To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Janet Schreur Cockrum entitled "Gender Differences Between Never-Married Adults: Sociodemographic, Psychological, and Social Support Factors." I have examined the final copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Home Economics.

Priscilla N. White

Priscilla N. White, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation and recommend its acceptance:

Gary W. Peterson

Roger M. Swagler

William A. Poppen

Accepted for the Council:

Carmichael

The Graduate School

GENDER DIFFERENCES BETWEEN NEVER-MARRIED ADULTS: SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC, PSYCHOLOGICAL, AND SOCIAL SUPPORT FACTORS

A Dissertation
Presented for the
Doctor of Philosophy
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Janet Schreur Cockrum

December 1983

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to thank the 60 single adults who gave of their time and of themselves to make this study posible. I apreciate their honesty, flexibility and openness during the interview process.

A special thank you to Martin Gerbman for his flexibility, kindness, and willingness to lend his computer to me when I needed it the most.

I want to express my gratitude to my committee members Dr. Gary Peterson, Dr. Bill Poppen, and Dr. Roger Swagler. I appreciated their guidance and input throughout the process of putting this project together. A special and warm thank you to my major professor Dr. Priscilla White. I have appreciated Priscilla's friendship, guidance and support during my years in the department and especially as I've labored on this study.

A final thank you goes out to my family who have supported me through their prayers, words of encouragement, and faith in my ability to finish this task. My deepest appreciation goes to my loving husband Mark who has supported, colabored, and guided me in the word processing of this project. I dedicate this project to Mark and to our friendship and continued concern for the single adults who we are proud to call our friends.

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the differences between never-married men and women on a number of social-psychological variables. Specific attention was also given to a select group of sociodemographic variables. A secondary purpose was to examine the relationship between life satisfaction as a criterion variable and the other social-psychological variables as predictor variables.

The sample consisted of 30 never-married men and 30 never-married women, between the ages of 27-46. The average age of both the men and women was 31. Individuals had to be caucasian and currently "not cohabiting, not emotionally, sexually, or financially dependent on one person" (Adams, 1976, p.30). Subjects were located through singles groups within Knox County, Tennessee and through a snowballing technique.

Subjects completed three psychological questionnaires: (a) Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965), (b) UCLA Loneliness Scale (Russell et al., 1978), and (c) Life Satisfaction Scale (Campbell, 1976). Sociodemographic information was collected on the Singles Inventory (Cockrum, 1983). Following the written questionnaires, participants where interviewed about their support systems. The Interview Schedule for Social Interaction (Henderson

et al., 1981) provided information on the availability and adequacy of the individual's social support system.

Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) followed by univariate comparisons on the dependent variables were done in three separate analyses. The MANOVA'S and univariate comparisons analyzed the differences between the never-married men and women in terms of sociodemographic, psychological, and social support characteristics. There were no differences in the sociodemographic and psychological characteristics between the never-married men and women. There was no main effect difference between the two groups on social support characteristics. However, two social support univariate analysis were significant: (a) never-married women had more attachment relationships available to them than did the men, and (b) the never-married men reported finding it less difficult to function without attachment relationships than did the women.

Two regression models were tested to determine what factors were predictive of the life satisfaction of the never-married men and the never-married women. A two-variable model consisting of self-esteem and the availability of social integration was predictive of 25% of the variance in never-married men's life satisfaction. The availability of attachments and emotional loneliness were the two predictor variables in the regression model for

the never-married women's life satisfaction. This two-variable model accounted for 45% of the variance in the life satisfaction of the women in this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Rationale	2
	Conceptual Framework	6
	Statement of the Problem	11
	Objectives of the Study	12
	Nominal Definitions	13
II.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	15
	Scope of the Literature on Adjustment to Singlehood	15
	Singles	16
	Demographic Factors	17
	Gender and Age	17
	Education, Income, and Occupational Prestige	20
	Social-Psychological Factors	24
	Self-Esteem	24
	Life Satisfaction	27
	Loneliness	30
	Familial Support Systems	33
	Nonfamilial Support Systems	36
	Attachment Bonds	41
	Summary	47
III.	METHODS	49
	Subjects	49
	Sampling Procedure	49
	Procedure	50
	Data Reduction and Transformation	51
	Description of the Sample	52
	Instrumentation	58
	Interview Schedule for Social Interaction	60
	Life Satisfaction Scale	64
	Self-Esteem Scale	65
	Singles Inventory	67
	UCLA Loneliness Scale	67
	Operational Definitions	69
	Hypotheses of the Study	70
IV.	RESULTS	72
	Introduction	72
	Descriptive Statistics	72
	Social-Psychological Characteristics	72
	General Interest Questions	74
	Multivariate Analysis of Variance	77
	Sociodemographic	77

Psychological..... 77
Social Support..... 79
Regression Equations..... 81

V. CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS..... 85
Conclusions..... 85
Discussion..... 87
Sociodemographic Characteristics and General Interest..... 87
Psychological Dimensions..... 91
Emphasis on Attachments..... 93
Life Satisfaction Predictors in the Regression Models..... 96
Implications for Theory and Research..... 100
Implications for Intervention..... 102
Limitations of the Study..... 104

LIST OF REFERENCES..... 105

APPENDICES..... 113
A. INTRODUCTION LETTER TO THE STUDY..... 114
B. INFORMED CONSENT FORM..... 115
C. INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR SOCIAL INTERACTION.... 116
D. LIFE SATISFACTION SCALE..... 130
E. SELF-ESTEEM SCALE..... 131
F. SINGLES INVENTORY..... 132
G. UCLA LONELINESS SCALE..... 138
H. CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS..... 139

VITA..... 140

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Age Differences Between Males and Females.....	53
2.	Level of Education of Males and Females.....	53
3.	Education Differences Between Males and Females.....	54
4.	Occupational Prestige Differences Between Males and Females.....	55
5.	Total Income of Males and Females.....	56
6.	Religious Orientation of Males and Females.....	57
7.	Frequency of Church Activity.....	59
8.	Life Satisfaction Means of Males and Females.....	73
9.	Self-Esteem Means of Males and Females.....	73
10.	Percentages of Males and Females on General Interest Items.....	76
11.	Multivariate and Univariate Analyses of Variance for Gender Over Demographic Characteristics.....	78
12.	Multivariate and Univariate Analyses of Variance for Gender Over Psychological Characteristics.....	80
13.	Multivariate and Univariate Analyses of Variance for Gender Over Social Support Characteristics.....	82
14.	Stepwise Regression Analysis for Life Satisfaction of Never-Married Men and Women.....	84
15.	Correlation Coefficients.....	139

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Historically, marriage, adulthood, and maturity have been linked together in our society. The majority of Americans have assumed that marriage is the reflection of adulthood and maturity (Stein, 1976; Unger, 1976). Family theorists and researchers have contributed to this belief by focusing most of their energies on (a) theory and research founded on a traditional marriage based structure and (b) omitting theory and slighting research that identifies and explains the experiences of the singles population.

In recent decades various political and social groups, particularly women's organizations, have opposed directly and indirectly the traditional definition of adulthood that has dominated family research, as well as the values of a large segment of the American population. Consistent with the ideals of such groups, a substantial segment of the population are now choosing nontraditional roles that do not include marriage (Stein, 1978). Others have expressed their views by campaigning for taxes and governmental policies that recognize singlehood as an acceptable adult status.

Currently there are over 55 million unmarried adults

who are over the age of 18 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1980). The growth of the singles population indicates a trend for individuals to delay marriage or return to single status. Singlehood accounts for larger periods of the life span and is becoming a permanent status for some individuals. The singles population is a diverse group of individuals which varies with respect to age, previous marital status, education, occupation, and income levels, length of single status, parental status, self concept, and adjustment to singlehood (Stein, 1978). The experiences of unmarried individuals are complex and heterogeneous.

Rationale

The virtual absence of empirical evidence and theory about single adults is a great oversight in human development and family studies. This is true especially as the group of singles is increasing in number. Research needs to be done that describes who the single adults in America are and what the special needs of each subgroup of the singles population are. Currently, much of the information on singles is based on "testimonies" of single adults or journalistic descriptions about men and women who are single, rather than research that increases our understanding of the specific experiences and needs of the

singles population. Research that supports or refutes the current generalizations about single adults is needed so that accurate information can be given to policy makers, educators, and individuals who are seeking to understand the experiences of singles and aid individuals who are struggling to positively define and enact the single role.

This study was a small scale attempt to compare never-married men and women and to provide information on the factors that influence the life satisfaction of adults who are never-married. From a review of the existing literature on singles, several factors were chosen as the focus of this study. These factors (life satisfaction, self-esteem, loneliness, and a support system) were chosen because the research indicated that they play a significant role in the adjustment of adults to singlehood. This study was important because it investigated how predictive these variables were of life satisfaction, and also probed into the important area of identifying the similarities and differences of never-married men and women. A summary of the rationale for the inclusion of each variable in this study is given below.

Life satisfaction of single adults was focused on most often in studies and articles on singlehood (Jacoby, 1974; Libby, 1977; Melville, 1977; Pearlin and Johnson, 1981; Stein, 1981). Differences based on gender and age are

cited often as factors influencing adjustment and life satisfaction of single adults (Stein, 1981). A college education, high occupational prestige, and a good income also are mentioned as factors that make singlehood a more satisfying lifestyle (Jacoby, 1974; Pearlin and Johnson, 1981). Individuals who possess higher levels of these personal resources are better able to translate the ideological freedoms and pleasures of singlehood into reality (Jacoby, 1974).

High self-esteem is another personal resource important in assigning a positive view to single status. Individuals who have a high self-esteem can use this resource to combat the outdated and often degrading stereotypes about single men and women. Singles were often viewed as nonconformists, unfit, and deviants whose lifestyles went against the grain of normal life (Gurin et al., 1960; Lee, 1974; Pearlin and Johnson, 1981; Udry, 1974). Singles, because they do not fit into the marriage-based structure of society are vulnerable to assaults on their self-esteem.

It appears that men are more vulnerable to many of the hazards of single life than women (Pearlin and Johnson, 1981; Somers, 1981). Loneliness is often mentioned as the most pressing problem of singles, particularly for men (Melville, 1977). Living in a couple oriented society means that at times singles are either

left out of activities or included as a third wheel. This is particularly true in small towns where most socializing takes place in family homes and singles are excluded selectively. The perils of loneliness have become an important topic of study as the tragic accounts of the lonely are becoming more visible. Lonely adults are more likely to commit suicide and to live shorter lives (Lynch, 1977; Ruhe, 1978). Loneliness can lead to depression, poor health, and other damaging and debilitating emotional problems (Lynch, 1977, 1980).

The presence of significant others who have similar values, interests, and lifestyles can reduce the loneliness and stigma many singles experience. Close affectionate relationships can serve as a buffer between the single individual and wider society. The presence of an attachment figure and a network of diffuse social relationships can provide a "patchwork" intimacy and reference group (Keiffer, 1977). This reference group can aid the adult in positively defining his/her world and positively adjusting to singlehood. The reference group not only serves to validate singlehood as a viable adult role, but perhaps more importantly, the social support provided by a group of individuals, can fulfill the needs a marriage partner would have fulfilled. Traditionally, marriage has served as a barrier between the outside

strain on the individual and his/her inner depression (Pearlin and Johnson, 1981). Singles, who have access to a group of individuals to meet their needs, can experience a similar buffering.

Conceptual Framework

Adjusting to a nontraditional adult role, such as singlehood, is a process that is influenced by many environmental and intrapersonal forces. This process is best understood through the symbolic interaction framework which has its roots in the works of James, Cooley, Dewey, and Mead (Burr et al., 1979). Early writings grew out of pragmatism which argued that individuals select the stimuli to which they will respond. It also focused on the use of symbols (signs and meanings) for the communication of ideas.

A basic assumption of the symbolic interaction framework is that humans live in a symbolic and physical world. In this world, humans learn a complex set of symbols. Humans, because they are evaluative, learn to assign a definition of value and worth to the phenomena they encounter. In essence, they are evaluating the symbols around them for their worth or their significance. A human being will usually act in a way consistent with his/her mental evaluations of the world.

This mental evaluation of symbols will have an influence on an individual's behavioral responses to the stimuli he/she encounters in the world. An individual cannot be understood apart from this internal mental process, for "if men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences" (Burr et al., 1979, p.65). The symbolic interaction framework provides a means to understand better the evaluations single adults may assign to traditional symbols, like marriage and parenthood, and the perceptions they have of the nontraditional roles they fill.

If an individual is going to define singlehood as a positive adult status, he/she must perceive singlehood as a viable adult role. A role is a set of behaviors and actions expected of an individual in specific situations (Burr, et al, 1979). Roles are useful because they structure and guide one's behavior. Traditionally, marriage and parenthood have been expected of adults. These are roles with clearly established duties and boundaries. It is easy to identify when an individual becomes a parent or a marriage partner. However, it is not clear when an individual becomes a single adult. Unlike the marriage ceremony that publically marks the advent of matrimony, it is unclear when an individual becomes a single adult,

instead of just someone in the transition period between young adulthood and marriage.

The lack of clarity regarding singlehood makes it difficult for both the single adult and society to evaluate how well an individual is functioning as an adult who is single. There are not clear role expectations for singles in our society. Cottrell (1942) emphasized that the clarity of role expectations was the measure of how identifiable versus ambiguously the behaviors expected of an individual in a certain role were defined. Our society has not identified what behaviors are expected of individuals who are single. Singles, much like adolescents and the elderly, are not clear about what expected behaviors for their roles are and what the expected goals are of individuals in their life-style. The ambiguity of the single role can cause some singles to suffer a decline in their feelings of self-esteem and self worth. Singles may be vulnerable to poor self evaluations because they are unable to evaluate themselves against a norm for single adults, yet they are often compared to the achievements and lifestyles of their married counterparts.

The lack of clarity of role expectations often produces external pressure on the single adult through the discriminating, teasing, and sterotyping by family, friends, and employers (Jacoby, 1974). It can be an

antecedent of role strain for single adults. Goode (1960) felt role strain resulted when an individual felt difficulty in fulfilling one's role obligations. Some strategies employed to reduce role strain involve changing feelings and beliefs about one's role or using chemicals as a way to minimize the strain (Burr et al., 1979). Studies have documented the use of drugs and alcohol by the never-married as being disproportional to the intake of their married counterparts (Lynch, 1980). For many singles, chemicals are one means to reduce role strain.

Role strain also may be intensified or minimized by establishing a consensus of role expectations with individuals who define singlehood in a similar fashion with the single adult. Since singlehood is so ambiguously defined, the perceptions of singlehood, held by those individuals in the single adult's world, would influence his/her own definitions of singlehood. Certain individuals evaluations become more important and these significant others greatly influence the single adult's perceptions of singlehood as a positive or negative adult role (Burr et al., 1979). It is very important that the single adult has significant others who positively define singlehood, if he/she hopes to positively define singlehood, too.

Individuals who are less traditional and who do not have strongly established ideas about marriage as the

appropriate adult role will be more likely to see singlehood as an acceptable adult status. They are more likely to define the lifestyle of single adults as a way to achieve personal goals and find personal satisfaction. The transition into singlehood, as a stable or a temporary lifestyle, is often very difficult for both single men and women. Stein (1979) found that the late twenties and early thirties was a time of crisis and stress for many singles. It was a realization that singlehood may no longer be just a temporary state, but perhaps a permanent status. Many singles experienced internal conflict over this realization, while often undergoing pressure and questioning by friends and family regarding when the individual was going to be getting married.

The transition into singlehood is intensified by the lack of anticipatory socialization for singlehood. The socialization process for adult roles, in our society, is almost exclusively marriage and parenthood oriented. Further, the transition into a new role is made easier when it is a role that an individual knows how long he/she will be enacting it (Burr et al., 1979). Perceiving a role as a means to obtaining one's goal also increases the ease of role transition (Burr et al., 1979). For most individuals, singlehood is not a role that they plan to be in for an extended period of time. Long term

single status often is viewed as blocking the accomplishment of goals that are socially approved, such as marriage and parenthood.

Another way anticipatory socialization for singlehood influences the ease with which individuals move into singlehood is the fact that most individuals lack single role models. Children grow up imitating and identifying with adults who are significant others. Yet, relatively few children have single adults who are either familial or extrafamilial significant others.

Statement of the Problem

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the differences between never-married men and women on a number of social-psychological variables. These variables were: (1) the relative percent of attachments, (2) adequacy of social integration, (3) availability of attachments, (4) number of not available attachments the single can live without, (5) availability of social integration, (6) life satisfaction, (7) emotional loneliness, (8) social loneliness, and (9) self-esteem. Special attention was also given to a select group of sociodemographic variables. Further, relationships between life satisfaction as a criterion variable and the other variables as predictor variables were examined.

