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**Information for Outside Research Groups on Learning and Using The System**

This system has been successfully adopted, as of September 2012 by approximately 15 other research groups (including two in Germany that have translated it into German). If you are interested in adopting it for your own research project you should know:

It generally takes about 12 weeks of work (at about 4 -6 hours/week) to learn to use the system reliably.

We are *happy* to help people in this process and can do so in several ways. We have a set of 5 pre-coded and annotated “training tapes” available for use.

We also generally are able to find an advanced doctoral student or post-doc who knows the system well and who can assist in training. We generally look to see them paid for their time at a rate of $30 - $40/hour. Usually they meet via phone for an hour or so a week with a group that is getting trained. Some groups have also chosen to have a more intensive 1 - 2 day training period at the outset led by this person.

We ask only that you keep us informed of results of research with the system, cite it appropriately in your reports, and let us know if you see ways of improving it.

A listing of publications using the system is included at the end of this manual, but the most up-to-date listing of our own publications will be available at the publications section of our web site (which also includes downloadable, full-text articles): [www.teenresearch.org](http://www.teenresearch.org).

# General Principles

The overall goal of the coding system is to identify behaviors promoting and inhibiting autonomy and relatedness in interactions between family members. To maximize the reliability of this system, it is essential that you carefully follow the procedure described below when coding a family discussion.

This coding system codes family interactions on the dyadic level. This means it does not attempt to code global patterns of family interaction, but rather, it focuses upon the patterns of interaction between individual dyads within the family (i.e. "mother to adolescent" or "father to mother"). Also, this system codes each member’s interactions separately within a dyad. Thus, for each behavior coded in a dyad, you will have a code for speech of the adolescent to the parent and a code for speech of the parent toward the adolescent.

The procedure takes place in three steps.

Step 1: Overview of the Family Discussion

First, you should listen to the family discussion one time in its entirety while reading along on the transcribed version of the discussion. The goal in this pass through the discussion is to get as good a feel as possible for the general tone of the discussion, as well as for the basic positions taken by each family member. For this reason, you should generally listen to the discussion without stopping or replaying sections of it, except in those few cases where this is necessary to understand what parties are saying. The object of this pass through the tape is to hear the discussion in "real time" as you would hear it if you were listening to it live.

During this pass, you should probably eventually be able to jot notes very quickly on your transcript, to highlight what appear to be important interactions or speeches to which you will want to pay particular attention on your next pass through the data, or which you want to be sure you don't miss.

Step 2: Second Pass through the Discussion: Coding the Discussion

In this pass through the discussion, you will be paying close attention to each speech, noting on your coding sheet to which codes it is relevant. Because each code represents the entirety of a member's speech to another member, this system will allow you to keep track of relevant speeches for each code. Although the final codes assigned are cumulative in nature (i.e. more, or a higher level of a particular type of speech yields a higher score), it is generally possible to enter a tentative score for a given code each time a speech occurs which is relevant to that code. In other words, each time you find a behavior relevant to a code--such as a critical comment from mother to adolescent--, note this on your scoring sheet, including the speech # on the transcript. After completing the coding, you will go back through your worksheet and decide the overall code for a dyad in a given category.

When doing this second pass, you should listen to a section of the tape (i.e. one disagreement), and then go back and carefully examine the transcript speech by speech and assign codes. You should expect to frequently replay speeches to make final coding decisions about them. In other words, look at the transcript, but don't over-rely on your memory regarding tone of voice etc. When in doubt, listen again.

Note that a speech may be relevant to more than one code, and should be coded as such. Also, pay particular attention to the tone and context within which speeches are made. For example, a question asked in a sarcastic and hostile tone and context would not be scored under the code for "information seeking queries". However, be careful not to become too impressionistic in interpreting tone of voice. If a speech is ambiguous in tone, it should be interpreted in accordance with its literal content.

Step 3: Checking your scores

When you're done with the second pass through the tape, go back and look over the scores you've given. Review the criteria by which you gave each score and determine whether the score you've given truly meets the criteria. At this time you can make decisions about any scores about which you were uncertain, by re-reviewing (on the transcript, or on the tape if necessary) speeches relevant to that code.

What to do when families deviate from assigned topic:

If a dyad discontinues discussion on the topic originally assigned, continue coding only if the new topic being discussed concerns a substantive area of disagreement. If the dyad moves on to a trivial disagreement or a topic that is not a disagreement, scoring should be discontinued. Note that coding may be resumed if and when the family resumes discussing a disagreement. If either party is on topic (or trying to be), then score the entire part of this discussion.

We count a dyad as being off topic, if there’s really not any way to translate what they’re talking about into a reason related to their disagreement, and typically, this happens for more than just a sentence or two.

What not to code:

Stop coding if the people say they are done and a reasonable interviewer would say they are done. OR, if they don’t say they are done, but have finished all the disagreements and are pausing or making clear (even briefly) that they don’t have anything else to do…stop there, EVEN if at some point after that they restart the discussion, as long as it has really ended once first. If the kids are done disagreeing and they think they are done, then its over.

Code everything prior to that point, whether or not on task.

**Guidelines for Specific Codes**

For those specific codes where ratings are done primarily at the level of individual speeches (i.e., recanting, overpersonalizing, pressuring, queries, validating, ignoring and hostility) See scoring guidelines at end of manual for instructions on combining scores to yield a total score for the transcript.

# Behaviors Promoting Autonomy

The following behaviors all promote a reasoned discussion of differences within a family by modeling and encouraging such discussions.

## A. States Reasons clearly for disagreeing

Definitional Overview: **One way to exhibit autonomy in a disagreement is by making statements that advance your own position.**

**Such statements are referred to as “points”, and are scored according to the amount of information that they provide about why a speaker holds a given position, belief, or behavior. Both frequency and quality of points are taken into account in this scale, such that a speaker can achieve a mid-range score by either providing one point that is thoroughly followed up, or several simple points that aren’t necessarily linked. However, in order to achieve the highest score, a speaker must make more than one point, and more than one of those points must be thoroughly followed up.**

Often dyads will change topics over the course of a discussion. Speakers are given credit for points promoting reasons (statements trying to be persuasive regarding their position) related to any disagreement that they discuss. Points across different topics are combined to yield the final score. Note that in order to count for coding reasons, disagreements must be about substantive topics that are related to adolescent issues. There may be exceptions to this rule, but if dyads shift to discussing minor issues (e.g. where to go to eat after the family visit), points raised in such discussions do *not* count towards the reasons score.

Criteria for rating points is given below. After each point is classified as vague, simple, briefly followed up, or thoroughly followed up, the coder should consult the table at the end of the section to determine the overall score for reasons. Speakers who provide only vague points receive a 0 on this scale; speakers who provide simple points will generally fall in the 1 to 2 range; speakers who give briefly followed up points will be in the 1 to 2.5 range, and those using thoroughly followed-up points will fall in the 2.5 to 4 range.

Note that credit is given for advancing points via straightforward statements (e.g. “I think I should be allowed to go out on week nights, as long as we don’t have any family plans.”), or via suggestions/negotiation (e.g. “Is it okay if I go out on week nights - as long as we don’t have any family plans?”).

Credit is also given for statements that advance the discussion by laying out possible areas for legitimate compromise or consensus, provided some new thought, plan or information is being offered (but not for simply agreeing or recanting).

**1. Non-points:** Statements that are irrelevant to the discussion (e.g., in a discussion about grades, saying “ I think my brother lies a lot”) are non-points, and are not considered in scoring reasons.

**2. Vague points** - These statements may be related to the disagreement, but either they do not address why a specific belief/position is held (or explain behaviors), or they do so in such a limited way that the meaning of the statement is questionable. The speaker may be attempting to advance and/or explain a position, but what they are attempting to defend is not clear. The statements are so vague that the degree of inference necessary to extract a position or reason from these statements is such that any number of positions could be fit to the same statement.

Brief statements advancing a position without going further to provide any reasoning are also classified here. Statements such as “yes you do” (have money to give me), “I don’t wanna” (babysit), (my failing) “health (class) is your fault” are examples of brief assertions of a position that are classified as vague. Finally, defensive points about one’s own behavior (e.g. saying “I do my homework” when parent accuses teen of not doing homework; saying “I do walk away” when parent suggests that teen walk away in fights with siblings) should also be scored as vague.

Note the examples below are classified as vague according to the context of the disagreement that they occurred in. Each statement must be evaluated in relation to previous and following statements for clarity/relevance to disagreement.

Example #1 of a vague point (topic is grounding - teen doesn’t want to be grounded during spring break):

A: ...Cause like..well. I, cause I’m probably gonna be playing basketball. You know, during most of the days. You know. *(Later, teen asserts that he doesn’t mind being grounded during the week because he will be playing basketball and can’t stay out late anyway. However, at the point of this statement, it is not at all clear how playing basketball is related to his ideas about being grounded, so the statement is classified as vague. )*

Example #2 of a vague point (a disagreement about money):

M: Okay, so what other areas of money do you want to discuss?

A: I don’t care. I’d like to go shopping and stuff. *(This may be a brief assertion of position - e.g. I want money to go shopping - but it could also be that teen is changing the topic, wants to go shopping after the visit, etc. Therefore, statement is vague in the absence of further clarification.)*

Example #3 of a vague point (discussion is about whether & who teen can date):

A: No see. But it’s, it’s not my own decision. *(Without elaboration, it is not at all clear what teen means by this statement. What, exactly, is not his own decision? How does this issue relate to his reasons regarding dating? Although you can infer a reasonable position from this statement, the content of this speech does not provide enough information to do so reliably).*

Example #4 of a vague point (in form of a demand; discussion is about dating):

A: I’m going to have money, but y’all shouldn’t mind giving me some. *(This appears to be a brief assertion of a position - e.g. wanting parents to fund his dates - but without further elaboration, the exact position that the teen is taking is not clear.)*

**3. Unfollowed-up “simple” points** - Statements that make a point about the discussion, without any follow-up and/or restatement, are considered simple points. A simple point is clearly intended to advance a position about the topic, and includes any statement that makes a point directly related to the disagreement (not just the broad topic area). Statements can be either directly or indirectly related to the position. For example, in defense of a poor grade in a class, a speaker can directly state that he/she does not like the teacher. However, the speaker could make this same point more indirectly by commenting on the teacher’s qualities (e.g. “that teacher is mean, boring, etc.”). The key here is that the speaker is contributing information that communicates at least in a small way about why they hold a belief/position and/or why they engage in specific behaviors. However, the coder may have to do some work to infer the speaker’s point from these statements.

Example #1 of two simple points (in a discussion about grades/homework):

A: I do my homework. Sometimes I stay after school and do it then instead.

A: When I come home, I sometimes have a game or go outside and play. (teen gets credit for two separate points about why he doesn’t do his homework right after school; they are not linked to each other by the teen, and therefore he does not get credit for a briefly followed up point as defined below; context of discussion plays a role here - teen is making defensive points in response to mom, and his reasoning comes across as scattered)

Example #2 of a simple point (in a discussion about teen being allowed to date):

M: Well, yeah, in the past, you’re sixteen now. But you were, when you talked about it, you were probably about 14, 15.

A: I was mature enough.

M: I’m not sure about that, but…

A: Well, then I was 15 then. I mean, you know, fifteen/sixteen is just a number, you know. That’s all it is. (A’s statements above together count as one simple point)

Example #3 of a simple point (in a discussion about the teen fighting with his sibs):

M: Why is it so hard to ignore them?

A: Cause most of the time, they just keep messin’ with me. It’s hard to ignore somebody that keep on messing with you. *(one simple point)*

Example #4 of a simple point (in the form of a suggestion; discussion about going out):

A: ...I’m just asking, is it all right if I go out tonight. You know, its not one of our nights we have anything planned, it’s just an open night, like Tuesday. What if I say, Tuesday I want to go out?

