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ABSTRACT

As the population of Latinx youth and families continues to grow within the United States, the more necessary it is to understand the dynamics of these families, especially given the positive impact that family support has on college success for students of Latin American descent. The present study examines how ethnic affirmation/belonging, respect-for-family, and disclosure to mothers, fathers, and siblings relate to positive and negative relationship quality within each of these relationships. Participants included 206 college students between 18-25 years-of-age enrolled in a 4-year university in the continental United States with at least one sibling and Latin American ancestry. Data was collected via online surveys. Measures used in the present study include the affirmation/belonging subscale of the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure; the respect-for-family subscale of the Family Obligations measure; frequency of voluntary disclosure to mothers, fathers, and closest-in-age siblings, and the short form of the Network of Relationships Inventory to assess positive and negative relationship quality with mothers, fathers, and siblings. Personal disclosure was related to positive relationship quality across family relationships. Gender differences emerged for relationships certain types of disclosure and positive and negative relationship quality, and for ethnic affirmation/belonging and positive and negative relationship quality. Respect-for-family was also consistently related to positive relationship quality and disclosure across all domains, and family members. Different patterns emerged for mixed gender and same gender sibling dyads and the relationship between ethnic affirmation/belonging, respect-for-family, and positive relationship quality. Limitations, future directions, and implications are also discussed.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

As of 2016, the United States population includes 58 million Latinx (the gender neutral, gender inclusive term used to refer to men, women, and people outside the gender binary with Latin American ancestry and used in addition to Latina and Latino depending on the gender identity of the individual; Ramirez & Blay, 2016; Santos, 2017) individuals – that accounts for 18% of the U.S. population – primarily originating from, but not limited to, Mexico, Puerto Rico, El Salvador, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, and Colombia (Flores, 2017). Within this population of the U.S., 35% of emerging adult-aged individuals (i.e. 18-25) attend either a two- or four-year college (Krogstad, 2016). While this has increased by 13% from 1993 and accounts for the largest increase in college attendance compared to other ethnic groups in the U.S. (Krogstad, 2016), there are lower rates of degree completion amongst this group (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010). However, family and relationship quality between family members is especially influential to the success of Latinx college students (Ong, Phinney, & Dennis, 2006). Receiving support from the family during this period of life has been linked to a greater sense of self-efficacy in academics among Latinx men and women attending college (Torres & Solberg, 2001). Higher levels of parental support and family interdependence are also related to higher academic achievement among Mexican American and Central American college students (Ong, Phinney, & Dennis, 2006).

To better understand Latinx individuals and families, the present study examines associations among ethnic affirmation/belonging, respect-for-family, disclosure, and
relationship quality in Latin American origin emerging-adult-aged college students living in the United States (see Figure 1 for conceptual model). Specifically, we expected ethnic affirmation/belonging to be directly associated with different types of disclosure and relationship quality with various family members (i.e., mothers, fathers, siblings). Respect-for-family was also expected to be directly associated with different types of disclosure and positive relationship quality and negative relationship quality. We also expected the interaction of ethnic affirmation/belonging and respect-for-family to differentially be related to disclosure and relationship quality with each family member. Finally, participant gender and sibling gender composition were expected to moderate these associations.

**Disclosure and Family Relationship Quality**

Disclosure is the voluntary telling or revealing of information about oneself to others (Jourard, 1971; Rotenberg, 1995) and has been shown to influence relationship quality within the family (Campione-Barr et al., 2015). Depending on the field of study and dyad of focus, disclosure can be a means through which to build intimacy (Reis & Shaver, 1988) or it can build and reinforce autonomy (Smetana, Metzger, Gettman, & Campione-Barr, 2006). Within the social psychology field, disclosure has been investigated as a method through which individuals can build intimacy within close relationships (Reis & Shaver, 1988). This is typically investigated in romantic relationships and in adulthood. Within developmental psychology, and when examining the parent-adolescent relationship, disclosure is seen as a method through which parents attain knowledge of their adolescent’s activities and experiences (Darling, Cumsille, Caldwell, & Dowdy, 2006; Finkenauer, Engels, & Meeus, 2002; Finkenauer, Frijns,
Engels, & Kerkhof, 2005; Smetana, Metzger, Gettman, & Campione-Barr, 2006) and as a means for adolescents to preserve autonomy and privacy (Petronio, 2002). This builds the adolescent’s autonomy by letting the adolescent control what information they disclose to their parents. However, during emerging adulthood, when individuals are filling roles that are more adult but still partially dependent on parents and their family, disclosure can serve both functions of building intimacy with, and autonomy from, the family.

Some research has indicated that more disclosure by children to parents leads to more positive relationship quality with these family members (Finkenauer, Engels, Branje, & Meeus; 2004). However, this research has not distinguished between gender differences and gender composition of the parent-child dyad and did not utilize a theoretically informed method of categorizing the information disclosed. The present study aimed to fill these gaps in the literature.

The association between disclosure and relationship quality is likely to vary depending on the gender of the emerging adult, and the gender composition of the dyad. This is especially possible because of the strong role that traditional gender norms and gender socialization plays in Latin America (Raffaelli & Ontai, 2004; Valenzuela, 1999). Women’s relationships are characterized by emotional intimacy and self-disclosure (Buhrmester & Furman, 1987). This is likely the case because of the enabling and facilitative style of interaction that is typical amongst female groups which allows these intimate interactions to begin and then continue (Maccoby, 1990). Men, however, are less likely to engage in intimate discussions and express their intimacy in different ways instead, such as through shared interests and activities (Rose, 2007). This may be because men are concerned more with not showing weakness to other males, causing a more
restrictive interaction style which would disrupt intimate interactions and end them instead (Maccoby, 1990). Viewed together, prior research indicates that these gender norms and interaction patterns would impact disclosure patterns.

Social domain theory provides the ability to differentiate types of disclosure across a variety of relationships (Smetana, 2013; Turiel, 2002). Social domain theory purports that people come to understand their social worlds by categorizing their interactions and information from those interactions into different domains of social knowledge. These domains are moral (relating to the fairness, justice, rights; e.g. stealing from a store), conventional (relating to expectations agreed upon by a society; e.g. saying please and thank you), personal (information about the private aspects of one’s life, outside of regulation by others; e.g. leisure time activities), and prudential (information regarding behaviors that pose a risk to an individual’s own self; e.g. smoking cigarettes; Smetana, 2013; Turiel, 2002). Multifaceted issues consist of interactions that can span across more than one of the previously mentioned domains because they are judged as being in different domains by different members of the relationship (e.g. keeping a bedroom clean; personal to the emerging adult, but conventional to parent; Smetana, 2011). With regards to disclosure, the topic or type of information that is being disclosed between relationship partners can be categorized into each of these domains. Social domain theory allows for the examination of disclosure across multiple relationships because it is based on the development of our social knowledge which is acquired through interactions with many relationship partners.

Previous research has demonstrated unique differences in disclosure and family subsystems. For example, gender has been seen to influence disclosure within the sibling
relationship (Campione-Barr et al., 2015). Disclosure of personal information by younger siblings and of multifaceted information by older siblings is related to more positive sibling relationship quality. When adolescent-aged boys disclose about multifaceted issues to their brothers, there is also more positive relationship quality within the sibling dyad. In adolescence and emerging adulthood, disclosure of prudential information to siblings is associated with more positive sibling relationship quality regardless of gender or birth order. These findings highlight the differences in disclosure patterns based on family subsystem, participant gender, and sibling gender composition. However, this work has focused primarily on European American samples, which are typically more individualistic than Latinx individuals who are more collectivistic (Triandis, 1996).

The present study adds to the existing literature by using a social domain approach to examine differences in disclosure within the various family dyads in Latinx families. Specifically, issues related to the personal domain, prudential domain, and multifaceted issues were primarily examined. This study also examined the role of gender of the individual, and gender composition. We expected that disclosure of personal and multifaceted information to siblings by women would relate to higher levels of positive relationship quality. This pattern should also be present for disclosure to siblings regardless of sibling gender composition. Prudential disclosure to siblings is also expected to relate to higher positive relationship quality but only for same gender sibling dyads. Given that disclosure of prudential information involves discussing topics that pose a risk to the individual’s health, it is also possible that disclosure of this information would relate to higher levels of negative relationship quality across all family
relationships as well. We do not have specific hypotheses for the mother and father models, but these will also be explored.

