Summary of Wave 3 Methods

Adoptive Families:
Outcomes for Young Adults

Harold D. Grotevant, Ph.D.
Principal Investigator

Martha Rueter, Ph.D., Co-Investigator
Gretchen Miller Wrobel, Ph.D., Co-Investigator
Lynn Von Korff, Ph.D., Research Fellow / Data Manager

April 25, 2009

Contact information:
Harold D. Grotevant, Ph.D.
Department of Psychology
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
Tobin Hall
Amherst, MA 01003

hgroteva@psych.umass.edu

Minnesota / Texas Adoption Research Project

Summary of Methods Used in Wave 3:
"Adoptive Families: Outcomes for Young Adults"

This document summarizes the sample, procedures, and measures used in Wave 3 (W3) of the Minnesota Texas Adoption Research Project (MTARP). We first describe the sample of adopted young adults (YA), their closest relationship partners (YAP), and their adoptive parents (AP), including the reasons for nonparticipation in Wave 3. Next, we describe procedures and measures, including interview data coding schemes.

Participants

At least one adoptive family member from 181 (95%) of the 190 adoptive families recruited at W1 participated at W3. W3 data collection occurred between 2005 – 2008.

Adopted Young Adult Participants

The W3 sample included 169 young adults (n = 87 males, 82 females; ages 20.77 – 30.34; M = 24.95 years). Race / ethnicity of the YAs included White / Caucasian (n=162, 95.9%), Hispanic / Mexican-American (n=6, 3.6%), and Black / African American (n=1, 0.6%). Complete data on all W3 measures were received from 151 YAs; partial data were received from 18 additional participants. Approximately 20% of YAs who completed the demographic questionnaire reported being married; 20% had at least one child. Most (75%) lived in their own place; most paid all (56%) or the majority (9%) of their housing expenses. About half (52%) had at most a high school diploma or GED, 14% had at most an AA degree, 30% had at most a bachelor's degree, and 4% had an advanced degree. A third (33%) of the YAs attended school full or part time at the time they were interviewed. Four percent had served or were serving in the military. A total of 21 YAs (62% males) did not participate at W3: 15 never responded or returned repeated contacts, 3 could not be located, 2 refused, and 1 was deceased.

Young Adult Partner Participants

YAs were asked to identify the person with whom they had the closest relationship. YAs were interviewed about their relationship with that person, and we asked their consent to invite their closest relationship partners (YAP) to participate as well. A total of 103 young adult partners (YAP) participated; 100 provided complete data on all measures. The relationships included romantic partners (37%), spouses (23%), close friends (37%), and siblings (3%). The 100 partners who filled out the demographic questionnaire ranged in age from 18 to 52 (M = 25.7, SD = 4.9) and 53% were females. Most of the YAPs were white (88%), but a small percentage (3% in each group) identified themselves as American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander. The majority of the partners had some level of college education (79%), while 11% stopped after high school, and 10% went on for graduate

schooling. Reasons for nonparticipation included the following: YA did not participate in the intimacy interview, making YAP participation moot (n = 28), YA refused to provide YAP name (n = 20), YAP did not respond to repeated contacts (n = 25), YAP refused (n = 12), YAP was not eligible (n = 2).

<u>Adoptive Parent Participants</u>

Adoptive mothers and adoptive fathers from the original 190 adoptive families at Wave I were invited to participate at Wave 3. The W3 sample included 151 adoptive mothers and 134 adoptive fathers. Complete data on all W3 measures were received from 136 adoptive mothers and 122 adoptive fathers; partial data were received from 15 additional mothers and 12 additional fathers. At Wave 3, participating adoptive mothers were ages 46 to 65 (M = 57 years), and adoptive fathers were ages 47 to 68 years (M = 59 years). Ten adoptive mothers and five adoptive fathers were widowed. Nine adoptive couples were separated and twenty-one were divorced by Wave 3.

<div align="center">Procedures</div>

<u>Adopted Young Adult Procedures</u>

The adopted young adults completed their interviews and questionnaires online. Each participant was assigned a unique username and password to access a menu page housing consent and compensation forms, a link to the secure chat site (for the interview) and a set of 11 questionnaires. Interviewers arranged by phone and emails to meet participants in the secure online chat sites prior to the first interview. After consenting to participate in the study, participants followed a link to the chat site to complete a section of the interview. Most interviews took place in 2 to 3 sessions. After completing all interview sessions, participants began the questionnaires. Participants were given access to questionnaires in a specified order. A new questionnaire became available after the participant had finished the preceding one. The young adults were compensated $75 for completion of the interviews and $75 for completion of the questionnaires. Some of the adopted young adults (n = 33) completed interviews over the telephone for reasons such as lack of internet access, discomfort communicating in an electronic format and lack of time. Some participants (n = 18) completed questionnaires in paper format for similar reasons.

