

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Korrel Woody Kanoy entitled "Parent-Child Relationships and Self Concept: A Comparison of Children from Divorced and Intact Families." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Home Economics.

Jo Lynn Cunningham
Jo Lynn Cunningham, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Priscilla White

Vernon Montgomery

Lynn C. Cagle

Donald K. Dink

Accepted for the Council:

L. Evans Rich
Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

PARENT-CHILD RELATIONSHIPS AND SELF-CONCEPT:

A COMPARISON OF CHILDREN FROM DIVORCED

AND INTACT FAMILIES

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Philosophy

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Korrel Woody Kanoy

June 1980

3046951

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to the many people who contributed to this dissertation. Most especially I would like to thank the mothers and children who participated in the research. These individuals were generous with their time and were very willing to share information about their families. I learned a lot from these families and enjoyed the opportunity to meet them.

Special thanks go to Jeanne Pais who began the initial project and provided many valuable insights and contributions to the conceptualization of the research. Suzanne James contributed a lot of time, effort, and support throughout the project and I appreciate her dedication to the research. In addition, several graduate and undergraduate students from the Department of Child and Family Studies helped with the more tedious aspects of the project such as data collection and coding.

I am very grateful to my computer consultant, Paul Wright, for his patience and expertise as I continually presented him with challenges and a series of minor crises. Also, special recognition goes to the secretaries in the Department of Child and Family Studies who provided a lot of clerical support and were willing to help in any way they could.

Special recognition, respect, and thanks go to Dr. Jo Lynn Cunningham, my major professor, for her dedication to my professional development throughout my graduate school days. Her expertise, enthusiasm, friendship, and tireless efforts have made my graduate school experience, and especially the dissertation research, a valuable

and pleasurable learning experience. Also special thanks go to Jo Lynn and Dr. Priscilla White, a member of my committee, for their initial encouragement to pursue the research. Working closely with Priscilla throughout the project has been enjoyable, and I appreciate her guidance, insights, and continuous support. I wish to thank the rest of my committee, Dr. Mick Nordquist, Dr. Lynn Cagle, and Dr. Abraham Farkas, for their flexibility as I undertook the research and their guidance throughout the process. In addition, I am grateful to Dr. Brent Miller for the contributions he made while a member of my committee.

A sigh of relief is shared with my husband, Bobby, as we have waited a long time for both of us to finish our graduate work. Special thanks to Bobby for his encouragement for me to pursue the doctorate and his patience, love, and support as I completed the process.

Thanks also goes to my parents, C. L. and Susie Woody, who have encouraged me throughout my life. I am grateful for their guidance and unwavering support.

ABSTRACT

Understanding the impact of divorce on children becomes more vital each year because of the increasing number of children who experience parental divorce. Although there is substantial literature on divorce, inconclusive findings exist because (a) not enough researchers have compared children of divorced families to children from intact families, (b) divorce often is viewed as a single event rather than a process involving many variables, and (c) few researchers have examined post-divorce relationships among family members as an important predictor of adjustment to divorce. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to compare children from divorced and intact families with regard to self-concept and perceptions of parent-child relationships. A unique contribution of this study was that children were asked for their perceptions rather than asking parents for children's reactions to divorce.

Data were collected from 45 divorced families (45 mothers and 77 children) and 44 intact families (44 mothers and 79 children) over an 18-month period. The divorced-family sample was obtained from the Knox County Chancery Court Records, and the intact-family sample was obtained by asking the divorced participants to suggest the names of people that met certain criteria. All participants were measured in their own homes. Children between the ages of 3 and 21 years completed various forms of instruments measuring self-concept (Bills Index of Adjustment and Values, Self-Concept Referents Test) and perceptions of parent-child relationships (Bronfenbrenner Parent Behavior Questionnaire, Social Schemas).

Mothers completed questionnaires measuring self-concept (Tennessee Self-Concept Scale), adjustment (Blair's Divorcées Adjustment Instrument, Index of Adjustment), and family relationships (Family Relations Inventory, Family Relations Inventory for Intact Families).

Separate stepwise regression analyses were used to predict children's self-concept and perceptions of parent-child relationships for divorced and intact families. Evidence was obtained to support the hypothesis that social-psychological variables (e.g., mother's present adjustment) and family relationship variables (e.g., quality of mother-child and father-child interaction) were predictive of the child's self-concept and perceptions of parent-child relationships in both divorced and intact families. A similar pattern emerged for the two family structures in that the mother's adjustment was predictive of the child's self-concept and the quality of the spouse or exspouse relationship and the father-child relationship were the most important predictors for determining children's perceptions of the quality and quantity of family relationships.

Three multivariate analyses of covariance (with age as the covariate) were used to determine if there were any differences between children from divorced and intact families. Although one of the multivariate analyses was not significant (i.e., self-concept), two multivariate analyses were significant, indicating that children from divorced and intact families perceived parent-child relationships differently.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Shortcomings of the Literature on Divorce	1
Rationale	4
Conceptual Framework	5
The family as a system of interacting parts	5
The process of adjustment	7
Model of family adjustment and interaction	8
Nominal Definitions	10
Assumptions	11
Objectives	11
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	13
Family Relationships	13
Family interaction	13
Perceptions of family relationships	14
Roles of the family members	15
The Divorce Process	18
Divorce adjustment	19
Quality of parental interaction	20
Parental adjustment and child behavior	21
Parent-child interaction	22
Children's reactions to divorce	24
State of the Art	28
III. METHODS	30
Design	30
Subjects	31
Sampling procedure	31
Descriptive information	34
Measurement	35
Mother's instruments	36
Children's instruments	39
Data Collection	44
Operational Definitions	45
Mothers	46
Children	47
Statistical Analyses	48
IV. RESULTS	50
Regression Analyses	50
Predictors of self-concept	50
Predictors of the quality and quantity of family relationships	53
Intercorrelations Among Variables	54
Multivariate Analyses of Covariance	57
Means and Standard Deviations	61
Summary	61

CHAPTER	PAGE
V. DISCUSSION	65
Importance of Family Relationships	65
Children's reports of parental childrearing behavior	67
Children's perceptions of family relationships	68
Summary	70
The Role of the Father and Mother	71
Salience of the father	71
The mother as the central figure	72
VI. CONCLUSION	74
Limitations of the Study	74
Sampling	75
Design	76
Data analysis	76
Implications for Theory, Research, and Practice	77
Theory and research	78
Practice	80
Concluding Comments	82
LIST OF REFERENCES	84
APPENDICES	90
Appendix A	91
Appendix B	95
Appendix C	98
Appendix D	139
Appendix E	169
Appendix F	172
Appendix G	177
VITA	182

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
4-1 Stepwise Regression Procedure for Predicting Children's Self-Concept and Perceptions of Parent-Child Relationships: Divorced Families	51
4-2 Stepwise Regression Procedure for Predicting Children's Self-Concept and Perceptions of Parent-Child Relationships: Intact Families	52
4-3 Intercorrelation Matrix for Mother and Child Variables: Divorced Families	55
4-4 Intercorrelation Matrix for Mother and Child Variables: Intact Families	56
4-5 Multivariate and Univariate Analysis of Covariance Results for Children in Divorced and Intact Families: Self-Concept	58
4-6 Multivariate and Univariate Analysis of Covariance Results for Children in Divorced and Intact Families: Parent-Child Relationships (BPBQ Variables)	59
4-7 Multivariate and Univariate Analysis of Covariance Results for Children in Divorced and Intact Families: Parent-Child Relationships (SS Variables)	60
4-8 N, Means, and Standard Deviations for Independent and Dependent Variables for Divorced and Intact Families	62
A-1 Frequency Counts for Descriptive Information	96
A-2 N, Mean, and Standard Deviation for Descriptive Information	97
A-3 Reliability Coefficients for Mother's Instruments	170
A-4 Reliability Coefficients for Children's Instruments	171

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

With over 1,122,000 divorces in 1978 and over 60% of these divorces involving children (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1979), divorce should be considered a phenomenon which affects both adults and children. Bane (1976) has determined a way of predicting the future percentage of children involved in divorce and estimated that 23.4% of those born in 1970 will have parents that divorce.

Because of these rising divorce statistics, the quality of family life in America has been questioned. When divorce is viewed as a threat to the family, it is seen as a precursor to problems rather than the potential solution it is intended to be. The intact, nuclear family is viewed as the ideal family structure and divorce threatens this ideal. Marotz-Baden, Adams, Bueche, Munro, and Munro (1979) have indicated that many assumptions exist about the superior quality of the ideal family structure (i.e., the middle-class nuclear family with both mother and father in the home). But many children do not live in a family with this ideal structure. Thus, this study was an endeavor to examine whether the quality of family relationships and the child's self-concept were different in divorced and intact families.

Shortcomings of the Literature on Divorce

Although a few researchers have examined the relationship between the divorced family structure and the child's development, clear-cut

answers about the impact of divorce on children are not available. The reasons for this ambiguity range from how divorce is conceptualized to how the data are collected.

Divorce is a complex process and should not be viewed as unidimensional. Many researchers have conceptualized divorce as the only independent variable and have examined various outcomes. Marotz-Baden et al. (1979) distinguished between the outcomes of divorce and the process leading to these outcomes. They noted that both the process and the outcomes were important to consider. Luepnitz (1979) supported a distinction between process and outcome by recommending that it was no longer profitable to speak of divorce as one discrete phenomenon for all children.

Another reason for the lack of conclusive findings is the deficit model which often is used when studying variant family forms (Marotz-Baden et al., 1979). For example, researchers such as Anthony (1974) and Goldstein, Freud, and Solnit (1973) have used clinical samples of children from divorced families and concluded that divorce created psychological damage in children. Proponents of the deficit model have taken biased samples of children of divorce and concluded that divorce was debilitating. The active, adaptive, coping mechanisms children are known to have (Kagan, 1976; Sameroff, 1975) are ignored with this type of model.

Describing children from divorced families rather than comparing them to children from intact families (with the implicit assumption that the children are different) is another problem in the divorce literature. Although describing children's reactions to divorce such as anger and

fear is helpful, researchers need to explore further any differences between children in divorced and intact families.

A final reason for the inconclusive findings has been the scarcity of studies examining family relationships as a predictor of post-divorce adjustment. Notable exceptions are the works by Lamb (1977), Weiss (1975), and Hetherington, Cox, and Cox (1978) in which interrelationships were found between the child's adjustment to divorce and the parents' behavior and/or adjustment. However, there are many other aspects of family relationships that need to be examined. For example, the quantity and quality of time the parents spend with the children may be important predictors of how children respond to divorce. Pais and White (1979) have suggested that because divorce is a crisis in family organization, it is possible to analyze adjustment to divorce as a process of family reorganization.

One of the most obvious subsystems of the family that needs reorganization is parent-child interaction. As Pais (1979) remarked, "Divorce does not terminate these bonds, but legally redefines the rights and duties of the parents" (p. 5). But there has been little attention given in the literature to the relationship between the noncustodial parent (usually the father) and the child after divorce. Although it is logical to assume that fathers will vary in their degree of commitment to and interaction with their children, it is not feasible to assume that the end of the marriage relationship also ends the relationship between the child and the noncustodial parent.

Rationale

Although the topic of divorce has been the focus of many research studies, there is a paucity of conclusive findings. Yet, such findings are essential for family practitioners, educators, and parents if these professionals are to work effectively with children from divorced families. As Brandwein, Brown, and Fox (1974) stated, it is necessary to have a clear understanding of which factors may influence the individual's and family's life-style following divorce before intelligent action can be taken.

Assumptions have been made about the ideal family form and the effects of family structure with only questionable empirical evidence to support these assumptions. Recently, some researchers have advocated examining family relationships as an important variable in an individual's adjustment (Hetherington et al., 1978; Pais, 1979). Pais found that perceptions of family relationships were an important predictor of adjustment for divorced mothers. Although Hetherington et al. considered family relationships as an important predictor of adjustment for children in divorced and intact families, the researchers did not consider the children's perceptions of the situation. However, children's perception of family relationships is an important variable that needs to be examined. If the quality of family relationships in both divorced and intact families is related to the child's well-being, then some of the assumptions about the ideal family structure and variations from this structure can be reconsidered.

Conceptual Framework

Many assumptions exist about divorce, and one of the most prevalent is that divorce severely damages the family unit, especially father-child interaction (assuming the father is the noncustodial parent). In many theories of family interaction, divorce is viewed as dysfunctional to the family. In these theories, more importance is placed on the structure and endurance of the family unit than on the relationships within the family. However, using some theories (e.g., systems), the researcher can place more emphasis on the interaction of family members. Thus, system theory was used as a primary basis for creating a conceptual framework that is applicable to both divorced and intact families.

The Family as a System of Interacting Parts

In the present study, the family was the system identified for study. The family system includes the mother, father, and all children. Subsystems of the family are formed by the interaction of two or more members (e.g., mother and father) as long as one member of the family is not present. When divorce occurs, the family restructures the system and some subsystems, but all of the family members continue to influence one another to some degree. The custodial parent in a divorced family will influence the interaction between the noncustodial parent and child(ren). In addition, the custodial parent and noncustodial parent sometimes interact on a regular basis, and the custodial parent and child interact quite frequently. Interaction within any of these subsystems will affect the other subsystems and the total family unit.

During the course of interaction, family members receive information from each other (input) that influences their behavior (outputs). An example of this would be the child's perceptions of mother-father interaction. If a child within a family perceives the mother and father to be fighting a lot, it may influence that child's adjustment, causing him/her to exhibit behavior problems at home or at school. Another example would be the development of self-concept in the child. Many researchers have demonstrated that the child's self-concept is related to the parents' self-concept (Coopersmith, 1967).

The importance of an individual's perception of the situation is implicit in system theory, but explicit in other theories of family interaction. Proponents of the interactional framework stress that how an individual perceives a situation or event is more important to his/her reactions than the objective reality of the situation (Stryker, 1972). In the development of self-concept, for example, the child's perceptions of the parent's actions towards him/her are more important than the actual actions. According to Cooley (1902), children form images of themselves based on their perceptions of how other people react to them. The children validate this impression through interaction with significant others, mainly the parents.

The concepts of open and closed systems also can be used to explain how an individual's perceptions are important. If one member of the family does not want to interact much with the others and remains closed to information from them, he/she may perceive attempts at communication as a threat or as an invasion of privacy. If however, the same person is open to communication, he/she may perceive the same attempt as an offer for help or a sign of understanding.

The Process of Adjustment

Adjustment to any major life changes such as divorce occurs over a period of time. In addition, intact families are in a constant process of adjusting to the new demands and stresses on the family unit, no matter how small they may seem to be. In many cases, marital partners in an intact family may be undergoing a major adjustment process if the marital relationship contains a lot of stress or conflict. Whereas the legal act of divorce provides some closure to family problems and an opportunity for reorganization, partners in an intact family do not have any such marker event to help them reorganize the family unit. If both partners agree that divorce was a necessary and viable solution, then they may have less difficulty adjusting to divorce than partners in a conflict-ridden but legally intact marriage have in adjusting to their marriage.

The goal for both the divorced family and the legally intact family system is to reach homeostasis. Although the system can continue to grow during a period of homeostasis, this growth is controlled and beneficial rather than random and possibly harmful. When divorce occurs, the previously defined steady-state condition of the family is abandoned. The success of the family in adapting to this strain will depend on how the members incorporate the positive and negative feedback they receive from one another. Positive feedback enhances growth, whereas negative feedback produces stability. For example, the father may receive positive feedback from the mother that will help him to establish a new pattern of father-child interaction. In addition, the child may receive negative feedback from the mother in order to maintain a stable

environment for the child. This feedback then influences each individual member's actions (outputs), which in turn affects the whole family system.

In the process of adapting to stresses, most divorced and intact families eventually achieve a steady-state condition, even though they began with different family structures. This process is termed equifinality. The concept of multifinality can be used to explain the idea that although divorced families have the same general family structure, they experience varying degrees of success in the adjustment process. Likewise, intact families experience various levels of adaptation and adjustment. Thus, adjustment is not the domain of either divorced or intact families but is a process experienced by both.

Model of Family Adjustment and Interaction

A model of family adjustment and interaction is illustrated in Figure 1. The model is applicable to divorced and intact families because the process of interaction and adjustment is the same in these families even though the structure is different. The impact of each family member on other family members is evident by all of the reciprocal influences. Perceptions and behaviors of individual members are noted as well as interaction between any two family members. Feedback processes also are depicted in the model. For example, as the mother gives the child input about her perceptions of the quality of family relationships, the child forms his/her own perceptions and sends information back to the mother. The feedback would be negative if it provided stability for the mother's point of view, or it would be positive if it influenced her to re-evaluate her ideas. Thus, as the mother's perception of the family




Figure 1. Model of variables relating to family interaction and adjustment in both divorced and intact families.

changed, her individual adjustment would be affected. This change in the mother's adjustment would affect the father and child, illustrating how a change in any part of the system would affect other parts. Finally, the entire system would change as a result of change in the individual components.

Nominal Definitions

Adjustment was viewed as a process of adaptation to particular situations and events. Although adjustment can be measured for an individual, it is affected by the process of family interaction. In addition, adjustment can be measured with regard to a particular event (e.g., divorce) or a general time period (e.g., low point in the marital relationship).

Self-concept was defined as an image an individual has about him/herself regarding physical, cognitive, and personality traits. This image should remain relatively stable over time but can be affected by life events. These traits often are value laden, leading individuals to express approval or disapproval of themselves (self-esteem).

The quality and quantity of family relationships can be viewed as each individual's perceptions of and evaluations about the interaction among family members in general and between any two members in particular. Mothers' perceptions of quality and quantity include both (ex)husband-(ex)wife interaction and parent-child interaction. Children's perceptions of family relationships include their evaluations of their parents' childrearing behaviors and their ideas about the quality and quantity of parent-child and mother-father interaction.

Assumptions

The major assumption in the present study was that divorce did not terminate the relationships among family members, especially the child(ren) and noncustodial parent. That divorced and intact families differ in structure does not mean that they will differ in the processes used in adaptation or in the quality of adjustment. In fact, if divorce is viewed as a viable alternative to difficult problems, it may enhance individual adjustment.

Although divorce may be a positive solution to problems, the legal act of divorce does change the dynamics of parent-child interaction. However, the change has more implications for the amount of time various family members spend together than the quality of the time. And, if the divorced families can maintain positive relationships, these relationships may supersede the importance of the family structure.

Another major assumption is that most families try to maintain or seek adjustment. When an event such as divorce disrupts the family system, the members will take action to achieve adaptation. During this process, the children are affected by, as well as have an impact on, their parents. Thus, every member of the family plays an important part in the process of adjustment.

Objectives

The overall objective of the study was to determine whether family relationships in divorced versus intact families were different. More specific objectives were as follows: (a) to determine how mother's past and present adjustment; self-concept; perceptions of the quantity of

mother-child and father-child interaction; and perceptions of the quality of mother-child, father-child, and mother-father interaction were related to children's self-concept and perceptions of parent-child relationships and (b) to determine if self-concept and perceptions of parent-child relationships of children in divorced families differed from those in intact families.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The quality of family relationships is an important variable for both divorced and intact families. The patterns of interaction established within a family are affected by many variables, including (a) the quality of interaction among members, (b) perceptions of this interaction, and (c) roles of the individual family members. When divorce occurs, the patterns of interaction among family members are changed, along with each person's perception of the family. One of the tasks of individuals during the divorce process is to establish satisfactory patterns of interaction which will facilitate adjustment.

Family Relationships

The quality of family relationships in both divorced and intact families affects the adjustment, behavior, and self-concept of individual family members (Longfellow, 1979). Longfellow contended that equivocal findings exist in the divorce literature because not enough researchers have examined the importance of parent-child relationships after divorce. Wallerstein and Kelly (1975, 1976) and Hetherington et al. (1978) have noted the relationship between the parents' well-being and the child's adjustment to divorce.

Family Interaction

Rutter (1971) conducted a study in which parent-child interaction and marital interaction were related to behavior problems in the child.

Rutter found that (a) 5% of the children in his sample had behavior problems when there were good parent-child relationships and a stable marriage, (b) 25% of the children had behavior problems when there were poor parent-child relationships and a stable marriage, (c) 40% of the children had behavior problems when there were good parent-child relationships but an unstable marriage, and (d) 90% of the children evidenced behavior problems when the quality of both parent-child and husband-wife interactions was poor. Thus, both good parent-child relationships and a stable marriage were associated with the child's well-being.

Perceptions of Family Relationships

Even though the quality of parent-child and husband-wife interaction has been associated with certain child behaviors, it is important to remember that the child's perceptions of family relationships also are important. For example, Bowerman and Elder (1964) found that even in families in which the spouses both reported that the mother was the dominant figure in childrearing and conjugal power, it was the father who more often was perceived by the child as being autocratic.

The significance of the child's perceptions of family relationships is illustrated best through an example from the field of family therapy. Minuchin (1974) developed the concept of structural family therapy to describe a technique in which family members share their perceptions of the family. As Minuchin said, "When the structure of the family group is transformed, the positions of members in that group are altered accordingly" (p. 2). Almost certainly when divorce occurs, family members will restructure their relationships within the family. However,

it has been assumed too often that this restructuring meant a removal of the father from the family system (Pais, 1979).

Bernhardt (1975) provided empirical evidence that children from divorced families do not perceive their fathers as absent. He compared how the age of the child, the gender of the child, and the family structure (father absent or father present) were related to the children's perceptions of the father's role. Although age was related to perception, there were no differences between the genders or between father-absent and father-present children with regard to how they perceived the father's role. Relationships within the family appear to be more important than the structure of the family in influencing the child's perceptions of the family.

Roles of the Family Members

Traditionally, the roles of the mother and father within the family have been viewed as expressive and instrumental, respectively. Maxwell (1976) provided evidence that the division of the roles along the instrumental-expressive dimension is beginning to change as fathers become more involved in childrearing. Within the present study, both fathers and mothers were conceptualized as having an active role in the social-emotional development of the child(ren). In addition, children were viewed as having an impact on their parents.

Father's role. Theoretically, both parents have an impact on the child's development. Yet quite often the father's influence on the child has been ignored or given secondary attention. However, some researchers have documented the importance of the father (Lamb & Lamb, 1976; Maxwell, 1976). Maxwell interviewed 30 fathers and concluded that fathers in

intact families have become more involved in childrearing and that there was less differentiation between the father's role and the mother's role than what was true historically. Blanchard and Biller (1971) also documented the fathers' importance by examining how the fathers' availability to the children was related to the children's academic performance. Children who had a lot of contact with their fathers were superior in terms of academic performance to the group that had little contact with their fathers. Although the researchers examined only academic achievement, it is likely that the degree of father availability would be related to other areas of the child's development such as self-concept.

Coopersmith (1967) conducted a comprehensive study of the relationship between certain parental variables and the child's self-esteem. In general, he found that children with high self-esteem came from families in which the parents had high self-esteem, the children were treated as responsible people, and the compatibility of the mother and father was high. With regard to father-child interaction, Coopersmith found that fathers of high self-esteem males were more likely to be attentive to and concerned with their sons' development than were fathers of low self-esteem males. Rosenberg (1965) substantiated Coopersmith's findings by documenting that parental attention and concern were related positively to the self-esteem of high school students. He also reported that those students with closer relationships to their fathers were higher in self-esteem than those with more distant relationships to their fathers.

