

# Family Conflict Observations and Outcomes Among Adopted School-Age Children With Lesbian, Gay, and Heterosexual Parents

Rachel H. Farr, Samuel T. Bruun, and Kyle A. Simon  
University of Kentucky

Children's externalizing problems are associated with family conflict among children and their biological parents, yet these linkages have remained unexamined among adoptive or lesbian and gay parent families. Investigating family processes facilitative of adjustment among adoptees, who face unique developmental challenges, is warranted. This multimethod study of 96 (26 lesbian, 29 gay, 41 heterosexual parent) adoptive families examined observations of adoptive family conflict and associations with child adjustment and feelings about adoption (children's  $M_{\text{age}} = 8$  years). The sample was recruited from 5 private, domestic infant adoption agencies across the United States. Parents and children reported about children's externalizing problems and feelings about adoption, respectively. Observations of family conflict interaction were rated from videotaped family discussions. Family interactions were associated with children's behavioral and adoption-specific adjustment, yet analysis of variance and hierarchical linear modeling analyses revealed no differences by parental sexual orientation in family dynamics (i.e., negativity/conflict, positive affect, cohesiveness) or child outcomes. Parents generally reported children to have few externalizing behaviors. Children reported positive feelings, moderate preoccupation, and low negativity about their adoption. These findings extend the family systems literature about conflict and child development among diverse families with sexual minority parents and adopted children. Practitioners who work with adoptive and sexual minority parent families can encourage positive and cohesive family interactions in supporting children's adjustment.

**Keywords:** adoption, child externalizing behaviors, family interactions, lesbian and gay parenting, parent–child conflict


Growing numbers of families in the United States include lesbian and gay (LG) parents and adopted children (Gates, 2013; S. K. Goldberg & Conron, 2018). Research about whether and how LG parents influence children's development has consistently shown that children born to, and adopted by, sexual minority and heterosexual parents are similarly well adjusted (Biblarz & Stacey,

2010; Farr, 2017; Fedewa, Black, & Ahn, 2015). Fewer studies of LG or adoptive parent households, however, have targeted overall family functioning and possible associations with children's adjustment (e.g., Farr, 2017). This is despite three disparate bodies of research demonstrating that (a) LG parents with young children engage in different coparenting practices than their heterosexual counterparts (e.g., Farr & Patterson, 2013), (b) adopted children may be more at risk than nonadopted children for externalizing problems (Grotevant, McRoy, Wrobel, & Ayers-Lopez, 2013; Grotevant, Rueter, Von Korff, & Gonzalez, 2011), and (c) family conflict is linked with child maladjustment, at least among heterosexual parents and biologically related children (Davies, Martin, & Cummings, 2018; El-Sheikh, Cummings, & Reiter, 1996). Thus, our twofold objective was to examine whether (a) positivity, negativity, and cohesiveness during family interaction would be related to school-age children's behavioral and adoption-specific adjustment, and (b) family conflict observations, child outcomes, or their associations differed among LG and heterosexual adoptive parent families. We next provide an overview, grounded in family systems theory, of relevant research about family conflict and child outcomes, particularly those focused on observational methods, sexual minority parent families, and adopted children.

## Associations Between Family Conflict and Child Outcomes

Family systems theory states that overall family functioning is influential to its individual members; individuals cannot be under-

This article was published Online First July 25, 2019.

 Rachel H. Farr, Samuel T. Bruun, and Kyle A. Simon, Department of Psychology, University of Kentucky.

This research was supported by funding from the American Psychological Foundation's Wayne F. Placek Grant awarded to Rachel H. Farr (Wave 2) and the Williams Institute at the University of California, Los Angeles to Charlotte J. Patterson (Wave 1). Rachel H. Farr was also supported (Wave 2) by funds from the Rudd Family Foundation Chair in Psychology at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. We thank the members of our research team who have contributed to the design and execution of the overall project, particularly our coding team, Jessica Cherry, Stefanie Jones, Alex Nelson, and Madison Yee. We are grateful to all the adoptive families who generously shared their experiences with us and have made this research possible. An earlier version of this article was presented at the American Psychological Association Convention in Washington, DC in August 2017.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Rachel H. Farr, Department of Psychology, University of Kentucky, 171 Funkhouser Drive, 012-B Kastle Hall, Lexington, KY 40506-0044. E-mail: [rachel.farr@uky.edu](mailto:rachel.farr@uky.edu)

stood apart from the family context (Cox & Paley, 1997; Minuchin, 1988). Thus, promoting family harmony has benefits for individual and whole-family outcomes (Van Doorn, Branje, & Meeus, 2008). Research among heterosexual parent families suggests that low family conflict is linked with positive child adjustment in childhood and adolescence (e.g., Cummings, Koss, & Davies, 2015; Demby, Riggs, & Kaminski, 2017; El-Sheikh et al., 1996). In addition, cross-cultural research in the United States, China, and Saudi Arabia indicates that family relational closeness is highest among adult children who report cohesive family conflict interactions, characterized by collaboration and compromise (Guan & Li, 2017).

Observational methods have often been used to investigate broad family functioning, including managing conflict. These studies generally involve video recordings of commonplace and low-intensity family disagreements, revealing that negativity (i.e., hostility) among parents is associated with negative emotional child outcomes across developmental stages from toddlerhood to adolescence (Davies, Coe, Martin, Sturge-Apple, & Cummings, 2015; Feinberg, Kan, & Goslin, 2009; Keller, Cummings, Peterson, & Davies, 2009). Many studies in this area have focused particularly on interparental or parent-child conflict (Davies et al., 2015; Keller et al., 2009), and fewer overall have focused on conflict within the family as a whole (Cummings et al., 2015; Demby et al., 2017). Observational studies focusing on whole-family interaction patterns during conflict have uncovered associations of fewer behavior problems among preadolescent children when families demonstrate more positive affect, less negativity, and more cohesiveness (i.e., general unity; Demby et al., 2017; Shigeto, Mangelsdorf, & Brown, 2014).

Many of these studies of family conflict observations relevant to children's adjustment have primarily been conducted among heterosexual parent families with biologically related children (Branje, van Doorn, van der Valk, & Meeus, 2009; Schoppe, Mangelsdorf, & Frosch, 2001; Singh & Nayak, 2016). Few observational studies have featured adoptive or LG parent families, yet available evidence has revealed some unique family communication patterns related to adoption status at least among heterosexual parent families with adolescents (Rueter & Koerner, 2008) as well as coparenting dynamics that are linked with child externalizing problems among LG and heterosexual adoptive parenting couples (Farr & Patterson, 2013). No study, to our knowledge, has specifically and simultaneously addressed topics of how LG adoptive parent families manage conflict and how these behaviors may relate to child outcomes. Thus, further examination of LG and heterosexual adoptive parent families is needed about how family functioning among diverse groups may be associated with young children's development.