**4. Briefly followed-up points** - A briefly followed-up point is distinguished from an unfollowed-up ”simple” point in that it provides more information regarding why an individual believes something/holds a specific position. The individual makes a point and follows up on it, but the follow-up adds a limited amount of information to the point. The quantity of the follow-up is considered; however, a speaker can say a lot (e.g. detailed descriptions/examples) without providing any new, meaningful information.

Some ways to follow-up that are scored here include: restatements of reasons to provide some new information or slant, providing single examples supporting the point (or a long list of examples that are redundant). Examples and restatements may be less cohesive than in a thoroughly followed-up point, and the coder may have to work somewhat harder to pull out the point from the speaker’s statements (however, the overall point is still clear). Note that simply re-stating a point does not count as follow-up.

Example #1 of a briefly followed-up point (discussion about grades): (Note that this example represents the *minimum* amount of reasoning/follow-up that qualifies as a briefly followed-up point.)

A36: They’re okay. I think I’m passing all of it, especially English. *(simple point)*

M36: Why do you think? You should know.

A37: (unclear) the average. I’m passing all the classes so far. *(repeat of A36)*

M37: What do you have in... reading?

A38: Like a C or a B? *(brief list of redundant examples follows - no more credit given at this point as they are all stated in response to mom’s questions)*

M38: What do you have in math?

A39: Like an 81 ... An A.

M39: What do you have in ...science? That’s the one…

A40: Like a D. That’s better than last time. *(new information provided here about how he is doing in school - point becomes briefly followed-up, but just barely)*

Example #2 of a briefly followed-up point (discussion about grades):

M: You was very good in science, cause you always got a B in that class. Now what made you fall in that class?

A: Cause all he do is work us there, he ain’t do nothing like last year. Last year was funner than this year. *(simple point about why he is not* doing *as well in science)*

A: Labs. Yeah. The only thing he do is worksheets.

A: Only it’s only things you got to define. The only think you’re doing is defining things off the top of your head. *(teen gives examples/elaborates on what is not fun in these two statements, providing more information that is attempting to be persuasive - becomes a briefly followed up point)*

Example #3 of a briefly followed-up point (discussion about clothes - mom doesn’t like teen wearing sweatshirts in the hot weather):

A: But I don’t be gettin’ hot though. *(speaker is implying "I don't get hot wearing a sweatshirt"; at this point, reasoning is vague)*

A: See, I don’t get hot as fast as others. I can take heat. *(becomes a simple point, but not enough new information yet to be briefly followed up)*

A: I don’t even sweat when I be... *(some new information; candidate for a briefly followed up point)*

A: I think it be cool in a sweatshirt. Y’know, materials more thick and it holds in cool air. *(adds new information, definitely briefly followed up at this point)*

Example # 4 of a briefly followed-up point (in the form of a suggestion, discussion about grades)

M: ... OK, let's look at it this way. Why don't you say, on the courses that you know you can work with, with little effort like, like your literature, your English class, because you write well. Why don't you work on getting those in, making sure that you keep your grade up in those, *(up to here, a simple point in form of a suggestion)* and then the ones that you know you have problems with, and, and your homework, your homework assignments are gonna be late, at least maybe you'll have something to balance off, and your grade point average will be better?  *(adds new information regarding why this particular solution is a good strategy)* Can you do that?

**5. Thoroughly-followed-up points** - Thoroughly followed up points consist of several points that are linked together, such that the speaker is not just throwing out reasons that are unrelated to one another. These points are followed-up extensively and cohesively. Both the quantity and the quality of the follow-up for these points are important; however, quality is really the key difference between these points and briefly followed-up points. In giving thoroughly followed-up points, the speaker provides a lot of additional information to support a line of reasoning.

Some of the ways that speakers can follow-up thoroughly include: providing relevant examples that are incorporated into a coherent position and/or restating reasons in different ways such that new information is conveyed and the person’s position is clarified (and the coder doesn’t have to put in a lot of effort to extract the point of the person’s statements). Note that thoroughly followed up points will almost always occur over the course of several statements by the speaker (vs. appearing coherently in a single speech).

*\*\*NOTE: below examples are probably on high end of this category*

Example #1 of a thoroughly followed-up point (conversation about grades - mom thinks teen can do better):

A: Yeah, there's no one in any, there's no one who has all of my courses who gets all A's. There are only I think five people who have all of the advanced courses I have.

A: Yes, There's no one who has a tougher schedule. *(up to here, teen could receive credit for a briefly followed up point, with this statement as the main point and the above one as the follow-up explaining how his schedule is tough.)*

A: K, um, last year, in my science class, there was one who got an A for the year, and in my algebra class last year, there was one person who got an A for the year. (*example that adds new information,* *further persuading re: how tough schedule is, not possible to do any better than he is doing)*:

A: That was me. I was the only person. So there is no one doing better than me. *(teen links example in A11 to main line of reasoning - providing extensive information about his position; at this point statements are a strong candidate for a thoroughly followed-up point)*

A: And, and in science, there are people doing better than me, but no one is getting straight A's. No one got straight A's in science last year. NO one got four A's in science last year, no one got three A's in science last year, one person got two very high A's in the first semester and the last semester, and every semester in between got B's and... *(definitely a thoroughly followed up point with this additional example - follows through with line of reasoning)*

Example #2 of a thoroughly followed-up point (conversation about teen’s ex-boyfriend - mom thinks teen should not see ex-boyfriend):

A: I don't know if I can be like that though. *(teen's position, clarified in next line)*

A: I don't- I don't- I don't want to just have to ignore him, I want to still be able to be friends with him *(teen clarifies position alluded to in 1st statement, goes on to give a reason about why she doesn’t want to ignore ex-boyfriend)*, I shared a year and a half of my life with him, like you and Dad, you don't see each other every day but you're still friends- *(at this point, teen has made a simple point)*

A: I mean that's just- that's just like- Oh my goodness. What if I see him in public, if I run into him in public, I'm not just going to walk by like I don't know him or something…. *(example of how she doesn't want to behave; no real new information here)*

A: I mean (both talking) I'm still going to be friends with him just like I'm friends with any other guy I used to date or something. *(gives new information as to why she doesn’t want to ignore ex; at this point, statements qualify for a briefly followed-up point)*

A: ...And I- see I can't just go ahead and just say well y'know that was then, it's over 'cause- it's just not that easy, I mean I still care for him as a person, I want him to be happy in life and y'know get-go back to school, get his electrician's stuff, I know that's what he wants to be and- *(two additional reasons, gives new information extending her justification for her position; at this point gets credit for a thoroughly followed-up point)*

A: ... It's hard to say, I'm not going to-I can't be like I'm never going to speak to Aaron and blah, blah, and I don't like him. And y'know if somebody mentions his name I'm not going to go like that or anything 'cause it's not like that, I-I don't hate Aaron, I don't dislike Aaron, y'know-I don't know-it's hard to just- *(latter part of statement in which she says she doesn’t hate/dislike Aaron gives more new information about why teen doesn’t want to ignore him)*

*NOTE: As is illustrated in above examples, statements that start out at a lower level (e.g. vague or simple) may become higher with the addition of follow up. Additional examples and/or restatements may bring the line of reasoning up depending on 1. how much the additions clarify the position; 2. how much new information is conveyed; and 3. how cohesive/linked together the follow up is.*

**Scoring**: Assign an overall score according to the number and quality of reasons, as outlined in the grid below. Note that you only need to meet the criteria in any one column to get that score. Note also that there are only 2 defined places in which combinations of different types of reasons increases a score. However, it is appropriate to increase a score up to 0.5 point for additional reasoning (e.g. assigning a score of 2.5 for 2 briefly followed up points plus several simple points).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Thoroughly Followed-up points | Briefly Followed-up points | Un-followed-up ”Simple” Points | Vague Points |
| 0 |  |  | up to 2 | any number |
| .5 |  |  | 2-3 |  |
| 1 |  | 1 | 4-5 |  |
| 1.5 |  | 1 + 2 or more simple | 6-7 |  |
| 2 |  | 2 OR 1 + 5 or more simple | 8 + |  |
| 2.5 | 1 | 3 + |  |  |
| 3 | 1 + 1 or more briefly followed up |  |  |  |
| 3.5 | 2 |  |  |  |
| 4 | 2 + 1 or more briefly followed up OR 3 or more |  |  |  |

## B. Confidence in stating thoughts and opinions

**GLOBAL Category -** Enter a code for this after each argument, under the argument number on the coding sheet.

**Definitional Overview: This category codes the extent to which a person demonstrates confidence in speaking. Indicated by speaking out forcefully and often and with confidence.**

Note that a loud, shrill statement that is repeated frequently is not necessarily a confident statement. Signs of lack of confidence include not speaking, speaking only when spoken to, and qualifying statements with insecure remarks (e.g. "Well, I'm not really sure, but..." or "I guess I disagree.")

Note that this code is slightly more impressionistically oriented. It may be helpful on the second pass through the tape to code this category for each dyad at the end of each disagreement. Pay the most attention to confidence around major/primary areas of disagreement rather than around small, minor issues in the discussion.

Be careful to not score down for niceness or sensitivity to the feeling of Other. A confident person can be nice, they just need to assert their position firmly throughout the discussion.

Also, reasons do not have to be fully developed or well thought out to get high confidence scores. A person can get a 4 if they just assert their position throughout the discussion (i.e. "I want money. Give it to me." repeated over and over again).

**Codes 0 - 2.0 (ULTIMATELY BACKING DOWN OR NEVER REALLY ASSERTING POSITION IN THE DISCUSSION):** These codes should be given to subjects who either never really assert a position, or ultimately stop trying to assert or support their position at some point during the discussion. They need not recant, but they do at least back down (i.e. they give up answering Other's points, or making points of their own). (IF someone appears truly persuaded to change their mind by Other, this does not count as backing down).

0 - Consistently quiet and hesitant to assert self. May briefly restate or assert position or give one half-hearted reason, but basically just withdraws or never participates in the discussion.

Example: A: Well, I kind of need money. I need to buy some stuff. I don't know, I guess I can do without it. Never mind.

Example: M: Well, I just prefer that you see, not just one person, but other people, but I guess I can't do anything to change your mind.

1 Initially makes a modest effort to state position or reasons, but stops doing so early on (e.g. after a few minutes) **AND/OR** makes only 1 or 2 statements (can be somewhat forceful) without contributing anything else to discussion.

Example: A: “Well, I kind of need money. I need to buy some stuff. I don't know just stuff. Okay, fine, whatever you say.” (may be repeated or restated for a few minutes but position is then dropped).

Example: M: “Well, I just prefer that you see, not just one person, but other people. I'm not so sure that this is a good relationship for you. I don't know, I guess I can't really do anything to change your mind.” (may be repeated or restated for a few minutes but position is then dropped).

Example: A: “But I really want to go out this Friday. (nothing else substantial said for a while) But Mom, all of my friends are going.” (nothing else substantial said for rest of discussion).

2 Tries to state position or reasons repeatedly over a period of time or until the argument is successfully resolved, but ultimately (before the end of the discussion) just gives up doing this **OR** alternates between arguing points and withdrawing and/or recanting.

Example: A: “Well, I kind of need money because I need stuff. Like I sort of need clothes, and I need ten dollars for school tomorrow to pay club dues. I don't know, I guess I kind of thought that you should give it to me because I'm your kid.” (may repeat, but ultimately stops and gives up position).

Example: M: “Well, I just prefer that you see, not just one person, but other people. I'm not so sure that this is a good relationship for you. I'm not going to push you to see other people, but don't you think that maybe you could, uh, don't you think that you can at least give it some thought?” (may repeat and/or restate, but ultimately stops and gives up position).

Example: A: “But its not fair that I have to do the dishes when I don’t make the mess! (several speeches go by in which teen is withdrawn and/or recants). Well, I still don’t think its fair. (not much else said and/or recanting). But I don’t think you make my sister do as many chores as I have to do.”

