

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
FEB 05 1997	_____	_____
MAY 12 1999	_____	_____
JAN 08 2001	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

MSU Is An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution

**ADOLESCENTS' TELEVISION-RELATED TALK
WITH PARENTS AND FRIENDS:
A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS**

By

Renato A. Linsangan

A DISSERTATION

**Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of**

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Communication Arts and Sciences

1989

ABSTRACT

**ADOLESCENTS' TELEVISION-RELATED TALK
WITH PARENTS AND FRIENDS:
A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS**

By

Renato A. Linsangan

Using the structural analysis of relations as a conceptual framework, this study examined differences in television-related talk (TVRT), defined as interpersonal communication about television content, that adolescents have with parents and friends. It also examined the association between structures of relations, defined in terms of communicative interaction procedures, and TVRT. TVRT was theorized to follow or reflect communicative interaction procedures.

This relational framework is based on the premise that interpersonal interactions are organized by participants into structures. Structure refers to the types of interactions which take place between the subject (e.g., adolescent) and the social object (e.g., parent), and these interactions become the source of knowledge or meaning for the participants.

It was predicted that adolescents would perceive themselves to be in two kinds of interpersonal relations--

one with parents and another with friends. More specifically, the general hypothesis was that adolescents' relationships with their parents would be mostly unilateral, where meaning resides in parents who strive to impart an already constructed knowledge to their children by virtue of their power and authority. In contrast, adolescents' relationships with their friends would more often be basically cooperative or mutual, where ideas can be challenged, opinions are expressed, and meaning is negotiated and co-constructed.

Data were collected from adolescents who were asked to indicate the frequency of their interactions with parents and friends on measures of communicative interaction procedures and TVRT. Measures of communicative interaction procedures were adapted from existing measures of generalized interactional patterns. Multiple indicator measurement models of TVRT were constructed for this study, and their factor structures were tested for unidimensionality using confirmatory factor analysis.

The results of tests of hypotheses about adolescents' communicative interaction procedures with their parents and friends generally supported the theoretical predictions of the structural analysis of relations. The respondents' relationships with their parents were found to be mostly unilateral while their relationships with their friends were found to be mostly mutual. Results of tests of hypotheses about their TVRT with their relations generally paralleled

the results on communicative interaction procedures.

Adolescents' TVRT with parents was found to be mostly unilateral while their TVRT with friends was found to be mostly mutual.

Copyright by

RENATO A. LINSANGAN

1989

To Vince, Mark, Janah, Jean, and Jason

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to say "maraming salamat" to Dr. Bradley Greenberg, my advisor and committee chair, for his guidance, encouragement, and patience. The same goes to the members of my committee--Dr. Thomas Baldwin, Dr. Charles Atkin, and Dr. Gina Garramone--for their critical questions and suggestions.

I would also like to thank Dr. Carrie Heeter for sharing with me her computer expertise during my first research assignments.

Without the love, understanding, and support of my family, I would not have survived graduate school. To my parents, sisters, and brother in the Philippines goes a very special thank you.

For encouraging me to pursue my interests and finish my Ph.D., the credit goes to a very good friend in Toronto--Mark Hafner.

Thanks also to all my friends in Michigan who made my student-life bearable, fun at times, and intensely exciting every now and then.

"Maraming, maraming salamat" to the secretaries and office staff of the Department of Telecommunication for all the assistance they gave me during my stay at MSU.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
LIST OF TABLES	xi
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW	4
Children's Social Development	5
Reciprocity of Complement	8
Direct Reciprocity	10
Communicative Procedures in Adolescents' Relations	11
Adolescent-Parent Relationship	13
Adolescent-Friend Relationship	15
Communicative Interaction Procedures	17
Adolescents' Communicative Interaction Procedures	18
About Television	
TVRT Information Purposes	20
Hypotheses	22
Communicative Interaction Procedures	22
TVRT Information Purposes	26
CHAPTER 3: METHODS	33
Respondents	33
Procedures	34
Operationalization	35
Communicative Interaction Procedures	35
TVRT Information Purposes	38
Analysis	40
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS OF CONFIRMATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS	44
Internal Consistency	47
Parallelism	65
Information Seeking (Object to Subject)	65
Information Seeking (Subject to Object)	78
Information Clarification (Object to Subject)	78
Information Clarification (Subject to Object)	89
Information Giving (Object to Subject)	89
Information Giving (Subject to Object)	104
Information Exchange	111

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER 5: RESULTS OF HYPOTHESIS TESTS	112
Comparison of Adolescents' Communicative Interaction Procedures with Parents and Friends	112
Comparison of Adolescents' Communicative Interaction Procedures with Mothers and Fathers	115
Comparison of Adolescents' Communicative Interaction Procedures with Friends	117
Comparison of Adolescents' Television-Related Talk with Parents and Friends	119
Comparison of Adolescents' Television-Related Talk with Mothers and Fathers	120
Comparison of Adolescents' Television-Related Talk with Same- and Opposite-Sex Friends	126
Comparison of Adolescents' Television-Related Talk and Communicative Interaction Procedures	128
Direct Influence	129
Social Verification	130
Notes	133
CHAPTER 6: SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION	134
Communicative Interaction Procedures	135
Summary	135
Parents and Friends	135
Mothers and Fathers	136
Parents and Sex-of-Child Differences	136
Friends and Sex-Related Differences	137
Discussion	139
TVRT Information Purposes	143
Summary	143
Parents and Friends	143
Mothers and Fathers	144
Parents and Sex-of-Child Differences	144
Friends and Sex-Related Differences	146
Discussion	147
Communicative Interaction Procedures and TVRT	152
Summary	152
Mother Data	152
Father Data	152
Same-sex Friend Data	153
Opposite-sex Friend Data	153
Discussion	154
Conclusion	155
BIBLIOGRAPHY	163
APPENDIX A: Test of Internal Consistency Tables for the Initial TVRT Measurement Models	166

	<u>Page</u>
APPENDIX B: Test of Parallelism Tables for the Initial TVRT Measurement Models	183
APPENDIX C: The Survey Questionnaire	224

Pa

1.1

1.2

1.3

1.4

1.5

1.6

1.7

2.1a

2.1b

2.2a

2.2b

2.3a

2.3b

2.4a

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.1 Factor Loadings of Information Seeking Items, Object to Subject	48
1.2 Factor Loadings of Information Seeking Items, Subject to Object	48
1.3 Factor Loadings of Information Clarification Items, Object to Subject	49
1.4 Factor Loadings of Information Clarification Items, Subject to Object	49
1.5 Factor Loadings of Information Giving Items, Object to Subject	50
1.6 Factor Loadings of Information Giving Items, Subject to Object	50
1.7 Factor Loadings of Information Exchange Items	50
2.1a Test of Internal Consistency Information Seeking/Object to Subject	51
2.1b Test of Internal Consistency Information Seeking/Object to Subject	52
2.2a Test of Internal Consistency Information Seeking/Subject to Object	53
2.2b Test of Internal Consistency Information Seeking/Subject to Object	54
2.3a Test of Internal Consistency Information Clarification/Object to Subject	55
2.3b Test of Internal Consistency Information Clarification/Object to Subject	56
2.4a Test of Internal Consistency Information Clarification/Subject to Object	57

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
2.4b	Test of Internal Consistency Information Clarification/Subject to Object	58
2.5a	Test of Internal Consistency Information Giving/Object to Subject	59
2.5b	Test of Internal Consistency Information Giving/Object to Subject	60
2.6a	Test of Internal Consistency Information Giving/Subject to Object	61
2.6b	Test of Internal Consistency Information Giving/Subject to Object	62
2.7a	Test of Internal Consistency Information Exchange	63
2.7b	Test of Internal Consistency Information Exchange	64
3.1a	Test of Parallelism Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X) Information Seeking/Subject to Object (Y)	66
3.1b	Test of Parallelism Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X) Information Seeking/Subject to Object (Y)	67
3.2a	Test of Parallelism Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X) Information Clarification/Object to Subject (Y)	68
3.2b	Test of Parallelism Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X) Information Clarification/Object to Subject (Y)	69
3.3a	Test of Parallelism Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X) Information Clarification/Subject to Object (Y)	70
3.3b	Test of Parallelism Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X) Information Clarification/Subject to Object (Y)	71
3.4a	Test of Parallelism Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X) Information Giving/Object to Subject (Y)	72
3.4b	Test of Parallelism Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X) Information Giving/Object to Subject (Y)	73

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
3.5a	74
Test of Parallelism	
Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X)	
Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)	
3.5b	75
Test of Parallelism	
Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X)	
Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)	
3.6a	76
Test of Parallelism	
Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X)	
Information Exchange (Y)	
3.6b	77
Test of Parallelism	
Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X)	
Information Exchange (Y)	
3.7a	79
Test of Parallelism	
Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X)	
Information Clarification/Object to Subject (Y)	
3.7b	80
Test of Parallelism	
Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X)	
Information Clarification/Object to Subject (Y)	
3.8a	81
Test of Parallelism	
Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X)	
Information Clarification/Subject to Object (Y)	
3.8b	82
Test of Parallelism	
Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X)	
Information Clarification/Subject to Object (Y)	
3.9a	83
Test of Parallelism	
Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X)	
Information Giving/Object to Subject (Y)	
3.9b	84
Test of Parallelism	
Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X)	
Information Giving/Object to Subject (Y)	
3.10a	85
Test of Parallelism	
Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X)	
Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)	
3.10b	86
Test of Parallelism	
Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X)	
Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)	
3.11a	87
Test of Parallelism	
Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X)	
Information Exchange (Y)	

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
3.11b	Test of Parallelism Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X) Information Exchange (Y)	88
3.12a	Test of Parallelism Information Clarification/Object to Subject (X) Information Clarification/Subject to Object (Y)	90
3.12b	Test of Parallelism Information Clarification/Object to Subject (X) Information Clarification/Subject to Object (Y)	91
3.13a	Test of Parallelism Information Clarification/Object to Subject (X) Information Giving/Object to Subject (Y)	92
3.13b	Test of Parallelism Information Clarification/Object to Subject (X) Information Giving/Object to Subject (Y)	93
3.14a	Test of Parallelism Information Clarification/Object to Subject (X) Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)	94
3.14b	Test of Parallelism Information Clarification/Object to Subject (X) Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)	95
3.15a	Test of Parallelism Information Clarification/Object to Subject (X) Information Exchange (Y)	96
3.15b	Test of Parallelism Information Clarification/Object to Subject (X) Information Exchange (Y)	97
3.16a	Test of Parallelism Information Clarification/Subject to Object (X) Information Giving/Object to Subject (Y)	98
3.16b	Test of Parallelism Information Clarification/Subject to Object (X) Information Giving/Object to Subject (Y)	99
3.17a	Test of Parallelism Information Clarification/Subject to Object (X) Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)	100
3.17b	Test of Parallelism Information Clarification/Subject to Object (X) Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)	101

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
3.18a	Test of Parallelism Information Clarification/Subject to Object (X) Information Exchange (Y)	102
3.18b	Test of Parallelism Information Clarification/Subject to Object (X) Information Exchange (Y)	103
3.19a	Test of Parallelism Information Giving/Object to Subject (X) Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)	105
3.19b	Test of Parallelism Information Giving/Object to Subject (X) Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)	106
3.20a	Test of Parallelism Information Giving/Object to Subject (X) Information Exchange (Y)	107
3.20b	Test of Parallelism Information Giving/Object to Subject (X) Information Exchange (Y)	108
3.21a	Test of Parallelism Information Giving/Subject to Object (X) Information Exchange (Y)	109
3.21b	Test of Parallelism Information Giving/Subject to Object (X) Information Exchange (Y)	110
4	Summary of Analysis of Variance for Communicative Interaction Procedures (CIP) by Relationship	114
5	Summary of t-tests for Communicative Interaction Procedures with Mother and Father	116
6	Summary of t-tests for Communicative Interaction Procedures with Same- and Opposite-sex Friends	118
7	Summary of t-tests for Television-Related Talk with Parents and Friends	121
8	Summary of t-tests for Television-Related Talk with Mother and Father	123

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
9	Summary of t-tests for Television-Related Talk with Parents according to Sex-of-Child	125
10	Summary of t-tests for Television-Related Talk with Same- and Opposite-Sex Friends	127
11	Summary of t-tests for Television-Related Talk according to Direct Influence	131
12	Summary of t-tests for Television-Related Talk according to Social Verification	132
13	Summary Table for Communicative Interaction Procedures with Parents and Friends	135
14	Summary Table for Communicative Interaction Procedures with Mothers and Fathers	136
15	Summary Table for Communicative Interaction Procedures with Parents by Sex-of-Child	137
16	Summary Table for Communicative Interaction Procedures with Same- and Opposite-Sex Friends	138
17	Summary Table for Television-Related Talk with Parents and Friends	143
18	Summary Table for Television-Related Talk with Mothers and Fathers	144
19	Summary Table for Television-Related Talk with Parents by Sex-of-Child	145
20	Summary Table for Television-Related Talk with Same- and Opposite-Sex Friends	146
21	Summary Table for Communicative Interaction Procedures and Television-Related Talk with Mothers	152

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
22	Summary Table for Communicative Interaction Procedures and Television-Related Talk with Fathers	153
23	Summary Table for Communicative Interaction Procedures and Television-Related Talk with Same- and Opposite-Sex Friends	154
A.1	Information Seeking Items Object to Subject	166
A.2	Information Seeking Items Subject to Object	166
A.3	Information Clarification Items Object to Subject	166
A.4	Information Clarification Items Subject to Object	167
A.5	Information Giving Items Object to Subject	167
A.6	Information Giving Items Subject to Object	167
A.7	Information Exchange Items	167
A.1a	Test of Internal Consistency Information Seeking/Object to Subject	168
A.1b	Test of Internal Consistency Information Seeking/Object to Subject	169
A.2a	Test of Internal Consistency Information Seeking/Subject to Object	170
A.2b	Test of Internal Consistency Information Seeking/Subject to Object	171
A.3a	Test of Internal Consistency Information Clarification/Object to Subject	172
A.3b	Test of Internal Consistency Information Clarification/Object to Subject	173
A.4a	Test of Internal Consistency Information Clarification/Subject to Object	174
A.4b	Test of Internal Consistency Information Clarification/Subject to Object	175

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
A.5a	Test of Internal Consistency Information Giving/Object to Subject 176
A.5b	Test of Internal Consistency Information Giving/Object to Subject 177
A.6a	Test of Internal Consistency Information Giving/Subject to Object 178
A.6b	Test of Internal Consistency Information Giving/Subject to Object 179
A.7a	Test of Internal Consistency Information Exchange 180
A.7b	Test of Internal Consistency Information Exchange 181
B.1a	Test of Parallelism Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X) Information Seeking/Subject to Object (Y) 182
B.1b	Test of Parallelism Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X) Information Seeking/Subject to Object (Y) 183
B.2a	Test of Parallelism Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X) Information Clarification/Object to Subject (Y) 184
B.2b	Test of Parallelism Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X) Information Clarification/Object to Subject (Y) 185
B.3a	Test of Parallelism Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X) Information Clarification/Subject to Object (Y) 186
B.3b	Test of Parallelism Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X) Information Clarification/Subject to Object (Y) 187
B.4a	Test of Parallelism Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X) Information Giving/Object to Subject (Y) 188
B.4b	Test of Parallelism Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X) Information Giving/Object to Subject (Y) 189

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
B.5a	Test of Parallelism Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X) Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)	190
B.5b	Test of Parallelism Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X) Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)	191
B.6a	Test of Parallelism Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X) Information Exchange (Y)	192
B.6b	Test of Parallelism Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X) Information Exchange (Y)	193
B.7a	Test of Parallelism Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X) Information Clarification/Object to Subject (Y)	194
B.7b	Test of Parallelism Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X) Information Clarification/Object to Subject (Y)	195
B.8a	Test of Parallelism Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X) Information Clarification/Subject to Object (Y)	196
B.8b	Test of Parallelism Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X) Information Clarification/Subject to Object (Y)	197
B.9a	Test of Parallelism Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X) Information Giving/Object to Subject (Y)	198
B.9b	Test of Parallelism Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X) Information Giving/Object to Subject (Y)	199
B.10a	Test of Parallelism Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X) Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)	200
B.10b	Test of Parallelism Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X) Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)	201
B.11a	Test of Parallelism Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X) Information Exchange (Y)	202

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
B.11b	203
Test of Parallelism	
Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X)	
Information Exchange (Y)	
B.12a	204
Test of Parallelism	
Information Clarification/Object to Subject (X)	
Information Clarification/Subject to Object (Y)	
B.12b	205
Test of Parallelism	
Information Clarification/Object to Subject (X)	
Information Clarification/Subject to Object (Y)	
B.13a	206
Test of Parallelism	
Information Clarification/Object to Subject (X)	
Information Giving/Object to Subject (Y)	
B.13b	207
Test of Parallelism	
Information Clarification/Object to Subject (X)	
Information Giving/Object to Subject (Y)	
B.14a	208
Test of Parallelism	
Information Clarification/Object to Subject (X)	
Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)	
B.14b	209
Test of Parallelism	
Information Clarification/Object to Subject (X)	
Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)	
B.15a	210
Test of Parallelism	
Information Clarification/Object to Subject (X)	
Information Exchange (Y)	
B.15b	211
Test of Parallelism	
Information Clarification/Object to Subject (X)	
Information Exchange (Y)	
B.16a	212
Test of Parallelism	
Information Clarification/Subject to Object (X)	
Information Giving/Object to Subject (Y)	
B.16b	213
Test of Parallelism	
Information Clarification/Subject to Object (X)	
Information Giving/Object to Subject (Y)	
B.17a	214
Test of Parallelism	
Information Clarification/Subject to Object (X)	
Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)	
B.17b	215
Test of Parallelism	
Information Clarification/Subject to Object (X)	
Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)	

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
B.18a	Test of Parallelism Information Clarification/Subject to Object (X) Information Exchange (Y)	216
B.18b	Test of Parallelism Information Clarification/Subject to Object (X) Information Exchange (Y)	217
B.19a	Test of Parallelism Information Giving/Object to Subject (X) Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)	218
B.19b	Test of Parallelism Information Giving/Object to Subject (X) Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)	219
B.20a	Test of Parallelism Information Giving/Object to Subject (X) Information Exchange (Y)	220
B.20b	Test of Parallelism Information Giving/Object to Subject (X) Information Exchange (Y)	221
B.21a	Test of Parallelism Information Giving/Subject to Object (X) Information Exchange (Y)	222
B.21b	Test of Parallelism Information Giving/Subject to Object (X) Information Exchange (Y)	223

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Television-related talk (TVRT), interpersonal communication about television content, has been studied largely as a dimension of parental or adult mediation of children's television viewing. Investigations focusing on TVRT in this respect have largely been attempts to demonstrate that parental or adult verbal intervention is effective in influencing what young people learn from television. However, a majority of studies have found little or no mediation of children's television use (Lyle & Hoffman, 1972; Streicher & Bonney, 1974; Comstock, 1976, 1978; Mohr, 1979; Bybee, Robinson, & Turrow, 1982).

TVRT need not be conceptualized solely on the basis of or in relation to mediation. Implicit in this common conceptualization is the assumption that verbal messages about television content are important only in relation to mediation of young people's television viewing. That conceptualization severely limits the definition of TVRT to communication aimed at translating the complexities of television into terms comprehensible to children of various cognitive levels of development. Additionally, this

perspective assumes that TVRT is unidirectional, that is, verbal messages regarding television content come only from parents or adults to children. Focusing on parents as transmitters of knowledge and meaning, mediation studies have not considered the interactional process that may possibly occur in parent-child communication, and the child's input to the construction of television messages. Furthermore, these studies have neglected the contribution of other sources of influence, such as friends or older siblings, on children's constructions of television portrayals or messages.

Some researchers have offered alternative perspectives from which interpersonal communication about television may be viewed. For example, it has been suggested that the communicative uses of television in families may fulfill relational functions, such as communication facilitation, as a resource for interpersonal affiliation or avoidance, a resource for social learning, and demonstration of competence or dominance (Lull, 1980). While these functions might describe how families use television, they do not reveal the nature of the talk participants' interactions about television content and how their relationship might influence such interactions. A more heuristic approach when dealing with communication about television might be to ascertain the nature of such communication within the relational context of the participants. Within a family or friendship milieu, how do participants interact about

television? What relational variables impact on their interactions?

The purpose of this study was to examine the association between structures of relations, as manifested in communicative interaction procedures, and TVRT in adolescent-parent and adolescent-friend relationships.

Three research questions were considered:

1. Are there differences (or similarities) in adolescents' structural relationships with parents and friends? mothers and fathers? same sex and opposite sex friends?
2. Are there differences (or similarities) in adolescents' TVRT with their parents and friends? fathers and mothers? same sex and opposite sex friends?
3. Are differences (or similarities) in TVRT related to differences (or similarities) in the structure of relations?

CHAPTER 2

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

This study used the structural analysis of relations (Youniss, 1980; Youniss & Smollar, 1985) as a conceptual framework. This perspective is primarily an integration and extension of Piaget (1965) and Sullivan's (1953) theoretical approach to social development.

The relational framework is based on the premise that interpersonal interactions are organized by participants into structures. Structure refers to the types of interactions which take place between the subject (e.g., adolescent) and the social object (e.g., parent), and these interactions become the source of knowledge or meaning for the participants.

Adolescents perceive themselves to be in two kinds of interpersonal relations--one with parents and another with friends (Hunter, 1983; Youniss & Smollar, 1985).

Communicative interaction procedures reveal these two structural relationships. Adolescents' relationship with their parents is mostly unilateral, where meaning resides in parents who strive to impart an already constructed knowledge to their children by virtue of their power and

authority. In contrast, adolescent relationship with friends or peers is basically cooperative or mutual, where ideas can be challenged, opinions are expressed, and meaning is negotiated and co-constructed.

To understand how adolescents come to perceive themselves in different relations and how they organize these relations into structures, discussion of Sullivan (1953) and Piaget's (1965) social development theories, as integrated by Youniss (1980) and Youniss & Smollar (1985), is in order.

Children's Social Development

Children are born into a socially ordered world. At infancy, they start out not being able to make a connection between their inner world and the external world. Although their actions seem controlled by inner biological factors, they soon perceive some kind of order in their actions and others' actions and reactions to them. When they cry, adults pick them up, feed them, or play with them. Sullivan and Piaget theorize that within the first year of life, infants begin to perceive a contingency between actions. They start to perceive that their actions are not self-contained units, but are a part of a continuing series of actions performed by themselves and others around them. For Sullivan and Piaget, this is the point when infants start to contend with interpersonal interactions, the point where meaning becomes social rather than private.

The first step then in children's social development is their realization that existence is social and not individual, which results from their participation in interactions with adults who have their welfare foremost in mind. The next step is the establishment of a structure by which children and adults develop a method for seeking and finding order with one another. This is supposed to be achieved during the preschool years when children attempt to adopt their parents' and other adults' versions of reality and gain approval for such attempts. Once this structure is formed, children learn to exchange conformity for approval. This process continues until early adolescence. And during this process, children learn to accept that reality is ordered, that they must master this order through the help of adults, and that the roles of children and adults in this ordered reality are that of learners and knowers, respectively.

Children start school with the belief that the ordered reality they know is shared by their peers. They soon find out that their version is not the only version of reality. They are then faced with the prospect of either constantly running up against contrary viewpoints held by peers or evolving a method of reconciling different versions of reality. Sullivan and Piaget propose that, through friendship, the latter prevails. Through cooperative effort with friends, children discover that differences in viewpoints are reconciled and order is achieved. With this

realization, children embark on another phase of development, characterized by a need for social union and willingness to engage in interactions that bring about mutual benefit to both participants.

Children's realization that there is another kind of relationship possible outside of their relationship with their parents leads them to an awareness of differences in interpersonal relations. These differences are "due to differences in structure, when structure refers to the types of interactions which take place between child and other. Children come to see themselves as being able to construct order in society either through adults or with peers" (Youniss & Smollar, 1985, p.21). These two kinds of relations are actually two versions of social experience, where the child's role is dependent upon the structure of the relationship. Specifically, the process by which the child is a participant in social construction with parents differs from the process by which s/he is a participant in social construction with friends. In the former relationship, the child looks to parents and constructs reality, or finds meaning for an event, through them in a tone of conformity. In friendship, cooperation occurs as friends co-construct meaning to an event by jointly searching to discover whose meaning is most workable, or by finding new meaning for the event. The meanings they both initially bring to an event are potentially equally valid. But they are obliged to contend with each other's meaning

through interactive procedures of taking and giving perspectives and then working toward a mutual perspective.

The concept of reciprocity, the basis for differentiating between these two relations, refers to the processes by which children exchange behavior and communicate with either parents or friends. Children's relationship with parents is characterized by reciprocity of complement, while their relationship with peers is characterized by direct reciprocity. Reciprocity of complement is basically asymmetrical, in the sense that children's contributions to interactions are restricted and most often directed by parents, but the reverse is not true. Direct reciprocity does not so much refer to equality between peers but to the process of cooperative presentation and listening that peers share, resulting in common understanding--even in disagreement.

Reciprocity of Complement

In their search for order, children discover that their interactions with adults are characterized by habits and routines in which adults and children have to play their respective parts. Their discovery might be summarized by the question: "What do they do when I do something?" Thus, children come to realize that the meaning of their actions can be found only in relation with the action of adults. Through different situations, they arrive at a generalization of a method which might be applicable to

different interactions. Since adults hold already established views of society, Sullivan and Piaget propose that adults' actions in relation to children's actions are mostly evaluative. Adults know what forms of behavior are appropriate, and they lead children into these forms of behavior. They also argue that adults' evaluative behaviors are independent of any particular disciplinary style. Though different their styles might be, all adults engage in typical evaluative behaviors, such as encouragement, discouragement, reinforcement, etc. From these evaluative behaviors, children learn to adjust their behavior accordingly, and move toward a social construction which they think adults hold.

The complementary nature of the child-adult relationship does not necessarily preclude children's initiatives at and adults' adjustments during interactions. The general idea is that adults do not treat children as equals in the task of ordering reality, in the sense that adults do not enter into interactions with children with the thought of altering their construction of reality. Whatever adjustments they make are attempts at better communicating to children their already established views. This is not to say that adults' actions are guided by rigidity. Rather, their actions are guided by their judgment of what is acceptable in society and by their desire to help children understand societal demands, thus, helping them be accepted by society.

In essence, the adult-child relationship is structurally unilateral. Meaning resides outside of the child, in adults; meaning is passed on to the child from the adult. This structure is accepted by the child because s/he discovers that conformity to adults' instructions brings about orderly effects and enables them to participate in a wide array of interactions with adults.

Direct Reciprocity

Children enter the world of peers with the expectation that their conception of reality, as they have determined from their interactions with parents or other adults, is applicable everywhere. Across a variety of situations, they soon discover that their versions of reality are sometimes not shared by peers. Even citing parents as authority does not always lead others to agreement with them. Slowly, they come to realize that no individual version of reality is the only right version.

In their search for order among peers, children come to the conclusion that each is free to contribute toward the interaction. However, equal contribution or direct reciprocity does not always bring results or order. But if one child conceded to another, s/he would merely be replicating the complementary relationship that s/he already has with her/his parents.

Sullivan and Piaget theorize that children discover a solution--one presents a point of view and another presents

a different point of view. They listen to each other, but each maintains a position. This experience opens a new relationship for them, something which they have not experienced with parents or other adults. The process actually leads to a new structure of relationship, a cooperative structure which, in turn, leads to order. Cooperation takes the form of procedures they use for arriving at order--debate, argument, negotiation, compromise.

In the same way that a unilaterally structured relationship evolves, the cooperatively structured relationship evolves out of a repeated interaction process in different interpersonal situations. As children move into adolescence, the contrast between their relationship with parents and their relationship with peers becomes more and more apparent. Adolescents now see themselves in two relations, with each relation requiring a distinct form of reciprocity.

Communicative Procedures in Adolescents' Relations

In studies of children aged 6-14 (Youniss, 1980), interactions between parents and preadolescents were found to follow a consistent form in different content areas. Parents guided their children through requests or commands, and children followed their parents' directives. From the children's reports, parents appeared to have exclusive rights of approval and disapproval, and children modified

their behavior according to these rights. This consistent form of interaction suggests that the parent-preadolescent structural relation involves unilateral authority. Between the ages of 9 and 14, children were found to start transforming their conception of the adult-child relationship from that of a complementary relationship to a directly reciprocal relationship. This was more pronounced between 12 and 14.

Interactions between peers were found to follow direct or symmetrical reciprocity. Between the ages of 6 and 8, children already understood their role in peer interactions and felt free to make like or equal contributions. Starting at the age of nine, children were found to start defining friendship as a relation sustained by cooperative procedures. As they developed, until early adolescence, children came to grasp the implications of cooperation and the norm of equality in their friendships.

In a series of studies consisting of eight projects over a four-year period, Youniss & Smollar (1985) assessed adolescents' interpersonal communication with parents and friends in terms of topics of conversation. This was in keeping with past research indicating that adolescents seek out parents and friends for advice depending on specific issues. For example, Brittain (1963) reported that adolescents rely more on peer wishes when it comes to present-oriented situations and more on parental wishes when it comes to future-oriented situations. They rely more on

parents and less on peers for advice regarding financial, educational, and career concerns. Regarding social activities, adolescents rely more on peers and less on parents for advice (Sebald, 1986).

The researchers also argued that relational structures may be revealed through the quality, or characteristics, of interpersonal communication. Quality was assessed in terms of types of understanding and kinds of general procedures used. If both members of the dyad assumed equal responsibility for ensuring understanding of their messages, their communication was typed as having symmetrical understanding. Symmetrical understanding is achieved through procedures used in direct reciprocity, characterized as open, accepting, and cooperative. If, on the other hand, only one member assumed this responsibility, the communication was typed as nonsymmetrical. This type of understanding is characteristic of procedures in reciprocity of complement, characterized as guarded, judgmental, and authoritative.

Adolescent-Parent Relationship

Two major findings from the Youniss & Smollar (1985) studies suggest that the status of parental authority during adolescence differs from its status during childhood. First, parental authority does not apply universally to the whole repertoire of parent-adolescent communicative interactions. Adolescents do discuss certain topics with

both their parents, but there are also topics which they discuss only with one parent and still others which they discuss with neither parent. Second, while parents retain their position of authority and can assert that position unilaterally, adolescents perceive that they can also interact cooperatively with their parents. On matters with clear objective standards, such as school performance, parents settle disagreements unilaterally; there is not much negotiation on such topics. In matters of personal problems where they are involved, parents act less as unilateral authorities; they appear more willing to listen and understand.

In addition, mothers and fathers interact differently with their adolescent children with regard to the above two issues. Fathers' involvement with their adolescent children is generally restricted to the domains of academic performance and future plans, where they communicate with unilateral authority. Mothers' involvement, aside from these two areas, extends to household rules, emotional states, and interpersonal areas of the adolescents' everyday lives. Aside from differences in topics of involvement, mothers and fathers also differ in their communicative procedures. While both parents act unilaterally when it comes to areas with clear objective standards, such as academic performance and household rules, mothers' involvement with their adolescent children in areas without clear objective standards, such as social competence and

emotional well-being, enables them to engage also in cooperative procedures with their children.

As suggested by these findings, the structure of unilateral authority characteristic of parent-child relations is revised during adolescence. Adolescents were found not to perceive their parents as a unit, but as separate relations. Fathers continued to be perceived as authorities; father-adolescent communication was typically nonsymmetrical. While mothers continued to be perceived as authorities as well, they were also described by adolescents as conversational partners in areas of private concerns, social life, and here-and-now interests. In short, mother-adolescent communication was both symmetrical and nonsymmetrical. In their involvement in adolescents' daily lives, mothers also become confidants from whom adolescents can gain consensual validation through cooperative procedures.

Adolescent-Friend Relationship

The same studies (Youniss & Smollar, 1985) reveal that activities and interactions in friendship relations are relatively unstructured, in the sense that they are not governed by formal rules of behavior. Adolescents described their interactions in terms of just being "out together" or simply "hanging around." In addition, these interactions usually occur outside parental view or supervision.

Communication in friendship relations may be described

as a process of consensual validation. In this process, "two persons seek to understand their world through a mutual exchange of ideas, feelings, and thoughts that are offered to each other for comment, discussion, or evaluation" (p. 128). The result of this process is a construction of the world by the self with another through mutual reflection.

Adolescents described their conversations with friends as encompassing both intimate (e.g., feelings, fears, problems) and nonintimate issues (e.g., TV, sports, school), characterized by consensual validation, or symmetrical understanding, through mutual reflection. They reported talking to their friends about their thoughts, feelings, and problems. They indicated expressing, and accepting as valid perspectives, opposing opinions.

Generally, these findings indicate that friends take measures to understand each other in an atmosphere of trust, openness, cooperation, and acceptance of each other's point of view. However, females were found to disclose and talk more with friends about their personal problems than males. They were also found to be more oriented toward meeting emotional needs than their male counterparts. In short, communication between female friends is more symmetrical than communication between males. The studies did not consider communication between friends of the opposite sex.

Communicative Interaction Procedures

As discussed previously, adolescents see themselves in two kinds of relational structures--unilateral with their parents and cooperative, or mutual, with their friends. These structures are revealed through their communicative interaction procedures with these relations. Youniss & Smollar (1985) also describe these procedures, in terms of quality of communication, as nonsymmetrical and symmetrical types of understanding. This latter distinction was derived from various studies describing procedures used in different situations (e.g., conflicts, conflict resolutions, typical and enjoyed activities) and topics (e.g., dating, feelings, problems) of communication.

Using data from these descriptive studies and earlier ones done by Youniss (1980) and Youniss & Volpe (1978), Hunter (1983) developed empirical measures of unilateral and mutual communicative interaction procedures used in direct influence and social verification contexts. Direct Influence refers to communicative procedures initiated by the other person (object) to get the subject to do something. Social Verification refers to procedures initiated by the subject to solicit input from the object for the purpose of clarification.

In Unilateral Direct Influence, the object tries to directly influence the subject's behavior by assuming greater power and authority. In Mutual Direct Influence,

the object attempts to influence the subject through negotiation, explanation, request, and exchange of benefits. Patterns of Unilateral Social Verification apply to situations where the subject seeks verification because s/he is uncertain about some ideas or actions. They also include responses of the object in the form of advice or opinions based on greater knowledge or experience. Mutual Social Verification is characterized by the object's attempts to understand and solve the subject's problems cooperatively. It is based on the object's willingness to co-construct new ideas rather than transmit already formed ideas.