<u>Adoptive Parent Procedures</u>

The adoptive parents completed interviews over the telephone and questionnaires by paper. After agreeing on the phone to participate in the study they were mailed a consent form and two questionnaires. Once these forms were returned, a telephone interview was scheduled. Mothers and fathers each completed separate questionnaires and interviews. A small number of parents (4 mothers, 6 fathers) completed one of the questionnaires using an online format. Adoptive parents were not compensated for participation.

Young Adult Partner Procedures

The young adult partners completed their interviews and questionnaires online following the same procedures as the adopted young adults. YAPs completed only one interview and three questionnaires. Most interviews took place in one session. They were compensated $25 for the interview and $25 for the questionnaires. Some of the partners completed interviews over the phone (n = 11), and two used a paper asynchronous format. Four completed the questionnaires using paper and pencil for the same reasons as the adopted young adults: discomfort with the electronic format, time, etc.

School Data Procedures

In Wave 3, permission to access school records was collected through mailed release forms. Each YA was mailed a form for each school he/she attended since the second wave of data collection. Each form included the school's address, phone number, and the years the YA attended the institution. Once the release forms were returned signed, the schools were contacted. Copies of the release forms were either mailed or faxed, based on the school's preference, to the schools along with a letter explaining what information was being requested.

<center>Measures</center>

Adopted Young Adult Measures

> Young Adult Interview. This interview contained three sections: 1) adoption, 2) close relationships (Personal Interaction Interview/Intimacy), and 3) religion and spirituality, school and occupation.
>
> The adoption section covered topics such as contact with birth family, information seeking, family representations, collaboration, and conversations about adoption.
>
> In the second section, the Personal Interaction Interview/Intimacy Interview, the young adult identified the person they are closest to and answered questions about his or her relationship with that person. Participants' closest partners could not be participants' parents, children, or pets. Participants were also asked not to list people who were deceased, spiritual beings such as God, or persons under the age of 18. The Personal Interaction Interview is a semi-structured interview that assesses level of intimacy maturity in young adult relationships (White, Speisman, Costos, Kelly, & Bartis, 1984). The interview consists of twenty-two questions regarding shared and separate activities, topics of discussion, how problems and differences are managed, expression of caring, perceptions of involvement and commitment, and ideas about how the relationship could be improved. A global code is given for each of six relationship dimensions: Orientation to the relationship, Concern, Commitment, Communication: Self-Disclosure,

Communication: Initiating, Communication: Responding. Interrater reliabilities of the intimacy maturity scale scores ranged from .75 to .85 in the 1986 paper by White, Speisman, Jackson, Bartis, and Costos.

The final section of the interview covered the topics of religion/spirituality, work experiences, and schooling. These sections are adaptations and extensions of Marcia's identity status interview, as modified by Grotevant and Cooper (1981).

The 11 YA questionnaires, in the order presented, were as follows:
1. Demographics (residence, education, employment, civic engagement)
2. Network of Relationships Inventory
3. Demographics (parents, siblings)
4. Adoption Communication Scale
5. Demographics (committed relationship partners, children)
6. Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment
7. Experiences in Close Relationships Questionnaire
8. Life Events
9. Adoption Dynamics Questionnaire
10. Achenbach Adult Self-Report
11. Inventory of Dimensions of Emerging Adulthood

Demographic Questionnaire. The young adult demographic questionnaire included sections about living arrangements, work/school history, volunteering experience, relationship history and children and parents. Information regarding the highest grade level completed in school was requested as well as detailed information about the most recent paid employment of the YA. The specific information regarding job history included the employer, the job title, whether it was full-time, part-time or seasonal, the length of employment and the gross pay rate either hourly, monthly, or annually. The educational and employment histories allow socio-economic status to be calculated. The demographic questionnaire was administered in 3 parts: 1) residence, education, employment, civic engagement; 2) parents, siblings; 3) committed relationship partners, children.