**Codes 2.0 - 4 (REMAINING ASSERTIVE THROUGHOUT THE DISCUSSION):** These codes should be given to participants who never stop making their argument or restating their position.

2 - Never really stops restating position, but is very hesitant and tentative in doing so. Looks down, mumbles, makes statements in a wishy-washy way that doesn't sound assertive (e.g. "I don't know, I just think that you should probably do it"). May just use very short sentences (e.g. just mumbles "I don't really think so." in response to Other's statements).

Example: A: Well, I need money because I need stuff. Like I sort of need clothes, and I need ten dollars for school tomorrow to pay club dues. I don't know, I guess I kind of thought that you should give it to me because I'm your kid. (similar to low end, but never gives up position).

Example: M: Well, I just prefer that you see, not just one person, but other people. I'm not so sure that this is a good relationship for you. I'm not going to push you to see other people, but don't you think that you maybe could consider my point of view? (similar to low end, but never gives up position)

3 - Consistently asserts position/reasons, but does so in a way that is at least a little bit tentative or hesitant. Occasionally behaves like a 2 (e.g. looking down, mumbling, or making wishy-washy statements).

Example: A: “Well, I need money because I need stuff. Like I need clothes, and I need ten dollars for school tomorrow to pay club dues. And I want to get this outfit. I don't know, I guess I kind of thought that you should give it to me because I'm your kid.” (makes similar types of statements throughout argument).

Example: M: “Well, I just prefer that you see, not just one person, but other people. I'm not so sure that this is a good relationship for you. I'm not going to push you to see other people, but maybe you could try more to understand my point of view. You're too young to be limiting yourself to just one person. I've had some experience in this area and I'm just trying to kind of guide you to, um, not make the same mistakes, although I know that I can't keep you from making mistakes, but I'm trying to kind of guide you. But if you do end up continuing to see him, which it looks like you will, you need to at least start respecting some of my rules.” (Makes similar types of statements throughout argument).

4 - Statements are made with no signs of uncertainty or hesitation. Not at all tentative and shows no signs of backing down. Isn't necessarily combative or unfriendly, although may be so. Can be nice and/or sensitive to Other's feelings, but must remain firm about own position.

Example: A: I want some money. I need money because I need stuff. Like I need clothes, and I need ten dollars for school tomorrow to pay club dues. And I want to get this outfit. Can you buy it and I'll just pay you back after I get the money? You should give it to me because I'm your kid and I'm underage. I deserve money all of the time, not just when I work for it.

**OR**:

A: I want some money. Give me some. (repeated throughout).

Example: M: Well, I just prefer that you see, not just one person, but other people. I'm not so sure that this is a good relationship for you. I'm not going to push you to see other people, but I think that you should, consider my point of view. You're too young to be limiting yourself to just one person. I've had some experience in this area and I'm trying to help guide you so that you don't make the same mistakes that I did. If you do end up continuing to see him, which it looks like you will, you need to start respecting some of my rules.

*(NOTE: can be nice/sensitive and still get a 4)*

# Behaviors Inhibiting Autonomy in a Dyad:

Behaviors coded in this section all inhibit autonomy in a dyad, either by directly undercutting another family member's statements about their positions, or by modeling behaviors that deliberately avoid the opportunity to discuss the reasons behind disagreements. Note that these behaviors are not simply the absence of autonomy, but reflect several different ways of undercutting or avoiding autonomous discussion within a dyad.

## C. Placating / Recanting

Definitional Overview: **This code includes behaviors that inhibit productive discussion of an issue by saying a statement that you don't mean (i.e. pretending to agree/change your position) in order to placate the other person and/or de-escalate the argument.**

Scores in this category are derived by considering two dimensions--1) the degree to which the coder thinks the speaker is (internally) *convinced vs. unconvinced* by the other person's arguments and 2) the amount of *specificity vs. ambiguity* that exists regarding the speaker's commitment to a new position.

*NOTE: If the person recants/placates on the same issue more than once, code it once at the highest level instance.*

### **1. FIRST DIMENSION: CONVINCED vs. UNCONVINCED**

The primary way of determining the degree to which the speaker is convinced vs. unconvinced is to examine the progression of the discussion (i.e. the statements leading up to and following a recanting/placating statement).

When deciding on a classification, focus more on how convinced or unconvinced the person is in their thoughts, rather than actual or likely behavior.

The degree to which the speaker is *unconvinced* is classified as convinced (low), somewhat convinced/somewhat unconvinced (medium), or unconvinced (high) according to the following guidelines:

*NOTE: When rating how convinced a person is when he/she makes a vague statement of agreement, you will need to interpret what that statement* ***actually*** *means & then decide whether the person is really convinced according to that meaning. For the purposes of coding, always interpret the statement to signify what the person would be least likely convinced of and what would still be a plausible thing for the other person to interpret from the statement.*

Example of vague statement of agreement: *(mother has been trying to convince teen not to hang out with certain friends, and to start hanging out with a different crowd; teen has just agreed to hang out more with friends whom mom does approve of, but nothing has been said about the other friends)*

A: "I'll start hanging with (the new friends) more."

M: "So...the problem (about friends) is solved, right?"

A: "Yeah, problem solved."

*(adolescent’s final statement is taken to mean: the WHOLE friends problem is solved, including the friends that mom does not approve of; THEN a rating is made as to whether or not the adolescent is* ***really*** *convinced of this new position)*

**Mostly Convinced (Low Unconvinced)** - A speaker is classified as convinced if the course of the conversation shows him/her leading up to a new position. In addition, the speaker does not return to his/her original position following the statement. You can also look for tone: does the person seem genuinely satisfied with the new position/situation? *NOTE: the person does not have to be overly ecstatic at having been convinced to be placed in this category. This category may also cover those situations in which it wasn't clear that the topic was a major source of disagreement in the first place, thus it doesn't take much for the speaker to adopt a modified stance.*

Example of mostly convinced: *(ADOLESCENT STATEMENT - in a discussion in which the teen wants more money from mom, mom finally agrees to give her $20 a month; this may be less than the teen wants, but it is certainly more than she was getting)*

M: "I'll give you $20 a month, that's the best that I can do."

A: "Yeah. Problem solved."

**Somewhat convinced/somewhat unconvinced** - A speaker is classified in this category if there is evidence that he/she may agree with *part* of the other's position, but there is reason to believe that he/she is trying to convey agreement with **more** than that part in order to de-escalate/end the discussion. Again, this judgement is mostly made according to the course of the discussion, and may also involve the content/tone of what is said.

Example of somewhat convinced/unconvinced: *(TEEN STATEMENTS - in a discussion in which mom is trying to convince teen not to fight with siblings; teen has offered no evidence that he feels there is anything wrong with his behavior)*

M: "But that's what we got to work on as a family. To try not to fuss and fight with each other."

A: "Mm-hm. And compromise."

M: "And compromise and let it go."

A: "Right." *(said fairly sincerely)*

*(afterwards, the teen goes back to justifying his behavior; although he may agree* ***in general*** *that compromise is a good thing, this belief does not seem to apply to his own behavior, although he tries to give mom that impression)*

**Unconvinced** - A speaker is classified as unconvinced if there is *no* evidence before his/her statement that he/she has truly adopted a new position or frame of mind with regard to the topic being discussed. The speaker may immediately return to his/her own original position, or the discussion may end with his/her statement or take a new turn. The speaker may *sound* like he/she is truly agreeing, **OR** he/she may sound unhappy/petulant or sarcastic. The key test as to whether a person is unconvinced is that if you pulled him/her out of the room and asked him/her whether he/she truly believed what he/she just said, the answer would be no.

Example # 1 of unconvinced: *(MOM STATEMENT - teen has been trying to convince mom that the school personnel are against her, which is why she keeps getting suspended; mom has argued strongly that, while this might sometimes be the case, it can't be the explanation for all of the suspensions)*

M: "Like I say, somebody is always to blame. First it was Mr. Jones, now it's the teacher."

A: "It's both of them. I'm telling you mom, Mr. Jones is a liar. I didn't do it."

M: *(sounding frustrated)* "Alright, Jane."

Example # 2 of unconvinced: *(TEEN STATEMENT - teen has been arguing that he can't get a job because no one will hire him)*

A: "They are not going to hire me. Why should I even try?"

M: "You just have a bad attitude."

A: "MOM. They are not going to hire me."

M: "Last summer was different. You can get a job this summer."

A: "Alright, fine. I'll get one tomorrow morning." *(said fairly sincerely, but evidence before and after statement indicates that teen neither really believes he can get a job, nor will he actually try to get one)*

### **2. SECOND DIMENSION: AMBIGUITY vs. SPECIFICITY**

The second dimension is assessed by considering the *tone* (e.g. sarcastic, neutral, dismissive) and *content* (e.g. commitment to a specific position or solution vs. vague or noncommittal position or stance).

Specificity is ranked as low (very ambiguous), medium (somewhat ambiguous), and high (not ambiguous/very specific) according to the following guidelines. *NOTE: A statement may be highly specific in content, but get rated lower on ambiguity/specificity because he/she uses a very sarcastic tone, indicating that he/she doesn't really intend to commit to a new position or behavior.*

**Low Specificity (Completely ambiguous)** - A statement is rated a low in specificity if what the person is agreeing to is very unclear AND/OR if the tone with which the statement is said is highly sarcastic.

Example #1 of Low Specificity: *(MOM STATEMENT)*

M: "Like I say, somebody is always to blame. First it was Mr. Jones, now it's the teacher."

A: "It's both of them. I'm telling you mom, Mr. Jones is a liar. I didn't do it."

M: (sounding frustrated) "Alright, Jane." *(unclear what exactly mom is agreeing to, and/or that she has truly adopted a new position)*

Example #2 of Low Specificity: *(ADOLESCENT STATEMENT)*

A: "That's so bogus mom. Why can't my brother take out the trash, too?"

M: "No. I want you to do it. So starting tonight, you will take out the trash every night after dinner, right?"

A: "Yeah, sure mom. Whatever you say." [but see example #1 under High Specificity below to see a case where “whatever” is highly specific] *(said* ***very*** *sarcastically -teen is not locked in by this statement because he makes it so clear by his tone that he has no real intention of changing his behavior)*

**Low/Medium Specificity (Ambiguous)** - The statement locks the person in to *some* new position, but the terms of this new agreement are very unclear.

Example of Low/Medium Specificity: *(mother has been trying to convince teen not to hang out with certain friends, and to start hanging out with a different crowd; teen has just agreed to hang out more with friends whom mom does approve of, but nothing has been said about the other friends)*

A: "I'll start hanging with (the new friends) more."

M: "So...the problem (about friends) is solved, right?"

A: "Yeah, problem solved."

*(teen's* ***final*** *statement appears to locks her into something with regard to the* ***whole*** *disagreement, but it is so vague that she is virtually free to continue her past behavior)*

**Medium Specificity (Some ambiguity)** - A statement is rated as medium in specificity if it appears that the statement commits the person to *some* new position or action, but it is not clear exactly what that position/action is, so that it would be relatively difficult for the other person to hold the speaker to the new "agreement".

Example: *(ADOLESCENT STATEMENT - mom has been criticizing teen's friends, and wants the teen to start hanging around a new crowd)*

M: "How come you don't like anybody at church? How come you don't want to hang with them?"

A: "I do."

M: "And you don't get in trouble when you hang out with them, do you?"

A: "No...but..."

M: "Well?"

A: "Okay, I'll start hanging out with them more."

*(although teen does commit a change involving these new friends, but it would be difficult for her mother to pin her down as to what "more" really means)*

**High Specificity (No ambiguity)** - A statement is rated as highly specificity if it absolutely locks the speaker in to a new position/behavior to which he/she can be held accountable. To get this rating, the content of the statement must be specific, and it must be said sincerely.

