



# VCU

Virginia Commonwealth University  
**VCU Scholars Compass**

---

Theses and Dissertations

Graduate School

---

2009

## AN EXAMINATION OF FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE FRIENDSHIPS IN YOUNG ADULTS FROM INTACT AND DIVORCED FAMILIES

Stephanie Wolf

*Virginia Commonwealth University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

© The Author

---

Downloaded from

<https://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/etd/2119>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at VCU Scholars Compass. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of VCU Scholars Compass. For more information, please contact [libcompass@vcu.edu](mailto:libcompass@vcu.edu).

AN EXAMINATION OF FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE FRIENDSHIPS IN YOUNG  
ADULTS FROM INTACT AND DIVORCED FAMILIES

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of  
Science at Virginia Commonwealth University.

By: STEPHANIE SUSANNE GENSER WOLF

Bachelor of Arts, University of Rochester, 1998  
Juris Doctorate, University of Maryland School of Law, 2001

Director: Arnold Stolberg, Ph.D.  
Title: Professor of Psychology  
Department of Psychology

Virginia Commonwealth University  
Richmond, Virginia  
May, 2010

## **Acknowledgment**

I would like to acknowledge the members of this thesis committee, Dr. Arnold Stolberg, Dr. Rosalie Corona, and Dr. Katherine Macie, for their time and expertise. I would particularly like to thank my research advisor and committee chair, Dr. Arnold Stolberg, for his mentorship throughout this project. I am especially grateful to my husband, Steven Wolf, my son Maxwell Wolf and my parents Sander and Lyne Genser for their endless support and unconditional love. Thanks also go to my friends and colleagues for their continual advice and encouragement,

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgments.....	ii
List of Tables .....	vi
Abstract .....	vii
Introduction .....	1
Review of Literature .....	1
Development of Friendships .....	1
Factors Affecting Friendships .....	3
Friendships and Relation to Parents .....	3
Parents Relation to Each Other and Impact on Offspring Friendship .....	7
Marital Status of Parents .....	8
Friendship and Emotion Regulation .....	9
Friendship and Life Experience .....	11
Statement of the Problem .....	11
Proposed Data Analyses .....	12
Method .....	15
Participants .....	16
Measures .....	17
Parental Bonding Instrument .....	17
Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire .....	19
Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale .....	20
Life Experiences Survey .....	22
Intimate Friendship Scale .....	23
Social Support Questionnaire .....	25
Procedure .....	26
Data Analyses .....	27
Results .....	27

Correlation Among Measures .....	27
Independent Samples T-Tests .....	32
Hierarchical Regressions .....	42
Discussion .....	53
Summary and Findings .....	53
Limitations .....	59
Implications and Future Research .....	60
List of References .....	63
Appendices .....	76
Recruitment Information .....	76
Demographics .....	80
Parental Bonding Instrument .....	83
Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire .....	93
Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale .....	117
Life Experiences Survey .....	125
Intimate Friendship Scale .....	143
Social Support Questionnaire .....	151
Vita .....	162

## List of Tables

Table .....	Page
1. Correlation Coefficients Among Independent Variables.....	29
2. Coefficients Among Dependent Variables .....	30
3. Correlations Between Independent and Dependent Variables .....	31
4. Means, Standard Deviations and T-Test Comparisons For Semester .....	33
5. Means, Standard Deviations and T-Test Comparisons By Gender .....	36
6. Means, Standard Deviations and T-Test Comparisons By Marital Status .....	39
7. Summary of Hierarchical Regression of Parenting Factors, Emotion Regulation and Life Experience on Intimacy .....	44
8. Summary of Hierarchical Regression of Parenting Factors, Emotion Regulation and Life Experience on Satisfaction with Friendship Network .....	47
9. Summary of Hierarchical Regression of Parenting Factors, Emotion Regulation and Life Experience on Perceived Number of Persons within Friendship Network .....	51

## **Abstract**

### **AN EXAMINATION OF FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE FRIENDSHIPS IN YOUNG ADULTS FROM INTACT AND DIVORCED FAMILIES**

By Stephanie Susanne Genser Wolf, J.D.

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of  
Science at Virginia Commonwealth University.

Virginia Commonwealth University, 2010

Major Director: Arnold L. Stolberg, Ph.D.  
Professor of Psychology  
Department of Psychology

Specific factors effecting young adult friendship development have been identified by the literature with little focus on which are most influential in determining friendship composition.. Hierarchical regression was used to examine such factors. Participants included 400 undergraduate Psychology students at a state university in the mid-Atlantic region. Findings indicated parental relationships were the strongest predictor of friendship quality. Parent-child bonds, conflict between parents, and emotion regulation skills best predicted levels of intimacy. Parent-child bond-especially with mother-best predicted satisfaction with friendship network as did conflict between parents. In addition, parent-child bond with mother and conflict between parents were found more important than emotion regulation skills although such skills were still found significant. Contrary to predictions life events were not significant to all outcome variables. Instead life events were found significant only to satisfaction with friendship networks. Finally, parental marital status was found significant, but minimally, only for friendship intimacy.

## An Examination of Factors that Influence Friendships in Adults from Intact and Divorced Families

Friends during our lifespan serve a crucial role in happiness. They provide us delight and companionship, help us become more self-aware, and provide support during difficult times (Bukowski, Newcomb, & Hartup, 1996; Pahl, Ray, & Spencer, 1997). Friendships are different than family relationships because we choose our friends and are accepted by them based on intrinsic qualities and shared interests (Rushton & Bons, 2005). The development of friendships and intimacy begins from infancy and continues through adulthood. It is important to understand this development before examining the factors which may affect our friendships. While we may choose our friends, there are many factors that may unconsciously affect the choices we make, how intimate we are with them and the number of persons in our social network. Such factors include our relationship with our parents, their relationship to each other, parents' marital status, individual internal characteristics such as emotion regulations ability, and our life experiences (Zarbatany, Conley, & Pepper, 2004; Bauminger, Finzi-Dottan, Chason, & Har-Even, 2008).

### *The Development of Friendships*

The voluntary nature of friendships enables us to find friends that fulfill us. Thus having close friendships is positively correlated with self-esteem and overall contentment (Denissen, Penke, Schmitt, & Van Aken, 2008). Furthermore, the skills we learn in making friends aids in the development of more intimate relationships and in forming life partners (Bagwell, Schmidt, Newcomb, & Bukowski, 2002).



Young children will interact and learn from others their age, but their egocentric nature makes them less vulnerable to peers acceptance or rejection (Hanish, Ryan, Martin, & Fabes, 2005). However, once the young child moves into middle childhood and their school years, the peer group takes on new importance. Friendships become more complex as the children grow-they demand more from their friends, become more selective as to who their friends are, and will become more vulnerable to rejections from friends (Erwin, 1998). But despite the increased attachment between friends, children typically have yet to experience true intimacy (Erwin, 1998).

Intimacy can be defined as the extent that two persons exchange their personal thoughts, ideas and feelings (Arnett, 2004). According to Sullivan (1953) the need for intimacy with friends heightens in pre-adolescence and continues to grow. Near the age of ten, children have a propensity to develop a close friendship with one particular person of the same gender (Arnett, 2004). This new level of friendship can be reached because the child has now formed the cognitive ability to have empathy for another and take their perspective. The friendship now shifts from play partners to a relationship in which each member cares about the person as an individual (Bagwell et al., 2002). As the child moves into adolescence, their friendships become increasingly more important to them and also serve to enhance their individual development (Bagwell et al., 2002). As they become more attached to each other, friends are more motivated to see things from the other's perspective. Friends also serve the important role of evaluator, providing accurate assessments of the individual's strengths and faults.

Such feedback allows a more accurate picture of one's self to be formed, contributing to the development of one's individual identity (Arnett, 2004). The adolescent has a greater cognitive ability, allowing for abstract thinking. Such thinking enables the adolescent to understand and talk about more abstract concepts in their friendships such as trust and loyalty (Erwin, 1998).

The changes in one's body, newfound freedoms, and the beginnings of sexual experience, further contribute to more personal information that can be shared and discussed with one's intimates, tightening the bond between them. As the adolescent moves into young adulthood, friendships become even more central to their lives. A young adult typically becomes more independent, finding a career and a place to live outside of his or her family's home. At this point in their life, most young adults will postpone marriage and child-bearing, and are not responsible for aging parents. Thus, they need to fill their lives with friends that serve their intimacy needs until they meet a life partner and start a family of their own. Later, when they make the transition to marriage and children, the dimensions of these friendships will lose some importance as their needs and the focus of intimacy are provided by their new family (Hartup & Stevens, 2005).

#### *Factors Affecting Friendships*

While friendship development will follow a trajectory based on age and maturity, friendships will also be affected by relationship with parents, their relationship to each other, internal characteristics such as emotion regulation ability, and life experiences (Zarbatany et al., 2004; Bauminger et al., 2008).

#### *Friendship and Relation to Parents*

Relationships with parents impact later friendships (Mayseless & Scharf, 2007; Furman, Simon, Shaffwe, & Bouchey, 2002). The literature suggests that a close relationship with parents may lead to close friendships while a less connected relationship with parents may lead to unsatisfying friendships (Liu, 2006; Ducharme, Doyle, & Markiewicz, 2002).

The association between parental relationship and friendship intimacy has been studied from different perspectives including a focus on attachment theory, the unique relationship between the child and his or her parents, and similarities/differences in parental relationships and friendships (Mayseless & Scharf, 2007; Furman et al., 2002). Adolescents have been the primary focus of studies, with a lesser focus on young adults and older persons (Engels, Finkenaur, & Mees, 2001).

Attachment effects on friendship can be profound. A secure attachment to parents is most promising for intimacy in friendships (Mayseless & Scharf, 2007; Barrett & Holmes, 2001; Furman, et al., 2002; Liu, 2006; Ducharme et al., 2002). Attachment style can affect the duration and quality of friendships (Miller & Hoicowitz, 2004), how a person interprets friends in social situations (Barrett & Holmes, 2001), and how a person behaves in a friendship (Furman, et al., 2002).

Attachment as explained by Bowlby (1969; 1973) is the beliefs and guidelines which are created in response to the initial caregiver, and once formed serve as a framework as how an individual will experience later social relationships (Miller & Hoicowitz, 2004).

Various attachments can be formed and may change as one ages: this includes (in addition to attachment to parents) attachment to friends and attachment to caregivers (Miller & Hoicowitz, 2004).

Securely attached persons are more likely to have friendships that last longer (Miller & Hoicowitz, 2004) are more likely to see interactions as supportive, and are less likely to experience rejection and disappointment (Liu, 2006). They are also more likely to be emotionally expressive and to use negotiation and compromise for conflict resolution (Ducharme, et al., 2002).

People with insecure attachments to parents tend to have shorter and lower quality friendships (Miller & Hoicowitz, 2004). They are less proactive in planning, more aggressive and display avoidant behaviors in their friendships (Barrett & Holmes, 2001).

The effect of parental attachment on friendship may be age dependent, with parental attachment affecting the friendships of older adolescents more than their younger counterparts (Engels et al., 2001). Parents tend to be very accepting of their child before they become adolescents, and thus the child's working model may say that "it does not matter whom I affiliate with, my parents will still love me."

However, as the child matures and individuates, parents become more cautious and aware of whom the child is choosing to affiliate with, and so the parental relationship may have a greater impact (Engels et al., 2001).

Mothers and fathers may affect their child's friendships differently. The literature conflicts as to which parent may have an effect and which parent relationship produces which specific result (Heyl & Schmitt, 2007).

The mother-child relationship has been shown to have a positive impact on friendship quality. When characteristics of good communication, support validation and affection

existed in mother-child relationships, they were more likely to be observed in the child's friendships (Brody, Stoneman, & McCoy, 1992).

When these same characteristics were found within the father-child relationship, no similar pattern was observed in the child's friendships. Instead, positive associations between the father-child relationship were found with the child's sibling relationships (Brody et al., 1994).

The father-child relationship may have a unique impact on friendships (Parke & Buriel, 1998). One study found that persons used more similar descriptions of their relationship with fathers and relationships with current friends, while they had more differences in their descriptions between relationships with their mothers and current friendships (Heyl & Schmitt, 2007).

Consistency between the closeness with friends and parents has been demonstrated with adolescent populations (Van Wel, 1994; Knoester, Haynie & Stephens, 2006). As adolescents age they seek friendships similar to their relationships with their parents - even as they individuate from their parents.

The parental-child emotional bond remains as the adolescent ages, though they may become less close overall as a function of heading toward adulthood (Van Wel, 1994). High-quality parental relationships lead to less deviant friends and more friends that have pro-social characteristics, such as future educational plans and involvement in extracurricular activity (Knoester et al., 2006).

There are some methodological problems with the research in this area. There is disagreement as to what is important in measuring the relationship with the parent. The

literature differs on whether the attachment classification, the interaction between the dyad or something else is the pivotal determinant (Heyl & Schmitt, 2007; Miller & Hoicowitz, 2004). Many of the studies conducted differ also as to how they evaluate the parent child relationship, and if they consider the relationship with parents together or the mother/father individually (Knoester et al., 2006; Heyl & Schmitt, 2007).

It can be difficult to generalize across the literature, due to the lack of a uniform definition of quality of friendship. There are almost as many measures and factors being used to evaluate quality as there are studies that endeavor to explore the area. This problem is not one that can be easily overcome as inherent in determining quality are judgments as to what is important to individuals, which can vary based on differing needs and backgrounds. Despite the lack of uniformity if the majority of the studies find significant results the effect of parental relationship on friendship must be strong.

#### *Parents Relations to Each Other and the Impact on Offspring Friendship*

How parents interact, the amount of conflict they exhibit, the degree of triangulation and the level of co-parenting that occurs have all been demonstrated to affect their offspring's relationship. Higher levels of inter-parent conflict predict that offspring will have lower levels of intimacy with their parents and will have more adjustment difficulties (Ferrante & Stolberg, 2005; Crockenberg & Langrock, 2001, Laumann-Billings & Emery, 2000).

Poor parental communication often leads to inconsistent parenting and low levels of monitoring, which have both been associated with poorer outcomes for their offspring (Ferrante & Stolberg, 2005). When children become involved in the parental feuds and the

boundaries between generations become distorted, the children suffer. This triangulation serves to create unclear boundaries in relationships, leading to more negative psychological adjustment as adults (Brenner & Fox, 1999).

Few studies have examined the effect of parental conflict on friendship. In one study, adolescent children from high conflict homes were more likely to have friends who fight more and were more deviant, though this effect was moderated by parental monitoring (Knoester et al., 2006). In a different study of a college sample high levels of family conflict (without the parental focus) led to smaller friendship networks and less satisfying friendships overall (Jones, 1992). In this study, family conflict also led to a more negative affective experience and greater loneliness (Jones, 1992).

#### *Marital Status of Parents*

Parental divorce can impact many important aspects of one's relationships, including levels of closeness, ranging from intimates to acquaintances. Divorce has been shown to directly affect the intimate romantic relationships of adult children in multiple ways. This includes interpersonal precociousness (Bartell, 2006), early sexual experiences (Wallerstein & Lewis, 1998), more sexual partners (Gabardi & Rosen, 1992), earlier marriage and childbearing (Keith & Finlay, 1988), more hesitancy about commitment (Gabardi & Rosen, 1992) and more fearfulness of divorce (Kirk, 2002). Higher divorce rates reflect some of the relational difficulties additionally reported in adult children of divorce (Arditti, 1999; Keith & Finlay, 1988).

Divorce also may adversely impact non-romantic relationships, including diminished quality and quantity of friends in a person's network (Jones, 1992; Kirk, 2002; Guttman, 1993).

The quality of friendships can be affected by divorce. Children of divorce are less likely to confide in their best friends than their counterparts from intact families, and are less willing to work through problems within the friendship (Guttman, 1993). They are more likely to have a best friend of the opposite sex (Guttman, 1993).

The number of friends within a person's network can also be affected by divorce. College students from families of divorce have been found to have smaller friendship networks than their intact counterparts. However, their affective experience and reported social support from friendships did not differ from experiences of intact family peers (Jones, 1992).

According to one study the effects of divorce on friendship may also have a gender component. Male children seem to suffer more, having fewer friends with less intimacy than their female counterparts. (Lindsey, Colwell, Frabutt, & Mackinnon-Lewis, 2006). This gender difference has not been demonstrated elsewhere to date.

Notably, there is evidence that contradicts many of the effects described above. In some studies, no effects from divorce were found on the quality of children's friendships, on their social life or on the likelihood of their having a best friend (Kirk, 2002; Guttman, 1993).

### *Friendship and Emotion Regulation*



Emotion regulation ability serves an essential role in determining the quality and flavor of social interactions. The higher the ability to successfully regulate emotions, the more likely a positive and long lasting friendship will occur (Argyle & Lu, 1990; Furr & Funder, 1998).

Emotion regulation has been defined as one's ability to adjust their emotional experiences in order to be at desired affective conditions and achieve adaptive outcomes (Gross & John, 2003; Lopes, Salovey, Cote, & Beer, 2005). This ability is imperative to successful social interactions. Emotions serve as a foundation to social interactions, setting a backdrop for exchanges and influencing how others respond. Studies have shown that positive emotion cultivates and leads to positive responses. Similarly, negative emotional expression tends to lead to negative responses and an end of the social interaction (Argyle & Lu, 1990; Lopes et al., 2005). Additionally, emotions provide expectations as to the quality of the interaction ahead, thus if a negative emotion were expressed, the receiving actor may expect a negative interaction and behave in a negative manner (Furr & Funder, 1998). While many studies have demonstrated that a higher level of emotion regulation ability is associated with higher social ability in children (Eisenberg, Fabes, Guthrie, & Reiser, 2000) there have been a limited number of studies that have demonstrated this relation in an adult population. One study of undergraduate students found emotion regulation abilities to be significantly correlated with quality of social interactions.

Participants with high levels of emotion regulation skills self-reported (and were confirmed by their peers) to be more interpersonally sensitive and have more pro-social behaviors (Lopes et al., 2005). In another recent study undergraduates with higher levels of emotion

regulation were found to have relationships with more companionship, affection and support. They were also found to have greater overall current relationships with their parents as measured through the Network of Relationship Inventory (Lopes, Salovey, & Straus, 2003).

### *Friendship and Life Experiences*

Life events can serve to hinder or bolster emotional intimacy and situational availability (Pahl & Pevalin, 2005; Glover & Parry, 2008).

Life events can change emotional intimacy with others. Positive life events can lead us to engage in more leisure activities, provide us with uplifted moods and increase our tolerance of others (Glover & Parry, 2008). However, negative life events can be equally or more powerful, depending on the specific life event and individual characteristics. Some may reach out more to others during times of distress, revealing more and increasing intimacy (Iwasaki & Mannell, 2000a). Others may withdraw more from social companions, have less to offer others, and find intimacy diminishing (Glover & Parry, 2008). The life events may serve to change the nature of the friendship or the friendship contract expectations (Wiseman, 1986).

