

University of Portland Pilot Scholars

Communication Studies Undergraduate
Publications, Presentations and Projects

Communication Studies

Spring 2014

The Effect of Affectionate Communication on Relational Closeness in the Emerging Adult Sibling Relationship

Rebecca Bell

Follow this and additional works at: http://pilotscholars.up.edu/cst_studpubs

 Part of the [Communication Commons](#)

Citation: Pilot Scholars Version (Modified MLA Style)

Bell, Rebecca, "The Effect of Affectionate Communication on Relational Closeness in the Emerging Adult Sibling Relationship" (2014). *Communication Studies Undergraduate Publications, Presentations and Projects*. 61.
http://pilotscholars.up.edu/cst_studpubs/61

This Student Project is brought to you for free and open access by the Communication Studies at Pilot Scholars. It has been accepted for inclusion in Communication Studies Undergraduate Publications, Presentations and Projects by an authorized administrator of Pilot Scholars. For more information, please contact library@up.edu.

The Effect of Affectionate Communication on Relational Closeness in the Emerging Adult

Sibling Relationship

Rebecca Bell

CST 425

Spring 2014

University of Portland

“I understand that in the interest of shared scholarship the University of Portland and its agents have the non-exclusive license to archive and make accessible my work in whole or in part in all forms of media in perpetuity. Further, I understand that my work, in addition to its bibliographic record and abstract, may be available to a wider community of scholars and researchers through electronic access.”

Introduction

Over 80% of the world's population has a sibling. The sibling relationship begins at birth and ends at death and throughout their lifetime siblings have a powerful presence in each other's lives (Rittenour, Myers, and Brann, 2007). This relationship is the longest lasting relationship in most people's lives, and because of this it is unique in many ways (Floyd and Morman, 2006). Due to its involuntary nature many siblings can be, both, on good terms and in conflict at the same time (Rocca and Martin, 1998). The sibling relationship provides a ground where people learn social skills and interaction styles that help develop and maintain satisfying interpersonal relationships in adulthood (Rauer and Volling, 2007). Because of how central the sibling relationship is in most people's lives, sibling relationships are understudied.

Despite the importance of the sibling relationship, it is the least studied familial relationship (Floyd and Morman, 2005). The majority of the research on the sibling relationship looks at how siblings communicate negative emotions like jealousy and envy to each other (Bevan and Stetzenbach, 2007) and not how siblings communicate positive emotions or affection. Additionally most research about the sibling relationship has been conducted on sibling relationships in childhood and or old age and not on the sibling relationship in early and middle adulthood (Myers and Bryant, 2008).

Given the gap in sibling research, this study will look at how siblings use affectionate communication to enhance their relational closeness in emerging adulthood. Because of the pervasive nature of the sibling relationship further study of relational closeness and sibling's use of affectionate communication may lead to a better understanding of how siblings can maintain or repair their relationships. The goal of this study is to reach a better understanding of how affectionate communication is used and how it affects relational closeness in the emerging adult

sibling relationship. The remainder of this paper is organized into four sections. The first section offers a review of the literature on emerging adulthood, affectionate communication, and relational. The second section presents the methods used during the current study. The third section shows the results of the study. The final section is a discussion of the findings of this study.

Literature Review

Emerging Adulthood

Emerging adulthood is characterized at the “transition from late adolescence to young adulthood” (Tastan, 2013, pg. 1139) and it focuses on the ages of 18 to 25. This time in a person’s life can be “characterized by a chaotic state of change and exploration,” (Myers and Bryant, 2008, pg. 102). Emerging adults are usually more individualistic with a lack of commitment to relational endeavors (Myers and Bryant, 2008).

Relational changes in the sibling relationship during emerging adulthood are often caused by one or more of the siblings moving out of the family home, these changes can cause some sibling relationships to grow closer and others to drift apart (Rocca and Martin 1998). Myers and Bryant (2008) found that when a person enters emerging adulthood their relationship changes in two ways. Firstly, they spend less time with their sibling. Secondly, they begin to view their sibling relationships more favorably (Myers and Bryant 2008).