The developmental trajectories of adopted children, including those who have LG parents, are important to uniquely consider, as these children face several distinct developmental challenges in understanding and contextualizing their adoptive status. Previous researchers note that adopted children spend differing amounts of time and energy thinking about their adoption (i.e., often termed "preoccupation with adoption"), and adopted children also show varying levels of curiosity about their biological origins, heritage, and family members (Kohler, Grotevant, & McRoy, 2002; Tan & Jordan-Arthur, 2012; Wrobel, Grotevant, & McRoy, 2004). Adopted children must also manage the psychological presence of,

and often direct relationships with, both adoptive and birth families (Brodzinsky, 2011; Grotevant et al., 2013). Perhaps relatedly, adopted children have also been posited as at risk for externalizing problems compared with their nonadopted peers (Grotevant et al., 2011, 2013).

Consistent with a family systems perspective, we know that satisfactory communication between children's birth and adoptive families shares associations with children's more complete and positive understanding of adoption, better feelings about their adoption, and fewer externalizing problems during adolescence—at least among adoptive families headed by heterosexual parents (Brodzinsky, 2006; Grotevant et al., 2011; Tieman, van der Ende, & Verhulst, 2008). In the context of positive reports of family functioning, adolescent adoptees often describe positive feelings about their adoption, including heightened curiosity or preoccupation (Wrobel et al., 2004). In addition, research has also demonstrated that sibling relationships, as well as parent-child relationships, also play a role in influencing adoptees' externalizing behaviors and positive feelings about adoption during adolescence and early adulthood (Farr, Flood, & Grotevant, 2016). Thus, it is reasonable to theorize that whole adoptive family interactions could share associations with preadolescent children's behavioral and adoption-specific adjustment. Little additional information exists, however, about the role of observed family interactions, including those that occur during family conflict, and possible associations with adopted children's externalizing behaviors and feelings about adoption. Even less research has been conducted on these topics among adoptive families headed by LG parents.

### Research on LG Parent Families and Adopted Children

LG parents are seven times more likely to adopt than are heterosexual parents (S. K. Goldberg & Conron, 2018), so the question of whether family interaction patterns and related child outcomes among LG adoptive parent families are similar or different to those previously demonstrated in the literature is imperative to examine. Existing research has demonstrated that children (including adopted children) with LG parents share very similar, or even more positive, developmental outcomes compared with children with heterosexual parents (Biblarz & Stacey, 2010; Fedewa et al., 2015; Golombok et al., 2014). Research about LG parent families has less often included studies about overall family functioning using observational data. Such data, when available, provide additional understanding about young children's positive development in LG parent families. For instance, researchers have uncovered significant associations between supportive parenting or coparenting practices and fewer child behavior problems (e.g., Bos, van Balen, & van den Boom, 2007), including among LG parent families specifically with adopted children (Farr & Patterson, 2013; Golombok et al., 2014).

Some studies have directly attended to the perspectives of children and adolescents adopted by LG parents, which have indicated positive feelings about adoption as well as about having LG parents (Cody, Farr, McRoy, Ayers-Lopez, & Ledesma, 2017; Farr, Crain, Oakley, Cashen, & Garber, 2016; Gianino, Goldberg, & Lewis, 2009). These studies have focused on qualitative analyses of individual interview data, and have not been extended to quantitative data about children's feelings about adoption and their possible associations with other family dynamics (such as family

conflict communication) among a diverse sample of adoptive families headed by LG and heterosexual parents. The broader body of literature about LG parent families, including those with adopted children, suggests that these families may embody unique strengths in terms of family communication (e.g., as related to preparation for bias related to heterosexism, racism, adoptism; Gianino et al., 2009; A. E. Goldberg & Smith, 2016) as well as resilience in individual outcomes in the context of adversity (i.e., facing stigma and discrimination; Farr, Crain, et al., 2016; Van Gelderen, Gartrell, Bos, & Hermanns, 2009). Thus, it is vital to understand more, employing a broader and more rigorous array of assessments (i.e., child and parent reports, observational data) about how these families navigate difficult conversations together and whether these interaction dynamics relate to young children's adjustment.

### Developmental Context of Middle Childhood

Given advances that children experience in their social perspective-taking abilities during middle childhood, from 6 to 12 years, children's adjustment may be particularly vulnerable at this time to the effects of family conflict (Davies et al., 2018; Demby et al., 2017). Some scholars posit that middle childhood is a "switch point" for children in translating stressful experiences into particular coping strategies for managing that stress or conflict (Del Giudice, Angeleri, & Manera, 2009). As such, this developmental stage may be one of heightened sensitivity to family conflict with long-term effects on adjustment (Davies, Martin, & Sturge-Apple, 2016).

Among adopted children, it is during middle childhood that they develop the cognitive capacity to grapple with complex issues about adoption (Brodzinsky, 2011). Children begin to consider their birth parents' motivations for placing them for adoption and the complexities of biological and emotional family ties, and they may seek more information about their adoption than they had earlier (Brodzinsky, 2011). Openness about adoption, in addition to broad communicative openness within families, can make this process of understanding adoption easier (Brodzinsky, 2006). No studies, to our knowledge, however, have examined how other family-level traits, such as qualities of managing family disagreements, may relate to preadolescent children's feelings about their adoption. Taken together, research is needed to explore how adoptive sexual minority parent families manage conflict as well as how these interactions may be associated with children's behavioral adjustment and perceptions about their adoption.

### The Current Study

This study addressed several gaps in family systems research, primarily by including a sample of LG adoptive parent families, observations of family interaction, and analyses about how family dynamics may be associated with children's behavioral and adoption-specific outcomes. We used a multimethod, multi-informant design with observational data and reports from children and parents to minimize self-report bias and directly examine family behaviors; previous research has demonstrated the importance of observational data (in addition to, or beyond self-report data) to more comprehensively assess dyadic and triadic family interaction patterns and associations with children's adjustment (Favez, Widmer, Frascarolo, & Doan, 2019; Teubert & Pinquart, 2010).