Ethnic Affirmation/Belonging, Respect-for-Family, and Disclosure

The social stratification caused by ethnic group membership in the United States leads families and children of color to develop values, attitudes, and behaviors that are unique to these groups and not a part of the dominant culture (Garcia Coll et al., 1996). This is referred to as the adaptive culture in Garcia Coll and colleagues’ (1996) integrative model of child development. This integrative model also suggests that family interactions reflect the adaptive culture because of their contextual surroundings. Thus, through this culturally-informed perspective, when examining relationship quality within Latinx families it is important to focus on culturally relevant experiences and processes such as ethnic affirmation/belonging (a specific aspect of ethnic identity) and respect-for-family (a specific aspect of family obligation).

Ethnic identity is one of many social identities (e.g. gender, sexual, religious) that individuals from ethnic groups develop through their life. An ethnic group refers to a group of people who hold the same belief about their descent and history, and who share cultural practices (e.g. music, literature, art, dress, language, and food; Branch, 1999; Levine, 1997). In the United States, where we are especially conscious of ethnicity and ethnic group membership, ethnic identity is especially salient and has a noticeable influence on other aspects of an individual’s life (Umaña-Taylor, Yazedijan, Bámaca-Goméz, 2004).

One of the ways that ethnic identity has been conceptualized is as being comprised of two dimensions: ethnic affirmation/belonging, and ethnic identity
achievement (Phinney, 1992; Roberts et al., 1999). Ethnic affirmation/belonging is the belief that one belongs to their ethnic or cultural background group. Ethnic identity achievement involves the exploration of one’s ethnic group.

The present study focused on the affirmation/belonging dimension of ethnic identity. If an individual has not explored their ethnic identity and does not identify with their ethnic group, then culturally specific variables will not be as meaningful to that individual’s experiences. Any associations we expected to see within ethnic minority individuals’ experiences and adjustment might only be the case for individuals with high ethnic affirmation/belonging. For example, and pertinent to the current study, in a sample of ethnically diverse adolescents, having stronger ethnic affirmation/belonging was associated with more respect for the family (Kiang & Fuligni, 2009). Having a sense of affirmation and belonging to one’s ethnic group and identity has a positive influence on culturally relevant variables.

Respect-for-family is a subset of beliefs related to family obligation (Fuligni, Tseng, & Lam, 1999). It is defined as the degree to which an individual holds the family in high esteem and respects their family and members of the family. A strong sense of obligation to the family and respect for family members stems from the traditional Latin American cultural value known as familism (Lugo Steidel & Contreras, 2003). This cultural value emphasizes the importance of the family and for individual members of the family to consider the family’s needs over their own individual needs. Familism informs an individual’s beliefs about the need to respect their family and fulfill expectations of obligation to the family. Thus, respect-for-family is an important culturally based belief and is relevant to other family processes in U.S. Latinx families.
Respect-for-family is a culturally relevant variable that focuses on overall beliefs about the family instead of focusing on dyadic processes within the family (Kiang & Fuligni, 2009). However, culturally relevant variables, like respect-for-family and family obligation, have been linked to dyadic family processes like disclosure. When examining a sample of Puerto Rican adolescents, Villalobos and Smetana (2012) found that teens who held stronger Latinx family values reported more disclosure of prudential information to their mothers and that there was a marginal relationship with prudential disclosure to fathers. However, these researchers used a composite score for Latinx family values that utilized the Mexican American Cultural Values Scale for Adolescents and Adults (Knight et al., 2010) and the respect-for-family subscale of the Family Obligation measure (Fuligni, Tseng, & Lam, 1999). So, the specific influence of respect-for-family is not understood. In another study examining the cultural values and disclosure in families, Yau and colleagues (2009) found that Mexican origin adolescents who reported higher levels of family obligation and interdependence (a composite scored derived from two highly correlated scales) also reported more disclosure to mothers about multifaceted and personal information, but this was not the case with disclosure to fathers. While relevant to the current study, these findings again do not focus on the specific respect-for-family aspect of family obligation and take other cultural factors (i.e. family interdependence) into account.

Respect-for-family might only be associated with other dyadic processes in Latinx families if ethnic affirmation/belonging is salient for the individual. Any associations that might arise with respect-for-family might only be present if the individual has a strong sense of belonging to the ethnic group in which respect-for-family is highly valued. The
sense of affirmation and belonging to the ethnic group that these cultural factors are relevant to was not accounted for in these previous studies.

The interaction between ethnic affirmation/belonging and respect-for-family, and their relationship with disclosure and relationship quality might vary depending on the gender of the emerging adult. This is especially possible due to the differences in gender socialization and gender role expectations between boys and girls in Latinx families (Raffaelli & Ontai, 2004; Valenzuela, 1999). Women frequently report having more expectations within the home (e.g. for child care, cleaning, etc.) and to stay close to the family more so than their brothers (Raffaelli & Ontai, 2004). This expectation may amplify Latina girls’ beliefs about their obligation to the family and respect for the family.

In the present study, we extended the previous literature by examining associations between ethnic affirmation/belonging, respect-for-family, personal, prudential, and multifaceted disclosure, and positive and negative relationship quality amongst Latinx emerging adults. We also examined differences in these associations based on gender and sibling gender composition (i.e. mixed-gender vs same-gender dyads). We expected that a higher sense of respect-for-family would be associated with more disclosure of personal, prudential, and multifaceted information to mothers by men and women. We also expected that this relationship would be stronger for individuals with a high sense of ethnic affirmation/belonging. Associations in these patterns for the relationship with fathers and siblings, and gender differences will also be explored.

**Ethnic Affirmation/Belonging, Respect-for-Family, and Family Relationship Quality**
Ethnic identity is a cultural factor that relates to family relationship quality. Ethnic identity development begins with a simple understanding of ethnic/racial groups in early childhood (Rogers et al., 2012). In childhood and adolescence, an understanding of one’s ethnic identity is dependent on ethnic socialization by parents and interdependent with parent-child relationship quality (Hughes et al., 2006). However, the transitional phase of emerging adulthood allows for the opportunity for the individual’s own characteristics to influence their relationships.

Cultural factors related to familism, family obligation, and respect-for-family are also influential on relationship quality within the family (Fuligni, Tseng, & Lam, 1999; Gamble & Yu, 2014; Killoren, Wheeler, Updegraff, Rodriguez de Jesus, McHale, 2015; Updegraff, McHale, Whiteman, Thayer, & Delgado, 2005). While respect-for-family describes an individual’s beliefs about respecting the family as an entire unit, relationship quality focuses more specifically on the quality between various family members on a dyadic level. So, while these are distinct and unique descriptors of family functioning, they are also related to each other.

While examining the relationship between respect-for-family and relationship quality, we investigated this association across multiple family subsystems – these being the relationship with mothers, with fathers, and the sibling relationship. Family systems theory posits that it is essential for multiple family subsystems to be considered simultaneously when examining associations within the family (Cox & Paley, 1997; Minuchin, 1985). Any one of these relationships does not occur in isolation from the other relationships in the family. Instead, these relationships, and the interactions therein, occur within the broader context and are impacted by the other subsystems within the
family. While the current study does not simultaneously examine the hypothesized associations in these relationships in the same model (due to the sample size, large number of variables, and concerns about lack of power), by investigating how these factors influence relationship quality with mothers, fathers, and siblings, we gain a more thorough understanding of the individual relationship in question.

Gender may also play a role in the association between respect-for-family and relationship quality with various family members. Latina daughters are socialized to stay within the home, and be oriented towards the household and family members, whereas Latino sons are permitted to focus on and be involved in extrafamilial connections and settings (Raffaeli & Ontai, 2004; Valenzuela, 1999). Given this, it is possible that these expectations would manifest themselves in their beliefs about their obligation to the family and in their relationship quality with their mothers, fathers, and siblings. The gender composition of the sibling dyad may also result in different patterns of association between these factors. So, gender is an important moderator to consider in these associations.

Respect-for-family has been found to be associated with positive relationship quality with mothers, fathers, and siblings. More respect-for-family values was associated with more cohesion and communication with mothers (Fuligni, Tseng, & Lam, 1999). More respect-for-family is also associated with better relationship quality and more cohesion with fathers (Fuligni, Tseng, & Lam, 1999). Cultural values like familism impact relationship quality within the sibling relationship in Latinx families as well (Gamble & Yu, 2014; Killoren, Wheeler, Updegraff, Rodriguez de Jesus, McHale, 2015; Updegraff, McHale, Whiteman, Thayer, & Delgado, 2005). When reported by mothers,
primarily of Mexican descent, higher levels of familism within the family is related to higher levels of warmth within the sibling relationship (Gamble & Yu, 2014). So overall, cultural values related to the family, like respect-for-family, has a positive influence on relationship quality across family subsystems.