Emerging adulthood is characterized by change. Moving out of the family home, going to college, and getting a job are all things that happen during this time in a person’s life, because of all the change, relationships change during that time as well. Because this is a formative time in one’s life this study will examine the sibling relationship in early adulthood, and how affectionate communication affects relational closeness during that time.

Affectionate Communication

The desire to be loved and appreciated is fundamental to humans, and one way people express their love is through affectionate communication (Floyd, Pauley, and Hesse, 2010). Affectionate communication is defined as both the verbal and nonverbal things people say and do to express their fondness for each other (Rittenour et al., 2007). An important purpose of affectionate communication is maintaining personal relationships (Floyd, 2006).

Affectionate communication has three dimensions; verbal expressions, nonverbal expressions, and social supportiveness (Rittenour et al., 2007). Verbal expressions occur when siblings express, through statements, their liking and loving for one another. Nonverbal expressions identified through nonverbal communication, such as touch and space behavior. Finally social supportiveness is conveyed through, “compliments, self-disclosure, or praise” (Rittenour et al., 2007, p. 172).

There are numerous positive effects that affectionate communication has on one’s life. Floyd (2002) found that people with high levels of affectionate communication had higher levels of happiness, social activity, mental health, and social esteem, while those with low levels of affectionate communication had higher levels of stress, depression, and social isolation. These benefits of affectionate communication lead to higher levels of relational satisfaction (Floyd, 2002).

According to Floyd (1998) most studies assess nonverbal affectionate communication instead of verbal affectionate communication. However, Owen (1987) found that verbal affectionate communication is just as important as nonverbal affectionate communication. Additionally Rittenour et al. (2007) found that siblings that engage in supportive communication are more committed to their siblings. Furthermore a study done by Myers, Byrnes, Frisby, and

Mansson (2011) found that adult siblings use affectionate communication strategically more than they use it routinely, in order to maintain their relationships.

Other studies of affectionate communication have examined how biological sex or sex composition affect affectionate communication (Floyd and Mormon, 1998). Many have also looked at the physiological repercussions of affectionate communication (Floyd, 2006; Floyd et al., 2010; and Floyd and Riforgiate, 2008) and not the emotional and relational benefits or detriments that come along with affectionate communication.

While studies have examined affectionate communication in the sibling relationship (Myers et al., 2011; and Rittenour et al., 2007) none of them have looked at the interpersonal benefit and relational satisfaction that can accompany affectionate communication in the sibling relationship. Affectionate communication is an important aspect of fostering healthy relationships (Floyd, 2002). Because of that I have proposed the following research questions about affectionate communication in the sibling relationship:

RQ1. What type of affectionate communication is used most frequently among siblings?

RQ2. Is there a significant difference in how men and women use affectionate communication in the sibling relationship?

Relational Closeness

Relational closeness is the sense of trust, shared experience, concern, and sense of enjoyment one gets out of their relationships (Chupp, 2009). Relational closeness was linked to relational commitment by Myers and Bryant (2008) saying, “On an affective level, when commitment occurs, relational partners report feelings of marital and relational satisfaction, liking, loving, trust, and relational closeness” (pg. 104). Relational closeness is a crucial part of helping to build and maintain a positive sibling relationship (Rocca and Martin, 1998)

A majority of the research involving relational closeness looks at relational closeness in post-divorce relationships and relational closeness between students and teachers (McManus and Nussbaum, 2011; Claus, Booth-Butterfield, and Chory, 2012, and Mazer and Thompson 2011). However, research has been done on relational closeness in the sibling relationship.

Rocca and Martin (1998) found that in the sibling relationship relational closeness is fostered by communication. The level of closeness within the relationship depends on the depth and breadth of their communication. Myers and Bryant (2008) found that siblings reveal relational closeness is via self-disclosure, affectionate communication, and shared activities. Connidis (1992) found that life events, such as marriage, death of a family member, or having children, can influence how close siblings feel. Additionally Floyd and Morman (2006) found that the closer the siblings are the more positive mental effects they experience and the less lonely they feel.

Relational closeness is a critical component of any healthy relationship, including the sibling relationships (Floyd and Morman, 2006). While it is a well-studied area of the sibling relationship there have been no definitive answers as to which communicative behaviors help enhance relational closeness and satisfaction in the sibling relationship (Chupp, 2009). Because of that the following research questions are asked:

- RQ3. In siblings with high levels of relational closeness what type of affectionate communication is used most frequently?
- RQ4. Is there a significant relationship between affectionate communication and relational closeness?