Example #1 of High Specificity: *(ADOLESCENT STATEMENT)*

M: So you need to make a schedule for your homework and have it done by 9pm…will you do that?

A: This is so stupid. Whatever, I’ll do it. [teen is expressing contempt, but is clearly agreeing to something very specific.]

Example #2 of High Specificity: *(TEEN STATEMENT)*

A: "They are not going to hire me. Why should I even try?"

M: "You just have a bad attitude."

A: "MOM. They are not going to hire me."

M: "Last summer was different. You can get a job this summer."

A: "Alright, fine. I'll get one tomorrow morning." *(said fairly sincerely)*

Example #3 of High Specificity: *(ADOLESCENT STATEMENT - mom and teen have been discussing whether or not its fair that the teen has to earn and use her own money to buy things she wants)*

A: "It's really not fair that Bobby (her younger brother) doesn't have to work and pay for everything like we do."

M: "Well, he doesn't have the advantage of being able to babysit like you do."

A: "True. But there are other things he can do."

M: "Well, we've tried to get him jobs mowing lawns and things like that, but he hasn't been able to do it very often. You know, I agree that it's a little unfair for you to have to use your babysitting money. But most of the time I don't have the money to give you."

A: "Yeah, I know. Sometimes I don't think it's unfair. Because I think if we really want something, we should be willing to spend our own money on it". *(final statement commits teen to a new, specific, position - that the situation isn't really that unfair - which makes it difficult for her to go back to her original position that it is completely unfair)*

*NOTE: It’s possible to be recanting and engaged at the same time, though it would be slightly different aspects of the statements that would be captured (if one is empathic at the same time as recanting). It’s also possible to be recanting and validating (but see the validating code for how this works).*

### **CODING**: Once the statement has been ranked according to both of the above dimensions, the following codes are assigned:

0 Convinced

.5 Mostly convinced + any range of specificity.

.5 - 1 Somewhat convinced/Somewhat unconvinced + Low specificity.

1 Somewhat convinced/Somewhat unconvinced + Low/Medium specificity.

**OR**

Unconvinced + Low specificity.

1-1.5 Somewhat convinced/Somewhat unconvinced + Medium specificity.

**OR**

Unconvinced + Low/Medium specificity.

1.5-2 Somewhat convinced/Somewhat unconvinced + High specificity.

**OR**

Unconvinced + Medium specificity.

2-3 Unconvinced + High specificity.

*NOTE: For a minor point, code according to the guidelines listed above and then cut the*

*score in half.*

## D. Overpersonalizing/Blurs the boundary between the person and their position

Definitional Overview: **There are several ways this may be done, all of which have one thing in common: they treat the disagreement as being in some respect a "fault" or feature of the person's disagreeing rather than a difference in ideas and reasons. By not separating the person from the disagreement, it becomes difficult to discuss differences reasonably--it is no longer enough for someone to come to see another person's position, rather someone must give in in an important way. Who will give in becomes more important than exploring why a person took the position they took.**

Please read below to see specific codes for various ways of blurring the person-position boundary. What's immediately below is a general code to be used when multiple means of overpersonalizing occur, or when the specific codes don't apply directly.

**GENERAL OVERPERSONALIZING CODES (for when specific codes don’t apply directly):**

1 - Statements which slightly or implicitly confuse person with disagreement. These statements at least imply a person/di­sagreement confusion in thinking, but generally are done in a relatively objective, non-critical or pressuring way.

2- Blurring of person/disagreement boundaries either by three or more “1” type statements or by statements which explicitly blur the person/di­sagreement boun­daries. These statements are not typically done in a very critical way, and thus don't apply immense pressure to the person to give up their position or reason.

3 - Three or more "2" type statements or one or two of the following statements which blur boundaries in a way which puts a higher level of pressure on person to give up their position or reason.

4 - Three or more statements at level "3."

### **SPECIFIC OVERPERSONALIZING CODES**

### **(D1) Enlisting an Outside Person's Opinion or Behavior**

It is possible for a person in a dyad to enlist a third person that is not present as supporting their position, or to reference a third person's opinion/behavior in a manner which equates that person with one of the members of the dyad with no reason given for equating the two (see statements under "2" below). This is blurring because it removes the focus of the discussion from a person's reasons and appeals to "the will of the majority."

If the person is talking about a fairness issue or that behaviors should be the same for different people, it probably gets scored under E4, so look there first.

*NOTE: bringing in another person's opinion/behavior may not necessarily be blurring if the statement refers merely to facts about a situation that involves another person.*

Examples (not blurring):

A: Even Dad will tell you that I called at 7:00. **OR**

A: I try to keep my room clean, but my sister always messes it up.

CODES FOR ENLISTING AN OUTSIDE PERSON’S OPINION OR BEHAVIOR

0 - No signs of bringing in the point of view of a person who is not present during the discussion.

0.5- Referring to the opinion of a person who is not present, but not really clearly implying which way the other person’s position will go.

Example of 0.5-level statement:

M: (sincerely) "I don't know what Dad will say, but... " (and then goes on with own opinion).

1 - Reference to past discussions where the person brought into the discussion was present, and all three parties previously agreed on the issue, **OR** representing a third party's position when that person is not present.

Example of 1-level statement:

M: "I think what Dad had said was that you have to bring home your history and read more."

**OR** *implicitly* stating that another person's opinion/behavior to support their position

Example of implicit statement of another’s supportive opinion:

“I’m not the only one who thinks that.”

1 vs. 2: The difference between a 1 and a 2 is that in a 1, the other person’s position either isn’t stated in a way that makes clear it has direct bearing on the answer, or it’s only referred to indirectly (i.e., without naming anyone, etc.). In a 2, there’s a clear statement that someone else thinks X, and that really matters here.

2 - *Directly* stated that a non-present person's position or behavior has direct bearing and is being called on to support the speaker's position, or erode the opposing position.

Examples of 2-level statements:

A: "Everyone else agrees with that." **OR**

M: "I know that your father would agree with me on this... "

3 - Statement that agreement between 2 speakers depends upon presence or agreement of a third party. Room may be left open for the discussion to continue, but it is clear that the statement is made to avoid talking about the disagreement and/or end the whole discussion. Speaker is "copping out" by using a third person to get out of discussing the issue.

Example of 3-level statement:

M: I don't feel like you asked your father about that when you had the chance. You need to talk to him not me. (This type of statement made when it is clear that there are things about the issue which could still be discussed between mom and teen - see NOTE below).

*NOTE: This code should be distinguished from good collaborative parenting in which one*

*parent notes that a final decision will have to await discussions with both parents, but completely leaves open the possibility that A may persuade the parent in the discussion of the correctness of A's position.* *The difference is that the example above says that the disagreement cannot be discussed in the absence of someone else...even though it is between the 2 parties present. In the example above, the teen may also need to talk to F, but clearly has a disagreement with M as well that is being clouded & avoided.*

4 - Multiple statements are made which bring in the opinions/behavior of others.

### **(D2) Forcing a role/Characterizing other person**

A speaker may force a role onto another person or falsely characterize them in any of the following ways:

1. Mimicking: Imitating or quoting the other person in a way that implies that the other person speaks or acts in a certain way (e.g., an adolescent who does an impersonation of her mother as a shrieking lunatic). This kind of characterization is coded as blurring because it defines the other person in a particular way and puts him or her on the defensive, trying to say that he/she isn't the way that's implied, and takes the focus away from the reasoning in the argument.

2. Hypothetical situations: Proposing hypothetical situations *that make assumptions about a person’s expected future behavior with some implication about their character or likely patterns of behavior,* is blurring because it puts the other person into a specific role which may have no relationship to how they would actually behave. For example, M: "If I had said no, you would have hung up on me." This turns the discussion to whether the person really would do this (a quality of the person), rather than focusing on the reasoning behind their positions. Simply using hypotheticals isn’t necessarily bluring, nor are statements about a person’s future behavior that are purely conditional (e.g.,: if you spend your money, you’ll be broke).

3. Forcing a role: Speakers may ask subjects to take on their role inappropriately in thinking about the disagreement (e.g., I want you to put yourself in my place so that you can see that its not reasonable not to give me what I'm asking for).

4. Falsely characterizing: Making exaggerated statements about the other person's character and/or their behavior (actual or hypothetical) is coded as blurring. Statements are scored more highly based on the extent to which the statement is inaccurate, and whether or not the statement characterizes the person's behavior or his/her character (with the latter being scored higher).

CODES FOR FORCING A ROLE/CHARACTERIZING OTHER PERSON

0 - Either no sign of any of the above, or *accurate* characterizations of a person's behavior, which are not scored as blurs.

Example of 0-level statement:

M: "You didn't take the trash out last night when I asked you to."

0.5 - Mimicking: During the course of the disagreement, the speaker quotes the other person. To qualify as only a 0.5 on this scale, the quotation should be given in a normal tone of voice, without imitating the voice quality of the other person, or applying explicit pressure.

Example of 0.5-level statement:

A: "The other day you said, 'Gail, you are not allowed to go to the movies'."

1 - Mimicking: In the process of quoting the other person, the speaker changes their voice such that it is clear that the speaker is imitating the tone of the other person.

Example of 1-level mimicking statement:

A: “And then you said (changing voice tone) *‘*Forget it, you are not going anywhere’*”.*

Forcing a role: Asking the other person to "put yourself in my place"; that is, one person asks the other person to try to see things from the first person's perspective

Hypothetical: Saying what the other person would do or what might happen in a hypothetical situation.

Example of 1-level hypothetical statement:

M: "You have potential to go college, but if you don't get good grades now, *it's going to be too late to go back and say 'Whoah, oh gosh, I could have worked harder. I'm willing to do the work, really'*." (italicized section is scored)

Falsely characterizing: Statements made about a person's behavior which are somewhat exaggerated **OR** statements made about their character which are global, accurate, and mildly derogatory.

Example of 1-level falsely characterizing statement:

M: "You *never* take out the trash when I ask you to." **OR**

M: "The problem is that you tend to be pretty lazy."

2 - Mimicking: The speaker not only imitates the tone of the other person when quoting that person, but does it in a critical way, or states that the other person *always* behaves this way.

Example of 2-level mimicking statement:

A: “You *always* say *’Forget it, you have to stay in tonight’*“.

*NOTE: Mimicking statements should be distinguished from statements in which the person mockingly parrots what the person has JUST said, (e.g., M: What do you think? T: (mockingly) What do you think?) These are scored as hostile, because they aren’t trying to force a role on the person (its clear what the person has just said) as much as said to just be rude.*

Forcing a role: Goes beyond simply asking the other person to put themselves in the speaker's position, and asks specifically what the person would do if the person was in the speaker's position. **OR** the speaker asks the other person to state what they would do if a specific hypothetical situation happened.

Examples of 2-level forcing a role statements:

M: "Just think about it from my point of view. What would you do if your son was flunking out of school?" **OR**

M: "Not that I would ever do this, but what would you say if I came home without my paycheck?"

Falsely characterizing: Statements made about a person's behavior which are highly exaggerated, **OR** statements made about their character which are slightly exaggerated and more derogatory (such statements may also be scored under "J" for being critical).

Examples of 2-level falsely characterizing statements:

A: "You *never* let me do *anything*". **OR**

M: "How can I trust you? You don't show any responsibility".

3 - Forcing a role: Not only asking the other person to take the speaker's point of view, but making the other person play out the role.

Example of 3-level forcing a role statement:

M: "Okay, say I was your teenager, and I came home and said I was going to Maureen's with Bob. What would you say?"

Falsely characterizing: Statements which greatly exaggerate a person's character, are derogatory in nature, and/or which are said in a nasty tone.

Example of 3-level falsely characterizing statement:

M: "You are *always so* stubborn". (said in a nasty tone).

4 - Repeated blurring statements, as outlined above.