	Unilateral	Mutual
Direct Influence		
Social Verification		

Adolescents' Communicative Interaction Procedures About Television

There is evidence that families engage in interpersonal communication about television (Desmond et al., 1985) and types of these interpersonal exchanges have been documented. For example, Messaris (1983) reported that parents and children engage in information-oriented kinds of conversations about television programs. Among friends, television shows are also topics of conversations (Youniss & Smollar, 1985). Is it possible that these types of

conversation may follow or be influenced by general communicative interaction procedures determined by familial and/or friendship relational structures? The specific interest in this study was whether or not TVRT reflected unilateral and/or mutual procedures.

Discovering the type of communicative procedures used in relational interactions about television content would provide answers to, among other things, some questions regarding the mediation of television messages. If these procedures were found to be unilateral (object to subject) in familial relationships, the implication would be that parent-child interactions about television are unidirectional, as implied in mediation studies. But how does one explain reports of little or no mediation? Could this be due to the possibility that both parents and their children "mediate" television messages?

There is no literature available on what, how, and why adolescents talk with their friends about television. It is paradoxical that researchers have not considered how young people "mediate" television messages among themselves when most studies attempt to assess the impact of the medium on them. Television continuously presents images of different versions of social relations, giving its audience multiple and contradictory interpretations. It would be interesting to discover how young viewers go about making sense of these images and how they bring to bear their limited life experiences to this process. Finding out how adolescents'

TVRT with friends are affected by the structure of their relationships is a start toward this discovery.

TVRT Information Purposes

There are no existing empirical measurements of information-oriented TVRT. The few published studies on this area (e.g.: Messaris, 1983; Bryce & Leichter, 1983) have used observational methods, the actual observation of families in television viewing situations. While observational studies may provide detailed accounts or descriptions of communicative interactions regarding television, they do not allow for the measurement of systematic variances in variables of theoretical interest.

Television-specific interaction procedures, defined in terms of TVRT information purposes, were developed for this study. These were suggested by information-oriented kinds of conversations about television and communicative procedures in unilateral and mutual relational structures.

The four TVRT information purposes developed for this study are explained below:

1. Information Seeking - This information purpose refers to interactions about television where the subject (adolescent) may inquire from the object about different elements of television programs. This is a parallel of Social Verification.

2. Information Clarification - Responses to "why" questions are a form of clarification or explanation. When

this type of TVRT is a direct response by the object (parent or friend) to the subject's Information Seeking, it constitutes Social Verification. Clarification, however, may not necessarily be a direct response to an inquiry; it is possible that this type of communication may be initiated by the object, as in Hunter's (1983) definition of direct influence. Thus, the object's Information Clarification, when unsolicited by the subject, takes the form of Direct Influence.

3. Information Giving - Unsolicited accounts, as in accounts of plot developments or characters' dialogues and actions, is a form of Direct Influence. When accounts are a response to the subject's Information Seeking, they take the form of Social Verification.

4. Information Exchange - When the subject and the object contribute mutually to interactions about television, the information purpose is called Information Exchange. It does not fall under either Direct Influence or Social Verification.

To type these purposes as either unilateral or mutual, they were delineated according to direction of communication. There is unilateral direction when one member of the dyad communicates more than the other. In mutual direction, there is equal communication between the subject and the object.

1. Information Seeking - When Information Seeking is done more by the subject than the object, the communicative

interaction is unilateral. When the subject and the object equally seek information from each other, the procedures are mutual.

2. Information Clarification - Unilateral direction is characteristic of greater object to subject TVRT procedures. When there is equal amount of clarification between the object and the subject, communication is mutual.

3. Information Giving - Unilateral procedures in this category are also characterized by greater object to subject communication. Equal amount of Information Giving between the object and the subject constitutes mutual procedures.

4. Information Exchange - This is characteristic of mutual procedures.

Hypotheses

Communicative Interaction Procedures

Hunter (1983) found that parents' interactions with their adolescent children were mostly unilateral in both Social Verification and Direct Influence contexts. Adolescent-friend interactions in both contexts were found to be predominantly mutual. These findings support the conceptualizations of the parent-child relationship as unilateral and the friendship relationship as mutual. They also confirm the nonsymmetrical and symmetrical types of understanding found by Youniss & Smollar (1985) in these two kinds of relations.

H₁: Adolescents' relationships with their parents and friends are structurally different.

H_{1a}: Unilateral Direct Influence will be more, and Mutual Direct Influence will be less, frequent in adolescent-parent relationships than in adolescent-friend relationships.

H_{1b}: Unilateral Social Verification will be more, and Mutual Social Verification will be less, frequent in adolescent-parent relationships than in adolescent-friend relationships.

	Unilateral	Mutual
Direct Influence	AP* > AF*	AP < AF
Social Verification	AP > AF	AP < AF

*AP = Adolescent-Parent Dyad

*AF = Adolescent-Friend Dyad

Results of Youniss & Smollar's (1985) studies show that while mothers' interactions with their children may show the same patterns as fathers', they are also less unilateral and more mutual. As discussed previously, both fathers and mothers are perceived by their adolescent children as authorities. However, mothers are also described by them as conversational partners who engage in cooperative interactions with them. Hunter (1983) did not find mothers to have higher mutual interactions than fathers with their adolescent children. But she explained that this finding may have been due to the wordings of the questionnaire instructions.

H₁: Adolescents' relationships with their mothers and fathers are structurally different.

H_{2a}: Mutual Direct Influence will be more, and Unilateral Direct Influence will be less, frequent in adolescent-mother relationships than in adolescent-father relationships.

H_{2b}: Mutual Social Verification will be more, and Unilateral Social Verification will be less, frequent in adolescent-mother relationships than in adolescent-father relationships.

	Unilateral	Mutual
Direct Influence	AM* < AD*	AM > AD
Social Verification	AM < AD	AM > AD

*AM = Adolescent-Mother Dyad

*AD = Adolescent-Father Dyad

Both Hunter (1983) and Youniss & Smollar (1985) found greater son-father interactions than daughter-father interactions. However, they found no differences in Direct Influence and Social Verification interactions by sons and daughters with their mothers. Mother-daughter interactions were expected to be stronger than mother-son interactions; same-sex similarities in social experiences are expected to bring about closer (more mutual) and greater interactions between parent and child of the same sex than between parent and child of the opposite sex (Hunter, 1983). Considering Youniss & Smollar's (1985) report that mothers are described by both males and females as conversational partners, results of no difference in interactions by sons and daughters with their mothers should not be surprising.

However, other studies show that same-sex parent-child relationships have closer attitudinal and psychological closeness than opposite-sex parent-child relationships (Hunter, 1983). Due to these inconsistent findings, no hypotheses were offered in this area. But differences in adolescents' structural relations with their same-sex and opposite-sex parents were explored in this study. Their results will be discussed with the results of tests of the second set of hypotheses above.

Although adolescents generally interact mutually and symmetrically with their friends, females tend to use more symmetrical procedures of understanding (Youniss & Smollar, 1985) and mutual patterns of communicative interactions (Hunter, 1983) with their friends than males. These findings are consistent with other studies showing that females are more peer-oriented and have greater intimacy and empathy in their friendships (Hunter, 1983).

Since no studies were found regarding differences in communicative interaction procedures between friends of the opposite sex, no hypotheses were offered in this area. However, communicative interactions between opposite-sex friends were explored in this study and will be discussed with the results of tests of the hypotheses below.

H₃: Female same-sex friendships are structurally different from male same-sex friendships.

H_{3a}: Mutual Direct Influence will be more frequent in female same-sex friendships than in male same-sex friendships.

H_{3b}: Mutual Social Verification will be more frequent in female same-sex friendships than in male same-sex friendships.

	Unilateral	Mutual
Direct Influence		FSS* > MSS*
Social Verification		FSS > MSS

*FSS = Female-Same-sex Friend Dyad

*MSS = Male-Same-sex Friend Dyad

TVRT Information Purposes

No prior research on information purposes of television-related talk exists--predictions about these variables can only be made on the basis of the framework used to conceptualize and develop them. In this framework, adolescents' interpersonal interactions with parents are theoretically predicted to be unilateral while their interactions with friends are predicted to be mutual. In parent-adolescent relationships, meaning resides in parents, who strive to impart an already constructed knowledge to their children by virtue of their power and authority. In friend-adolescent relationships, ideas can be challenged, opinions expressed, and meaning is negotiated and co-constructed.

The following hypotheses are formulated under the assumption that interpersonal communication about television content followed the theoretical predictions of the structural analysis of relations. They are also based on findings that while adolescents strive for mutual procedures

with parents, they still perceive parents as authorities and seek approval and validation from them. Adolescents perceive friendship as a supportive relationship, where friends help and cooperate with each other and share personal knowledge and common perspectives on a number of issues.

H₄: Adolescents' TVRT with their parents and friends are different.

H_{4a}: In adolescent-parent relationships, object to subject Information Giving will be more frequent than subject to object Information Giving; they will not be significantly different in adolescent-friend relationships.

H_{4b}: In adolescent-parent relationships, subject to object Information Seeking will be more frequent than object to subject Information Seeking; they will not be significantly different in adolescent-friend relationships.

H_{4c}: In adolescent-parent relationships, object to subject Information Clarification will be more frequent than subject to object Information Clarification; they will not be significantly different in adolescent-friend relationships.

H_{4d}: Information Exchange will be more frequent in adolescent-friend relationships than in adolescent-parent relationships.

	AP	AF
Information Giving	O/S* > S/O*	O/S = S/O
Information Seeking	S/O > O/S	S/O = O/S
Information Clarification	O/S > S/O	O/S = S/O
Information Exchange	AF > AP	

*O/S = Object to Subject
*S/O = Subject to Object

As discussed previously, adolescents' communicative procedures with their mothers and fathers differ. In aspects of adolescent lives where no clear objective standards apply, mothers' participation tends to be greater than fathers' participation. Mothers also pay more attention to their adolescent children's everyday activities and concerns. Additionally, they are perceived by their children as more willing than fathers to strive for mutual communicative procedures. Television is an everyday activity, even with adolescents whose central concern are their social and emotional lives. It is also an area where no clear objective standards apply as evidenced, though indirectly, by studies showing little or no parental mediation of television use. It is expected that television content would be more in the agenda of adolescent-mother than adolescent-father communicative interactions. It is also expected that these interactions would be more mutual than unilateral.

H₅: Adolescents' TVRT with their mothers and fathers are different.

H_{5a}: In adolescent-father relationships, object to subject Information Giving will be more frequent than subject to object Information Giving; they will not be significantly different in adolescent-mother relationships.

H_{5b}: In adolescent-father relationships, subject to object Information Seeking will be more frequent than object to subject Information Seeking; they will not be significantly different in adolescent-mother relationships.

H_{3c} : In adolescent-father relationships, object to subject Information Clarification will be more frequent than subject to object Information Clarification; they will not be significantly different in adolescent-mother relationships.

H_{3d} : Information Exchange will be more frequent in adolescent-mother relationships than in adolescent-father relationships.

	AD	AM
Information Giving	O/S > S/O	O/S = S/O
Information Seeking	S/O > O/S	S/O = O/S
Information Clarification	O/S > S/O	O/S = S/O
Information Exchange	AM > AD	

No hypotheses on same-sex and opposite-sex parent-child differences in TVRT were formulated, but they were investigated in this study and will be discussed with the tests of the above hypotheses.

Adolescents spend a considerable portion of their waking hours watching television. Female teens are consistently reported (Greenberg, 1988) to watch more television than their male counterparts. If viewing were an indication of the extent of TVRT among young people, then, females should be expected to talk more about television content. In addition, if the nature of talk about television were to follow general communicative procedures, females should also be expected to engage more than males in TVRT and to use more mutual patterns in these interactions. In other words, the frequency of TVRT between female friends

should not be expected to be significantly different.

As discussed earlier, male adolescents tend to use less symmetrical or mutual communicative interaction procedures. If TVRT were to follow general communicative procedures, males should then be expected to use less mutual (and more unilateral) procedures when talking about television. The generalization about the nature of male adolescents' communicative procedures with each other does not allow for the prediction of which direction--object to subject or subject to object--of TVRT would be more frequent. Therefore, the hypothesis could only be that male friends would have significantly different TVRT.

TVRT between friends of the opposite sex were also explored in this study. No hypotheses were offered in this area.

H₁: TVRT in female same-sex friendships and in male same-sex friendships are different.

H_{1a}: In male same-sex friendships, subject to object Information Giving will be significantly different from object to subject Information Giving; they will not be significantly different in female same-sex friendships.

H_{1b}: In male same-sex friendships, subject to object Information Seeking will be significantly different from object to subject Information Seeking; they will not be significantly different in female same-sex friendships.

H_{1c}: In male same-sex friendships, subject to object Information Clarification will be significantly different from object to subject Information Clarification; they will not be significantly different in female same-sex friendships.

H_{6d} : Information Exchange will be more frequent in female same-sex friendships than in male same-sex friendships.

	MSS	FSS
Information Giving	S/O = O/S	S/O = O/S
Information Seeking	S/O = O/S	S/O = O/S
Information Clarification	O/S = S/O	O/S = S/O
Information Exchange	FSS > MSS	

The overall goal of this study was to explore the relationship between relational structures, delineated in terms of communicative interaction procedures, and TVRT, defined according to information purposes. If TVRT were determined by the structure of relations, then, communicative interaction procedures should have an effect on the nature of information purposes adolescents have with their parents and friends. Mutual communicative procedures should be expected to result in mutual information purposes. By the same token, unilateral interaction procedures should be expected to bring about unilateral TVRT interaction purposes.

H_{7a} : For adolescents whose Direct Influence and Social Verification procedures with their relations are unilateral, Information Giving, Information Seeking, and Information Clarification would also be unilateral.

H_{7b} : For adolescents whose Direct Influence and Social Verification procedures with their relations are mutual, Information Giving, Information Seeking, and Information Clarification would also be mutual.

Information
Giving
Information
Seeking
Information
Clarification

UDI	USV	MDI	MSV
$O/S > S/O$	$O/S > S/O$	$O/S = S/O$	$O/S = S/O$
$S/O > O/S$	$S/O > O/S$	$S/O = O/S$	$S/O = O/S$
$O/S > S/O$	$O/S > S/O$	$O/S = S/O$	$O/S = S/O$

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

This chapter outlines the methods used to investigate differences in adolescents' structural relations and television-related talk with their parents and friends. The sample from which data were collected is described, and the operationalization of variables is presented. Then, the analyses used to examine structural relations, defined in terms of communicative interaction procedures, and TVRT, defined in terms of information purposes, are discussed.

Respondents

Questionnaires were administered to 230 grade 9 students in an urban middle school in the Midwest. Incomplete questionnaires were discarded, leaving a total of 200 usable questionnaires. The respondents were predominantly white (71%), but were almost equally represented by males (49%) and females (51%). Their mean age was 14.73.

The respondents reported watching an average of 3.09 hours of television on a typical schoolday, 2.13 hours (69%) of which were spent watching television with someone. On

weekends (Saturday and Sunday), they watched an average of 6.69 hours, 5.15 hours (77%) of which were spent watching television with someone. They also reported having an average of three working television sets at home, with 127 (63.5%) of them saying they had their own set. One hundred fifty-seven (78.5%) of the respondents reported having cable at home, while 131 (65.5%) reported having HBO or some other pay cable channel.

Procedures

Copies of the questionnaire were sent to the two teachers whose classes were going to be used in the study. They reviewed and pretested the questionnaire to ensure that the instructions and questions were clear to the respondents. Students who participated in the pretest were not included in the final sample.

Two versions of the questionnaire were prepared for the actual data collection. The first version had questions about communicative interaction procedures first, followed by questions on TVRT. The second version had questions about TVRT first, followed by questions on communicative interaction procedures. All questions were repeated four times--one each for mother, father, same-sex friend, and opposite-sex friend. Each version repeated the questions in two sequences. The first had the questions for the parents first, followed by the questions for the friends. The second had the questions for the friends first, followed by

the questions for the parents.

No significant differences due to question sequencing were found.

Operationalization

Two sets of variables were operationalized in this study. The first set--Unilateral Social Verification, Mutual Social Verification, Unilateral Direct Influence, and Mutual Direct Influence--represented communicative interaction procedures. The second set of variables represented information purposes of TVRT. These purposes were measured in terms of Information Seeking, Information Clarification, Information Giving, and Information Exchange.

Communicative Interaction Procedures

Social Verification was measured in terms of the object's procedures of social verification and the subject's reasons for seeking social verification from the object. Three procedure and four reason items were used to measure Unilateral Social Verification while four procedure and four reason items were used to measure Mutual Social Verification. Response categories for all these items were "Never" (0), "Not Often" (1), "Often" (2), "Very Often" (3), and "Always" (4). All questions were repeated four times--one each for mother, father, same-sex friend, and opposite-sex friend.

Procedure items for Social Verification were headed by

the following: "Think of the times when you feel unsure about important decisions you have to make, or unsure about personal problems you have, or unsure whether your ideas about something are right. How often does s/he do the following when you talk to him/her about something you are not sure of?"

Reason items for Social Verification were headed by the following questions: "Why do you talk to him/her when you are not sure about something? How often are the following answers similar or close to your reasons?"

Below are the procedure and reason items used to operationalize Unilateral and Mutual Social Verification:

Procedure items for Unilateral Social Verification:

1. S/he tells me that s/he points out where I'm wrong for my own good.
2. S/he tells me that I would realize her/his ideas are right when I get more experience.
3. S/he tells me what is right.

Procedure items for Mutual Social Verification:

1. S/he tries to figure out with me whether or not I'm right.
2. S/he tells me that s/he thinks I'm right.
3. S/he takes time to understand in what way I'm uncertain about something.
4. S/he tells me s/he wonders about the same thing.

Reason items for Unilateral Social Verification

1. Because I know s/he really cares about my doing the right thing.
2. Because s/he has taught me a lot of things.
3. Because s/he has more experience than I do.
4. Because I respect her/his knowledge about certain things.

Reason items for Mutual Social Verification:

1. Because s/he understands how I feel.
2. Because s/he thinks with me about what might be

- right instead of just telling me what s/he thinks is right.
3. Because I don't feel embarrassed to tell her/him about what's troubling me.
 4. Because s/he is having similar experiences as I am.

Direct Influence was measured in terms of the object's procedures of direct influence and reasons for attempts at direct influence. Four procedure and four reason items were used to measure Unilateral Direct Influence. Four procedure and four reason items were also used to measure Mutual Direct Influence. Response categories for all these items were "Never" (0), "Not Often" (1), "Often" (2), "Very Often" (3), and "Always" (4). All questions were repeated four times--one each for mother, father, same-sex friend, and opposite-sex friend.

Procedure items for Direct Influence were headed by the following: "Think of the times when this relative (friend) wants you to do something when you want to do something else. How often does s/he do the following when s/he wants you to do something else?"

Reason items for Direct Influence were headed by the following questions: "Why do you think s/he wants you to do those things? How often are the following answers similar or close to his/her reasons?"

Following are the procedure and reason items used to operationalize Unilateral and Mutual Direct Influence:

Procedure items for Unilateral Direct Influence:

1. S/he says I'm supposed to do what s/he tells me to do.
2. S/he simply tells me to do it.
3. S/he says s/he expects me to do what s/he tells me.

4. S/he keeps telling me to do it until I do it.

Procedure items for Mutual Direct Influence:

1. S/he keeps talking to me about what s/he wants me to do hoping I will start wanting to do it.
2. S/he says I would enjoy doing what s/he wants me to do.
3. S/he tells me that s/he would do favors for me at other times if I would go along with her/him now.
4. S/he asks me if I would be willing to do it.

Reason items for Unilateral Direct Influence:

1. Because s/he wants to teach me to do the right thing.
2. Because s/he doesn't trust my judgment.
3. Because s/he is supposed to tell me what to do.
4. Because s/he knows what I should do about some things better than I do.

Reason items for Mutual Direct Influence:

1. Because s/he wants me to help her/him to do something.
2. Because s/he knows I would want to do what s/he wants me to do.
3. Because s/he wants to spend time with me by doing something together.
4. Because s/he wants me to do the same thing s/he wants to do.

TVRT Information Purposes

Variations of talk--asking, explaining, telling, discussing--were used to assess respondents' purposes of talk about television content with their parents and friends. Subject to object (e.g., respondent to mother) and object to subject (e.g., mother to respondent) directions of talk were also assessed except in Information Exchange, which is a mutual procedure. Items starting with "I" indicated subject to object direction while items starting with "She" or "He" indicated object to subject direction.

Response options used for all items were "Never" (0), "Not Often" (1), "Often" (2), "Very Often" (3), and "Always" (4). All questions were repeated four times--one each for mother, father, same-sex friend, and opposite-sex friend.

The following items operationalized the different information purposes of TVRT:

Information Seeking (Object to Subject):

1. S/he asks me if what happens on TV shows is like real-life.
2. S/he asks me about events that happen on TV shows.
3. S/he asks me about conversations that take place on TV shows.
4. S/he asks me about TV characters.
5. S/he asks me why TV characters act the way they do.

Information Seeking (Subject to Object):

1. I ask her/him if what happens on TV shows is like real-life.
2. I ask her/him about events that happen on TV shows.
3. I ask her/him about conversations that take place on TV shows.
4. I ask her/him about TV characters.
5. I ask her/him why TV characters act the way they do.

Information Clarification (Object to Subject):

1. S/he explains to me that what happens on TV shows is like real-life.
2. S/he explains to me that what happens on TV shows is not like real-life.
3. S/he explains to me the events that happen on TV shows.
4. S/he explains to me the conversations that take place on TV shows.
5. S/he explains to me why TV characters act the way they do.

Information Clarification (Subject to Object):

1. I explain to her/him that what happens on TV shows is like real-life.
2. I explain to her/him that what happens on TV shows is not like real-life.
3. I explain to her/him the events that happen on TV shows.

4. I explain to her/him the conversations that take place on TV shows.
5. I explain to her/him why TV characters act the way they do.

Information Giving (Object to Subject):

1. S/he tells me that what happens on TV shows is like real-life.
2. S/he tells me that what happens on TV shows is not like real-life.
3. S/he tells me about events that happen on TV shows.
4. S/he tells me about conversations that take place on TV shows.
5. S/he tells me about TV characters.
6. S/he tells me why TV characters act the way they do.

Information Giving (Subject to Object):

1. I tell her/him that what happens on TV shows is like real-life.
2. I tell her/him that what happens on TV shows is not like real-life.
3. I tell her/him about events that happen on TV shows.
4. I tell her/him about conversations that take place on TV shows.
5. I tell her/him about TV characters.
6. I tell her/him why TV characters act the way they do.

Information Exchange:

1. We talk about TV shows.
2. We discuss whether or not what happens on TV shows is like real-life.
3. We talk about events that happen on TV shows.
4. We talk about conversations that take place on TV shows.
5. We talk about TV characters.
6. We discuss why TV characters act the way they do.

Analysis

Measures of communicative interaction procedures were adapted from Hunter's (1985) measures of generalized interactional patterns, which had been verified as forming

distinct factors. Multiple indicator measurement models of information purposes of TVRT were constructed for this study, and their factor structures were tested for unidimensionality. A factor or scale is unidimensional only if the items are alternate indicators of the construct being measured. A multiple indicator measurement model is a measurement model that specifies a unidimensional scale.

Confirmatory factor analysis was used to assess the structures of the seven TVRT measurement models. Specifically, the analysis was used to confirm the hypothesis that the factor structures of the proposed information purposes measurements, consisting of the multiple items specified a priori, were unidimensional.

Hunter (1977) suggested three evaluation criteria for unidimensionality. The first, homogeneity of content, refers to the similarity of meaning among cluster items. The second and third criteria, internal consistency and parallelism, are statistical procedures.

The first criterion, homogeneity of content, was implemented during the construction of the items. The items were written to reflect similarity of meaning among them.

The product rule for internal consistency requires that the correlation between two items (observed correlation) in the same cluster should be the product of their loadings on the factor (expected correlation) where they were hypothesized to load. If the deviations of the observed correlations from the expected correlations are within

sampling error, the cluster is unidimensional.

The product rule for external consistency, or parallelism, requires that the correlation between a cluster item and an item belonging to an outside factor (observed correlation) should be the product of their loadings on their hypothesized factors (expected correlation). If the deviations of the observed correlations from the expected correlations are within sampling error, the cluster of interest is unidimensional.

To test for internal consistency and parallelism, parameters of the models were first estimated using LIMSTAT (Lim, 1987). The statistical program first provided matrices for use in evaluating internal consistency. They consisted of 1) a matrix of observed correlations among cluster items, 2) a matrix of expected correlations among cluster items based on their factor loadings using communalities (reliabilities of items) in the diagonal, 3) a matrix of deviations of the observed correlations from the expected correlations, and 4) a matrix of deviations from the sampling error.

The program then provided the matrices for evaluating parallelism. These were 1) a matrix of observed correlations between cluster items and outside factor items, 2) a matrix of expected correlations between cluster items and outside factor items based on their factor loadings, 3) a matrix of deviations of the observed correlations from the expected correlations, and 4) a matrix of deviations from

the sampling error.

The factor structures were then evaluated for unidimensionality.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS OF CONFIRMATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS

Initial tests of internal consistency showed that the specified factor structures could be accepted as unidimensional (Appendix A). However, the tests of parallelism indicated a few rather large deviations (Appendix B) from the sampling error. The measurement models were re-examined to identify which items were contributing to the large deviations from the sampling error. Those pairs of items (cluster item and outside factor item) with observed correlations that had large deviations from the expected correlations were identified, and they were deleted from the models one at a time.

The subsequent tests of parallelism revealed that three similar items in each of the Information Seeking, Information Giving, and Information Exchange factors consistently caused the large deviations from the sampling error. The items were those containing the "like real-life," "not like real-life," and "why characters act the way they do" phrases. The items were:

Information Seeking

1. I ask her/him if what happens on TV shows is like real-life.

2. I ask her/him why TV characters act the way they do.
3. S/he asks me if what happens on TV shows is like real-life.
4. S/he asks me why TV characters act the way they do.

Information Giving

1. I tell her/him that what happens on TV shows is like real-life.
2. I tell her/him that what happens on TV shows is not like real-life.
3. I tell her/him why TV characters act the way they do.
4. S/he tells me that what happens on TV shows is like real-life.
5. S/he tells me that what happens on TV shows is not like real-life.
6. S/he tells me why TV characters act the way they do.

Information Exchange

1. We discuss whether or not what happens on TV shows is like real-life.
2. We discuss why TV characters act the way they do.

In addition, two items in the Information Clarification model also contributed to the large deviations from the sampling error. These items contained explanations of "events that happen" and "conversations that take place" on TV shows. The items were:

1. I explain to her/him the events that happen on TV shows.
2. I explain to her/him the conversations that take place on TV shows.
3. S/he explains to me the events that happen on TV shows.
4. S/he explains to me the conversations that take place on TV shows.

Reexamination of each measurement model led to a possible and plausible explanation as to why the items mentioned above were causing problems regarding the unidimensionality of the models. The explanation is based

on an assumption held in viewer-oriented television text analysis that viewer experiences are brought to bear in making sense of television (Fiske & Hartley, 1978), and on the proposition that this process occurs during viewers' television-related talk (Linsangan, 1987). Talking about the likeness or unlikeness of television portrayals to real-life, or about the motives behind characters' actions, may be seen as an opportunity for viewers to bring their own experiences and social knowledge into the talk. In other words, the stimuli for communicative interaction may be provided by television content, but the criteria for evaluation may come from the everyday cultural life of TVRT participants. Thus, talking about these elements of television content would be a more complex communicative process than relating plot developments (events) and dialogues (conversations) or talking about characters outside of the reality and motive contexts. If this "complexity" assumption were true, the meaning of the "reality" and "motives" items would be dissimilar from the meaning of the rest of the items in the Information Seeking, Information Giving, and Information Exchange models. When viewers talk about these elements, more than likely, they try to clarify them within the context of their social and cultural lives. By the same token, the items about "events" and "conversations" would not have similar meanings as the other items in the Information Clarification models. Relating "events" and "conversations" would not have an

evaluative component and, therefore, viewers would not have to draw upon their socio-cultural knowledge and personal experiences.

Results of confirmatory factor analysis on the revised measurement models supported the hypothesis that their factor structures were unidimensional. In addition, the analysis showed that, aside from having construct validity, the measurements also had very high reliability.

Results of confirmatory factor analysis on the revised measurement models are discussed below.

Internal Consistency

Tables 1.1-1.7 show the items and factor loadings for each of the seven measurement models. Tables 2.1a-2.7b show the tests of internal consistency. The "a" tables have the observed and expected correlations. The "b" tables show the deviations of the observed correlations from the expected correlations and the deviations from the sampling error.

It is clear from the "b" tables that each revised cluster of items representing each of the seven purposes of talk is unidimensional. The deviations of the observed from the expected correlations, except for two deviations (Table 2.7b) in the Father Data, were within sampling error. These two deviations (.02 and .01), however, are negligible. Under the internal consistency criterion, the seven measurement models were accepted as unidimensional.

Table 1.1
Factor Loadings* of Information Seeking Items****
Object to Subject

ITEMS	MData*	FData*	SSFData*	OSFData*
1. S/he asks me about events that happen on TV shows.	72	71	82	83
2. S/he asks me about conversations that take place on TV shows.	84	84	75	80
3. S/he asks me about TV characters.	80	78	81	82
Standard Coefficient Alpha =	83	82	84	86

*MData = Mother data

*FData = Father data

*SSFData = Same-sex Friend Data

*OSFData = Opposite-sex Friend Data

Table 1.2
Factor Loadings of Information Seeking Items
Subject to Object

ITEMS	MData	FData	SSFData	OSFData
1. I ask her/him about events that happen on TV shows.	80	75	78	80
2. I ask her/him about conversations that take place on TV shows.	87	76	73	85
3. I ask her/him about TV characters.	81	86	79	83
Standard Coefficient Alpha =	87	83	81	87

**Item numbers in Tables 1.1-1.7 correspond with the item numbers in Tables 2.1a-2.7b and Tables 3.1a-3.21b.

***Factor loadings and coefficient alphas in Tables 1.1-1.7 and correlation coefficients and deviations in Tables 2.1a-3.21b were multiplied by 100 to eliminate the decimal point.

