject to many problems, including reactance, habituation, and fatigue (Bolger et al., 2003). Therefore, the importance of examining these factors is critical in daily diary studies to reach accurate conclusions. Initial examination of the data suggested some reactivity to completing the daily diary with a sub-set of this sample; however, the findings generally demonstrated accurate assessments. In general, participants reported answering the daily diary honestly to very honestly and fighting no more or less than average. Thus, the data likely represented typical behavior for these couples. However, as female reported honesty decreased, females reported greater male-initiated conflicts and greater intensity of self-initiated conflicts, suggesting that frequency and intensity of conflict may have been over-reported when females answered less honestly.

Additionally, participants reported being somewhat more aware of their behavior. This finding was not surprising because self-monitoring of one’s own behavior inevitably leads to increased awareness of one’s behavior (Nelson, 1977). However, individuals
were only somewhat more aware of their behavior, and therefore completing the diary did not seem to greatly impact level of behavioral awareness. However, to truly assess reactance to the diary, participants should have been specifically asked whether or not their behavior (i.e., conflict frequency) changed during or after participation as a result of the monitoring (Bolger et al., 2003).

Because this study involved individuals reporting on romantic relationship interactions through an unmonitored assessment, another concern was consultation of item answers. Results demonstrated that individuals, on average, reported consulting with their boyfriend or girlfriend between three and five days. On average, individuals reported contact with each other for 98% of days. Therefore, this finding suggested that individuals consulted with one another a small amount. However, this data did not indicate on which days individuals consulted and whether individuals were more likely to consult on days with or without conflict.

Based on both the unconditional growth curve model and the items examining timing-effects, individuals reported greater conflict frequency earlier in daily diary period compared to later. Thus, fatigue may have been a factor in completing the daily diary. If individuals had not experienced fatigue, the growth curve would have been flat rather than negative. When examining timing effects, participants also reported greater conflict in the beginning of the daily diary period compared to later in the diary period. Based on this evidence, participants may have under-reported levels of conflict, specifically in the later days of the diary period (days 10-14). Finally, habituation may have been an issue with completing the daily diary survey (Bolger et al., 2003). Several items contained
follow-up questions and individuals may have become aware of these follow-up items throughout the course of the diary. Therefore, individuals may have learned which items required follow-ups (i.e., conflict items) and responded to these items quickly by responding with no or assuming they knew which item they were answering without fully re-reading the question.

Although daily diaries have been previously used to study conflict, this methodology was new for studying temporal and relational spillover. Therefore, the daily diary methodology was also tested to determine if frequency of conflict differed based on three factors: when completed, who completed, and whether individuals followed directions. First, conflicts did not occur more frequently on weekdays versus weekends; this finding held for both temporal and relational spillover. Additionally, conflict reporting was not impacted by whether one individual (female or male) or both individuals completed the daily diary. Regarding diary directions, I instructed individuals to complete the diary between 8pm and 10pm. However I included data if individuals completed the survey during a much larger time window (4pm to 4am). In comparison of diary completion during the instructed time compared to this larger time, conflict occurred no more or less frequently when individuals followed the specified instructions. Based on these comparisons, I acquired greater confidence that the rate of conflict in couples was not greatly impacted by these three factors.

4.6 Clinical Implication.

As apparent in this study, conflict occurs in many romantic relationships, and many different factors predicted frequency and intensity of this conflict. Understanding which
factors best predict conflict, temporal spillover of conflict and relational spillover of conflict is critical for prevention and intervention efforts. For example, history of conflict resolution strategy use, specifically physical assault, often predicted frequency of conflict and conflict spillover. Importantly, individuals who use aggressive strategies to resolve conflict often also have negative mental health outcomes, such as depression and anxiety (i.e., Kashani, Burbach, & Rosenberg, 1998) or low self-esteem (Jezl, Molidor, & Wright, 1996), whereas individuals who use compromise or negotiation to resolve conflict report fewer mental health problems or symptoms (i.e., Petrosky & Birkimer, 1991). Therefore, teaching young adults positive conflict resolution strategies may reduce instances of violence that occur in times of conflict.

One strategy aimed at violence prevention and intervention for college students is based on the social-norms approach (Berkowitz, 2003a, 2003b). This approach focuses on understanding social norms related to dating conflict and violence by helping individuals recognize the difference between actual and perceived norms for dating situations. This prevention tactic involves collecting data from a specific sample (i.e., college campus) regarding what is perceived to be normal versus what is truly normative. This data is then presented back to the population in different mediums (i.e., workshops, media presentations, group discussions) to challenge incorrect perceptions. In fact, many prevention and intervention efforts focus on this discrepancy as a core tenet of their efforts to reduce physical aggression and other forms of dating violence.

Since I also demonstrated that some factors from the interparental and parent-child relationships also impacted conflict frequency in isolated and spillover conflicts,
prevention or intervention efforts may be best considered when adolescents are still living within their family of origin home and may still be exposed to either high rates of conflict or poor conflict resolution strategies. For example, The Safe Dates Project (Foshee, Linder, Bauman, Langwick, Arriaga, Heath et al., 1996, Foshee, Bauman, Arriaga, Helms, Koch, & Linder, 1998; Foshee, Baumann, & Greene, 2000; Foshee, Bauman, Ennett, Linder, Benefield., & Suchindran, 2004) focuses education on conflict-resolution skills and challenges norms related to dating scenarios in 8th and 9th grade students.

Another program, the Minnesota School Curriculum Project (Jones, 1987, 1991), has also been empirically supported for use in both junior and high school. This program incorporates an educational component on risk factors for dating violence and victimization, as well as providing activities to be incorporated into the teachers’ classroom curriculum. Importantly, researchers also focused efforts on the transition from adolescence into young adulthood, when conflict significantly shifts from parent-child and non-romantic peer relationships into romantic peer relationships (i.e., the Dating Violence Intervention Program; Sousa, 1991). Ideally, conflict resolution strategies should be incorporated into general education curriculum to help adolescents and young adults learn to manage conflict across many relationships, including romantic and non-romantic peer and family relationships.

Knowledge of common conflicts would allow for more targeted prevention and intervention efforts to assist young adult couples who report high levels of conflict. Communication difficulties encompassed many reports of conflict, making communication training an integral component for prevention and intervention efforts.
For example, prevention efforts could involve communication or conflict-resolution training to teach young adults to proactively solve conflicts before they escalate into aggression (i.e., Noonan & Charles, 2009; Wolfe, Wekerle, Scott, Straatman, Grasley, & Reitzel-Jaffe, 2003). Additionally, by educating adolescents and young adults about the inevitable and normative nature of conflict, perceptions that conflict is negative may be reversed allowing for greater mental energy and flexibility to work toward proactive solutions.

Since some difficulties with conflict start within the family-of-origin, identification of families exhibiting at-risk communication and conflict-resolution styles could help reduce conflict in later relationships. Families identified to exhibit difficulties in communication could be referred for family therapy for education and practice of appropriate communication strategies, such as the empirically supported problem-solving communication therapy (Robin & Foster, 1989). This behavioral-family systems approach teaches families problem-solving and communication skills, such as using I-statements, talking in a neutral tone, noticing body language, expressing negative affect appropriately, reflecting and validating (Robin & Foster, 1984). Additionally, this therapy provides families a model for problem solving conflicts, including problem definition, generation of viable solutions, negotiation of a solution and re-negotiation. Ideally, by teaching appropriate communication skills during childhood and adolescence through the family of origin, appropriate strategies can replace negative conflict resolution strategies in later romantic relationships.
4.7 Limitations.

Although several important conclusions can be generated from this study, several important factors required consideration in the interpretation of this data. First, the individuals involved in this project reflect a predominantly Caucasian sample of primarily college students and thus is a convenience sample. These findings lack external validity and cannot be generalized to more diverse samples. It is unclear whether amount and intensity of conflict would be similar in a same-aged, non-college sample. Although this study included some non-student partners, future research should replicate these findings with a more diverse group. Additionally, this sample was limited to individuals between the ages of 18 and 25 and therefore, it is unclear whether these findings would replicate in both younger (i.e., early and middle adolescent) and older (i.e., married) samples.

Individuals in this sample also reported being fairly mentally healthy (i.e., average levels of internalizing and externalizing psychopathology), being very satisfied in their relationship and being in frequent contact with one another. Therefore, these findings may not generalize to individuals with higher rates of psychopathology or in more rocky relationships. For example, several studies have shown a significant relationship between adverse mental health outcomes and dating violence (i.e., Magdol, Moffitt, Caspi, Newman, Fagan & Silva, 1997). If this sample reported more problems with internalizing and externalizing problems, perhaps they may have also reported higher levels of physical assault and psychological aggression during conflicts. Conflict resolution
strategy levels reported in this study may be restricted in range because of the average level of mental health problems.

Second, findings on the importance of romantic relationship physical aggression in impacting conflict frequency and intensity, as well as temporal and relational spillover of conflict, may be somewhat unstable because of the poor reliability of the romantic relationship physical aggression scale from the CTS2 for males (alpha equaled .46). Closer examination of the items comprising this scale illustrated that deleting the item “I grabbed my partner” would greatly improve the reliability for males to .93, but would significantly reduce reliability for females to .38. Perhaps the construct of physical aggression may be manifested differently by females and males, with females more likely to grab their partners than males. Additionally, both the maternal and paternal corporal punishment scales for females and males demonstrated poor reliability (alphas ranged from .48 to .67). Revisions of these scales did not substantially improve reliability. Hence, the lack of findings related to corporal punishment may be related to the measurement of this construct.

Another important limitation for many models involved the sample size of 82 couples. In particular, when examining the intensity variables, group sizes were reduced to only individuals who reported conflict or temporal spillover of conflict. This small sample likely impacted model fit, model convergence and the standard errors of parameters. Also due to the sample size, several models across all outcome variables were limited by the variables which could be included in the final models. Some important constructs, such as affect, life stress and family status, could not be
incorporated into all models. Additionally, the models including the interparental and parent-child constructs could not control for the relevant individual and relationship variables; therefore, it is unclear whether these variables would remain significantly associated after consideration of these initial predictors. Finally, many findings were interpreted after only demonstrating statistical trends. Therefore, these findings should be interpreted with caution, but I would assume with a somewhat larger sample size, these findings would have reached a statistically significant level. Also, chi-square difference tests in many instances did not demonstrate a statistically significant difference between the impact of female and male behavior on conflict frequency and/or intensity. Therefore, conflict frequency and intensity, and subsequently temporal and relational spillover, may truly be impacted by both individuals in the relationship.

A few limitations existed in this study of temporal and relational spillover. One important limitation was that individuals only completed diaries once per day. Perhaps temporal spillover occurs across multiple interactions with those interactions occurring multiple times per day. However, by only having couples complete diaries once daily, multiple daily conflicts were reflected as only one instance of conflict. Perhaps individuals who reported multiple topics of conflict are in fact reporting on multiple instances of conflict for that day; hence temporal spillover may be more frequent than is shown in this study. Additionally, based on the small percentages of individuals reporting conflict (particularly temporal and relational spillover), sample sizes were significantly reduced when examining the conflict intensity variables. Therefore, several variables were excluded for multivariate analyses due to non-significant bivariate
relationships. Cohen (1994) argues that sample size impacts power and the ability to detect meaningful differences. Therefore, some predictor variables may still have important contributions in understanding romantic relationship conflict intensity despite not demonstrating statistical significance in this study.

Relational spillover results were also limited specifically in several ways. First, family structure could not be considered within the multivariate analyses. Therefore, the interparental and parent-child conclusions should be interpreted cautiously for individuals across different family structures. In particular, the results for males from dual biological parent families who dated females reporting relational spillover may be biased, as these individuals reported greater relational spillover than males from other family constellations. Additionally, the proposed definition of relational spillover intensity was inadequate for capturing intensity in this study. The proposed definition of intensity included a composite of the number of people involved in subsequent conflicts, how many times conflict spilled over into other relationships, and whether both individuals in a couple were involved in relational spillover after the same initial incident of conflict. Based on limited variability of these composites, relational spillover intensity was only reflected by the number of relationships impacted. Subsequent studies of relational spillover may want to consider other measures of intensity, such as how upset each conflict made one, and whether these conflicts escalated.
APPENDIX A

Consent Forms

Informed Consent to Participate in a Research Study - Participant

**Study Title:** Dynamic Understanding of Dyadic Experiences  
**Principal Investigator:** Manfred H. M. van Dulmen  
**Co-Investigators:** Claire Burke Draucker, Donna S. Martsolf

You are being invited to participate in a research study. This consent form will provide you with information on the research project, what you will need to do, and the associated risks and benefits of the research. Your participation is voluntary. Please read this form carefully. It is important that you ask questions and fully understand the research in order to make an informed decision. You will receive a copy of this document to take with you.