For the sibling subsystem, however, there are also specific findings related to gender composition in how familism impacts relationship quality between siblings. Familism is especially related to higher levels of intimacy for sister-sister sibling dyads (Killoren et al., 2015; Updegraff et al., 2005), compared to other gender compositions. Similarly, when older brothers have a stronger sense of familism values, this is associated with more feelings of intimacy with their younger siblings (Updegraff et al., 2005).

Given this, we expected that higher levels of respect-for-family would have a positive association with positive relationship quality for the relationship with mothers and fathers. For siblings, we expected there would be a positive association for both men and women, but when examining sibling gender composition, this association would be stronger for same gender dyads. We also expected that this effect between respect-for-family and positive relationship quality would be stronger when individuals were high on ethnic affirmation/belonging. Associations between ethnic affirmation/belonging, respect-for-family and negative relationship quality were also explored.

**Present Study**

The present study took a comprehensive look at how ethnic affirmation/belonging, respect-for-family, disclosure, and relationship quality relate to each other for emerging adults of Latin American origin. Along with examining these associations, the present study examined how participant gender moderated these
associations across family relationships. For the sibling relationships, sibling gender composition (i.e. being from a mixed-gender dyad vs. same-gender dyad) was also taken into consideration as a possible moderator (see Table 1 for summary of hypotheses).

We expected that the domain of disclosure would differentially relate to relationship quality depending on the specific relationship being examined. Disclosure of personal information was hypothesized to relate to more positive relationship quality with mothers and fathers regardless of gender. For the sibling relationship, disclosure of personal information was hypothesized to relate to more positive relationship quality more strongly for women than for men given gender differences in disclosure, but this pattern of association was hypothesized to be the same for mixed gender and same gender sibling dyads. For disclosure of prudential information to mothers, fathers, and siblings, this association with positive relationship quality was more exploratory in nature. Disclosure of multifaceted information and the relationship with positive relationship quality were also considered exploratory for the relationship mothers and fathers. For the relationship with siblings, this association would likely be present in same gender sibling dyads. Disclosure of prudential information to all family members was hypothesized to be related to higher levels of negative relationship quality. However, the relationship between personal and multifaceted disclosure to family members and negative relationship quality were explored.

As for the relationship between ethnic affirmation/belonging, respect-for-family and disclosure, we expected that higher levels of respect-for-family would be related to more disclosure of personal, prudential, and multifaceted information to mothers by men and women. We also expected that this relationship would be stronger for individuals
with a higher sense of ethnic affirmation/belonging. Associations in these patterns for the relationship with fathers and siblings, and differences based on gender and sibling gender composition were also explored.

For the relationship between ethnic affirmation/belonging, respect-for-family, and relationship quality, we expected that higher levels of respect-for-family would be associated with higher levels of positive relationship quality with mothers and fathers. For siblings, we expected that there would be a positive association between respect-for-family and positive relationship quality for both men and women when they also report higher levels of ethnic affirmation/belonging. When examining sibling gender composition, this association was hypothesized to only be present for same gender dyads. Associations between ethnic affirmation/belonging, respect-for-family and negative relationship quality were also explored for each relationship.
CHAPTER 2

METHOD

Participants

Participants for this study were drawn from a sample of 1171 college students. The sample used or the current analyses included 206 students who self-identified as having origins in Latin America and were attending a 4-year university in the United States and indicated having at least one sibling. Most of the sample identified as women (64.1%; 35.4% men; 0.5% missing). The students ranged in age from 18-25 years and were a mean age of 21.03 years old ($SD = 1.93$). Among other demographic questions, students were asked to self-report their ethnic background and nationality. In this sample, included 49.0% participants reported Mexican origin, 28.2% were Puerto Rican origin, 14.1% originated from South American, 6.3% originated from Central America, 5.8% were Dominican origin, and 2.9% were Cuban origin. Most of the participants were native English speakers (65.5%; 34.5% non-native English speakers). Bivariate correlations between this and the variables of interest were not significant, so this was not used as a control variable.

Parents of these students had a wide range of education levels. Mothers had either completed some high school or graduated high school (41.4 %), had some college experience or a college degree (41.7%), or had gone to graduate/professional school (11.7%). Fathers had either completed some high school or graduated high school (47.6%), had some college experience or a college degree (37.4%), or had attended graduate/professional school (9.2%).
Each of the participants also reported on their relationship with their closest-in-age sibling. The siblings that participants reported on were an average of 4.58 years apart and ranged in age from 1 year apart to 20 years apart. Of the siblings that were reported on, 54.4% of the participants reported on a brother and 44.7% of the participants reported on a sister. There were more mixed-gender sibling dyads (53.9%) than same-gender sibling dyads (44.2%). There were also more older siblings (51.0%) that participated than there were younger siblings (48.5%). While the participants were asked to respond about their closest-in-age sibling, the participants ranged in the total number of siblings they had in their family. The number of siblings that participants had included 1 sibling (42.71%), 2 siblings (32.04%), 3 siblings (12.14%), 4 siblings (7.32%), 5 siblings (3.40%), 6 siblings (0.49%), and 7 siblings (0.97%).

Procedure

This sample was recruited from universities in Arizona, Connecticut, Missouri, and through Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (mTurk). MTurk is an online labor market where participants are screened to determine their eligibility to participate and then are compensated for their time and participation. This has been found to be reliable (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011) and useful for collecting quick and cost-effective data (Kim & Hodgins, 2017).

For participants recruited through universities, information was disseminated through courses in Human Development and Family Science (HDFS) departments. Students who were interested were sent an internet link to complete the surveys online through Qualtrics. All surveys were administered and completed in English, and all
HDFS students were eligible to participate. Students who participated through HDFS courses were entered into a raffle for the chance to win 1 out of 100 Amazon gift cards.

Participants recruited through mTurk were eligible to participate if they indicated being of Latin American background, and were an undergrad attending a 4-year university in the United States. An initial questionnaire was administered to identify participants and those who did not meet these requirements were not granted access to the survey. Upon completion of the survey, these participants were paid $5 for their time.

Given that these data were recruited from different universities and through different methods of recruitment, t-tests were conducted to ensure that source of data did not account for differences in variables of interest. The only differences that emerged were for variables that examined the relationship with mothers and fathers. Thus, data source was included as a control variable in these models.

Measures

Ethnic Affirmation/Belonging. The Affirmation and Belonging subscale of the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM; Phinney, 1992) was used to assess the individuals’ sense of belonging and orientation toward their ethnic group. This scale was developed and tested using diverse samples of adolescents and emerging adults over the course of 5 years and over several rounds of data collection. In previous studies, the researchers administered the measure multiple times to several different groups of ethnically diverse college students and conducted interviews with adolescents to gain a better understanding of various aspects of ethnic identity. Between each administration of the survey, item analysis and revisions occurred in order to ensure good reliability. This previous research informed the final version of the survey presented in Phinney (1992).
and this final version was administered to a group of high school students and a separate
group of college students with diverse ethnic backgrounds (e.g. including Asian
American, African American, Latin American, and European American). Principle axis
factor analysis was conducted using this data. The factor loadings indicated that the items
all loaded onto two separate factors for both the high school and college sample with
factor loadings around .50.

The affirmation/belonging subscale is a 5-item scale where individuals rate how
much they agree or disagree with the item on a 4-point Likert scale. Example items
include “I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to,” “I have a lot of pride
in my ethnic group,” and “I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group.”
Cronbach’s alpha for ethnic affirmation/belonging data collected from this sample was
.91.

Respect-for-family. This 7-item subscale of the Family Obligations measure
(Fuligni, Tseng, & Lam, 1999) assesses the individual’s belief about the importance of
respecting their family members and following their wishes. This measure was originally
developed by researchers using focus groups of Asian and Latin American adolescents in
research conducted before the paper where the final measure was tested. The adolescents
in this previous study were asked about their thoughts and beliefs on a variety of family
obligations. As a result of these focus groups, three separate family obligation subscales
were created and tested in the study: 1) current assistance to the family, 2) future support
to the family as adults, and 3) respect for the family. Confirmatory factor analyses of
each of these scales was conducted by Fuligni and colleagues (1999) and factor loadings
indicated that the items for each subscale loaded onto the specific type of family
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obligation and were adequate (i.e. all items for each scale had a factor loading above .50). Example items of the Respect-for-family scale include “How important is it to follow your parents’ advice about choosing friends?” and “How important is it to make sacrifices for your family?” Cronbach’s alpha for Respect-for-family in the current sample was .86.