We had two main research questions:

1. Are family conflict interactions and children's outcomes associated among this sample of adoptive families with preadolescent children and diverse in parental sexual orientation? As previous research has shown connections between successful family conflict resolution and positive outcomes for young children (El-Sheikh et al., 1996; Richmond & Stocker, 2006), we predicted that lower negativity, higher positive affect, and greater cohesiveness during a family disagreement task would be associated with fewer child externalizing behaviors (Demby et al., 2017). There are no observational studies (to our knowledge) addressing family conflict and adoption-specific outcomes. Based on related research (e.g., Farr & Patterson, 2013; Grotevant et al., 2011; Tieman et al., 2008; Wrobel et al., 2004), however, we anticipated that family interactions and children's feelings about adoption would be significantly associated. As this was an exploratory hypothesis, we did not generate more specific predictions.
2. Are there differences in family conflict interactions (i.e., family negativity, positive affect, cohesiveness), in child outcomes, or in associations between conflict interactions and child outcomes among families with LG or heterosexual parents? Given previous research (Biblarz & Stacey, 2010; Farr, 2017; Fedewa et al., 2015; Goldberg & Smith, 2013), we hypothesized no significant differences by family type (i.e., LG and heterosexual parents) in observed family dynamics, in children's outcomes, or in associations between the two.

## Method

### Participants

Participants were 96 families who provided questionnaire and observational data from the second wave (Wave 2 [W2]; collected in 2013–2014) of a larger longitudinal study (Farr, 2017; Farr & Patterson, 2013; see Table 1 for demographic characteristics). Each family had one target child (the focus of analyses) between 5 and 12 years ( $M_{\text{age}} = 8$ ). The target child was the oldest adopted child within 1 to 5 years old at the first wave (Wave 1 [W1]) of data collection (in 2007–2009). All children (48 girls, 48 boys) were adopted in infancy from one of five private adoption agencies across the United States who had placed children with LG and heterosexual parents. No children had prior placements, and all families were initially invited to participate through their adoption agency. Families generally represent high socioeconomic status (SES), and close to half (46%) had completed transracial adoptions. Although most adoptive parents who participated at W2 were White (81%), most adopted children represented racial/ethnic minority backgrounds (38% White, 32% Black, 25% Multiethnic, 3% Latino/Hispanic, 2% other racial/ethnic identities). Families lived across the United States in one of 12 states in the South and both coasts. Although fewer than half of families had more than one child at W1 (Farr & Patterson, 2013), by W2, 63% of participating families had two or more children. To encourage whole-

Table 1  
Demographic Information by Family Type

Variable	Lesbian mother families ( <i>n</i> = 26)	Gay father families ( <i>n</i> = 29)	Heterosexual parent families ( <i>n</i> = 41)	Sample ( <i>N</i> = 96)	ANOVA or $\chi^2$
	<i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	<i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	<i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	<i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	
Household income (in thousands USD)	139 (81)	249 (147)	171 (99)	187 (120)	$F(2, 85) = 6.61^{**}$
Child age (years)	8.38 (1.68)	8.21 (1.47)	8.37 (1.77)	8.32 (1.64)	$F(2, 95) < 1$
	<i>n</i> (%)	<i>n</i> (%)	<i>n</i> (%)	<i>n</i> (%)	
Child sex (% female)	16 (62%)	11 (38%)	21 (51%)	48 (50%)	$\chi^2(2) = 3.10$
Transracial adoption (% yes)	13 (50%)	17 (59%)	14 (34%)	44 (46%)	$\chi^2(2) = 4.35$
Siblings (% yes)	15 (58%)	19 (66%)	27 (66%)	61 (64%)	$\chi^2(2) < 1$
Couple together (% yes)	18 (69%)	27 (93%)	38 (93%)	83 (87%)	$\chi^2(2) = 9.04^*$

Note. Demographic characteristics for Wave 1 were originally reported in Farr and Patterson (2013), and for Wave 2, in Farr (2017).

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

family conversation that felt natural and realistic, as well as to accurately capture family-level functioning among families with multiple children, siblings were invited to participate if the families so chose (Richmond & Stocker, 2006). Thus, siblings, when present, frequently participated in family interaction tasks. Specifically, of the families who provided observational data ( $n = 90$ ) and also had more than one child, 61% completed the family conflict interaction task with the target child and a sibling.

## Measures and Procedure

Families were visited in their homes, where the observation tasks were completed, by Rachel H. Farr. Individual parents and children completed questionnaires using Qualtrics. Rachel H. Farr assisted children by reading all questions aloud to them. Before participating, parents and children provided informed consent and assent, respectively; no financial compensation was provided. The institutional review boards of the University of Virginia, University of Massachusetts Amherst, and University of Kentucky approved the study.

**Observations of family interaction.** To assess how families navigate conflict discussion, parents and children were asked to discuss a recent disagreement and work toward resolution for approximately 10 min—a video-recorded task used to elicit a range of emotions and problem-solving behaviors. This type of observational task is designed to facilitate and coordinate the perspectives of multiple family members, showcasing power “sharing” versus “wielding” dynamics that are typical during family conflict interactions (e.g., Favez et al., 2019). To select a topic, parents individually completed the Issues Checklist (Robin & Foster, 1989) prior to the interaction. We made some wording modifications for parents of preadolescent children and eight of 45 original items (e.g., “Going on dates,” “How money is spent”) were omitted (as they were originally intended for parents of adolescents). Parents responded “yes” or “no” to whether they had discussed each of 37 items (e.g., “Doing homework,” “Putting away clothes,” “Cleaning bedroom”) with their child in the last 4 weeks. Parents also listed the “top three issues,” which were then used as possible conversation topics during the observational task. The most common disagreements were related to school, sibling fighting, and time spent on TV, Internet, and video games.

To assess family interactions in the context of parent–child disagreements, we used the System for Coding Interactions and Family Functioning (SCIFF; Lindahl & Malik, 2001). The SCIFF is a macrolevel coding scheme that has been effective in identifying how family-level traits (i.e., negativity/conflict, positive affect, and cohesiveness) are linked with children’s behavioral adjustment and emotional health (Cummings et al., 2015; Demby et al., 2017; Shigeto et al., 2014). Thus, we included the Negativity/Conflict, Cohesiveness, and Positive Affect subscales. Negativity/Conflict assesses the degree to which parent–child interactions are hostile or tense, including body language and tone. Cohesiveness measures how well the family works together to resolve conflict, including how well families stay “on task.” Finally, Positive Affect measures pleasant emotional tone in the family’s interactions, including body language, tone, and markers such as smiles and laughter. All items are rated by coders on a 1 to 5 Likert scale (1 = very low, 5 = very high), indicating the degree to which that element characterized the interaction (Lindahl & Malik, 2001).

Undergraduate research assistants were trained to rate families’ interactions. Complete observational data were provided by 90 of 96 families. Each interaction was rated by at least two trained coders, who met weekly to resolve discrepancies through discussion. Reliability was excellent; intraclass correlation coefficients averaged .84 across the three observational variables.

