Published in final edited form as:

Child Dev. 2014 January ; 85(1): 338–354. doi:10.1111/cdev.12119.

The Legacy of Early Insecurity Histories in Shaping Adolescent Adaptation to Interparental Conflict

Patrick T. Davies,
University of Rochester

Melissa L. Sturge-Apple,
University of Rochester

Sonnette M. Bascoe, and
University of Rochester

E. Mark Cummings
University of Notre Dame

Abstract

This study tested whether the mediational pathway involving interparental conflict, adolescent emotional insecurity, and their psychological problems was altered by their earlier childhood histories of insecurity. Participants included 230 families, with the first of the five measurement occasions occurring when children were in first grade (*Mean* age = 7 years). Results indicated that interparental conflict was associated with increases in adolescent emotional insecurity which, in turn, predicted subsequent increases in their psychological problems. Childhood insecurity predicted adolescent maladjustment five years later even after considering contemporaneous family experiences. Moderator findings revealed that adolescents with relatively higher levels of insecurity in childhood evidenced disproportionately greater and reduced levels of insecurity in the context of high and low levels of interparental conflict, respectively.

Witnessing high levels of discord and conflict increases children's risk for a wide array of psychological problems including internalizing (e.g., depression, anxiety) and externalizing (e.g., aggression, conduct problems) problems (Harold & Leve, 2012). In further highlighting its potency as a risk factor, the magnitude of risk conferred by frequent interparental hostility and discord is documented to be nearly twice the size of the risk associated with divorce (Grych & Fincham, 2001). Toward the goal of explaining why exposure to interparental conflict is burdensome for children, emotional security theory (EST) proposes that children's worries about their security in the context of the interparental relationship progressively intensify following repeated exposure to interparental conflict and, in turn, increase children's vulnerability to adjustment problems (Davies & Cummings, 1994). Although preserving a sense of security is conceptualized as a latent goal in EST, signs of insecurity are theorized to be expressed in children's observable response processes. Insecurity is specifically posited to be manifested in children's tendencies to respond to interparental conflict with intense, prolonged bouts of fearful distress, greater involvement, and negative internal representations of the implications interparental difficulties have for themselves and their families. Supporting this hypothesis, studies using diverse measurement approaches and designs (e.g., cross-sectional, longitudinal) have identified

children's emotional security as a mediator in the association between interparental conflict and their psychological problems (Cummings & Davies, 2010).

The burdens of coping with interparental conflict may assume particular significance in the lives of young adolescents. A recent study specifically documented that the association between interparental conflict and children's concerns about insecurity was significantly stronger for adolescents than preadolescent children (Cummings, Schermerhorn, Davies, Goeke-Morey, & Cummings, 2006). Children's dispositions to mediate interparental conflicts also increase sharply during preadolescence and peak sometime during early adolescence (Cummings, Ballard, El-Sheikh, & Lake, 1991). Young adolescents have also been shown to exhibit greater acuity than younger children in discriminating between interparental conflict tactics and drawing causal connections between social events and their impact on future interpersonal relations (Cummings & Davies, 2010; Davies, Myers, Cummings, & Heindel, 1999). Moreover, a growing corpus of studies has consistently identified mediational pathways among interparental conflict, adolescent emotional insecurity, and their psychological maladjustment (i.e., Cummings, George, McCoy, & Davies, 2012; Cummings et al., 2006; Davies, Harold, Goeke-Morey, & Cummings, 2002; Harold, Shelton, Goeke-Morey, & Cummings, 2004).

By the same token, these studies also revealed that emotional security was a modest to moderate mediator of adolescent vulnerability to interparental conflict (Cummings et al., 2006; Davies et al., 2002; Harold et al., 2002). As a result, substantial variability exists across adolescents in the salience of emotional security as a mediator of interparental conflict. Thus, a significant challenge in advancing EST during adolescence is to better account for sources of heterogeneity in pathways between interparental conflict and child functioning. As children transition into adolescence, the accumulation of worries about interparental conflict during childhood may be particularly likely to shape how they adapt to their contemporaneous experiences and concerns with interparental conflict. To address this significant gap, EST posits that *earlier histories of insecurity* may modify and shape the mediational role of emotional security in two ways (Cummings & Davies, 2010; Davies & Cummings, 2006).

First, the concept of hierarchical motility in developmental psychopathology underscores the possibility that attributes of prior psychological patterns and experiences emerge in novel, dynamic forms of functioning even in the face of new circumstances (Cicchetti & Cohen, 1995). Supporting the plausibility of this thesis, Sroufe, Egeland, and Kreutzer (1990) found that early family experiences and child adaptation continued to account for child functioning in middle childhood even after statistically controlling for contemporaneous experiences. Toward advancing the enduring thesis of early experience in EST, we specifically examine whether insecurity histories in childhood continue to beget adolescent adjustment difficulties even after taking into account the hypothesized risk of temporally proximal experiences with insecurity.

Second, mediational paths involving adolescent security in the interparental relationship are hypothesized to be moderated by childhood experiences with insecurity. Although questions remain as to precisely how early insecurity may moderate associations among interparental conflict, adolescent insecurity, and their psychological problems, three prevailing models in developmental psychopathology offer some guidance on how histories of difficulties in childhood may serve to potentiate their vulnerability to stressful family events in subsequent developmental periods (see Figure 1). Each of the models shares the assumption that early adversity primes children to become increasingly sensitive to subsequent stressful experiences. However, they differ significantly in their articulation of the environmental conditions that engender children's heightened reactivity or risk.

In the first conceptualization, the stress amplification or dual risk model proposes that early adversity serves as a risk factor that becomes disproportionately magnified following exposure to subsequent stressful experiences (Rudolph & Flynn, 2007). Thus, support for this model in EST would be reflected in childhood histories of insecurity amplifying the magnitude of associations between (a) interparental conflict (i.e., the stressful event) and adolescent emotional insecurity, or (b) emotional insecurity and their psychological problems (Davies, Winter, & Cicchetti, 2006). By the same token, the ordinal nature of the interaction depicted in Figure 1a specifically illustrates that adolescents with histories of adverse experiences will exhibit relatively higher vulnerability to subsequent problems across the entire range of contexts (i.e., relatively benign to adverse). Although adolescents with and without insecure histories may not differ significantly from each other in their experience of psychological difficulties under conditions of very low stress, teens with insecure histories are posited to evidence increasing vulnerability as levels of stress associated with contemporaneous interparental conflict rise.

According to the second conceptualization, a stress susceptibility model postulates that adolescents who experienced earlier psychological hardships in childhood are more reactive to subsequent family processes, for better or worse, depending on contemporaneous exposure to stress in adolescence. The stress susceptibility and amplification models share the hypothesis that adolescents with childhood histories of insecurity suffer disproportionately in highly adverse family circumstances than do adolescents with secure histories. However, as the central source of distinction between the two models, the stress susceptibility model postulates that children's greater sensitivity to level of stress is manifested in the potential to actually fare better, and show substantially better adjustment, in the context of more benign family processes. Supporting this model, biological sensitivity to context (BSC) theory and the adaptive calibration model (ACM) both propose that children's early exposure to stress may amplify their biological and stress sensitivity to challenges in a way that may increase their openness to subsequent environmental cues (Del Giudice, Ellis, & Shirtcliff, 2011; Ellis, Essex, & Boyce, 2005). In applying the stress susceptibility conceptualization to the first link in the mediational model of security, the solid line in Figure 1b denotes that interparental conflict predicts progressively higher levels of emotional insecurity when adolescents experienced relatively high levels of insecurity during childhood. Conversely, the flat slope of the dotted line indicates that teens experiencing moderate to high levels of security during childhood are expected to experience relatively limited variations in insecurity during adolescence, regardless of the level of interparental adversity. In sum, childhood histories of insecurity may increase children's sensitivity to interparental relationship quality such that they fare substantially better than normal in benign interparental contexts, but suffer disproportionately in the face of high interparental conflict.