Table 1.3
Factor Loadings of Information Clarification Items
Object to Subject

ITEMS	MData	FData	SSFData	OSFData
1. S/he explains to me that what happens on TV shows is like real-life.	78	80	79	83
2. S/he explains to me that what happens on TV shows is not like real-life.	62	66	73	71
3. S/he explains to me why TV characters act the way they do.	77	65	70	65
Standard Coefficient Alpha =	77	74	78	77

Table 1.4
Factor Loadings of Information Clarification Items
Subject to Object

ITEMS	MData	FData	SSFData	OSFData
1. I explain to her/him that what happens on TV shows is like real-life.	74	89	81	86
2. I explain to her/him that what happens on TV shows is not like real-life.	70	70	83	70
3. I explain to her/him why TV characters act the way they do.	76	75	70	73
Standard Coefficient Alpha =	78	82	82	81

Table 1.5
Factor Loadings of Information Giving Items
Object to Subject

ITEMS	MData	FData	SSFData	OSFData
1. S/he tells me about events that happen on TV shows.	83	86	83	83
2. S/he tells me about conversations that take place on TV shows.	90	79	74	81
3. S/he tells me about TV characters.	84	80	75	72
Standard Coefficient Alpha =	89	86	81	83

Table 1.6
Factor Loadings of Information Giving Items
Subject to Object

ITEMS	MData	FData	SSFData	OSFData
1. I tell her/him about events that happen on TV shows.	85	82	81	89
2. I tell her/him about conversations that take place on TV shows.	85	73	67	82
3. I tell her/him about TV characters.	79	83	80	82
Standard Coefficient Alpha =	87	83	80	88

Table 1.7
Factor Loadings of Information Exchange Items

ITEMS	MData	FData	SSFData	OSFData
1. We talk about TV shows.	77	83	80	78
2. We talk about events that happen on TV shows.	85	86	82	88
3. We talk about conversations that take place on TV shows.	82	78	72	74
4. We talk about TV characters.	75	70	74	77
Standard Coefficient Alpha =	87	87	85	87

Table 2.1a
Test of Internal Consistency

Information Seeking/Object to Subject

Observed Correlations				Expected Correlations		
ITEMS	1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data						
1	54			52		
2	61	70		60	71	
3	57	68	64	58	67	64
Father Data						
1	52			50		
2	60	70		60	71	
3	55	66	62	55	66	61
Same-Sex Friend Data						
1	67			67		
2	62	58		62	56	
3	67	61	66	66	61	66
Opposite-Sex Friend Data						
1	69			69		
2	66	64		66	64	
3	68	65	67	68	66	67

Table 2.1b
Test of Internal Consistency

Information Seeking/Object to Subject

Deviations Observed-Expected				"00": Deviation Within S.E.		
ITEMS	1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data				S.E. = .044		
1	-			-		
2	01	-		00	-	
3	01	01	-	00	00	-
Father Data				S.E. = .045		
1	-			-		
2	00	-		00	-	
3	00	00	-	00	00	-
Same-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .042		
1	-			-		
2	00	-		00	-	
3	01	00	-	00	00	-
Opposite-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .040		
1	-			-		
2	00	-		00	-	
3	00	01	-	00	00	-

Table 2.2a
Test of Internal Consistency

Information Seeking/Subject to Object

Observed Correlations				Expected Correlations		
ITEMS	1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data						
1	65			64		
2	70	76		70	76	
3	65	71	66	65	70	66
Father Data						
1	57			56		
2	57	59		57	58	
3	65	66	73	64	65	74
Same-Sex Friend Data						
1	61			61		
2	57	55		57	53	
3	62	58	63	62	58	62
Opposite-Sex Friend Data						
1	65			64		
2	69	73		68	72	
3	67	71	69	66	71	69

Table 2.2b
Test of Internal Consistency

Information Seeking/Subject to Object

Deviations Observed-Expected				"00": Deviation Within S.E.		
ITEMS	1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data				S.E. = .037		
1	-			-		
2	00	-		00	-	
3	00	01	-	00	00	-
Father Data				S.E. = .043		
1	-			-		
2	00	-		00	-	
3	00	01	-	00	00	-
Same-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .046		
1	-			-		
2	00	-		00	-	
3	00	00	-	00	00	-
Opposite-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .037		
1	-			-		
2	01	-		00	-	
3	01	00	-	00	00	-

Table 2.3a
Test of Internal Consistency

Information Clarification/Object to Subject

Observed Correlations				Expected Correlations		
ITEMS	1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data						
1	62			61		
2	48	39		48	38	
3	62	47	60	60	48	59
Father Data						
1	63			64		
2	53	44		53	44	
3	53	41	43	52	43	42
Same-Sex Friend Data						
1	63			62		
2	58	54		58	53	
3	56	51	50	55	51	49
Opposite-Sex Friend Data						
1	68			69		
2	60	51		59	50	
3	55	44	43	54	46	42

Table 2.3b
Test of Internal Consistency

Information Clarification/Object to Subject

Deviations Observed-Expected				"00": Deviation Within S.E.		
ITEMS	1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data				S.E. = .051		
1	-			-		
2	00	-		00	-	
3	02	01	-	00	00	-
Father Data				S.E. = .054		
1	-			-		
2	00	-		00	-	
3	01	02	-	00	00	-
Same-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .049		
1	-			-		
2	00	-		00	-	
3	01	00	-	00	00	-
Opposite-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .051		
1	-			-		
2	01	-		00	-	
3	01	02	-	00	00	-

Table 2.4a
Test of Internal Consistency

Information Clarification/Subject to Object

Observed Correlations				Expected Correlations		
ITEMS	1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data						
1	55			55		
2	51	50		52	49	
3	57	53	58	56	53	58
Father Data						
1	78			79		
2	63	51		62	49	
3	68	51	58	67	52	56
Same-Sex Friend Data						
1	66			66		
2	68	69		67	69	
3	57	58	50	57	58	49
Opposite-Sex Friend Data						
1	73			74		
2	61	51		60	49	
3	63	50	54	63	51	53

Table 2.4b
Test of Internal Consistency

Information Clarification/Subject to Object

Deviations Observed-Expected				"00": Deviation Within S.E.		
ITEMS	1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data				S.E. = .050		
1	-			-		
2	01	-		00	-	
3	01	00	-	00	00	-
Father Data				S.E. = .045		
1	-			-		
2	01	-		00	-	
3	01	01	-	00	00	-
Same-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .044		
1	-			-		
2	01	-		00	-	
3	00	00	-	00	00	-
Opposite-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .047		
1	-			-		
2	01	-		00	-	
3	00	01	-	00	00	-

Table 2.5a
Test of Internal Consistency

Information Giving/Object to Subject

Observed Correlations				Expected Correlations		
ITEMS	1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data						
1	70			69		
2	75	80		75	81	
3	70	76	72	70	76	71
Father Data						
1	74			74		
2	69	63		68	62	
3	69	63	65	69	63	64
Same-Sex Friend Data						
1	68			69		
2	61	55		61	55	
3	63	55	57	62	56	56
Opposite-Sex Friend Data						
1	69			69		
2	68	65		67	66	
3	60	58	53	60	58	52

Table 2.5b
Test of Internal Consistency

Information Giving/Object to Subject

Deviations Observed-Expected				"00": Deviation Within S.E.		
ITEMS	1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data				S.E. = .032		
1	-			-		
2	00	-		00	-	
3	00	00	-	00	00	-
Father Data				S.E. = .039		
1	-			-		
2	01	-		00	-	
3	00	00	-	00	00	-
Same-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .046		
1	-			-		
2	00	-		00	-	
3	01	00	-	00	00	-
Opposite-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .044		
1	-			-		
2	01	-		00	-	
3	00	00	-	00	00	-

Table 2.6a
Test of Internal Consistency

Information Giving/Subject to Object

Observed Correlations				Expected Correlations		
ITEMS	1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data						
1	73			72		
2	73	73		72	72	
3	68	67	64	67	67	62
Father Data						
1	68			67		
2	60	54		60	53	
3	69	60	69	68	61	69
Same-Sex Friend Data						
1	65			66		
2	53	46		54	45	
3	66	53	64	65	54	64
Opposite-Sex Friend Data						
1	79			79		
2	74	68		73	67	
3	74	67	68	73	67	67

Table 2.6b
Test of Internal Consistency

Information Giving/Subject to Object

Deviations Observed-Expected				"00": Deviation Within S.E.		
ITEMS	1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data				S.E. = .037		
1	-			-		
2	01	-		00	-	
3	01	00	-	00	00	-
Father Data				S.E. = .043		
1	-			-		
2	00	-		00	-	
3	01	01	-	00	00	-
Same-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .047		
1	-			-		
2	01	-		00	-	
3	01	01	-	00	00	-
Opposite-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .034		
1	-			-		
2	01	-		00	-	
3	01	00	-	00	00	-

Table 2.7a
Test of Internal Consistency
Information Exchange

Observed Correlations					Expected Correlations			
ITEMS	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Mother Data								
1	59				59			
2	66	73			65	72		
3	60	73	67		63	70	67	
4	60	61	62	57	58	64	62	56
Father Data								
1	69				69			
2	77	74			71	74		
3	63	64	61		65	67	61	
4	56	58	60	50	58	60	55	49
Same-Sex Friend Data								
1	63				64			
2	68	67			66	67		
3	56	58	53		58	59	52	
4	58	59	57	56	59	61	53	55
Opposite-Sex Friend Data								
1	62				61			
2	72	76			69	77		
3	56	64	56		58	65	55	
4	59	65	60	59	60	68	57	59

Table 2.7b
Test of Internal Consistency

Information Exchange

Deviations Observed-Expected					"00": Deviation Within S.E.			
ITEMS	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Mother Data					S.E. = .042			
1	-				-			
2	01	-			00	-		
3	03	03	-		00	00	-	
4	02	03	00	-	00	00	00	-
Father Data					S.E. = .043			
1	-				-			
2	06	-			02	-		
3	02	03	-		00	00	-	
4	02	02	05	-	00	00	01	-
Same-Sex Friend Data					S.E. = .046			
1	-				-			
2	02	-			00	-		
3	02	01	-		00	00	-	
4	01	02	04	-	00	00	00	-
Opposite-Sex Friend Data					S.E. = .043			
1	-				-			
2	03	-			00	-		
3	02	01	-		00	00	-	
4	01	03	03	-	00	00	00	-

Parallelism

Tables 3.1a-3.21b show the tests of parallelism. The "a" tables have the observed and expected correlations. The "b" tables show the deviations of the observed correlations from the expected correlations and the deviations from the sampling error.

It should be noted that a set of variables will rarely satisfy the definition of parallelism because it is a very stringent requirement (Hunter, 1977). Since all the scales had been found to be unidimensional under the test of internal consistency, a less strict requirement for the test of parallelism was adopted by drawing a confidence interval at .001 level of significance for the sampling error. In addition, a deviation of .05 or less from this confidence interval was considered a negligible deviation when evaluating the scales for unidimensionality.

Information Seeking (Object to Subject). Tests of parallelism (Tables 3.1b-3.6b) clearly indicate that this factor can be accepted as unidimensional with respect to all the other factors, except with respect to Information Giving (Subject to Object). Table 3.5b shows one deviation of .11 from the sampling error for the same-sex friend data. For the mother data, father data, and opposite-sex friend data, the deviation of the observed from the expected correlation, for the same pair of items, was equal to zero. Since this large deviation was not consistently observed among all the

Table 3.1a
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X)
Information Seeking/Subject to Object (Y)

		Observed Correlations			Expected Correlations		
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data							
X 1		68	60	63	56	61	57
2		62	75	59	65	71	66
3		54	63	68	62	68	63
Father Data							
X 1		63	50	54	50	51	57
2		54	63	55	59	60	68
3		54	57	73	55	56	63
Same-Sex Friend Data							
X 1		69	57	55	60	56	61
2		44	67	44	55	51	56
3		60	56	71	59	56	60
Opposite-Sex Friend Data							
X 1		76	61	67	62	66	65
2		60	71	53	60	64	62
3		58	58	75	62	66	64

Table 3.1b
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X)
Information Seeking/Subject to Object (Y)

Deviations Observed-Expected				"00": Deviation W/in S.E. (p=.001)		
ITEMS	Y 1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data				S.E. = .042		
X 1	12	01	06	00	00	00
2	03	04	07	00	00	00
3	08	05	05	00	00	00
Father Data				S.E. = .047		
X 1	13	01	03	00	00	00
2	05	03	13	00	00	00
3	01	01	10	00	00	00
Same-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .047		
X 1	09	01	06	00	00	00
2	11	16	12	00	00	00
3	01	00	11	00	00	00
Opposite-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .042		
X 1	14	05	02	00	00	00
2	00	07	09	00	00	00
3	04	08	11	00	00	00

Table 3.2a
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X)
Information Clarification/Object to Subject (Y)

ITEMS	Observed Correlations			Expected Correlations		
	Y 1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data						
X 1	34	37	31	35	28	34
2	36	28	39	41	32	40
3	46	30	40	39	31	38
Father Data						
X 1	33	38	55	41	34	34
2	35	32	58	49	40	40
3	27	31	54	46	38	37
Same-Sex Friend Data						
X 1	32	27	39	37	34	33
2	31	24	42	34	31	30
3	34	28	46	36	34	32
Opposite-Sex Friend Data						
X 1	34	35	41	48	41	37
2	44	36	50	46	39	36
3	40	33	57	47	40	37

Table 3.2b
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X)
Information Clarification/Object to Subject (Y)

Deviations Observed-Expected				"00": Deviation W/in S.E. (p=.001)		
ITEMS	Y 1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data				S.E. = .062		
X 1	01	09	03	00	00	00
2	05	04	01	00	00	00
3	07	01	02	00	00	00
Father Data				S.E. = .059		
X 1	08	04	21	00	00	01
2	14	08	18	00	00	00
3	19	07	17	00	00	00
Same-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .063		
X 1	05	07	06	00	00	00
2	03	07	12	00	00	00
3	02	06	14	00	00	00
Opposite-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .059		
X 1	14	06	04	00	00	00
2	02	03	14	00	00	00
3	07	07	20	00	00	01

Table 3.3a
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X)
Information Clarification/Subject to Object (Y)

Observed Correlations				Expected Correlations		
ITEMS	Y 1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data						
X 1	26	37	33	33	31	34
2	37	34	43	39	36	40
3	41	34	41	37	35	38
Father Data						
X 1	31	31	31	35	28	30
2	46	25	52	42	33	35
3	35	19	42	39	31	35
Same-Sex Friend Data						
X 1	41	33	32	41	42	35
2	41	35	41	37	38	32
3	41	41	39	40	41	35
Opposite-Sex Friend Data						
X 1	47	44	45	54	44	46
2	46	36	54	52	43	44
3	51	48	57	54	44	45

Table 3.3b
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X)
Information Clarification/Subject to Object (Y)

Deviations Observed-Expected				"00": Deviation W/in S.E. (p=.001)		
ITEMS	Y 1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data				S.E. = .062		
X 1	07	06	01	00	00	00
2	02	02	03	00	00	00
3	04	01	03	00	00	00
Father Data				S.E. = .062		
X 1	04	03	01	00	00	00
2	04	08	17	00	00	00
3	04	12	09	00	00	00
Same-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .061		
X 1	00	09	03	00	00	00
2	04	03	09	00	00	00
3	01	00	04	00	00	00
Opposite-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .055		
X 1	07	00	01	00	00	00
2	06	07	10	00	00	00
3	03	04	12	00	00	00

Table 3.4a
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X)
Information Giving/Object to Subject (Y)

Observed Correlations				Expected Correlations		
ITEMS	Y 1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data						
X 1	72	59	60	53	58	54
2	61	61	53	62	67	63
3	57	61	62	59	64	60
Father Data						
X 1	63	57	60	58	53	54
2	60	70	52	69	63	64
3	66	53	67	64	59	59
Same-Sex Friend Data						
X 1	60	59	61	66	59	60
2	49	70	49	60	54	55
3	59	59	75	65	58	59
Opposite-Sex Friend Data						
X 1	73	63	58	68	66	59
2	64	77	54	65	64	56
3	53	56	69	67	65	58

Table 3.4b
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X)
Information Giving/Object to Subject (Y)

Deviations Observed-Expected				"00": Deviation W/in S.E.(p=.001)		
ITEMS	Y 1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data				S.E. = .045		
X 1	19	01	06	04	00	00
2	01	06	10	00	00	00
3	02	03	02	00	00	00
Father Data				S.E. = .045		
X 1	05	04	06	00	00	00
2	09	07	12	00	00	00
3	02	06	08	00	00	00
Same-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .045		
X 1	06	00	01	00	00	00
2	11	16	06	00	01	00
3	06	01	16	00	00	01
Opposite-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .043		
X 1	05	03	01	00	00	00
2	01	13	02	00	00	00
3	14	09	11	00	00	00

Table 3.5a
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X)
Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)

Observed Correlations				Expected Correlations		
ITEMS	Y 1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data						
X 1	69	62	55	56	56	62
2	58	75	54	65	65	60
3	52	56	60	62	62	58
Father Data						
X 1	76	50	58	57	51	58
2	52	75	56	68	60	68
3	58	54	70	63	56	63
Same-Sex Friend Data						
X 1	73	60	55	65	54	64
2	44	75	42	60	49	59
3	57	57	75	64	53	64
Opposite-Sex Friend Data						
X 1	75	61	70	72	67	67
2	67	75	59	70	64	64
3	69	62	76	72	66	66

Table 3.5b
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X)
Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)

Deviations Observed-Expected				"00": Deviation W/in S.E.(p=.001)		
ITEMS	Y 1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data				S.E. = .045		
X 1	13	06	03	00	00	00
2	07	10	06	00	00	00
3	10	06	02	00	00	00
Father Data				S.E. = .045		
X 1	19	01	00	04	00	00
2	16	15	12	01	00	00
3	05	02	07	00	00	00
Same-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .046		
X 1	08	06	09	00	00	00
2	16	26	17	01	11	02
3	00	00	03	00	00	00
Opposite-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .038		
X 1	03	06	03	00	00	00
2	03	11	05	00	00	00
3	03	04	10	00	00	00

Table 3.6a
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X)
Information Exchange (Y)

		Observed Correlations				Expected Correlations			
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Mother Data									
X	1	66	65	56	59	51	56	54	50
	2	56	57	67	51	60	66	63	58
	3	46	49	60	61	57	63	60	55
Father Data									
X	1	56	62	53	54	50	51	47	42
	2	41	52	68	45	59	61	55	49
	3	47	43	53	54	54	56	51	46
Same-Sex Friend Data									
X	1	53	57	57	63	58	59	52	53
	2	44	46	65	42	53	54	48	49
	3	53	50	52	69	57	58	51	53
Opposite-Sex Friend Data									
X	1	59	64	59	63	57	64	54	56
	2	44	48	65	55	55	62	52	54
	3	58	53	48	69	56	64	53	56

Table 3.6b
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X)
Information Exchange(Y)

		Deviations Observed-Expected				"00": Deviation W/in S.E.(p=.001)			
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Mother Data						S.E. = .047			
X 1		15	09	02	09	00	00	00	00
2		04	09	04	07	00	00	00	00
3		11	14	00	06	00	00	00	00
Father Data						S.E. = .052			
X 1		06	11	06	12	00	00	00	00
2		18	09	13	04	01	00	00	00
3		07	13	02	08	00	00	00	00
Same-Sex Friend Data						S.E. = .050			
X 1		05	02	05	10	00	00	00	00
2		09	08	17	07	00	00	00	00
3		04	08	01	16	00	00	00	00
Opposite-Sex Friend Data						S.E. = .048			
X 1		02	00	05	07	00	00	00	00
2		11	14	13	01	00	00	00	00
3		02	11	05	13	00	00	00	00

four sets of data, this scale was accepted as unidimensional under the test of parallelism.

Information Seeking (Subject to Object). With respect to the other Information Seeking scale, this factor has already been accepted as parallel; Table 3.1b shows that all the deviations of the observed from the expected correlations are equal to zero. With respect to the two Information Clarification (Tables 3.7b and 3.8b) and the two Information Giving (Tables 3.9b and 3.10b) scales, it is clear that the items of this scale are also parallel. Tables 3.7b and 3.8b show that all the deviations of the observed from the expected correlations are within sampling error. In Tables 3.9b and 3.10b, 90% of the deviations are equal to zero. The other deviations (7 out of 72 or 10%) are equal to .05 or less. With respect to Information Exchange, only one deviation (.07) did not meet the ".05 or less" criterion of acceptance (Table 3.11b, father data). Since this deviation was only 2% (1 out of 48) of the total number of deviations being evaluated, the items in the Information Seeking (Subject to Object) factor were also accepted as parallel with respect to the items of Information Exchange.

Information Clarification (Object to Subject). The items of this scale have already been accepted as parallel with respect to the items of the two Information Seeking scales (see Tables 3.2b and 3.7b). It is clear from Tables 3.13b and 3.14b that the items of this scale are parallel with

Table 3.7a
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X)
Information Clarification/Object to Subject (Y)

		Observed Correlations			Expected Correlations		
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data							
X	1	34	44	46	42	33	41
	2	43	33	49	45	36	45
	3	36	34	46	42	34	42
Father Data							
X	1	51	45	43	51	42	41
	2	49	43	54	52	43	42
	3	44	41	57	58	48	48
Same-Sex Friend Data							
X	1	28	22	36	32	30	28
	2	34	26	35	30	28	27
	3	25	28	37	32	30	29
Opposite-Sex Friend Data							
X	1	37	43	45	46	39	36
	2	33	43	45	49	42	38
	3	38	50	48	48	41	37

Table 3.7b
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X)
Information Clarification/Object to Subject (Y)

Deviations Observed-Expected				"00": Deviation W/in S.E. (p=.001)		
ITEMS	Y 1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data				S.E. = .059		
X 1	08	11	05	00	00	00
2	02	03	04	00	00	00
3	06	00	04	00	00	00
Father Data				S.E. = .055		
X 1	00	03	02	00	00	00
2	03	00	12	00	00	00
3	14	07	09	00	00	00
Same-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .064		
X 1	04	08	08	00	00	00
2	04	02	08	00	00	00
3	07	02	08	00	00	00
Opposite-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .058		
X 1	09	04	09	00	00	00
2	16	01	07	00	00	00
3	10	09	11	00	00	00

Table 3.8a
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X)
Information Clarification/Subject to Object (Y)

Observed Correlations				Expected Correlations		
ITEMS	Y 1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data						
X 1	29	43	43	39	37	40
2	42	44	47	42	40	44
3	38	34	44	40	37	41
Father Data						
X 1	43	32	41	37	29	32
2	34	23	38	38	30	32
3	34	21	46	43	34	36
Same-Sex Friend Data						
X 1	35	34	37	36	37	31
2	33	27	44	34	35	29
3	26	32	43	36	37	32
Opposite-Sex Friend Data						
X 1	42	44	51	48	39	41
2	43	41	46	51	42	43
3	41	47	45	50	41	42

Table 3.8b
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X)
Information Clarification/Subject to Object (Y)

Deviations Observed-Expected				"00": Deviation W/in S.E.(p=.001)		
ITEMS	Y 1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data				S.E. = .059		
X 1	10	06	03	00	00	00
2	00	04	03	00	00	00
3	02	03	03	00	00	00
Father Data				S.E. = .062		
X 1	06	03	09	00	00	00
2	04	07	06	00	00	00
3	09	13	10	00	00	00
Same-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .062		
X 1	01	03	06	00	00	00
2	01	08	15	00	00	00
3	10	05	11	00	00	00
Opposite-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .057		
X 1	06	05	10	00	00	00
2	08	01	03	00	00	00
3	09	06	03	00	00	00

Table 3.9a
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X)
Information Giving/Object to Subject (Y)

Observed Correlations				Expected Correlations		
ITEMS	Y 1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data						
X 1	67	60	61	60	66	61
2	66	72	61	66	71	67
3	65	62	73	61	66	62
Father Data						
X 1	67	58	56	61	56	57
2	64	73	40	62	57	58
3	65	63	71	70	65	65
Same-Sex Friend Data						
X 1	57	51	54	62	55	56
2	51	69	49	58	51	52
3	57	45	75	62	56	56
Opposite-Sex Friend Data						
X 1	62	61	45	58	56	50
2	54	70	47	61	60	53
3	54	57	66	60	58	52

Table 3.9b
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X)
Information Giving/Object to Subject (Y)

Deviations Observed-Expected				"00": Deviation W/in S.E.(p=.001)		
ITEMS	Y 1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data				S.E. = .041		
X 1	07	06	00	00	00	00
2	00	01	06	00	00	00
3	04	04	11	00	00	00
Father Data				S.E. = .044		
X 1	06	02	01	00	00	00
2	02	16	18	00	01	03
3	05	02	06	00	00	00
Same-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .048		
X 1	05	04	02	00	00	00
2	07	18	03	00	02	00
3	05	11	19	00	00	03
Opposite-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .047		
X 1	04	05	05	00	00	00
2	07	10	06	00	00	00
3	06	01	14	00	00	00

Table 3.10a
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X)
Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)

Observed Correlations				Expected Correlations		
ITEMS	Y 1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data						
X 1	66	72	58	63	63	59
2	56	77	54	69	69	64
3	58	66	72	64	64	60
Father Data						
X 1	67	51	54	54	48	54
2	44	61	36	54	48	55
3	58	53	69	61	55	62
Same-Sex Friend Data						
X 1	68	50	57	62	51	61
2	43	69	49	58	48	57
3	56	45	79	63	52	62
Opposite-Sex Friend Data						
X 1	69	51	56	61	56	56
2	59	66	52	64	59	59
3	63	54	67	63	58	58

Table 3.10b
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X)
Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)

Deviations Observed-Expected				"00": Deviation W/in S.E.(p=.001)		
ITEMS	Y 1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data				S.E. = .042		
X 1	03	09	01	00	00	00
2	13	08	10	00	00	00
3	06	02	12	00	00	00
Father Data				S.E. = .050		
X 1	13	03	00	00	00	00
2	10	13	19	00	00	03
3	03	02	07	00	00	00
Same-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .047		
X 1	06	01	04	00	00	00
2	15	21	08	00	05	00
3	07	07	17	00	00	01
Opposite-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .046		
X 1	08	05	00	00	00	00
2	05	07	07	00	00	00
3	00	04	09	00	00	00

Table 3.11a
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X)
Information Exchange (Y)

		Observed Correlations				Expected Correlations			
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Mother Data									
X	1	59	62	58	59	54	60	58	53
	2	53	59	72	53	59	65	63	57
	3	51	56	60	62	55	61	58	53
Father Data									
X	1	57	65	56	53	57	59	53	48
	2	53	47	77	39	57	59	54	48
	3	59	54	61	66	65	67	61	55
Same-Sex Friend Data									
X	1	45	50	50	56	52	53	47	48
	2	41	45	63	42	48	50	44	45
	3	49	47	46	61	52	54	47	49
Opposite-Sex Friend Data									
X	1	57	59	52	49	52	59	50	52
	2	54	50	58	43	56	63	53	55
	3	62	58	53	67	54	61	52	54

Table 3.11b
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X)
Information Exchange (Y)

		Deviations Observed-Expected				"00": Deviation W/in S.E. (p=.001)			
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Mother Data						S.E. = .046			
X 1		05	02	02	06	00	00	00	00
2		06	06	09	04	00	00	00	00
3		04	05	02	09	00	00	00	00
Father Data						S.E. = .048			
X 1		00	06	03	05	00	00	00	00
2		04	12	23	09	00	00	07	00
3		06	12	00	11	00	00	00	00
Same-Sex Friend Data						S.E. = .054			
X 1		07	03	03	08	00	00	00	00
2		07	05	19	03	00	00	01	00
3		03	07	01	12	00	00	00	00
Opposite-Sex Friend Data						S.E. = .049			
X 1		05	00	02	03	00	00	00	00
2		02	13	05	12	00	00	00	00
3		08	03	01	13	00	00	00	00

respect to the items of the two Information Giving scales; deviations from the sampling error were all equal to zero. With respect to the items of Information Exchange (Table 3.15b), the items of this scale were also found to be parallel; all the deviations were also equal to zero. With respect to the Information Clarification (Subject to Object) scale, this factor was also accepted as parallel although one deviation in the opposite-sex friend data was greater than .05 (Table 3.12b, opposite-sex friend data). This deviation was only 3% of the total number of deviations being evaluated.

Information Clarification (Subject to Object). It is clear from Tables 3.16b, 3.17b, and 3.18b that the items of this scale are parallel with respect to the items of the two Information Giving and Information Exchange scales. All the deviations from the sampling error were equal to zero. With respect to the two Information Seeking (see Tables 3.3b and 3.8b) and the other Information Clarification (see Table 3.12b) factors, this factor has already been accepted as parallel.

Information Giving (Object to Subject). With respect to the two Information Seeking (see Tables 3.4b and 3.9b) and the two Information Clarification scales (see Tables 3.13b and 3.16b), the items of this scale have already been accepted as parallel. Table 3.19b shows the results of the parallelism test between the items of this factor and the

Table 3.12a
Test of Parallelism

Information Clarification/Object to Subject (X)
Information Clarification/Subject to Object (Y)

Observed Correlations				Expected Correlations		
ITEMS	Y 1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data						
X 1	66	44	46	55	52	56
2	37	58	35	44	41	45
3	52	54	69	54	51	56
Father Data						
X 1	57	50	52	60	47	50
2	39	56	25	49	39	42
3	45	35	60	49	38	41
Same-Sex Friend Data						
X 1	61	59	38	58	59	50
2	53	62	30	53	55	46
3	58	53	62	51	52	44
Opposite-Sex Friend Data						
X 1	58	42	50	69	56	58
2	49	66	40	59	48	50
3	57	47	74	54	44	46

Table 3.12b
Test of Parallelism

Information Clarification/Object to Subject (X)
Information Clarification/Subject to Object (Y)

Deviations Observed-Expected				"00": Deviation W/in S.E.(p=.001)		
ITEMS	Y 1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data				S.E. = .052		
X 1	11	08	10	00	00	00
2	07	17	10	00	00	00
3	02	03	13	00	00	00
Father Data				S.E. = .056		
X 1	03	03	02	00	00	00
2	10	17	17	00	00	00
3	04	03	19	00	00	01
Same-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .051		
X 1	03	00	12	00	00	00
2	00	07	16	00	00	00
3	07	01	18	00	00	01
Opposite-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .051		
X 1	11	14	08	00	00	00
2	10	18	10	00	01	00
3	03	03	28	00	00	11

Table 3.13a
Test of Parallelism

Information Clarification/Object to Subject (X)
Information Giving/Object to Subject (Y)

Observed Correlations				Expected Correlations		
ITEMS	Y 1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data						
X 1	31	42	42	40	44	41
2	36	30	36	32	35	32
3	38	48	47	40	43	40
Father Data						
X 1	43	55	41	55	51	51
2	38	48	37	45	42	42
3	47	56	55	45	41	42
Same-Sex Friend Data						
X 1	27	32	33	35	32	32
2	19	29	32	33	29	30
3	32	38	38	31	28	28
Opposite-Sex Friend Data						
X 1	41	50	34	50	49	44
2	38	43	32	43	42	37
3	38	51	53	39	38	34

Table 3.13b
Test of Parallelism

Information Clarification/Object to Subject (X)
Information Giving/Object to Subject (Y)

Deviations Observed-Expected				"00": Deviation W/in S.E. (p=.001)		
ITEMS	Y 1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data				S.E. = .060		
X 1	09	02	01	00	00	00
2	04	05	04	00	00	00
3	02	05	07	00	00	00
Father Data				S.E. = .055		
X 1	12	04	10	00	00	00
2	07	06	05	00	00	00
3	02	15	13	00	00	00
Same-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .064		
X 1	08	00	01	00	00	00
2	14	00	02	00	00	00
3	01	10	10	00	00	00
Opposite-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .058		
X 1	09	01	10	00	00	00
2	05	01	05	00	00	00
3	01	13	19	00	00	00

Table 3.14a
Test of Parallelism

Information Clarification/Object to Subject (X)
Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)

Observed Correlations				Expected Correlations		
ITEMS	Y 1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data						
X 1	19	34	24	32	32	30
2	27	29	22	25	25	24
3	34	42	35	31	31	29
Father Data						
X 1	38	42	26	45	40	45
2	46	28	32	37	33	37
3	44	45	40	36	32	37
Same-Sex Friend Data						
X 1	23	33	28	31	26	31
2	23	23	19	29	24	29
3	26	35	38	28	23	27
Opposite-Sex Friend Data						
X 1	43	46	28	48	44	44
2	41	37	33	41	38	38
3	41	49	49	38	35	35

Table 3.14b
Test of Parallelism

Information Clarification/Object to Subject (X)
Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)

Deviations Observed-Expected				"00": Deviation W/in S.E. (p=.001)		
ITEMS	Y 1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data				S.E. = .065		
X 1	13	02	06	00	00	00
2	02	04	02	00	00	00
3	03	11	06	00	00	00
Father Data				S.E. = .061		
X 1	07	02	19	00	00	00
2	09	05	05	00	00	00
3	08	13	03	00	00	00
Same-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .066		
X 1	08	07	03	00	00	00
2	06	01	10	00	00	00
3	02	12	11	00	00	00
Opposite-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .059		
X 1	05	02	16	00	00	00
2	00	01	05	00	00	00
3	03	14	14	00	00	00

Table 3.15a
Test of Parallelism

Information Clarification/Object to Subject (X)
Information Exchange (Y)

		Observed Correlations				Expected Correlations			
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Mother Data									
X 1		37	30	40	41	40	44	42	39
2		43	36	32	38	32	35	34	31
3		35	43	45	40	39	43	42	38
Father Data									
X 1		51	43	56	43	54	56	51	45
2		47	38	44	44	44	46	42	37
3		48	39	54	41	44	45	41	37
Same-Sex Friend Data									
X 1		24	21	32	34	28	29	25	26
2		25	13	24	26	26	26	23	24
3		25	20	30	26	25	25	22	23
Opposite-Sex Friend Data									
X 1		32	43	44	41	45	51	43	45
2		43	40	40	35	39	44	37	38
3		41	40	36	50	35	40	34	35

Table 3.15b
Test of Parallelism

Information Clarification/Object to Subject (X)
Information Exchange

		Deviations Observed-Expected				"00": Deviation W/in S.E. (p=.001)			
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Mother Data						S.E. = .060			
X 1		03	14	02	02	00	00	00	00
2		11	01	02	07	00	00	00	00
3		04	00	03	02	00	00	00	00
Father Data						S.E. = .056			
X 1		03	13	05	02	00	00	00	00
2		03	08	02	07	00	00	00	00
3		04	06	13	04	00	00	00	00
Same-Sex Friend Data						S.E. = .066			
X 1		04	08	07	08	00	00	00	00
2		01	13	01	02	00	00	00	00
3		00	05	08	03	00	00	00	00
Opposite-Sex Friend Data						S.E. = .059			
X 1		13	08	01	04	00	00	00	00
2		04	04	03	03	00	00	00	00
3		06	00	02	15	00	00	00	00

Table 3.16a
Test of Parallelism

Information Clarification/Subject to Object (X)
Information Giving/Object to Subject (Y)

Observed Correlations				Expected Correlations		
ITEMS	Y 1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data						
X 1	21	22	31	30	33	30
2	26	34	36	28	31	29
3	29	39	41	31	34	31
Father Data						
X 1	29	37	25	37	34	34
2	22	28	29	29	27	27
3	29	43	38	31	28	29
Same-Sex Friend Data						
X 1	25	37	34	35	31	32
2	29	29	36	36	32	32
3	30	29	32	30	27	27
Opposite-Sex Friend Data						
X 1	41	49	35	47	46	41
2	34	34	33	38	37	33
3	37	49	49	40	39	35

Table 3.16b
Test of Parallelism

Information Clarification/Subject to Object (X)
Information Giving/Object to Subject (Y)

Deviations Observed-Expected				"00": Deviation W/in S.E.(p=.001)		
ITEMS	Y 1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data				S.E. = .064		
X 1	09	11	01	00	00	00
2	02	03	07	00	00	00
3	02	05	10	00	00	00
Father Data				S.E. = .064		
X 1	08	03	09	00	00	00
2	07	01	02	00	00	00
3	02	15	09	00	00	00
Same-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .064		
X 1	10	06	02	00	00	00
2	07	03	04	00	00	00
3	00	02	05	00	00	00
Opposite-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .060		
X 1	06	03	06	00	00	00
2	04	03	00	00	00	00
3	03	10	14	00	00	00

Table 3.17a
Test of Parallelism

Information Clarification/Subject to Object (X)
Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)

Observed Correlations				Expected Correlations		
ITEMS	Y 1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data						
X 1	25	38	35	37	37	34
2	31	39	30	35	35	33
3	39	47	45	38	38	35
Father Data						
X 1	34	51	32	42	37	42
2	34	32	24	33	29	33
3	28	51	38	35	31	35
Same-Sex Friend Data						
X 1	20	41	28	35	29	34
2	24	34	35	36	29	35
3	20	44	38	30	25	30
Opposite-Sex Friend Data						
X 1	56	53	47	55	51	51
2	43	36	38	45	41	41
3	47	50	49	47	43	43

Table 3.17b
Test of Parallelism

Information Clarification/Subject to Object (X)
Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)

Deviations Observed-Expected				"00": Deviation W/in S.E.(p=.001)		
ITEMS	Y 1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data				S.E. = .061		
X 1	12	01	01	00	00	00
2	04	04	03	00	00	00
3	01	09	10	00	00	00
Father Data				S.E. = .062		
X 1	08	14	10	00	00	00
2	01	03	09	00	00	00
3	07	20	03	00	00	00
Same-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .064		
X 1	15	12	06	00	00	00
2	12	05	00	00	00	00
3	10	19	08	00	00	00
Opposite-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .055		
X 1	01	02	04	00	00	00
2	02	05	03	00	00	00
3	00	07	06	00	00	00

Table 3.18a
Test of Parallelism

Information Clarification/Subject to Object (X)
Information Exchange (Y)

		Observed Correlations				Expected Correlations			
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Mother Data									
X	1	27	20	29	28	29	32	31	28
	2	27	34	35	32	27	30	29	27
	3	25	35	37	29	30	33	32	29
Father Data									
X	1	25	22	36	32	37	38	35	31
	2	34	24	31	36	29	30	27	24
	3	35	29	40	30	31	32	29	26
Same-Sex Friend Data									
X	1	26	27	35	31	30	31	27	28
	2	33	23	23	33	31	31	27	28
	3	23	23	30	25	26	26	23	24
Opposite-Sex Friend Data									
X	1	41	42	42	35	44	50	42	44
	2	52	40	24	31	36	41	34	36
	3	39	43	46	45	38	42	36	37

Table 3.18b
Test of Parallelism

Information Clarification/Subject to Object (X)
Information Exchange (Y)

		Deviations Observed-Expected				"00": Deviation W/in S.E. (p=.001)			
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Mother Data						S.E. = .065			
X 1		02	12	02	00	00	00	00	00
2		00	04	06	05	00	00	00	00
3		05	02	05	00	00	00	00	00
Father Data						S.E. = .064			
X 1		12	16	01	01	00	00	00	00
2		05	06	04	12	00	00	00	00
3		04	03	11	04	00	00	00	00
Same-Sex Friend Data						S.E. = .066			
X 1		04	04	08	03	00	00	00	00
2		02	08	04	05	00	00	00	00
3		03	03	07	01	00	00	00	00
Opposite-Sex Friend Data						S.E. = .060			
X 1		03	08	00	09	00	00	00	00
2		16	01	10	05	00	00	00	00
3		01	01	10	08	00	00	00	00

items of the Information Giving (Subject to Object) factor. Under the father data, one deviation exceeds the .05 acceptance criterion. Since this deviation (.07) represents only 3% of the total number of deviations being evaluated, and since the other three sets of data strongly support the test of parallelism, this factor was accepted as parallel with respect to the other Information Giving factor.