**Purpose:** We want to do research on romantic relationships and how experiences in romantic relationships are related to other relationships in your life. We want to do this study because we would like to learn about how relationships with partners (boyfriends/girlfriends) impact how you interact with other important people in your life (i.e., parents, friends, siblings). We would like you to take part in this project.

**Procedures:** Today’s visit will take approximately two to two and a half hours. You will first fill out a packet of questionnaires. Then, you will be asked to answer some questions individually with a research assistant. We also would like to videotape you and your partner completing 4 tasks together. Following today, we would also like you to participate in a two-week daily web-based assessment that will last approximately 5-10 minutes each day. We are also asking your permission to re-contact you later for possible follow-up assessments. At that time, you can decide whether you want to participate in the follow-up assessment.

**Audio Recording:** We would like to audio-tape you during the individual interview you will complete with a research assistant. These audio-tapes will be stored in a locked filing cabinet after your participation today and will only be accessible to project personnel. We are also requesting, with your permission, to use these audio-tapes in training or for presentation at a professional meeting. You will be given the option of listening to your audio-taped interview prior to agreeing for us to use your tape for any of these purposes. You will sign a separate consent form agreeing to audio-taping.
**Video Recording:** We would like to video-tape you during 4 tasks that you will complete with your partner. These DVDs will be stored in a locked filing cabinet after your participation today and will only be accessible to project personnel. We are also requesting, with your permission, to use these DVDs in training or for presentation at a professional meeting. You will be given the option of viewing your DVD prior to agreeing for us to use your tape for any of these purposes. You will sign a separate consent form agreeing to video-taping. You will be mailed a copy of the DVD.

**Benefits:** Your participation in this study will help us better understand relationships during young adulthood.

**Risks and Discomforts:** We do not anticipate any serious risks, but some of our research involves material of a personal nature, including some questions about your sexual behavior. Some of the questions we ask may be upsetting or you may feel uncomfortable answering them. If you do not wish to answer a question, you may skip it and go on to the next question. Should you feel upset after completing this study, please be aware that talking to someone can help you. There are several resources on campus, including:

- Department of Psychology’s Psychological Clinic  Kent Hall  330-672-2372
- Counseling and Human Development Center  White Hall  330-672-2208
- University Health Services Psychological Center  DeWeese  330-672-2487

**Privacy and Confidentiality:** All of the information in these sessions will be kept confidential. Each participant will be assigned an ID number to insure confidentiality, and neither you nor your partner’s name will ever appear on documents or publications from this project. Your study related information will be kept confidential within the limits of the law. Any identifying information will be kept in a secure location and only the researchers will have access to the data. Research participants will not be identified in any publication or presentation of research results; only aggregate data will be used. Confidentiality may not be maintained if you indicate that you may do harm to yourself or others.

**Compensation:** You will receive 6 research credits for your psychology course for your participation today. For your participation in the daily diary phase, you will receive another 6 credits for completion of at least 75% of these daily assessments (or 10 of 14 daily assessments).

**Voluntary Participation:** Taking part in this research study is entirely up to you. You may choose not to participate or you may discontinue your participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You will be informed of any new, relevant information that may affect your health, welfare, or
willingness to continue your study participation. Choosing to participate or not participate will not affect your course grade.

**Contact Information:** If you want to know more about this research project, please call Dr. Manfred van Dulmen at (330) 672-2503. The project has been approved by Kent State University. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant or complaints about the research, you may call the IRB at 330.672.2704.

**Consent Statement and Signature:** I have read this consent form and have had the opportunity to have my questions answered to my satisfaction. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study. I understand that a copy of this consent will be provided to me for future reference.

| Signature | Date |
Informed Consent to Participate in a Research Study - Partner

**Study Title:** Dynamic Understanding of Dyadic Experiences  
**Principal Investigator:** Manfred H. M. van Dulmen  
**Co-Investigators:** Claire Burke Draucker, Donna S. Martsolf

You are being invited to participate in a research study. This consent form will provide you with information on the research project, what you will need to do, and the associated risks and benefits of the research. Your participation is voluntary. Please read this form carefully. It is important that you ask questions and fully understand the research in order to make an informed decision. You will receive a copy of this document to take with you.

**Purpose:** We want to do research on romantic relationships and how experiences in romantic relationships are related to other relationships in your life. We want to do this study because we would like to learn about how relationships with partners (boyfriends/girlfriends) impact how you interact with other important people in your life (i.e., parents, friends, siblings). We would like you to take part in this project.

**Procedures:** Today’s visit will take approximately two to two and a half hours. You will first fill out a packet of questionnaires. Then, you will be asked to answer some questions individually with a research assistant. We also would like to videotape you and your partner completing 4 tasks together. Following today, we would also like you to participate in a two-week daily web-based assessment that will last approximately 5-10 minutes each day. We are also asking your permission to re-contact you later for possible follow-up assessments. At that time, you can decide whether you want to participate in the follow-up assessment.

**Audio Recording:** We would like to audio-tape you during the individual interview you will complete with a research assistant. These audio-tapes will be stored in a locked filing cabinet after your participation today and will only be accessible to project personnel. We are also requesting, with your permission, to use these audio-tapes in training or for presentation at a professional meeting. You will be given the option of listening to your audio-taped interview prior to agreeing for us to use your tape for any of these purposes. You will sign a separate consent form agreeing to audio-taping.

**Video Recording:** We would like to video-tape you during 4 tasks that you will complete with your partner. These DVDs will be stored in a locked filing cabinet after your participation today and will only be accessible to project personnel. We are also requesting, with your permission, to use these DVDs in training or for presentation at a professional meeting. You will be given the option of viewing your DVD prior to agreeing for us to use your tape for any of these purposes. You will sign a separate consent form agreeing to video-taping. You will be mailed a copy of the DVD.
**Benefits:** Your participation in this study will help us better understand relationships during young adulthood.

**Risks and Discomforts:** We do not anticipate any serious risks, but some of our research involves material of a personal nature, including some questions about your sexual behavior. Some of the questions we ask may be upsetting or you may feel uncomfortable answering them. If you do not wish to answer a question, you may skip it and go on to the next question. Should you feel upset after completing this study, please be aware that talking to someone can help you. There are several resources on campus, including:

- Department of Psychology’s Psychological Clinic  Kent Hall  330-672-2372
- Counseling and Human Development Center  White Hall  330-672-2208
- University Health Services Psychological Center  DeWeese  330-672-2487

**Privacy and Confidentiality:** All of the information in these sessions will be kept confidential. Each participant will be assigned an ID number to insure confidentiality, and neither you nor your partner’s name will ever appear on documents or publications from this project. Your study related information will be kept confidential within the limits of the law. Any identifying information will be kept in a secure location and only the researchers will have access to the data. Research participants will not be identified in any publication or presentation of research results; only aggregate data will be used. Confidentiality may not be maintained if you indicate that you may do harm to yourself or others.

**Compensation:** You will receive $20 for your participation today. For your participation in the daily diary phase, you will receive another $20 for completion of at least 75% of these daily assessments (or 10 of 14 daily assessments).

**Voluntary Participation:** Taking part in this research study is entirely up to you. You may choose not to participate or you may discontinue your participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You will be informed of any new, relevant information that may affect your health, welfare, or willingness to continue your study participation. Choosing to participate or not participate will not affect your course grade.

**Contact Information:** If you want to know more about this research project, please call Dr. Manfred van Dulmen at (330) 672-2503. The project has been approved by Kent State University. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant or complaints about the research, you may call the IRB at 330.672.2704.

**Consent Statement and Signature:** I have read this consent form and have had the opportunity to have my questions answered to my satisfaction. I voluntarily agree to
participate in this study. I understand that a copy of this consent will be provided to me for future reference.

Signature                      Date
Dynamic Understanding of Dyadic Experience

Contact Information

You are consenting today to participate in the daily web-based assessments for the next two weeks. We would also like to possibly re-contact you for future research projects. Please initial the box below to indicate your consent and provide your contact information below so we can re-contact you. Please print clearly.

_____ I consent to be contacted to participate in future studies, including a potential follow-up from this study.

Name: _________________________________________________

Local Address: __________________________________________
City, State, Zip: _________________________________________

Permanent Address: _____________________________________
City, State, Zip: _________________________________________
Phone: ___________________________________ (Home) ____________________ (Cell)
Email: __________________________________________________
Alternate Email: __________________________________________

In the event that you move and we need to get in contact with you, please also provide the name, address, and phone number of two other persons who would always know where you live:

________________________   ________________________
________________________   ________________________
________________________   ________________________
Phone: __________________   Phone: __________________

Please rank order from 1 to 5 the following methods of contact, with 1 being the most preferred contact method and 5 being the least preferred contact method.

_____ Cell Phone             _____ Local Address
_____ Home Phone            _____ Home Address
_____ Email
AUDIOTAPE CONSENT FORM
Dynamic Understanding of Dyadic Experiences – Wave I

I agree to audio taping at Kent State University on ____________________________.


Signature Date

I have been told that I have the right to listen to the audio tapes before they are used for this research project.

I have been told that I have the right to listen to the audio tapes before they are used for this research project. I have decided that I:

_____ want to hear the tapes  _____ do not want to hear the tapes

Sign now below if you do not want to hear the tapes. If you want to hear the tapes, you will be asked to sign after listening to them.

Manfred van Dulmen and other researchers approved by Kent State University may / may not use the tapes made of me. The original tapes or copies may be used for:

_____ this research project  _____ teacher education  _____ presentation at professional meetings


Signature Date
APPENDIX B

Demographic Questionnaire

For each item below, please circle or fill in the answer that best applies to you.

1. What is today’s date? _____/_____/20___

2. What is your birth date? _____/_____/_____

3. What is your gender?
   a. Female  b. Male

4. What is your ethnic origin (circle all that apply)?
   a. Caucasian/White  b. African American/Black
c. Asian American/Pacific Islander  d. Native American/Alaskan Native
e. Hispanic/Latino(a)  f. Other (Please specify: ________________)

5. Which of the following best describes your year in school?
   a. Freshman  b. Sophomore  c. Junior
d. Senior  e. Postundergraduate  f. Graduate student
6. What is your current educational status?
   a. Part time  
   b. Full time  
   c. Not in school

7. What is your current paid work-status?
   a. Part time  
   b. Full time  
   c. I currently do not work  
   (Skip to question 9)

8. How many hours a week do you conduct paid work? ___________

9. What is your current living situation?
   a. Live by myself  
   b. Live with friends/roommates  
   c. Live with parents/family  
   d. Live with romantic partner  
   e. Other

10. What do you see as your means of financial support right now? **Circle all** that apply and then please fill in what percentage of your financial support comes from each of the means you circled. **Note: Percentages should add up to 100%**.
   a. parents/guardian _____%  
   b. other relative(s) _____%  
   c. significant other _____%  
   d. job (myself) _____%  
   e. my job and my partner’s job _____%
f. student loans _____%

11. Do you currently have a credit card in your name?
   a. No
   b. Yes, one
   c. Yes, more than one

12. Do you carry a balance on your credit card?
   a. No
   b. Yes

13. How long have you been in your current romantic relationship?

   _______ months

14. How many romantic relationships would you say that you have been in?

   _______

15. How long do you have to travel to see your romantic partner?
   a. We live in same dorm/house/apartment building.
   
   b. Less than 15
   c. 15-30 minutes
   d. 30 minutes - 1 hour
   e. More than hour – If so, how long? ___________ (in hours)
APPENDIX C

Relationship Interview

***Notes to interviewer are in italics.***

PART A: HOUSEHOLD ROSTER

I’d like to ask you about all the people currently living in your household. You don’t need to tell me their names, just tell me their relationship to you. Examples include: my mother, my father, my sister, my friend. Please also tell me their age, gender, ethnicity and length of time they have lived with you.