Network of Relationships Inventory. The Network of Relationship Inventory (Furman & Buhrmester, 1985) is made up of 45 questions that comprise 15 subscales that measure characteristics of close relationships. The subscales include: companionship, conflict, instrumental aid, antagonism, intimacy, nurturance, affection, admiration, relative power, reliable alliance, support, criticism, dominance, satisfaction, and punishment. For this study, the three items of the punishment scale were omitted. Each question was measured on a five point Likert scale ranging from 1= "little or none" to 5= "the most". The NRI assesses these relationship characteristics across different types of close relationships including platonic, romantic, and familial relationships. The Minnesota Texas Adoption Research Project utilized the NRI to evaluate perceptions of the relationship between the target adopted young adult and the

person that he/she identified in the Personal Interaction Interview as their closest relationship partner. The NRI was administered to both the adopted young adult and the identified partner, about each other. There are 14 subscales with three items each. Eight subscales are combined to create a social support scale; four are combined to create a negative interaction scale. The remaining two subscales, satisfaction and relative power, are not combined with other subscales. The reliabilities for YA data in MTARP were as follows: social support ($\alpha = .90$); negative interaction ($\alpha = .79$); satisfaction ($\alpha = .93$); and relative power ($\alpha = .81$).

Adoption Communication Scale. The original Adoption Communication Openness Scale (Brodzinsky, 2005) was a 14-item, self-report instrument using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1= "strongly disagree" to 5= "strongly agree." We adapted the scale by creating two items from each original item: one set of questions referring to the adoptee's mother and one to his/her father. (The original items referred only to the respondent's "adoptive parents." The instrument measures the extent to which adoptees experience their parents as being open and sensitive in adoption communication, as well as the extent to which they feel comfortable discussing adoption with their parents. The mean ratings across the 14-item scales for mother and father represent their perception of communication openness in the family, with higher ratings reflecting a greater degree of openness. Examples of scale items include: "My parents are good listeners when it comes to my thoughts and feelings about being adopted; My parents have difficulty understanding adoption from my point of view; If there is something I need to know about my adoption, my parents are always there for me, trying to answer my questions." Pilot testing revealed moderately high test-retest reliability for adoptees over a one week time period, r = .70. Cronbach's alpha for the scale was .79 (Brodzinsky, 2006, p. 8). The 28 items form two scales that assess communicative openness with adoptive mother ($\alpha = .94$, 14 items), and communicative openness with adoptive father ($\alpha = .96$, 14 items).

Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment. The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987) was developed to assess adolescents' perceptions of the positive and negative affective/cognitive dimension of relationships with their parents and close friends. In particular, it assesses how well these figures serve as sources of psychological security (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987). Three broad dimensions of attachment are assessed: 1) degree of mutual trust, 2) quality of communication, and 3) extent of anger and alienation. The instrument is a self-report questionnaire with a five point Likert-type response format ranging from 1 = "almost never or never true" to 5 = "almost always or always true". Sample items include: "My mother respects my feelings," "My father has his own problems, so I don't bother him with mine," and "My friends accept me as I am". The original version of the IPPA consists of 28 parent and 25 peer items, yielding two attachment scores. The revised version (Mother, Father, Peer version) which MTARP used is comprised of 25 items in each section, yielding three attachment scores (mother attachment, father attachment, peer attachment). The IPPA is scored by reverse-coding the

negatively worded items and then summing the response values in each section. Test-retest reliabilities for the original version of the IPPA were .93 for parent attachment and .86 for peer attachment. Cronbach's alphas for the revised version were .87 for mother attachment, .89 for father attachment, and .92 for peer attachment. The IPPA was used in Waves 2 and 3 of MTARP data collection. Reliabilities with the MTARP sample were as follows: mother attachment (α = .96, 25 items); father attachment (α = .97, 25 items); peer attachment (α = .94, 25 items); trust parents (α = .91, 20 items); communication parents (α = .77, 12 items); alienation parents (α = .89, 12 items); trust peers (α = .93, 10 items); communication peers (α = .93, 8 items); and alienation peers (α = .78, 7 items).

Experience in Close Relationships. Experience in Close Relationships (ECR) (Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998) is a 36-item, self-report measure of adult romantic attachment style. Participants respond about relationships in general rather than about a specific or current relationship. The ECR measures two dimensions of attachment—anxiety and avoidance—with 18 questions assessing each dimension. Items on the Avoidance scale of the ECR include statements such as "I prefer not to show a partner how I feel deep down" and "I want to get close to my partner, but I keep pulling back"; items on the Anxiety scale include "I worry about being abandoned" and "When I'm not involved in a relationship, I feel somewhat anxious and insecure". All items are rated by the participant using a 7 point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = "disagree strongly" to 7 = "agree strongly". Scoring of the ECR involves recoding reverse variables for items 3, 15, 19, 22, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, and 35. Each scale is averaged resulting in a possible scale score between 1 and 7. Higher scores indicate greater levels of Anxiety and Avoidance. Reliability coefficients for each scale in the MTARP sample are high (Avoidance α = 95 and Anxiety, α = 95).