Life events can also change situational availability, thus impacting friendships. Life changes such as geographical mobility and divorce of parents will affect whom one affiliates with (Pahl & Pevalin, 2005).

As a person experiences different life transitions they can dramatically become more or less involved in a variety of activities where friendships are found. This differing involvement then serves to change the strength of these affiliations (Feld & Carter, 1998).

### *Statement of the Problem*

Friendship is vital to an individual living a fulfilled and joyous life. Friendships serve to promote self-growth and to provide support during times of hardship (Bukowski, et al., 1996; Pahl et al., 1997). Due to the pivotal nature of friendship in many aspects of an individual's life, understanding factors that impede the quality and quantity of friendship is imperative to being able to help individuals who may struggle in this area.

The present study intends to further identify and clarify the salience of these factors in friendship intimacy, satisfaction and network size through examining young adults from divorced and intact families. There is some evidence that the divorce experience might be significant to friendship and as such the variable should be included for further exploration (Guttman, 1993; Jones, 1992; Kirk, 2002). Additionally, conflict is expected to be an important factor in the friendship outcomes. By including divorced as well as intact populations there is a greater probability of identifying high conflict families within the sample.

The literature suggests specific factors that may be important in overall friendship. The role of family factors - including the bond with the parent or parents and their relationship with each other (Miller & Hoicowitz, 2004), individual emotion regulation abilities (Argyle & Lu, 1990) and life experiences (Wiseman, 1986) - all may have an impact on friendship.

*Proposed Data Analyses:*

Hierarchical regressions were utilized in the data analyses in order to employ current theoretical understandings of the identified variables within the friendship literature. Placement of variables within each step corresponded to the current identified level of

importance and corresponding strength of the literature related to that variable. Parental bond was chosen to be entered in step 1 of the hierarchical regressions because it has the largest amount of current support for its relation to friendship. Strong Parental bonds both with mothers and fathers have been found related to satisfaction and intimacy within friendships (Liu, 2006; Ducharme, Doyle, & Markiewicz, 2002). In addition the level of attachment to the parent has been shown to relate to the quality of friendship interactions, emotion expression utilized and the amount of conflict present (Miller & Hoicowitz, 2004; (Ducharme, et al., 2002).

Co-parenting was entered in step 2 of the hierarchical regressions because it has been demonstrated as having a strong impact on offspring life adjustment but there are less studies which specifically relate this variable to friendship. The impact of co-parenting on adjustment has been most profoundly seen within the divorce literature but also finds some support within the friendship arena. Low levels of co-parenting predict offspring may have lower levels of intimacy with family and more adjustment difficulties (Ferrante & Stolberg, 2005; Crockenberg & Langrock, 2001). Low levels of co-parenting have also been demonstrated to lead to more deviant friends, smaller friendship networks and less friendship satisfaction (Knoester et al., 2006; Jones, 1992).

Parental marital status was entered into step 3 of the hierarchical regressions because the literature is more unclear on the importance of this variable. While there is a large body of older literature indicating that parental status is determinative in offspring outcome (Wallerstein & Lewis, 1998; Gabardi & Rosen, 1992; Keith & Finlay, 1988), this idea has been clarified in the past decade and the focus has turned more towards the level of co-

parenting and conflict within the parents' relation to each other as the more significant factor (Bartell, 2006). Within the friendship arena the impact of marital status has only been examined by a small number of studies and results have been contradictory (Guttmann, 1993; Jones, 1992) in determining whether there is an impact and what that impact may be

Emotion regulation skills were entered into step 4 of the hierarchical regressions because while the relation of emotion regulation ability and sociability has been widely recognized in young children there has been little research examining these abilities and friendships in young adults. In the few studies that have been conducted correlations were found between emotion regulation skills and the quality of social interactions as well as pro-social behaviors (Lopes et al., 2005; Lopes et al., 2003).

Total positive and negative life experiences were entered in the final step of the hierarchical regressions as a result of the lack of any direct friendship literature that examines their impact. Other literature concerning overall life happiness though indicates life experiences can have a profound effect on life satisfaction (Pahl & Pevalin, 2005; Glover & Parry, 2008). Because part of life satisfaction involves friendships, life events may have a unique effect on friendships that deserves exploring.

*Specific Hypotheses:*

- 1) Young adults' friendship intimacy will be predicted by their parent-child bond, the amount and type of co-parenting their parents' employ, the marital status of their parents, their emotion regulation skills, and their total positive and negative life experiences. Within the overall model, each will account for a unique portion of the variance but parent-child bond will be a stronger predictor.

- 2) Young adults' friendship satisfaction will be predicted by their parent-child bond, the amount and type of co-parenting their parents' employ, their emotion regulation skills, and their total positive and negative life experiences. Within the overall model, each will account for a unique portion of the variance but parent-child bond will be a stronger predictor.
- 3) Young adults' number of friends within their friendship network will be predicted by their parent-child bond, the amount and type of co-parenting their parents' employ, their emotion regulation skills, and their total positive and negative life experiences. Within the overall model, each will account for a unique portion of the variance but emotion regulations will be a stronger predictor.

### **Method**

This study investigated factors that may affect friendships through an examination of young adults from intact and divorced families. Young adults that experienced parental divorce were compared with young adults whose parents were married and living together. The participants were compared on various measures relating to quality and quantity of friendship. Information was obtained through questionnaires reflecting factors relating to the parent child relationship, the parental relationship, emotion regulation and life experiences. The factors associated with parent-child interactions and parental behaviors were measured by retrospective report of the young adult participants. Participants were asked to think back to their childhood in order to respond to many of the questions.

The predictors of friendship quality studied here were:

- Family status (divorced vs. intact)

- Inter-parent conflict (measured by Triangulation and Conflict scales each for mother and father on the Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire)
- Quality of co-parenting (measured by Communication and Respect/Cooperation scales each for mother and father on the Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire)
- Quality of relationship with parents (measured by Care and Protection subscales each for mother and father on the Parental Bonding Instrument)
- The effect of life change events (measured by the Life Change Events total score for positive and negative events)
- Level of emotion regulation skills (measured by the 6 scales for emotion regulation on The Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale): Non-acceptance, Goals, Impulse, Awareness, Strategies and Clarity

The outcomes for young adult friendships that were measured were:

- Quality of intimate friendships (measured by the Total Intimacy score of the Intimacy Friendship Scale)
- Satisfaction of friendships (measured by the Satisfaction Friendship Score of the Social Support Questionnaire)
- Perceived number of social supports (measured by the Perceived Number of Social Support average score of the Social Support Questionnaire)

### **Participants**

Participants were 400 undergraduate Psychology students at a large state university in the mid-Atlantic region.

Participants were excluded from analyses if they reported their parents had never been married, or if they had been separated but not divorced. Participants were also excluded if completion time was less than ten minutes. A total of seven participants were excluded. Three hundred and ninety-three surveys were included for the statistical analyses.

A total of 193 participants used in the analyses were children of divorced parents, while 200 were children of married parents. Males made up 38% (n=150) of the sample and females made up 62% (n=243). Participants were 62% (n=230) Caucasian, 18% (n=67) African-American, 8% (n=30) Asian, 4% (n=15) Latino and .3% (n=1) American Indian. 7% (n=26) of participants reported a racial affiliation that did not fit these categories, and 6% (n=24) of participants did not report a racial affiliation.

## **Measures**

**Demographic questionnaire.** An original demographics questionnaire was used to collect certain necessary information not captured by the other questionnaire measures. These questions included the participant's gender, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status. In addition, participants were asked to report on the marital status of their biological parents.

*Parental Bonding Instrument (PBI):* The PBI is a 25-item Likert-type style scale which measures an adult's level of bonding with their parents.

Developed by Parker and colleagues (Parker, Tupling, & Brown, 1979) the conceptual framework is attachment theory - as the scale attempts to understand the quality of the parent-child bond. The measure has two subscales: Care (12 items concerning affection, warmth and closeness) which includes statements such as "Spoke to me in a warm and friendly voice" and Protection (13 items concerning autonomy and independence) which



includes statements such as “Let me decide things for myself” Participants are asked to respond to items based on their first 16 years of life and complete the scale for each parent answering in a 4 point Likert format ranging from very likely to very unlikely. From the Care scale the following items are reversed scored: 2, 4, 14, 16, 18 and 24. From the Protection scale the following items are reversed scored: 3, 7, 15, 21, 22, 25.

Factor analysis supported the two factor approach accounting for 28% and 17% of the variance in parent-child bonding. PBI scores were shown to have high significant correlations (Care = 0.77, Protection= 0.47) with ratings on the same dimensions when participants described their parents during interviews (Parker et al., 1979). The instrument’s test-retest reliability was 0.76 for the Care Scale and 0.63 for the Protection Scale. Split-half reliability was 0.88 for the Care Scale and 0.74 for the Protection Scale. The PBI has been shown to have high stability over time with a non-clinical sample demonstrating stability ranging from 0.59-0.75 (Wilhelm et al. 2005). The scale has been widely used with undergraduate populations to measure parent-child relationships in relation to a variety of subjects including Depression, Anorexia and Attention-Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (Safford, Alloy, & Pieracci, 2006; Gau, 2007; Yoshizumi, Murase, Murakami, & Jiro, 2007).

In this study, participant’s parent-child relationship will be used according to their raw scores on each scale in order to enable a continuous variable to be created. The scores will be then used to better understand participant’s relationships with their parents and how it may have influenced their friendships. The higher the total raw score the higher the level of parent-child bonding. In the current study for the PBI Care-mother subscale the Cronbach alpha coefficient was .92, for the PBI Care-father subscale the Cronbach alpha

coefficient was .93, for the PBI Protect mother subscale the Cronbach alpha coefficient was .85, and for the PBI Protect father subscale the Cronbach alpha coefficient was .86.

**The Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire (CBQ).** The CBQ is an 86-item, Likert format instrument that measures parenting and co-parenting. The measure was developed by Stolberg and his colleagues (Mullett & Stolberg, 1999; Macie & Stolberg, 2003; Schum & Stolberg, 2007) and has been used to measure co-parenting practices in both children from divorce and intact families as well as to predict children, adolescent and young adults' post divorce adjustment. The instrument consists of 12 subscales composed of 4 co-parenting factors (communication, respect/cooperation, triangulation, conflict), 4 father parenting factors (monitoring, discipline, warmth, parent-child communication), and 4 mother parenting factors (monitoring, discipline, warmth, parent-child communication). The five point Likert format choices range from 1 (almost never) to 5 (almost always). The following items are reversed scored: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 21, 22, 25, 27, 31, 35.

The unique approach of this parenting measure is that the behaviors in question are measured from the child's perspective. The conceptual underpinning is that the recipient of the behavior, the child, is the best informant of the target behaviors (Mullett & Stolberg, 1999). Items within the co-parenting factors include statements such as the following: For communication, "My parents talk to each other about my problems." For respect/cooperation, "When my mom needs help with me she asks my dad." For triangulation, "When my parents argue I feel forced to choose sides." For conflict, "When my parents talk to each other they accuse each other of bad things." Developed with a

college population, factor analysis confirmed the validity of the scale (Mullett & Stolberg, 1999).

The 12-dimension factor structure created was maintained based on the Eigen value loadings ranging from .55-.88. Internal consistency for each subscale resulted in alpha coefficients ranging from .60-.93 with a mean of .80. Second order analysis suggested that the scale reflects family systems processes due to the high relation of many of the subscales (Mullett & Stolberg, 1999). The subscales pertaining to co-parenting were utilized in this study with higher scores reflecting higher amounts of each factor.

For the Conflict scale the Cronbach alpha coefficient was .92, for the Communication scale the Cronbach alpha coefficient was .74, for the Triangulation scale the Cronbach alpha coefficient was .65, and for the Respect scale the Cronbach alpha coefficient was .92.

**The Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale (DERS).** The DERS consists of 36 self-report items that measure difficulty in regulating emotions. It was developed based on the integrative model of emotion regulation in order to create a measure that could be used reliably on adult populations (Gratz & Romer, 2004). From this theory six subscales were created including non-acceptance of emotional responses (6 questions, alpha= .86), difficulties engaging in goal directed behavior (5 question, alpha= .88), impulse control difficulties (6 questions, alpha =.86), lack of emotional awareness (6 questions, alpha = .79), limited access to emotional regulation strategies (8 questions, alpha = .87) and lack of emotional clarity (5 questions, alpha=.81). The six subscale scores can be understood as separate parts of emotion regulation or taken together to form a total DERS composite score (alpha = .92). Initial validation and factor structure analysis was performed in two studies on

a college population with samples of 479 students and 357 students respectively (Gratz & Romer, 2004).

Questions within the subscales include statements such as, “When I’m upset, I feel guilty for feeling that way” (non-acceptance of emotional responses), “When I’m upset, I have difficulty focusing on other things” (difficulties engaging in goal directed behavior), “When I’m upset, I lose control over my behaviors” (impulse control difficulties), “When I’m upset, I acknowledge my emotions”(lack of emotional awareness)(all items in this subscale are reversed scored), “When I’m upset, I believe that there is nothing I can do to make myself feel better”(limited access to emotional regulation strategies) and “I have no idea how I am feeling”(lack of emotional clarity).

For each item the participant is asked how often the statement applies to them. Responses are on a 5 point Likert scale ranging from almost never (1) to almost always (5). The following items were reversed scored: 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 10, 17, 20, 22, 24 and 34. The higher the total for each subscale the higher the level of difficulty experienced.

Construct validity was demonstrated by the DERS’ positive correlation with the Negative Mood Regulation Scale. The DERS has demonstrated predictive validity in university samples and has good test-retest reliability over a 4-8 week timeframe ( $r = .88$ ,  $p < .01$ ). This scale has been validated and used with college populations.

In this study we will use the six subscale emotion regulation scores to measure the participants various abilities to regulate emotions. A person’s ability to regulate emotions may impact the quality and amount of their friendships. This may be independent of other factors concerning their family or it may be a result of familial experiences.

In the current study for the Non-acceptance of emotional responses subscale the Cronbach alpha coefficient was .90 and for the Difficulties engaging in goal directed behavior subscale the Cronbach alpha coefficient was .25. Due to the low level of this subscales alpha coefficient, item #26 (When I'm upset, I have difficulty concentrating) was deleted and the new Cronbach alpha coefficient was recalculated resulting in an alpha coefficient of .82. For this reason item #26 was deleted from the analyses. For the Impulse control difficulties subscale the Cronbach alpha coefficient was .85, for the Lack of emotional awareness subscale the Cronbach alpha coefficient was .80, for the Limited access to emotional regulation strategies subscale the Cronbach alpha coefficient was .89, and for the Lack of emotional clarity subscale the Cronbach alpha coefficient was .80.

**The Life Experiences Survey (LES).** The LES is a 47 specific item, and 3 open ended item, Likert-type scale that measures the amount and severity of different life events experienced in the past year. The LES was developed by Sarason and colleagues (Sarason, Johnson, & Seigel, 1978) and includes experiences such as “change in residence,” “gaining a new family member” and “trouble with employer.”

Participants indicate which events they have experienced, whether they consider the event as positive or negative and, at the time the event occurred what impact it had on their life. The events are rated on a Likert-scale from extremely negative (-3) to extremely positive (+3). All scores rated as positive and all scores rated negative are summed, to form positive and negative change scores. Finally, both positive and negative change scores are summed together to form a total change score.

The LES has good reliability with test-retest correlations consisting of the following: for the positive change score .19-.53, for the negative change score .56-.88 and for the total change score .63-.64. There were significant relationships shown between the negative change scores and scores on the Beck Depression Inventory ( $r = .24$ ) as well as Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale ( $r = 0.32$ ) and as expected a non- significant relationship between the Beck Depression Inventory and the positive change score ( $r = .02$ ) (Sarason et al., 1978).

In this study The LES was used to determine the current context of the participant's life and of the existence of events/stresses that may make them more or less likely to choose and maintain, or to need friendships. For this reason the total LES score was utilized. The higher the number the more total change the person has experienced.

In the current study the Cronbach alpha coefficient was .71.

**The Intimate Friendship Scale (IFS).** The IFS is a 32-item, six-point Likert format scale that measures eight dimensions of intimate friendship (Sharabany, 1974) including frankness and spontaneity ("I feel free to talk with my friend about almost everything"), sensitivity and knowing ("I can tell when my friend is worried about something"), attachment to the friend ("I feel close to my friend"), exclusiveness in the relationship ("I do things with my friend which are quite different from what others do") giving and sharing ("When something nice happens to me I share the experience with my friend"), imposition ("I can be sure my friend will help me whenever I ask for it"), common activities ("I like to do things with my friend"), and trust and loyalty ("I know that whatever I tell my friend is kept secret between us") (Sharabany, 1994). The eight dimensions were derived from a review of the

psychoanalytic literature, sociological studies on social distance, and Webster's Dictionary of Synonyms. The dimensions are meant to be taken together to represent a complete picture of the degree of intimacy within a friendship, as well as examining the quality and amount of each dimension separately for meaning (Sharabany, 1994).

Participants are asked to list six people they know well, and then asked to write down the name of their best friend, excluding any romantic partners. The participant then completes the intimacy scale twice, once for their best friend and once for the person they named last on the list. For each of the eight dimensions a mean of the four items is computed, and then these means are tallied to reach a total intimacy score. The higher the intimacy score the more intimacy is experienced within the friendship. The instrument has been used with a variety of populations and has been specifically used with children of divorced parents (Hertz-Lazarowitz et al., 1989) and within college populations (Cordeiro, 2005).

The total intimacy score for the eight dimensions will be used in this study. The reliability coefficients within each subscale range from .72 to .77 (Sharabany, 1994). The scale has reasonable demonstrated content validity.

Three psychologists classified the 32 items into descriptions of the dimensions and achieved unanimous agreement on 28 of the 32 items, an 88% rate (Sharabany, 1994). The correlation between the dimensions range from .33 to .71 indicated consistency among them (Hertz-Lazarowitz et al., 1989). The instrument has been established reliable across many ages (from fourth grade to adult) and across cultures (Hertz-Lazarowitz et al, 1989; Jones &

Dembo, 1986). In this study, the quality of intimate friendships only will be measured by the IFS utilizing the subscales. In the current study the Cronbach alpha coefficient was .94.

**Social Support Questionnaire (SSQ).** The SSQ consists of 27-items with each item requiring both an open-ended response and a Likert-formatted response. The SSQ was developed by Sarason and colleagues (Sarason, Levine, Basham, & Sarason, 1983) to measure the amount of and satisfaction with a person's social support network. Social support was conceptualized as having two parts: a person's subjective view that there are enough people in their life to provide support, and how satisfied the person is with the support they receive (Sarason et al., 1983). Based on this theory, the instrument contains two subscales: perceived number of social supports and satisfaction with social support. Items include questions such as, "Whom can you really count on to listen to you when you need to talk?" and "Whom could you really count on to help you out in a crisis situation, even though they would have to go out of their way to do so?"

For the first part of the question, participants must list the initials of all people (or their relation to them) that provide the type of support listed. The number of support persons listed becomes the Number (N) score for each item.