Table 3.20b shows the test of parallelism between this factor and Information Exchange. Two deviations in the father data are greater than .05 and one deviation in the opposite-sex friend data also exceeds this level of acceptance. Considering the strong results of the internal consistency test and the equally strong results of the parallelism test in two sets of data (mother and opposite-sex friend data) for this factor, it was decided to accept this factor as parallel with respect to Information Exchange.

Information Giving (Subject to Object). Table 3.21b shows only one deviation that exceeds the .05 level of acceptance (same-sex friend data). The items of this scale were accepted as parallel with respect to the items of Information Exchange since this deviation constitutes only 2% of the total number of deviations being evaluated. In addition, the results of the test of parallelism in the mother, father, and opposite-sex friend data strongly supported the acceptance of this factor as unidimensional.

Table 3.19a
Test of Parallelism

Information Giving/Object to Subject (X)
Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)

		Observed Correlations			Expected Correlations		
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data							
X 1		61	64	55	56	56	52
2		47	63	52	61	61	57
3		50	61	64	57	57	53
Father Data							
X 1		63	49	55	63	57	64
2		54	74	53	58	52	59
3		65	46	70	59	53	60
Same-Sex Friend Data							
X 1		66	54	63	70	58	69
2		55	72	48	62	52	62
3		62	51	80	63	52	62
Opposite-Sex Friend Data							
X 1		72	65	63	70	65	65
2		65	77	58	68	63	63
3		51	53	68	61	56	56

Table 3.19b
Test of Parallelism

Information Giving/Object to Subject (X)
Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)

Deviations Observed-Expected				"00": Deviation W/in S.E. (p=.001)		
ITEMS	Y 1	2	3	1	2	3
Mother Data				S.E. = .047		
X 1	05	08	03	00	00	00
2	14	02	05	00	00	00
3	07	04	11	00	00	00
Father Data				S.E. = .046		
X 1	00	08	09	00	00	00
2	04	22	06	00	07	00
3	06	07	10	00	00	00
Same-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .044		
X 1	04	04	06	00	00	00
2	07	20	14	00	05	00
3	01	01	18	00	00	03
Opposite-Sex Friend Data				S.E. = .042		
X 1	02	00	02	00	00	00
2	03	14	05	00	00	00
3	10	03	12	00	00	00

Table 3.20a
Test of Parallelism

Information Giving/Object to Subject (X)
Information Exchange (Y)

		Observed Correlations				Expected Correlations			
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Mother Data									
X	1	66	73	70	64	59	65	63	57
	2	53	63	74	64	64	70	68	62
	3	51	55	58	69	60	66	63	58
Father Data									
X	1	64	71	66	62	71	73	66	60
	2	62	64	85	61	65	67	61	55
	3	58	57	50	78	66	68	62	55
Same-Sex Friend Data									
X	1	68	74	52	58	66	68	60	61
	2	53	57	73	51	59	61	53	55
	3	58	49	54	69	60	62	54	56
Opposite-Sex Friend Data									
X	1	63	72	64	63	63	72	60	63
	2	51	57	75	57	62	70	59	61
	3	56	56	49	76	55	62	52	54

Table 3.20b
Test of Parallelism

Information Giving/Object to Subject (X)
Information Exchange (Y)

		Deviations Observed-Expected				"00": Deviation W/in S.E.(p=.001)			
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Mother Data						S.E. = .042			
X 1		07	08	07	07	00	00	00	00
2		11	07	06	02	00	00	00	00
3		09	11	05	11	00	00	00	00
Father Data						S.E. = .041			
X 1		07	02	00	02	00	00	00	00
2		03	03	24	06	00	00	10	00
3		08	11	12	23	00	00	00	09
Same-Sex Friend Data						S.E. = .046			
X 1		02	06	08	03	00	00	00	00
2		06	04	20	04	00	00	05	00
3		02	13	00	13	00	00	00	00
Opposite-Sex Friend Data						S.E. = .044			
X 1		00	00	04	00	00	00	00	00
2		11	13	16	04	00	00	01	00
3		01	06	03	22	00	00	00	07

Table 3.21a
Test of Parallelism

Information Giving/Subject to Object (X)
Information Exchange (Y)

		Observed Correlations				Expected Correlations			
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Mother Data									
X	1	56	63	56	57	54	60	58	53
	2	54	58	65	54	54	60	58	53
	3	49	46	48	61	50	56	54	49
Father Data									
X	1	56	58	49	56	56	59	53	48
	2	45	49	66	42	50	52	47	42
	3	51	50	44	65	57	59	54	48
Same-Sex Friend Data									
X	1	59	61	53	63	62	64	56	58
	2	46	51	73	48	51	53	46	48
	3	56	49	50	67	61	63	55	57
Opposite-Sex Friend Data									
X	1	55	63	57	59	60	68	57	60
	2	45	60	69	61	56	63	53	55
	3	54	58	51	74	56	63	53	55

Table 3.21b
Test of Parallelism

Information Giving/Subject to Object (X)
Information Exchange (Y)

		Deviations Observed-Expected				"00": Deviation W/in S.E. (p=.001)			
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Mother Data						S.E. = .049			
X 1		02	03	02	04	00	00	00	00
2		00	02	07	01	00	00	00	00
3		01	10	06	12	00	00	00	00
Father Data						S.E. = .051			
X 1		00	01	04	08	00	00	00	00
2		05	03	19	00	00	00	02	00
3		06	09	10	17	00	00	00	00
Same-Sex Friend Data						S.E. = .048			
X 1		03	03	03	05	00	00	00	00
2		05	02	27	00	00	00	11	00
3		05	14	05	10	00	00	00	00
Opposite-Sex Friend Data						S.E. = .046			
X 1		05	05	00	01	00	00	00	00
2		11	03	16	06	00	00	01	00
3		02	05	02	19	00	00	00	03

This factor has already been accepted as parallel with respect to the other factors.

Information Exchange. With respect to all the other six factors, Information Exchange has already been accepted as parallel.

CHAPTER 5

RESULTS OF HYPOTHESIS TESTS

This chapter presents the results of hypothesis tests concerning adolescents' communicative interaction procedures and information purposes of their TVRT with their parents and friends.

Comparison of Adolescents' Communicative Interaction Procedures with Parents and Friends

The first set of hypotheses predicted that adolescents' structural relationships, measured in terms of communicative interaction procedures, with their parents and friends would be structurally different. Specifically, it was hypothesized that:

- H_{1a}: Unilateral Direct Influence will be more, and Mutual Direct Influence will be less, frequent in adolescent-parent relationships than in adolescent-friend relationships.
- H_{1b}: Unilateral Social Verification will be more, and Mutual Social Verification will be less, frequent in adolescent-parent relationships than in adolescent-friend relationships.

Adolescents' communicative interaction procedures with their mother and father were also expected to differ. The hypotheses tested were:

H_{2a}: Mutual Direct Influence will be more, and Unilateral Direct Influence will be less, frequent in adolescent-mother relationships than in adolescent-father relationships.

H_{2b}: Mutual Social Verification will be more, and Unilateral Social Verification will be less, frequent in adolescent-mother relationships than in adolescent-father relationships.

An analysis of variance with tests of contrast was used to determine if there were differences in adolescents' communicative interaction procedures with their parents and friends. Results in Table 4 show that structural relationships are significantly different: Unilateral Direct Influence ($p < .001$), Mutual Direct Influence ($p < .03$), Unilateral Social Verification ($p < .001$), and Mutual Social Verification ($p < .001$).

The tests of contrast supported the anticipated differences in three of the four communicative interaction procedures used by adolescents with their parents and friends. Parents were found to engage more frequently in Unilateral Direct Influence ($p < .001$) and Unilateral Social Verification ($p < .001$) than friends. Mutual Social Verification ($p < .001$) was more frequent with friends than with parents. Mutual Direct Influence was not significantly more frequent with friends than with parents.

The prediction that Unilateral Direct Influence would

Table 4
Summary of Analysis of Variance
for Communicative Interaction Procedures (CIP)
by Relationship

Adolescents' CIP with Relations					F	Prob.
	Mother	Father	SSFriend	OSFriend		
CIP	$\bar{X}/SD$	$\bar{X}/SD$	$\bar{X}/SD$	$\bar{X}/SD$		
UDI*	2.04@/.89	1.98/.99	0.42/.46	0.66/.66	232.89	<.001
MDI*	1.65/.65	1.46/.72	1.64/.70	1.68/.80	3.09	.026
USV*	2.59.84	2.32/.95	1.52/.77	1.52/.79	82.18	<.001
MSV*	1.89/.76	1.56/.94	2.17/.92	1.90/.88	14.14	<.001

Tests of Contrasts for CIP with Paired Relations			
CIP		t	Prob.
UDI	Parents > Friends	26.10	<.001
MDI	Parents < Friends	1.89	ns
USV	Parents > Friends	15.16	<.001
MSV	Parents < Friends	4.77	<.001

Tests of Contrasts for CIP with Parents			
CIP		t	Prob.
UDI	Mother < Father	0.74	ns
MDI	Mother > Father	2.44	.015
USV	Mother > Father	3.00	.003
MSV	Mother > Father	3.58	<.001

*UDI = Unilateral Direct Influence

*MDI = Mutual Direct Influence

*USV = Unilateral Social Verification

*MSV = Mutual Social Verification

@Scale used: 0 = Never
 1 = Not often
 2 = Often
 3 = Very Often
 4 = Always

be more frequent in adolescent-father than in adolescent-mother relationships was not supported. It was anticipated that Unilateral Social Verification would be more frequent in adolescent-father than in adolescent-mother relationships, but results show that this procedure was more frequent in adolescent-mother than adolescent-father relationships ($p < .005$). As expected, adolescent-mother relationships were found to have more Mutual Direct Influence ($p < .05$) and Mutual Social Verification ($p < .001$) than adolescent-father relationships.

Comparison of Adolescents' Communicative Interaction Procedures with Mothers and Fathers

No hypotheses were offered regarding differences in adolescents' communicative interaction procedures with same-sex and opposite-sex parents, but these were also investigated in this study. Results of t-tests are presented in Table 5.

Both mothers and fathers were found to engage in the same amount of Unilateral Direct Influence with their sons and daughters. While mothers were also found to have the same amount of Mutual Direct Influence with their sons and daughters, fathers were found to engage more frequently in this communicative procedure with their sons ($p < .001$) than with their daughters. Mothers' Unilateral Social Verification was found to be more frequent with their daughters ($p < .01$) than with their sons. No differences were

Table 5
Summary of t-tests
for Communicative Interaction Procedures
with Mother and Father

	Male	Female	t	Prob.
Relation	$\bar{X}/SD$	$\bar{X}/SD$		
UDI				
Mother	2.10/0.87	1.99/.90	.84	ns
Father	2.09/1.00	1.88/.97	1.36	ns
MDI				
Mother	1.64/.67	1.67/.64	.27	ns
Father	1.70/.79	1.25/.57	4.09	<.001
USV				
Mother	2.42/.87	2.75/.78	2.72	.007
Father	2.41/.96	2.24/.95	1.10	ns
MSV				
Mother	1.78/.75	2.00/.77	1.99	.048
Father	1.80/.90	1.33/.92	3.30	.001

found in fathers' Unilateral Social Verification with their sons and daughters. Mothers' Mutual Social Verification was found to be more frequent with their daughters ($p < .05$) than with their sons. Similarly, fathers' Mutual Social Verification was found to be more frequent with their sons ($p < .005$) than with their daughters.

Comparison of Adolescents' Communicative Interaction Procedures with Friends

It was hypothesized that:

- H_{3a}: Mutual Direct Influence will be more frequent in female same-sex friendships than in male same-sex friendships.
- H_{3b}: Mutual Social Verification will be more frequent in female same-sex friendships than in male same-sex friendships.

No hypotheses were offered regarding opposite-sex friendships, but these were also investigated. Table 6 shows the results of t-tests for the hypothesized, as well as the non-hypothesized, relationships above.

Results show that males engage more frequently than females in Unilateral Direct Influence with their friends, whether they are of the same ($p < .05$) or opposite ($p < .05$) sex. With same-sex friends, the prediction that females would have more frequent Mutual Direct Influence than males was supported ($p < .005$). There were no significant differences between males and females in this communicative procedure with opposite-sex friends. Females were found to

Table 6
Summary of t-tests
for Communicative Interaction Procedures
with Same- and Opposite-sex Friends

	Male	Female	t	Prob.
Relation	$\bar{X}/SD$	$\bar{X}/SD$		
UDI				
Same-sex	.50/.55	.35/.35	2.28	.024
Opposite-sex	.78/.75	.56/.54	2.35	.020
MDI				
Same-sex	1.48/.71	1.79/.67	3.22	.002
Opposite-sex	1.63/.89	1.73/.72	.85	ns
USV				
Same-sex	1.29/.72	1.74/.75	4.36	<.001
Opposite-sex	1.39/.71	1.64/.85	2.21	.029
MSV				
Same-sex	1.66/.81	2.65/.75	8.90	<.001
Opposite-sex	1.66/.81	2.12/.89	3.79	<.001

consistently engage more frequently than males in Unilateral Social Verification with their same-sex ($p < .001$) and opposite-sex ($p < .05$) friends. In Mutual Social Verification procedures, the results were significant in the same direction. Females engage in this procedure more frequently than males with their same-sex ($p < .001$) and opposite-sex ($p < .001$) friends.

Comparison of Adolescents' Television-Related Talk with Parents and Friends

Under the assumption that interpersonal communication about television content followed the theoretical predictions of the structural analysis of relations, the following hypotheses were formulated:

- H_{aa}: In adolescent-parent relationships, object to subject Information Giving will be more frequent than subject to object Information Giving; they will not be significantly different in adolescent-friend relationships.
- H_{ab}: In adolescent-parent relationships, subject to object Information Seeking will be more frequent than object to subject Information Seeking; they will not be significantly different in adolescent-friend relationships.
- H_{ac}: In adolescent-parent relationships, object to subject Information Clarification will be more frequent than subject to object Information Clarification; they will not be significantly different in adolescent-friend relationships.
- H_{ad}: Information Exchange will be more frequent in adolescent-friend relationships than in adolescent-parent relationships.

Table 7 shows the results of t-tests for the above set of hypotheses. The anticipated no-difference between friends in the first three types of TVRT was supported (1), with the results of the t-tests showing no significant differences in the amount of Information Giving, Information Seeking, and Information Clarification between object to subject and subject to object.

The predictions that there would be more frequent Information Giving from parents to their children and more frequent Information Seeking by children from their parents were not supported. Instead, more frequent subject to object (children to parents) than object to subject (parents to children) Information Giving was supported by the data ($p < .01$). As predicted, parents were found to engage more frequently in Information Clarification than their children ($p < .005$). The hypothesis that there would be more frequent Information Exchange between friends than between parents and their children was not supported.

Comparison of Adolescents' Television-Related Talk with Mothers and Fathers

Mothers were hypothesized to engage in more mutual TVRT with their adolescent children than fathers, and fathers were hypothesized to engage in more unilateral TVRT with their children than mothers. The hypotheses tested were:

Table 7
Summary of t-tests
for Television-Related Talk
with Parents and Friends

	Object to Adolescent*	Adolescent to Object	t	Prob.
Relation	$\bar{X}/SD$	$\bar{X}/SD$		
Information Giving				
Parents	1.24/.80	1.38/.75	2.65	.009
Friends	1.52/.71	1.49/.74	.93	ns
Information Seeking				
Parents	1.23/.71	1.27/.82	.99	ns
Friends	1.42/.72	1.35/.78	1.82	ns
Information Clarification				
Parents	.83/.75	.68/.70	3.39	.001
Friends	.74/.65	.75/.69	.39	ns
Information Exchange				
		$\bar{X}/SD$	t	Prob.
Parents		1.54/.76	1.30	ns
Friends		1.64/.69		

*Since the subject is always the adolescent, "Adolescent" was used instead of "Subject" in Tables 7-12.

- H_{5a}: In adolescent-father relationships, object to subject Information Giving will be more frequent than subject to object Information Giving; they will not be significantly different in adolescent-mother relationships.
- H_{5b}: In adolescent-father relationships, subject to object Information Seeking will be more frequent than object to subject Information Seeking; they will not be significantly different in adolescent-mother relationships.
- H_{5c}: In adolescent-father relationships, object to subject Information Clarification will be more frequent than subject to object Information Clarification; they will not be significantly different in adolescent-mother relationships.
- H_{5d}: Information Exchange will be more frequent in adolescent-mother relationships than in adolescent-father relationships.

The results of t-tests for the above hypotheses are shown in Table 8. The predicted mutual TVRT procedures with mothers were not supported in Information Giving and Information Clarification, but was supported in Information Seeking. Results also show that the adolescents in the study reported engaging in more Information Giving ($p < .05$) than their mothers but reported receiving more Information Clarification ($p < .001$) from them.

The hypothesized unilateral TVRT procedures by fathers were not supported either. They were not found to do more frequent Information Giving than their adolescent children; in fact, the reverse was supported by the data ($p < .01$). In addition, fathers' and adolescents' Information Seeking and Information Clarification with each other were found not to be significantly different.

Table 8
Summary of t-tests
for Television-Related Talk
with Mother and Father

	Object to Adolescent	Adolescent to Object	t	Prob.
Relation	$\bar{X}/SD$	$\bar{X}/SD$		
Information Giving				
Mother	1.34/1.00	1.46/.95	2.12	.035
Father	1.11/0.87	1.26/.86	2.69	.008
Information Seeking				
Mother	1.32/.92	1.32/.99	.04	ns
Father	1.13/.81	1.18/.91	1.02	ns
Information Clarification				
Mother	.86/.84	.69/.77	3.98	<.001
Father	.76/.78	.69/.78	1.25	ns
Information Exchange				
		$\bar{X}/SD$	t	Prob.
Mother		1.72/.91	6.02	<.001
Father		1.25/.85		

Support was found for the prediction that mothers would have more frequent Information Exchange ($p < .001$) than fathers would have with their adolescent children.

The differences between male and female adolescents' TVRT with their mother and father were also considered in this study. Results of t-tests to investigate these differences are shown in Table 9.

Male adolescents were found to have no significant differences in the amount of Information Giving, Information Seeking, and Information Clarification they share with their fathers. This finding was also true with their mothers except in Information Clarification, where mothers were found to give more clarification than their sons ($p < .005$).

Female adolescents were found to do more frequent Information Giving than mothers ($p < .01$) and fathers ($p < .05$). Like their male counterparts, however, females' Information Clarification was found to be less frequent than their mothers' ($p < .01$). With fathers, females did not significantly differ in the amount of Information Clarification and Information Seeking.

Male and female adolescents were found not to differ in their Information Exchange with their mothers. However, males were found to have more of this TVRT than females with their fathers ($p < .05$).

Table 9
Summary of t-tests
for Television-Related Talk
with Parents according to Sex-of-Child

	Object to Adolescent	Adolescent to Object	t	Prob.
Relation	$\bar{X}/SD$	$\bar{X}/SD$		
Information Giving				
<u>Mother</u>				
Female	1.46/1.09	1.67/.97	2.90	.005
Male	1.20/.88	1.23/.88	.29	ns
<u>Father</u>				
Female	.98/.83	1.18/.81	2.63	.010
Male	1.25/.90	1.34/.91	1.17	ns
Information Seeking				
<u>Mother</u>				
Female	1.47/.99	1.47/1.09	0	ns
Male	1.16/.82	1.16/.85	.06	ns
<u>Father</u>				
Female	.99/.77	1.08/.85	1.43	ns
Male	1.27/.81	1.29/.96	.22	ns
Information Clarification				
<u>Mother</u>				
Female	.75/.81	.63/.75	2.65	.009
Male	.98/.85	.76/.79	3.02	.003
<u>Father</u>				
Female	.56/.65	.60/.73	.71	ns
Male	.97/.86	.78/.83	1.94	ns
Information Exchange				
<u>Mother</u>				
Female		1.81/.96	1.65	ns
Male		1.59/.81		
<u>Father</u>				
Female		1.11/.75		
Male		1.40/.90	2.09	.038

**Comparison of Adolescents'
Television-Related Talk
with Same- and Opposite-Sex Friends**

T-tests were used to investigate differences in male and female adolescents' TVRT with their same- and opposite-sex friends. No hypotheses were formulated regarding differences with opposite-sex friends, but the following hypotheses were formulated regarding differences with same-sex friends:

- H_{aa}: In male same-sex friendships, subject to object Information Giving will be significantly different from object to subject Information Giving; they will not be significantly different in female same-sex friendships.
- H_{ab}: In male same-sex friendships, subject to object Information Seeking will be significantly different from object to subject Information Seeking; they will not be significantly different in female same-sex friendships.
- H_{ac}: In male same-sex friendships, subject to object Information Clarification will be significantly different from object to subject Information Clarification; they will not be significantly different in female same-sex friendships.
- H_{ad}: Information Exchange will be more frequent in female same-sex friendships than in male same-sex friendships.

Table 10 shows that no support was found for the prediction that male same-sex friendships would have significantly different object to subject and subject to object Information Giving, Information Seeking, and Information Clarification. Neither was support found for

Table 10
Summary of t-tests
for Television-Related Talk
with Same- and Opposite-Sex Friends

	Object to Adolescent	Adolescent to Object	t	Prob.
Relation	$\bar{X}/SD$	$\bar{X}/SD$		
Information Giving				
<u>Same-sex Friend</u>				
Female	1.82/.95	1.75/.97	1.26	ns
Male	1.54/.91	1.44/.85	1.64	ns
<u>Opposite-sex Friend</u>				
Female	1.24/.82	1.30/.93	.96	ns
Male	1.27/.79	1.21/.81	.93	ns
Information Seeking				
<u>Same-sex Friend</u>				
Female	1.69/.90	1.52/.94	2.36	.020
Male	1.34/.92	1.32/.96	.37	ns
<u>Opposite-sex Friend</u>				
Female	1.21/.80	1.23/.92	.30	ns
Male	1.26/.88	1.15/.80	1.66	ns
Information Clarification				
<u>Same-sex Friend</u>				
Female	.73/.74	.65/.68	1.72	ns
Male	.74/.80	.78/.86	.65	ns
<u>Opposite-sex Friend</u>				
Female	.61/.67	.59/.66	.42	ns
Male	.81/.73	.86/.83	.64	ns
		$\bar{X}/SD$	t	Prob.
Information Exchange				
<u>Same-sex Friend</u>				
Female		1.88/.88	1.07	ns
Male		1.74/.88		
<u>Opposite-sex Friend</u>				
Female		1.33/.84		
Male		1.37/.78	.28	ns

the hypothesis that female same-sex friends would have more frequent Information Exchange than male same-sex friends.

In female same-sex friendships, predictions of no significant differences between object to subject and subject to object Information Giving and Information Clarification were supported. The same prediction for Information Seeking was not supported by the data, with results showing that object to subject procedures in this type of TVRT are significantly more frequent than subject to object procedures ($p < .05$).

In all four types of TVRT, and for both male and female adolescents, no significant differences were found in procedures with opposite-sex friends.

Comparison of Adolescents' Television-Related Talk and Communicative Interaction Procedures

As discussed in Chapter 2, TVRT could be typed as either unilateral or mutual. When there is an equal amount of Information Giving, Information Seeking, and Information Clarification between the subject and the object, TVRT is mutual. When TVRT by one member of the dyad is more than the other's, it is unilateral.

To determine if adolescents' communicative interaction procedures had an influence on their TVRT, the respondents were first classified as having either unilateral or mutual Direct Influence or Social Verification procedures with their parents and friends. Respondents were classified in

the unilateral condition if their scores on the unilateral communicative interaction procedures were larger than their scores on the mutual procedures. They were classified under the mutual condition if their scores on the mutual procedures were larger than their scores on the unilateral procedures. T-tests on the adolescents' TVRT were then performed, using the unilateral and mutual conditions as the comparison groups. Information Exchange was not included in this analysis since it is only a mutual procedure.

The hypotheses tested were:

- H_{1a}: For adolescents whose Direct Influence and Social Verification procedures with their relations are unilateral, Information Giving, Information Seeking, and Information Clarification would also be unilateral.
- H_{1b}: For adolescents whose Direct Influence and Social Verification procedures with their relations are mutual, Information Giving, Information Seeking, and Information Clarification would also be mutual.

Direct Influence

Classification according to either Unilateral or Mutual Direct Influence revealed that only three respondents had greater unilateral than mutual procedures with their same-sex friends on this type of communicative interaction; 183 engaged in greater mutual than unilateral procedures with their same-sex friends. Only 13 respondents were classified as having greater unilateral than mutual procedures with their opposite-sex friends while 138 were classified as

having greater mutual procedures. Because of the eschewed differences (toward the mutual condition) in the number of respondents classified under the two categories, friendship relations were dropped from this analysis.

Mother Data. Table 11 shows that there are no significant differences between adolescents and their mothers in both unilateral and mutual Information Giving and Information Seeking. Significant differences between adolescents and their mothers were found in both unilateral ($p < .001$) and mutual ($p < .05$) Information Clarification.

Father Data. Results in Table 11 show that there are no significant differences between adolescents and their fathers in both unilateral and mutual Information Seeking and Information Clarification. Under Unilateral Direct Influence, the results further show that adolescents do more of Information Giving ($p < .05$) than their fathers.

Social Verification

Results of t-tests are presented in Table 12.

Mother Data. Information Giving between adolescents and their mothers was found to be significantly different in the Mutual Social Verification ($p = .05$), but not in the Unilateral Social Verification, condition. Their Information Seeking procedures, under both unilateral and mutual conditions, were not significantly different. Information Clarification by mothers under Unilateral Social Verification was significantly more frequent than

Table 11
Summary of t-tests
for Television-Related Talk
according to Direct Influence

	Object to Adolescent	Adolescent to Object	t	Prob.
	$\bar{X}/SD$	$\bar{X}/SD$	n	
Information Giving				
<u>Unilateral Direct Influence</u>				
Mother	1.35/1.05	1.46/.99	1.55 117	ns
Father	1.00/.82	1.16/.83	2.32 93	.023
<u>Mutual Direct Influence</u>				
Mother	1.34/.97	1.44/.93	1.08 56	ns
Father	1.41/.87	1.53/.84	1.08 38	ns
Information Seeking				
<u>Unilateral Direct Influence</u>				
Mother	1.30/.94	1.35/1.03	.93 117	ns
Father	1.05/.76	1.12/.84	1.34 93	ns
<u>Mutual Direct Influence</u>				
Mother	1.41/.95	1.27/.94	1.72 56	ns
Father	1.32/.88	1.40/1.00	.57 38	ns
Information Clarification				
<u>Unilateral Direct Influence</u>				
Mother	.88/.92	.68/.80	3.61 117	<.001
Father	.77/.72	.73/.75	.70 93	ns
<u>Mutual Direct Influence</u>				
Mother	.87/.69	.70/.71	2.40 56	.020
Father	.74/.82	.58/.74	1.19 38	ns

Table 12
Summary of t-tests
for Television-Related Talk
according to Social Verification

	Object to Adolescent	Adolescent to Object	t	Prob.
	$\bar{X}/SD$	$\bar{X}/SD$	n	
Information Giving				
<u>Unilateral Social Verification</u>				
Mother	1.39/1.02	1.49/.95	1.48 153	ns
Father	1.09/.82	1.22/.83	2.35 123	.020
S-sex friend*	1.47/.77	1.10/.89	2.91 24	.008
O-sex friend*	1.25/.80	1.26/.90	.06 41	ns
<u>Mutual Social Verification</u>				
Mother	1.02/.76	1.24/.87	2.02 30	.053
Father	1.16/1.01	1.40/.92	1.38 15	ns
S-sex friend	1.73/.96	1.70/.91	.65 161	ns
O-sex friend	1.24/.81	1.25/.85	.13 111	ns
Information Seeking				
<u>Unilateral Social Verification</u>				
Mother	1.38/.93	1.37/1.00	.28 153	ns
Father	1.10/.76	1.16/.89	1.08 123	ns
S-sex friend	1.08/.79	1.07/.78	.11 24	ns
O-sex friend	1.39/.91	1.17/.1.03	1.85 41	ns
<u>Mutual Social Verification</u>				
Mother	.97/.69	1.04/.84	.58 30	ns
Father	1.20/.96	1.20/.83	0 15	ns
S-sex friend	1.61/.92	1.50/.96	2.13 161	.035
O-sexfriend	1.15/.80	1.19/.82	.76 111	ns
Information Clarification				
<u>Unilateral Social Verification</u>				
Mother	.87/.83	.68/.76	3.97 153	<.001
Father	.72/.74	.66/.75	1.03 123	ns
S-sex friend	.57/.63	.49/.72	.72 24	ns
O-sex friend	.76/.73	.88/.96	1.02 41	ns
<u>Mutual Social Verification</u>				
Mother	.71/.69	.63/.61	.88 30	ns
Father	.76/.71	.67/.55	.69 15	ns
S-sex friend	.74/.77	.73/.76	.27 161	ns
O-sex friend	.66/.68	.62/.64	1.04 111	ns

*S-sex friend = Same-sex friend

*O-sex friend = Opposite-sex friend

adolescents'. This type of TVRT was not significantly different under the mutual condition.

Father Data. Information Giving by adolescents was found to be significantly more frequent ($p < .05$) than fathers' Information Giving under the unilateral, but not under the mutual, condition. Information Seeking and Information Clarification between them was not different under either condition.

Same-sex Friend Data. Table 12 shows that same-sex friends have significantly different Information Giving under Unilateral Social Verification ($p < .01$); under mutual procedures, this type of TVRT was not different.

Information Seeking was found to be significantly different in the mutual condition ($p < .05$) but not in the unilateral condition. Information Clarification was not significantly different under either unilateral or mutual condition.

Opposite-Sex Friend Data. Under either unilateral or mutual Social Verification, TVRT between opposite-sex friends was found not to be significantly different.

Notes

- (1) "Support" for a prediction of no-difference indicates that the test of the alternative hypothesis (in this case, a hypothesis predicting a difference) did not find a statistically significant difference.

CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the association between structures of relations, as measured by communicative interaction procedures, and television-related talk in adolescent-parent and adolescent-friend relationships. Three research questions were considered:

1. Are there differences (or similarities) in adolescents' structural relationships with parents and friends? mothers and fathers? same sex and opposite sex friends?
2. Are there differences (or similarities) in adolescents' TVRT with their parents and friends? fathers and mothers? same sex and opposite sex friends?
3. Are differences (or similarities) in TVRT related to differences (or similarities) in the structure of relations?

Discussion of the results of this study will be presented in the same order as the questions were posed. Findings and comments about adolescents' communicative interaction procedures with their parents and friends will

first be discussed, followed by results about their TVRT with these relations and the association between communicative interaction procedures and TVRT.

Communicative Interaction Procedures

Summary

Parents and Friends. Results (Table 13) supported the hypothesis that adolescents' relationships with their parents and friends are different. Parents were found to engage more than friends in procedures with their adolescent children in both Unilateral Direct Influence and Unilateral Social Verification contexts. Although the respondents were not found to have more frequent Mutual Direct Influence with their friends than with their parents, they were found to engage more frequently in Mutual Social Verification with friends.

Table 13
Summary Table for Communicative Interaction Procedures
with Parents and Friends

	Unilateral	Mutual
Direct Influence	AP* > AF* p < .001	AP = AF
Social Verification	AP > AF p < .001	AP < AF p < .001

*AP = Adolescent-Parent Dyad

*AF = Adolescent-Friend Dyad

Mothers and Fathers. For both parents, unexpected results (Table 14) were found in the unilateral procedures in both contexts. It was hypothesized that fathers would have more frequent Unilateral Direct Influence and Unilateral Social Verification than mothers. However, the findings did not support the prediction regarding Direct Influence; both mothers and fathers were found to exert the same amount of Unilateral Direct Influence on their children. And mothers, instead of fathers, were found to have more frequent Unilateral Social Verification. Mothers were also found to have more frequent Mutual Direct Influence and Mutual Social Verification with their children than fathers.