Objectives of the Study

The general objective of this study was to compare never-married men and women on a number of sociodemographic and social-psychological variables. Specific objectives of the study were:

1. To ascertain if there was a difference in sociodemographic characteristics between never-married men and women. Univariate comparisons were made on the variables of:
    a. total income
    b. occupational prestige
    c. education
2. To ascertain if there was a difference in psychological characteristics between never-married men and women. Univariate comparisons were made on the variables of:
    a. life satisfaction
    b. self-esteem
    c. social loneliness
    d. emotional loneliness
3. To ascertain if there was a difference in social support characteristics between never-married men and women. Univariate comparisons were made on the variables of:
    a. availability of attachments

b. adequacy of attachments percent

c. availability of social integration

d. adequacy of social integration

e. number of attachments one doesn't have and can live without

4. To explore what factors were predictive of life satisfaction of never-married men and women.

Nominal Definitions

Social support refers to a formal or informal friendship that provides emotional, psychological, social, and other means of support; intimacy within a social support system can involve sharing and continuity and it can supplement or replace the traditional family structure (Stein, 1981).

Attachment refers to an affectionately close relationship which provides a sense of security and peace.

Social integration refers to a network of persons with whom interests and values are shared.

Availability of social support refers to the perception of how available and accessible relationships are to the individual.

Adequacy of social support refers to an evaluation of how well needs are meet in a relationship.

Life satisfaction refers to an individual's feelings about the quality and happiness of his/her life.

Emotional loneliness refers to a feeling that an individual does not have an attachment figure; he/she is alienated.

Social loneliness refers to a feeling that an individual does not have a group or network that he/she belongs to; he/she is isolated.

Self-esteem refers to the evaluation an individual has about his or herself.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Scope of the Literature on Adjustment to Singlehood

In recent decades, there have been significant changes and growth in the singles population. In 1950, there were 4 million single adults. This number increased in 1982 to 19.4 million. In the past decade alone, the number of singles has grown from 10.9 million in 1970, to 19.4 million in 1982, a 78% increase. The growth in the singles population has created a new singles market consisting of videodating, bars, health clubs, restaurants, sports cars, resorts, cruises, and housing projects geared to the special interests and needs of single adults (U.S. News and World Report, 1983). In Edgewater, New Jersey, condominiums called "mingles" cost between $142,000 and $236,000. A similar housing project in Coconut Grove, Florida, starts at $90,000 up to $135,000 (U.S. News and World Report, 1983). The population statistics and market analyses support the existence of a large group of single adults who have unique needs and experiences.

Despite these redefinitions of the American adult population, "the unmarried represent one of the most under researched topics in the behavioral sciences"

(Cargan, 1981, p.377). Skolnick and Skolnick (1977) believed this oversight was a result of the belief that marriage is necessary to fulfill the important functions of reproduction, socialization, and provision of intimacy, affection, and other personal needs. This view means that other forms of intimacy and alternative lifestyles are dysfunctional to the purposes of our society, leaving marriage as the most appropriate adult role.

It is important to understand that today's single adults are filling roles that have been traditionally viewed as second class or less than desirable. From a review of the existing literature on singles, factors that appeared to influence one's adjustment to singlehood and one's life satisfaction as a single adult have been identified. These factors include one's self-esteem, perceptions of life satisfaction, degree of loneliness, availability of and adequacy of attachment relations and one's support system, as well as a select group of socio-demographic variables (age, gender, income, education). The influence of these variables on one's adjustment to singlehood and life satisfaction is discussed in the following pages.

Singles

"Singlehood" and "singles" have been ambiguously and inconsistently defined in the literature. For this reason

it is important to clarify who comprises the population of singles. Some studies have lumped adults who are never-married, divorced, separated, and widowed under the term single; others refered to singles as the minority who never-marry. Census statistics use single as synonomous with never-married. Libby (1977) defined singlehood as a "state of availability in an individual's sexual career." Adams (1976) identified the singles as those "not legally married or cohabiting...not emotionally, sexually, or financially dependent on one person; psychological and social autonomy are necessary to be defined as single" (p.30). Stein (1976) conceptualized singlehood as being a continuum and a stage of the life cycle and life spiral. The life spiral described singlehood as one of many alternative roles and situations an individual may pass through, return to, or permanently stay in during adulthood. Others view singlehood as a residential category or those who live alone (Stein, 1976).

Demographic Factors

Gender and Age

An individual's gender will have an impact on his/her adjustment to singlehood. The impact of gender on adjustment varied, based on the marital status of the individual and his/her age (Hess, 1981; Laner et al., 1979; Stein,

1978). Both divorced and never-married adults are vulnerable to negative evaluations by others. In spite of changing values in our society, marriage is still perceived as the normal adult role for both adult males and females.

Traditional values also influence the courtship patterns of single adults. The traditional values associated with male-female relationships makes the chances for involvement in new relationships much more likely for men than for women. Males still are seen, by both men and women, as the aggressor in most relationships. Males have the power to decide how much contact will occur between the couple, where the time together will be spent, and the pace with which the relationship progresses. The dating differential accounted for another dating pattern of men and women (Bernard, 1972; Melville, 1977). The dating differential explained the phenomenon where a man seeks a woman who is younger, smaller, less educated, and possesses a lesser degree of the traditionally socially desirable qualities of males. Women have traditionally sought a man that had a greater degree of these qualities (Bernard, 1972).

Although traditional values are changing, opportunities for never-married men to meet and establish relationships with women were much greater than for

their female counterparts (Darlin, 1981). The pool of desirable partners for women is much smaller than for men. Therefore, chances for marriage and remarriage are higher for never-married and divorced men than women.

In spite of benefiting from several aspects of their roles, never-married men are not invulnerable to hazards. Never-married men in their late thirties and older appear to have more problems than both married individuals and never-married women. Common problems found with older never-married men were poor mental health, low income levels, low educational achievement, low job status, and few, if any supportive relationships (Bernard, 1972; Hess, 1981; Pearlin and Johnson, 1981). Such characteristics handicap particularly older never-married men, as they attempt to function in the business community, social settings and personal relationships. Older never-married men are therefore less likely to experience high levels of adjustment to singlehood than are never-married women.

In contrast to their male counterparts, many never-married women in their thirties and older appeared to be the "cream of the crop" of women. They were more likely to be in high paying and personally rewarding occupations (Bernard, 1972; Pearlin and Johnson, 1981). They had more status than divorced, widowed and married women. Older never-married women had higher incomes, more career

success and more personal resources. These factors positively influence their definition of and adjustment to singlehood. A high income, career status, and personal are factors that positively impact on the life satisfaction of never-married women.

Singles experience varying degrees of discomfort in relation to traditional values, dependent on their gender and age. Men and women who were never-married singles under the age of 28 appeared to perceive many rewards of their lifestyle. Social stigma and pressure to marry were not as great on them, as was the pressure on singles who were in their early thirties. Stein (1976) found that most singles experienced a period of crisis and reevaluation of themselves and their jobs during their late twenties and early thirties. Family and personal pressure was applied on them to move into the accepted appropriate adult status, that is marriage. This period was a time of realization that singlehood may not be a transitional period prior to marriage, but that it might be a permanent adult role. In summary, one's gender and age influence adjustment to singlehood and satisfaction with this lifestyle.

Education, Income, and Occupational Prestige

High levels of education, income, and occupational prestige were reported as important resources for

translating the ideological freedoms of singlehood into reality (Hayes, 1981; Jacoby, 1974; Stein, 1976). Money was useful in combating the loneliness and stigma that are often associated with singlehood (Jacoby, 1974). Singles with money were able to choose a nice apartment or home, instead of deciding to live with three roommates or in a small studio apartment. Individuals who had financial resources were able to enjoy the cars, trips, restaurants, housing complexes and other luxuries that were helpful in combating loneliness since they provided a means to get out and meet other singles. Status associated with high levels of education and occupational prestige helped validate singlehood as an acceptable alternative to marriage (Gould,1978; Sheehy, 1976; Vaillant, 1977). It seems logical that social and occupational status are useful in combating the pressures of family and friends to move out of singlehood into marriage. As others see the financial and material rewards gained from singlehood or the occupational prestige associated with career and educational attainment, their pressure toward marriage for the single adult is often reduced. Singles in high status positions also can draw from their work reference group as a means to validate singlehood as a viable adult role.

Singles with high levels of education, income, and occupational prestige are more likely to experience

greater amounts of personal and life satisfaction. Gender appears to influence these factors. Hayes (1981) found that profession, education, and income were factors related to the life satisfaction scores of professional never-married women. Sokoloff (1981) found that remaining single affected the early career activity of women who are college graduates. Almost all women who remain single through their midtwenties, regardless of socioeconomic origins, work in the paid labor force. Reasons mentioned for employment included: (1) self support, (2) to establish an independent single life style, (3) to keep busy, and/or (4) to look for the "right man".

"If the career takes precedence over mate selection in college and the post graduate period, the woman 26-29 with a Ph.D. may have decisively priced herself out of the marriage market" (Hayes, 1981, p.3). At least partially because they are not married, educated women often invest their energies in establishing their career or securing a higher status professional life. If marriage becomes a desired goal, these women may find too few "equal males" once they enter the marriage market. The higher up the professional ladder a women was the more likely she was to be never-married or divorced (Glick, 1975). Divorce rates of highly salaried and highly educated women are

more than twice the average of all women (Consumer Union News Digest, 1981).

The amount of research that focused on how education, income, and occupational prestige influence men's definition of singlehood was limited. When never-married men and women were compared in these three areas, the relative superiority of unmarried women was demonstrated. At every age level, the average never-married woman surpassed the the average never-married man in terms of education, occupational prestige, and income (Bernard, 1972). At earlier ages this difference was not great; however a significantly large difference was evident in middle adulthood, especially, for men and women in the forty-five to fifty-four age brackets (Bernard, 1972). It was found that executives viewed never-married men as unstable and as having personal problems that hindered their job performance (Jacoby, 1974). Never-married women, in contrast, were seen as being commited more to their profession. Marriage was, therefore, a positive factor for a male, but a negative resource for a woman in the professional world, because married women were viewed as likely to resign to raise children.

Educational and financial status influenced the desirability of marriage in a study by Lopata (1973). Individuals with lower class status were more likely to

see marriage as a desirable alternative to their current status. This was particularly true of women who were no longer able to rely on familial support (Lopata, 1973). The influence of education and occupational prestige on life satisfaction and adjustment to singlehood may therefore be a result of social class differences and not because of one's marital status.

To summarize the role of education, income, and occupational prestige on one's adjustment to singlehood, it appears that high levels of each of these resources positively influenced one's adjustment to singlehood. High levels of each of these resources were related to the ability to translate the ideological freedoms of singlehood into reality. Therefore, greater life satisfaction was experienced by these single adults.

Social-Psychological Factors

Self-Esteem

An individual's overall attitude about his/her own value, worth, and importance makes up his/her self-esteem (Zeller and Carmines, 1980). Self-esteem is influenced by a variety of variables, including one's self evaluations and the evaluations of others. Some singles were especially vulnerable to negative evaluations because they were enacting adult roles that have been classified as deviant

(Stein, 1978). Singles are sensitive to the myths and stereotyping that individuals in other variant lifestyles experience. Never-married and divorced singles experience labeling and stereotyping from different sources, both in their professional and personal realms.

Never-married men and women are vulnerable to different types of negative evaluations that influence their self-esteems. Bachelors were often viewed as swingers, sexually active, and highly mobile, or the "bottom of the barrel losers" (Bernard, 1972). Society has found it more acceptable for a man to remain unmarried than for his female counterpart. Single women have often been viewed as less feminine, less loving and nurturing, less sexually attractive, and more selfish, or as women who have strong independent personalities and other qualities that cause them to be less likely to marry (Knupper, 1966; Nadelson and Notman, 1981; Srole, 1962). Even in the recent past, a woman's status was derived from the status of the men in her life; first her father and than later her husband. A woman's source of status and esteem was therefore dependent on her selection of a mate. For a woman to remain never-married was a source of great shame and damage to her family's pride; the term "old maid" reflected this stigma (Nadelson and Notman,

1981). Some parents may see the failure of their offspring to marry as the result of their own failures as a parent or as keeping them from having their coveted grandchildren. These reactions and evaluations can intensify the more general stigma of singlehood putting additional pressure on the unmarried adult. This stigma can prevent the individual from forming a positive self-esteem because they are labelled a failure or disappointment.

A review of the literature on singles shows how society has viewed singlehood and illuminates why many singles struggle with negative self evaluations and poor self-esteem. Kuhn reviewed the literature on never-married men and women in the 1950's and found all the reasons given for remaining unmarried were negative. The reasons included poor health, perceptions of marriage as threating one's career and educational aspirations, restriction of geographical mobility, homosexuality, hostility to the opposite sex, dependence on one's parents, perceptions that one was unattractive and unable to find a "true love", and limited chances to meet an eligible partner (Nadelson and Notman, 1981).

A more recent review of the literature by Stein (1976) found some positive reasons given for remaining unmarried. Reasons citied in the literature included the better social experiences and opportunities to meet a

variety of people with whom friendships could be developed, the opportunities for personal and economic growth, as well as greater autonomy.

It appears singlehood is more likely today to be seen as one's choice of status or at least a status with some potentially positive outcomes. If the definitions assigned to singlehood by the individual and his/her significant others parallel those of the 1950's, the individual is likely to have a poor self-esteem. However, a positive self evaluation and self-esteem are likely to exist if singlehood is seen as a choice and/or an appropriate adult role. In summary, one's self-esteem is influenced by how one perceives one's self in comparison to these prototypes. Significant others may either support or oppose the single's self perceptions and thereby influence the adult's self evaluation and self-esteem.

Life Satisfaction

The life satisfaction of individuals who enact nontraditional roles as single adults was an area frequently focused on in studies and articles on singlehood (Jacoby, 1974; Libby, 1977; Melville, 1977; Pearlin and Johnson, 1981; Stein, 1981). While several factors were identified that influenced the level of life satisfaction, these factors are not unique to single adults. One's gender and age were found to correlate with the

level of life satisfaction singles experienced (Bernard, 1972; Hess, 1981; Laner et al., 1979; Stein, 1978). A good college education, high occupational prestige, and a good salary also were identified as factors that made singlehood a more satisfying lifestyle (Jacoby, 1974; Pearlin and Johnson, 1981). These resources were useful to translate the "benefits" of singlehood into reality and therefore increase satisfaction with singlehood as an adult. The growth of a singles market has soared as singles have invested money into trips, cruises, dining out, cars, stereos, and other luxuries (U.S. News and World Report, 1983), as ways to meet people, combat loneliness, and to increase their life satisfaction. Good health, friends, and opportunities for personal growth were reported as important for the happiness of the unmarried (Cargan and Melko, 1982). Unfilled sharing needs are related to unhappiness in individuals. Hayes (1981) found professional never-married women were most likely to say that the lack of male companionship was the main ingredient missing in their lives and this prevented greater life satisfaction.

Loneliness and unhappiness are reduced through companionship and accessible contact with significant others. Friends are very important to the happiness and life satisfaction of singles. Visiting friends was one of

the major activities of single adults (Adams, 1976; Starr and Carns, 1972). Social participation was associated with satisfaction and happiness in life and in marriage (Graney, 1975; Hess and Waring, 1978; Phillips, 1967).

Deaux and Taynor (1973) found that males were evaluated within a broader range than were females. Males were more likely to be viewed as competent or evaluated more critically, when compared on equal measures with their female counterparts. Females were seen as more powerful if they failed than were males who failed. Individuals who fail to marry and succeed in the marriage market therefore may be more likely to be judged negatively if they are men. This was true because males were initiators in relationships and since males were more vulnerable to negative evaluations from their failures (Deaux and Taynor, 1973). Never-married men also experience discrimination in their personal and occupational spheres. Traditionally, males have been expected to fill the breadwinner and headship role in marriage. Males have been evaluated by what they do and what they accomplish.

Role theory (Burr et al., 1979) proposes that the evaluations of others influence one's satisfaction with him/herself and satisfaction with one's role. The life satisfaction of the never-married male will be influenced

by the evaluations that others make of him and the role he fills.

Among adults, singles may be unique in the extent to which their life satisfaction is influenced by the evaluations of others. Being single, in a couple-oriented society, means that single adults are a minority group. They are therefore susceptible to the stigmatizing and discrimination that other minority groups experience.