For the second part of each question, the participants must indicate how satisfied they are with the overall support they have by rating it on a scale from "very satisfied" to "very dissatisfied." This yields a Satisfaction (S) score for each item ranging with a higher number meaning more satisfaction. The overall N and S scores are obtained by dividing the sum of N or S scores for all items by 27, the number of items. Therefore the Number score



represents the average number of social supports and the Satisfaction score represents the average satisfaction with social support.

The two components of network size and network support were maintained through factor analysis, which identified two distinct factors accounting for the variance. This was further supported by the low correlation of .34 between the two scales formed from the two identified factors. The internal item consistency alphas were .97 for the Number scale and .94 for the Satisfaction scale. The SSQ has high reliability with  $r = .67$ . It also has proven stability. The test-retest correlations between a 4-week interval were .90 for the N scale and .83 for the S scale (Sarason et al., 1983). The SSQ has been used with a wide variety of populations including college students (Bass & Stein, 1997).

In order to determine both the size and quality of the participant's friendship network, both subscales were used in this study. In the current study the Cronbach's alpha coefficient was .98 for the Number scale and .97 for the Satisfaction scale.

### **Procedure**

Upon IRB approval, participants were recruited through an on-line research program identified as SONA. This program permitted students to explore what research projects they may wish to participate in, and then allowed them to sign up and/or participate directly through the internet. In conformity with IRB requirements, the study was advertised on the SONA site with a brief research description.

Upon completion of the study by a participant, the SONA program automatically administered two course experiment credits for participation.

The IRB for the University approved the study on April 2, 2009. The study

became active on the SONA system soon after the approval data.

### **Data Analyses**

Data were first analyzed for evaluation of assumptions. Next, reliabilities (i.e., Cronbach's alpha coefficients) for each scale were calculated. Descriptive statistics were then calculated for intimate friendship total, social support network size and social support network satisfaction, to determine their distribution properties.

Semester differences, gender differences and differences based on parental marital status were then examined using independent samples t-tests. Correlational analyses were conducted to evaluate the relations among all variables in the study.

Hierarchical regression was then used to evaluate the relative contributions of each independent variable (i.e., parent-child bonding, parental marital status etc.) to friendship dependant variables. Analyses were conducted for each of three dependant variables:

For analysis for each of the dependant variables, the first step included parental bonding factors, the second step included co-parenting behavior factors, and the third step included parental marital status. The fourth step for each of the dependant variables included emotions regulation, and the final step included life experiences.

## **Results**

### **Correlations Among Measures**

Correlations among independent variable scales were calculated and are reported in Table 7. Findings related to the relationship between these variables were consistent with what was expected. Relationships were mostly significant and in the expected directions. It was anticipated that there would be some overlap between the measures. As anticipated the

overlap between some of the subscales of the Parental Bonding Instrument (PBI) and Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire was found. The more triangulation (CBQ) parents express the less protection from mother ( $r = -.16$ ) and less protection from father ( $r = -.14$ ) the participant experiences. The shared variance between the two variables is 2.5% and 1.9% respectively.

Table 1.

*Correlation Coefficients among Independent Variables.*

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1. PBIcare mom	1															
2. PBIprotect mom	-.21 <sup>+</sup>	1														
3. PBIcaredad	.16 <sup>+</sup>	-.05	1													
4. PBIprotect dad	-.01	.26 <sup>+</sup>	-.15 <sup>+</sup>	1												
5. CBQcommunication	.24 <sup>+</sup>	.02	.4 <sup>+</sup>	.03	1											
6. CBQrespect	.33 <sup>+</sup>	-.15 <sup>+</sup>	.4 <sup>+</sup>	-.12*	.3 <sup>+</sup>	1										
7. CBQtriangulation	.30 <sup>+</sup>	-.16 <sup>+</sup>	.21 <sup>+</sup>	-.14 <sup>+</sup>	.24 <sup>+</sup>	.68 <sup>+</sup>	1									
8. CBQconflict	.33 <sup>+</sup>	-.15 <sup>+</sup>	.39 <sup>+</sup>	-.12*	.3 <sup>+</sup>	1. <sup>+</sup>	.68 <sup>+</sup>	1								
9. Parental marital status	-.14 <sup>+</sup>	-.09	-.31 <sup>+</sup>	.01	-.1*	-.29 <sup>+</sup>	.05	-.28 <sup>+</sup>	1							
10. DERSnoacceptance	-.26 <sup>+</sup>	.06	-.21 <sup>+</sup>	.02	-.10*	-.19 <sup>+</sup>	-.18 <sup>+</sup>	-.19 <sup>+</sup>	.1.	1						
11. DERSgoals	-.12*	.08	-.05	.02	-.02	-.14 <sup>+</sup>	.21 <sup>+</sup>	.14 <sup>+</sup>	.03	.38 <sup>+</sup>	1					
12. DERSimpulsivity	-.24 <sup>+</sup>	.06	-.14 <sup>+</sup>	.07	-.09	-.15 <sup>+</sup>	.25 <sup>+</sup>	-.15 <sup>+</sup>	.1*	.53 <sup>+</sup>	.46 <sup>+</sup>	1				
13. DERSawareness	-.2 <sup>+</sup>	.05	-.21 <sup>+</sup>	.06	-.16 <sup>+</sup>	-.16 <sup>+</sup>	-.12*	-.16 <sup>+</sup>	.04	.24 <sup>+</sup>	.1*	.2 <sup>+</sup>	1			
14. DERSstrategy	-.27 <sup>+</sup>	.12*	-.23 <sup>+</sup>	.07	-.11*	-.17 <sup>+</sup>	-.22 <sup>+</sup>	-.17 <sup>+</sup>	.06	.68 <sup>+</sup>	.48 <sup>+</sup>	.67 <sup>+</sup>	.24 <sup>+</sup>	1		
15. DERSclarity	-.25 <sup>+</sup>	.13 <sup>+</sup>	-.24 <sup>+</sup>	.12*	-.13*	-.21 <sup>+</sup>	.22 <sup>+</sup>	-.21 <sup>+</sup>	.1	.54 <sup>+</sup>	.32 <sup>+</sup>	.51 <sup>+</sup>	.5 <sup>+</sup>	.63 <sup>+</sup>	1	
16. LEStotal	-.04	0	.2 <sup>+</sup>	-.01	.07	-.12*	.06	.12*	-.12*	-.07	-.04	-.13*	-.18 <sup>+</sup>	-.15 <sup>+</sup>	-.18 <sup>+</sup>	1

Note: N = 393 \*p < .05. <sup>+</sup> p < .01

Correlations between dependent variables were significant and in the expected directions. See Table 2.

Table 2.

*Coefficients among Dependent Variables.*

Variables	1	2	3
1. Intimate Friendship Scale	1		
2. Social Support Questionnaire-Satisfaction	.36**	1	
3. Social Support Questionnaire-Perceived Friends	.29**	.51**	1

\*\* $p < .01$ .

Correlations between independent and dependent variables demonstrated some relationships as indicated by many being above .3. However, multicollinearity was found not to be a problem as none of the correlations were at the .7 level or higher (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001)

Table 3.

*Correlations Between Independent and Dependent Variables.*

Variable	Intimate Friendship Scale	Social Support Questionnaire – Satisfaction	Social Support Questionnaire - Perceived
1. PBIcaremom	.17**	.38**	.28**
2. PBIprotectmom	-.11*	-.12*	-.06
3. PBIcaredad	.15**	.25**	.16**
4. PBIprotectdad	-.07	-.08	-.11*
5. CBQcommunication	.08	.09	.09
6. CBQrespect	-.04	.12*	.13*
7. CBQtriangulation	-.02	.13**	.07
8. CBQconflict	-.04	.12*	.13*
9. Parental Marital Status	-.06	-.06	-.09
10. DERSnoacceptance	-.04	-.30**	-.14**
11. DERSgoals	.01	-.12*	-.08
12. DERSimpulsivity	-.08	-.31**	-.15**
13. DERSawareness	-.13*	-.28**	-.21**
14. DERSstrategy	-.12*	-.40**	-.18**
15. DERSclarity	-.20**	-.47**	-.25**
16. LEStotal	.02	.24**	.07

## **Independent Samples T-Tests**

**Independent samples t-tests by semester.** Data was collected for the last two months of the Spring semester of 2009 and for the first month of the Fall semester of 2009. Independent samples t-tests were conducted to compare all independent and dependant variables for those participants that completed the survey in the Spring versus the Fall semesters.

For the independent variables tested, significant differences were found only for the Parental Bonding Instrument, Care Father variable, for the Co-parenting Behavior Questionnaire Respect variable, and for the Co-parenting Behavior Questionnaire Conflict variable between Spring versus Fall semesters these are reported in Table 4.

Table 4.

*Means, Standard Deviations and T-Test Comparisons for Semester.*

Variable	Spring Semester (n=301)		Fall Semester (n=73)		T-test
	M	SD	M	SD	
Parental Bonding Instrument, Care Mother	26.82	7.77	25.48	8.60	1.29
Parental Bonding Instrument, Care Father	22.19	8.99	19.07	9.81	2.61**
Parental Bonding Instrument, Protect Mother	16.12	7.37	15.67	7.58	.46
Parental Bonding Instrument, Protect Father	14.83	7.78	15.38	9.20	-.52
Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire Communication	14.09	4.60	12.93	6.38	1.78
Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire Respect	23.74	8.05	18.05	6.95	5.55***
Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire Triangulation	41.86	7.63	41.86	9.39	.001
Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire Conflict	35.76	10.03	32.14	10.17	2.76**
Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale-No Acceptance	13.43	5.67	14.04	6.01	-.82
Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Goals	15.35	3.03	14.96	2.82	1.0
Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Impulse	12.64	4.95	11.97	4.24	1.07
Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Aware	14.36	5.00	13.62	3.88	1.19
Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Strategy	18.09	7.16	16.82	5.36	1.42
Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Clarity	11.02	3.92	11.58	3.64	-1.1
Life Events Survey Total	.33	13.68	-3.25	17.91	1.88
Social Support Questionnaire-Average Satisfaction	5.14	.97	5.16	1.04	-.18
Social Support Questionnaire Perceived Number of Social Supports	4.0	2.6	4.0	2.35	.02
Intimate Friendship Scale	4.65	.80	4.75	.70	-.99

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\* p <.001



For the Parental Bonding Instrument, Care Father there is a significant difference in scores for participants in the Spring Semester ( $M= 22.19$ ,  $SD = 8.99$ ) and for participants in the Fall Semester ( $M=19.07$ ,  $SD=9.81$ ;  $t(374) = 2.61$ ,  $p = .01$ ). The magnitude of the differences in the means is small ( $\eta^2 = .02$ ). Though these results indicate a significant difference based on semester, the calculated  $\eta^2 = .02$ , is considered a small effect size (Cohen, 1988). Thus only 2 percent of the variance in the Parental Bonding Instrument Care Father variable is explained by semester.

The second significant difference among the independent variables was found for the Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire Respect variable between Spring versus Fall semesters. There is a significant difference in scores for participants in the Spring Semester ( $M= 23.74$ ,  $SD = 8.05$ ) and for participants in the Fall Semester ( $M=18.05$ ,  $SD=6.95$ ;  $t(374) = 5.55$ ,  $p = .00$ ). The magnitude of the differences in the means is moderate ( $\eta^2 = .07$ ). These results indicate a significant difference in Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire Respect based on semester. The calculated  $\eta^2 = .07$  is considered a moderate effect size (Cohen, 1988) and 7 percent of the variance in the Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire Respect variable is explained by semester. When entering this variable into the various models, if it is found significant it will be important to recognize that part of the significance is due to the semester difference.

The final significant difference among the independent variables was found for the Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire Conflict variable between Spring versus Fall semesters. There is a significant difference in scores for participants in the Spring Semester ( $M= 35.76$ ,  $SD = 10.03$ ) and for participants in the Fall Semester ( $M=32.14$ ,  $SD=10.17$ ;  $t(374) = 2.76$ ,  $p$

=.01). The magnitude of the differences in the means is small (eta squared = .02). These results indicate a significant difference in Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire Conflict based on semester. The calculated Eta squared= .02 is considered a small effect size (Cohen, 1988) and 2 percent of the variance in the Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire Conflict variable is explained by semester.

For the dependant variables, no significant differences were found on any of the three dependant variables based on semester.

**Independent samples t-tests by gender.** Independent samples t-tests were conducted to compare all independent and dependant variables by gender. For the independent variables, significant differences based on gender were found only for the Parental Bonding Instrument Protect Father.

For the dependant variables significant differences based on gender were found for the Social Support Questionnaire's Average Person variable and for the Intimate Friendship Scale Total. These results are reported in Table 5

Table 5.

*Means, Standard Deviations and T-Test Comparisons by Gender.*

Variable	Female (n=243)		Male (n=150)		T-test
	M	SD	M	SD	
Parental Bonding Instrument, Care Mother	26.56	8.22	26.65	7.43	-.114
Parental Bonding Instrument, Care Father	21.88	9.77	20.83	8.20	1.1
Parental Bonding Instrument, Protect Mother	15.97	7.60	16.00	7.11	-.037
Parental Bonding Instrument, Protect Father	16.39	8.23	12.62	6.99	4.66**
Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire Communication	13.62	5.21	14.20	4.66	-1.12
Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire Respect	22.68	8.71	22.22	7.02	.55
Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire Triangulation	42.02	8.11	41.91	8.12	.13
Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire Conflict	34.69	10.50	35.62	9.39	-.89
Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale-No Acceptance	13.40	5.96	13.53	5.25	-.22
Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Goals	15.32	3.00	15.22	2.97	.33
Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Impulse	12.46	5.07	12.72	4.65	-.51
Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Aware	14.07	4.86	14.46	4.67	-.79
Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Strategy	17.81	6.99	17.87	6.61	-.09
Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Clarity	11.29	3.97	10.89	3.79	.97
Life Events Survey Total	-.48	15.43	-.57	13.47	.05
Social Support Questionnaire-Average Satisfaction	5.19	.94	5.00	1.05	1.92
Social Support Questionnaire Perceived Number of Social Supports	4.18	2.46	3.65	2.73	1.97*
Intimate Friendship Scale	4.78	.75	4.45	.82	4.04***

\*p&lt;.05, \*\*p&lt;.01, \*\*\* p &lt;.001

There was a significant difference in scores by gender for the Parental Bonding Instrument Protect father: for females ( $M = 16.39$ ,  $SD = 8.23$ ), for males: ( $M = 12.62$ ,  $SD = 6.99$ ;  $t(391) = 4.66$ ,  $p = .00$ ). The calculated Eta squared = .05 is considered a small to moderate effect size (Cohen, 1988) and 5 percent of the variance in the Parental Bonding Instrument Protect Father variable is explained by gender. If this variable is found significant when entered into the model the effect of gender will need to be taken into account when considering the results.

For the dependant variables significant differences based on gender were found for the Social Support Questionnaire's Perceived Number of Social Supports variable: for females ( $M = 4.18$ ,  $SD = 2.46$ ), for males: ( $M = 3.65$ ,  $SD = 2.73$ ;  $t(390) = 2.32$ ,  $p = .05$ ). The calculated Eta squared = .01 is considered a small effect size (Cohen, 1988) and only 1 percent of the variance in the Social Support Questionnaire's Perceived Number of Social Supports is explained by gender thus when this variable is entered into the model if found significant the effect of gender does not need to be considered.

For the dependant variable Intimate Friendship Survey Total significant differences based on gender were also found: for females ( $M = 4.78$ ,  $SD = .75$ ), for males: ( $M = 4.45$ ,  $SD = .82$ ;  $t(294) = 4.04$ ,  $p = .00$ ). The calculated Eta squared = .04 is considered a small effect size (Cohen, 1988) and only 4 percent of the variance in the Intimate Friendship Survey total score is explained by gender thus when this variable is entered into the model if found significant the effect of gender does not need to be considered.

**Independent samples t-tests by parental marital status.** Independent samples t-tests were conducted to compare all independent and dependant variables by parental marital status. For the independent variables, significant differences based on parental marital status were found for the Parental Bonding Instrument Care Mother, Parental Bonding Instrument Care Father, Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire Communication, Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire Respect, Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire Conflict, Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale-No Acceptance, and Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale Impulsivity subscales.

These results are reported in Table 6.

Table 6.

*Means, Standard Deviations and T-Test Comparisons by Parental Marital Status.*

Variable	Parents Married (n=200)		Parents Divorced (193)		T-test
	M	SD	M	SD	
Parental Bonding Instrument, Care Mother	27.67	7.20	25.49	8.47	2.74**
Parental Bonding Instrument, Care Father	24.26	8.27	18.60	9.27	6.39***
Parental Bonding Instrument, Protect Mother	16.61	7.30	15.34	7.49	1.7
Parental Bonding Instrument, Protect Father	14.89	7.63	15.01	8.36	-.162
Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire Communication	14.33	3.89	13.33	5.92	1.97*
Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire Respect	25.96	7.53	18.93	7.06	9.54***
Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire Triangulation	41.60	6.42	42.38	9.54	-.96
Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire Conflict	37.85	9.44	32.13	9.94	5.84***
Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale-No Acceptance	12.9	5.37	14.02	5.97	-1.95*
Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale-Goals	15.19	3.04	15.38	2.93	-.63
Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale-Impulsivity	12.08	4.68	13.06	5.09	-2.00*
Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale-Awareness	14.01	4.85	14.43	4.72	-.88
Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale-Strategy	17.43	6.96	18.25	6.7	-1.2
Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Clarity	10.78	3.93	11.51	3.85	-1.88
Life Events Survey Total	1.23	13.98	-2.33	15.22	2.42*
Social Support Questionnaire-Average Satisfaction	1.36	1.38	.99	1.22	2.38
Social Support Questionnaire Perceived Number of Social Supports	4.19	2.62	3.75	2.52	1.7
Intimate Friendship Scale	4.7	.79	4.61	.8	1.1

\*p&lt;.05, \*\*p&lt;.01, \*\*\* p &lt;.001

There was a significant difference in Parental Bonding Instrument Care Mother scores based on parental marital status for participants with married parents ( $M = 27.67$ ,  $SD = 7.20$ , for participants with divorced parents: ( $M = 25.49$ ,  $SD = 8.47$ ;  $t(376) = 2.74$ ,  $p = .006$ ). The calculated Eta squared = .02 is considered a small effect size (Cohen, 1988) and 2 percent of the variance in the Parental Bonding Instrument Care Mother variable is explained by parental marital status. Thus when this variable is entered into the model if found significant the effect of parental marital status does not need to be considered.

Significant differences based on parental marital status were found for the independent variable Parental Bonding Instrument Care Father: for participants with married parents ( $M = 24.26$ ,  $SD = 8.27$ , for participants with divorced parents: ( $M = 18.60$ ,  $SD = 9.27$ ;  $t(393) = 6.39$ ,  $p = .000$ ). The calculated Eta squared = .09 is considered a moderate to large effect size (Cohen, 1988) and 9 percent of the variance in the Parental Bonding Instrument Care Father variable is explained by parental marital status. Thus when this variable is entered into the model if found significant the effect of parental marital status needs to be considered.