As a third form of priming of later responses, the risk sensitization model proposes that histories of vulnerability lower children's subsequent thresholds for sensitivity to subsequent family difficulties in adolescence (Harkness, Bruce, & Lumley, 2006; Rudolph & Flynn, 2007). Through this kindling process (Monroe & Harkness, 2005), the level of family adversity necessary to evoke children's psychological difficulties becomes progressively more mild. Thus, in models of security, the hypersensitivity of adolescents grappling with earlier vestiges of insecurity is specifically reflected in the experience of greater psychological burdens than their secure counterparts only when at low or mild levels of family stress. For example, in applying this to the first link in our proposed mediational chain, Figure 1c shows that adolescents with insecure histories (i.e., solid line) evidence higher levels of emotional insecurity than teens with secure histories (i.e., dotted line) only at the low or mild levels of interparental conflict. Conversely, exposure to frequent, destructive forms of interparental conflict (i.e., high levels) poses such a palpable threat that

teens have a general tendency to experience insecurity regardless of their prior developmental histories. Given the diversity of different forms of moderation based on earlier adversity, a central objective of this study is to employ tests of moderated mediation to explore the three alternative hypotheses on the role of early insecurity in altering the mediational role of adolescent experiences with insecurity.

To maximize sensitivity in testing the effects of early histories of security, our measures targeted children's insecurity in the interparental relationship during the early elementary school years. The early school years may be a key period for the emergence of stable, organized patterns of responding to conflict that may leave indelible imprints on how children subsequently respond to interparental problems years later in adolescence. Gains in social perspective-taking are theorized to increase the salience of interparental discord, as children increasingly contend with concerns about the welfare of their parents and themselves within the broader family unit (Cicchetti, Cummings, Greenberg, & Marvin, 1990). As part of this process, achieving an understanding that individuals differ in their emotions, motives, and knowledge (i.e., theory of mind) around five years of age has been shown to set the stage for more persistent styles of processing, responding, and regulating reactions to threatening events (Grist & Field, 2012; Vasey, Crnic, & Carter, 1994). Thus, in this study, insecurity histories manifested in children's distress, avoidance, and involvement in interparental conflict during the early school years may assume sufficient stability to have a distinctive and sustainable impact on adolescent adjustment.

In summary, this study is designed to break new substantive ground in several ways. In the context of the sparse tests of EST in adolescence, this study is the first to test the role of adolescent emotional security as a mediator of the association between their exposure to interparental conflict and psychological maladjustment in a fully lagged design. Previous studies using this data set have specifically tested how emotional security in the elementary school period mediates interparental conflict and subsequent adjustment problems (e.g., Cummings et al., 2006; Cummings, George, McCoy, & Davies, 2012), but have not yet examined the mediational role of adolescent emotional security in models of interparental conflict. In the broader literature beyond this specific data set, there is some empirical support for adolescent insecurity as a mediator of interparental conflict (Cummings et al., 2006; Davies, Harold, Goeke-Morey, & Cummings, 2002; Harold, Shelton, Goeke-Morey, & Cummings, 2004). However, the exclusive use of cross-sectional or limited longitudinal designs containing two measurement occasions in these studies precluded a full analysis of the conditions necessary to stringently test the cascade of mediational processes. Thus, studies have yet to delineate the dynamic changes in adolescent emotional security in the context of models of interparental conflict and child psychopathology. Following analytic recommendations for more authoritatively testing mediational hypotheses (Cole & Maxwell, 2003), we specifically conducted temporally ordered prospective analyses using assessments of interparental conflict, emotional insecurity, and adolescent psychological problems. Hypothesized mediational pathways were specifically tested using latent difference score indices of prospective changes in teen emotional insecurity and their psychological problems (Ferrer, Balluerka, & Widaman, 2008; McArdle, 2009).

In addition, the present paper is the first empirical test of key developmental principles in EST centered on how vestiges of earlier histories of insecurity in the interparental relationship may alter adolescent functioning in response to exposure to interparental conflict during the teen years. As one component of the model, we examine whether early insecurity is an enduring predictor of adolescent psychological problems even after controlling for child sex and contemporaneous experiences with interparental conflict, emotional insecurity, and family socio-economic characteristics. In the second developmental piece, additional SEM analyses are conducted to test whether childhood

history of insecurity moderates the mediational paths between interparental conflict, children's emotional insecurity, and their psychological adjustment during adolescence. To reduce the operation of common method and informant variance in tests of all hypotheses, we utilized a multi-method (i.e., surveys, interviews, observations), multi-informant (i.e., observer, mother, father, child, teacher) battery of measures.

METHOD

Participants

Participants were drawn from a larger project that originally included 235 families (i.e., mother, father, and child) recruited through local school districts and community centers in a moderate-sized metropolitan area in the Northeast and a small city in the Midwest. Interested families were included in the project if they met the following eligibility criteria: (a) the primary caregivers had a child in kindergarten; (b) the kindergarten child and two primary caregivers lived together for at least the preceding 3 years; and (c) the primary caregivers and child were fluent in English. The longitudinal design consisted of three annual measurement occasions beginning when children were in kindergarten followed by three additional annual measurement occasions beginning when children were in 7th grade (M age = 13 years). Because the interview measures of childhood history were implemented after the first wave of data collection, data from the second through sixth waves of data collection were used in the current paper. For simplicity and clarity, the primary measurement occasions in the paper are referred hereafter as Waves 1 through 5. Due to family attrition between kindergarten and first grade, the sample for this paper consisted of 230 families.

The average age of children at Wave 1 was 7.0 years ($SD = .48$), with 55% of the sample consisting of girls. Median household income of the families was between \$40,000 and \$54,999 per year. On average, mothers and fathers completed comparable years of education, 14.54 years ($SD = 2.33$) and 14.68 years ($SD = 2.69$), respectively. Most parents (i.e., 92%) were married at the outset of the study. The majority of the sample was White (77%), followed by smaller percentages of African American (16%), Latino (4%), and family members of other races (3%). Children lived with their biological mother in most cases (95%), with the remainder living with an adoptive mother (3%) or a stepmother or female guardian (2%). In addition, children lived with their biological father in the majority of cases (87%), with the remainder of the sample living with either an adoptive father (4%) or a stepfather or male guardian (9%).

Retention rates across contiguous waves of data collection averaged 94% (range 90 – 97%) across the five waves. To test for selective attrition, we conducted statistical comparisons between those families who participated in all five waves and the families that dropped out during the longitudinal component of the study along the 25 primary variables and covariates (SES, child sex) assessed during the first four waves and demographic characteristics at Wave 1 (e.g., parent and child race, parent age, marital status). The results yielded no more significant differences than would be expected by chance (i.e., 1 out of 25).

Procedures and Measures

Families visited the laboratory at one of the two research sites. The laboratories were designed to be comparable to each other in size and quality and included: (a) an observation room that was designed to resemble a family room and equipped with audiovisual equipment to capture family interactions and (b) interview rooms for completing confidential survey measures. In Phase 1 of the study, mothers and children participated in two annual waves of data collection beginning when children were in first grade (Waves 1

and 2). During Phase 1, indices of children's histories of insecurity in the interparental relationship were derived from interview measures completed by the children at each wave. During the next three annual measurement occasions (Waves 3, 4, and 5) in Phase 2, mothers, fathers, and children visited the laboratory again starting when children were in seventh grade to participate in a family interaction task and complete survey measures of child functioning. During Wave 3, mothers and fathers participated in an interparental interaction task in which they attempted to approach, manage, and resolve common disagreements in their relationship and completed survey measures designed to assess interparental conflict in the home and completed survey measures of interparental conflict. Mothers, teachers, and adolescents reported on various questionnaire measures of child adjustment at Waves 3, 4, and 5. All research procedures were approved by the Institutional Review Board at both research sites prior to conducting the study. Families and teachers were compensated monetarily for their participation.

