Published in final edited form as:

J Child Fam Stud. 2016 April ; 25(4): 1110–1118. doi:10.1007/s10826-015-0288-2.

Youth Negative Affect Attenuates Associations between Compromise and Mother-Adolescent Conflict Outcomes

Brett Laursen,

Department of Psychology, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, FL

Dawn DeLay,

T. Denny Sanford School of Social and Family Dynamics, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ

Ashley Richmond, and

Miami-Dade College, Miami FL

Kenneth H. Rubin

Department of Human Development & Quantitative Methodology, University of Maryland, College Park, MD

Introduction

Successful conflict management is a hallmark of successful relationships. Negotiation is assumed to be critical to maintaining relationship harmony, despite the fact that rates of compromise vary considerably across relationships (Adams & Laursen, 2001). For this reason, some scholars argue that constructive conflict management involves more than negotiation; the regulation of negative affect is also essential (Eisenberg et al., 2008). This raises an important question: Is the impact of conflict on parent-child relationships a product of the manner in which the disagreement is resolved, the emotions expressed during the disagreement, or both?

Conflict describes a state of disagreement involving incompatible or opposing behaviors or views (Shantz, 1987). Adolescents report that conflicts arise most frequently in relationships with mothers (Laursen & Collins, 1994). This is perhaps not surprising, because disagreement is an important vehicle for the expression of autonomy and for the reorganization of roles and responsibilities within the household (Smetana, Campione-Barr, & Metzger, 2005). Conflict is also a marker of relationship functioning. Elevated conflict predicts escalating parent-child discord (Herrenkohl, Kosterman, Hawkins, & Mason, 2009) and declining relationship satisfaction across late adolescence (Laursen, DeLay, & Adams, 2010). The consequences of conflict can be measured directly by asking participants whether the disagreement adversely impacted the relationship (e.g. Larson & Csikszentmihalyi, 1983) as was done in the current inquiry.

The study of conflict processes often focuses on the manner in which disagreements are resolved, consistent with the view that discord and relationship deterioration are a product of

the failure to negotiate. The success of a relationship is posited to depend on the management of conflict (Canary, Cupach, & Messman, 1995). The particulars differ, but there is general agreement that compromise fosters mutually beneficial solutions, affirms the importance of the affiliation over the source of the dispute, and facilitates the continuity of social exchanges. Claims that successful conflict resolution safeguards interpersonal bonds are supported by research indicating that prospective relationship satisfaction, and even the future of the relationship itself, depends on the manner in which conflicts are settled (Laursen & Hafen, 2010).

An alternative view holds that the role of compromise has been overstated when it comes to understanding the impact of conflict on parent-adolescent relationships. According to this line of thought, negotiation is more apt to foster amity in voluntary relationships between peers than in parent-child relationships (Laursen & Pursell, 2009). Friendships and romantic relationships are predicated on mutuality and reciprocity. When disputes arise in these relationships, compromise is expected; negative affect is avoided as are unequal outcomes because each is a risk to relationship continuity. In contrast, parent-adolescent relationships are obligatory, with power unevenly distributed. Because relationship continuity does not require equal or fair outcomes, family members do not anticipate negotiated resolutions. Indeed, the hierarchical nature of the relationship invites resolutions that are imposed unilaterally. For this reason, conflict management tactics may not be the most salient feature of family conflicts. Family members are more apt than friends to express negative affect during a disagreement (Adams & Laursen, 2007). Negative affect during a dispute tends to linger, undermining warmth and relatedness between parents and children (Allen, Hauser, O'Connor, Bell, & Eickholt, 1996). Furthermore, friends are more apt than family members to take steps to mitigate expressions of anger after a dispute (Laursen, Hartup, & Koplas, 1996). For these reasons, the affective tenor of a disagreement may be more salient than the manner in which it was resolved in determining the impact of a dispute on parent-adolescent relationships.