Loneliness

Loneliness is a serious problem in America today. Loneliness is not merely a problem of the elderly or the poor; it attacks individuals in every racial, social, cultural, and economic group. Loneliness is one of the greatest problems for singles.

Mortality statistics indicate the risks of being lonely for those who live alone. Never-married singles, like other adults who lived alone, were found to be more likely to die prematurely. Projections of the likelihood of premature death ranged from two to ten times higher for those who lived alone in comparison to those who lived with others (Lynch, 1980). Lonely individuals were found to visit doctors and stay in hospitals longer. Loneliness was a contributor to the likelihood of engaging in criminal activity (Lynch, 1980). Lonely adults were more likely to experience depression, poor health,

debilitating emotional problems and were more likely to commit suicide (Lynch, 1980). Loneliness is therefore a serious problem that handicaps it's victims and reduces their productivity, social contribution, and life satisfaction.

The perils and pains of loneliness are not equally distributed among single adults. Studies revealed that loneliness was more often experienced by men than by women (Lynch, 1980; Pearlin and Johnson, 1981; Somers, 1981). Traditional sex role socialization has often left men without the skills to build social and emotional support systems that can be used to reduce loneliness. Traditionally, it was appropriate for a male to use only his wife as a confidant and source of emotional support. Single males lack this "socially acceptable" resource. Therefore they are more likely to experience intense loneliness.

Unlike sex-role socialization for males, expressiveness and sharing have been encouraged and fostered in sex-role socialization for females. Women are therefore more likely to have support systems and to utilize their family network as means to combat the distress and depression that loneliness can precipitate. However, an interesting trend in recent statistics on loneliness showed that more women are currently experiencing loneliness. As

women's roles have been changing, more women have taken on "male characteristics" and defense patterns. One interpretation of this situation is that more women are denying their need for companionship and therefore are more vulnerable to the perils of loneliness (Lynch, 1980).

Studies on loneliness have been helpful in identifying what the lonely experienced (Russell et al., 1978; Weiss, 1975). Weiss identified two forms of loneliness commonly found among single adults. Many individuals experienced a sense of emotional alienation or what he termed "emotional loneliness". This involved a sense of loss and longing for a close attachment relationship (for someone who is accessible and will love accept love in return). Problems associated with emotional loneliness involved anxiety, tension, loss of appetite, sleep difficulties, somatic symptoms, and feelings of being "empty or hollow" (Weiss, 1975; 1981).

The other type of loneliness is "social isolation" or what Weiss termed social loneliness. Social isolation resulted when an individual did not have a community of friends; a social network where information, news and gossip were exchanged. Social networks may involve co-workers or colleagues, neighbors, church acquaintances, or family. Problems associated with social loneliness

included boredom, discontent, and feelings of being excluded (Weiss, 1975).

For many singles, loneliness is often a way of life. Becoming a member of special interest groups or clubs is one way many singles seek to reduce the pain of social loneliness. Alleviating emotional loneliness is more difficult. Social and emotional loneliness may well be a hazard of being single in our society, but many singles cope by finding others like themselves with whom the experience can be shared.

Familial Support Systems

Singles' definitions of singlehood are vulnerable to the perceptions and labeling that others assign to single status. This is particularly true of the definition assigned by the never-married adult's significant family members. Each family member's response to the single adult will be tempered by that individual's personal definition of singlehood. Parents and extended kin who see singlehood as a deviant lifestyle may ridicule and question the individual for remaining or returning to singlehood. This negative labeling affects the single as he/she is seeking to positively define his/her status and adjust to the lifestyle. Other kin may define singlehood as a favorable or desirable lifestyle and they can

therefore serve as an important source of emotional and social support for the single adult family member.

One major service that kin may provide for the single adult is the exchange of goods and services with the single. This type of interchange will positively effect the single's definition of his/her status. A supportive family network can help to reduce social isolation and provide a place to turn for help and interaction. Studies indicated that within the singles population, men were not as integrated into their kin networks as were never-married women (Gibson, 1972).

Two other kinds of support from kin are important for the single adult. One is emotional support which may come in the form of intimate interactions, guidance, feedback, nurturance, and/or social participation. Emotional support is particularly important because much of the single's world is temporary or transitory. Relying too much on friends, which frequently turn out to be short term relationships, often leaves the single person emotionally alone. Involvement with kin provides a more secure investment for the single individual (Burney, 1978). A second support with kin is the exchange of goods and services. This form of support may involve physical help or material support through gifts or loans. Financial aid from kin is a particularly beneficial resource for

many singles, as singles usually lack a partner with whom they are able to share their economic burdens.

The amount of support kin provide to single adult family members is influenced by several factors. One factor is the number of relatives who are accessible to the individual. Gibson (1972) found "nearly three-quarters of never-married singles, compared with one-fifth of the divorced have three or less kin" (p.13). It appeared that individuals who lived alone had the smallest kin networks. Never-married men and women lived closer to kin than did divorced men and women and were more integrated into their family support systems (Gibson, 1972). It appeared that never-married individuals received proportionally more aid from kin than divorced singles received and more than their married siblings.

A second factor that influences the amount of support kin provide is the gender of the single adult. Women received more support than men. Women were more likely to initiate contact with relatives, maintain contact with kin, and remain more emotionally dependent on family support systems (Gibson, 1972). Most of the differences between men and women reflected the traditional sex roles assigned to men and women and the patterns that children internalize during traditional socialization. The traditional values individuals learned made it more acceptable

for women to be expressive and to receive nurturance from kin. Women were therefore more likely to receive material aid, goods and services, and emotional support from family members.

The optimal amount of support to receive from kin can perhaps be best described as a curvilinear relationship. Too little help can leave the single without a stable support system. Too much help can be interpreted as an attempt to intrude into the single's life. This intrusion could reduce the freedom and independence that is most often perceived as the advantage gained from remaining single (Stein, 1976). Too much help also can obligate the single person to the kin network. This sense of obligation could reduce the single adult's satisfaction gained from single status, because it minimizes the autonomy that is mentioned most frequently as the advantage of singlehood. In summary, relatives are a potential source of support and aid to the single adult. However, if a family member defines singlehood as an undesirable lifestyle, this will probably prevent that individual from functioning as a resource to the single adult.

Nonfamilial Support Systems

Nonfamilial support systems provide an important source of support for single men and women. The presence

or absence of this support system influences an individual's definition of singlehood. A nonfamilial support system may include friends, co-workers, dating partners, clergy, and/or roommates. There are many functions this support system can provide including: (a) material aid, (b) physical assistance, (c) intimate interaction, (d) guidance, (e) feedback, (f) social participation, (g) a sense of community, (h) shared living arrangements and expenses, and/or (i) support through mutual membership in an organization (Gottlieb, 1981).

Nonfamilial systems can replace a dysfunctional or unavailable familial support system. By providing a sense of community, they can become a substitute for a missing spouse by the formation of what has been termed as a "patchwork intimacy". Patchwork intimacy was defined as a group of individuals who together were able to provide the support and companionship a spouse could usually provide (Kieffer, 1977). Functions of the patchwork network included providing emotional support, exchanging goods and services, and being a buffer for the individual against the impersonalized technological society in which they existed. Feelings of interconnectedness and accessible contact were important elements of a nonfamilial support system (Boissevain, 1974). Friendships that were characterized as "reciprocal" were an important component of

the system. Stein (1976) found that for singles in his study, the appropriateness and commonality of these relationships was more important than the permanence of the relationships.

Friendships serve another vital function for singles. They are an important source for validating that single-hood is an acceptable adult status. Friendships with others who are like oneself and are significant others to the individual are an important source of self worth and gaining approval (Burr et al., 1979). Whether based on common living arrangements or work related, homogenous values shared with one's friends are a significant source of support and reinforcement to the single adult as he/she functions and lives in a marriage based society. It reassures the never-married that he/she is not a deviant adult; the individual is enacting an appropriate and desirable adult role.

Living arrangements are important because they supply sources for one's nonfamilial support system. Adams (1981) found that "accessible neighborliness" was a key to the amount of support singles experienced. For some, this involved a group of singles living together. For others, it meant separate residents, but accessibility to one another because they lived in the same neighborhood or close by. Individuals in these systems exchanged goods

and services, emotional support, and often sexual involvement. This allowed them to share the practical daily mechanics of life, reduce isolation and loneliness, and still invest their energies in their career or other areas instead of in marriage. For many individuals, this arrangement was desirable because it facilitated a sense of community, but allowed the individual to establish his/her own residence. Establishing one's own independent home was an important affirmation for singles. For many singles, purchasing a home became a sign of stability and a means to psychological well being. Owning a home, was a "rite of passage" into adulthood, much like marriage has traditionally functioned in our society (Adams, 1981). Support for this was seen in a recent survey of the National Association of Realtors which revealed that 25% of first time home buyers and a high proportion of second and third time buyers are singles (U.S. News and World Report, 1983).

Many singles found a community social support network by becoming members of different groups, including political, therapeutic, encounter, support, special interest, religious, and clubs designed exclusively for men or women (Stein and Etzkowitz, 1979). Memberships provided an important social resource. Whether professional or nonprofessional in nature, the relationships developed

within these groups functioned as an important source of validating self worth and normalcy for many singles.

"Singles bars" are a fairly recent phenomenon. Singles who are actively seeking dating partners and acquaintances may find potential companions at a singles bar. Many individuals see singles bars a way to meet people and therefore as a means to reduce their loneliness (Allon and Fishel, 1981). The bars have become a popular gathering place of singles, because of the quick accessibility to other single adults. However, for many individuals, the bars are another source of frustration, loneliness, and a reminder that being single may be the same as being alone. Even here, the games of initiating contact conform to traditional sex role lines for men and women (Allon and Fishel, 1981). A game of staring and touching facilitated a "nonthreatening" initiation with a prospective partner. Over concern with the self and concern about the first impression intensify the need to be successful in the dating arena.

A dimension that has been identified as characteristic of relationships of singles is the apparent homogeneity of their networks. Even within the singles population, discrimination and labeling occurs; often divorced and never-married singles are not interested in becoming a part of one another's networks. The formerly

married male and female often questioned the psychological adjustment and sexual adequacy of the never-married (Hunt, 1966). Divorced individuals also found that many of their significant life experiences were not meaningful or interesting to never-married individuals who had not had similar exposure and life experiences. Divorced individuals, particularly in the initial years after the divorce, preferred the companionship of other divorced individuals (Hunt, 1966).

This selective isolation can leave never-married adults with a support system composed primarily of other never-married adults and a few kin. It is very important then that the significant others in one's support system positively define singlehood, so that they can help the never-married adult positively define his/her lifestyle and adult role. The quality and quantity of the single's nonfamilial support system will influence his/her definition of singlehood as a viable adult role and lifestyle. The support system will facilitate a positive or a negative evaluation of singlehood as an adult role and of the individual who fills that role.

Attachment Bonds

"All humans need intimacy" (Stein, 1981, p.99). Social participation is particularly crucial to single adults because it improves the life chances and the

alternative lifestyle options available to the single adult (Stein, 1981). The permanence and length of commitment to one another in a relationship was not as important to singles in a study done by Stein (1976), as were the appropriateness and commonality shared. Boissevain (1974) found that a feeling of interconnectedness and accessible contact were important elements in nonfamilial support systems.

Singles have sought relationships and social participation through living arrangements (Adams, 1981), developing patchwork intimacy networks (Keiffer, 1977), and joining professional, therapeutic, and recreational clubs (Stein, 1976). Burr et al. (1979) theorized that friendships with significant others, who were like oneself, were an important source of support, self worth, and a means to gain approval. These friendships are an important source of validating that singlehood is a viable and acceptable adult role. The need to belong and have a group one identifies with has been labeled as a basic human need and a requirement of self actualization (Maslow, 1954). Developing and forming attachment bonds significantly influences an individual's definition of singlehood. Successful dating experiences increase one's feelings of self worth, desirability, and self esteem. Failure in this area will negatively impact one's adjustment to

singlehood and the life satisfaction they experience (Hunt, 1966).

The basic need that all human beings have for intimacy and a sense of belonging to a group has traditionally been met through different outlets, by each of the sexes. Males have been traditionally socialized, from childhood on, that high self disclosure and affection are antithetical to success in adulthood; both in one's relationships and within the business community (Hess, 1981). Boys are expected to have a large network of buddies with whom team experiences are shared and with whom competition thrives.

One American anthropologist (Tiger, 1970) has proposed that from earliest times males have had a unique deep and unquestionable trust that has enabled men to work well together. This comradery began in the small hunting trips of long ago and is still evident in Sunday football games and other forms of male outings. Tiger suggested that the female nature by contrast was fixed on the mother-child bond. Women by nature were believed to avoid group experiences and seek attachments similar to the mother-child bond, almost to the exclusion of other relationships (Tiger, 1970).

To summarize this perspective, the male role is characterized by a preoccupation with team experiences

and a high level of competition between males. Males are further limited in relationships by the fear of appearing feminine or homosexual (Hess, 1981). Homophobia reduces the contact between many men. Fears of being perceived as unmanly reduces contacts between men and women where vulnerability, self-disclosure, and attachment bonds could develop. Surface level friendships, with an extensive network of buddies, are the normal experience of the American male.

The differences in the social support systems of men and women has been an area of speculation and investigation. Significant differences have been reported between males and females in this area (Hess, 1981; Jourard, 1971; Pearlin and Johnson, 1981). Males are socialized to avoid being vulnerable and sharing personal details about themselves (Hess, 1981). This fear of intimacy appears in all areas of males relationships; both in male-to-male and male-to-female relationships. Jourard (1971) has called the inability of males to share intimacies one of the "lethal aspects" of the male role. One byproduct of this restriction is that it may actually function to inhibit males to intimacy within the boundaries of marriage only. Marriage therefore functions as a mental and physical preservative for men. This idea is supported by the

research that shows high incidences of suicides, loneliness, depression, and other problems in never-married men, when compared to the happy and well functioning caricature of the married man (Pearlin and Johnson, 1981; Somers, 1981).

Females, beginning in childhood, are socialized to be competent in personal relationships and to develop close and highly emotional relationships with a few individuals. Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) found that beginning in childhood males tend to form large peer groups, while girls form pairs or small cliques. The girls' relationships are characterized by greater intimacy and sharing than are the boy's groups. Women disclose more, are more willing to receive, and are more likely to give personal details while communicating. Komarovsky (1974) found that undergraduate males disclosed more to their closest female friends than they disclosed to their male friends. This pattern of disclosure usually carries over into adult relationships and is one of the "lethal aspects" of the male role; male intimacy is only acceptable with the woman (wife or partner) in one's life. It appears that for both single men and women, individuals are more likely to confide in cross-sex rather than in same-sex friendships (Booth and Hess, 1974; Stein, 1976). In all friendships, women disclose more and are more likely to confide in a

friend than their male counterparts. The extent of intimacy takes precedence over the number of social contacts for women, while the opposite appears to be true of males.

To summarize, males are socialized to be group oriented and to have low levels of disclosure within their personal relationships. Females are socialized for intimacy and high levels of sharing, with a few family members and friends. Attachment relationships are therefore more important to women and women are more likely to have close attachment bonds than are men. Males are more comfortable with fewer attachment relationships than their female counterparts, since the male role socializes men to not need this kind of dependency and disclosure for happiness and successful adult living. The patterns of intimacy established early in life, for males and females, are therefore preparatory socialization for the roles men and women are traditionally expected to fill in adulthood (Hess, 1981).

The presence of an attachment bond can provide one with feelings of worth and acceptance, while reducing feelings of isolation and loneliness. Higher levels of adjustment to singlehood and life satisfaction are therefore influenced by the existence of attachment bonds. In summary, a support network is a very significant influence on the life satisfaction of the single adult.

The quality and quantity of one's attachment bonds will influence his/her definition of singlehood as a viable adult role and lifestyle.

Summary

This review of the literature has focused on variables that appeared to influence the life experiences of individuals who are never-married adults. Although some research has been done on how each of these factors may influence the life experiences of men and women who remain single, it is evident, that there is a great need for more research on never-married adults. Research on singles is at the early stages where scholars are still trying to identify what are the factors that should be studied in relation to single adults.

Research needs to be done that combines some of the variables of previous studies, in order for family researchers to build models that clarify how these factors independently and collectively influence single adults. There also is a need for greater conceptual clarity for concepts such as "single" and social support in order to allow for comparisons between research projects.