Childhood history of insecurity in the interparental relationship (Waves 1 & 2)

During Waves 1 and 2, children completed the Emotional Reactivity, Involvement, and Avoidance Scales from an adapted version of the Security in the Interparental Subsystem (SIS; Davies, Forman, et al., 2002) scale. Because the original SIS questionnaire was designed for older children, the measure used in this study was modified for use with younger children in three primary ways. First, to increase comprehensibility, experimenters administered the items in interview format. Second, the response alternatives for the items were simplified from five to three: "No" (0); "Sometimes" (1); and "Yes" (2). Third, to prevent fatigue, items were designed to assess three of the original seven SIS scales. Complexity in wording of the original items were simplified and abstract, cognitive items (e.g., "I can't stop thinking about their problems") were replaced with more concrete, physical forms of reactivity (e.g., "Do you feel sick when your parents argue?"). The resulting ten items on the Emotional Reactivity scale assessed children's frequent and prolonged negative affective arousal (e.g., "When your parents have an argument, do you get scared?"). The Involvement scale contained ten items measuring children's attempts to mediate the conflict, comfort the parents, and help solve the interparental problem (e.g., "When your parents have an argument, do you get in the middle and try to stop it?"). Five items comprising the Avoidance scale were designed to index children's attempts to reduce their exposure to the interparental conflicts (e.g., "Do you try to get away from your parents when they argue?"). Internal consistencies for the scales ranged from .73 to .86 across the two time points. Given the moderate stability from Wave 1 to 2 in the Emotional Reactivity ($r = .40, p < .001$), Involvement ($r = .36, p < .001$), and Avoidance ($r = .42, p < .001$) scales and our goal of capturing cumulative insecurity over time, assessments of each scale were averaged together to form three parsimonious indicators of emotional reactivity, involvement, and avoidance.

Interparental conflict (Wave 3)

Three measurement batteries collected at Wave 3 were used as indicators of destructive interparental conflict. For the first two sets of assessments, mothers and fathers independently completed the Verbal Aggression, Stonewalling, and Frequency scales from the Conflict and Problem-Solving Scales (Kerig, 1996). Frequency assesses the number of times the primary caregiver reports engaging in minor (e.g., "spats") and major (e.g., "big fights") conflicts over the past year, with response alternatives ranging from 1 (once a year or less) to 6 (just about every day). Each of the remaining scales contained items rated along 4-point scales (0 = never, 3 = often), reflecting the frequency with which parents and their partners engage in: (a) verbally aggressive conflict tactics such as yelling, accusing, and insulting (Verbal Aggression; e.g., "Raise voice, yell, shout") and (b) impasses in conflict characterized by unresolved hostility, distress, and disengagement (Stonewalling; e.g.,

“Storm out of the house”). Internal consistencies for the mother and father reports on each of the CPS scales ranged from .67 to .91, and evidence for the validity of the scales are well documented (Kerig, 1996). To obtain more parsimonious indicators of destructive interparental conflict for analyses, the three scales were standardized and aggregated together for each informant. The resulting two composites of maternal and paternal reports of interparental conflict each possessed adequate internal consistency at the scale level, with α s of .72 and .76, respectively.

For the third composite indicator of interparental conflict, mothers and fathers participated in an interparental interaction task at Wave 3 in which they attempted to address two common, intense interparental disagreements that they viewed as problematic in their relationship (Cummings et al., 2006). The couples subsequently discussed each topic for seven minutes each while they were alone in the laboratory room. Videotaped records of the interactions were subsequently rated by three trained coders using five-point ordinal scales (1 = Very Low; 5 = High) from the System for Coding Interactions in Dyads (SCID; Malik & Lindahl, 2004). Coders coded interparental use of destructive conflict tactics across the fourteen minute interaction along four SCID scales: (1) Negativity and Conflict, characterized by displays of anger and frustration by each parent, (2) Withdrawal, defined by the degree to which each individual in the dyad displays emotional disengagement and indifference; (3) Negative Escalation, with high scores reflecting intensification of negativity by the couple over the course of the conflict, and (4) Pursuit Withdrawal characterized by one partner persistently responding with avoidance to the consistent demands of the other partner to engage in the conflict. The three trained coders, who were each responsible for coding approximately half of the interparental dyads, overlapped with each other on approximately twenty percent of the video records in order to calculate interrater reliability. Interrater reliability values, based on single-rater intraclass correlation coefficients that are mathematically comparable to kappa values (Sawa & Morikawa, 2007), ranged from satisfactory (ICC = .49) to good (ICC = .73). To create an observational composite as the third indicator of interparental conflict for the primary analyses, the four scale scores were standardized and summed together (α = .81).

Adolescent insecurity in the interparental relationship (Waves 3 and 4)

Consistent with prior research (Davies, Harold, Goeke-Morey, & Cummings, 2002), adolescents completed five scales derived from the Security in Interparental Subsystem (SIS) Scales to assess their emotional insecurity at Waves 3 and 4 (Davies, Forman, et al., 2002). As the first indicator of insecurity, the Emotional Reactivity scale assesses multiple, prolonged experiences of fear and distress in response to conflict (e.g., 9 items; “When my parents argue, I feel scared”). Following previous procedures (e.g., Davies, Harold, et al., 2002), an insecure representation assessment served as the second indicator and consisted of the aggregation of two standardized scales: (1) Destructive Family Representations scale, assessing appraisals of the deleterious impact of interparental conflict for the family (4 items; “When my parents have an argument, I wonder if they will divorce or separate”) and (2) Conflict Spillover Representations scale, defined as children’s evaluation that interparental conflict proliferates to negatively impact their welfare and relations with parents (e.g., 4 items; “When my parents have an argument, I feel like they are upset at me”). Consistent with previous approaches (e.g., Davies, Harold, et al., 2002), the final composite indicator assessing children’s regulation of exposure to interparental conflict consisted of the aggregation of standardized measures of the SIS Involvement (e.g., “I try to solve the problem for them”) and Avoidance (“I keep really still, almost as if I were frozen”) scales. Alpha coefficients were .89 and .88 for Emotional Reactivity, .82 and .85 for Regulation of Exposure to Conflict, and .87 and .87 for Internal Representations at Waves 3 and 4, respectively.

Adolescent psychological problems (Waves 4 and 5)

To obtain a comprehensive assessment of adolescent psychological problems, the measurement battery capitalized on mother, teen, and teacher reports to collectively obtain assessments of emotional difficulties, behavioral problems, academic engagement, and interpersonal functioning. Maternal reports of adolescent psychological problems were derived from the Academic Competence Scale (reverse scored; e.g., “My child can’t do the schoolwork”; “My child often forgets what he or she learns”) of the Parent’s Rating Scale of Child’s Actual Behavior (PRSCAB; Harter, 1985; 1988) and the Internalizing (e.g., “Nervous, high-strung, or tense,” “Unhappy, sad, or depressed”), Externalizing (e.g., “temper tantrums or hot temper,” “gets in many fights”), and Social Problems (e.g., “doesn’t get along with other kids,” “gets teased a lot”) Scales from the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL; Achenbach, Dumenci, & Rescorla, 2003). Previous studies have provided consistent evidence for the reliability and convergent and discriminant validity of the PRSCAB Academic Competence Scale (e.g., Cole, Gondoli, & Peeke, 1998) and the three CBCL scales (e.g., Achenbach et al., 2003). Alpha coefficients for the four measures across the two waves ranged from .75 to .92 (*Mean α* = .84 at Waves 4 and 5). To form a parsimonious indicator of maternal reports of adolescent psychological problems, the four measures were standardized and averaged together at each of the waves. Internal consistency coefficients of the scales in the composite were .79 and .77 for Waves 4 and 5, respectively.

As part of the self-report battery of assessments, children completed assessments of depressive symptoms from The Center for Epidemiological Studies – Depression Scale (Radloff, 1977) and anxiety difficulties from the Revised Child Manifest Anxiety Scale (RCMAS; Reynolds & Richmond, 1997). Reliability and validity of each of these scales is well-established (e.g., Seligman, Ollendick, Langley, & Baldacci, 2004). The remaining three assessments were derived from child reports on the Conduct Problems (e.g., “I get very angry and often lose my temper,” “I fight a lot”), Hyperactivity (e.g., “I am constantly fidgeting or squirming”), and Peer Problems (e.g., “Other children and young people pick on me”) scales from the self-report version of the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ; Goodman & Scott, 1999). The psychometric properties of each of the five-item SDQ scales have been supported in previous studies (e.g., Goodman, 1999). Alpha coefficients for the five scales at each of the waves ranged from .52 to .89 (*Mean α* = .74 at Wave 4 and .73 at Wave 5). The five scales were standardized and averaged together at each wave to obtain a single child report measure of their psychological problems at Waves 4 (scale-level α = .75) and 5 (scale-level α = .74).