**Disclosure.** Initially developed by Smetana and colleagues (2006), and revised by Campione-Barr and colleagues (2015) for use in parent-child and sibling relationships, the disclosure measure asked how frequently individuals voluntarily tell various others, without being asked, about issues that are either personal (11 items), prudential (6 items), or multifaceted (10 items). This measure was previously validated using a Latinx sample to determine if the frequency of disclosure measure had cultural equivalence (Villalobos & Smetana, 2012). Two separate confirmation two-factor principle components analyses (CFA) were conducted for data collected from adolescents in reference to disclosure with mothers and fathers. The CFAs indicated that the disclosure items loaded onto three distinct factors (personal, prudential, and multifaceted) as initially predicted for mothers and fathers.

In the current study, individuals were asked about frequency of disclosure in reference to their mother, father, and closest-in-age sibling separately. Example items include “Where I hang out or who I hang out with when I’m away from the family” (personal), “Whether I drink beer, wine, or other alcoholic drinks” (prudential), and “Whether I am going to get or have gotten a tattoo or piercing” (multifaceted). Cronbach’s alphas for disclosure to mothers, fathers, and siblings within this sample for
personal issues was .87, .90, .92 respectively; .79, .79, .85 for prudential issues respectively; and .78, .79, .82 for multifaceted issues respectively.

**Relationship Quality.** The short form of the Network of Relationships Inventory (NRI) Social Provisions Scale (Furman & Buhrmester, 1985) was used to assess positive and negative relationship quality across the various family relationships. This measure was not developed using an ethnic or diverse sample but has been used with various Latinx samples since its creation (Moilanen & Raffaelli, 2010; Updegraff, McHale, Whiteman, Thayer, & Delgado, 2005). Within these studies, the NRI has shown appropriate reliability across samples, subscales, and family relationship (Cronbach’s alphas ranging from .76 - .92).

Positive relationship quality was assessed using the 5-item support subscale of the short form of the NRI Social Provisions Scale. This was also asked in reference to their mother, father, and sibling separately. Students were asked to respond about each item on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (little or none) to 5 (the most). An example positive item includes “How much do you play around and have fun with this person?” In order to reduce overlap between variables, the item asking about disclosure to relationship partners was dropped from the positivity variable. Cronbach’s alphas were .86, .86, and .85 for positive relationship quality with mothers, fathers, and siblings, respectively within this sample.

Negative relationship quality was assessed using the 6-item negative interactions subscale of the short form of the NRI Social Provisions Scale. This was also asked in reference to their mother, father, and sibling separately. Students were asked to respond about each item on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (little or none) to 5 (the most).
An example negative item includes “How much do you and this person get upset with or mad at each other?” Cronbach’s alphas were .95, .94, and .94 for negative relationship quality with mothers, fathers, and siblings, respectively within this sample.
CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Analytical Plan

The hypothesized model of associations between Ethnic Affirmation/Belonging, Respect-for-Family, the three types of Disclosure, and Positive and Negative Relationship Quality was tested using structural equation modeling (SEM) in AMOS 25.0 with maximum likelihood estimation. Given that, the typical guidelines for determining power do not easily apply to analyses when utilizing SEM methods, the sample size for the current study was adequate based on criteria outlined by Wolf, Harrington, Clark, and Miller (2013) which considers the number of factors in the model. Three separate path models were created (see Figure 1 for conceptual model) to investigate these associations in the relationship with mothers, with fathers, and the sibling relationship. Based on correlations between demographic variables and variables of interest (see Table 2 for correlations and variable means for mothers and fathers; see Table 3 for correlations and variable means for siblings), the mother and father models included data source, participant birth order, and number of siblings as control variables. In the sibling model, participant age, sibling age, and number of siblings were included in the model as control variables.

Multigroup comparisons were conducted using the procedure outlined by Kenny (2011) to investigate whether these associations varied in all three models based on the emerging adult’s gender. In the sibling model, a multigroup comparison was also conducted to investigate differences in this model based on sibling gender composition (i.e. mixed-gender sibling dyads vs. same-gender sibling dyads).
For the models examining the relationship with mothers (see Table 4 for model comparison summary) and with fathers (see Table 5 for the model comparison summary), the best fitting model included constrained intercepts, non-significant regression weights, and significant regression weights that had the same pattern of effects between men and women. For the model examining the relationship with siblings and differences in the model based on participant gender (see Table 6 for model comparison summary), the best fitting model included constrained intercepts, means, non-significant regression weights, and significant regression weights that had the same pattern of effects between men and women. When examining differences in the sibling model based on sibling gender composition (see Table 7 for model comparison summary), the best fitting model also included constrained intercepts, means, non-significant regression weights, and significant regression weights that had the same pattern of effects between mixed-gender sibling dyads and same-gender siblings dyads.

**Descriptive Statistics**

Bivariate correlations were run between relevant demographic variables and the variables of interest to the current study (see Table 2 for correlations in mother and father models; see Table 3 for correlations in sibling model). The demographic variables that were included in the correlations (and examined as potential control variables) were Participant Age, Participant Gender (Men = 0; Women = 1), Data Source (Missouri = 1; Arizona = 2; Connecticut = 3; mTurk = 4), Birth Order (Younger Sibling = 0; Older Sibling = 1), Number of Siblings, Sibling Age, Sibling Gender (Men = 1; Women = 1), Nativity Status (Born Inside Continental U.S. = 0; Born Outside Continental U.S. = 1), Country of Origin (Mexico = 1; Puerto Rico = 2; Cuba = 3; Dominican Republic = 4;
Central America = 5; South America = 6), and Mother’s Education. These were correlated with Ethnic Affirmation/Belonging, Respect-for-Family, Personal Disclosure, Prudential Disclosure, Multifaceted Disclosure, Positive Relationship Quality, and Negative Relationship Quality separately for the relationship with mothers, fathers, and siblings.

Out of all the demographic variables that were examined, Nativity Status, Country of Origin, and Mother’s Education were the only variables that were not significantly correlated with any of the main variables of interest across the three family relationships. Thus, none of these were used as controls variables in the final models.

The bivariate correlations indicated that Ethnic Affirmation/Belonging and Respect-for-Family were significant and positively correlated with each other. They were also significant and positively correlated with Mother Personal Disclosure and Multifaceted Disclosure. For mothers and fathers, Ethnic Affirmation/Belonging had a significant positive correlation with Positive Relationship Quality and a significant negative correlation with Negative Relationship Quality. Respect-for-Family had significant positive correlations with Personal Disclosure, Prudential Disclosure, Multifaceted Disclosure, and Positive Relationship Quality, and significant negative correlations with Negative Relationship Quality.

Positive Relationship Quality was significant and positively correlated with Personal, Prudential, and Multifaceted Disclosure for all three family relationships. Negative Relationship Quality was not correlated to any type of disclosure in any of the family relationships.

**Associations for the Relationship with Mothers**
Fit statistics proposed by Hu and Bentler (1999) indicated that the model that examined the father relationship and differences based on participant gender fit the data well with constrained intercepts, non-significant paths, and similarly significant paths between groups (see Table 4 for model comparison and fit statistics). Results of the path analysis indicated that for Latino men, and not Latina women, a higher sense of Ethnic affirmation/belonging to their ethnic group, was associated with lower negative mother relationship quality (see Figure 2 for estimates). For Latina women, and not men, more respect-for-family was associated with less negative mother relationship quality. For both Latinx men and women, higher respect-for-family was also associated with more prudential and multifaceted disclosure to mothers. For men and women, more respect-for-family was associated with more positive mother relationship quality and more personal disclosure to mothers. Personal disclosure to mothers was also associated with more positive mother relationship quality. A test of indirect effects indicated that personal disclosure to mothers significantly contributed to the effect between respect-for-family and positive mother relationship quality, $IE = .20$, 95% CI (0.10, 0.32).

