

KEEL SHINN, LAUREN M., M.S. The Role of Gender and Social Class in Parent-Child Communication. (2005)
Directed by Dr. Marion O'Brien. 74 pp.

This study focuses on the interactions between parents and children, which are anticipated to influence both participants' understanding of gender and social class. Conversations between parents and children were transcribed and coded for 40 dyads, evenly divided by gender and social class. Children were in third grade at the time of data collection. Transcripts of the parent-child interaction were coded for parents' and children's use of assertive and affiliative categories of speech. Parents' assertive and affiliative speech was found to differ based on dyad type. The majority of these differences occurred between opposite-gendered dyads (mother-son versus father-daughter). Additionally, differences in parent speech were found for social class. Few differences in children's speech were found for either dyad or class. These results suggest that when examining gender differences in interaction, it is important to consider the gender composition of the dyad.

THE ROLE OF GENDER AND SOCIAL CLASS
IN PARENT-CHILD COMMUNICATION

by

Lauren M. Keel Shinn

A Thesis Submitted to
the Faculty of The Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science

Greensboro
2005

Approved by

Committee Chair

APPROVAL PAGE

This thesis has been approved by the following committee of the
Faculty of the Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Committee Chair _____

Committee Members _____

Date of Acceptance by Committee

Dates of Final Oral Examination

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A special thanks to Dr. Marion O'Brien for her patience, direction, and assistance in helping me through the research process. I am grateful to Dr. Jonathan Tudge and Dr. Garry Lange for their help and feedback on this project. Also, I would like to extend appreciation to Cheryl Sarratt for her willingness to help me through the everyday matters of research. I thank Melissa Mekita for her continuous support and effort towards the completion of the tedious aspects of this research and also Courtney Hartgrove, Stephanie Newby, and Emily Duke for their assistance in transcribing and tallying. Lastly, I would like to thank my husband for his never-ending devotion, interest, and support that enabled me to persevere, and my family for their past and ever-present encouraging words through my all of my endeavors.

This research was supported in part by a grant (#25430) from the National Institutes of Child Health and Human Development to the University of Kansas. The NICHD Study of Early Child Care is a study directed by a Steering Committee and supported by NICHD through a cooperative agreement (U10) that calls for scientific collaboration between the grantees and the NICHD staff. Gratitude is extended to the study coordinators, research assistants, and families who participated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES.....	4
III. GENDER AND SOCIAL CLASS IN COMMUNICATION.....	8
IV. COMMUNICATION IN PARENT-CHILD DYADS	14
V. THE CURRENT STUDY	17
VI. RESEARCH QUESTION.....	19
VII. METHODS	21
VIII. RESULTS	25
IX. DISCUSSION	30
REFERENCES	40
APPENDIX A. TABLES.....	48
APPENDIX B. PARENT-CHILD DYAD CODING MANUAL	60
APPENDIX C. PARENT-CHILD RULES DISCUSSION QUESTIONS	72
APPENDIX D. INTER-RATER AGREEMENT FOR ASSERTIVE AND AFFILIATIVE SPEECH CATEGORIES	73

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
TABLE 1. Mean Hollingshead Scores and Median Income to Needs Ratio for Dyads and Social Class	49
TABLE 2. Mean Frequencies and Proportions of Speech Categories for Parents and Children.....	50
TABLE 3. Total Utterances and Proportion of Interruptions for Parents and Children in Four Dyad Types	52
TABLE 4. Mean Proportions of Assertive and Affiliative Speech for Parents and Children in Four Dyad Types.....	53
TABLE 5. Mean Proportions of Assertive and Affiliative Speech for Parents and Children by Social Class	54
TABLE 6. Mean Proportions of Speech Categories for Parents and Children in Four Dyad Types	55
TABLE 7. Mean Proportions of Speech Categories for Parents and Children Based on Social Class	57
TABLE 8. Correlations Between Parent and Child Proportional Speech	59

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Communication is essential to human interaction and is an everyday part of parent-child relationships. Although it is important to acknowledge the many similarities between men and women, it is also evident that gender differences in communication exist, and these differences impact our everyday experiences. Young adults can clearly differentiate between typically male and typically female speech (Kramer, 1977). Some researchers even argue that men and women speak different languages (Tannen, 1990) or through same-sex play grow up in “separate worlds” (Maccoby, 1998; Maltz & Borker, 1982). Not only do men and women differ in the amount of speech they use (for a review, see Lanvers, 2004), research also suggests that women communicate in a more soft-spoken, cooperative manner while men are regarded to be more authoritative, directive, and competitive in speech (Siegler & Siegler, 1976).

An individual’s understanding of gender comes from both social and biological experiences. West and Zimmerman (2002) refer to gender as a socially constructed idea that is understood through social experiences or interactions. As West and Zimmerman state, “a person’s gender is not simply an aspect of what one is, but more fundamentally, it is something that one *does*, and does recurrently, in interaction with others” (p. 16). In addition to creating a social idea of gender through interactions, individuals also have cognitive understandings, or schemas, regarding gender (Martin, Ruble, & Szkrybalo,

2002). This schema influences how an individual thinks, behaves, and communicates, and thus, how he/she acts in a gendered way. By the time an individual reaches adulthood, he or she has a well established cognitive schema regarding gender (Martin et al., 2002). Thus, it would be expected that mothers will think, behave, communicate, and interact differently with their children than fathers do. Further, parents relate to their sons and daughters differently depending on their child's sex and parent's beliefs about gender (Gurwitz & Dodge, 1975; Rubin, Provenzano, & Luria, 1974). These beliefs are created and reinforced through social interactions, and then internalized, impacting an individual's cognitive schema regarding gender.

Although children in middle childhood may not have an established cognitive understanding of gender (Hibbard & Buhrmester, 1998), they still bring their own ideas about gender into parent-child interactions. The child's concept of gender is clearly influenced by both parents' previous communication and behavior through interaction. However, the large number of social networks children in middle childhood are involved in (Collins, Madsen, & Susman-Stillman, 2002) also impact children's understanding of gender through experiences with other people, such as peers (e.g. Thorne, 1993). Through these previous experiences and cognitive abilities, children in middle childhood have already developed an understanding of how gendered interactions occur and they bring these notions of gendered communication and enact their understanding of gendered communication in parent-child interactions. It is especially true that in middle childhood, and as children get older, parents and children reinforce or redefine the meanings of gender together through everyday activities.

In addition to gender differences, social class differences in communication also occur. Social class is different from gender in that it is not something that must necessarily be cognitively understood. Even more so than gender, class is created, or demonstrated, reinforced and understood, through social interaction (West & Fenstermaker, 2002). Although research on class differences in communication is very limited (Laursen & Collins, 2004) there has been substantial research demonstrating the behavioral differences between classes in parent-child interactions (Bayley & Shafer, 1960; Bronfenbrenner, 1958; Gecas, 1979; Hart & Risley, 1992; Hart & Risley, 1995; Hart & Risley, 1999; Heath, 1986; Hess & Shipman, 1965; Hoff & Tian, 2005; Hoff, Laursen, & Tardiff, 2002; Hoff-Ginsberg, 1991; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Additionally, class may impact the way in which an individual understands and enacts gender in daily interactions (Bardwell, Cochran, & Walker, 1986; Binion, 1990; Bowman & Howard, 1985; Hill, 1999; Hill, 2002). Kohn (1977) suggests that these class differences stem from a difference in values resulting from occupational and educational experiences. The current study will expand the literature on differences in parent-child communication by examining the effects of gender and social class in communication, taking into account the role of both the mother and the father, and differences that may occur based on the sex of the child.

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

Two different but complementary theoretical frameworks, Vygotsky's sociocultural theory and Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory, form the basis for the current study.

Vygotsky's Theoretical Perspective

By middle childhood, children have spent years being socialized by their parents, their peers, the media, and their school. However, socialization is a lifelong process. Not only do conversations between parents and children reflect gender differences, but they indicate continued socialization for both the parent and the child. Within Vygotsky's theory, children are viewed as active participants in socialization. Through interaction, the parent and child, together, create a zone of proximal development (ZPD) (Vygotsky, 1978). The child is not just being taught by the parent, but in fact, in every interaction, teaching and learning may occur for both the parent and the child.

Tudge (2005) states that the zone of proximal development is often the sole focus of researchers who apply Vygotsky's theory, and the biological, cultural, and historical components are neglected. The current research uses Vygotsky's theoretical approach primarily to accentuate the active role of both the parent and the child in the interaction, but does not focus on the ZPD itself. Although biology is regarded as a critical factor in development (for a review, see Booth, Carver, & Grandner, 2001), this research will focus

on both history and cultural aspects of development, reflected in the conversations of parents and children. The history of the child, or the ontogenetic development, is portrayed by his or her participation in the conversation. Further, the history of the interaction, or microgenetic development, is considered as communication patterns of a given conversation are analyzed. Culture is also reflected in the parent-child communication by examining how participants talk and the ways in which they interact with each other. These cultural values observed in the interaction are expected to differ based on gender and social class.

Bronfenbrenner's Theoretical Perspective

The current study is primarily oriented toward examining what Bronfenbrenner identifies as proximal processes (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998). Proximal processes can be thought of as the everyday practices, interactions, and activities that people engage in (Tudge, 2005). Additionally, proximal processes are regarded as the primary influence on development (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998). In light of Vygotsky's notion that in an interaction learning (and thus development) may occur for both the parent and the child, it is suggested that both parent and child develop through these everyday interactions. Additionally, these interactions, or proximal processes, are what reinforce cultural notions of gender or social class and allow these concepts to change.

Bronfenbrenner's overall model also includes the aspects of person, context, and time. Bronfenbrenner suggests that proximal processes change based on the person and the context (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998). According to Bronfenbrenner, there are three characteristics that an individual brings to any situation: force, resources, and

demand characteristics (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998; Tudge, 2005). Force characteristics are the biological aspects of an individual, such as temperament. The role of force characteristics in the interaction is not considered in this study. Resources refer to our experiences, abilities, and knowledge. For this study, these most clearly relate to the participants' experiences as a male or female individual and the experiences associated with being a part of a particular social class. Lastly, demand characteristics are the physically apparent characteristics that elicit reactions. For the current study, the most important of these is sex.