Life Events. Life Events is a 37-item inventory of major events in the Young Adult's life over the past 12 months. Respondents are asked whether each identified major event Did Not Occur; Yes-Did Occur (to you or someone important to you) but was not very stressful to you; Yes-Did occur (to you or someone important to you) and was somewhat stressful to you; and Yes-Did occur (to you or someone important to you) and was extremely stressful to you. Example events include experiencing unemployment, trouble with relatives, drug use, being a victim of crime and going into debt.

Adoption Dynamics Questionnaire. The Adoption Dynamics Questionnaire (Benson, Sharma & Roehlkepartain, 1994) assesses adoptees' positive affect about adoption, preoccupation with their adoption, and negative experiences with adoption. Two modifications were made to the original questionnaire, one question was dropped (Would you like to meet your birthparents to find out what they look like?), and another question was added (How about often do you have dreams at night about meeting or living with your birthmother/father?). Possible responses include rating answers on a five-point Likert scale from 1= "not true or strongly disagree or never" to 5= "always true or strongly agree or always";

choosing between 7 levels of frequency ranging from "never" to "everyday"; and marking "no", "not sure" or "yes" or "have already met one or both". The 44 items form three scales that assess positive affect about own adoption (PA, α = .92, 20 items), preoccupation with own adoption history (PRE, α = .84, 17 items), and negative experience with own adoption (NE, α = .70, 7 items).

Adult Self Report. The Achenbach System of Empirically Based Assessment (ASEBA) is a multi-dimensional set of instruments used to measure an individual's adaptive functioning and emotional and behavioral problems, indicated as syndromes. ASEBA comprises several forms for assessing adaptive functioning and problems. The forms used in Wave 3 of this study include the Adult Self Report (ASR) and the Adult Behavior Checklist (ABCL) (Achenbach, 2003). The Adult Self Report (ASR) is a self-report assessment administered to the person for whom information is being gathered and includes questions on demographics (occupation, education); adaptive functioning (illnesses or disabilities, concerns/worries, best things about the respondent); and, problems (behavioral, emotional, social). The Adult Behavior Checklist (ABCL) is a filled out by the parent, spouse, partner or other important person of whom the information is being gathered and includes the questions sets as the ASR.

The ASR and ABCL are parallel instruments; the ASR is a self-report and the ABCL is reported by someone else. The purpose of using multiple informants is to capture the likely overlap between the respondents (Achenbach, McConaughy, & Howell, 1987). Achenbach (2003) notes that when more informants are utilized, more robust data are gathered. Since the ASR and ABCL are parallel instruments, items on each are similar. Each item asks for the informant to respond to a statement with 0 = "not true," 1 = "somewhat or sometimes true," or 2 = "very true or often true." For example, item 72 on the ASR reads, "I worry about my family," while item 72 on the ABCL reads, "Worries about his/her family." Responses taken from these measures are gathered into subscales including the following: adaptive functioning, syndrome scales, DSM oriented scales, substance abuse, critical items, internalizing and externalizing.

Inventory of Dimensions of Emerging Adulthood (IDEA). The IDEA (Arnett, Reifman, & Colwell, 2003) was developed for use with the population of individuals 18 -25 years old who are in a developmental time of transition to adulthood called Emerging Adulthood. Emerging Adulthood is a time between adolescence and full-fledged adulthood. It is viewed as a time to explore a variety of possible life directions in love, work, and world view. IDEA respondents are asked to think about their life at the current moment, including a few years before and after. The survey then presents the stem question: "Is this period of your life a…" followed by 31 phrases such as "time of many possibilities," a "time of exploration?" Respondents are asked to make selections on a scale as follows: 1= "strongly disagree," 2= "somewhat disagree," 3= "somewhat agree" and 4= "strongly agree." Alphas for MTARP data are as follows: Identity exploration (α = .83, 7 items), Experimentation/possibilities (α = .77, 5 items);

Negativity/instability (α = .84, 7 items); Other focused (α = .73, 3 items); Self-focused (α = .77, 6 items); and Feeling in-between (α = .82, 3 items).

School Data. The data requested from high schools included academic achievement tests and IQ tests administered either individually or in a group, grade point averages (GPA), class rank, and any applicable special education data. All achievement and cognitive test data are entered in the form of percentile rankings and normal curve equivalents to facilitate standardization. The data are coded based on the category of examination, achievement versus cognitive and individual versus group, as well as the year in school the data were collected. Most exams have been normed to national samples, while GPA was normed to the school population. Transcripts (unofficial) from post-secondary institutions were sought as well. These include information about the terms the student was enrolled, courses taken, grades earned, and degrees earned.

