Supplement 1

A sample model, with number of criticisms at the 9-month evaluation as the outcome variable, is below:

Level 1 (Within-Family):
$$E\ (\textit{9-month Criticism} \mid \beta) = \lambda$$
$$\log\ (\lambda) = \eta$$

$$\eta = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\textit{baseline criticism}) + \beta_2\ (\textit{age}) + \beta_3\ (\textit{gender}) + \beta_4\ (\textit{baseline adolescent CESD})$$
$$+ \beta_5\ (\textit{9 mos. adolescent CESD}) + R$$

Level 2 (Between-Family):
$$\beta_0 = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}\ *(\textit{Condition}) + U_o$$
$$\beta_1 = \gamma_{10}$$
$$\beta_2 = \gamma_{20}$$
$$\beta_3 = \gamma_{30} + \gamma_{31}\ *(\textit{Condition})$$
$$\beta_4 = \gamma_{40}$$
$$\beta_5 = \gamma_{50}$$

Although we were interested in λ – the expected rate of criticisms at month 9 given the predictors in the model – the model used the log link to predict η (i.e., log number of criticisms), which then can be converted back to the original scale. Variables that could vary within a family were included at Level 1; variables that could vary between families (e.g., condition) were included as predictors at Level 2. The Level 2 model aggregated the within-family estimates to provide estimates for the average number of criticisms at the 9-month evaluation (i.e., intercept, γ_{00}) and the average relation between the Level 1 predictors and the outcome variable for the sample. Of particular interest in the present study were γ_{01} – representing group differences in the number of criticisms at post-intervention (9 months), and γ_{31} – representing a gender by condition interaction in predicting the number of criticisms at 9 months. The inclusion of a random intercept, U_o, at Level 2 accounted for the dependency among siblings' data.