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SELF-CONSTRUALS: Representation of self as
- Independent (individualism)
- Interdependent (collectivism)
(Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Singelis, 1994)
- INT-IND Balance

Motivational processes

Self Determination Theory
(basic psychological needs):
- Independence
- Interdependence
- Competence
(Deci & Ryan, 2000)

WHEN?
Attachment theory:
- Attachment (Interdependence)
- Exploration (Independence)

Optimal development:
-> Balance: Exploration (INDependence) – Attachment (INTerdependence)

Moderators:
Culture
(e.g., Trommsdorff, 2009)

Family
(e.g., Albert et al., 2013; Barni et al., 2011; Kuczynski & Hilderbrand, 1997)

Are TRANSMITTED across generations
(e.g., Barni et al., 2013; Bentson, 1975; Trommsdorff et al., 2004)
Families?
Parents-adolescent child
**Mothers**: Care and protection (INTerdependence)

**Fathers**: Introduce the world, challenge, negotiate, teach and play (INDependence)

(e.g., Gilbert et al., 1982; Grossmann et al., 2002; Lubiewska et al., 2018)

**Adolescence:**
- Parents are still socialisation agents but role of peers increases (e.g., Allen, 2016 Schwarz et al., 2012)
- Independence is higher than in parents (e.g., Sabatier & Lannegrand-Willems, 2005)
Family

as the context of value transmission?

Quality of relationship
Bengtson and Schrader (1982) proposed dimensions defining intergenerational solidarity:

- **Associational** (physical integration/isolation)
- **Structural** (geographic proximity/distance)
- **Affectual** (e.g., intimacy)
- **Consensual** (e.g., agreement/dissent in values and norms between family members)
- **Functional** (dependency-autonomy, support), and normative (familism) dimensions

Family patterns in **adult child – parent** relations:
- ✓ Amicable
- ✓ Harmonious
- ✓ Ambivalent
- ✓ Detached
- ✓ Disharmonious
  (e.g., Ferring et al., 2009; Nauck, 2014)

Family patterns in **adolescent child – parent** relations:
- ✓ Amicable
- ✓ Harmonious
- ✓ Detached
- ✓ Disharmonious
  
  Positive family climate

  Negative family climate
  (Lubiewska et al., 2018)
## Family solidarity patterns

**Description of Family Solidarity Patterns in Adolescent Child-Parents Relations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family pattern</th>
<th>Cluster size (%)</th>
<th>Family Values A-P consensus*</th>
<th>Affectual Solidarity</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>A-to-P Emotional Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Detached</strong></td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>− (sometimes)</td>
<td>− (sometimes)</td>
<td>-- (sometimes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disharmonious</strong></td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>− −</td>
<td>− (sometimes)</td>
<td>++ (often)</td>
<td>− (sometimes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amicable</strong></td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++ (very often)</td>
<td>− (sometimes)</td>
<td>++ (very often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Harmonious</strong></td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ (often)</td>
<td>− (sometimes)</td>
<td>+ (sometimes)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Relative saturation of dimensions based on: (1) ANOVA differences where ++ indicates very high, + indicates high, − indicates low, − − indicates relatively very low mean within each component of solidarity compared to the component’s mean values in other patterns; (2) Likert response-scale format (in brackets) indicating the frequency of affect, conflict and support in parents-child relations. * Between-patterns differences in family value consensus are based on relative distance of absolute value of pattern mean from zero (indicating lack of parents-child differences). A-adolescents. P-parents.*
Is the Family Solidarity Model useful in explaining developmental processes? (e.g., value transmission)

The present study

- Self construals of INTerdependence and INDependence
- Individual INT-IND balance

- **Family solidarity patterns in adolescence:**
  - Positive family climate: Amicable (+), Harmonious (+),
  - Negative family climate: Detached (-), Disharmonious (-)

**RQ 1:** Are self-construals of IND, INT self, and individual INT-IND balance different across family solidarity patterns?

**RQ 2:** Are intergenerational relations between self-construals of IND, INT self and individual INT-IND balance different across family solidarity patterns?