Another area that needs to be concentrated on, in studies on singlehood, is the integration of theory into the scholarly investigations on singles. Theory is

useful to explain, predict, and evaluate the results of research. There are few studies on singles that have utilized a theoretical framework. The lack of theory in this area of research has meant each researcher has been left to draw his/her own conclusions regarding the findings of their study. This practice of omitting a theoretical framework from research on singlehood has made it very difficult for researchers to build on previous studies and learn more about the experiences of and unique needs of single adults. This study was a small scale attempt to establish a link between the research on singlehood and a model that is useful in predicting and explaining the experiences of singles.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

Subjects

Sampling Procedure

Potential subjects for the never-married sample were identified from single's organizations, club memberships, and church groups in Knox County. Current addresses and phone numbers were located using the Knoxville telephone directory, the Knoxville City directory, and South Central Bell information. Potential participants were sent a letter introducing the research and/or contacted by the researcher by phone (see Appendix A).

Phone contacts were made to ascertain whether each man or woman met the criteria for eligibility and to establish his/her willingness to participate. The criteria for participating in the study were: (1) The individual was caucasian, (2) currently, he/she was "not cohabiting, not emotionally, sexually or financially dependent on one person," (Adams, 1976, p.30), and (3) he/she was between the ages of 27-46. A sample consisting of 30 never-married men and 30 never-married women was identified.

Procedure

Appointments were made to deliver the questionnaires to the participants' home or to meet the participant in an office at the Department of Child and Family Studies, at the University of Tennessee. Several subjects were interviewed in a room at their church and others at their place of employment. The "informed consent" form was read and signed by the participants before questioning began (see Appendix B). Each participant completed the questionnaires in a block of time ranging from thirty to ninety minutes.

The researcher explained each questionnaire in enough detail so that subjects were able to complete the instruments independent of the researcher. The researcher was available to answer questions the respondents had beyond the initial explanation. First, the participants completed the four written questionnaires. The order of these instruments was alternated to reduce any ordering effects or sensitivity to questions regarding the individual's feelings about his/her life. Upon completing the questionnaires, participants where then interviewed about their support systems. The researcher practiced the full interview process with several individuals who were not in the study to insure uniformity and clarity throughout the interview.

Data Reduction and Transformation

Quantitative data gathered on the never-married sample was transformed by the researcher. A codebook was constructed for the reduction of the instruments. Quality checking of all coding and keypunching was done to verify its accuracy. Three multivariate analysis of variances (MANOVA) followed by univariate (ANOVA) comparisons were done to analyze the differences between the never-married men and women in terms of sociodemographic, psychological, and social support characteristics. The Statistical Analysis for Social Sciences was the computer program used for both the MANOVA and ANOVA. An alpha level of .05 was established as the criterion for significance. Wilks' criterion test of significance were used for each of the MANOVAS.

Stepwise regression models were tested to ascertain what factors were predictive of the life satisfaction of the never-married men and women. Variables had to meet the criterion level of .15 to be included in the regression equation. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences was used to obtain measures of central tendency, frequencies, and the correlation matrix. All computer analyses were done at University of Tennessee Computer Center.

Description of the Sample

The average age of the men and women was almost identical. The mean age of the men was 31.97 and 31.17 was the mean for the women (see Table 1). The men's ages ranged between 27 to 46 years old. The ages of the women ranged from 27 through 40. On the average, the participants in the study were highly educated. Eighty-three percent of the males and 87% of the females had graduated from college. The remaining subjects had at least attended college, even though they did not graduate, or they had received an associate degree (see Table 2). Table 3 compares the educational levels of males and females who had received college and graduate training.

The participants in the study were not only well educated, but also had a high level of occupational prestige (see Table 4). Furthermore, salaries of the males and females were fairly high. However, when income from all sources where combined (employment, relatives, and other sources) males averaged higher total incomes with $21,168.97 as the mean, while the females total income mean was $18,080.00 (see Table 5).

The majority of the participants in the study had a similar religious orientation. Seventy-four percent of the men and 88% of the women indicated an identification with some type of Protestant denomination (see Table 6).

TABLE 1

Age Differences Between Males and Females

Gender	Mean	Standard deviation	Minimum value	Maximum value
Males	31.97	5.109	27	46
Females	31.17	3.04	27	40

TABLE 2

Level of Education of Males and Females

Level of education	% Males	% Females
Completed less than grade 8	0	0
Completed grade 8	0	0
Attended high school but did not graduate	0	0
Graduated from high school	0	0
Attended college but did not graduate or associates degree	16.67	13.33
Graduated or received R.N. degree	26.67	16.67
Attended graduate school	13.33	13.33
Received graduate degree (e.g. master's, doctorate, J.D.)	43.33	56.67

TABLE 3

Education Differences Between Males and Females

Gender	Mean	Standard deviation	Minimum value	Maximum value
Males	6.833*	1.768	5	8
Females	7.133*	1.136	5	8

*(6 = received graduate degree or R.N., 7 = attended graduate school, 8 = received graduate degree)

TABLE 4

Occupational Prestige Differences Between Males and Females*

Gender	Mean	Standard deviation	Minimum value	Maximum value
Males	66.357	17.213	40	93
Females	61.896	16.916	17	84

*(N = 28 for males and N = 29 for females.)

TABLE 5

Total Income of Males and Females

Gender	Variable	N	Mean	Standard deviation	Minimum value	Maximum value
Males						
	Income from employment	29	19086.206	11578.110	1000	45000
	Income from relatives	5	3320.000	3948.037	500	10000
	Income from others*	10	4380.000	4842.588	200	13000
Females						
	Income from employment	29	17568.965	8564.447	2500	50000
	Income from relatives	4	2500.000	1290.944	1000	4000
	Income from others*	8	2862.500	2862.500	300	10000

*(sources include stocks and bonds, interest, consultations, savings, property, and professional drag racing)

TABLE 6

Religious Orientation of Males and Females

Religious Orientation	% Males	% Females
Protestant (Fundamentalist Baptist, Evangelical, Presbyterian)	40.68	57.62
Protestant (Episcopalian, Methodist)	33.90	30.50
Catholic	10.16	0.00
Jewish	0.00	3.38
None	10.16	3.38
Other	6.76	3.38

The remaining individuals said they identified with another religious orientation or did not identify with any religious persuasion. Consistent with the high number of participants who identified themselves with a particular religious group, the majority of the singles indicated both consistent and frequent involvement in church activity. There was not enough normative data available for comparisons to determine if these adults were more active in church activity than other adults are. However, religious statistics indicated that 4 out of every 10 adults attended a church or synagogue in a typical week of 1982 (Emerging Trends, 1983). Over half of all the subjects where involved in weekly church activity. Table 7 has the frequencies of church activity of the male and female subjects.

Instrumentation

The participants in the study completed four short questionnaires. The Life Satisfaction Scale (Campbell, 1976) measured the level of satisfaction each participant is currently experiencing. The Singles Inventory (Cockrum, 1983) provided the sociodemographic information about the participants and general questions regarding attitudes about singlehood and marriage. Self-esteem was measured by Rosenberg's (1965) Self-Esteem Scale.

TABLE 7

Frequency of Church Activity

Frequency	% Males	% Females
Never	0	0
Once a year	17.24	10.34
4 to 6 times a year	10.34	20.69
2 to 3 times a month	17.24	13.79
Once a week	27.59	3.45
More than once a week	27.59	51.72

The UCLA Loneliness Scale (Russell et al., 1978) provided information on the social and emotional loneliness reported by participants in the study. Finally, the never-married men and women were interviewed about the availability and adequacy of their social support systems. The Interview Schedule for Social Interaction (Henderson et al., 1981) measured the availability and adequacy of both attachment relationships and of the social integration of each of the participants.

Interview Schedule for Social Interaction (ISSI)

This interview schedule was developed to measure the social environments of both healthy and psychiatrically ill persons. The ISSI measures the quantity and quality of relationships available to an individual and how satisfied he/she is with these relationships (see Appendix C). The perceived adequacy of available attachments is a subjective measure based on an individual's personal requirements of and for relationships. Individuals responded to questions about acquaintances, work associates, friends, close attachment figures and the forms of interaction shared with these groups.

Analysis of the ISSI yielded 4 main scores: (1) availability of attachments (AVAT), (2) perceived adequacy of attachment, (3) availability of social integration (AVSI), and (4) perceived adequacy of social integration.

The score ADAT% is calculated "as a percentage of the number of ADAT questions the respondent was asked" (Henderson et al., 1981). A straight measure of ADAT is too dependent on responses to AVAT since only individuals who said they had attachment relationships responded to how adequately their AVAT relationships were functioning. Responses on the ADAT therefore varied across respondents. The ADAT% was one means to correct this. A final score was obtained by the number of attachment relationships the individual was lacking yet was able to live without. The NOATT score was a measure of tolerance of not having attachments.

The reliability of the ISSI was conducted on a sample of 756 adults. A Cronbach's alpha (Cronbach, 1951) was calculated for each of the four main scales. It was decided though that a split-half coefficient was more appropriate for the measure of ADAT and NOATT. The coefficients for each scale were: (a) AVAT=.67, (b) AVSI=.71, (c) ADSI=.79, (d) ADAT% =.69, and (e) NOATT=.37. Cronbach's alpha were calculated on each of the main scales for this sample of never-married men and women. The analysis found alpha values of: (a) AVAT=.45, (b) AVSI=.44, (c) ADSI=.68, (d) ADAT=.61, and (e) NOATT=.04. Henderson et al (1981) noted the low coefficient on internal consistency for NOATT was to be expected because

rarely was a respondent asked all of the items, and responses were conditional based on his/her answers.

Test-retest reliability of ISSI was examined on a subsample of the original 756. A sample of 51 individuals were reinterviewed at an interval of 18 days (sd=4.6) after having first been interviewed. Coefficients for the the test-retest reached a satisfactory level with each scale having a coefficient of: (a) AVAT=.76, (b) AVSI=.75, (c) ADSI=.75, (d) ADAT%=.71, and (e) NOATT=.51.

Several attempts were made to assess the validity of the ISSI scales. Face validity was evident upon examination of the content on each scale. The ISSI also was compared to the Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI) (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1964). A subsample of 221 respondents completed the EPI at two periods of time, eight months apart. The EPI has a measure of extraversion-introversion. A correlation of .78 was found between the two administrations. This indicated that the EPI was a reliable measure of persistent personality traits. The EPI measure of extraversion was a useful test to compare the ISSI with, since "sociability is an important component of extraversion (Henderson et al., 1981). Individuals who scored high on the extraversion measure should also report a high range of social contacts, which is measured on the AVSI. The correlations for the EPI and the ISSI

main scales were calculated and for each scale the product-moment correlation was found to be: (a) AVAT=.03, (b) AVSI =.31, (c) ADAT=.06, and (d) ADSI=.15. It appears that more work is needed to establish the reliability of these scales.

Validity of the ISSI was also analyzed by comparing the responses of 114 subjects with those of a close friend of the respondent. Modifications were made in the ISSI so that the questions addressed the original respondent. Product-moment correlations between the two sets of data were found to be: (a) AVAT=.42, (b) ADAT=.39, (c) AVSI =.59, and (d) ADSI =.26, with significance beyond .01 for all the scales. Since a friend was more likely to know about the availability rather than perceived adequacy of another's relationships, it was not surprising to find that AVAT and AVSI had higher correlations than did ADAT and ADSI. These correlations were superior, except for ADSI, to the correlations of .33 that Crandall (1976) found were necessary for validation of a self-report measure by another person. It appears from the many attempts to examine the validity of the ISSI that the variables need to be further developed to increase the reliability of this instrument, particularly for use in research on never-married adults.

Life Satisfaction Scale (LSS)

Campbell (1976) developed this scale as a general measure of life satisfaction (see Appendix D). A technique called "semantic differentials was used in the LSS. This is a technique that explores the connative meaning of a concept for each individual tested and involves a battery of opposite or "polar" adjectives which are placed at the extremes of a 7-point rating scale. Each respondent checked a point along that scale which best approximated his/her description of that concept. The LSS asked respondents to describe their "present life" on a 10-item semantic differential scale. Items were reversed in the scale to minimize the tendency to check boxes down a column.

Campbell (1976) found the LSS was a means of getting qualitative details on the way individuals viewed their lives. Intercorrelations of the 10 items found a cluster of 8 items which seemed to fit together tightly. Two adjective pairs did not seem to fit within that same close cluster. These were "easy vs hard" and "free vs tied down." Intercorrelations of these two items with the other eight showed an average of about .27. However, intercorrelations of the other eight items ranged from .40 to .61 with an average of .50. Correlations of these eight items were found to be relatively high and stable

over time. The cluster of eight items was grouped into a single index called the "Index of General Affect." Reliability of this index was found to be about .89 based on both Cronbach's (1951) alpha and omega. The two adjective pairs with lower intercorrelations were kept in the scale because of the important information they provide. A Cronbach's alpha of .76 was found on the LSS for this sample of never-married men and women.

A small subsample of 285 of the original respondents were tested to see if a retest of the LSS was adequately responsive to changes in life situations over an eight-month period. The stability of the index over the eight-month interval was calculated to be only .56. Campbell (1976) noted that the stability was a gross under estimate of the reliability of the instrument.

Face validity of the LSS is evidenced by the content of the individual items. The 10 item scale was compared to national measures of well being. Multiple regression analysis indicated correlations of .57 and .54 when compared to indices of life satisfaction and happiness respectively.

Self-Esteem Scale (SES)

This 10 item likert-type scale was developed by Rosenberg (1965). Each respondent chose from one of four responses: strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly

disagree. The scale was designed to be a general and short index of self-esteem (see Appendix E).

Rosenberg alternated the positively and negatively worded items to reduce the potential of response set. The scale was originally tested on a sample consisting of 5,024 high school juniors and seniors who were randomly selected from ten schools in New York state. Rosenberg found a .92 coefficient of reproduceability by using the Guttman procedure and the scalability of the test was .72 for the sample of high school students. Test-retest reliability was shown to be .85 for a group of college students who were retested after two weeks. A Cronbach's alpha of .82 was found on the SES for this sample of never-married men and women.

There were several attempts made to assess the validity of the SES. First, students in the sample of 5,024 completed a self report scale that measured depressive affects. Second, a significant correlation was found between the depressive affects and self-esteem. A significant correlation was also found between self-esteem and a number of psychosomatic symptoms. The third test of validity involved a sample of fifty "normal" volunteer" adults who were employed by the National Institute of Mental Health. The volunteers filled out the SES. As a means of comparison, ward

nurses rated each individual on the Leary Scales (Leary, 1957). The depression of the participants (as rated by the nurses) was found to be significantly associated with self-esteem scores. Finally, although Rosenberg constructed this scale for use in large surveys of high school students, analysis of Rosenberg's items have indicated it can be successfully employed in adult surveys.

Singles Inventory (SI)

This scale was designed to identify the sociodemographic status of the never-married adults and feelings about singlehood and marriage (see Appendix F). A second purpose was to determine the factors the participants perceived to be advantages and disadvantages of their lifestyle; these factors were believed to be related to life satisfaction of the adults. The SI was pilot tested on a small group of never-married men and women. Modifications were made, based on feedback from the pilot test sample, to insure that the items and directions were clear and easy to follow.

UCLA Loneliness Scale (LS)

This instrument was developed by Russell et al. (1978). It consisted of 20 statements about loneliness (see Appendix G). Participants responded from four

alternatives to describe themselves: (a) I often feel this way, (b) I sometimes feel this way, (c) I rarely feel this way, and (d) I never feel this way. For the purposes of this study, the LS was broken into two subscale: emotional and social loneliness. A Cronbach's alpha was calculated for each of the subscales based on the sample of this study: (a) emotional loneliness =.84 and (b) social loneliness =.78.

The LS showed a high level of internal consistency for an instrument consisting of only 20 items. A coefficient alpha of .96 was found for the original sample. This level was higher than what was necessary for instruments that were used in applied clinical settings (Nunnally, 1967). Test-retest reliability of the LS was found to be high also. A sample at the University of Tulsa of 102 student volunteers yielded a test-retest correlation of .73. This indicated that in spite of changes in an individuals's personal level of loneliness, this measure of loneliness had some stability over time (Russell et al., 1978).