NOTE: Please list in years, months. If they have lived with them their whole life, please write their age in years, months. Please fill out completely – we will code directly from this sheet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Their relationship to you</th>
<th>Age (Years)</th>
<th>Gender (Circle one)</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>How Long Lived With?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PART B: PARENT - YOUNG ADULT RELATIONS

**NOTES TO INTERVIEWER:**

1) Use the answer to question 1 to ask the following questions about primary caregivers.

2) If biological parents are not mentioned, be sure to probe about them as well.

3) Be sure to probe about each caregiver individually.
4) If the respondent says “same” – verify by repeating what was just said about previous parent.

1. Who was/were the main person/people who raised you?

2. What is the marital status of your biological parents?

NOTE: If biological parents are not married or were never married, please ask all questions below for both mother and father.


4. What is your parents’ yearly income? (If you are unsure, please make your best guess.)

5. What is the highest level of education obtained by your mother?

(EXAMPLES: Doctoral/profession – PhD/MD/JD, Masters’ degree, 4-year college degree (BA/BS), 2-year college degree (Associates), some college, trade school, high school, did not graduate high school)

6. What is the highest level of education obtained by your father?

Please ask the following sections about each caregiver. Repeat until all caregivers have been probed about.

A. Bio-Mother:

1 – How often do you spend time with her in person?
2 - What have you done with your bio mom in the past week or so (or before if necessary)?

3 - How often do you have contact (i.e., telephone calls, text messages, AOL instant messenger, Facebook, email)?

4 – On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is extremely dissatisfied, 3 is neutral, and 5 is extremely satisfied, how satisfied are you with how often you spend time with her?
5 – On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is extremely dissatisfied, 3 is neutral, and 5 is extremely satisfied, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you in your relationship with your bio-mom?

(1) extremely dissatisfied (2) dissatisfied (3) neutral (4) satisfied (5) extremely satisfied

*If the participant gives a number, be sure to verify the wording with that number.*

6 – Why? *Probe for reason, e.g.: Can you tell me more about why you choose ‘3-neutral’?*

7 – On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is not at all close, 3 is neutral, and 5 is extremely close, how close is your relationship with your bio-mom.

(1) not at all close (2) not close (3) neutral (4) close (5) extremely close

*If the participant gives a number, be sure to verify the wording with that number.*

8 – Why? *Probe for reason, e.g.: Can you tell me more about why you choose ‘3-neutral’?*

**B. Bio-Father**

1 – How often do you spend time with him in person?

   a. Several times a day   b. Once a day
   c. 5-6 times/week   d. 2-5 times/week
   e. Once per week   f. Less than once per week

2 - What have you done with your bio dad in the past week or so (or before if necessary)?
3 - How often do you have contact (i.e., telephone calls, text messages, AOL instant messenger, Facebook, email)?
   a. Several times a day   b. Once a day
   c. 5-6 times/week       d. 2-5 times/week
   e. Once per week        f. Less than once per week

4 – On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is extremely dissatisfied, 3 is neutral, and 5 is extremely satisfied, how satisfied are you with how often you spend time with him?
   (1) extremely dissatisfied (2) dissatisfied (3) neutral (4) satisfied (5) extremely satisfied

5 – On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is extremely dissatisfied, 3 is neutral, and 5 is extremely satisfied, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you in your relationship with your bio-dad?
   (1) extremely dissatisfied (2) dissatisfied (3) neutral (4) satisfied (5) extremely satisfied

*If the participant gives a number, be sure to verify the wording with that number.*

6 – Why? *Probe for reason, e.g.: Can you tell me more about why you choose ‘3-neutral’?*

7 – On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is not at all close, 3 is neutral, and 5 is extremely close, how close is your relationship with your bio-dad?
(1) not at all  (2) not close  (3) neutral  (4) close  (5) extremely close

*If the participant gives a number, be sure to verify the wording with that number.*

8 – Why? *Probe for reason, e.g.: Can you tell me more about why you choose ‘3-neutral’?*

**C. Other: Please specify: ______________ [If applicable]**

1 – How often do you **spend time** with him/her in person?
   a. Several times a day   b. Once a day
   
   c. 5-6 times/week   d. 2-5 times/week
   
   e. Once per week   f. Less than once per week

2 - What have you done with him/her in the past week or so (or before if necessary)?

3 - How often do you have **contact** (i.e., telephone calls, text messages, AOL instant messenger, Facebook, email)?
   a. Several times a day   b. Once a day
   
   c. 5-6 times/week   d. 2-5 times/week
   
   e. Once per week   f. Less than once per week
4– On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is extremely dissatisfied, 3 is neutral, and 5 is extremely satisfied, how satisfied are you with how often you spend time with him/her?

(1) extremely dissatisfied (2) dissatisfied (3) neutral (4) satisfied (5) extremely satisfied

5 – On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is extremely dissatisfied, 3 is neutral, and 5 is extremely satisfied, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you in your relationship with him/her?

(1) extremely dissatisfied (2) dissatisfied (3) neutral (4) satisfied (5) extremely satisfied

If the participant gives a number, be sure to verify the wording with that number.

6 – Why?

Probe for reason, e.g.: Can you tell me more about why you choose ‘3-neutral’?

7 – On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is not at all close, 3 is neutral, and 5 is extremely close, how close is your relationship with your him/her?

(1) not at all close (2) not close (3) neutral (4) close (5) extremely close

If the participant gives a number, be sure to verify the wording with that number.

8 – Why? Probe for reason, e.g.: Can you tell me more about why you choose ‘3-neutral’?

D. Other: Please specify: _______________ [If applicable]

1 – How often do you spend time with him/her in person?
a. Several times a day b. Once a day
c. 5-6 times/week d. 2-5 times/week
e. Once per week f. Less than once per week

2 - What have you done with him/her in the past week or so (or before if necessary)?

3 - How often do you have contact (i.e., telephone calls, text messages, AOL instant messenger, Facebook, email)?

   a. Several times a day b. Once a day
c. 5-6 times/week d. 2-5 times/week
e. Once per week f. Less than once per week

4 – On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is extremely dissatisfied, 3 is neutral, and 5 is extremely satisfied, how satisfied are you with how often you spend time with him/her?

   (1) extremely dissatisfied (2) dissatisfied (3) neutral (4) satisfied (5) extremely satisfied

5 – On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is extremely dissatisfied, 3 is neutral, and 5 is extremely satisfied, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you in your relationship with him/her?

   (1) extremely dissatisfied (2) dissatisfied (3) neutral (4) satisfied (5) extremely satisfied

*If the participant gives a number, be sure to verify the wording with that number.*
6 – Why? Probe for reason, e.g.: Can you tell me more about why you choose ‘3-neutral’?

7 – On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is not at all close, 3 is neutral, and 5 is extremely close, how close is your relationship with your him/her?

(1) not at all close
(2) not close
(3) neutral
(4) close
(5) extremely close

If the participant gives a number, be sure to verify the wording with that number.

8 – Why? Probe for reason, e.g.: Can you tell me more about why you choose ‘3-neutral’?

Repeat Section D until you have obtained information on all caregivers

When you were completing the surveys, do you remember completing this measure on your mother/mother-figure and your father/father-figure?

Show them a copy of the CTS2-M and CTS2-D.

Please tell me which of the above caregivers you were referring to when you were completing these questionnaires.

CTS2-M =
CTS2-D =

PART C: CURRENT ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIP

Make sure you ask the name of the individuals’ partner, if not already known, to fill-in-the blanks below.

Now we are going to talk about romantic relationships.
16. How often do you **spend time** with your romantic partner in person?  
   a. Several times a day   b. Once a day  
   c. 5-6 times/week   d. 2-5 times/week  
   e. Once per week   f. Less than once per week  

17. How often do you have contact (i.e., telephone calls, text messages, AOL instant messenger, Facebook, email) with your romantic partner?  
   a. Several times a day   b. Once a day  
   c. 5-6 times/week   d. 2-5 times/week  
   e. Once per week   f. Less than once per week  

18. How did you meet _____?  

19. What first attracted you to _____?  

20. Do you know what first attracted _____ to you? If so, what?  
   *Probe for evidence of how participant knew.*  

21. How does _____ treat you?  
   *Probe to have participant give example if participant gives one word adjective.*  

22. What do you like most about your relationship?  
   *Be sure to probe vague descriptors, i.e., ask what they mean.*  
   a. Why?  
   b. Give me an example.  

23. What are some things you don’t like about your relationship?  
   *Be sure to probe vague descriptors, i.e., ask what they mean.*
a. Why?

b. Give me an example.

24. Tell me about a time when you felt especially close to ________.
   Be sure to ask for a specific example if one is not given.

25. Tell me about a time when you didn’t feel so close to ________.
   Be sure to ask for a specific example if one is not given.

26. On a scale from 1-5, with 1 being very difficult and 5 being very easy, how easy or
difficult is it for you to talk about things with ________?
   1) Very       2) Difficult   3) Neutral   4) Easy       5) Very easy
difficult

If the participant gives a number, be sure to verify the wording with that number.

27. Do you feel like you can talk about everything with ________?
   a. Why or why not?
   b. What types of things are difficult [or more difficult - if they can talk about
everything] to talk about with ________?
   c. Tell me about a time when you shared something difficult with ________.
      Be sure to ask for a specific example.

28. Do you consider this a serious relationship?
   a. Probe if needed: What about this relationship makes it serious to you?

29. Do you feel ________ loves you?
   a. Why?
   If participant says, “Because I know” – Ask, How do you know?

30. Do you love ________?
   a. Why?
   If participant says, “Because I know” – Ask, How do you know?

31. Have you seriously discussed getting married?
   Yes           No           Engaged
   a. What does ________ think about getting/being married?
b. What do you think about getting/being married?

32. Have you talked about having children together?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a. What do you think ________ would say about having children together?

b. What do you think about having children together with ________?

33. What is the biggest argument or fight you have had?

*If never, then ask:* Do you agree on everything? If not, ask them the following questions about something they have disagreed on?

a. What was it about?

b. What happened?

*Prompts:* Did you argue? Fight? Avoid each other? Was it physical? How did it start?

NOTE: Get the play-by-play of the argument/fight/disagreement

c. How long did it take to work it out?

d. How satisfied are you with how it worked out? Why?

e. How satisfied is ________ with how it worked out? Why?

f. Is this still an issue in your relationship?

g. Is this how your arguments/fights usually go? Is this typical?

*If this is not typical, ask them to also describe a more typical fight.*

34. How often do you fight/argue/disagree? *Dependent on how described above.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Less than monthly</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

35. As far as you know, has ________ ever been unfaithful in your relationship?

*If yes:*

h. What happened?

i. How did you find out about it?

j. How did you react?

k. How has this affected your relationship?

*If no:*

a. How would you react if ________ were unfaithful?

b. How would it affect your relationship if ________ were unfaithful?

36. Have you ever been unfaithful in your relationship with ________?

*If yes:*

l. What happened?
m. Did you tell ______ about it?

n. How did ______ react?

o. How has this affected your relationship?

If no:

a. How would ______ react if you were unfaithful?

b. How do you think it would affect your relationship if you were unfaithful?

37. Has there ever been a time when you thought your relationship with ______ would end?

If yes: Why? How did you feel about that?

If no: If the relationship ended, how would it change how things were between the two of you?

38. Do you expect to be in this relationship five years from now?

a. Why or why not?

39. Overall, on a scale of 1-5, with 1 being very dissatisfied, 3 being neutral and 5 being very satisfied, how satisfied are you with your relationship with ________?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the participant gives a number, be sure to verify the wording with that number.

40. Why? Probe for reason

41. Overall, on a scale of 1-5, with 1 being very dissatisfied, 3 being neutral, and 5 being very satisfied, how satisfied do you think _____ is with your relationship?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the participant gives a number, be sure to verify the wording with that number.