Mother's role. Even though the change in and importance of the father's role has been documented, the mother quite often has been considered the nucleus of the family in intact families (Farber, 1962). The mother also is the nucleus for most divorced families, because most mothers receive custody or joint custody of their children. The constructs of representation (one member of the family telling a second member of the family something about a third member of the family in the third member's absence) and transitivity (two members of the family relating to each other through a third member) are indicative of the type of role the mother may have within the family. The mother may tell the child(ren) about the father in his absence (especially in divorced families) or serve as a link between the father and child (especially in intact families). However, as Maxwell (1976) noted, the role of the mother within the family may change somewhat as the father becomes more involved.

Regardless of what changes may be occurring in the mother's role, the impact of the mother on the child's well-being has been documented. Coopersmith (1967) found that mothers of children with high self-esteem had higher self-esteem and were more stable emotionally than mothers of children with low self-esteem. These mothers also were more likely to be loving and have a closer relationship to the children than mothers of children with low self-esteem. Finally, mothers with high self-esteem showed interest, concern, and availability for congenial joint activities as compared with the low self-esteem group.

Child's role. Recently, some authors (e.g., Lerner & Spanier, 1978) have conceptualized and researched the child's impact on the parents and

the total family. Investigations before this time were focused primarily on the impact of a special child (e.g., mentally retarded, congenitally malformed, autistic) on family functioning or the role of children in family crises (e.g., the parental decision to divorce, the occurrence of child abuse). Undeniably, children influence their parents on a daily basis as well. For example, in their research on divorce, Hetherington et al. (1978) stated, "the behavior of the children—particularly of the sons—was causing the emotional responses of the mother" (p. 171). The researchers also stated that the same pattern was evident for intact-family mothers and children.

The Divorce Process

The removal of one parent from the home is not the only variable important to the study of divorce (Longfellow, 1979). Luepnitz (1979) noted that divorce is a process and that many variables need to be examined in the process of adjustment. Hetherington et al. (1978) conducted a comprehensive study of divorce by using multiple variables and comparing 48 divorced and intact families over an 18-month period. The findings from their research can be used as a framework for examining the (a) variables involved in the post-divorce adjustment process, (b) quality of parental interaction, (c) relationship between parental adjustment and child behavior, and (d) parent-child interaction. Although Hetherington et al. examined children's reactions to divorce, they focused on parent-child interaction as a correlate of child behavior. Other research focused on children's behavior and development also is important to examine in considering some of the outcomes for children.

Divorce Adjustment

Goode (1956) defined the divorce adjustment process as follows:

A disruption of role sets and patterns, and of existing social relations, is incorporated into the individual's life pattern, such that the roles accepted and assigned do not take the prior divorce into account as the primary point of reference. (p. 19)

Goode also noted that there was an inverse relationship between the amount of trauma experienced during the divorce and the length of time required for adjustment.

Variables related to post-divorce adjustment. Brandwein, Brown, and Fox (1974) conceptualized divorce as a time when the mother takes over certain functions for the family (e.g., economic, authoritative). The increased demands on the mother often increase the amount of stress the mother experiences. Researchers have found that mothers delegate some of these responsibilities to the children (Hetherington et al., 1978). Hetherington, Cox, and Cox (1976) noted that when there was support and agreement between the exspouses, family disruption was minimized and the adjustment process was accelerated. Pais (1979) found a positive relationship between the mother's satisfactions with post-divorce family relationships and post-divorce adjustment. In addition, Pais found that the mother's self-concept was the most important variable in predicting her adjustment to divorce.

Hetherington et al. (1978) conducted a thorough investigation of the divorce adjustment process. They found that for the first year after divorce, the parents felt more anxious, depressed, angry, rejected, and incompetent than intact-family parents. Divorced fathers underwent a greater initial change in self-esteem than divorced mothers or intact-family parents, but divorced mother's changes lasted longer. Both

divorced mothers and fathers experienced more feelings of loneliness and had more restricted social lives than intact-family couples. Happiness, self-esteem, and competence increased steadily for the divorced individuals over the 2-year period but were not as high at the end of the second year as for intact-family couples.

Quality of Parental Interaction

Hetherington et al. (1978) reported that although the relationship between the exspouses improved following divorce, 66% of the exchanges between the partners 2 months after the divorce were conflicts over economics, visitation, and childrearing. However, the quality of parental interaction when the family was intact is important to consider when comparing the two family structures.

Both Burgess (1970) and Nye (1957) compared children living in intact but unhappy families to children living with single parents (including families separated by death, divorce, and desertion). Nye found that children from families broken by death and divorce showed less delinquent behavior, less psychosomatic illness, and better adjustment than children living in intact but unhappy families. Nye also revealed that children living in mother-only families scored higher on a measure of parent-child relationships than children from intact but unhappy families. Burgess reported similar results and concluded, "Children are measurably better off living with one parent than the children of unhappy homes characterized by bitterness, fighting, and physical and mental cruelty" (p. 40).

Results from studies in which children from divorced and intact families were compared are mixed, with some researchers reporting better

adjustment by children in divorced families (e.g., Burgess, 1970; Nye, 1957) and others reporting poorer adjustment (e.g., Hetherington et al., 1978). The discrepancy between these findings is related to the happiness of the intact-family group. Those researchers who measured happiness concluded that an unhappy but intact family was more problematic for the child than divorce.

Parental Adjustment and Child Behavior

The individual responses of the parents also are related to the child's well-being after divorce. Wallerstein and Kelly (1974, 1975, 1976) and Kelly and Wallerstein (1976) interviewed children between 3 and 18 years of age 6 months after the parental divorce and again 1 year later. Although these researchers found that children of different age groups initially responded to the divorce in different ways, other patterns besides age differences existed at the follow-up. One of these patterns was that most of the children in the worst clinical condition at the time of the follow-up had parents who were adjusting poorly to the divorce. In the preschool group, 6 of the 7 children experiencing the most difficulty had fathers with variously defined psychiatric disorders, and 4 of these 7 children had mothers who described a high-tension year. In addition, the impact of divorce on the father was predictive of the visiting patterns and the beneficiality of the visits for the children more than was the quality of the father-child relationship prior to divorce. A third pattern was characteristic of children in middle childhood. Although some of the fathers had developed a closer relationship with their children after the divorce, this was not associated necessarily with an improvement in the child. The researchers concluded that an

improvement in the father-child relationship did not prevent adjustment problems for the child and that a deterioration in the mother-child relationship was related to deterioration of the child at the follow-up.

Other researchers such as Biller (1970) and Landis (1960) have shown that the mother's response and adjustment to the divorce process modulates the impact on the child(ren). McDermott (1970) found that the prognosis for the child was associated with the relationship of the child to the custodial parent.

However, the noncustodial father continues to be important to the child also. Hetherington et al. (1978) found associations between the father's behavior and the child's adjustment. Frequent father-child contact in divorced families was associated with positive mother-child interaction and positive adjustment in the child if (a) the parents agreed about childrearing decisions, (b) the parents had a positive attitude about each other, (c) the parents were low in conflict, and (d) the father was mature. Disruptive behavior by the child was associated with frequent father-child contact, disagreement by the parents, and poor adjustment of the father.

Parent-Child Interaction

Although many researchers have examined various child behaviors after divorce and others have noted the relationship between parental adjustment and child adjustment, there have been very few attempts to describe the actual interaction between parents and children. These interactions can be categorized according to the quality of interaction and the quantity of interaction. Not surprisingly, there is more information available on the quantity of interaction, such as the amount of time

lost with both the mother and father and the type and frequency of visiting. Hetherington et al. (1978) have provided most of the information on the quality of interaction.

Quality of interaction. Hetherington et al. (1978) reported that differences between divorced and intact families were greatest during the first year of the study. Although almost 25% of the fathers and 50% of the mothers in divorced families reported improved relations with their children after the predivorce period, many problems still were evident. Divorced parents were more demanding and communicated less well with their children than did intact-family parents. In addition, they tended to be more inconsistent and less affectionate and to have less control over their children's behavior. The researchers concluded that undesirable behavior in the children was associated with poor parenting. For example, disobedient, aggressive, and demanding behavior by children in divorced families was related to lower feelings of esteem and competence and higher feelings of anxiety by mothers in divorced families. Marked improvement occurred between the first and second year after divorce in the parent-child relationships in divorced families. At 2 years after the divorce, divorced parents were more affectionate, consistent, and effective in their relationships with their children than they were immediately following the divorce.

Quantity of interaction. Jacobson (1978) investigated the amount of time lost with the parents for 51 children 3 to 17 years of age from 30 divorced families. She interviewed both parents and children and had the parents complete questionnaires about the amount of time spent with children and the children's behavior. Jacobson found that the time spent

with the children decreased for both mothers (by 20 hours) and fathers (by 30 hours) from 2 weeks prior to the separation to 2 weeks prior to the interview. She found that the greater the amount of time lost with either parent, the poorer the adjustment of the child. Jacobson also noted that there was a circular relationship between the amount of time lost with the parents and the child's maladjustment. As children lost more time with their parents, they became more maladjusted, and their parents spent less time with them.

Kelly and Wallerstein (1977) examined how much time various age groups of children actually spent with their fathers and what variables seemed to be related to the amount of visiting. They found that children who were the angriest about the divorce received the fewest visits. Furthermore, the children reported that frequent access to the father helped them to cope with divorce. Yet 25% of the children received erratic visits, and only 20% of the children reported being content with the amount of visiting.

Children's Reactions to Divorce

Although many researchers may believe they are studying the impact of divorce on children, very few (except McDermott, 1968) actually have studied children before and after the divorce and noted any changes in behavior. Most researchers have studied children after their parents' divorce and have assumed that the children's behaviors have been caused by the divorce. For example, some researchers have examined self-concept and implied (or reported) that divorce is associated with a change in self-concept. Others have noted a variety of behavior problems in children after divorce occurs.

However, some researchers have noted that children do have or develop coping mechanisms which allow them to adapt to their parents' divorce (Westman, Cline, Swift, & Kramer, 1970). In addition, the divorce may never have been perceived as a traumatic event by the child, depending on the amount of predivorce conflict (Landis, 1960).

Self-concept. Very few researchers have commented directly on how divorce is related to the self-concept of the child. When they have, most researchers have agreed that divorce is associated with a decline in the child's self-concept.

Gardner (1956), from interviews with a clinical sample of children from divorced families, concluded that divorce damaged the child's sense of self-worth and integrity. However, because Gardner used a clinical sample of children and did not interview them before and after the divorce, his conclusion should be accepted with caution. Wallerstein and Kelly (1975) also concluded that divorce negatively affected self-concept. However, because Wallerstein and Kelly were using the interview technique and asked for retrospective data, their results also should be interpreted with caution. Beissinger (1976) did not use a clinical sample but did collect retrospective data from college students. These students reported that they experienced lower self-esteem, self-acceptance, and self-worth as a result of parental divorce.

Raschke and Raschke (1979) studied self-concept in children from divorced- and intact-family structures and concluded that self-concept was not related to family structure. In addition, they noted that an inverse relationship existed between the amount of conflict in the family and children's self-concept. Thus, when children from divorced

and intact families have been compared, no differences have been found.

Social behaviors. McDermott (1968) observed 16 preschool children before, during, and after parental divorce. Of the 16 children, McDermott reported that only 2 were suffering severe problems in the postdivorce period. Of the remaining 14 children, 8 had mild problems such as anger and sadness, and 6 had no apparent negative reactions. McDermott also reported that even though most of the children showed initial shock, this was followed by a restoration of skills. Thus, the change in behavior after divorce apparently is temporary and usually mild rather than a mass deterioration of skills.

Wallerstein and Kelly (1974, 1975, 1976) and Kelly and Wallerstein (1976) also studied social behavior but had a much larger sample (131 children) than did McDermott (1968). However, they did not measure changes in behavior from the predivorce period and used the interview technique rather than observations. Preschool children in the sample felt guilty about the divorce, blamed themselves, and expressed fears about being deserted by the custodial parents. Quite often these children showed a regression in behavior. The early latency group (aged 7 to 9 years) expressed sadness, loss, fear, and insecurity. Many of these children were angry at one of the parents and had an intense desire for the parents to reconcile. The later latency children (aged 10 to 12 years) were ashamed, lonely, and felt rejected. However, they had a more realistic understanding of divorce and were able to express their feelings better than the early latency group. The adolescent group of children (aged 13 to 18 years) expressed strong feelings of

anger, sadness, and embarrassment. They were able to see their parents as individuals, though, and to reassess their relationships with both parents.

Coping skills. Westman et al. (1970) did a case history survey in a child psychiatric clinic and concluded that the incidence of parental divorce was not higher for children seen in the clinic than for the population at large. In other words, children from divorced families were not overrepresented in the clinic cases.

Westman et al. (1970) criticized most clinicians' views of divorce. They said that most clinicians believe that (a) survival of the child depends on an enduring, stable family unit, and (b) divorce automatically ends the noncustodial parent-child relationship and causes bereavement. Westman (1972) added, "Because of the frequency of divorce, one cannot assume that most children are adversely affected in a clinical sense" (pp. 54-55). In fact, Westman (1972) stated that the stress and frustration associated with divorce could strengthen coping skills and the capacity to master stress. Sameroff (1975) and Kagan (1976) have shown that children have active, adaptive coping mechanisms, and it is probable that these coping skills could be used during the time of marital distress and parental divorce.

Perceptions of family relationships. The degree of coping to parental divorce required by most children may depend on their perceptions of the situation. Longfellow (1979) commented, "Often overlooked is the fact that the degree to which any experience affects a child depends in part on the way it is assimilated and understood by the child" (p. 287).

However, very few researchers have asked children for their perceptions of divorce. Landis (1960) considered the children's perceptions of the family happiness to be an important variable in how they responded to divorce. He found that if the children perceived the parents' marriages to be happy before the divorces, then the divorces were more problematic for the children than if they perceived the parents' marriages to be unhappy. Landis also reported, however, that all the children in the study said they felt less secure and happy immediately following the divorce than they had before.

State of the Art

Goode (1956) maintained that researchers cannot ascertain the effects of divorce on children because differences between divorced- and intact-family children may exist because of socialization practices rather than the legal event of divorce. Certainly definitive conclusions cannot be made about the effects of divorce from the research that has been conducted so far because of the mixed findings and conclusions. Several reasons may account for these mixed results.

First, most researchers have not measured children before and after divorce or compared children from divorced and intact families. Without at least one of these two strategies incorporated into the design, it is difficult to draw any conclusions about the effects of divorce. Even with one of these strategies, researchers cannot be sure of the direction of the effects unless a cross-lagged panel correlation technique is used.

In addition, too many researchers have relied on clinical samples of children, interviews, and descriptive analysis. These techniques are

problematic because the researcher's bias can influence what and how the data are collected and reported. Although more objective techniques and empiricism do not guarantee removal of bias, this problem is minimized with these techniques.

Finally, many researchers previously have conceptualized divorce as a single event. More recently, some researchers have recognized that before the outcomes of divorce can be studied, the processes involved must be considered. Hetherington et al. (1978), Longfellow (1979), and Luepnitz (1979) all advocated the use of multiple independent variables that were indicative of processes within the family and individual members.

Hetherington et al. (1978) have made other contributions to the conceptualization and study of divorce that are indicative of current research. They noted that divorce involves all of the family members and that the father's role in this process needs to be addressed. In addition, they made comparisons between divorced and intact families and studied the individuals over a 2-year period of time. In addition, these researchers used multiple methods to collect their information.

Despite these improvements, there are still many gaps in the divorce literature. First, more comparisons need to be made between children in divorced and intact families with regard to major personality characteristics such as self-concept. Second, more research is needed on children of all ages rather than just the preschool age group. And finally, researchers need to collect data directly from children with regard to parent-child interaction and their perceptions of the family rather than relying on parental or teacher report of child behavior.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

This research was conducted as one part of a larger project in which data were collected from fathers, mothers, and children from divorced and intact families. Pais (1979) analyzed data from divorced mothers to predict post-divorce adjustment. James (1979) analyzed data from fathers, mothers, and children in divorced families to predict how parental adjustment to divorce was related to the child's self-concept. In the present study, the relationships among family relationship variables, family structure, children's self-concept, and children's perceptions of parent-child relationships were examined for children and mothers from divorced and intact families. The specific hypotheses for the present study were that (a) mother's perceptions of the quality and quantity of family relationships, mother's self-concept, and mother's adjustment would be predictive of children's self-concept and perceptions of the quality and quantity of family relationships and (b) children from divorced and intact families would not differ with regard to self-concept and perceptions of family relationships.

Design

The design for the study was a two-group comparison with children from divorced and intact families forming the two groups. Measured variables included mother's perception of the quality and quantity of family relationships, mother's adjustment, mother's self-concept,

child's self-concept, and child's perception of the quality and quantity of parent-child relationships.

Subjects

Data were collected from 45 divorced families and 44 intact families. The mother and at least one child from the family had to participate before the family was included in the sample. A total of 77 children from divorced families and 79 children from intact families participated in the study. In all, 245 individuals were included in the sample.

Sampling Procedure

Pais (1979) studied the post-divorce adjustment of 62 women who had custody or joint custody of the children. No data were collected from the children, however, so an extension of the Pais study was begun in September, 1978. At that time, all of the mothers from the Pais sample were contacted and asked about the participation of their children. Data were collected from children in 24 of these families. Additional names of divorced families and an initial sample of intact families were obtained to expand the project. All mothers were contacted initially by a letter explaining the project (Appendix A).

Divorced families. Pais (1979) determined eligibility for the original sample of divorced women by obtaining information from the divorce decree including:

(a) the divorce had occurred, (b) the wife was Caucasian, (c) the marriage terminated was the wife's first marriage, (d) there was at least one child born to the marriage and the wife had received either full or joint custody of at least one child, and (e) at least one of the children in the mother's custody was under 18 years of age. (p. 38)

Pais established further criteria when she called the women about participating in the study. These criteria were that the woman had not remarried and the family income prior to divorce was between \$12,000 and \$40,000.

Approximately 2 to 3 months after participating in the Pais (1979) study, the 62 women were contacted by a letter containing a description of the proposed research involving their children. Enclosed with each letter was a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the mother could indicate whether or not she was willing to receive more information about the study.

A follow-up phone call was made to all participants from whom the researcher did not receive postcards and to all the women who wanted further information. Of the 51 women reached by phone, 24 agreed to participate. These 24 mothers had 39 children who were eligible and agreed to be in the study.

Additional names of divorced women were obtained from the public divorce records at the Knox County Chancery Court. All divorce decrees filed between March, 1978, and September, 1978, were read for eligibility based on the criteria established by Pais (1979). A total of 103 women were found to be eligible for the study.

Current addresses and phone numbers were located for these women using the information on the divorce decrees, the Knoxville Telephone Directory, and South Central Bell Information. Addresses were obtained for 97 women. A letter explaining the project was mailed to each of these women.

To follow up the letter, telephone calls were made to the women. Of the 49 women that were reached by phone, 8 were not eligible for the

study because they had remarried or because the predivorce income was not in the \$12,000 to \$40,000 range. Of the 23 women who agreed to participate, 21 kept appointments with the researcher. These 21 mothers had 43 children, 4 of whom were ineligible to participate because of age. Of those remaining, 38 children agreed to participate.

Intact families. The divorced mothers were asked to provide the names of intact families based on the premise that it was important to have a sample of intact-family mothers similar to the divorced mothers except for marital status. The divorced mothers were asked to give the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of friends, relatives, or acquaintances that (a) lived in the Knoxville area, (b) had intact marriages (marriages which were legally intact and in which it was the first marriage for both partners), (c) had a Caucasian wife, and (d) had children between the ages of 3 and 21 years. The divorced mothers were insured that their names would not be given to the intact-family mothers. Compliance with additional criteria was established by calling the potential subjects. These criteria were (a) a family income in the \$12,000 to \$45,000 range for the previous calendar year and (b) both partners working at least 20 hours per week or attending school full time.

The divorced mothers provided 160 names of intact families. Complete addresses were obtained for 123 families, and phone numbers were available for 138 families. Letters explaining the project were mailed to these 123 families. A follow-up phone call was made to each of these families in order to establish their eligibility and willingness to participate. Of the families eligible for phone contact, 16 had a

private number or no current listing. Of the remaining families, 30 did not meet at least one criterion, 33 chose not to participate, and 44 mothers agreed to participate. These mothers had a total of 97 children, of whom 79 participated in the study.

Descriptive Information

Descriptive information relevant to this study for both divorced and intact families included mother's age; participation in marital counseling; past family income; present family income; number, age, and gender of children living in the home and those not living at home; number of hours worked per week by the mother; mother's educational level; and whether or not the family had changed residence within the last 2 years. Additional information obtained from the divorced mothers only was the number of months divorced, whether the exspouse lived in Knox County, and number of miles the exspouse lived from the mother's current residence. For intact-family mothers, additional information obtained included whether the couple ever had separated and number of months since a low point in the marital relationship (to correspond to the number of months divorced). Tables and frequency counts for these variables are contained in Appendix B (Tables A-1 and A-2).

The divorced- and intact-family mothers were similar in age, number of children, and the past family income (prior to divorce for the divorced group). The divorced group married younger, had less education, was not as likely to have sought marital counseling, and worked more hours per week than the intact-family mothers.

Another important variable that distinguished between the two groups of women was stability of residence. As might be expected, the divorced

group had changed residence more than the intact group at a ratio slightly over 2:1. Moving, at the least, is considered a transition event requiring adjustment to a new community, a new school system, and new neighbors (Weissman & Paykel, 1972).

Another variable with an important pattern was the amount of time since the low point in the marital relationship. Although the mean response was over 3 years, the modal response was that it was occurring at the time of assessment. In addition, the median response was between 6 months and 1 year before the assessment, which corresponded closely to the length of time divorced for the divorced group. Thus, the low point in the marital relationship was a recent experience for most of these women, making them similar to the divorced women in terms of the time period of life they were using as a referent in completing the questionnaires.

Measurement

Questionnaires were used to collect data from the mothers and a combination of questionnaire and interview techniques were used with children. All mothers completed the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (TSCS). Divorced-family mothers completed the Blair's Divorcées Adjustment Instrument (BDAI) and the Family Relations Inventory (FRI), and the intact-family mothers completed the Index of Adjustment (IA) and the Family Relations Inventory for Intact Families (FRIIF). Instruments used with the children in divorced and intact families were the Index of Adjustment and Values (IAV), Self-Concept Referents Test (SCRT), Bronfenbrenner Parent Behavior Questionnaire (BPBQ), and Social Schemas (SS). All mother and child instruments, except for the TSCS, and

relevant information on scoring and/or testing materials, are contained in Appendices C and D, respectively.

Mother's Instruments

All mothers completed a self-concept measure, a family relations measure, and an adjustment measure. The content of the family relations and adjustment measures differed slightly for divorced- and intact-family mothers, but the format and scoring were exactly the same for instruments which were designed to measure similar constructs.

Reliability coefficients for each scale are in Appendix E (Tables A-3 and A-4). Items which diminished scale reliability were dropped.

Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. Fitts (1964) developed the TSCS as a measure of self-concept. The instrument contains subscales dealing with various aspects of an individual's self-concept such as personal attractiveness and moral character. In addition, there is a total scale which yields a self-concept score for all of the subscales combined. The total scale consists of 100 items. The individual chooses from among five alternatives that range from completely false to completely true.

Cronbach's alpha was computed to assess reliability for the present study. Information on the reliability and validity of the TSCS was reported in the instruction manual (Fitts, 1964). In a test-retest study over a 2-week period, reliability scores ranged from .61 to .92 on the various subscales in the instrument. Only the Total Positive subscale was used in this study, and its reliability was reported by Fitts as .92. Fitts reported several measures of validity. Social science professionals were used to assess content validity, and only items on

which there was unanimous agreement were included in the instrument. In addition, the TSCS has been tested for construct validity. Scores of psychiatric patients were different from nonpatients' scores. Criterion-related validity exists for the TSCS because it has been correlated with other personality measures such as the MMPI.