Significant differences based on parental marital status were found for the independent variable Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire Communication: for participants with married parents ( $M = 14.33$ ,  $SD = 3.89$ , for participants with divorced parents: ( $M = 13.33$ ,  $SD = 5.92$ ;  $t(393) = 1.97$ ,  $p = .05$ ). The calculated Eta squared = .01 is considered a small effect size (Cohen, 1988) and 1 percent of the variance in the Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire Communication variable is explained by parental marital status. Thus when

this variable is entered into the model if found significant the effect of parental marital status need not be considered.

Significant differences based on parental marital status were found for the independent variable Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire Respect: for participants with married parents ( $M = 25.96$ ,  $SD = 7.53$ , for participants with divorced parents: ( $M = 18.93$ ,  $SD = 7.06$ ;  $t(393) = 9.54$ ,  $p = .000$ ). The calculated Eta squared = .18 is considered a large effect size (Cohen, 1988) and 18 percent of the variance in the Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire Respect variable is explained by parental marital status. Thus when this variable is entered into the model if found significant the effect of parental marital status needs to be considered.

Significant differences based on parental marital status were found for the independent variable Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire Conflict: for participants with married parents ( $M = 37.85$ ,  $SD = 9.44$ , for participants with divorced parents: ( $M = 32.13$ ,  $SD = 9.94$ ;  $t(393) = 5.84$ ,  $p = .000$ ). The calculated Eta squared = .08 is considered a moderate to large effect size (Cohen, 1988) and 8 percent of the variance in the Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire Conflict variable is explained by parental marital status. Thus when this variable is entered into the model if found significant the effect of parental marital status needs to be considered.

Significant differences based on parental marital status were found for the independent variable Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale No Acceptance: for participants with married parents ( $M = 12.9$ ,  $SD = 5.37$ , for participants with divorced parents: ( $M = 14.02$ ,  $SD = 5.97$ ;  $t(393) = -1.95$ ,  $p = .05$ ). The calculated Eta squared = .01 is considered a small effect size (Cohen, 1988) and 1 percent of the variance in the Difficulties



in Emotion Regulation Scale No Acceptance variable is explained by parental marital status. Thus when this variable is entered into the model if found significant the effect of parental marital status needs not be considered.

Significant differences based on parental marital status were found for the independent variable Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale Impulsivity: for participants with married parents ( $M = 12.08$ ,  $SD = 4.68$ , for participants with divorced parents: ( $M = 13.06$ ,  $SD = 5.09$ ;  $t(393) = -2.00$ ,  $p = .046$ ). The calculated Eta squared = .01 is considered a small effect size (Cohen, 1988) and 1 percent of the variance in the Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale Impulsivity variable is explained by parental marital status. Thus when this variable is entered into the model if found significant the effect of parental marital status needs not be considered. Significant differences based on parental marital status were found for the independent variable Life Experiences Survey Total for participants with married parents ( $M = 1.23$ ,  $SD = 13.98$ ), for participants with divorced parents: ( $M = -2.33$ ,  $SD = 15.23$ ;  $t(393) = -2.42$ ,  $p = .02$ ). The calculated Eta squared = 0.01 is considered a small effect size (Cohen, 1988) and 1 percent of the variance in the Difficulties in the Life Experience Survey Total score variable is explained by parental marital status. Thus when this variable is entered into the model if found significant the effect of parental marital status needs not be considered.

### **Hierarchical Regression**

Hierarchical regression analyses were employed to address all hypotheses.

**Hierarchical regression of parenting factors, emotion regulation and life experience on intimacy in friendship.** The first regression was conducted to determine the extent to which the various external and internal factors relate to intimacy in

friendships. Young adults' level of intimate friendships was expected to be predicted by their parent-child bond, the characteristics of their parents' co-parenting relationship, the marital status of their parents, the difficulty they have with emotion regulation, and their total life experiences. Parent-child bond was predicted to be more strongly related to intimacy in friendships than the other variables, although all relationships were expected to be significant.

The first model, reported in Table 7, examined the parent-child bond protection and care subscales (PBI for mother and father), the triangulation, communication and conflict subscales (CBQ), marital status of participant's parents, emotion regulation subscales of non-acceptance of emotional responses, difficulties engaging in goal directed behavior, impulse control difficulties, lack of emotional awareness, limited access to emotional regulation strategies and lack of emotional clarity (DERS), and the total life experience scores (LES) as the predictor variables in order to predict intimacy in friendships (IFS). The overall model was significant ( $R^2 = .113$ ,  $F(15, 377) = 3.21$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

Table 7.

*Summary of Hierarchical Regression of Parenting Factors, Emotion Regulation and Life Experience on Intimacy in Friendship.*

Step	Variables entered	<i>sr</i> <sup>a</sup>	<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup> change
1	<b><i>Variables at Step 1 (Parental Bonding Instrument)</i></b> Father protect subscale Mother protect subscale Father care subscale Mother care subscale	 -.029 -.066 .113* .127*	.049	.049***
2	<b><i>Variables at Step 2 (Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire)</i></b> Triangulation subscale Communication subscale Conflict subscale	 .003 .023 -.136*	.078	.029**
3	<b><i>Variable at Step 3 (Parental Marital Status)</i></b> Marital Status	 -.044	.080	.002
4	<b><i>Variables at Step 4 (Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale)</i></b> Non-acceptance of emotional responses subscale Difficulties engaging goal directed behavior subscale Difficulties with impulse control subscale Lack of emotional awareness subscale Limited access emotion regulation strategies subscale Lack of emotional clarity subscale	 .094 .092 .007 -.018 -.039 -.130**	.116	.033*
5	<b><i>Variable at Step 5 (Life Experience Survey)</i></b> Total negative and positive experience subscale	 -.025	.113	.000

Note: *N* = 393

<sup>a</sup>Semi-partial correlation at the step at which the variable was entered.

\* *p* < .05. \*\* *p* < .01. \*\*\**p* < .001.

Step 1 revealed parental bonding accounted for a significant portion of the variance in the relationship between Parenting, Emotion Regulation, Life Experience and Intimacy in Friendship ( $F(4, 388) = 4.97, p < .001$ ). The variables included in this first step of the

analyses explained 4.9% of the variance in the relationship between the predictor variables and friendship. Calculation of the semi-partial correlations reveal that *Care of father* (PBI) ( $B = .010$ ,  $Beta = .116$ ) uniquely explains 1.3% of the variance in the friendship intimacy (IFS) and *Care of mother* (PBI) ( $B = .013$ ,  $Beta = .132$ ) uniquely explains 1.6% of the variance. These are the only scales in the Parental Bonding Instrument that were found to be significant influences on the intimacy score.

The addition of the co-parenting variables of triangulation, communication and conflict (CBQ) at Step 2, ( $F(7, 385) = 4.63$ ,  $p < .001$ ), account for an additional 2.9% of the variance resulting in an overall model explanation of 7.8% of the variance. The semi-partial correlations reveal that the *Conflict* subscale (CBQ) ( $B = -.016$ ,  $Beta = -.199$ ) uniquely explains 1.8% of the variance in friendship intimacy (IFS).

The addition of parental marital status at Step 3, ( $F(8, 384) = 4.15$ ,  $p < .001$ ), did not significantly improve the  $R^2$  demonstrating that marital status of parents does not explain a person's intimacy in friendships later in life.

The addition of emotion regulation difficulties at Step 4, ( $F(14, 378) = 3.42$ ,  $p < .001$ ) accounts for an additional 3.4% of the variance resulting in an overall model explanation of 11.6% of the variance. The semi-partial correlations reveal that *Lack of emotional clarity* (DERS) ( $B = -.039$ ,  $Beta = -.191$ ) uniquely explains 1.7% of the variance in friendship intimacy.

Finally, the addition of Total Life Experience at Step 5, ( $F(15, 377) = 3.21$ , n.s.) did not significantly improve the  $R^2$ .

These data suggest that parent-child bonding positively affects the level of intimacy young adults experience in friendship. This is true for the child's relationship with his or her

mother and father. In addition the amount of conflict between parents negatively affects the level of intimacy offspring experience with friends although to a lesser extent. Finally, the amount of difficulty a person has in emotion regulation has a negative effect on the level of intimacy they experience in friendship. In particular the more difficult time a person has in knowing and being clear about the emotions her or she is feeling, the less intimacy experienced in friendships.

**Summary of hierarchical regression of parenting factors, emotion regulation and life experience on satisfaction with friendship network.** The second regression was calculated to determine the extent to which the various external and internal factors relate to satisfaction in one's friendship network. Young adults; satisfaction with their friendship network was expected to be predicted by their parent-child bond, the amount and type of co-parenting their parents employed, the marital status of their parents, the difficulty with emotion regulation they have and their total life experiences. Parental bond was predicted to be more strongly related to satisfaction in friendship network than the other variables, although all relations were expected to be significant.

The second model, reported in Table 8, examined the parent-child bond protection and care subscales (PBI for mother and father), the triangulation, communication and conflict subscales (CBQ), marital status of participant's parents, emotion regulation subscales of non-acceptance of emotional responses, difficulties engaging in goal directed behavior, impulse control difficulties, lack of emotional awareness, limited access to emotional regulation strategies and lack of emotional clarity (DERS), and the total life experience scores (LES) as the predictor variables in order to predict satisfaction in friendship network (SSQ). The overall model was found significant, ( $R^2 = .360$ ,  $F(15, 376) = 14.09$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

Table 8.

*Summary of Hierarchical Regression of Parenting Factors, Emotion Regulation and Life Experience on Satisfaction with Friendship Network.*

Step	Variables entered	$sr^a$	$R^2$	$R^2$ change
1	<b>Variables at Step 1 (Parental Bonding Instrument)</b>		.179	.179***
	Father protect subscale	-.039		
	Mother protect subscale	-.029		
	Father care subscale	.177***		
	Mother care subscale	.326***		
2	<b>Variables at Step 2 (Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire)</b>		.192	.013
	Triangulation subscale	.048		
	Communication subscale	-.060		
	Conflict subscale	-.092**		
3	<b>Variable at Step 3 (Parental Marital Status)</b>		.193	.000
	Marital Status	.021		
4	<b>Variables at Step 4 (Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale)</b>		.336	.143***
	Non-acceptance of emotional responses subscale	.030		
	Difficulties engaging goal directed behavior subscale	.074		
	Difficulties with impulse control subscale	-.024		
	Lack of emotional awareness subscale	-.038		
	Limited access emotion regulation strategies subscale	-.097*		
	Lack of emotional clarity subscale	-.199***		
5	<b>Variable at Step 5 (Life Experience Survey)</b>		.360	.026
	Total negative and positive experience subscale	.159***		

Note:  $N = 393$

<sup>a</sup>Semi-partial correlation at the step at which the variable was entered.

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

Step 1 revealed that parental bonding accounted for a significant portion of the variance in the relationship between Parenting, Emotion Regulation, Life Experience and Satisfaction in Friendship ( $F(4, 387) = 21.07, p < .001$ ). The variables included in this first step of the analyses explained 17.9% of the variance in the relationship between the predictor variables and friendship. Calculation of the semi-partial correlations reveal that *Care with mother* (PBI) ( $B = .042, \text{Beta} = .339$ ) uniquely explains 10.6% of the variance in satisfaction with friendship network (SSQ) and *Care with father* (PBI) ( $B = .020, \text{Beta} = .181$ ) uniquely explains 3.1% of the variance in satisfaction with friendship network (SSQ). These are the only scales in the Parental Bonding Instrument that were found to be significant influences on the satisfaction with friendship network.

The addition of co-parenting variables of triangulation, communication and conflict (CBQ) at Step 2, ( $F(7, 384) = 13.04, p < .001$ ), account for an additional 1.3% *the* variance, resulting in an overall model explanation of 19.2% of the variance. The semi-partial correlations reveal that the *Conflict* subscale (CBQ) ( $B = -.013, \text{Beta} = -.135$ ) uniquely explains .8% of the variance in satisfaction with friendship network.

The addition of parental marital status at Step 3 ( $F(8, 383) = 11.42, p < .001$ ) did significantly improve the  $R^2$  but by very little. The addition of parental marital status accounted for no additional reported percent of the variance but resulted in an overall model explanation of 19.3% of the variance.

The addition of the emotion regulation subscales (DERS) at Step 4 ( $F(14, 377) = 13.50, p < .001$ ) accounts for an additional 14.3 %, resulting in an overall model explanation of 33.6 % of the variance.

The semi-partial correlations reveal that *Lack of emotional clarity* (the extent to which a person is clear about the emotions they are experiencing) (DERS) ( $B = -.075$ , Beta =  $-.295$ ) uniquely explains 4% of the variance in satisfaction with friendship network, while *Limited access to emotion regulation strategies* (DERS strategy) ( $B = -.024$ , Beta =  $-.167$ ) uniquely explains .9% of the variance in satisfaction with friendship network.

The addition of total life experience (LES) at Step 5 ( $F(15, 376) = 14.09$ ,  $p < .001$ ) accounts for an additional 2.6%, resulting in an overall model explanation of 36% of the variance in satisfaction of social support network.

The results of this model demonstrate that the level of parental care positively affects the amount of satisfaction in one's social support network. Parental care, particularly from one's mother, leads to higher levels of satisfaction with one's social support network, although parental care from one's father also shows a positive impact. In addition, the amount of parental conflict negatively affects social support satisfaction, with higher parental conflict the less satisfied a person is with their social support network. Results also indicate that the less emotion regulation skills an individual has (not being clear of their emotions and having little belief that once a person is upset they can handle the situation), the less satisfaction they will have in their social support networks. Finally, life events the individual has experienced directly affects satisfaction with his or her friendship network.

**Summary of hierarchical regression of parenting factors, emotion regulation and life experience on perceived number of persons within friendship network.** The third regression was conducted to determine the extent to which the various external and internal factors relate to perceived number of persons within a friendship network.



Young adults' perceived number of persons within their friendship network was expected to be predicted by their parent-child bond, the characteristics of their parents' co-parenting relationship, the marital status of their parents, the difficulty with emotion regulation they have and their total life experiences. Emotion regulation was predicted to be more strongly related to perceived number of persons within friendship network than the other variables, although all relations were expected to be significant.

The third model, reported in Table 9, examined the parent-child bond protection and care subscales (PBI for mother and father), the triangulation, communication and conflict subscales (CBQ), marital status of participant's parents, emotion regulation subscales of non-acceptance of emotional responses, difficulties engaging in goal directed behavior, impulse control difficulties, lack of emotional awareness, limited access to emotional regulation strategies and lack of emotional clarity (DERS), and the total life experience score (LES) as the predictor variables in order to predict perceived number of friends within the friendship network (SSQ). The overall model was found significant,  $R^2 = .136$  ( $F(15, 376) = 3.94$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

Table 9.

*Summary of Hierarchical Regression of Parenting Factors, Emotion Regulation, and Life Experience on Perceived Number of Persons.*

Step	Variables entered	<i>sr</i> <sup>a</sup>	R <sup>2</sup>	R <sup>2</sup> change
1	<b><i>Variables at Step 1 (Parental Bonding Instrument)</i></b> Father protect subscale Mother protect subscale Father Care subscale Mother Care subscale	 -.091 .028 .105* .258***	.101	.101***
2	<b><i>Variables at Step 2 (Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire)</i></b> Triangulation subscale Communication subscale Conflict subscale	 -.048 -.007 .022	.104	.003
3	<b><i>Variable at Step 3 (Parental Marital Status)</i></b> Marital Status	 .000	.104	.000
4	<b><i>Variables at Step 4 (Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale)</i></b> Non-acceptance of emotional responses subscale Difficulties engaging goal directed behavior subscale Difficulties with impulse control subscale Lack of emotional awareness subscale Limited access emotion regulation strategies subscale Lack of emotional clarity subscale	 .033 -.001 -.009 -.068 -.019 -.090	.136	.032*
5	<b><i>Variable at Step 5 (Life Experience Survey)</i></b> Total negative and positive experience subscale	 .021	.136	.000

Note: N = 393

<sup>a</sup>Semi-partial correlation at the step at which the variable was entered.

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

Step 1, revealed parental bonding accounted for a significant portion of the variance in the relationship between Parenting, Emotion Regulation, Life Experience and Perceived Number of Friends in Social Network ( $F(4, 387) = 10.89, p < .001$ ). The variables included in

this first step of the analyses explained 10.1% of the variance in the relationship between predictor variables and perceived number of friends in social support network. Calculation of the semi-partial correlations reveal that *Care of mother* (PBI)( $B = .087$ ,  $Beta = .269$ ) uniquely explains 6.7% of the variance in the total perceived number of friends in social support network while *Care of father* (PBI)( $B = .030$ ,  $Beta = .107$ ) uniquely explains 1.1% of the variance in the perceived number of friends in the social support network.

The addition of co-parenting variables of triangulation, communication and conflict (CBQ) at Step 2 ( $F(7, 384) = 6.35$ ,  $p < .001$ ) account for an additional .3% the variance by resulting in an overall model explanation of 10.4% of the variance.

The addition of parental marital status at Step 3 ( $F(8, 383) = 5.54$ ,  $p < .001$ ) did not significantly improve the  $R^2$  demonstrating that marital status of one's parents does not explain the perceived number of friends in the social support network later in life.

The addition of emotion regulation variables (DERS) at Step 4 ( $F(14, 377) = 4.22$ ,  $p < .001$ ) account for an additional 3.2% of the variance resulting in an overall model explanation of 13.6% of the variance.

The addition of Total Life Experience at Step 5 ( $F(15, 376) = 3.94$ ,  $p < .001$ ) did not significantly improve the  $R^2$ .

The findings from this model demonstrate that the higher the level of mother care a person experiences, the higher number of perceived friends a person will have.

The amount of father care also has an impact on perceived friends, but only to a lesser extent. The model further finds that emotion regulation has an impact on number of perceived friends, but there is not a particular skill that has more of an impact than others –

instead, it is the total amount of skill that has an impact. Finally, life experience has no significant effect on perceived number of social supports.

In summary, the findings from all three regressions indicate parent-child bond, emotion regulation skills and life events all serve to impact friendship in varying degrees. While parental relationship also impacts friendship, it is the level of conflict between the parents that is important instead of the whether they are married or divorced.

## **Discussion**

### **Overview and Discussion of Findings**

Intimate friendships were found to be shaped by four factors:

1. Parent-child bond may affect friendships. The bond with both parents may lead to greater intimacy. The bond with one's mother in particular may lead to more satisfaction with friendship networks as well as an overall larger number of friends.
2. Parental interaction, and maybe not parents' marital status, may affect offspring friendships. Parental conflict may impact the level of intimacy within friendships and the satisfaction with the friendship network but it does not seem to impact the number of friends within the network.
3. Emotion regulation skills may affect friendship intimacy, satisfaction, and the number of perceived friends. Most salient are the emotion regulation skills of being clear about one's emotions and feeling capable of regulation skills when upset.
4. Life events may *only* impact the satisfaction one gets from their friendship network and not their overall level of intimacy or the number of friends they have.