Table 14
Summary Table for Communicative Interaction Procedures
with Mothers and Fathers

	Unilateral	Mutual
Direct Influence	AM*= AD*	AM > AD p < .05
Social Verification	AM > AD p < .005	AM > AD p < .001

*AM = Adolescent-Mother Dyad

*AD = Adolescent-Father Dyad

Parents and Sex-of-Child Differences. Although no hypotheses were offered regarding adolescents' communicative interaction procedures with same- and opposite-sex parents, these were investigated in this study. No significant differences (Table 15) were found in both parents' Unilateral Direct Influence with either same-sex or

opposite-sex child. Unilateral Social Verification procedures by fathers with their sons and daughters were not significantly different. Mothers were found to do more of this communicative procedure with their daughters than with their sons. More frequent son-father than daughter-father interactions were found in mutual procedures in both Direct Influence and Social Verification. Mother-daughter interactions were not found to be more frequent than mother-son interactions in Mutual Direct Influence. However, more frequent mother-daughter than mother-son interactions were found in Mutual Social Verification.

Table 15
Summary Table for Communicative Interaction Procedures
with Parents by Sex-of-Child

	Unilateral	Mutual
Direct Influence	MD* = MS* FS* = FD*	MD = MS FS > FD P < .001
Social Verification	MD > MS p < .001 FS = FD	MD > MS p < .05 FS > FD P < .005

*MD = Mother-Daughter Dyad
 *MS = Mother-Son Dyad
 *FS = Father-Son Dyad
 *FD = Father-Daughter Dyad

Friends and Sex-Related Differences. No hypotheses were offered regarding adolescents' communicative interaction procedures with opposite-sex friends, but these were also investigated in this study. This summary discusses both

same-and opposite-sex friends' communicative interaction procedures. Male respondents in this study were found (Table 16) to do more Unilateral Direct Influence with their same- and opposite-sex friends than females. Females, on the other hand, were found to have more frequent Unilateral Social Verification with both friends than males. Females also engaged more than males in Mutual Direct Influence with same-sex friends; with opposite-sex friends, no difference was found between males and females. In addition, females had significantly higher Mutual Social Verification interactions than males with both same- and opposite-sex friends.

Table 16
Summary Table for Communicative Interaction Procedures
with Same- and Opposite-Sex Friends

	Unilateral	Mutual
Direct Influence	MSS*> FSS* p < .05 MOS*> FOS* p < .05	FSS > MSS p < .005 FOS = MOS
Social Verification	FSS > MSS p < .001 FOS > MOS P < .05	FSS > MSS p < .001 FOS > MOS P < .001

*MSS = Male-Same-sex Friend Dyad

*MOS = Male-Opposite-sex Friend Dyad

*FSS = Female-Same-sex Friend Dyad

*FOS = Female-Opposite-sex Friend Dyad

Discussion

The findings of this study about adolescents' communicative interaction procedures with their parents and friends generally support past research confirming theoretical predictions of the structural analysis of relations. This study further supports the conceptualization that adolescents' relationships with their parents are mostly unilateral while their relationships with friends are mostly mutual.

The non-significant finding regarding the difference in Mutual Direct Influence between parents and friends could be attributed to mothers' having mutual procedures, like friends, in this context with their children, offsetting the impact of fathers' lesser mutual procedures. This result supports previous research showing that while mothers continue to be perceived as authorities, they are also perceived by their children as confidants who are capable of consensual validation through cooperative procedures. Thus, the findings that mothers engage more than friends in Unilateral Direct Influence with their adolescent children and that friends do not engage more than mothers (see x's in Table 4) in Mutual Direct Influence are not irreconcilable. Mothers try to directly influence their children's behavior because of their greater power and authority but, at the same time and like friends, they use negotiation, explanations, and requests in trying to exert their

influence on their children. Mothers make both kinds of influence attempts.

Past research suggests that both parents retain their position of authority and assert that position unilaterally. This was supported by the finding in this study that fathers and mothers do not differ in their Unilateral Direct Influence procedures with their children. The finding that mothers have more frequent Mutual Direct Influence procedures with their children supports Youniss & Smollar's (1985) report that while mothers' interactions may show the same unilateral patterns as fathers', they are also more mutual. On the other hand, it disconfirms Hunter's (1983) results of no-difference in mutual interactions between mother-child and father-child, giving credence to her explanation that her results might have been affected by questionnaire wording.

The more frequent Unilateral and Mutual Social Verification by mothers than fathers also may be explained by adolescents' perception of their mothers as confidants and conversational partners. Social Verification refers to procedures initiated by the subject to solicit input from the object for the purpose of clarification. If adolescents perceive their mothers as more open and willing to discuss different areas of their interpersonal lives with them, it is not surprising that they would solicit more input from their mothers than from their fathers. Past research has shown that fathers' involvement with their children are

generally restricted to domains of academic performance and future plans, where Direct Influence would be a more prevalent communicative procedure than Social Verification. As in Direct Influence, the more frequent mutual procedures in Social Verification between mothers and children may be attributed to children's perceptions that mothers, more than fathers, are receptive to their ideas and willing to engage in cooperative or mutual interactions with them.

Differences in adolescents' communicative interaction procedures with their same-sex and opposite-sex parents partly supported previous findings that father-son interactions are more frequent than father-daughter interactions. The support was found in mutual procedures in both Direct Influence and Social Verification; in unilateral procedures, no significant differences were found. These findings are conjoint with the idea that, although fathers generally engage in unilateral procedures with their children, they tend to become more involved with the socialization of their sons than the socialization of their daughters because of the similarity of male experiences (Hunter, 1983). Greater involvement may mean that fathers are more willing to listen to their sons than daughters, and may actually be willing to negotiate and exchange certain ideas with them.

Mothers' Direct Influence procedures with their sons and daughters are not different, but their interactions with their daughters are more frequent than their interactions

with their sons in both Unilateral and Mutual Social Verification. The nonrelationship described by Wright & Keple (1981) about father-daughter relationships may account for this more frequent verification procedure between mothers and daughters. If fathers are not willing to get involved with the socialization of their daughters as much as they are willing to get involved with the socialization of their sons, it seems logical to suppose that daughters would then try to get more input from the willing parent. In addition, since mothers are also considered by their children as conversational partners, confidants, and consensual validators of experiences, it is also very likely that daughters would have a more open relationship with them. This closeness may be manifested by mothers' openness in sharing ideas and experiences with their daughters, and their willingness to listen to their input.

The prediction that female adolescents engage in more mutual interactions than their male counterparts with their same-sex friends was confirmed in this study. This supports previous observations that females tend to be more peer-oriented than males. Further support of these observations was also found in females' having significantly more frequent Mutual Social Verification than males with opposite-sex friends, and a higher (but not significant) mean than males on Mutual Direct Influence with opposite-sex friends.

TVRT Information Purposes

Summary

Parents and Friends. Results (Table 17) supported the prediction that Information Giving, Information Seeking, and Information Clarification between friends would not be significantly different. In adolescent-parent relationships, more frequent Information Giving by adolescents, instead of by parents (as hypothesized), was found. No difference was found in adolescent-to-parent and parent-to-adolescent Information Seeking. As predicted, parents did more of Information Clarification than their children. Information Exchange was not significantly different between adolescent-parent and adolescent-friend relationships.

Table 17
Summary Table for Television-Related Talk
with Parents and Friends

	AP	AF
Information Giving	S/O* > O/S* p < .01	O/S = S/O
Information Seeking	S/O = O/S	S/O = O/S
Information Clarification	O/S > S/O p < .005	O/S = S/O
Information Exchange	AF = AP	

*O/S = Object to Subject

*S/O = Subject to Object

Mothers and Fathers. The prediction that Information Giving by fathers would be more frequent than Information Giving by their children was not supported (Table 18). The hypothesis that this type of TVRT between mothers and their children will not be significantly different was not supported either. Results show that children engage more than their parents in Information Giving. Like mothers, fathers were found to have an equal amount of Information Seeking with their children. Unlike mothers, fathers' Information Clarification was not found to be significantly more frequent than their children's. As predicted, Information Exchange by mothers with their children was more frequent than Information Exchange by fathers.

Table 18
Summary Table for Television-Related Talk
with Mothers and Fathers

	AD	AM
Information Giving	S/O > O/S p < .01	S/O > O/S p < .05
Information Seeking	S/O = O/S	S/O = O/S
Information Clarification	O/S = S/O	O/S > S/O p < .001
Information Exchange	AM > AD p < .001	

Parents and Sex-of-Child Differences. Male respondents of this study were found (Table 19) to have equal Information Giving, Information Seeking, and Information Clarification

Table 19
Summary Table for Television-Related Talk
with Parents by Sex-of-Child

	Male	Female
Information Giving Mother	O/S = S/O	S/O > O/S p < .01
Father	O/S = S/O	S/O > O/S p < .05
Information Seeking Mother	S/O = O/S	S/O = O/S
Father	S/O = O/S	S/O = O/S
Information Clarification Mother	O/S > S/O p < .005	O/S > S/O p < .01
Father	O/S = S/O	O/S = S/O
Information Exchange Mother	Male = Female	
Father	Male > Female p < .05	

with their fathers. With mothers, these same respondents were also found to have equal Information Giving and Information Seeking. The female respondents were found to do more frequent Information Giving than their mothers and fathers. Results also show that they have equal Information Seeking with both their parents and equal Information Clarification with their fathers. Mothers were found to do more of Information Clarification than both their male and female children. In addition, they were found to have equal Information Exchange with their sons and daughters.

Fathers, on the other hand, were found to have more frequent Information Exchange with their sons than their daughters.

Table 20
Summary Table for Television-Related Talk
with Same- and Opposite-Sex Friends

	Male	Female
Information Giving SSF	O/S = S/O	O/S = S/O
OSF	O/S = S/O	O/S = S/O
Information Seeking SSF	S/O = O/S	O/S > S/O p < .05
OSF	S/O = O/S	S/O = O/S
Information Clarification SSF	O/S = S/O	O/S = S/O
OSF	O/S = S/O	O/S = S/O
Information Exchange SSF	Male = Female	
OSF	Male = Female	

Friends and Sex-Related Differences. Males were found (Table 20) to have equal amounts of Information Giving, Information Seeking, Information Clarification, and Information Exchange with both their same- and opposite-sex friends. Except for Information Seeking with same-sex friends, females were also found to have equal amounts of these TVRT procedures with their same- and opposite-sex

friends. Same-sex friends were found to do more frequent Information Seeking than the female respondents of this study.

Discussion

Results of this study about adolescents' TVRT with friends parallel the results on their communicative interaction procedures with each other. Adolescent-friend interactions about television were found to be mostly mutual--object to subject and subject to object TVRT were found not to be significantly different. Friends had equal scores on Information Giving, Information Seeking, and Information Clarification. Male respondents and their same- and opposite-sex friends followed this pattern. The female respondents did, too, except in Information Seeking with same-sex friends. Here, females' reports that their friends did more frequent Information Seeking was found to be significant. However, females generally reported their same-sex friends to do more frequent TVRT than themselves (see Table 10). The significant result on Information Seeking should, therefore, be interpreted with caution.

Overall, the findings suggest that interpersonal communication between friends about television followed the theoretical predictions of the structural analysis of relations. TVRT between friends may possibly be a process of consensual validation of "television experiences"--a process which allows them to offer each other a point of

view about television images as they perceive them within the realm of their own experiences. In other words, when talking about television, friends engage in a cooperative or mutual process, wherein they express opinions, challenge each other's ideas, and negotiate and co-construct meaning of messages or portrayals.

To a certain extent, the findings about TVRT with parents also support the predictions of the structural analysis of relations. Parents were found to engage more frequently than their children in Information Clarification. The data do not really indicate whether or not this type of TVRT is solicited by the adolescent respondents. If it were not, then, the more frequent Information Clarification by parents would be a parallel of Unilateral Direct Influence, wherein parents construct their own meaning about television content and impart this meaning to their children. If it were solicited by the respondents, then, the more frequent Information Clarification by parents would be a parallel of Unilateral Social Verification, wherein parents respond to their children's request for clarification by giving them an already constructed meaning. Thus, by virtue of their greater knowledge and experience, parents also retain their position of authority and assert that position unilaterally when communicating with their children about television.

The finding that parents do more frequent Information Clarification than their children was due to mothers' having higher scores on this type of TVRT than their children;

fathers were found not to have significantly higher scores on Information Clarification than their children. Results also show that children have higher scores than their mothers on Information Giving. As discussed in Chapter 4, Information Giving is a much simpler process than Information Clarification. The former concerns the relating of plot developments (events) and dialogues (conversations) or talking about characters outside of the reality ("like/not like real-life") and motive ("why characters act the way they do") contexts. The latter focuses on the reality and motive contexts. In addition, clarification of television portrayals contains an evaluative component and necessitates TVRT participants to draw upon their socio-cultural knowledge and personal experiences. The higher scores that the respondents have on Information Giving and their lower scores on Information Clarification suggest an interaction scenario with their mothers wherein their contribution is focused on the non-evaluative components of TVRT, to which mothers respond with points of clarification or explanation in addition to giving information. The results on the Social Verification measures also point to the possibility of a scenario wherein the clarification offered by mothers would be a response to their children's request for input. Mothers were found to engage in both Direct and Mutual Social Verification with their children.

That mothers, more than fathers, do more of Information Clarification may be explained by past research showing that

fathers' involvement with their children are confined to those domains of academic performance, future plans, and other subject matter with clear objective standards. Mothers' involvement with their children extend beyond these areas, into areas that concern their children's day to day lives. In the sense that interpretation or meaning of its content is subject to the values or beliefs that the interpreter holds, television is an area which does not really have clear objective standards. And it is also a day to day experience for most children. It is not surprising that adolescents communicate with their mothers about television in such a way that reflect how they perceive them--as both authority and conversational partners. As authorities, mothers do more of Information Clarification than their children. As conversational partners, they equally engage in Information Seeking and Information Exchange.

Mothers were found to do more frequent Information Clarification than both their sons and daughters. On the other hand, fathers were found to do more frequent Information Clarification with their sons than with their daughters. Additionally, fathers were found to have more Information Exchange with their sons than with their daughters. These findings are reflective of the results on communication interaction procedures by fathers with their sons. Fathers had more Mutual Direct Influence and Mutual Social Verification with their sons than with their

daughters. As discussed earlier, research shows that father-son interactions are more frequent than father-daughter interactions. These findings further suggest that fathers are more involved with their sons than with their daughters, even in areas that are not usually within their domains of involvement. These results also further support the non-relationship described by Wright & Keple (1981) between fathers and daughters. While daughters were found to do more frequent Information Giving than their fathers, and that both equally engage in Information Seeking with each other, fathers seem to contribute less to their daughters', and more to their sons', request for clarification and attempts at exchange of information. Thus, in terms of overall results, fathers have more mutual communication about television with their sons than with their daughters. They have equal Information Giving, Information Seeking, and Information Exchange with their sons than with their daughters. They also are more involved with their sons in terms of clarifying television portrayals for them. Mothers' communication about television with their sons and daughters are parallel, showing that sex-of-child differences are more pronounced with fathers than with mothers.

Communicative Interaction Procedures and TVRT

Summary

Mother Data. Under Unilateral Direct Influence and Unilateral Social Verification, the expected unilateral (either $O/S > S/O$ or $S/O > O/S$) TVRT procedures were not confirmed (Table 21) except in Information Clarification. Under Mutual Direct Influence, the hypothesized mutual procedures of Information Giving and Information Seeking were supported. The predicted no-difference in Information Clarification was not supported. Under Mutual Social Verification, the predicted mutual procedures were confirmed in Information Seeking and Information Clarification but not in Information Giving.

Father Data. Under Unilateral Direct Influence and Unilateral Social Verification, the predicted unilateral TVRT procedures were confirmed (Table 22) in Information Giving, but not in Information Seeking and Information

Table 21
Summary Table for Communicative Interaction Procedures
and Television-Related Talk with Mothers

	UDI	USV	MDI	MSV
Information Giving	$O/S = S/O$	$O/S = S/O$	$O/S = S/O$	$S/O > O/S$ $p = .05$
Information Seeking	$S/O = O/S$	$S/O = O/S$	$S/O = O/S$	$S/O = O/S$
Information Clarification	$O/S > S/O$ $p < .001$	$O/S > S/O$ $p < .001$	$O/S > S/O$ $p < .05$	$O/S = S/O$

Clarification. Mutual procedures in all three types of TVRT were found under both Mutual Direct Influence and Mutual Social Verification.

Same-sex Friend Data. Under Unilateral Social Verification, unilateral procedures of Information Giving, but mutual procedures of Information Seeking and Information Clarification, were found (Table 23). Under Mutual Social Verification, mutual procedures of Information Giving and Information Clarification, but unilateral procedures of Information Seeking, were found.

Opposite-sex Friend Data. Mutual procedures in all types of TVRT were found (Table 23) under both Unilateral Social Verification and Mutual Social Verification.

Table 22
Summary Table for Communicative Interaction Procedures
and Television-Related Talk with Fathers

	UDI	USV	MDI	MSV
Information Giving	S/O > O/S p < .05	S/O > O/S p < .05	O/S = S/O	O/S = S/O
Information Seeking	S/O = O/S	S/O = O/S	S/O = O/S	S/O = O/S
Information Clarification	O/S = S/O	O/S = S/O	O/S = S/O	O/S = S/O

Table 23
Summary Table for Communicative Interaction Procedures
and Television-Related Talk
with Same- and Opposite-Sex Friends

	Same-sex Friend		Opposite-sex Friend	
	USV	MSV	USV	MSV
Information Giving	O/S > S/O p < .01	O/S = S/O	O/S = S/O	O/S = S/O
Information Seeking	S/O = O/S	O/S > S/O p < .05	S/O = O/S	S/O = O/S
Information Clarification	O/S = S/O	O/S = S/O	O/S = S/O	O/S = S/O

Discussion

The results in this section do not support the notion that the structures of relations, defined in terms of communicative interaction procedures, determine the nature of TVRT information purposes that adolescents have with their parents and friends. Some findings show a correspondence in direction (unilateral or mutual) between communicative interaction procedures and TVRT, but this correspondence appears to be more a function of relationship and/or sex rather than of relational structure. For example, Table 21 shows that mothers do more frequent Information Clarification than their children under three conditions--Unilateral Direct Influence, Unilateral Social Verification, and Mutual Direct Influence. If communicative interaction procedures determined the nature of TVRT, then, Information Clarification would be mutual under the mutual

condition. It is clear that, in this case, communicative interaction procedures do not indicate the nature of TVRT.

The results in Table 21 reflect the findings in Table 19, where mothers are also shown as having more frequent Information Clarification than their children, regardless of sex. It seems that it is the adolescent-mother relationship that strongly influences the nature of this type of TVRT. The summaries for fathers (Tables 19 and 22) and same- and opposite-sex friends (Tables 20 and 23) show the same pattern as the summaries for mothers (Tables 19 and 21). For example, fathers' TVRT procedures are shown in both tables to be mostly mutual except in Information Giving (under Unilateral Direct Influence and Unilateral Social Verification), where subject to object communication is more frequent than object to subject. This difference is a function of the sex (female) of the child as shown in Table 19. The respondents' TVRT with friends are also shown to be mostly mutual. The differences found under the same-sex friend columns for Information Seeking (Table 20) and Information Giving (Table 23) are also sex-related, with females reporting more frequent communication by their same-sex friends.

Conclusion

The results of tests of hypotheses about adolescents' communicative interaction procedures with their parents and friends generally supported the theoretical predictions of

the structural analysis of relations. The respondents' relationships with their parents were found to be mostly unilateral while their relationships with their friends were found to be mostly mutual. Results of tests of hypotheses about their TVRT with their relations generally paralleled the results on communicative interaction procedures.

Adolescents' TVRT with parents, specifically Information Clarification, was found to be mostly unilateral while their TVRT with friends was found to be mostly mutual. However, when the measures on communicative interaction procedures were used to determine whether or not classification of respondents according to them would yield corresponding directions of talk about television, the results were disappointing. Clearly, classification according to these measures was not indicative of the nature of TVRT.

The disappointing results, however, need to be interpreted with caution. The results of separate tests of hypotheses on communicative interaction procedures and TVRT information purposes generally supported the predictions of the theoretical framework of this study, indicating that relational structure is a workable analytical framework. The disappointing results may have been due to methodological, rather than theoretical, problems.

The TVRT measures developed for this study have one limitation. The measures come in pairs--the object to subject direction of talk is measured differently from the subject to object direction of talk. For example, object to

subject Information Seeking was operationalized by the following three items: "S/he asks me about events that happen on TV shows," "S/he asks me about conversations that take place on TV shows," and "She asks me about TV characters." These items were then constructed into an index to get the respondents' score on object to subject Information Seeking. Subject to object Information Seeking was operationalized by the following three items: "I ask her/him about events that happen on TV shows," "I ask her/him about conversations that take place on TV shows, and "I ask her/him about TV characters." Similarly, these items were constructed into an index to get the respondents' separate score on subject to object Information Seeking.

In other words, the directions of talk are measured independently of each other. Since there is no good way to combine them, the use of one score that could be entered into a correlation or regression equation is eliminated. The nature of the measures, therefore, confine the statistical analysis to comparisons, such as the t-test.

As discussed in Chapter 2, children strive to transform their relationship with parents from a complementary to a directly reciprocal relationship during adolescence. Adolescents perceive that while parents assert their position of authority, they are also willing to interact cooperatively with them on certain areas. Results of this study demonstrate that, with regard to television, parents and their adolescent children sometimes interact

cooperatively through mutual procedures. They equally seek information from each other about television (see Table 17). In addition, adolescents' Information Exchange (a mutual procedure) with their parents about television is as frequent as their Information Exchange with friends.

It is not possible to ascertain from the data the supposed conceptual transformation by children of their relationship with parents, and if this transformation occurs as well with regard to TVRT. A research agenda that looks at this conceptual transformation by children of their relationship with parents would be a logical follow-up to this study.

According to Youniss (1980), children start to transform their conception of the adult-child relationship from that of a complementary relationship to a directly reciprocal relationship between the ages of 9 and 14. And this is more pronounced between the ages of 12 and 14. In addition, the 6-8 age group's structural relationship with parents basically involves unilateral authority.

Respondents of this study were mostly 14 and 15 years-old ($X = 14.73$), slightly older than the 9-14 age group. The follow-up study would survey three age groups--6-8, 9-11, and 12-14--using the same instruments and procedures used in this study. Results of the proposed study would reveal if there is indeed a process of transformation, such as described above, that occurs as children get older and reach adolescence. Additionally, the study would indicate

if the nature of TVRT with parents changes as children become adolescents.

Results of this study also show that parents, mothers specifically, exercise unilateral authority in clarifying information about television portrayals (see Tables 17 and 18). This suggests that the implicit conceptualization of TVRT in mediation studies--communication aimed at translating the complexities of television into terms comprehensible to children of various cognitive levels of development--merits more attention. While the measure on Information Clarification used in this study reveals the extent to which clarification is used between parents and their children, it does not provide detailed information on this kind of TVRT. The index measures the frequency of this kind of talk with regard to the "likeness" or "not likeness" of what happens on TV shows to real-life and with regard to "why TV characters act the way they do;" but the index does not provide insight into the criteria used by talk participants to assess the "reality" of portrayals or the "motives" behind characters' behaviors.

It has been suggested that viewer experiences are brought to bear in making sense of television (Fiske & Hartley, 1978) and proposed that this process occurs during viewers' TVRT (Linsangan, 1987). It has also been demonstrated that viewers use their social and cultural background (Katz & Liebes, 1985, 1987) when assessing the "reality" of programs and the behaviors of characters. A

research project that would incorporate the measures used in this study, combined with an in-depth interview method, would enhance the understanding of the process of clarification used by parents and/or their children. Aside from having the three age groups of adolescents identified earlier, the proposed study would also have parents. The first part of the study would assess the frequency of Information Clarification between parents and their children. The second part would involve in-depth interviews with both parents and children to find out the set of criteria used by parents and/or their children during Information Clarification of television content. Is there an element of explanation or construction of meaning during this process? Or is the clarification simply a process of relating what is happening on the screen? The study might also reveal, for example, if changes in children's conceptual transformation of their relationship with parents and in their TVRT coincide with changes in the criteria used to clarify television content. Furthermore, the interviews might also reveal how talk about television differs from talk about other aspects of children's lives, such as school performance and dating. Television is an activity that does not seem to be mediated vigorously by parents. Is it possible that some of the results found in this study, such as the mutual Information Seeking procedures between parents and children, could be due to parents' acceptance or view that television is a domain where their children have

greater expertise than themselves.

When assessing the nature of Information Clarification between parents and children, important factors that might also be considered are socio-economic status and number and sex of siblings. One would expect that socio-economic status would differentiate television-related behaviors in families. However, research shows that socio-economic status has no influence on children's television use (Barnes, Kelloway, & Russell, 1978), nor on parental control of viewing (Gross & Walsh, 1980). Research also shows that the number of children in the home is negatively related to parent-child interaction, and that parents tend to exert more influence over girls' television use than boys' (Gross & Walsh, 1980). Additionally, children attempt to gain information from both parents and siblings in order to resolve ambiguous or complex message presentations in television commercials (Reid & Frazer, 1980). It would be informative to determine how these family variables would influence the nature of Information Clarification about television content that takes place in families.

In addition to including parents in the study proposed above, including friends would provide the continuation of the comparative analysis started in this study. As pointed out in Chapter 2, there is no literature available on how adolescents talk about television among themselves. Results of this study show that adolescents use mutual procedures when talking about television with friends. Discovering

just how they go about "mutually mediating" television messages, and what criteria they use, would provide the much needed insight into how adolescents make sense of television images, some of which may be completely out of their realm of experiences. Results of the proposed study might also reveal differences or similarities in the criteria used by young people in assessing the "reality of programs" and the "motivations behind TV characters' actions" with friends and with parents.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brittain, C.V. (1963). Adolescent choices and parent-peer cross-pressures. American Sociological Review, 28, 385-391.
- Bryce, J.W. & Leichter, H.J. (1983). The family and television: Forms of mediation. Journal of Family Issues, 4(2), 309-328.
- Bybee, C., Robinson, D., & Turrow, J. (1982). Determinants of parental guidance of children's television viewing for a special subgroup: Mass media scholars. Journal of Broadcasting, 26(3), 697-710.
- Comstock, G.A. (1976). The evidence so far. Journal of Communication, 26(2), 98-107.
- Comstock, G.A. (1978). The impact of television on American institutions. Journal of Communication, 28(2), 12-28.
- Desmond, J.D., Singer, J.L., Singer, D.G., Calam, R., & Colimore, K. (1985). Family mediation patterns and television viewing: Young children's use and grasp of the medium. Human Communication Research, 11(4), 461-480.
- Fiske, J. & Hartley, J. (1978). Reading television. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd.
- Greenberg, B.S. (1988). Mass media and adolescents: A review of research reported from 1980-1987. Paper prepared for the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Department of Telecommunication, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.
- Gross, L.S. & Walsh, R.P. (1980). Factors affecting parental control over children's television viewing: A pilot study. Journal of Broadcasting, 24(3), 411-419.
- Hunter, F.T. (1983). Procedures of socializing influence in adolescents' relationships with mothers, fathers, and friends (Doctoral dissertation, The Catholic University of America, 1983). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 3750B-3751B. (University Microfilms No. DA8306544).

- Hunter, J.E. (1977). Cluster analysis: Reliability, construct validity, and the multiple indicators approach to measurement. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Psychology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.
- Katz, E. & Liebes, T. (1985). The export of meaning: Cross-cultural readings of American TV. Paper prepared for the Manchester Symposium on Broadcasting, March 5-6, England.
- _____. (1986). Decoding "Dallas": Notes from a cross-cultural study. In G. Gumpert & R. Cathcart (eds.), Intermedia: Interpersonal communication in a media world, 3rd ed. NY: Oxford University Press.
- Lim, T.S. (1987). LIMSTAT: Confirmatory factor analysis computer program. Department of Communication, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.
- Linsangan, R.A. (1987). Television-related talk: Measuring topics of talk about TV. Annual Conference, Speech Communication Association of Puerto Rico, San Juan, Puerto Rico.
- Lull, J. (1980). The social uses of television. Human Communication Research, 6(3), 197-209.
- Lyle, J. & Hoffman, H.R. (1972). Explorations in patterns of television viewing by pre-school age children. In E.A. Rubinstein, G.A. Comstock, & J.P. Murray (eds.), Television and social behavior, vol. 4. Television in day-to-day life: Patterns of use. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Messarlis, P. (1983). Family conversations about television. Journal of Family Issues, 4(2), 293-308.
- Mohr, P.J. (1979). Parental guidance of children's viewing of evening television programs. Journal of Broadcasting, 23(2), 213-227.
- Piaget, J. ([1932] 1965). The moral judgment of the child. New York: Free Press.
- Reid, L.N. & Frazer, C.F. (1980). Children's use of commercials to initiate social interaction in family viewing situations. Journal of Broadcasting, 24(2), 149-158.
- Sebald, H. (1986). Adolescents' shifting orientation toward parents and peers: A curvilinear trend over recent decades. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48, 5-13.

- Streicher, L. & Bonney, N. (1974). Children talk about television. Journal of Communication, 24, 54-61.
- Sullivan, H.S. (1953). The interpersonal theory of psychiatry. New York: Norton.
- Wright, P.H. & Keple, T.W. (1981). Friends and parents of a sample of high school juniors: An exploratory study of relationship intensity and interpersonal rewards. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 43, 559-570.
- Youniss, J. (1980). Parents and peers in social development. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- _____ & Smollar, J. (1985). Adolescent relations with mothers, fathers, and friends. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- _____ & Volpe, J. (1978). A relational analysis of children's friendship. In W. Damon (ed.) Social cognition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

APPENDIX A

Test of Internal Consistency Tables for the Initial TVRT Measurement Models

Appendix A*
Table A.1
Information Seeking Items
Object to Subject

1. S/he asks me if what happens on TV shows is like real-life.
2. S/he asks me about events that happen on TV shows.
3. S/he asks me about conversations that take place on TV shows.
4. S/he asks me about TV characters.
5. S/he asks me why TV characters act the way they do.

Table A.2
Information Seeking Items
Subject to Object

1. I ask her/him if what happens on TV shows is like real-life.
2. I ask her/him about events that happen on TV shows.
3. I ask her/him about conversations that take place on TV shows.
4. I ask her/him about TV characters.
5. I ask her/him why TV characters act the way they do.

Table A.3
Information Clarification Items
Object to Subject

1. S/he explains to me that what happens on TV shows is like real-life.
2. S/he explains to me that what happens on TV shows is not like real-life.
3. S/he explains to me events that happen on TV shows.
4. S/he explains to me conversations that take place on TV shows.
5. S/he explains to me why TV characters act the way they do.

*Item numbers in Tables A.1-A.7 (Appendix A) correspond with the item numbers in Tables A.1a-A.7b (Appendix A) and Tables B.1a-B.21b (Appendix B).

Appendix A
Table A.4
Information Clarification Items
Subject to Object

1. I explain to her/him that what happens on TV shows is like real-life.
2. I explain to her/him that what happens on TV shows is not like real-life.
3. I explain to her/him events that happen on TV shows.
4. I explain to her/him conversations that take place on TV shows.
5. I explain to her/him why TV characters act the way they do.

Table A.5
Information Giving Items
Object to Subject

1. S/he tells me that what happens on TV shows is like real-life.
2. S/he tells me that what happens on TV shows is not like real-life.
3. S/he tells me about events that take happen on TV shows.
4. S/he tells me about conversations that take place on TV shows.
5. S/he tells me about TV characters.
6. S/he tells me why TV characters act the way they do.

Table A.6
Information Giving Items
Subject to Object

1. I tell her/him that what happens on TV shows is like real-life.
2. I tell her/him that what happens on TV shows is not like real-life.
3. I tell her/him about events that happen on TV shows.
4. I tell her/him about conversations that take place on TV shows.
5. I tell her/him about TV characters.
6. I tell her/him why TV characters act the way they do.

Table A.7
Information Exchange Items

1. We talk about TV shows.
2. We discuss whether or not what happens on TV shows is like real-life.
3. We talk about events that happen on TV shows.
4. We talk about conversations that take place on TV shows.
5. We talk about TV characters.
6. We discuss why TV characters act the way they do.

Appendix A*
Table A.1a
Test of Internal Consistency

Information Seeking/Object to Subject

Observed Correlations						Expected Correlations					
ITEMS	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
Mother Data											
1	41					41					
2	36	42				42	42				
3	41	61	60			50	51	61			
4	44	57	68	64		51	52	62	64		
5	68	36	50	54	52	46	47	56	58	52	
Father Data											
1	37					37					
2	40	43				40	42				
3	49	60	76			54	57	77			
4	34	55	66	52		44	47	63	52		
5	50	29	53	43	38	37	40	54	44	37	
Same-Sex Friend Data											
1	33					34					
2	35	51				42	52				
3	34	62	57			44	55	58			
4	40	67	61	61		45	56	59	61		
5	59	37	52	45	47	39	49	52	53	46	
Opposite-Sex Friend Data											
1	32					31					
2	51	64				45	64				
3	40	66	62			44	63	62			
4	39	68	65	67		46	66	65	67		
5	50	51	62	69	61	44	62	62	64	61	

*Correlation coefficients and deviations in Tables A.1a-A.7b were multiplied by 100 to eliminate the decimal point.