Blair's Divorcees Adjustment Instrument. The instrument was developed originally by Blair (1970) and modified by Salts (1976). The modified version of the instrument used in this study contains 93 items. Each item consists of a statement for which the respondent decided how true it was of her feelings and behaviors. The instrument consists of two subscales, one which measures present adjustment and the other which measures past adjustment or adjustment at the time of divorce. The items for the two subscales are identical except for the time period the mother was asked to use as a referent (i.e., at the time of her divorce or now). There were six possible responses to each item ranging from always or almost always true to always or almost always not true.

For the present study, reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha. Salts (1976) reported that six professionals evaluated the original instrument for content validity. Pais (1979) also used a content validity procedure to assess the modifications she made to the Salts version. The instrument was administered to a small sample of divorced mothers at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. These women provided feedback on the clarity of the instrument and the representativeness of the items with regard to the divorce adjustment process.

Index of Adjustment. The IA consists of 84 items and was developed by Kanoy, Cunningham, and White (1979) to parallel the BDAI.

Each item consists of a statement to which the respondent decided how true it was of her feelings and behaviors. The instrument consists of two subscales, one which measures adjustment at the time of a low point in the marriage and one which measures present adjustment. The items for the two subscales were identical except for the time period the mother was supposed to use as a referent (i.e., when she experienced a low point in her marital relationship or now). There were six possible responses to each item which were identical to those on the BDAI.

Reliability for the IA was determined by using Cronbach's alpha for each of the two subscales. Construct validity was determined by having five family studies professionals from The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, judge the instrument according to how it measured the construct of adjustment as defined earlier in this paper. The professionals concurred that the instrument was appropriate and thorough in its measurement of past and present adjustment.

Family Relations Inventory. This instrument was developed by Pais (1978) and consisted of 64 items. Sociodemographic information as well as information about family relationships were contained in these items. An additional 19 items were added to the original instrument to assess the mother's involvement with the children and her use of day care.

Five variables from the instrument that were used to measure family relationships were assessed for reliability using Cronbach's alpha. The validity of the 83 items was determined by a construct validity procedure. Five family studies professionals from The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, reviewed the instrument for its measurement of family relationship variables as defined earlier in this paper. The

professionals' responses ranged from agree to somewhat agree regarding the ability of the instrument to measure the quality and quantity of family relationships.

Family Relations Inventory for Intact Families. This instrument was developed by Kanoy, Cunningham, and White (1979) based on the FRI. The instrument contains 81 items measuring sociodemographic information, use of day care, and family relationship variables. The specific family relationship variables on the FRI and FRIIF are the mother's perceptions of the quality and quantity of mother-child and father-child interaction and her perceptions of the quality of her relationship with the (ex)spouse.

Cronbach's alpha was used to determine the reliability of each of these variables. Construct validity was determined for this instrument by five family studies professionals from The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. The professionals evaluated how well the instrument measured various aspects of family relationships. The professionals varied in their specific responses but generally agreed that the instrument was an appropriate measure of family relationship variables.

Children's Instruments

Children in divorced and intact families completed the same sets of age-appropriate instruments. All children completed the SS, children between the ages of 10 and 21 years completed the BPBQ, and all children completed some type of self-concept measure. Children between 3 and 7 years of age completed the SCRT, children between the ages of 8 and 10 years completed the Elementary School IAV, children between the ages of 11 and 14 years completed the Junior High School IAV, children

between the ages of 15 and 18 completed the High School IAV, and children 19 and older completed the Adult IAV. Reliability coefficients for each instrument are in Appendix E. All items which diminished the reliability of a scale were dropped.

Social Schemas. The SS technique was developed by Kuethe (1962), who asked college students to place various figures on a felt board in order to examine the schemas or social sets people develop in relation to other individuals. Kuethe hypothesized that people with similar experiences would show a commonality in how they placed the figures. He also suggested that if the same response was typical for many people, it would be indicative of a pervasive tendency in the culture. For his purposes, Kuethe used the following figures: man, woman, child, dog, square, circle, triangle, and three rectangles, each of a different height.

The materials for the SS used in this study were a piece of blue felt 1 yard by 2 yards (.91 m by 1.82 m) and felt figures between 6 and 10 inches (.15 m and .25 m) representing a man, a woman, a child, and two rectangles. All children were asked to place various combinations on the felt in any manner they wished. In order of presentation to the subjects, the sets were: (a) woman and child; (b) man and child; (c) man and woman; (d) man, woman, and child; (e) woman, child, and two rectangles; (f) man, child, and two rectangles; (g) man, woman, and two rectangles; and (h) man, woman, child, and two rectangles. As the child placed the figures on the felt board, the research assistant recorded the position of the figures on a scaled model of the felt board.

Reliability was determined for the SS by the test-retest method. Five children from each of three different age groups (3 to 5 years of age, 6 to 11 years of age, and 12 to 21 years of age) were administered the SS twice within a 4-week period of time. Reliability was established for the distance scale, $r(13) = .78$, $p < .007$; and for the nonhuman barriers scale, $r(13) = .38$, $p < .16$.

Construct validity for the SS was determined by comparing the distance and nonhuman barriers subscales to the variables measuring the quality and quantity of family relationships from the FRIIF or FRI. For intact families, the distance between the child and mother, child and father, and mother and father were correlated negatively with the quality of husband-wife interaction. The number of nonhuman barriers between any two of the figures was not correlated with any of the variables from the FRIIF. For the divorced families, none of the distance variables was correlated with any variables from the FRI. The only nonhuman barriers variable correlated with the FRI was a negative relationship between the quantity of mother-child interaction and the nonhuman barriers between the child and father.

Although the FRI and SS were used as measures of family relationships, these two instruments were not measuring the same constructs. Whereas the FRI was designed for the mother to give her perceptions of the quality and quantity of family relationships, the SS was designed to measure the perceived physical distance between any two family members. In addition, the SS contained a variable which was used to measure the number of nonhuman barriers perceived between any two members by the child. Yet, the distance scores for intact families were

correlated with the quality of husband-wife interaction. It appears, then, that a relationship may exist between the mother's and child(ren)'s perceptions of the quality and quantity of family relationships in intact families.

Self-Concept Referents Test. This measure was adapted from the Brown IDS Self-Concept Referents Test (Brown, n.d.) and the Thomas Self-Concept and Values Test (Thomas, 1967) by Kanoy, Cunningham, and White (1978). The instrument contains 14 items for which the children choose between two alternatives such as happy or sad. All 14 items were administered three times to ascertain how the children perceived themselves and how they thought their mothers and fathers perceived them. Thus, three scores were obtained for each child: a self score, a mother score, and a father score.

Cronbach's alpha was computed for the self score. Construct validity for the SCRT was determined by asking five child development professionals from The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, to review the instrument for its measurement of self-concept as defined earlier in this paper. In general, the instrument was rated very high in construct validity. However, most of the professionals believed that 3-year-olds would have difficulty understanding the terms and switching referents.

Index of Adjustment and Values. This instrument is a self-report measure developed by Bills (1975) to understand better how children perceive themselves, how they feel about the way they are, and how they would like to be. Four different forms of this instrument were used depending on the age and/or grade of the child in school. Each form of

the instrument contains descriptive adjectives appropriate to that particular age of children.

Bills (1975) reported split-half reliabilities for each of the test forms to be between .74 and .96. Cronbach's alpha was used with the present data to determine internal consistency scores. To assess content validity, Bills administered the instrument to age-appropriate children. Those trait words which showed a greater average variation than the average variation of the children on all of the items were eliminated. Concurrent validity was determined by correlations of the IAV "How I Am" scores with the Phillips Attitudes Toward Self and Others Questionnaire and the California Test of Personality. Correlations of the "How I Am" scores were significant at the .01 alpha level with the Phillips and .05 alpha level with the California Test of Personality.

Bronfenbrenner Parent Behavior Questionnaire. The BPBQ was developed by Devereux, Bronfenbrenner, and Suci (1962). Siegelman (1965) determined that the 45-item questionnaire consists of three major factors: loving, demanding, and punishing. Each item contains a stem and five response choices ranging from always to never. The respondent checks the choice that best describes his/her relationship with the mother or father.

A Cronbach's alpha was computed on each factor to assess reliability for the present study. Siegelman (1965) previously had tested the BPBQ for reliability and validity. Internal consistency coefficients based on the factors of loving, demanding, and punishing ranged from .70 to .91. Construct validity was determined by factor analyses done for males with a mother referent (male-mother), males with a father referent

(male-father), females with a mother referent (female-mother), and females with a father referent (female-father). The first three factors of loving, demanding, and punishing accounted for 62% of the variance for male-father, 54% for male-mother, 57% for female-father, and 50% for female-mother. Each of the remaining three factors considered for males and females accounted for less than 9% of the total variance.

Data Collection

A convenient time for testing each mother and her child(ren) was arranged by calling the mother. Data were collected from the families in their own homes. All testing was done by research assistants who were trained to answer participants' questions and to administer the instruments.

Upon entering the home of a family, the research assistant asked each participant in that home to read and sign an informed consent form (Appendix F). Any children that were able to read were given the children's form to read and sign. For any child that could not read, the assistant read the form to the child, obtained his/her verbal permission, and either signed as a witness or asked the mother to do so.

Before beginning to work with the child(ren), the research assistant asked the mother to complete her questionnaires in another room if she had not completed them for Pais (1979). The mother was given the opportunity to ask any questions at this time. If it was not convenient for the mother to complete her questionnaires at this time, she was asked to complete them in one block of time during the next week. The research assistant made arrangements to return to the home a week later

to collect the instruments. At this time, the assistant reviewed the questionnaires to determine if they were complete. If any questions were not answered, the mother was asked to read the item and give her response.

After explaining the mother's instruments to her, the assistant worked with each child separately in a quiet place. Before beginning, the assistant talked to each child to establish rapport. After 5 to 10 minutes, the testing began. After completing the first test, the child took a break to prevent fatigue or boredom with the task. Depending on the age and interests of the child, the assistant talked with him/her, played a game, or read a story. Testing was continued after 5 to 10 minutes.

After the questionnaires had been completed by each participant in the home, the research assistant stayed to discuss the project with the mother and/or child(ren) if they desired. Any questions about the study were answered except for those relating to the hypotheses (because of possible risks or inaccurate speculations).

Data were collected from all participants from divorced families between September, 1978, and March, 1979, and from all intact families between June, 1979, and October, 1979. At the conclusion of the study, a summary of all project results was mailed to each home. The letter contained the project directors' addresses and phone numbers in case the participants had any questions.

Operational Definitions

The variables of interest were the same for divorced- and intact-family mothers and for divorced- and intact-family children. Specific

item numbers for all variables can be found in Appendix G. Only those items which were not dropped from the scale when computing reliability coefficients were included in the operational definitions.

Mothers

A variety of variables were used to measure the quality and quantity of family relationships. In all cases, the mother's perceptions were measured from items on the FRI (divorced mothers) or FRIIF (intact-family mothers). The quality of husband-wife (exhusband-exwife), mother-child, and father-child interaction was measured by items pertaining to the mother's satisfactions with the interaction and her beliefs about the amount of interaction and conflict in the interaction. The mother's perceptions about the quantity of mother-child and father-child interaction were obtained by items measuring the number of activities done together, the amount of time spent together, and the degree of responsibility given to the child for determining how the time would be spent.

Three other variables relating to individual well-being were measured for each mother. Past adjustment for the divorced mothers was measured by items on the BDAI relating to the mothers' feelings and behaviors at the time of divorce. Past adjustment for the intact-family mothers was measured by items on the IA pertaining to the mothers' behaviors and feelings at the time of a low point in the marital relationship. For divorced- and intact-family mothers, present adjustment was computed by using items relating to feelings and behaviors at the present time from the BDAI and IA, respectively. An average score of from 1 to 6 was possible on each of these subscales. A final

variable, self-concept, was measured by the TSCS for both divorced- and intact-family mothers. The mothers completed items relating to their perceptions and evaluations of themselves. An average score of 1 to 5 was possible on this scale.

Children

All children from divorced and intact families completed the SS. Variables of interest from the SS and the way of computing each were: (a) distance—the amount of space between any two of the figures on the felt board, and (b) nonhuman barriers—the number of rectangles placed between any two of the human figures.

Each child completed the SCRT or a form of the IAV as a measure of self-concept. Both of these instruments contain a self score which was used to indicate the child's perceptions and evaluations of him/herself. The response choices on these instruments ranged from 0 to 1 (SCRT) to 1 to 5 (High School and Adult IAV). All self-concept scores were standardized to have a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1 so that the scores would be comparable for data analysis.

On the BPBQ, the loving factor contained items about the amount of freedom the parent granted, how often the parent shared experiences with the child, and how close the child felt to the parent. The demanding factor was measured by items dealing with how much responsibility the parent gave to him/her and how closely the parent monitored the child's activities. The punishing factor related to how often the parent punished the child and the types of methods used in punishment.

Statistical Analyses

Separate stepwise multiple regression analyses were used to predict children's self-concept and perceptions of parent-child relationships in both divorced and intact families. The predictor variables in the models were the mother's past adjustment, present adjustment, self-concept, and perceptions of the quantity and quality of family relationships. The scores for all children from a family were averaged for these analyses so that each mother's data would be used only once in the computations. Only those variables which accounted for an additional 10% of the variance were included in the model (except for the first variable of each model).

A multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) was used to determine if children from divorced and intact families differed with regard to self-concept and perceptions of the quality and quantity of family relationships. In each analysis, age was used as a covariate to adjust for any initial age differences between the two groups. Three separate analyses were used because not all children received all instruments. These three analyses were: (a) all children from divorced and intact families were compared with regard to self-concept; (b) all children were compared on their perceptions of the quality and quantity of family relationships obtained from the SS; and (c) all children 10 years of age and older were compared on the variables from the BPBQ regarding perceptions of the quality of parent-child interaction.

For both the stepwise regression and multivariate analysis of covariance, the .10 alpha level was used to determine significance.

This somewhat liberal level was chosen because some of the instruments never had been used and the sample size was limited given the number of variables studied.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Regression analyses and MANCOVA were used to answer the research questions. Item intercorrelations were examined to determine the amount of shared variance between predictor and criterion variables. The means and standard deviations were computed so the degree and direction of the univariate results could be examined. A final section contains a summary of the findings and statements about the hypotheses.

Regression Analyses

A stepwise multiple regression procedure was used to answer the question of which parental variables could be used to predict the child's self-concept and perceptions of parent-child relationships. F values were computed for a simple linear model with each predictor variable entered in descending order. The best model for each variable is listed in Table 4-1 for children from divorced families and Table 4-2 for children from intact families:

Predictors of Self-Concept

Different parental variables were the best predictors of self-concept for children from divorced and intact families. In divorced families, the mother's present adjustment was the best predictor, whereas in intact families, the mother's past adjustment was the best predictor.

Table 4-1

Stepwise Regression Procedure for Predicting Children's Self-Concept
and Perceptions of Parent-Child Relationships:
Divorced Families

Criterion Variable	Predictor Variable	Univariate		Multivariate			
		β	SE	df	R ²	F	P
Child's self-concept	Mother's present adjustment	.40	.19	1,43	.09	4.48	.04
Mother loving	Quality of mother-child interaction	-.38	.14	1,21	.26	7.41	.01
Mother demanding	Quality of husband-wife interaction	.36	.14	1,21	.24	6.58	.02
Mother punishing	Quality of father-child interaction	.29	.13	1,21	.20	5.24	.03
Father loving	Quantity of father-child interaction	-.36	.11	1,21	.34	10.72	.004
Father demanding	Quality of husband-wife interaction	.29	.13	1,21	.19	4.91	.04
Father punishing	Quality of father-child interaction	.20	.08	1,21	.23	6.28	.02
Distance between the child and mother	Mother's present adjustment	.20	.15	1,43	.04	1.77	.19
Distance between the child and father	Mother's past adjustment	-.36	.15	1,43	.08	3.58	.06
Distance between the mother and father	Quality of father-child interaction	-.17	.12	1,43	.04	2.05	.16
Nonhuman barriers between the child and mother	Mother's self-concept	-.66	.33	1,43	.09	4.09	.05
Nonhuman barriers between the child and father	Mother's self-concept	-.75	.29	1,43	.13	6.72	.01
Nonhuman barriers between the mother and father	Mother's self-concept	-.86	.30	1,43	.16	8.49	.01

Table 4-2

Stepwise Regression Procedure for Predicting Children's Self-Concept
and Perceptions of Parent-Child Relationships:
Intact Families

Criterion Variable	Predictor Variable(s)	Univariate		Multivariate			
		β	SE	df	R ²	F	p
Child's self-concept	Mother's past adjustment	-.41	.17	1,42	.12	5.82	.02
Mother loving	Mother's self-concept	.35	.23	1,24	.09	2.31	.14
Mother demanding	Quality of mother-child interaction	.32	.12				
	Quality of father-child interaction	-.24	.11	2,23	.25	3.91	.03
Mother punishing	Quality of father-child interaction	-.26	.13	1,24	.14	3.80	.06
Father loving	Mother's self-concept	.41	.24	1,24	.11	2.91	.10
Father demanding	Quality of father-child interaction	-.34	.12				
	Quality of mother-child interaction	.25	.13	2,23	.27	4.27	.03
Father punishing	Quality of father-child interaction	-.38	.12	1,24	.29	9.93	.004
Distance between the child and mother	Quality of husband-wife interaction	-.47	.12				
	Quality of father-child interaction	.40	.13	2,41	.28	7.83	.001
Distance between the child and father	Quality of husband-wife interaction	-.48	.15				
	Quality of father-child interaction	.35	.16	2,41	.20	5.16	.01
Distance between the mother and father	Quality of husband-wife interaction	-.41	.13	2,41	.20	5.28	.01
	Quality of father-child interaction	.32	.14				
Nonhuman barriers between the child and mother	Quality of father-child interaction	.10	.07	1,42	.04	1.88	.18
Nonhuman barriers between the child and father	Mother's self-concept	.29	.16	1,42	.07	3.16	.08
Nonhuman barriers between the mother and father	Mother's present adjustment	-.12	.10	1,42	.03	1.42	.24

Predictors of the Quality and Quantity of Family Relationships

Two different techniques were used to ascertain children's perceptions of family relationships. Whereas the BPBQ was used to measure the quality of family relationships, the SS may measure quantity as well as quality of family relationships.

Criterion variables from the BPBQ. The best predictor variables for how loving the mother and father were perceived to be differed for the two groups of children. For divorced-family children, the quality of mother-child interaction was predictive of how loving she was perceived to be, and the quantity of father-child interaction (as perceived by the mother) was predictive of how loving the father was perceived to be. For the intact-family children, none of the variables was a significant predictor for how loving the mother was perceived to be. The mother's self-concept was the best predictor for how loving the father was perceived to be.

How demanding both the mother and father in divorced families were perceived to be was predicted from the quality of husband-wife interaction. For intact families, the parent-child relationships were better predictors, with the quality of mother-child and father-child interaction predictive of how demanding the children perceived the mother and father to be.

Although different patterns were evident for the loving and demanding variables, the same variable was predictive of how punishing both mothers and fathers in divorced and intact families were perceived to be. The quality of father-child interaction was the only predictor in each of these cases.

Criterion variables from the SS. The distance variable on the SS was used to measure children's perceptions of the quality and quantity of family interaction. In divorced families, for two of the three criterion variables there was not a predictive model significant at the .10 level or beyond. However, the mother's past adjustment was predictive of the distance between the child and father. In intact families, the quality of husband-wife interaction and the quality of father-child interaction were predictive of the distance between the child and mother, the child and father, and the mother and father.

The number of nonhuman barriers between any two family members was designed as a measure of the quality of family relationships. In divorced families, the mother's self-concept was predictive of the number of nonhuman barriers between the mother and child, father and child, and mother and father. The mother's self-concept in intact families was predictive of the number of nonhuman barriers between the father and child. The mother's perception of the quality of father-child interaction was predictive of the number of nonhuman barriers between the mother and child, and her present adjustment was predictive of the number of nonhuman barriers between the mother and father.

Intercorrelations Among Variables

Intercorrelations among all the predictor and criterion variables are presented in Tables 4-3 and 4-4. In intact families, many of the variables pertaining to the quality and quantity of family relationships were intercorrelated beyond the .10 level. In divorced families, some variables pertaining to the quality and quantity of parent-child interaction were related, and the variables pertaining to children's

Intercorrelation Matrix for Mother and Child Variables: Divorced Families
(N = 45)

Variables	SELF	LOV	DEM	PUN	FLOV	FDEM	FPUN	DICRMO	DICHFA	DIMOFA	NBCHMO	NBCHFA	NBMOFA	AGE	QNFACH	QLFACH	QLHW	QLMOCH	QNMUCH	PASADJ	PREADJ	SELFCON
SELF		-.16	.36	.64	-.11	.27	.29	-.20	-.11	-.06	-.19	-.29	-.10	-.04	.16	.14	-.07	.12	.58	.16	.30	.29
		.47	.10	.001	.62	.22	.18	.17	.47	.68	.21	.05	.49	.76	.30	.34	.63	.44	.01	.28	.04	.05
LOV			.16	-.25	.29	.15	-.36	-.04	.002	.09	.08	.18	-.02	.36	-.16	-.35	.02	-.51	-.15	-.15	-.27	-.02
			.46	.25	.18	.48	.09	.85	.99	.66	.71	.41	.92	.09	.46	.10	.91	.01	.65	.49	.22	.93
DEM				.65	.07	.80	.43	.14	-.01	-.05	.19	.03	.01	.39	.40	.41	.49	.07	-.06	.10	.20	.19
				.001	.73	.0001	.004	.50	.97	.82	.38	.89	.96	.06	.06	.05	.02	.74	.86	.63	.37	.38
PUN					-.06	.95	.70	-.10	-.15	-.21	.14	-.11	-.02	.02	.31	.45	.43	.41	.21	.15	.28	.30
					.77	.01	.0002	.64	.49	.34	.53	.62	.93	.94	.15	.03	.04	.05	.54	.50	.19	.16
FLOV						.20	-.23	.006	.05	.04	.38	.27	.06	.39	-.58	-.56	-.16	-.15	.25	.08	.002	-.17
						.36	.28	.98	.84	.86	.07	.21	.77	.06	.004	.004	.45	.50	.46	.71	.99	.42
FDEM							.43	.15	.18	.13	.05	-.18	-.07	.32	.30	.32	.43	-.13	-.28	.26	.27	.07
							.04	.49	.41	.53	.81	.41	.74	.13	.16	.14	.04	.54	.40	.23	.21	.74
FPUN								.001	-.002	-.006	.04	-.01	.07	.01	.30	.48	.37	.35	-.11	-.12	-.03	.21
								.99	.99	.98	.84	.97	.76	.97	.16	.02	.09	.10	.76	.59	.88	.33
DICRMO									.76	.80	-.07	-.22	-.35	.15	-.003	-.19	-.08	.02	-.06	.14	.20	.10
									.0001	.0001	.07	.15	.02	.34	.98	.22	.58	.87	.78	.35	.19	.49
DICHFA										.84	-.23	-.34	.28	-.01	-.21	.003	.03	.16	.28	.27	.19	
										.0001	.13	.10	.02	.06	.91	.18	.98	.82	.49	.07	.07	.20
DIMOFA										-.25	-.23	-.22	.24	.04	-.21	-.04	-.03	.06	.06	.10	.10	.08
										.10	.12	.15	.11	.81	.16	.76	.84	.81	.70	.49	.58	
NBCHMO											.83	.75	-.31	.04	.15	.05	-.08	.34	-.05	.21	-.29	
											.0001	.04	.81	.33	.72	.68	.13	.70	-.17	.12	.05	
NBCHFA												.76	-.27	-.08	.14	.02	-.01	-.39	-.19	-.35	-.37	
												.0001	.07	.57	.37	.92	.94	.08	.20	.02	.01	
NBMOFA													-.22	.005	.21	.01	.02	-.35	-.20	-.33	-.40	
													.14	.97	.16	.96	.91	.12	.19	.02	.01	
AGE													.08	-.25	-.05	-.12	.15	.11	.13	.20		
													.60	.10	.74	.44	.51	.46	.37	.20		
QNFACH																.52	.27	.02	.12	-.001	.08	.17
																.0002	.07	.89	.60	.99	.61	.25
QLFACH																	.53	.26	.02	.11	.14	.01
																	.0002	.08	.92	.46	.36	.93
QLHW																		.29	-.04	.09	.11	.13
																		.05	.86	.57	.46	.39
QLMOCH																			.65	.07	.13	.42
																			.001	.62	.39	.004
QNMUCH																				.16	.27	.54
																				.48	.23	.01
PASADJ																					.84	.42
																					.0001	.004
PREADJ																						.47
																						.001
SELFCON																						

Note. The first number in each entry is r and the second is p .