**Child behavioral outcomes.** The Externalizing Behavior subscale of the Child Behavioral Checklist for Ages 6 to 18 (Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001) was used to assess children’s adjustment at W2. Both parents in each family generally completed this measure; they rated 42 externalizing problems on a 0 to 2 scale about their child (0 = not true, 1 = somewhat or sometimes true, 2 = very true or often true; e.g., “Disobedient at home,” “Gets in many fights,” “Lying or cheating”). Scores are calculated through aggregating all items, which are then converted into standardized *T* scores adjusted for child sex and age. Higher *T* scores indicate greater problems; scores 64 or higher indicate clinical levels (Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001). Cronbach’s alpha for externalizing items was .91. Scores were available for children in 95 of 96 families.

**Feelings about adoption.** Children’s feelings about their own adoption were assessed with the Adoption Dynamics Question-

naire (ADQ; Benson, Sharma, & Roehlkepartain, 1994). This scale is comprised of three subscales: Positive Affect About Own Adoption (20 items; e.g., "I think my parents are happy they adopted me," "I'm glad my parents adopted me"), Negative Experiences With Adoption (seven items; e.g., "I get tired of having to explain adoption to people," "I get teased about being adopted"), and Preoccupation With Adoption (three items; e.g., "How often do you think about your birth mother?," "How often do you think about adoption?"). The first two subscales are rated from 1 (*not true or strongly disagree or never*) to 5 (*always true or strongly agree or always*). The Preoccupation subscale is rated from 1 (*never*) to 7 (*every day*). Items are averaged for each subscale; higher numbers indicate greater positive affect, negative experiences, and preoccupation, respectively. Originally developed for adolescents, the ADQ was modified for younger children by omitting 14 of 17 preoccupation items (e.g., "I wish I knew more about my medical history"). Cronbach's alphas averaged .72 across subscales, demonstrating good internal consistency. Of the 96 children at W2, 88 completed the ADQ.

**Power analyses.** We conducted power analyses (G\*Power; Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007) for analyses of interest ( $\alpha = .05$ ,  $N = 96$  families). For bivariate correlations, power was .99 for large, .85 for medium, and .16 for small effects. For one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA; three groups), power was .94 for large, .57 for medium, and .13 for small effects. For multiple regression (three predictors), power was .99 for large, .89 for medium, and .18 for small effects. Thus, analyses were mostly powered to detect medium to large effects.

## Results

### Descriptive Information and Preliminary Analyses

Families generally displayed high cohesiveness and positive affect, with moderate negativity/conflict. Children's mean exter-

nalizing behaviors were below clinical levels. Children also tended to have very positive feelings, few negative experiences, and moderate preoccupation related to their adoption. Table 2 includes all descriptive information.

Preliminary analyses revealed that the target child's age and sex, as well as the presence and participation of siblings in each family, were not significantly associated with any observational variables; thus, these demographic characteristics were not considered in subsequent analyses. Similarly, few demographic differences characterized families as a function of parental sexual orientation. Gay-father families reported greater household income, on average, than the other two family groups, yet preliminary analyses indicated that income was unrelated to all study variables. Although some W1 couples were no longer together by W2 (and with lesbian couples more likely to have dissolved their relationship than gay or heterosexual couples; Farr, 2017), all families who provided data were included. With the unexpected exception of *higher* mean scores in observed family cohesiveness among separated-parent families, no other significant differences were found as a function of W2 couple status. To ensure that we did not miss differential findings based on couple relationship status, we ran all our analyses two ways: (a) including all families, and (b) excluding families who had experienced couple separation. No significant differences in the patterns of results emerged; thus, we maintained our analyses with all available data from participating families.

### Associations Between Family Observations and Child Outcomes

Consistent with our first hypothesis, several associations between family observations and child outcomes were uncovered (see Table 3 for correlations among all study variables). Although externalizing behaviors (averaged among parents within the same families) were not correlated with positive affect during family

Table 2

*Descriptive Results (Means, Standard Deviations, ANOVAs, and Bayesian Analyses) by Family Type*

Variable	Lesbian mother families ( $n = 26$ )	Gay father families ( $n = 29$ )	Heterosexual parent families ( $n = 41$ )	Sample ( $N = 96$ )	ANOVA	Bayes ( $BF_{01}$ ) <sup>a</sup>
	$n = 23$	$n = 27$	$n = 40$	$N = 90$		
Family						
Negativity/conflict	2.48 (.79)	2.37 (1.11)	2.53 (.85)	2.47 (.91)	$F(2, 87) < 1$	8.12
Cohesiveness	3.61 (.84)	3.59 (.97)	3.28 (.88)	3.46 (.90)	$F(2, 87) = 1.46$	3.01
Positive affect	3.00 (.74)	3.15 (.91)	2.83 (1.01)	2.97 (.92)	$F(2, 87) = 1.02$	4.29
	$n = 25$	$n = 29$	$n = 41$	$N = 95$		
Child						
Externalizing <sup>b</sup>	50.10 (11.15)	50.02 (10.04)	49.50 (9.18)	49.82 (9.88)	$F(2, 92) < 1$	9.93
	$n = 24$	$n = 26$	$n = 38$	$N = 88$		
Positive adoption affect <sup>c</sup>	4.42 (.17)	4.36 (.35)	4.31 (.34)	4.36 (.30)	$F(2, 85) < 1$	4.65
Negative experiences <sup>c</sup>	2.05 (.58)	2.22 (.71)	2.33 (.74)	2.22 (.69)	$F(2, 85) = 1.23$	3.66
	$n = 24$	$n = 25$	$n = 38$	$N = 87$		
Preoccupation <sup>d</sup>	4.01 (1.85)	3.63 (1.69)	3.40 (1.84)	3.64 (1.80)	$F(2, 84) < 1$	4.91

Note. No ANOVA results were significant at  $p < .05$ .

<sup>a</sup> Bayes factors reflect the likelihood of obtaining the null vs. alternate model. <sup>b</sup> Means represent average scores of parents' reports for the same child within families. <sup>c</sup> Means reflect scores from items on a 1–5 scale. <sup>d</sup> Means reflect scores from items on a 1–7 scale.

Table 3  
Associations Among Variables of Interest

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Family observations							
1. Negativity/conflict	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
2. Positivity	-.49***	—	—	—	—	—	—
3. Cohesiveness	-.60***	.62***	—	—	—	—	—
Parent reports							
4. Child externalizing score (Parent A)	.20 <sup>a</sup>	-.08	-.29**	—	—	—	—
5. Child externalizing score (Parent B)	.30**	-.18 <sup>a</sup>	-.34**	.66***	—	—	—
Child reports							
6. Positive adoption affect	-.23*	.30**	.23*	.02	-.003	—	—
7. Negative adoption experiences	.09	-.13	-.16	.23*	.12	-.31**	—
8. Adoption preoccupation	-.07	.05	.25*	-.08	-.03	.09	-.06

<sup>a</sup>  $p < .10$ .