Method

Respondents

The respondents of this survey were recruited via social media (Facebook) as well as through email at a small sized Catholic university. Since participants were able to complete the survey online on their own personal computers or smart phones, participation was voluntary and anonymous. In order to participate, volunteers had to have at least one sibling. If they had more than one sibling, they were asked to report on the sibling they felt closest to throughout the entire survey. If the participant did not have a biological sibling they were allowed to report on their relationship with a stepsibling, half-sibling, or adopted sibling.

The 90 person sample for this study was composed of 22 males and 68 females, whose ages ranged from 18 to 24 (M: 20.96, SD: 1.19). The ethnicity of the participants was as follows: 79 white, 4 Hispanic or Latino, 1 Black of African American, 4 Asian/Pacific Islander, and 2 identified as other. The participants reported on 44 male and 46 female siblings. The majority of participants (73) reported on biological siblings, while 8 reported on half-siblings, 1 reported on a stepsibling, 1 reported on an adopted sibling, and 7 reported on their twin. The ethnicity of the siblings reported on was as follows: 78 white, 4 Hispanic or Latino, 5 Asian/Pacific Islander, and 3 identified as other.

Measures

In order to measure affectionate communication this study used an adapted version of Floyd and Morman's (1998) affectionate communication index. The affectionate communication index was adapted to look specifically at the sibling relationship. The final scale looked at how frequently siblings engage in affectionate communication. The scale specifically measures nonverbal affectionate communication (three items), verbal affectionate

communication (five items), and social supportiveness (five items). Specific items in the scale are “my sibling and I sit close to each other”, “my sibling and I say ‘I like you’”, and “my sibling and I help each other with problems”. Participants were asked to say how frequently they engage in the specified behavior with their sibling. Respondents answered using a five point scale with one being never and 5 being all the time.

Rittenour et al. (2007) found that the scale was accurate and reliable. They found a Cronbach’s Alpha of .87 for the nonverbal dimension of the scale, a Cronbach’s Alpha of .88 for the verbal dimension of the scale, and a Cronbach’s Alpha of .86 for the social supportiveness dimension of the scale. To check for consistency in this study, a Pearson Bivariate Correlation was run on the affectionate communication index. Cronbach’s Alpha was .923. indicating that the scale was highly reliable. A Pearson Bivariate Correlation was also run on the three dimensions of the affectionate communication index, a coefficient alpha of .842 was found for the social supportiveness dimension of the scale, a coefficient alpha of .883 was found for the verbal dimension of the scale, and a coefficient alpha of .778 was found for the nonverbal dimension of the scale, indicating that all of the dimensions of the scale were reliable.

To measure relational closeness this study used Dibble and Levine’s (2011) unidimensional relationship closeness scale that had been adapted to specifically look at the sibling relationship. The scale asked questions about how much time siblings spend together, how much they think about their siblings, and how confident they are in their relationship with their sibling. Respondents answered using a five point scale with one being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree.

Dibble and Levine (2011) found this scale to be both valid and reliable with a Cronbach’s Alpha of .93 when they used it to study relational closeness in romantic relationships, and a

Cronbach's Alpha of .99 when they used it to studied relational closeness in friendships. To check for consistency in this study, a Pearson Bivariate Correlation was run on the unidimensional relational closeness scale. Cronbach's Alpha was .953, indicating the scale was highly reliable.

There were also general questions that asked about how much time siblings spend together and how frequently they communicate with each other. These questions were added to gain a more rounded understanding of the data. Finally there was demographic questions about both the participant and their sibling. Such questions asked about sex, age, ethnicity of both the participant and their sibling, and how the participant is related to the sibling in question (i.e.; biologically related, half-siblings, stepsiblings, adopted siblings, or twins).

Procedures

The 23 item survey, created in Qualtrics, was distributed via social media and email to college students. The survey was sent/posted with a short description of the research project and a web address from which they could access the survey online. After they were presented with the informed consent form the participants completed the survey (See Appendix A for a copy of the informed consent and the survey). The participants were asked to think of the sibling they were closest to and report on them for the duration of the survey.

