Published in final edited form as:

J Adolesc. 2014 October ; 37(7): 965–972. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2014.07.003.

Self-reported Rates of Interpersonal Conflict Vary as a Function of Questionnaire Format: Why Age-related Trends in Disagreement (and Other Events) May Not be What They Seem

Shrija Dirghangi,

Florida Atlantic University

Brett Laursen,

Florida Atlantic University

Justin Puder,

Auburn University

Dave Bjorklund, and

Florida Atlantic University

Dawn DeLay

Arizona State University

Abstract

Two studies examine whether self-reports of interpersonal conflict differ as a function of how the question is asked. In Study 1, 56 U.S. college students ($M=20.7$ years) completed different versions of a questionnaire, four times, at one week intervals. Participants reported more conflicts with the aid of memory prompts than without, an effect that was especially strong when questions focused on events from the previous day. In Study 2, 123 middle-school students ($M=11.08$ years) and 128 primary school students ($M=8.2$ years) from the same region completed one of two questionnaires describing conflict during the previous day. Children reported more conflicts with memory prompts than without. The effect was twice as strong for younger children than older children. The findings suggest that increases in reports of conflict across the transition into adolescence may be due to improvements in the ability to recall and recount events in the absence of memory cues.

Keywords

conflict; self-report; questionnaire decomposition; development; memory

© 2014 The Association for Professionals in Services for Adolescents. Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Correspondence should be directed to Shrija Dirghangi or Brett Laursen at the Department of Psychology, Florida Atlantic University, 777 Glades Road, Boca Raton Florida 33431. sdirghan@fau.edu or laursen@fau.edu.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Developmental scholars often look to rates of conflict for clues about individual adjustment and relationship change, particularly during the transition to adolescence, when there is a rapid realignment of the social world. But self-reports about the frequency of events are sensitive to variations in the structure of the questionnaire (Schwarz, 1999), raising questions about the validity of much of the conflict-frequency literature. For instance, systematic differences in self-reports of event frequencies arise as a function of the provision of memory cues, which often take the form of a list of potential events (Schwarz & Oyserman, 2001). Questionnaire format distinctions may be exacerbated by memory limitations related to age (Laursen, Dennison, & Bjorklund, 2012). The tremendous divergence in the format of conflict-frequency questionnaires leave open the possibility that age-related differences in self-reported rates of conflict during late childhood and early adolescence may not be quite what they appear. Two studies were conducted to examine whether reports of conflict frequencies vary as a function of questionnaire format and if differences were especially pronounced in younger respondents.

Interpersonal conflict describes a state of disagreement between two individuals, often defined in terms of overt behavioral opposition (Shantz, 1984). Disagreement is normative. Most children and adolescents report that conflicts are a common occurrence in relationships with parents, siblings, and peers (Collins & Laursen, 1992). The role of conflict in the development of adolescent autonomy is worth considering. Disagreement is one of the primary vehicles through which parents and adolescent children renegotiate relationship roles and responsibilities (Smetana, 1988). Much has been made of whether there are age-related differences in rates of conflict across the transition into adolescence and what the presence or absence of these differences might mean (Laursen & Collins, 1994).

Self-reports are typically used to assess interpersonal conflict during middle childhood and adolescence. In part, this is because self-reports are easy to collect, but it is also the case that independent observers find that children are less biased than parents in reports of conflict (Gonzales, Cauce, & Mason, 1996). Self-reports are widely used in the behavioral sciences, and self-report measures of interpersonal conflict resemble self-report measures of other behavioral events. Participants are often simply asked to recount the number of times an event took place during a specific time period. However, it is worth noting that the answer to an event frequency question depends, in part, on how the question is asked

One important distinction between self-report questionnaires involves the provision of memory cues. Decomposition is a questionnaire strategy in which behavioral frequency reports are divided into subcategories, each with its own memory prompt. Decomposition increases the frequency of event reports and, for infrequent or irregular behaviors, improves the accuracy of the reports provided (Schwarz & Oyserman, 2001). To illustrate, respondents who kept records about daily activities were much more accurate when later asked to remember the number of times they drank from a water fountain at specific locations (e.g., classroom, library, gym) than when they were simply asked to remember the number of times they drank from a water fountain (Menon, 1997). Cues aid retrieval of salient and irregular events by priming memory and facilitating recall; participants not only remember more events, they remember them more accurately, because they count rather than estimate their occurrence (Menon & Yorkston, 2000). Given the abundance of evidence

that cues for recall increase the reporting of events such as the use of the telephone (Belli, Schwarz, Singer, & Tallarico, 2000) and dining at a restaurant (Sudman & Schwarz, 1989), there is good reason to expect similar effects for interpersonal conflict.