Adoptive Parent Measures

The following measures were administered separately to the adoptive father and the adoptive mother:

Adoptive Parent Interview. The interview protocol included questions on the following topics: 1) what it is like to parent a child transitioning to adulthood, 2) talking about adoption with their young adult, 3) how contact and collaboration with the birthfamily occurred, 4) parental views on their child seeking more information than is known about the birthmother and birthfather, 5) a description of their family, parental reflections about the role of birthmothers, and 6) general attitudes about adoption.

Demographic Questionnaire. This measure requested basic information about marital status, education, occupation and employment, income, community of residence, religion, family composition and basic indicators of stress (unemployment, separation or break-up, divorce, marriage, retirement, moving, or death of someone close).

Adult Behavior Checklist. The Achenbach System of Empirically Based Assessment (ASEBA) is a multi-dimensional set of instruments used to measure an individual's adaptive functioning and emotional and behavioral problems, indicated as syndromes. ASEBA comprises several forms for assessing adaptive functioning and problems. The forms used in Wave 3 of this study include the Adult Self Report (ASR) and the Adult Behavior Checklist (ABCL) (Achenbach, 2003). Each adoptive parent was asked to complete the Adult Behavior Checklist (ABCL) about his or her target young adult. The ABCL is a self-report assessment administered to the person for whom information is being gathered and includes questions on demographics (occupation, education); adaptive functioning (illnesses or disabilities, concerns/worries, best things about the respondent); and, problems (behavioral, emotional, social).

The ASR and ABCL are parallel instruments; the ASR is a self-report and the ABCL is reported by the YA's parents. Since the ASR and ABCL are parallel instruments, items on each are similar. Each item asks for the informant to respond to a statement with 0 = "not true," 1 = "somewhat or sometimes true," or 2 = "very true or often true." For example, item 72 on the ASR reads, "I worry about my family," while item 72 on the ABCL reads, "Worries about his/her family." Responses taken from these measures are gathered into subscales including the following: adaptive functioning, syndrome scales, DSM oriented scales, substance abuse, critical items, internalizing and externalizing.

Young Adult Partner Measures

The following measures were administered to the young adult partners:

Personal Interaction Interview/Intimacy Interview. The Personal Interaction Interview is a semi-structured interview that assesses level of intimacy maturity in young adult relationships (White, Speisman, Costos, Kelly, & Bartis, 1984). The interview consists of twenty-two questions regarding shared and separate activities, topics of discussion, how problems and differences are managed, expression of caring, perceptions of involvement and commitment, and ideas about how the relationship could be improved. The participant responds to the questions regarding the target YA who nominated them as their closest relationship. A global code is given for each of six relationship dimensions: Orientation to the relationship, Concern, Commitment, Communication: Self-Disclosure, Communication: Initiating, Communication: Responding. Interrater reliabilities of the intimacy maturity scale scores ranged from .75 to .85 in the 1986 paper by White, Speisman, Jackson, Bartis, and Costos.

Demographic Questionnaire. A basic demographic survey was designed by the MTARP team to collect the essential information needed to mirror the YA demographic information. The information collected included age, gender, race, and ethnicity. Information regarding the highest grade level completed in school was requested as well as detailed information about the most recent paid employment the YAP had. The specific information regarding job history included the employer, the job title, whether it was full-time, part-time or seasonal, the length of employment and the gross pay rate either hourly, monthly, or annually. The educational and employment histories allow socio-economic status to be calculated. Finally, the YAPs were asked whether or not they were also adopted.

Experience with Close Relationships. Experience in Close Relationships (ECR) (Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998) is a 36-item, self-report measure of adult romantic attachment style. Participants respond about relationships in general rather than about a specific or current relationship. The ECR measures two dimensions of attachment—anxiety and avoidance—with 18 questions assessing

each dimension. Items on the Avoidance scale of the ECR include statements such as "I prefer not to show a partner how I feel deep down" and "I want to get close to my partner, but I keep pulling back"; items on the Anxiety scale include "I worry about being abandoned" and When I'm not involved in a relationship, I feel somewhat anxious and insecure". All items are rated by the participant using a 7 point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = "disagree strongly" to 7 = "agree strongly". Scoring of the ECR involves recoding reverse variables for items 3, 15, 19, 22, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, and 35. Each scale is averaged resulting in a possible scale score between 1 and 7. Higher scores indicate greater levels of Anxiety and Avoidance. Reliability coefficients for each scale are high (Avoidance = .93 and Anxiety = .92).