The final indicator of adolescent psychological problems was comprised of five teacher report measures of child functioning. Teachers specifically completed the Conduct Problems (“Often has temper tantrums or hot tempers”), Hyperactivity (“constantly fidgeting or squirming”), and the Prosocial (e.g., “considerate of other people’s feelings”) Scales from the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ; Goodman, 1999). For the final two indices, teachers completed: (1) the Hyperactivity and Distractibility Scale from the Child Behavior Scale consisting of four items indexing concentration and attention problems in school (CBS; Ladd & Profilet, 1996; “poor concentration”); and (2) the Social Competence Scale of the Teacher’s Rating Scale of Child’s Actual Behavior (TRSCAB; Harter, 1988), comprised of two items assessing children’s ability to get along with peers (“This individual does have a lot of friends”). Internal consistencies for the five scales across the two waves ranged from .71 to .89 (*Mean α* = .81 at Wave 4 and .78 at Wave 5). Consistent with the assessment of psychological problems, the SDQ Prosocial and TRSCAB Social Competence Scales were reverse scored and all five scales were subsequently standardized and aggregated together to create a single teacher report measure of psychological problems at each wave.

In support of this practice, scale-level alpha coefficients for the teacher reported composites were .85 and .87 at Waves 4 and 5, respectively.

RESULTS

Descriptive Analyses

Table 1 provides the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for the variables used in the primary analyses. As denoted by the italicized coefficients in Table 1, correlations among the indicators of each of the higher-order constructs were generally moderate to strong in magnitude. Given evidence of skew in children's negative representations of interparental relationships and maternal reports of psychological problems at each wave, these variables were log transformed in order to increase normality in their distributions. Structural equation models were estimated using full-information maximum likelihood (FIML) in Amos 19.0 to retain the full sample for primary analyses (Enders, 2001).

Mediational Pathways Involving Interparental Conflict, Adolescent Insecurity, and Problems in the Context of Histories of Insecurity in Childhood

In analyses testing the mediational pathways involving interparental conflict, adolescent insecurity and their psychological problems and the role of childhood insecurity in these associations, we examined changes in children's emotional insecurity and psychological problems across measurement occasions through second-order latent difference score (LDS) models (Ferrer et al., 2008; McArdle, 2009). LDS offers a powerful way of testing predictors of individual differences in change in emotional insecurity and psychological problems (Sbarra & Allen, 2009). In accordance with standard LDS applications, the two components of our dual change model consisted of: (1) a growth parameter reflecting the change in level of the variable across the two measurement occasions, and (2) an autoregressive component that estimates the effect of the initial status of the variable on itself at the subsequent measurement occasion. Thus, in integrating the advantages of latent growth curve and autoregressive analyses, the dual change LDS model offers a rigorous way of capturing change in levels of a variable while controlling for the effects of initial status of the variable on change over time (e.g., Ferrer et al., 2008).

As a first step in examining the nature of the interplay between childhood and adolescent insecurity in models of interparental conflict, Figure 2 depicts a model that simultaneously examines: (1) adolescent insecurity as a mediator of interparental conflict and psychological problems; and (2) childhood insecurity as a unique, additive predictor of adolescent problems over and above contemporaneous adolescent experiences. The model provided a good fit with the data, $\chi^2(142, N = 230) = 212.71, p < .001, RMSEA = .05$, and χ^2/df ratio = 1.50, and $CFI = .95$. Lending support to the measurement model, the standardized loadings of the manifest indicators onto their respective latent constructs were all significant ($p < .001$) and moderate to high in magnitude (range .50 to .95). In accord with mediational hypotheses, interparental conflict at Wave 3 predicted increases in adolescent insecurity from Wave 3 to Wave 4, $\beta = .31, p < .001$. Wave 4 adolescent insecurity, in turn, predicted greater psychological problems from Wave 4 to Wave 5, $\beta = .34, p < .05$. Notably, these paths were robust even after inclusion of child sex and SES as covariates. In further supporting mediation, bootstrapping tests utilizing the PRODCLIN software program indicated that the indirect path involving interparental conflict, change in adolescent insecurity, and change in psychological problems was significantly different from 0, 95% CI = .01 to .09 (MacKinnon, Fritz, Williams, & Lockwood, 2007).

Figure 2 also depicts the structural paths for examining the additive role of childhood insecurity history as a predictor of adolescent insecurity and psychological problems.

Insecurity evidenced moderate stability over the approximately five years from Waves 1 and 2 during middle childhood and Wave 3 in early adolescence, $\beta = .28, p < .05$, even after inclusion of adolescent exposure to interparental conflict, family SES, and child sex as predictors. In support of the additive role of childhood insecurity history, the findings further revealed that childhood insecurity uniquely predicted adolescent psychological problems six years later at Wave 4 even after specifying child sex, family SES, and contemporaneous family process variables (i.e., Wave 3 interparental conflict, Wave 3 and 4 adolescent insecurity) as predictors, $\beta = .27, p < .01$.

Child Insecurity History as a Moderator of the Mediation Role of Adolescent Insecurity

Toward the goal of identifying sources of individual differences in the mediational role of adolescent emotional insecurity, our next analytic step was to test childhood history of insecurity as a moderator of prospective associations among adolescent experiences with interparental conflict, emotional insecurity, and psychological problems. Following procedures outlined by Marsh, Wen, and Hau (2004), we centered all manifest indicator variables, created cross products using a matched pair approach, and specified each resulting product as an indicator of the latent interaction variable. In the matched pair method, indicators for the cross product are paired together as operands based on the corresponding loading strengths (i.e., standardized loadings), a quantitative indicator of their quality. Thus, the product of the two indicators with the highest respective loadings on each of the latent variables representing main effects was created to form the first indicator of the latent interaction. Likewise, the two indicators on each latent construct with the second highest loadings were multiplied together to form the second indicator and the remaining two indicators with the lowest loading strength produced the final indicator of the latent interaction variable. Because prior work has shown that constraining the factor loadings of the cross products is unnecessary (Marsh et al., 2004), the loadings were freely estimated in the analyses.

Childhood insecurity as a moderator of interparental conflict and adolescent insecurity

Our first model examined childhood insecurity history as a moderator of the first link in the mediational chain involving associations between Wave 3 interparental conflict and latent changes in adolescent emotional insecurity from Wave 3 to Wave 4. The model, which is depicted in Figure 3, provided a good representation of the data, $\chi^2 (97, N = 230) = 121.71, p = .05, RMSEA = .03$, and $\chi^2/df \text{ ratio} = 1.25$, and $CFI = .97$. All covariances among the predictor, moderator, covariates, and Wave 4 latent insecurity were estimated. However, for the sake of clarity, only significant correlations are depicted in Figure 3. The interaction between children's history of emotional insecurity at Waves 1 and 2 and Wave 3 interparental conflict was a significant predictor of latent change in adolescent insecurity from Wave 3 to 4 even after controlling for SES and children's sex, $\beta = .22, p < .05$. To portray the interaction across a relatively comprehensive range of the proposed predictor (i.e., 95%), we conducted simple slope plots and analyses at $-2 SD$ and $+ 2 SD$ from the mean of interparental conflict (Aiken & West, 1991; Roisman et al., 2012). The resulting graphical plot of the moderating effects presented in Figure 4 revealed a disordinal interaction. Post hoc simple slope analyses designed to further characterize the nature of the interaction indicated that interparental conflict at Wave 3 predicted significantly greater insecurity for adolescents who experienced high ($+ 1 SD$) levels of childhood insecurity, $b = 4.83, p = .001$. In contrast, the association between interparental conflict and changes in insecurity was not significant for adolescents who experienced low levels ($- 1 SD$) of childhood insecurity, $b = -.064, p = .65$.