More events also tend to be recalled when the time period for recollection is brief. The recollection period refers to the time frame during which the events occurred (not the amount of time given to the participant to remember events). Shorter time frames are assumed to elicit more event reports per unit of time than longer time frames, because participants look to the recollection period for clues as to the frequency of an event (Schwarz, 1999). When the recall period encompasses brief time intervals, participants assume that mundane incidents that occur frequently should be reported (Schwarz & Oyserman, 2001). When the recall period encompasses lengthy time intervals, participants assume that unusual incidents that occur infrequently should be reported (Winkielman, Knauper, & Schwarz, 1998). The time frame differential is exacerbated by the fact that recall declines as the time period for recollection increases. In one study (Winkielman, Knauper, & Schwarz, 1998), college students reported feeling angry more often when recollecting events during the past week than when recollecting events during the past year (about twice a week compared to about 4 or 5 times a year). Similar findings are expected for inquiries about interpersonal conflict: Brief recollection periods should elicit many disagreements, because they capture minor squabbles, whereas longer recollection periods should elicit only a few events, because reports will be skewed toward major disputes only.

A careful inspection of the evidence reveals considerable variability in conflict event frequencies (e.g., Laursen & Koplas, 1995; Montemayor & Hanson, 1985) and in the questionnaire formats used to assess them (e.g., Fuligni, 1998; Galambos & Almeida, 1992). Most of the empirical literature focuses on parent-adolescent conflict, where different recollection periods give rise to different rates of conflict (Laursen, Dennison, & Bjorklund, 2012). Conflict reports also vary as a function of memory prompts (Burk, Denissen, van Doorn, Branje, & Laursen, 2009). In general, the fewest conflicts are reported when the time frame for recollection is long and no memory cues are provided, whereas the most conflicts are reported when the time frame for recollection is brief and memory cues are available (Laursen et al., 2012). Findings from four studies with four different questionnaires illustrate this point. Across a two-week reference period, adolescents reported an average of two disagreements (approximately one per week) without memory cues (Yau & Smetana, 2003), compared with about six disagreements (approximately three per week) when cues were available (Smetana, Daddis, & Chuang, 2003). Across a one-day reference period, adolescents reported an average of $\frac{1}{2}$ a disagreement a day (approximately one every other day) without memory cues (Jensen-Campbell & Graziano, 2001), compared with approximately six disagreements a day with memory cues (Adams & Laursen, 2007). Similar variability can be found in the more limited literature on reports of conflict with peers (Laursen & Pursell, 2009). The upshot is that age group differences in rates of conflict cannot be extrapolated from different cross-sectional studies. Worse still is the possibility that age-group differences within studies may be confounded with memory, such that increases in conflict across the transition into adolescence are a reflection of changes in encoding and recall abilities rather than changes in the actual frequency of events.

Developmental differences in event-frequency recall are poorly understood. The impact of questionnaire format on event frequency responses is minimized for events that are well represented in memory (Menon, Raghurir, & Schwarz, 1995), which suggests that age differences in memory may contribute to age differences in the variability ascribed to questionnaire format. Age-related declines in memory performance make it difficult for the elderly to encode and recall mundane events (Knauper, Schwarz, & Park, 2004). Thus, event frequency reports of older adults are more heavily influenced by questionnaire format than are those of younger adults (Knauper, Schwarz, & Park, 2004). Young children, whose memory capacities are not fully developed, may be similarly influenced by questionnaire format. We know that memory improves across late childhood and early adolescence, with advances in encoding, retrieval, and metamemory skills (Bjorklund, Dukes, & Brown, 2009). This suggests that differences between cued and uncued conflict reports should diminish across the primary and middle school years, as memory prompts become less critical for event recall.