Our investigation was designed to address the following question: To what extent is the perceived impact of conflict on the mother-adolescent relationship a product of compromise and to what extent is it a product of negative affect? Two studies of mother-adolescent conflict addressed this question, using concurrent and longitudinal child-report data. We know that strategies used to resolve parent-adolescent conflict predict changes in family climate (Rueter & Conger, 1995), but we do not know the degree to which this association is independent of the affective tenor of the dispute, raising the prospect that adverse relationship outcomes previously attributed to conflict resolutions (e.g., Hastings & Grusec, 1997) are instead due to the expression of negative affect. Consistent with previous studies (e.g., Laursen, 1993) we hypothesized that adolescent perceptions of compromise and negative affect would correlate with concurrent and prospective adverse relationship outcomes. Unlike previous studies, we expected youth negative affect to account for most of the shared variance in conflict outcomes because the hierarchical, obligatory nature of parent-adolescent relationships should minimize the importance of compromise.

Study 1

Participants

The sample included 55 8th grade middle school students and 46 9th grade high school students (68 girls, 33 boys), ranging from 13 to 16 years old ($M=13.89$, $SD=0.65$). There were 53 European Americans (52.48%), 21 Asian Americans (20.79%), 9 Hispanic Americans (8.91%), and 9 African Americans (8.91%), with the remainder identifying mixed and other ethnic backgrounds. Participants attended public schools in Montgomery County Maryland (metropolitan Washington DC). Parent and child reports indicated that 91 lived with 2 biological parents (90.10%) and 10 lived with a single biological mother (9.90%). Using parent reports of education and occupation, Hollingshead four factor (1975) socioeconomic scores ranged from 9 to 66 ($M=54.14$, $SD=10.28$) out of a potential range of 8 (e.g. laborer with a primary school education) to 66 (e.g. executives with a post-baccalaureate education). The 8th graders and the 9th graders did not differ on any study variable. A series of chi-square tests indicated that those who did and those who did not report conflict with mothers did not differ in terms of their grade, ethnicity, and household structure. The two groups did differ as a function of gender, $\chi^2_{(1)}=11.68$, $p<.001$; more females than males reported conflict with mothers.

Participants were recruited from a larger sample of students who had already agreed to participate in a peer nomination survey. Written parent consent and student assent was obtained prior to participation. Mothers of the 724 adolescents who participated in this earlier wave of data collection were later invited to participate in a study in which they and their children would receive surveys in the mail. Of those invited to participate, 31.9% ($n=231$) of youth received written parent consent and returned conflict questionnaires. Of those invited to participate, there were no demographic differences between youth who did and did not return conflict questionnaires. Of youth returning conflict questionnaires, 101 reported conflicts with mother.

Procedure

Prior to data collection, research assistants reviewed procedures with participants. Questionnaires were completed at home at the same time on three consecutive days: Thursday, Friday, and Saturday. These days were selected to ensure a sample of interactions during weekdays and on weekends. Questionnaires were collected the following Monday at school. Families were compensated as part of a larger longitudinal project.

Measures

Participants completed social interaction diaries that were based on the *Rochester Interaction Record* (Nezlek, 1993; Reis & Wheeler, 1991). Participants identified all social interactions lasting at least five minutes at the conclusion of each day for three consecutive days (Burk, Denissen, Van Doorn, Branje, & Laursen, 2009). For each interaction, participants indicated whether the exchange involved a disagreement. Participants then completed a modified version of the *Interpersonal Conflict Questionnaire* (Laursen, 1993), describing the characteristics of each disagreement.

Conflict was defined as disagreement: “You objected to something someone said or did, someone objected to something you said or did, or you and some had a quarrel or argument.” Participants answered several questions about the characteristics of each conflict, including one question concerning the resolution, three questions concerning the affective intensity, and one question about the perceived impact of the conflict on the relationship. Internal reliability could not be determined on single-item measures and too few participants reported multiple conflicts to calculate reliability across conflicts within individuals. However, mean level and rank-order stability have been demonstrated in multiple studies using similar interaction based assessments of conflict (Burk et al., 2009).

Number of conflicts describes the frequency of disagreements involving mothers. Participants reported an average of 1.40 ($SD=0.69$) disagreements per day with mothers.

Resolutions describe the behaviors that brought about a cessation of the disagreement (“How was the disagreement resolved?”). Participants chose one of five resolutions: we compromised; I gave in; other gave in; no resolution; and someone else resolved it.

Perceived compromise represents the proportion of all disagreements that a participant reported with mother that were resolved by compromise ($M=29.37\%$, $SD=43.02$).