Appendix A
Table A.1b
Test of Internal Consistency

Information Seeking/Object to Subject

Deviations Observed-Expected W/in S.E. (p=.001)						"00": Deviation					
ITEMS	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
Mother Data						S.E. = .052					
1	-					-					
2	06	-				00	-				
3	09	10	-			00	00	-			
4	07	05	06	-		00	00	00	-		
5	22	11	06	04	-	05	00	00	00	-	
Father Data						S.E. = .055					
1	-					-					
2	00	-				00	-				
3	05	03	-			00	00	-			
4	10	08	03	-		00	00	00	-		
5	13	11	01	01	-	00	00	00	00	-	
Same-Sex Friend Data						S.E. = .054					
1	-					-					
2	07	-				00	-				
3	10	07	-			00	00	-			
4	05	11	02	-		00	00	00	-		
5	20	12	00	08	-	02	00	00	00	-	
Opposite-Sex Friend Data						S.E. = .049					
1	-					-					
2	06	-				00	-				
3	04	03	-			00	00	-			
4	07	02	00	-		00	00	00	-		
5	06	11	00	05	-	00	00	00	00	-	

Appendix A
Table A.2a
Test of Internal Consistency

Information Seeking/Subject to Object

Observed Correlations						Expected Correlations					
ITEMS	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
Mother Data											
1	43					44					
2	47	58				50	58				
3	48	70	68			54	62	67			
4	49	65	71	67		54	62	67	67		
5	55	41	47	51	41	55	41	47	51	41	
Father Data											
1	47					46					
2	59	66				55	66				
3	43	57	49			48	57	49			
4	42	65	66	61		53	63	55	61		
5	65	57	47	58	59	52	62	54	60	59	
Same-Sex Friend Data											
1	40					40					
2	36	51				45	50				
3	42	57	53			46	52	53			
4	34	62	58	50		45	50	52	50		
5	65	39	40	39	43	42	47	48	47	44	
Opposite-Sex Friend Data											
1	38					37					
2	46	57				46	58				
3	47	69	70			51	64	71			
4	41	67	71	65		49	62	68	66		
5	58	44	55	57	50	43	54	60	58	50	

Appendix A
Table A.2b
Test of Internal Consistency

Information Seeking/Subject to Object

Deviations						"00": Deviation					
Observed-Expected W/in S.E.(p=.001)											
ITEMS	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
Mother Data						S.E. = .050					
1	-					-					
2	03	-				00	-				
3	06	08	-			00	00	-			
4	05	03	04	-		00	00	00	-		
5	13	08	05	01	-	00	00	00	00	-	
Father Data						S.E. = .049					
1	-					-					
2	04	-				00	-				
3	05	00	-			00	00	-			
4	11	02	11	-		00	00	00	-		
5	13	05	07	02	-	00	00	00	00	-	
Same-Sex Friend Data						S.E. = .055					
1	-					-					
2	09	-				00	-				
3	04	05	-			00	00	-			
4	11	12	06	-		00	00	00	-		
5	23	08	08	08	-	05	00	00	00	-	
Opposite-Sex Friend Data						S.E. = .049					
1	-					-					
2	00	-				00	-				
3	04	05	-			00	00	-			
4	08	05	03	-		00	00	00	-		
5	15	10	05	01	-	00	00	00	00	-	

Appendix A
Table A.3a
Test of Internal Consistency

Information Clarification/Object to Subject

Observed Correlations						Expected Correlations					
ITEMS	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
Mother Data											
1	51					52					
2	48	38				45	38				
3	43	45	52			52	45	52			
4	57	46	76	71		61	53	61	72		
5	62	47	47	59	55	53	46	53	63	55	
Father Data											
1	47					48					
2	53	42				45	42				
3	39	49	51			49	46	50			
4	52	45	67	66		56	53	58	66		
5	53	41	48	60	50	49	46	50	58	50	
Same-Sex Friend Data											
1	53					53					
2	58	41				47	41				
3	40	31	41			47	41	41			
4	40	35	62	43		47	42	42	42		
5	56	51	42	41	51	52	45	45	46	50	
Opposite-Sex Friend Data											
1	48					48					
2	60	52				50	52				
3	42	52	52			50	52	52			
4	41	46	66	53		50	53	53	53		
5	55	44	43	52	46	47	49	49	50	46	

Appendix A
Table A.3b
Test of Internal Consistency

Information Clarification/Object to Subject

Deviations						"00": Deviation					
Observed-Expected W/in S.E. (p=.001)											
ITEMS	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
Mother Data						S.E. = .051					
1	-					-					
2	03	-				00	-				
3	09	00	-			00	00	-			
4	04	07	15	-		00	00	00	-		
5	09	01	06	04	-	00	00	00	00	-	
Father Data						S.E. = .053					
1	-					-					
2	08	-				00	-				
3	10	03	-			00	00	-			
4	04	08	09	-		00	00	00	-		
5	04	05	02	02	-	00	00	00	00	-	
Same-Sex Friend Data						S.E. = .056					
1	-					-					
2	11	-				00	-				
3	07	10	-			00	00	-			
4	07	07	20	-		00	00	00	-		
5	04	06	03	05	-	00	00	00	00	-	
Opposite-Sex Friend Data						S.E. = .053					
1	-					-					
2	10	-				00	-				
3	08	00	-			00	00	-			
4	09	07	13	-		00	00	00	-		
5	08	05	06	02	-	00	00	00	00	-	

Appendix A
Table A.4a
Test of Internal Consistency

Information Clarification/Subject to Object

Observed Correlations						Expected Correlations					
ITEMS	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
Mother Data											
1	47					48					
2	51	43				46	44				
3	41	41	44			46	44	44			
4	43	41	59	51		49	47	47	50		
5	57	53	47	55	60	53	51	51	55	59	
Father Data											
1	68					69					
2	63	40				52	40				
3	47	41	44			55	42	44			
4	47	28	59	42		54	41	43	42		
5	68	51	44	53	61	65	49	51	51	61	
Same-Sex Friend Data											
1	56					56					
2	68	53				55	53				
3	29	27	27			39	38	27			
4	37	34	62	40		47	46	33	40		
5	57	58	27	35	45	50	49	35	42	45	
Opposite-Sex Friend Data											
1	56					56					
2	61	42				49	42				
3	38	38	39			47	40	38			
4	49	41	62	58		57	49	47	58		
5	63	50	44	63	63	59	51	49	60	62	

Appendix A
Table A.4b
Test of Internal Consistency

Information Clarification/Subject to Object

Deviations						"00": Deviation					
Observed-Expected W/in S.E.(p=.001)											
ITEMS	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
Mother Data						S.E. = .054					
1	-					-					
2	05	-				00	-				
3	05	03	-			00	00	-			
4	06	06	12	-		00	00	00	-		
5	04	02	04	00	-	00	00	00	00	-	
Father Data						S.E. = .053					
1	-					-					
2	11	-				00	-				
3	08	01	-			00	00	-			
4	07	13	16	-		00	00	00	-		
5	03	02	07	02	-	00	00	00	00	-	
Same-Sex Friend Data						S.E. = .057					
1	-					-					
2	13	-				00	-				
3	10	11	-			00	00	-			
4	10	12	29	-		00	00	10	-		
5	07	09	08	07	-	00	00	00	00	-	
Opposite-Sex Friend Data						S.E. = .052					
1	-					-					
2	12	-				00	-				
3	09	02	-			00	00	-			
4	08	08	15	-		00	00	00	-		
5	04	01	05	03	-	00	00	00	00	-	

Appendix A
Table A.5a
Test of Internal Consistency

Information Giving/Object to Subject

Observed Correlations							Expected Correlations						
ITEMS 1 2 3 4 5 6							1 2 3 4 5 6						
Mother Data													
1	36						36						
2	44 24						29 24						
3	31 35 55						44 36 55						
4	38 21 75 59						46 38 57 59						
5	40 29 70 76 64						48 39 59 62 64						
6	61 51 42 52 57 58						46 37 56 59 61 58						
Father Data													
1	42						42						
2	56 28						34 28						
3	41 33 56						49 40 56						
4	46 31 69 61						51 41 58 61						
5	32 29 69 63 52						47 38 54 56 52						
6	55 44 46 59 58 59						50 41 58 60 55 59						
Same-Sex Friend Data													
1	45						45						
2	59 43						44 44						
3	31 34 40						42 42 40						
4	38 40 61 50						47 46 44 49						
5	34 36 63 55 47						46 46 43 48 48						
6	67 57 30 44 46 52						48 48 45 50 50 52						
Opposite-Sex Friend Data													
1	42						42						
2	69 54						48 55						
3	39 46 52						47 53 52						
4	44 53 68 63						52 59 58 64						
5	28 34 60 58 40						41 47 45 50 40						
6	54 56 42 52 50 51						47 53 52 58 45 52						

Appendix A
Table A.5b
Test of Internal Consistency

Information Giving/Object to Subject

Deviations "00": Deviation Observed-Expected W/in S.E.(p=.001)											
ITEMS 1 2 3 4 5 6						1 2 3 4 5 6					
Mother Data						S.E. = .055					
1	-					-					
2	15 -					00 -					
3	13 01 -					00 00 -					
4	08 17 18 -					00 00 00 -					
5	08 10 11 14 -					00 00 00 00 -					
6	15 14 14 07 07 -					00 00 00 00 00 -					
Father Data						S.E. = .054					
1	-					-					
2	22 -					04 -					
3	08 07 -					00 00 -					
4	05 10 11 -					00 00 00 -					
5	15 09 15 07 -					00 00 00 00 -					
6	05 03 12 01 03 -					00 00 00 00 00 -					
Same-Sex Friend Data						S.E. = .056					
1	-					-					
2	15 -					00 -					
3	11 08 -					00 00 -					
4	09 06 17 -					00 00 00 -					
5	12 10 20 07 -					00 00 02 00 -					
6	19 09 15 06 04 -					00 00 00 00 00 -					
Opposite-Sex Friend Data						S.E. = .053					
1	-					-					
2	21 -					04 -					
3	08 07 -					00 00 -					
4	08 06 10 -					00 00 00 -					
5	13 13 15 08 -					00 00 00 00 -					
6	07 03 10 06 05 -					00 00 00 00 00 -					

Appendix A
Table A.6a
Test of Internal Consistency

Information Giving/Subject to Object

Observed Correlations							Expected Correlations					
ITEMS	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mother Data												
1	31						31					
2	52	34					32	34				
3	29	38	54				41	43	55			
4	33	38	73	64			45	46	59	64		
5	26	29	68	67	49		39	41	52	56	49	
6	56	42	36	49	43	45	38	39	50	54	47	45
Father Data												
1	43						42					
2	62	30					36	30				
3	40	32	50				46	39	50			
4	42	32	60	59			50	42	55	59		
5	26	18	69	60	42		42	36	46	50	42	
6	52	46	35	58	47	51	47	40	51	55	47	52
Same-Sex Friend Data												
1	48						48					
2	66	41					44	41				
3	20	24	30				37	35	29			
4	47	35	53	53			50	47	39	53		
5	24	29	66	53	39		43	40	34	46	40	
6	69	58	22	47	37	53	50	47	39	53	46	53
Opposite-Sex Friend Data												
1	50						50					
2	73	43					46	42				
3	51	46	69				59	54	69			
4	49	45	74	64			57	52	66	64		
5	42	37	74	67	55		53	48	61	59	55	
6	53	48	58	60	58	55	53	48	61	59	55	55

Appendix A
Table A.6b
Test of Internal Consistency

Information Giving/Subject to Object

Deviations Observed-Expected							"00": Deviation W/in S.E.(p=.001)					
ITEMS	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mother Data							S.E. = .056					
1	-						-					
2	20	-					02	-				
3	12	05	-				00	00	-			
4	12	08	14	-			00	00	00	-		
5	13	12	16	11	-		00	00	00	00	-	
6	18	03	14	05	04	-	00	00	00	00	00	-
Father Data							S.E. = .056					
1	-						-					
2	26	-					08	-				
3	06	07	-				00	00	-			
4	08	10	05	-			00	00	00	-		
5	16	18	23	10	-		00	00	05	00	-	
6	05	06	16	03	00	-	00	00	00	00	00	-
Same-Sex Friend Data							S.E. = .058					
1	-						-					
2	22	-					03	-				
3	17	11	-				00	00	-			
4	03	12	14	-			00	00	00	-		
5	19	11	32	07	-		00	00	13	00	-	
6	19	11	17	06	09	-	00	00	00	00	00	-
Opposite-Sex Friend Data							S.E. = .050					
1	-						-					
2	27	-					11	-				
3	08	08	-				00	00	-			
4	08	07	08	-			00	00	00	-		
5	11	11	13	08	-		00	00	00	00	-	
6	00	00	03	01	03	-	00	00	00	00	00	-

Appendix A
Table A.7a
Test of Internal Consistency

Information Exchange

Observed Correlations							Expected Correlations						
ITEMS	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Mother Data													
1	56						56						
2	50	44					50	44					
3	66	42	61				58	51	61				
4	60	48	73	66			61	53	63	66			
5	60	50	61	62	60		58	51	61	63	61		
6	37	58	42	50	50	39	47	41	48	50	48	38	
Father Data													
1	67						67						
2	67	57					62	56					
3	77	60	66				66	61	66				
4	63	58	64	67			67	62	66	67			
5	56	55	58	60	53		59	54	58	59	52		
6	47	49	48	63	51	43	54	50	53	54	48	44	
Same-Sex Friend Data													
1	56						56						
2	50	45					50	45					
3	68	45	59				58	52	59				
4	56	46	58	54			55	49	56	53			
5	58	48	59	57	61		58	52	60	57	61		
6	27	47	34	37	46	27	39	35	40	38	41	27	
Opposite-Sex Friend Data													
1	57						58						
2	54	50					54	50					
3	72	56	68				63	59	69				
4	56	50	64	57			57	53	62	56			
5	59	44	65	60	59		59	55	64	58	59		
6	44	65	48	53	59	50	54	50	59	53	55	50	

Appendix A
Table A.7b
Test of Internal Consistency
Information Exchange

Deviations							"00": Deviation						
Observed-Expected W/in S.E.(p=.001)													
ITEMS	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Mother Data							S.E. = .050						
1	-						-						
2	00	-					00	-					
3	08	09	-				00	00	-				
4	01	05	10	-			00	00	00	-			
5	02	01	00	01	-		00	00	00	00	-		
6	09	17	06	00	02	-	00	01	00	00	00	-	
Father Data							S.E. = .047						
1	-						-						
2	06	-					00	-					
3	11	01	-				00	00	-				
4	04	04	02	-			00	00	00	-			
5	03	01	00	01	-		00	00	00	00	-		
6	07	00	05	09	03	-	00	00	00	00	00	-	
Same-Sex Friend Data							S.E. = .054						
1	-						-						
2	00	-					00	-					
3	10	07	-				00	00	-				
4	01	03	02	-			00	00	00	-			
5	00	04	01	00	-		00	00	00	00	-		
6	12	12	06	01	05	-	00	00	00	00	00	-	
Opposite-Sex Friend Data							S.E. = .048						
1	-						-						
2	00	-					00	-					
3	09	03	-				00	00	-				
4	01	03	02	-			00	00	00	-			
5	00	11	01	02	-		00	00	00	00	-		
6	10	15	11	00	04	-	00	00	00	00	00	-	

APPENDIX B

Test of Parallelism Tables for the Initial TVRT Measurement Models

Appendix B*
Table B.1a
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X)
Information Seeking/Subject to Object (Y)

		Observed Correlations					Expected Correlations				
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Mother Data											
X 1		63	36	40	37	63	42	48	52	52	41
2		35	68	60	63	39	42	49	53	53	41
3		37	62	75	59	43	51	59	63	63	49
4		45	54	63	68	50	52	60	65	65	51
5		54	38	46	46	73	47	54	58	58	46
Father Data											
X 1		57	33	35	31	33	37	43	38	42	41
2		29	63	50	54	29	39	46	40	45	44
3		34	54	63	55	42	53	63	54	60	60
4		27	54	57	73	40	43	51	44	49	49
5		53	32	36	45	60	37	43	38	42	41
Same-Sex Friend Data											
X 1		57	22	34	33	49	36	41	42	41	38
2		32	69	57	55	35	45	51	52	51	47
3		34	44	67	44	46	47	53	55	53	50
4		38	60	56	71	45	49	55	56	55	51
5		66	32	45	37	70	42	48	49	48	44
Opposite-Sex Friend Data											
X 1		66	45	32	34	50	33	42	46	44	39
2		47	76	61	67	39	48	60	66	64	56
3		47	60	71	53	47	47	59	65	63	55
4		46	58	58	75	50	49	61	68	65	57
5		70	46	53	51	71	47	58	64	62	54

*Correlation coefficients and deviations in Tables B.1a-B.21b were multiplied by 100 to eliminate the decimal point.

Appendix B
Table B.1b
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X)
Information Seeking/Subject to Object (Y)

		Deviations Observed-Expected					"00": Deviation W/in S.E.(p=.001)				
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Mother Data							S.E. = .051				
X 1		11	02	02	05	12	00	00	00	00	00
2		00	09	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
3		04	00	02	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
4		00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
5		00	06	02	02	17	00	00	00	00	00
Father Data							S.E. = .056				
X 1		20	10	03	11	08	02	00	00	00	00
2		10	17	10	09	15	00	00	00	00	00
3		19	09	09	05	18	01	00	00	00	00
4		16	03	13	24	09	00	00	00	06	00
5		16	11	02	03	19	00	00	00	00	01
Same-Sex Friend Data							S.E. = .055				
X 1		21	19	08	08	11	03	01	00	00	00
2		13	18	05	04	12	00	00	00	00	00
3		13	09	12	09	04	00	00	00	00	00
4		11	05	00	16	06	00	00	00	00	00
5		24	16	04	11	26	06	00	00	00	08
Opposite-Sex Friend Data							S.E. = .049				
X 1		33	03	14	10	11	17	00	00	00	00
2		01	16	05	03	17	00	00	00	00	01
3		00	01	06	10	08	00	00	00	00	00
4		03	03	10	10	07	00	00	00	00	00
5		23	12	11	11	17	07	00	00	00	01

Appendix B
Table B.2a
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X)
Information Clarification/Object to Subject (Y)

		Observed Correlations					Expected Correlations				
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Mother Data											
X	1	74	43	35	52	59	42	37	42	50	44
	2	34	37	71	58	31	43	37	43	51	44
	3	36	28	58	61	39	52	44	52	61	53
	4	46	30	52	61	40	53	46	53	63	54
	5	65	37	39	49	66	48	41	48	56	49
Father Data											
X	1	46	38	19	44	60	39	36	40	45	40
	2	33	38	65	63	55	41	39	42	48	42
	3	35	32	49	71	58	56	53	57	66	57
	4	27	31	58	50	54	46	43	47	54	47
	5	53	34	32	39	58	39	36	40	45	40
Same-Sex Friend Data											
X	1	55	46	17	25	47	37	32	32	33	36
	2	32	27	54	44	39	46	40	40	41	44
	3	31	24	48	65	42	48	42	42	43	47
	4	34	28	53	52	46	50	43	43	44	48
	5	50	40	31	37	67	43	38	38	38	42
Opposite-Sex Friend Data											
X	1	59	45	33	37	51	34	36	36	36	34
	2	34	35	68	50	41	49	51	51	52	48
	3	44	36	56	69	50	49	51	51	51	48
	4	40	33	54	45	57	50	53	53	53	50
	5	51	40	36	49	64	48	50	50	51	47

Appendix B
Table B.2b
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X)
Information Clarification/Object to Subject (Y)

Deviations Observed-Expected						"00": Deviation W/in S.E. (p=.001)					
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Mother Data						S.E. = .054					
X	1	32	06	07	02	15	14	00	00	00	00
	2	09	00	28	07	13	00	00	10	00	00
	3	16	16	06	00	14	00	00	00	00	00
	4	07	16	01	02	14	00	00	00	00	00
	5	17	04	09	07	17	00	00	00	00	00
Father Data						S.E. = .056					
X	1	07	02	21	01	20	00	00	03	00	02
	2	08	01	23	15	13	00	00	05	00	00
	3	21	21	08	05	01	03	03	00	00	00
	4	19	12	11	04	07	01	00	00	00	00
	5	14	02	08	06	18	00	00	00	00	00
Same-Sex Friend Data						S.E. = .059					
X	1	18	14	15	08	11	00	00	00	00	00
	2	14	13	14	03	05	00	00	00	00	00
	3	17	18	06	22	05	00	00	00	03	00
	4	16	15	10	08	02	00	00	00	00	00
	5	07	02	07	01	25	00	00	00	00	06
Opposite-Sex Friend Data						S.E. = .055					
X	1	25	09	03	01	17	07	00	00	00	00
	2	15	16	17	02	07	00	00	00	00	00
	3	05	15	05	18	02	00	00	00	00	00
	4	10	20	01	08	07	00	02	00	00	00
	5	03	10	14	02	17	00	00	00	00	00

Appendix B
Table B.3a
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X)
Information Clarification/Subject to Object (Y)

		Observed Correlations					Expected Correlations				
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Mother Data											
X	1	66	51	41	34	50	41	39	39	42	46
	2	26	37	58	51	33	42	40	40	43	47
	3	37	34	50	76	43	50	48	48	52	56
	4	41	34	46	57	41	51	49	49	53	57
	5	65	45	43	48	66	46	44	44	48	52
Father Data											
X	1	63	50	33	30	45	46	35	36	36	43
	2	31	31	65	44	31	49	37	39	38	46
	3	46	25	63	65	52	66	50	52	51	62
	4	35	19	47	49	42	54	41	43	42	51
	5	55	44	37	42	69	46	35	36	36	43
Same-Sex Friend Data											
X	1	62	64	17	20	54	44	42	30	37	39
	2	41	33	69	60	32	54	53	37	45	48
	3	41	35	45	71	41	57	55	40	48	51
	4	41	41	57	58	39	58	57	41	49	52
	5	63	51	22	40	68	51	50	35	43	46
Opposite-Sex Friend Data											
X	1	52	48	43	47	56	43	37	35	43	45
	2	47	44	73	65	45	61	53	51	62	64
	3	46	36	57	75	54	60	52	50	61	64
	4	51	48	63	63	57	63	54	52	64	66
	5	64	53	48	58	76	60	52	49	60	63

Appendix B
Table B.3b
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X)
Information Clarification/Subject to Object (Y)

		Deviations Observed-Expected					"00": Deviation W/in S.E. (p=.001)				
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Mother Data							S.E. = .055				
X 1		25	12	02	08	04	07	00	00	00	00
2		16	03	18	08	14	00	00	00	00	00
3		13	14	02	24	13	00	00	00	06	00
4		10	15	03	04	16	00	00	00	00	00
5		19	01	01	00	14	01	00	00	00	00
Father Data							S.E. = .057				
X 1		17	15	03	06	02	00	00	00	00	00
2		18	06	26	06	15	00	00	07	00	00
3		20	25	11	14	10	01	06	00	00	00
4		19	22	04	07	09	00	03	00	00	00
5		09	09	01	06	26	00	00	00	00	07
Same-Sex Friend Data							S.E. = .055				
X 1		19	22	13	17	15	01	04	00	00	00
2		13	20	32	15	16	00	02	14	00	00
3		16	20	05	23	10	00	02	00	05	00
4		17	16	16	09	13	00	00	00	00	00
5		12	01	13	03	22	00	00	00	00	04
Opposite-Sex Friend Data							S.E. = .050				
X 1		09	11	08	04	11	00	00	00	00	00
2		14	09	22	03	19	00	00	06	00	03
3		14	16	07	14	10	00	00	00	00	00
4		12	06	11	01	09	00	00	00	00	00
5		04	01	01	02	13	00	00	00	00	00

Appendix B
Table B.4a
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X)
Information Giving/Object to Subject (Y)

		Observed Correlations						Expected Correlations					
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mother Data													
X	1	79	45	27	37	37	60	37	30	46	48	50	47
	2	38	32	72	59	60	41	38	31	47	49	50	48
	3	39	20	61	61	53	46	45	37	56	58	61	58
	4	47	25	57	61	62	47	47	38	57	60	62	59
	5	67	36	34	42	41	66	42	34	52	54	56	53
Father Data													
X	1	59	42	25	29	21	42	38	31	43	45	42	45
	2	35	34	63	57	60	44	40	33	46	48	44	48
	3	39	24	60	70	52	52	54	44	63	65	60	64
	4	29	20	66	53	67	45	44	36	51	53	49	53
	5	53	38	37	46	44	73	38	31	43	45	42	45
Same-Sex Friend Data													
X	1	67	55	31	30	35	52	39	39	37	41	40	42
	2	35	31	60	59	61	31	49	48	46	51	50	52
	3	38	31	49	70	49	39	51	51	48	54	53	55
	4	34	37	59	59	75	43	53	52	50	55	54	57
	5	66	52	35	49	38	73	46	45	43	48	47	49
Opposite-Sex Friend Data													
X	1	73	62	46	44	35	54	36	41	40	45	35	40
	2	45	46	73	63	58	36	52	59	58	64	50	58
	3	41	50	64	77	54	51	51	58	57	63	50	57
	4	38	46	53	56	69	52	53	61	59	66	52	59
	5	60	56	44	53	41	64	51	58	56	62	49	56

Appendix B
Table B.4b
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X)
Information Giving/Object to Subject (Y)

		Deviations Observed-Expected						"00": Deviation W/in S.E. (p=.001)					
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mother Data								S.E. = .054					
X 1		42	15	19	11	13	13	24	00	01	00	00	00
2		00	01	25	10	10	07	00	00	07	00	00	00
3		06	17	05	03	08	12	00	00	00	00	00	00
4		00	13	00	01	00	12	00	00	00	00	00	00
5		25	02	18	12	15	13	07	00	00	00	00	00
Father Data								S.E. = .056					
X 1		21	11	18	16	21	03	03	00	00	00	03	00
2		05	01	17	09	16	04	00	00	00	00	00	00
3		15	20	03	05	08	12	00	02	00	00	00	00
4		15	16	15	00	18	08	00	00	00	00	00	00
5		15	07	06	01	02	28	00	00	00	00	00	10
Same-Sex Friend Data								S.E. = .054					
X 1		28	16	06	11	05	10	10	00	00	00	00	00
2		14	17	14	08	11	21	00	00	00	00	00	03
3		13	20	01	16	04	16	00	02	00	00	00	00
4		19	15	09	04	21	14	01	00	00	00	03	00
5		20	07	08	01	09	24	02	00	00	00	00	06
Opposite-Sex Friend Data								S.E. = .051					
X 1		37	21	06	01	00	14	20	04	00	00	00	00
2		07	13	15	01	08	22	00	00	00	00	00	05
3		10	08	07	14	04	06	00	00	00	00	00	00
4		15	15	06	10	17	07	00	00	00	00	00	00
5		09	02	12	09	08	08	00	00	00	00	00	00

Appendix B
Table B.5a
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X)
Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)

		Observed Correlations						Expected Correlations					
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mother Data													
X	1	73	51	29	37	30	57	36	37	47	51	45	43
	2	27	35	69	62	55	32	36	38	48	52	45	44
	3	31	29	58	75	54	50	44	45	58	62	55	52
	4	44	35	52	56	60	50	45	46	59	64	56	54
	5	68	44	34	44	40	74	40	42	53	58	50	48
Father Data													
X	1	54	48	32	30	24	50	39	33	42	46	39	43
	2	32	17	76	50	58	39	41	35	45	49	41	46
	3	38	22	52	75	56	57	56	47	61	66	56	62
	4	28	14	58	54	70	45	46	39	50	54	46	51
	5	59	51	40	47	39	65	39	33	42	46	39	43
Same-Sex Friend Data													
X	1	61	69	17	30	26	59	42	39	33	44	38	44
	2	33	38	73	60	55	37	52	48	41	55	48	55
	3	40	35	44	75	42	47	55	51	43	58	50	58
	4	36	38	57	57	75	48	57	52	44	60	52	60
	5	68	56	24	49	36	81	49	46	39	52	45	52
Opposite-Sex Friend Data													
X	1	56	52	42	40	32	49	40	36	46	45	41	41
	2	43	38	75	61	70	48	57	52	66	64	59	59
	3	50	46	67	75	59	56	56	51	66	63	58	58
	4	51	51	69	62	76	54	58	53	68	66	61	61
	5	69	55	54	53	52	69	55	51	65	62	58	58

Appendix B
Table B.5b
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X)
Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)

		Deviations Observed-Expected						"00": Deviation W/in S.E. (p=.001)					
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mother Data								S.E. = .054					
X 1		37	14	18	14	15	14	19	00	00	00	00	00
2		09	03	21	10	10	12	00	00	03	00	00	00
3		13	16	00	13	01	02	00	00	00	00	00	00
4		01	11	07	08	04	04	00	00	00	00	00	00
5		28	02	19	14	10	26	10	00	01	00	00	08
Father Data								S.E. = .056					
X 1		15	15	10	16	15	07	00	00	00	00	00	00
2		09	18	31	01	17	07	00	00	13	00	00	00
3		18	25	09	09	00	05	00	07	00	00	00	00
4		18	25	08	00	24	06	00	07	00	00	06	00
5		20	18	02	01	00	22	02	00	00	00	00	04
Same-Sex Friend Data								S.E. = .054					
X 1		19	30	16	14	12	15	01	12	00	00	00	00
2		19	10	32	05	07	18	01	00	14	00	00	00
3		15	16	01	17	08	11	00	00	00	00	00	00
4		21	14	13	03	23	12	03	00	00	00	05	00
5		19	10	15	03	09	29	01	00	00	00	00	11
Opposite-Sex Friend Data								S.E. = .049					
X 1		16	16	04	05	09	08	00	00	00	00	00	00
2		14	14	09	03	11	11	00	00	00	00	00	00
3		06	05	01	12	01	02	00	00	00	00	00	00
4		07	02	01	04	15	07	00	00	00	00	00	00
5		14	04	11	09	06	11	00	00	00	00	00	00

Appendix B
Table B.6a
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X)
Information Exchange (Y)

		Observed Correlations						Expected Correlations					
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mother Data													
X	1	31	48	29	36	36	57	44	38	45	47	45	36
	2	66	42	65	56	59	46	44	39	46	48	46	37
	3	56	37	57	67	51	40	53	47	55	57	55	44
	4	46	45	49	60	61	49	55	48	57	59	57	45
	5	32	45	34	43	38	60	49	43	51	53	51	41
Father Data													
X	1	29	47	22	36	22	48	43	39	42	43	37	34
	2	56	45	62	53	54	49	45	41	45	45	40	36
	3	41	35	52	68	45	57	61	56	61	61	54	49
	4	47	35	43	53	54	47	50	46	50	50	44	40
	5	38	35	30	45	40	59	43	39	42	43	37	34
Same-Sex Friend Data													
X	1	30	57	26	22	36	48	40	35	41	39	41	27
	2	53	41	57	57	63	44	49	44	50	48	51	34
	3	44	37	46	65	42	44	52	46	53	50	54	36
	4	53	37	50	52	69	44	53	48	55	52	55	37
	5	21	44	29	35	30	71	46	41	48	45	48	32
Opposite-Sex Friend Data													
X	1	35	69	41	42	40	53	39	36	42	38	39	36
	2	59	51	64	59	63	44	55	52	60	55	56	52
	3	44	40	48	65	55	47	55	51	60	54	55	51
	4	58	44	53	48	69	53	57	53	62	56	57	53
	5	47	57	37	44	45	67	54	50	59	53	55	50

Appendix B
Table B.6b
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Object to Subject (X)
Information Exchange (Y)

		Deviations Observed-Expected						"00": Deviation W/in S.E. (p=.001)					
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mother Data								S.E. = .054					
X	1	13	10	16	11	09	21	10	00	00	00	00	00
	2	22	03	19	08	13	09	04	00	01	00	00	00
	3	03	10	02	10	04	04	00	00	00	00	00	00
	4	09	03	08	01	04	04	00	00	00	00	00	00
	5	17	02	17	10	13	19	00	00	00	00	00	01
Father Data								S.E. = .056					
X	1	14	08	20	07	15	14	00	00	02	00	00	00
	2	11	04	17	08	14	13	00	00	00	00	00	00
	3	20	21	09	07	09	08	02	03	00	00	00	00
	4	03	11	07	03	10	07	00	00	00	00	00	00
	5	05	04	12	02	03	25	00	00	00	00	00	07
Same-Sex Friend Data								S.E. = .057					
X	1	10	22	15	17	05	21	00	03	00	00	00	02
	2	04	03	07	09	12	10	00	00	00	00	00	00
	3	08	09	07	15	12	08	00	00	00	00	00	00
	4	00	11	05	00	14	07	00	00	00	00	00	00
	5	25	03	19	10	18	39	06	00	00	00	00	10
Opposite-Sex Friend Data								S.E. = .049					
X	1	16	16	04	05	09	08	00	00	00	00	00	00
	2	14	14	09	03	11	11	00	00	00	00	00	00
	3	06	05	01	12	01	02	00	00	00	00	00	00
	4	07	02	01	04	15	07	00	00	00	00	00	00
	5	14	04	11	09	06	11	00	00	00	00	00	00

Appendix B
Table B.7a
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X)
Information Clarification/Object to Subject (Y)

		Observed Correlations					Expected Correlations				
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Mother Data											
X	1	62	57	39	47	56	45	39	45	53	46
	2	34	44	69	61	46	52	45	52	61	53
	3	43	33	67	72	49	56	48	56	66	58
	4	36	34	62	64	46	56	48	56	66	58
	5	62	41	45	52	62	44	38	44	52	45
Father Data											
X	1	73	52	35	41	51	46	43	47	53	47
	2	51	45	63	56	43	54	51	56	64	56
	3	49	43	62	71	54	47	44	48	55	48
	4	44	41	68	59	57	52	49	54	61	54
	5	61	41	46	35	52	52	49	53	60	53
Same-Sex Friend Data											
X	1	51	42	21	27	49	38	33	33	34	37
	2	28	22	53	41	36	43	37	37	38	41
	3	34	26	45	55	35	44	38	38	39	43
	4	25	28	46	39	37	43	37	37	38	41
	5	43	33	30	38	63	40	35	35	35	38
Opposite-Sex Friend Data											
X	1	60	49	36	38	53	39	41	41	41	39
	2	37	43	69	57	45	49	51	51	52	48
	3	33	43	59	61	45	54	56	56	57	53
	4	38	50	66	52	48	52	54	54	55	51
	5	47	51	36	45	72	46	48	48	48	45

Appendix B
Table B.7b
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X)
Information Clarification/Object to Subject (Y)

		Deviations Observed-Expected					"00": Deviation W/in S.E. (p=.001)				
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Mother Data							S.E. = .052				
X 1		17	18	06	06	10	00	01	00	00	00
2		18	01	17	00	07	01	00	00	00	00
3		13	15	11	06	09	00	00	00	00	00
4		20	14	06	02	12	03	00	00	00	00
5		18	03	01	00	17	01	00	00	00	00
Father Data							S.E. = .052				
X 1		27	09	12	12	04	10	00	00	00	00
2		03	06	07	08	13	00	00	00	00	00
3		02	01	14	16	06	00	00	00	00	00
4		08	08	14	02	03	00	00	00	00	00
5		09	08	07	25	01	00	00	00	08	00
Same-Sex Friend Data							S.E. = .061				
X 1		13	09	12	07	12	00	00	00	00	00
2		15	15	16	03	05	00	00	00	00	00
3		10	12	07	16	08	00	00	00	00	00
4		18	09	09	01	04	00	00	00	00	00
5		03	02	05	03	25	00	00	00	00	05
Opposite-Sex Friend Data							S.E. = .054				
X 1		21	08	05	03	14	03	00	00	00	00
2		12	08	18	05	03	00	00	00	00	00
3		21	13	03	04	08	03	00	00	00	00
4		14	04	12	03	03	00	00	00	00	00
5		01	03	12	03	27	00	00	00	00	09