General Method

The conflict measures were adapted from self-report questionnaires used in prior studies of adolescents and young adults (Burk et al., 2009). Conflict was defined as interpersonal disagreement; participants were instructed that disagreement involved (but was not limited to) objecting to something that someone else said or did, arguments, and fights. Conflict was distinguished from negative affect: “Sometimes people get angry during a disagreement, but not always.” To avoid the possibility that participants would look to the response scale for clues about event frequency (Schuman & Presser, 1981), participants wrote the number of disagreements experienced in a blank space. Questionnaires did not mention specific relationships; participants were instructed to recall all disagreements with others. Participants were instructed to count each disagreement only once. Some disagreements could be classified into more than one topic. In this case, participants were asked to select the single topic that best described the disagreement.

In the first study, questionnaires differed in terms of the reference period for the recall of conflict and the memory prompts provided to aid recall. Using a within-subjects design, college students completed four different questionnaires at approximately one-week intervals to determine the impact of questionnaire format on the frequency of conflict reports. In the second study, questionnaires differed in terms of memory prompts provided to aid recall. Using a between-subjects design, primary school and middle-school students reported the frequency of conflict during the previous day, with or without memory prompts, to determine if the effect of memory cues varies with age.

Study 1

Participants

The sample included 56 undergraduate students (22 male and 34 female) aged 18 to 24 ($M = 20.74$). Students were recruited from the psychology subject pool at a large public university in southeastern Florida (USA) and received research credit for participation.

Measures and Procedure

Four questionnaires were completed by all participants. Participants completed a different questionnaire online at four different time points, approximately 6 days apart (Range=3–15, $M=6.41$, $SD=1.11$). The four questionnaires were completed in counterbalanced order, which resulted in 24 different combinations. There were neither order effects, $F(3, 52)=1.63$, $p=0.19$, partial $\eta^2=0.09$, nor time effects, $F(3, 165)=1.65$, $p=0.18$, partial $\eta^2=0.03$.

Questionnaires varied in terms of memory prompts: cued or uncued. In the cued condition, participants responded to 10 questions about specific conflict issues: (1) annoying behavior; (2) car, phone, TV, or computer; (3) criticism, or teasing; (4) differences of opinion; (5) money or possessions; (6) personal freedom; (7) relationships; (8) responsibilities; (9) school or work; and (10) standards of behavior. In the uncued condition, participants responded to a single question about conflict with no mention of specific issues.

Questionnaires also varied in terms of the reference periods provided for the recollection of conflicts: the previous two weeks or the previous day.

One-day uncued questionnaires asked participants about the number of conflicts that occurred during the previous day without reference to conflict issues. *How many disagreements did you experience yesterday?*

One-day cued questionnaires asked participants about the number of conflicts that occurred during the previous day over 10 conflict issues. Reports were summed across categories. Sample item: *How many disagreements did you experience yesterday about annoying behavior?*

Two-week uncued questionnaires asked participants about the number of conflicts that occurred during the previous two weeks without reference to conflict issues. Reports were divided by 14 to obtain a rate of conflict per day score that was comparable to results from questionnaires with a one day reference period. *How many disagreements did you experience in the past two weeks?*

Two-week cued conflict questionnaires asked participants about the number of conflicts that occurred during the previous two weeks over 10 conflict issues. Reports were summed across categories then divided by 14 to obtain a rate of conflict per day score that was comparable to results from questionnaires with a one day reference period. Sample item: *How many disagreements did you experience in the past two weeks about annoying behavior?*

Results

A 2 (sex) by 2 (reference period: one day and two weeks) by 2 (memory prompt: cued and uncued) repeated measures ANOVA was conducted on the mean number of conflicts reported per day. The reference period and memory prompt factors were repeated measures. A significant main effect emerged for memory prompt, $F(1, 54)=43.25$, $p<0.001$, $d=0.84$ (95% CI: 0.53, 1.14), such that more daily conflicts were reported in the cued condition ($M=4.47$, $SD=5.20$) than in the uncued condition ($M=1.26$, $SD=1.78$). There was also a

significant main effect for reference period, $F(1, 54)=44.62, p<0.001, d=1.04$ (95% *CI*: 0.30, 1.77), such that more daily conflicts were reported in the one-day reference period ($M=4.97, SD=5.69$) than the two week reference period ($M=0.76, SD=0.96$). Main effects were qualified by an interaction between memory prompt and reference period, $F(1, 54)=39.92, p<0.001$. The differences were dramatic, from a high of more than 8 conflicts per day in the one-day cued condition to a low of less than 1 conflict per day in the two weeks uncued condition.