Although the simple slope analyses and visual inspection of the graphical plot correspond most closely with the stress susceptibility model (see Figure 1), the availability of statistical

tools originally created to test the comparative utility of the differential susceptibility and dual risk (i.e., stress amplification) models permitted more definitive tests of the relative viability of the stress amplification and stress susceptibility models (Roisman et al., 2012). Despite differences in some conceptual assumptions of stress amplification and stress susceptibility models (Belsky & Pluess, 2009), both frameworks share the hypothesis that children experiencing high levels of the susceptibility factor, whether in the form of difficult temperament or histories of insecurity, will be more affected by socialization contexts for better or for worse. Thus, as two additional analyses, we calculated the regions of significance on X (RoS on X) test and the proportion of the interaction (PoI) metric to examine the stress susceptibility hypothesis that children who experience insecure histories in childhood should evidence better functioning under benign interparental conditions (i.e., low conflict) and poorer functioning under adverse interparental conditions (i.e., high conflict) relative to children who did not experience insecure histories.

The RoS on X test was used to identify regions along the range of the interparental conflict variable for which insecurity history as the proposed moderator is significantly associated with adolescent psychological problems (Roisman et al., 2012). Support for the stress amplification model would be evidenced by findings indicating that childhood insecurity history is significantly associated with increases in adolescent insecurity only at high levels of interparental conflict. In contrast, stress susceptibility theory would be supported if the results reveal that insecurity history is a predictor of significant increases in adolescent insecurity at high levels of interparental conflict and significant decreases in adolescent insecurity at low levels of interparental conflict. Consistent with stress susceptibility theory, results of analyses from an on-line utilities program indicated that higher insecurity in childhood was associated with increases in adolescent insecurity at high (+ 2 SD) levels of interparental conflict, $b = 1.18, p < .05$, and reductions in adolescent insecurity (– 2 SD) at low levels of interparental conflict, $b = -1.26, p < .05$ (Preacher, Curran, & Bauer, 2006; <http://www.quantpsy.org/interact/mlr2.htm>).

As the second index for testing the relative correspondence of the interaction with stress amplification and susceptibility models, we calculated the PoI index (Roisman et al., 2012). In our specific application of testing stress susceptibility, the index consists of the ratio of improved functioning for adolescents with insecure histories relative to the overall aggregate of improved and poor outcomes. Values between .40 and .60 offer strong support for stress susceptibility, while coefficients approaching .00 provide increasingly definitive evidence for stress amplification. In support of stress susceptibility, the PoI index for insecurity history was .53.

Childhood insecurity as a moderator of links between adolescent insecurity and child problems

As final analytic step, we examine whether childhood insecurity history moderated the link between adolescent emotional insecurity at Wave 4 and latent changes in psychological problems from Wave 4 to 5. Consistent with the prior tests of moderation, we specified a path between a latent childhood insecurity x Wave 4 adolescent insecurity interaction product based on the matched pair approach with centered manifest variables (Marsh et al., 2004) and the LDS for adolescent psychological problems within a broader model that estimated predictive effects of each main effect (i.e., childhood insecurity, Wave 4 teen insecurity) and the two covariates (i.e., SES, child sex). The model provided a good representation of the data, $\chi^2 (97, N = 230) = 151.71, p < .001, RMSEA = .05$, and χ^2/df ratio = 1.56, and $CFI = .95$. However, the moderating role of early childhood insecurity was not significant, $\beta = .26, ns$. Therefore, no additional follow up tests of moderation were conducted for the second link in the mediational chain.

DISCUSSION

According to emotional security theory (EST), insecurity in the interparental relationship is an important mediator of the association between interparental conflict and children's psychological problems during adolescence as well as childhood (Davies & Cummings, 1994). In spite of these predictions, research has not explored emotional security as a dynamic process underlying adolescent vulnerability to interparental conflict. To address this gap, results from temporally lagged, LDS analyses of mediation indicated that increases in adolescent emotional insecurity over a one year period were predicted by their earlier exposure to interparental conflict and, in turn, served as a precursor of subsequent escalation in psychological maladjustment. In accord with developmental hypotheses, earlier experiential histories of insecurity in childhood played a significant role in understanding the pathways of adolescent adaptation to interparental conflict as both a unique predictor of adolescent psychological problems and a moderator of the association between exposure to interparental conflict and teen emotional insecurity.

Although understanding the developmental dynamics of emotional security in adolescence has been identified as a critical direction for future research (Cummings & Davies, 2010), the rare existing studies have exclusively relied on single snapshot measures of adolescent insecurity (i.e., Cummings et al., 2012; Cummings et al., 2006; Davies et al., 2002; Harold et al., 2004). Thus, even at the most basic developmental level, delineating the degree of consistency and change in individual differences in insecurity over lengthy developmental periods has been neglected in previous research. In addressing this question, children's insecurity during the early elementary school years was still a moderate predictor of insecurity approximately five years later during adolescence even after taking into account children's sex, current experiences with interparental conflict, and family socioeconomic status. Empirical documentation of moderate stability of insecurity is consistent with the EST thesis that security in the interparental relationship is a coping construct with some degree of consistency over time (Cummings & Davies, 2010). Continuity is specifically theorized to reflect tendencies to utilize previously developed patterns as guides for interpreting and reacting to subsequent threatening events in the interparental subsystem (Davies, Harold, et al., 2002). Moreover, according to EST, differences between children in their responses to conflict must evidence some coherence over time if they increase the likelihood of intensification and proliferation into patterns of psychopathology.

By the same token, dynamic changes in insecurity during adolescence were also expected to be a lawful product, in part, of children's exposure to interparental conflict (Davies & Sturge-Apple, 2007). In addressing the first link in the proposed cascade of insecurity, we tested the hypothesis that witnessing destructive interparental conflict progressively sensitizes adolescents to concerns about their security in the interparental relationship. In accord with this prediction, findings indicated that interparental conflict was a moderate predictor of increases in adolescent insecurity over one year. Signs of insecurity were specifically evidenced by adolescents' experiences with prolonged, intense distress in response to interparental conflicts, efforts to intervene and avoid parental arguments, and negative internal representations of the implications of interparental disputes for the welfare of their families and themselves. Thus, even though plasticity in responding to social threat and challenge is theorized to become progressively more limited with development (Davies & Sturge-Apple, 2007; Frankenhuis & Del Giudice, 2012; Waddington, 1957), our results highlight that children remain vulnerable to interparental conflict as they progress through early adolescence. Consistent with this conclusion, Cummings and colleagues (2006) reported that the relation between interparental conflict and insecurity was significantly stronger for adolescents than preadolescents. In drawing on prior developmental work, adolescent susceptibility to insecurity following exposure to interparental conflict may be

rooted in their increasing abilities to identify threat cues in interpersonal interactions and stronger dispositions to intervene in adult problems (Cummings & Davies, 2010).

In testing the second link in the proposed mediational model, results indicated that adolescent insecurity predicted subsequent increases in adolescent psychological problems one year later. Although little empirical work exists on the pathogenic mechanisms underlying emotional security in adolescence, theoretical advances highlight some of the putative processes that may explain why insecurity increases children's risk for adjustment problems. For example, insecure manifestations of vigilance and high reactivity to threats in the interparental relationship are proposed to increase the tendency for children to adopt broader insecure scripts consisting of highly automatic rules for identifying and processing threat. Thus, children's psychological problems may deepen and broaden from their tendencies to reflexively and intransigently apply insecure scripts in novel or challenging interpersonal contexts (Davies et al., 2006; Johnston et al., 2009). At a developmental level, adolescent insecurity may also increase psychopathology by undermining their mastery of developmental tasks, including academic engagement, establishment of close friendships, development of supportive peer networks, and the graduated formation of opposite-sex relationships with peers (Obradovic, Burt, & Masten, 2010).