Several contexts are identified by Bronfenbrenner, including the microsystem, the mesosystem, the exosystem, and the macrosystem (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Bronfenbrenner, 1988; Tudge, 2005). The microsystem encompasses an individual's interaction with people, symbols and objects. The personal characteristics identified above play a large part in microsystems because they exist not only for the individual in question, but for the person/people the individual is interacting with. The microsystem is the context that is examined within the current study, specifically focusing on the interaction between people. The mesosystem (connections between the microsystems that the individual is involved in) and the exosystem (context that influences the individual, but that the individual is not directly involved in) are also regarded as important, but are not the focus of the current study. Lastly, the macrosystem addresses the overall consistency of the other three contexts in regards to culture and beliefs. The concept of the macrosystem is similar to Vygotsky's understanding of culture. Within

the current study, the macrosystem will be reflected in the gender and class differences demonstrated within the microsystem.

Lastly, time for Bronfenbrenner can occur on three levels: micro, meso, and macro (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998; Tudge, 2005). Micro-time applies to the proximal process of interest. Specifically, it addresses if the activity or interaction maintains continuity during the time in which it is occurring. The current research does not assess whether the interaction maintains continuity while it occurs, although the concept of micro-time helps to frame the interaction in a theoretical way. The current study does not assess meso-time, or the continuity of actions or interactions over time. Lastly, macro-time is akin to Vygotsky's notion of history. However, for Bronfenbrenner, macro-time also incorporates the historical time period in which the interaction or event is taking place. For the current study, this means that it is important to keep in mind the current atmosphere in relation to gender and class (e.g. data were collected after the feminist movement, which will impact individual's interactions).

CHAPTER III

GENDER AND SOCIAL CLASS IN COMMUNICATION

The focus of this study is on the occurrence of gendered communication within parent-child dyads of two different social classes. In this section, gender will be examined based on the current literature assessing communication, parent differences, and child differences. Social class differences for parents and children will then be considered based on the current literature.

Gender

This section will first address previous research findings concerning gendered communication in dyads. Second, differences in parental socialization based on the sex of their child will be examined. Last, children's understanding of gender in middle childhood will be assessed.

Gender differences and dyadic communication. Research has shown that communication differs based on gender. Women have been found to talk more than men (for a review, see Lanvers, 2004). Additionally, women have been found to be interrupted more than men. However, the amount of interruptions men engage in varies based on the sex of the person they are speaking with whereas women do not differentiate based on partner sex (for a review, see Ridgeway & Smith-Lovin, 1999). It has been widely accepted that the gender composition of a dyad influences the gendered communication of the participants, but the actual behavior of male and female individuals

in different groups has been difficult to identify. Carli (1990) found that men and women act in more role-typical ways in *opposite* sex dyads. In direct opposition to Carli, Leaper (1991) suggests that girls and boys communicate in more role-typical ways in *same* sex dyads. Contradicting Carli, but partially supporting Leaper, research by Leaper, Tenenbaum, and Shaffer (1999) suggests that girls *and* boys tend to communicate in a more stereotypically feminine way when interacting with girls. Clearly, the literature is inconclusive regarding gendered outcomes for individuals in same-sex and different-sex dyads. Reasons for these contradictions may include methodology or context, age of participants, race of participants, and social class of participants (Leaper, 1991; Leaper, Anderson, & Sanders, 1998; Leaper et al., 1999).

Parental socialization. Parents engage in different parenting practices depending on if they are raising a son or a daughter (for a review, see Leaper, 2002). Parental expectations for children differ based on the parent's and child's gender. For example, men and women evaluated the same infant's behavior differently based on whether they thought the child was a boy or girl (Condry & Condry, 1976; Gurwitz & Dodge, 1975). This notion is further supported by the research of Rubin et al. (1974) who found that parents, and in particular, fathers, regard newborn sons as stronger and better coordinated and evaluated newborn daughters as weaker and more delicate. The beliefs of parents influence their interactions with their children. Thus, through parent-child interactions, and the influence of gender expectations, both parents and children engage in the enactment of gender and in the creation of what it means to be a boy or a girl.

Gender in middle childhood. Much of the research examining parental socialization and parent-child communication focuses on young children and their mothers (Lytton & Romney, 1991; Leaper & Smith, 2004; Stafford, 2004). Preschool children's understanding of gender is very concrete and rigid (Levy, Taylor, & Gelman, 1995). However, children in middle childhood have a flexible perspective of gender practices and what members of a particular gender are "allowed" to do (Katz & Ksansnak, 1994). In adolescence, the perspective of appropriate gender behavior again becomes more rigid through gender intensification (Alfieri, Ruble, & Higgins, 1996). The fact that gender intensification occurs in adolescences may be related to the fact that children do not gain an explicit understanding of male and female interaction styles until 7th grade, or about age 13 (Hibbard & Buhrmester, 1998). Examination of the occurrence of gendered communication during middle childhood may provide further understanding of children's understanding and enactment of gender through communication. If speech by children in middle childhood does not reflect strong gender differences, this may indicate that children do not have a rigid understanding of gender communication by middle childhood. Additionally, although research indicates that children in middle childhood are not rigid in their evaluation of gender stereotypes or behaviors, gendered communication may change at a different rate. Currently, the literature lacks an understanding and focus on gendered communication between parents and children during middle childhood.

Social Class

Researchers in the area of gendered communication often fail to consider other potentially important influences on communication styles, such as social class. It is important to note that reports of stereotypical gendered communication are based primarily on White middle-class individuals, who tend to be the most highly sampled population (Popp, Donovan, Crawford, Marsh, & Peele, 2003). In this section, social class differences will be examined followed by an assessment of how social class is enacted within the family based on the current literature. Finally, the literature on social class and parent-child communication will be reviewed.

Social class differences. Research has identified several differences in the parenting values of working- and middle-class families. Working-class parents feel that it is important to train their children on how to take orders in the same way that middle-class parents feel it is important to teach their children how to be independent thinkers (Hoff et al., 2002; Kohn, 1977). Kohn suggests that these differences are a reflection of the occupational experiences of the parents. Kohn reports that middle-class individuals in professional occupations are expected to make their own decisions, to think creatively, and to be self-directed. Subsequently, middle-class employees expect their decisions and actions to make an impact. Working-class employees experience quite a different world, where they are told what to do and how and when to do it, thus making their decisions and actions seem inconsequential. Although Kohn focuses on the effects of occupation, the importance of education for developing the skills needed to engage in self-direction is

also noted (Kohn, 1995). The experiences of parents, through education and employment translate into parents' everyday expectations for themselves and for their children.

Social class and parent-child interaction. Similarly to gender, class socialization also occurs within families. Gecas (1979) suggests that interactions between parents and children are an important factor in the reproduction of social class. As children age and parents continue to implement the values typically held by their particular social class through interactions, children actively reflect those values and make them their own. Empirical research suggests that, as Kohn proposed, working-class parents tend to value obedience while middle-class families engage in more of a democracy (Bronfenbrenner, 1958, Hoff et al., 2002). These values reveal themselves through parenting styles and in many aspects of parent-child interactions such as parents' discipline practices, affection, emphasis on independence, and communication (for reviews, see Hoff et al., 2002; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Focusing solely on mothers, additional research suggests that working-class mothers tend to be more controlling and encourage less autonomy than middle-class mothers (Bayley & Shafer, 1960; Hart & Risley, 1992; Hoff-Ginsberg, 1991; Luster, Rhoades, & Haas, 1989). Thus, current research indicates that middle-class families value independent thought and action, while working-class families place greater emphasis on conformity.

Social class and parent-child communication. Laursen and Collins (2004) note that literature assessing the effects of social class on communication between parents and older children is limited. Although research is limited, differences in parent-child communication based on class have been found (Heath, 1986; Hoff et al., 2002; Portes,

Dunham, & Williams, 2001). Research suggests that there are differences between middle- and working-class parents with middle-class parents talking more, interrupting more, asking more eliciting questions, and teaching in a more explicit way (Hoff et al., 2002; Portes et al., 2001). Research by Heath (1986) suggests that there are few differences in communication by social class for White families, but large differences between social classes occur for Black families. As discussed previously, a large body of literature exists on class differences in parent-child interaction, although it has not focused on communication. Based on the greater number of findings by past researchers examining social class values demonstrated through behavior, it is suggested that social class values, at least those of the parent, can also be observed in communication. In relation to the current research on social class values, the literature suggests that communication in working-class families would reflect the value of obedience and conformity while communication in middle-class families will reflect the values of autonomy and independence.

CHAPTER IV

COMMUNICATION IN PARENT-CHILD DYADS

This section will review literature on parent-child dyads, coding verbal interactions, and affiliation and assertion. First, parent-child dyads will be examined in relation to the existing literature and the current theoretical framework. Then the concept of assertive and affiliative speech will be examined in conjunction with current research. Last, the method of coding that is used in this study will be described.

Parent-Child Dyads

As suggested previously, the sex composition of dyads influences the ways in which individuals communicate (Carli, 1990; Leaper, 1991; Leaper et al., 1999). Based on our theoretical framework, it is important to examine these interactions in order to understand how both parents and children are influenced developmentally by gendered and class behavior. In parent-child interactions mothers and fathers can be paired with sons and daughters, resulting in four parent-child dyads: mother-daughter, mother-son, father-daughter, and father-son. Parental beliefs and expectations for boys and girls are known to affect the way parents interact with their child (Gurwitz & Dodge, 1975; Rubin et al., 1974). Further, research has shown that mothers and fathers communicate differently with their sons and daughters. In a review of the literature, Lanvers (2004) indicates that mothers talk more with daughters than sons and fathers talk less to daughters than sons. A meta-analysis by Leaper et al. (1998) also indicates that mothers

tend to be less directive than fathers. Additionally, mothers use more supportive, directive, negative, and imperative speech with daughters than sons (Lanvers, 2004). Fathers tend to cognitively challenge sons more than daughters through language. Further, sons are encouraged by both parents to be more assertive than daughters. Lanvers notes that parental differences in type of speech (supportive, negative, etc.) based on child gender varies the most when children are older.

Reflecting researchers' tendencies to downplay children's active role, it is important to note that much less research has been done examining how sons and daughters communicate differently with their parents than how mothers and fathers communicate differently with their children (Leaper & Smith, 2004). The theoretical position of Vygotsky suggests that the active role of the child is an especially important aspect to examine in order to gain a more complete understanding of the process of gender and class in everyday activities. Additionally, based on Bronfenbrenner, it is also important to recognize the personal characteristics that an individual brings to the interaction and reveals through his/her style of communication. These personal characteristics will make the child an active participant by impacting how the parent reacts to the child. For example, a child with a calm temperament is likely to elicit more speech from their parent than a child with a more active temperament. Based on relevant theories and research on dyadic peer interactions and evidence that mothers, fathers, sons, and daughters use different communication styles, the type of dyad is an important independent variable due to potential differences in individual and dyadic communication patterns.