Figure 1 depicts the mean number of conflicts per day reported by college students for the two-week and one-day reference periods in the cued and uncued questionnaire conditions. Follow-up paired samples *t*-tests indicated that the magnitude of the cued-uncued difference was somewhat greater for the one-day reference period, $t(55)=6.13, p<.001$ ($d=0.82$, 95% *CI*: 0.51, 1.12) than the two-week reference period, $t(55)=4.82, p<.001$ ($d=0.64$, *CI*: 0.35, 0.93). Neither the main effect of sex nor any interactions involving sex were significant.

Study 2

The second study examined whether the effect of recollection cues varies as a function of age. We focused on a brief reference period, given that cued-uncued differences were greatest for one-day recall. Conflicts occur unpredictably and with varying frequency, so the use of a brief time period for recall increases the likelihood that participants will count rather than estimate frequencies, which increases the accuracy of reports (Schwarz & Oyserman, 2001). The next study was designed to determine the extent to which age group differences between middle childhood and early adolescence in the number of disagreements reported are a reflection of the procedures for measuring their occurrence.

Participants

The sample included 66 boys and 62 girls from a primary school ($M=8.2$ years $SD=0.84$) and 54 boys and 69 girls from a middle school ($M=11.08$ years, $SD=0.90$). Primary school students (grades 2, 3 and 4) were categorized into the younger age group. Middle school students (grades 5, 6 and 7) were categorized into the older age group.

Measures and Procedure

All students in the 2nd through 7th grades were invited to participate. Parent consent and child assent was required for participation. The overall participation rate was 69% (primary school=76%, middle school=60%).

Trained research assistants tested students in small groups in a quiet area in the school. Questionnaires were read aloud by a research assistant prior to completion. Each student completed one of two questionnaires concerning conflict during the previous day. Questionnaires varied in terms of memory prompts: cued or uncued. Within grade and sex, students were randomly assigned to a questionnaire condition. In the primary school, 66 students were assigned to the uncued condition and 62 students were assigned to the cued condition. In the middle school, 64 students were assigned to the uncued condition, and 59 students were assigned to the cued condition.

Cued questionnaires asked participants about the number of conflicts or disagreement that occurred during the previous day over 5 specific issues: (1) opinions, beliefs, or ideas; (2) money or possessions; (3) homework, chores, or rules; (4) how you treat others and how you are treated; (5) personal freedom. Examples of disagreements within categories were provided. Reports were summed across categories. Sample item: *How many disagreements did you experience yesterday about homework, chores, or rules?*

Uncued questionnaires asked participants about the number of conflicts that occurred during the previous day without reference to conflict issues. *How many disagreements did you experience yesterday?*

Results

Figure 2 depicts the mean number of conflicts during the previous day reported by younger and older children in the cued and uncued questionnaire conditions. A 2 (sex) by 2 (memory prompt: cued and uncued) by 2 (age group: younger and older) between-subjects ANOVA was conducted. The average number of conflicts per day was the dependent variable. There was a main effect for age group, $F(1, 243)=5.12, p=0.02, d=0.30$ (95% CI: 0.05, 0.54), such that more conflicts were reported by older participants ($M=4.86, SD=4.57$) than by younger participants ($M=3.52, SD=4.45$). There was also a main effect for memory cue, $F(1, 243)=27.73, p<0.001, d=0.68$ (95% CI: 0.42, 0.93), such that more conflicts were reported in the cued condition ($M=5.70, SD=5.26$) than in the uncued condition ($M=2.76, SD=3.18$). Main effects were qualified by an interaction between memory cue and age group, $F(1, 243)=3.98, p=0.047$.

Follow-up independent sample *t*-tests indicated that the magnitude of the cued-uncued effect was twice as great in the younger age group, $t(126) = 5.54, p<.001$ ($d=0.98$, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.34) than the older age group, $t(121) = 2.37, p=.02$ ($d=0.42$, 95% CI: 0.06-, 0.77). Rates of conflict reported by the older and younger children did not differ in the cued condition, $t(119) = 0.32, p=.74$ ($d=0.06$, 95% CI: -0.29, 0.41) whereas older children reported more than twice the number of conflicts than younger children in the uncued condition, $t(128) = 4.42, p<.001$ ($d=0.78$, 95% CI: 0.41, 1.10). Neither the main effect of sex nor any interactions involving sex were significant.