**General H1:** INT-IND balance and parent-child transmission will be higher in positive family solidarity patterns

**General H2:** Different role of mothers and fathers
Method
Value of Children and Intergenerational Relations
(VOC; Trommsdorff & Nauck)

Sample in Poland (2006-2009):
575 mother-adolescent dyads
576 290 fathers)-adolescent dyads

Adolescents (40% were males; 14-17 years of age; $M = 15.6; SD = 1.34$)
Mothers ($M = 43.06; SD = 5.24$)
Fathers ($M = 45.25; SD = 5.23$)
Instruments: Self construals

Self construals (Self Construal Scale by Singelis, 1994)

- **Independent self** (5 items, Likert scale 1-5)
  3. I prefer to be direct and forthright when dealing with family members.
  4. I enjoy being unique and different from family members in many respects.
  5. My personal identity, independent of my family, is very important to me.
  6. I value being in good health above everything else.
  7. Being able to take care of myself is a primary concern for me.

(alphas between .74 - .77)

- **Interdependent self** (5 items, Likert scale 1-5)
  1. It is important to me to respect decisions made by my family.
  2. I often have the feeling that my relation with my family is more important than my own accomplishments.
  8. My happiness depends on the happiness of my family.
  9. It is important for me to maintain harmony within my family.
  10. I would sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of my family.

(alphas between .61 - .64)
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## Self-construals across family solidarity patterns: IND-INT in subsamples

### SUBSAMPLE level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsample</th>
<th>Detached</th>
<th>Disharmonious</th>
<th>Amicable</th>
<th>Harmonious</th>
<th>$F$ (df)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents</td>
<td>3.86 (.56)</td>
<td>3.82 (.54)</td>
<td>3.99 (.53)</td>
<td>3.88 (.57)</td>
<td>1.75 (573)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>3.78 (.60) $^a$</td>
<td>3.56 (.60) $^a$</td>
<td>3.73 (.62)</td>
<td>3.75 (.62)</td>
<td>3.28 (571)$^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>3.59 (.59)</td>
<td>3.44 (.54) $^a$</td>
<td>3.75 (.66) $^a$</td>
<td>3.66 (.57)</td>
<td>3.04 (292)$^*$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INDEPENDENT Self: Mean level

#### Adolescents 3.86 (.56) 3.82 (.54) 3.99 (.53) 3.88 (.57)

#### Mothers 3.78 (.60) $^a$ 3.56 (.60) $^a$ 3.73 (.62) 3.75 (.62)

#### Fathers 3.59 (.59) 3.44 (.54) $^a$ 3.75 (.66) $^a$ 3.66 (.57)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsample</th>
<th>Detached</th>
<th>Disharmonious</th>
<th>Amicable</th>
<th>Harmonious</th>
<th>$F$ (df)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents</td>
<td>3.54 (.70) $^a$</td>
<td>3.37 (.67) $^b$</td>
<td>4.04 (.53) $^a, b$</td>
<td>3.84 (.57) $^a, b$</td>
<td>26.98 (574)$^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>4.23 (.56)</td>
<td>4.26 (.53)</td>
<td>4.34 (.43)</td>
<td>4.20 (.60)</td>
<td>1.53 (571)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>4.00 (.58) $^a$</td>
<td>4.14 (.50)</td>
<td>4.32 (.52) $^a$</td>
<td>4.06 (.58)</td>
<td>4.00 (292)$^{**}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Self-construals across family solidarity patterns: IND-INT personal balance

**INDIVIDUAL** level

| Family role of individuals | **IND-INT Balance**: Withiperson abs. IND-INT difference (0 - 4) |   |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
|                           | Detached | Disharmonious | Amicable | Harmonious |   |   |
| Adolescents               | .72 (.60) | .80 (.62) | **.49 (.50)** | .63 (.54) |   |   |
| Mothers                   | .89 (.66) | .98 (.65) | .87 (.69) | .86 (.68) | **.85 (574)** |   |
| Fathers                   | .83 (.61) | .97 (.63) | .69 (.56) | .82 (.67) | **1.92 (292)** |   |