Assertive and Affiliative Speech

Assertive and affiliative speech were the focus of the current coding scheme. Assertive and affiliative styles of speech are linked to particular gender roles (for a review, see Ridgeway & Smith-Lovin, 1999; Leaper et al., 1995). Associated more with women, affiliative speech is other-focused, encouraging, and involving. Assertive speech is associated with the male gender role and is self-focused, controlling, and influential (Leaper, 1991; Leaper et al., 1995). Leaper et al. (1995) also suggest that affiliative and assertive speech are related to parenting style. Authoritative parenting is associated with affiliative speech while authoritarian parenting is associated with assertive speech. Further, working-class parents are more likely to engage in authoritarian parenting while middle-class parents are more likely to engage in authoritative parenting (Hoff et al., 2002).

Coding Scheme

For the current study, a coding scheme adapted from Leaper's Psychosocial Processes Coding Scheme (PPCS) (Leaper, 1991; Leaper, Leve, Strasser, & Schwartz, 1995; Leaper & Gleason, 1996; Leaper et al., 1999; Strough & Berg, 2000) was used. The overall categories of affiliative and assertive speech from the Psychosocial Processes Coding Scheme were retained. Because the PPCS was developed to code peer interactions, individual codes within the two overall categories were developed based on pilot transcripts of parent-child interactions (See Appendix B for coding manual).

CHAPTER V

THE CURRENT STUDY

The current study will examine conversations between mother-daughter, mother-son, father-daughter, and father-son dyads in which participants were asked by a researcher to discuss specific rules, including rules for children (e.g. “Kids should be able to eat only what they like”), rules for parents (e.g. “Parents should decide who their children can be friends with”), and difficult situations (e.g. “Sometimes it’s OK to tattle”). Participating children were in third grade when data were collected in 2000. For each conversation, utterances were coded based on a coding scheme adapted from Leaper (1991). Codes were broadly classified as being assertive, affiliative, or other. The effects of social class were also evaluated.

By focusing on middle childhood, the present study sheds light on the role of gender in everyday communication between parents and children during middle childhood. Additionally, this study examines communication patterns for all four possible parent-child dyads, a recommended avenue of research (Lanvers, 2004). Therefore, the current study considers more than just individual sex differences by also examining an individual’s sex differences based on the sex of the dyadic partner. Furthermore, the current research not only focuses on communication by the parent, but also communication by the child, an aspect often overlooked in the current literature (Segrin & Flora, 2005). The incorporation of social class expands the literature beyond

the typically middle-class sample. The current study also provides greatly needed information to the limited understanding of the effect of social class on parent-child communication, including analysis of all four parent-child dyads. Finally, the current research offers a deeper understanding of the effects of social class on gendered communication.

CHAPTER VI

RESEARCH QUESTION

The focus of the current study is to examine differences in communication patterns among four parent-child dyads: mother-daughter; mother-son; father-daughter; and father-son. The present study will answer the following research question: Does the level of assertion and affiliation of mothers, fathers, sons, and daughters vary based on dyad type or social class?

Based on the literature, several hypotheses were made. Mothers were expected to have more total utterances than were fathers, and mothers in mother-daughter dyads were expected to have more utterances than were mothers in mother-son dyads. Daughters were expected to have more total utterances than were sons. Furthermore, fathers and sons were expected to interrupt in opposite-sex dyads more than in same-sex dyads whereas mothers and daughters were not expected to vary in their amount of interruptions based on the sex composition of the dyad. Focusing on the proposed research question, mothers were expected to engage in more affiliative speech than were fathers and fathers were expected to engage in more assertive speech than were mothers. Similarly, daughters were expected to engage in more affiliative speech and sons in more assertive speech. Based on previous research, it was unclear how these patterns would vary based on the sex of the partner. However, it was expected that individual sex differences would occur based on the sex of the dyadic partner. It was unclear if parents would demonstrate

more gendered behavior with a child of their own sex as a way of modeling appropriate behavior, or if parents would act in a more role typical way when paired with a child of the opposite sex, unintentionally increasing the differences between male and female gendered behavior. However, it was expected that both mothers and fathers would engage in more assertive speech when they were paired with daughters due to research suggesting that girls are regarded as weak (Rubin et al., 1974) and that boys are encouraged to be more assertive than girls (Lanvers, 2004). Regarding effects of social class, it was hypothesized that working-class parents would engage in more assertive speech than would middle-class parents, who were expected to engage in more affiliative speech based on the literature examining parents' behavioral enactment of family values. It was unclear how children would differ in the use of assertive and affiliative speech based on class. Middle-class children might engage in more affiliative speech than might working-class children, who may engage in more assertive speech than middle-class children based on the notion that children in middle childhood would reflect their parents' social class values. However, the possibility that both middle-class and working-class children might engage in more affiliative speech than assertive speech because of the power differential between parents and children was also recognized. Finally, it was hypothesized that there would be an interaction between dyad type and social class. Working-class fathers were expected to use more assertive speech than were working-class mothers or middle-class parents. Middle-class mothers were expected to use more affiliative speech than were middle-class fathers or working-class parents.

CHAPTER VII

METHODS

Participants

Analysis was conducted on selected participants of the NICHD Study of Early Child Care. Two-parent European-American families who participated at the Kansas site were included. Children were in third grade at the time of data collection. The interactions of 40 parent-child dyads were analyzed (10 mother-daughter, mother-son, father-daughter, and father-son dyads). Half of the dyads in each category were middle-class and half working-class based on the Hollingshead index (Hollingshead, 1975). A Hollingshead score of 40 or below was considered to be working class while a score of 48 or above was considered to be middle class. Children were observed in conversation with both parents. To prevent dependency, only one parent-child dyad from each family was randomly selected to be examined. The Hollingshead scores and income to needs ratio for each dyad group and social class are shown in Table 1.

Measures

The analysis focused on the Rules Discussion Task which was conducted in the participant's home. The parent and child were asked to play a game together, and were videotaped while doing so. The parent and child were given a spinner with red, blue and green sections. Each section corresponded to a stack of cards. Blue cards addressed rules for children (e.g., "Kids should be able to eat only what they like"); red cards

addressed rules for parents (e.g., “Parents should decide who their children can be friends with”); and green cards addressed difficult situations (e.g., “Sometimes it’s OK to tattle”) (Appendix C for a complete list of questions). Parent-child dyads were instructed to discuss each rule presented on the cards. The parent-child dyad spun the spinner and discussed the question on the corresponding colored card. There were 9 questions total (3 of each color). The spinner was spun until all 9 questions were discussed or until the dyad ran out of time. Interactions lasted between approximately 3:30 minutes and 16:00 minutes with a median time of 6 minutes.

Conversations between parent-child dyads were transcribed verbatim.

Transcriptions were coded based on a developed coding scheme adapted from the Psychosocial Processes Coding Scheme (PPCS) developed by Leaper (Leaper, 1991; Leaper et al., 1995; Leaper & Gleason, 1996; Leaper et al., 1999; Strough & Berg, 2000). Observers watched the video as they coded so nonverbal behaviors and the tone of speech could be taken into account to better understand the meaning behind verbal speech acts.

Utterances (phrases or sentences spoken by a participant) and obvious nonverbal behavior that may be used as communication (e.g., shrugging shoulders, shaking head) were coded based on the developed coding scheme that included 19 categories of speech (see Appendix B for coding manual). Seven codes were classified as assertive, six as affiliative, and five as other. Assertive speech is direct and clear; it may involve making statements about how things are, suggesting new ideas, or rejecting others’ ideas. Assertive speech is considered to be masculine. Assertive speech included the following codes: Negative statements, directive/suggestions, disagreements, evasions,

opinions/statements, reasoning, and directive questions. Affiliative speech is indirect and sometimes tentative, and is often regarded as feminine. It included positive statements, eliciting questions, agreements, acknowledgements, submissions, and uncertainty. Clarification questions/answers, repeating, avoiding, and filler was classified in the category of “other.” Speech that was classified as “other” was not affiliative or assertive and was not the focus of analysis.

The proportion of speech for each dyad was calculated by dividing the number of utterances in each category by the total number of utterances for that person. A second observer independently coded 25% of the interaction sessions, across all dyad types. Prior to coding data tapes, the two observers obtained exact agreement of at least 85% for each code within the assertive and affiliative categories using pilot data. Inter-rater agreement was calculated by dividing the total number of agreements by the number of agreements plus disagreements. Inter-rater agreement for overall categories of assertive and affiliative speech ranged from 87.3% to 90.8%. Inter-rater agreement for specific types of speech within the affiliative and assertive categories ranged from 58.7% to 88.9% (see Appendix D). Categories were labeled with NA if the mean number of utterances in the category less than 1.

Analysis

Initial descriptive analyses examined the total amount of speech for each dyad type and social class. Differences in total number of utterances of parent and child and in proportion of interruptions for parent and child was assessed based on a 4 (dyad type) x 2 (social class) ANOVA. Differences in proportions of assertive and affiliative speech

used based on the rule being discussed by the participants will then be reported. The research question was addressed by a series of 4 (dyad type) x 2 (social class) ANOVAs comparing proportions of assertive and affiliative speech for parent and child within each dyad and social class. Bonferonni post-hoc tests ($p < .10$) were conducted to examine the direction and types of differences between dyads and social classes. Differences in selected individual speech categories were also examined by a series of 4 (dyad type) x 2 (social class) ANOVAs. As before, Bonferonni post-hoc tests ($p < .10$) were conducted to examine the direction and types of differences between dyad type and social class. Finally, correlations between parent and child assertive speech and selected individual categories of parent and child speech were conducted.

CHAPTER VIII

RESULTS

Descriptive Data

Table 2 shows the mean frequencies and proportions of parents' and children's speech in each of the coded categories. Proportions for each category were calculated by dividing the total number of utterances in that category by the total utterances across the entire interaction. The most frequently used assertive category of speech for parents and children was opinion/statements and the most frequently used affiliative category for parents and children was acknowledgements. Uncertainty occurred least often for parents, except for evasion and avoiding, which never occurred. Avoiding also did not occur for children and positive statements and agreement occurred least often for children.