The validity of the LS was established in variety of ways. The scale's face validity was evident by the content of the individual items. Concurrent validity was evidenced by a comparison of the high scores of individuals who described themselves as lonely on supplemental

self report questions. High scorers were also more likely to have volunteered for a 3-week clinic/discussion program of loneliness that was advertised in the school paper. Participants in the clinic had a mean of 60.1 when compared to a mean of 39.1 for the comparison sample (t 41=5.09, $p < .001$). Finally, theoretical views of loneliness which link it to a variety of emotional states was found to correlate with scores on the LS. The emotional states that were correlated to the LS were: "feeling 'empty' (r=.58), 'self-enclosed' (r=.54), 'awkward' (r=.46), 'restless' (r=.38) 'bored' (r=.36), 'shy' (r=.45), 'less attractive' (r=.30), 'being depressed' (r[131]=.49) and 'anxious' (r[131]=.35)" (Henderson et al., 1978, p.293).

Operational Definitions

Adequacy of Attachments: The average value of items 25C,25D, 26B,26C,27B,27C,28B,28C,29B,29C,30B,33A on the ISSI.

Adequacy of Attachments Percent: "Ratio of ADAT score to maximum ADAT score possible for the available attachments nominated by the respondent" (Henderson et al., 1981, p.230).

Adequacy of Social Integration: The average value of items 2,4,6,9,11,12,14,16,18,19A,19B,20B,32,35,37, 39,41, on the ISSI.

Availability of Attachments: The average value of items 24B,52B,26,27,28,29,30,33 on the ISSI.

No Attachments: The average value of items 24C, 25E,26D,27D,28D,29D,30C on the ISSI.

Availability of Social Integration: The average value of items 1,3,5,8,10,13,17,19,20,20A,31,34A,36A,38A, 40A on the ISSI.

Life Satisfaction: The average numerical score of items 1-10 on the LSS.

Emotional Loneliness: The average value of items 2,3,5,7,8,10,11,13,15,17,20 on the LS.

Social Loneliness: The average value of items 1,4,6,9,10,11,12,14,16,17,18, and 19 on the LS.

Self-Esteem: The average numerical value of items 1-10 on the SES.

Hypotheses of the Study

The hypotheses of the study were that there would be:

1. No difference in the availability of attachments between never-married men and women.

2. No difference in the relative adequacy of attachments between never-married men and women.

3. No difference in the availability of social integration between never-married men and women.

4. No difference in the adequacy of social integration between never-married men and women.

5. No difference in the number of attachments not available that one can live without between never-married men and women.

6. No difference in life satisfaction between never-married men and women.

7. No difference in self-esteem between the never-married men and women.

8. No difference in emotional loneliness between never-married men and women.

9. No difference in social loneliness between never-married men and women.

10. To ascertain the relationship of psychological and social support predictor variables to the criterion variable of life satisfaction for never-married men.

11. To ascertain the relationship of psychological and social support predictor variables to the criterion variable of life satisfaction for never-married women.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) followed by univariate done in three separate analyses. The MANOVA'S and univariate comparisons analyzed the differences between the never-married men and women in terms of sociodemographic, psychological, and social support characteristics. Two regression models were tested to determine what factors were predictive of the life satisfaction of the never-married men and never-married women. A third analysis compared the men and women's attitudes about singlehood and marriage. This analysis was of descriptive interest and not a part of the hypotheses of the study.

Descriptive Statistics

Social-Psychological Characteristics

Both the males and the females reported a high level of satisfaction with their lives (see Table 8). Related to this, the never-married adults indicated that they felt good about themselves and their self worth by scoring high on the Self-Esteem Scale (see Table 9). Interpretation of levels of social and emotional loneliness were difficult

TABLE 8

Life Satisfaction Means of Males and Females

Gender	Mean*	Standard deviation	Minimum value	Maximum value
Males	4	.45	3	4.78
Females	3.80	.63	2.22	4.89

*(4 ≐ satisfied on 5 point scale)

TABLE 9

Self-Esteem Means of Males and Females

Gender	Mean*	Standard deviation	Minimum value	Maximum value
Males	3.39	.41	2.7	4
Females	3.37	.43	2	4

*(4 point scale)

to ascertain. There was not enough normative data available for comparisons to determine if these adults experienced loneliness more often, less often or about the same amount as other adults do.

Similarly, there is little normative data existing on the availability and adequacy of one's social support system. It was therefore difficult to compare the functioning of the social support systems of the never-married adults in this study to the functioning of other support systems. However, it appeared that both the men and women had several attachment figures that were accessible to them and that were functioning adequately. Both the men and women indicated that they had access to a more extensive social network and that they felt satisfied with the adequacy of this social network. Women indicated a greater need for attachment figures then did the men. Males reported that they were able to function and felt little strain and loss over the absence of attachment relationships.

General Interest Questions

The subjects were asked how satisfied they were with their single status. Males reported feeling very-satisfied to satisfied in 57% of the cases, while only 47% of the females felt this way. A greater percentage of women reported feeling dissatisfied with singlehood than did the

men, with 30% of the women reporting being not very satisfied to not satisfied as compared to 27% of the men (see Table 10).

The singles were questioned on how likely it was that they would marry at some point in their lives. Males reported feeling approximately 80% sure that they would marry at some time in their lives. The females indicated that there was only a 66% chance of marriage for them over their life span (see Table 10).

A final question on singlehood and marriage asked the subjects to describe their single status. Four descriptions were given from which the subjects identified on which best described their status: (a) single by choice, but for a temporary period, (b) single by choice for a permanent lifestyle, (c) single not by choice, but for a temporary period, and (d) single not by choice for a permanent lifestyle (Stein, 1979). Sixty-three percent of the men and 60% of the women felt singlehood was a chosen lifestyle, but a lifestyle for a temporary period. Table 10 has the submeans of the men and women on their descriptions of their single status.

TABLE 10

Percentages of Males and Females on General Interest Items

	% Males	% Females
Satisfaction with singlehood		
Very satisfying - satisfying	56.60	46.68
Neutral	16.66	23.34
Not very satisfying - not satisfying	26.68	30
Likelihood I'll ever marry		
Never of almost for sure never will	10.02	13.34
Neutral	6.68	23.34
For sure or almost for sure will	89.84	63.28
Description of single status		
Choice for a temporary period of time	63.33	60.71
Choice for permanent life-style	13.33	3.57
Not by choice and for a temporary period of time	23.33	28.57
Not by choice and for a permanent lifestyle	0	7.14

Multivariate Analysis of Variance

Sociodemographic

Multivariate analysis of variance and univariate comparisons were used to determine sociodemographic differences between the never-married men and women. A 2 X 3 factorial design consisted of two levels of gender and there levels of the sociodemographic variables; total income, education, and occupational prestige. The three sociodemographic variables were measured by the Singles Inventory (Cockrum, 1983). The hypothesis being tested was that there was no difference in the sociodemographic characteristics between never-married men and women.

The results of the MANOVA indicated that there was no significant main effect for gender over the sociodemographic variables $F (6, 50) = 1.23$, $p < .3068$ (see Table 11). Univariate comparisons on all three variables indicated that there were no differences between the men and women in terms of any of the sociodemographic characteristics; therefore, the hypothesis was not rejected.

Psychological

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) and univariate comparisons were done on the four psychological characteristics to determine if there were differences

TABLE 11

Multivariate and Univariate Analyses of Variance for Gender Over Demographic Characteristics

F-Fatio for Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean = 1.23

d.f. = 6 and 50 p less than .3068

Variable	d.f.	Mean Square	Univariate F	p
Total income	1, 55	147169173.1484	1.15	.29
Education	1, 55	.8642	.66	.42
Occupational prestige	1, 55	283.4432	.97	.33

between the never-married men and women. Self-esteem, life satisfaction, social loneliness, and emotional loneliness were the four levels of the psychological dependent variables in the 2 X 4 factorial design, with two levels of gender. The hypothesis being tested was that there was no difference in psychological characteristics of never-married men and women.

The MANOVA compared the men and women on the four psychological variables and found there was no main effect $F (4, 55) = .66$, $p < .6230$ (see Table 12). Univariate comparisons were done on each of the psychological characteristics to determine if there were differences between the groups on each variable individually. On all four variables, the univariate comparisons found no differences for men and women; therefore the hypothesis was not rejected.

Social Support

There were five social support variables that were compared in a 2 X 5 factorial design, with two levels of gender. A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) and univariate comparisons were done to determine if there were differences between the men and women in terms of the availability of attachment (AVAT), adequacy of attachment percent (ADATPCT), availability of social integration (AVSI), adequacy of social integration (ADSI), and number

TABLE 12

Multivariate and Univariate Analyses of Variance for Gender Over Psychological Characteristics

F-Ratio for Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean = .6230

d.f. = 4 and 55 p less than 0.6230

Variable	d.f.	Mean Square	Univariate F	p
Life satisfaction	1, 58	.5352	1.80	.18
Social loneliness	1, 58	.0135	.06	.81
Emotional loneliness	1, 58	.0432	.18	.67
Self-esteem	1, 58	.0007	0	.95

of attachments the individual can live without (NOATT). The hypothesis being tested was that there was no difference between never-married men and women on social support characteristics.

The MANOVA showed that there was no significant main effect between the groups on social support characteristics $F (5, 54) = 1.55$, $p < .1902$ (see Table 13). The hypothesis was therefore not rejected. Univariate analysis of the five social support variables found that there were no differences between the men and women in relation to ADATPCT, AVSI, and ADSI. Univariate analysis of AVAT revealed that women had more AVAT than did the men $F (1, 58) = 5.55$, $p < .0219$. Related to the AVAT, women also indicated a greater need for close attachment relationship, when compared to the need of the never-married men. The univariate comparisons of NOATT found a difference in the men and women's need for attachments, where the men reported having a greater tolerance for not having attachment relationships $F (1, 58) = 5.18$, $p < .0265$.

Regression Equations

Two models were tested to determine what factors were predictive of the life satisfaction of never-married men and women. The singles' self-esteem, emotional and social loneliness, availability and adequacy of attachments,

TABLE 13

Multivariate and Univariate Analyses of Variance for Gender Over Social Support Characteristics

F-Ratio for Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean = 1.55

d.f. = 5 and 54 p less than .1902

Variable	d.f.	Mean Square	Univariate F	p
Availability of attachment	1, 58	9.60	5.55*	.02
Adequacy of attachment percent	1, 58	370.8450	.46	.50
Availability of social integration	1, 58	.4167	.08	.78
Adequacy of social integration	1, 58	5.40	.51	.47
No attachments	1, 58	2.0167	5.18*	.03

* $p < .05$

availability and adequacy of social integration, and the number of attachments the individual did not have and yet could live without were the predictor variables. The criterion variable, life satisfaction, was computed from Campbell's Life Satisfaction Scale (1976). One model tested the predictor variables to ascertain what factors were predictive of the criterion variable of life satisfaction for men. A second model identified what variables were predictive of the criterion variable of life satisfaction for women. All variables were entered into the equation by step-wise regression.

Correlation coefficients were computed determine if multicollinearity had occured. The correlation matrix for all of the variables is in Appendix H. The regression analyses yielded two models that predicted the life satisfaction of the never-married adults. As shown in Table 12, the two-variable model for the life satisfaction of the men was self-esteem and ADSI. This model accounted for 25% of the variance and met the criterion for the significance, $F (2, 27) = 4.17$, $p < .03$. The two-variable model of life satisfaction of the women was AVAT and emotional loneliness. This model accounted for 45% of the variance and met the criterion for significance, $F (2, 28)$ 10.44, $p < .0005$ (see Table 14).

TABLE 14

Stepwise Regression Analysis for Life Satisfaction of Never-Married Men and Women

		Univariate				Multivariate			
Criterion Variable	Prediction Variable	B	SE	F	p	df	R2	F	p
Male's Life Satisfaction	Self-esteem	.43	.19	5.29	.03	2, 27	.25	4.17	.03
	Availability of Social Integration	.06	.03	3.56	.07				
Female's Life Satisfaction	Emotional Loneliness	-.68	.20	12.0	.002	2, 28	.45	10.44	.0005
	Availability of Attachment	.16	.08	3.6	.07				

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS

Conclusions

Based on the data collected for this study, there are four conclusions that can be drawn regarding the never-married men and women. First, there were no differences in the sociodemographic characteristics of the single adults. The fact that the mean ages of the males and females were so similar, and that the means were in the low thirties, probably prevented the distinction between sociodemographic characteristics of never-married men and women, which have been reported in the middle and later years (Bernard, 1972; Gove, 1972; Pearlin and Johnson, 1981). Based on the means of the general interest items, there appear to be differences in the feelings of the men and women regarding singlehood and the likelihood of marriage. A second conclusion was that there were no differences between the never-married men and women in relation to the psychological variables.

In reference to the support systems of the single adults, the men and women differed in the availability of their attachment relationships. Women had more attachment relationships than did the men. In spite of the fact that

the women had more attachment bonds, there was no difference in the reported satisfaction with the adequacy of the attachment relationships between the two genders. The never-married men and women differed in the number of attachment relationships they did not have and yet could live without. Males reported finding it less difficult to function without attachment relationships. There was no difference between the availability of and adequacy of social integration between the never-married men and women. This was consistent with other research that indicated men and women have the same amount of friends in their social network (Booth, 1972; Unger, 1979).

Finally, the life satisfaction of the never-married men and women was related to different variables. A tow-variable model consisting of self-esteem and the availability of social integration was predictive of 25% of the variance in never-married men's life satisfaction. The availability of attachments and emotional loneliness were the two predictor variables in the regression model for the never-married women's life satisfaction. This two-variable model accounted for 45% of the variance in life satisfaction of the women in this study.

Discussion

Sociodemographic Characteristics and General Interest

In general, the subjects in this study were highly educated and filled high status jobs. While many studies have pointed out the discrepancy between the level of income, occupational prestige and educational achievement between never-married men and women (Bernard, 1972; Gove, 1972; Pearlin and Johnson, 1977), this study did not find any differences between the men and women on these variables. Based on previous research, which has pointed out the relative superiority of never-married women in their thirties and older, as compared to their male counterparts (Bernard, 1972; Pearlin and Johnson, 1981; Spretzer and Riley, 1974; Unger 1979), it was surprising to find that there were no differences between the men and women in this study.

Previous studies have found there were differences between the genders, in part, because single women benefit in the market place from their marital status. This appeared to be true of the women in this study, since the majority of the women were highly educated and filled high status occupations. This appears to be a characteristic of never-married women; they are more likely to be committed to their professions and careers, be more educated,

and have higher status jobs than do their male counterparts. Successful women are less likely to marry than are successful men. The never-married woman with graduate training and/or a high status occupation is unlikely to find a suitable mate. Hayes (1981) has pointed out that the professional single woman often finds she has priced herself out of the marriage market. There is a shortage of professionally and educationally comparative never-married men for the single professional woman to court and marry.

Perhaps one explanation for the findings in this study was because of the homogeneous nature of the sample demographically. Both men and women in the study were highly educated and filled high status occupational roles. Further, the men in this study did not fit into the "bottom of the barrel" (Bernard, 1972) stereotype of never-married men who experience discrimination, are viewed as unstable, homosexual, and/or as having personal problems that will hinder their job performance (Jacoby, 1974). Perhaps part of these effects had not yet been felt due to their relatively young age.

Bernard (1972) offered a further explanation that is applicable to the present findings. She pointed out that in the earlier years, the differences between men and

women in these areas was not great. However, a significantly large difference between the men and women was evident in middle adulthood, especially for men and women in the forty-five to fifty-four age bracket. Probably the fact that the mean ages of the men and women in this study was only 31 accounted for the greater similarity in terms of these resources for males and females.

The majority of the participants in this study indicated they identified with some Protestant religious persuasion. The majority of the subjects also were involved in both consistent and frequent church activity. The religious persuasion of these single adults was not as relevant as was the frequency of church activity.

Stein (1979) reported on the importance of special interest groups and church groups as a form of support and social participation for single adults. In recent years, many churches have begun to recognize the special needs of single adults and to develop special classes, activities, and staff whose sole purpose is to work with single men and women. It is possible that the high percentage of singles in this study who were involved in regular church activities was due to the support they found within the single's organizations and activities within the church. Further, singles may have been involved in church

activities because of the special peace, direction and purpose their faith brought to their lives.

Normative data was not available for comparison of the feelings of the subjects in relation to the general interest items about singlehood and marriage. Males in the study reported greater satisfaction with singlehood than did the females. Eighty-eighty percent of males also reported feelings sure they would marry at some point in their lives, as compared to 66% of the females. Campbell (1976) noted that the single strongest positive correlate to happiness reports was the individual's marital status. It is highly probable then, that the males greater satisfaction with their single status was related to their belief that singlehood was a transitory status and not a permanent adult role.