### **(D3) Attacking the speaker (rather than addressing what they say)** -- These kinds of statements, such as "you're just saying that because you're a woman," make it harder to treat the person's statements and reasons objectively. They imply that the disagreement is a result of a flaw in the person disagreeing, which allows their reasons to be discounted.

**OR (D3) Asserting one's own limits as definitive (by pleading helpless or invoking guilt):**

In addition to attacking the other party in the conversation, a speaker may introduce aspects of his or her own character in ways that pull for the other party to give in because of the effects of the other’s position on the speaker. This type of statement can shut down a discussion both by suggesting that the speaker can’t handle what the other person is proposing, and/or by otherwise ”guilting” the other person to give in. Key components to determine whether and to what extent the statement should be scored as a blur include: (1) how much the statement invokes the speaker’s limits (e.g. how much does it suggest that the speaker can’t handle the other’s position/behavior); (2) how guilt-invoking the statement is (e.g. how much does the speaker personalize the discussion by implying that “if you really loved me, you’d do what I want” and/or otherwise suggest that the other is acting atrociously towards him/her); and (3) how much reasoning is incorporated into the person’s statement.

However, please note that statements *can* incorporate feelings regarding another person’s behavior without being scored as blurring: Non-blurring presentation: I don’t think that it’s fair for me to have to do all of the housework, especially when I am busy with a lot of other things. It really bothers me when I come home from a busy day and find that nothing has been done in the house. *(Presents reasons for own position; invoking own feelings, but not in an accusatory/attacking way).* Blurring presentation: I thought that you were going to help me with the housework, *at least* with the *few* things you knew had to be done. I really expected that you were going to do those chores *for me* ! It was *totally* unfair to me when it wasn’t done. *(Doesn’t include reasons why it wasn’t fair; guilt-invoking in that it implies that other would have done it if he/she really cared about speaker, paints other’s behavior as completely unreasonable.)*

*NOTE: "Blurring type" statements about the person's age and/or self-limiting statement involving concrete characteristics such as physical limitations are not blurring if they refer to knowledge or activities which are, in reality, related to such characteristics. For example, a statement that the teen doesn't know about driving laws because he/she is not yet 16 and doesn't have his/her license is not coded as a blur. Similarly, stating that one cannot do a chore because she/he is injured is also not blurring.*

CODING FOR ATTACKING OR SELF-DEPRICATING/GUILTING STATEMENTS

0 - No signs of attack on speaker or self-deprecation.

0.5 - Suggestion that the other person's position depends upon who they are (ad hominem) but without implying any lack of validity to the other's position.

Example of 0.5-level statement:

M: "I think we're disagre­eing because there's a generation gap here."

1 - Implicit suggestion of problems with person stating reason (e.g. mild in­credulity at a reason or position) **OR** an explicit statement referring to person's position as relevant to their arguments, but this is construc­tively done as a way of exploring differen­ces.

Example #1 of 1-level statement:

A: "Maybe you don't realize what its like to be a 15 year-old in this town." (said non-critically)

**OR** An introduction of speaker’s character in which the guilt-invoking is mild/implicit and/or in which the limits of the speaker do not determine the outcome.

Further examples of 1-level statements:

M: "I was hoping that you wouldn't go out and drink, because you would stop and think, 'I know my mom doesn't like that'."

**OR**

M: "When I have money, I share it, don't I? Haven't I taken you out, when I've had the money? Especially, let you eat lobster? Huh? Letting you enjoy that." (Mom is invoking guilt by characterizing herself as generous which weakens the teen’s argument that she should get more money).

**OR**

M: "I'm just not sure how well I can handle what you're proposing...we might have to try it and see how it goes."

**OR**

16 year old: “But since I’m still a child I should be able to act like a child in this.” (in part because it’s a teenager saying it not a child).

2 - Explicit suggestion that resolution of argument depends upon a characteristic of the person (rather than upon their behavior). HOWEVER, statement is not critical of the person.

Example #1 of 2-level statement:

M: "If you were older, I think you'd understand better." *(Note that age is not necessarily linked to ability to understand).*

**OR**

An introduction of the speaker’s character in which guilt-invoking is stronger/more explicit or it is implied (but not explicitly stated) that the speaker’s limits should determine the outcome.

Further examples of 2-level statements:

M: I thought that you were going to help me with the housework, *at least* with the *few* things you knew had to be done. I really expected that you were going to do those chores *for me*! It was *totally* unfair to me when it wasn’t done.

**OR**

M: “I really can’t stand to hear you and your sister fighting - it just drives me over the edge.” (implied limits)

A: “I really can’t stand cleaning the cat’s litter box—it just drives me over the edge.”

3 - An ad hominem argument made in a critical way.

Examples of 3-level statements:

"You're just saying that because you're a ..."

"You're thinking too much like a lawyer/pa­rent/adol­escent, etc.".

**OR** An introduction of the speaker’s character that suggests that the limits of the speaker should determine the outcome of the discussion/dictate the other’s behavior, and that is highly guilt-invoking (these statements imply that the speaker will “fall apart” if Os behavior does not change).

Further examples of 3-level statements:

M: I just don’t know *how* I’ll feel if you don’t graduate from high school”.

**OR**

M: "You know I'll just be heartbroken if you let boys come into this house when I'm not here."

4 - Multiple "3" level statements.

### **(D4) Using self or other person as an example, or equating own or other's views/ experiences with reasons**, by making statements along the lines of: "I am this way, so you should be too", **OR** "I did/didn't do this, so you should/shouldn't", **OR** "You do (or don't do) this so why should/shouldn't I?". This type of argument turns the discussion to personal traits, and does not prompt discussion of reasons. It is important, however, to distinguish between personal background or behavior used as an example in the context of reasons and personal behavior brought into the discussion without such a context.

CODES FOR USING SELF OR OTHER AS AN EXAMPLE

0 - No use of personal examples **OR** use of personal examples only in the context of a line of reasoning

Examples of 0-level statements:

M: "Good grades are very important for later success in life, because they open up opportunities that would not otherwise be available. For example, I got good grades, and it opened up opportunities for me which allowed me to become successful."

**OR**

M: "Drinking can have a lot of negative consequences. It is against the law if you are underage, which means you can get in trouble for doing it. It can cause your judgment to be impaired so that you might do something you will regret later, or something dangerous, like drunk driving. That is why I never drank, because I was worried about getting caught, plus I was always the designated driver."

Both of these examples show the use of personal history as an example to illustrate a point in a line of reasoning; *the personal example is NOT the sole argument offered, and the statements are therefore not blurring.*

1 - A personal example is given, with reasons implied, but the overall reasoning is not directly stated; the sole basis for the argument is personal examples.

Examples of 1-level statements:

M: "I never drank when I was younger because I was concerned about getting caught and I was always the driver."

**OR**

A: "No one cleans up in our house. Your room is always messy, too. I don't see why I am the only one who has to clean."

[1 vs. 2]: with a “1” the blur contains a reason as well, that’s linked to the personalization. With a “2” the blur is without any reasons other than something like “you did it too” or “I never did that.” This is clear in the examples if you read them closely.

2 - A personal example is given, with some reasons implied, but the reasoning is less clear.

Examples of 2-level statements:

M: "I never drank. I was always the driver."

**OR**

A: "Your room is always messy, too."

**OR**

A: “Everyone else does things like that.”

3 - A personal example is given, and the speaker either explicitly states that because this trait or behavior is/was present in the speaker, it should also be present in the other person (thus implicitly cutting off discussion) AND/OR the statement is made in an angry tone, with the implication that the other person is wrong or stupid not to be like the speaker. (such statements may also be scored under "J" for hostile/critical").

Example of 3-level statement:

M: "I never drank, and I don't think you should."

**OR**

M: "I got good grades, so you should, too".

**OR**

A: "How can you tell me to keep my room clean? You're a slob, too."

4 - Multiple lower level statements.

## E. Pressures Other to Agree.

Definitional Overview: **Makes statements that implicitly or explicitly pressures other to change their mind by making it uncomfortable for them not to do so.**

The determining feature of pressuring is whether the person's statement is likely to make it uncomfortable for the other person to maintain their position. However, do not confuse a confident, reasoned statement promoting one's own position with pressuring. Even though such a statement may indeed make it uncomfortable for the other person to maintain his/her position, if a strongly worded statement is presented in a reasoned way, it does not necessarily warrant a pressuring code.

Pressuring may be done in a variety of ways; both the form/content and style are important to consider. The form of a pressuring statement is often a rhetorical, close ended question that tries to pressure the other person to take another position (e.g. "*Don't you think* that you should be in by 10:00?"). However, a statement that has a more neutral, open ended *form* may also be scored as pressuring due to the tone. The tone of a pressuring statement usually is sarcastic and/or implies disbelief, implicitly or explicitly suggesting that the other person's position/behavior is invalid/inappropriate (e.g. "Do you *always* do your homework on time?") and at the extreme, ridiculous (e.g. "That's totally absurd!"). Pressuring may also be done non-verbally through facial expressions and verbalizations that convey sentiments of impatience, disgust, incredulity/disbelief (e.g. eye rolls, sighs, grunts). Pressuring statements often indirectly convey a person's position, but they do so in such a way as to limit open-ended discussion of each person's views.

Almost all pressuring statements are implicitly critical, in that they are generally derisive of the others' views. However, only pressuring statements that are also devaluing of the other person (vs. their position in the disagreement) are candidates for scoring under J for Hostile/Rude/Devaluing. For example, a statement such as "You're crazy - you must have bumped your head" are both ridiculing the person's position as well as the individual him/ herself.

**Rhetorical/leading questioning**: Some rhetorical/leading questions may serve some purpose other than pressuring (e.g. truly seeking information about the other person's thoughts, clarifying an idea or situation). To the extent that such questions are open-ended and indicate interest in the other person's views, these statements are *not* scored as pressuring. For example, asking "Do you *really* think that I am too hard on you?" with an interested tone does imply that the speaker has an opinion about this issue, but also makes it clear that he/she is truly interested in the other person's thoughts. Other leading questions are more closed, and are less clearly seeking information from the other person. These statements are coded under pressuring according to the guidelines outlined below.

Note that some pressuring statements of this form may contain elements of both pressuring and querying (truly information seeking). However, it is very difficult to weigh relative levels of pressing/questioning within one statement. Therefore, if a statement is judged to be pressuring, it is *not* also scored as a query and vice versa. Keep in mind that if a statement contains truly questioning elements, it is likely to be scored lower on the pressuring scale.

**Blurring & pressuring**: Although most blurring statements in some way put pressure on other, blurring statements are *not* scored as pressuring if the only pressure comes from the blurred content of the statement. If however, tone, form, or other features of a speech (e.g. a blurring statement stated as rhetorical question) also place pressure on other, then the statement can be scored under both codes.

**Possible ways of pressuring (things to look for when coding):**

1. Rhetorical questions

2. Leading questions (e.g. Don't you think that....? or ....don't you?)

3. Sarcasm, impatience, condescension or incredulity

4. Non‑verbal signs of incredulity, frustration, or impatience (raised eyebrows, rolling eyeballs, sighing / exhaling noticeably, shaking head)

5. Statements of ultimate position ("Obviously..." or "Of course...")

6. Direct challenges to another person's position ("Oh come on, you can't

really mean that." **OR** "Can't you just...?")

7. Repeating a question/statement two or more times, when the desired

answer was not given. ("Can I give her the bear? MOM! CAN I?)

8. Acting as if no disagreement exists, or assuming the other person agrees

when it is not clear that they do. ("I know you agree with me that...")

