Differences in Adolescent Disclosure to Siblings in Intact versus Non-Intact Families Sarah Hanske, Alice Guo & Dr. Nicole Campione-Barr

INTRODUCTION

THE IMPORTANCE OF SIBLING RELATIONSHIPS • Most people in the United States grow up with at least one sibling, and oftentimes, relationships with siblings are the most long-lasting relationships in people's lives (Whiteman et al., 2011).

 Some research shows that adolescents disclose more to their siblings than their close friends or parents (Howe et al., 2000).

FAMILY STRUCTURE IN RELATION TO ADOLESCENT SIBLING RELATIONSHIPS

 Perceived marital satisfaction is a significant predictor of total sibling closeness, support, and communication (Milevsky, 2008).

• The spillover hypothesis implies that the quality of marriage may affect the quality of parent child relationships, or in other words, marital conflict might spill over and create conflict in other family subsystems (Erel and Burman, 1995).

• The compensatory hypothesis states that when parents experience marital conflict, they compensate by becoming more invested in their parent-child relationships (Krishnakumar & Buehler, 2000).

GENDER AND AGE IN RELATION TO ADOLESCENT SIBLING DISCLOSURE

 Research shows that females were more concerned with emotional issues than males (Howe et al., 2001).

 Research shows that younger siblings typically disclose more to older siblings than the reverse (Howe et al., 2001).

THE PRESENT STUDY: The present study examines whether emerging adult sibling disclosure is moderated by the gender or age of the siblings, or domain of disclosure, depending on family structure (intact or non-intact).

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1 \rightarrow Siblings from non-intact households will disclose more frequently to each other than siblings from intact families.

disclosure more to siblings regardless of if they come from intact versus non-intact families.

Hypothesis 3 \rightarrow Siblings from the non-intact families will disclose more issues in the multifaceted domain than siblings in intact families.



Table 1.

Pers Inta Non

Pru Intac Non

Mu Non

Figure 1.



This project was funded by a Research Council grant from the University of Missouri System, awarded to Dr. Nicole Campione-Barr as well as the Department of Psychological Sciences at Mizzou. The authors would like to thank the Columbia Public School District and undergraduate members of the Family Relationships and Adolescent Development Lab at the University of Missouri for all of their contributions.

Participants	139 first born; 121 second born	Disclosur
Mean Age	18.52 (±0.87)	used. Par
Age Range	17-27	on a scale
Sex Composition	159 (F); 101 (M)	
Ethnicity	W (87%); B (6%); A/PI (4%); H (2%); Other (1%)	• <u>Person</u> individ
Median Income	\$85,000 - \$99,000	• <u>Pruder</u>
Parental Education	72% college degree	health,
Parental Marital Status	72% intact	• <u>Multifo</u>

PROCEDURES

First year college students were recruited from a psychology department participant pool in a Midwestern college town. Students were invited to participate if they were the first- or second-born child in their family and biological second- or first-born sibling. Participants were sent an online questionnaire via individualized link that was completed at their own conv

RESULTS

Means (Standard Deviations) of Disclosure to Sibling by Target Gender, Sibling Gender, Domain, Family Intactness, and Target Birth Order

	Male	(target)	Female (target)	
	Male (sibling)	Female (sibling)	Male (sibling)	Female (sibling)
onal Domain				
t				
Born	2.59 (1.00)	1.83 (0.68)	2.43 (0.84)	3.17 (0.81)
Born	2.66 (0.77)	2.20 (0.85)	2.57 (0.87)	3.02 (0.99)
intact				
Born	2.41 (1.03)	2.28 (0.88)	2.07 (0.48)	3.09 (0.84)
Born	1.98 (0.85)	2.26 (0.90)	2.21 (1.15)	2.42 (1.06)
ential Domain				
t				
Born	2.78 (0.98)	1.82 (0.76)	2.40 (1.10)	3.06 (1.11)
Born	3.00 (1.03)	2.40 (1.04)	2.95 (1.18)	3.10 (1.17)
intact				
Born	2.41 (1.37)	1.65 (0.94)	1.97 (0.84)	3.08 (1.22)
Born	2.08 (0.96)	2.24 (1.00)	2.62 (1.44)	2.75 (1.14)
ifaceted Domain				
t				
Born	2.44 (0.80)	1.76 (0.59)	2.44 (0.73)	3.23 (0.84)
Born	2.55 (0.71)	2.36 (0.81)	2.62 (0.79)	2.94 (1.05)
intact				
Born	2.44 (0.96)	1.92 (0.81)	2.14 (0.78)	2.87 (1.09)
Born	1.90 (0.58)	2.27 (0.83)	2.31 (1.28)	2.51 (1.08)







