



## Technical Report

## Parent Wave 2

### Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS-7)

<b>Source/Developer</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• G. B. Spanier</li><li>• Spanier, G. B. (1976). "Measuring Dyadic Adjustment: New Scales for Assessing the Quality of Marriage and Similar Dyads", <i>Journal of Marriage and the Family</i>, 38 (1), 15-28.</li><li>• Sharpley, C. F. &amp; Rogers, H. J. (1984). Preliminary validation of the abbreviated Spanier dyadic adjustment scale: Some psychometric data regarding a screening test of marital adjustment", <i>Educational and Psychological Measurement</i>, 44, 1045-1049.</li></ul>
<b>Description</b>	A short assessment of harmony between the parents of the target child.
<b>Measured Concepts/ Subdimensions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Dyadic Consensus</li><li>• Dyadic Cohesion</li><li>• Dyadic Satisfaction</li></ul>
<b>Response Categories</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Consensus &amp; cohesion:</i> 6-point Likert scale (from "always disagree"/"never" to "always agree"/"more than once a day")</li><li>• <i>Satisfaction:</i> 7-point Likert scale (from "extremely unhappy" to "perfect")</li></ul>
<b>Number of Items</b>	7
<b>Item Example</b>	"How often would you say the following events occurred during the last year between you and your mate?: Calmly discuss something together" (Cohesion)
<b>Administration History</b>	Wave 2

## Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS-7) – Subscale “Dyadic Consensus”

- Variable Values**
- 6-point Likert scale
  - 1- always disagree
  - 2- almost always disagree
  - 3- frequently disagree
  - 4- occasionally disagree
  - 5- almost always agree
  - 6- always agree
  
  - 7- Does not apply (*MISSING*)
  - 8- Don't know/ Can't remember (*MISSING*)
  - 9- No answer/ Answer refused (*MISSING*)

**Variable Wording & Case Summary**

Variable Name	Label	Wording	Missings (%)
Indicate the approximate extent of agreement or disagreement between you and your partner DURING THE LAST YEAR for each item:			
P2_5010	Dyadic consensus 1	Philosophy of life	2 (0.2%)
P2_5020	Dyadic consensus 2	Aims, goals, and things believed important	0 (0.0%)
P2_5030	Dyadic consensus 3	Amount of time spent together	6 (0.6%)

Total N = 980

**Descriptive Statistics**

Variable Name	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	$\alpha$ If Item Removed ( $\alpha = .723$ )
P2_5010	Dyadic consensus 1	4.65	.889	1	6	-.745	1.15	.550	.627
P2_5020	Dyadic consensus 2	4.89	.853	2	6	-.725	.735	.591	.581
P2_5030	Dyadic consensus 3	4.94	.936	1	6	-.959	1.28	.496	.698

**Sum Index Descriptive Statistics**

**Dyadic Consensus Subscale** (P2\_consens)

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	ANOVA		
								df	F	p
Full sample	979	3.83	.719	.670	5.00	-.822	1.57			
Gender								1	.697	.404
Girls	472	3.81	.731	.670	5.00	-.756	.988			
Boys	507	3.84	.707	.670	5.00	-.887	2.22			
Treatment								3	.302	.824
Control	268	3.82	.683	1.33	5.00	-.468	.410			
Triple P	234	3.85	.689	1.00	5.00	-.873	1.60			
PATHS	264	3.80	.784	.667	5.00	-1.22	2.85			
Combination	213	3.85	.712	1.67	5.00	-.467	.154			
Language								8	8.95	.000
German	627	3.71	.682	.670	5.00	-.733	1.37			
Albanian	67	4.13	.728	1.50	5.00	-1.27	2.14			
Bos./Cro./ Serb.	77	4.01	.689	2.00	5.00	-.549	-.266			
English	14	3.90	.514	3.33	4.67	.117	-1.53			
Italian	14	3.64	1.60	.667	5.00	-1.36	.218			
Portuguese	65	4.07	.643	2.33	5.00	-.710	.556			
Spanish	32	3.80	.627	2.00	5.00	-.387	1.21			
Tamil	48	4.35	.575	3.00	5.00	-.534	-.476			
Turkish	35	3.83	.720	1.67	5.00	-.972	2.05			

**Comments:**

- 1) The scale has been constructed by taking the average of all the three variables. The maximum number of missing values allowed was 1. For the purpose of rescaling, 1 has been subtracted from the total scale.
- 2) The results of the ANOVA are highly significant for the language groups ( $F(8,970) = 8.95, p < .001$ ). ANOVA yielded no significant results for either the gender groups ( $F(1,977) = .697, p > .05$ ) or the treatment groups ( $F(3,975) = .302, p > .05$ ).