Differences in Utterances and Interruptions by Dyad Type and Social Class

The total number of utterances (everything that was said) and the proportion of interruptions were analyzed using 4 (dyad type) x 2 (SES) ANOVAs. Significant differences for dyad type were found for total parent utterances and interruptions, but no significant differences for social class were found. No significant differences occurred for child utterances or interruptions and no interaction effects for dyad type x class were found. Results are shown in Table 3.

For total number of parent utterances there was a significant main effect for dyad type, $F(3, 32) = 2.89, p = .05$. Post-hoc tests showed that mothers in mother-son dyads used significantly more total utterances than fathers in father-daughter dyads. There was a significant main effect for parents' proportional interruptions for dyad type, $F(3, 32) = 3.19, p = .04$. Post-hoc tests indicated that mothers in mother-daughter dyads had significantly more interruptions than mothers in mother-son dyads.

Differences in Assertive and Affiliative Speech by Type of Rule Being Discussed

Differences in proportions of assertive and affiliative speech for parents and children based on the type of question being discussed (rules for kids, rules for parents, or difficult situation) were examined using a repeated measures MANOVA. There were no significant differences based on the type of rule the dyad was discussing; therefore, data were analyzed across the entire session.

Differences in Speech Categories by Dyad Type and Class

The proportions of assertive and affiliative speech were analyzed using 4 (dyad type) x 2 (SES) ANOVAs. Significant differences for both dyad type and class were found for both categories of parent speech, but no significant differences were found for child speech and no interaction effects for dyad type x class were found. Results are shown in Tables 4 and 5.

For parent assertive speech there was a significant main effect for dyad type, $F(3, 32) = 5.87, p = .003$, and a marginally significant main effect for social class, $F(1, 32) = 3.44, p = .07$, but no interaction effect. Post-hoc tests showed that fathers in father-daughter dyads engaged in significantly more assertive speech than mothers in mother-

daughter dyads or mother-son dyads. Working-class parents tended to use more assertive speech than middle-class parents. For parent affiliative speech there was a significant main effect for dyad type, $F(3, 32) = 4.69, p = .008$, and a significant main effect for social class, $F(1, 32) = 5.86, p = .02$, but no interaction effect. Post-hoc tests indicated that mothers in mother-son dyads used significantly more affiliative speech than fathers in father-daughter dyads. There was also a trend for mothers in mother-daughter dyads to use more affiliative speech than fathers in father-daughter dyads. Middle-class parents engaged in significantly more affiliative speech than working-class parents.

To determine which of the individual speech categories within the assertive and affiliative categories differed by dyad type and class, one-way ANOVAs were conducted. Only those speech categories within the assertive and affiliative categories that had a mean occurrence greater than 1 were analyzed. More differences were found for parents than children. There were no significant dyad type x class interactions. Results are shown in Tables 6 and 7.

For categories within parent assertive speech, there were significant main effects for dyad type in the category of opinion/statements, $F(3, 32) = 3.10, p = .04$, with a trend found for directive/suggestions, $F(3, 32) = 2.43, p = .08$, and reasoning, $F(3, 32) = 2.39, p = .09$. Post-hoc tests showed that fathers in father-daughter dyads used significantly more opinion/statements than mothers in mother-son dyads. There was a trend for fathers in father-son dyads to use more directive/suggestions than mothers in mother-son dyads. Another trend was found in which fathers in father-daughter dyads used more reasoning than fathers in father-son dyads. For categories within parent affiliative speech, there

was a significant main effect for dyad type in the category of eliciting questions, $F(3, 32) = 4.60, p = .009$, and a significant main effect for social class in the category of parents' acknowledgements, $F(1, 32) = 5.70, p = .02$. Post-hoc tests indicated that mothers in mother-son dyads used significantly more eliciting questions than fathers in father-daughter dyads. Middle-class parents used significantly more acknowledgements than working-class parents.

Very few differences in children's speech between dyad type and social class were found. A main effect for dyad type was found for children's use of directive/suggestions, $F(3, 32) = 3.55, p = .03$. Daughters in father-daughter dyads used significantly more directive/suggestions than sons in mother-son dyads.

Correlations Between Parent Speech and Child Speech

Correlations between parents' and children's use of assertive and affiliative speech were also examined. Parent assertive or affiliative speech was not correlated with child assertive or affiliative speech (r 's ranged from .00 to .30). However, parent assertive speech was negatively correlated with parent affiliative speech, $r(38) = -.81, p = .000$. Similarly, child assertive speech negatively correlated with child affiliative speech $r(38) = -.48, p = .002$. In other words, as parents and children used more assertive speech, parents and children also used less affiliative speech, respectively.

As seen in Table 8, several significant correlations were found between parents' and children's selected individual speech categories. As parents used more reasoning and directive/suggestions, children also used more reasoning and directive/suggestions, respectively. Parents' engagement in reasoning was positively correlated with children's

use of acknowledgements. Parents' use of directive/suggestions was negatively correlated with children's use of reasoning and acknowledgement. Correlations between parent affiliative speech and child speech also occurred, including parents' use of eliciting questions, positive statements, and agreement. Parents' use of eliciting questions was negatively correlated with children's use of directive/suggestions. Additionally, as parents used more positive statements, children used more reasoning.

CHAPTER IX

DISCUSSION

In this section, the parent differences in assertive and affiliative speech will be discussed, followed by differences in individual categories of speech. These differences will be interpreted in light of the current literature. Child differences in speech will be discussed and examined in relation to the current literature. Findings for both parent and child speech will be examined with the proposed theories. Next, results of the correlations between parent and child speech will be discussed. Strengths and limitations of the current study will then be assessed, followed by recommendations for future research.

Differences in Parent Communication

The results of the current study indicate that there are gender and social class differences in parent and child speech. These differences are found primarily in parental speech and mainly differentiate between opposite-gender dyads (mother-son and father-daughter dyads). Based on these results, the hypotheses made for parental speech were partially supported. Mothers did use more total utterances than fathers, as expected, but only when mothers were paired with sons and fathers with daughters, contrary to the literature suggesting that mothers talk more with daughters than sons. The hypothesis that male interruptions would vary based on the dyad type was not supported. Instead, mothers' interruptions varied based on dyad type. Differences in the level of assertion

and affiliation parents and children use in conversation were also found. As predicted, fathers did engage in more assertive speech than mothers, but only when fathers were paired with daughters and mothers were paired with sons. Similarly, mothers did engage in more affiliative speech than fathers, as hypothesized, but this was only true when mothers were paired with sons and fathers were paired with daughters. Hypotheses based on social class differences in parent speech were supported, with working-class parents moderately more likely to use more assertive speech than middle-class parents and middle-class parents using significantly more affiliative speech than working-class parents. It should be noted that the mean proportions of several nonsignificant effects were very close to the mean proportions of several statistically significant effects.

Although hypotheses were not made regarding individual categories of speech, differences between dyads and social class were found based on speech categories. These differences tended to support the overall assertive/affiliative differences. Significant differences tended to occur between opposite gender dyads (father-daughter and mother-son). However, trends toward differences between dyads that were not of opposite gender were also found. A significant social class difference was also found that supported the differences revealed in the analysis of assertive and affiliative speech, with middle-class parents using more acknowledgements (affiliative) than working-class parents. Unlike the findings for assertive and affiliative speech, there was a significant difference found for children's use of directive/suggestions. Although children did not differ in the direction expected (more assertive speech by son than daughters), there were differences between opposite-gender dyads, similar to the differences found in parents'

speech, with daughters in father-daughter dyads using more directive/suggestions than sons in mother-son dyads.

Parent Communication Findings in Relation to the Current Literature

As suggested by the literature and as found in the current study, the sex composition of dyads does influence the ways in which individuals communicate (Carli, 1990; Leaper, 1991; Leaper et al., 1999). Supporting the findings of previous research, mothers did have more utterances, but the current study reveals the important influence of the dyadic partner. The finding that mothers talked significantly more with sons than fathers did with daughters does not support previous research that suggests that mothers talk more with daughters than sons (for a review, see Lanvers, 2004). The findings concerning parent interruptions do not support the literature because mothers, not fathers, vary in their number of interruptions based on dyad type (for a review, see Ridgeway & Smith-Lovin, 1999). The results of the current study indicating parental differences in the use of assertive and affiliative speech support research by Carli (1990) who also found that men act more masculine and women more feminine in opposite sex dyads. This suggests that parents are not necessarily modeling appropriate gendered speech to their children in same-sex dyads, but they may be reinforcing what they feel is their children's appropriate gendered speech in opposite-sex dyads by acting in a more role-typical way. It is not clear from the present study if parental beliefs and expectations about their child's gender are causing the difference, as suggested by the literature and gender schema theory (Gurwitz & Dodge, 1975; Martin et al., 2002; Rubin et al., 1974) or if differences in parents' communication are a result of parents' own gendered

practices which may be accentuated by an opposite-gendered partner. It is likely that parental differences based on dyad type are a combination of both of these factors. Not only might parents have certain expectations for how their children should behave based on sex, and thus act differently, but parents also have a long history of opposite gender interactions, and therefore are likely to act in a particular way based on previous experiences, thus replicating such experiences for their children.

The findings of this study concerning class add to the literature by generating a greater understanding of the impact of social class on parent-child communication. The results support research examining the effect of social class values on parent behaviors (Bronfenbrenner, 1958; Gecas, 1979; Kohn, 1977; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Examining this study in light of previous research suggests that middle-class parents act, and talk, in a more affiliative way to foster independent thought whereas working-class parents act, and talk, in a more assertive way to encourage obedience. However, the specific social class differences noted in the literature on parent communication were not found (Hoff et al., 2002; Portes et al., 2001). Additionally, the social class differences in communication that were found in the current sample of White parents contradict research by Heath (1986). Although parents did not seem to be modeling gendered speech for their same-sex child, the results suggest that regardless of dyad, parents are modeling speech reflecting the values of their social class.

The lack of interaction between dyad type and social class for parents was unexpected. Based on the literature, social class was expected to influence how gender is

understood and enacted (Bardwell et al., 1986; Binion, 1990; Bowman & Howard, 1985; Hill, 1999; Hill, 2002). This is most likely due to the small number of participants.

Differences in Child Communication

Although it was expected that children's assertive and affiliative speech would differ based on dyad type and class, there were very few findings related to children's speech. No significant differences in child speech based on social class were found. It is hypothesized that this is most likely due to the fact that class has not become an integral part of a child's life by middle childhood. Additionally, if it has, it may not reveal itself in the parent-child interaction, where social class is shared. The only significant difference across dyad type in child speech was that daughters in father-daughter dyads used significantly more directive/suggestions (assertive) than sons in mother-son dyads. Although this difference occurred between opposite-gender dyads, as was most often the case with differences in parent speech, it does not differ in the direction hypothesized. This may be due to an anecdotally observed difference, not captured by the code, between father-daughter dyads and other dyads. Father-daughter dyads tended to tease or provoke their daughters which often led to a directive response from their daughters as they played along or told their dad to stop.