Youth negative affect experienced describes the emotional intensity of the disagreement (“How did you feel during the disagreement?”). Participants separately rated happy, sad, and angry affect on 5-point scales that ranged from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*very*). These three components were derived from Experience Sampling Method of the affective tenor of social interactions (Larson & Czikszentmihalyi, 1983). Youth negative affect experienced represents the mean of the angry, sad, and reverse scored happy items, averaged across all disagreements reported by a participant ($M=3.73$, $SD=0.92$). Internal reliability was acceptable ($\alpha=.68$). The same pattern of statistically significant findings emerged when negative affect experienced was operationalized as only the angry item.

Adverse relationship impact describes the perceived consequences of the disagreement (“How did the disagreement affect your relationship?”). Participants rated each disagreement on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*made it better*) to 5 (*made it worse*), averaged across all disagreements reported by a participant ($M=3.04$, $SD=0.92$).

Data Analyses

Step-wise regression analyses examined the unique contribution of perceived compromise and youth negative affect experienced to concurrent adverse relationship impact, after controlling for demographic variables (e.g., child age, child sex, and SES) and number of conflicts with mothers. Data were not multicollinear (VIF= 1.03 to 1.15). Perceived compromise was positively skewed, but the same pattern of results emerged when using logarithmic transformations to adjust for skew (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The same pattern of results emerged when demographic variables were omitted from the first step of the analyses. Additional analyses indicated that there were no statistically significant interactions when demographic variables and conflict frequency were crossed with perceived compromise and youth negative affect experienced, and when youth negative affect experienced was crossed with perceived compromise.

Results and Discussion

A series of sex by ethnicity by household structure ANOVAs were conducted, with perceived compromise, youth negative affect experienced, and adverse relationship impact as the dependent variables. Main effects and interactions did not arise at levels greater than chance.

Correlations are presented in Table 1. Perceived compromise and youth negative affect experienced were inversely correlated. Adverse relationship impact was associated with both perceived compromise and youth negative affect experienced.

Table 2 summarizes the results of the stepwise regression analysis. Adverse relationship impact was the dependent variable. Demographic variables and total number of conflicts with mother were predictor variables on the first step. Perceived compromise and youth negative affect experienced were predictor variables on the second step. Negative affect experienced was positively associated with adverse relationship impact; as negative affect increased so did adverse relationship outcomes. The association between compromise and adverse relationship impact was not statistically significant. None of the control variables predicted adverse relationship impact.

Supplemental analyses confirmed these results. Youth negative affect experienced and perceived compromise were entered as predictors on separate steps in the regression analyses, with the initial step dedicated to control variables. When perceived compromise was entered on the second step as a predictor, youth negative affect experienced (on the third step) accounted for approximately 16% of the variance in adverse relationship impact, but when youth negative affect experienced was entered on the second step as a predictor, perceived compromise (on the third step) accounted for a nonsignificant (approximately 3%) portion of the variance in adverse relationship impact. The same pattern of statistically significant findings emerged when negative affect experienced was operationalized as only the angry item.

The results suggest that youth negative affect experienced is a stronger predictor than compromise of the impact of conflict on mother-adolescent relationships. There was no evidence that perceived compromise has a unique impact on adverse conflict outcomes; associations disappeared after accounting for the effect of youth negative affect experienced. Anger, sadness, and unhappiness appear to be the primary determinants of relationship damage arising from conflict.

To bolster confidence in these conclusions, we turn to a different sample and a different analytic strategy: Perceived compromise and youth negative affect experienced at one time point are used to predict changes in the impact of conflict on mother-adolescent relationships at a later time point. We employ a path analysis framework to illustrate the longitudinal nature of the association.

Study 2

Participants

The sample included 271 adolescents (159 girls, 112 boys) from public high schools in the Miami and Fort Lauderdale metropolitan area. Participants were in the 6th grade at the outset and ranged in age from 11 to 14 ($M=11.60$, $SD=0.55$). There were 78 (28.8%) African Americans, 87 (32.1%) European Americans, and 103 (37.7%) Hispanic Americans; the remainder did not specify ethnic backgrounds. Parent reports indicated that 213 (78.6%) lived with two biological parents, 20 (7.4%) lived with a single biological mother, and 38 (14%) lived with a biological mother and a step father. Hollingshead (1975) socioeconomic scores ranged from 11 to 66 ($M=37.24$, $SD=10.22$).