Appendix B
Table B.8a
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X)
Information Clarification/Subject to Object (Y)

		Observed Correlations					Expected Correlations				
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Mother Data											
X 1		65	61	47	41	51	44	42	42	45	49
2		29	43	64	62	43	50	48	48	52	56
3		42	44	58	73	47	54	52	52	56	61
4		38	34	56	57	44	54	52	52	56	61
5		57	41	43	42	62	42	41	41	44	47
Father Data											
X 1		63	59	37	29	53	49	37	39	38	46
2		43	32	66	43	41	58	44	46	45	54
3		34	23	54	69	38	50	38	40	39	47
4		34	21	53	56	46	56	42	44	44	52
5		52	41	43	41	71	55	42	44	43	52
Same-Sex Friend Data											
X 1		74	58	25	32	66	49	48	34	41	44
2		35	34	67	58	37	55	54	38	47	49
3		33	27	55	68	44	57	55	39	48	51
4		26	32	58	49	43	55	54	38	47	49
5		59	58	24	43	71	51	50	36	43	46
Opposite-Sex Friend Data											
X 1		69	55	44	51	65	46	40	38	46	48
2		42	44	74	67	51	57	49	47	58	60
3		43	41	60	67	46	63	55	52	64	66
4		41	47	72	57	45	61	53	50	62	64
5		53	53	36	43	67	53	46	44	54	56

Appendix B
Table B.8b
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X)
Information Clarification/Subject to Object (Y)

		Deviations Observed-Expected					"00": Deviation W/in S.E.(p=.001)				
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Mother Data							S.E. = .053				
X 1		21	19	05	04	02	04	02	00	00	00
2		21	05	16	10	13	04	00	00	00	00
3		12	08	06	17	14	00	00	00	00	00
4		16	18	04	01	17	00	01	00	00	00
5		15	00	02	02	15	00	00	00	00	00
Father Data							S.E. = .056				
X 1		14	22	02	09	07	00	04	00	00	00
2		15	12	20	02	13	00	00	02	00	00
3		16	15	14	30	09	00	00	00	12	00
4		22	21	09	12	06	04	03	00	00	00
5		03	01	01	02	19	00	00	00	00	01
Same-Sex Friend Data							S.E. = .055				
X 1		25	10	09	09	22	07	00	00	00	04
2		20	20	29	11	12	02	02	11	00	00
3		24	28	16	20	07	06	10	00	02	00
4		29	22	20	02	06	11	04	02	00	00
5		08	08	12	00	25	00	00	00	00	07
Opposite-Sex Friend Data							S.E. = .051				
X 1		23	15	06	05	17	06	00	00	00	00
2		15	05	27	09	09	00	00	10	00	00
3		20	14	08	03	20	03	00	00	00	03
4		20	06	22	05	19	03	00	05	00	02
5		00	07	08	11	11	00	00	00	00	00

Appendix B
Table B.9a
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X)
Information Giving/Object to Subject (Y)

		Observed Correlations						Expected Correlations					
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mother Data													
X	1	57	55	34	39	44	60	39	32	48	50	52	50
	2	35	36	67	60	61	46	45	37	56	58	60	57
	3	44	25	66	72	61	52	49	40	60	63	65	62
	4	38	34	65	62	75	51	49	40	60	63	65	62
	5	66	37	33	43	45	70	38	31	47	49	51	48
Father Data													
X	1	64	49	38	44	32	57	41	33	47	49	45	48
	2	38	35	67	58	56	50	48	39	56	58	54	57
	3	43	23	64	73	40	41	42	34	48	50	46	50
	4	39	17	65	63	71	51	47	38	54	56	52	55
	5	47	34	36	46	44	62	46	38	53	55	51	55
Same-Sex Friend Data													
X	1	54	63	26	35	31	54	40	39	37	41	41	43
	2	23	31	57	51	54	27	45	44	42	47	46	48
	3	34	31	51	69	49	46	46	45	43	48	47	49
	4	25	31	57	45	75	40	45	44	42	47	46	48
	5	47	52	31	37	36	57	42	41	39	43	43	45
Opposite-Sex Friend Data													
X	1	72	56	44	52	34	61	38	43	42	46	37	42
	2	45	49	62	61	45	35	47	53	52	58	45	52
	3	41	43	54	70	47	36	52	59	57	64	50	57
	4	39	45	54	57	66	46	50	57	55	62	48	55
	5	54	54	33	47	43	64	44	50	49	54	42	49

Appendix B
Table B.9b
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X)
Information Giving/Object to Subject (Y)

		Deviations Observed-Expected						"00": Deviation W/in S.E. (p=.001)					
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mother Data								S.E. = .052					
X 1		18	23	14	11	08	10	01	06	00	00	00	00
2		10	01	11	02	01	11	00	00	00	00	00	00
3		05	15	06	09	04	10	00	00	00	00	00	00
4		11	06	05	01	08	11	00	00	00	00	00	00
5		28	06	14	06	06	22	11	00	00	00	00	05
Father Data								S.E. = .054					
X 1		23	16	09	05	13	09	05	00	00	00	00	00
2		10	04	11	00	02	07	00	00	00	00	00	00
3		01	11	16	23	06	09	00	00	00	05	00	00
4		08	21	11	07	19	04	00	03	00	00	01	00
5		01	04	17	09	07	07	00	00	00	00	00	00
Same-Sex Friend Data								S.E. = .057					
X 1		14	24	11	06	10	11	00	05	00	00	00	00
2		22	13	15	04	08	21	03	00	00	00	00	02
3		12	14	08	21	02	03	00	00	00	02	00	00
4		20	13	15	02	29	08	01	00	00	00	10	00
5		05	11	08	06	07	12	00	00	00	00	00	00
Opposite-Sex Friend Data								S.E. = .053					
X 1		34	13	02	06	03	19	17	00	00	00	00	02
2		02	04	10	03	00	17	00	00	00	00	00	00
3		11	16	03	06	03	21	00	00	00	00	00	04
4		11	12	01	05	18	09	00	00	00	00	01	00
5		10	04	16	07	01	15	00	00	00	00	00	00

Appendix B
Table B.10a
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X)
Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)

		Observed Correlations						Expected Correlations					
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mother Data													
X	1	54	55	31	40	39	48	37	38	48	52	46	44
	2	27	42	66	72	58	39	42	44	56	60	53	50
	3	35	38	56	77	54	46	45	47	60	65	57	54
	4	32	40	58	66	72	42	45	47	60	65	57	54
	5	67	43	32	42	40	65	35	37	47	51	44	42
Father Data													
X	1	72	55	42	35	29	47	39	33	43	47	39	44
	2	45	32	67	51	54	41	47	40	51	56	47	52
	3	32	17	44	61	36	37	40	34	44	48	40	45
	4	39	20	58	53	69	42	45	38	49	53	45	50
	5	49	40	32	45	41	60	45	38	49	53	45	49
Same-Sex Friend Data													
X	1	69	64	17	36	29	67	44	41	34	46	40	46
	2	27	33	68	50	57	39	49	46	39	52	45	52
	3	31	37	43	69	49	43	51	47	40	54	46	54
	4	24	31	56	45	79	39	49	46	39	52	45	52
	5	51	54	22	34	37	70	46	43	36	49	42	49
Opposite-Sex Friend Data													
X	1	72	58	46	43	38	62	40	36	47	45	42	42
	2	41	29	69	51	56	47	50	45	58	56	52	52
	3	48	38	59	66	52	42	55	50	64	62	57	57
	4	45	45	63	54	67	48	53	48	62	60	55	55
	5	55	47	38	42	41	65	46	42	54	52	48	48

Appendix B
Table B.10b
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X)
Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)

		Deviations Observed-Expected						"00": Deviation W/in S.E. (p=.001)					
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mother Data								S.E. = .054					
X 1		17	17	17	12	07	04	00	00	00	00	00	00
2		15	02	10	12	05	11	00	00	00	00	00	00
3		10	09	04	12	03	08	00	00	00	00	00	00
4		13	07	02	01	15	12	00	00	00	00	00	00
5		32	06	15	09	04	23	14	00	00	00	00	05
Father Data								S.E. = .057					
X 1		33	22	01	12	10	03	14	03	00	00	00	00
2		02	08	16	05	07	11	00	00	00	00	00	00
3		08	17	00	13	04	08	00	00	00	00	00	00
4		06	18	09	00	24	08	00	00	00	00	05	00
5		04	02	17	08	04	11	00	00	00	00	00	00
Same-Sex Friend Data								S.E. = .056					
X 1		25	23	17	10	11	21	07	05	00	00	00	03
2		22	13	29	02	12	13	04	00	11	00	00	00
3		20	10	03	15	03	11	02	00	00	00	00	00
4		25	15	17	07	34	13	07	00	00	00	16	00
5		05	11	14	15	05	21	00	00	00	00	00	03
Opposite-Sex Friend Data								S.E. = .052					
X 1		32	22	01	02	04	20	15	05	00	00	00	03
2		09	16	11	05	04	05	00	00	00	00	00	00
3		07	12	05	04	05	15	00	00	00	00	00	00
4		08	03	01	06	12	07	00	00	00	00	00	00
5		09	05	16	10	07	17	00	00	00	00	00	00

Appendix B
Table B.11a
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X)
Information Exchange (Y)

		Observed Correlations						Expected Correlations					
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mother Data													
X 1		36	55	34	38	47	47	45	39	46	48	46	37
2		59	38	62	58	59	37	51	45	53	55	53	42
3		53	49	59	72	53	46	55	49	58	60	58	46
4		51	45	56	60	62	48	55	49	58	60	58	46
5		35	46	32	36	39	56	43	38	45	47	45	36
Father Data													
X 1		42	59	34	46	37	49	49	45	48	49	43	39
2		57	50	65	56	53	47	58	53	58	58	51	47
3		53	46	47	77	39	46	51	46	50	51	44	41
4		59	48	54	61	66	46	56	51	56	56	49	45
5		42	44	40	49	46	50	56	51	55	56	49	45
Same-Sex Friend Data													
X 1		23	44	25	35	30	53	40	35	41	39	41	28
2		45	22	50	50	56	38	45	40	46	44	47	31
3		41	32	45	63	42	43	46	41	47	45	48	32
4		49	37	47	46	61	48	45	40	46	44	47	31
5		20	32	21	25	26	60	42	37	43	40	43	29
Opposite-Sex Friend Data													
X 1		35	64	43	44	34	61	41	39	45	41	42	39
2		57	48	59	52	49	45	51	48	56	51	52	48
3		54	43	50	58	43	46	57	53	62	56	58	53
4		62	47	58	53	67	55	55	51	60	54	56	51
5		46	53	36	36	40	68	48	45	52	47	49	45

Appendix B
Table B.11b
Test of Parallelism

Information Seeking/Subject to Object (X)
Information Exchange (Y)

		Deviations Observed-Expected						"00": Deviation W/in S.E. (p=.001)					
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mother Data		S.E. = .054											
X 1		09	16	12	10	01	10	00	00	00	00	00	00
2		08	07	09	03	06	05	00	00	00	00	00	00
3		02	00	01	12	05	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
4		04	04	02	00	04	02	00	00	00	00	00	00
5		08	08	13	11	06	20	00	00	00	00	00	02
Father Data		S.E. = .053											
X 1		07	14	14	03	06	10	00	00	00	00	00	00
2		01	03	07	02	02	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
3		02	00	03	26	05	05	00	00	00	09	00	00
4		03	03	02	05	17	01	00	00	00	00	00	00
5		14	07	15	07	03	05	00	00	00	00	00	00
Same-Sex Friend Data		S.E. = .059											
X 1		17	09	16	04	11	25	00	00	00	00	00	06
2		00	18	04	06	09	07	00	00	00	00	00	00
3		05	09	02	18	06	11	00	00	00	00	00	00
4		04	03	01	02	14	17	00	00	00	00	00	00
5		22	05	22	15	17	31	03	00	03	00	00	12
Opposite-Sex Friend Data		S.E. = .053											
X 1		06	25	02	03	08	22	00	08	00	00	00	05
2		06	00	03	01	03	03	00	00	00	00	00	00
3		03	10	12	02	15	07	00	00	00	00	00	00
4		07	04	02	01	11	04	00	00	00	00	00	00
5		02	08	16	11	09	23	00	00	00	00	00	06

Appendix B
Table B.12a
Test of Parallelism

Information Clarification/Object to Subject (X)
Information Clarification/Subject to Object (Y)

		Observed Correlations					Expected Correlations				
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Mother Data											
X 1		66	44	40	37	46	46	44	44	47	51
2		37	58	46	35	35	39	38	38	40	44
3		28	35	62	63	41	46	44	44	47	51
4		39	41	49	62	44	54	52	52	56	60
5		52	54	47	42	69	47	45	45	48	52
Father Data											
X 1		57	50	38	35	52	48	37	38	38	45
2		39	56	35	27	25	45	34	36	35	43
3		25	24	55	52	34	50	38	39	39	47
4		41	32	58	69	39	56	43	45	44	53
5		45	35	40	42	60	50	38	39	39	47
Same-Sex Friend Data											
X 1		61	59	26	31	38	52	51	36	44	46
2		53	62	25	28	30	46	44	32	38	41
3		30	27	61	55	23	46	44	32	38	41
4		30	31	54	65	33	46	45	32	39	41
5		58	53	25	44	62	51	49	35	42	45
Opposite-Sex Friend Data											
X 1		58	42	36	34	50	49	43	41	50	52
2		49	66	43	33	40	51	44	42	52	54
3		48	40	75	51	39	51	44	42	52	54
4		38	27	61	62	45	52	45	43	53	55
5		57	47	38	49	74	48	42	40	49	51

Appendix B
Table B.12b
Test of Parallelism

Information Clarification/Object to Subject (X)
Information Clarification/Subject to Object (Y)

Deviations Observed-Expected							"00": Deviation W/in S.E.(p=.001)				
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Mother Data							S.E. = .055				
X	1	20	00	04	10	05	02	00	00	00	00
	2	02	20	08	05	09	00	02	00	00	00
	3	18	09	18	16	10	00	00	00	00	00
	4	15	11	03	06	16	00	00	00	00	00
	5	05	09	02	06	17	00	00	00	00	00
Father Data							S.E. = .058				
X	1	09	13	00	03	07	00	00	00	00	00
	2	06	22	01	08	18	00	03	00	00	00
	3	25	14	16	13	13	06	00	00	00	00
	4	15	11	13	25	14	00	00	00	06	00
	5	05	03	01	03	13	00	00	00	00	00
Same-Sex Friend Data							S.E. = .058				
X	1	09	08	10	13	08	00	00	00	00	00
	2	07	18	07	10	11	00	00	00	00	00
	3	16	17	29	17	18	00	00	10	00	00
	4	16	14	22	26	08	00	00	03	07	00
	5	07	04	10	02	17	00	00	00	00	00
Opposite-Sex Friend Data							S.E. = .054				
X	1	09	01	05	16	02	00	00	00	00	00
	2	02	22	01	19	14	00	04	00	01	00
	3	03	04	33	01	15	00	00	15	00	00
	4	14	18	18	09	10	00	00	00	00	00
	5	09	05	02	00	23	00	00	00	00	05

Appendix B
Table B.13a
Test of Parallelism

Information Clarification/Object to Subject (X)
Information Giving/Object to Subject (Y)

		Observed Correlations						Expected Correlations					
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mother Data													
X	1	79	43	31	42	42	66	45	37	55	58	60	57
	2	44	78	36	30	36	47	39	32	48	50	52	49
	3	39	29	76	69	63	50	45	37	55	58	60	57
	4	52	34	67	81	69	57	53	43	65	68	71	67
	5	58	50	38	48	47	73	46	38	57	59	62	58
Father Data													
X	1	80	49	43	55	41	65	47	38	54	57	52	56
	2	55	74	38	48	37	40	44	36	51	53	49	53
	3	33	29	72	67	64	47	48	40	56	58	54	57
	4	48	27	58	83	51	51	55	45	64	66	61	65
	5	60	34	47	56	55	69	48	40	56	58	54	57
Same-Sex Friend Data													
X	1	71	50	27	32	33	62	48	47	45	50	49	52
	2	49	65	19	29	32	51	42	41	40	44	43	45
	3	32	26	58	57	56	38	42	41	40	44	43	45
	4	31	33	51	69	48	36	43	42	40	45	44	46
	5	61	56	32	38	38	72	47	46	44	49	48	50
Opposite-Sex Friend Data													
X	1	63	66	41	50	34	73	45	52	50	56	44	50
	2	48	69	38	43	32	50	47	54	52	58	46	52
	3	34	42	69	62	57	37	47	54	52	58	46	52
	4	35	49	53	68	41	46	48	55	53	59	46	53
	5	50	57	38	51	53	74	45	51	49	55	43	49

Appendix B
Table B.13b
Test of Parallelism

Information Clarification/Object to Subject (X)
Information Giving/Object to Subject (Y)

		Deviations Observed-Expected						"00": Deviation W/in S.E.(p=.001)					
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mother Data								S.E. = .051					
X 1		34	06	24	16	18	09	17	00	07	00	01	00
2		05	46	12	20	16	02	00	29	00	03	00	00
3		06	08	21	11	03	07	00	00	04	00	00	00
4		01	09	02	13	02	10	00	00	00	00	00	00
5		12	12	19	11	15	15	00	00	02	00	00	00
Father Data								S.E. = .051					
X 1		33	11	11	02	11	09	16	00	00	00	00	00
2		11	38	13	05	12	13	00	21	00	00	00	00
3		15	11	16	09	10	10	00	00	00	00	00	00
4		07	18	06	17	10	14	00	01	00	00	00	00
5		12	06	09	02	01	12	00	00	00	00	00	00
Same-Sex Friend Data								S.E. = .056					
X 1		23	03	18	18	16	10	05	00	00	00	00	00
2		07	24	21	15	11	06	00	06	03	00	00	00
3		10	15	18	13	13	07	00	00	00	00	00	00
4		12	09	11	24	04	10	00	00	00	06	00	00
5		14	10	12	11	10	22	00	00	00	00	00	04
Opposite-Sex Friend Data								S.E. = .053					
X 1		18	14	09	06	10	23	01	00	00	00	00	06
2		01	15	14	15	14	02	00	00	00	00	00	00
3		13	12	17	04	11	15	00	00	00	00	00	00
4		13	06	00	09	05	07	00	00	00	00	00	00
5		05	06	11	04	10	25	00	00	00	00	00	08

Appendix B
Table B.14a
Test of Parallelism

Information Clarification/Object to Subject (X)
Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)

		Observed Correlations						Expected Correlations					
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mother Data													
X	1	69	48	19	34	24	54	35	37	47	51	44	42
	2	38	61	27	29	22	30	31	32	40	44	38	37
	3	28	32	57	63	51	33	35	37	47	51	44	42
	4	40	43	49	63	45	42	42	43	55	60	52	50
	5	58	54	34	42	35	66	36	38	48	52	46	44
Father Data													
X	1	63	53	38	42	26	48	40	34	44	48	40	45
	2	50	51	46	28	32	24	38	32	42	45	38	42
	3	31	20	64	47	53	28	42	35	45	49	42	46
	4	45	28	58	70	48	40	47	40	52	56	47	52
	5	50	32	44	45	40	61	42	35	45	49	42	46
Same-Sex Friend Data													
X	1	53	52	23	33	28	51	46	43	36	49	42	49
	2	48	62	23	23	19	47	41	38	32	43	37	43
	3	20	27	64	50	56	30	41	38	32	43	37	43
	4	28	29	49	65	46	34	41	38	32	44	38	44
	5	49	53	26	35	38	68	45	42	35	48	41	48
Opposite-Sex Friend Data													
X	1	61	63	43	46	28	58	45	41	53	51	47	47
	2	50	65	41	37	33	46	47	43	55	53	49	49
	3	43	39	68	57	63	44	47	43	55	53	49	49
	4	39	30	53	64	51	48	48	44	56	54	50	50
	5	46	46	41	49	49	65	44	41	52	50	46	46

Appendix B
Table B.14b
Test of Parallelism

Information Clarification/Object to Subject (X)
Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)

Deviations Observed-Expected							"00": Deviation W/in S.E.(p=.001)						
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mother Data							S.E. = .058						
X	1	34	11	28	17	20	12	15	00	09	00	01	00
	2	07	29	13	15	16	07	00	10	00	00	00	00
	3	07	05	10	12	07	09	00	00	00	00	00	00
	4	02	00	06	03	07	08	00	00	00	00	00	00
	5	22	16	14	10	11	22	03	00	00	00	00	03
Father Data							S.E. = .057						
X	1	23	19	06	06	14	03	04	00	00	00	00	00
	2	12	19	04	17	06	18	00	00	00	00	00	00
	3	11	15	19	02	11	18	00	00	00	00	00	00
	4	02	12	06	14	01	12	00	00	00	00	00	00
	5	08	03	01	04	02	15	00	00	00	00	00	00
Same-Sex Friend Data							S.E. = .059						
X	1	07	09	13	16	14	02	00	00	00	00	00	00
	2	07	24	09	20	18	04	00	05	00	01	00	00
	3	21	11	32	07	19	13	02	00	13	00	00	00
	4	13	09	17	21	08	10	00	00	00	02	00	00
	5	04	11	09	13	03	20	00	00	00	00	00	01
Opposite-Sex Friend Data							S.E. = .054						
X	1	16	22	10	05	19	11	00	04	00	00	01	00
	2	03	22	14	16	16	03	00	04	00	00	00	00
	3	04	04	13	04	14	05	00	00	00	00	00	00
	4	09	14	03	10	01	02	00	00	00	00	00	00
	5	02	05	11	01	03	19	00	00	00	00	00	01

Appendix B
Table B.15a
Test of Parallelism

Information Clarification/Object to Subject (X)
Information Exchange (Y)

		Observed Correlations						Expected Correlations					
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mother Data													
X	1	37	50	30	40	41	60	48	42	50	52	50	40
	2	43	49	36	32	38	35	41	36	43	45	43	34
	3	64	39	65	62	57	38	48	42	50	52	50	40
	4	58	49	59	68	56	52	57	50	59	61	59	47
	5	35	55	43	45	40	60	49	43	51	53	51	41
Father Data													
X	1	51	65	43	56	43	54	54	49	53	54	47	43
	2	47	50	38	44	44	33	51	46	50	51	44	41
	3	64	43	63	63	61	44	55	51	55	55	49	45
	4	60	56	58	77	54	51	63	58	62	63	55	51
	5	48	50	39	54	41	68	55	51	55	55	49	45
Same-Sex Friend Data													
X	1	24	46	21	32	34	55	43	38	44	42	44	30
	2	25	40	13	24	26	43	37	33	38	36	39	26
	3	48	27	52	48	57	42	37	33	38	36	39	26
	4	47	25	47	61	45	38	38	34	39	37	40	26
	5	25	34	20	30	26	61	42	37	43	40	43	29
Opposite-Sex Friend Data													
X	1	32	57	43	44	41	52	46	43	50	46	47	43
	2	43	58	40	40	35	52	48	45	53	48	49	45
	3	56	47	63	50	53	42	48	45	53	48	49	45
	4	44	40	43	55	50	47	49	46	53	48	49	46
	5	41	46	40	36	50	69	45	42	50	45	46	42

Appendix B
Table B.15b
Test of Parallelism

Information Clarification/Object to Subject (X)
Information Exchange (Y)

		Deviations Observed-Expected						"00": Deviation W/in S.E. (p=.001)					
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mother Data								S.E. = .055					
X 1		11	08	20	12	09	20	00	00	02	00	00	02
2		02	13	07	13	05	01	00	00	00	00	00	00
3		16	03	15	10	07	02	00	00	00	00	00	00
4		01	01	00	07	03	05	00	00	00	00	00	00
5		14	12	08	08	11	19	00	00	00	00	00	01
Father Data								S.E. = .052					
X 1		03	16	10	02	04	11	00	00	00	00	00	00
2		04	04	12	07	00	08	00	00	00	00	00	00
3		09	08	08	08	12	01	00	00	00	00	00	00
4		03	02	04	14	01	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
5		07	01	16	01	08	23	00	00	00	00	00	06
Same-Sex Friend Data								S.E. = .061					
X 1		19	08	23	10	10	25	00	00	03	00	00	05
2		12	07	25	12	13	17	00	00	05	00	00	00
3		11	06	14	12	18	16	00	00	00	00	00	00
4		09	09	08	24	05	12	00	00	00	04	00	00
5		17	03	23	10	17	32	00	00	03	00	00	12
Opposite-Sex Friend Data								S.E. = .055					
X 1		14	14	07	02	06	09	00	00	00	00	00	00
2		05	13	13	08	14	07	00	00	00	00	00	00
3		08	02	10	02	04	03	00	00	00	00	00	00
4		05	06	10	07	01	01	00	00	00	00	00	00
5		04	04	10	09	04	27	00	00	00	00	00	09

Appendix B
Table B.16a
Test of Parallelism

Information Clarification/Subject to Object (X)
Information Giving/Object to Subject (Y)

		Observed Correlations						Expected Correlations					
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mother Data													
X 1		66	40	21	22	31	56	37	30	45	47	49	47
2		41	51	26	34	36	46	35	29	43	45	47	45
3		45	41	59	44	54	45	35	29	43	45	47	45
4		39	26	58	59	51	44	38	31	47	49	51	48
5		50	32	29	39	41	66	41	34	51	53	55	52
Father Data													
X 1		58	42	29	37	25	56	43	35	50	52	48	51
2		39	57	22	28	29	48	33	27	38	39	36	39
3		24	24	55	57	47	47	34	28	40	41	38	41
4		26	13	46	64	36	41	34	28	39	41	37	40
5		42	30	29	43	38	68	41	33	47	49	45	48
Same-Sex Friend Data													
X 1		60	63	25	37	34	50	46	46	43	48	48	50
2		51	68	29	29	36	51	45	44	42	47	46	48
3		13	21	55	53	55	16	32	32	30	33	33	34
4		21	24	50	62	51	30	39	38	37	41	40	42
5		48	49	30	29	32	60	41	41	39	43	43	44
Opposite-Sex Friend Data													
X 1		66	56	41	49	35	49	47	54	52	58	46	52
2		52	63	34	34	33	41	41	47	45	50	40	45
3		44	39	62	59	53	41	39	45	43	48	38	43
4		51	53	55	67	46	40	48	55	53	59	46	53
5		60	58	37	49	49	63	50	57	55	61	48	55

Appendix B
Table B.16b
Test of Parallelism

Information Clarification/Subject to Object (X)
Information Giving/Object to Subject (Y)

		Deviations Observed-Expected						"00": Deviation W/in S.E.(p=.001)					
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mother Data								S.E. = .058					
X 1		29	10	24	25	18	09	10	00	05	06	00	00
2		06	22	17	11	11	01	00	03	00	00	00	00
3		10	12	16	01	07	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
4		01	05	11	10	00	04	00	00	00	00	00	00
5		09	02	22	14	14	14	00	00	03	00	00	01
Father Data								S.E. = .059					
X 1		15	07	21	15	23	05	00	00	02	00	04	00
2		06	30	16	11	07	09	00	11	00	00	00	00
3		10	04	15	16	09	06	00	00	00	00	00	00
4		08	15	07	23	01	01	00	00	00	04	00	00
5		01	03	18	06	07	20	00	00	00	00	00	01
Same-Sex Friend Data								S.E. = .059					
X 1		14	17	18	11	14	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
2		06	24	13	18	10	03	00	05	00	00	00	00
3		19	11	25	20	22	18	00	00	06	01	03	00
4		18	14	13	21	11	12	00	00	00	02	00	00
5		07	08	09	14	11	16	00	00	00	00	00	00
Opposite-Sex Friend Data								S.E. = .054					
X 1		19	02	11	09	11	03	01	00	00	00	00	00
2		11	16	11	16	07	04	00	00	00	00	00	00
3		05	06	19	11	15	02	00	00	01	00	00	00
4		03	02	02	08	00	13	00	00	00	00	00	00
5		10	01	18	12	01	08	00	00	00	00	00	00

Appendix B
Table B.17a
Test of Parallelism

Information Clarification/Subject to Object (X)
Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)

		Observed Correlations						Expected Correlations					
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mother Data													
X	1	65	46	25	38	35	62	39	40	52	56	49	47
	2	47	69	31	39	30	52	37	39	49	53	47	45
	3	35	40	61	58	60	41	37	39	49	53	47	45
	4	31	35	58	77	53	45	40	42	53	57	50	48
	5	52	45	39	47	45	73	44	45	58	62	54	52
Father Data													
X	1	74	57	34	51	32	68	53	45	58	63	53	59
	2	54	66	34	32	24	43	41	34	44	48	41	45
	3	42	23	63	64	51	47	42	36	46	50	42	47
	4	32	28	44	75	45	49	42	35	46	50	42	46
	5	55	45	28	51	38	73	50	42	55	59	50	56
Same-Sex Friend Data													
X	1	70	69	20	41	28	63	56	52	44	59	51	59
	2	59	78	24	34	35	63	54	50	43	58	50	58
	3	17	29	72	57	59	23	39	36	30	41	35	41
	4	30	30	54	75	52	41	47	44	37	50	43	50
	5	54	55	20	44	38	72	50	46	39	53	46	53
Opposite-Sex Friend Data													
X	1	75	60	56	53	47	68	54	49	63	61	56	56
	2	56	72	43	36	38	39	47	43	54	53	49	49
	3	45	40	72	57	61	46	44	41	52	50	46	46
	4	49	42	62	69	56	57	54	50	64	61	57	57
	5	54	48	47	50	49	76	57	52	66	64	59	59

Appendix B
Table B.17b
Test of Parallelism

Information Clarification/Subject to Object (X)
Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)

Deviations Observed-Expected							"00": Deviation W/in S.E.(p=.001)						
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mother Data							S.E. = .055						
X	1	26	06	27	18	14	15	08	00	09	00	00	00
	2	10	30	18	14	17	07	00	12	00	00	00	00
	3	02	01	12	05	13	04	00	00	00	00	00	00
	4	09	07	05	20	03	03	00	00	00	02	00	00
	5	08	00	19	15	09	21	00	00	01	00	00	03
Father Data							S.E. = .055						
X	1	21	12	24	12	21	09	03	00	06	00	03	00
	2	13	32	10	16	17	02	00	14	00	00	00	00
	3	00	13	17	14	09	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
	4	10	07	02	25	03	03	00	00	00	07	00	00
	5	05	03	27	08	12	17	00	00	09	00	00	01
Same-Sex Friend Data							S.E. = .055						
X	1	14	17	24	18	23	04	00	00	06	00	05	00
	2	05	28	19	24	15	05	00	10	01	06	00	00
	3	22	07	42	16	24	18	04	00	24	01	06	00
	4	17	14	17	25	09	09	00	00	00	07	00	00
	5	04	09	19	09	08	19	00	00	01	00	00	01
Opposite-Sex Friend Data							S.E. = .050						
X	1	21	11	07	08	09	12	05	00	00	00	00	00
	2	09	29	11	17	11	10	00	13	00	01	00	00
	3	01	01	20	07	15	00	00	00	04	00	00	00
	4	05	08	02	08	01	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
	5	03	04	19	14	10	17	00	00	03	00	00	01

Appendix B
Table B.18a
Test of Parallelism

Information Clarification/Subject to Object (X)
Information Exchange (Y)

		Observed Correlations						Expected Correlations					
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mother Data													
X	1	27	51	20	29	28	47	40	35	41	43	41	33
	2	27	41	34	35	32	43	38	34	40	41	40	32
	3	53	41	47	46	48	41	38	34	40	41	40	32
	4	49	36	55	62	44	32	41	36	43	44	43	34
	5	25	40	35	37	29	49	44	39	46	48	46	37
Father Data													
X	1	25	46	22	36	32	46	49	45	48	49	43	39
	2	34	44	24	31	36	41	37	34	37	37	33	30
	3	44	37	61	54	47	51	39	36	38	39	34	31
	4	45	30	38	63	31	45	38	35	38	38	34	31
	5	35	34	29	40	30	49	46	42	45	46	40	37
Same-Sex Friend Data													
X	1	26	49	27	35	31	48	46	41	47	45	48	32
	2	33	44	23	23	33	48	45	40	46	44	47	31
	3	48	26	57	55	56	35	32	29	33	31	33	22
	4	40	23	45	61	41	40	39	35	40	38	40	27
	5	23	34	23	30	25	60	41	37	42	40	43	29
Opposite-Sex Friend Data													
X	1	41	60	42	42	35	56	50	47	55	50	51	47
	2	52	57	40	24	31	43	43	41	47	43	44	41
	3	53	48	56	49	54	46	41	39	45	41	42	39
	4	40	42	47	60	49	53	51	47	56	50	51	47
	5	39	54	43	46	45	72	53	49	58	52	54	49

Appendix B
Table B.18b
Test of Parallelism

Information Clarification/Subject to Object (X)
Information Exchange (Y)

		Deviations Observed-Expected						"00": Deviation W/in S.E. (p=.001)					
ITEMS		Y 1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mother Data		S.E. = .060											
X 1		13	16	21	14	13	14	00	00	01	00	00	00
2		11	07	06	06	08	11	00	00	00	00	00	00
3		15	07	07	05	08	09	00	00	00	00	00	00
4		08	00	12	18	01	02	00	00	00	00	00	00
5		19	01	11	11	17	12	00	00	00	00	00	00
Father Data		S.E. = .060											
X 1		24	01	26	13	11	07	04	00	06	00	00	00
2		03	10	13	06	03	11	00	00	00	00	00	00
3		05	01	23	15	13	20	00	00	03	00	00	00
4		07	05	00	25	03	14	00	00	00	05	00	00
5		11	08	16	06	10	12	00	00	09	00	00	00
Same-Sex Friend Data		S.E. = .061											
X 1		20	08	20	10	17	16	00	00	00	00	00	00
2		12	04	23	21	14	17	00	00	03	01	00	00
3		16	03	24	24	23	13	00	00	04	04	03	00
4		01	12	05	23	01	13	00	00	00	03	00	00
5		18	03	19	10	18	31	00	00	00	00	00	11
Opposite-Sex Friend Data		S.E. = .055											
X 1		09	13	13	08	16	09	00	00	00	00	00	00
2		09	16	07	19	13	02	00	00	00	01	00	00
3		12	09	11	08	12	07	00	00	00	00	00	00
4		11	05	09	10	02	06	00	00	00	00	00	00
5		14	05	15	06	09	23	00	00	00	00	00	05