Discussion

Previous research has shown that minor changes to self-report event frequency questionnaires can lead to major changes in the results obtained (Schwarz, 1999). Consistent with this literature, we conducted two studies in which differences in the frequency of conflict reports varied across cued questionnaires (which included a list of conflict topics) and uncued questionnaires (which did not include a list of conflict topics). Results from a within-subjects study indicated that college students reported more conflicts when memory cues were available than when they were not, an effect that was pronounced when the time period for recollection was limited to the previous day. Results from a between-subjects study indicated that children who completed questionnaires with memory cues reported more conflicts during the previous day than children who completed questionnaires without

memory cues. This effect was twice as large for primary school children than for middle-school children. Thus, older children reported more conflicts than younger children when cues were absent, but not when cues were present.

Scholars would be well advised to carefully consider the construction of self-report questionnaires that assess event frequencies. The fewer the number of events there are to report and the easier it is to recall them, the more likely a respondent will employ enumeration as a reporting strategy (Menon & Yorkston, 2000). Whenever possible, questionnaires should encourage respondents to enumerate (count) the number of events, rather than guessing or estimating, because enumeration is more accurate than estimation (Burton & Blair, 1991). Underreporting is the primary risk associated with enumeration; respondents may not remember all events that occurred. Decomposed questionnaires provide memory prompts that aid event recall. The number of events that are remembered and reported increases as a function of the number of appropriate memory prompts provided (Menon, 1997). Memory prompts provide cues about the interpretation of research questions, which can also avert underreporting (Schwarz & Oyserman, 2001). Events that were encoded as something other than a disagreement may come to be understood as falling within the category of disagreements when illustrated with a memory cue. Brief time frames for recollection increase the chances that a respondent will employ enumeration, in part because recent events are easier to access than distant events, and in part because the shorter the interval the fewer events there are to recall (Schwarz, 1999). Worries that brief time periods limit generalizability are unfounded, provided that a large number of respondents are sampled on different days.

Strategies designed to encourage enumeration are not without risk. Decomposition may foster over-reporting under some specific circumstances. Mundane events that occur frequently and with a high degree of regularity are poorly represented in memory and difficult to retrieve (Schwarz & Oyserman, 2001). When asked to recall events of this sort, respondents tend to resort to round number estimates that often exceed the actual number of events (Belli et al., 2000). Decomposition amplifies this problem, because the errors inherent in estimation are multiplied by the number of cues. The quality of the memory cues matters. Decomposition may discourage enumeration if the memory prompts lack specificity (Wright, Gaskell, & O'Muricheartaigh, 1994). Brief time periods for recollection may also foster over-reporting under some specific circumstances. Forward telescoping describes instances when an event from an earlier period is brought into the time period for recollection (Rubin & Baddeley, 1989). Fortunately, decomposition and brief time periods for recollection work well in combination: Memory prompts that encourage enumeration are successful at reducing over-reporting across short reference periods (Menon, 1997).

We could not determine the accuracy of the reports of conflict gathered in this study. Although we assume that decomposed reports of a one-day time interval were the most valid assessment of conflict, we must consider the possibility that conflict frequencies were over-reported in this condition. False memories (reporting events that never occurred) seem unlikely because the decomposed questions were not leading (Bruck & Ceci, 1999). We think it likely that disagreements during the previous day are salient enough and infrequent enough to invoke episodic enumeration rather than estimation. The number of daily events

reported, typically four or fewer in the uncued condition and fewer within each cue, suggests that the memory load was not so taxing that participants would need to resort to estimation. Furthermore, it seems unlikely that age-related differences in the number of events reported in the uncued condition are a product of older children over-reporting conflicts rather than (as we hypothesize) younger children underreporting conflicts, because (a) estimation typically yields higher not lower levels of event frequencies than enumeration, and (b) there are few plausible reasons to assume that older children would estimate in circumstances when younger children enumerate.