Correlations with Subscales & DVs	<i>Dyadic Consensus Subscale</i> (P2_consens)									
	Variable	r	Full Sample P2	N	r	Girls P2	N	r	Boys P2	N
Subscales										
<i>Dyadic Cohesion</i>	.305	***	975		.325	***	471	.284	***	504
<i>Dyadic Satisfaction</i>	.512	***	976		.520	***	471	.505	***	505
Parent SBQ										
<i>Aggression</i>	-.245	***	976		-.213	***	471	-.285	***	505
<i>Prosociality</i>	.128	***	974		.102	*	468	.166	***	506
Teacher SBQ										
<i>Aggression</i>	-.028	ns	955		.050	ns	461	-.095	*	494
<i>Prosociality</i>	.009	ns	958		.048	ns	463	-.011	ns	495
Child SBQ										
<i>Aggression</i>	-.129	***	965		-.100	*	464	-.161	***	501
<i>Prosociality</i>	-.006	ns	965		-.057	ns	464	.037	ns	501

1 \*\*\* p<.001, \*\* p<.01, \* p<.05, ns p>.05

*Comments* : The Dyadic Consensus subscale is positively correlated with the other dyadic adjustment subscales. The correlations are highly significant and range from moderate to high for the dyadic satisfaction subscale, casting doubt on the divergent validity of the construct. The subscale is weakly but significantly associated with child aggression only when the informant is the parent or the child him/herself. The correlation between Dyadic Consensus and child prosociality is also low and significant only when the informant is the parent. Overall, the subscale yields low predictive validity.

## Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS-7) – Subscale “Dyadic Cohesion”

- Variable Values**
- 6-point Likert scale
  - 1- never
  - 2- less than once a month
  - 3- once or twice a month
  - 4- once or twice a week
  - 5- once a day
  - 6- more often
  
  - 7- Does not apply (*MISSING*)
  - 8- Don't know/ Can't remember (*MISSING*)
  - 9- No answer/ Answer refused (*MISSING*)

### Variable Wording & Case Summary

Variable Name	Label	Wording	Missings (%)
How often would you say the following event occurred DURING THE LAST YEAR between you and your mate:			
P2_5110	Dyadic cohesion 1	Have a stimulating exchange of ideas	8 (0.8%)
P2_5120	Dyadic cohesion 2	Calmly discuss something together	6 (0.6%)
P2_5130	Dyadic cohesion 3	Work together on a project	11 (1.1%)

Total N = 980

### Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	$\alpha$ If Item Removed ( $\alpha = .498$ )
P2_5110	Dyadic cohesion 1	4.11	1.12	1	6	-.226	-.139	.226	.534
P2_5120	Dyadic cohesion 2	4.41	1.03	1	6	-.470	.391	.417	.254
P2_5130	Dyadic cohesion 3	3.89	1.36	1	6	-.036	-.717	.328	.388

### Sum Index Descriptive Statistics

#### Dyadic Cohesion Subscale (P2\_cohes)

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	ANOVA		
								df	F	p
Full sample	976	3.14	.837	.000	5.00	-.100	.220			
Gender								1	.075	.784
Girls	471	3.13	.845	.000	5.00	-.058	.241			
Boys	505	3.14	.831	.330	5.00	-.141	.215			
Treatment								3	.533	.660
Control	268	3.13	.838	.670	5.00	-.176	.259			
Triple P	234	3.19	.832	1.00	5.00	.091	-.136			
PATHS	263	3.10	.824	.000	5.00	-.283	.686			
Combination	211	3.12	.862	1.00	5.00	-.005	.035			
Language								8	4.33	.000
German	627	3.08	.805	.330	5.00	.108	.260			
Albanian	67	2.95	.844	1.00	5.00	-.122	.097			
Bos./Cro./ Serb.	76	3.33	.831	.670	4.67	-.706	.907			
English	14	3.17	.931	1.67	5.00	.531	.073			
Italian	14	3.26	.797	2.00	5.00	.492	.598			
Portuguese	65	3.23	.959	1.00	5.00	-.144	-.226			
Spanish	32	3.34	.805	1.67	5.00	-.317	-.593			
Tamil	48	3.66	.764	1.00	5.00	-.814	1.86			
Turkish	33	2.96	.971	.000	4.33	-1.35	1.81			

#### Comments:

- 1) The scale has been constructed by taking the average of the three variables. The maximum number of missing values allowed was 1. For the purpose of rescaling, 1 has been subtracted from the total scale.
- 2) The results of the ANOVA are highly significant for the language groups ( $F(8,967) = 4.33, p < .001$ ). ANOVA yielded no significant results for either the gender groups ( $F(1,974) = .075, p > .05$ ) or the treatment groups ( $F(3,972) = .533, p > .05$ ).