*Hypothesis 1 supported*
Results

Self-construals and their individual balance across family solidarity patterns

Intergenerational relations across family solidarity patterns
Intergenerational transmission: analytical strategy

**DIADIC level:**
Father/Mother – Adolescent dyad, e.g.:
abs. Difference = |M INT self – A INT self|

**SUBSAMPLE level:**
Regression testing moderating effects
**Intergenerational relations between self-construals:**

**IND-INT diadic cohesion**

**FAMILY level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family dyad</th>
<th>Self-construal</th>
<th>Diadic cohesion: Dyad abs. Difference: Mean level (0 - 4)</th>
<th>$F (df)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>Disharmonious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Adolescent</td>
<td>Independent-self</td>
<td>.59 (.43)</td>
<td>.62 (.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interdependent-self</td>
<td>.79 (.63)(^a)</td>
<td>.98 (.68)(^b,c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Adolescent</td>
<td>Independent-self</td>
<td>.66 (.49)</td>
<td>.66 (.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interdependent-self</td>
<td>.83 (.60)</td>
<td>.94 (.70)(^a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mother – Adolescent dyad:

abs. Difference = |M INDself – A INDself|
### Intergenerational relations between self-construals: IND-INT in subsamples

#### SUBSAMPLE level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Adolescents</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent self</td>
<td>Interdependent self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Sex</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family pattern</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.20***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Independent self</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Interdependent self</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Independent self</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Interdependent self</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>1.12***</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **A Interdependent self**:
  - Females > Males
  - P F. climate > N F. climate

#### Parents & A Self:
- M & F **independent** s. -> A independent self
- M **interdependent** s. -> A interdependent self
Intergenerational relations between self-construals: IND-INT in subsamples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Adolescents</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent self</td>
<td>Interdependent self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Sex</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family pattern</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.20***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Independent self</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Interdependent self</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Independent self</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Interdependent self</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.12***</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < .001; ** p < .01; * p < .05
Interaction effect: $B = .10^*$

Detached: $B = .31^{***}$
Disharmonious: $B = .40^{***}$
Amicable: $B = .50^{***}$
Harmonious: $B = .59^{***}$
Moderation effects

Interaction effect: $B = -.08^*$

Detached: $B = .17^{**}$
Disharmonious: $B = .09$
Amicable: $B = .01$
Harmonious: $B = -.08$
Self-construals: Intergenerational relations

### INDIVIDUAL level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Adolescents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IND-INT Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Sex</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family pattern</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M IND-INT Balance</strong></td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F IND-INT Balance</strong></td>
<td><strong>.13</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.03*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$. Balance = withinperson absolute IND-INT difference.

**not Moderated**

**IND-INT balance:**
Fathers -> Adolescents

**Hypothesis 2 supported**
Parents-adolescent transmission of INT and IND self construals is moderated by the family solidarity pattern -> family solidarity patterns
   Positive emotional climate fosters the transmission strength

Different parental roles in self-construals transmission in adolescence:
   - **Fathers**: agents of IND self transmission (Lubiewska et al., 2018) and INT-IND balance transmission
   - **Mothers**: (1) INT self transmission agents (e.g., Grossmann et al. 2002); and (2) “attach” adolescents in detached families

Individual balance between INT-IND self values may be a marker of developmental processes (positive developmental outcomes)

Amicable vs Harmonious patterns (Lubiewska et al., 2018)
Further directions

- Family solidarity framework (Bengtson & Schrader, 1982) explains developmental processes but is it better than other frameworks?

  Dynamic system theory (e.g., Lindblom et al., 2017): **Intimacy** (I) and **Autonomy** (A) between parents -> family patterns: **Cohesive** (high I and A); **Authoritarian** (lacking I and moderate A); **Discrepant** (discrepant view of family relationships of mothers and fathers); **Enmeshed** (low A, moderate I); **Distant** (low I and A)

- To explore: Mothers „attach” adolescents in detached families
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