42. Why? Probe for reason

43. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is not at all close, 3 is neutral, and 5 is extremely close, how close is your relationship with your partner?
If the participant gives a number, be sure to verify the wording with that number.

44. Why? Probe for reason

45. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is not at all close, 3 is neutral and 5 is extremely close, how close do you think _________ is in your relationship with you?

46. Why? Prove for reason

PART D: DATING HISTORY

Now I would like to ask you some questions about your dating history.

1. How many people have you dated or had a romantic relationship (regardless if it was sexual or not) with since you began dating? _________ Total number of relationships

Interviewers use the grid to construct a picture of dating history.

I am going to ask you about your previous relationships, starting with your first romantic relationship, and moving until your current relationship. I will be asking the same questions about each romantic relationship and marking them on this grid. When we are finished, I will ask you to verify the grid is accurate with what you remember. Grid is attached as separate sheet.
2. Think back to the first person you went out with.
   a. When did this relationship start? _____ Month _____ Year
   b. Are you still going out with this person? Yes (Skip to d)    No
   c. When did this relationship end? _____ Month _____ Year
   d. How long did this relationship last? _______days
   e. How old were you when this relationship started? ______ years
   f. How old was your partner when this relationship started? _______ years
   g. What gender was your partner?  Female  Male
   h. Was there any other time you dated this person? Yes    No (if no, skip to 3)
   i. When did you date this person again? _____ Month _____ Year
   j. How long did the next relationship last? _______ days
   k. How old were you when this relationship re-started? ______ years
   l. How old was your partner when this relationship started? _______ years
   m. Was there any other time you dated this person? Yes (repeat I – L) No (skip to 3)

   NOTE: IF ONLY 1 (one) RELATIONSHIP TOTAL, SKIP TO NEXT SECTION

3. Think back to the next person you went out with.
   a. When did this relationship start? _____ Month _____ Year
   b. Are you still going out with this person? Yes (Skip to d)    No
   c. When did this relationship end? _____ Month _____ Year
   d. How long did this relationship last? _______ days
   e. How old were you when this relationship started? ______ years
   f. How old was your partner when this relationship started? _______ years
   g. What gender was your partner?  Female  Male
   h. Was there any other time you dated this person? Yes    No (if no, skip to 29)
   i. When did you date this person again? _____ Month _____ Year
   j. How long did the next relationship last? _______ days
   k. How old were you when this relationship re-started? ______ years
   l. How old was your partner when this relationship started? _______ years
   m. Was there any other time you dated this person? Yes (repeat I – L) No (skip to 4)

4. Think back to the next person you went out with.
   a. When did this relationship start? _____ Month _____ Year
   b. Are you still going out with this person? Yes (Skip to d)    No
   c. When did this relationship end? _____ Month _____ Year
   d. How long did this relationship last? _______ days
   e. How old were you when this relationship started? ______ years
   f. How old was your partner when this relationship started? _______ years
   g. What gender was your partner?  Female  Male
h. Was there any other time you dated this person? Yes No (if no, skip to 29)
i. When did you date this person again? Month Year
j. How long did the next relationship last? days
k. How old were you when this relationship re-started? years
l. How old was your partner when this relationship started? years
m. Was there any other time you dated this person? Yes (repeat I – L) No (skip to 29)

REPEAT UNTIL YOU ARE AT CURRENT PARTNER.

PART E: FRIENDSHIPS

Let’s talk about friends for a few minutes.

1. How many close friends would you estimate you have? 
   a. How many of these friends are primarily friends with you and not your partner? 
   b. How many of these friends are mutual friends of you and your partner?

2. How often do you see (i.e., spend time with) your closest same-sex friends?
   a. Several times a day   b. Once a day
      c. 5-6 times/week   d. 2-5 times/week
      e. Once per week   f. Less than once per week

3. How often do you have contact (i.e., telephone calls, text messages, AOL instant messenger, Facebook, and email) with your closest same-sex friends?
   a. Several times a day   b. Once a day
4. How often do you see (i.e., spend time with) your closest opposite-sex friends?
   a. Several times a day   b. Once a day
   c. 5-6 times/week   d. 2-5 times/week
   e. Once per week   f. Less than once per week

5. How often do you have contact (i.e., telephone calls, text messages, AOL instant messenger, Facebook, and email) with your closest opposite-sex friends?
   a. Several times a day   b. Once a day
   c. 5-6 times/week   d. 2-5 times/week
   e. Once per week   f. Less than once per week

6. What have you done with your friends in the past week or so (or before if necessary)?

7. How satisfied are you with how often you spend time with friends?
   (1) extremely dissatisfied   (2) dissatisfied   (3) neutral   (4) satisfied   (5) extremely satisfied
   a. Why?
   b. Do you feel that you spend time with friends too often or not enough?

8. Do you spend more, less or the same amount of time with your friends that you used to, say 3 or 4 years ago?
   More        Less        Same
9. Do you tend to spend time with friends? Circle all that apply and probe about each

One-on-one    In small groups    In large groups
Number of people: _______  Number of people ______

a. Why? If necessary probe about how it is now different and what makes it different.

10. Where did you first meet most of your friends? (Circle all that apply)?

Work    School    Through romantic partner    Friends from childhood    Other:
Which? (i.e., elementary, JH, HS)

11. Overall, on a scale of 1-5, with 1 being extremely dissatisfied, 3 being neutral, and 5 being extremely satisfied, how satisfied are you with your relationship with your friends?

(1) extremely dissatisfied   (2) dissatisfied   (3) neutral   (4) satisfied   (5) extremely satisfied

If the participant gives a number, be sure to verify the wording with that number.

a. Why? Probe for reason

12. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is not at all close, 3 is neutral, and 5 is extremely close, how close do you feel to your friends?

(1) not at all close   (2) not close   (3) neutral   (4) close   (5) extremely close

If the participant gives a number, be sure to verify the wording with that number.

a. Why? Probe for reason

PART F: SIBLINGS IN GENERAL

Let’s talk about siblings for now.
Do you have any siblings? *If no, interview is over.*

1. Please tell me the first name(s), gender(s), type of sibling (i.e. biological, half, or adopted) and age(s) of your sibling(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Type of Sibling</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How often do you spend time with your siblings in person?
   a. Several times a day   b. Once a day
   c. 5-6 times/week        d. 2-5 times/week
   e. Once per week         f. Less than once per week

3. What have you done with your sibling(s) in the past week or so (or before if necessary)?

4. How often do you have contact (i.e., telephone calls, text messages, AOL instant messenger, Facebook and email) with your siblings?
a. Several times a day  b. Once a day
c. 5-6 times/week  d. 2-5 times/week
e. Once per week  f. Less than once per week

5. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is extremely dissatisfied, 3 is neutral, and 5 is extremely satisfied, how satisfied are you with how often you spend time with your siblings?
   (1) extremely dissatisfied  (2) dissatisfied  (3) neutral  (4) satisfied  (5) extremely satisfied

6. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is extremely dissatisfied, 3 is neutral, and 5 is extremely satisfied, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you in your relationship with your siblings?
   (1) extremely dissatisfied  (2) dissatisfied  (3) neutral  (4) satisfied  (5) extremely satisfied

If the participant gives a number, be sure to verify the wording with that number.

   a. Why? Probe for reason, e.g.: Can you tell me more about why you choose ‘3-neutral’?

7. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is not at all close, 3 is neutral, and 5 is extremely close, how close is your relationship with your him/her?
   (1) not at all close  (2) not close  (3) neutral  (4) close  (5) extremely close

If the participant gives a number, be sure to verify the wording with that number.

   a. Why? - Probe for reason, e.g.: Can you tell me more about why you choose ‘3-neutral’?

**PART G: SPECIFIC SIBLING**
1. Please tell me the name of the sibling you feel closest to. (First name: __________)  
*Note: If they can’t pick – choose the one closest in age to them.*

2. What do you do with __________ when you spend time with him/her?

3. How does __________ treat you?  
*Probe to have participant give example if participant gives one word adjective.*

4. On a scale from 1-5, with 1 being very difficult, 3 being neutral and 5 being very easy, how easy or difficult is it for you to talk about things with __________?  
   1) Very difficult  
   2) Difficult  
   3) Neutral  
   4) Easy  
   5) Very easy  

difficult

*If the participant gives a number, be sure to verify the wording with that number.*

5. Do you feel like you can talk about everything with __________?  
   a. Why or why not?  
   b. What types of things are difficult or more difficult - if they can talk about everything/ to talk about with __________?  
   c. Tell me about a time when you shared something difficult with __________.  
      *Be sure to ask for a specific example.*

6. What is the biggest argument or fight you have had with __________?  
*If never, then ask: Do you agree on everything? If not, ask them the following questions about something they have disagreed on?*  
   a. What was it about?  
   b. What happened?  
      *Prompts: Did you argue? Fight? Avoid each other? Was it physical? How did it start?*  
      *NOTE: Get the play-by-play of the argument/fight/disagreement*  
   c. How long did it take to work it out?  
   d. How satisfied are you with how it worked out? Why?  
   e. How satisfied is __________ with how it worked out? Why?  
   f. Is this still an issue in your relationship?  
   g. Is this how your arguments/fights usually go? Is this typical?  

*If this is not typical, ask them to also describe a more typical fight.*

7. How often do you fight/argue/disagree? *Dependent on how described above*  
   Daily  
   Weekly  
   Monthly  
   Less than monthly  
   Never
8. Overall, on a scale of 1-5, with 1 being extremely dissatisfied, 3 being neutral and 5 being extremely satisfied, how satisfied are you with your relationship with __________?

(1) extremely dissatisfied  (2) dissatisfied  (3) neutral  (4) satisfied  (5) extremely satisfied

If the participant gives a number, be sure to verify the wording with that number.

   a. Why? Probe for reason

9. Overall, on a scale of 1-5, with 1 being extremely dissatisfied, 3 being neutral, and 5 being extremely satisfied, how satisfied do you think _____ is with your relationship?

(1) extremely dissatisfied  (2) dissatisfied  (3) neutral  (4) satisfied  (5) extremely satisfied

If the participant gives a number, be sure to verify the wording with that number.

   a. Why? - Probe for reason

10. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is not at all close, 3 is neutral, and 5 is extremely close, how close is your relationship with ____________.

(1) not at all close  (2) not close  (3) neutral  (4) close  (5) extremely close

If the participant gives a number, be sure to verify the wording with that number.

   a. Why? - Probe for reason, Can you tell me more about why you choose ‘3-neutral’?

11. Is __________ currently involved in a romantic relationship?
If yes:
   a. How long have they been in a relationship?
   b. How old is __________’s partner?
c. If yes, how is your romantic relationship different from ______'s romantic relationship?

d. How is your romantic relationship similar to ______'s romantic relationship?