Child Communication Findings in Relation to the Current Literature

The lack of differences in child speech across dyad types supports the literature that suggests that children in middle childhood have not yet experienced gender intensification (Alfieri et al., 1996; Hibbard & Buhrmester, 1998). The current finding of almost no differences between boys and girls in dyadic communication contradicts the

literature examining gender differences in dyadic communication. Despite the fact that past research has been inconclusive on the effects of dyadic partners on an individual's communication, differences between boys and girls were have been noted throughout the literature. Additionally, although a review of the literature by Lanvers (2004) suggested that boys are encouraged by parents to be more assertive than girls and that encouragement increases with age, the current research found that children do not seem to be demonstrating this difference in middle childhood. Finally, the lack of differences in children's communication based on social class suggests that social class does not have a large impact on children's communication in middle childhood, at least in reference to children's communication with parents.

Theoretical Interpretation of Results

Theoretically, the lack of differences among children's speech based on dyad type or social class does not necessarily mean that the child does not play an active role in the everyday processes where gender and class are enacted. It may indicate, according to Vygotsky, that the history of the child has not impacted his/her enactment of gender and class through speech, thus far. The finding that parents do communicate differently with sons and daughters suggests that the child plays an active role in the interaction, although perhaps unintentionally, simply by being a boy or girl, or, according to Bronfenbrenner, based on his/her demand characteristics. Additionally, Bronfenbrenner would also suggest that parental differences in speech based on dyad type and class are, in part, the result of the parent's demand characteristics and resources (experience and knowledge) and how those interact with their child's demand characteristics and resources. The

finding that parents differ in speech based on dyad type and social class while children do not reveals, according to Vygotsky, the participants' different cultures in relation to gender and class. Parents reflect cultural differences that do not yet exist for children in this study. The culture of the child is different from that of the parent. However, it is important to keep in mind that differences in speech do occur for children interacting with peers (Leaper et al., 1999; Leaper, 1991). The powerful role of the parent may subdue the variability in communication by the child.

The differences in parents' speech should be considered in light of the importance of proximal processes, or everyday interactions and activities, and the history of those interactions. Looking into the future, as these processes, which differ based on dyad and class, repeat themselves on a daily basis, these everyday interactions impact both the parent's and child's understanding and future enactment of gender and class. Furthermore, according to Vygotsky, the findings of this study should be interpreted in light of the history of the interaction, implying that the interaction has been repeatedly occurring in this way previously. This notion that both the parent and the child "learn" from their interaction stems from Vygotsky's concept of the Zone of Proximal Development in which he suggests that both the parent and child engage in learning and teaching.

It is recognized that both Vygotsky and Bronfenbrenner propose contextualist theories (Tudge, 2005) and that, in some ways, the current study is not methodologically designed in a contextualist format. Additionally, the need for connection between theory and method is recognized (e.g. Winegar, 1997). However, this study is seen as a starting

place for future research that could be methodologically designed with these theories in mind. Future research could be contextually designed, incorporating both longitudinal and naturalistic qualities. For the current study, the theories proposed provide a contextual lens for interpreting the results and a basis for more contextual research in this area.

Correlations Between Parent and Child Speech

As a follow-up analysis, correlations between parent and child assertive and affiliative speech were also conducted. Not surprisingly, as parents' use of assertive speech increased, their use of affiliative speech decreased. The same was true for children. When individual categories of parent and child speech were correlated, no obvious patterns emerged. This may be explained by the fact that correlations were examined across dyads. However, with such a small sample, it is difficult to test for relationships between individual categories of parent and child speech.

Strengths and Limitations

The current study pursues a recommendation for future research (Lanvers, 2004) by examining parent-child communication in all four types of dyads. The incorporation of class into analysis further expanded knowledge concerning parental differences based on dyad and class and the lack of social class differences in communication for children in middle childhood. The focus on children in middle childhood was a needed addition to the field, given the large amount of research focusing on parent-child interaction of children at a young age (Leaper & Smith, 2004; Lytton & Romney, 1991). A greater understanding of children's gender enactment of gender in communication during middle

childhood was achieved. Finally, given the limited amount of research on children's speech in parent-child interactions, the current study contributes to an understanding of how children in middle childhood communicate in parent-child dyads.

Although the current study makes many contributions to the field, there were some limitations. The total number of participants was relatively low. A larger sample would increase power. A second limitation to the current study was the developed coding scheme. There were several subtle nuances that occur in conversations that range from hidden humor to particular styles of speech. The current coding scheme does not capture these differences and therefore does not lend itself to a complete understanding of the interaction. A broader coding scheme for transcripts, or perhaps using a general coding scheme based on solely on viewing the interaction, may be more effective than such a detailed coding scheme.

Recommendations for Future Research

Researchers in this area still have many avenues to pursue. Conducting a longitudinal study to examine changes in children's communication in parent-child dyads as they age would offer greater understanding of communication development in boys and girls and its relationship with the sex of the parent. This type of study would also lend itself to furthered understanding of the relationship between parent and child communication. For instance, researchers could determine if a parent's communication style changes as a child's communication style changes and if this differs by dyad. Research in this area would also benefit from more naturalistic observations and a coding scheme that captures the many various aspects of the interaction. Additionally,

examining the effects of race, in conjunction with dyad type and social class, would add another important dimension to the research on parent-child communication.

Summary

In conclusion, considering the composition of a dyad is important when examining parent-child communication. Differences in assertive and affiliative speech tend to occur between opposite-gender dyads. Social class also influences the type of communication parents use. Very few differences in parent-child communication occur between dyad type or social class for children in middle childhood.

REFERENCES

- Alfieri, T., Ruble, D.N., & Higgins, E.T. (1996). Gender stereotypes during adolescence: Developmental changes and the transition to junior high school. *Developmental Psychology, 32*, 1129-1137.
- Bardwell, J.R., Cochran, S.W., & Walker, S. (1986). Relationship of parental education, race, and gender to sex role stereotyping in five-year-old kindergartners. *Sex Roles, 15*, 275-281.
- Bayley, N., & Schaefer, E.S. (1960). Relationships between socioeconomic variables and the behavior of mothers toward young children. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 96*, 61-77.
- Binion, V.J. (1990). Psychological androgyny: A Black female perspective. *Sex Roles, 22*, 487-507.
- Booth, A., Carver, K., & Granger, D.A. (2001). Biosocial perspectives on the family. In Milardo, R.M (Ed.), *Understanding Families into the New Millennium: A Decade in Review*. (pp. 237-253). Lawrence, KS: NCFR and Alliance Communications Group.
- Bowman, P.J., & Howard, C. (1985). Race-related socialization, motivation, and academic achievement: A study of Black youths in three-generation families. *Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry, 24*, 134-141.

- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1958). Socialization and social class through time and space. In E.E. Maccoby, R.M. Newcomb, and E.L. Harley (Eds.), *Readings in social psychology* (pp. 400-425). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1988). Interacting systems in human development. Research paradigms: Present and future. In Bolder, N., Caspi, A., Downey, G., & Moorehouse, M. (Eds.), *Persons in context: Developmental process* (pp. 25-49). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P.A. (1998). The ecology of developmental processes. In W. Damon (Series Ed.) & R.M. Lerner (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 1. Theoretical models of human development* (5th ed., pp. 993-1028). New York: John Wiley.
- Carli, L.L. (1990). Gender, language, and influence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 941-951.
- Collins, W.A., Madsen, S.D., & Susman-Stillman, A. (2002). Parenting during middle childhood. In M.H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting, Vol. 1: Children and parenting* (2nd ed., pp. 73-101). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Condry, J. & Condry, S. (1976). Sex differences: A study in the eye of the beholder. *Child Development*, 47, 812-819.

- Gecas, V. (1979). The influence of social class on socialization. In Burr, W.R., Hill, R., Nye, F.I., & Reiss, I.L. (Eds.), *Contemporary theories about the family* (pp. 365-404), New York: The Free Press.
- Gurwitz, S.B., & Dodge, K.A. (1975). Adults' evaluations of a child as a function of sex of adult and sex of child. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 32, 822-828.
- Hart, B., & Risley, T.R. (1992). American parenting of language-learning children: Persisting differences in family-child interactions observed in natural home environments. *Developmental Psychology*, 28, 1096-1106.
- Hart, B., & Risley, T.R. (1995). *Meaningful differences in the everyday experience of young American children*. Baltimore, MD: Brookes.
- Hart, B., & Risley, T.R. (1999). *The social world of children learning to talk*. Baltimore, MD: Brookes.
- Heath, S.B. (1986). What no bedtime story means: narrative skills at home and school. In B.B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 97-124). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hess, R.D., & Shipman, V.C. (1965). Early experience and the socialization of cognitive modes in children. *Child Development*, 36, 869-886.
- Hibbard, D.R., & Buhrmester, D. (1998). The role of peers in the socialization of gender-related social interaction styles. *Sex Roles*, 39, 185-202.
- Hill, S.A. (1999). Racial socialization. *African American children: Socialization and development in families* (pp. 81-102). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Hill, S.A. (2002). Teaching and doing gender in African American families. *Sex Roles*, 47, 493-507.
- Hoff, E., Laursen, B., & Tardif, T. (2002). Socioeconomic status and parenting. In M.H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting, Vol. 2: Biology and ecology of parenting* (2nd ed., pp. 231-252). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hoff, E., & Tian, C. (2005). Socioeconomic status and cultural influences on language. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 38, 271-278.
- Hoff-Ginsberg, E. (1991). Mother-child conversation in different social classes and communicative settings. *Child Development*, 62, 782-796.
- Hollingshead, A. (1975). *The four-factor index of social status*. Unpublished manuscript. Yale University, Department of Sociology, New Haven, CT.
- Katz, P.A., & Ksanskak, K.R. (1994). Developmental aspects of gender role flexibility and traditionality in middle childhood and adolescence. *Developmental Psychology*, 30, 272-282.
- Kohn, M. (1977). *Class and Conformity: A study in values. With a reassessment, 1977* (2nd ed). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kohn, M. (1995). Social structure and personality through time and space. In P. Moen, G.H. Elder, Jr., & K. Lüscher (Eds.), *Examining lives in context: Perspectives on the ecology of human development*. (pp. 141-168). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Kramer, C. (1977). Perceptions of female and male speech. *Language and Speech*, 20, 151-161.