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ . \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

interaction, they were correlated with family negativity/conflict,  $r(89) = .26, p = .013$ : Families with greater negative emotions during conflict had children with more externalizing problems. Externalizing behaviors were also correlated with cohesiveness,  $r(89) = -.34, p = .001$ , such that families who displayed greater unity in their problem solving had children with fewer problems.

Children's positive affect about their adoption and negativity/conflict were correlated,  $r(83) = -.23, p = .036$ , such that conflictual family interactions were linked with less positive adoption feelings. Children's positive adoption feelings and cohesiveness were also correlated,  $r(83) = .23, p = .036$ : Families who displayed greater unity during conflict had children who felt more positively about adoption. Children's positive affect about adoption and observed family positive affect were associated,  $r(83) = .30, p = .007$ : Families who displayed positive emotions had children who reported greater positivity about their adoption. Children's negative experiences with adoption were not significantly correlated with any of the three observed family conflict variables, yet children's preoccupation with adoption history was significantly associated with family cohesiveness,  $r(82) = .25, p = .024$ .

Next, we investigated our first hypothesis about whether observed family interaction variables were associated with child outcomes using a multivariate approach, specifically for outcomes in which multiple family interaction variables were significantly associated. We employed hierarchical linear modeling (HLM; Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002) and multiple regression to examine externalizing problems and positive affect about adoption as dependent variables, respectively. HLM (represented by the equation below) was employed (using HLM7; Raudenbush, Bryk, Cheong, Congdon, & du Toit, 2011) to account for potential covariance in dual parent reports within families; and missing data (generally fewer than 5% of cases across variables) were handled with full maximum likelihood. Level 1 represents the calculation for parents' reports of children's externalizing problems,  $Y_{ij}$ ;  $\beta_{0j}$  represents the random intercept; and  $e_{ij}$  is the error term. The Level 2 equation represents a comparison of those averages for externalizing behaviors. The  $u_{0j}$  coefficient controls for the nonindependent data structure. We simultaneously entered observed family negativity/conflict and cohesiveness (based on correlational results) as independent variables to statistically predict children's externalizing problems.

Level 1:

$$Y_{ij}(\text{Externalizing}) = \beta_{0j} + \beta_{1j}(\text{Negativity/Conflict}) + \beta_{2j}(\text{Cohesiveness}) + e_{ij}$$

Level 2:

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_{0j} &= \gamma_{00} + u_{0j} \\ \beta_{1j} &= \gamma_{10} + u_{10j} \\ \beta_{2j} &= \gamma_{20} + u_{20j}\end{aligned}$$

Specifically, the HLM analysis revealed that family cohesiveness during conflict significantly predicted children's externalizing behaviors,  $t\text{-ratio}(83) = -2.26, p = .027$ , but family negativity/conflict did not,  $t\text{-ratio}(83) = .78, p = .439$ . Using the average of parents' reports within families for children's externalizing problems, multiple regression results were consistent with HLM. The overall regression model was significant,  $F(2, 86) = 5.76, p = .004, R^2 = .10$ , and greater family cohesiveness (but not lower negativity/conflict) emerged as significant in predicting fewer externalizing behaviors.

Simultaneous multiple regression was used to assess whether family cohesiveness, positive affect, and negativity/conflict would statistically predict children's positive adoption feelings. Although the overall model proved significant,  $F(3, 79) = 2.86, p = .042; R^2 = .06$ , no individual predictor was significantly associated with children's positive adoption feelings. It is important to note that although family observations statistically predicted child outcomes in the preceding analyses, directionality of effects cannot be determined with these cross-sectional data.

### Family-Type Differences

Next, we investigated our second hypothesis by using one-way ANOVA tests to compare observed variables and child outcomes by family type (lesbian, gay, and heterosexual parent families). We also included Bayesian analyses to supplement traditional hypothesis testing. A Bayes factor ( $BF_{01}$ ) of 1 to 3 indicates anecdotal evidence, and  $BF_{01}$  of 3 to 10 indicates substantial evidence for the null hypothesis (i.e.,  $BF_{01} = 3$  indicates that the data are 3 times more likely to support the null rather than alternative hypothesis; Jarosz & Wiley, 2014). Across variables, and consistent with our second hypothesis, there were no differences in family interactions

or child outcomes as a function of parental sexual orientation; this was supported by the Bayes factors indicating substantially greater likelihood for the null over alternate model (Jarosz & Wiley, 2014; see Table 2). Finally, we tested whether correlations among observed family variables and child outcomes differed by family type by using Fisher's  $r$ -to- $z$  transformations (Diedenhofen & Musch, 2015). In no case were the differences significant between correlations among lesbian, gay, and heterosexual parent families.

### Discussion

Our findings contribute to theory and empiricism surrounding family systems research among adoptive LG and heterosexual parent families. Previous research including observations of family interaction has not often focused on these family systems, yet this study reveals information about family functioning and associated child outcomes among adoptive LG parent families. Consistent with outcomes among heterosexual parent families (Davies et al., 2015; Demby et al., 2017; Teubert & Pinquart, 2010) and adoptive LG parent families (Goldberg & Smith, 2013), our central finding was that children's broad and adoption-specific outcomes were associated with dynamics of family conflict interaction regardless of parental sexual orientation.

Our results underscore that children's externalizing behaviors were associated with qualities of family interaction, particularly cohesiveness. Lower cohesiveness was associated with behavior problems, as has been found among other families with adolescent children (e.g., Richmond & Stocker, 2006), yet family negativity was not. Although negativity was correlated with externalizing problems, cohesiveness was more strongly associated when simultaneously considered. This may indicate the unique importance of family unity in resolving disagreements in its relation to children's behavioral adjustment, and perhaps particularly among adoptive sexual minority parent families (Brodzinsky, 2006; Guan & Li, 2017). That this sample was characterized by relatively low negativity during interaction should be acknowledged. More intensely negative family interactions would likely impact child behavior (Schoppe et al., 2001).