Correlations with Subscales & DVs	<i>Dyadic Cohesion Subscale (P2_cohes)</i>									
	Variable	r	Full Sample P2	N	r	Girls P2	N	r	Boys P2	N
Subscales										
	<i>Dyadic Consensus</i>	.305	***	975	.325	***	471	.284	***	504
	<i>Dyadic Satisfaction</i>	.308	***	974	.358	***	470	.258	***	504
Parent SBQ										
	<i>Aggression</i>	-.141	***	973	-.152	***	470	-.137	**	503
	<i>Prosociality</i>	.190	***	971	.208	***	467	.184	***	504
Teacher SBQ										
	<i>Aggression</i>	-.006	ns	953	-.012	ns	460	-.008	ns	493
	<i>Prosociality</i>	-.059	ns	956	-.038	ns	462	-.075	ns	494
Child SBQ										
	<i>Aggression</i>	-.013	ns	963	.005	ns	463	-.028	ns	500
	<i>Prosociality</i>	.019	ns	963	-.009	ns	463	.042	ns	500

<sup>1</sup> \*\*\* p<.001, \*\* p<.01, \* p<.05, ns p>.05

*Comments* : The Dyadic Cohesion subscale is positively correlated with the other dyadic adjustment subscales. The correlations are highly significant and moderate. The subscale is weakly but significantly associated with child aggression and prosociality but only when the informant is the parent. The subscale has no association with any of the teacher- and child-reported measures of aggression/prosociality. Overall, the subscale yields low predictive validity.

## Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS-7) – Subscale “Dyadic Satisfaction”

- Variable Values**
- 7-point Likert scale
  - 1- extremely unhappy
  - 2- fairly unhappy
  - 3- a little unhappy
  - 4- happy
  - 5- very happy
  - 6- extremely happy
  - 7- perfect
- 97- Does not apply (*MISSING*)  
 98- Don't know/ Can't remember (*MISSING*)  
 99- No answer/ Answer refused (*MISSING*)

**Variable Wording & Case Summary**

Variable Name	Label	Wording	Missings (%)
P2_5200	Dyadic satisfaction 1	The dots on the following line represent different degrees of happiness in your relationship	3 (0.3%)
Total N = 980			

**Descriptive Statistics**

Variable Name	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis
P2_5200	Dyadic satisfaction 1	4.63	1.15	1	7	.171	.279

**Sum Index Descriptive Statistics**

**Dyadic Satisfaction Subscale (P2\_satis)**

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	ANOVA		
								df	F	p
Full sample	977	4.63	1.15	1.00	7.00	.171	.279			
Gender								1	.344	.558
Girls	471	4.65	1.18	1.00	7.00	.201	.136			
Boys	506	4.61	1.12	1.00	7.00	.132	.432			
Treatment								3	.186	.906
Control	267	4.60	1.15	1.00	7.00	.132	.363			
Triple P	235	4.67	1.16	1.00	7.00	.249	.004			
PATHS	262	4.63	1.19	1.00	7.00	-.050	.620			
Combination	213	4.63	1.11	2.00	7.00	.469	.012			
Language								8	12.33	.000
German	627	4.48	1.10	1.00	7.00	-.111	.466			
Albanian	67	5.69	1.26	3.00	7.00	-.320	-1.41			
Bos./Cro./ Serb.	77	4.97	1.09	3.00	7.00	.619	-.807			
English	14	4.21	.579	3.00	5.00	.028	.209			
Italian	14	4.43	.514	4.00	5.00	.325	-2.24			
Portuguese	65	4.43	.918	3.00	7.00	1.15	1.90			
Spanish	32	4.41	.979	1.00	7.00	-.490	4.97			
Tamil	48	5.19	1.44	3.00	7.00	-.030	-1.32			
Turkish	33	4.58	.936	3.00	7.00	.982	1.20			

Comments: The results of the ANOVA are highly significant for the language groups ( $F(8,968) = 12.33, p < .001$ ). ANOVA yielded no significant results for either the gender groups ( $F(1, 975) = .344, p > .05$ ) or the treatment groups ( $F(3,973) = .186, p > .05$ ).

**Correlations with Subscales & DVs**

**Dyadic Satisfaction Subscale (P2\_satis)**

Variable	r	Full Sample P2	N	r	Girls P2	N	r	Boys P2	N
Subscales									
Dyadic Consensus	.512	***	976	.520	***	471	.505	***	505
Dyadic Cohesion	.308	***	974	.358	***	470	.258	***	504
Parent SBQ									
Aggression	-.195	***	974	-.169	***	470	-.219	***	504
Prosociality	.158	***	972	.184	***	467	.133	**	505
Teacher SBQ									

<i>Aggression</i>	-.097	**	954	.021	ns	460	-.186	***	494
<i>Prosociality</i>	.076	*	957	.050	ns	462	.098	*	495
Child SBQ									
<i>Aggression</i>	-.105	**	964	-.125	**	463	-.086	ns	501
<i>Prosociality</i>	.010	ns	964	-.008	ns	463	.019	ns	501

<sup>1</sup> \*\*\* p<.001, \*\* p<.01, \* p<.05, ns p>.05

*Comments* : The Dyadic Satisfaction item is positively correlated with the other two dyadic adjustment subscales. The correlations are highly significant and range from moderate to high for the dyadic consensus subscale, casting doubt on the divergent validity of the construct. This item is also very weakly correlated with child aggression and prosociality, irrespective of the type of the informant, though the correlations are slightly stronger for the parent-reported measures. Overall, the item yields low predictive validity.