Participants were recruited from classrooms identified by principals as representative of the entire school body. Parent consent forms and letters describing the project were sent home from school with students. Written parent consent was obtained. Small cash incentives were offered for participation. Participation rates resembled those of previous studies (e.g., Silk, Steinberg, & Morris, 2003), ranging from approximately 45% to 75% within schools. Attrition rate from 6th grade to 7th grade was 19.81% ($N=52$).

Procedure

Questionnaires were administered at annual intervals in a quiet school setting in small group sessions. Research assistants read the instructions aloud and supervised the completion of the questionnaires. A total of 326 students completed questionnaires in the 6th grade. Three participants were omitted because they did not live with a mother or step-mother. An additional 50 students were omitted because they did not report conflict with mothers at either time point. Two students with outlier scores (3 SD above the mean) were also omitted.

A series of chi-square tests indicated that those who did and those who did not report conflict with mothers did not differ in terms of sex, household structure, and ethnicity, with one exception: Ethnic group differences emerged in the 7th grade, $\chi^2_{(2)}=18.44$, $p<.001$. More European Americans and Hispanic Americans reported conflict with mothers than African Americans. Similar analyses failed to reveal differences between those who participated in both waves of the study and those who only participated in one wave of the study ($N=66$ or 24.4%). Students with conflict in only one wave of data collection were included in the analyses. Full information maximum likelihood (FIML) procedures were applied. Little's MCAR test (Little & Rubin, 1987) revealed that data were missing completely at random, $\chi^2_{(14)}=10.00$, $p=.76$. Supplemental analyses restricted to participants with two complete waves of data yielded an identical pattern of statistically significant results.

Measures

Participants completed the *Interpersonal Conflict Questionnaire* (Laursen, 1993) in which they were asked to recall conflicts from the previous day. Conflict was defined as disagreement, using the definition given in Study 1. Participants reviewed a list of 34 conflict topics (e.g. chores, money, privacy, etc.) and were asked to identify the number of disagreements arising over each. Separate worksheets containing several questions about the

conflict were then completed for each identified disagreement. One question on each worksheet addressed the resolution of the conflict, two questions addressed the affective intensity, and one question addressed the perceived impact of the conflict on the relationship. Perceived compromise and adverse relationship impact were assessed with the same questions described in Study 1.

Number of conflicts describes the frequency of disagreements involving mothers. Participants reported an average of 7.82 ($SD=6.77$) disagreements per day with mothers in the 6th grade and 6.26 ($SD=6.08$) disagreements per day with mothers in the 7th grade.

Perceived compromise represents the proportion of all disagreements that a participant reported with mother that were resolved by “we compromised” (6th Grade: $M=48.98\%$, $SD=37.58$; 7th Grade: $M=49.66\%$, $SD=38.17$). *Adverse relationship impact* describes the consequences of the disagreement on the mother-adolescent relationship, averaged across all disagreements reported by the participant (6th Grade: $M=2.15$, $SD=0.81$; 7th Grade: $M=2.23$, $SD=0.84$). For those reporting multiple conflicts, intraclass correlations for adverse relationship impact ratings were calculated between conflicts, within individuals. The results suggest acceptable reliability ($r=.72$ to $.94$). *Youth negative affect experienced* represents the mean of two items averaged across all disagreements reported by the participant (6th Grade: $M=2.63$, $SD=0.96$; 7th Grade: $M=2.65$, $SD=0.94$): “How did you feel during the disagreement?” “How did you feel after the disagreement?” Internal reliability was good ($\alpha=.84-.85$). Participants rated each on a 5-point scale that ranged from 1 (*friendly*) to 5 (*angry*). For those reporting multiple conflicts, intraclass correlations for negative affect ratings were calculated between conflicts, within individuals. The results indicated good reliability ($r=.81$ to $.94$). The same pattern of statistically significant findings emerged when negative affect experienced was operationalized as only how one felt during the disagreement.