12. Do you have another other siblings currently involved in a romantic relationship?
*If applicable ask 11a-d for each sibling involved in a romantic relationship.*
APPENDIX D

Positive and Negative Affect Schedule

This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer in the space next to that word. Indicate to what extent you have felt this way **during the past few weeks**. Use the following scale to record your answers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very slightly or not at all</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Quite a lot</td>
<td>Extremely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____ interested  _____ irritable
_____ distressed  _____ alert
_____ excited  _____ ashamed
_____ upset  _____ inspired
_____ strong  _____ nervous
_____ guilty  _____ determined
_____ scared  _____ attentive
_____ hostile  _____ jittery
_____ enthusiastic  _____ active
_____ proud  _____ afraid
## APPENDIX E

### Social Readjustment Rating Scale – Revised

Place an “X” in the column labeled “Happened” for those events that have occurred in your life recently (i.e., the past year) or that you expect to occur soon. Leave this column blank if it has not happened.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Life Event</th>
<th>Happened</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Death of a romantic partner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Death of a close family member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>If this has happened, please list which family member(s):</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Major injury/illness to self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>If this has happened, please list the illness or injury:</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Detention in jail or other institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Major injury/illness to close family member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>If this has happened, please list which family member and what illness or injury they had/have:</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Foreclosure on loan/mortgage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Divorce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>If this has happened, please list who divorced:</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Being a victim of crime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Being a victim of police brutality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Infidelity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Experiencing domestic violence/sexual abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Separation or reconciliation with a romantic partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Being fired/laid-off/unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Experiencing financial problems or difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Death of a close friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Surviving a disaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Assuming responsibility for sick or elderly loved one</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If this has happened, please list which family member(s):*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Loss of or major reduction in health insurance or benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Self being arrested for violating the law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If this has happened, please list what you were arrested for:*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Close family member being arrested for violating the law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If this has happened, please list which family member(s) and what they were arrested for:*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Experiencing/being involved in an auto accident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Being disciplined at work/demoted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Dealing with unwanted pregnancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Adult child moving in with parent/parent moving in with adult child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Experiencing employment discrimination/sexual harassment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Attempting to modify addictive behavior of self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If this has happened, please list what addictive behavior:*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 27. | Discovering/attempting to modify addictive behavior of close family member  
*If this has happened, please list which family member(s) and the addictive behavior(s):* |
| 28. | Employer reorganization/downsizing |
| 29. | Dealing with infertility/miscarriage |
| 30. | Getting married |
| 31. | Changing employers/careers |
| 32. | Failure to obtain/qualify for a mortgage |
| 33. | Pregnancy of self/romantic partner |
| 34. | Experiencing discrimination/harassment outside the workplace |
| 35. | Release from jail  
*If this has happened, please list what you were arrested for:* |
| 36. | Romantic partner begins/ceases work outside the home |
| 37. | Major disagreement with boss/co-worker |
| 38. | Change in residence |
| 39. | Experiencing a large unexpected monetary gain |
| 40. | Change work positions (transfer or promotion) |
| 41. | Gaining a new family member  
*If this has happened, please list who was/were the family member(s):* |
<p>| 42. | Changing work responsibilities |
| 43. | Obtaining a home mortgage |
| 44. | Obtaining a major loan other than a home mortgage |
| 45. | Retirement |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>46.</strong></td>
<td>Beginning/ceasing formal education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>47.</strong></td>
<td>Receiving a ticket for violating the law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If this has happened, please list what was/were the ticket(s) for:*
APPENDIX F

Adult Self-Report
ADULT SELF-REPORT FOR AGES 18-59

YOUR FULL NAME

YOUR GENDER

□ Male □ Female

YOUR AGE

ETHNIC GROUP OR RACE

TODAY'S DATE

YOUR BIRTHDATE

Mo. ___ Date ___ Yr. ___ Mo. ___ Date ___ Yr. ___

PLEASE CHECK YOUR HIGHEST EDUCATION

□ 1. No high school diploma and no GED
□ 2. General Equivalency Diploma (GED)
□ 3. High school graduate
□ 4. Some college but no college degree
□ 5. Associate's Degree
□ 6. Bachelor's or RN Degree
□ 7. Some college but no degree
□ 8. Master's Degree
□ 9. Doctoral or Law Degree
□ Other education (specify):

Please fill out this form to reflect your views, even if other people might not agree. You need not spend a lot of time on any item. Feel free to print additional comments. Be sure to answer all items.

I. FRIENDS:

A. About how many close friends do you have? (Do not include family members.)

□ None □ 1 □ 2 or 3 □ 4 or more

B. About how many times a month do you have contact with any of your close friends? (Include in-person contacts, phone, letters, e-mail.)

□ Less than 1 □ 1 or 2 □ 3 or 4 □ 5 or more

C. How well do you get along with your close friends?

□ Not at all well □ Average □ Above average □ Far above average

D. About how many times a month do any friends or family visit you?

□ Less than 1 □ 1 or 2 □ 3 or 4 □ 5 or more

II. SPOUSE OR PARTNER:

What is your marital status?

□ Never been married □ Married but separated from spouse
□ Married, living with spouse □ Divorced
□ Widowed □ Other—please describe:

At any time in the past 6 months, did you live with your spouse or with a partner?

□ No—please skip to page 2.
□ Yes—Circle 0, 1, or 2 beside items A-H to describe your relationship during the past 6 months:

0 = Not True 1 = Somewhat True or Sometimes True 2 = Very True or Often True

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0 1 2</th>
<th>A. I get along well with my spouse or partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>B. My spouse or partner and I have trouble sharing responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>C. I feel satisfied with my spouse or partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>D. My spouse or partner and I enjoy similar activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>E. My spouse or partner and I disagree about living arrangements, such as where we live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>F. I have trouble with my spouse or partner's family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>G. I like my spouse or partner's friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>H. My spouse or partner's behavior annoys me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please be sure you have answered all items.

Then see other side.
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III. FAMILY:
Compared with others, how well do you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Get along with your brothers?</th>
<th>B. Get along with your sisters?</th>
<th>C. Get along with your mother?</th>
<th>D. Get along with your father?</th>
<th>E. Get along with your biological or adopted children?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have no brothers</td>
<td>I have no sisters</td>
<td>Mother is deceased</td>
<td>Father is deceased</td>
<td>I have no children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Oldest child Not applicable 2. 2nd oldest child Not applicable 3. 3rd oldest child Not applicable 4. Other children Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Get along with your stepchildren? I have no stepchildren

IV. JOB: At any time in the past 6 months, did you have any paid jobs (including self-employment and military service)?
☐ No—please skip to Section V.
☐ Yes—please describe your job(s):
Circle 0, 1, or 2 beside items A-I to describe your work experience during the past 6 months:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0 = Not True</th>
<th>1 = Somewhat or Sometimes True</th>
<th>2 = Very True or Often True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>A. I work well with others</td>
<td>F. I do things that may cause me to lose my job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>B. I have trouble getting along with bosses</td>
<td>G. I stay away from my job even when I am not sick or on vacation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>C. I do my work well</td>
<td>H. My job is too stressful for me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>D. I have trouble finishing my work</td>
<td>I. I worry too much about work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>E. I am satisfied with my work situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. EDUCATION: At any time in the past 6 months, did you attend school, college, or any other educational or training program? ☐ No—please skip to Section VI.
☐ Yes—what kind of school or program?
What degree or diploma are you seeking?
Major?
When do you expect to receive your degree or diploma?
Circle 0, 1, or 2 beside items A-E to describe your educational experience during the past 6 months:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0 = Not True</th>
<th>1 = Somewhat or Sometimes True</th>
<th>2 = Very True or Often True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>A. I get along well with other students</td>
<td>D. I am satisfied with my educational situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>B. I achieve what I am capable of</td>
<td>E. I do things that may cause me to fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>C. I have trouble finishing assignments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. Do you have any illness, disability, or handicap? ☐ No ☐ Yes—please describe:

VII. Please describe your concerns or worries about family, work, education, or other things: ☐ No concerns

VIII. Please describe the best things about yourself:
Please print your answers. Be sure to answer all items.

VIII. Below is a list of items that describe people. For each item, please circle 0, 1, or 2 to describe yourself over the past 6 months. Please answer all items as well as you can, even if some do not seem to apply to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>0 = Not True</th>
<th>1 = Somewhat or Sometimes True</th>
<th>2 = Very True or Often True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I am too forgetful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I make good use of my opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I argue a lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I work up to my ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I blame others for my problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I use drugs (other than alcohol and nicotine) for nonmedical purposes (describe):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I brag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I have trouble concentrating or paying attention for long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I can't get my mind off certain thoughts (describe):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I have trouble sitting still</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I am too dependent on others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I feel lonely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I feel confused or in a fog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I cry a lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I am pretty honest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I am mean to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I daydream a lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I deliberately try to hurt or kill myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I try to get a lot of attention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I damage or destroy my things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I damage or destroy things belonging to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I worry about my future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I break rules at work or elsewhere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I don't eat as well as I should</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I get along with other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I don't feel guilty after doing something I shouldn't</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I am jealous of others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I get along badly with my family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I am afraid of certain animals, situations, or places (describe):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>My relations with the opposite sex are poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>I am afraid I might think or do something bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>I feel that I have to be perfect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I feel that no one loves me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>I feel that others are out to get me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>I feel worthless or inferior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>I accidently get hurt a lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>I get in many fights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>My relations with neighbors are poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>I hang around people who get in trouble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>I hear sounds or voices that other people think aren't there (describe):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>I am impulsive or act without thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>I would rather be alone than with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>I lie or cheat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>I feel overwhelmed by my responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>I am nervous or tense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Parts of my body twitch or make nervous movements (describe):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>I lack self-confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>I am not liked by others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>I can do certain things better than other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>I am too fearful or anxious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>I feel dizzy or lightheaded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>I feel too guilty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>I have trouble planning for the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>I feel tired without good reason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>My moods swing between elation and depression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Physical problems without known medical cause:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>I physically attack people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>I pick my skin or other parts of my body (describe):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>I fail to finish things I should do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>There is very little that I enjoy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>My work performance is poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>I am poorly coordinated or clumsy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Please print your answers. Be sure to answer all items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0 = Not True</th>
<th>1 = Somewhat or Sometimes True</th>
<th>2 = Very True or Often True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>012 63. I would rather be with older people than with people of my own age</td>
<td>012 93. I talk too much</td>
<td>012 101. I stay away from my job even when I'm not sick and not on vacation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012 64. I have trouble setting priorities</td>
<td>012 94. I tease others a lot</td>
<td>012 102. I don't have much energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012 65. I refuse to talk</td>
<td>012 95. I have a hot temper</td>
<td>012 103. I am unhappy, sad, or depressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012 66. I repeat certain acts over and over (describe):</td>
<td>012 96. I think about sex too much</td>
<td>012 104. I am louder than others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012 87. I have trouble making or keeping friends</td>
<td>012 97. I threaten to hurt people</td>
<td>012 105. People think I am disorganized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012 98. I scream or yell a lot</td>
<td>012 98. I like to help others</td>
<td>012 106. I try to be fair to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012 69. I am secretive or keep things to myself</td>
<td>012 99. I dislike staying in one place for very long</td>
<td>012 107. I feel that I can't succeed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012 70. I see things that other people think aren't there (describe):</td>
<td>012 108. I tend to lose things</td>
<td>012 109. I like to try new things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012 71. I am self-conscious or easily embarrassed</td>
<td>012 110. I wish I were of the opposite sex</td>
<td>012 111. I keep from getting involved with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012 72. I worry about my family</td>
<td>012 112. I worry a lot</td>
<td>012 113. I worry about my relations with the opposite sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012 73. I meet my responsibilities to my family</td>
<td>012 114. I fail to pay my debts or meet other financial responsibilities</td>
<td>012 115. I feel restless or fidgety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012 74. I show off or clown</td>
<td>012 116. I get upset too easily</td>
<td>012 117. I have trouble managing money or credit cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012 75. I am too shy or timid</td>
<td>012 118. I am too impatient</td>
<td>012 119. I am not good at details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012 76. My behavior is irresponsible</td>
<td>012 120. I drive too fast</td>
<td>012 121. I tend to be late for appointments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012 77. I sleep more than most other people during the day and/or night (describe):</td>
<td>012 122. I have trouble keeping a job</td>
<td>012 123. I am a happy person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012 78. I have trouble making decisions</td>
<td>124. <strong>In the past 6 months</strong>, about how many times per day did you use tobacco (including smokeless tobacco)? _________ times per day.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012 79. I have a speech problem (describe):</td>
<td>125. <strong>In the past 6 months</strong>, on how many days were you drunk? _________ days.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012 80. I stand up for my rights</td>
<td>126. <strong>In the past 6 months</strong>, on how many days did you use drugs for nonmedical purposes (including marijuana, cocaine, and other drugs, except alcohol and nicotine)? _________ days.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please be sure you have answered all items.*
APPENDIX G

Conflict Tactics Scale: Romantic Relationships

No matter how well a couple gets along, there are times when they disagree, get annoyed with the other person, want different things from each other, or just have spats or fights because they are in a bad mood, are tired, or for some other reason. Couples also have many different ways of trying to settle their differences. This is a list of things that might happen when you have differences. Please circle how many times you did these things in the past year, and how many times your partner did them in the past year. If you or your partner did not do one of these things in the past year, but it happened before that, circle “7”.