Since the survey was available to take online and was posted on social media, the respondents may have been from colleges and universities around the country (there was no data collected about that). However, it is assumed that most of the respondents attended college or university in the Pacific Northwest. There was no compensation for students who completed the survey.

Results

In order to create the relational closeness variable, the items on the relational closeness scale were added together to make variable labeled *Closeness*. Additionally, to create the social supportiveness, verbal, and nonverbal variables, the items of the affection index that measure social supportiveness were added together to create a variable labeled *Support*, the items of the affection index that measured verbal communication were added together to create the variable labeled *Verbal*, and the items of the affection index that measured nonverbal communication were added together to create a variable labeled *Nonverbal*. Finally all of the items from the affectionate communication index were added together to create a variable labeled *Total Affection*.

The first research question asked what type of affectionate communication is used most frequently among siblings. By running a frequency over the variables *Support*, *Verbal*, and *Nonverbal* it was found that social supportiveness (i.e. helping each other with problems” was used most frequently among siblings (M: 19.77; SD: 3.82) followed by verbal communication (M: 13.57; SD: 5.57), and then nonverbal communication (M: 10.22; SD: 3.02).

The second research question asked if there was a difference between how men and women use affectionate communication in the sibling relationship. To answer this question a Univariate Analysis of Variance was run. Results showed there was no significant difference between the sexes.

The third research question asked what type of affectionate communication is used most frequently in siblings with high levels of relational closeness. First a Chi Square test was run to see if there was a significant difference in affection between those who were high in closeness and low in closeness. The results were significant (F: 36.87; $p < .001$). Then crosstabs were

created comparing high and low levels relational closeness and high and low levels of social supportiveness, verbal communication, and nonverbal communication. It was found that 88.1% of participants with high levels of closeness also had high levels of social supportiveness (figure 1), 77.8% of participants who reported high levels of closeness had high levels of verbal communication (figure 2), and that 71.1% of participants who reported high levels of closeness also had high levels of nonverbal communication (figure 3).

	Low Supportiveness	High Supportiveness
Low Closeness	83.8%	16.2%
High Closeness	11.9%	88.1%

Figure 1 level of relational closeness compared to level of social supportiveness.

	Low Verbal	High Verbal
Low Closeness	86.1%	13.9%
High Closeness	22.2%	77.8%

Figure 2 level of relational closeness compared to level of verbal communication.

	Low Nonverbal	High Nonverbal
Low Closeness	72.2%	27.8%
High Closeness	28.9%	71.1%

Figure 3 level of relational closeness compares to level of nonverbal communication.

The fourth and final research question asked if there was a significant relationship between affectionate communication and relational closeness. A Pearson Correlation between affectionate communication and relational closeness was run to test whether the two variables

were related. Findings were significant ($r: .785; p < .001$). Additionally, a Pearson Correlation between social supportiveness and relational closeness was run to test whether the two variables were related. Findings were significant ($r: .834; p < .001$). Furthermore, a Pearson Correlation between verbal communication and relational closeness was run to test whether the two variables were related. Findings were significant ($r: .694; p < .001$). Finally, a Pearson Correlation between nonverbal communication and relational closeness was run to test whether the two variables were related. Findings were significant ($r: .554; p < .001$).

In sum this study found that there was a significant relationship between affectionate communication and relational closeness. It was found that with regards to frequency social supportiveness was used most frequently among siblings, followed by verbal communication, then nonverbal communication. It was found that the majority of siblings who engage in high levels of social supportiveness had high levels of relational closeness. High levels of relational closeness were also found in siblings with high levels of verbal communication and high levels of nonverbal communication.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to reach a better understanding of how affectionate communication is used and how it affects relational closeness in the emerging adult sibling relationship. In this study it was found that there is a significant relationship between affectionate communication (verbal communication, nonverbal communication, and social supportiveness) and relational closeness in the emerging adult sibling relationship. These results are not surprising given that Floyd (2002) found that the positive benefits that are associated with affectionate communication (i.e. higher levels of happiness, social activity, and social esteem) lead to higher levels of relational satisfaction.