Building on the documentation of the mediational role of adolescent emotional insecurity, another key developmental objective was to examine whether earlier histories of insecurity leave an insidious legacy on adolescent functioning. Guided by models of developmental psychopathology (Cicchetti & Cohen, 1995; Sroufe, Egeland, Carlson, & Collins, 2005), we first tested the hypothesis that childhood insecurity would be a distinct predictor of adolescent psychological problems in the context of their concomitant experiences with insecurity, interparental conflict, and socioeconomic factors. Consistent with predictions, child interview assessments of their insecurity over a two year span in the early elementary years uniquely predicted their adjustment difficulties six years later in adolescence at Wave 4 even after controlling for concurrent and prior (1 year earlier) adolescent emotional insecurity, adolescent exposure to interparental conflict, contemporaneous family socioeconomic background, and children's sex. Thus, in accord with the concept of hierarchical motility, early insecurity may set in motion a unique set of pathogenic processes during childhood that were not accounted for by more temporally proximal experiences with interparental adversity during adolescence. For example, as children assume greater social roles and challenges during the early school years, EST proposes that they may increasingly utilize ways of responding to family adversity as guides to adapting to complex or stressful social contexts (e.g., peer interactions). Therefore, through a developmental cascade process, the defensive strategies insecure children exhibit in response to interparental conflict may evolve into intractable patterns of heightened sensitivity to extrafamilial stressors and, in the process, uniquely impact their later adjustment (Bascoe, Davies, Sturge-Apple, & Cummings, 2009). As another example, the substantial increase in social perspective taking capacities during the early school years may precipitate distinctive ways of responding to interparental conflict by sensitizing children to concerns about the safety of their caregivers and its implications for their own well-being (Cummings & Davies, 2010).

The moderate magnitude of the pathways among interparental conflict, emotional security, and child psychopathology during adolescence also highlights the significance of identifying the sources of variability in the mediational role of adolescent insecurity. In addressing this issue from a developmental perspective, the final aim of our paper was to examine whether the mediational pathways involving adolescent security were moderated by their insecurity histories during childhood. Although the analyses did not yield significant moderating effects in the link between adolescent insecurity and their subsequent psychological problems, insecurity in childhood was a significant moderator of the prospective association

between interparental conflict and teen emotional insecurity. Follow up tests designed to better characterize the nature of the moderating effects consistently supported the relative viability of the stress susceptibility framework over the other two models presented in Figure 1. First, simple slope analyses revealed that exposure to interparental conflict was only a significant predictor of emotional insecurity when adolescents exhibited relatively insecure histories during childhood. Second, the disordinal interaction depicted in Figure 4 corresponds closely with the shape of the interaction outlined in the stress susceptibility conceptualization (i.e., Figure 1b). Third, results of the RoS on X test further indicated that adolescents with insecure histories evidenced significantly greater levels of insecurity at high levels of interparental conflict but significantly lower levels of insecurity at low levels of interparental conflict than did teens with childhood histories of security. Finally, the PoI index fell within the range of values indicating strong support for the stress susceptibility theory (Roisman et al, 2012). Thus, the sensitization of adolescents with histories of insecurity occurred in a “for better” or “for worse” fashion that was dependent on their respective exposure to benign and adverse interparental conditions.

Definitive empirical support garnered for the stress susceptibility hypotheses begs the question of why adolescents with earlier histories of insecurity evidence greater developmental plasticity across variations in levels of interparental conflict. Clinical and theoretical conceptualizations of early adversity are consistent in the assumption that adolescents with insecure histories may be predisposed to filter, process, and respond in guarded ways to high levels of subsequent conflict (Davies et al., 2006; Johnston et al., 2009). For example, affective structures consisting of constellations of emotional reactivity (e.g., distress reactions), action tendencies (e.g., intervention, avoidance), and physiological symptoms may become increasingly integrated and coupled together as children grapple with threat and insecurity. Thus, even mild activation of one node of this network in response to subsequent exposure to destructive interparental conflict may be more apt to trigger the operation of reciprocal influences among the response systems and, in turn, manifest themselves in higher levels of adolescent emotional insecurity. In this context, the conceptualizations are consistent with the finding that adolescents with prior histories of insecurity were more prone to experience insecurity when exposed to elevated interparental conflict than were adolescents with secure histories.

Although these conceptualizations may explain how early insecurity may amplify adolescent insecurity under adverse interparental conditions, they cannot readily account for why adolescents with insecure histories evidenced lower levels of insecurity than did adolescents with secure histories in contexts of benign interparental conflict. As a complementary explanation, it is possible that adolescents with prior concerns about safety generally have higher stakes in remaining sensitively attuned to interparental relations regardless of their benign or threatening properties. Thus, when exposed to high levels of subsequent interparental conflict, adolescents with insecure histories may be disproportionately primed to invest in immediate personal safety at the expense of other goals (e.g., relational, exploratory). By the same token, the larger emotional investment and concern in monitoring the interparental relationship by adolescents with insecure histories may also account for their comparable plasticity in reducing concerns about safety when the subsequent interparental cues signal minimal or manageable levels of threat. Consistent with this explanation, a previous study has shown that children with more communal attributes characterized by interpersonal investment and sensitivity fared worse in their adjustment in the context of dysfunctional interparental circumstances but significantly better in their outcomes when interparental conflict was low (Davies & Lindsay, 2004).

Evolutionary-developmental theories of differential susceptibility also offer viable explanations for the disordinal form of our moderation findings. As three prevailing

theories, differential susceptibility (Belsky & Pluess, 2009), biological sensitivity to context (Ellis et al., 2005), and adaptive calibration (Del Giudice et al., 2011) models share the proposition that prior developmental experiences shape differences between children in their responsiveness to environmental stimuli. Although the theories place differential focus on precursors and mechanisms underlying children's heightened plasticity, a common assumption is that individual differences in early exposure to environmental adversity, temperament, neurobiological reactivity to stress, and genetic processes all play a role in children's subsequent sensitivity to environmental input. Given that children's concerns about security are proposed to be products of the interplay among earlier experiences with family adversity (e.g., interparental conflict), physiological stress reactivity, and child constitutional attributes (Cummings & Davies, 2010), it is likely that multiple processes are operating to increase the susceptibility to subsequent interparental conflict for adolescents experiencing histories of emotional insecurity. In the context of theories of differential susceptibility, our findings are novel in the identification of a plasticity agent at a new level of analysis (i.e., history of coping with interparental conflict).

In placing the findings in a broader perspective, several limitations merit discussion. First, although there was some diversity in the racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic backgrounds of the families in our study, our analyses specifically focused on adolescent psychological problems in a community sample of predominantly White and middle class families. Thus, our findings may not necessarily generalize to families with other sociodemographic backgrounds. Second, although our prospective study over nine years from childhood to adolescence is an advance over previous studies, our targeted analytic approach does not fully delineate all potential forms of directionality in relations between interparental conflict, emotional insecurity, and psychological maladjustment. For example, our results do not address the possibility that psychological functioning in childhood and adolescence may amplify interparental difficulties (e.g., Cui, Donnellan, & Conger, 2007). Likewise, although the lagged longitudinal design may reduce the potential effects of third variables, it does not eliminate possible effects of confounds, including the operation of shared genes between parents and children. Third, the mediational paths involving adolescent insecurity and the effects of childhood security as an additive predictor and moderator were modest to moderate in magnitude. Nonetheless, even modest associations are interpreted in EST as substantively meaningful in the context of the multi-method, multi-informant, longitudinal design. Finally, the use of different measures to assess insecurity in childhood and adolescence raises questions about the measurement equivalence across the two developmental periods. Although findings supporting the hypothesis of moderate stability in insecurity from childhood to adolescence may allay these concerns, replication using different measurement approaches is an important research direction.

Despite these limitations, our findings break new ground in addressing important developmental themes in EST. In offering the most definitive theoretical test of adolescent emotional insecurity as an explanatory construct to date (Davies & Cummings, 1994), the present results demonstrate that changes in concerns about insecurity remain an important mediating mechanism in the prospective pathway between interparental conflict and adolescent insecurity. Our developmental analyses further supported the hypothesis that earlier experiences of insecurity may inconspicuously impact adolescence by serving as both an additive predictor and moderator in the mediational pathways involving interparental conflict and teen insecurity and psychological problems. Highlighting the importance of early experience (Johnston et al., 2009; Sroufe, 1997), insecurity during the early elementary school years continued to predict adolescent psychological problems even after controlling for contemporaneous exposure to interparental conflict, adolescent insecurity, sex, and family socioeconomic factors. As a further testament to the significance of early adversity, the moderating effects of childhood insecurity supported a stress susceptibility hypothesis.