**Parent-child bond affects friendships.** Parent-child bond was found, as expected, to have a significant effect on friendship intimacy. The greater the bond with the parent, the greater intimacy was reported with one's closest friend. In addition, the bond with both parents is equally important. The closer a person feels to his or her parents, the closer he or she may be able to be with their friends.

Children interact and learn different models of behavior from their mothers and fathers (Collins & Russell, 1991). Thus it is surprising that the impact of the relationship with each parent on friendship intimacy is the same. Fathers have been shown to engage in more external play-oriented behaviors with their offspring whereas mothers seem to be more involved with internal-oriented interactions and care giving (Parke & Buriel, 1998; Heyl & Schmitt, 2007). A strong relationship with one's father has been shown specifically to produce higher levels of self esteem (Robinson, 2001) as well as cause people to have less conflict in friendships. Additionally, a strong relationship with one's mother has been demonstrated to have a positive effect on friendship by increasing satisfaction and closeness (Baril, Chartrand, & Dub, 2009). While the overall effect on intimacy is the same for each parent, the mechanism is different. For fathers it is that the relationship leads to an increase in self esteem, providing the child with confidence to enter intimate friendships. For mothers, it is that the relationship leads to learned empathy and closeness which they can then model in their intimate friendships.

Additionally, the bond with a person's mother was found in this study to be more crucial to having more friends and greater satisfaction in one's social network. The mother relationship as an important determinant in numbers of friends within a social network could be a result of the tendency for mothers to be more involved in their children's lives (LeCroy,

1988) and thus their influence may be stronger. Overall, mothers spend far more time with their children than fathers and take a more active role in their upbringing (Amato, 1994; Lamb, 1987; Pleck, 1985). Perhaps the tendency for mothers to be more involved in their children's lives serves to imprint on children the warmth and openness that is more typical of the female caregiver (Parke & Buriel, 1998). By encouraging their children to be more willing to share feelings, mothers by extension provide the blueprint for their children as young adults to feel more comfortable with intimacy and to seek out greater numbers of friends.

A strong relationship with one's mother may also lead to greater overall satisfaction in one's friendship network. This result is consistent with current literature, which has found a link between mother and daughter relationships and daughters' satisfaction of support from their friendships (Baril, Chartrand, & Dub, 2009). While the literature has not focused on both genders, the current study expands on past findings and includes males within this conclusion.

**Parental relationships affect friendship but parental marital status appears to have little impact.** Parents' marital status does not seem to have a significant effect on the quality of friendships. Such a finding is consistent with previous literature of the past decade highlighting the important determinant in offspring outcomes as the relationship between the parents and their children during and after a divorce (Ferrante & Stolberg, 2005; Crockenberg & Langrock, 2001). Further, conflict between parents has been found to be one of the most crucial predictors for positive outcomes following divorce (Ferrante & Stolberg, 2005). This study serves to expand on the previously determined findings and adds friendship quality to the list of variables that can be negatively affected by parental conflict.

It is important to note that while the findings are consistent with the current literature the later placement of the marital status variable within the hierarchical regression model also allowed for a smaller opportunity for the variable to account for more variance.

**Emotion regulation may affect friendship satisfaction and network size.** Strong emotion regulation ability may lead to more friendship intimacy, greater satisfaction in amount of support from friends and larger friendship networks.

This finding confirms past research which indicates emotion regulation plays a key role in furthering or hindering how people relate to each other (Argyle & Lu, 1990; Salovey, Cote, & Beers, 2005).

Being clear of emotions and having confidence in one's ability to use regulation strategies were identified in this study as especially important skills to furthering friendships.

Knowing of internal emotional state facilitates a person's ability to negotiate interpersonal interactions (Kiraly, 2000). Persons without this ability or with severe deficits in this area, such as those with Autism Spectrum Disorder often have trouble socially and may be unable to make personal connections (Rieffe, Terwogt, & Meerum, 2007). Lack of emotional clarity has also been associated with higher levels of a variety of dysfunction including eating, anxiety, and substance abuse disorders (Whiteside, Chen, Neighbors, Hunter, Lo, & Larimer, 2007; Roemer, Lee, Salters-Pedneault, Erisman, Orsillo, & Mennin, 2009; Fox, Hong, & Sinha, 2008).

Thus it is not surprising that lower clarity of emotions would also be associated with less intimacy and less satisfaction in a person's friendship network. Past research has indicated that people who are not willing to talk about their feelings have weaker social skills and are less able to attract friends (Cohen, Clark, & Sherrod, 1986). Implicit in the ability to

talk about feeling is knowing what those feelings are. Without clarity, a person cannot share with others and thus will be impeded in the level of intimacy that can be achieved. As a result, a person may be left unsatisfied with their number of friendships due to this inability to achieve intimacy.

Confidence in one's ability to use regulation strategies was found in this study to be directly related to satisfaction in friendship network size. In persons with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder, emotion regulation strategies are often impaired; and such persons have been recognized as tending to lack satisfaction with their friendship networks, particularly with intimate friends (Normand, Schneider, & Robaey, 2007). Perhaps their lack of skills prevents them from attaining their goals, or it could result from a lack of skills and low levels of confidence. Without confidence in emotional regulation skills, they likely feel unable to achieve whatever level of social contact they would like and thereby fail to make continuous efforts towards friendships.

Finally, competence in all six areas of emotions regulation skills measured seems to contribute to perceived size of friendship network. This includes acceptance of emotional responses, engaging in goal directed behavior, impulse control, emotional awareness, access to emotional regulation and emotional clarity. These six skills were identified by Gratz and Roemer (2004) as representing a unified theory concerning emotions regulations. However, the current study suggests that they also represent an important core component to perceived social support. This is consistent with the suggestion that emotions regulation skills are an integral part of relationships (Argyle & Lu, 1990).

Perhaps the reason that all of the skills seem to contribute equally to perceived size of friendship network but do not contribute uniformly to intimacy and satisfaction with one's



friendship network, is because perceived network size is a more concrete, broader categorization. It asks for an external evaluation or tallying of those surrounding us, whereas intimacy and satisfaction are more internal processes which require more specific skill competencies.

**Life events seem to affect satisfaction with friendship network.** Total life events seem to have a significant effect on the satisfaction with the social network. Contrary to what was expected, total life events were not found to have a significant effect on friendship intimacy or perceived number of friends.

The more positive life events a person has experienced it appears the more satisfied they are with their friendship networks. The findings indicate that negative events may serve to hinder and positive events may serve to bolster friendship network satisfaction. This finding is consistent with other life event literature if satisfaction with friendship network is categorized as positive adjustment. When studying children of divorce, an increase in negative life events is related to more maladjustment, psychopathology, and fewer pro-social skills, whereas stability in positive events serves to lower maladjustment (Sandler, Wolchik, Braver, Fogas, 1994; Goodyer, 1993, Stolberg & Bush, 1985; Stolberg & Anker, 1984; Stolberg, Camplair, Currier, & Wells, 1984). Life events such as divorce can serve to change how persons interact within friendships or even cause friendships to dissolve (Stolberg & Bush, 1985) though deemed less important than other factors surrounding the divorce in overall adjustment (Sandler et al., 1994).

Contrary to expectations, total life events did not seem to impact friendship intimacy or perceived number of friends. Perhaps the effect is only seen in satisfaction with network

because significant life events serve to change expectations from friendship networks. Four factors have been identified as central to relationship satisfaction.

These include interaction, positivity, supportiveness and self-disclosure (Oswald, Clark, & Kelly, 2001; Oswald & Clark, 2003). When major life events occur a person may require more supportiveness from the friend than they previously received. Additionally, a person may interact less with others as they attempt to handle their own emotions. Because life events may affect two out of the four factors outlined by Oswald et al. (2001) they may lead to the lesser satisfaction that has been demonstrated in this study.

### **Limitations**

Several limitations should be recognized when interpreting the results. One important limitation is the cross-sectional design which serves as highlighting a moment in time of these participant's lives. By capturing the data at only one point, the study is unable to take into account the changing nature of participant's friendships or the additional life experiences that may come to impact the quality and quantity of their relations. Furthermore, emotion regulation skills by their very nature have the possibility of further developing or deteriorating over time which could lead to a different impact on friendship.

This study is also limited by the retrospective nature of some of the measures. Both the Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire and the Parental Bonding Instrument required the participant to recollect experiences from childhood. Therefore, the recollection may be inaccurate and is susceptible to memory fallibility and more current interaction biases.

The choice of friendship measures may also have influenced the findings. The literature lacks consensus as to what the most important qualities of friendship are.

The choice of the Intimate Friendship Survey may have tapped into only a limited number of possible factors that create the construct of friendship intimacy. Furthermore, The Social Support Questionnaire may have not measured friendship in its purest form because it does not exclude family members from the person's identified as social supports. However because family members often may additionally serve in the role as friends the measure was deemed appropriate to understand a person's overall social support with this recognized limitation.

Despite these limitations, this study has important implications for future interventions and research.

### **Implications and Future Research**

By understanding some of the important factors that contribute to friendship intimacy and how they may interact with each other, clinicians are in a better position to help those suffering from social dissatisfaction. The impact of familial factors on friendship is more deeply understood through an appreciation of the effect of parent-child bond with offspring, and parental conflict on friendship quality, satisfaction and network size. The finding suggests to all parents, not just those who are divorced, that the way they interact both with each other and with their child will influence future relationships their child has. Through knowledge of such a process, parents may make more of an effort to reduce conflict between each other and increase the positive relationships with their child. In particular, the study highlights the importance of a father's role in their child's future friendship intimacy and can serve to encourage fathers that are inactive to become more active in their child's lives. It also may be helpful to discern if improving the relationship between the father and their child would improve the child's friendships.

Such research would further explore if the parent-child bond is a stable entity that once formed cannot be changed, or if it is subject to later modification. If modification is possible, then this may have implications for possible treatments for socially dysfunctional persons.

Emotion regulation skills serve an important role in friendship intimacy and social support networks. A clinician can now focus treatment on skill-building by recognizing that deficits in skills of emotional clarity and confidence in being able to handle emotionally loaded situations both contribute to lower levels of intimacy in friendship, network satisfaction and network size. By decreasing such deficits, an increase in overall friendship happiness may be achieved. Further studies could design more specific targeted approaches and test the efficacy of such a treatment. In addition, the emotion regulation skill of emotional clarity has been identified in dysfunctional populations such as those with eating disorders and substance abuse problems. Both of these populations often isolate themselves from others during the course of their diseases (Halperin, 1996; Crowe, Philbin, Richards, & Crawford, 1998). Often it is assumed that this isolation occurs as a consequence of the disease, though findings from this study suggest that perhaps the same emotion regulation skills that have made them vulnerable to the diseases are the cause of their social isolation. Further exploration concerning these particular emotion regulation deficits and the negative outcomes that lead to their occurrence could implicate treatment that incorporates their skill buildings in other interventions targeting other disorders.

This study should be considered an exploratory step in examining the factors that contribute to friendship quality, friendship satisfaction and network size of young adults. Despite its limitation in scope, this study has highlighted the importance of parental, self and life event factors that shape the friendship experience. Specifically, from this study it can be

concluded that parental marital status does not impact friendship. However, conflict between parents does have a negative effect on friendships. Additionally, parent-child bond, emotion regulation skills and life events all serve to impact friendship. From these findings the literature has been further expanded, and suggestions for future studies and clinical applications in this area have been highlighted.

## List of References

## List of References

- Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1973). The development of infant-mother attachment. In B.Caldwell & H. Ricciuti (Eds.). *Review of child development research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ainsworth, M. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Amato, P. R. (1994). Life-span adjustment of children to their parents' divorce. *The Future of Children*, 4, 143-164.
- Amato, P. R. (1996). Explaining the intergenerational transmission of divorce. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 58, 628-640.
- Amato, P. R. (2007). Life-span adjustment of children to their parents' divorce. In S.J. Ferguson, *Shifting the center: Understanding contemporary families (3rd ed.)*(pp. 567-588). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Amato, P. R. & DeBoer, D. (2001). The transmission of marital stability across generations: Relationship skills or commitment to marriage? *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 63, 1038-1051.
- Amato, P. R., Johnson, D. R., Booth, A., & Rogers, S.J. (2003). Continuity and change in marital quality between 1980 and 2000. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 65, 1-22.
- Apter, A., Galatzer, A., Weizman, A., & Weizman, T. (1994). Psychological aspects of developmental endocrinopathies in adolescence. *Israel Journal of Psychiatry and Related Sciences*, 31, 246-253.
- Arditti, J.A. (1999). Rethinking relationships between divorced mothers and their children: Capitalizing on family strengths. *Family Relations*, 48, 109-119.
- Argyle, M. & Lu, L. (1990). The happiness of extraverts. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 11, 1011-1017.
- Arnett, J. J. (2004). *Emerging adulthood: The winding road from the late teens through the twenties*: New York, Oxford University Press.

- Bagwell, C.L., Schmidt, M.E., Newcomb, A., & Bukowski, W.M. (2002). Friendship and peer rejection as predictors of adult adjustment. In W. Damon (Series Ed.), D. W. Nangle & C. A. Erdley (Vol. Eds.), *New directions for child and adolescent development: Vol. 91. The role of friendship in psychological adjustment* (pp. 25-49). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Baril, H., Julien, D., Chartrand, É., & Dubé, M. (2009). Females' quality of relationships in adolescence and friendship support in adulthood. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement*, *41*, 161-168.
- Bartell, D.S. (2006). Influence of parental divorce on romantic relationships in young adulthood: A cognitive-developmental perspective. In M. Fine, & J. Harvey (Eds.), *Handbook of divorce and relationship dissolution* (pp. 339-360). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Barrett, P. M., & Holmes, J. (2001). Attachment relationship as predictors of cognitive interpretation and response bias in late adolescence. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *10*, 51-64.
- Bass, L. A., & Stein, C.H. (1997). Comparing the structure and stability of network ties using the Social Support Questionnaire and the Social Network List. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *14*, 123-132.
- Bauminger, N., Finzi-Dottan, R., Chason, S., & Har-Even, D. (2008). Intimacy in adolescent friendship: The roles of attachment, coherence, and self-disclosure. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *25*, 409-428.
- Beckwith, L., Cohen, S., & Hamilton, C. (1999). Maternal sensitivity during infancy and subsequent life events relate to attachment representation at early adulthood. *Developmental Psychology*, *35*, 693-700.
- Betts, L. R., & Rotenberg, K. J. (2007). Trustworthiness, friendships and self-control: Factors that contribute to young children's school adjustment. *Infant and Child Development*, *16*, 491-508.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and Loss: Vol. 1. Attachment*. New York: Basic Books.
- Brenner, V., Nicholson, B. C., Fox, R. A. (1999). Evaluation of a community-based parenting program with the parents of young children. *Early Child Development and Care*, *148*, 1-9.
- Brody, G. H., Stoneman, Z., & McCoy, J. K. (1992). Associations of maternal and paternal direct and differential behavior with sibling relationships: Contemporaneous and longitudinal analyses. *Child Development*, *63*, 82-92.



- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. (1998). The ecology of developmental processes. In W., Damon (Series Ed.), R. M. Lerner (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 1. Theoretical models of human development (5<sup>th</sup> ed., pp. 993-1028)*. New York: Wiley.
- Bukowski, W. M., Newcomb, A. F., & Hartup, W. W. (1996). *The company they keep: Friendships in childhood and adolescence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Campos, J., Barrett, K., Lamb, M., Goldsmith, H., & Stenberg, C. (1983). Socioemotional development. In M. Haith & J. Campos (Eds.) *Infancy and developmental psychobiology: Vol. II. Handbook of child psychology (pp. 783– 915)*. New York: Wiley.
- Cohen, S., Sherrod, D. R., Clark, M. S. (1986). Social skills and the stress-protective role of social support. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *50*, 963-973.
- Collins, W. A., & Russell, G. (1991). Mother-child and father-child relationships in middle childhood and adolescence: A developmental analysis. *Developmental Review*, *11*, 99-136.
- Connolly, J. A., & Konarski, R. (1994). Peer self-concept in adolescence: Analysis of factor structure and of associations with peer experience. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *4*, 385-403.
- Cordeiro, R. (2005). Physical appearance and intimate friendship in adolescence: A study using a Portuguese college student sample. *Social Behavior and Personality*, *33*, 89-94.
- Crockenberg, S., Langrock, A. (2001). The role of specific emotions in children's responses to interparental conflict: A test of the model, *Journal of Family Psychology*, *15*, 163-182.
- Crowe, P. A., Philbin, J., Richards, M. H., & Crawford, I. (1998). Adolescent alcohol involvement and the experience of social environments. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *8*, 403-422.
- Denissen, J. A., Penke, L., Schmitt, D. P., & Van Aken, M. A. (2008). Self-esteem reactions to social interactions: Evidence for sociometer mechanisms across days, people, and nations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *95*, 181-196.
- Descutner, C. J., & Thelen, M. H. (1991). Development and validation of a Fear-of-Intimacy Scale. *Psychological Assessment*, *3*, 218-225.

- Donnelly, D., & Finkelhor, D. (1992). Does equality in custody arrangement improve the parent-child relationship? *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *54*, 837-845.
- Ducharme, J., Doyle, A. B., & Markiewicz, D. (2002). Attachment security with mother and father: Association with adolescents' reports of interpersonal behavior with parents and peers. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *19*, 203-231.
- DuBois, D. L., & Hirsch, B. J. (1993). School/nonschool friendship patterns in early adolescence. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, *13*, 102-122.
- Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., Guthrie, I. K., & Reiser, M. (2000). Dispositional emotionality and regulation: Their role in predicting quality of social functioning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *78*, 136-157.
- Eldar-Avidan, D., Haj-Yahia, M. M., & Greenbaum, C. W. (2008). Money matters: Young adults' perception of the economic consequences of their parents' divorce. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, *29*, 74-85.
- Emery, R. E., Laumann-Billings, L., Waldron, M. C., Sbarra, D. A., & Dillon, P. (2001). Child custody mediation and litigation: Custody, contact, and co-parenting 12 years after initial dispute resolution. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *69*, 323-332.
- Engels, R. C., Finkenauer, C., Meeus, W., Deković, M. (2001). Parental attachment and adolescents' emotional adjustment: The associations with social skills and relational competence. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *48*, 428-439.
- Erikson, E. H. (1963). *Childhood and society* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). New York: Norton.
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity, youth, and crisis*. New York: Norton.
- Erwin, P. (1998). *Friendships in childhood and adolescence*. London: Routledge.
- Feld, S., & Carter, W. C. (1998). Foci of activity as changing contexts for friendship. In R.G. Adams & G. Allan (Eds.), *Placing friendship in context* (pp. 136-152). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferrante, J.A., & Stolberg, A. (2005). Co-parenting in intact and divorced families: Its impact on young adult adjustment. Unpublished master's thesis, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond.
- Fox, H. C., Hong, K. A., & Sinha, R. (2008). Difficulties in emotion regulation and impulse control in recently abstinent alcoholics compared with social drinkers. *Addictive Behaviors*, *33*, 388-394.