0 = This never happened
1 = Once
2 = Twice
3 = 3-5 times
4 = 6-10 times
5 = 11-20 times
6 = More than 20 times
7 = Not in the past year, but it did happen before

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>I showed my partner I cared even though we disagreed.</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My partner showed care for me even though we disagreed.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I explained my side of a disagreement to my partner.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My partner explained his/her side of a disagreement to me.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I insulted or swore at my partner.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>My partner insulted or swore at me.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I threw something at my partner that could hurt.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>My partner threw something at me that could hurt.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I twisted my partner’s arm or hair.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>My partner twisted my arm or hair.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I showed respect for my partner’s feelings about an issue.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>My partner showed respect for my feelings about an issue.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I pushed or shoved my partner.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>My partner pushed or shoved me.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I called my partner fat or ugly.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>My partner called me fat or ugly.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I destroyed something belonging to my partner.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>My partner destroyed something belonging to me.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I shouted or yelled at my partner.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>My partner shouted or yelled at me.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I said I was sure we could work out a problem.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>My partner was sure we could work it out.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I grabbed my partner.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>My partner grabbed me.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I stomped out of the room/house/yard during a disagreement.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>My partner stomped out of the room/house/yard.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I slapped my partner.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>My partner slapped me.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I suggested a compromise to a disagreement.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>My partner suggested a compromise to a disagreement.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>I said something to spite my partner.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>My partner said something to spite me.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I threatened to hit or throw something at my partner.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>My partner threatened to hit or throw something at me.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>I agreed to try a solution to a disagreement my partner suggested.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>My partner agreed to try a solution to a disagreement I suggested.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

Experiences in Close Relationships – Revised

The statements below concern how you feel in emotionally intimate relationships. We are interested in how you generally experience relationships, not just in what is happening in your current relationship. Respond to each statement by circling a number to indicate how much you agree or disagree with the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I’m afraid that I will lose my partner’s love.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I prefer not to show a partner how I feel deep down.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I often worry that my partner will not want to stay with me.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel comfortable sharing my private thoughts and feelings with my partner.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I often worry that my partner doesn’t really love me.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on romantic partners.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I worry that romantic partners won’t care about me as much as I care about them.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am very comfortable being close to romantic partners.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I often wish that my partner’s feelings for me were as strong as my feelings for him or her.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I don’t feel comfortable opening up to romantic partners.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I worry a lot about my relationships.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I prefer not to be too close to romantic partners.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. When my partner is out of sight, I worry that he or she might become interested in someone else.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I get uncomfortable when a romantic partner wants to be very close.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. When I show my feelings for romantic partners, I’m afraid they will not feel the same about me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I find it relatively easy to get close to my partner.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I rarely worry about my partner leaving me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. It’s not difficult for me to get close to my partner.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My romantic partner makes me doubt myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with my partner.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I do not often worry about being abandoned.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. It helps to turn to my romantic partner in times of need.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23.</strong></td>
<td>I find that my partner(s) don’t want to get as close as I would like.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24.</strong></td>
<td>I tell my partner just about everything.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25.</strong></td>
<td>Sometimes romantic partners change their feelings about me for no apparent reason.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26.</strong></td>
<td>I talk things over with my partner.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27.</strong></td>
<td>My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>28.</strong></td>
<td>I am nervous when partners get too close to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>29.</strong></td>
<td>I’m afraid that once a romantic partner gets to know me, he or she won’t like who I really am.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30.</strong></td>
<td>I feel comfortable depending on romantic partners.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>31.</strong></td>
<td>It makes me mad that I don’t get the affection and support I need from my partner.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>32.</strong></td>
<td>I find it easy to depend on romantic partners.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>33.</strong></td>
<td>I worry that I won’t measure up to other people.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>34.</strong></td>
<td>It’s easy for me to be affectionate with my partner.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>35.</strong></td>
<td>My partner only seems to notice me when I’m angry.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>36.</strong></td>
<td>My partner really understands me and my needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

Relationship Assessment Scale

Please respond with the number that best describes each statement:

1. How well does your partner meet your needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poorly</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Extremely well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. In general, how satisfied are you with your relationship?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ununsatisfied</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Extremely satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How good is your relationship compared to most?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. How often do you wish you hadn’t gotten into this relationship?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. To what extent has your relationship met your original expectations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hardly at all</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. How much do you love your partner?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How many problems are there in your relationship?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very few</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very many</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J

Conflict Tactics Scale – Maternal Version

No matter how well two parents get along, there are times when they disagree, get annoyed with the other person, want different things from each other, or just have spats or fights because they are in a bad mood, are tired, or for some other reason. Parents also have many different ways of trying to settle their differences. Please circle how many times your mother/mother figure did each of these things ever to your father using the rating scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>My mother showed my father she cared even when they disagreed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My mother explained her side of a disagreement to my father.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>My mother insulted or swore at my father.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My mother threw something at my father that could hurt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My mother twisted my father’s arm or hair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>My mother showed respect for my father’s feelings about an issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>My mother pushed or shoved my father.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>My mother called my father fat or ugly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>My mother destroyed something belonging to my father.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>My mother shouted or yelled at my father.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>My mother said she was sure they could work out a problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>My mother grabbed my father.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>My mother stomped out of the room/house/yard during a disagreement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>My mother slapped my father.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>My mother suggested a compromise to a disagreement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>My mother said something to spite my father.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>My mother threatened to hit or throw something at my father.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>My mother agreed to try a solution to a disagreement my father suggested.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- **0**: This never happened
- **1**: Once
- **2**: Twice
- **3-5 times**: 3-5 times
- **6-10 times**: 6-10 times
- **11-20 times**: 11-20 times
- **More than 20 times**: More than 20 times
APPENDIX K

Conflict Tactics Scale – Paternal Version

No matter how well two parents get along, there are times when they disagree, get annoyed with the other person, want different things from each other, or just have spats or fights because they are in a bad mood, are tired, or for some other reason. Parents also have many different ways of trying to settle their differences. Please circle how many times your father/father figure did each of these things ever to your mother using the rating scale below.

0 = This never happened
1 = Once
2 = Twice
3 = 3-5 times
4 = 6-10 times
5 = 11-20 times
6 = More than 20 times

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>My father showed my mother he cared even when they disagreed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My father explained his side of a disagreement to my mother.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>My father insulted or swore at my mother.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My father threw something at my mother that could hurt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My father twisted my mother’s arm or hair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>My father showed respect for my mother’s feelings about an issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>My father pushed or shoved my mother.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>My father called my mother fat or ugly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>My father destroyed something belonging to my mother.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>My father shouted or yelled at my mother.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>My father said he was sure they could work out a problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>My father grabbed my mother.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>My father stomped out of the room/house/yard during a disagreement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>My father slapped my mother.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>My father suggested a compromise to a disagreement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>My father said something to spite my mother.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>My father threatened to hit or throw something at my mother.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>My father agreed to try a solution to a disagreement my mother suggested.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Children often do things that are wrong, disobey or make their parent angry. We would like to know what your mother/mother figure did when you did something wrong or made her upset or angry. Below is a list of items and I would like you to tell me whether your mother/mother figure did these things ever using the scale below.

When I did something wrong, my mother (or mother figure) would.....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Explain why something was wrong.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Put me in “time out” (or sent me to my room).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Shook me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hit me on the bottom with something like a belt, hairbrush, stick, or some other hard object.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Gave me something else to do instead of what I was doing wrong.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Shouted, yelled, or screamed at me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hit me with a fist or kicked me hard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Spanked me on the bottom with her bare hand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>swore or cursed at me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Said she would send me away or kick me out of the house.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Threatened to spank or hit me but did not actually do it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Hit me on some other part of the body besides the bottom with something like a belt, hairbrush, a stick or some other hard object.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Slapped me on the hand, arm or leg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Took away privileges or grounded me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Pinched me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Threw or knocked me down.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Called me dumb or lazy or some other name like that.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Slapped me on the face or head or ears.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX M

Parent-Child Conflict Tactics Scale - Paternal Version

Children often do things that are wrong, disobey or make their parent angry. We would like to know what your father/father figure did when you did something wrong or made him upset or angry. Below is a list of items and I would like you to tell me whether your father/father figure did these things ever using the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When I did something wrong, my father (or father figure) would.....</th>
<th>This never happened</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>Twice</th>
<th>3-5 times</th>
<th>6-10 times</th>
<th>11-20 times</th>
<th>More than 20 times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Explain why something was wrong.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Put me in “time out” (or sent me to my room).</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Shook me.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hit me on the bottom with something like a belt, hairbrush, stick, or some other hard object.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Gave me something else to do instead of what I was doing wrong.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Shouted, yelled, or screamed at me.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Hit me with a fist or kicked me hard.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Spanked me on the bottom with his bare hand.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Swore or cursed at me.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Said he would send me away or kick me out of the house.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Threatened to spank or hit me but did not actually do it.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Hit me on some other part of the body besides the bottom with something like a belt, hairbrush, a stick or some other hard object.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Slapped me on the hand, arm or leg.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Took away privileges or grounded me.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Pinched me.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Threw or knocked me down.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Called me dumb or lazy or some other name like that.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Slapped me on the face or head or ears.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX N

Web Based Follow-up Questionnaire

Thank you for your willingness to participate in the *Dynamic Understanding of Dyadic Experiences* study. Just to make sure that you understand what you are agreeing to for this phase of the study, we have highlighted below some of the information from the consent form you recently signed.

1. You agreed to participate in a two-week daily web-based assessment that will last approximately 5-10 minutes each day. For your participation in this phase, if you are enrolled in the required psychology course, you will receive another 6 research credits for completion of at least 75% of these daily assessments (or 10 of 14 daily assessments). If you are a partner of an individual enrolled in the required psychology course, you will receive $20 for completion of at least 75% of these daily assessments (or 10 of 14 daily assessments).

2. All of the information in these sessions will be kept confidential. Each participant will be assigned an ID number to insure confidentiality, and neither you nor your partner’s name will ever appear on documents or publications issued from this project. Confidentiality may not be maintained if you indicate that you may do harm to yourself or others.

3. You participation is voluntary. Taking part in this project is entirely up to you, and no one will hold it against you if you decide not to do it. If you do take part, you may stop at any time. Feel free to ask any questions you may have prior to or during your participation.

4. If you want to know more about this research project, please call me at (330) 672-2504. The project has been approved by Kent State University. If you have questions about Kent State University's rules for research, please contact the IRB at 330.672.2704.

Sincerely,

Manfred van Dulmen, Ph.D.
Principal Investigator
Assistant Professor
Department of Psychology
Please answer the following questions by either checking the correct response or filling in your answer. While answering these questions, think about the last 24 hours from right now.