**Associations for the Relationship with Fathers**

Fit statistics proposed by Hu and Bentler (1999) indicated that the model that examined the father relationship and differences based on participant gender fit the data well with constrained intercepts, non-significant paths, and similarly significant paths between groups (see Table 5 for model comparison and fit statistics). Results of the path analysis indicated that for Latino men, more Ethnic affirmation/belonging to their ethnic group, was associated with less negative father relationship quality (see Figure 3 for estimates). For Latina women, more Ethnic affirmation/belonging was associated with
more positive father relationship quality. For both men and women, a higher sense of respect-for-family was associated with more prudential disclosure and multifaceted disclosure to fathers. More respect-for-family was also associated with more personal disclosure to fathers and more positive father relationship quality. Personal disclosure to fathers was also associated with more positive relationship quality with fathers. A test of indirect effects indicated that personal disclosure to fathers significantly contributed to the effect between respect-for-family and positive father relationship quality, $IE = .23$, 95% CI (0.12, 0.36).

Results also indicated a positive association between the Ethnic affirmation/belonging and Respect-for-family interaction and multifaceted disclosure to fathers for men but not women. Follow up simple slope analyses using the SPSS Process v3.3 macro (Hayes, 2018) indicated that for men with high Ethnic affirmation/belonging, the more Respect-for-family they reported, the more they disclosed about multifaceted issues to their fathers (see Figure 4 for slope estimates).

**Associations for the Relationship with Siblings**

Fit statistics proposed by Hu and Bentler (1999) indicated that the model that examined the sibling relationship and differences based on participant gender fit the data well with constrained intercepts, means, non-significant paths, and similarly significant paths between groups (see Table 6 for model comparison and fit statistics). Results of the path analysis indicated that for Latino men, a higher sense of Ethnic affirmation/belonging to their ethnic identity was associated with lower negative relationship quality with siblings (see Figure 5 for estimates). Respect-for-family was also positively associated with prudential disclosure and multifaceted disclosure to
siblings for both Latinx men and women. For Latinas, however, more prudential
disclosure to siblings was associated with less positive relationship quality, and for
Latinos more multifaceted disclosure was associated with more negative relationship
quality with siblings. Respect-for-family was also significant and positively associated
with personal disclosure to siblings for both Latino men and Latina women. However,
personal disclosure to siblings was associated with more negative relationship quality
with siblings and with more positive relationship quality for women and not men. There
was also a significant positive association between respect-for-family and positive sibling
relationship quality, and a follow-up test of indirect effects indicated that personal
disclosure significantly contributed to this effect for women, IE = .33, 95% CI (0.19,
0.51).

Fit statistics proposed by Hu and Bentler (1999) indicated that the model that
examined the sibling relationship and differences based on sibling gender composition
(i.e. mixed-gender dyads vs. same-gender dyads) fit the data well with constrained
intercepts, means, non-significant paths, and similarly significant paths between groups
(see Table 7 for model comparison and fit statistics). When examining the moderating
effect of sibling gender composition (i.e. mixed-gender vs. same-gender sibling dyads),
results for the path model indicated that for individuals from same-gender dyads a higher
sense of Ethnic affirmation/belonging to their ethnic identity was significant and
positively associated with more positive sibling relationship quality (see Figure 6 for
estimates). Higher respect-for-family was significantly associated with more prudential
and multifaceted disclosure to siblings for individuals from both mixed-gender and same-
gender dyads. Results also indicated that for siblings in both mixed-gender and same-
gender sibling dyads, higher levels of respect-for-family was associated with higher levels of personal disclosure to siblings. For both mixed-gender and same-gender sibling dyads, higher respect-for-family and more personal disclosure to siblings were associated with more positive relationship quality with siblings. A test of indirect effects indicated that personal disclosure to siblings significantly contributed to the effect between respect-for-family and positive sibling relationship quality regardless of sibling gender composition, IE = .27, 95% CI (0.14, 0.43).

The Ethnic affirmation/belonging and Respect-for-family interaction was also significantly associated with positive sibling relationship quality. However, the significant association was negative for individuals from mixed-gender dyads, and it was positive for individuals from same-gender dyads. Follow-up simple slope analyses conducted using the SPSS PROCESS v3.3 macro (Hayes, 2018) indicated that for individuals from mixed-gender sibling dyads, when they were high in Ethnic affirmation/belonging, and high in Respect-for-family, they had lower levels of positive sibling relationship quality (see Figure 7 for slope estimates). For individuals from same-gender sibling dyads, when they reported high Ethnic affirmation/belonging, and high Respect-for-family, they also reported higher levels of positive sibling relationship quality (see Figure 8 for slope estimates).
CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

As the population of Latinx youth and families continues to grow within the United States (Flores, 2017), the more necessary it is to understand the dynamics of these families. Especially given that more support and positive relationship quality present between family members is protective for and conducive to the success of Latinx college students (Ong, Phinney, & Dennis, 2006). It is not enough to learn about what factors increase positive relationship quality, but also what decreases negative relationship quality. It is also important to take an integrative approach to understand developmental competencies in this minoritized population and consider cultural factors in addition to family processes and individual factors (Garcia Coll et al., 1996). Thus, the current study examined how ethnic affirmation/belonging, respect-for-family, and disclosure to mothers, fathers, and siblings relate to positive and negative relationship quality within each of these relationships.

Disclosure and Relationship Quality in U.S. Latinx Families Dependent on Gender

In the present study, based on previous literature examining disclosure and relationship quality in the sibling relationship (Campione-Barr et al., 2015) and in the parent-child relationship (Finkenauer, Engels, Branje, & Meeus; 2004), we hypothesized that disclosure of personal information would be associated with more positive relationship quality with mothers and fathers, regardless of participant gender. And that for the sibling relationship, disclosure of personal information would relate to more positive relationship quality for women more than for men. We also expected that disclosure of multifaceted information would relate to more positive relationship quality
with siblings for individuals from same gender sibling dyads. Lastly, we hypothesized that disclosure of prudential information to all family members would be related to higher levels of negative relationship quality.

Our findings partially supported our hypotheses in that disclosure of personal information (but not multifaceted or prudential information) to mothers and fathers was related to more positive relationship quality for both men and women college students. This was in line with previous research on Dutch youth that found more disclosure to parents leads to more satisfaction with the relationship (Finkenauer, Engels, Branje, & Meeus, 2004). Given this, it seems that this link between personal disclosure and relationship quality may be a more universal aspect of this developmental period instead of a culturally specific experience. Our work extends this research by focusing on the type of information that is disclosed – information in the personal domain which is within the regulation of the individual themselves. We also extend this research by demonstrating that this association extends into emerging adulthood and is not isolated to adolescence, and that this pattern emerges in a non-European/European American sample. So, disclosing personal information is beneficial to the parent-child relationship even in emerging adulthood and among U.S. Latinx families.

Disclosing personal information to siblings was also associated with more positive sibling relationship quality regardless of sibling gender composition. However, when examining gender differences in the relationship between sibling personal disclosure and positive relationship quality, this pattern was only the case for women. More prudential disclosure to siblings was only related to less positive relationship quality for women with their siblings, which we did not expect. However, given that
prudential information involves issues that are risky to the individual’s health, maybe the disclosure of this decreases positive feelings towards the sibling. Given that women’s relationships are typically characterized by emotional intimacy and self-disclosure (Buhrmester & Furman, 1987) and are generally more facilitative in their interactions (Maccoby, 1990) disclosure of personal and prudential information with siblings may come more naturally to women than men, and more easily in the sibling relationship than in the relationship with parents because siblings are more like peers and there is more balance in power in this relationship.

Personal disclosure was also related to more negative relationship quality for men with their fathers, and for women with their siblings suggesting that disclosure of personal information is especially detrimental for the sibling relationship and the father-son relationship. Another finding that we did not expect was that for men who disclosed more about multifaceted issues to their siblings, this was related to more negative sibling relationship quality. Multifaceted issues are those that are more complex and can be viewed as either being in the personal domain or prudential domain depending on the person making the judgement within the relationship. This means that there is more room for potential conflict or disagreement when these issues are being discussed with siblings. Previous research has demonstrated the potential for conflict as a result of disclosure about multifaceted issues, which may explain this finding (Smetana, 1989). Previous research has also primarily focused on the relationship between disclosure and positive relationship quality, and not the specific relationship of disclosure with negative relationship quality. The assumption that a presence of positive relationship quality also indicates a lack of negative relationship quality is not an accurate reflection of
relationships given that these qualities do not operate in isolation of each other. This is evident given work done by Killoren and colleagues (2017) that found distinct profiles of sibling relationship quality in Mexican origin families where most the relationships were simultaneously high in positive and negative relationship quality. So, examining associations between family processes and both positive and negative relationship qualities is essential and a contribution of this study.