Our findings also indicate, for the first time, to our knowledge, that overall family functioning is significantly related to adoption-specific child outcomes. Family cohesiveness, positive affect, and negativity during conflict all correlated with children's positive adoption feelings. Observed family cohesiveness was also significantly positively correlated with children's preoccupation with adoption. The regression model of the three observed family-level variables onto children's positive adoption feelings was significant despite no significant individual predictors. Thus, broad qualities of family interaction, including cohesiveness, may be important to children's perceptions about their adoption. Cohesive families who function effectively during conflict may facilitate more successful family communication about adoption. As children in this sample were found to be moderately preoccupied with adoption, on average, this may reflect a general curiosity and inquisitiveness about their adoption during this developmental stage of middle childhood (Kohler et al., 2002; Wrobel et al., 2004). Thus, in the context of family cohesiveness, children curious about their adoption may feel comfortable discussing it and asking questions. They may more readily acknowledge their thoughts about their birth

parents as well as feel more positively about being adopted (Le Mare & Audet, 2011).

Indeed, research has indicated several positive outcomes related to adoptive identity development among adoptees in families who regularly discuss adoption in responsive and supportive ways. For instance, families who encourage their children to openly discuss adoption and ask questions through natural, free-flowing conversational exchanges tend to best support the identity development of their children (Colaner & Soliz, 2017). Von Korff and Grotevant (2011) have also shown longitudinally that, among adoptees from adolescence to emerging adulthood, more frequent adoption-related conversation in families is linked with adoptive identity development. Among adult adoptees, research has demonstrated that greater adoption communication openness within families is associated with lower adoption preoccupation, and the general communication environment provided by adoptive families tends to be associated both with adoptive identity and self-esteem outcomes (Horstman, Colaner, & Rittenour, 2016). Preoccupation was moderate, on average, among Horstman et al.'s (2016) sample, as it was in the current sample. The construct of preoccupation, however, was defined slightly differently by Horstman and colleagues—as an overcommitment to one's adoptive status—and it was measured with different items than were used in the current study. In contrast, in a study of adolescent adoptees who responded to the same preoccupation items as did the children in our sample, adoptees who demonstrated moderate or low levels of adoption preoccupation also reported greater parent-child closeness than did those who showed high adoption preoccupation (Kohler et al., 2002). Moreover, similar patterns of communication, closeness, and positive feelings have been observed in family discussions of other difficult topics (Guan & Li, 2017). Thus, adopted children in this sample may feel safer expressing more complex feelings or experiences in family environments characterized by greater cohesiveness (Demby et al., 2017).

Of course, because these data are cross-sectional, the reverse pattern of findings could also be true—children who feel positively about their adoption may contribute to effective family communication and overall family cohesiveness. Regardless, our findings broaden previous research indicating associations between familial openness during conflict and positive child outcomes, specifically among diverse adoptive families headed by LG and heterosexual parents with school-age children.

In attempting to resolve conflicts, families displayed greater positive affect and cohesiveness than negativity and conflict, regardless of parental sexual orientation. This is noteworthy, given the emphasis of previous research on ensuring children have positive models for conflict resolution (e.g., Feinberg et al., 2009). LG parents did not differ from heterosexual parents in navigating family disagreements, with similar levels of cohesiveness, positive affect, and negativity and conflict observed among families. This aligns with research indicating few differences in parenting and family relationships among LG and heterosexual parent families (Biblarz & Stacey, 2010; Farr, 2017; Golombok et al., 2014, 2018). It is a first (to our knowledge), however, that these similarities have been demonstrated in the context of family conflict among LG and heterosexual parent adoptive families with school-age children.

Across the sample, children were reported by their parents to have relatively low levels of externalizing behavior problems,

which contrasts with the notion that adopted children are at risk for psychopathology—particularly externalizing problems (Grotevant et al., 2011). It should be acknowledged, however, that the low level of externalizing problems could also reflect the homogeneity in this sample (i.e., relatively high family SES, all children adopted via private domestic infant adoption) or an issue related to parent reports (some parents could be reluctant to describe their children as having behavioral challenges). More research is necessary to address these potential limitations of our results, but we have reported elsewhere that children's teachers, as well as their parents, agree that children in this sample, on average, show low levels of behavior problems (Farr, 2017).

Our findings are also consistent with the literature indicating that children with LG and heterosexual parents are comparably well-adjusted, despite ongoing social controversy (Biblarz & Stacey, 2010; Fedewa et al., 2015). Furthermore, this is the first study, to our knowledge, directly assessing children's perspectives about adoption among LG and heterosexual parent families. Children across family types felt positively about their adoption, reported few negative experiences, and noted moderate levels of preoccupation. Findings were comparable with means reported among samples of adolescent adoptees (Tan & Jordan-Arthur, 2012; Wrobel et al., 2004), with both positive affect and preoccupation somewhat higher among our sample of adoptees in middle childhood (although studies with older adoptees have included versions of the ADQ with more preoccupation items). As no study that we know of has specifically addressed this topic among a sample of adopted children with sexual minority and heterosexual parents, our results are noteworthy in indicating that these school-age adoptees report positive perceptions about their adoption regardless of their parents' sexual orientation. Finally, in no case were associations between family conflict interactions and child outcomes significantly different as a function of parental sexual orientation. Thus, taken together, sexual minority and heterosexual parents appear equally capable in providing family environments that foster well-adjusted adopted children, aligned with earlier research (e.g., Goldberg & Smith, 2013), and also extending it to feelings about adoption.

### Strengths and Limitations

This study adds to the literature by examining adoption-specific child outcomes in the context of family systems theory, which posits that children's development cannot be understood without considering influences of the whole family (Cox & Paley, 1997). Data from multiple sources provided a richer picture of factors influencing child adjustment. Participation of LG and heterosexual parents allowed for cross-comparisons underrepresented in family systems research.

Some limitations should also be noted. The data are cross-sectional; directionality of effects cannot be determined. Although our relatively high-SES sample is representative of families who complete private domestic adoptions, future research should consider how SES, parental sexual orientation, race, and varying pathways to parenthood intersect with family dynamics and child development. For instance, the majority of adoptive placements in the United States today are via public domestic adoptions through the child welfare system (Farr & Grotevant, 2019). Children adopted from foster care are often older and have experienced

adversity in the form of abuse, neglect, or other trauma (Farr & Grotevant, 2019). As such, dynamics of managing family conflict are likely different and more complex among these adoptive families compared with the sample in this study; caution should be taken in generalizations of these findings to adoptive families who have adopted through different pathways than private domestic infant adoption. We also did not study other adoption-related variables, such as birth family contact, as related to child adjustment or family interactions. Indeed, openness between birth and adoptive families is generally linked with positive child outcomes (Grotevant et al., 2013).