Relational closeness is a well-studied area of the sibling relationship. Rocca and Martin (1998) found that relational closeness in the sibling relationship is fostered via communication. However, prior to this study there were no definitive answers as to which communicative behaviors help enhance relational closeness in the sibling relationship. The current study found that social supportiveness, verbal communication, and nonverbal communication, respectively, are used most frequently in siblings in emerging adulthood with high levels of relational closeness. Moreover, social supportiveness was most highly correlated.

Many studies have been done that examine the individual dimensions of affectionate communication (Floyd, 1998; Owen, 1987; and Rittenour et al., 2007) but none of them have looked at all of the dimensions together as a whole. The current study examines the effect of affection on relational closeness as a whole as well as the individual dimensions of affectionate communications effect on relational closeness. Additionally, prior studies examining affectionate communication have examined the physiological repercussions engaging in affectionate communication (Floyd, 2006; Floyd et al., 2010; and Floyd and Riforgiate, 2008). The current study examined the interpersonal benefits that are associated with affectionate communication. This study found the interpersonal benefits include higher levels of relational closeness.

Finally the current study looked at the effect of affectionate communication on relational closeness in the sibling relationship during emerging adulthood. Emerging adulthood is a formative time in a person's life where they spend less time with their sibling (Myers and Bryant, 2008). Despite its formative nature, little research has been done on the sibling relationship in emerging adulthood. The current study examined two important aspects of the

sibling relationship (affectionate communication and relational closeness) during one of the most important times of a person's life, emerging adulthood.

There are limitations of this study that should be recognized. One of the limitations of the current study was the homogeneous nature of the sample. The participants were mostly women which could have skewed the results of the study towards the female perspective of affectionate communication and relational closeness, regardless of if they were reporting on a male or female sibling. The way males use affectionate communication may be different than how females do. Future areas of research could attempt to equalize the number of males and females in the study and see if different results are obtained. Additionally, future research could examine the sex of the sibling dyad when analyzing the results.

Another limitation of the study is that the sample consisted of mostly Caucasians, with the number of respondents from other ethnic groups being very small. Cultural background may change the way that sibling express affection towards one another. Because of that, future research could examine how ethnicity plays a part in affectionate communication and relational closeness.

A final limitation of the current study was that while all of the participants were in emerging adulthood (between the ages of 18 to 25), no data was collected to see how old their siblings were. Future studies could examine how the age difference of the dyad effects affectionate communication and relational closeness.

Other future areas of research could examine how frequency of communication informs the use of affectionate communication and relational closeness in emerging adulthood. This would be an interesting area of study because of Myers and Bryant's (2008) findings that showed that in emerging adulthood siblings spend less time with each other. Another area of future

research could study how the type of sibling relationship (biological sibling, adopted sibling, half-sibling, stepsibling, and twin) effects affectionate communication and relational closeness.

Conclusion

This study has laid the foundation for continued research on how affectionate communication effects relational closeness in the sibling relationship in emerging adulthood. The results of the study show that affectionate communication has an effect on relational closeness, and that high levels of social supportiveness, verbal communication, and nonverbal communication are related to high levels of relational closeness. Future research can build upon these results in order to further the understanding of how affectionate communication and relational closeness play out in the emerging adult sibling relationship.

Works Cited

- Bevan, J. L., & Stetzenbach, K. A. (2007). Jealousy Expression and Communication Satisfaction in Adult Sibling Relationships. *Communication Research Reports*, 24(1), 71-77. doi:10.1080/08824090601128224
- Chupp, E. (2009). Love You Like a Sister: How Emotions Experienced and Expressed Affect Relationship Closeness Among Siblings. *Conference Papers -- National Communication Association*, 1.
- Claus, C. J., Booth-Butterfield, M., & Chory, R. M. (2012). The Relationship Between Instructor Misbehaviors and Student Antisocial Behavioral Alteration Techniques: The Roles of Instructor Attractiveness, Humor, and Relational Closeness. *Communication Education*, 61(2), 161-183. doi:10.1080/03634523.2011.647922
- Connidis, I. A. (1992, November). Life Transitions and the Adult Sibling Tie: A Qualitative Study. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 54(4), 972-982. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/>
- Dibble, J. L., Levine, T. R., & Park, H. S. (2011, November 14). The Unidimensional Relationship Closeness Scale (URCS): Reliability and Validity Evidence for a New Measure of Relationship Closeness. *Psychological Assessment*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1037/a0026265
- Floyd, K. (2002). Human Affection Exchange: V. Attributes of the Highly Affectionate. *Communication Quarterly*, 50(2), 135-152
- Floyd, K. (2006). Human Affection Exchange: XII. Affectionate Communication is Associated with Diurnal Variation in Salivary Free Cortisol. *Western Journal Of Communication*, 70(1), 47-63. doi:10.1080/10570310500506649