The simultaneous influence of personal disclosure on both positive and negative relationship qualities within some of the family relationships might also have to do with gender norms in Latin America. While personal disclosure was related to more positive relationship quality within various family relationships, it was also related to more negative relationship quality within the father-son relationship and for women with their siblings. In the case of the father-son relationship, this association may be due to the machismo prevalent in Latin America and Latinx culture. Machismo is a commonly held attitude that men should dominate social relationships (DeSouza, Baldwin, Koller, & Narvaez, 2004). This may interact with the relationship quality between fathers and sons. Perhaps the machismo attitudes exacerbate any negativity that might arise from disclosing personal information and result in more negative relationship quality between Latinx fathers and sons.

In terms of the sibling relationship, perhaps the quintessential “love-hate” dynamic contributes to both the positive and negative relationship quality being associated with personal disclosure. There is a constant struggle for power and authority between siblings, and while personal disclosure can bring siblings closer together, it may also provide an opportunity for siblings to enforce their power by potentially using the
personal information against their sibling. While disclosure can relate to more positive relationship quality between family members, there are certain norms and dynamics that also link disclosure to more negative relationship quality as well.

**The Role of Latinx Cultural Factors in Disclosure and Family Relationship Qualities**

In the present study, the larger cultural factors of interest were ethnic identity and family obligation. We focused on the ethnic affirmation/belonging dimension of ethnic identity because this reflects the individual’s sense of belonging to their ethnic identity (i.e. to the Latinx identity in this study) and the respect-for-family aspect of family obligation because this reflects beliefs about the family instead of behaviors towards the family. These two factors were independently and directly related to relationship quality in their own ways. These factors are interacted with each other and related to specific family dynamics depending on gender.

Based on previous work by Villalobos and Smetana (2012), and Yau, Tasopolous-Chan, and Smetana (2009), we hypothesized that higher levels of respect-for-family would be related to more disclosure of personal, prudential, and multifaceted information to mothers, but not to fathers, by men and women. We also expected that this relationship would be stronger for individuals with a higher sense of ethnic affirmation/belonging. Our findings partially supported our hypotheses because more respect-for-family was related to more personal, prudential, and multifaceted disclosure to mothers, fathers, and siblings by men and women, and for individuals from both mixed gender and same gender sibling dyads. This may highlight the impact that having a sense of respect-for-family has on the individual and that this value really does create a sense of obligation to
the family, even when that obligation involves disclosing all kinds of information, including issues that involve risky behavior. This is can be both positive and negative for the emerging adult. In one way this is positive because it means that communication is still happening with their parents during this major life transition, so while they are building autonomy, they are still talking to parents about what is happening in their lives and maintaining that connection and intimacy. However, this can also be negative if the obligation to the family and discussing these topics has a negative influence on the emerging adult’s internalizing symptoms.

In terms of the relationship between respect-for-family and relationship quality, based on findings from research by Fuligni and colleagues (1999), and Killoren and colleagues (2015), and Updegraff and colleagues (2005), we hypothesized that higher levels of respect-for-family would be associated with higher levels of positive relationship quality with mothers and fathers when they also report higher levels of ethnic affirmation/belonging. For siblings, we expected that there would be a positive association between respect-for-family and positive relationship quality for both men and women when they also report higher levels of ethnic affirmation/belonging. When examining sibling gender composition, the association between respect-for-family and positive relationship quality was hypothesized to only be present for same gender dyads. Our findings partially supported these hypotheses in that more respect-for-family was related to more positive relationship quality across all relationships suggesting that respect-for-family has beneficial outcomes for all relationships in the family and not only with parents. Respect-for-family was also related to negative relationship quality with mothers for women which was not expected. Due to the same gender composition of the
dyad and perhaps the strict adherence to traditional gender norms by moms in Latinx families that would make having a greater sense of respect-for-family especially beneficial to mother-daughter relationships and not only increase positive relationship quality but also decrease negative relationship quality.

In partial support of our hypotheses, a higher sense of ethnic affirmation/belonging to the Latinx ethnic group was related to more positive relationship quality for women with their fathers and for individuals from same gender sibling dyads with their siblings. For the same gender siblings, the elevated positive feelings toward their ethnic group may work as mechanism that bonds them with their same gender siblings. For women, having a strong sense of ethnic affirmation/belonging might help them understand their fathers more and help to facilitate a positive relationship between them. Another unexpected finding was that more ethnic affirmation/belonging was also related to less negative relationship quality for men with their mothers, fathers, and siblings. The fact that this pattern was seen consistently across the relationships may highlight the importance of ethnic affirmation/belonging for men and their relationships and its protective nature in family relationships.

For specific outcomes, especially when gender was considered, ethnic affirmation and respect-for-family interacted. When men had a higher sense of ethnic affirmation/belonging and a higher sense of respect-for-family, they also disclosed more to their fathers about multifaceted issues which was not expected. As mentioned before, multifaceted issues are the more complex issues that may be perceived as personal or prudential depending on the individuals in the relationship. Thus, disclosing these issues may allow the opportunity for more conflict – as has been seen in previous research – but
even given this possibility, perhaps the strong sense of connection with fathers that men feel through their strong sense of ethnic affirmation/belonging, makes them feel obligated to and comfortable with disclosing this information.

Also, in partial support of our hypotheses, higher levels of ethnic affirmation/belonging and respect-for-family had different relationships with positive sibling relationship quality depending on the gender composition of the sibling dyad. For individuals from mixed-gender sibling dyads, high ethnic affirmation/belonging and high respect-for-family was related to lower levels of positive relationship quality with the opposite gender sibling. However, contrary to this finding, individuals from same-gender sibling dyads who had high ethnic affirmation/belonging and high respect-for-family also reported higher levels of positive sibling relationship quality, instead of lower levels as was the case with mixed gender dyads. Perhaps the closer adherence to traditional values and beliefs that result from holding higher cultural values causes the opposite gender siblings to clash. Whereas these values might bring the same gender siblings closer together. It was surprising that the interaction of ethnic affirmation/belonging and respect-for-family only related to relationship quality with siblings and not with mothers and fathers, and only when considering the gender composition of the sibling dyad and not the participant’s own gender. Maybe it is expected that parents hold the respect-for-family values and norms that result from this (e.g. adherence to traditional gender norms) and so these factors do not play as much of a role in relationship quality with parents. However, if siblings support these norms and adhere to them, then this has more of an influence on positive relationship quality because of more balance of power that should be present between siblings.
The Important Role of Gender and Ethnic Identity in U.S. Latinx Families

Due to the differences in gender socialization and differences in gender role expectations between men and women in Latinx families (Raffaelli & Ontai, 2004; Valenzuela, 1999), we hypothesized that there would be differences in these associations based on participant gender and sibling gender composition of the dyad. Latina women often report having more expectations placed on them to stay within and help around the home (e.g. for child care, cleaning, etc.; Raffaelli & Ontai, 2004), while Latino men are not given the same restrictions. In the present study, while gender did not moderate associations between respect-for-family and disclosure, gender did have an influence on positive and negative relationship quality with mothers, fathers, and siblings directly. More specifically, women with more respect-for-family had lower negative relationship quality with mothers, and when they were higher on ethnic affirmation/belonging they had more positive relationship quality with fathers. Individuals from same-sex sibling dyads and with higher ethnic affirmation/belonging also had more positive sibling relationship quality. It is possible that differential treatment by parents based on gender may account for these differences in resulting relationship quality (McHale et al., 2005). Girls from Mexican-origin families are treated differently by parents and receive fewer privileges like going to friends’ houses or parties than their younger brothers and fewer privileges than older siblings in older brother-younger sister, brother-brother, and sister-sister dyads. This differential treatment may be reflected in the relationship quality with parents and siblings. These gender differences may also be more salient in mixed-gender sibling dyads given that the different gender norms and expectations are being reinforced
within the same household and more easily comparable between mixed gender sibling dyads.

In addition to gender dynamics, ethnic identity played an important role in the primary findings of this study. In general, we expected that respect-for-family would have an influence on disclosure and relationship quality if the emerging adult also had a strong commitment and sense of belonging to their ethnic group. However, in this sample, ethnic affirmation/belonging was primarily related to positive and negative relationship quality across all family relationships. A stronger sense of ethnic affirmation/belonging only interacted with respect-for-family was and associated with positive sibling relationship quality based on sibling gender composition (mixed gender vs. same gender dyads). The only instance where higher ethnic affirmation/belonging resulted in lower levels of positive relationship quality was for individuals from mixed gender sibling dyads with high respect-for-family. Perhaps being raised in a household with an opposite gender sibling makes the differential treatment based on gender more salient and more detrimental to the relationship. Given that ethnic affirmation/belonging was overall related to better relationship quality across all family relationships, but not for individuals from mixed gender sibling dyads, it is important to consider the ways that ethnic identity can be reinforced and fostered in Latinx youth, while also taking gender differences and traditions into account and not perpetuating oppressive gender norms.