Adolescent reports from the *Network of Relationships Inventory* (NRI; Furman & Buhrmester, 1985) were used as control variables. Sixth grade participants rated items describing the mother-child relationship on a scale ranging from 1 (*little or none*) to 5 (*the most*). *Social support* included 24 items that describe admiration, affection, companionship, instrumental aid, intimacy, nurturance, reliable alliance, and satisfaction (e.g., How satisfied are you with your relationship with this person?). *Negativity* included 6 items that describe annoying behaviors and conflict (e.g., How much do you and this person get on each other’s nerves?). Item scores were averaged to create subscales. Internal reliability was adequate ($\alpha=.87-.92$).

Data Analyses

Path analysis using Mplus 6.11 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998–2012) examined longitudinal associations from 6th grade perceived compromise and 6th grade youth negative affect experienced to 7th grade adverse relationship impact, controlling for the stability of each variable as well as the number of mother-child conflicts at each time point. A χ^2 difference test contrasted paths that predicted adverse relationship impact by calculating the difference in the chi square values of the original model and a model with the paths constrained to equality. A fully saturated model was originally estimated; all nonsignificant paths were

trimmed with the exception of the hypothesized path from 6th grade perceived compromise to 7th grade relationship impact. The frequency of mother-child conflict was positively skewed at both time points, but the same pattern of results emerged when using logarithmic transformations to adjust for skew (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

To test for sex differences in patterns of association, multiple group models contrasted paths for boys and girls. No statistically significant differences were found. Similar analyses failed to reveal ethnic group differences. To address the possibility that results were driven by troubled families who experience low levels of compromise and high levels of negative affect, we controlled for perceptions of support and negativity in mother-child relationships (in addition to rates of conflict). Time 1 reports of relationship quality (i.e. social support and relationship negativity) were added to the model as control variables that were correlated with all other Time 1 variables. Table 1 describes correlations between predictor variables and relationship quality variables. The same pattern of statistically significant results emerged when relationship quality variables were included in and excluded from the model. We report the latter to simplify the presentation.

Results and Discussion

A series of sex by ethnicity by household structure ANOVAs were conducted, with perceived compromise, youth negative affect experienced, and adverse relationship impact as the dependent variables. Main effects and interactions did not arise at levels greater than chance.

Correlations are presented in Table 1. Grade 6 adverse relationship impact was inversely correlated with Grade 6 perceived compromise and directly correlated with Grade 6 youth negative affect experienced. Grade 7 adverse relationship impact was inversely related to Grade 6 perceived compromise, and directly related to Grade 6 youth negative affect experienced and Grade 6 adverse relationship impact.

Figure 1 summarizes the results of the path analysis. Model fit was adequate [CFI=.99, RMSEA=.02, $\chi^2_{(10, N=271)}=10.69, p=.38$]. The results indicate that 6th grade youth negative affect experienced predicted changes in 7th grade adverse relationship impact, but 6th grade perceived compromise did not predict changes in 7th grade adverse relationship impact. Differences between the paths predicting 7th grade adverse relationship impact were statistically significant ($\chi^2_{(1)}=4.25, p<.05$). The same pattern of statistically significant findings emerged when negative affect experienced was operationalized as only how one felt during the disagreement.

The findings from Study 2 replicate and extend those of Study 1. Replication came in the form of results indicating that adverse relationship outcomes are more strongly associated with concurrent negative affect experienced than concurrent perceived compromise. Extension came in the form of results indicating that regardless of the initial quality of the relationship, youth negative affect in the 6th grade anticipates changes in adverse relationship outcomes in the 7th grade, but perceived compromise in the 6th grade does not.

General Discussion

What predicts whether conflict will have an adverse impact on mother-adolescent relationships? Findings from our two studies indicate that although perceived compromise and youth negative affect experienced are both correlated with outcomes, youth negative affect accounts for a greater portion of unique variance in adverse relationship impact. The temporal sequence implied by the cross-sectional data was confirmed with longitudinal data: Youth negative affect uniquely anticipated a worsening of mother-adolescent relationships in response to conflict one year later. In each case, concurrent and longitudinal associations between perceived and adverse relationship outcomes were attenuated when both were included in the same model, rendering associations with compromise nonsignificant and (in longitudinal analyses) negligible. The findings are not driven by poor quality relationships; associations hold at all levels of mother-adolescent social support, negativity and conflict.