Abbreviations for variable labels are as follows:

- | | | | |
|--------|--|---------|---|
| SELF | = Child's self-concept | NBCHA | = Nonhuman barriers between the child and father |
| LOV | = Mother loving | NBMOFA | = Nonhuman barriers between the mother and father |
| DEM | = Mother demanding | AGE | = Child's age |
| PUN | = Mother punishing | QNFACH | = Quantity of father-child interaction |
| FLOV | = Father loving | QLFACH | = Quality of father-child interaction |
| FDEM | = Father demanding | QLHW | = Quality of (ex)husband-(ex)wife interaction |
| FPUN | = Father punishing | QLMOCH | = Quality of mother-child interaction |
| DICHMO | = Distance between the child and mother | QNMOCB | = Quantity of mother-child interaction |
| DICHFA | = Distance between the child and father | PASADJ | = Past adjustment |
| DIMOFA | = Distance between the mother and father | PREADJ | = Present adjustment |
| NBCHMO | = Nonhuman barriers between the child and mother | SELFCON | = Mother's self-concept |

Table 4-4
Intercorrelation Matrix for Mother and Child Variables: Intact Families
(N = 44)

Variables	SELF	LOV	DEM	PUN	FLOV	FDEN	FPUN	DICHMO	DICHFA	DIMOF	NBCHMO	NBCHFA	NBMOFA	AGE	QNFACH	QLFACH	QLHW	QLMOCH	QNMUCH	PASADJ	PREADJ	SELFCON
SELF																						
LOV	-.47																					
DEM	-.06	-.02																				
PUN	-.47	-.35	.05																			
FLOV	.01	.76	.91	.01	.08	.80	.48	.53	.14	.50	.95	.98	.79	.55	.55	.18	.69	.16	.02	.16	.89	
FDEN	-.28	-.24	.84	.13	-.11			-.006	.05	.07	-.21	.002	.30	.45	.02	.03	.23	-.14	-.22	.15	.20	.29
FPUN	.16	.24	.001	.52	.58	.97	.79	.72	.30	.99	.14	.02	.93	.87	.24	.50	.29	.46	.32	.14		
DICHMO	.52	-.09	.55	.08	.19	.21	.09	-.07	-.18	.13	-.17	.08	-.17	-.26	.33	-.07	.26	.10	-.002			
DICHFA	.01	.66	.003	.71	.34	.31	.65	.71	.40	.53	.40	.70	.39	.19	.10	.72	.20	.61	.99			
DIMOF	-.03	.46	.72	-.09	-.01	-.05	.02	.003	-.17	.004	-.31	-.36	-.33	.02	-.19	.11	.02	.08				
NBCHMO	.87	.01	.001	.64	.97	.78	.92	.89	.40	.98	.11	.06	.09	.92	.36	.60	.93	.67				
NBCHFA		.16	-.17	.01	.07	.10	-.17	.11	.21	.33	-.09	.04	.06	.11	-.003	.12	.05	.33				
NBMOFA		.44	.41	.97	.74	.61	.38	.59	.31	.10	.64	.85	.76	.59	.98	.54	.81	.10				
AGE					.37	-.09	-.05	-.14	-.06	-.18	-.02	.09	-.09	-.39	-.05	.11	-.20	.25	.20	-.04		
QNFACH					.06	.66	.78	.48	.75	.38	.93	.65	.63	.05	.80	.58	.32	.21	.32	.83		
QLFACH																						
QLHW																						
QLMOCH																						
QNMUCH																						
PASADJ																						
PREADJ																						
SELFCON																						

Notes. The first number in each entry is r and the second is p .

Abbreviations for variable levels are as follows:

SELF = Child's self-concept
LOV = Mother loving
DEM = Mother demanding
PUN = Mother punishing
FLOV = Father loving
FDEN = Father demanding
FPUN = Father punishing
DICHMO = Distance between the child and mother
DICHFA = Distance between the child and father
DIMOF = Distance between the mother and father
NBCHMO = Nonhuman barriers between the child and mother

NBCHFA = Nonhuman barriers between the child and father
NBMOFA = Nonhuman barriers between the mother and father
AGE = Child's age
QNFACH = Quantity of father-child interaction
QLFACH = Quality of father-child interaction
QLHW = Quality of (ex)husband-(ex)wife interaction
QLMOCH = Quality of mother-child interaction
QNMUCH = Quantity of mother-child interaction
PASADJ = Past adjustment
PREADJ = Present adjustment
SELFCON = Mother's self-concept

perceptions of parental behavior (e.g., mother demanding) and the quality of (ex)husband-(ex)wife interaction were related.

Another group of variables that were intercorrelated was the mother's past adjustment, present adjustment, and self-concept. These variables were correlated positively at the .001 level or beyond, making it very unlikely that two or more of these variables would be significant predictors within the same model.

Multivariate Analyses of Covariance

A second research question was whether there were differences between children from divorced and intact families. Three separate multivariate analyses of covariance were used to answer this question with family structure (divorced or intact) as the independent variable and age as the covariate. A separate multivariate analysis was conducted for the variables from each instrument because not all children were assessed using all the instruments. Table 4-5 contains the results for the dependent variable of self-concept, Table 4-6 contains the results for the dependent variable of quality of parent-child relationships (obtained from the BPBQ), and Table 4-7 contains the results for the dependent variables of quality and quantity of parent-child relationships (obtained from the SS).

In two of the three analyses, the MANCOVA was significant, indicating that there were differences between divorced- and intact-family children with regard to perceptions of parent-child relationships. However, the MANCOVA on self-concept was not significant. Also, the covariate of age was significant in two analyses, indicating that age differences between the divorced group and intact-family group were important.

Table 4-5

Multivariate and Univariate Analysis of Covariance Results
for Children in Divorced and Intact Families:
Self-Concept

Variable	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Multivariate Analysis (<u>df</u> = 1, 146)		
Self-concept	.01	.96
Covariate Analysis (<u>df</u> = 1, 146)		
Age	.05	.82
Univariate Analysis (<u>df</u> = 2, 146)		
Self-concept	.03	.97

Table 4-6

Multivariate and Univariate Analysis of Covariance
Results for Children in Divorced and Intact
Families: Parent-Child Relationships
(BPBQ Variables)

Variables	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Multivariate Analysis (<u>df</u> = 6, 60)		
Parent-child relationships	3.34	.01
Covariate Analysis (<u>df</u> = 6, 60)		
Age	4.07	.002
Univariate Analysis (<u>df</u> = 2, 65)		
Mother loving	4.95	.01
Mother demanding	5.26	.01
Mother punishing	.86	.43
Father loving	9.19	.003
Father demanding	5.41	.01
Father punishing	1.08	.35

Table 4-7

Multivariate and Univariate Analysis of Covariance Results
for Children in Divorced and Intact Families: Parent-
Child Relationships (SS Variables)

Variable	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Multivariate Results (<u>df</u> = 6, 139)		
Parent-child relationships	4.03	.001
Covariate Results (<u>df</u> = 6, 139)		
Age	1.94	.08
Univariate Results (<u>df</u> = 2, 144)		
Distance between the child and mother	1.09	.34
Distance between the child and father	1.40	.25
Distance between the mother and father	4.04	.02
Nonhuman barriers between the child and mother	8.28	.0004
Nonhuman barriers between the child and father	6.84	.001
Nonhuman barriers between the mother and father	9.36	.0002

In the univariate analyses for all children, there were no differences between the two groups on self-concept, distance between the child and the mother, distance between the child and the father, or how punishing both the mother and father were perceived to be. There were differences between the two groups on the SS variables of distance between the mother and father, number of nonhuman barriers between the child and both parents, and number of nonhuman barriers between the mother and father. In addition, there were differences on the BPBQ variables of mother loving, mother demanding, father loving, and father demanding.

Means and Standard Deviations

The means in Table 4-8 were computed to determine the direction and degree of differences between divorced- and intact-family children. Children from divorced families perceived their mothers and fathers to be more loving and demanding than intact-family children perceived their parents to be. Also, they placed more distance and nonhuman barriers between their parents and between themselves and their parents than did children from intact families. Finally, children from divorced families perceived their mothers to be less punishing than did children from intact families.

Summary

Evidence was obtained to support the hypothesis that social-psychological variables and family relationship variables were predictive of the child's self-concept and perceptions of parent-child relationships.

Table 4-8

N, Means, and Standard Deviations for Independent and
Dependent Variables for Divorced and Intact
Families

Variable	Divorced Families			Intact Families		
	<u>N</u>	<u>$\bar{X}$</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>$\bar{X}$</u>	<u>SD</u>
Dependent Variables						
Child's self-concept	74	.03	.97	79	.03	.87
Mother loving	34	2.09	.66	36	1.89	.46
Mother demanding	34	2.86	.80	36	2.62	.48
Mother punishing	34	4.02	.89	36	4.18	.60
Father loving	34	2.23	.62	36	1.91	.45
Father demanding	34	3.08	.73	36	2.79	.52
Father punishing	34	4.34	.70	36	4.22	.60
Distance between the child and mother	72	.71	.86	79	.55	.78
Distance between the child and father	72	.80	.92	79	.65	.87
Nonhuman barriers between the child and mother	72	.45	.62	79	.24	.36
Nonhuman barriers between the child and father	72	.38	.58	79	.22	.36
Nonhuman barriers between the mother and father	72	.48	.64	79	.20	.37

Table 4-8 (continued)

Variable	Divorced Families			Intact Families		
	<u>N</u>	<u>$\bar{X}$</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>$\bar{X}$</u>	<u>SD</u>
Independent Variables						
Mother's perception of the quantity of father-child interaction	45	3.43	.93	44	4.50	.54
Mother's perception of the quality of father-child interaction	45	4.20	.95	44	4.69	.73
Mother's perception of the quality of husband-wife interaction	45	3.65	1.08	44	4.76	.78
Mother's perception of the quality of mother-child interaction	45	4.54	.75	44	4.80	.63
Mother's perception of the quantity of mother-child interaction	21 ^a	5.18	.58	44	5.01	.48
Mother's past adjustment	45	3.92	.70	44	3.78	.74
Mother's present adjustment	45	4.51	.60	44	4.98	.56
Mother's self-concept	45	3.96	.28	44	3.94	.32

^aThis variable was added after Pais (1979) had collected data from 24 mothers.

In over 75% of the multiple regression analyses, the predictor variables were significant at or beyond the .10 level. In addition, although some of the univariate analyses were not significant, the multivariate analyses were indicative of differences between children in divorced and intact families, especially with regard to perceptions of parent-child relationships. Thus, the hypothesis that there would be no differences between these two groups of children was not supported.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

As expected, the model of family adjustment and interaction was applicable to both divorced and intact families. Variables from the model could be used to predict children's self-concept and perceptions of parent-child relationships in both divorced and intact families. The importance of the custodial and noncustodial father was substantiated by the predictive power of the quality of father-child interaction for both divorced and intact families. As suggested earlier, the father in a divorced family is not absent from the family, but he must form a new pattern of interaction with the child(ren). The importance of the quality of family relationship variables for both divorced and intact families is indicative that the structure of the family may not be as important as the quality of the relationships. Finally, the relationships among the mother's social-psychological well-being and the child's self-concept is indicative of the influence that family members have on one another.

Importance of Family Relationships

In the stepwise regression analyses, different mother variables were predictive of children's self-concept and perceptions of parent-child relationships. For children from divorced families, individual mother variables (e.g., self-concept, present adjustment) more often were predictors than for children from intact families, where family relationship variables more often were predictors. This pattern could

exist because of the structure of these two family forms. The mother in divorced families usually does not have another adult to interact with as the mother in an intact family does. This may add emphasis to the importance of individual mother variables for children from divorced families and to relationship variables for children from intact families.

However, family relationship variables were predictive of children's perceptions in the divorced families. Hetherington et al. (1978), Pais (1979), and Weiss (1975) all suggested that the importance of family relationship variables has been overlooked in divorced families. Pais suggested that although divorce ends the marital relationship, it does not terminate the family relationships. From the stepwise regression results, it can be concluded that in divorced as well as intact families, the quality of time spent with the children was important to their well-being.

The patterns of item intercorrelations are important to consider in relation to differences between divorced and intact families. In the intact families, there was a positive relationship among all of the family relationship variables. For the divorced families, however, some of the qualitative and quantitative variables were not related or were related negatively. It is possible that, given the constraints of time, divorced mothers consciously place more emphasis on the quality of relationships. In addition, the intact-family mothers may associate the quality of relationships with the quantity of relationships, thus accounting for the positive relationships. Finally, although the variables are labeled quality and quantity of family relationships, the qualitative variable has some quantitative dimensions and vice versa.

Children's Reports of Parental Childrearing Behavior

Children's perceptions of parental behavior differed for divorced and intact families. Children from divorced families reported both their mothers and fathers to be more demanding than did children from intact families. In addition, for the divorced-family children, how demanding both parents were perceived to be was predicted from the quality of the exspouse relationship. A likely explanation of the finding is that the more support the exspouses can offer to one another, the less likely it is that the custodial parent will make increasing demands on the children. Divorce is a period of readjustment for both parents and children, and the distribution of family roles and responsibilities often is reallocated. As Brandwein et al. (1974) noted, the mother must take over certain family functions (e.g., authoritative, economic) that she may not have handled before the divorce. This is likely to place increased stress on the mother, who may delegate some of these responsibilities to the children.

Another area of difference with regard to the quality of parent-child relationships was that both mothers and fathers were perceived by their children to be more loving in divorced families than in intact families. One explanation for the difference with regard to the mothers may be that the mothers in divorced families reported a greater amount of mother-child interaction than intact-family mothers reported for themselves. In addition, in divorced families, the children usually have just one adult at home, the mother, and thus may perceive her as more loving. With regard to the fathers in divorced families being perceived as more loving than intact-family fathers, at least two

explanations are possible. First, Kelly and Wallerstein (1977) reported that the fathers in their study developed closer, less conflict-oriented relationships with their child(ren). However, the degree and quality of this interaction often subsided between the first and second year after divorce. Because one of the criteria for the present sample was a maximum time period of 2 years after the divorce, it is possible that more distance will develop between these fathers and their children. A second explanation may be that fathers in intact families sometimes are not available to their children (Blanchard & Biller, 1971), and it is unlikely that the father would be perceived as loving if he is physically present but not available. A final explanation for the reported differences is related to both the mother loving and father loving variables and concerns the name given to the loving factor on the BPBQ. Although this factor is termed loving, some of the items more accurately might be labeled as permissive. Because of the increased demands on the mother and the physical separation of the father and child, parents from divorced families may be more permissive than intact-family parents.

Children's Perceptions of Family Relationships

Some differences also were apparent between divorced- and intact-family children with regard to the distance and number of nonhuman barriers between any two family members. Children from divorced families placed more distance and nonhuman barriers between their parents than intact-family children did. The children from divorced families may have been reacting to the actual physical distance between the two parents or may have been indicating their perceptions of the difficulties between the two parents. Regardless of which explanation

(or both) is more plausible, the divorced-family children probably were reflecting a realistic picture of the mother-father relationship when they put more distance and barriers between their parents than the intact-family children did.

Children from divorced families also placed more nonhuman barriers between themselves and both the mother and father than intact-family children. Several explanations of this finding are possible. First, Wallerstein and Kelly (1974, 1975, 1976) concluded that many children from divorced families feel rejected by and angry at their parents. They may react to these feelings by establishing some barriers between themselves and their parents so that they will not be hurt further. However, the children from divorced families in the present study did not perceive any greater distance between themselves and their parents than the intact-family children did, making the first explanation somewhat questionable. A second explanation is related to the reliability of these two subscales. The reliability of the nonhuman barriers subscale was low, but the reliability of the distance subscale was high. Because validity is not possible without reliability, it is possible that the nonhuman barriers subscale was not a good measure of the perceived barriers between the child and either parent.

A final point concerning the results of the SS is the age of the children completing the instrument. Even though age was used as a covariate, thus adjusting any age differences between the two groups, age differences among children within the groups were not adjusted.

When Kuethe (1962) developed the SS, he noted that similar experiences would have an effect on how people placed the figures.

Obviously, younger children have less experience in general and less similar experiences than older children do. Thus, a 6-year-old from a divorced family and an 18-year-old from a divorced family may have responded to the technique in very different ways. Perhaps age is more important than family structure in explaining the results obtained on the SS. Age differences are related to how children respond to parental divorce (Wallerstein & Kelly, 1974, 1975, 1976). These differences are logical given differences in reasoning ability, experience, and emotional development that are associated with, although not entirely dependent on, age.

Summary

The findings of this study were mixed with regard to determining what was more important to these children, quality of family relationships or structure of the family. Although there were differences between the children in divorced and intact families, many of the variables contributing to this overall difference may reflect a realistic perception of divorce rather than a traumatic experience (e.g., amount of distance between the mother and father).

There was no difference between the two groups of children with regard to self-concept. In his investigation of self-esteem, Coopersmith (1967) included children from both divorced and intact families and did not state any differences between these two groups. Raschke and Raschke (1979) concluded from their study that family structure made no difference in terms of the child's self-concept. Thus, it is probable that the quality of family relationships is more important than the structure of the family with regard to self-concept.

The quality of family relationships was predictive of children's perceptions for both divorced and intact families. For both groups, the quality of father-child, mother-child, and (ex)husband-(ex)wife interaction was predictive of how the children perceived family relationships.

The Role of the Father and Mother

Although it is hard to separate the importance of the mother and father when studying family relationships, certain patterns were evident in these data that need further comment. The importance of the father to children from both divorced and intact families was evident. In addition, the importance of the mother's well-being to the child was evident, but there was little support for the idea that the mother is the nucleus of the family or serves as a link between the father and child.

Salience of the Father

The quality of father-child interaction was an important predictor variable in many of the regression analyses where the criterion variable was the child's perception of the quality and quantity of family relationships. However, it is impossible to tell from the present data if this variable was important because of the gender of the father or his relationship to the child(ren).

For divorced-family children, the quality of father-child interaction may be important because these children obviously will lose a lot of time with the father. Jacobson (1978) reported that the quantity of time lost with the father for children in divorced families

was related to the children's behavior problems. However, it would be impossible for most noncustodial parents (usually fathers) to maintain the quantity of interaction with their children after divorce that they had before the divorce. But the quality of interaction can be maintained or improved.

The fact that the quality of father-child interaction was an important predictor in the present study did not mean necessarily that the fathers had established relationships high in quality. It did mean, however, that the quality of father-child interaction (whether it was low or high) was predictive of how children perceived parent-child relationships. Thus, ideas about the father's importance for divorced families (Pais, 1979; Weiss, 1975) and for intact families (Lamb & Lamb, 1976; Maxwell, 1976) were substantiated in this study.

The Mother as the Central Figure

Many researchers (Hetherington et al., 1978; Wallerstein & Kelly, 1975) have noted the relationship between the mother's adjustment and the child's self-concept and/or adjustment after divorce. The conclusion from most of these studies has been that the mother and child within a divorced family influence one another's adjustment. In the present study, the mother's past and present adjustment and self-concept were predictive of the children's self-concept and perceptions of family relationships indicating the relationship between the social-psychological well-being of the mother and child.

However, there was a difference between divorced and intact families. The mother's past adjustment was predictive of the child's self-concept in intact families, whereas the mother's present adjustment

was predictive of the child's self-concept in divorced families. Past adjustment was related to a low point in the marital relationship for the intact-family mothers. For most of these women, the low point had occurred in the recent past, yet there was no marker event to help these women adapt to the situation. Many of these women still may have been having adjustment difficulties within the marriage, accounting for why past adjustment was an important predictor variable. For the divorced women, however, the legal event of divorce (or perhaps the point of separation) provided a marker event for reorganization of their lives, and present adjustment was a stronger predictor than past adjustment.

Even though the mother's adjustment was predictive of children's self-concept and perceptions of family relationships, inferences cannot be made that the mothers were the central figures in the children's lives, especially in intact families. As reported earlier, many father-child variables were predictive of children's perceptions of family relationships, indicating the salience of the fathers to the children. Thus, the mothers may not be serving as links between the fathers and children in intact families. In divorced families, the importance of the mothers' well-being to the children's perceptions is evident, but this does not mean necessarily that they serve as a link between the fathers and children. More data need to be collected before this question can be answered.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

The results from the present study are a useful contribution to the divorce literature. First, the variables selected for study were reflective of divorce as a process and the relationships among these variables needed further documentation. Second, the same variables were studied for children in divorced and intact families, allowing conclusions to be drawn about the relative importance of the structure of the family and the quality of the relationships. Third, no assumptions were made about the quality of any particular family structure; differences between these two groups were determined empirically. Fourth, the sample was not a clinical sample as had been used in many previous studies. Fifth, relationships among variables within divorced and intact families were examined to determine if differences existed between these two groups without assuming or stating that the differences were caused by the family structure. Finally, the focus of this research was on the interactions among family members, rather than on individual outcomes.

Limitations of the Study

Even though the present research was designed to overcome many of the weaknesses inherent in the divorce literature, there were some limitations of the present study. Sampling technique has been a problem in past research and was a limitation of the present study. Identifying appropriate parameters for the subject population limits the

generalizability of the findings in much of the divorce literature. In addition, designing a study which would allow the researcher to answer questions about the effects of divorce is difficult because people should be studied both before and after the divorce. Finally, although multiple variables were studied, there are still many variables that need to be examined.

Sampling

One of the major limitations of the study was the sample. Although the sampling technique of using divorce decrees was a sound method, some of the restrictions placed on the sample make the findings applicable only to certain groups of people (e.g., Caucasian, middle-class, ever-married). In addition, in an effort to make the intact group comparable to the divorced group, a snowball sampling technique was used for intact families. This technique lacks sophistication and resulted in a select and possibly unrepresentative group. However, generalizations probably can be made to groups of white, middle-class, well-educated people with a high degree of accuracy because the participants were screened carefully on these variables. The ability to generalize probably is better for the divorced group than the intact group because using the divorce decrees was a better sampling strategy.

Another difficulty with the sampling technique was the self-selected nature of the sample. All potential participants were given thorough explanations of the study and then asked whether they wanted to participate. Probably many of the divorced- and intact-family mothers who were experiencing severe problems chose not to participate, thus making the results applicable predominantly to divorced and intact

families without severe problems. In addition, the refusal percentage was similar for divorced- and intact-family mothers. Thus, it is unlikely that one group more than the other group refused to participate because of severe problems.