- Floyd, K., & Morman, M. T. (Eds.). (2006). *Widening the Family Circle, New Research on Family Communication* (1 ed.). Thousand Oaks , CA: Sage .
- Floyd, K., & Morman, M. T. (1998). The measurement of affectionate communication. *Communication Quarterly*, 46(2), 144-162.
- Floyd, K., & Morman, M. T. (1997). Affectionate communication in nonromantic relationships: Influences of communicator, relational. *Western Journal Of Communication*, 61(3), 279-298.
- Floyd, K., Pauley, P. M., & Hesse, C. (2010). State and Trait Affectionate Communication Buffer Adults' Stress Reactions. *Communication Monographs*, 77(4), 618-636.
doi:10.1080/03637751.2010.498792
- Floyd, K., & Riforgiate, S. (2008). Affectionate Communication Received from Spouses Predicts Stress Hormone Levels in Healthy Adults. *Communication Monographs*, 75(4), 351-368.
doi:10.1080/03637750802512371
- Mazer, J. P., & Thompson, B. (2011). The Validity of the Student Academic Support Scale: Associations with Social Support and Relational Closeness. *Communication Reports*, 24(2), 74-85. doi:10.1080/08934215.2011.622237
- McManus, T. G., & Nussbaum, J. (2011). Ambiguous Divorce-Related Communication, Relational Closeness, Relational Satisfaction, and Communication Satisfaction. *Western Journal Of Communication*, 75(5), 500-522. doi:10.1080/10570314.2011.608407
- Myers, S. A., & Bryant, L. E. (2008). The Use of Behavioral Indicators of Sibling Commitment Among Emerging Adults. *Journal Of Family Communication*, 8(2), 101-125.
doi:10.1080/15267430701857364
- Myers, S. A., Byrnes, K. A., Frisby, B. N., & Mansson, D. H. (2011). Adult Siblings' Use of

- Affectionate Communication as a Strategic and Routine Relational Maintenance Behavior. *Communication Research Reports*, 28(2), 151-158.
doi:10.1080/08824096.2011.565276
- Owen, W. F. (1987). The verbal expression of love by women and men as a critical Communication event in personal relationships. *Women's Studies in Communication*.
- Rauer, A. J., & Volling, B. L. (2007). Differential parenting and sibling jealousy: Developmental correlates of young adults' romantic relationships. *Personal Relationships*, 14(4), 495-511. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6811.2007.00168.x
- Rittenour, C. E., Myers, S. A., & Brann, M. (2007). Commitment and Emotional Closeness in the Sibling Relationship. *Southern Communication Journal*, 72(2), 169-183.
doi:10.1080/10417940701316682
- Rocca, K. A., & Martin, M. M. (1998). The Relationship Between Willingness to Communicate and Solidarity with Frequency, Breadth, and Depth of Communication in the Sibling Relationship. *Communication Research Reports*, 15(1), 82-90.
- Tastan, N. (2013). EFFECT OF FATHER-CHILD BONDING ON CONFLICT RESOLUTION DURING EMERGING ADULTHOOD. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, 41(8), 1339-1345. doi:10.2224/sbp.2013.41.8.1339

Appendix A

Informed Consent

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Rebecca Bell, from the UNIVERSITY OF PORTLAND Department of Communication Studies. I am studying the influence of affectionate communication on relational closeness in the emerging adult sibling relationship. You were selected as a possible participant in this study because you have a sibling.

If you decide to participate, you will be asked to fill out an online questionnaire. The questionnaire will take about 10-12 minutes.