Replication strengthens confidence in the conclusions. The two studies differed in the demographic composition of the samples and in the data collection procedures. Different methods and different samples yielded differences in conflict reports. Responding to a lengthy list of conflict topics, youth in Study 2 reported more conflicts than youth in Study 1, who did not have a list of conflict topics to draw upon. Although it may be tempting to ascribe differences to demographic characteristics, a growing body of evidence suggests that conflict reports resemble other event frequency reports in that they vary dramatically as a function of data collection procedures (Laursen, Denissen, & Bjorklund, 2012). Rates of conflict reported in the present studies closely resemble rates from comparable studies in which participants did and did not respond to a list of conflict topics (Dirghangi, Laursen, Puder, Bjorklund & DeLay, 2014). Compared to those simply asked to recount the number of disagreements arising the previous day, children, adolescents and young adults all reported more disagreements when given a list of conflict topics that served as memory prompts. Despite differences in samples and mean level differences in reports of conflict, associations between conflict variables were remarkably consistent across studies, lending considerable credibility to the results.

Conflict is not uniformly deleterious. Moderate levels of conflict promote positive adjustment in parent-child relationships characterized by warmth, support, and trust, whereas the same amount of conflict has been linked to maladjustment for those in relationships characterized by hostility and negativity (Adams & Laursen, 2007). Therefore, it would be a mistake to conclude that compromise is irrelevant to individual outcomes. Nevertheless, family relationships are clearly more susceptible to negative affect than to the failure to compromise. Anger is associated with a distinct set of autonomic responses and individuals who trigger it may be encoded as agents who threaten well-being (Levine & Pizarro, 2004). It is not unusual in obligatory relationships for participants to develop interaction patterns that include expressions of anger that have the potential to alter the tenor of the affiliation. Confident that the relationship will continue, many parents and children behave in ways that inadvertently link the affiliation to distress responses. It remains to be seen whether similar processes are at work in friend relationships, which place a much higher emphasis on compromise and equality (Laursen & Hartup, 2002).

The investigation is not without limitations. The findings do not describe the outcomes of specific conflicts but rather aggregated individual reports of relationship outcomes and their association with aggregated individual reports of conflict behavior. Perceived compromise proportion scores were obtained from categorical responses, which meant that values were limited by the number of conflicts reported. As a consequence, perceived compromise scores probably contained more error variance than the youth negative affect experienced and relationship impact variables, which were scored on scales. Some of this systematic error was accounted for by controlling for the number of conflicts reported, but percentage scores remain blunt instruments when few events are reported (Cohen, Cohen, Aiken, & West, 2003). Single item indicators may be of concern, particularly in Study 1, where most participants only described one conflict. Negative affect experienced may be a better predictor of conflict outcomes than perceived compromise proportion scores because the former combines more items and is more reliable than the latter. This concern is attenuated by the fact that a similar pattern of results emerged when a single item measure of negative affect experienced was adopted. The data came exclusively from adolescent reports. Mothers tend to view family interactions differently than adolescent children, reporting less conflict but more negative repercussions from disagreements (see Laursen & Collins, 2009, for review). Participation rates were low, raising the possibility that troubled families were under-represented. Fathers were not included in the analyses because the percentage of adolescents reporting conflicts was low, raising concerns about generalizability and the interpretation of null findings. Mother-child and father-child relationships are both involuntary and hierarchical, so we would expect the two to evince similar associations between negative affect, perceived compromise, and relationship outcomes. Annual assessments are a suboptimal means of assessing change in events assessed on a daily basis. Data collected more frequently and at shorter intervals (e.g., monthly) would have greater stability and allow for a meaningful test of mediation. We could not test whether negative affect experienced mediates the association between perceived compromise and adverse relationship impact, because three waves of data are required to test longitudinal mediation (Fritz & MacKinnon, 2012). Our two-wave longitudinal results suggest, however, that mediation is unlikely, because there were no over-time links between negative affect experienced and perceived compromise. Finally, our measure of experienced negative affect failed to distinguish expressed emotions from emotions that were not expressed. Presumably conflation of the two resulted in an underestimation of associations involving experienced negative affect; conflict escalation is less likely to occur when anger is suppressed than when it is expressed.