Appendix B
Table B.19a
Test of Parallelism

Information Giving/Object to Subject (X)
Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)

		Observed Correlations						Expected Correlations					
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mother Data													
X	1	72	46	34	41	35	58	31	32	40	44	38	37
	2	33	60	24	20	23	29	25	26	33	36	31	30
	3	20	32	61	64	55	27	38	39	50	54	47	45
	4	28	29	47	63	52	38	39	41	52	56	49	47
	5	28	37	50	61	64	38	41	42	54	58	51	49
	6	52	40	32	44	39	63	39	40	51	55	48	46
Father Data													
X	1	64	50	33	32	22	44	38	33	42	46	38	43
	2	38	55	37	16	23	33	31	27	34	37	31	35
	3	30	15	63	49	55	35	44	38	48	53	44	49
	4	42	17	54	74	53	41	46	39	50	55	46	51
	5	35	18	65	46	70	35	43	36	47	50	43	47
	6	57	41	41	51	44	69	46	39	50	54	46	50
Same-sex Friend Data													
X	1	67	59	18	35	21	55	47	44	37	50	43	50
	2	62	67	21	29	29	58	46	43	36	49	42	49
	3	30	30	66	54	63	32	44	41	35	47	40	47
	4	42	35	55	72	48	43	49	46	39	52	45	52
	5	32	33	62	51	80	35	49	45	38	51	44	51
	6	55	48	20	34	39	70	51	47	40	54	46	54
Opposite-Sex Friend Data													
X	1	68	54	39	37	30	56	45	41	53	51	47	47
	2	55	63	45	46	36	57	51	47	60	58	54	54
	3	45	35	72	65	63	47	50	46	59	56	52	52
	4	55	43	65	77	58	56	56	51	65	63	58	58
	5	31	31	51	53	68	44	44	40	51	49	46	46
	6	61	61	43	53	42	65	50	46	59	56	52	52

Appendix B
Table B.19b
Test of Parallelism

Information Giving/Object to Subject (X)
Information Giving/Subject to Object (Y)

		Deviations Observed-Expected						"00": Deviation W/in S.E.(p=.001)					
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mother Data								S.E. = .058					
X 1		41	14	06	03	03	21	22	00	00	00	00	02
2		08	34	09	16	08	01	00	15	00	00	00	00
3		18	07	11	10	08	18	00	00	00	00	00	00
4		11	12	05	07	03	09	00	00	00	00	00	00
5		13	05	04	03	13	11	00	00	00	00	00	00
6		13	00	19	11	09	17	00	00	00	00	00	00
Father Data								S.E. = .058					
X 1		26	17	09	14	16	01	07	00	00	00	00	00
2		07	28	03	21	08	02	00	09	00	02	00	00
3		14	23	15	04	11	14	00	04	00	00	00	00
4		04	22	04	19	07	10	00	03	00	00	00	00
5		08	18	18	04	27	12	00	00	00	00	08	00
6		11	02	09	03	02	19	00	00	00	00	00	00
Same-Sex Friend Data								S.E. = .056					
X 1		20	15	19	15	22	05	02	00	01	00	04	00
2		16	24	15	20	13	09	00	06	00	02	00	00
3		14	11	31	07	23	15	00	00	13	00	05	00
4		07	11	16	20	03	09	00	00	00	02	00	00
5		17	12	24	00	36	16	00	00	06	00	18	00
6		04	01	20	20	07	16	00	00	02	02	00	00
Opposite-Sex Friend Data								S.E. = .052					
X 1		23	13	14	14	17	09	06	00	00	00	00	00
2		04	16	15	12	18	03	00	00	00	00	01	00
3		05	11	13	09	11	05	00	00	00	00	00	00
4		01	08	00	14	00	02	00	00	00	00	00	00
5		13	09	00	04	22	02	00	00	00	00	05	00
6		11	15	16	03	10	13	00	00	00	00	00	00

Appendix B
Table B.20a
Test of Parallelism

Information Giving/Object to Subject (X)
Information Exchange (Y)

		Observed Correlations						Expected Correlations					
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mother Data													
X	1	38	52	28	38	36	63	45	39	46	48	46	37
	2	41	54	39	29	37	45	36	32	38	39	38	30
	3	66	42	73	70	64	42	55	48	57	59	57	45
	4	53	38	63	74	64	47	57	50	59	62	59	47
	5	51	41	55	58	69	51	59	52	62	64	62	49
	6	41	55	45	51	45	67	56	50	59	61	59	47
Father Data													
X	1	45	63	35	52	41	54	54	49	53	54	47	43
	2	46	45	38	33	32	43	44	40	43	44	39	35
	3	64	45	71	66	62	55	62	57	61	62	55	50
	4	62	53	64	85	61	59	65	59	64	65	57	52
	5	58	44	57	50	78	55	60	55	59	60	52	48
	6	49	52	46	53	51	73	64	58	63	64	56	51
Same-sex Friend Data													
X	1	30	51	23	34	28	51	48	43	49	46	50	33
	2	34	51	27	31	31	51	47	42	48	46	49	33
	3	68	39	74	52	58	35	45	40	46	44	47	31
	4	53	43	57	73	51	42	50	45	51	49	52	35
	5	58	43	49	54	69	52	49	44	50	48	51	34
	6	24	46	21	30	31	70	51	46	53	50	53	36
Opposite-Sex Friend Data													
X	1	39	70	40	46	32	63	49	46	54	49	50	46
	2	48	67	47	50	41	54	56	53	61	56	57	53
	3	63	54	72	64	63	43	55	51	60	54	55	51
	4	51	51	57	75	57	51	61	57	66	60	62	57
	5	56	41	56	49	76	49	48	45	52	47	49	45
	6	34	54	45	44	56	69	55	51	60	54	55	51

Appendix B
Table B.20b
Test of Parallelism

Information Giving/Object to Subject (X)
Information Exchange (Y)

Deviations Observed-Expected								"00": Deviation W/in S.E.(p=.001)					
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mother Data								S.E. = .053					
X	1	07	13	18	10	10	26	00	00	01	00	00	09
	2	05	22	01	10	01	15	00	05	00	00	00	00
	3	11	06	16	11	07	03	00	00	00	00	00	00
	4	04	12	04	12	05	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
	5	08	11	07	06	07	02	00	00	00	00	00	00
	6	15	05	14	10	14	20	00	00	00	00	00	03
Father Data								S.E. = .050					
X	1	09	14	18	02	06	11	00	00	02	00	00	00
	2	02	05	05	11	07	08	00	00	00	00	00	00
	3	02	12	10	04	07	05	00	00	00	00	00	00
	4	03	06	00	20	04	07	00	00	00	04	00	00
	5	02	11	02	10	26	07	00	00	00	00	10	00
	6	15	06	17	11	05	22	00	00	01	00	00	06
Same-Sex Friend Data								S.E. = .056					
X	1	18	08	26	12	22	18	00	00	08	00	04	00
	2	13	09	21	15	18	18	00	00	03	00	00	00
	3	23	01	28	08	11	04	05	00	10	00	00	00
	4	03	02	06	24	01	07	00	00	00	06	00	00
	5	09	01	01	06	18	18	00	00	00	00	00	00
	6	27	00	32	20	22	34	09	00	14	02	04	16
Opposite-Sex Friend Data								S.E. = .051					
X	1	10	24	14	03	18	17	00	07	00	00	01	00
	2	08	14	14	06	16	01	00	00	00	00	00	00
	3	08	03	12	10	08	08	00	00	00	00	00	00
	4	10	06	09	15	05	06	00	00	00	00	00	00
	5	08	04	04	02	27	04	00	00	00	00	10	00
	6	21	03	15	10	01	18	04	00	00	00	00	01

Appendix B
Table B.21a
Test of Parallelism

Information Giving/Subject to Object (X)
Information Exchange (Y)

		Observed Correlations						Expected Correlations					
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mother Data													
X	1	27	50	23	32	34	55	37	33	39	40	39	31
	2	31	52	35	37	42	42	39	34	40	42	40	32
	3	56	40	63	56	57	34	49	43	51	53	51	41
	4	54	43	58	65	54	43	53	47	56	58	56	44
	5	49	39	46	48	61	36	47	41	49	50	49	39
	6	32	43	30	36	31	61	45	39	47	48	47	37
Father Data													
X	1	30	52	27	38	41	43	43	39	43	43	38	35
	2	31	40	19	22	26	33	37	33	36	37	32	29
	3	56	40	58	49	56	44	47	43	47	47	41	38
	4	45	34	49	66	42	51	51	47	51	51	45	41
	5	51	35	50	44	65	42	43	39	43	43	38	35
	6	34	38	32	43	32	54	48	44	47	48	42	38
Same-sex Friend Data													
X	1	26	52	27	37	29	46	48	43	49	46	50	33
	2	28	47	21	26	32	44	44	39	45	43	46	31
	3	59	31	61	53	63	35	37	33	38	36	39	26
	4	46	38	51	73	48	41	50	45	52	49	52	35
	5	56	35	49	50	67	48	43	39	45	42	45	30
	6	23	42	25	32	32	67	50	45	52	49	52	35
Opposite-Sex Friend Data													
X	1	41	64	40	41	33	54	49	45	53	48	49	45
	2	37	58	40	36	38	51	44	42	49	44	45	42
	3	55	52	63	57	59	46	57	53	62	56	58	53
	4	45	45	60	69	61	50	55	51	60	54	55	51
	5	54	39	58	51	74	46	51	47	55	50	51	47
	6	35	51	47	52	49	69	51	47	55	50	51	47

Appendix B
Table B.21b
Test of Parallelism

Information Giving/Subject to Object (X)
Information Exchange (Y)

		Deviations Observed-Expected						"00": Deviation W/in S.E. (p=.001)					
ITEMS	Y	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mother Data								S.E. = .057					
X 1		10	17	16	08	05	24	00	00	00	00	00	05
2		08	18	05	05	02	10	00	00	00	00	00	00
3		07	03	12	03	06	07	00	00	00	00	00	00
4		01	04	02	07	02	01	00	00	00	00	00	00
5		02	02	03	02	12	03	00	00	00	00	00	00
6		13	04	17	12	16	24	00	00	00	00	00	05
Father Data								S.E. = .058					
X 1		13	13	16	05	03	08	00	00	00	00	00	00
2		06	07	17	15	06	04	00	00	00	00	00	00
3		09	03	11	02	15	06	00	00	00	00	00	00
4		06	13	02	15	03	10	00	00	00	00	00	00
5		08	04	07	01	27	07	00	00	00	00	08	00
6		14	06	15	05	10	16	00	00	00	00	00	00
Same-Sex Friend Data								S.E. = .058					
X 1		22	09	22	09	21	13	03	00	03	00	02	00
2		16	08	24	17	14	13	00	00	05	00	00	00
3		22	02	23	17	24	09	03	00	04	00	05	00
4		04	07	01	24	04	06	00	00	00	05	00	00
5		13	04	04	08	22	18	00	00	00	00	03	00
6		27	03	27	17	20	32	08	00	08	00	01	13
Opposite-Sex Friend Data								S.E. = .053					
X 1		08	19	13	07	16	09	00	02	00	00	00	00
2		07	16	09	08	07	09	00	00	00	00	00	00
3		02	01	01	01	01	07	00	00	00	00	00	00
4		10	06	00	15	06	01	00	00	00	00	00	00
5		03	08	03	01	23	01	00	00	00	00	06	00
6		16	04	08	02	02	22	00	00	00	00	00	05

APPENDIX C

The Survey Questionnaire*

***The questionnaire in this appendix was the version completed by female respondents. The version for male respondents was identical, except for pronouns used in the same-sex and opposite-sex friend sections.**

Circle the one statement that applies to you and complete the rest of the orange pages.

I live with my mother.
 I live with my stepmother.
 I live with my father's girlfriend.

 Think of the times when the relative you have circled above wants you to do something when you want to do something else. How often does she do the following when she wants you to do something?

Choose one answer from the following: Never(0), Not Often(1), Often(2), Very Often(3), Always(4). Choose the answer which comes closest to what you think even when none of the answers is exactly right for you. Please answer every question.

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
She keeps talking to me about what she wants me to do hoping I will start wanting to do it. 0		1	2	3	4
She says I'm supposed to do what she tells me to do. 0		1	2	3	4
She says I would enjoy doing what she wants me to do. . 0		1	2	3	4
She simply tells me to do it. 0		1	2	3	4
She says she expects me to do what she tells me. . . . 0		1	2	3	4
She tells me that she would do favors for me at other times if I would go along with her now. 0		1	2	3	4
She keeps telling me to do it until I do it. 0		1	2	3	4
She asks me if I would be willing to do it. 0		1	2	3	4

Why do you think she wants you to do those things? How often are the following answers similar or close to her reasons?

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
Because she wants to teach me to do the right thing. . . 0		1	2	3	4
Because she doesn't trust my judgment. 0		1	2	3	4
Because she wants me to help her to do something. . 0		1	2	3	4
Because she is supposed to tell me what to do. . . 0		1	2	3	4
Because she knows I would want to do what she wants me to do. 0		1	2	3	4
Because she knows what I should do about some things better than I do. . 0		1	2	3	4
Because she wants to spend time with me by doing something together. 0		1	2	3	4
Because she wants me to do the same thing she wants to do. 0		1	2	3	4

Think of the times when you feel unsure about important decisions you have to make, or unsure about personal problems you have, or unsure whether your ideas about something are right. How often does she do the following when you talk to her about something you are not sure of?

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
She tries to figure out with me whether or not I'm right. 0		1	2	3	4
She tells me that she thinks I'm right. 0		1	2	3	4
She takes time to understand in what way I'm uncertain about something. 0		1	2	3	4

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
She tells me that she points out where I'm wrong for my own good.	0	1	2	3	4
She tells me that I would realize her ideas are right when I get more experience. 0	0	1	2	3	4
She tells me she wonders about the same thing . . .	0	1	2	3	4
She tells me what is right. 0	0	1	2	3	4

Why do you talk to her when you are not sure about something? How often are the following answers similar or close to your reasons?

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
Because I know that she really cares about my doing the right thing. . .	0	1	2	3	4
Because she has taught me a lot of things.	0	1	2	3	4
Because she has more experience than I do. . . .	0	1	2	3	4
Because she understands how I feel.	0	1	2	3	4
Because she thinks with me about what might be right instead of just telling me what she thinks is right. .	0	1	2	3	4
Because I don't feel embarrassed to tell her what's troubling me	0	1	2	3	4
Because she is having similar experiences as I am	0	1	2	3	4
Because I respect her knowledge about certain things.	0	1	2	3	4

The following statements are about you and this relative.
How often do you and this relative do the activities
described in the statements?

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
We talk about TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
We discuss whether or not what happens on TV shows is like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
We talk about events that happen on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
We talk about conversations that take place on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
We talk about TV characters.	0	1	2	3	4
We discuss why TV characters act the way they do.	0	1	2	3	4
She tells me that what happens on TV shows is like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
She tells me that what happens on TV shows is not like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
She tells me about events that happen on TV shows	0	1	2	3	4
She tells me about conversations that take place on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
She tells me about TV characters.	0	1	2	3	4
She tells me why TV characters act the way they do	0	1	2	3	4
She explains to me that what happens on TV shows is like real-life	0	1	2	3	4

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
She explains to me that what happens on TV shows is not like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
She explains to me events that happen on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
She explains to me the conversations that take place on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
She explains to me why TV characters act the way they do.	0	1	2	3	4
She asks me if what happens on TV shows is like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
She asks me about events that happen on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
She asks me about conversations that take place on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
She asks me about TV characters.	0	1	2	3	4
She asks me why TV characters act the way they do.	0	1	2	3	4
I tell her that what happens on TV shows is like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
I tell her that what happens on TV shows is not like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
I tell her about events that happen on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
I tell her about conversations that take place on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
I tell her about TV characters.	0	1	2	3	4

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
I tell her why TV characters act the way they do.	0	1	2	3	4
I explain to her that what happens on TV shows is like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
I explain to her that what happens on TV shows is not like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
I explain to her events that happen on TV shows. .	0	1	2	3	4
I explain to her conversations that take place on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
I explain to her why TV characters act the way they do.	0	1	2	3	4
I ask her if what happens on TV shows is like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
I ask her about events that happen on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
I ask her about conversations that take place on TV shows	0	1	2	3	4
I ask her about TV characters	0	1	2	3	4
I ask her why TV characters act the way they do	0	1	2	3	4

Complete the green section of the questionnaire only if you live with one of the following: your father, your stepfather, or your mother's boyfriend.

If you don't live with any of them, check the box below and go to the next section (another color) of the questionnaire.

☐ I don't live with my father, stepfather, or mother's boyfriend.

If you live with one of them, go to the next page.

Circle the one statement that applies to you and complete the rest of the green pages.

I live with my father.
 I live with my stepfather.
 I live with my mother's boyfriend.

 Think of the times when this relative wants you to do something when you want to do something else. How often does he do the following when he wants you to do something?

Choose one answer from the following: Never(0), Not Often(1), Often(2), Very Often(3), Always(4). Choose the answer which comes closest to what you think even when none of the answers is exactly right for you. Please answer every question.

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
He keeps talking to me about what he wants me to do hoping I will start wanting to do it.	0	1	2	3	4
He says I'm supposed to do what he tells me to do.	0	1	2	3	4
He says I would enjoy doing what he wants me to do.	0	1	2	3	4
He simply tells me to do it.	0	1	2	3	4
He says he expects me to do what he tells me.	0	1	2	3	4
He tells me that he would do favors for me at other times if I would go along with him now.	0	1	2	3	4
He keeps telling me to do it until I do it.	0	1	2	3	4
He asks me if I would be willing to do it.	0	1	2	3	4

Why do you think he wants you to do those things? How often are the following answers similar or close to his reasons?

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
Because he wants to teach me to do the right thing. . . 0	0	1	2	3	4
Because he doesn't trust my judgment. 0	0	1	2	3	4
Because he wants me to help him to do something. . 0	0	1	2	3	4
Because he is supposed to tell me what to do. . . 0	0	1	2	3	4
Because he knows I would want to do what he wants me to do. 0	0	1	2	3	4
Because he knows what I should do about some things better than I do. . 0	0	1	2	3	4
Because he wants to spend time with me by doing something together. 0	0	1	2	3	4
Because he wants me to do the same thing he wants to do. 0	0	1	2	3	4

Think of the times when you feel unsure about important decisions you have to make, or unsure about personal problems you have, or unsure whether your ideas about something are right. How often does he do the following when you talk to him about something you are not sure of?

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
He tries to figure out with me whether or not I'm right. 0	0	1	2	3	4
He tells me that he thinks I'm right. 0	0	1	2	3	4
He takes time to understand in what way I'm uncertain about something. 0	0	1	2	3	4

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
He tells me that he points out where I'm wrong for my own good.	0	1	2	3	4
He tells me that I would realize his ideas are right when I get more experience.	0	1	2	3	4
He tells me he wonders about the same thing	0	1	2	3	4
He tells me what is right.	0	1	2	3	4

Why do you talk to him when you are not sure about something? How often are the following answers similar or close to your reasons?

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
Because I know that he really cares about my doing the right thing.	0	1	2	3	4
Because he has taught me a lot of things.	0	1	2	3	4
Because he has more experience than I do.	0	1	2	3	4
Because he understands how I feel.	0	1	2	3	4
Because he thinks with me about what might be right instead of just telling me what he thinks is right.	0	1	2	3	4
Because I don't feel embarrassed to tell him what's troubling me	0	1	2	3	4
Because he is having similar experiences as I am	0	1	2	3	4
Because I respect his knowledge about certain things.	0	1	2	3	4

The following statements are about you and this relative.
How often do you and this relative do the activities
described in the statements?

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
We talk about TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
We discuss whether or not what happens on TV shows is like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
We talk about events that happen on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
We talk about conversations that take place on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
We talk about TV characters.	0	1	2	3	4
We discuss why TV characters act the way they do.	0	1	2	3	4
He tells me that what happens on TV shows is like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
He tells me that what happens on TV shows is not like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
He tells me about events that happen on TV shows . . .	0	1	2	3	4
He tells me about conversations that take place on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
He tells me about TV characters.	0	1	2	3	4
He tells me why TV characters act the way they do	0	1	2	3	4
He explains to me that what happens on TV shows is like real-life	0	1	2	3	4

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
He explains to me that what happens on TV shows is not like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
He explains to me events that happen on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
He explains to me the conversations that take place on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
He explains to me why TV characters act the way they do.	0	1	2	3	4
He asks me if what happens on TV shows is like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
He asks me about events that happen on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
He asks me about conversations that take place on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
He asks me about TV characters.	0	1	2	3	4
He asks me why TV characters act the way they do.	0	1	2	3	4
I tell him that what happens on TV shows is like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
I tell him that what happens on TV shows is not like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
I tell him about events that happen on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
I tell him about conversations that take place on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
I tell him about TV characters.	0	1	2	3	4

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
I tell him why TV characters act the way they do.	0	1	2	3	4
I explain to him that what happens on TV shows is like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
I explain to him that what happens on TV shows is not like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
I explain to him events that happen on TV shows. .	0	1	2	3	4
I explain to him conversations that take place on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
I explain to him why TV characters act the way they do.	0	1	2	3	4
I ask him if what happens on TV shows is like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
I ask him about events that happen on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
I ask him about conversations that take place on TV shows	0	1	2	3	4
I ask him about TV characters	0	1	2	3	4
I ask him why TV characters act the way they do	0	1	2	3	4

Think of your best or good friend who is of the same sex as you. Complete the yellow section of the questionnaire with that friend in mind.

Think of the times when this friend who is of the same sex as you wants you to do something when you want to do something else. How often does she do the following when she wants you to do something?

Choose one answer from the following: Never(0), Not Often(1), Often(2), Very Often(3), Always(4). Choose the answer which comes closest to what you think even when none of the answers is exactly right for you. Please answer every question.

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
She keeps talking to me about what she wants me to do hoping I will start wanting to do it. 0		1	2	3	4
She says I'm supposed to do what she tells me to do. 0		1	2	3	4
She says I would enjoy doing what she wants me to do. . 0		1	2	3	4
She simply tells me to do it. 0		1	2	3	4
She says she expects me to do what she tells me. . . . 0		1	2	3	4
She tells me that she would do favors for me at other times if I would go along with her now. 0		1	2	3	4
She keeps telling me to do it until I do it. 0		1	2	3	4
She asks me if I would be willing to do it. 0		1	2	3	4

Why do you think she wants you to do those things? How often are the following answers similar or close to her reasons?

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
Because she wants to teach me to do the right thing. . 0		1	2	3	4
Because she doesn't trust my judgment. 0		1	2	3	4

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
Because she wants me to help her to do something. . . 0		1	2	3	4
Because she is supposed to tell me what to do. . . . 0		1	2	3	4
Because she knows I would want to do what she wants me to do. 0		1	2	3	4
Because she knows what I should do about some things better than I do. . . 0		1	2	3	4
Because she wants to spend time with me by doing something together. 0		1	2	3	4
Because she wants me to do the same thing she wants to do. 0		1	2	3	4

Think of the times when you feel unsure about important decisions you have to make, or unsure about personal problems you have, or unsure whether your ideas about something are right. How often does she do the following when you talk to her about something you are not sure of?

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
She tries to figure out with me whether or not I'm right. 0		1	2	3	4
She tells me that she thinks I'm right. 0		1	2	3	4
She takes time to understand in what way I'm uncertain about something. 0		1	2	3	4
She tells me that she points out where I'm wrong for my own good. 0		1	2	3	4
She tells me that I would realize her ideas are right when I get more experience. 0		1	2	3	4

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
She tells me she wonders about the same thing . . .	0	1	2	3	4
She tells me what is right.	0	1	2	3	4

Why do you talk to her when you are not sure about something? How often are the following answers similar or close to your reasons?

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
Because I know that she really cares about my doing the right thing. . .	0	1	2	3	4
Because she has taught me a lot of things.	0	1	2	3	4
Because she has more experience than I do. . . .	0	1	2	3	4
Because she understands how I feel.	0	1	2	3	4
Because she thinks with me about what might be right instead of just telling me what she thinks is right. .	0	1	2	3	4
Because I don't feel embarrassed to tell her what's troubling me	0	1	2	3	4
Because she is having similar experiences as I am	0	1	2	3	4
Because I respect her knowledge about certain things.	0	1	2	3	4

The following statements are about you and your best or good friend who is of the same sex. How often do you and this friend do the activities described in the statements?

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
We talk about TV shows. . . . 0		1	2	3	4
We discuss whether or not what happens on TV shows is like real-life. 0		1	2	3	4
We talk about events that happen on TV shows. 0		1	2	3	4
We talk about conversations that take place on TV shows. 0		1	2	3	4
We talk about TV characters. 0		1	2	3	4
We discuss why TV characters act the way they do. 0		1	2	3	4
She tells me that what happens on TV shows is like real-life. 0		1	2	3	4
She tells me that what happens on TV shows is not like real-life. 0		1	2	3	4
She tells me about events that happen on TV shows . . . 0		1	2	3	4
She tells me about conversations that take place on TV shows. 0		1	2	3	4
She tells me about TV characters. 0		1	2	3	4
She tells me why TV characters act the way they do 0		1	2	3	4
She explains to me that what happens on TV shows is like real-life 0		1	2	3	4

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
She explains to me that what happens on TV shows is not like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
She explains to me events that happen on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
She explains to me the conversations that take place on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
She explains to me why TV characters act the way they do.	0	1	2	3	4
She asks me if what happens on TV shows is like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
She asks me about events that happen on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
She asks me about conversations that take place on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
She asks me about TV characters.	0	1	2	3	4
She asks me why TV characters act the way they do.	0	1	2	3	4
I tell her that what happens on TV shows is like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
I tell her that what happens on TV shows is not like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
I tell her about events that happen on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
I tell her about conversations that take place on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
I tell her about TV characters.	0	1	2	3	4

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
I tell her why TV characters act the way they do.	0	1	2	3	4
I explain to her that what happens on TV shows is like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
I explain to her that what happens on TV shows is not like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
I explain to her events that happen on TV shows. .	0	1	2	3	4
I explain to her conversations that take place on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
I explain to her why TV characters act the way they do.	0	1	2	3	4
I ask her if what happens on TV shows is like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
I ask her about events that happen on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
I ask her about conversations that take place on TV shows	0	1	2	3	4
I ask her about TV characters	0	1	2	3	4
I ask her why TV characters act the way they do	0	1	2	3	4

Think of your best or good friend who is of the opposite sex. Complete the gold section of the questionnaire with that friend in mind.

Think of the times when this friend who is of the opposite sex wants you to do something when you want to do something else. How often does he do the following when he wants you to do something?

Choose one answer from the following: Never(0), Not Often(1), Often(2), Very Often(3), Always(4). Choose the answer which comes closest to what you think even when none of the answers is exactly right for you. Please answer every question.

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
He keeps talking to me about what he wants me to do hoping I will start wanting to do it.	0	1	2	3	4
He says I'm supposed to do what he tells me to do.	0	1	2	3	4
He says I would enjoy doing what he wants me to do.	0	1	2	3	4
He simply tells me to do it.	0	1	2	3	4
He says he expects me to do what he tells me.	0	1	2	3	4
He tells me that he would do favors for me at other times if I would go along with him now.	0	1	2	3	4
He keeps telling me to do it until I do it.	0	1	2	3	4
He asks me if I would be willing to do it.	0	1	2	3	4

Why do you think he wants you to do those things? How often are the following answers similar or close to his reasons?

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
Because he wants to teach me to do the right thing.	0	1	2	3	4
Because he doesn't trust my judgment.	0	1	2	3	4

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
Because he wants me to help him to do something. . . 0	0	1	2	3	4
Because he is supposed to tell me what to do. . . . 0	0	1	2	3	4
Because he knows I would want to do what he wants me to do. 0	0	1	2	3	4
Because he knows what I should do about some things better than I do. . . 0	0	1	2	3	4
Because he wants to spend time with me by doing something together. 0	0	1	2	3	4
Because he wants me to do the same thing he wants to do. 0	0	1	2	3	4

Think of the times when you feel unsure about important decisions you have to make, or unsure about personal problems you have, or unsure whether your ideas about something are right. How often does he do the following when you talk to him about something you are not sure of?

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
He tries to figure out with me whether or not I'm right. 0	0	1	2	3	4
He tells me that he thinks I'm right. 0	0	1	2	3	4
He takes time to understand in what way I'm uncertain about something. 0	0	1	2	3	4
He tells me that he points out where I'm wrong for my own good. 0	0	1	2	3	4
He tells me that I would realize his ideas are right when I get more experience. 0	0	1	2	3	4

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
He tells me he wonders about the same thing . . .	0	1	2	3	4
He tells me what is right.	0	1	2	3	4

Why do you talk to him when you are not sure about something? How often are the following answers similar or close to your reasons?

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
Because I know that he really cares about my doing the right thing. . .	0	1	2	3	4
Because he has taught me a lot of things.	0	1	2	3	4
Because he has more experience than I do. . . .	0	1	2	3	4
Because he understands how I feel.	0	1	2	3	4
Because he thinks with me about what might be right instead of just telling me what he thinks is right. .	0	1	2	3	4
Because I don't feel embarrassed to tell him what's troubling me	0	1	2	3	4
Because he is having similar experiences as I am	0	1	2	3	4
Because I respect his knowledge about certain things.	0	1	2	3	4

The following statements are about you and your best or good friend who is of the opposite sex. How often do you and this friend do the activities described in the statements?

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
We talk about TV shows. 0		1	2	3	4
We discuss whether or not what happens on TV shows is like real-life. 0		1	2	3	4
We talk about events that happen on TV shows. 0		1	2	3	4
We talk about conversations that take place on TV shows. 0		1	2	3	4
We talk about TV characters. 0		1	2	3	4
We discuss why TV characters act the way they do. 0		1	2	3	4
He tells me that what happens on TV shows is like real-life. 0		1	2	3	4
He tells me that what happens on TV shows is not like real-life. 0		1	2	3	4
He tells me about events that happen on TV shows . . . 0		1	2	3	4
He tells me about conversations that take place on TV shows. 0		1	2	3	4
He tells me about TV characters. 0		1	2	3	4
He tells me why TV characters act the way they do 0		1	2	3	4
He explains to me that what happens on TV shows is like real-life 0		1	2	3	4

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
He explains to me that what happens on TV shows is not like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
He explains to me events that happen on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
He explains to me the conversations that take place on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
He explains to me why TV characters act the way they do.	0	1	2	3	4
He asks me if what happens on TV shows is like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
He asks me about events that happen on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
He asks me about conversations that take place on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
He asks me about TV characters.	0	1	2	3	4
He asks me why TV characters act the way they do.	0	1	2	3	4
I tell him that what happens on TV shows is like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
I tell him that what happens on TV shows is not like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
I tell him about events that happen on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
I tell him about conversations that take place on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
I tell him about TV characters.	0	1	2	3	4

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not Often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
I tell him why TV characters act the way they do.	0	1	2	3	4
I explain to him that what happens on TV shows is like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
I explain to him that what happens on TV shows is not like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
I explain to him events that happen on TV shows. .	0	1	2	3	4
I explain to him conversations that take place on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
I explain to him why TV characters act the way they do.	0	1	2	3	4
I ask him if what happens on TV shows is like real-life.	0	1	2	3	4
I ask him about events that happen on TV shows.	0	1	2	3	4
I ask him about conversations that take place on TV shows	0	1	2	3	4
I ask him about TV characters	0	1	2	3	4
I ask him why TV characters act the way they do	0	1	2	3	4

The following questions ask you how real certain things on TV are. Zero means you think something is not real at all, and 10 means you think it is very real. For each question, circle one number that describes how real you think each thing is.

	Not Real											Very Real
How real to life are events that happen on TV shows?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

How real to life are conversations that take place on TV shows?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

How real to life are TV characters?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

How real to life are TV characters' actions?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Your answers to the following questions will help us understand more about the students in your school.

1. How old are you? _____

2. What grade are you in? _____

3. Are you male or female? _____

4. What is your race? Please circle all that apply.

ASIAN BLACK HISPANIC WHITE OTHER(Specify)

5. Which parents or older adults live with you? Please circle all that apply.

MOTHER STEPMOTHER FATHER'S GIRLFRIEND

FATHER STEPFATHER MOTHER'S BOYFRIEND

6. Please answer these questions if your mother, stepmother, or father's girlfriend lives with you.
- a) Does she work: Full-time? Part-time? Not Work?
- b) How much schooling has she had? Less Than High School
High School
Some College
College Degree
7. Please answer these questions if your father, stepfather, or mother's boyfriend lives with you.
- a) Does he work: Full-time? Part-time? Not Work?
- b) How much schooling has he had? Less Than High School
High School
Some College
College Degree
8. a) How many older stepbrothers do you have? _____
- b) How many younger stepbrothers do you have? _____
- c) How many older brothers do you have? _____
- d) How many younger brothers do you have? _____
- e) How many older stepsisters do you have? _____
- f) How many younger stepsisters do you have? _____
- g) How many older sisters do you have? _____
- h) How many younger sisters do you have? _____
9. a) On a typical schoolday,
how many hours of TV
do you watch? 0 1 2 3 4 5 More
- b) How many of these hours do
you watch with someone? . 0 1 2 3 4 5 More
10. a) On a typical Saturday,
how many hours of TV
do you watch? 0 1 2 3 4 5 More
- b) How many of these hours do
you watch with someone? 0 1 2 3 4 5 More

11. a) On a typical Sunday,
how many hours of TV
do you watch? 0 1 2 3 4 5 More
- b) How many of these hours do
you watch with someone? 0 1 2 3 4 5 More
12. How many working TV sets do you have at home? _____
13. Do you have your own TV set? YES NO
14. Do you have cable TV at home? YES NO
15. Do you have HBO or some other
pay cable channel at home? YES NO

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293005725860