Please enter the 5-digit ID number that you choose during your in-lab assessment:

_____

1. What is your birth month and day? Month: _______ Day: _______

PANAS (Today)

This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer in the space next to that word. Indicate to what extent you have felt this way today. Use the following scale to record your answers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very slightly or not at all</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Quite a lot</td>
<td>Extremely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>interested</th>
<th>irritable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>distressed</td>
<td>alert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excited</td>
<td>ashamed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upset</td>
<td>inspired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong</td>
<td>nervous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guilty</td>
<td>determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scared</td>
<td>attentive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hostile</td>
<td>jittery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enthusiastic</td>
<td>active</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
_____ proud  
_____ afraid

2. Did you talk to your partner today?  
   Yes  No (Skip to #4)

3. Did you:
   a. See your partner in person?  
      Yes  No
   b. Talk on the telephone?  
      Yes  No
   c. Talk through email?  
      Yes  No
   d. Talk by text-message?  
      Yes  No

4. Did you talk to your biological mother today?  
   Yes  No (Skip to #6)

5. Did you:
   a. See your biological mother in person?  
      Yes  No
   b. Talk on the telephone?  
      Yes  No
   c. Talk through email?  
      Yes  No
   d. Talk by text-message?  
      Yes  No

6. Did you talk to your biological father today?  
   Yes  No (Skip to #8)

7. Did you:
   a. See your biological father in person?  
      Yes  No
   b. Talk on the telephone?  
      Yes  No
   c. Talk through email?  
      Yes  No
   d. Talk by text-message?  
      Yes  No

8. Did you talk to your step-mother today?  
   Yes  No (Skip to #10)

9. Did you:
   a. See your step-mom in person?  
      Yes  No
   b. Talk on the telephone?  
      Yes  No
c. Talk through email? Yes No
d. Talk by text-message? Yes No

10. Did you talk to your step-father today? Yes No (Skip to #12)

11. Did you:
   a. See your step-father in person? Yes No
   b. Talk on the telephone? Yes No
c. Talk through email? Yes No
d. Talk by text-message? Yes No

12. Did you talk to another mother-figure today? Yes No (Skip to #14)

13. Did you:
   a. See your other mother-figure in person? Yes No
   b. Talk on the telephone? Yes No
c. Talk through email? Yes No
d. Talk by text-message? Yes No

14. Did you talk to another father-figure today? Yes No (Skip to #16)

15. Did you:
   a. See your other father-figure in person? Yes No
   b. Talk on the telephone? Yes No
c. Talk through email? Yes No
d. Talk by text-message? Yes No

16. Did you talk to a same-sex close friend today? Yes No (Skip to #18)

17. Did you:
   a. See your friend in person? Yes No
   b. Talk on the telephone? Yes No
c. Talk through email? Yes No
d. Talk by text-message? Yes No

18. Did you talk to an opposite-sex close friend today? Yes No (Skip to #20)

19. Did you:
   a. See your friend in person? Yes No
   b. Talk on the telephone? Yes No
c. Talk through email? Yes No
d. Talk by text-message? Yes No

20. Did you talk to a sibling today? Yes No (Skip to #22)

21. Did you:
   a. See your sibling in person? Yes No
   b. Talk on the telephone? Yes No
c. Talk through email? Yes No
d. Talk by text-message? Yes No

22. Did you visit your family with your partner? Yes No (Skip to 24)
   a. If so, who did you visit? _______________ (please give relationship (i.e.,
      mother, grandpa), not name)
   b. How would you rank this experience?
      Positive Experience    Neutral Experience    Negative Experience
c. How did you feel during this activity? (Check all that apply)
      Extremely Satisfied    Neutral    Dissatisfied    Extremely Dissatisfied

23. Did you visit your partner’s family with your partner? Yes No (Skip to 25)
a. If so, who did you visit? ____________ (please give relationship (i.e., mother, grandpa), not name)
b. How would you rank this experience?
   Positive Experience  Neutral Experience  Negative Experience

c. How did you feel during this activity? (Check all that apply).
   Extremely Satisfied  Neutral  Dissatisfied  Extremely Satisfied
   Satisfied  Neutral  Dissatisfied

24. Did your partner do something to make you happy?   Yes  No (Skip to 26)
   a. How would you rank this experience?
      Positive Experience  Neutral Experience  Negative Experience
   b. How did you feel during this activity?
      Extremely Satisfied  Neutral  Dissatisfied  Extremely Satisfied
         Satisfied  Neutral  Dissatisfied
   c. What did you partner do to make you happy?

25. Did you partner do something to make you laugh?   Yes  No (Skip to 27)
   d. What did you partner do?
      e. How funny was it?
         Extremely  Very Funny  Kinda Funny  Not Funny

26. Please check if you have experienced any of these academic stressors today:
   a. Homework/ Presentation/ Individual Project/ Group Project
b. Exam/Mid-Term

27. Did you stay overnight with your partner?  Yes  No

28. If yes to 17, did you stay in the same room?  Yes  No

29. Were you and your partner:
   a. intimate in any of the following ways?
      i. Hugging  Yes  No
      ii. Kissing  Yes  No
      iii. Holding hands  Yes  No
      iv. Cuddling  Yes  No
      v. Making out  Yes  No
      vi. Touched each other under/without clothing  Yes  No
      vii. Touched each others’ genitals (private parts)  Yes  No
      viii. Oral Sex  Yes  No
     ix. Sexual Intercourse  Yes  No
   b. How would you rank this experience?
      Positive Experience  Neutral Experience  Negative Experience
   c. How did you feel during this activity?
      Extremely Satisfied  Neutral  Dissatisfied  Extremely Dissatisfied

Directions: Listed below are some things which can cause problems for dating couples.
Please review the list and then answer the questions. You may use this list to assist you in thinking about problems that you and your partner may have had today (as in the last 24 hours). You may also have had problems with something not listed below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERPERSONAL PROBLEMS</th>
<th>COMMUNICATION:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• He/she promised to do something, but didn’t do it.</td>
<td>• He/she avoids talking about difficult issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• He/she expects you to do everything with them when you wanted to spend time with others.</td>
<td>• He/she puts you down in front of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not feeling able to be self around him/her.</td>
<td>• We have a hard time talking to each other/ knowing what to talk about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not liking his/her attitudes or behaviors.</td>
<td>• He/she didn’t call when they said they would.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not liking some of his/her friends.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parents do not like him/her.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATING:</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Deciding where to go on dates.</td>
<td>• He/she was not doing his/her share of household tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How often you go on dates.</td>
<td>• Not having shared hobbies/interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Deciding whether to go out as a couple or with friends.</td>
<td>• He/she expects you to drop your own interests or hobbies and do theirs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not having a car/ transportation for dates.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JEALOUSY:</th>
<th>TIME:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• He/she was jealous because you were talking to another male/female.</td>
<td>• He/she expecting you to spend so much time with them/ talking on phone you can’t complete your work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• He/she flirted with other males/females.</td>
<td>• He/she doesn’t spend enough time with you.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONEY:</th>
<th>OTHER:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Never enough money to do things on dates.</td>
<td>• Sex/contraception issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• He/she doesn’t have a job.</td>
<td>• Not liking the way he/she drinks alcohol/ smokes cigarettes/ uses marijuana or other drugs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• He/she spends too much money so you have trouble paying the bills.</td>
<td>• He/She not washing self, taking care of hair or clothes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Who should pay for dates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO BE ASKED ON DAY 2 AND BEYOND FOR EVENTS NOTED ON THE PREVIOUS DAY(S) - ONLY IF CONFLICT QUESTIONS WERE ENDORSED POSITIVELY

30. Yesterday you stated that your [partner/same-sex friend/opposite-sex friend/mother/father/sibling] did something that made you upset. Think about this topic as you answer the following questions:
   a. Is this still an issue in your relationship today?
      Yes  No
   b. Were you still upset by this event today?
      Yes  No
   c. How upset are you today about this event?
      1  2  3  4  5  6  7
      Not at all upset
      ____________
      Extremely Upset

31. Did your partner do something to make you upset today? (i.e., Did you have a conflict or disagreement about something with your partner that he/she started?)
   Yes  No (Skip to 32)
   a. What was the conflict/disagreement about? (You may refer to above topics or provide your own).
   __________________________________________________________
   b. Would you consider this a major or minor event?
      Major  Minor
   c. How much did this event expand beyond the original topic?
      1  2  3  4  5  6  7
      None
      __________________________________________
      Extremely
   d. How upset were you by this event?
      1  2  3  4  5  6  7
      Not at all upset
      __________________________________________
      Extremely
e. Did you talk about this topic with anyone else?
Yes  No (Skip to 32)

f. Who?
   i. Mother
   ii. Father
   iii. Step-Mother
   iv. Step-Father
   v. Other mother figure
   vi. Other father figure
   vii. Sibling
   viii. Same Sex Close Friend
   ix. Opposite Sex Close Friend
   x. Roommate

32. Did you do something to make your partner upset today? (i.e., Did you have a conflict or disagreement about something with your partner that you started?)
Yes  No (Skip to 22)

a. What was the conflict/disagreement about? (You may refer to above topics or provide your own).

b. Would you consider this a major or minor event?
   Major  Minor

c. How much did this event expand beyond the original topic?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   None  Extremely

   d. How upset were you by this event?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Not at all upset  Extremely Upset

e. Did you talk about this topic with anyone else?
Yes  No (Skip to 33)

f. Who?
   i. Mother
   ii. Father
   iii. Step-Mother
iv. Step-Father  
v. Other mother figure  
vi. Other father figure  
vii. Sibling  
viii. Same Sex Close Friend  
ix. Opposite Sex Close Friend  
x. Roommate  

33. Did one of your same-sex friends do something to make you upset today? (i.e., Did you have a conflict or disagreement about something?)  
Yes  No (Skip to 34)  
a. What was the conflict/disagreement about? (You may refer to above topics or provide your own).  

b. Would you consider this a major or minor event?  
Major  Minor  
c. How much did this event expand beyond the original topic?  
1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
None  Extremely  
d. How upset were you by this event?  
1  2  3  4  5  6  7  
Not at all upset  Extremely Upset  
e. Did you talk about this topic with anyone else?  
Yes  No (Skip to 34)  
f. Who?  
i. Partner  
ii. Mother  
iii. Father  
iv. Step-Mother  
v. Step-Father  
vi. Other mother figure  
vii. Other father figure  
viii. Sibling  
ix. Same Sex Close Friend  
x. Opposite Sex Close Friend  
x. Roommate  

34. Did one of your opposite-sex friends do something to make you upset today? (i.e., Did you have a conflict or disagreement about something?)  
Yes  No (Skip to 35)
a. What was the conflict/disagreement about? (You may refer to above topics or provide your own).

b. Would you consider this a major or minor event?
   Major  Minor

c. How much did this event expand beyond the original topic?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   None

   d. How upset were you by this event?
      1  2  3  4  5  6  7
      Not at all upset

   e. Did you talk about this topic with anyone else?
      Yes  No (Skip to 35)

   f. Who?
      i. Partner
      ii. Mother
      iii. Father
      iv. Step-Mother
      v. Step-Father
      vi. Other mother figure
      vii. Other father figure
      viii. Sibling
      ix. Same Sex Close Friend
      x. Opposite Sex Close Friend
      xi. Roommate

35. Did your mother/step-mother/mother-figure do something to make you upset today? (i.e., Did you have a conflict or disagreement about something?)
   Yes  No (Skip to 36)

   a. Which mother?
      i. Biological mother
      ii. Step-mother
      iii. Mother-figure

   b. What was the conflict/disagreement about? (You may refer to above topics or provide your own).

   c. Would you consider this a major or minor event?
      Major  Minor

   d. How much did this event expand beyond the original topic?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
None

Extremely

e. How upset were you by this event?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not at all upset

Extremely Upset

f. Did you talk about this topic with anyone else?
   Yes  No (Skip to 36)

g. Who?
   i. Partner
   ii. Mother
   iii. Father
   iv. Step-Mother
   v. Step-Father
   vi. Other mother figure
   vii. Other father figure
   viii. Sibling
   ix. Same Sex Close Friend
   x. Opposite Sex Close Friend
   xi. Roommate

36. Did your father do something to make you upset today? (i.e., Did you have a conflict or disagreement about something?)
   Yes  No (Skip to 37)

a. Which father?
   i. Biological father
   ii. Step-father
   iii. Other father-figure

b. What was the conflict/disagreement about? (You may refer to above topics or provide your own).

c. Would you consider this a major or minor event?
   Major  Minor

d. How much did this event expand beyond the original topic?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
None

Extremely

   e. How upset were you by this event?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
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f. Did you talk about this topic with anyone else?
Yes No (Skip to 37)

g. Who?
   i. Partner
   ii. Mother
   iii. Father
   iv. Step-Mother
   v. Step-Father
   vi. Other mother figure
   vii. Other father figure
   viii. Sibling
   ix. Same Sex Close Friend
   x. Opposite Sex Close Friend
   xi. Roommate

37. Did one of your siblings do something to make you upset today? (i.e., Did you have a conflict or disagreement about something?)
Yes No (Skip to 38)

   a. What was the conflict/disagreement about? (You may refer to above topics or provide your own).

   b. Would you consider this a major or minor event?
      Major Minor

   c. How much did this event expand beyond the original topic?
      1  2  3  4  5  6  7