In family relationship terms, it would seem that compromise is not necessarily good and failure to compromise is not necessarily bad. Instead, detrimental outcomes appear to be contingent on feelings of anger, sadness, and unhappiness, which tend to be accompanied by intemperate behavior and disruptive enmity. These conclusions hold considerable practical significance. Scholars and practitioners who advise families that negotiated resolutions to disagreements help to avoid relationship disruption may be discouraged in their efforts unless a similar emphasis is placed on minimizing negative affect. Maintaining a friendly, nonthreatening family climate may be the single most important aspect in managing the

disagreements that arise between parents and children who are navigating normative developmental transitions during the adolescent years.

Acknowledgments

This investigation was supported by a grant to Kenneth H. Rubin from the US National Institute of Mental Health (MH58116) and by grants to Brett Laursen from the US National Institute of Child Health and Human Behavior (HD33006) and from the US National Science Foundation (0923745, 0909733). We would like to express our appreciation to Gwen Pursell and the students, parents, teachers,

References

- Adams R, Laursen B. The organization and dynamics of adolescent conflict with parents and friends. *Journal of Marriage and Family*. 2001; 63:97–110.
- Adams RE, Laursen B. The correlates of conflict: Disagreement is not necessarily detrimental. *Journal of Family Psychology*. 2007; 21:445–458. [PubMed: 17874930]
- Allen JP, Hauser ST, O'Connor TG, Bell KL, Eichholt C. The connection of observed hostile family conflict to adolescents' developing autonomy and relatedness with parents. *Development and Psychopathology*. 1996; 8:425–442.
- Burk WJ, Denissen J, van Doorn M, Branje SJT, Laursen B. The vicissitudes of conflict measurement: Stability and reliability in the frequency of disagreements. *European Psychologist*. 2009; 14:153–159.
- Canary, DJ.; Cupach, WR.; Messman, SJ. *Relationship conflict: Conflict in parent-child, friendship, and romantic relationships*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage; 1995.
- Cohen, J.; Cohen, P.; West, SG.; Aiken, LS. *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. 3. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum; 2003.
- Dirghangi S, Laursen B, Puder J, Bjorklund DF, DeLay D. 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. *Journal of Adolescence*. 2014; 37(7):965–972. [PubMed: 25086497]
- Eisenberg N, Hofer C, Spinrad TL, Gershoff ET, Valiente C, Losoya S, Maxon E. Understanding mother-adolescent conflict discussions: Concurrent and across-time prediction from youths' dispositions and parenting. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*. 2008; 73(2)
- Furman W, Buhrmester D. Children's perceptions of the personal relationships in their social networks. *Developmental Psychology*. 1985; 21:10016–11024.
- Fritz, MS.; MacKinnon, DP. Mediation models for developmental data. In: Laursen, B.; Little, TD.; Card, NA., editors. *Handbook of developmental research methods*. New York: Guilford; 2012. p. 291-310.
- Hastings P, Grusec JE. Conflict outcome as a function of parental accuracy in perceiving child cognitions and affect. *Social Development*. 1997; 6:76–90.
- Herrenkohl TI, Kosterman R, Hawkins JD, Mason WA. Effects of growth in family conflict in adolescence on adult depressive symptoms: Mediating and moderating effects of stress and school bonding. *Journal of Adolescent Health*. 2009; 44:146–152. [PubMed: 19167663]
- Hollingshead, AB. *Four Factor Index of Social Status*. New Haven CT: Yale University; 1975. Unpublished manuscript
- Larson R, Csikszentmihalyi M. The experience sampling method. *New Directions for Methodology of Social & Behavioral Science*. 1983; 15:41–56.
- Laursen B. The perceived impact of conflict on adolescent relationships. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*. 1993; 39:535–550.
- Laursen B, Collins WA. Interpersonal conflict during adolescence. *Psychological Bulletin*. 1994; 115:197–209. [PubMed: 8165270]