METHODS

MEASURES

re: A revised version of Smetana et al.'s (2006) measure was ticipants reported the frequency of their disclosure to their sibling e of 1 (never tell) to 5 (always tell) in three different domains:

al- private issues that are completely left to the discretion of the lual ($\alpha = .94$)

ntial- pertain to negative consequences for the self, like issues with , safety, or harm ($\alpha = .87$)

<u>aceted-</u> issues where multiple domains overlap ($\alpha = .87$)

ANALYTICAL PLAN

tal	Differences in adolescent disclosure were
	examined using a 2 (Target Gender) X 2 (Sibling
had a	Gender) X 3 (Domain) X 2 (Family Intactness) X 2
	(Target Birth Order) Repeated-Measures Analysis
venience.	of Variance (ANOVA).

Means for Disclosure to Sibling by Target Gender and Sibling Gender

- Siblings from intact families disclosed more to each other than siblings from non-intact families, $F(1, 240) = 4.05, p < .05, \eta^2$ =.02.
- When the target adolescent was first-born and female, they disclosed significantly less to their younger brothers than their younger sisters, t(84) = -4.06, p < .01.
- If target was first-born and male, they disclosed significantly more to their younger brothers than their younger sisters, t(43) = 3.47, p < .01.
- If target was secondborn, neither males nor females disclosed differently to their older siblings.
- Only second-borns disclosed significantly more issues from the prudential domain than from the personal domain (t(119) = -4.13, p < .01),and the moral domain (t(119) = -3.63, p < .01).



DISCUSSION

Hypothesis 1: Not supported - Siblings from intact families disclosed more to each other than siblings from non-intact families.

Hypothesis 2: Partially Supported-

When target adolescent was female, they disclosed more to their female sibling than males. And when target was male, they disclosed more to their male sibling than females disclosed to their male sibling.

Hypothesis 3: Not supported - Only second-

borns disclosed significantly more issues from the prudential domain than from the personal domain and the moral domain.

CONCLUSIONS

- Adolescents are more likely to disclose to siblings in intact families.
- Adolescents disclose a variety of issues to their siblings.

LIMITATIONS

- Sample was predominantly White, middle-class adolescents.
- Non-binary adolescents were not examined.
- Intact families outnumbered non-intact families.

IMPLICATIONS

- Adolescents likely disclose more to siblings in intact families because of social learning from strong parental role models.
- Siblings in non-intact families might not spend as much time together, decreasing the frequency of disclosure.
- Parents and researchers can use these findings to understand sibling communication in various family structures and family dynamics.

REFERENCES

Erel, O., & Burman, B. (1995). Interrelatedness of marital relations and parent-child relations: A meta-analytic review. Psychological Bulletin, 118(1), 108-132. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.118.1.108 Howe, N., Aquan-Assee, J., Bukowski, W. M., Lehoux, P. M., & Rinaldi, C. M. (2001). Siblings as confidants: Emotional understanding, relationship warmth, and sibling self-disclosure. Social Development, 10(4), 439-454. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9507.00174 Howe, N., Aquan-Assee, J., Bukowski, W. M., Rinaldi, C. M., & Lehoux, P. M. (2000). Sibling self-disclosure in early adolescence. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 46(4), 653-671. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/23092569 Krishnakumar, A., & Buehler, C. (2000). Interparental conflict and parenting behaviors: A metaanalytic review. Family Relations: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies,

49(1), 25-44. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2000.00025.x Milevsky, A. (2008). Perceived parental marital satisfaction and divorce: Effects on sibling relations in emerging adults. Journal of Divorce & Remarriage, 41(1-2), 115-128.

- https://doi.org/10.1300/J087v41n01_07
- Smetana, J. G., Campione-Barr, N., & Metzger, A. (2006). Adolescent development in interpersonal and societal contexts. Annual Review of Psychology, 57, 255-284.
- https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.57.102904.190124
- Smetana, J. G., Jambon, M., & Ball, C. (2014). The social domain approach to children's moral and social judgments. In M. Killen & J. G. Smetana (Eds.), Handbook of moral development., 2nd ed. (pp. 23-45). New York, NY: Psychology Press. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType =ip,cookie,url,uid&db=psyh&AN=2013-21910-002&site=ehost-live&scope=site
- Whiteman, S. D., McHale, S. M., & Soli, A. (2011). Theoretical perspectives on sibling relationships. Journal of Family Theory & Review, 3(2), 124-139. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1756-2589.2011.00087.x