Related to the problem of a self-selected sample is the notion that some people may have chosen to participate but may have given socially acceptable answers in an attempt to mask problems or everyday concerns faced by most families. Although the mothers were assured confidentiality, the data were not collected anonymously. However, the severity of the problem of socially desirable answers may have been decreased by the elimination of items which reduced the reliability of an instrument.

Design

As mentioned earlier, divorce is a complex process and adjustment occurs over time. Thus, the strategy used in this study to measure participants only once did not allow any conclusions to be drawn about how the families change over time. Because the variable of past adjustment was used to refer to a time in the past, however, an index of how the mother thought she felt at an earlier time was provided.

Data Analysis

A final problem concerns the variables chosen for data analysis. Some variables such as age of the child and length of time divorced are known to be related to the divorce adjustment process (Wallerstein & Kelly, 1974, 1975, 1976). Yet these variables were controlled (by exclusion or covariance) in data analysis in order to study relationships among variables that had not been documented well.

Another group of variables such as stability of residence, impact of economic changes, and father's adjustment and self-concept also were not studied. Theoretically and empirically, these variables have been related to the post-divorce adjustment of mothers and/or children but need further exploration. However, given the limits of sample size, not all potentially relevant variables could be studied within this one project. Including additional variables would have increased the likelihood of finding significance by chance within any one statistical test, thus increasing the likelihood of error. Thus, the present study was limited to perceptions of family relationships and social-psychological characteristics of mothers and children.

Implications for Theory, Research, and Practice

Although the divorce literature has many gaps, some of the recent studies (e.g., Hetherington et al., 1978) and recent theoretical works (e.g., Marotz-Baden et al., 1979) have provided valuable insight into divorce as a process involving many variables. In the present study, divorce was conceptualized as a multidimensional process and as a time of family reorganization. When divorce is conceptualized in this way, different results are found than were reported in the past literature. For example, the importance of the quality of father-child interaction should contribute to further theory development in the area of parent-child relationships and to future research efforts in the area of family relationships, not just in the area of divorce. In addition, the conceptualization of divorce as a process that involves more than a legal event facilitates the researcher's suggesting implications for

practice. Clinicians can glean information about the relative importance of the structure of the family versus family relationships and help the family to restructure the relationships.

Theory and Research

Many of the implications from the present study are related to both theory and research. A very important implication is the need for researchers to begin to use an interdisciplinary approach to the study of crises and family relationships. Some of the variables which were not included in this study (e.g., stability of residence, economic changes) may have important implications for the study of divorce. The relationship of these variables to divorce adjustment and to an individual's adjustment need to be conceptualized and then researched.

In addition, expansion and refinement of ideas about the components of parent-child relationships would be helpful. Although there were some relationships among the scales used to measure the quality and quantity of family relationships for the parents and children, these relationships were not as evident as might have been expected. Also, there were very few measures of parent-child relationships available to use with either parents or children. Thus, family theorists need to define more clearly what the dimensions of family relationships are for parents and children, how these dimensions can be measured reliably and validly, and how these dimensions may change when a crisis event such as divorce occurs.

Another valuable addition to theory and research would be perspectives on the mother's and father's roles in divorced and intact families. How does the father's role in the family change when divorce

occurs? How are changes in the father's role (in divorced or intact families) related to the mother's role? How do differences in the availability of fathers and the quality and quantity of time spent with the children affect the children's development? These and many other questions need to be addressed to obtain a clearer picture of the relative influence of the mother and father and of the divorced- versus intact-family structure.

Further exploration also would be beneficial in the area of self-concept and self-esteem. Rosenberg (1979) indicated that self-concept and self-esteem are different, though not mutually exclusive, constructs. Yet in most literature, including the divorce literature, these terms are used interchangeably. Researchers need to define clearly which construct they are measuring and to explore the differences in self-concept and self-esteem within the same child and among children of different family structures.

A final area needing further exploration is the effects of divorce on children. Goode (1956) contended that the effects of divorce could not be measured because differences between children of various family structures may exist because of socialization practices. However, it is probable that divorce has some impact on children and researchers should be able to answer this question. One way to answer this question would be to take a large sample of intact families and measure the quality of family relationships, amount of conflict, and individual adjustment variables over a long period of time. As some of the parents divorced, a cross-lagged panel correlation technique could be used to determine the direction of the effects, and multivariate analysis of

variance techniques could be used to determine if and when the individual family members changed. Weiss (1975) has speculated that predivorce conflict is more damaging to the child's development than divorce.

Although some researchers have suggested that children are better off living with a happy single parent than with two unhappy parents (Burgess, 1970; Nye, 1957), more work needs to be done in this area.

Practice

When answers are obtained about the effects of divorce on children, then family practitioners will be able to offer more services to divorced parents and children. Even without these answers, practitioners can offer valuable services such as divorce counseling or marital counseling. In addition, educational programs would be appropriate. When offering either type of service, practitioners need to be cognizant of the importance of family relationships and the impact that each family member has on the other members.

Therapeutic intervention. In divorce counseling, the therapist can help the family adjust to the upcoming transition. The results from the present study can be helpful in providing a focus for the counseling.

First, the partners (and/or the individual) can be given some guidance on how to prepare children for divorce or how to help them cope. Because children's perceptions of the situation are related to their reactions, it is unrealistic for the parents to try to mask the conflict or pretend that no problems exist. In addition, the developmental status of the child is important to consider. Adolescents probably are dealing with the issues of independence and dependence.

The counselor can help the parent(s) explore how the dependence-independence conflict will influence an adolescent's reaction to divorce. Preschoolers, however, are dealing with separation anxiety and the parent(s) can be warned that these children may fear that both parents will desert them.

Second, the parent(s) can be given help in restructuring the parent-child relationships. The importance of the quality of father-child interaction to the divorced children in the present study is undeniable. However, the process of the restructuring can be painful and problematic. These difficulties may be diminished if the children are given some input into the arrangements for seeing the noncustodial parent. In addition, the parents can be warned that the children may perceive them as more demanding than before. If the parents keep their expectations congruent with the children's emotional, physical, and intellectual development, the children may adjust better to the transition. Some children have a tendency to regress for a temporary period during the divorce process. Regression by the children coupled with increased demands by the parents can create an explosive situation. Counselors can sensitize parents to these potential difficulties and possibly help the parents to prevent them.

A third area where the counselor can be particularly helpful is in the restructuring of the mother-father relationship. Most interactions following divorce involve conflicts over children (Westman et al., 1970), yet the results from the present study are indicative that the quality of the exspouse interaction is an important predictor of the child's perceptions of family relationships. The counselor can help the couple

establish boundaries between themselves, develop new interests, and arrange visitation. If these details are handled satisfactorily early in the divorce process, then future conflict situations may be avoided.

Educational intervention. Family practitioners can offer more family life education programs that deal with maintaining satisfactory marital adjustment, the importance of the father's role to the child's development, and the influence that each family member has on the other members. Such programs may help to build and/or maintain strong family ties and provide an alternative to divorce for some families.

Educational intervention is appropriate also for divorced families. In the Wallerstein and Kelly (1974, 1975, 1976) project, the children had been referred for preventive counseling rather than therapy. Preventive education is offered for several transitions during the life cycle (e.g., marriage, parenthood) and is appropriate for divorcing families. The focus of this education can be on preparing the individual for the vacillation of feelings, providing suggestions for how to restructure the family and how to manage time, giving the parents information about how the children may react and what feelings they may experience, and providing children an opportunity to express their thoughts and feelings and to ask questions about the divorce.

Concluding Comments

As more research is conducted in the area of divorce, researchers will be able to provide theorists and clinicians with valuable information about the family structure and relationships, the process of divorce, and how to prepare families for such a transition. The area of divorce

provides a challenge to all family and child specialists because of the massive number of couples that seek divorce each year. Projects like the present one certainly do not provide all of the answers but represent an important contribution to the literature.

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Anthony, E. Children at risk from divorce: A review. In E. J. Anthony & C. Koupernik (Eds.), The child in his family: Children at psychiatric risk (Vol. 3). New York: Wiley, 1974.
- Bane, M. J. Marital disruption and the lives of children. Journal of Social Issues, 1976, 32, 103-117.
- Bernhardt, J. The young child's perception of the father's role using a comparison of age, sex, and father absent, father present family composition (Doctoral Dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975, 35, 4955B.
- Beissinger, T. The relationship of parental divorce, during adolescence, to self-concept (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 37, 4020A. (University Microfilms No. 77-682)
- Biller, H. Father absence and the personality development of the male child. Developmental Psychology, 1970, 2, 181-201.
- Bills, R. E. A system for assessing affectivity. Birmingham, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1975.
- Blair, M. Divorcées adjustment and attitudinal changes about life (Doctoral Dissertation, Florida State University, 1970). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970, 30, 5541A-5542A. (University Microfilms No. 70-11,099)
- Blanchard, R., & Biller, H. Father's availability and academic performance of third grade boys. Developmental Psychology, 1971, 4, 301-305.
- Bowerman, C., & Elder, G., Jr. Variations in adolescent perception of family power structure. American Sociological Review, 1964, 29, 551-567.
- Brandwein, R., Brown, C., & Fox, E. The social situation of divorced mothers and their families. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1974, 36, 498-514.
- Brown, R. Brown IDS Self-Concept Referents Test. New York: New York Medical College, n.d.
- Burgess, J. The single parent family: A social and psychological problem. Family Coordinator, 1970, 19, 134-144.
- Cooley, C. H. Human nature and social order. New York: Scribner's, 1902.

- Coopersmith, S. The antecedents of self-esteem. San Francisco: Freeman, 1967.
- Devereux, E., Bronfenbrenner, U., & Suci, G. Patterns of parent behavior in America and West Germany: A cross-national comparison. International Social Science Journal, 1962, 14, 488-506.
- Farber, G. Marital integration as a factor in parent-child relations. Child Development, 1962, 33, 1-4.
- Fitts, W. Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. Nashville: Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1964.
- Gardner, G. Separation of the parents and the emotional life of the child. Mental Hygiene, 1956, 40, 53-64.
- Goldstein, J., Freud, A., & Solnit, A. Beyond the best interests of the child. New York: Free Press, 1973.
- Goode, W. After divorce. New York: Free Press, 1956.
- Hetherington, E., Cox, M., & Cox R. The aftermath of divorce. Family Coordinator, 1976, 25, 417-428.
- Hetherington, E., Cox, M., & Cox, R. The aftermath of divorce. In J. Stevens & M. Mathews (Eds.), Mother/child, father/child relationships. Washington: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1978.
- Jacobson, D. The impact of marital separation/divorce on children: Parent-child separation and child adjustment. Journal of Divorce, 1978, 1, 341-360.
- James, S. Familial predictors of self-concept in children who have experienced parental divorce. Unpublished master's thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1979.
- Kagan, J. New views on cognitive development. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 1976, 5, 113-129.
- Kanoy, K., Cunningham, J. L., & White, P. Self-Concept Referents Test. Unpublished manuscript, 1978. (Available from The University of Tennessee, Knoxville).
- Kanoy, K., Cunningham, J. L., & White, P. Family Relations Inventory for Intact Families. Unpublished manuscript, 1979. (Available from The University of Tennessee, Knoxville).
- Kanoy, K., Cunningham, J. L., & White, P. Index of Adjustment. Unpublished manuscript, 1979. (Available from The University of Tennessee, Knoxville).

- Kelly, J., & Wallerstein, J. The effects of parental divorce: Experiences of the child in early latency. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1976, 46, 20-32.
- Kelly, J., & Wallerstein, J. Part-time parent, part-time child: Visiting after divorce. Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 1977, 2, 51-54.
- Kueth, J. Social schemas. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, 64, 31-38.
- Lamb, M. The effects of divorce on children's personality development. Journal of Divorce, 1977, 1, 163-174.
- Lamb, M., & Lamb, J. The nature and importance of the father-infant relationship. Family Coordinator, 1976, 25, 379-385.
- Landis, J. The trauma of children when parents divorce. Marriage and Family Living, 1960, 22, 7-13.
- Lerner, R., & Spanier, G. (Eds.). Child influences on marital and family interaction: A life-span perspective. New York: Academic Press, 1978.
- Longfellow, D. Divorce in context: Its impact on children. In G. Levinger & O. C. Moles (Eds.), Divorce and separation: Context, causes, and consequences. New York: Basic Books, 1979.
- Luepnitz, D. Which aspects of divorce affect children? Family Coordinator, 1979, 28, 79-85.
- Marotz-Baden, R., Adams, G., Bueche, N., Munro, B., & Munro, G. Family form or family process? Reconsidering the deficit family model approach. Family Coordinator, 1979, 28, 5-16.
- Maxwell, J. The keeping fathers of America. Family Coordinator, 1976, 25, 387-392.
- McDermott, J. Parental divorce in early childhood. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1968, 124, 1424-1432.
- McDermott, J. Divorce and its psychiatric sequelae in children. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1970, 23, 421-448.
- Minuchin, S. Families and family therapy. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974.
- Nye, I. Child adjustment in broken and unhappy homes. Marriage and Family Living, 1957, 19, 356-361.
- Pais, J. Family Relations Inventory. Unpublished manuscript, 1978. (Available from The University of Tennessee, Knoxville).

- Pais, J. Social-psychological predictors of adjustment for divorced mothers (Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1978). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1979, 39, 5165A. (University Microfilms No. 7903460)
- Pais, J., & White, P. Family redefinition: A review of the literature toward a model of divorce adjustment. Journal of Divorce, 1979, 2, 271-281.
- Raschke, H., & Raschke, V. Family conflict and children's self-concepts: A comparison of intact and single-parent families. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1979, 41, 367-374.
- Rosenberg, M. Society and the adolescent self-image. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965.
- Rosenberg, M. Conceiving the self. New York: Basic Books, 1979.
- Rutter, M. Parent-child separation: Psychological effects on the children. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 1971, 22, 233-260.
- Salts, C. Comparison of post divorce adjustment by sex and other variables. Unpublished master's thesis, Florida State University, 1976.
- Sameroff, A. Transactional models in early social relations. Human Development, 1975, 18, 65-79.
- Siegelman, M. Evaluation of Bronfenbrenner's questionnaire for children concerning parental behavior. Child Development, 1965, 36, 163-174.
- Stryker, S. Symbolic interaction theory: A review and some suggestions for comparative family research. Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 1972, 3, 17-32.
- Swagler, R. Consumers and the market (2nd ed.). Lexington, Mass: D. C. Heath and Co., 1979.
- Thomas, W. The Thomas Self-Concept Values Test. Rosemont, Illinois: Combined Motivation Education Systems, 1967.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstracts of the United States (Vol. 100). Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1979.
- Wallerstein, J., & Kelly, J. The effects of parental divorce: The adolescent experience. In E. Anthony & C. Koupernik (Eds.), The child in his family: Children at psychiatric risk. New York: Wiley, 1974.

- Wallerstein, J., & Kelly, J. The effects of parental divorce: Experiences of the preschool child. Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry, 1975, 14, 600-616.
- Wallerstein, J., & Kelly, J. The effects of parental divorce: Experiences of the child in later latency. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1976, 46, 256-269.
- Weiss, R. Marital separation. New York: Basic Books, 1975.
- Weissman, M., & Paykel, E. Moving and suppression in women. Society, 1972, 9, 24-28.
- Westman, J. Effect of divorce on a child's personality development. Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality, 1972, 6, 38-55.
- Westman, J., Cline, D., Swift, W., & Kramer, D. The role of child psychiatry in divorce. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1970, 23, 416-420.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

PROJECT DESCRIPTION FOR MOTHERS FROM PAIS SAMPLE

Like yourself, I have a special interest in children. I work at one of the University of Tennessee Child Development Laboratories with children 2-5. I have also worked with older children and find it a very challenging experience. Because of my special interest in children, I am doing a follow-up study to the research project which you participated in this year. I feel it would be very valuable to have information from your child (children) in order to learn more about the dynamics of divorce.

Depending on the age of your child (children), they will be asked to complete two tests (4-9 years of age) or three tests (10-21 years of age). These tests are fun for children to do and appropriate for different ages. All testing will be done in your home at a time convenient to you and your child (children). The testing will take between one and two hours with less time needed for the younger children and will be done in one session with a short break between the tests. I, or a research worker who has been trained to give the tests, will do all the testing.

Results for the entire group of children will be sent to you at the completion of the project. No specific information about your child's (children's) results will be released to you, your child (children) or anyone else. Confidentiality will be maintained by using code numbers instead of names on the tests your child (children) complete.

Enclosed is a self-addressed postcard. Please take the time to think about this project and return the card indicating whether or not you wish to participate. If after one to two weeks Jeanne Pais or Priscilla White has not received your card, they will be calling you to see if you wish to participate and if you have any questions.

I hope that you will be able to participate in my study. I know that you have already devoted time to another study and I hope that you found it worthwhile and would also like for your children to participate. Thank you for your time in reviewing this letter.

Sincerely,

Korrel Kanoy

PROJECT DESCRIPTION FOR ADDITIONAL DIVORCED MOTHERS

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
KNOXVILLE 37916
COLLEGE OF HOME ECONOMICS

January 2, 1979

DEPARTMENT OF CHILD
AND FAMILY STUDIES

AREA 615
TELEPHONE 974-5316

Dear Ms.

We have been conducting a research project with families who have experienced divorce. We are interested in the divorce experience and its impact both on children and adults. We have had experience working directly with young children and families and are concerned about finding information to improve the well-being of families in a variety of situations.

Your name was selected by a random procedure from the records of divorce that have been granted in Knox County. We would appreciate your participation in our study.

The purpose of this study is to find out more about the post-divorce experience of both children and parents. Very little time will be required of you or your child(ren). Results of the study will be sent to you at the completion of the study if you wish.

To find out more about the post-divorce experience, we will be using tests for children and questionnaires for adults. The tests we will use are fun for children and appropriate for different ages. They are standardized tests and do not include any mention of divorce. All testing will be done in your home at a time convenient to you and your child(ren). All testing will be done by a trained research worker.

At the time we are testing your child(ren), we would like for you to fill out a series of standardized questionnaires. All information you and your child(ren) provide will be kept entirely confidential. All questionnaires and tests will be identified only by a number and no individual data will be reported.

As our study will include perceptions of the post-divorce experience both by parents and children, we may be contacting your ex-spouse. However, all contacts will be independent of you and your child(ren), and no information or results will be shared.

Please take time to think about this project and return the enclosed postcard indicating whether or not you would like more information. We will call you in the near future if you indicate your willingness to receive more information. Your time, your insights, and your perceptions will be a valuable contribution, and we appreciate your assistance.

Sincerely,

Jo Lynn Cunningham, Ph.D.
Associate Professor

Korrel Kanoy
Graduate Student

Priscilla White, Ph.D.
Associate Professor

Suzanne James
Graduate Student

Enc.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION FOR INTACT-FAMILY MOTHERS

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
KNOXVILLE 37916
COLLEGE OF HOME ECONOMICS

DEPARTMENT OF CHILD
AND FAMILY STUDIES

AREA 615
TELEPHONE 974-5316

We have been conducting a research project focused on parent-child relationships in families with different structures. We have had experience working directly with young children and families and are concerned about finding information to improve the well-being of families in a variety of situations.

Your name was suggested to us by someone that has participated in our project. We would appreciate your participation in our study. Very little time will be required of you or your children. Results of the study will be sent to you at the completion of the study if you wish.

To find out more about family relationships, we will be using questionnaires for your child(ren) and yourselves. The instruments we will use for children are fun and appropriate for different ages. They are standardized questionnaires and have been used with children in a variety of situations. At the time we are testing your child(ren), we would like for you to fill out a series of standardized questionnaires. All information you and your child(ren) provide will be kept confidential. All questionnaires will be identified only by a number, and no individual data will be reported. All testing will be done in your home at a time convenient to you and your child(ren). All testing will be done by a trained research assistant.

Please take time to think about this project. We will call you in the near future to give you further information about the project and to discuss your willingness to participate. Your time, your insights, and your perceptions will be a valuable contribution, and we appreciate your assistance.

Sincerely,

Jo Lynn Cunningham
Associate Professor

Korrel Kanoy
Graduate Student

Priscilla White
Associate Professor

Suzanne James
Graduate Student

APPENDIX B

Table A-1

Frequency Counts for Descriptive Information

Variable and Subcategories	Frequency	
	Divorced	Intact
Child's Age		
Preschool and early primary school	28	36
Elementary school	23	29
Junior high school	10	13
High school	8	11
Adult	5	0
Child's Gender		
Male	36	41
Female	38	38
Number of families with children not living in the home	3	2
Educational level		
Less than grade 8	1	0
Completed grade 8	0	0
Attended high school	2	1
Graduated from high school	12	2
Attended college	8	12
Graduated college or received RN degree	10	9
Attended graduate school	4	6
Received graduate degree	8	14
Received marital counseling		
Yes	3	7
No	42	37
Exspouse living in Knox County		
Yes	32	-
No	13	-
Moved within last two years		
Yes	19	8
No	26	36

Table A-2
N, Mean, and Standard Deviation for
Descriptive Information

Variables	Divorced			Intact		
	<u>N</u>	<u>$\bar{X}$</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>$\bar{X}$</u>	<u>SD</u>
Age	45	33.07	6.82	44	34.36	4.54
Months divorced	45	10.82	6.31	-	-	-
Months since low point	-	-	-	44	38.01	60.36
Hours worked per week	45	37.74	13.56	44	29.45	15.04
Present income	45	14,612 ^a	25,106	42	29,333	13,375
Past income	45	22,436 ^a	10,674	41	23,114	8,740
Number of miles exspouse lives from Knox County	13	1089	2706	-	-	-

^aThe income figures obtained for present income in 1978 and past income in 1977 for divorced families were adjusted for inflation so that they would be comparable to income figures obtained from intact families for present income in 1979 and past income in 1978. Swagler (1979) provided a formula for this transformation.

APPENDIX C

BLAIR'S DIVORCÉES ADJUSTMENT INSTRUMENT

(MODIFIED FORM)

Directions: The purpose of this questionnaire is to describe your feelings and behaviors since divorce. Please read each statement carefully and decide how accurately it describes you. Mark your answer on the enclosed answer sheet. Think carefully about each item, but do not dwell on them. There are no right or wrong answers. Some items will contain the words "from what they generally had been in the past". This phrase refers to your usual patterns of behaviors in your adult life. Where the words "when your divorce became final" appear, think about the period of time immediately following your divorce.

1. When your divorce became final, your personal grooming became less important from what it generally had been in the past.
2. Your personal grooming habits are less important now from what they generally had been in the past.
3. When your divorce became final, you thought about giving up living.
4. You want to give up living now.
5. When your divorce became final, you dreaded being at home because of circumstances or memories created by the divorce.
6. You now dread being at home because of circumstances or memories caused by divorce.
7. When your divorce became final, and you started dating again, you felt as if the person considered you good company on a date. (If you did not date, mark NA.)
8. When you date now you feel as if the person considers you good company on a date. (If you do not date, mark NA.)
9. When your divorce became final, and you started dating, you compared your dates with your ex-spouse. (If you did not date, mark NA.)
10. When you date now, you compare your dates with your ex-spouse. (If you do not date, mark NA.)
11. When your divorce became final, you felt that the divorce made you view life in a more negative way than you generally had in the past.
12. You now feel that the divorce has made you view life in a more negative way than you generally had in the past.
13. When your divorce became final, you felt as if you were a happier person than you generally had been in the past.
14. You now feel as if you are a happier person since the divorce.
15. When your divorce became final, you felt like a failure in your ability to have satisfying interpersonal relationships more than you generally had in the past.
16. You now feel like a failure in your ability to have satisfying interpersonal relationships more than you generally had in the past.