9. Tit-for-tat exchanges (see below).

**Tit for Tat** is a type of pressuring in which pressure is exerted by threatening retaliation for other's statement or views. The scoring of a tit for tat statement is based on the tone of the statement and the content of the statement, which encompasses (1) degree of threat (i.e. how much the stakes of the argument are raised), and (2) the appropriateness of the type of retaliation. When the stated consequences are vague, the tone of the statement becomes more important to evaluate in scoring the statement. Stating a consequence of an action in the context of reasons is NOT coded as a tit-for-tat. Non-pressuring example: "I think a 12:30 curfew is reasonable because there is not much to do after then anyway. Just like with any other rule, if you break it, there must be consequences. So the next time you are late without a good excuse, I will have to ground you for two weeks. Tit-for-tat: "If you break curfew, you will be grounded." (The latter statement may be appropriate after a rule has been decided, but is *not* an appropriate way to go about discussing the validity of the rule.)

Caveats:

\*Answering one's own questions does not equal pressure when addressing an issue which is *not* the focus of disagreement.

\*Parents setting rules is not pressure if it does not cut off discussion (*could be* pressuring if it did cut off discussion).

\*Saying ”okay”, "you know", etc. at the end of a sentence is often more of a conversational filler (asking for an indication from the other than point has been heard/understood) rather than a pressure to agree.

*\*\*NOTE: the code for any individual statement only goes as high as 2.5 (and scores above a 2 are rare). This is because the highest level of pressure is thought to occur when pressuring behavior is repeatedly exerted.\*\**

.5 Pressuring that is lighthearted, truly humorous **OR** a minor point that no one cares about **OR** done in a tentative way **OR** a little exasperated **OR** a tit for tat exchange said jokingly in a way that its clear the consequences would not be enforced.

Examples:

M: "Can't you discipline yourself about your time?" (said with good humor)

M: "1:00 is a reasonable hour, right?" (said in a pleasant tone)

M: "Do I get upset when you study and don't do well?" (leading question ,but still somewhat open-ended)

Tit for tat Example: A: "I just want to dump my stuff in the front hall when I come in." M: "I could just change the locks and make you go around back."

1 Pressuring that is more simply questioning or reacting (not demanding) and therefore the tone is more low key than harsh. For example, a request to change position **OR** presuming agreement in non-threatening way **OR** incredulous **OR** answers own question (i.e. rhetorical question) **OR** a tit for tat exchange said more matter-of-factly and the consequences are both realistic and directed just at the issue in question.

Examples:

A: "So is that my fault that you did not say anything to me?"(tone is matter of fact)

A: "So why don't you just say 2:00 mom?" (stated as a request - later curfew)

M: "Do you *always* do your best on your school work?" (leading question - clear emphasis on always, tone is low key)

Tit for tat Example: A: "If you keep naggin' me, maybe I just won't take out the trash."

*NOTE on "shut up": In most cases, the goal of saying "shut up" is to cut off the discussion rather than to force a change in the other person's position. However, some element of pressuring to change may be present, and if this is the case, the statement can be scored up to a "1", but no higher.*

1.5 Pressure which is in between a request and a demand or encompasses elements of both. Statements at this level generally contain stronger implicit criticism of the other person's statements/reasons.

Examples:

A: "Then *why* do you keep arguing?" (said with some anger/exasperation)

M: " And you claim you want a car - don't you think you ought to work to get it?" (said somewhat critically)

A: "Oh yeah, I just walk on the streets all the time at 4:00 am. I can't even go anywhere. I can't even sneak out of my house because where I am I gonna go - down to the pond?" (strong sarcasm - implies that mom's accusation of her sneaking out is completely unfounded)

Series of rhetorical/leading questions can also be scored here (or up to a 2, depending on tone and/or the extent to which they box the other person in)

Example:

M1: So you're satisfied with getting the C's? (A1:Yeah.)

M2:So you're satisfied with being average?(A2: Yeah.)

M3: So you'll be satisfied with whatever consequences are that go along with being average? *(whole series is coded together as a 1.5)*

2 Pressuring statement with a commanding/demanding tone **OR** strong anger **OR** implicit or explicit but clear demand to change **OR** presuming agreement in threatening way (threat of anger, feeling stupid, etc.) **OR** pressure to agree, not just to give up **OR** tit for tat exchanges which are explicitly threatening (i.e. delivered in a serious way) **OR** a tit for tat exchange said more forcefully and the consequences are disproportionate and go beyond the issue in question.

Example:

A: Well, I'll be 18 in a few more months.

M: *Oh yeah, and you'll be grown then, won't you?* (said angrily and very sarcastically - this statement is also devaluing and thus would be scored under J as well)

Tit for tat Example: M: "If you don't start picking up your room, you can just move out." (not said with particular anger).

2.5 Pressuring statement which shows both an explicit demand to change and strong anger.

Tit for tat Example: M: "You keep on runnin' your mouth, you won't get nothin" (said angrily and aggressively).

No single statement can score any higher than a 2.5 (and 2.5 level statements are fairly rare). Higher scores are reached by combinations of statements throughout the discussion (see scoring procedures on last page of manual).

# Behaviors Promoting Relatedness

The following codes all refer to behaviors which would tend to increase the degree of positive interaction between two family members, often by expressing interest or positive reaction toward the other person and their thoughts and feelings.

## F. Queries of another person which are truly information seeking

Definitional Overview: **This category specifically refers to statements that indicate a genuine interest in what the other person thinks.**

What is a query?

Research on the nature of questions has shown that the grammatical form of a speech is often an unreliable indicator of whether information is truly being sought. Thus, as described under Pressuring (E) above, questioning statements that are rhetorical, to make a point, resembling cross-examinations, or hostile, are not to be considered in this category. However, as is also noted above, some statements may contain elements of both querying and pressuring. If such a statement is coded under queries (according to guidelines below), it is *not* also scored as a pressure. Keep in mind that if a statement contains pressuring elements, it is likely to be scored lower or not at all on the querying scale.

Also note that many very earnest inquiries may be offered in the form of a declarative sentence, e.g. "I would like you to help me understand in detail how you came to that conclusion." Such statements are coded as Queries.

**Questions about behavior**

Do not confuse questions about other's thinking and reasoning with questions about *behavior*. The latter will generally be much more critical, implying something like, "Do you have any defense for your unacceptable behavior? or, less harshly, "Why would you ever do (or want to do) a thing like that)?” The marker for these questions is that there would be no way not to feel defensive if they were targeted at you. *Although they often look like open-ended questions, they are often actually pressuring. If such statements are scored as pressuring, they should be given* ***no credit*** *under Queries.*

*NOTE about yes/no vs. open-ended questions: Sometimes, grammatical form is misleading. IF a question is stated in a yes/no fashion but is actually asking for more information (i.e., “Does it make you anxious?”…actually could be rephrased as “tell me more about it, it sounds like it makes you anxious.”) Conversely asking, “where are you going to eat dinner tomorrow night?”…really isn’t asking for anything more than a one-word answer and should be scored as such.*

0 - No queries, or only purely rhetorical queries, or factual queries that are completely unrelated to the disagreement: e.g.: "What time is it?", or "How long do we have to stay here?"

0.5- Closed-ended, factual questions, not asking about other's thoughts. **OR** questions asking about other's thoughts, but not in a way related to the disagreement.

Examples:

M: "Did you get home before your Dad last night?"

M: "Who is going to do the work?"

**OR**

Questions that are somewhat leading and closed ended, but are meant to draw out the other person and/or clarify their positions (vs. pressuring them)

Example:

M: Do I get upset when you study and you don't do well?

1.0 - Closed-ended (e.g. yes/no) questions clarifying the simple *meaning* of other's *statements about the disagreement* *or other’s thoughts about the disagreement.*

**OR** conversational turn-taking statementsthat minimally express interest in the other person’s thoughts (e.g., M: But you know, have you thought about one thing? T: What? **OR**, “I think you your curfew should be 11, what’s your response?)[conveying the idea, now its your turn to talk/respond]

Examples:

A: "Are you saying I'd always have to come early?"

M: "Do you mean you want to have 3 hours on the phone each night?"

A: "Are you talking about Mom's car or Dad's car?"

M: (At end of task), “Do you have any other related topics you want to discuss?” (its almost just looking for a way to fill the time & offering to raise a new topic)

**OR**

completely factual, but open-ended queries that don’t address anything related to the reasoning behind the disagreement:

Example:

Disagreement about do-rags… “how do they put those together anyway?”

1.5 - Closed-ended (yes/no) questions that are more inviting of open discussion

Examples:

M: "Do you think that the phone rule is unreasonable?"

M: At end or near end of task “is there anything else about this that you wanted to mention?” (not just looking to fill the remaining time; really making sure you’ve heard all person’s thoughts about this topic).

2.0 - Open-ended questions clarifying simple *meaning* of other's *statements* *about the disagreement, or asking about thoughts or solutions to the disagreement*.

LOWER SCORES SIGNIFICANTLY (E.G., TO .5) IF QUESTION IS SIMPLY CLARIFYING MEANING OF A SENTENCE THAT WAS JUST UTTERED. (I.E. WHAT THEY LITERALLY SAID, NOT THE UNDERLYING CONTENT OF THEIR THOUGHT PROCESS).

Examples:

M: "What do you think we should do about this problem?"

M: "What do you perceive as communication in other families?"

M: "What do you think is a reasonable curfew?"

Persons in the 3.0 to 4.0 range consistently ask questions and make statements expressing genuine interest in the other person's thoughts and feelings. Overall, they are genuinely trying to understand the other person's position (vs. seeking clarification, using questions to argue back, etc.).

3.0 - Open ended questions asking about other's *thinking and reasons* for position. Asks for more than a clarification of what other has already said. Does NOT include requests/demands for explanation of other's past or future behaviors (see 0.5 above). DOES NOT INCLUDE the opening statement to a disagreement in which someone says, “tell me what you think.” That should be scored a 2.0.

Examples:

M: "How could I be sure you would be safe if you stayed out later?"

M: "Why do you think that's fair?" (only if said with no hint of incredulity or skepticism: i.e., implying, "I want to understand how you see this as a fair deal.).

## 4.0 - Multiple 3's.

## G. Validates/Agrees/Positively Reacts to Other Person

Definitional Overview: **This category codes statements which tend to validate the other person by reacting positively to them.** This may be done by:

- agreeing with them directly

- "copying" what they say (repeatedly saying "that's exactly what I thought.")

- noting with words or tone that what they said is important, interesting or insightful

- laughing at a joke the other person has made.

- agreements which are really a recantation of positions (score as both recantation, if appropriate and validation/agreement if it truly constitutes validation).

- compliments (scoring of compliments depends both on the overall enthusiasm/positivity of the compliment and on whether, and to what extent, it is qualified by other remarks)

Statements are not counted as validating if sarcastic, rhetorical, patronizing or merely saying yes so as to go on stating position, i.e. "yes, but don't you see.", Look for true agreement. If its questionable, it may be scored on this scale, but never higher than a 1 or 2.)

Statements such as "I said that." or, M: He doesn't have a choice. A: OK, he doesn't have a choice. M: Right!, would only be scored if there was some enthusiasm expressed, (not if someone was just making their position clear.)

*NOTE: Statements of agreement may not necessarily be coded if Speaker B is repeating something that Speaker A stated earlier, and Speaker A makes a statement of agreement. In this case, Speaker A is really only agreeing with him or herself, and is not truly validating Speaker B. Also, statements of agreement only get coded if stated with clear enthusiasm.*

0 - No agreement stated, or "yeah" said occasionally, but as a conversational filler not as significant agreement.

Example: "Yeah, but..." type statements where the yeah is used only as a conversational filler.

**OR** "Yeah, but..." type statements when meant to say "I hear you," but not I agree with you.

.5 - Statement of agreement which just makes existence of similar positions known, esp. if in the course of a general "poll-taking" of positions.

Example:

(at beginning of discussion) M: I think he should steal the money.

A: Yeah, that's what I said too.

**OR** Briefly acknowledging other's point, but goes on to disagree with major points and conclusions: "Yes, but... or OK, but... (where the yes is real, and indicates at least mild agreement with person's point, but the "but" is person's primary point and no real agreement with implications of other's point is indicated.)