The findings have important implications for our understanding of interpersonal conflict. It is difficult to escape the conclusion that some of the normative increase in conflict attributed to factors such as puberty and relationship change that accompany the transition from childhood into adolescence may instead be an artifact of changes in the ability to recall conflict in uncued questionnaires. We do not question the widespread assumption that family conflict grows as children approach adolescence. Reports from multiple sources indicate this to be the case (Laursen & Collins, 1994). Our findings do raise questions, however, about the magnitude of the effect. We did not measure disagreements in specific relationships, but there is no reason to suspect that age differences in responses to different questionnaire formats would vary across relationship contexts, especially for parent-child relationships, which account for roughly half of all conflicts that adolescents report (e.g., Laursen, 1995). Findings that age-related differences in conflict frequencies are limited to uncued questionnaires imply that much of the increases in the reported frequency of parent-child disagreements are due to improvements in the ability to remember them. This would not be the first time that suppositions about developmental change in family conflict rates have been challenged. The widely held view that parent-child conflict rises and falls across adolescence appears to have been the product of a measurement artifact, driven by a confound between changes in conflict affect and changes in conflict rates (Laursen, Coy, & Collins, 1998).

Our research is not without limitations. The measure of conflict was not relationship specific. Extrapolations to parent-child relationships must be made with caution, although the fact that parents occupy the role of principal disagreement partner bolsters confidence in our conclusions. Age-specific memory cues were not provided, suggesting that conflicts may have been under-reported in the cued condition and that differences between cued and uncued questionnaires are even greater than that reported here. Age-group differences in event frequency as a function of questionnaire format only imply that developmental changes in recall abilities are responsible for some measure of the increase in parent-child conflict across middle childhood and early adolescence. Stronger support requires an assessment of free-recall abilities. Improved memory is only one of several cognitive and interpersonal changes that take place during this time period. Few of these changes speak to the differences found between reports from cued and uncued questionnaires, but the absence of a plausible alternative explanation is a weak argument for our position. Perhaps the greatest weakness was our inability to ascertain the retrieval mechanisms used by the participants to obtain reports of conflict. In the absence of this information, we can only speculate as to why different questionnaires yielded different rates of conflict.

The fact that the two studies had slightly different questionnaires, with more conflict topic cues in Study 1 than in Study 2, is both a strength and weakness of the design. The number of cues provided may be linked to the number of conflicts reported, such that 10 cues prompt greater recollection than the 5 cues. This is an empirical question for another day. For the present study, the different number of cues simply precludes mean-level contrasts across studies, which was not a goal of the study. Instead, the present study concerned differences between questionnaires, with the central goal of comparing cued means and uncued means within each study. Differences between questionnaires replicated across studies, which strengthens the conclusion that more conflicts are reported with conflict cues than without, regardless of the number of cues provided.

Other areas may profit from a similar examination of instrument construction. Health risk behaviors that are prominent during adolescence, such as unprotected sexual activity (Youth Risk Behavior Survey, Center for Disease Control and Prevention, 1989), reckless driving (Young Driver Attitude Scale, Malfetti, Rose, DeKorp, & Basch, 1989), and substance use (Monitoring the Future survey, Johnston, O'Malley, & Bachman, 1987; The American Drug and Alcohol Survey, Oetting, Beauvais, & Edwards, 1985), may all be under-reported in self-report surveys. As a consequence, problem behaviors may be more prevalent than scholars and policy makers assume. Assumptions underlying age-related changes in the frequency of a host of different events may need to be revisited. We suspect that interpersonal conflict may not be the only field in which scholars find that developmental changes in frequency reports cannot be divorced from developmental changes in recall abilities. Self-reports of smoking (Aloise-Young & Hennigan, 1996), computer and Internet usage (Roberts, Foehr, Rideout, & Brodie, 1999; Subrahmanyam, Greenfield, Kraut, & Gross, 2001), as well as television and videogame consumption (Robinson, 2001) all suggest that these behaviors increase across the transition from childhood to adolescence. It is possible, however, decomposed questions may minimize age-related differences in these and other behaviors.

Self-reports are a ubiquitous feature of research with adolescents. The accuracy of event frequency reports is rarely suspect because the questions hold considerable face validity. Findings indicating that answers to conflict-frequency questions depend on how questions are asked should give investigators pause, because they raise the possibility that the accuracy of the reports, not just the frequency, increases with age. Accurate assessments of change in the frequency of interpersonal conflict are important not only because they shape parental and societal expectations about normative adolescent development (Steinberg, 2001), but also because individual differences in rates of conflict that are tied to individual differences in adjustment outcomes (e.g., Adams & Laursen, 2007) must be decoupled from individual differences in recall abilities. Our findings are specific to age-related change in interpersonal conflict, but our conclusions may be applicable to all manner of self-reported events that are thought to increase across childhood and adolescence.