17. When your divorce became final you felt as if you would never want to marry again.
18. You now feel as if you would never want to marry again.
19. When your divorce became final, it was difficult for you to tell others that you were divorced.
20. It is now difficult for you to tell others that you are divorced.
21. When your divorce became final, your eating habits changed from what they generally had been in the past (e.g., not eating on a regular basis, doing without food, etc.).
22. When your divorce became final, you were reluctant to go to public functions alone.
23. You now are reluctant to go to public functions alone.
24. When your divorce became final, you would have taken your ex-spouse back into your life.
25. You would take your ex-spouse back into your life now.
26. When your divorce became final, you grieved for your ex-spouse.
27. You are grieving for your ex-spouse at the present time.
28. When your divorce became final, and you started dating again, you felt as if you did not know what to talk about on a date. (If you did not date, mark NA.)
29. When you date now, you feel as if you do not know what to talk about on the date. (If you do not date, mark NA.)
30. When your divorce became final, you wanted more male companionship.
31. You would like more male companionship now.
32. When your divorce became final, you felt as if your general attitude toward life was reasonable in view of the circumstances.
33. You now feel as if your general attitude toward life is reasonable in view of the circumstances.
34. When your divorce became final, you dreaded spending an evening alone more than you generally had in the past.
35. You now dread spending an evening alone more than you generally had in the past.
36. When your divorce became final, you felt unlovable more than you generally had in the past.
37. You feel unlovable now more than you generally have in the past.

38. When your divorce became final you thought being single for the rest of your life would be undesirable.
39. You now feel that being single for the rest of your life would be undesirable.
40. When your divorce became final, it bothered you to be around people you and your ex-spouse both knew well.
41. It bothers you now to be around people you and your ex-spouse both knew well.
42. When your divorce became final, you made new friends.
43. You now make new friends.
44. When your divorce became final, you found your job to be less bearable than it generally had been in the past. (If you were unemployed, mark NA.)
45. You find that your job (employment) is less bearable now than it generally had been in the past. (If you are unemployed, mark NA.)
46. When your divorce became final, you began to smoke more than you generally had in the past. (If you did not smoke, mark NA.)
47. You smoke more now than you generally did in the past. (If you do not smoke, mark NA.)
48. When your divorce became final, and you started dating again, you felt self-conscious on a date. (If you did not date, mark NA.)
49. You now feel self-conscious on a date. (If you do not date, mark NA.)
50. When your divorce became final, you found that your work or leisure activity outside the home helped you in reorganizing a new life.
51. You now find that your work or leisure activity outside the home helps you in reorganizing a new life.
52. When your divorce became final, it was hard for you to realize that the past was gone and you could not live it any more.
53. It is hard for you to realize now that the past is gone and you cannot live it any more.
54. When your divorce became final, you dreaded eating alone more than you generally had in the past.
55. You now dread eating alone more than you generally had in the past.
56. When your divorce became final, you felt that your life was more chaotic and lacked routine, more than you generally had in the past.
57. You now feel that your life is chaotic and lacks routine more than it generally had in the past.

58. When your divorce became final, you blamed your ex-spouse for causing the divorce.
59. You now blame your ex-spouse for causing the divorce.
60. When your divorce became final, you had frustrated feelings about your sexual life.
61. You now have frustrated feelings about your sexual life.
62. When your divorce became final, you had more difficulty in remembering things than you generally had in the past.
63. You now have more difficulty remembering things than you generally had in the past.
64. When your divorce became final, you began to drink more than you generally did in the past. (If you did not drink, mark NA.)
65. You drink more now than you generally did in the past. (If you do not drink, mark NA.)
66. When your divorce became final, and you started dating again, it was difficult for you to have positive feelings towards your date. (If you did not date, mark NA.)
67. When you date now, it is difficult for you to have positive feelings towards your date. (If you do not date, mark NA.)
68. When your divorce became final, you became more interested in church, civic, or social activities than you generally had been in the past.
69. You are more interested in church, civic, or social activities now than you generally had been in the past.
70. When your divorce became final, it was hard to accept your present state of affairs without resentment.
71. It is now hard to accept your present state of affairs without resentment.
72. When your divorce became final, planning social activities over the week-ends caused feelings of anxiety more than they generally had in the past.
73. Planning social activities for week-ends causes you feelings of anxiety now more than they had in the past.
74. When your divorce became final, doing things your ex-spouse had been responsible for doing seemed overwhelming.
75. Doing things your ex-spouse had been responsible for doing now seems overwhelming.
76. When your divorce became final, you felt as if you did not wish to be categorized as a "divorcee".

77. You now feel as if you do not wish to be categorized as a "divorcée".
78. When your divorce became final, you felt you were unable to make a satisfactory sexual adjustment.
79. You now feel that you do not have a satisfactory sexual adjustment.
80. When your divorce became final, you had more difficulty sleeping than you generally had in the past.
81. You now have more difficulty sleeping than you generally had in the past.
82. When your divorce became final, and you started dating again, you felt as if you were good company on a date. (If you did not date, mark NA.)
83. When you date now you feel as if you are good company on a date. (If you do not date, mark NA.)
84. When your divorce became final, you had more difficulty in handling the situation if your date became too bold than you did before you married. (If you did not date, mark NA.)
85. You have more difficulty in handling the situation now if your date becomes too bold than you did before you married. (If you do not date, mark NA.)
86. When your divorce became final, you felt as if the divorce made it possible for you to become a stronger person than you had generally been in the past.
87. You now feel that the divorce made it possible for you to become a stronger person than you generally had been in the past.
88. When your divorce became final, it was a necessity to "sound off" to family, friends, or others.
89. It is now necessary for you to "sound off" to family, friends, or others.
90. When your divorce became final, you blamed yourself for the divorce.
91. You now blame yourself for the divorce.
92. When your divorce became final, you felt more self-confident than you generally had in the past.
93. You now feel more self-confident than you generally have in the past.

ANSWER SHEET

(PAGE 1)

Answer Sheet: Decide how true each statement on the questionnaire is for you. Circle your answer in the appropriate column provided below. Only circle one answer for each question.

	always or almost always true	usually true	sometimes true	sometimes not true	usually not true	always or almost always not true	not applicable
1.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
2.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
3.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
4.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
5.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
6.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
7.	X	X	X	X	X	X	NA
8.	X	X	X	X	X	X	NA
9.	X	X	X	X	X	X	NA
10.	X	X	X	X	X	X	NA
11.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
12.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
13.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
14.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
15.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
16.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
17.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
18.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
19.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
20.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
21.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
22.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
23.	X	X	X	X	X	X	

INDEX OF ADJUSTMENT

Directions: All of us experience crises in our lives. Some of these crises may be related to marriage and the "ups" and "downs" of such a relationship. Please recall the most recent time when you were concerned about your marriage and the future of this relationship. Please read each statement carefully and decide how accurately it describes you. Mark your answer on the enclosed answer sheet. Think carefully about each item, but do not dwell on any of them. There are no right or wrong answers. Some items contain the words "from what they generally had been in the past." This phrase refers to your usual patterns of behaviors in your adult life. Where the words "when you were experiencing a low point" appear, think about the most recent time you were concerned about your marital relationship.

1. When you experienced a low point, your personal grooming became less important than what it generally had been in the past.
2. Your personal grooming habits are less important now than what they generally had been in the past.
3. When you experienced a low point, you thought about giving up living.
4. You want to give up living now.
5. When you experienced a low point, you dreaded being at home because of circumstances or memories associated with marriage.
6. You now dread being at home because of circumstances or memories associated with the marriage.
7. When you experienced a low point, you felt that you viewed life in a more negative way than you generally had in the past.
8. You now feel that the low point has made you view life in a more negative way than you generally had in the past.
9. When you experienced a low point, you felt as if you were a happier person than you generally had been in the past.
10. You now feel as if you are a happier person since the low point.
11. When you experienced a low point, you felt like a failure in your ability to have satisfying interpersonal relationships more than you generally had in the past.
12. You now feel like a failure in your ability to have satisfying interpersonal relationships more than you generally had in the past.
13. When you experienced a low point, you thought about the possibility of divorce.
14. You now think about the possibility of divorce.
15. When you experienced a low point, it was difficult for you to tell others that you were experiencing marital conflict.

-2-

16. It is now difficult for you to tell others when you are experiencing marital conflict.
17. When you experienced a low point, your eating habits changed from what they generally had been in the past (e.g., not eating on a regular basis, doing without food).
18. Your eating habits now are different than what they had been in the past.
19. When you experienced a low point, you were reluctant to go to public functions alone.
20. You now are reluctant to go to public functions alone.
21. When you experienced a low point, you still wanted to maintain the marriage relationship.
22. You want to maintain your marriage relationship now.
23. When you experienced a low point, you were depressed about your relationship.
24. You are depressed about your relationship now.
25. When you experienced a low point, you wanted more companionship with other males.
26. You would like more companionship with other males now.
27. When you experienced a low point, you felt as if your general attitude toward life was reasonable in view of the circumstances.
28. You now feel as if your general attitude toward life is reasonable in view of the circumstances.
29. When you experienced a low point, you dreaded spending an evening alone more than you generally had in the past.
30. You now dread spending an evening alone more than you generally did in the past.
31. When you experienced a low point, you felt unlovable more than you generally had in the past.
32. You feel unlovable now more than you generally did in the past.
33. When you experienced a low point, you thought being single would be desirable.
34. You now think that being single would be desirable.
35. When you experienced a low point, it bothered you to be around people you and your spouse both knew well.

-3-

36. It bothers you now to be around people you and your spouse both know well.
37. When you experienced a low point, you made new friends.
38. You now make new friends.
39. When you experienced a low point, you found your job to be less bearable than it generally had been in the past. (If you were unemployed, mark NA.)
40. You find that your job (employment) is less bearable now than it generally had been in the past. (If you are unemployed, mark NA.)
41. When you experienced a low point, you began to smoke more than you generally had in the past. (If you did not smoke, mark NA.)
42. You smoke more now than you generally did in the past. (If you do not smoke, mark NA.)
43. When you experienced a low point, you felt self-conscious out in public with your spouse.
44. You now feel self-conscious out in public with your spouse.
45. When you experienced a low point, you found that your work or leisure activity outside the home helped you in organizing your life.
46. You now find that your work or leisure activity outside the home helps you in organizing your life.
47. When you experienced a low point, it was hard for you to realize that the past was gone and you could not live it any more.
48. It is hard for you to realize now that the past is gone and you cannot live it any more.
49. When you experienced a low point, you dreaded eating with your spouse more than you generally had in the past.
50. You now dread eating with your spouse more than you generally did in the past.
51. When you experienced a low point, you felt that your life was more chaotic and lacked routine more than you generally had in the past.
52. You now feel that your life is chaotic and lacks routine more than it generally did in the past.
53. When you experienced a low point, you blamed your spouse for causing marital conflict.
54. You now blame your spouse for causing marital conflict.

-4-

55. When you experienced a low point, you had frustrated feelings about your sexual life.
56. You now have frustrated feelings about your sexual life.
57. When you experienced a low point, you had more difficulty in remembering things than you generally had in the past.
58. You now have more difficulty remembering things than you generally had in the past.
59. When you experienced a low point, you began to drink more than you generally did in the past. (If you did not drink, mark NA.)
60. You drink more now than you generally did in the past. (If you do not drink, mark NA.)
61. When you experienced a low point, you became more interested in church, civic, or social activities than you generally had been in the past.
62. You are more interested in church, civic, or social activities now than you generally had been in the past.
63. When you experienced a low point, it was hard to accept your present state of affairs without resentment.
64. It is now hard to accept your present state of affairs without resentment.
65. When you experienced a low point, planning social activities over the week-ends caused feelings of anxiety more than it generally had in the past.
66. Planning social activities for week-ends causes you feelings of anxiety now more than it generally did in the past.
67. When you experienced a low point, dividing family responsibilities seemed overwhelming.
68. Dividing family responsibilities now seems overwhelming.
69. When you experienced a low point, you felt as if you did not want other people to categorize your marriage as unhappy.
70. You now feel as if you do not wish people to categorize your marriage as unhappy.
71. When you experienced a low point, you felt you were unable to achieve a satisfactory sexual adjustment.
72. You now feel that you do not have a satisfactory sexual adjustment.

-5-

73. When you experienced a low point, you had more difficulty sleeping than you generally had in the past.
74. You now have more difficulty sleeping than you generally had in the past.
75. When you experienced a low point, you had more difficulty in handling sexual initiations by your spouse than you generally had in the past.
76. You have more difficulty now in handling sexual initiations by your spouse than you generally had in the past.
77. When you experienced a low point, you felt as if the conflict made it possible for you to become a stronger person than you generally had been in the past.
78. You now feel that the conflict made it possible for you to become a stronger person than you generally had been in the past.
79. When you experienced a low point, it was a necessity to "sound off" to family, friends, or others.
80. It is now necessary for you to "sound off" to family, friends, or others.
81. When you experienced a low point, you blamed yourself for the conflict.
82. You now blame yourself for the conflict.
83. When you experienced a low point, you felt more self-confident than you generally had in the past.
84. You now feel more self-confident than you generally did in the past.

ANSWER SHEET

(PAGE 1)

Answer Sheet: Decide how true each statement on the questionnaire is for you. Circle your answer in the appropriate column provided below. Only circle one answer for each question.

	always or almost <u>always true</u>	usually true	sometimes true	sometimes not true	usually not true	always or almost always <u>not true</u>	not applicable
1.	x	x	x	x	x	x	
2.	x	x	x	x	x	x	
3.	x	x	x	x	x	x	
4.	x	x	x	x	x	x	
5.	x	x	x	x	x	x	
6.	x	x	x	x	x	x	
7.	x	x	x	x	x	x	
8.	x	x	x	x	x	x	
9.	x	x	x	x	x	x	
10.	x	x	x	x	x	x	
11.	x	x	x	x	x	x	
12.	x	x	x	x	x	x	
13.	x	x	x	x	x	x	
14.	x	x	x	x	x	x	
15.	x	x	x	x	x	x	
16.	x	x	x	x	x	x	
17.	x	x	x	x	x	x	
18.	x	x	x	x	x	x	
19.	x	x	x	x	x	x	
20.	x	x	x	x	x	x	
21.	x	x	x	x	x	x	
22.	x	x	x	x	x	x	
23.	x	x	x	x	x	x	

FAMILY RELATIONS INVENTORY

DIRECTIONS: The purpose of this questionnaire is to find out about your life style and family relationships. Please read each question carefully and print your answers in the blank provided. For questions where no blank is provided circle your answers on the questionnaire.

1. How old are you? _____ yrs.
2. How old were you when you married? _____ yrs.
3. How old were you when your divorce was final? _____ yrs.
4. How long have you been divorced? _____ months.
5. How many months were there between the time you and your ex-spouse separated and the date your divorce was granted? _____ months.
6. How many hours per week do you work outside the home? _____ hrs.
7. How many hours per week did you work outside the home prior to your divorce? _____ hrs.
(Write "0" in the blank if you do not work outside the home.)
8. What is your highest level of education?
 1. 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 RN degree
 7. attended graduate school
 8. received graduate degree (Masters, Doctorate, J.D., M.D., etc.)
9. If you are in school now what degree are you working on?
 1. not in school now
 2. high school diploma or G.E.D.
 3. B.A. or B.S.
 4. M.A., M.S., or M.B.A.
 5. Ed.S.
 6. J.D. or M.D.
 7. Ph.D. or Ed.D.
 8. other, please describe _____
10. Please fill in the amount of money you receive yearly from the following sources (for child support and alimony fill in the amount you actually receive from your ex-spouse rather than what you were awarded in your divorce settlement). If you are not sure of the exact amount give your best estimate.
 1. income from employment _____ per year.
 2. income from child support _____ per year.
 3. income from alimony _____ per year.
 4. income from child's earnings _____ per year.
 5. income from relatives _____ per year.
 6. other income _____ per year.

If you have marked "other income" please describe what these sources are:

11. What is the amount of child support you were awarded by the court?
\$ _____ per _____.
12. What was your yearly family income prior to your divorce? \$ _____
Fill in the amount you received yearly from the following sources. If you are not sure of the exact amount give your best estimate.
1. husband's income _____ per year.
 2. wife's income _____ per year.
 3. other income _____ per year.
- If you marked "other income" please describe what these sources were:
_____.

13. For each child currently living in your home circle their sex and write in their age in the chart provided below:

child	sex	age
1.	M F	
2.	M F	
3.	M F	
4.	M F	
5.	M F	
6.	M F	

14. For each child not currently living in your home circle their sex and write in their age in the chart provided below. Also circle "yes" if they have any financial responsibility towards their support. If they support themselves, or someone else supports them, circle "no". Write "none" if you have no children that are not currently living in your home.

child	sex	age	you contribute to their support	
1.	M F		YES	NO
2.	M F		YES	NO
3.	M F		YES	NO
4.	M F		YES	NO
5.	M F		YES	NO

15. What religion are you?
1. Protestant
 2. Catholic
 3. Jewish
 4. none
 5. other, please describe _____.
16. What is your race?
1. Caucasian
 2. Negroid
 3. Mongoloid

17. In your opinion, how involved were you in the decision to separate from your spouse?
 1. totally involved
 2. very involved
 3. partly involved
 4. only slightly involved
 5. not at all involved
18. In your opinion, how involved were you in the decision to divorce?
 1. totally involved
 2. very involved
 3. partly involved
 4. only slightly involved
 5. not at all involved
19. In your opinion, how involved were you in the decision to seek legal counsel?
 1. totally involved
 2. very involved
 3. partly involved
 4. only slightly involved
 5. not at all involved
20. In your opinion, how involved were you in the decision to seek psychological or marital counseling prior to your divorce?
 1. we did not seek any counseling
 2. totally involved
 3. very involved
 4. partly involved
 5. only slightly involved
 6. not at all involved
21. In your opinion, how involved were you in the custody decision?
 1. totally involved
 2. very involved
 3. partly involved
 4. only slightly involved
 5. not at all involved
22. In your opinion, how involved were you in decisions regarding the place where you lived at the time of your separation? (Decisions such as who would stay and who would leave, who would keep the house or apartment, would your house be sold, etc.)
 1. totally involved
 2. very involved
 3. partly involved
 4. only slightly involved
 5. not at all involved
23. In your opinion, how involved were you in decisions regarding the division of your joint property?
 1. totally involved
 2. very involved
 3. partly involved
 4. only slightly involved
 5. not at all involved

24. In your opinion, how involved was your spouse in the decision to separate from you?
 1. totally involved
 2. very involved
 3. partly involved
 4. only slightly involved
 5. not at all involved
25. In your opinion, how involved was your spouse in the decision to divorce?
 1. totally involved
 2. very involved
 3. partly involved
 4. only slightly involved
 5. not at all involved
26. In your opinion, how involved was your spouse in the decision to seek legal counsel?
 1. totally involved
 2. very involved
 3. partly involved
 4. only slightly involved
 5. not at all involved
27. In your opinion, how involved was your spouse in the decision to seek psychological or marital counseling prior to your divorce?
 1. we did not seek any counseling
 2. totally involved
 3. very involved
 4. partly involved
 5. only slightly involved
 6. not at all involved
28. In your opinion, how involved was your spouse in the custody decision?
 1. totally involved
 2. very involved
 3. partly involved
 4. only slightly involved
 5. not at all involved
29. In your opinion, how involved was your spouse in decisions regarding the place where you lived at the time of your separation? (Decisions such as who would stay and who would leave, who would keep the house or apartment, would your house be sold, etc.)
 1. totally involved
 2. very involved
 3. partly involved
 4. only slightly involved
 5. not at all involved
30. In your opinion, how involved was your spouse in decisions regarding the division of your joint property?
 1. totally involved
 2. very involved
 3. partly involved
 4. only slightly involved
 5. not at all involved

31. Does your ex-spouse live in Knox County?
1. yes
 2. no
- If no, estimate the number of miles he lives from your home. _____ miles.

FOR THE QUESTIONS THAT FOLLOW, CONSIDER ONLY YOUR CHILDREN UNDER 18 WHO CURRENTLY LIVE WITH YOU. IT MAY BE DIFFICULT TO HAVE SPECIFIC INFORMATION ABOUT SOME OF THESE QUESTIONS. IN THESE CASES CONSIDER YOUR GENERAL IMPRESSIONS.