These findings also call into question the importance of gender norms and traditional gendered behaviors to the overall Latinx culture and community. Parents’ traditional views and expectations surrounding gender may be in direct conflict with the more progressive views on gender in today’s youth and emerging adults. *Latinx* is a term
used by younger generations to highlight the diversity in gender identity outside the gender binary (Santos, 2017). However, it’s possible that gender norms are so intertwined with Latinx culture, that gender might be more salient and influential to associations with culturally specific values and factors.

**Limitations and Future Directions**

While the current study provided new insights into the various factors related to relationship quality in U.S. Latinx families, it also has some limitations. This study examined these associations using a cross-sectional design. Given this, the true direction of effects could not be determined. Many of these factors act in a bidirectional manner (e.g. relationship quality influences disclosure, disclosure influences relationship quality, and back and forth over time) and the cross-sectional design does not allow for an examination of how these factors influence each other over time. Future research should examine these associations over multiple time points and consider previous levels of relationship quality and disclosure. Using a longitudinal design will also allow us to examine how these factors change or stay the same over time. Ethnic affirmation/belonging is likely to change over time and may differentially influence some of the associations that were examined.

In addition to the cross-sectional design, the single-reporter design is a limitation of this study. The present study asked about the relationship quality of three separate family relationships, but only included reports by one family member – the participating college student. Additional reports from family members will provide a more thorough look at family dynamics and relationship quality. In addition to using data reported by multiple family members, additional methods should be used like interviews, behavioral
tasks, and observational coding in order to gain a better understanding of family processes.

The current study attempted to utilize a family systems framework to examine how these associations work in multiple family relationships to understand the U.S. Latinx family system better. However, we could not fully implement this framework and examined these relationships in separate models given the number of participants and variables that were included. Future work should include multiple family members in one model and consider the relationship quality and disclosure patterns with other family members in order to get a more accurate understanding of how these relationships influence each other and how these multiple influences affect the individual relationship.

This study examined cultural factors and family dynamics in U.S. Latinx families which extended previous research on these topics, however it also used a pan-ethnic approach by grouping individuals from various Latin American countries into one group. Ideally, we would have examined these associations in specific groups based on country of origin, but the samples for each country were too small (except for Mexico which comprised almost half of the sample). A lot of research on the Latinx community has primarily focused on Mexican origin or Puerto Rican samples given that these are two of the larger groups of Latin Americans in the continental United States. But there are many more subgroups within the Latinx community with different histories and traditions that might influence the associations we have examined. Thus, future research can take a more focused look at some of these subgroups to examine specific patterns of associations. Especially in today’s economic and political climate when we have a large influx of immigration from Central America and negative rhetoric surrounding this group
(from within the United States as well as Mexico), it would be beneficial to examine the experiences of these youth and families.

Examining associations within the sibling relationship adds to the growing literature on the interactions and influences within the sibling relationship, however the present study included a wide age range (from 1 year to 20 years apart) for the sibling that was reported on. Sibling relationships can be very different when the siblings are further apart in age. So future research should examine these associations in sibling relationships that are closer in age or within 4-5 years apart. On the other hand, future research can focus on examining these associations in sibling relationships that have a wide age range and see how these compare to those that are closer in age.

A final, but important, limitation to acknowledge is the binary view of gender that is utilized in the rationale and analytic strategies for the present study. Given the data that was collected, we were only able to categorize gender as a binary construct (i.e. as either a man or a woman). However, gender identity is more complex than this type of categorization. Gender identity is a social construction based on norms and beliefs imposed on children by society based on their biological sex. Future work should use constructs that reflect more gender identities, gender fluidity, or a continuum that examines masculinity, femininity, and androgyny. Future work can also examine how gender nonconformity relates to cultural factors and family dynamics in U.S. Latinx families.

While this study has its limitations, it still adds new information to the existing literature on U.S. Latinx families. This study considered cultural factors, individual factors, family processes and their relation to dyadic factors to understand the U.S. Latinx
experience better. College advisers and administrators can use this information to better understand their Latinx students whose academic success has been found to be dependent on family support (Ong, Phinney, & Dennis, 2006). If college advisers understand that cultural values and family relationships can influence the individual’s success, they will be better equipped to help struggling students. College administrators can use this information to ensure that parents and siblings are a part of the college community and included in college programming. Through investigating these factors in this population, we can better understand what is happening within the family and how to support these individuals.

While some findings from the current study replicated findings from previous studies that examined predominantly European American families, the cultural values and factors that emerged as significant indicate that these culturally specific constructs are also at play in Latinx families. This was especially the case for the sibling relationship and the sibling gender composition of the dyad. A lot of gender differences also emerged, and this highlights the importance of considering gender when examining Latinx youth and families. Taking these factors into account will help bring a better understanding of these families in the United States.
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Figure 1. Conceptual model of hypothesized associations. Controls and error terms were also included in each model where appropriate. E-AB = Ethnic affirmation/belonging. RFF = Respect-for-family.
Figure 2. Model of significant paths for relationship with mothers. Participant gender used as a moderator. See Table 4 for fit statistics. E-AB = Ethnic affirmation/belonging. RFF = Respect-for-family. When paths differed between genders, estimates for men are presented before the slash and estimates for women are presented after the slash. *p≤.05. **p≤.01. ***p≤.001.
Figure 3. Model of significant paths for relationship with fathers. Participant gender used as a moderator. See Table 5 for fit statistics. E-AB = Ethnic affirmation/belonging. RFF = Respect-for-family. When paths differed between genders, estimates for men are presented before the slash and estimates for women are presented after the slash. *p ≤ .05, **p ≤ .01, ***p ≤ .001.
Figure 4. Simple slopes analysis of interaction between Ethnic affirmation/belonging and Respect-for-family and association with multifaceted disclosure to fathers by men. E-AB = Ethnic affirmation/belonging. RFF = Respect-for-family. All variables were mean centered.
Figure 5. Model of significant paths for relationship with siblings. Participant gender used as a moderator. See Table 6 for fit statistics. E-AB = Ethnic affiliation/belonging. RFF = Respect-for-family. When paths differed between genders, estimates for men are presented before the slash and estimates for women are presented after the slash. *p ≤ .05. **p ≤ .01. ***p ≤ .001.
Figure 6. Model of significant paths for relationship with mothers. Participant sibling gender composition (i.e., mixed-gender dyads vs. same-gender dyads) used as a moderator. See Table 7 for fit statistics. E-AB = Ethnic affirmation/belonging. RFF = Respect-for-family. When paths differed between sibling gender compositions, estimates for mixed-gender dyads are presented before the slash and estimates for same-gender dyads are presented after the slash. \( *p \leq 0.05 \), \( **p \leq 0.01 \), \( ***p \leq 0.001 \).
Figure 7. Simple slopes analysis of interaction between Ethnic affiliation/belonging and Respect-for-family and association with positive sibling relationship by individuals from mixed-gender sibling dyads. E-AB = Ethnic affiliation/belonging. RFF = Respect-for-family. Ethnic affiliation/belonging and Respect-for-family were mean centered.
Figure 8. Simple slopes analysis of interaction between Ethnic affirmation/belonging and Respect-for-family and association with positive sibling relationship by individuals from same-gender sibling dyads. E-AB = Ethnic affirmation/belonging. RFF = Respect-for-family. Ethnic affirmation/belonging and Respect-for-family were mean centered.
Table 1. Predicted Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mothers</strong></td>
<td>Personal Disclosure positively associated with Positive Relationship Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respect-for-Family positively associated with Personal, Prudential, and Multifaceted Disclosure. Stronger effect for those with higher Ethnic Affirmation/Belonging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fathers</strong></td>
<td>Personal Disclosure positively associated with Positive Relationship Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respect-for-Family positively associated with Positive Relationship Quality with for individuals who are high in Ethnic Affirmation/Belonging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Siblings</strong></td>
<td>Personal Disclosure positively associated with Positive Relationship Quality for women, mixed gender dyads, and same gender dyads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respect-for-Family positively associated with Positive Relationship Quality with for individuals from same-gender sibling dyads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Correlations and descriptive statistics of study variables and potential control variables for mothers and fathers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Participant</td>
<td>2.133</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>2.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Participant (1.99)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Data Source</td>
<td>- .47***</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Birth Order</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Number of Siblings</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sibling Age</td>
<td>2.120</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.74***</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>2.120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sibling Age (1.71)</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.74***</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>2.120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Father's Education</td>
<td>- .10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Country of Origin</td>
<td>- .15**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mother's Education</td>
<td>- .10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Ethic</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td>.12***</td>
<td>.12***</td>
<td>.16***</td>
<td>.10***</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Affirmation/Bringing</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td>.12***</td>
<td>.12***</td>
<td>.16***</td>
<td>.10***</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Risperid-</td>
<td>- .15**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td>.12***</td>
<td>.12***</td>
<td>.16***</td>
<td>.10***</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Disclosure</td>
<td>- .10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Disclosure (1.00)</td>
<td>- .10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Positive RQ</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Negative RQ</td>
<td>- .10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: RQ = Relationship Quality. Correlations for mothers are below the diagonal. Correlations for fathers are above the diagonal.