Related to the likelihood of marriage and satisfaction with singlehood, the majority of the men and women indicated that they felt singlehood was a chosen lifestyle, but only for a temporary period of time. Men were more likely to describe their singlehood as a choice than were the never-married women. The belief that one has chosen singlehood is important to the satisfaction one feels with being a single adult. Fracchia (1979) discussed the importance of feeling one has been actively involved in making the decision to remain unmarried.

Satisfaction with singlehood is reduced when an individual feels he/she is single not because of one's own choice, but as a result of other uncontrollable circumstances.

Psychological Dimensions

The comparisons of reported self-esteem, life satisfaction, social loneliness, and emotional loneliness of the never-married men and women in this study found there were no differences between the two groups on any of these variables. Both groups reported high levels of life satisfaction and self-esteem. Campbell (1976) found that individuals usually reported high levels of life satisfaction and the participants in this study reported similar feelings about their lives. Sociodemographic factors may help account for this.

Loneliness was common at times for both the men and women. Weiss (1975) and others have studied the loneliness of single adults and found it to be one of the common problems among the unmarried. The fact that there were no differences between the men and women in this study appeared to contradict previous findings which have pointed out the relative superiority of never-married women, when compared to their male cohorts in this area (Bernard, 1972; Gove, 1972; Pearlin and Johnson, 1981).

Never-married women were found to have high self-esteems and to experience greater life satisfaction than

never-married men (Bernard, 1972; Gove, 1972). Instrumental in this finding, were the educational and financial superiority of the never-married women, as well as the presence of a support system. Relationships with significant others are an important means of validating one's self worth and role performance (Burr et al., 1981).

While studies have pointed out the superiority of women in relation to psychological characteristics, when compared to never-married men, the differences between the men and women were most visible in the middle and later years of life (Bernard, 1972; Gove, 1972). This may explain why there were no differences found between the men and women in this study. The fact that this group of singles were in the earlier stages of young adulthood may have eliminated the differences that are found in middle and later singlehood, between never-married men and women. From this study and earlier research, it was concluded that never-married men and women have similar psychological caricatures in young adulthood, but that never-married men have more psychological disorders and problems in middle and later life. Perhaps one important factor that needs to be considered in describing never-married men and women in terms of psychological factors is their age.

Emphasis on Attachments

The importance of a social support system for the single adult has been discussed by many researchers (Hess, 1981; Gove, 1972; Lynch, 1977; Pearlin and Johnson, 1981; Weiss, 1981). The differences in the social support systems of men and women has been an area of speculation and investigation, but the findings have appeared to be consistent from one study to the next. Women tend to develop close attachment bonds with a few individuals (Hess, 1981; Tiger, 1970). Males tend to form less intimate bond and focus more on group activities (Hess, 1981; Tiger, 1970). Males are socialized to avoid being vulnerable and sharing personal details; therefore, social integration is more the norm for males rather than developing attachment bonds (Jourard, 1971).

This study found that the singles' social support systems were similar to those described in other studies (Hess, 1981; Jourard, 1971; Lynch, 1977, Pearlin and Johnson, 1981). There were similarities as well as stereotypical gender differences between the men and women's social support systems. Both groups reported a similar number of friends available to them or a similar social network in terms of size. Boothe (1972) reported similar findings in her study; the men and women had a comparable number of social contacts. Unger (1979) found

"no sex differences in number of friends reported...between unmarried men and women" (p. 279). The men and women in this study also reported feeling satisfied with the adequacy of their social network and the support functions provided by their networks.

The importance of attachment bonds was the area where differences were found between the men and women in this study. As expected, women reported having more attachment relationships available to them. As Hess (1981) has pointed out, it was not surprising to find that women had more attachment bonds because females are socialized to form pair relationships and to develop intimacy bonds that allow high disclosure and emotional sharing (Macoby and Jacklin, 1974). Males are traditionally socialized to avoid dependency, disclosure, and depth in relationships (Hess, 1981; Jourard, 1971; Tiger, 1970). Knupher et al. (1966) found that never-married men were more antisocial and more isolated than were females and married men. Fears of being perceived as homosexual or unmanly prevented many males from self disclosure outside of the socially acceptable boundaries of marriage. Unmarried males would therefore be expected to have fewer attachment relationships than females.

Jourard (1981) has called the inability of males to share intimacies with others, outside of a marriage

relationship, one of the "lethal aspects" of the male role. Support of Jourard's idea is the research that shows high incidences of suicides, loneliness, depression, and other problems in never-married men, when compared to the relatively happy and well functioning description of married men and women (Bernard, 1972; Gove, 1972; Pearlin and Johnson, 1981; Somers, 1981).

Related to the availability of attachment relationships, it was expected that there would be a difference in the number of attachment bonds the men and women had available to them. As mentioned earlier, attachment relationships are more important to women than they are to men. It was not surprising to find that there was a difference in the number of attachment relationships the men and women did not have and yet were comfortable to live without. Women expressed a greater need for and discomfort if left without attachment bonds. This finding was consistent with the research that was mentioned previously, regarding female socialization versus male socialization for intimacy (Hess, 1981; Jourard, 1971; Tiger, 1970).

Although the men in this study reported that they had fewer attachment relationships available to them than women, there was no difference between the men and women in terms of their satisfaction with their attachment

relationships. This finding was consistent with the research on the intimacy needs of men and women. Men have less need for attachment relationships because of the way they have been socialized for intimacy. Therefore men are satisfied with fewer attachment relationships in comparison to the needs and desires of their female counterparts.

Life Satisfaction Predictors in the Regression Models

The importance of friendships and a support system to single adults has been discussed in the previous section. It was not surprising to find in the regression models that factors related to the quality and quantity of human relationships were important to the life satisfaction of the single adults. Good health, friends, and opportunities for personal growth were reported as important for the happiness of the unmarried in a study be Cargan and Melko (1982). Similarly, Hayes (1981) found professional never-married women were most likely to say that the lack of male companionship was the main ingredient missing in their lives preventing greater life satisfaction. Friends are very important to the happiness and life satisfaction of single adults. Visiting friends was one of the major activities of single adults and a means to reduce loneliness and unhappiness (Adams, 1976; Starr and Carns, 1972). Not only are these factors important for single adults, but for adults in general. Social participation

was associated with satisfaction and happiness in life and in marriage (Graney, 1975; Hess and Waring, 1978; Phillips, 1967).

While human relationships were important to the life satisfaction of both the men and women in this study, there were predictable gender differences. Men's life satisfaction was related to the availability of social integration or the presence of a network of individuals with whom interests and values were shared. As mentioned earlier, males are socialized to form relationships with low levels of disclosure, within a group context (Hess, 1981; Macoby and Jacklin, 1974). Team experiences and an extensive social network are the norm for most males (Tiger, 1970).

The life satisfaction of the women in this study also was related to aspects of their social support systems. The availability of attachment relationships was very important to the life satisfaction of the never-married women. The presence of affectionately close relationships that provided a sense of security and peace was one of the two variables in the model which predicted life satisfaction of the women. Attachment relationships were significant to the life satisfaction of women because women are socialized to be specialist in human relations (Hess, 1981). Girls usually pair off or form small cliques (Macoby and Jacklin, 1974). High levels of

self-disclosure and emotional involvement, with a few intimate friends, characterize female intimacy bonds. The importance of attachment relationships for unmarried women may be heightened by the fact that they do not have a marital relationship in which to have intimacy needs met.

The second variable in the model predictive of female life satisfaction was emotional loneliness. This is closely related to the availability of attachments. Individuals who suffer feelings of emotional loneliness are experiencing a sense of being alienated or being deprived of intimacy. Emotional loneliness is remedied by the presence of a close attachment relationship (Weiss, 1981). It appears that the availability of attachments may measure the quantity of attachment relationships and emotional loneliness can be seen as tapping the more qualitative aspects of the extent to which attachment relationships buffer one from feelings of alienation.

While the model predicting women's life satisfaction, in this study, revolved completely around aspects of their support systems, this was not true for men. The second variable in the model predicting men's life satisfaction was the men's self-esteem. The feelings and perceptions the men had about themselves related to their level of life satisfaction.

There was little comparative research on the role of

self-esteem in the life satisfaction of never-married men. A possible explanation of why self-esteem related to never-married men's life satisfaction and not that of women was found in a study by Deaux and Taynor (1973). They found that males were evaluated within a broader range than were females. Males were more likely to be viewed as competent or evaluated more critically, when compared on the same measures with their female counterparts. Females were seen as more powerful if they failed than were men when they failed. Therefore, if singlehood is seen as a failure to marry and succeed in the marriage market, men are more likely to be judged negatively. Further, males are assumed to be the initiators in relationships and singlehood may be seen more as a result of rejection than as a lack of opportunity. Males also appeared to be more vulnerable to negative evaluations from their "failures" (Deaux and Taynor, 1973).

Jacoby (1974) discussed the discrimination never-married men experienced, both in their personal and occupation spheres. Men were evaluated by what they did and what they accomplished. A never-married male's self-esteem is therefore dependent, in part, on how he perceives others evaluating his performance on these dimensions. Therefore, it may be that single status has greater implications for the self-esteems of men than

women. Educational and occupational accomplishments of women may help compensate for the fact that they are unmarried. Singlehood may be seen as a lifestyle chosen to facilitate these accomplishments for women. But we expect men to achieve regardless of marital status. Therefore, self-esteem may be related more directly to the life satisfaction of men. Certainly there is a need for further investigation of this relationship.

Implications for Theory and Research

"Bachelors and spinsters are a topic of much common sense speculation but of remarkably little social scientific research" (Spretzer and Riley, 1974, p. 533). It is only in recent years that social scientists have began to examine singlehood as a viable alternative to marriage (Adams, 1976; Libby, 1977; Stein, 1976, 1981). Therefore we lack the necessary information to explain the experiences and lifestyles of the rapidly growing singles population (Braito and Anderson, 1981). Glick (1979) predicted that the 1980's would bring an increase in the 4-5% of the population who remain never-married up to 8-9% of the adult population who will remain never-married. This segment of the population needs to be identified and studied as attitudes toward singlehood and marriage are

changing and more people are remaining or returning to single life.

Future studies need greater conceptual clarity. Many studies use the term single meaning all categories of singles, while other studies differentiate among categories. Uniformity in concepts must be maintained across studies if researchers hope to build on one another's findings. Several studies have identified unique and differing experiences of never-married, divorce, and widowed singles (Bernard, 1972; Gove, 1972; Pearlin and Johnson, 1981). Further, this study identified differences in never-married men and women. Therefore, gender is an important factor in categorizing singles. An accurate picture of the lifestyle and adjustment of single adults will only be drawn as subgroups of singles are studied, compared, and contrasted to one another and to their married cohorts.

This study attempted to investigate several factors that influenced adjustment to singlehood. Previously these factors had not been studied in multivariate designs. More multivariate research is needed to investigate both the individual contribution of variables, as well as the contributions of groups of variables. Variables do not operate independently in the lives of singles and research need to reflect ths reality.

Research is needed on larger samples and more diverse groups of the never-marrieds to explore how complete and accurate our current knowledge is. Longitudinal research on never-married men and women as they pass through adulthood is needed if we are going to really understand the experiences and needs of the unmarried. Findings in the present study revealed a description of younger never-marrieds that differed from descriptions of middle-aged never-marrieds.

Implications for Intervention

Studies have documented that the unmarried are more vulnerable to mental illness than are married adults (Bernard, 1972; Gove, 1972; Pearlin and Johnson, 1981). Never-married men are particularly at risk because they are more socially isolated and more antisocial than single women are (Knupher et al., 1966). Intervention and educational programs that teach interpersonal skills may be especially beneficial to never-married adults. Findings from the present study supported the importance of social support for the life satisfaction of both never-married men and women.

Stein (1979) found that never-married individuals experienced a period of crisis in the late twenties through their early thirties. This was a time when one

realized that singlehood may not be a temporary lifestyle but a permanent status. Data from the present study showed that both men and women, but especially women, were beginning to make this transition. Special programs should be developed to help singles deal with this time of change and to facilitate an easier transition into this new phase of singlehood. Since support systems are so vital to the happiness and well being of the never-married, intervention and education programs that have a group orientation could provide a basis for the men and women to develop or extend their support systems.

Family life educators must take an active role in developing programs for single adults. The lack of preparatory socialization experiences makes it difficult for many individuals to enact the role of a never-married adult. Family life educators have an opportunity to provide services that can benefit greatly this rapidly growing segment of the population. Helping combat myths and sterotypes about singlehood could be an important contribution not only to single adults, but also to increase the knowledge of and acceptance of singlehood as a viable adult lifestyle.

Limitations of the Study

1. Data was collected in Knox County, Tennessee. Individuals who live in this region of the country may have perspectives and experiences as single adults that may not be representative of other never-married adults. Particular caution should be take in generalizing conclusions from this study to single adults in rural settings.

2. The sample in this study was relatively small and it was not selected randomly. Obviously the subjects were not representative of the population of never-married adults.

3. Overall the individuals in this study were middle-class. All the participants were white. The life satisfaction and adjustment to singlehood of singles from other socioeconomic statuses and other races may differ.

4. The variables in this study were based on self-report data. Individuals were encouraged to be honest but participants may have been concerned about social desirability. Combining self-report measures with other approaches would provide opportunities to control for some of these threats to validity.

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

Adams, M. Living singly. In Peter Stein (Ed.), Single Life: Unmarried Adults in Social Context. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981.

Adams, M. Single Blessedness. New York: Basic Books, 1976.

Allon, N., & Fishel, D. Single bars as examples of urban courting patterns. In Peter Stein (Ed.), Single Life: Unmarried Adults in Social Context. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981.

Bell, R. R. & Jones, W. The adult male sex role and resistance to change. Paper presented at the National Council on Family Relations annual meeting, New York City, October, 1976.

Bernard, J. The Future of Marriage. New York: World Publishing Co., 1972.

Boissevain, J. Friends of Friends Oxford, England: Base Blakewell, 1974.

Booth, B. & Hess D. Cross sex friendships. Journal of Marriage and Family Relations. 1974, 36, 1, 38-47.

Braito, R. & Anderson, D. Singles and aging: Implications for needed research. In Peter Stein (Ed.), Single Life: Unmarried Adults in Social Context. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981.

Burr, W. R., Hill R., Nye, F. I., & Reiss, T. L. Contemporary Theories About the Family Volume II. New York: Macmillian Publishing, 1979.

Campbell, A., Converse, P. E. & Rodgers, W. L. The Quality of American Life. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1976.

Cargan, L. & Melko, M. Singles: Myths and Realities. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1982.

Cargan, L. Two stereotypes. Family Relations. July 1981, 30, 377-385.

Cockrum, J. S. Singles Inventory Unpublished manuscript, 1983. (available from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN).

Consumer Union News Digest. Vol. 6, 17, Sept. 1, 1981.

Cottrell, L. S. Jr. The adjustment of the individual to his age and sex roles. American Sociological Review. 1942, 26, 28-29.

Crandall, R. Validation of self-report measures using ratings by others. Sociological Methods and Research. 1976, 4, 3, 380-400.

Cronbach, L. J. Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika. 16, 297-334.

Darlin, J. Late-marrying bachelors. In Peter Stein (Ed.), Single Life: Unmarried Adults in Social Context. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981.

Deaux, K. & Taynor, J. Evaluations of male and female ability: Bias works both ways. Psychological Reports. 1973, 32, 261-262.

Doundna, C. & McBride, F. Where are the men for the women at the top? In Peter Stein (Ed.), Single Life: Unmarried Adults in Social Context. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981.

Emerging Trends. Princeton Religious Research Center. January 1983, 5,1, 3.

Eysenck, H. J. & Eysenck, S. B. G. Manual of the Eysenck Personality Inventory. London: London University Press, 1964.

Fracchia, C. A. How To Be Single Creatively. New York: McGraw Hill, 1979.

Gibson, G. Kin family Network: Overheralded structure in past conceptualizations of family functioning. Journal of Marriage and the Family. February 1972, 51, 13-23.

Gilder, G. Naked Nomads. New York: Quandrangle 1974.

Glick, P. Some recent changes in American families. Current Population Reports. 1975, 52, 23.

Goode, W. J. A theory of role strain. American Sociological Review. August 1960, 25, 488-96.

Gottlieb, B. H. Social Networks and Social Support. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1981.

Gould, R. L. The phases of adult life: A study in developmental psychology. The American Journal of Psychiatry. July-December 1972, 1, 29, 521-531.

Gould, R. L. Transformations: Growth and Change in Adult Life. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1978.

Gove, W. R. The relationship between sex roles, marital status and mental illness. Social Forces. 1972, 51, 34-44.