**OR** "Um Hmm" or "Yeah" by tone indicating true agreement.

**OR** Parroting the other person's positions in a clear, non-mocking way, which indicates that you agree with them.

Example:

M: "Stealing can never be justified."

*A: "Stealing can never be justified." (said in agreement)*

1 - Any indication of true validation or true agreement with other (except if just about position as described above), stated **with some enthusiasm or encouragement**.

"That's true" or "Right" "That's interesting" said to indicate true validation/ agreement re: significant statements of the other person, but without strong enthusiasm. (*NOTE: Sometimes a speaker will use "Yeah" to indicate any of the above; "yeah" can be scored a 1 if it seems to serve the same purpose as the above statements. More often, however, it is scored at a 0.5, if at all).*

**OR** Laughs at something said by other which was intended as a funny statement (i.e. laughs with other).

**OR** A compliment, which is only somewhat enthusiastic or is qualified by a somewhat negative remark -- but the overall statement is still complimentary.

Example:

M: "Well, I think you said that fairly well."

M: "I think that you are a good student, but you need to work harder in math."

2 - Statements expressing sincere understanding or insight into thoughts or feelings of the other person about the disagreement…in a way that strongly, if implicitly, acknowledges the validity of the other person’s point. (*NOTE: Statements which seem less sincere may be scored lower.) [Score as lower than 2, if it technically fits, but doesn’t have the same strong feel as the example below]:*

Example:

M: "I can understand why you would feel that way."

**OR** Responds very positively to other's ideas, while disagreeing:

"That's a very interesting argument, I can see how it fits, but I think...".

**OR** An unambivalent, sincere compliment which stands alone (i.e. is not modified by another, less complimentary remark).

3 - Enthusiastic, unqualified agreement with a significant statement of the other person.

"You're absolutely right!" or "I agree completely"

4- Repeated responses which each would be scored as a "3". Person is genuinely interested in other's reasoning, listens to what they say and is encouraging even when they don't agree, but may also often agree heartily.

**OR** Numerous repeated clear agreements ("3's") so much as to be a clear and consistent pattern.

## H. Engaged Interaction

**GLOBAL Category** - If multiple distinct disagreements are discussed as a regular part of the interaction task, then enter a code for this category after each argument. Otherwise, a single code is entered for the entire interaction.

Definitional Overview: **This category focuses upon the degree to which a person is engaging with the other person. People show that they are engaged by following up on what a person says (whether agreeing or disagreeing), leaving time for the other to talk, and listening to what the other has to say. A person can demonstrate engagement both verbally and non-verbally; non-verbal signs of engagement can include eye-contact, body posture, head movements (i.e. nodding, shaking head, etc.), and facial expressions. A person is fully engaged only if they are both communicating and sensitive to what the other is communicating.**

The code for engaged is based on both the amount and quality of engagement. The overall code should be based on an intuitive average of the interaction. Scores ARE NOT based on the highest level reached. For example, if someone was at the 0 level for the first 8 minutes, but then reached the 2.5 level for the last 2 minutes of the interaction, that person would probably be in the .5 or 1 range.

Scores in the 0 - 2 range should be assigned when tone of an interaction does not indicate any true connection. There may be listening and interacting occurring, but in the absence of any demonstrable efforts to connect or any evidence of empathy.

0 - looking down or away, little or no eye contact

- completely ignoring or not responding to other person

- cutting other person off or leaving them no time to speak

- looking bored/staring blankly

**OR**

- at least some response to other, after hearing them

- some interest in other, even if it is concerning a minor/trivial point

- may initiate a little interaction

**OR**

- little eye contact and little interaction

- keeps the interaction going minimally, but still shows no or very few signs of interest in what other is saying

- Shows little or no affect

**OR**

- participation in conversation (i.e. statements on same topic), but never addressing the content of what the other person says

- "unresponsive lectures"

- dueling monologues

1 -Generally following conversation, but not usually taking into account what other person is saying

-Statements may occasionally (i.e. 2 of the times) respond to the content of what the other person is saying, but for the most part content is ignored

1.5 - Attentive and interacting, but minimally hearing other (i.e. placating)

2 - Interaction with attentiveness to other's statements, but mainly so as to argue/respond

- "Courtroom listening" (sensitive to what other says, but only to the extent that they can then use the information to further their own argument)

- Statements indicate a response to the content of what the other person is saying, although no attempts are made to *understand* the content of their speeches

Scores in the 2.5 - 4 range are assigned when the tone of the interaction does reflect some level of empathy or effort to connect with the other person (i.e. trying to understand their point of view).

2.5 - At least 1-2 examples of empathy or efforts to understand other person's point of view displayed (as defined under "3"). This example has to occur in the context of empathy, which is generally at the 1.5-2.0 range (in other words, one statement reflecting understanding which occurs in the context of otherwise completely ignoring the other person would not earn a 2.5 for empathy).

3 - Empathy/effort to connect with other person is present and occurs more than 1-2 times AND/OR enough to be a noteworthy feature of at least part of the discussion.

- Signs of empathy might include:

\* finishing other's sentences in a good way

\* comments reflecting what other just said

\* evidence of seeing other's point of view

\* actively responding to other's point of view

\* open ended questions about other's feelings

3.5 - Signs of empathy as defined above shown on multiple occasions throughout the discussion (at least 3) AND/OR empathy is a more extensive, pervasive aspect of the discussion.

4 -Empathic quality or tone to entire interaction. Overt signs of empathy do not have to be continuously displayed, but they should be displayed quite frequently.

-Verbal and non-verbal behavior are mostly consistent with each other and with an attitude of connectedness with other person (i.e. most generally facing each other with good eye contact)

*NOTE: A person need not be completely empathic to receive a "4"--such empathy is unlikely in the face of a serious disagreement. But effort to understand and communicate this understanding should be a strong feature of most of the discussion.*

It’s possible to be recanting and engaged at the same time, though it would be slightly different aspects of the statements that would be captured (if one is empathic at the same time as recanting).

**Validating VS. Engaged**: A validating statement makes the person feel complimented for their thinking or actions; an engaged statement makes them feel heard. Both can happen at the same time, but they don’t at all need to.

**Behaviors Inhibiting Relatedness**

The 3 types of behavior coded in this section are all behaviors which actively undermine the degree of positive interaction within a dyad, either by explicitly cutting them off when they try to speak, or by devaluing them and what they are saying and thus implicitly cutting them off, or by refusing to engage in discussion.

## I. Distracting/Ignoring/Cutting Off Other Person.

Definitional Overview: **This category refers to actions which ignore or cut off another person. The more statements explicitly communicate a lack of interest in the other’s statements, and/or a lack of willingness to hear what the other is saying, the higher the score for I. In addition to being more distracting, higher level statements are likely to annoy, hurt, irritate or frustrate the other person because they are not being heard. Note that statements that explicitly respond to the other person, but that implicitly may communicate a lack of interest (e.g. ”Okay, fine, whatever” said dully), are more likely to be factored into the score for Engaged, and less likely to be scored under I for explicitly ignoring.**

In general, interruptions which occur when both parties start to speak at the same time don't get counted. Don't count interjections--defined as statements which are (a) limited to a few words, (b) don't interrupt the flow of the other person's speech AND (c) don't appear intended as the beginning of a longer statement. (i.e. This is an interjection: M: He needs to please his father A: For his own safety M: as long as he's living in his father's house. This IS NOT an interjection but IS an interruption: M: He needs to please his father A: Not really, because M: as long as he's living...".)

Distracting statements that attempt to bring someone who is off topic back onto topic can be scored, depending on the extent to which such statements reflect a lack of caring/sensitivity towards the other person. The underlying core of the I code is that one person is communicating a lack if willingness to listen to the other, which may or may not be occurring when someone tries to get back on task.

1. IS NOT coded under I: Topic of Household Rules

A: Well, I think you treat my sister differently than you treat me.

M: Hmm, aren’t we supposed to be talking about rules?

2. IS coded under I: Topic of Household Rules:

A: Well, I think you treat my sister differently than you treat me.

M: Look, we are NOT talking about your sister here, okay? (said harshly, clearly rejecting other’s statement)

Distracting behavior can be coded, but we don’t code just general teen antsy-ness. Code behavior when it would be annoying/distracting to most anyone. In general, code these behaviors in terms of how much they are like an ignoring/distracting statement as discussed below.

0 - Pays attention to other appropriately and doesn't interrupt overly often or without giving other a chance to express self.

.5 - A little non-receptive (e.g. a poor listener who sometimes doesn't follow what the other person is saying)

A: "I think I should be able to stay out until 12:00 because sometimes parties don't end until 11:30, and I need time to make it home."

M: "So tell me again why do you think you should get to stay out late." (i.e. person wasn't paying attention, NOT that other person spoke to softly to be heard)

**OR**

One premature interruption (e.g. after S has had a chance to make one point, but clearly cutting him or her off from making another point), which does not just stem from undue excitement in a discussion.

Example:

A: "I think I should get to stay out until 12:00 because sometimes parties aren't over until 11:30, and also because that is when..."

M: "/Well, I think you should be in by 11:00."

**OR**

Seems reluctant to give input into discussion at the very beginning (i.e. probably due more to shyness or nervousness than lack of concern for what other person is saying)

Example:

M: "So tell me again why you want to stay out later?"

A: "Um...I don't know." (assuming that the teen *does* know but is not forthcoming with a response).

***NOTE:*** *.5 level statements may not be scored at all if they occur at the beginning of the argument. At this time participants may cut each other off in their eagerness to state their own position* ***OR*** *demonstrate reluctance to engage with each other due to feeling uncomfortable with the task.*

1 -Interrupts other somewhat rudely/clearly cuts other off before he/she gets to make a point

A: (early in the discus­sion) "I think I should get to stay out later because..."

M: "/Well, 11:00 is late enough."

**1 vs. 2:** In general, 1 and 2 are similar, but 1 captures ignoring or cut-offs which may be less intentional and/or are less harsh. In general, statements which only cut off the other person, without also communicating a rejection of what they are saying, will not get scored higher than a 1. 2's reflect a stronger lack of interest/willingness to communicate, and are more likely to have a clear effect of stifling other.

1.5 - Clearly non-receptive/not choosing to follow other person (can include explicitly not following other’s line of thought, as well as multiple statements talking over other).

Example:

A: "I think I should be able to stay out later because all of my friends do."

M: "Okay, so why don't you start by saying what you thought". (i.e. makes it clear that they are ignoring statement by other person)

Example:

F: “Maybe after you grow up, you’ll say, I wish my dad was telling me stuff like”

A: “/Well, we’re getting off topic.”

**OR**:

Statements that refuse to talk about something the other person has just brought up that’s relevant, but that don’t cut off the entire conversation and aren’t particularly rude in tone:

Example:

M: “Well you did get a pretty poor grade in world history.”

A: “Let’s not get into that.” (said in a reasonable, straightforward, not unfriendly tone)

2 - A clearly distracting statement that is not an immediate response to a statement of other (and is therefore less rudely ignoring other than if statement immediately followed other's statement)

Example:

M: "I think that you should be home by 11:00." (10 second pause)

A: "Is the 10 minutes up yet?"

**OR**

Statements that remain on topic, but clearly dismiss/reject what the other is saying.

Example:

A: But I did most of the cleaning, my sister only…

M: /No, no, the two of you

A: /did the dishes

M:/Alright, Sam, listen to me. (harsh tone) Do you think that as one of three people living in the house, that you should have to help with the chores? (This final statement not only cuts off the teen, but completely rejects his statements in favor of mom pressing her own argument)

**OR**:

Statements that refuse to talk about something the other person has just brought up that’s relevant, but that don’t cut off the entire conversation and aren’t particularly rude in tone:

Example:

M: “Well you did get a pretty poor grade in world history.”