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our appreciation to the students, parents, faculty, and staff of the A. D. Henderson School. Brett Laursen received support from the U.S. National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (HD068421) and the U.S. National Science Foundation (0909733).

References

- Adams RE, Laursen B. The correlates of conflict: Disagreement is not necessarily detrimental. *Journal of Family Psychology*. 2007; 21(3):445–458. [PubMed: 17874930]
- Aloise-Young PA, Hennigan KM. Self-image, the smoker stereotype and cigarette smoking: Developmental patterns from fifth through eighth grade. *Journal of adolescence*. 1996; 19(2):163–177. [PubMed: 9245274]
- Belli RF, Schwarz N, Singer EJ, Talarico. Decomposition can harm the accuracy of behavioral frequency reports. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*. 2000; 14(4):295–308.
- Bjorklund, DF.; Dukes, C.; Brown, RD. The development of memory strategies. In: Courage, ML.; Cowan, N., editors. *The development of memory in infancy and childhood*. Hove, United Kingdom: Psychology Press; 2009. p. 145-175.
- Bruck M, Ceci SJ. The suggestibility of children's memory. *Annual review of psychology*. 1999; 50(1):419–439.
- Burk WJ, Denissen J, Van Doorn MD, Branje SJ, Laursen B. The vicissitudes of conflict measurement: stability and reliability in the frequency of disagreements. *European Psychologist*. 2009; 14(2):153–159.
- Burton S, Blair E. Task conditions, response formulation processes, and response accuracy for behavioral frequency questions in surveys. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 1991; 55(1):50–79.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. [Accessed on (5th May, 2014)] Youth Risk Behavior Survey. 1989. Available at: www.cdc.gov/yrbs.
- Collins, WA.; Laursen, B. Conflict and the transition to adolescence. In: Shantz, CU.; Hartup, WW., editors. *Conflict in child and adolescent development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1992. p. 216-241.
- Fulgini AJ. Authority, autonomy, and parent–adolescent conflict and cohesion: A study of adolescents from Mexican, Chinese, Filipino, and European backgrounds. *Developmental psychology*. 1998; 34(4):782–792. [PubMed: 9681270]
- Galambos NL, Almeida DM. Does parent-adolescent conflict increase in early adolescence? *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 1992; 54(4):737–747.
- Gonzales NA, Cauce AM, Mason CA. Interobserver agreement in the assessment of parental behavior and parent-adolescent conflict: African American mothers, daughters, and independent observers. *Child Development*. 1996; 67(4):1483–1498. [PubMed: 8890496]
- Jensen-Campbell LA, Graziano WG. Agreeableness as a moderator of interpersonal conflict. *Journal of Personality*. 2001; 69(2):323–362. [PubMed: 11339802]
- Johnston, L.; O'Malley, P.; Bachman, J. National trends in drug use and related factors among American high school students and young adults, 1975–1986 (DHHS Publication No. ADM87-1535). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office; 1987.
- Knäuper B, Schwarz N, Park DC. Frequency reports across age groups: Differential effects of frequency scales. *Journal of Official Statistics*. 2004; 20(1):91–96.
- Laursen B, Koplas AL. What's important about important conflicts? Adolescents' perceptions of daily disagreements. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*. 1995; 41(4):536–553.
- Laursen B. Conflict and social interaction in adolescent relationships. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*. 1995; 5(1):55–70.
- Laursen B, Collins WA. Interpersonal conflict during adolescence. *Psychological Bulletin*. 1994; 115(2):197–209. [PubMed: 8165270]
- Laursen B, Coy KC, Collins WA. Reconsidering changes in parent-child conflict across adolescence: A meta-analysis. *Child Development*. 1998; 69(3):817–832. [PubMed: 9680687]
- Laursen, B.; Denissen, J.; Bjorklund, DF. Event frequency measurement. In: Laursen, B.; Little, TD.; Card, NA., editors. *Handbook of developmental research methods*. New York: Guilford; 2012. p. 66-81.
- Laursen, B.; Pursell, G. Conflict in peer relationships. In: Rubin, KH.; Bukowski, WM.; Laursen, B., editors. *Handbook of peer interactions, relationships, and groups*. New York: Guilford; 2009. p. 267-286.