### Implications and Conclusion

Our findings align with and extend previous research, demonstrating that effective family conflict resolution and positive child outcomes are associated among adoptive LG parent families (Golombok et al., 2014; Teubert & Pinquart, 2010). Notably, these outcomes included children's feelings about their adoption, a variable not yet considered within the conflict resolution or family systems literatures. Our findings may support practitioners working with adoptive families about how open, positive, and cohesive family communication may encourage children's positive adoption feelings as well as help them express questions related to their adoption (and vice versa). The results could also inform law and policy surrounding adoptive LG parent families. Although same-sex marriage rights have made adoption more feasible for sexual minority parents in the United States, legal and practical barriers remain (Farr & Goldberg, 2018; Harris, 2017). Our results about well-adjusted children in well-functioning families suggest no empirical justification for obstacles to adoption by sexual minority adults. The findings expand our understanding about family conflict and overall family functioning among diverse adoptive families, highlighting positive parenting, family functioning, and child adjustment. How families manage conflict appears to be more strongly associated than parental sexual orientation with adopted children's outcomes, including those broadly related to behavioral adjustment as well as those specifically related to feelings about one's own adoption.

### References

- Achenbach, T. M., & Rescorla, L. A. (2001). *Manual for the ASEBA school-age forms & profiles*. Burlington, VT: Research Center for Children, Youth, & Families, University of Vermont.
- Benson, P. L., Sharma, A. R., & Roehlkepartain, E. C. (1994). *Growing up adopted: A portrait of adolescents and their families*. Minneapolis, MN: Search Institute.
- Biblarz, T. J., & Stacey, J. (2010). How does the gender of parents matter? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72, 3–22. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2009.00678.x>
- Bos, H. M., van Balen, F., & van den Boom, D. C. (2007). Child adjustment and parenting in planned lesbian-parent families. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 77, 38–48. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0002-9432.77.1.38>
- Branje, S. J., van Doorn, M., van der Valk, I., & Meeus, W. (2009). Parent-adolescent conflicts, conflict resolution types, and adolescent adjustment. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 30, 195–204. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2008.12.004>
- Brodzinsky, D. (2006). Family structural openness and communication openness as predictors in the adjustment of adopted children. *Adoption Quarterly*, 9, 1–18. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J145v09n04\\_01](http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J145v09n04_01)



- Brodzinsky, D. M. (2011). Children's understanding of adoption: Developmental and clinical implications. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 42*, 200–207. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0022415>
- Cody, P. A., Farr, R. H., McRoy, R. G., Ayers-Lopez, S. J., & Ledesma, K. J. (2017). Youth perspectives on being adopted from foster care by lesbian and gay parents: Implications for families and adoption professionals. *Adoption Quarterly, 20*, 98–118. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10926755.2016.1200702>
- Colaner, C. W., & Soliz, J. (2017). A communication-based approach to adoptive identity: Theoretical and empirical support. *Communication Research, 44*, 611–637. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0093650215577860>
- Cox, M. J., & Paley, B. (1997). Families as systems. *Annual Review of Psychology, 48*, 243–267. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.48.1.243>
- Cummings, E. M., Koss, K. J., & Davies, P. T. (2015). Prospective relations between family conflict and adolescent maladjustment: Security in the family system as a mediating process. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 43*, 503–515. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10802-014-9926-1>
- Davies, P. T., Coe, J. L., Martin, M. J., Sturge-Apple, M. L., & Cummings, E. M. (2015). The developmental costs and benefits of children's involvement in interparental conflict. *Developmental Psychology, 51*, 1026–1047. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/dev0000024>
- Davies, P. T., Martin, M. J., & Cummings, E. M. (2018). Interparental conflict and children's social problems: Insecurity and friendship affiliation as cascading mediators. *Developmental Psychology, 54*, 83–97. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/dev0000410>
- Davies, P. T., Martin, M. J., & Sturge-Apple, M. L. (2016). Emotional security theory and developmental psychopathology. In D. Cicchetti (Ed.), *Developmental psychopathology: Vol. 1. Theory and method* (3rd ed., pp. 199–264). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Del Giudice, M., Angeleri, R., & Manera, V. (2009). The juvenile transition: A developmental switch point in human life history. *Developmental Review, 29*, 1–31. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2008.09.001>
- Demby, K. P., Riggs, S. A., & Kaminski, P. L. (2017). Attachment and family processes in children's psychological adjustment in middle childhood. *Family Process, 56*, 234–249. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/famp.12145>
- Diedenhofen, B., & Musch, J. (2015). cocor: A comprehensive solution for the statistical comparison of correlations. *PLoS ONE, 10*, e0121945. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0121945>
- El-Sheikh, M., Cummings, E. M., & Reiter, S. (1996). Preschoolers' responses to ongoing interadult conflict: The role of prior exposure to resolved versus unresolved arguments. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 24*, 665–679. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01670106>
- Farr, R. H. (2017). Does parental sexual orientation matter? A longitudinal follow-up of adoptive families with school-age children. *Developmental Psychology, 53*, 252–264. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/dev0000228>
- Farr, R. H., Crain, E. E., Oakley, M. K., Cashen, K. K., & Garber, K. J. (2016). Microaggressions, feelings of difference, and resilience among adopted children with sexual minority parents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 45*, 85–104. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10964-015-0353-6>
- Farr, R. H., Flood, M. E., & Grotevant, H. D. (2016). The role of siblings in adoption outcomes and experiences from adolescence to emerging adulthood. *Journal of Family Psychology, 30*, 386–396. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/fam0000173>
- Farr, R. H., & Goldberg, A. E. (2018). Sexual orientation, gender identity, and adoption law. *Family Court Review, 56*, 374–383. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/fcre.12354>
- Farr, R. H., & Grotevant, H. G. (2019). Adoption. In B. Fiese (Ed.), *APA handbook of contemporary family psychology* (pp. 725–741). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Farr, R. H., & Patterson, C. J. (2013). Coparenting among lesbian, gay, and heterosexual couples: Associations with adopted children's outcomes. *Child Development, 84*, 1226–1240. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12046>
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G\*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods, 39*, 175–191. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3758/BF03193146>
- Favez, N., Widmer, E. D., Frascarolo, F., & Doan, M. T. (2019). Mother-stepfather coparenting in stepfamilies as predictor of child adjustment. *Family Process, 58*, 446–462. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/famp.12360>
- Fedewa, A. L., Black, W. W., & Ahn, S. (2015). Children and adolescents with same-gender parents: A meta-analytic approach in assessing outcomes. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies, 11*, 1–34. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1550428X.2013.869486>
- Feinberg, M. E., Kan, M. L., & Goslin, M. C. (2009). Enhancing coparenting, parenting, and child self-regulation: Effects of family foundations 1 year after birth. *Prevention Science, 10*, 276–285. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11121-009-0130-4>
- Gates, G. J. (2013). Demographics and LGBT health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 54*, 72–74. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022146512474429>
- Gianino, M., Goldberg, A., & Lewis, T. (2009). Family outings: Disclosure practices among adopted youth with gay and lesbian parents. *Adoption Quarterly, 12*, 205–228. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10926750903313344>
- Goldberg, A. E., & Smith, J. Z. (2013). Predictors of psychological adjustment in early placed adopted children with lesbian, gay, and heterosexual parents. *Journal of Family Psychology, 27*, 431–442. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0032911>
- Goldberg, A. E., & Smith, J. Z. (2016). Predictors of race, adoption, and sexual orientation related socialization of adoptive parents of young children. *Journal of Family Psychology, 30*, 397–408. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/fam0000149>
- Goldberg, S. K., & Conron, K. J. (2018). *How many same-sex couples in the U.S. are raising children?* Retrieved from <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/research/parenting/how-many-same-sex-parents-in-us/>
- Golombok, S., Blake, L., Slutsky, J., Raffanello, E., Roman, G. D., & Ehrhardt, A. (2018). Parenting and the adjustment of children born to gay fathers through surrogacy. *Child Development, 89*, 1223–1233. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12728>
- Golombok, S., Mellish, L., Jennings, S., Casey, P., Tasker, F., & Lamb, M. E. (2014). Adoptive gay father families: Parent-child relationships and children's psychological adjustment. *Child Development, 85*, 456–468. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12155>
- Grotevant, H. D., McRoy, R. G., Wrobel, G. M., & Ayers-Lopez, S. (2013). Contact between adoptive and birth families: Perspectives from the Minnesota/Texas Adoption Research Project. *Child Development Perspectives, 7*, 193–198. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12039>
- Grotevant, H. D., Rueter, M., Von Korff, L., & Gonzalez, C. (2011). Post-adoption contact, adoption communicative openness, and satisfaction with contact as predictors of externalizing behavior in adolescence and emerging adulthood. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 52*, 529–536. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2010.02330.x>
- Guan, X., & Li, X. (2017). A cross-cultural examination of family communication patterns, parent-child closeness, and conflict styles in the United States, China, and Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Family Communication, 17*, 223–237. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15267431.2017.1293062>
- Harris, E. A. (2017, June 20). Same-sex parents still face legal complications. *New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/06/20/us/gay-pride-lgbtq-same-sex-parents.html>
- Horstman, H. K., Colaner, C. W., & Rittenour, C. E. (2016). Contributing factors of adult adoptees' identity work and self-esteem: Family communication patterns and adoption-specific communication. *Journal of Family Communication, 16*, 263–276. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15267431.2016.1181069>