Network of Relationships Inventory. The Network of Relationship Inventory (Furman & Buhrmester, 1985) is made up of 45 questions that comprise 15 subscales that measure characteristics of close relationships. The subscales include: companionship, conflict, instrumental aid, antagonism, intimacy, nurturance, affection, admiration, relative power, reliable alliance, support, criticism, dominance, satisfaction, and punishment. For this study, the three items of the punishment scale were omitted. Each question was measured on a five point Likert scale ranging from 1= "little or none" to 5= "the most". The NRI assesses these relationship characteristics across different types of close relationships including platonic, romantic, and familial relationships. The Minnesota Texas Adoption Research Project utilized the NRI to evaluate perceptions of the relationship between the target adopted young adult and the person that he/she identified in the Personal Interaction Interview as their closest relationship partner. The NRI was administered to both the adopted young adult and the identified partner, about each other. There are 14 subscales with three items each. Eight subscales are combined to create a social support scale; four are combined to create a negative interaction scale. The remaining two subscales, satisfaction and relative power, are not combined with other subscales. The reliabilities for YAP data: social support (α = .91); negative interaction (α = .76); satisfaction (α = .95); and relative power, (α = .84).

Interview Coding

A number of coding schemes have been applied to the extensive interview data provided by participants.

Adoptive Identity and Affect about Adoption Coding

Adoptive identity and affect about adoption were rated from the Adoption sections of the Young Adult Interview. Adoption questions elicited open discussion of the participant's experiences, feelings, knowledge and attitudes about his or her adoption, adoptive identity, adoptive family situation, birth parents, and issues specific to the level of openness of his or her adoption. Ratings were based on the entire adoption section of the interview. The adoption questions were very similar to those asked at Wave 2, but were

revised to reflect the different experiences of adolescents and young adults. The primary coding scheme for adoptive identity is the same as was used at Wave 2.

Six dimensions are drawn from two earlier-developed systems: the coding system for assessing identity exploration, commitment, and status (Grotevant & Cooper, 1981) and the coding system of the Family Narrative Consortium (Fiese, et al., 1999).

> Depth of Adoptive Identity Exploration is the degree participants reflect on the meaning of adoption or being adopted or actively engaged in a process of gathering information or decision-making. Statements include: (a) contrasting past and present thinking; (b) contrasting one's own role, ideas, thoughts, or actions with those of others; (c) reflecting on the meaning or implications of adoption or being adopted; (d) indicating active gathering of information on any aspect of adoption or being adopted; or (e) describing the process of making a decision, experimenting, or questioning an issue related to adoption or being adopted (5 pt scale higher scores indicates higher exploration).

> Internal consistency: A narrative is highly internally consistent when it includes examples that support personal theories or themes, and synthesizing statements that pull the narrative together. A narrative lacks internal consistency when it has few or no examples, lacks synthesizing statements, or includes contradictions that are unexplained or unrecognized (5 pt scale, with higher scores reflecting greater consistency)

> Flexibility is the degree the participant is able to view issues as others might see them. Flexibility involves recognition that there is more than one side to a story. Participants presenting a highly flexible story are willing to consider the complex nature of issues and relationships, and to acknowledge that their personal view is not the only valid one. Inflexible participants adhere rigidly to their story-line and assume that relationships are to be considered from only one vantage point, their own. (5 pt scale, with higher scores reflecting greater flexibility)

> Salience is the degree adoption and adoptive status dominate a participant's description of his or her thoughts, behaviors, decisions, and expressed emotions in response to interview questions about whether adoption plays a future role in three specific areas of life. Adoption will be highly salient to a participant when adoption and adoptive status influence future plans regarding: (1) relationship (dating, marriage and adopting children), (2) religious, and (3) career/educational choices. (5 pt. scale, with higher scores reflecting greater salience)

> Positive Affect about Adoption and Negative Affect about Adoption are two separate dimensions that capture the degree of current affect participants express about: 1) adoption and being adopted, 2) adoptive family members and connections with adoptive family, related to adoption issues, and 3) birth family members and connections with birth family, related to adoption issues. Aspects of positive and negative affect include, but are not limited to participants'

expressions of their level of comfort when talking about adoption with family members, friends, peers, and other people; feelings regarding connections with the adoptive or birth family, feelings about adoptive and birth family members; feelings about being adopted; and, considerations of adoption in general as positive or negative. High levels of positive affect about adoption do not imply low levels of negative affect about adoption, and visa versa. (5 pt scales with higher scores indicating higher affect)