Graney, M. J. Happiness and social participation in aging. Journal of Gerontology. 1975, 30, 6, 701-706.

Gurin, G., Veroff, J, & Feld, S. Americans View Their Mental Health. New York: Basic Books, 1974.

Hayes, M. P. Life satisfaction of never-married professional women. Paper presented at National Council of Family Relations, Willwaike, Wisconsin, 1981.

Hess, B. Friendship and gender roles over the life course. In Peter Stein (Ed.), Single Life: Unmarried Adults in Social Context. New York: St. Martin's Press 1981.

Hess, B. & Waring, J. Changing patterns of aging and family bonds in later life. The Family Coordinator. October, 1978, 27, 4, 303-314.

Henderson, S., Byrne, D. G., & Duncan-Jones, P. Neurosis and the Social Environment. New York: Academic Press, 1981.

Hunt, M. The World of the Formerly Married. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966.

Jacoby, S. 49 million singles can't all be right. The New York Times Magazine. February 17, 1974, 13, 41-46.

Jourard, S. M. The Transparent Self. New York: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1971.

Kieffer, C. New depths in intimacy. In Roger Libby and Robert Whitehurst (Eds.) Marriage and Alternatives. Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1977.

Komarovsky, M. Patterns of self-disclosure of male undergraduates. Journal of Marriage and the Family. 1974, 36, 4, 677-686.

Knupper, G., Clark, W., & Room, R. The mental health of the unmarried. The American Journal of Psychiatry. February, 1966, 122, 841-851.

Kuhn, M. How mates are sorted. In Becker H. & Hill R. (Eds.) Marriage and Parenthood. Boston: D.C. Heath and Co., 1955.

Kurth, S. A process of identity transformation for non-marrieds. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for the Study of Social problems, San Francisco, 1975.

Laner, M. R., Laner, R. H., & Palmer, C. E. Motivated to marry or satisfied with singlehood?: Stein's pushes and pulls revisited. Cornell Journal of Social Relations. Summer 1979, 14, 1, 59-74.

Lee, G. A. Marriage an anomie: a causal argument. Journal of Marriage and the Family. 1974, 36, 3, 523-32.

Leary, T. Interpersonal Diagnosis of Personality. New York: Ronald, 1957.

Libby, R. W. Creative singlehood as a sexual life-style: Beyond marriage as a rite of passage. In Roger Libby and Robert Whitehurst (Eds.) Marriage and Alternatives. Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1977.

Lynch, J. J. The Broken Heart. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Lynch, J. J. Warning: Living alone is dangerous to your health. U.S. News and World Report. June 30, 1980, 47-48.

Maccoby, E. E. & Jacklin, C. N. The Psychology of Sex Differences. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1974.

Maslow, A. H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Row, 1954.

Melville, K. Marriage and Family Today. New York: Random House, 1977.

Nadelson, C. C. & Notman, M. T. To marry or not to marry: A choice. American Journal of Psychiatry. 1981, 138, 10, 1352-1356.

Pearlin, L. I. & Johnson, J. S. Marital status, life strains, and depression. American Sociological Review. October, 1977, 42, 704-715.

Pearlin, L. I. & Johnson, J. S. Marital status, life strains, and depression. In Peter Stein (Ed.), Single Life: Unmarried Adults in Social Context. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981.

Phillips, D. L. Social participation and happiness. American Journal of Sociology. 1967, 72, 479-488.

Radloff, L. Sex differences in depression - the effects of occupation and marital status. Sex Roles. 1975, 1, 249-265.

Robinson, J. & Shaver, P. Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes. University of Michigan Press, 1968.

Rosenberg, M. Society and the Adolescent Self-image. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Russell, D., Peplau, L. A., & Ferguson, M. L. Developing a measure of loneliness. Journal of Personality Assessment. 1978, 42, 3, 1978, 290-294.

Sheehy, G. Passages: Predictable Crises of Adult Life. New York: E.P. Dutton and Co., Inc., 1976.

Skolnick, A. S. & Skolnick, J. H. (Eds.) Family in Transition. Boston: Little and Brown, Co., 1977.

Smith-Rosenberg, C. The female world of love and ritual: Relations between women in nineteenth-century America. Signs. 1975, 1, 1, 1-29.

Sokoloff, N. J. Early work patterns of single and married women. In Peter Stein (Ed.), Single Life: Unmarried Adults in Social Context. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981.

Somers, A. R. Marital status, health, and the use of health services: An old relationship revisited. In Peter Stein (Ed.), Single Life: Unmarried Adults in Social Context. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981.

Spreitzer, E. & Riley, L. E. Factors associated with singlehood. Journal of Marriage and Family Relations. 1974, 36, 533-542.

Srole, L., Langes, T., Michale, S. T., Opler, M. K., & Rennie, T. A. C. Mental Health in the Metropolis: The Midtown Manhattan Study. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981.

Starr, J. & Carns, D. Singles in the city. Society. 1972, 9, 43-48.

Stein, P. J. and Etkowitz, H. Lifeshifts in the adult life spiral: An alternative model of the life cycle. Paper presented at the ASA, San Francisco, California, September 4-8, 1979.

Stein, P. J. The lifestyles and life changes of the never-married. Marriage and Family Review. July-August 1978, 1,4,1,3-11.

Stein, P. J. Single. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1976.

Stein, P. J. Single Life: Unmarried Adults in Social Context. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981.

Stein, P. J. The Single Life. Paper presented at the Southern Newspaper Publishers Association, Knoxville, Tennessee, April 8-11, 1979.

Stolk, Y., & Brotherton, P. Attitudes towards single women. Sex Roles. 1981, 7, 1, 73-78.

Schwartz, M. A. Career strategies of the never-married. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, New York City, August, 1976.

Tiger, L. Men in Groups. New York: Random House, 1970.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current population reports, Series P-20, No.1 349, Marital Status and Living Arrangements: March 1979, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1980.

U.S. News and World Report. 19 million singles: Their joys and frustrations. February 21, 1983, 53-56.

Undry, J. R. The Social Context of Marriage (3rd ed.) Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1974.

Unger, R. K. Female and Male: Psychological Perspectives New York: Harper and Row, 1979,

Vaillant, G. Adaptation to Life. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1977.

Weiss, R. The emotional impact of marital separation. In Peter Stein (Ed.), Single Life: Unmarried Adults in Social Context. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981.

Weiss, R. Marital Separation. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1975.

Zeller, R. A. & Carmines, E. G. Measurement in the Social Sciences. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INTRODUCTION LETTER TO THE STUDY

Dear Single:

After several years as a single adult with a variety of experiences and being involved with other singles, I have become interested in studying the experiences of single men and women for my doctoral dissertation research. Because of the growing increase of the singles population and the heterogeneous experiences of singles, I believe that it is imperative that information be obtained on this growing segment of society. I would like to ask your help in contributing to a greater understanding of single men and women.

Your name was selected from a list of members in a single's organization or given to me by a mutual acquaintance in Knoxville. I would appreciate your participation in my study and your help in this research effort to learn more about single adults.

I would like to assure you in advance that all information you provide will be kept confidential. The questionnaires that you fill out and the interview you respond to will be identified only by a number. I will be the only one who has access to this information. Your name will appear nowhere on the questionnaires or on the interview. Results from this study will be reported as group data and there will be no reference relating specifically to you.

I will be contacting you by phone in approximately one week to see if you are willing to participate in this study. If you agree to participate, we will set up an appointment for the questionnaires to be delivered and the interview to be done. The whole process will require approximately one hour of your time.

I hope you will decide to participate in this study. Your time and insights will be a valuable contribution.

Sincerely yours,

Janet S. Cockrum
Ph.D. candidate

APPENDIX B

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
KNOXVILLE 37916
COLLEGE OF HOME ECONOMICS

DEPARTMENT OF CHILD
AND FAMILY STUDIES

AREA 615
TELEPHONE: 974-5316

The purpose of this study is to learn about the experiences of never-married men and women. This is an important area of research, because the singles population is continuing to grow as individuals are chosing singlehood as a temporary or permanent life style. The focus of this study will be on the satisfaction of single adults with their support systems. A short interview will center on your feelings about this area. A few short questionnaires will focus on your feelings about yourself at this point in your life.

Participation in this study will require about one hour of your time. I recognize that some of the questions may start you thinking about some areas of your life that you do not enjoy thinking about. However, I hope that this can be constructive for you.

I would like to assure you that your name will not appear on any of the questionnaires. Your confidentiality as a participant will be preserved by the use of a number (instead of names) in the study. All information will be reported as group data. There will not be individual references that could be linked with you.

You are free to withdraw at any time from the study. There are no penalties for withdrawal of the study. I will be glad to answer questions you have about the study and the procedures I am using. (My home phone number is 693-2108 and my office number is 974-5316).

Thank you for your time.

Janet S. Cockrum
Ph.D. candidate

I have read this form and understand the procedures of this study. On this basis I agree to participate in this study.

signed_____

date_____

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR SOCIAL INTERACTION

First, I want to get some idea of the people around you in your life. This includes those you are closest to-your family, friends and neighbors-all the people you may meet from day to day. These first questions will be about people you know a little, but who are not close friends.

1. Now let's consider people you exchange a word or two with; that is, someone serving you in a shop or in an office, but whom you normally don't see apart from at their work. Most days, how many people like this do you see?

none.....1
1-2.....2
3-5.....3
6-10.....4
11-15.....5
More than 15.....6

2. Would you like more or less of this or is it about right?

Less.....1
About right.....2
More.....3

I shall be asking this sort of question through this section-would you want more or less of this or is it about right.

3. On most days, how many people do you see whom you know just a little, to smile or wave to, or to say good morning to? People you do not know well-you may not know their names-but you greet each other when you pass by.

None.....1
1-2.....2
3-5.....3
6-10.....4
11-15.....5
More than 15.....6

4. Is this about right for you, or do you wish you saw more or fewer of such people?

Less.....1
About right.....2
More.....3

5. These days, how many people with similar interests to you do you have contact with?

None.....1
1-2.....2
3-5.....3
6-10.....4
11-15.....5
More than 15.....6

6. Would you like more or less of this or is it about right? (persons, duration or frequency)

Less.....1
About right.....2
Depends on the situation....3
More.....4

7. On your job, do you usually work with others or alone?

Not employed (Go to Q.10)...0
With others.....1
Depends on the situation....2
Alone.....3

8. How often do you go out with the people at work?

Never.....0
Once a year.....1
A few times a year.....2
Monthly.....3
Weekly or more.....4
Not applicable.....8

9. Would you like to go out together more or less than you do or is this about right?

Less.....1
About right.....2
Depends on the situation....3
More.....4
Not applicable.....8

10. In an ordinary week, how many people whom you know would you say you have contact with?

None.....1
1-2.....2
3-5.....3
6-10.....4
11-15.....5
More than 15.....6

11. Would you like more or less of this or is it about right for you? (persons, duration or frequency)

Less.....1
About right.....2
Depends on the situation....3
More.....4

12. At present, do you wish there were more or less or are there about the right number of people in your day-to-day life?

Less.....1
About right.....2
Depends on the situation....3
More.....4

Now I would like you to think about people you are close to who live in or near Knoxville. Close friends who are near enough physically so you can see them whenever you wish.

13. How many friends do you have who could come to your home at any time and take things as they find them-they wouldn't be embarrassed if the house were untidy or you were in the middle of as meal.

None.....1
1-2.....2
3-5.....3
6-10.....4
11-15.....5
More than 15.....6

14. Would you prefer more of less of this or is it about right for you?

Less.....1
About right.....2
Depends on the situation....3
More.....4

15. How many friends do you have whom you could visit at any time, without waiting for an invitation. You could arrive without being expected and still be sure you would be welcome.

None.....1
1-2.....2
3-5.....3
6-10.....4
11-15.....5
More than 15.....6

16. Would you like to have more or fewer friends like this or is it about right for you?

Less.....1
About right.....2
Depends on the situation....3
More.....4

17. Overall, would you say you belong to a close circle of friends-a group of people who all keep in close touch with each other-or not?

Yes.....1
Qualified response.....2
No.....3

18. Would you like more or less of this or is this about right for you? (persons, duration or frequency)

Less.....1
About right.....2
Depends on the situation....3
More.....4

19. Among your family and friends, how many people are there who are immediately available to you whom you can talk with frankly, without having to watch what you say?

None (Go to Q.19D).....1
1-2.....2
3-5.....3
6-10.....4
11-15.....5
More than 15.....6

A. Would you like to have more or less people like this or is it about right for you?

Less.....1
About right.....2
Depends on the situation....3
More.....4
Not applicable.....8

B. With the one (those) you have, would you like to feel more free to be frank or is it about right?

About right.....1
Depends on the situation....2
More free.....3
Not applicable.....4

C. Who is this mainly? (Fill in one only on the Attachment Table)

(Go to Q.20)

D. Do you wish there were someone or not?

Yes.....1
Don't know.....2
No.....3
Not applicable.....8

20. If something unpleasant or irritating happens and you get upset or angry about it, do you have someone you can go to who isn't involved and tell them just how you feel or not?

Yes.....1
Depends on the situation....2
No (Code 0 for number, and go to Q. 20C.).....3

A. How many people like this are there?

Number....._____

B. Do you wish you had more or fewer people like this or is this about right?

Fewer.....1
About right.....2
Depends on the situation....3
More.....4
Not applicable.....8

(Go to Q. 21)

(If no one)
C. Is there no one you can go to in that situation or do you prefer to keep such things to yourself?

No one.....1
Depends on the situation....2
Keep things to yourself.....3
Not applicable.....8

21. These last questions were about close friends and people you know really well. At this time last year, did you have more or fewer people or about the same number?

Fewer last year, more now...1
Same.....2
Depends on the situation....3
More last year, fewer now...4

22. And would you say that the quality of friendships you had a year ago was as good, less good, or better?

Less good a year.....1
Same (Go to Q.23).....2
Depends on the situation....3
Better a year ago.....4

23. Now I want you to think about everybody in Knoxville to whom you are close. Considering those you live with, your family and friends, who ABOVE ALL would you say you are closest to, fondest of, most attached to? Who would be next? Anyone? (Fill in on Attachment Table for each person mentioned)

24. Would you say you have a single, lasting relationship, someone you intend to go on sharing your life with or not?

No one (Go to Q.24C)... _____
Yes..... _____

A. Who is this? (Fill in only one on Attachment Table)

B. Do you wish you felt more certain of this or not?

Yes.....1
No.....2
Not applicable.....8

(Go to Q.25)

(If no one)
C. Do you wish there were someone or do you prefer to be unattached right now?

Wishes there was someone....3
Don't know.....2
Prefers to be unattached....1
Not applicable.....8

25. Now I would like to ask if there is anyone who lives in or near Knoxville who knows you very well as a person. (This includes friends as well as family members.)

No one (Go to Q.25E).....1
Yes (qualified).....2
Yes.....3

A. Who is this? (Fill in on only one on Attachment Table)

B. Would you say_____really knows you very well indeed?

Yes.....1
No.....2
Not applicable.....8

C. Do you wish_____did not know you quite so well, knew you better, or is it about right?

Less.....1
About right.....2
Depends on the situation....3
Better.....4
Not applicable.....8

D. Would you like to have someone else like this or not?

Yes.....1
Don't know.....2
Depends on the situation....3
No.....4
Not applicable.....8

(Go to Q.26)

(If no one)
E. Do you wish there were someone or not?

Yes.....1
Don't know.....2
No.....3
Not applicable.....8

26. Is there any particular person you feel you can lean on?

No one (Go to Q.26D).....1
Yes, but don't need anyone..2
Yes.....3

A. What is his/her name? (Fill in only one on Attachment Table)

B. Would you like to be able to lean more or less on_____?

Less.....1
About right.....2
Depends on the situation....3
More.....4
Not applicable.....8

C. Would you like to have someone else like this or is he/she enough?

Yes.....1
Don't know.....2
Enough.....3
Not applicable.....8

(Go to Q.27)

(If no one)
D. Is it that you have no need for such a person or do you wish there were someone?

Wish there were.....1
Don't know.....2
No need.....3
Not applicable.....8

27. Do you feel there is one particular person who feels very close to you?

No one (Go to Q.27D).....1
Not sure.....2
Yes.....3

A. Who is this mainly? (Fill in only one on Attachment Table)

B. Would you like_____to feel closer, or not so close to you or is it about right the way it is?

Closer.....1
About right.....2
Depends on the situation....3
Not so close.....4
Not applicable.....8

C. Would you like to have more or fewer people like this or is this about right?

Fewer.....1
About right.....2
More.....3
Not applicable.....8

(Go to Q.28)

(If no one)
D. Do you wish there were someone or not?