      None Extremely

   d. How upset were you by this event?
      1  2  3  4  5  6

      Not at all Extremely

      Upset

   e. Did you talk about this topic with anyone else?
      Yes No (Skip to 37)

   f. Who?
      i. Partner
      ii. Mother
      iii. Father
      iv. Step-Mother
38. Did you participate in any of the following activities today? If yes, please answer the follow-up questions:

a. Had meal with/Made meal together
   i. Who did you eat with today? (Check all that apply).
      1. I ate alone. (Cannot answer 2-12)
      2. Partner
      3. Biological mother
      4. Biological father
      5. Step-mother
      6. Step-father
      7. Other mother figure
      8. Other father figure
      9. Same-sex close friend
     10. Opposite-sex close friend
     11. Sibling
     12. Other person, please specify ___________
   ii. How did you feel during this experience?
      Positive  Neutral  Negative
      Experience  Experience  Experience

b. Watched a movie
   i. Who did you see a movie with? (Check all that apply).
      1. I watched it alone. (Cannot answer 2-12)
      2. Partner
      3. Biological mother
      4. Biological father
      5. Step-mother
      6. Step-father
      7. Other mother figure
      8. Other father figure
      9. Same-sex close friend
     10. Opposite-sex close friend
     11. Sibling
12. Other person, please specify __________

ii. How did you feel during this experience?
   Positive  Neutral  Negative
   Experience  Experience  Experience

c. Went to a play
   Yes  No (Skip to 22d)
   i. Who did you see the play with? (Check all that apply).
      1. I went alone. (Cannot answer 2-12)
      2. Partner
      3. Biological mother
      4. Biological father
      5. Step-mother
      6. Step-father
      7. Other mother figure
      8. Other father figure
      9. Same-sex close friend
     10. Opposite-sex close friend
     11. Sibling
     12. Other person, please specify __________

   ii. How did you feel during this experience?
      Positive  Neutral  Negative
      Experience  Experience  Experience

d. Visited a museum
   Yes  No (Skip to 22e)
   i. Who did you visit the museum with? (Check all that apply).
      1. I went alone. (Cannot answer 2-12)
      2. Partner
      3. Biological mother
      4. Biological father
      5. Step-mother
      6. Step-father
      7. Other mother figure
      8. Other father figure
      9. Same-sex close friend
     10. Opposite-sex close friend
     11. Sibling
     12. Other person, please specify __________

   ii. How did you feel during this experience?
      Positive  Neutral  Negative
      Experience  Experience  Experience
e. Went to a concert  Yes  No (Skip to 22f)
   i. Who did you see the concert with? (Check all that apply).
      1. I went alone. (Cannot answer 2-12)
      2. Partner
      3. Biological mother
      4. Biological father
      5. Step-mother
      6. Step-father
      7. Other mother figure
      8. Other father figure
      9. Same-sex close friend
     10. Opposite-sex close friend
     11. Sibling
     12. Other person, please specify ____________
   ii. How did you feel during this experience?
      Positive  Neutral  Negative
      Experience  Experience  Experience

f. Went to a sporting event  Yes  No (Skip to 22g)
   i. Who did you attend the sporting event with? (Check all that apply).
      1. I went alone. (Cannot answer 2-12)
      2. Partner
      3. Biological mother
      4. Biological father
      5. Step-mother
      6. Step-father
      7. Other mother figure
      8. Other father figure
      9. Same-sex close friend
     10. Opposite-sex close friend
     11. Sibling
     12. Other person, please specify ____________
   ii. How did you feel during this experience?
      Positive  Neutral  Negative
      Experience  Experience  Experience

g. Watched a sporting event on TV  Yes  No (Skip to 22h)
   i. Who did you watch the sporting event with? (Check all that apply).
      1. I went alone. (Cannot answer 2-12)
      2. Partner
      3. Biological mother
4. Biological father
5. Step-mother
6. Step-father
7. Other mother figure
8. Other father figure
9. Same-sex close friend
10. Opposite-sex close friend
11. Sibling
12. Other person, please specify ___________

ii. How did you feel during this experience?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Experience</th>
<th>Neutral Experience</th>
<th>Negative Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

h. Went grocery shopping

i. Who did you go grocery shopping with? (Check all that apply).
1. I went alone. (Cannot answer 2-12)
2. Partner
3. Biological mother
4. Biological father
5. Step-mother
6. Step-father
7. Other mother figure
8. Other father figure
9. Same-sex close friend
10. Opposite-sex close friend
11. Sibling
12. Other person, please specify ___________

ii. How did you feel during this experience?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Experience</th>
<th>Neutral Experience</th>
<th>Negative Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

i. Went to a Laundromat/did laundry together

j. Who did you do laundry with? (Check all that apply).
1. I went/did it alone. (Cannot answer 2-12)
2. Partner
3. Biological mother
4. Biological father
5. Step-mother
6. Step-father
7. Other mother figure
8. Other father figure
9. Same-sex close friend
10. Opposite-sex close friend
11. Sibling
12. Other person, please specify ___________

ii. How did you feel during this experience?
   Positive               Neutral               Negative
   Experience             Experience           Experience

j. Went to a restaurant   Yes        No (Skip to 22k)
   i. Who did you go to a restaurant with? (Check all that apply).
      1. I went alone. (Cannot answer 2-12)
      2. Partner
      3. Biological mother
      4. Biological father
      5. Step-mother
      6. Step-father
      7. Other mother figure
      8. Other father figure
      9. Same-sex close friend
     10. Opposite-sex close friend
     11. Sibling
     12. Other person, please specify ___________
   ii. How did you feel during this experience?
      Positive               Neutral               Negative
      Experience             Experience           Experience

k. Studied or did homework  Yes        No (Skip to 22l)
   i. Who did you study or do homework with? (Check all that apply).
      1. I studied alone. (Cannot answer 2-12)
      2. Partner
      3. Biological mother
      4. Biological father
      5. Step-mother
      6. Step-father
      7. Other mother figure
      8. Other father figure
      9. Same-sex close friend
     10. Opposite-sex close friend
     11. Sibling
     12. Other person, please specify ___________
   ii. How did you feel during this experience?
      Positive               Neutral               Negative
      Experience             Experience           Experience
1. Watched television
   i. Who did you watch television with? (Check all that apply).
      1. I watched it alone. (Cannot answer 2-12)
      2. Partner
      3. Biological mother
      4. Biological father
      5. Step-mother
      6. Step-father
      7. Other mother figure
      8. Other father figure
      9. Same-sex close friend
      10. Opposite-sex close friend
      11. Sibling
      12. Other person, please specify ___________
   ii. How did you feel during this experience?
      Positive    Neutral    Negative
      Experience  Experience  Experience

m. Attended a religious or spiritual event
   i. Who did you go to a religious or spiritual event with? (Check all that apply).
      1. I went alone. (Cannot answer 2-12)
      2. Partner
      3. Biological mother
      4. Biological father
      5. Step-mother
      6. Step-father
      7. Other mother figure
      8. Other father figure
      9. Same-sex close friend
     10. Opposite-sex close friend
     11. Sibling
     12. Other person, please specify ___________
   ii. How did you feel during this experience?
      Positive    Neutral    Negative
      Experience  Experience  Experience

n. Went to a bar
   i. Who did you go to a bar with? (Check all that apply).
1. I went alone. (Cannot answer 2-12)
2. Partner
3. Biological mother
4. Biological father
5. Step-mother
6. Step-father
7. Other mother figure
8. Other father figure
9. Same-sex close friend
10. Opposite-sex close friend
11. Sibling
12. Other person, please specify ___________

ii. How did you feel during this experience?
   Positive          Neutral          Negative
   Experience        Experience        Experience

o. Went to a party
   Yes             No (Skip to 22p)

   i. Who did you go to a party with? (Check all that apply).
      1. I went alone. (Cannot answer 2-12)
      2. Partner
      3. Biological mother
      4. Biological father
      5. Step-mother
      6. Step-father
      7. Other mother figure
      8. Other father figure
      9. Same-sex close friend
     10. Opposite-sex close friend
     11. Sibling
     12. Other person, please specify ___________

   ii. How did you feel during this experience?
       Positive          Neutral          Negative
       Experience        Experience        Experience

p. Went shopping
   Yes             No (Skip to 22q)

   i. Who did you go shopping with? (Check all that apply).
      1. I went alone. (Cannot answer 2-12)
      2. Partner
      3. Biological mother
      4. Biological father
      5. Step-mother
      6. Step-father
7. Other mother figure
8. Other father figure
9. Same-sex close friend
10. Opposite-sex close friend
11. Sibling
12. Other person, please specify ___________

ii. How did you feel during this experience?
   Positive                  Neutral                  Negative
   Experience                Experience                Experience

q. Went to gym/exercised with
   Yes        No (Skip to 22r)

   i. Who did you go to the gym/exercise with? (Check all that apply).
      1. I went alone. (Cannot answer 2-12)
      2. Partner
      3. Biological mother
      4. Biological father
      5. Step-mother
      6. Step-father
      7. Other mother figure
      8. Other father figure
      9. Same-sex close friend
     10. Opposite-sex close friend
     11. Sibling
     12. Other person, please specify ___________

   ii. How did you feel during this experience?
      Positive                  Neutral                  Negative
      Experience                Experience                Experience

r. Went for a walk
   Yes        No (Skip to 22s)

   i. Who did you go for a walk with? (Check all that apply).
      1. I went alone. (Cannot answer 2-12)
      2. Partner
      3. Biological mother
      4. Biological father
      5. Step-mother
      6. Step-father
      7. Other mother figure
      8. Other father figure
      9. Same-sex close friend
     10. Opposite-sex close friend
     11. Sibling
     12. Other person, please specify ___________
ii. How did you feel during this experience?
   Positive   Neutral   Negative
   Experience Experience Experience

s. Did an outdoor activity (i.e., hike, bike, played sport) Yes  no (Skip to 22t)
i. Who did you do an outdoor activity with? (Check all that apply).
   1. I went alone. (Cannot answer 2-12)
   2. Partner
   3. Biological mother
   4. Biological father
   5. Step-mother
   6. Step-father
   7. Other mother figure
   8. Other father figure
   9. Same-sex close friend
   10. Opposite-sex close friend
   11. Sibling
   12. Other person, please specify ___________

ii. How did you feel during this experience?
   Positive   Neutral   Negative
   Experience Experience Experience

t. Played video games     Yes   No (Skip to 22u)
i. Who did you play video games with? (Check all that apply).
   1. I played alone. (Cannot answer 2-12)
   2. Partner
   3. Biological mother
   4. Biological father
   5. Step-mother
   6. Step-father
   7. Other mother figure
   8. Other father figure
   9. Same-sex close friend
   10. Opposite-sex close friend
   11. Sibling
   12. Other person, please specify ___________

ii. How did you feel during this experience?
   Positive   Neutral   Negative
   Experience Experience Experience

u. Hung out     Yes   No (Skip to #23)
i. Who did you hang out with? (Check all that apply).
   1. I went alone. (Cannot answer 2-12)
   2. Partner
   3. Biological mother
   4. Biological father
   5. Step-mother
   6. Step-father
   7. Other mother figure
   8. Other father figure
   9. Same-sex close friend
   10. Opposite-sex close friend
   11. Sibling
   12. Other person, please specify ___________

ii. How did you feel during this experience?
   Positive  Neutral  Negative
   Experience  Experience  Experience
APPENDIX O
DAILY DIARY FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS

We would like to ask you a few questions about your experience in completing this online daily diary for the past 14 days. We ask that you answer these questions honestly and to the best of your ability. You will not be penalized (i.e., receive fewer credits or less money) for your answers on these items.

Day 14 Questions Addendum:

1) How honestly do you feel you answered the daily diary over the past 14 days?
   a. Very honestly
   b. Honestly
   c. Somewhat honestly
   d. Rarely honestly
   e. Not honestly at all

2) Do you feel participating in the online daily diary made you more aware of your behavior?
   a. Not at all aware
   b. Somewhat aware
   c. Average
   d. Somewhat aware
   e. Extremely aware

3) Do you think you fought more or less, on average, than usual during the online daily diary?
   a. Much more
   b. Somewhat more
   c. Average
   d. Somewhat less
   e. Much less

4) How often did you consult with your boyfriend or girlfriend on your answers during the online daily diary period?
5) How often did you and your boyfriend or girlfriend complete the online daily diary together?

a. Never
b. 1-2 days
c. 3-5 days
d. 6-10 days
e. more than 10 days

6) Do you and your boyfriend or girlfriend live together?

a. Yes
b. No, but we spend many nights together
c. No, and we don’t spend nights together
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