Adoptive Identity (AI) and Affect about Adoption coding required a moderate to high level of inference, depending on the dimension and the interview transcript being coded. Coders were advanced graduate students in family social science with backgrounds in adoption studies. Coder training involved approximately six group sessions plus individual homework. Coders were required to attain .80 percent agreement or better (exact percent agreement on five out of six dimensions or better) on at least two criterion transcripts before coding independently. Coders used the Wave 3 Adoptive Identity and Affect about Adoption Coder Manual (Von Korff, Grotevant & Friese, 2007) to assign codes and resolve differences during consensus. The Wave 3 Coder Manual contains examples from Wave 3 transcripts for each code level of every dimension. Throughout the coding process, coders attended weekly group meeting designed to: 1) maintain coder adherence to the Coding Manual, 2) reinforce training, and 3) ensure consensus meetings were performed on a timely basis. Percent agreement was determined by comparing individuals' codes with codes agreed upon during consensus meetings. Reliability was monitored throughout the coding process using percent exact agreement. Approximately 40% of all interviews were coded independently by two coders. Disagreements were resolved through discussion during consensus meetings. Weighted kappas ranged from $\kappa w = .68$ to $\kappa w = .78$. Kappa coefficients below .41 are considered fair, coefficients .41 to .60 are considered moderate and 61.to .80 are considered substantive (Landis & Koch, 1977). Weighted kappas fully correct for chance agreement while also adjusting for the degree of disagreement between coders (Cohen, 1968).

Occupation / Education Exploration Coding

Occupational / educational exploration will be rated from the Occupation / education Identity section of the Young Adult Interview (Grotevant & Cooper, 1981), a semi-structured interview that assesses the degree to which the young adult has actively considered occupational and educational options for the future. Both breadth and depth of exploration are rated. Depth of identity exploration is defined as the degree to which the young adult investigates or examines this aspect of identity with clarity, intensity, reflection or thoughtfulness. Depth of exploration will be rated on a scale from 1 (no/minimal depth) to 5 (great depth). Breadth of identity exploration is defined as the degree to which the young adult explores multiple identity choices or options with regard to occupation and/or education, or different ways of thinking about occupation or education. In order to distinguish breadth from depth of exploration, a young adult has breadth if exploration of alternatives is considered at least at a superficial level. Breadth will be coded on a scale from 1 (no/minimal breadth) to 4 (great breadth).

Depth of identity exploration was coded at Wave 2 for the domains of occupation, friendship, religion and adoption. It was coded at Wave 3 for adoption, and will be coded for religion/spirituality, and school/occupation. Depth of identity exploration is defined as the degree to which the young adult investigates or examines an identity with clarity, intensity, reflection or thoughtfulness. Exploration will be rated on a scale from 1 (no/minimal depth) to 5 (great depth).

Breadth of identity exploration was coded at Wave 2 for occupation and religion. It will be coded at Wave 3 for domains religion/spirituality and school/occupation. Breadth of identity exploration is defined as the degree to which the young adult explores multiple identity choices or options, or different ways of thinking about occupation or religion. In order to distinguish breadth from depth of exploration, a young adult has breadth if exploration of alternatives is considered at least at a superficial level. Breadth will be coded on a scale from 1 (no/minimal breadth) to 4 (great breadth).

Work Status

Work status (from Egeland, Sroufe, & Collins Minnesota Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children 23 year assessment) will be used to assess the participant's current status regarding occupation and/or education. It is rated on a 5 point scale from 1 = engaged in little or no work or school experience to 5 = engaged in full time work, or full time school, or a combination of work and education that would constitute full-time participation.

Religion / Spirituality Exploration Coding

Religious / spiritual exploration will be rated from the Religion / spirituality Identity section of the Young Adult Interview (Grotevant & Cooper, 1981), a semi-structured interview that assesses the degree to which the young adult has actively considered his or her stance with regard to religion and/or spirituality. Both breadth and depth of exploration are rated. Depth of identity exploration is defined as the degree to which the young adult investigates or examines this aspect of identity with clarity, intensity, reflection or thoughtfulness. Depth of exploration will be rated on a scale from 1 (no/minimal depth) to 5 (great depth). Breadth of identity exploration is defined as the degree to which the young adult explores multiple identity choices or options with regard to religion and/or spirituality, or different ways of thinking about religion or spirituality. In order to distinguish breadth from depth of exploration, a young adult has breadth if exploration of alternatives is considered at least at a superficial level. Breadth will be coded on a scale from 1 (no/minimal breadth) to 4 (great breadth).

Depth of identity exploration was coded at Wave 2 for the domains of occupation, friendship, religion and adoption. It was coded at Wave 3 for adoption, and will be coded for religion/spirituality, and school/occupation. Depth of identity exploration is defined as the degree to which the young adult investigates or

examines an identity with clarity, intensity, reflection or thoughtfulness. Exploration will be rated on a scale from 1 (no/minimal depth) to 5 (great depth).