- Fry, P. S., & Grover, S. C. (1983). An exploration of the child's perspective: Children's perceptions of parental treatment, personal anxiety and attributions of blame in single-parent families. *Journal of Psychiatric Treatment & Evaluation*, 5, 353-362.
- Furr, R. M., & Funder, D. C. (1998). A multimodal analysis of personal negativity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 1580-1591.
- Furman, W., Simon, V. A., Shaffer, L., & Boucheay, H. A. (2002). Adolescents' working models and styles for relationships with parents, friends, and romantic partners. *Child Development*, 73, 241-255.
- Gabardi, L., & Rosen, L. (1992). Intimate relationships: College students from divorced and intact families. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 18, 25-56.
- Gartstein, M. A, Crawford, J., & Robertson, C. D. (2008). Early markers of language and attention: Mutual contributions and the impact of parent-infant interactions. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development*, 39, 9-26.
- Gau, S. S. (2007). Parental and family factors for attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder in Taiwanese children. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 41, 688-696.
- Gloger-Tippelt, G., & Konig, L. (2007). Attachment representations in 6-year-old children from one and two parent families in Germany. *School Psychology International*, 28, 313-330.
- Glover, T.D., & Parry, D.C. (2008). Friendships developed subsequent to a stressful life event: The interplay of leisure, social, capital, and health. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 40, 208-230.
- Goodyer, I., Wright, C., & Altham, P. (1990). The friendships and recent life events of anxious and depressed school-age children. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 156, 689-698.
- Goodyer, I. M. (1993). Recent stressful life events: Their long term effects. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 2, 1-9.
- Gratz, K. L., & Roemer, L. (2004). Multidimensional assessment of emotion regulation and dysregulation: Development, factor structure, and initial validation of the difficulties in emotion regulation scale. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 26, 41-54.
- Gross, J. J., & John, O. P. (2003). Individual differences in two emotion regulation processes: Implications for affect, relationships, and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 348-362.

- Guttman, J. (1993). Adolescents from divorced families and their best friend relationship: A qualitative analysis. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage*, 20, 95-110.
- Halpenny, A. M., Greene, S., & Hogan, D. (2008). Children's perspectives on coping and support following parental separation. *Child Care in Practice*, 14, 311-325.
- Halperin, E. N. (1996). The role of socialization in male anorexia nervosa: Two cases. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development*, 26, 159-168.
- Hanish, L. D., Ryan, P., Martin, C. L., & Fabes, R. A. (2005). The social context of young children's peer victimization. *Social Development*, 14, 3-19.
- Hartup, W. W., & Stevens, N. (1999). Friendships and adaptation across the life span. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 8, 76-79.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1988). Adult attachment biased overview of the study of love. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 5, 473-510.
- Henderson, S. H., Hetherington, E. M., Mekos, D., & Reiss, D. (1996). Stress, parenting, and adolescent psychopathology in non-divorced and stepfamilies: A within-family perspective. In E. M. Hetherington & E.A. Blechman (Eds.). *Stress, coping, and resiliency in children and families* (pp. 39-66). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Hertz-Lazarowitz, R., Rosenberg, M., & Guttman, J. (1989). Children of divorce and their intimate relationships with parents and peers. *Youth Society*, 21, 85-104.
- Hetherington, E. M. (2003). Intimate pathways: Changing patterns in close personal relationships across time. *Family Relations*, 52, 318-331.
- Heyl, V., & Schmitt, M. (2007). The contribution of adult personality and recalled parent-child relations to friendships in middle and old age. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 31(1), 38-48.
- Iwaski, Y., and Mannell, R.C. (2000a). Hierarchical dimensions of leisure stress coping. *Leisure Sciences*, 22, 163-181.
- Jones, D. C. (1992). Parental divorce, family conflict and friendship networks. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 9, 219-235.
- Jones, G. P., & Dembo, M. H. (1986). The development of intimacy in childhood and adolescence. Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

- Keith, V. M., & Finlay, B. (1988). The impact of parental divorce on children's educational attainment, marital timing, and likelihood of divorce. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 50, 797-809.
- Kiraly, Z. (2000). The relationship between emotional self-disclosure of male and female adolescents' friendship. *Dissertations Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*, 60 (7-B), 3619.
- Kirk, A. (2002). The effects of divorce on young adults' relationship competence: The influence of intimate friendships. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage*, 38, 61-90.
- Knoester, C., Haynie, D. L., & Stephens, C. M. (2006). Parenting practices and adolescents' friendship networks. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68, 1247-1260.
- Knox, D., Zusman, M., & DeCuzzi, A. (2004). The effect of parental divorce on relationships with parents and romantic partners of college students. *College Student Journal*, 38, 597-601.
- Kurtz, L. (1994). Psychosocial coping resources in elementary school-age children of divorce. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 64, 554-563.
- Lamb, M. E. (1987). Introduction: The emergent American father. In M. Lamb (Ed.). *The father's role: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 3-25). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- LeCroy, C. W. (1988). Parent-adolescent intimacy: Impact on adolescent functioning. *Adolescence*, 23, 137-147.
- Lindsey, E.W., Colwell, M. J., Frabutt, J. M., & Mackinnon-Lewis, C. (2006). Family conflict in divorced and non-divorced families: Potential consequences for boys' friendship status and friendship quality. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 23: 45-63.
- Liu, H., & Wang, H. (2009). Relationship between loneliness, friendship quality and peer acceptance in primary school children, *Chinese Mental Health Journal*, 23, 44-47.
- Lopes, P. N., Salovey, P., Cote, S., & Beer, M. (2005). Emotion regulation abilities and the quality of social interaction. *Emotion*, 5, 113-118.
- Lopes, P. N., Salovey, P., & Straus, R. (2003). Emotional intelligence, personality, and the perceived quality of social relationships. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35, 641-658.

- Lustig, J. L., Wolchik, S. A., & Braver, S. L. (1992). Social support in chumships and adjustment in children of divorce. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 20, 393-399.
- Macie, K. M., & Stolberg, A. L. (2003). Assessing parenting after divorce: The co-parenting behavior questionnaire. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 39(1-2), 89-107.
- Maysseless, O., & Scharf, M. (2007). Adolescents' attachment representations and their capacity for intimacy in close relationships. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 17, 23-50.
- McCormick, C. B., & Kennedy, J. H. (2000). Father-child separation, retrospective and current views of attachment relationship with father, and self-esteem in late adolescence. *Psychological Reports*, 86, 827-834.
- Miller, J. B., & Hoicowitz, T. (2004). Attachment contexts of adolescent friendship and romance. *Journal of Adolescence*, 27, 191-206.
- Miller, P. H. (2002). *Theories of developmental psychology (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.)*. New York: Worth Publishers.
- Mullett, E. K., & Stolberg, A. L. (1999). The development of the Co-Parenting Behaviors Questionnaire: An instrument for children of divorce. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage*, 31, 115-137.
- Nelson, J. K., & Bennett, C. S. (2008). Introduction: Special issue on attachment. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, 36, 3-7.
- Normand, S., Schneider, B. H., & Robaey, P.(2007). Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder and the challenges of close friendship. *Journal of the Canadian Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 16, 67-73.
- O'Connor, B. P. (1995). Family and friend relationships among older and younger adults: Interaction motivation, mood, and quality. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 40, 9-29.
- Oswald, D. L., Clark, E. M., Kelly, C. M.(2004). Friendship maintenance: An analysis of individual and dyad behaviors. *Journal of Social & Clinical Psychology*, 23, 413-441.
- Oswald, D. L., & Clark, E. M. (2003). Best friends forever?: High school best friendships and the transition to college. *Personal Relationships*, 10, 187-196.

- Pahl, R., & Pevalin, D. J. (2005). Between family and friends: A longitudinal study of friendship choice. *British Journal of Sociology*, *56*, 433-450.
- Pahl, R., & Spencer, L. (1997). The politics of friendship. *Renewal*, *5*, 100-107.
- Parke, R. D., & Buriel, R. (1998). Socialization in the family: Ethnic and ecological perspectives. In W. Damon & N. Eisenberg (Eds.); *Handbook of child psychology, Social, emotional, and personality development*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Parker, G., Tupling, H., & Brown, L. (1979). A Parental Bonding Instrument. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, *52*, 1-10.
- Pellegrini, A. D., & Smith, P. K. (1998). Physical activity play: The nature and function of a neglected aspect of play. *Child Development*, *69*, 577-598.
- Pleck, J. H. (1985). Working wives, working husbands. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Rieffe, C., Terwogt, M. M., & Kotronopoulou, K. (2007). Awareness of single and multiple emotions in high-functioning children with autism. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, *37*, 455-465.
- Roemer, L., Lee, J. K., Salters-Pedneault, K., Erisman, S. M., Orsillo, S. M., & Mennin, D. S. (2009). Mindfulness and emotion regulation difficulties in generalized anxiety disorder: Preliminary evidence for independent and overlapping contributions. *Behavior Therapy*, *40*, 142-154.
- Rothbart, M. K., & Sheese, B. E. (2007). Temperament and Emotion Regulation. In J. J., Gross, *Handbook of emotion regulation (pp. 331-350)*. New York, Guilford Press.
- Rubin, K. H., Dwyer, K. M., Booth-LaForce, C., Kim, A. H., Burgess, K. B., & Rose-Krasnor, L. (2004). Attachment, friendship, and psychosocial functioning in early adolescence. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, *24*, 326-356.
- Rushton, J. P., & Bons, T. A. (2005). Mate choice and friendship in twins: evidence for genetic similarity. *Psychological Science*, *16*, 555-559.
- Russell, D. W. (1996). UCLA Loneliness Scale (Version 3): reliability, validity, and factor structure. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *66*, 20-40.
- Russell, D., Peplau, L. A., & Cutrona, C. E. (1980). The revised UCLA Loneliness Scale: Concurrent and discriminant validity evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *39*, 472-480.

- Russell, D., Peplau, L. A., & Ferguson, M. L. (1978). Developing a measure of loneliness. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 42*, 290–294.
- Saferstein, J. A., Neimeyer, G. J., & Hagans, C. L. (2005). Attachment as a predictor of friendship qualities in college youth. *Social Behavior and Personality, 33*, 767-776.
- Safford, S. M., Alloy, L. B., Pieracci, A. (2007). A comparison of two measures of parental behavior. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 16*, 375-384.
- Sandler, I., Wolchik, S., Braver, S., & Fogas, B. (1991). Stability and quality of life events and psychological symptomatology in children of divorce. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 19*, 501-520.
- Sarason, I. G., Johnson, J. H., & Siegel, J. M. (1978). Assessing the impact of life changes: development of The Life Experiences Survey. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46*, 932-946.
- Sarason, I. G., Levine, H. M., Basham, R. B., & Sarason, B. R. (1983). Assessing social support: The Social Support Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44*, 127–139.
- Schum, L., & Stolberg, A. L. (2007). *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage, 47*, 103-132.
- Shaffer, C.M.V.(2007). Concurrent validity and predictive accuracy of parenting styles derived from the co-parenting questionnaire. Unpublished master's thesis, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond.
- Sharabany, R. (1974b). Intimate Friendship Scale: Conceptual underpinnings, psychometric properties and construct validity. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 11*, 449–469.
- Sharabany, R. (1994). Intimate Friendship Scale: Conceptual underpinnings, psychometric properties and construct validity. *Journal of Social and Personality Relationships, 11*, 449-469.
- Sherman, M. D., & Thelen, M. H. (1996). Fear of Intimacy Scale: Validation and extension with adolescents. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 13*, 507-521.
- Solnit, A. J., & Nordhaus, B. F. (2005). Divorce and custody in a changing society. In L. Gunsberg & P. Hymowitz, *A handbook of divorce and custody: Forensic, developmental, and clinical perspectives (pp. 139-142)*. New York: The Analytic Press/Taylor & Francis Group.



- Sroufe, L. A. (1996). *Emotional development: The organization of emotional life in the early years*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Stevenson, J.L. (2007). The effect of child characteristics and environmental demands on parenting across intact and divorced families: An exploratory view. Unpublished master's thesis, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond.
- Stolberg, A. L. & Anker, J. M. (1983). Cognitive and behavioral changes in children resulting from parental divorce and consequent environmental changes. *Journal of Divorce*, 7, 23-41.
- Stolberg, A. L., & Bush, J. P. (1985). A path analysis of factors predicting children's divorce adjustment. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 14, 49-54.
- Stolberg, A. L., Camplair, C. W., Currier, K., & Wells, M. J. (1987). Individual, familial and environmental determinants of children's post-divorce adjustment and maladjustment. *Journal of Divorce*, 11, 51-70.
- Sullivan, H. S. (1953). *The interpersonal theory of psychiatry*. New York: Norton.
- Thomson, L. (2007). Hypnosis for Children with Elimination Disorders. In W.C. Wester, & L. I., Sugerman, *Therapeutic hypnosis with children and adolescents* (pp. 387-415). Norwalk, CT, Crown House Publishing Limited.
- Van Wel, F. (1994) I count my parents among my best friends': Youths' bonds with parents and friends in the Netherlands. *Journal of Marriage & the Family*, 56, 835-843.
- Wallerstein, J. S., & Lewis, J. (1998). The long-term impact of divorce on children: A first report from a 25-year study. *Family and Conciliation Courts Review*, 36, 368-383.
- Whiteside, U., Chen, E., Neighbors, C., Hunter, D., Lo, T., & Larimer, M. (2007). Difficulties regulating emotions: Do binge eaters have fewer strategies to modulate and tolerate negative affect? *Eating Behaviors*, 8, 162-169.
- Wilhelm, S., Steketee, G., Reilly-Harrington, N. A., Deckersbach, T., Buhlmann, U., & Baer, L. (2005). Effectiveness of cognitive therapy for obsessive-compulsive disorder: An open trial. *Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy*, 19, 173-179.
- Wiseman, J. P. (1986). Friendship: Bonds and binds in a voluntary relationship. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 3, 191-211.
- Youniss, J., & Smollar, J. (1989). Adolescents' interpersonal relationships in social context. In T. J., Berndt & G. W., Ladd, *Peer relationships in child development* (pp. 300-316). Oxford, England: John Wiley & Sons.

Yoshizumi, T., Murase, S., Murakami, T., & Takai, J. (2007). Dissociation as a mediator between perceived parental rearing style and depression in an adult community population using college students. *Personality and Individual Differences, 43*, 353-364.

Zarbatany, L., Conley, R., & Pepper, S. (2004). Personality and gender differences in friendship needs and experiences in preadolescence and young adulthood. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 28*, 299-310.

## Appendix A

### Recruitment Information for University 101 Undergraduate Course

#### **RESEARCH SUBJECT INFORMATION AND CONSENT FORM**

**TITLE:** An Examination of Factors that Influence the Development of Friendships in Young Adults from Intact and Divorced Families

**VCU IRB NO.:**HM12077

This consent form may contain words that you do not understand. Please ask the study staff to explain any words that you do not clearly understand. You may take home an unsigned copy of this consent form to think about or discuss with family or friends before making your decision.

#### **PURPOSE OF THE STUDY**

The purpose of this research study is to find out about how your family and your life experiences shape your friendships.

#### **DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY**

In this study you will be asked to fill out a series of questionnaires. The questionnaires will take approximately two hours to complete. Some of the questionnaires will ask you about yourself and your friendships. Other questionnaires will ask you about your family, including your parents and siblings. There are approximately 410 questions in this survey. Significant new findings developed during the course of the research will be provided to you.

#### **RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS**

Sometimes talking about these subjects causes people to become upset. Some questions will be asked about your family, your relationships with family members, the quality of your friendships and life experiences you may have had. Some of your relationships and experiences may be unpleasant. You do not have to answer any questions you do not feel comfortable with and you may stop participating in the study at any time. **If you become upset the study staff will give you names of counselors to contact so you can get help in dealing with these issues.** There are approximately 410 questions in this survey and it will take you approximately two hours to complete. This may become tiring to you and you may become frustrated as there may appear to be some redundancy in questions asked. Some questions may appear to be asking the same thing but in different ways which may cause you to feel annoyed. If you feel this way at any point you may stop participating in this study at any time.

## **BENEFITS TO YOU AND OTHERS**

You may not get any direct benefit from this study, but, the information we learn from people in this study may help us better understand how our families and other factors affect the quality of our friendships.

## **COSTS**

There are no costs for participating in this study other than the time you will spend filling out the questionnaires.

## ***PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION***

*You will receive two hours of research experience credit toward your Psychology 101 class or other Psychology course research experience requirement. Credit will be given upon completion of all questionnaires.*

## **ALTERNATIVES**

*The alternative to this study is to choose not to participate in this study.*

## ***CONFIDENTIALITY***

Potentially identifiable information about you will consist of questionnaires. Data is being collected only for research purposes. Your data will be identified by ID numbers, not names, and stored separately from questionnaires in a locked research area. All personal identifying information will be kept in password protected files and these files will be deleted upon completion of the study. The data set from the questionnaires will be kept indefinitely. Access to all data will be limited to study personnel. A data and safety monitoring plan is established.

We will not tell anyone the answers you give us; however, information from the study and the consent form signed by you may be looked at or copied for research or legal purposes by Virginia Commonwealth University.

What we find from this study may be presented at meetings or published in papers, but your name will not ever be used in these presentations or papers.

We will not tell anyone the answers you give us. But, if you tell us that someone is hurting a child or an elder, or that you may hurt yourself or someone else, the law says that we have to let people in authority know so they can protect you.

## ***IF AN INJURY HAPPENS***

*Virginia Commonwealth University and the VCU Health System do not have a plan to give long-term care or money if you are injured because you are in the study.*

*If you are injured because of being in this study, tell the study staff right away. The study staff will arrange for short-term emergency care or referral if it is needed..*

*Bills for treatment may be sent to you or your insurance. Your insurance may or may not pay for taking care of injuries that happen because of being in this study.*

### ***VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL***

You do not have to participate in this study. If you choose to participate, you may stop at any time without any penalty. You may also choose not to answer particular questions that are asked in the study.

Your participation in this study may be stopped at any time by the study staff or the without your consent. The reasons might include:

- the study staff thinks it necessary for your health or safety;
- you have not followed study instructions;
- the sponsor has stopped the study; or
- administrative reasons require your withdrawal.

If you leave the study before completing all of the questionnaires, you may feel psychological discomfort about recalling family relationships, life experiences or the quality of your friendships.