*p ≤ .05, **p ≤ .01, ***p ≤ .001.
Table 3. Correlations and descriptive statistics of study variables and potential control variables for sibling model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Participant Age</td>
<td>21.03 (1.51)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Participant Gender</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Data Source</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.88***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Birth Order</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Number of Siblings</td>
<td>2.01 (1.22)</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sibling Age</td>
<td>21.20 (5.71)</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.74***</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sibling Gender</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Nativity Status</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Country of Origin</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mother's</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3.18 (.38)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative/Elaborated</td>
<td>3.81 (1.77)</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Respect for Family</td>
<td>2.59 (.91)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td>2.43 (1.04)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.80***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td>2.47 (.84)</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>.83***</td>
<td>.79***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td>3.37 (1.06)</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td>.63***</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Negative RQ</td>
<td>2.16 (.96)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: RQ = Relationship Quality. *p ≤ .05. **p ≤ .01. ***p ≤ .001.
### Table 4. Model comparison chart of mother model with participant gender as the moderator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Model comparison</th>
<th>$\chi^2$ (df; p)</th>
<th>$A\chi^2$ (df; p)</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>AIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1: Unconstrained</td>
<td>M1 &gt; M2</td>
<td>48.22 (42; .24)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>272.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: Fully constrained</td>
<td>M1 &lt; M3</td>
<td>157.13 (96; .000)</td>
<td>108.91 (54; .000)</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>273.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3: Intercepts only</td>
<td>M3 &gt; M4</td>
<td>54.77 (47; .20)</td>
<td>6.55 (5; .26)</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>268.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4: Intercepts &amp; means</td>
<td>M5 &gt; M5</td>
<td>80.90 (53; .01)</td>
<td>26.12 (6; .000)</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>282.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5: Intercepts &amp; variances</td>
<td>M6 &gt; M6</td>
<td>86.61 (56; .01)</td>
<td>31.84 (9; .000)</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>282.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6: Intercepts &amp; non-significant paths</td>
<td>M7 &lt; M7</td>
<td>71.50 (64; .24)</td>
<td>16.73 (17; .47)</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>251.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M7: Intercepts, non-significant, &amp;</td>
<td>M8 &gt; M8</td>
<td>78.64 (72; .28)</td>
<td>7.14 (8; .52)</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>242.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>similarly significant paths</td>
<td>M9 &gt; M9</td>
<td>104.89 (78; .02)</td>
<td>30.69 (9; .000)</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>255.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes.** Model comparison using participant gender as the moderator for the relationship with mothers. Model 7 is the final model.
Table 5. Model comparison chart of father model with participant gender as the moderator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Model comparison</th>
<th>$\chi^2$ (df; $p$)</th>
<th>$\Delta\chi^2$ (df; $p$)</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>AIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1: Unconstrained</td>
<td></td>
<td>45.82 (42; .32)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>269.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: Fully constrained</td>
<td>M1 &gt; M2</td>
<td>160.36 (96; .000)</td>
<td>114.54 (54; .000)</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>276.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3: Intercepts only</td>
<td>M1 &lt; M3</td>
<td>46.86 (47; .48)</td>
<td>1.03 (5; .960)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>260.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4: Intercepts &amp; means</td>
<td>M3 &gt; M4</td>
<td>72.63 (53; .04)</td>
<td>25.77 (6; .000)</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>274.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5: Intercepts &amp; variances</td>
<td>M3 &gt; M5</td>
<td>76.89 (56; .03)</td>
<td>30.03 (9; .000)</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>272.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6: Intercepts &amp; non-significant paths</td>
<td>M3 &lt; M6</td>
<td>60.42 (64; .60)</td>
<td>13.56 (17; .70)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>240.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M7: Intercepts, non-significant, &amp; similarly significant paths</td>
<td>M6 &lt; M7</td>
<td>64.35 (69; .64)</td>
<td>3.94 (5; .56)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>234.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M8: Intercepts, non-significant, similarly significant paths, &amp; means</td>
<td>M7 &gt; M8</td>
<td>90.20 (75; .11)</td>
<td>29.79 (11; .002)</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>248.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M9: Intercepts, non-significant, similarly significant paths, &amp; variances</td>
<td>M7 &gt; M9</td>
<td>93.47 (78; .11)</td>
<td>33.05 (14; .003)</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>245.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes: Model comparison using participant gender as the moderator for the relationship with fathers. Model 7 is the final model.*
Table 6. Model comparison chart of sibling model with participant gender as the moderator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Model comparison</th>
<th>$\chi^2$ (df; p)</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$ (df; p)</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>AIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1: Unconstrained</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>58.63</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>282.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: Fully constrained</td>
<td>M1 &gt; M2</td>
<td>151.39</td>
<td>92.97 (33; .001)</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>265.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3: Intercepts only</td>
<td>M1 &lt; M3</td>
<td>61.55</td>
<td>2.93 (5; .71)</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>275.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4: Intercepts &amp; means</td>
<td>M3 &lt; M4</td>
<td>70.27</td>
<td>8.72 (6; .19)</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>272.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5: Intercepts, means &amp; variances</td>
<td>M4 &gt; M5</td>
<td>107.70</td>
<td>37.43 (10; .000)</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>289.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6: Intercepts, means &amp; non-significant</td>
<td>M4 &lt; M6</td>
<td>77.68</td>
<td>7.41 (14; .92)</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>251.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M7: Intercepts, means, non-significant,</td>
<td>M6 &lt; M7</td>
<td>78.95</td>
<td>1.27 (4; .87)</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>244.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; similarly significant paths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M8: Intercepts, means, non-significant,</td>
<td>M7 &gt; M8</td>
<td>115.90</td>
<td>38.22 (14; .000)</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>261.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>similarly significant paths, &amp; variances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Model comparison using participant gender as the moderator for the sibling relationship. Model 7 is the final model.
Table 7. Model comparison chart of sibling model with sibling gender composition as the moderator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Model comparison</th>
<th>$\chi^2$(df; p)</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$(df; p)</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>AIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1: Unconstrained</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>57.32 (42; .06)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>281.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: Fully constrained</td>
<td>M1 &gt; M2</td>
<td>137.27 (97; .004)</td>
<td>79.96 (55; .02)</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>251.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3: Intercepts only</td>
<td>M1 &gt; M3</td>
<td>68.40 (47; .02)</td>
<td>11.08 (5; .05)</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>282.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4: Intercepts &amp; means</td>
<td>M1 &lt; M4</td>
<td>73.45 (33; .03)</td>
<td>16.14 (11; .14)</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>275.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5: Intercepts, means &amp; variances</td>
<td>M4 &gt; M5</td>
<td>97.04 (63; .004)</td>
<td>23.59 (10; .01)</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>279.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6: Intercepts, means &amp; non-significant</td>
<td>M4 &lt; M6</td>
<td>90.78 (72; .07)</td>
<td>17.33 (19; .57)</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>254.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M7: Intercepts, means, non-significant, &amp;</td>
<td>M6 &lt; M7</td>
<td>91.96 (78; .13)</td>
<td>1.18 (6; .98)</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>243.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>similarly significant paths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M8: Intercepts, means, non-significant,</td>
<td>M7 &gt; M8</td>
<td>116.02 (88; .02)</td>
<td>24.06 (10; .01)</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>248.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>similarly significant paths, &amp; variances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Model comparison using sibling gender composition (i.e. mixed-gender dyads vs. same-gender dyads) as the moderator for the sibling relationship. Model 7 is the final model.
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