Breadth of identity exploration was coded at Wave 2 for occupation and religion. It will be coded at Wave 3 for domains religion/spirituality and school/occupation. Breadth of identity exploration is defined as the degree to which the young adult explores multiple identity choices or options, or different ways of thinking about occupation or religion. In order to distinguish breadth from depth of exploration, a young adult has breadth if exploration of alternatives is considered at least at a superficial level. Breadth will be coded on a scale from 1 (no/minimal breadth) to 4 (great breadth).

Economic Self-Sufficiency

Economic self-sufficiency will be rated from the Young Adult Questionnaire, which includes questions about education, training, and employment history. The variable will be a rating (7 point global rating scale) of the degree to which the economic and employment situation of the young adult are matched with his or her education and career goals.

Adoption Coding: Discrete and Global

Coding schemes were developed to assess discrete and global issues other than identity within the adoption section of the Young Adult Interview. For Discrete Coding, mutually exclusive codes were applied for most items coded. Issues coded from the interviews for discrete coding included the following: logistics of the interview (e.g. whether the interview was done on the telephone or in a secure internet chat site), talking about adoption (e.g. with whom the young adult talks about his/her adoption most openly), birth mother knowledge and contact, birth father knowledge and contact, knowledge of and/or contact with a third birth family member, adopted siblings' contact with birth family, and collaboration between adoptive parents and birth parents. Coders made judgments that required a moderate level of inference. All coding was performed by graduate students or mature undergraduates in the social sciences. Coders were trained to a percent agreement of .90. Percent agreement was determined by comparing coders' individual codes with the codes decided upon during consensus and was monitored throughout the course of coding. Percent exact agreement was used in reliability calculations because it requires perfect agreement between coders and is therefore a stringent criterion. Approximately one-quarter of all interviews were coded independently by two coders and disagreements were resolved through discussion.

Global Coding examined issues based on the Adoption Curiosity Pathway process model (Wrobel & Dillon, 2009) and were coded for both the birth mother and the birth father. They included: the young adult's perception of his/her information gap (what he/she does not know about his birth mother or birth father) and the strength of desire to fill the gap, perceived barriers and facilitators to filling the gap, information seeking action taken by the young adult, and the young adult's satisfaction with his/her openness arrangements.

Coders made judgments that require a moderate to high level of inference. All coding was performed by three graduate students, a mature undergraduate, or one of the investigators. Coders were trained to a percent agreement of .80. Approximately one-quarter of all interviews were coded independently by two coders and disagreements were resolved through discussion.

Personal Interaction Interview/Intimacy Coding

Coding of Personal Interaction/Intimacy interviews was based on the conceptual work and operationalization of Kathleen White's Intimacy Interview, renamed the Personal Interaction Interview for our purposes. Informed by White's coding manual, six variables were coded: Orientation to the relationship, Concern, Commitment, Communication: Self-Disclosure, Communication: Initiating, Communication: Responding. One variable was not coded, Communication: Listening, because of an absence of data in the interviews to support coding that dimension.

White's scale employs three levels with two stages represented in each level resulting in a total of six stages. The three levels are Self-focused, Role-Focused, and Individuated/Connected. These three levels were used but in order to increase variability, three stages for each level, rather than two, were used, resulting in nine distinct stages within the scale. Each variable was coded on the scale ranging from 1 to 9.

The following are the definitions we used for coding the identified variables:

>Orientation is the quality of the generalized thoughts, feelings, and behaviors regarding the relationship.

>Concern is the expression of affection and caring in the relationship.

>Commitment reflects why a person wants to stay in the relationship.

>Communication: Self-Disclosure is the manner in which the respondent shares feelings and reactions with the partner on a wide range of subjects.

>Communication: Initiating is the manner in which the respondent raises discussions of problems and issues within the relationship.

>Communication: Responding is the manner in which the focal follows through on a discussion of differences to achieve resolution.

Two coders rated the same transcript and then compared codes. One coder was considered the "initial" coder while the other coder was considered the "reliability" coder. The reliability coder was the coder whose reliability was being checked in comparison of the two codes. Reliability was considered achieved when the reliability coder's codes matched or were within one stage above or below the initial coder's codes on at least five of the six constructs. When the reliability coder had accomplished

reliability twice, that coder was considered reliable and was then free to code independently. After achieving reliability, coders were required to consense one of every four transcripts with another coder throughout the duration of the coding. Intraclass correlations for intimacy coding were as follows: orientation = .60, concern = .55, commitment = .59, self disclosure= .84, responding = .62.

Family Representations Coding

This coding process is in development.

Appendix

Codebook List

Adoptive Identity Codebook (Finalized:)
Intimacy Codebook (Finalized:)
YA Adoption Discrete Codebook (Finalized:)
YA Adoption Global Codebook (Finalized:)
Family Representations Codebook (In progress)
Work, School & Religion Codebook (In progress)