There are no risks or benefits associated with this study, though I hope to gain a better insight into how affectionate communication affects the sibling relationship. I also hope that my study will contribute to helping students who wish to become closer to their sibling do so.

Subject identities will be anonymous. Each survey will be assigned a number. Information obtained in connection from this study will be aggregated, and will not identify you in any way. My advisor will keep surveys in a locked cabinet. I will present the findings of my study in a poster presentation on campus, and hopefully at a local conference. After the study is completed, surveys will be shredded. Your participation is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your relationship with your university. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation at any time without penalty.

If you have any questions about the study, please feel free to contact me by phone at (971) 255-9535, by email at bellr14@up.edu, or by mail at 6407 N Willamette Blvd., Portland, OR 97203. Also, feel free to contact my advisor, Dr. Shapiro, at (503) 943-7349. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, please contact the IRB (IRB@up.edu). If you would like a copy of this form, please email me, and I will send it to you.

Your accessing the online survey indicates that you have read and understand the information provided above, that you willingly agree to participate, that you may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Bell

January 20, 2014

Survey Questions

Q2 How many siblings do you have?

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- More than 4

Q3 For the rest of the survey please think only of the sibling you are closest to.

Q4 Would you explain why or how you and your closest sibling became close? What factors do you think contributed?

Q5 How are you related to your sibling (i.e.; biological siblings, half siblings, step-siblings)?

- Biological sibling
- Half-sibling
- Stepsibling
- Twin
- Adopted sibling

Q6 Do you live with your sibling?

- Yes
- No

Q7 Please identify how often you engage in the following behaviors with your sibling on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being never and 5 being all the time.

	Never 1	Rarely 2	Sometimes 3	Often 4	All of the Time 5
My sibling and I help each other with problems	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My sibling and I acknowledge each other's birthday	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My sibling and I share private information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My sibling and I give each other complements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My sibling and I praise each other's accomplishments	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q8 Please think about your relationship with your sibling and respond to the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neither Agree or Disagree 3	Agree 4	Strongly Agree 5
My relationship with my sibling is close.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
When we are apart, I miss my sibling a great deal.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My sibling and I disclose important personal things to each other.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My sibling and I have a strong connection.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My sibling and I want to spend time together.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I'm sure of my relationship with my sibling.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My sibling is a priority in my life.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My sibling and I do a lot of things together.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
When I have free time I choose to	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<p>spend it alone with my sibling.</p>					
<p>I think about my sibling a lot.</p>	○	○	○	○	○
<p>My relationship with my sibling is important in my life.</p>	○	○	○	○	○
<p>I consider my sibling when making important life decisions.</p>	○	○	○	○	○

Q9 Please identify how often you engage in the following behaviors with your sibling on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being never and 5 being all the time.

	Never 1	Rarely 2	Sometimes 3	Often 4	All of the time5
My sibling and I say "you're a good friend"	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My sibling and I say "I like you"	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My sibling and I say "I love you"	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My sibling and I say "you're my best friend"	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My Sibling and I talk about how important our relationship is	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q10 Please identify how often you engage in the following behaviors with your sibling on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being never and 5 being all the time.

	Never 1	Rarely 2	Sometimes 3	Often 4	All of the Time 5
My sibling and I hug each other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My sibling and I sit close to each other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My sibling and I look into each other's eyes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q11 How affectionate would you say your family is?

- Not at all affectionate
- Rarely affectionate
- Somewhat affectionate
- Affectionate
- Highly affectionate

Q12 How close would you say you are to your sibling?

- Not at all close
- Not very close
- Somewhat close
- Close
- Very close

Q13 How often do you see your sibling?

- Never
- When family gets together
- On school breaks
- Every few weeks
- Once a Week
- A few times a week
- Everyday

Q14 How old are you?

Q15 Are you

- Male
- Female

Q16 Is your sibling

- Male
- Female

Q17 Please specify your ethnicity

- White
- Hispanic or Latino
- Black or African American
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Native American or American Indian
- Other _____
- Prefer not to answer

Q18 Please specify your siblings ethnicity

- White
- Hispanic or Latino
- Black or African American
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Native American or American Indian
- Other _____
- Prefer not to answer