Specifically, adolescents with earlier histories of insecurity evidenced disproportionately lower and higher levels of insecurity in the context of their respective exposure to benign and destructive characteristics of interparental conflict.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by the National Institute of Mental Health (R01 MH57318 and 2R01 MH57318) awarded to Patrick T. Davies and E. Mark Cummings. Patrick Davies was also supported by the James McKeen Cattell Sabbatical Award during the preparation of this manuscript. We are grateful to the children, parents, school staff who participated in the project. We also express our gratitude to the project personnel at the University of Rochester and University of Notre Dame.

REFERENCES

- Achenbach TM, Dumenci L, Rescorla LA. DSM-oriented and empirically based approaches to constructive scales from the same item pools. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*. 2003; 32:328–340. [PubMed: 12881022]
- Aiken, LS.; West, SG. Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage; 1991.
- Bascoe SM, Davies PT, Sturge-Apple ML, Cummings EM. Children's representations of family relationships, peer information processing, and school adjustment. *Developmental Psychology*. 2009; 45:1740–1751. [PubMed: 19899928]
- Belsky J, Pluess M. Beyond diathesis stress: Differential susceptibility to environmental influences. *Psychological Bulletin*. 2009; 135:885–908. [PubMed: 19883141]
- Cicchetti, D.; Cohen, DJ. Developmental psychopathology: Vol. 1. Theory and methods. Vol. 2. Risk, disorder, and adaptation. New York: Wiley; 1995.
- Cicchetti, D.; Cummings, EM.; Greenberg, MT.; Marvin, RS. An organizational perspective on attachment beyond infancy. In: Greenberg, MT.; Cicchetti, D.; Cummings, EM., editors. Attachment in the preschool years. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1990. p. 51-95.
- Cole DA, Gondoli DM, Peeke LG. Structure and validity of parent and teacher perceptions of children's competence: A multitrait-multimethod-multigroup investigation. *Psychological Assessment*. 1998; 10:241–249.
- Cole DA, Maxwell SE. Testing mediational models with longitudinal data: Questions and tips in the use of structural equation modeling. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*. 2003; 112:558–577. [PubMed: 14674869]
- Cui M, Donnellan MB, Conger RD. Reciprocal influence between parents' marital problems and adolescents' internalizing and externalizing behavior. *Developmental Psychology*. 2007; 43:544–552.
- Cummings EM, Ballard M, El-Sheikh M, Lake M. Resolution and children's responses to interadult anger. *Developmental Psychology*. 1991; 27:462–470.
- Cummings EM, George MRW, McCoy KP, Davies PT. Interparental conflict in kindergarten and adolescent adjustment: Prospective investigation of emotional security as an explanatory mechanism. *Child Development*. 2012; 83:1703–1715. [PubMed: 22694264]
- Cummings EM, Schermerhorn AC, Davies PT, Goeke-Morey MC, Cummings JS. Interparental discord and child adjustment: Prospective investigations of emotional security as an explanatory mechanism. *Child Development*. 2006; 77:132–152. [PubMed: 16460530]
- Cummings, EM.; Davies, PT. Marital conflict and children: An emotional security perspective. New York: Guilford; 2010.
- Davies PT, Cummings EM. Marital conflict and child adjustment: An emotional security hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin*. 1994; 116:387–411. [PubMed: 7809306]
- Davies, PT.; Cummings, EM. Interparental discord, family process, and developmental psychopathology. In: Cicchetti, D.; Cohen, DJ., editors. Developmental Psychopathology, Risk, disorder, and adaptation. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons Inc; 2006. p. 86-128.

- Davies PT, Forman EM, Rasi JA, Stevens KI. Assessing children's emotional security in the interparental subsystem: The Security in the Interparental Subsystem (SIS) Scales. *Child Development*. 2002; 73:544–562. [PubMed: 11949908]
- Davies PT, Lindsay LL. Interparental conflict and adolescent adjustment: Why does gender moderate early adolescent vulnerability? *Journal of Family Psychology*. 2004; 18:160–170. [PubMed: 14992618]
- Davies PT, Harold GT, Goeke-Morey MC, Cummings EM. Child emotional security and interparental conflict. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*. 2002; 67:63–80.
- Davies PT, Meyers RL, Cummings EM, Heindel S. Adult conflict history and children's subsequent responses to conflict: An experimental test. *Journal of Family Psychology*. 1999; 13:610–628.
- Davies PT, Sturge-Apple, ML. Advances in the formulation of emotional security theory: An ethologically based perspective. In: Kail, R., editor. *Advances in child development and behavior*. Vol. 35. New York: Academic Press; 2007. p. 90-138.
- Davies PT, Winter MA, Cicchetti D. The implications of emotional security theory for understanding and treating childhood psychopathology. *Development and Psychopathology*. 2006; 18:707–735. [PubMed: 17152397]
- Del Giudice M, Ellis BJ, Shirtcliff EA. The adaptive calibration model of stress responsivity. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*. 2011; 35:1562–1592. [PubMed: 21145350]
- Ellis BJ, Essex MJ, Boyce WT. Biological sensitivity to context: II. Empirical explorations of an evolutionary-developmental theory. *Development and Psychopathology*. 2005; 17:303–328. [PubMed: 16761547]
- Enders CK. A primer on maximum likelihood algorithms available for use with missing data. *Structural Equation Modeling*. 2001; 8:128–141.
- Ferrer E, Balluerka N, Widaman KF. Factorial invariance and the specification of second-order latent growth models. *Methodology*. 2008; 4:22–36. [PubMed: 20046801]
- Frankenhuis WE, Del Giudice M. When do adaptive developmental mechanisms yield maladaptive outcomes. *Developmental Psychology*. 2012; 48:628–642. [PubMed: 21967567]
- Goodman R. The extended version of the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire as a guide to child psychiatric caseness and consequent burden. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*. 1999; 40:791–799. [PubMed: 10433412]
- Goodman R, Scott S. Comparing the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire and the Child Behavior Checklist: Is small beautiful? *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*. 1999; 27:17–24. [PubMed: 10197403]
- Grist RM, Field AP. The mediating effect of cognitive development on children's worry elaboration. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*. 2012; 43:801–807. [PubMed: 22178472]
- Grych, JH.; Fincham, FD. Interparental conflict and child adjustment: An overview. In: Grych, JH.; Fincham, FD., editors. *Interparental conflict and child development: Theory, research, and application*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press; 2001. p. 1-8.
- Harkness KL, Bruce AE, Lumley MN. The role of childhood abuse and neglect in the sensitization to stressful life events in adolescent depression. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*. 2006; 115:730–741. [PubMed: 17100530]
- Harold, GT.; Leve, LD. Parents as partners: How the parental relationship affects children's development. In: Balfour, A.; Morgan, M.; Vincent, C., editors. *How couple relationships shape our world: Clinical practice, research, and policy perspectives*. London: Karnac Books; 2012. p. 25-56.
- Harold GT, Shelton KH, Goeke-Morey MC, Cummings EM. Marital conflict and child adjustment: Prospective longitudinal tests of the mediating role of children's emotional security about family relationships. *Social Development*. 2004; 13:350–376.
- Harter, S. The Self-Perception Profile for Children: Revision of the Perceived Competence Scale for Children. University of Denver; 1985. Unpublished manuscript
- Harter, S. Manual for the self-perception profile for adolescents. University of Denver; 1988. Unpublished manual