- Malfetti, JL.; Rose, PR.; DeKorp, NA.; Basch, CE. The development and field-testing of an instrument to measure young driver risk-taking attitudes. New York: New York Teachers College, Columbia University; 1989. The Young Driver Attitude Scale.
- Menon G. Are the parts better than the whole? The effects of decompositional questions on judgments of frequent behaviors. *Journal of Marketing Research*. 1997; 34:335–346.
- Menon G, Raghubir P, Schwarz N. Behavioral frequency judgments: An accessibility-diagnostics framework. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 1995; 22:212–228.
- Menon, G.; Yorkston, EA. The use of memory and contextual cues in the formation of behavioral frequency judgments. In: Stone, AA.; Turkkan, JS.; Bachrach, CA.; Jobe, JB.; Kurtzman, HS.; Cain, VS., editors. *The science of self-report: Implications for research and practice*. Erlbaum: Mahwah, NJ; 2000. p. 63-79.
- Montemayor R, Hanson E. A naturalistic view of conflict between adolescents and their parents and siblings. *Journal of Early Adolescence*. 1985; 5(1):23–30.
- Oetting, ER.; Beauvais, F.; Edwards, RW. The American drug and alcohol survey. Fort Collins, CO: Rocky Mountain Behavioral Science Institute; 1985.
- Robinson TN. Television viewing and childhood obesity. *Pediatric Clinics of North America*. 2001; 48(4):1017–1025. [PubMed: 11494635]
- Roberts, DF.; Foehr, UG.; Rideout, VJ.; Brodie, M. Kids and media @ the new millennium. Menlo Park, CA: Kaiser Family Foundation; 1999.
- Rubin DC, Baddeley AD. Telescoping is not time compression: A model. *Memory & Cognition*. 1989; 17(6):653–661. [PubMed: 2811662]
- Shantz C. Conflicts and conundrums in child development. *Newsletter of the Division on Developmental Psychology (Div. 7, APA)*. 1984 Fall; 18–28.
- Schuman, H.; Presser, S. Questions and answers in attitude surveys: Experiments in question form, wording, and context. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage; 1981.
- Schwarz N. Self-reports: How the questions shape the answers. *American Psychologist*. 1999; 54:93–105.
- Schwarz N, Oyserman D. Asking questions about behavior: Cognition, communication, and questionnaire construction. *American Journal of Evaluation*. 2001; 22:127–160.
- Smetana, JG. Concepts of self and social convention: Adolescents' and parents' reasoning about hypothetical and actual family conflicts. In: Gunnar, M., editor. *21st Minnesota symposium on child psychology*. Erlbaum: Hillsdale, NJ; 1988. p. 79-122.
- Smetana JG, Daddis C, Chuang SS. "Clean your room!" A longitudinal investigation of adolescent-parent conflict and conflict resolution in middle-class African American families. *Journal of Adolescent Research*. 2003; 18(6):631–650.
- Steinberg L. We know some things: Parent-adolescent relationships in retrospect and prospect. *Journal of research on adolescence*. 2001; 11(1):1–19.
- Subrahmanyam K, Greenfield P, Kraut R, Gross E. The impact of computer use on children's and adolescents' development. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*. 2001; 22(1):7–30.
- Sudman S, Schwarz N. Contributions of cognitive psychology to advertising research. *Journal of Advertising Research*. 1989; 29:43–53.
- Winkelman P, Knauper B, Schwarz N. Looking back at anger: Reference periods change the interpretation of emotion frequency questions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1998; 75:719–728. [PubMed: 9781408]
- Wright DB, Gaskell GD, O'Muricheartaigh CA. How much is 'quite a bit'? Mapping between numerical values and vague quantifiers. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*. 1994; 8:479–496.
- Yau J, Smetana J. Adolescent-parent conflict in Hong Kong and Shenzhen: A comparison of youth in two cultural contexts. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*. 2003; 27(3):201–211.

Figure 1. Mean number of conflicts per day reported by college students for two-week and one-day reference periods in cued and uncued questionnaire conditions.

Figure 2. Mean number of conflicts per day reported by younger (7 to 9 year olds) and older (10 to 12 year olds) children for a one-day reference period in cued and uncued questionnaire conditions.