- Lanvers, U. (2004). Gender in discourse behaviour in parent-child dyads: A literature review. *Child: Care, Health & Development, 30*, 481-493.
- Laursen, B., & Collins, A.W. (2004). Parent-child communication during adolescence. In Vangelisti, A.L. (Ed.), *Handbook of family communication* (pp. 333-348). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Leaper, C. (1991). Influence and involvement in children's discourse: Age, gender, and partner effects. *Child Development, 62*, 797-811.
- Leaper, C. (2002). Parenting boys and girls. In M.H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting, Vol. 1: Children and parenting* (2nd ed., pp. 189-225). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Leaper, C., Anderson, K.J., & Sanders, P. (1998). Moderators of gender effects on parents' talk to their children: A meta-analysis. *Developmental Psychology, 34*, 3-27.
- Leaper, C., & Gleason, J.B. (1996). The relationship of play activity and gender to parent and child sex-typed communication. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 19*, 689-703.
- Leaper, C., Leve, L., Strasser, T., & Schwartz, R. (1995). Mother-child communication sequences: Play activity, child gender, and marital status effects. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 41*, 307-327.
- Leaper, C., & Smith, T.E. (2004). A meta-analytic review of gender variations in children's language use: Talkativeness, affiliative speech, and assertive speech. *Developmental Psychology, 40*, 993-1027.

- Leaper, C., Tenenbaum, H.R., & Shaffer, T.G. (1999). Communication patterns of African American girls and boys from low-income, urban backgrounds. *Child Development, 70*, 1489-1503.
- Levy, G.D., Taylor, M.G., & Gelman, S.A. (1995). Traditional and evaluative aspects of flexibility in gender roles, social conventions, moral rules, and physical laws. *Child Development, 66*, 515-531.
- Luster, T., Rhoades, K., & Haas, B. (1989). The relation between parental values and parenting behavior: A test of the Kohn hypothesis. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 51*, 139-147.
- Lytton, H., & Romney, D.M. (1991). Parents' differential socialization of boys and girls: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 109*, (267-296).
- Maccoby, E.E. (1998). *The two sexes: Growing up apart, coming together*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Maccoby, E.E., & Martin, J. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In P.H. Mussen (Series Ed.) & E.M. Hetherington (Vol Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4. Socialization, personality, and social development* (4th ed., pp. 1-101). New York: Wiley.
- Maltz, D. N., & Borker, R.A. (1982). A cultural approach to male-female miscommunication. In J.J. Gumperz (Ed.), *Communication, language and social identity* (pp. 196-216). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Martin, C.L., Ruble, D.N., & Szkrybalo, J. (2002). Cognitive theories of early gender development. *Psychological Bulletin, 128*, 903-933.

- Portes, P.R., Dunham, R.M., & Williams, S.A. (2001). Preschool intervention, social class, and parent-child interaction differences. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 147*, 241-255.
- Popp, D., Donovan, R.A., Crawford, M., Marsh, K.L., & Peele, M. (2003). Gender, race and speech style stereotypes. *Sex Roles, 48*, 317-325.
- Ridgeway, C.L., & Smith-Lovin, L. (1999). Gender and interaction. In Chafetz, J.S. (Ed.), *Handbook of the sociology of gender* (pp. 247-274). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.
- Rubin, J.Z., Provenzano, F.J., & Luria, Z. (1974). The eye of the beholder: Parents' views on sex of newborns. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 44*, 512-531.
- Segrin, C., & Flora, J. (2005). Parent-child communication. In *Family communication* (pp. 157-180). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Siegler, D.M., & Siegler, R.S. (1976). Stereotypes of males' and females' speech. *Psychological Reports, 39*, 167-170.
- Stafford, L. (2004). Communication competencies and sociocultural priorities of middle childhood. In Vangelisti, A.L. (Ed.), *Handbook of Family Communication*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Strough, J. & Berg, C.A. (2000). Goals as a mediator of gender differences in high-affiliation dyadic conversations. *Developmental Psychology, 36*, 117-125.
- Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. New York: Morrow.

- Thorne, B. (1993). *Gender play: Girls and boys in school*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Tudge, J. (2005). Chapter 3: Theory. *The everyday lives of young children: Culture, class, and childrearing in diverse societies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind and society: The development of higher mental processes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- West, C., & Fenstermaker, S. 2002. Doing difference. In Fenstermaker, S. and West, C. (Eds.) *Doing Gender, Doing Difference: Inequality, Power, and Institutional Change*. New York: Routledge
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. 2002. Doing gender. In Fenstermaker, S. and West, C. (Eds.), *Doing Gender, Doing Difference: Inequality, Power, and Institutional Change*. New York: Routledge.
- Winegar, L. (1997). Developmental research and comparative perspectives: Applications to developmental science. In Tudge, J., Shanahan, M.J., & Valsiner, J. (Eds.), *Comparisons in Human Development*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix A

Tables

Table 1

Mean Hollingshead Scores and Median Income to Needs Ratio for Dyads and Social Class

	Mother-Son Dyad		Mother-Daughter Dyad		Father-Son Dyad		Father-Daughter Dyad	
	Working Class	Middle Class	Working Class	Middle Class	Working Class	Middle Class	Working Class	Middle Class
Hollingshead Score								
Range	21 – 40	53 – 61	21 – 40	52 – 61	28 – 36	48 – 61	25 – 40	51 – 61
Mean	31.0	57.6	30.0	56.8	31.9	55.0	32.3	55.5
Income to Needs Ratio								
Range	1.38 – 4.44	2.47 – 7.40	.63 – 5.62	2.22 – 11.32	.88 – 3.27	3.26 – 9.32	2.22 – 4.29	3.85 – 5.59
Median	3.26	3.27	2.52	3.85	2.81	4.44	3.27	4.28
Mean	2.85	4.05	3.00	5.73	2.22	5.15	3.46	4.49

Table 2

Mean Frequencies and Proportions of Speech Categories for Parents and Children

Category	Parent		Child	
	Freq. (SD)	Prop. (SD)	Freq. (SD)	Prop. (SD)
Assertive	44.24 (16.27)	0.44 (0.10)	42.50 (21.43)	0.51 (0.08)
Opinion/Statement	18.18 (8.37)	0.18 (0.08)	26.13 (15.03)	0.32 (0.11)
Reasoning	9.83 (6.10)	0.10 (0.06)	11.63 (7.20)	0.14 (0.07)
Directive Question	7.45 (5.84)	0.07 (0.05)	0.15 (0.53)	0.00 (0.00)
Directive/Suggestion	6.90 (4.87)	0.07 (0.04)	3.55 (3.28)	0.04 (0.04)
Disagreement	1.33 (2.19)	0.01 (0.02)	0.70 (1.52)	0.01 (0.02)
Negative	0.58 (1.93)	0.01 (0.03)	0.10 (0.30)	0.00 (0.00)
Evasion	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.25 (0.87)	0.00 (0.01)

Table 2 continued

Category	Parent		Child	
	Freq. (SD)	Prop. (SD)	Freq. (SD)	Prop. (SD)
Affiliative	36.75 (20.57)	0.34 (0.11)	20.05 (13.01)	0.23 (0.08)
Acknowledgement	20.63 (11.19)	0.19 (0.07)	18.85 (12.70)	0.22 (0.08)
Eliciting Question	13.38 (11.89)	0.12 (0.06)	0.33 (0.80)	0.00 (0.01)
Positive	1.45 (1.80)	0.02 (0.02)	0.05 (0.22)	0.00 (0.00)
Agreement	1.05 (1.30)	0.01 (0.01)	0.05 (0.22)	0.00 (0.00)
Uncertain	0.20 (0.61)	0.00 (0.00)	0.63 (0.93)	0.01 (0.01)
Submit	0.05 (0.22)	0.00 (0.00)	0.15 (0.43)	0.00 (0.01)
Other	21.70 (7.76)	0.22 (0.07)	20.35 (7.83)	0.26 (0.08)
Filler	10.85 (4.33)	0.12 (0.06)	12.03 (5.60)	0.16 (0.07)
Uncodeable	4.30 (3.50)	0.04 (0.03)	4.80 (3.85)	0.06 (0.04)
Repeat	3.45 (3.27)	0.03 (0.03)	0.93 (1.47)	0.01 (0.02)
Clarification Question/Answer	3.10 (2.70)	0.03 (0.02)	2.60 (2.68)	0.03 (0.03)
Avoiding	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)

Table 3

Total Utterances and Proportion of Interruptions for Parents and Children in Four Dyad Types

	Mother-Daughter	Mother-Son	Father-Daughter	Father-Son
	Freq. (SD)	Freq. (SD)	Freq. (SD)	Freq. (SD)
Total Parent Utterances	91.50 ^{a,b} (22.22)	123.20 ^a (55.23)	82.40 ^b (24.17)	113.70 ^{a,b} (25.66)
Total Child Utterances	78.10 (19.96)	101.20 (56.93)	73.60 (13.57)	78.70 (36.89)
	Prop. (SD)	Prop. (SD)	Prop. (SD)	Prop. (SD)
Parent Interruptions	0.19 ^a (0.06)	0.11 ^b (0.06)	0.15 ^{a,b} (0.09)	0.12 ^{a,b} (0.06)
Child Interruptions	0.19 (0.07)	0.16 (0.10)	0.15 (0.09)	0.15 (0.08)

Note. Means on the same row with different superscripts differ at $p < .10$ based on a Bonferroni post-hoc test.

Table 4

Mean Proportions of Assertive and Affiliative Speech for Parents and Children in Four Dyad Types

	Mother-Daughter	Mother-Son	Father-Daughter	Father-Son
	Prop. (SD)	Prop. (SD)	Prop. (SD)	Prop. (SD)
Parent Assertive Speech	0.42 ^a (0.07)	0.37 ^a (0.07)	0.53 ^b (0.11)	0.43 ^{a,b} (0.10)
Parent Affiliative Speech	0.36 ^a (0.09)	0.40 ^a (0.08)	0.25 ^b (0.11)	0.35 ^{a,b} (0.10)
Child Assertive Speech	0.49 (0.09)	0.53 (0.08)	0.53 (0.05)	0.49 (0.09)
Child Affiliative Speech	0.20 (0.08)	0.28 (0.10)	0.22 (0.06)	0.23 (0.08)

Note. Means on the same row with different superscripts differ at $p < .10$ based on a Bonferroni post-hoc test.