- Laursen, B.; Collins, WA. Parent-child relationships during adolescence. In: Lerner, R.; Steinberg, L., editors. *Handbook of adolescent psychology: Vol. 2. Contextual influences on adolescent development*. 3. New York: Wiley; 2009. p. 3-42.
- Laursen B, DeLay D, Adams RE. Trajectories of perceived support in mother-adolescent relationships: The poor quality get poorer. *Developmental Psychology*. 2010; 46:1792–1798. [PubMed: 21058837]
- 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. 65-81.
- Laursen B, Hafen CA. Future directions in the study of close relationships: Conflict is bad (except when it's not). *Social Development*. 2010; 19:858–872. [PubMed: 20953335]
- Laursen B, Hartup WW. The origins of reciprocity and social exchange in friendships. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*. 2002; 2002(95):27–40. [PubMed: 11933530]
- Laursen B, Hartup WW, Koplas AL. Towards understanding peer conflict. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly* (1982-). 1996:76–102.
- 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.
- Levine LJ, Pizarro DA. Emotion and memory research: A grumpy overview. *Social Cognition*. 2004; 22:530–554.
- Little, RJA.; Rubin, DB. *Statistical analysis with missing data*. New York: Wiley; 1987.
- Muthén, LK.; Muthén, BO. *Mplus user's guide*. 7. Los Angeles: Muthén & Muthén; 1998–2012.
- Nezlek JB. The stability of social interaction. *Journal of Personality and social Psychology*. 1993; 65:930–941.
- Reis HT, Wheeler L. Studying social interaction with the Rochester Interaction Record. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. 1991; 24:269–318.
- Rueter MA, Conger RD. Antecedents of parent-adolescent disagreements. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 1995; 57:435–448.
- Shantz CU. Conflict between children. *Child Development*. 1987; 58:283–305.
- Silk JS, Steinberg L, Morris AS. Adolescents' emotion regulation in daily life: Links to depressive symptoms and problem behavior. *Child Development*. 2003; 74:1869–1880. [PubMed: 14669901]
- Smetana JG, Campione-Barr N, Metzger A. Adolescent development in interpersonal and societal contexts. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 2005; 57:255–284.
- Tabachnick, BG.; Fidell, LS. *Using multivariate statistics*. 5. Boston: Allyn and Bacon; 2007.

Figure 1.

Youth negative affect and perceived compromise in Grade 6 as predictors of change in adverse impact on mother-adolescent relationship from Grade 6 to Grade 7 ($N = 271$). Standardized regression weights are reported.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 1

Correlations among Study Variables for Study 1 (N=101) and Study 2 (N=271).

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Study 1									
1. Number of conflicts	-								
2. Perceived Compromise	-.10	-							
3. Youth Negative Affect	.06	-.33*							
4. Adverse Relationship Impact	.07	-.29*	.42*	-					
Study 2									
1. Number of conflicts T1	-								
2. Perceived Compromise T1	-.06	-							
3. Youth Negative Affect T1	.25*	-.24*	-						
4. Adverse Relationship Impact T1	.16*	-.38*	.62*	-					
5. Social Support T1	-.16*	.22*	-.26*	-.35*	-				
6. Relationship Negativity T1	.23*	-.09	.20*	.21*	-.22*	-			
7. Number of conflicts T2	.32*	.06	.05	-.08	.05	.21*	-		
8. Perceived Compromise T2	-.13	.21*	-.15*	-.19*	.23*	-.14*	.01	-	
9. Youth Negative Affect T2	.14*	-.09*	.46*	.28*	-.30*	.20*	.11	-.27*	-
10. Adverse Relationship Impact T2	.12	-.14*	.40*	.49*	-.33*	.11	.09	-.36*	.60*

Note.

* $p < .05$.** $p < .01$.

Table 2

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Perceived Compromise and Youth Negative Affect Predicting Concurrent Adverse Relationship Impact: Study 1 (N=101)

Variable	Model 1			Model 2		
	B	SE	β	B	SE	β
Total Conflict	0.07	0.14	0.06	0.02	0.13	0.02
Age	0.02	0.16	0.01	0.09	0.14	0.06
Sex	0.12	0.21	0.06	0.20	0.19	0.11
SES	0.01	0.01	0.09	0.02	0.01	0.18
Perceived Compromise				-0.37	0.22	-0.18
Youth Negative Affect				0.38	0.09	0.42**
R^2		0.01			0.24	
F for change in R^2		0.27			4.46**	

Note.

* $p < .05$.

** $p < .01$.