- Johnston, J.; Roseby, V.; Kuehnle, K. In the name of the child: A developmental approach to understanding and helping children of conflicted and violent divorce. New York: Springer; 2009.
- Kerig P. Assessing the links between interparental conflict and child adjustment: The conflict and problem-solving scales. *Journal of Family Psychology*. 1996; 10:454–473.
- Ladd GW, Profilet SM. The child behavior scale: A teacher report measure of young children's aggressive, withdrawn, and prosocial behaviors. *Developmental Psychology*. 1996; 32:1008–1024.
- MacKinnon DP, Fritz MS, Williams J, Lockwood CM. Distribution of the product confidence limits for the indirect effect: Program PRODCLIN. *Behavior Research Methods*. 2007; 39:384–389. [PubMed: 17958149]
- Malik, NM.; Lindahl, KM. System for Coding Interactions in Dyads (SCID). In: Kerig, PK.; Baucom, DH., editors. Couple observational coding systems. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum; 2004. p. 173-188.
- Marsh HW, Wen Z, Hau KT. Structural equation models of latent interactions: Evaluation of alternative estimation strategies and indicator construction. *Psychological Methods*. 2004; 9:275–300. [PubMed: 15355150]
- McArdle JJ. Latent variable modeling of differences and changes with longitudinal data. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 2009; 60:577–605.
- Monroe SM, Harkness KL. Life stress, the “kindling” hypothesis, and the recurrence of depression: Considerations from a life stress perspective. *Psychological Review*. 2005; 112:417–445. [PubMed: 15783292]
- Obrodovic J, Burt KB, Masten AS. Testing a dual cascade model linking competence and symptoms over 20 years from childhood to adulthood. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*. 2010; 39:90–102. [PubMed: 20390801]
- Preacher KJ, Curran PJ, Bauer DJ. Computational tools for probing interaction effects in multiple linear regression, multilevel modeling, and latent curve analysis. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*. 2006; 31:437–448.
- Radloff LS. The CES-D Scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the general population. *Applied Psychological Measurement*. 1977; 1:385–401.
- Reynolds CR, Richmond BO. Factor structure and content validity of “what I think and feel”: The revised children's manifest anxiety scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*. 1979; 43:281–283. [PubMed: 469706]
- Roisman GI, Newman DA, Fraley RC, Haltigan JD, Groh AM, Haydon KC. Distinguishing differential susceptibility from diathesis-stress: Recommendations for evaluating interaction effects. *Development and Psychopathology*. 2012; 24:389–409. [PubMed: 22559121]
- Rudolph KD, Flynn M. Childhood adversity and youth depression: Influence of gender and pubertal status. *Development and Psychopathology*. 2007; 19:497–521. [PubMed: 17459181]
- Sawa J, Morikawa T. Interrater reliability for multiple raters in clinical trials of ordinal scales. *Drug Information Journal*. 2007; 41:595–605.
- Sbarra DA, Allen JJB. Decomposing depression: On the prospective and reciprocal dynamics of mood and sleep disturbances. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*. 2009; 118:171–182. [PubMed: 19222323]
- Seligman LD, Ollendick TH, Langley AK, Baldacci HB. The utility of measures of child and adolescent anxiety: A meta-analytic review of the Revised Children's Anxiety Scale, the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children, and the Child Behavior Checklist. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*. 2004; 33:557–565. [PubMed: 15271613]
- Sroufe LA. Psychopathology as an outcome of development. *Development and Psychopathology*. 1997; 9:251–268. [PubMed: 9201444]
- Sroufe, LA.; Egeland, B.; Carlson, EA.; Collins, WA. The development of the person: The Minnesota study of risk and adaptation from birth to adulthood. New York, NY, US: Guilford; 2005.
- Sroufe LA, Egeland B, Kreutzer T. The face of early experience following developmental change: Longitudinal approaches to individual adaptation in childhood. *Child Development*. 1990; 61:1363–1373. [PubMed: 2245730]
- Vasey MW, Crnic KA, Carter WG. Worry in childhood: A developmental perspective. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*. 1994; 18:529–549.
- Waddington, CH. The strategy of the genes. London: George Allen; 1957.

Figure 1.

Figure 2.

Structural equation model examining process associations between interparental conflict, children's emotional insecurity, and changes in children's psychological maladjustment. Parameter estimates for the structural paths are standardized path coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. Dashed lines indicate non-significant pathways. LDS = Latent Difference Score; Negative Reps = Negative Representations. ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$.

Figure 3.

Structural equation model examining the interactive effect of children's early histories of emotional insecurity and Wave 3 interparental conflict on changes in psychological maladjustment from Wave 5 to Wave 6. LDS = Latent Difference Score; Negative Reps. = Negative Representations. Parameter estimates for the structural paths are standardized path coefficients. Dashed lines indicate non-significant pathways. ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$.

Figure 4.

A graphical plot of childhood histories of emotional insecurity as a moderator of the prospective association between exposure to interparental conflict and adolescent emotional insecurity.

Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations of the Primary Variables in the Analyses.

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
Covariates																					
1. Child Sex	1.55	0.50	--																		
2. Wave 3 SES	-0.03	0.78	-.05	--																	
Wave 3 Interparental Conflict (Mean Age = 13 years old)																					
3. Observation	0.02	0.69	.02	-.18*	--																
4. Mother Survey	0.04	0.83	.00	.04	.28*	--															
5. Father Survey	0.01	0.84	-.06	-.01	.49*	.55*	--														
Childhood History of Insecurity (Waves 1 and 2; Mean Ages 7 and 8 years old, respectively)																					
6. Emotion Reactivity	17.09	4.36	.00	-.30*	.21*	.11	.09	--													
7. Involvement	21.86	4.16	.13	-.13	.03	.07	-.06	.51*	--												
8. Avoidance	9.61	2.48	-.05	-.21*	.12	.07	.01	.70*	.39*	--											
Wave 3 Emotional Insecurity (Mean Age = 13 years old)																					
9. Representations	0.01	1.75	-.04	-.25*	.05	.12	.03	.30*	.23*	.22*	--										
10. Emotion Reactivity	14.89	6.02	.04	-.19*	.14	.10	.05	.29*	.20*	.20*	.75*	--									
11. Regulation	0.07	1.66	.05	-.15*	.10	.02	.02	.25*	.17*	.17*	.47*	.59*	--								
Wave 4 Emotional Insecurity (Mean Age = 14 years old)																					
12. Representations	-0.14	1.57	-.09	-.10	.23*	.17*	.23*	.15*	.01	.13	.33*	.27*	.11	--							
13. Emotion Reactivity	13.95	5.14	-.01	-.14	.32*	.18*	.29*	.19*	.02	.12	.40*	.44*	.36*	.66*	--						
14. Regulation	0.05	1.70	.00	.05	.16*	.06	.21*	.12	.02	.09	.31*	.38*	.49*	.43*	.65*	--					
Wave 4 Psychological Problems (Mean Age = 14 years old)																					
15. Mother Survey	0.00	0.78	-.05	-.15*	-.02	.28*	.03	.16*	.22*	.15*	.24*	.13	.00	.08	.00	-.16*	--				
16. Child Survey	-0.01	0.71	.03	-.28*	.07	.10	.09	.22*	.17*	.19*	.41*	.37*	.25*	.33*	.26*	.17*	.26*	--			
17. Teacher Survey	-0.06	0.76	-.14	-.25*	.14	.14	.05	.33*	.23*	.37*	.31*	.17	.03	.16	.16	-.09	.40*	.41*	--		
Wave 5 Psychological Problems (Mean Age = 15 years old)																					
18. Mother Survey	-0.01	0.77	.00	-.08	-.08	.14	-.08	.03	.08	.05	.27*	.13	-.03	.21*	.10	-.03	.79*	.25*	.34*	--	
19. Child Survey	0.00	0.70	.05	-.21*	-.01	.06	.07	.19*	.15*	.17*	.45*	.31*	.18*	.47*	.34*	.19*	.23*	.69*	.30*	.39*	--

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20. Teacher Survey	0.02	0.84	-.15	-.29*	.11	.14	.07	.29*	.19*	.28*	.40*	.26*	.10	.27*	.22*	.01	.43*	.44*	.57*	.33*	.44*

Note. SES = Socioeconomic Status; Regulation = Regulation of Exposure to Conflict; Child Sex: 1 = male; 2 = female.

* $p < .05$.