- Jarosch, A. F., & Wiley, J. (2014). What are the odds? A practical guide to computing and report reporting Bayes Factors. *The Journal of Problem Solving*, 7, 1–9. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7771/1932-6246.1167>
- Keller, P. S., Cummings, E. M., Peterson, K. M., & Davies, P. T. (2009). Marital conflict in the context of parental depressive symptoms: Implications for the development of children's adjustment problems. *Social Development*, 18, 536–555. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9507.2008.00509.x>
- Kohler, J. K., Grotevant, H. D., & McRoy, R. G. (2002). Adopted adolescents' preoccupation with adoption: The impact on adoptive family relationships. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64, 93–104. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2002.00093.x>
- Le Mare, L., & Audet, K. (2011). Communicative openness in adoption, knowledge of culture of origin, and adoption identity in adolescents adopted from Romania. *Adoption Quarterly*, 14, 199–217. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10926755.2011.608031>
- Lindahl, K. M., & Malik, N. M. (2001). The System for Coding Interactions and Family Functioning. In P. K. Kerig & K. M. Lindahl (Eds.), *Family observational coding systems: Resources for systemic research* (pp. 77–91). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Minuchin, P. (1988). Relationships within the family: A systems perspective on development. In R. A. Hinde & J. Stevenson-Hinde (Eds.), *Relationships within families: Mutual influences* (pp. 7–26). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Raudenbush, S. W., & Bryk, A. S. (2002). *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Raudenbush, S. W., Bryk, A. S., Cheong, Y. F., Congdon, R., & du Toit, M. (2011). *HLM7: Hierarchical linear and nonlinear modeling*. Lincolnwood, IL: Scientific Software International.
- Richmond, M. K., & Stocker, C. M. (2006). Associations between family cohesion and adolescent siblings' externalizing behavior. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 20, 663–669. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.20.4.663>
- Robin, A. L., & Foster, S. L. (1989). *Negotiating parent-adolescent conflict: A behavioral-family systems approach*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Rueter, M. A., & Koerner, A. F. (2008). The effect of family communication patterns on adopted adolescent adjustment. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 70, 715–727. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2008.00516.x>
- Schoppe, S. J., Mangelsdorf, S. C., & Frosch, C. A. (2001). Coparenting, family process, and family structure: Implications for preschoolers' externalizing behavior problems. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 15, 526–545. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.15.3.526>
- Shigeto, A., Mangelsdorf, S. C., & Brown, G. L. (2014). Roles of family cohesiveness, marital adjustment, and child temperament in predicting child behavior with mothers and fathers. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 31, 200–220. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0265407513490586>
- Singh, R., & Nayak, J. K. (2016). Parent-adolescent conflict and choice of conflict resolution strategy: Familial holiday planning. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 27, 88–115. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJCM-04-2014-0025>
- Tan, T. X., & Jordan-Arthur, B. (2012). Adopted Chinese girls come of age: Feelings about adoption, ethnic identity, academic functioning, and global self-esteem. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 34, 1500–1508. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2012.04.001>
- Teubert, D., & Pinquart, M. (2010). The association between coparenting and child adjustment: A meta-analysis. *Parenting: Science and Practice*, 10, 286–307. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15295192.2010.492040>
- Tieman, W., van der Ende, J., & Verhulst, F. C. (2008). Young adult international adoptees' search for birth parents. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 22, 678–687. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0013172>
- Van Doorn, M. D., Branje, S. T., & Meeus, W. J. (2008). Conflict resolution in parent-adolescent relationships and adolescent delinquency. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 28, 503–527. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0272431608317608>
- Van Gelderen, L., Gartrell, N., Bos, H., & Hermanns, J. (2009). Stigmatization and resilience in adolescent children of lesbian mothers. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies*, 5, 268–279. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15504280903035761>
- Von Korff, L., & Grotevant, H. D. (2011). Contact in adoption and adoptive identity formation: The mediating role of family conversation. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 25, 393–401. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0023388>
- Wrobel, G. M., Grotevant, H. D., & McRoy, R. G. (2004). Adolescent search for birthparents: Who moves forward? *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 19, 132–151. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0743558403258125>

Received February 9, 2019

Revision received June 14, 2019

Accepted June 18, 2019 ■