32. How frequently does the non-custodial parent see his child or children?
1. not at all
 2. a few times a year
 3. at least once a month
 4. at least twice a month
 5. at least once a week
 6. at least twice a week
 7. more than twice a week
33. How often does (do) your child (children) stay over night at the non-custodial parent's home?
1. not at all
 2. a few times per year
 3. at least once a month
 4. at least twice a month
 5. at least once a week
 6. at least twice a week
 7. more than twice a week
34. How often does (do) you child (children) spend extended periods of time (more than two days at a time) with the non-custodial parent? _____ weeks per year.
35. How often does the non-custodial parent cancel or miss prearranged visits with your child or children?
1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. always or almost always
 6. there are no prearranged visits
36. Considering the age and/or abilities of your child, how much does the non-custodial parent allow the child or children to participate in decisions regarding the frequency or time of visitation?
1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. always or almost always
 6. child is too young to participate
37. How often does the non-custodial parent consider the interests of your child or children in planning activities during his visitation?
1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. always or almost always

38. How often does the non-custodial parent initiate spontaneous interaction with your child or children? (phone calls, visits in addition to the regularly scheduled visitation, etc.)
1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. very frequently
39. How often does (do) your child (children) see relatives of the non-custodial parent?
1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. very frequently
40. How often does the non-custodial parent fail to make a child support payment?
1. always or almost always
 2. frequently
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. very frequently
41. How often does the non-custodial parent take an interest in your child's or children's educational achievements? (visiting the school, parent-teacher conferences, participation in P.T.A., viewing report cards, etc.)
1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. always or almost always
42. How often does the non-custodial parent take an interest in your child's or children's extra-curricular activities (attends recitals or plays in which your child performs, goes to scout meetings, attends sports activities in which your child is involved, attends special functions to which parents are invited, etc.)
1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. always or almost always
43. How often does the non-custodial parent involve your child or children in his achievements or special celebrations? (his birthday, special awards or honors he might receive, etc.)
1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. always or almost always
44. How often does the non-custodial parent involve your child or children in his significant relationships? (his friends, dates, second wife, etc.)
1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. always or almost always

45. How do you think the non-custodial parent feels about the quality of his interaction with your child or children?
1. always or almost always unsatisfied
 2. usually unsatisfied
 3. sometimes unsatisfied
 4. sometimes satisfied
 5. usually satisfied
 6. always or almost always satisfied
46. In your opinion, how important is (are) your child (children) to the non-custodial parent?
1. very unimportant
 2. unimportant
 3. important
 4. very important
47. How do you feel about the quantity of interaction between you and your ex-spouse?
1. always or almost always unsatisfied
 2. usually unsatisfied
 3. sometimes unsatisfied
 4. sometimes satisfied
 5. usually satisfied
 6. always or almost always satisfied
48. How do you feel about the quantity of interaction between the non-custodial parent and your child or children?
1. always or almost always unsatisfied
 2. usually unsatisfied
 3. sometimes unsatisfied
 4. sometimes satisfied
 5. usually satisfied
 6. always or almost always satisfied
49. In your opinion, how often does conflict occur between the non-custodial parent and your child or children?
1. very frequently
 2. frequently
 3. sometimes
 4. seldom
 5. never or almost never
50. How do you feel about the quality of interaction between you and your ex-spouse?
1. always or almost always unsatisfied
 2. usually unsatisfied
 3. sometimes unsatisfied
 4. sometimes satisfied
 5. usually satisfied
 6. always or almost always satisfied
51. In your opinion, how often is there conflict between you and your ex-spouse?
1. very frequently
 2. frequently
 3. sometimes
 4. seldom
 5. never or almost never

52. How do you feel about the quantity of interaction between you and your child or children?
1. always or almost always unsatisfied
 2. usually unsatisfied
 3. sometimes unsatisfied
 4. sometimes satisfied
 5. usually satisfied
 6. always or almost always satisfied
53. How do you think your child or children feel(s) about the quantity of interaction between them and yourself?
1. always or almost always unsatisfied
 2. usually unsatisfied
 3. sometimes unsatisfied
 4. sometimes satisfied
 5. usually satisfied
 6. always or almost always satisfied
54. In your opinion, how often is there conflict between you and your child or children?
1. very frequently
 2. frequently
 3. sometimes
 4. seldom
 5. never or almost never
55. How do you think that your child or children currently feel(s) about your divorce?
1. very unaccepting
 2. unaccepting
 3. accepting
 4. very accepting
56. How do you think your child or children feel(s) about the quantity of interaction between them and the non-custodial parent?
1. always or almost always unsatisfied
 2. usually unsatisfied
 3. unsatisfied
 4. satisfied
 5. usually satisfied
 6. always or almost always satisfied
57. How do you think your child or children feel(s) about the quality of interaction between them and the non-custodial parent?
1. always or almost always unsatisfied
 2. usually unsatisfied
 3. sometimes unsatisfied
 4. sometimes satisfied
 5. usually satisfied
 6. always or almost always satisfied
58. How do you think your ex-spouse feels about the quantity of interaction between him and yourself?
1. always or almost always unsatisfied
 2. usually unsatisfied
 3. sometimes unsatisfied
 4. sometimes satisfied
 5. usually satisfied
 6. always or almost always satisfied

59. How do you think your ex-spouse feels about the quality of interaction between him and yourself?
1. always or almost always unsatisfied
 2. usually unsatisfied
 3. sometimes unsatisfied
 4. sometimes satisfied
 5. usually satisfied
 6. always or almost always satisfied
60. How do you feel about the quality of interaction between you and your child or children?
1. always or almost always unsatisfied
 2. usually unsatisfied
 3. sometimes unsatisfied
 4. sometimes satisfied
 5. usually satisfied
 6. always or almost always satisfied
61. Do you feel that your child or children currently has (have) any problems that are directly related to your divorce?
1. many problems
 2. some problems
 3. a few problems
 4. no problems
62. How do you think the non-custodial parent feels about the quantity of interaction between him and your child or children?
1. always or almost always unsatisfied
 2. usually unsatisfied
 3. sometimes unsatisfied
 4. sometimes satisfied
 5. usually satisfied
 6. always or almost always satisfied
63. How do you feel about the quality of interaction between the non-custodial parent and your child or children?
1. always or almost always unsatisfied
 2. usually unsatisfied
 3. sometimes unsatisfied
 4. sometimes satisfied
 5. usually satisfied
 6. always or almost always satisfied
64. How do you think your child or children feel (s) about the quality of interaction between you and them?
1. always or almost always unsatisfied
 2. usually unsatisfied
 3. sometimes unsatisfied
 4. sometimes satisfied
 5. usually satisfied
 6. always or almost always satisfied

65. For each of the categories of child care listed below, please mark your use of this service, how difficult it has been to obtain this service, and how satisfied you are with the service.

	<u>Use</u>		<u>Amount of Difficulty</u>					<u>Amount of Satisfaction</u>				
	Yes	No	Not at all	A little	Some-what	Very	Ex-tremely	Not at all	A little	Some-what	Very	Totally
Day care												
After-school care												
Nursery school												
Day-care home												
Relatives in your own home												
Non-relatives in your own home												
Relatives in their home												
Other (Please specify): _____												

66. What financial arrangements have been made for child-care services?

1. You provide total support.
2. Support has been provided by ex-spouse through child-support payments.
3. You and your ex-spouse share the costs of child care.
4. Title XX or other government funds have been provided.
5. Other, please specify: _____.

67. How difficult has it been for you financially to provide child-care services for your child?

1. Not at all difficult
2. A little difficult
3. Somewhat difficult
4. Very difficult
5. Extremely difficult

68. How frequently do you spend time alone with your child or children?
1. not at all
 2. a few times a year
 3. at least once a month
 4. at least twice a month
 5. at least once a week
 6. at least twice a week
 7. more than twice a week
69. How often does (do) your child (children) stay over night alone with you?
1. not at all
 2. a few times per year
 3. at least once a month
 4. at least twice a month
 5. at least once a week
 6. at least twice a week
 7. more than twice a week
70. How often does (do) your child (children) spend extended periods of time (more than two days at a time) alone with you? _____ weeks per year.
71. How often do you cancel or miss prearranged activities with your child or children?
1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. always or almost always
 6. there are no prearranged visits
72. Considering the age and/or abilities of your child, how much do you allow the child or children to participate in decisions regarding the frequency or amount of time spent together?
1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. always or almost always
 6. child is too young to participate
73. How often do you consider the interests of your child or children in planning activities during your leisure time with the child (children)?
1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. always or almost always
74. How often do you initiate spontaneous interaction with your child or children (phone calls, playing games, talking, etc.)?
1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. very frequently

75. How often does (do) your child (children) see your relatives?
1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. very frequently
76. Who makes decisions regarding spending family resources on the children?
1. always my ex-spouse
 2. mostly my ex-spouse
 3. about equal between me and my ex-spouse
 4. mostly me
 5. always me
77. How often do you take an interest in your child's or children's educational achievements (visiting the school, parent-teacher conferences, participation in P.T.A., viewing report cards, etc.)?
1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. always or almost always
78. How often do you take an interest in your child's or children's extra-curricular activities (attend recitals or plays in which your child performs, go to scout meetings, attend sports activities in which your child is involved, attend special functions to which parents are invited, etc.)?
1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. always or almost always
79. How often do you involve your child or children in your achievements or special celebrations (your birthday, special awards or honors you might receive, etc.)?
1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. always or almost always
80. How often do you involve your child or children in your significant relationships (friends, dates, business associates, etc.)?
1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. always or almost always
81. In your opinion, how important is (are) your child (children) to you?
1. very unimportant
 2. unimportant
 3. important
 4. very important

82. How do you think your ex-spouse feels about the quantity of interaction between you and your children?
1. always or almost always unsatisfied
 2. usually unsatisfied
 3. sometimes unsatisfied
 4. sometimes satisfied
 5. usually satisfied
 6. always or almost always satisfied
83. How do you think your ex-spouse feels about the quality of interaction between you and your children?
1. always or almost always unsatisfied
 2. usually unsatisfied
 3. sometimes unsatisfied
 4. sometimes satisfied
 5. usually satisfied
 6. always or almost always satisfied

FAMILY RELATIONS INVENTORY FOR INTACT FAMILIES

DIRECTIONS: The purpose of this questionnaire is to find out about your life style and family 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. How old were you when you married? _____ years
3. How long ago was the most recent time when you were concerned about your marriage and the future of this relationship? _____ years
(Write "0" in the blank if it has been less than a year.)
4. Have you ever been separated from your spouse because of marital conflict?
 1. yes
 2. no
5. If you have been separated because of marital conflict, how long ago was this? _____ years
(Write "0" in the blank if it has been less than a year. Write "X" in the blank if you never have been separated because of marital conflict.)
6. In your opinion, how involved were you in the decision to separate?
 1. totally involved
 2. very involved
 3. partly involved
 4. only slightly involved
 5. not at all involved
 6. not applicable (never separated)
7. In your opinion, how involved was your spouse in the decision to separate?
 1. totally involved
 2. very involved
 3. partly involved
 4. only slightly involved
 5. not at all involved
 6. not applicable (never separated)
8. Have you ever talked to an attorney about getting a divorce?
 1. yes
 2. no
9. If you have talked to an attorney about getting a divorce, how long ago was this? _____ years
(Write "0" in the blank if it has been less than a year. Write "X" in the blank if you never have talked to an attorney about getting a divorce.)

10. In your opinion, how involved were you in the decision to talk to an attorney about a divorce?
 1. totally involved
 2. very involved
 3. partly involved
 4. only slightly involved
 5. not at all involved
 6. not applicable (did not talk to an attorney)
11. To your knowledge, has your spouse ever talked to an attorney about getting a divorce?
 1. yes
 2. no
12. If your spouse has talked to an attorney about getting a divorce, how long ago was this? _____ years
(Write "0" in the blank if it has been less than a year. Write "x" in the blank if your spouse never has talked to an attorney about getting a divorce.)
13. In your opinion, how involved was your spouse in the decision to talk to an attorney about a divorce?
 1. totally involved
 2. very involved
 3. partly involved
 4. only slightly involved
 5. not at all involved
 6. not applicable (did not talk to an attorney)
14. Have you and/or your spouse ever received marital counseling?
 1. yes
 2. no
15. If you and/or your spouse ever have sought counseling, how long ago was this? _____ years
(Write "0" in the blank if it has been less than a year. Write "x" in the blank if you and/or your spouse never have sought marital counseling.)
16. In your opinion, how involved were you in the decision to seek marital counseling?
 1. totally involved
 2. very involved
 3. partly involved
 4. only slightly involved
 5. not at all involved
 6. not applicable (never have sought counseling)
17. In your opinion, how involved was your spouse in the decision to seek marital counseling?
 1. totally involved
 2. very involved
 3. partly involved
 4. only slightly involved
 5. not at all involved
 6. not applicable (never have sought counseling)

18. How many hours per week do you work outside the home? _____ hours
(Write "0" in the blank if you do not work outside the home.)
19. Since your marriage, has there been a time when you did not work outside the home?
1. yes
2. no
20. How long ago was this period of time when you did not work outside the home? _____ years
(Write "0" in the blank if you currently are not working outside the home. Write "X" in the blank if you always have worked outside the home.)
21. 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., M.D.)
22. If you are in school now, 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.A., 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 _____
23. Please fill in the amount of money you receive yearly from the following sources. If you are not sure of the exact amount, give your best estimate.
1. income from husband's employment _____ per year
2. income from wife's employment _____ per year
3. income from child's earnings _____ per year
4. income from relatives _____ per year
5. other income _____ per year
If you have marked "other income," please describe what the source(s) is (are): _____
24. For each child currently living in your home, circle the sex and write in the age in the chart provided below:

child	sex	age
1.	M F	
2.	M F	
3.	M F	
4.	M F	
5.	M F	
6.	M F	

25. For each child not currently living in your home, circle the sex and write in the age in the chart provided below. Also circle "yes" if you have any financial responsibility toward his/her support. If the children support themselves, or someone else supports them, circle "no". Write "none" if you have no children that are not currently living in your home.

child	sex	age	you contribute to their support	
1.	M F		Yes	No
2.	M F		Yes	No
3.	M F		Yes	No
4.	M F		Yes	No
5.	M F		Yes	No

26. What religion are you?

1. Protestant
2. Catholic
3. Jewish
4. none

5. other, please describe _____

27. What is your race?

1. Caucasian
2. Negroid
3. Mongoloid

FOR THE QUESTIONS THAT FOLLOW, CONSIDER ONLY YOUR CHILDREN UNDER 18 WHO CURRENTLY LIVE WITH YOU. IT MAY BE DIFFICULT TO HAVE SPECIFIC INFORMATION ABOUT SOME OF THESE QUESTIONS. IN THESE CASES CONSIDER YOUR GENERAL IMPRESSIONS.

28. How frequently does your spouse spend time alone with your child or children?

1. not at all
2. a few times a year
3. at least once a month
4. at least twice a month
5. at least once a week
6. at least twice a week
7. more than twice a week

29. How often does your spouse stay overnight alone with your child(ren)?

1. not at all
2. a few times a year
3. at least once a month
4. at least twice a month
5. at least once a week
6. at least twice a week
7. more than twice a week

30. How often do(es) your child(ren) spend extended periods of time (more than two days at a time) with your spouse without you present?
_____ weeks per year

31. How often does your spouse cancel or postpone prearranged activities with your child(ren)?
 1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. always or almost always
 6. there are no prearranged activities
32. Considering the age and/or abilities of your child(ren), how much does your spouse allow your child(ren) to participate in decisions regarding the frequency or amount of time spent together?
 1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. always or almost always
 6. child(ren) is (are) too young to participate
33. How often does your spouse consider the interests of your child(ren) in planning activities during his/her leisure time with the child(ren)?
 1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. always or almost always
34. How often does your spouse initiate spontaneous interaction with your child(ren) (e.g., phone calls, playing games, talking)?
 1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. very frequently
35. How often do(es) your child(ren) see relatives of your spouse?
 1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. very frequently
36. Who makes the arrangements for these visits?
 1. always my spouse
 2. mostly my spouse
 3. about equal between me and my spouse
 4. mostly me
 5. always me

37. How often does your spouse take an interest in your child(ren)'s educational achievements (e.g., visiting the school, parent-teacher conferences, participation in P.T.A., viewing report cards)?
 1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. always or almost always
38. How often does your spouse take an interest in your child(ren)'s extra-curricular activities (e.g., attends recitals or plays in which your child performs, goes to scout meetings, attends sports activities in which your child is involved, attends special functions to which parents are invited)?
 1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. always or almost always
39. How often does your spouse involve your child(ren) in his/her achievements or special celebrations (e.g., his/her birthday, special awards or honors he/she might receive)?
 1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. always or almost always
40. How often does your spouse involve your child(ren) in his/her significant relationships (e.g., friends, business associates)?
 1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. always or almost always
41. How do you think your spouse feels about the quality of his/her interaction with your child(ren)?
 1. always or almost always unsatisfied
 2. usually unsatisfied
 3. sometimes unsatisfied
 4. sometimes satisfied
 5. usually satisfied
 6. always or almost always satisfied
42. In your opinion, how important is (are) your child(ren) to your spouse?
 1. very unimportant
 2. unimportant
 3. important
 4. very important

43. How do you feel about the quantity of interaction between you and your spouse?
1. always or almost always unsatisfied
 2. usually unsatisfied
 3. sometimes unsatisfied
 4. sometimes satisfied
 5. usually satisfied
 6. always or almost always satisfied
44. How do you feel about the quantity of interaction between your spouse and your child(ren)?
1. always or almost always unsatisfied
 2. usually unsatisfied
 3. sometimes unsatisfied
 4. sometimes satisfied
 5. usually satisfied
 6. always or almost always satisfied
45. In your opinion, how often does conflict occur between your spouse and your child(ren)?
1. very frequently
 2. frequently
 3. sometimes
 4. seldom
 5. never or almost never
46. How do you feel about the quality of interaction between you and your spouse?
1. always or almost always unsatisfied
 2. usually unsatisfied
 3. sometimes unsatisfied
 4. sometimes satisfied
 5. usually satisfied
 6. always or almost always satisfied
47. In your opinion, how often is there conflict between you and your spouse?
1. very frequently
 2. frequently
 3. sometimes
 4. seldom
 5. never or almost never
48. How do you feel about the quantity of interaction between you and your child(ren)?
1. always or almost always unsatisfied
 2. usually unsatisfied
 3. sometimes unsatisfied
 4. sometimes satisfied
 5. usually satisfied
 6. always or almost always satisfied

49. How do you think your child(ren) feel(s) about the quantity of interaction between them and you?
1. always or almost always unsatisfied
 2. usually unsatisfied
 3. sometimes unsatisfied
 4. sometimes satisfied
 5. usually satisfied
 6. always or almost always satisfied
50. In your opinion, how often is there conflict between you and your child(ren)?
1. very frequently
 2. frequently
 3. sometimes
 4. seldom
 5. never or almost never
51. How do you think that your child(ren) feel(s) about the relationship between you and your spouse?
1. very positive
 2. somewhat positive
 3. neutral
 4. somewhat negative
 5. very negative
52. How do you think your child(ren) feel(s) about the quantity of interaction between them and your spouse?
1. always or almost always unsatisfied
 2. usually unsatisfied
 3. unsatisfied
 4. satisfied
 5. usually satisfied
 6. always or almost always satisfied
53. How do you think your child(ren) feel(s) about the quality of interaction between them and your spouse?
1. always or almost always unsatisfied
 2. usually unsatisfied
 3. sometimes unsatisfied
 4. sometimes satisfied
 5. usually satisfied
 6. always or almost always satisfied
54. How do you think your spouse feels about the quantity of interaction between him/her and you?
1. always or almost always unsatisfied
 2. usually unsatisfied
 3. sometimes unsatisfied
 4. sometimes satisfied
 5. usually satisfied
 6. always or almost always satisfied

55. How do you think your spouse feels about the quality of interaction between him/her and you?
1. always or almost always unsatisfied
 2. usually satisfied
 3. sometimes unsatisfied
 4. sometimes satisfied
 5. usually satisfied
 6. always or almost always satisfied
56. How do you feel about the quality of interaction between you and your child(ren)?
1. always or almost always unsatisfied
 2. usually unsatisfied
 3. sometimes unsatisfied
 4. sometimes satisfied
 5. usually satisfied
 6. always or almost always satisfied
57. How many problems do you think your child(ren) has (have) that are related directly to your marriage relationship?
1. many problems
 2. some problems
 3. a few problems
 4. no problems
58. How do you think your spouse feels about the quantity of interaction between him/her and your child(ren)?
1. always or almost always unsatisfied
 2. usually unsatisfied
 3. sometimes unsatisfied
 4. sometimes satisfied
 5. usually satisfied
 6. always or almost always satisfied
59. How do you feel about the quality of interaction between your spouse and your child(ren)?
1. always or almost always unsatisfied
 2. usually unsatisfied
 3. sometimes unsatisfied
 4. sometimes satisfied
 5. usually satisfied
 6. always or almost always satisfied
60. How do you think your child(ren) feel(s) about the quality of interaction between you and them?
1. always or almost always unsatisfied
 2. usually unsatisfied
 3. sometimes unsatisfied
 4. sometimes satisfied
 5. usually satisfied
 6. always or almost always satisfied

61. For each of the categories of child care listed below, please mark your use of this service, how difficult it has been to obtain this service, and how satisfied you are with the service.

	<u>Use</u>		<u>Amount of Difficulty</u>					<u>Amount of Satisfaction</u>				
	Yes	No	Not at all	A little	Some-what	Very	Ex-tremely	Not at all	A little	Some-what	Very	Totally
Day care												
After-school care												
Nursery school												
Day-care home												
Relatives in your own home												
Non-relatives in your own home												
Relatives in their own home												
Other (please specify): _____												

62. What financial arrangements have been made for child-care services?
1. you provide total support
 2. support has been provided by your spouse
 3. you and your spouse share the costs of child care
 4. Title XX or other government funds have been provided
 5. other, please specify _____
63. How difficult has it been for you financially to provide child-care services for your child(ren)?
1. not at all difficult
 2. a little difficult
 3. somewhat difficult
 4. very difficult
 5. extremely difficult
64. How frequently do you spend time alone with your child(ren)?
1. not at all
 2. a few times a year
 3. at least once a month
 4. at least twice a month
 5. at least once a week
 6. at least twice a week
 7. more than twice a week
65. How often does (do) your child(ren) stay overnight alone with you?
1. not at all
 2. a few times a year
 3. at least once a month
 4. at least twice a month
 5. at least once a week
 6. at least twice a week
 7. more than twice a week
66. How often does (do) your child(ren) spend extended periods of time (more than two days at a time) alone with you? _____ weeks per year
67. How often do you cancel or postpone prearranged activities with your child or children?
1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. always or almost always
 6. there are no prearranged activities
68. Considering the age and/or abilities of your child(ren), how much do you allow the child(ren) to participate in decisions regarding the frequency or amount of time spent together?
1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. always or almost always
 6. child(ren) is (are) too young to participate

69. How often do you consider the interests of your child(ren) in planning activities during your leisure time with the child(ren)?
1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. always or almost always
70. How often do you initiate spontaneous interaction with your child(ren) (e.g., phone calls, playing games, talking)?
1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. very frequently
71. How often do(es) your child(ren) see your relatives?
1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. very frequently
72. Who makes decisions regarding spending family resources on the child(ren)?
1. always my spouse
 2. mostly my spouse
 3. about equal between me and my spouse
 4. mostly me
 5. always me
73. How often do you take an interest in your child(ren)'s educational achievements (e.g., visiting the school, parent-teacher conferences, participation in P.T.A., viewing report cards)?
1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. always or almost always
74. How often do you take an interest in your child(ren)'s extracurricular activities (e.g., attend recitals or plays in which your child performs, go to scout meetings, attend sports activities in which your child is involved, attend special functions to which parents are invited)?
1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. always or almost always

75. How often do you involve your child(ren) in your achievements or special celebrations (e.g., your birthday, special award or honors you might receive)?
1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. always or almost always
76. How often do you involve your child(ren) in your significant relationships (e.g., friends, business associates)?
1. never or almost never
 2. seldom
 3. sometimes
 4. frequently
 5. always or almost always
77. In your opinion, how important is (are) your child(ren) to you?
1. very unimportant
 2. unimportant
 3. important
 4. very important
78. How do you think your spouse feels about the quantity of interaction between you and your child(ren)?
1. always or almost always unsatisfied
 2. usually unsatisfied
 3. sometimes unsatisfied
 4. sometimes satisfied
 5. usually satisfied
 6. always or almost always satisfied
79. How do you think your spouse feels about the quality of interaction between you and your child(ren)?
1. always or almost always unsatisfied
 2. usually unsatisfied
 3. sometimes unsatisfied
 4. sometimes satisfied
 5. usually satisfied
 6. always or almost always satisfied
80. What was your approximate income from each of these sources in 1978?
1. husband's income _____
 2. wife's income _____
 3. child's earnings _____
 4. other income _____
- If you have marked "other income," please describe what the source(s) is (are): _____

81. Have you moved (including within the same city) in the last two years?
1. yes
 2. no
82. If you did move, what was the reason?
1. personal
 2. financial
 3. maintenance
 4. wanted more space
 5. wanted less space
 6. other, please describe _____
83. How long have you been at your current address? _____ months

APPENDIX D

SOCIAL SCHEMAS

Instructions for Administration and Scoring

The experimenter will stretch a piece of dark colored felt (1 yard by 2 yards) on a table or some other flat surface. On each trial the child should be given two or more objects cut from yellow felt and be told to place them on the felt field in any manner he/she wishes. Each child will place eight sets of objects on the field in the following order:


1. woman and child
2. man and child
3. man and woman
4. man, woman, and child
5. woman, child, and two rectangles
6. man, child, and two rectangles
7. man, woman, and two rectangles
8. man, woman, child, and two rectangles

A graph depicting the felt board will be marked off into 12 inch blocks. The experimenter will put the appropriate symbol (man=m, woman=w, child=c, and rectangles=r1 and r2) in the appropriate block according to where the child placed it on the felt field.

Before beginning the testing, say to the subject, "(Child's name), I am now going to ask you to place some figures on a piece of felt. You may place these figures anywhere you want to. If you want to, you may move around the felt as you place the figures."

Before giving the child each set of figures, say, "Now I want you to place these figures on the felt."

Hand the figures to the child in the order they are listed on this sheet and complete all eight sets in the manner described above.



SOCIAL SCHEMAS CHART

SET NUMBER _____

SET NUMBER _____

SELF-CONCEPT REFERENTS TEST

Instructions to Subjects and Administration Procedures

Prior to photographing S the following standard instruction should be given by E:

"Well now, we're going to take a picture of you. Get ready...
when I count to three I'll snap your picture. Are you ready now?
1, 2, 3..."