### ***QUESTIONS***

*In the future, you may have questions about your participation in this study. If you have any questions, complaints, or concerns about the research, contact:*

*Dr. Arnold L. Stolberg  
Department of Psychology  
Virginia Commonwealth University  
806 W. Franklin Street  
Richmond, VA 23284  
808-828-1242*

*If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this study, you may contact:*

*Office for Research*

*Virginia Commonwealth University  
800 East Leigh Street, Suite 113  
P.O. Box 980568  
Richmond, VA 23298  
Telephone: 804-827-2157*

*You may also contact this number for general questions, concerns or complaints about the research. Please call this number if you cannot reach the research team or wish to talk to someone else. Additional information about participation in research studies can be found at <http://www.research.vcu.edu/irb/volunteers.htm>.*

***CONSENT***

*I have been given the chance to read this consent form. I understand the information about this study. Questions that I wanted to ask about the study have been answered. By clicking on the “Proceed” button, I demonstrate that I am willing to participate in this study.*

## Appendix B

### Study Questionnaire (Demographics)

Listed below are questions about your background and your parents' separation/divorce. If you are given the option to decline to answer a question, then declining to answer is considered a response.

1. What is your gender?

Male

Female

2. What race/ethnicity do you consider yourself to be? You may check more than one.

African  
American/Black

American  
Indian, Native  
American or  
Alaska Native

Asian or  
Pacific  
Islander

Latino/Hispanic

Caucasian

Other  
race/ethnicity

Check this box if you do not want to provide an answer for this question

3. Which of the following categories best describes your family's annual household income?

- 25,000 or under
- 25,000- 50,000
- 50,000- 75,000
- 75,000- 100,000
- 100,000- 150,000
- 150,000+

4. Please check all of the following that apply concerning your biological parents:

- married
- separated
- divorced
- never lived together
- never separated

5. Have your biological parents ever physically separated without moving back in together or divorcing?

- Yes
- No

6. If your biological parents separated, how old were you at the first separation (list chronological age in years..e.g. 1, 2, 3...)?

7. Did your biological parents separate and reconcile more than once?

- Yes
- No

8. If your biological parents separated more than once, how many times total did they separate?

Check this box if you do not want to provide an answer for this question

9. How old were you the last time your parents separated? (list chronological age in years e.g. 1, 2, 3..)

10. What was the formal, legal custody arrangement made at the time of your parents' divorce? If you do not know please indicate as such.

11. If there was a formal legal custody arrangement was it ever modified?

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable

12. If there was a modification to the formal legal custody arrangement when and why was it modified?

20. Was the court system involved in your parents' custody agreement?

- Yes
- No

21. Would you consider your parents divorce hostile?

- Yes
- No

22. What is your mother's current marital status?

- Remarried and divorced again
- Remarried and remains married



- Widowed
- Single, never remarried

23. What is your father's current marital status?

- Remarried and divorced again
- Remarried and remains married
- Widowed
- Single, never remarried

## Appendix C

### Parental Bonding Instrument (Parker, Tupling, & Brown, 1979)

The following questions list various attitudes and behaviors of parents. As you remember your mother in your first 16 years please indicate the most appropriate response.

1. During my first 16 years my mother spoke to me in a warm and friendly voice.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

2. During my first 16 years my mother did not help me as much as I needed.

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

3. During my first 16 years my mother let me do those things that I liked doing.

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

4. During my first 16 years my mother seemed emotionally cold to me.

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

5. During my first 16 years my mother appeared to understand my problems and worries.

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

6. During my first 16 years my mother was affectionate to me.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

7. During my first 16 years my mother liked me to make my own decisions.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

8. During my first 16 years my mother did not want me to grow up.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

9. During my first 16 years my mother tried to control everything I did.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

10. During my first 16 years my mother invaded my privacy.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

11. During my first 16 years my mother enjoyed talking things over with me.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

12. During my first 16 years my mother frequently smiled at me.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

13. During my first 16 years my mother tended to baby me.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

14. During my first 16 years my mother did not seem to understand what I needed or wanted.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

15. During my first 16 years my mother let me decide things for myself.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

16. During my first 16 years my mother made me feel I wasn't wanted.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely

- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

17. During my first 16 years my mother could make me feel better when I was upset.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

18. During my first 16 years my mother did not talk with me very much.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

19. During my first 16 years my mother tried to make me feel dependent on her.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

20. During my first 16 years my mother felt I could not look after myself unless she was around.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

21. During my first 16 years my mother gave me as much freedom as I wanted.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

22. During my first 16 years my mother let me go out as often as I wanted.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

23. During my first 16 years my mother was overprotective of me.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

24. During my first 16 years my mother did not praise me.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

25. During my first 16 years my mother let me dress in any way I pleased.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

The following questions list various attitudes and behaviors of parents. As you remember your father in your first 16 years please indicate the most appropriate response.

26. During my first 16 years my father spoke to me in a warm and friendly voice.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

27. During my first 16 years my father did not help me as much as I needed.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

28. During my first 16 years my father let me do those things that I liked doing.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

29. During my first 16 years my father seemed emotionally cold to me.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

30. During my first 16 years my father appeared to understand my problems and worries.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

31. During my first 16 years my father was affectionate to me.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

32. During my first 16 years my father liked me to make my own decisions. Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely

- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

33. During my first 16 years my father did not want me to grow up. Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

34. During my first 16 years my father tried to control everything I did. Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

35. During my first 16 years my father invaded my privacy. Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

36. During my first 16 years my father enjoyed talking things over with me. Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

37. During my first 16 years my father frequently smiled at me. Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely



38. During my first 16 years my father tended to baby me.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

39. During my first 16 years my father did not seem to understand what I needed or wanted.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

40. During my first 16 years my father let me decide things for myself.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

41. During my first 16 years my father made me feel I wasn't wanted.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

42. During my first 16 years my father could make me feel better when I was upset.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

43. During my first 16 years my father did not talk with me very much. Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

44. During my first 16 years my father tried to make me feel dependent on him.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

45. During my first 16 years my father felt I could not look after myself unless he was around.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

46. During my first 16 years my father gave me as much freedom as I wanted.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

47. During my first 16 years my father let me go out as often as I wanted.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

48. During my first 16 years my father was overprotective of me.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

49. During my first 16 years my father did not praise me.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

50. During my first 16 years my father let me dress in any way I pleased.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- very likely
- moderately likely
- moderately unlikely
- very unlikely

## Appendix D

### Co-Parenting Behavior Questionnaire (Stolberg & Mullett, 1999)

Listed below are statements that have to do with you and your parents.

How often during my high school years did my parents complain about each other? (CBQ1)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My dad tells me bad things about my mom. (CBQ2)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My parents argue about money in front of me. (CBQ3)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: When my parents argue, I feel forced to choose sides. (CBQ4)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes

- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: When my parents talk to each other they accuse each other of bad things. (CBQ5)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My parents talk nicely to each other. (CBQ6)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My mom asks me questions about my dad that I wish she would not ask. (CBQ7)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: I feel caught between my parents. (CBQ8)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My dad asks me to carry messages to my mom. (CBQ9)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: (if parents are separated or divorced)(if parents are still together please decline to answer)My parents fight about where I should live. (CBQ10)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: (if parents are together)(if parents are separated or divorced please decline to answer). My parents fight about matters involving me. (CBQ10T)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My dad asks me questions about my mom that I wish he would not ask. (CBQ11)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My mom wants me to be close to my dad. (CBQ12)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: When my mom needs to make a change in my schedule my dad helps. (CBQ13)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My parents argue in front of me. (CBQ14)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: (if parents are separated or divorced)(if parents are still together please decline to answer) :My mom tells me to ask my dad about child support. (CBQ15)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: (if parents are together)(if parents are separated or divorced please decline to answer) :My mom tells me to ask my dad for money for my allowance or for the things that I need. (CBQ15T)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: It is okay to talk about my mom in front of my dad. (CBQ16)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My parents talk to each other about my problems. (CBQ17)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: It is okay to talk about my dad in front of my mom. (CBQ18)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always



How often did this statement happen during your high school years: (if parents are separated or divorced)(if parents are still together please decline to answer):My parents talk to each other about how I feel about the divorce. (CBQ19)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: (if parents are together)(if parents are separated or divorced please decline to answer): My parents talk about how I feel if I am happy or sad. (CBQ19T)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My parents talk to each other about my school and my health (CBQ20)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My dad gets angry at my mom. (CBQ21)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: When my parents talk to each other, they get angry. (CBQ22)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My parents talk to each other about big choices in my life. (CBQ23)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years (if parents are separated or divorced)(if parents are still together please decline to answer): My parents talk to each other at least once a week. (CBQ24)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: (if parents are together)(if parents are separated or divorced please decline to answer): My parents talk about me, and my needs, at least once a week. (CBQ 24T)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My mom tells me bad things about my dad. (CBQ25)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: When my mom needs help with me she asks my dad. (CBQ26)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My mom asks me to carry messages to my dad. (CBQ27)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My mom tells me good things about my dad. (CBQ 28)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My parents talk to each other about the good things I do. (CBQ29)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: When my dad needs help with me, he asks my mom. (CBQ30)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My mom gets angry at my dad. (CBQ31)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My dad tells me good things about my mom. (CBQ32)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My dad wants me to be close to my mom. (CBQ33)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My parents get along well. (CBQ34)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My parents yell at each other. (CBQ35)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: When my dad needs to make a change in my schedule, my mom helps. (CBQ36)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My dad likes being with me. (CBQ37B)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My mom and I have friendly talks. (CBQ38)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My mom asks me about my day in school. (CBQ39)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: When I do something wrong, my mom talks to me about it. (CBQ40)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: I feel that my mom cares about me. (CBQ41)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My dad talks to me about big choices in my life. (CBQ42)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: I feel that my dad cares about me. (CBQ43)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: I spend time doing fun things with my mom. (CBQ44)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My mom knows who my friends are and what they are like. (CBQ45)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My mom knows what kinds of things I do after school. (CBQ46)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My mom likes being with me. (CBQ47)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: I talk to my mom. (CBQ48)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always



How often did this statement happen during your high school years:(if parents are separated or divorced)(if parents are still together please decline to answer) . I have chores to do at my dad's house. (CBQ49S)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years:(if parents are together)(if parents are separated or divorced please decline to answer) My dad gives me chores to do. (CBQ49T)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My dad says he loves me and gives me hugs. (CBQ50)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: When I leave the house, my dad knows where I am and who I am with. (CBQ51)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: If I have problems in school, my dad knows about it. (CBQ52)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: When I break one of my mom's rules, she punishes me. (CBQ53)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My dad asks me about my day in school. (CBQ54)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My dad knows who my friends are and what they are like. (CBQ55)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My dad knows what kinds of things I do after school. (CBQ56)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years:(if parents are separated or divorced)(if parents are still together please decline to answer)I have chores to do at my mom's house. (CBQ57S)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years:(if parents are together)(if parents are separated or divorced please decline to answer)My mom gives me chores to do. (CBQ57T)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: When I leave the house, my mom knows where I am and who I am with. (CBQ58)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My mom talks to me about big choices in my life. (CBQ59)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: If I have problems at school my mom knows about it. (CBQ60)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: When I do something wrong, my dad talks to me about it. (CBQ61)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My dad praises me when I do something good at home or at school. (CBQ62)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: I talk to my mom about my problems. (CBQ63)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: If I get in trouble at school, my mom punishes me. (CBQ64)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My mom says nice things about me. (CBQ65)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: I spend time doing fun things with my dad. (CBQ66)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My dad knows who my teachers are and how well I am doing in school. (CBQ67)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years:(if parents are separated or divorced)(if parents are still together please decline to answer)I have rules to follow at my dad's house. (CBQ68S)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years:(if parents are together)(if parents are separated or divorced please decline to answer). My dad gives me rules to follow. (CBQ68T)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: I talk to my dad. (CBQ69)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: I talk to my dad about my problems. (CBQ70)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.  almost never

- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My dad says nice things about me. (CBQ71)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years:(if parents are separated or divorced)(if parents are still together please decline to answer)I have rules to follow at my mom's house. (CBQ72S)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years(if parents are together)(if parents are separated or divorced please decline to answer):My mom gives me rules to follow. (CBQ72T)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My dad and I have friendly talks. (CBQ73)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: When my dad says he is going to punish me, he does it. (CBQ74)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My mom knows who my teachers are and how well I am doing in school. (CBQ75)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: When I break one of my dad's rules, he punishes me. (CBQ76)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always



How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My dad talks to me about my friends. COPY (CBQ77)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My mom talks to me about my friends. (CBQ78)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My dad is patient with me. (CBQ79)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: I talk to my mom about things that I do well. (CBQ80)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My mom praises me when I do something good at home or at school. (CBQ81)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My mom says she loves me and gives me hugs. (CBQ82)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: If I get in trouble at school, my father punishes me. (CBQ83)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: My mom is patient with me. (CBQ84)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: I talk to my dad about things I do well. (CBQ85)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

How often did this statement happen during your high school years: When my mom says she is going to punish me, she does it. (CBQ86)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never
- occasionally
- sometimes
- frequently
- almost always

## Appendix E

### Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale (Gratz & Romer, 2004)

Please indicate how often the following statements apply to you.

1. I am clear about my feelings.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

I pay attention to how I feel. (DERS2)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

I experience my emotions as overwhelming and out of control. (DERS3)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

I have no idea how I am feeling. (DERS4)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

I have difficulty making sense out of my feelings. (DERS5)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

I am attentive to my feelings. (DERS6)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

I know exactly how I am feeling. (DERS7)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

I care about what I am feeling. (DERS8)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

I am confused about how I feel. (DERS9)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

When I'm upset, I acknowledge my emotions. (DERS10)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

When I'm upset, I become angry with myself for feeling that way. (DERS11)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

When I'm upset, I become embarrassed for feeling that way. (DERS12)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

When I'm upset, I have difficulty getting work done. (DERS13)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

When I'm upset, I become out of control. (DERS14)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

When I'm upset, I believe that I will remain that way for a long time. (DERS15)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

When I'm upset, I believe that I'll end up feeling very depressed. (DERS16)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

When I'm upset, I believe that my feelings are valid and important. (DERS17)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

When I'm upset, I have difficulty focusing on other things. (DERS18)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

When I'm upset, I feel out of control. (DERS19)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

When I'm upset, I can still get things done. (DERS20)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

When I'm upset, I feel ashamed with myself for feeling that way. (DERS21)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

When I'm upset, I know that I can find a way to eventually feel better. (DERS22)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

When I'm upset, I feel like I am weak. (DERS23)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

When I'm upset, I feel like I can remain in control of my behaviors. (DERS24)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

When I'm upset, I feel guilty for feeling that way. (DERS25)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.



- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

When I'm upset, I have difficulty concentrating. (DERS26)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

When I'm upset, I have difficulty controlling my behaviors. (DERS27)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

When I'm upset, I believe that there is nothing I can do to make myself feel better. (DERS28)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

When I'm upset, I become irritated with myself for feeling that way. (DERS29)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

When I'm upset, I start to feel very bad about myself. (DERS30)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

When I'm upset, I believe that wallowing in it is all I can do. (DERS31)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

When I'm upset, I lose control over my behaviors. (DERS32)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

When I'm upset, I have difficulty thinking about anything else. (DERS33)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

When I'm upset, I take time to figure out what I'm really feeling. (DERS34)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

When I'm upset, it takes me a long time to feel better. (DERS35)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

When I'm upset, my emotions feel overwhelming. (DERS36)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- almost never (0-10%)
- sometimes(11-35%)
- about half the time(36-65%)
- most of the time(65-90%)
- almost always(91-100%)

## Appendix F

### Life Events Survey (Sarason, Johnson, & Seigel, 1978)

Listed below are a number of events which sometimes bring about change in the lives of those who experience them and necessitate social readjustment. For each event you have experienced in the recent past please indicate when in the recent past it happened and the extent to which you viewed the event as having either a positive or negative impact on your life at the time the event occurred. That is, indicate the type and extent of impact the event had. You will be marking two responses for each question

#### 1. Marriage

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
  - Occurred in the past 7-12 months
  - Extremely negative (-3)
  - Moderately negative (-2)
  - Somewhat negative (-1)
  - No impact (0)
  - Slightly positive (1)
  - Moderately positive (2)
  - Extremely positive (3)
  - Not applicable to me
- Check this box if you do not want to provide an answer for this question

#### Death of spouse

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

#### Major change in sleeping habits (much more or much less sleep)

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

Death of a close family member including: mother, father, brother, sister, grandmother, grandfather, or other.

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

Major change in eating habits (much more or much less food intake)

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

Foreclosure on mortgage or loan

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

Death of a close friend

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

Outstanding personal achievement

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

Minor law violations (traffic tickets disturbing the peace, etc.)

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

Either yourself or your wife/girlfriend/partner's pregnancy

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

Changed work situation (different work responsibility, major change in working conditions, working hours, etc.)

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)

Not applicable to me

New job

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

Serious illness or injury of close family member, including: father, mother, sister, brother, grandfather, grandmother, spouse, other.

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

Trouble with employer (in danger of losing job, being suspended, demoted, etc.)

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)



- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

- Trouble with in-laws

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

- Major change in financial status (a lot better off or a lot worse off)

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

- Major change in closeness of family members (increased or decreased closeness)

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)

- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

Gaining a new family member (through birth, adoption, family member moving in, etc.)  
Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

Change of residence  
Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

Marital separation from mate  
Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)

- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

- Major change in church activities (increased or decreased attendance)

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

- Marital reconciliation with mate

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

- MARRIED MALE: Change in wife's work outside the home (beginning work, ceasing work, changing to a new job, etc.)MARRIED FEMALE: Change in husband's work (loss of job, beginning new job, retirement, etc.)

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

- Major change in usual type and/or amount of recreation

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

- Borrowing more than \$10,000 (buying home, business, etc.)

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

Borrowing less than \$10,000 (buying car, TV, getting school loan, etc.)

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

Being fired from job

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

Major personal illness or injury

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)

Not applicable to me

Major change in social activities, e.g., parties, movies, visiting (increased or decreased participation)

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

Major change in living conditions of family (building new home, remodeling, deterioration of home, neighborhood, etc.)

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

Divorce

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)

- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

- Serious injury or illness of close friend

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

- Retirement from work

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

- Son or daughter leaving home (due to marriage, college, etc.)

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)

- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

Ending of formal schooling

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

Separation from spouse (due to work, travel, etc.)

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

Engagement

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.



- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

- Breaking up with boyfriend/ girlfriend

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

- Leaving home for the first time

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

Reconciliation with boyfriend/ girlfriend

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

Beginning a new school experience at a higher academic level (college, graduate school, professional school, etc.)

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

Changing to a new school at same academic level (undergraduate, graduate, etc.)

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)

- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

Academic probation

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

Being dismissed from dormitory or other residence

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

Failing an important exam

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)

- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

Changing a major

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

Failing a course

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

Dropping a course

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)

- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

- Joining a fraternity/sorority

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

- Financial problems concerning school (in danger of not having sufficient money to continue)

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected. Participants may decline to answer this question.

- Occurred in the past 0-6 months
- Occurred in the past 7-12 months
- Extremely negative (-3)
- Moderately negative (-2)
- Somewhat negative (-1)
- No impact (0)
- Slightly positive (1)
- Moderately positive (2)
- Extremely positive (3)
- Not applicable to me

## Appendix G

### Intimate Friendship Scale (Sharabany, 1974)

Please list five current friends of yours (initials only). Do not include anyone you are currently involved in a romantic relationship with. (List of friends)

For the first person on your list, what gender are they?