Table 5

Mean Proportions of Assertive and Affiliative Speech for Parents and Children by Social Class

	Working-Class	Middle-Class
	Prop. (SD)	Prop. (SD)
Parent Assertive Speech	0.46 (0.12)	0.41 (0.08) ⁺
Parent Affiliative Speech	0.31 (0.11)	0.38 (0.09) [*]
Child Assertive Speech	0.51 (0.09)	0.51 (0.06)
Child Affiliative Speech	0.22 (0.09)	0.23 (0.07)

Note. Means on the same row with different superscripts differ based on a Bonferroni post-hoc test.

⁺p<.10. ^{*}p < .05.

Table 6

Mean Proportions of Speech Categories for Parents and Children in Four Dyad Types

Category	Parent			
	Mother-Daughter	Mother-Son	Father-Daughter	Father-Son
	Prop. (SD)	Prop. (SD)	Prop. (SD)	Prop. (SD)
<i>Assertive</i>				
Opinion/Statement	0.18 ^{a,b} (0.07)	0.13 ^a (0.06)	0.23 ^b (0.09)	0.18 ^{a,b} (0.08)
Reasoning	0.10 ^{a,b} (0.05)	0.10 ^{a,b} (0.07)	0.14 ^a (0.06)	0.07 ^b (0.05)
Directive Question	0.06 (0.05)	0.09 (0.05)	0.05 (0.02)	0.08 (0.05)
Directive/Suggestion	0.07 ^{a,b} (0.03)	0.04 ^a (0.04)	0.07 ^{a,b} (0.05)	0.09 ^b (0.04)
Disagreement	0.02 (0.03)	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.02)
<i>Affiliative</i>				
Acknowledgement	0.21 (0.05)	0.19 (0.07)	0.15 (0.08)	0.22 (0.08)
Eliciting Question	0.12 ^{a,b} (0.05)	0.17 ^a (0.06)	0.08 ^b (0.05)	0.11 ^{a,b} (0.06)
Positive	0.01 (0.01)	0.02 (0.03)	0.02 (0.02)	0.01 (0.01)
Agreement	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)

Table 6 continued

Category	Child			
	Mother-Daughter	Mother-Son	Father-Daughter	Father-Son
	Prop. (SD)	Prop. (SD)	Prop. (SD)	Prop. (SD)
<i>Assertive</i>				
Opinion/Statement	0.13 (0.09)	0.12 (0.06)	0.13 (0.06)	0.12 (0.07)
Reasoning	0.16 (0.09)	0.15 (0.04)	0.15 (0.07)	0.10 (0.07)
Directive/Suggestion	0.04 ^{a,b} (0.03)	0.03 ^a (0.04)	0.07 ^b (0.05)	0.03 ^{a,b} (0.02)
Disagreement	0.00 (0.01)	0.00 (0.01)	0.01 (0.02)	0.01 (0.02)
<i>Affiliative</i>				
Acknowledgement	0.19 (0.08)	0.26 (0.10)	0.20 (0.05)	0.22 (0.06)

Note. Means on the same row with different superscripts differ at $p < .10$ based on a Bonferroni post-hoc test.

Table 7

Mean Proportions of Speech Categories for Parents and Children Based on Social Class

Category	Parent	
	Working-Class	Middle-Class
	Prop. (SD)	Prop. (SD)
<i>Assertive</i>		
Opinion/Statement	0.20 (0.10)	0.16 (0.05)
Reasoning	0.11 (0.07)	0.10 (0.05)
Directive Question	0.06 (0.05)	0.08 (0.04)
Directive/Suggestion	0.07 (0.05)	0.06 (0.03)
Disagreement	0.02 (0.02)	0.01 (0.01)
<i>Affiliative</i>		
Acknowledgement	0.17 (0.07)	0.22 (0.07)*
Eliciting Question	0.11 (0.07)	0.13 (0.06)
Positive	0.02 (0.02)	0.02 (0.02)
Agreement	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)

Table 7 continued

Category	Child	
	Working-Class	Middle-Class
	Prop. (SD)	Prop. (SD)
<i>Assertive</i>		
Opinion/Statement	0.33 (0.11)	0.31 (0.10)
Reasoning	0.12 (0.07)	0.15 (0.07)
Directive/Suggestion	0.05 (0.04)	0.04 (0.04)
Disagreement	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.02)
<i>Affiliative</i>		
Acknowledgement	0.21 (0.08)	0.22 (0.07)

Note. Means on the same row with different superscripts differ based on a Bonferroni post-hoc test.

*p < .05.

Table 8

Correlations Between Parent and Child Proportional Speech

Parent	Child	Opinion/ Statement	Reasoning	Direct/ Suggestion	Disagreement	Acknowledgement
Opinion/Statement		.06	-.21	.28	.03	-.10
Reasoning		-.62**+	.61**	.11	-.30	.32*
Directive Question		.06	-.12	-.14	.20	.21
Directive/Suggestive		-.00	-.33*	.33*	-.12	-.35*
Disagreement		.02	-.26	.09	.29	-.25
Acknowledgement		.00	.13	-.13	.06	.08
Eliciting Question		.48**	-.06	-.44**	.09	.16
Positive		-.32*	.43**	.09	-.10	-.01
Agreement		.18	-.06	-.12	-.05	-.17

Note. Selected speech categories are reported. Only those speech categories classified as assertive or affiliative with a mean greater than 1 were included. Data are proportions of utterances in each category.

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

Appendix B

Parent-Child Dyad Coding Manual

Speech will be coded by utterance, defined as a sentence or unfinished (incomplete) sentence. Each entry in a transcript will be considered an utterance. If more than one sentence or partial sentence is included in an entry, the entry will be marked to indicate the break points between utterances. Clear nonverbal signals (head nods indicating “yes,” shaking the head to indicate “no,” shrugging the shoulders to indicate “I don’t know”) will be counted as utterances and should be noted on the transcript. Only nonverbal signals that indicate opinion (responses to EQ) or are a response to a Directive or Clarification Question will be coded (not Acknowledgements). Spinning will be coded when it serves a purpose such as evasion or directing the game. Less obvious nonverbal communicative behavior (facial expressions, looking at or away from the other person) will not be counted or coded.

Total utterances (speech acts)

Count the number of sentences or partial (incomplete) sentences spoken by parent and by child. Reading a question counts

Interruptions

Count the number of times each participant interrupts the other. Interruptions are marked by < or >

Coding speech

Coding will be done using both transcripts and videotapes. In watching the tapes, if a coder identifies errors on the transcripts, these should be noted and brought to Lauren’s attention.

Each utterance will be coded into one of the categories on the attached sheet. Obvious nonverbal signals will be coded as if they were utterances.

In recording codes, we need to indicate the type of question (1 = rules for kids, 2 = rules for parents, 3 = difficult situations) as well as the type of utterance.

Be aware of tag questions. These are questions at the end of a statement such as: “We just studied that, right?” Ignore tag questions and code the utterance based on the statement.

Some utterances will be uncodeable because the majority of the utterance or a key word or phrase cannot be understood. These are still counted in the total number of utterances but will not be coded into any category.

Coding utterances should be done within the context of the complete conversation. For example, a disagreement utterance is coded as such based on what the partner previously said. All codes should reflect the conversation that occurs before and after the coded utterance.

Coding Collaboration

Episodes of collaborative speech will be coded when the parent and child engage in active cooperation or construction of ideas. This includes times when one person adds to or expands on other's statement, completing or extending the other's thoughts without interrupting or trying to control or change the idea of the other person. Collaboration coding does not have to identify exactly when collaboration begins and ends, just that it occurred. Collaborative episodes will be coded after coding individual speech acts.

Assertive codes

Negative

Criticism, hostility, defiance, emphasis on own wishes with no real regard for the other, correcting when aim is to criticize rather than help, threats. Negative statements should be obviously negative by words or tone.

If you only ate what you liked it'd be, what, candy, chips, and pop?

I'm going to tell Grandma!

Probably better than me beating you or something

Directive or suggestion

Giving a directive or an order but in a friendly manner (if unfriendly, code as Negative), making a suggestion for what to do next, can be in the form of a question. The speaker could suggest what the partner should do or the speaker may do something and describe what he/she is doing, or the speaker may simply do something. This may include taking charge of the game.

Directives are usually in the form of imperatives:

Speak loud or Spin it

They can be statements:

We'll both read it. You can't watch it here.

Suggestions would be:

Why don't we . . . ? or Let's . . . or You want to do it again?

Sometimes they just indicate the person is controlling the situation:

My turn or Your turn or I'll read it

It may also be coupled with an action

This is an OK card (person places card in ok pile regardless of what the pair agreed on)

Questions asked that refer to a specific person are regarded as D/S

Is it my turn to spin?

Is it your turn to spin?

C: Mmhmm. (ACK)

Questions that are neutral are **not** D/S, but are coded as a Clarification Question

Who spins first?

Disagreement

Resisting or questioning other's position, correcting the other, stating the opposite viewpoint, defending one's own position. If the disagreement involves a lot of content or explanation, it may be coded as reasoning.

That's not right.
No, never

Evasion

Changing the topic, or going on with the game (spinning for a new card) without participating in the conversation or coming to resolution. Person appears to be taking action to avoid making a statement or listening to any more from the other person. This could be considered a particular type of directive.

Why's your car out there?
Whatever <spin> (a spin may be used to avoid further conversation)

Opinion/Statement

Making a statement of fact or stating one's opinion about something. If there is a rationale beyond an opinion or statement, code as reasoning. First person to speak after a card is read is usually stating an opinion – letting the other know what he or she thinks about the rule or situation. Opinions can be stated in a question tone (see ex.) Opinions should be generated from the individual, often not a response to a DQ, which is guiding the child's opinion. "Guided" opinions should be thought of as statements. Responses to factual or eliciting questions from the other person also are usually (but not always) considered statements. If they include a rationale, they are coded as reasoning. Statements may be one word. Statements related to the game (color, question) should be coded as filler.

