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Introduction

The Present Study

The present study tested a theoretical process model that proposed associations among adolescent and parent personality, parent and adolescent communication, adolescent conflict, and adolescent externalizing behavior in adoptive and non-adoptive families (see proposed conceptual process model, Figure 1). To account for different parent-adolescent theoretical family processes, separate mother-adolescent and father-adolescent dyadic models were tested (see Figure 2). Testing the Figure 2 model was an important step toward understanding a small but noteworthy difference in and risk for externalizing behaviors for adopted adolescents (Grotevant, Rueter, von Korff, & Gonzales, 2015). Although some variation in externalizing behavior may be due to prenatal or preplacement factors (Grotevant et al., 2006) or a small number of cases (Brand & Brinich, 1999), we know relatively little about what accounts for this notable difference.

Theoretical Frameworks

• Goodness of fit theory (Lerner, 1993; Thomas & Chess, 1977)
• Person-environment transactional theory (Caspi et al., 1987, 1988; Scarr & McCartney, 1983)
• Family Communications Patterns Theory (FCPT; Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002a, 2000b, 2004, 2006)
• Actor-partner interdependence model (APIM; Kenny & Cook, 1999; Kenny et al., 2006; Kenny & Ledermann, 2010)

Participants

Data for this study were from the Sibling Interaction and Behavior Study (SIBS; McGue et al., 2007). Participating families at intake (N = 617) had at least one parent and two adolescent siblings (M = 14.9 years, SD = 1.9). The present study used data from the mothers (M = 45.56, SD = 4.23), fathers (M = 48.23, SD = 4.42), elder (M = 16.14, SD = 1.5), and younger sibling (M = 13.3, SD = 1.6). In 384 (308) families, the elder (younger) sibling was adopted (International: n = 253 (208), 67% (63%) Asian). In 231 (208) families, the elder (younger) sibling was the biological offspring of both parents. Two adoptive families were removed from the sample due to ineligibility resulting in a final sample of 615 families.

Measures

Personality Traits

• Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire (MPQ; Tellegen & Waller, 2008) – Mother and father self-reported Aggression and Alienation scales
• Personality Booklet – Youth Abbreviated (PBYA; Tellegen & Waller, 2008) – adolescent reported Aggression and Alienation scales

4-point scale (1 = definitely false to 4 = definitely true) – high scores reflect high levels

Family Interactions

• Assessed using trained observers’ global ratings of dyadic (e.g. adolescent to mother, father to adolescent, etc.) family interaction tasks from the Sibling Interaction and Behavior Rating Scales (SIBRS; adapted from the Iowa Family Interaction Rating Scales, Melby & Conger, 2001). All SIBRS are based on the following scale: 1 = not at all characteristic to 9 = mainly characteristic.

• Communication (conceptualized as conversation-oriented behavior): factor scores of the Warmth (ICCs: .37 to .72), Listening Responsiveness (ICCs: .34 to .83), and Communication (ICCs: .70 to .75) scales

• Conflict: observed scores of Hostility (ICCs: .71 to .73) and Angry/Coercion (ICCs: .65 to .87) scales

Adolescent Externalizing Behaviors

• Delinquent Behavior Inventory (DBI; Gibson, 1967) – adolescent self-reported
• Diagnostic Interview for Children & Adolescents – Revised (DICA-R; Welner, Reich, Herjanic, Jung, & Amado, 1987) – adolescent or mother reported ADHD (k = .77), ODD (k = .71), CD (k = .81), symptom counts

• In-class behavior checklist adapted from Conners’ Teacher Rating Scale (Conners, 1969) and Rutter Child Scale B (Rutter, 1967) – summed teacher responses (α = .97)

Adoption status: 1 = adopted, 2 = not adopted

Results

Mother-Adolescent Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adoption status</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-2.36</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male sex</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent externalizing behaviors</td>
<td>-4.72</td>
<td>-4.98</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Father-Adolescent Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adoption status</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male sex</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent externalizing behaviors</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Future Directions

• Future work should continue to uncover explanatory family processes that help explain the small but noteworthy risk for adopted adolescent externalizing behaviors.
• Present study was cross sectional; future investigations should establish direction of effects.

Discussion

• Findings underscore the complexity of adoptive family processes that contributed to adopted adolescent externalizing behaviors.
• Conceptual process alone revealed a differential parent involvement pattern and explained substantial variance in adolescent externalizing behaviors.

• First study to suggest a differential parent involvement pattern in adoptive family processes.
  a) Full support for mother-adolescent model consistent with previous research.
  b) Full support for the conceptual process was not found for father-adolescent model.

• With the exception of the statistically significant negative association between mother Conversation and adolescent conflict, all associations were in the expected direction — suggesting that the overall family process mostly operated as the theoretical framework surmised and, in one case (FCPT), strengthened it.

  • This association suggestive of a double bind (defined as complex, paradoxical communicative dilemma; Bateson, Jackson, Haley, & Weakland, 1956).

  Adoption Status

  • Contributed differently (between the proposed process) based on parent-adolescent subsystem.
  • With respect to the overall process…
    a) …adolescent externalizing behavior was salient for adopted adolescent-mother (but not father) dyads (consistent with previous research); accounted for small increase in explained variance.
    b) …adolescent conversation and adolescent conversation were salient for adopted adolescent father dyads.