Male

Female

How long have you been friends for?

For the first person on your list please consider the following statement for how you feel about him/her: I feel free to talk with him/her about almost everything

Strongly Disagree

Moderately Disagree

Slightly Disagree

Slightly Agree

Moderately Agree

Strongly Agree

Thinking of the person first on your list, please consider the following statement for how you feel about him/her: If he/she does something which I do not like, I can always talk with him/her about it. Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

Strongly Disagree

Moderately Disagree

Slightly Disagree

Slightly Agree

Moderately Agree

Strongly Agree

For the person first on my list: I talk with him/her about my hopes and plans for the future.

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

Strongly Disagree

Moderately Disagree

Slightly Disagree

- Slightly Agree
- Moderately Agree
- Strongly Agree

For the person first on my list: I tell him/her when I have done something that other people would not approve of. Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Strongly Disagree
- Moderately Disagree
- Slightly Disagree
- Slightly Agree
- Moderately Agree
- Strongly Agree

For the person first on my list: I know how he/she feels without him/her telling me. Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Strongly Disagree
- Moderately Disagree
- Slightly Disagree
- Slightly Agree
- Moderately Agree
- Strongly Agree

For the person first on my list: I know which kinds of books, games and activities he/she likes. Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Strongly Disagree
- Moderately Disagree
- Slightly Disagree
- Slightly Agree
- Moderately Agree
- Strongly Agree

For the person first on my list: I know how he/she feels about the girl/boy he/she likes. Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Strongly Disagree
- Moderately Disagree
- Slightly Disagree
- Slightly Agree
- Moderately Agree
- Strongly Agree

For the person first on my list: I can tell when he/she is worried about something.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Strongly Disagree
- Moderately Disagree
- Slightly Disagree
- Slightly Agree
- Moderately Agree
- Strongly Agree

For the person first on my list: I feel close to him/her.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Strongly Disagree
- Moderately Disagree
- Slightly Disagree
- Slightly Agree
- Moderately Agree
- Strongly Agree

For the person first on my list: I like him/her.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Strongly Disagree
- Moderately Disagree
- Slightly Disagree
- Slightly Agree
- Moderately Agree
- Strongly Agree

For the person first on my list: When he/she is not around I miss him/her.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Strongly Disagree
- Moderately Disagree
- Slightly Disagree
- Slightly Agree
- Moderately Agree
- Strongly Agree



For the person first on my list: When he/she is not around I keep wondering where he/she is and what he/she is doing.

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Strongly Disagree
- Moderately Disagree
- Slightly Disagree
- Slightly Agree
- Moderately Agree
- Strongly Agree

For the person first on my list: The most exciting things happen when I am with her/him and nobody else is around.

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Strongly Disagree
- Moderately Disagree
- Slightly Disagree
- Slightly Agree
- Moderately Agree
- Strongly Agree

For the person first on my list: I do things with him/her which are quite different from what other people do.

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Strongly Disagree
- Moderately Disagree
- Slightly Disagree
- Slightly Agree
- Moderately Agree
- Strongly Agree

For the person first on my list: It bothers me to have other people come around and join in when the two of us are doing something together.

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Strongly Disagree
- Moderately Disagree
- Slightly Disagree
- Slightly Agree
- Moderately Agree
- Strongly Agree

For the person first on my list: I stay with him/her when he/she needs  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Strongly Disagree
- Moderately Disagree
- Slightly Disagree
- Slightly Agree
- Moderately Agree
- Strongly Agree

For the person first on my list: When something nice happens to me I share the experience with him/her.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Strongly Disagree
- Moderately Disagree
- Slightly Disagree
- Slightly Agree
- Moderately Agree
- Strongly Agree

For the person first on my list: Whenever he/she tells me about a problem I stop what I am doing and listen for as long as he/she wants.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Strongly Disagree
- Moderately Disagree
- Slightly Disagree
- Slightly Agree
- Moderately Agree
- Strongly Agree

For the person first on my list: I offer him/her the use of my things (like clothes, food or books).  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Strongly Disagree
- Moderately Disagree
- Slightly Disagree
- Slightly Agree
- Moderately Agree
- Strongly Agree

For the person first on my list: If he/she wants something I let him/her have it even if I want it too.

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Strongly Disagree
- Moderately Disagree
- Slightly Disagree
- Slightly Agree
- Moderately Agree
- Strongly Agree

For the person first on my list: I can be sure he/she will help me whenever I ask for it.

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Strongly Disagree
- Moderately Disagree
- Slightly Disagree
- Slightly Agree
- Moderately Agree
- Strongly Agree

For the person first on my list: I can plan how we'll spend our time without having to check with him/her.

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Strongly Disagree
- Moderately Disagree
- Slightly Disagree
- Slightly Agree
- Moderately Agree
- Strongly Agree

For the person first on my list: If I want him/her to do something for me all I have to do is ask.

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Strongly Disagree
- Moderately Disagree
- Slightly Disagree
- Slightly Agree
- Moderately Agree
- Strongly Agree

For the person first on my list: I can use his/her things without asking permission.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Strongly Disagree
- Moderately Disagree
- Slightly Disagree
- Slightly Agree
- Moderately Agree
- Strongly Agree

For the person first on my list: Whenever you see me you can be pretty sure he/she is also around.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Strongly Disagree
- Moderately Disagree
- Slightly Disagree
- Slightly Agree
- Moderately Agree
- Strongly Agree

For the person first on my list: I like to do things with him/her.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Strongly Disagree
- Moderately Disagree
- Slightly Disagree
- Slightly Agree
- Moderately Agree
- Strongly Agree

For the person first on my list: I work with him/her on some of his/her hobbies.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Strongly Disagree
- Moderately Disagree
- Slightly Disagree
- Slightly Agree
- Moderately Agree
- Strongly Agree

For the person first on my list: I work with him/her on some of his/her school work.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Strongly Disagree
- Moderately Disagree

- Slightly Disagree
- Slightly Agree
- Moderately Agree
- Strongly Agree

For the person first on my list: After we fight we make up easily.  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Strongly Disagree
- Moderately Disagree
- Slightly Disagree
- Slightly Agree
- Moderately Agree
- Strongly Agree

## Appendix H

### Social Support Questionnaire (Sarason, Levine, Basham, & Sarason, 1983)

The following questions ask about people in your environment who provide you with help or support.

Whom can you really count on to listen to you when you need to talk? Please list the initials of up to 9 persons and their relationship to you-for example, SW (sister)-or indicate "no one." (SSQ1)

Free-entry response.

Considering the question, "Whom can you really count on to listen to you when you need to talk", how satisfied are you with the overall support you have in this area?

- Very satisfied
- Fairly satisfied
- A little satisfied
- A little dissatisfied
- Fairly dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Whom could you really count on to help you if a person whom you thought was a good friend insulted you and told you that he/she didn't want to see you again? Please list the initials of up to 9 persons and their relationship to you or indicate "no one." (SSQ2)

Free-entry response.

Considering the question, "Whom could you really count on to help you if a person whom you thought was a good friend insulted you and told you that he/she didn't want to see you again?" how satisfied are you with the overall support you have in this area? (SSQsatisf2)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Very satisfied
- Fairly satisfied
- A little satisfied
- A little dissatisfied
- Fairly dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Whose lives do you feel that you are an important part of? Please list the initials of up to 9 persons and their relationship to you or indicate "no one." (SSQ3)

Free-entry response.

Considering the question, "Whose lives do you feel that you are an important part of?" how satisfied are you with the overall support you have in this area? (SSQsatisfied3)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Very satisfied
- Fairly satisfied
- A little satisfied
- A little dissatisfied
- Fairly dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Whom do you feel would help you if you were married and had just separated from your spouse? Please list the initials of up to 9 persons and their relationship to you for example, JR (sister) or indicate "no one." (SSQ4separated)  
Free-entry response.

Considering the question, "whom do you feel would help you if you were married and had just separated from your spouse?", how satisfied are you with the overall support you have in this area? (SSQsatisfied4)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Very satisfied
- Fairly satisfied
- A little satisfied
- A little dissatisfied
- Fairly dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Whom could you really count on to help you out in a crisis situation, even though they would have to go out of their way to do so? Please list the initials of up to 9 persons and their relationship to you for example, JR (sister) or indicate "no one." (SSQ5counton)  
Free-entry response.

Considering the question, "Whom could you really count on to help you out in a crisis situation, even though they would have to go out of their way to do so?" How satisfied are you with the overall support you have in this area? (SSQsatisfied5)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Very satisfied
- Fairly satisfied
- A little satisfied
- A little dissatisfied
- Fairly dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Whom can you talk with frankly, without having to watch what you say? Please list the initials of up to 9 persons and their relationship to you for example, JR (sister) or indicate "no one." (SSQ6franktalk)

Free-entry response.

Considering the question, "Whom can you talk with frankly, without having to watch what you say?" How satisfied are you with the overall support you have in this area? (SSQsatisfied6)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Very satisfied
- Fairly satisfied
- A little satisfied
- A little dissatisfied
- Fairly dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Who helps you feel that you truly have something positive to contribute to others? Please list the initials of up to 9 persons and their relationship to you for example, JR (sister) or indicate "no one." (SSQ7contribposi)

Free-entry response.

Considering the question, "Who helps you feel that you truly have something positive to contribute to others?" How satisfied are you with the overall support you have in this area? (SSQ7satisfied)

Multiple-choice question, more than one choice can be selected.

- Very satisfied
- Fairly satisfied
- A little satisfied
- A little dissatisfied
- Fairly dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Whom can you really count on to distract you from your worries when you feel under stress? Please list the initials of up to 9 persons and their relationship to you for example, JR (sister) or indicate "no one." (SSQ8distractu)

Free-entry response.

Considering the question, "Whom can you really count on to distract you from your worries when you feel under stress?" How satisfied are you with the overall support you have in this area? (SSQ8satisfied)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Very satisfied
- Fairly satisfied



- A little satisfied
- A little dissatisfied
- Fairly dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Whom can you really count on to be dependable when you need help? Please list the initials of up to 9 persons and their relationship to you for example, JR (sister) or indicate "no one." (SSQ9dependable)

Free-entry response.

Considering the question, "Whom can you really count on to be dependable when you need help?" How satisfied are you with the overall support you have in this area? (SSQ9satisfidepe)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Very satisfied
- Fairly satisfied
- A little satisfied
- A little dissatisfied
- Fairly dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Whom could you really count on to help you out if you had just been fired from your job or expelled from school? Please list the initials of up to 9 persons and their relationship to you for example, JR (sister) or indicate "no one." (SSQ10fired)

Free-entry response.

Considering the question, "Whom could you really count on to help you out if you had just been fired from your job or expelled from school?" How satisfied are you with the overall support you have in this area? (SSQ10satisfired)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Very satisfied
- Fairly satisfied
- A little satisfied
- A little dissatisfied
- Fairly dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

With whom can you totally be yourself? Please list the initials of up to 9 persons and their relationship to you for example, JR (sister) or indicate "no one." (SSQ11totalself)

Free-entry response.

Considering the question, "With whom can you totally be yourself?" How satisfied are you with the overall support you have in this area? (SSQ11satisfself)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Very satisfied
- Fairly satisfied
- A little satisfied
- A little dissatisfied
- Fairly dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Whom do you feel really appreciates you as a person? Please list the initials of up to 9 persons and their relationship to you for example, JR (sister) or indicate "no one."  
(SSQ12appreciate)  
Free-entry response.

Considering the question, "Whom do you feel really appreciates you as a person?" How satisfied are you with the overall support you have in this area? (SSQ12satsifappr)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Very satisfied
- Fairly satisfied
- A little satisfied
- A little dissatisfied
- Fairly dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Whom can you really count on to give you useful suggestions that help you to avoid making mistakes? Please list the initials of up to 9 persons and their relationship to you for example, JR (sister) or indicate "no one." (SSQ13avoidmistk)  
Free-entry response.

Considering the question, "Whom can you really count on to give you useful suggestions that help you to avoid making mistakes?" How satisfied are you with the overall support you have in this area? (SSQ13satsmistak)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Very satisfied
- Fairly satisfied
- A little satisfied
- A little dissatisfied
- Fairly dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Whom can you count on to listen openly and uncritically to your innermost feelings? Please list the initials of up to 9 persons and their relationship to you for example, JR (sister) or indicate "no one." (SSQ14innerfeeli)  
Free-entry response.

Considering the question, "Whom can you count on to listen openly and uncritically to your innermost feelings?" How satisfied are you with the overall support you have in this area? (SSQ14satsiffeel)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Very satisfied
- Fairly satisfied
- A little satisfied
- A little dissatisfied
- Fairly dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Who will comfort you when you need it by holding you in their arms? Please list the initials of up to 9 persons and their relationship to you for example, JR (sister) or indicate "no one." (SSQ15comfort)

Free-entry response.

Considering the question, "Who will comfort you when you need it by holding you in their arms?" How satisfied are you with the overall support you have in this area? (SSQ15satiscomfo)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Very satisfied
- Fairly satisfied
- A little satisfied
- A little dissatisfied
- Fairly dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Whom do you feel would help if a good friend of yours had been in a car accident and was hospitalized in serious condition? Please list the initials of up to 9 persons and their relationship to you for example, JR (sister) or indicate "no one." (SSQ16accident)

Free-entry response.

Considering the question, "Whom do you feel would help if a good friend of yours had been in a car accident and was hospitalized in serious condition?" How satisfied are you with the overall support you have in this area? (SSQ16satacciden)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Very satisfied
- Fairly satisfied
- A little satisfied
- A little dissatisfied
- Fairly dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Whom can you really count on to help you feel more relaxed when you are under pressure or tense? Please list the initials of up to 9 persons and their relationship to you for example, JR (sister) or indicate "no one." (SSQ17relax)

Free-entry response.

Considering the question, "Whom can you really count on to help you feel more relaxed when you are under pressure or tense?" How satisfied are you with the overall support you have in this area? (SSQ17satrelax)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Very satisfied
- Fairly satisfied
- A little satisfied
- A little dissatisfied
- Fairly dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Whom do you feel would help if a family member very close to you died? Please list the initials of up to 9 persons and their relationship to you for example, JR (sister) or indicate "no one." (SSQ18famdied)

Free-entry response.

Considering the question, "Whom do you feel would help if a family member very close to you died?" How satisfied are you with the overall support you have in this area? (SSQ18satfamdied)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Very satisfied
- Fairly satisfied
- A little satisfied
- A little dissatisfied
- Fairly dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Who accepts you totally, including both your worst and best points? Please list the initials of up to 9 persons and their relationship to you for example, JR (sister) or indicate "no one." (SSQ19accept)

Free-entry response.

Considering the question, "Who accepts you totally, including both your worst and best points?" How satisfied are you with the overall support you have in this area? (SSQ19sataccept)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Very satisfied
- Fairly satisfied

- A little satisfied
- A little dissatisfied
- Fairly dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Whom can you really count on to care about you, regardless of what is happening to you? Please list the initials of up to 9 persons and their relationship to you for example, JR (sister) or indicate "no one." (SSQ20care)  
Free-entry response.

Considering the question, "Whom can you really count on to care about you, regardless of what is happening to you?" How satisfied are you with the overall support you have in this area? (SSQ20satcare)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Very satisfied
- Fairly satisfied
- A little satisfied
- A little dissatisfied
- Fairly dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Whom can you really count on to listen to you when you are very angry at someone else? Please list the initials of up to 9 persons and their relationship to you for example, JR (sister) or indicate "no one." (SSQ21angry)  
Free-entry response.

Considering the question, "Whom can you really count on to listen to you when you are very angry at someone else?" How satisfied are you with the overall support you have in this area? (SSQ21satangry)  
Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Very satisfied
- Fairly satisfied
- A little satisfied
- A little dissatisfied
- Fairly dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Whom can you really count on to tell you, in a thoughtful manner, when you need to improve in some way? Please list the initials of up to 9 persons and their relationship to you for example, JR (sister) or indicate "no one." (SSQ22improve)  
Free-entry response.

Considering the question, "Whom can you really count on to tell you, in a thoughtful manner, when you need to improve in some way?" How satisfied are you with the overall support you have in this area? (SSQ22satimprove)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Very satisfied
- Fairly satisfied
- A little satisfied
- A little dissatisfied
- Fairly dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Whom can you really count on to help you feel better when you are feeling generally down in the dumps? Please list the initials of up to 9 persons and their relationship to you for example, JR (sister) or indicate "no one." (SSQ23feelbetter)

Free-entry response.

Considering the question, "Whom can you really count on to help you feel better when you are feeling generally down in the dumps?" How satisfied are you with the overall support you have in this area? (SSQ23satfeelbet)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Very satisfied
- Fairly satisfied
- A little satisfied
- A little dissatisfied
- Fairly dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Whom do you feel truly loves you deeply? Please list the initials of up to 9 persons and their relationship to you for example, JR (sister) or indicate "no one." (SSQ24love)

Free-entry response.

Considering the question, "Whom do you feel truly loves you deeply?" How satisfied are you with the overall support you have in this area? (SSQ24satlove)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Very satisfied
- Fairly satisfied
- A little satisfied
- A little dissatisfied
- Fairly dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Whom can you count on to console you when you are very upset? Please list the initials of up to 9 persons and their relationship to you for example, JR (sister) or indicate "no one."

(SSQ25upset)

Free-entry response.

Considering the question, "Whom can you count on to console you when you are very upset?" How satisfied are you with the overall support you have in this area?

(SSQ25satupset)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Very satisfied
- Fairly satisfied
- A little satisfied
- A little dissatisfied
- Fairly dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Whom can you really count on to support you in major decisions you make? Please list the initials of up to 9 persons and their relationship to you for example, JR (sister) or indicate "no one." (SSQ26support)

Free-entry response.

Considering the question, "Whom can you really count on to support you in major decisions you make?" How satisfied are you with the overall support you have in this area?

(SSQ26satsupport)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Very satisfied
- Fairly satisfied
- A little satisfied
- A little dissatisfied
- Fairly dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Whom can you really count on to help you feel better when you are very irritable, ready to get angry at almost anything? Please list the initials of up to 9 persons and their relationship to you for example, JR (sister) or indicate "no one." (SSQ27irritable)

Free-entry response.

Considering the question, "Whom can you really count on to help you feel better when you are very irritable, ready to get angry at almost anything?" How satisfied are you with the overall support you have in this area? (SSQ27satirritab)

Multiple-choice question, only one choice can be selected.

- Very satisfied
- Fairly satisfied
- A little satisfied
- A little dissatisfied

- Fairly dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied



## Vita

Stephanie Susanne Genser Wolf was born on January 17, 1976 in Washington D.C. She graduated from St. Andrews Episcopal School in Bethesda, Maryland in 1994. She received her Bachelor of Art in Psychology and Anthropology from University of Rochester in 1998. She received her Juris Doctorate from the University of Maryland School of Law in 2001.