A: “Let’s not get into that.” (said in a brusquer, harsher tone)

**2 vs. 3** - Higher levels of distracting/ignoring will reflect both more active and/or explicit interruptions, as well as ones that clearly attempt to derail the conversation. Distracting statements which do not completely ignore the content of what the other person says and/or which do not completely remove discussion from the topic at hand are scored lower than a 3. Note that these statements are often rude/harsh, and thus may also be scored under J.

2.5 Statements that actively reject what other is saying, without explicitly completely cutting off the whole conversation.

Example:

A: Why should I be nice to my brother?

M: Well, because he is nice to you. You know, he really looks up to you, in fact, when he was younger, he used to...

A: Oh gag me! I don’t want to hear that stupid story all over again. It’s always the same. Blah, blah, blah, just stop.

3 - Refuses to discuss other's point of view/clearly does not want to discuss topic/protests discussing topic to camera.

Example:

M: "What do you think about our rules about dating?"

A: "Forget it." **OR** "I have nothing to say." **OR** "I don't want to talk about this." *NOTE: This example refers to someone cutting off the entire discussion in a somewhat abrupt way.*

M: "(to camera) OK. I guess we are done with this topic." *(NOTE: statements such as these indicate reluctance to discuss a particular point, versus refusal to discuss anything at all, which can be scored under 4 below)*

**OR** Refuses to respond to direct statements/questions

Example:

M: "So what do you think about that?"

A: (no response)

**OR** A clearly distracting statement which is an immediate response to a statement of other and makes it clear that the speaker does not want to continue the discussion.

Example:

M: "I think that you should be home by 11:00."

A: "Is the 10 minutes up yet?" (follows immediately after other's statement)

4 - This score can be reached by one instance of *completely* refusing to continue the entire discussion.

Example:

M: "(to camera) That's it. We're done. Let's stop now."

**OR**

by multiple "3" level statements.

***J. Hostile or Devaluing Statements Toward Other, either explicitly or implicitly***

Definitional Overview: **This category refers to devaluing statements which would be reasonably expected (at least slightly) to leave the other person feeling annoyed, hurt, or worse about themselves. This category includes statements which are rude, hostile, mean, disdainful or devaluing toward the other person or their statements. Anger which does not include any one of the above is NOT scored under this category.**

This category includes behaviors which attack the other person. Coders should keep in mind that speakers are disagreeing about important and difficult issues, and that they may often address problems with each other's behavior. To be considered for this scale, a statement must go *beyond* straightforward criticism of and/or displeasure with the other person to those that are more insulting, pejorative and hurtful of the other person's feelings.

Example:

M: "You say that you are not going to spend all of your money on cigarettes, but then you do" IS NOT scored as critical, as this comment addresses a specific behavior.

Example:

M: "You are a liar". IS scored as critical because they address characteristics of the person.

Both tone and content are important to consider when scoring: mildly devaluing statements which are said in an extremely hostile way can be scored highly, as well as very devaluing statements said in a pleasant tone.

Hostile and/or rude *behaviors* can also be scored in this category (hitting, sticking out tongue). However, unless very extreme, these behaviors will almost always be scored as implicitly, rather than explicitly, hostile (up to a 1 or 1.5).

0 - No sign of devaluing or hostile statements.

.5 - Mildly hostile, rude, or devaluing remarks.

Examples:

M: "Oh come on now, you really think that?"

M: "Okay I'm going to tell you what I think" A: *"Oh, great"* (said sarcastically)

A: "I've only missed my curfew once" M: *"Yeah, right* - its been more like 5 days in a row"(said sarcastically)

1 - Implicitly devaluing or rude statements.

Examples:

A: "All you do is read all the time - that's boring"

M: "You had better get your act together soon"

A: "This (discussion) is stupid".

M: "That's all of you kids' problem - you wanna be 18 before you get there."

2 - Clearly hostile, rude or openly devaluing remarks.

Examples:

A: "You really only think of yourself, don't you?"

M: "Nasty as you are, you think I'm just supposed to hand you money?"

M: "You are a little slow to catch on, but you are doing it" (said flippantly).

3 - Extremely hostile, devaluing, rude, or critical remarks.

Examples:

M: "You're lying!"

A: "You must be really stupid if you think that."

M: "You're out of your mind. You must have bumped your head".

4 - Repeated, frequent hostile or critical remarks, or more than 1 extremely hostile remark (i.e. no single statement will score a 4).

**Summary of Scoring Procedures**

**Stating Reasons (A), Confident assertiveness (B), and Engaged Interaction (H)**: These categories are scored as an average or cumulative level across the entire interaction.

**All other categories**: Coded cumulatively using the following algorithm.

The rule is that 2 examples of a score yield a score 0.5 point higher, and 3 examples yield a score 1 point higher. Always group in groups of 3 first. Scores of 0.5 are an exception, in which case it takes 3 examples of 0.5 point to yield a 1.

For example:

6 examples of a given score (e.g., 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2,) are considered (2 sets of 3) (e.g., 3 & 3) which combine to yield a score 1-2 points higher.

You can handle complex examples by breaking them into smaller chunks as follows:

If you have: 1 1 1 2 2 2 3

Step 1: 1 + 1 + 1 = 2

Step 2: now you have four 2s => 2 + 2 + 2 = 3 (fourth 2 left over & does not further elevate score)

Step 3: now you have two 3s => 3 + 3 = 3.5

If you have: .5 .5 .5 1 1 2

Step 1: .5 + .5 + .5 = 1

Step 2: now you have three 1s => 1 + 1 + 1 = 2

Step 3: now you have two 2s => 2 + 2 = 2.5 (final score)

*(NOTE that the 3 .5's only add up to a 1. The reason for this is so that extremely low level scores on a category don't take on excessive weight if oft-repeated).*

**Summary Scales**

To date, these individual codes have been used to create the following 3 summary scales (with codes loading as follows):

Autonomous-relatedness: Stating reasons + Confident Assertiveness + Validating + Engaged Interaction

Undermining Autonomy: Recanting + Overpersonalizing + Pressuring

Undermining Relatedness: Ignoring/interrupting + Hostility

Queries was not used in initial analyses due to odd factor loadings (it has since been revised to tap only queries that are likely to promote relatedness).

Some labs have also kept Autonomy and Relatedness measures separate, with some evidence that this is reasonable from a factor analytic perspective.

Some evidence also exists that different ways of undermining autonomy may have different associations to adolescent attachment status (with overpersonalizing statements positively linked to passivity of thought (i.e. preoccupation), and recanting statements negatively linked to passivity).

Reliabilities for overall composite scales range roughly from .7 to .85 (intraclass correlations). If 2 coders code all tapes and their average codes are used, the resulting Spearman-Brown reliabilities should go up to .8 to .9.

**References**

Allen, J. P., & Hauser, S. T. (1996). Autonomy and Relatedness in Adolescent-Family Interactions as Predictors of Young Adults' States of Mind Regarding Attachment. *Development and Psychopathology, 8,* 793-809.

Allen, J. P., Hauser, S. T., Bell, K. L., & O'Connor, T. G., (1994). Longitudinal assessment of autonomy and relatedness in adolescent-family interactions as predictors of adolescent ego development and self-esteem. *Child Development*, *65,* 179-194.

Allen, J. P., Hauser, S. T., Eickholt, C., Bell, K. L., & O'Connor, T. G. (1994). Autonomy and relatedness in family interactions as predictors of expressions of negative adolescent affect. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *4,* 535-552.

Allen, J. P., Hauser, S. T., O'Connor, T. G., Bell, K. L., & Eickholt, C. (1996). The Connection of Observed Hostile Family Conflict to Adolescents' Developing Autonomy and Relatedness With Parents. *Development and Psychopathology, 8*, 425-442.

Allen, J. P., Hauser, S. T., O’Connor, T. G., & Bell, K. L. (in press). Prediction of peer-rated adult hostility from autonomy struggles in adolescent-family interactions. *Development and Psychopathology.*

Allen, J. P., Insabella, G. M., & Porter, M. R. (2006). A social-interactional model of the development of depressive symptoms in adolescence. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 74(1), 55-65.

Allen, J. P., Marsh, P., McFarland, C., McElhaney, K. B., Land, D. J., Jodl, K., & Peck, S (2002). Attachment and autonomy as predictors of the development of social skills and delinquency during midadolescence*. Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 70*, 56-66.

Allen, J. P., McElhaney, K. B., Kuperminc, G. P., Jodl, K. M (2004). Stability and change in attachment security across adolescence. Child Development, 75, 1792-1805.

Allen, J. P., Porter, M., McFarland, F. C., McElhaney, K. B., Marsh, P. (2007). The relation of attachment security to adolescents' paternal and peer relationships, depression, and externalizing behavior. Child Development.

Bell, K. L., Allen, J. P., Hauser, S. T., & O'Connor, T. G. (1996). Family factors and young adult transitions: Educational attainment and occupational prestige. In J. A. Graber, J. Brooks-Gunn, & A. C. Petersen (Eds.), *Transitions through adolescence: Interpersonal domains & context* (pp. 345-366). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bender, H. T., Allen, J. P., McElhaney, K. B., Moore, C. M., O'Beirne Kelly, H., & Davis, S. M. (2007). Use of harsh physical discipline and developmental outcomes in adolescence. Development and Psychopathology, 19, 227-242.

Best, K. M., Hauser, S. T., & Allen, J. P. (1997). Predicting young adult competencies: Adolescent era parent and individual influences. Journal of Research on Adolescence, 12, 90-112.

Marsh, P., McFarland, F. C., Allen, J. P., McElhaney, K. B., & Land, D. (2003). Attachment, autonomy, and multifinality in adolescent internalizing and risky behavioral symptoms. Development and Psychopathology, 15, 451-467.

McElhaney, K. B., & Allen, J. P. (2001). Autonomy and Adolescent Social Functioning: The Moderating Effect of Risk. *Child Development, 72*, 220-231.

McElhaney, K.B., Porter, M.R., Thompson, L.W., & Allen, J.P.  (2008). Apples and oranges: Divergent meanings of parents' and adolescents' perceptions of parental influence.  The Journal of Early Adolescence, 28, 206-229.

O'Connor, T. G., Allen, J. P., Hauser, S. T., Bell, K. L. (1996). Adolescent-parent relationships and leaving home in young adulthood. In J. A. Graber, & J. S. Dubas (Eds.) New Directions in Child Development, No. 71, 39-52.

Samuolis, J., Hogue, A., Dauber, S., Liddle, H.A (2005). Autonomy and Relatedness in Inner-City Families of Substance Abusing Adolescents. Journal of Child and Adolescent Substance Abuse, 15(2), 53-86.

Szwedo, D.E., Mikami, A.Y., & Allen, J.P. (2010). Qualities of peer relations on social networking websites: Predicting from negative mother-teen interactions. Journal of Research on Adolescence.

Whitton, S.W., Waldinger, R.J., Schulz, M.S., Allen, J.P., Crowell, J., & Hauser, S.T.  (2008). Prospective associations from family-of-origin interactions to adult marital interactions and relationship adjustment. Journal of Family Psychology, 22 (2), 274-286.

SHEET FOR CODING DYAD

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | ***Teen to Parent*** | ***Parent to Teen*** |
| Exhibiting Autonomy | | |
| **A.** Reasons/Points |  |  |
| **B.** Confidence |  |  |
| Undermining Autonomy | | |
| **C.** Recanting/Collapsing |  |  |
| **D.** Blurs |  |  |
| **E.** Pressures |  |  |
| Exhibiting Relatedness | | |
| **F.** Queries |  |  |
| **G.** Validates |  |  |
| **H.** Engaged |  |  |
| Undermining Relatedness | | |
| **I.** Distracting/Ignoring |  |  |
| **J.** Hostile/Devaluing |  |  |