Yes.....1
Don't know.....2
No.....3
Not applicable.....8

28. When you are happy, is there any particular person you can share it with-someone whom you feel sure will feel happy simply because you are?

No one (Go to Q.28D).....0
Yes.....1

A. Who is this mainly? (Fill in only one on Attachment Table)

B. Would you like to feel this more with_____or is it about right?

About right.....1
More.....2
Not applicable.....8

C. Would you like to have someone else like this or is this enough?

Yes.....1
Don't know.....2
Enough.....3
Not applicable.....8

(Go to Q.29)

(If no one)
D. Do you wish there were someone or not?

Yes.....1
Don't know.....2
No.....3
Not applicable.....8

29. At present, do you have someone you can share your most private feelings with (confide in) or not?

No one (Go to Q.29D).....0
Yes.....1

A. Who is this mainly? (Fill in only one on Attachment Table)

B. Do you wish you could share more with_____or is it about right?

About right.....1
Depends on the situation....2
More.....3
Not applicable.....8

C. Would you like to have someone else like this as well, would you prefer not to use a confidant, or is it just about right for you the way it is?

Prefers no confidant.....1
About right.....2
Depends on the situation....3
Like someone else as well...4
Not applicable.....8

(Go to Q.30)

(If no one)
D. Would you like to have someone like this or would you prefer to keep your feelings to yourself?

Keep things to self.....1
Like someone.....2
Not applicable.....8

30. Are there ever times when you are comforted by being held in someone's arms or not?

No (Go to Q.30C).....0
Yes.....1

A. By whom mainly? (Fill in only one on Attachment Table)

B. Is there anyone you'd like to comfort you more in this way or is it all right the way it is?

All right as is.....2
Yes.....1
Not applicable.....8

C. Is this because there is no one to hold you or because you prefer not being comforted that way?

No one.....2
Prefer it that way.....1
Not applicable.....8

31. Still thinking of people in or near Knoxville. Your family and everyone else-how many people are there who depend on YOU particularly for help, or guidance, or advice in day-to-day life?

Number (If none, code 0)_____

32. Would you like to have more or less of this in your life, or is it about right?

Less.....1
About right.....2
Depends on the situation....3
More.....4

(If Respondent lives alone, go to Q.34)

33. Do you think those at home REALLY appreciate what you do for them or not?

Yes.....1
Not really.....2
Depends on the situation....3
Not at all.....4
Not applicable.....8

A. Would you like ANY of them to show appreciation more, or less or is it about right?

Less.....1
About right.....2
Depends on the situation....3
More.....4
Not applicable.....8

34. Are there any (other) people outside your home who really appreciate what you are doing for them?

No (Code 0 for number, go to Q.35).....
Yes.....

A. How many? Number.....

35. Would you like more of this, or less, or is it about right?

Less.....1
About right.....2
Depends on the situation.....3
More.....4

36. Do people TELL you that you are good at doing some things or not? Being praised (commended) for something you're good at, in the home, at work or elsewhere.

No (Code 0 for number, and go to Q.37)....._____
Yes....._____

A. How many? Number....._____

37. Would you like more of this, or less, or is it about right?

Less.....1
About right.....2
Depends on the situation.....3
More.....4

38. Are there people around from whom you can easily ask small favors? Such as people you know well enough to borrow tools or things for cooking.

No (Code 0 for number, and go to Q.39)....._____
Yes....._____

A. How many? Number....._____

39. Would you like to have more of this, or less, or is it about right?

Less.....1
About right.....2
Depends on the situation.....3
More.....4

40. (Apart from those at home) are there people in Knoxville to whom you can turn in times of difficulties? Someone you can see fairly easily whom you could trust and whom you could expect real help from in times of trouble.

No (Code 0 for number, and go to Q.41)....._____
Yes....._____

A. How many? Number....._____

41. Do you wish you had more of such help available or is it about right?

About right.....1
Depends on the situation.....2
More.....3

42. When things are difficult, do you find it more helpful to be with someone or to be by yourself?

Be with someone.....1
Depends on the situation.....2
Be by yourself.....3

Interview Schedule for Social Interaction—Attachment Table

Fill in this information for each person mentioned Q.21, Q.23-30											Code 1 (or 2 if qualified response, Q.29-31 only) for each question in which a person is mentioned. Only in Q.23 should person's rank be recorded.								
Line No.	Name of person	What is his/her relationship to you?	Sex	Where does he/she live?							Q.19	Q.23	Q.24	Q.25	Q.26	Q.27	Q.28	Q.29	Q.30
			1=M or 2=F	Household	This town	This country	Outside the country	Dead	Don't know			Rank person		Code 2 if response is qualified					
				Code 1	2	3	4	7	8										

APPENDIX D

LIFE SATISFACTION SCALE

PERSONAL FEELINGS. Here are some words we would like you to use to describe how you feel about your present life. For example, if you think your present life is very boring, put an X in the blank right next to the word "boring." If you think it is very interesting, put an X in the blank right next to the word "interesting." If you think it belongs somewhere in between, put an X where you think it belongs.

		1	2	3	4	5	
C1.	BORING	___	___	___	___	___	INTERESTING
C2.	ENJOYABLE	___	___	___	___	___	MISERABLE
C3.	EASY	___	___	___	___	___	HARD
C4.	USELESS	___	___	___	___	___	WORTHWHILE
C5.	FRIENDLY	___	___	___	___	___	LONELY
C6.	FULL	___	___	___	___	___	EMPTY
C7.	DISCOURAGING	___	___	___	___	___	HOPEFUL
C8.	TIED DOWN	___	___	___	___	___	FREE
C9.	DISAPPOINTING	___	___	___	___	___	REWARDING

APPENDIX E

SELF-ESTEEM SCALE

For each statement below, check the statement that best describes your feelings about yourself.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	DISagree	Strongly DISagree
B1. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.				
B2. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.				
B3. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.				
B4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.				
B5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.				
B6. I take a positive attitude toward myself.				
B7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.				
B8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.				
B9. I certainly feel useless at times.				
B10. At times I think I am no good.				

APPENDIX F

SINGLES INVENTORY

Directions: The purpose of this questionnaire is to find out about your life style and relationships. Please read each question carefully and print your answer in the blank provided. For questions where no blank is provided, circle the number of the correct response on the questionnaire.

1. How old are you?_____years

2. Your gender is _____male _____female

3. In your opinion, how involved were you in the decision to remain single?
    1. totally involved
    2. very involved
    3. partly involved
    4. only slightly involved
    5. not at all involved

4. How many hours per week do you work outside the home?_____hours

5. What is your highest level of education?
    1. completed less than grade 8
    2. completed grade 8
    3. attended high school but did not graduate
    4. graduated from high school
    5. attended college but did not graduate
    6. graduated college or received R.N degree
    7. attended graduate school
    8. received graduate degree (e.g. masters, doctorate, J.D.)

6. If you are in school <u>now</u>, toward what degree are you working?
    1. not in school now
    2. high school diploma or G.E.D.
    3. B.A., B.S., or R.N.
    4. M.S., M.B.A., M.S.N., M.S.W
    5. Ed.S.
    6. J.D. or M.D.
    7. Ph.D or Ed.D
    8. other, please describe

7. What is the status of your current job?
    1. Professional, technical, and kindred workers
    2. Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm
    3. Clerical, sales, and kindred workers
    4. Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers
    5. Operatives and kindred workers
    6. Service workers, including private household
    7. Laborers, except farm and mine

8. Please fill in the amount of money you received yearly from the following sources. If you are not sure of the exact amount, give your best estimate.
    1. income from employment_____per year
    2. income from relatives_____per year
    3. other income_____per year

If you marked "other income," please describe what the source(s) is (are)_____.

9. In which category does your income fall?
    1. $12,000--13,999
    2. $14,000--15,999
    3. $16,000--17,999
    4. $18,000--19,999
    5. $20,000--21,999
    6. $25,000--30,000
    7. Above $30,000

10. What religion are you?
    1. Protestant(Fundamentalist, Baptist, Evangelical, Presbyterian)
    2. Protestant(Episcopalian, Methodist)
    3. Catholic
    4. Jewish
    5. none
    6. other, please describe_____.

11. Have your religious beliefs influenced your decision to remain single?
    1. yes
    2. no

If yes, briefly list how it has influenced your decision

_____
_____.

12. How often do you attend a religious activity?
    1. never
    2. once a year
    3. 4 to 6 times a year
    4. 2 to 3 times a month
    5. once a week
    6. more than once a week

13. What advantages have you experienced from being single? Please list the ones most significant to you?
    1.
    2.
    3.
    4.
    5.

14. What disadvantages have you experienced from being single? Please list the ones most significant to you.
    1.
    2.
    3.
    4.
    5.

15. What is the composition of your household?
    1. live alone
    2. live with relative(s)
    3. live communally (more than one person I am not related to)
    4. other, please specify_____.

16. If you live with relatives, who do you live with?
    1. both parents
    2. mother only
    3. father only
    4. siblings
    5. other, please specify_____.

17. How many years have you maintained the household listed in question 15? _____years.

18. Is your present living arrangement your PREFERRED living arrangement?
    1. yes
    2. no
    If no, please indicate why it is not_____
_____.

19. Using this scale, indicate how much you usually like doing the following things with others and alone.

dislike intensely	dislike	neutral	like	like intensely
1	2	3	4	5

	with OTHERS	ALONE
a. eating an evening meal in restaurants	-----	-----
b. shopping	-----	-----
c. attending church	-----	-----
d. going on vacation	-----	-----
e. seeing a movie	-----	-----
f. staying in motels/hotels when out of town	-----	-----
g. going to a party	-----	-----
h. making an important decision	-----	-----
i. staying home on Friday/Saturday night	-----	-----

20. How difficult has it been for you to financially provide for yourself?

1. not at all difficult
2. a little difficult
3. somewhat difficult
4. very difficult
5. extremely difficult

21. Have you moved (including within the same city) in the last two years?

1. yes
2. no

22. If you did move, what was the reason?

1. personal
2. financial
3. maintenance
4. wanted more space
5. wanted less space
6. social opportunities
7. career opportunities
8. other, please specify_____.

23. How far do you live from your parent's home? (if they are not living together, respond to the question in terms of the parent you have the closest relationship with)
    1. 0-30 minutes
    2. 30-60 minutes
    3. one hour - three hours
    4. a day's journey
    5. two - five day journey
    6. parents are deceased
    7. other, please specify_____.

24. How frequently do you feel lonely?
    1. not at all
    2. a few times a year
    3. at least once a month
    4. at lease twice a month
    5. at least once a week
    6. at least twice a week
    7. more than twice a week

25. To meet new friends, where would you be MOST likely to look?
    1. single's bars
    2. religious groups
    3. special interest groups
    4. private parties and mutual acquaintances
    5. other, please specify_____.

26. What is the second place you would be MOST likely to look for new friends?
    1. single's bars
    2. religious groups
    3. special interest groups
    4. private parties and mutual acquaintances
    5. job related activities
    6. other, please specify_____.
    7. Not applicable

27. To meet new dating partners, where would you be MOST likely to look?
    1. single's bars
    2. religious groups
    3. special interest groups
    4. private parties and mutual acquaintances
    5. job related activities
    6. other, please specify_____.

28. Where is the second place you would be MOST likely to look for new dating partner?

1. single's bars
2. religious groups
3. special interest groups
4. private parties and mutual acquaintances
5. job related activities
6. other, please specify

29. Please briefly describe the major functions of the job you are currently employed in_____
_____
_____.

30. Do your fellow employees provide a support system for you?

1. never or almost never
2. seldom
3. sometimes
4. frequently
5. very frequently

31. How likely do you think it is that you will ever marry?
(put an X on the place on the line that best describes your feelings)

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

never or almost for sure will never marry — neutral — for sure or almost for will marry

32. Overall, I feel that being single is:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

not very satisfying — neutral — very satisfying

33. Which of the following best characterizes your single status?

1. voluntary and temporary status
2. voluntary and permanent status
3. involuntary and temporary status
4. involuntary and permanent status

APPENDIX G

UCLA LONELINESS SCALE

Indicate how often each of the statements below is descriptive of you.
Circle one letter for each statement:

O indicates "I often feel this way"
S indicates "I sometimes feel this way"
R indicates "I rarely feel this way"
N indicates "I never feel this way"

1. I am unhappy doing so many things alone.....O S R N
2. I have nobody to talk to.....O S R N
3. I cannot tolerate being so alone.....O S R N
4. I lack companionship.....O S R N
5. I feel as if nobody really understands me.....O S R N
6. I find myself waiting for people to call or write.....O S R N
7. There is no one I can turn to.....O S R N
8. I am no longer close to anyone.....O S R N
9. My interests and ideas are not shared by those around me.....O S R N
10. I feel left out.....O S R N
11. I feel completely alone.....O S R N
12. I am unable to reach out and communicate with those around me...O S R N
13. My social relationships are superficial.....O S R N
14. I feel starved for company.....O S R N
15. No one really knows me well.....O S R N
16. I feel isolated from others.....O S R N
17. I am unhappy begin so withdrawn.....O S R N
18. It is difficult for me to make friends.....O S R N
19. I feel shut out and excluded by others.....O S R N
20. People are around me but not with me.....O S R N

APPENDIX H

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS

TABLE 15

Correlation Coefficients
N = 60

	LIFESAT	SOCLONLY	EMOLONLY	ESTEEM	AVAT	ADATPCT	AVSI	ADSI	NOATT
LIFESAT	1.00000 0.0000	-0.29904 0.0203	-0.46358 0.0002	0.40576 0.0013	0.17096 0.1915	0.18433 0.1586	-0.03402 0.7964	0.29966 0.0200	0.02172 0.8692
SOCLONLY	-0.29904 0.0203	1.00000 0.0000	0.83910 0.0001	-0.46591 0.0002	-0.13951 0.2877	-0.30969 0.0160	-0.21823 0.0939	-0.28047 0.0300	-0.06215 0.6371
EMOLONLY	-0.46358 0.0002	0.83910 0.0001	1.00000 0.0000	-0.48985 0.0001	-0.20488 0.1163	-0.45378 0.0003	-0.08401 0.5234	-0.41451 0.0010	-0.05910 0.6537
ESTEEM	0.40576 0.0013	-0.46591 0.0002	-0.48985 0.0001	1.00000 0.0000	-0.03863 0.7695	0.14743 0.2609	0.07707 0.5583	0.30769 0.0168	0.16658 0.2033
AVAT	0.17096 0.1915	-0.13951 0.2877	-0.20488 0.1163	-0.03863 0.7695	1.00000 0.0000	0.28012 0.0302	0.14839 0.2578	0.31093 0.0156	-0.40383 0.0014
ADATPCT	0.18433 0.1586	-0.30969 0.0160	-0.45378 0.0003	0.14743 0.2609	0.28012 0.0302	1.00000 0.0000	-0.05763 0.6618	0.54544 0.0001	0.12078 0.3580
AVSI	-0.03402 0.7964	-0.21823 0.0939	-0.08401 0.5234	0.07707 0.5583	0.14839 0.2578	-0.05763 0.6618	1.00000 0.0000	-0.02661 0.8401	-0.22185 0.0885
ADSI	0.29966 0.0200	-0.28047 0.0300	-0.41451 0.0010	0.30769 0.0168	0.31093 0.0156	0.54544 0.0001	-0.02661 0.8401	1.00000 0.0000	0.01353 0.9183
NOATT	0.02172 0.8692	-0.06215 0.6371	-0.05910 0.6537	0.16658 0.2033	-0.40383 0.0014	0.12078 0.3580	-0.22185 0.0885	0.01353 0.9183	1.00000 0.0000

VITA

Janet Schreur Cockrum was born in Escondido, California, on December 1, 1956. She attended elementary and secondary school in Orange, California. She graduated from Villa Park High School in 1975. Ms. Cockrum majored in psychology at Seattle Pacific University and graduated in 1979. In the fall of 1979, she began the masters program in the Department of Child and Family Studies, at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. The Master of Science was awarded in 1981.

The author continued her graduate training at the University of Tennessee, in the interdisciplinary doctoral program, in the College of Home Economics. Her concentration was on family relations, with collateral study in consumer economics and counseling. While pursuing graduate training, the author worked as a graduate assistant for the Women's Studies and Child and Family Studies Departments. She also worked as a graduate research assistant for the Departments of Child and Family Studies and Psychology. She taught undergraduate courses for three years in the Department of Child and Family Studies. In December 1983, the author was awarded the Doctor of Philosophy.