Opinion:

Rule is read, person reading says, *Yes* or *That's a good rule*
I don't mind what you wear
But I don't think we're supposed to finish them all
If "it depends" is in response to question that was read

F: Kids should be able to decide their own bedtime
 C: *Sometimes?*

Statement:

I love ice.
It doesn't even work
That's not a discussion

F: Who has the messiest room here?
 C: *Me.*

Reasoning

Any kind of rationale or reasoning. Providing guidance or ideas about a situation. May correct the other person but intent is to help, not to criticize. Giving ideas about how to handle a situation in the future or reasoning about why a rule is good or bad. Child may explain his or her reasoning or talk about a situation in which the rule might be helpful. This may include an opinion with an explanation/rationale. This also includes bringing up a past situation as an example, but it is not seriously negative. Reasoning statements that are linked to an original reasoning statement but are interrupted by the other speaker are still coded as reasoning statements. Additionally, statements that are connected to the other speaker's reasoning statements should be coded as reasoning.

Reasoning Statements should include a conditional word. These include words such as when, so, if, because, sometimes, would, one time, then, even though, that's why, it depends, only if "it depends" is followed by an explanation and is not a direct answer to the question at hand, or "might..." when might is used to start a hypothetical situation. If a phrase has a reasoning statement but has not reasoning, do not code as reasoning.

If a statement does not have a conditional word in it, but answers the question "why", it should be coded as reasoning.

If a statement does not have a conditional word in it, but is an example of a past situation or a hypothetical situation, it should be coded as reasoning.

Quick Reference: It is reasoning when...

***Conditional word with explanation/ reasoning**

***Hypothetical or past situation**

***Connected to previous (self or other) reasoning statement** ***Answers the question "why"**

*If you get in with a bad crowd of kids, I'm going to tell you not to hang out with those kids.
If you got hurt, I'd want to know.
Because if you got up in the middle of the night...you might trip on something*

*M: Because they are in charge
C: Yeah.
M: They are the authority
C: Yeah
M: Because you have respect for them*

*C: Yeah, but if I don't remember it, you should...
M: >That's where parents come in.
C: You should know that I have homework.*

*M: Because you'd stay up late and be too tired for anything
C: Like school.*

It might be something nasty that it has on the t-shirt.

*M: Why not?
C: It could make you sick.*

Directive Questions

This can generally be thought of as “leading the witness.” This includes questions that direct the conversation or the other person’s thinking. The speaker seems to want to get their partner to agree to a point. The question seems to imply that there is a correct answer. If there is a statement that is a request for information that seems to be “leading the witness.” but may not be in a question tone, it is still a DQ. DQ often seem to be reasoning in the form of questions.

Ok, what’s dad’s rule on that?

What time are you supposed to go to bed every night

And you understand that?

Do you tattle a lot at times where you should probably take care of it yourself?

(Statement about cleaning room) *Are you very good at that?* (Tone implies that he’s not)

Affiliative codes

Positive Statements

Showing support or understanding. Praise, encouragement, expression of trust or confidence. Acknowledgement of other's feelings or ideas. May relate an experience that fits with what the other person is saying. This must be fairly obvious. It can be game related. (The phrase "right" or "That's right" is coded as an acknowledgement.)

*I can see how you'd think that.
That's a very creative idea.
I know you wouldn't cheat.
You're a smart kid
Good spin or Good point
Good.*

Eliciting question

Questions that encourage the other person to think about or talk about the topic. An EQ is a request for information. Asking the other's opinion in a way that shows interest. Requesting the other's help, advice, or support by asking for suggestions, decisions, or an evaluation of the situation. It may also be a statement that elicits the other's response or reasoning, such as describing a hypothetical situation to elicit the child's opinion (if not in question format, then a hypothetical situation is reasoning). This also includes when a speaker repeats their partner's statement, or summarizes their partner's statement, in question format.

Do you really think that?

What do you think?

Which one did you like best?

Is it right or is it wrong to cheat?

Depends on what?

C: No

M: No?

C: Because then I'll be in school and I'll be so tired that I won't be able to pay attention.

F: *You won't get enough sleep for school?*

C: Sometimes yes.

M: *What do you mean by sometimes yes?*

Agreement

Agreeing with the other, showing a willingness to go along (contrast with submit). Statements indicating agreement are also coded as agreement. Has to be clearly an agreement, not simply a yes or no, or right. However, if yes/no/right is followed by restating the child's opinion, then it can be coded as agreement. Must indicate that they do agree with the first speaker.

I think so too.

We agree on that.

C: And you should know the rules.

F: *Yes- yeah that's right, you oughta know the rules too.*

Acknowledgements

Use of standard polite expressions. Also expressions to show that the person is listening to the other person. This also includes a response to a question that's not asking an opinion, such as a DQ. These acknowledgements indicate understanding or that they have heard the question. Acknowledgements may also simply be used as a pattern of speech. (This implies that *all* acknowledgement type statements said in speech (ok, alright, etc.) should be coded as acknowledgement, not as Filler, even if they are not directly following the partner's statement.) Yes/no indicating feelings about the question that was read are not counted here. Responses to EQ, when there is no clear y/n answer, are coded as Opinion/Statement.

Thank you / You're welcome

Um-hmm, Yes, Uh, Ok

That's right or Right.

M: Green or blue?

C: Blue

M: *OK.*

C: Green

M: Green again

M: *Okay*

Submit

Change opinion to go along with the other person but does not seem to have changed his or her mind about the issue, is simply giving in without really agreeing. (If person seems to genuinely agree, code as agreement.) Person may seem to be agreeing in order to stop the conversation or stop from being criticized by the other person. This may be game related. If it is game related, it should be more than just going along with the person. It should be obvious that the person is giving in unwillingly.

M: Ok, it goes in the good pile cause I said.

C: *ok, whatever.*

C; I want to read one

M: no, I'm going to read this one

C: but I want to read this one

M: ok. (not coded as submit – if it was said in a negative/sarcastic tone, or as “whatever”, then it would be submit)

C: It's ok

M: *Alright, fine.*

Uncertainty

“I don't know”

Neutral codes

Clarification question or answer

A question intended to have the other person repeat what he/she said or make it clear. These are usually not content related, although they may occur in the discussion surround the question at hand. If someone restates an opinion in response to a CQ, it is still coded as a CA. Questions asking person to say more or to explain their opinion are coded under EQ. Questions asking the person to clarify their opinion are coded here.

These can be game related question/answers.

Can you say that again?

friend?

C: I disagree with this.

M: *What did you say?* (CQ)

C: *I disagree with this.* (CA)

M: You think a parent might pick
Someone mean to be a

C: If they act nice.

M: *You mean they might trick the
parent?*

Is it my turn or yours?

Yours

Do we start now?

Yes

Repeating

When a person says essentially the same thing two utterances in a row or when the listener repeats (essentially the same words) what the speaker says (not in question format), code as repeating. This can involve verbally repeating an indicative behavior, such as a head nod or shake that indicates an opinion.

C: Yeah.

M: Yeah.

format)

C: It's Ok.

C: *It's Ok.*

C: (Shakes head no)

M: *No. (not in question*

Avoiding

Ignoring the other person, saying nothing after the other person has spoken for a period of more than 3 seconds. Not sure whether this should be assertive – it's so passive.

Filler

Speech related to the game that does not fit into another category (reading the question, saying a color). Correcting a person's reading of the question will be considered filler, unless it is done in a negative way. Simple phrases such as yes/no or uhmhmm anywhere in speech are coded as acknowledgements, not as fillers.

One more card.

It worked out perfect

Those are harder ones.

Uncodeable

Speech that is inaudible (XXX) or incomplete or vague utterances. This may also occur when a person is speaking and is interrupted mid-sentence. This is to prevent counting one statement/question twice. When interruptions occur, if both phrases are incomplete, but without the interruption, they make a complete utterance, code the concluding phrase as though it was complete. If one portion of the phrase is complete and the other is not, code the complete phrase appropriately, and the other as U. If there are two phrases that go together, but were interrupted, and both phrases still make sense standing alone, code both with the appropriate code (not U).

M: You think I (Uncodeable)

C: >No

M: >wouldn't know if you got in trouble? (DQ)

C: No

C: The kid could turn their homework in (oST)

F: > Yeah

C: >on time. (U)

M: But if they're all doing it, it must be (R)

C: > It doesn't matter

M: > It must be something good (R)

Assertive codes

N	Negative
D/S	Directive/Suggestion
D	Disagreement
E	Evasion
O/ST	Opinion/Statement
R	Reasoning
DQ	Directive Questions

Affiliative codes

PS	Positive statements
EQ	Eliciting Question
AG	Agreement
ACK	Acknowledgements
SB	Submit
UC	Uncertainty

Neutral codes

CQ/CA	Clarification question or answer
RPT	Repeating
AV	Avoiding
F	Filler
U	Uncodeable

Appendix C

Parent-Child Rules Discussion Questions

Mother

Blue (Kid Rules)

- Kids should be responsible for their own belongings
- Kids should be able to wear whatever they want.
- Kids should be able to eat only what they like

Red (Parent Rules)

- Parents should let their children decide their own punishment
- Parents should set limits on what television their children can watch
- Parents should decide who their children can be friends with

Green (Difficult Decisions)

- It's OK for kids not to tell their parents when they get into trouble at school
- Sometimes it's OK to tattle
- Sometimes it's OK to give your friend the right answer on a test

Father

Blue (Kid Rules)

- Kids should not be asked to do household chores
- Kids should always obey their teachers
- Kids should be able to decide their own bedtime

Red (Parent Rules)

- Parents should make sure their children turn their homework in on time
- Parents should set limits on what television their children can watch
- Parents should decide who their children can be friends with

Green (Difficult Decisions)

- It's OK to do something wrong if all your friends are doing it
- Kids shouldn't fight with their friends
- It's OK for kids to have messy rooms

Appendix D
Inter-Rater Agreement for Assertive and Affiliative Speech Categories

Category	Parent	Child
Assertive	90.4%	90.8%
Negative	NA	NA
Directive/Suggestion	78.6%	76.0%
Disagreement	88.9%	NA
Evasion	NA	NA
Opinion/Statements	75.6%	85.0%
Reasoning	73.5%	86.5%
Directive Questions	58.7%	NA
Affiliative	88.1%	87.3%
Positive	75.0%	NA
Eliciting Questions	81.9%	NA
Agreement	63.6%	NA
Acknowledgement	87.9%	85.3%
Submit	NA	NA

Appendix D continued

Other		
Uncertainty	NA	64.3%
Clarifications	50.9%	53.5%
Repetitions	66.7%	33.3%
Avoiding	NA	NA
Filler	78.9%	84.7%
Uncodeable	48.1%	42.5%

Note. Percentages are based on total agreements / (agreements + disagreements). Categories are labeled NA if the mean number of utterances in that category was less than 1.