(Notice that no instruction to "smile" etc. has been included. This is purposefully left ambiguous in order to obtain a spontaneous facial expression, and is especially important because giving this instruction would clearly bias responses to the happy-sad item.)

After the exposure has been made, E waits 15 seconds, then pulls the developed print from the developer compartment of the camera. During this time interval, E may speak with S to establish rapport. After 15 seconds, E says to S:

"Well look at that (pointing to print). That's a picture of you.
That's a picture of (child's name). Isn't this a nice picture of
(child's name). This is really you because you are (child's name)
and there you are in the picture."

(E points to S's image in the photograph.)

To ascertain the effectiveness of the induction, E then asks S:

"Tell me who that is in the picture?"

(E must obtain a response indicating that S knows that it is he/she in the photograph; either "That's me," or child states his own name or simply points to himself/herself. If S does not recognize himself/herself in the picture, E repeats induction above. E must obtain a statement from S indicating that he/she recognizes himself/herself in the picture before proceeding further.)

E seats S at a table suitable in height and size for a young child and places the photograph on the table top, directly forward of S and beneath his/her head in about the same position as a dinner plate is usually placed. Because the recently developed print will tend to curl, it will be useful to use two small pieces of tape at the top and bottom edges of the print, fastening it to the surface of the table. E should seat himself/herself directly opposite S at the table and then say the following:

"Now I'd like to ask you a few questions about (child's name)."

E then points to the picture, placing his/her own index finger on it and proceeds to ask the set of questions in the context of the "self" referent. E must restate the introductory stem before asking each question and must point to the photograph each time he/she asks a question.

E proceeds through all items in the "self" referent in this manner. It is important that E explicitly point to the picture before asking each question, thereby repeatedly directing S's gaze and attention to it. It is also important to restate the question stem continually in the objective case: "Is (child's name)...happy or is he/she sad? This procedure establishes a set in which the child is induced to "stand back from himself/herself" and to gain a perspective of himself/herself as an "object" in the photograph. This also should assist S to assume the role of another toward himself/herself.

After responding to all items on the "self" referent, the "mother" referent is introduced by E:

"Now that was very good, (child's first name). I'd like to ask you a few more questions. This time I'd like to ask you a few questions about (child's name) mother. Tell me...Does (child's name) mother think that (child's name) is happy or sad?"

E proceeds through the entire set of items in the "mother" referent context. Again, E must point to the photograph and repeat the appropriate stem before asking each question. The 14 items asked under the "mother" referent are identical to those asked under all other referents. Only the referent itself is to be varied.

At this point, S will have completed two referent scales...The "self" referent scale, and in the case illustrated above, the "mother" referent. The referent scale for father will be completed in the same manner as the one for mother, substituting the word father for mother when appropriate.

Upon completion of the three referents, the examination is terminated. E should thank S warmly, present him/her with the photograph, and again reinforce the value of the picture by saying:

"Well now, this picture is for you to keep, just as I promised. Here it is: Remember you can do whatever you like with it; you can keep it for yourself or show it to your mother or teacher or whatever you like."

SELF-CONCEPT REFERENTS TEST

Child's Code Number _____

Time _____

Date _____

Examiner _____

Examples of question format: 1. Is John Doe happy or sad?
 2. Does John Doe's mother think he is happy or sad?
 3. Does John Doe's father think he is happy or sad?

<u>Item</u>	<u>Self Score</u>	<u>Mother Score</u>	<u>Father Score</u>
1. Happy-- Sad	1, 0	1, 0	1, 0
2. Clean-- Dirty	1, 0	1, 0	1, 0
3. Doesn't like to play w th other kids-- Likes to play with other kids	0, 1	0, 1	0, 1
4. Weak-- Strong	0, 1	0, 1	0, 1
5. Scared of a lot of things-- Not scared of a lot of things	0, 1	0, 1	0, 1
6. Not scared of a lot of people-- Scared of a lot of people	1, 0	1, 0	1, 0
7. Good looking-- Not good looking	1, 0	1, 0	1, 0
8. Sick-- Healthy	0, 1	0, 1	0, 1
9. Smart-- Not very smart	1, 0	1, 0	1, 0
10. Likes to be with adults-- Doesn't like to be with adults	1, 0	1, 0	1, 0
11. Doesn't like other kids to play with his/her things-- Likes other kids to play with his/her things	0, 1	0, 1	0, 1
12. Likes to be hugged-- Doesn't like to be hugged	1, 0	1, 0	1, 0
13. Likes the way his/her face looks-- Doesn't like the way his/her face looks	1, 0	1, 0	1, 0
14. Doesn't like to talk a lot-- Likes to talk a lot	0, 1	0, 1	0, 1

BILLS INDEX OF ADJUSTMENT AND VALUES

Instructions for Administration and Scoring

Each child will be provided with a copy of the instructions and an answer sheet. The examiner then reads the "self" instructions to the child and inquires if there are any questions. If the child does not know the meaning of a word it can be provided. The child is then instructed to begin. While he/she is working, the examiner should observe to see that he/she is making three ratings for each trait before proceeding to the next trait. This same procedure is followed for the Adult, High School, and Junior High School Forms.

For the Elementary School Form, only the examiner has the instruction forms. The child makes ratings by encircling the appropriate alternative on a three point scale.

Each child is given a copy of the "Self" blank and a marker (an IBM card is excellent for this purpose). The examiner then asks the child to place his/her marker on the first line so that the number 1 is exposed. The examiner then says, "You see three words, 'yes', 'no', and 'sometimes'. Now I am going to ask you a question. 'Are you truthful?' If you are, put a circle around the word 'yes'. If you are not truthful, put a circle around the word 'no'. If you are truthful sometimes and not truthful sometimes, put a circle around the word 'sometimes'. Now move your marker down one line. 'Do you like the way you are?' If you do, put a circle around the word 'yes'. If you do not like being this way, put a circle around the word 'no'. If you don't care, put a circle around the words 'don't care'. Now move your marker down one line. 'How truthful would you like to be?' If you would like to be as truthful as you are now, circle the word 'same', and if you want to be less truthful, circle 'less'. Now move your marker down one line. You should see the number 2 and the three words 'yes', 'no', and 'sometimes'." The examiner continues until all 19 items of the index have been covered.

Directions for Scoring

The scores of the Adult IAV are obtained by adding each of the three columns and by finding the sum of the differences between Column I and Column III, summed without regard for sign. This latter score is called the discrepancy score.

Before adding Columns I and III, the ratings on negative traits must be reversed so they have meanings comparable to the ratings on the positive traits. To illustrate, suppose a subject places a 1 in Column I for the trait "cruel". This means that he/she is saying, "Seldom am I a cruel person". Since this is a negative trait he/she has given himself/herself the highest possible rating—comparable to a rating of 5 on a positive trait such as "dependable". For the total score on Column I (or Column III) to reflect that a 1 on a negative trait is a high rating, the 1 should be changed to a 5. Similarly, a 2 on a negative trait should be changed to a 4, a 3 remains the same, a 4 becomes a 2, and a 5 becomes a 1. For most people, items 5 (annoying), 13 (cruel), 18 (fearful),

25 (meddlesome), 28 (nervous), 34 (reckless), 36 (sarcastic), 41 (stubborn), and 49 (fault-finding) are negative traits and the ratings in Columns I and III should be reversed before adding these columns.

More exactly, a negative trait is defined as any traits with a negative discrepancy between Columns I and III, or a trait with a 1 or 2 rating in Columns I and III and a 3, 4, or 5 rating on Column II. In practice, little difference in total scores results when the Column I and III ratings on items 5, 13, 18, 25, 28, 34, 36, 41, and 49 are reversed for all subjects, and this is the recommended practice when testing large groups of subjects.

Ratings on Column II are not reversed since these are not affected by the negative-positive nature of the trait. There is one exception to this statement. Making the ratings for negative traits sometimes presents a problem for a subject. He/She may make ratings of 1 in all three columns. In effect, he/she is saying, I am not this kind of person and I do not desire to be this kind of person but I very much dislike being as I am in this respect. Obviously, a error has been made. To correct these errors, it is the usual practice to scan an answer sheet before scoring and, if three ratings of 1 are found to follow a negative trait, to change the Column II rating to a 5.

After the negative traits have been reversed, Columns I, II, and III may be summed and the discrepancy score computed. These sums are the scores for self concept, acceptance of self - concept of the ideal self, and discrepancy. The same scores are computed for the "Others" form of the index.

The High School IAV is scored in the same manner as the Adult IAV except that since this form of the IAV contains no negative traits, it is not necessary to make adjustments in the ratings before scoring.

On the Junior High IAV, concern is with the check marks in the three subcolumns under the headings "I am like this," "The way I feel about being as I am," "I wish I were," and the differences between the ratings for the first and third of these headings. In each of the first three instances, a rating in the first of the three subcolumns is given a weight of 3, a rating in the second of the three subcolumns is given a weight of 2, and a rating in the third of the three subcolumns is given a weight of 1. Scores on Columns I, II, and III can thus range from $1 \times 35 = 3 \times 35 = 105$. Discrepancy scores can range from 0 to $2 \times 35 = 70$.

On the Elementary IAV, responses on line 1 of each block are equivalent to Column I responses on the other three levels, line 2 responses correspond to Column II responses, and line 3 is the equivalent of Column III. A response of "yes" is given a value of 3, while "no" responses have a value of 1, and "don't care" or "sometimes" responses have a value of 2. Self-concept is the total of the values of the words encircled on line 1, acceptance of self is computed from line 2, and ideal self from line 3.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL INDEX OF ADJUSTMENT AND VALUES

Self Instructions for IAV (Elementary School Form)

DIRECTIONS: Each one of us would like to know more about himself; so let's see if we can do just that by playing this game.

I am going to read some sentences to you. I want you to tell me just exactly how you feel. There are no right or wrong answers, because everyone is different.

1. Are you usually truthful?
Do you like the way you are?
How truthful would you like to be?
2. Are you usually helpful?
Do you like the way you are?
How helpful would you like to be?
3. Do you usually play fair?
Do you like the way you are about being fair?
How fair would you like to be?
4. Are you usually kind?
Do you like the way you are?
How kind would you like to be?
5. Are you usually smart?
Do you like the way you are?
How smart would you like to be?
6. Are you usually healthy?
Do you like the way you are?
How healthy would you like to be?
7. Are you usually happy?
Are you glad you are this way?
How happy would you like to be?
8. Are you usually brave?
Do you like the way you are?
How brave would you like to be?
9. Are you usually friendly?
Do you like the way you are?
How friendly would you like to be?

10. Do you usually share your toys?
Do you like the way you are?
How much sharing would you like to do?
11. Are you usually nice looking?
Do you like the way you are?
How nice looking would you like to be?
12. Are you usually honest?
Do you like the way you are?
How honest would you like to be?
13. Do you usually play with others?
Do you like the way you are?
How much playing with others would you like to do?
14. Do you usually get mad?
Do you like the way you are?
How much getting mad would you like to do?
15. Do you usually make fun of others?
Do you like the way you are?
How much making fun of others would you like to do?
16. Do you usually say and do funny things?
Do you like the way you are?
How many funny things would you like to do and say?
17. Do you usually like grown ups?
Do you like the way you are?
How much do you want to like grown ups?
18. Are you usually a good worker?
Do you like the way you are?
How much do you want to be a good worker?
19. Do you usually get scared?
Do you like the way you are?
How much do you want to be scared?

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL INDEX OF ADJUSTMENT AND VALUES

Child's Code Number _____

Time _____

Date _____

Examiner _____

1. YES SOMETIMES NO YES DON'T CARE NO MORE SAME LESS	8. YES SOMETIMES NO YES DON'T CARE NO MORE SAME LESS	15. YES SOMETIMES NO YES DON'T CARE NO MORE SAME LESS
2. YES SOMETIMES NO YES DON'T CARE NO MORE SAME LESS	9. YES SOMETIMES NO YES DON'T CARE NO MORE SAME LESS	16. YES SOMETIMES NO YES DON'T CARE NO MORE SAME LESS
3. YES SOMETIMES NO YES DON'T CARE NO MORE SAME LESS	10. YES SOMETIMES NO YES DON'T CARE NO MORE SAME LESS	17. YES SOMETIMES NO YES DON'T CARE NO MORE SAME LESS
4. YES SOMETIMES NO YES DON'T CARE NO MORE SAME LESS	11. YES SOMETIMES NO YES DON'T CARE NO MORE SAME LESS	18. YES SOMETIMES NO YES DON'T CARE NO MORE SAME LESS
5. YES SOMETIMES NO YES DON'T CARE NO MORE SAME LESS	12. YES SOMETIMES NO YES DON'T CARE NO MORE SAME LESS	19. YES SOMETIMES NO YES DON'T CARE NO MORE SAME LESS
6. YES SOMETIMES NO YES DON'T CARE NO MORE SAME LESS	13. YES SOMETIMES NO YES DON'T CARE NO MORE SAME LESS	
7. YES SOMETIMES NO YES DON'T CARE NO MORE SAME LESS	14. YES SOMETIMES NO YES DON'T CARE NO MORE SAME LESS	

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL INDEX OF ADJUSTMENT AND VALUES

Self Instructions for IAV (Grades 6, 7, & 8 Form)

There is a need for each of us to know more about ourselves, but seldom do we have an opportunity to look at ourselves as we are or as we would like to be. On the following page is a list of terms that to a certain degree describe people.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COLUMN I

Take each term separately and apply it to yourself by completing the following sentence:

I AM A (AN) _____ PERSON.

The first word in the list is sharing, so you would substitute this term in the above sentence. It would read—I am a sharing person.

Then decide HOW MUCH OF THE TIME this statement is like you by checking under one of the three possible answers.

1. Most of the time, I am like this.
2. About half of the time, I am like this.
3. Hardly ever, I am like this.

Place a check in the box under the term that suits you best. EXAMPLE: Under the term SHARING, check the first box—Most of the time I am a sharing person.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COLUMN II

Now go to Column II. Use one of the statements given below to tell HOW YOU FEEL about yourself as described in Column I.

1. I like being as I am in this respect.
2. I neither dislike being as I am nor like being as I am in this respect.
3. I dislike being as I am in this respect.

Place a check in the box under the term that suits you best. EXAMPLE: In Column II beside the term sharing, check the first block—I like being as sharing as I am.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COLUMN III

Finally, go to Column III: Using the same term, complete the following sentence:

I WOULD LIKE TO BE A (AN) _____ PERSON.

Then decide HOW MUCH OF THE TIME you would like this to be an example of you and rate yourself on the following scale.

1. Most of the time, would I like this to be me.
2. About half of the time, would I like this to be me.
3. Hardly ever, would I like this to be me.

EXAMPLE: In Column III beside the term SHARING, place a check in the box under the term Most of the time, I would like to be this kind of person.

Start with the word AGREEABLE and fill in Columns I, II, and III before going on to the next word. There is no time limit. Be honest with yourself so that your description will be a true measure of how you look at yourself.

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL INDEX OF ADJUSTMENT AND VALUES

Child's Code Number

Time _____

Date _____

Examiner

	I	II	III
	THE WAY I FEEL ABOUT BEING AS I AM		
	I AM LIKE THIS		I WISH I WERE
	MOST OF THE TIME ABOUT ½ OF THE TIME HARDLY EVER	I LIKE IT I NEITHER LIKE NOR DISLIKE I DISLIKE	MOST OF THE TIME ABOUT ½ OF THE TIME HARDLY EVER
a. sharing	✓ — —	✓ — —	✓ — —
1. agreeable	— — —	— — —	— — —
2. alert	— — —	— — —	— — —
3. brave	— — —	— — —	— — —
4. busy	— — —	— — —	— — —
5. careful	— — —	— — —	— — —
6. cheerful	— — —	— — —	— — —
7. considerate	— — —	— — —	— — —
8. cooperative	— — —	— — —	— — —
9. dependable	— — —	— — —	— — —
10. fair	— — —	— — —	— — —
11. friendly	— — —	— — —	— — —
12. generous	— — —	— — —	— — —
13. good	— — —	— — —	— — —
14. good sport	— — —	— — —	— — —
15. happy	— — —	— — —	— — —
16. helpful	— — —	— — —	— — —
17. honest	— — —	— — —	— — —
18. kind	— — —	— — —	— — —

HIGH SCHOOL INDEX OF ADJUSTMENT AND VALUES

Self Instructions for IAV (High School Form)

There is a need for each of us to know more about ourselves, but seldom do we have an opportunity to look at ourselves as we are or as we would like to be. On the next page is a list of terms that to a certain degree describe people. Take each term separately and apply it to yourself by completing the following sentence:

I AM A (AN) _____ PERSON.

The first word in the list is jolly, so you would substitute this term in the above sentence. It would read—I am a jolly person.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COLUMN I

Then decide HOW MUCH OF THE TIME this statement is like you and rate yourself on a scale from 1 to 5 according to the following key.

1. Seldom is this like me.
2. Occasionally this is like me.
3. About half of the time this is like me.
4. A good deal of the time this is like me.
5. Most of the time this is like me.

EXAMPLE: Beside the term JOLLY, number 2 is inserted to indicate that—occasionally, I am a jolly person.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COLUMN II

Now go to Column II. Use one of the statements given below to tell HOW YOU FEEL about yourself as described in Column I.

1. I very much dislike being as I am in this respect.
2. I dislike being as I am in this respect.
3. I neither dislike being as I am nor like being as I am in this respect.
4. I like being as I am in this respect.
5. I like very much being as I am in this respect.

You will select the number beside the statement that tells how you feel about the way you are and insert the number in Column II.

EXAMPLE: In Column II beside the term JOLLY, number 1 is inserted to indicate that I dislike very much being as I am in respect to the term, jolly. Note that being as I am always refers to the way you described yourself in Column I.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COLUMN III

Finally, go to Column III; using the same term, complete the following sentence:

I WOULD LIKE TO BE A (AN) _____ PERSON.

Then decide HOW MUCH OF THE TIME you would like this trait to be characteristic of you and rate yourself on the following 5-point scale:

1. Seldom would I like this to be me.
2. Occasionally I would like this to be me.
3. About half of the time I would like this to be me.
4. A good deal of the time I would like this to be me.
5. Most of the time I would like this to be me.

You will select the number beside the phrase that tells how much of the time you would like to be this kind of person and insert the number in Column III.

EXAMPLE: In Column III beside the term JOLLY, the number 5 is inserted to indicate that most of the time, I would like to be this kind of person.

Start with the word ACTIVE and fill in Columns I, II, and III before going on to the next word. There is no time limit. Be honest with yourself so that your description will be a true measure of how you look at yourself.

HIGH SCHOOL INDEX OF ADJUSTMENT AND VALUES

Child's Code Number _____

Time _____

Date _____

Examiner _____

	THE WAY I FEEL ABOUT BEING				THE WAY I FEEL ABOUT BEING		
	I AM LIKE THIS	AS I AM	I WISH I WERE		I AM LIKE THIS	AS I AM	I WISH I WERE
	I	II	III		I	II	III
a. jolly	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>	19. kind	—	—	—
1. active	—	—	—	20. loyal	—	—	—
2. alert	—	—	—	21. neat	—	—	—
3. carefree	—	—	—	22. obedient	—	—	—
4. cheerful	—	—	—	23. patient	—	—	—
5. considerate	—	—	—	24. playful	—	—	—
6. cooperative	—	—	—	25. polite	—	—	—
7. courteous	—	—	—	26. quiet	—	—	—
8. dependable	—	—	—	27. sharing	—	—	—
9. democratic	—	—	—	28. sincere	—	—	—
10. faithful	—	—	—	29. studious	—	—	—
11. friendly	—	—	—	30. sociable	—	—	—
12. generous	—	—	—	31. tactful	—	—	—
13. happy	—	—	—	32. thoughtful	—	—	—
14. helpful	—	—	—	33. thrifty	—	—	—
15. honest	—	—	—	34. trustworthy	—	—	—
16. humorous	—	—	—	35. truthful	—	—	—
17. intelligent	—	—	—	36. understanding	—	—	—
18. interesting	—	—	—	37. unselfish	—	—	—

ADULT INDEX OF ADJUSTMENT AND VALUES

Self Instructions for IAV (Adult Form)

There is a need for each of us to know more about ourselves, but seldom do we have an opportunity to look at ourselves as we are or as we would like to be. On the following page is a list of terms that to a certain degree describe people. Take each term separately and apply it to yourself by completing the following sentence:

I AM A (AN) _____ PERSON.

The first word in the list is academic, so you would substitute this term in the above sentence. It would read—I am an academic person.

Then decide HOW MUCH OF THE TIME this statement is like you, i.e., is typical or characteristic of you as an individual, and rate yourself on a scale from 0.3 to five according to the following key:

1. Seldom is this like me.
2. Occasionally this is like me.
3. About half of the time this is like me.
4. A good deal of the time this is like me.
5. Most of the time this is like me.

Select the number beside the phrase that tells how much of the time the statement is like you and insert it in Column I on the next page.

EXAMPLE: Beside the term ACADEMIC, number two is inserted to indicate that—occasionally, I am an academic person.

Now go to Column II. Use one of the statements given below to tell HOW YOU FEEL about yourself as described in Column I.

1. I very much dislike being as I am in this respect.
2. I dislike being as I am in this respect.
3. I neither dislike being as I am nor like being as I am in this respect.
4. I like being as I am in this respect.
5. I like very much being as I am in this respect.

You will select the number beside the statement that tells how you feel about the way you are and insert the number in Column II.

EXAMPLE: In Column II beside the term ACADEMIC, number one is inserted to indicate that I dislike very much being as I am in respect to the term, academic. Note that being as I am always refers to the way you described yourself in Column I.

Finally, go to Column III; using the same term, complete the following sentence:

I WOULD LIKE TO BE A (AN) _____ PERSON.

Then decide HOW MUCH OF THE TIME you would like this trait to be characteristic of you and rate yourself on the following 5-point scale:

1. Seldom would I like this to be me.
2. Occasionally I would like this to be me.
3. About half of the time I would like this to be me.
4. A good deal of the time I would like this to be me.
5. Most of the time I would like this to be me.

You will select the number beside the phrase that tells you how much of the time you would like to be this kind of person and insert the number in Column II.

EXAMPLE: In Column III beside the term ACADEMIC, number five is inserted to indicate that most of the time, I would like to be this kind of person.

Start with the word acceptable and fill in Columns I, II, and III before going on to the next word. There is no time limit. Be honest with yourself so that your description will be a true measure of how you look at yourself.

ADULT INDEX OF ADJUSTMENT AND VALUES

Child's Code Number _____

Time _____

Date _____

Examiner _____

	THE WAY I FEEL ABOUT				THE WAY I FEEL ABOUT		
	I AM LIKE THIS	BEING AS I AM	I WISH I WERE		I AM LIKE THIS	BEING AS I AM	I WISH I WERE
	I	II	III		I	II	III
a. academic	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>	25. meddlesome	—	—	—
1. acceptable	—	—	—	26. merry	—	—	—
2. accurate	—	—	—	27. mature	—	—	—
3. alert	—	—	—	28. nervous	—	—	—
4. ambitious	—	—	—	29. normal	—	—	—
5. annoying	—	—	—	30. optimistic	—	—	—
6. busy	—	—	—	31. poised	—	—	—
7. calm	—	—	—	32. purposeful	—	—	—
8. charming	—	—	—	33. reasonable	—	—	—
9. clever	—	—	—	34. reckless	—	—	—
10. competent	—	—	—	35. responsible	—	—	—
11. confident	—	—	—	36. sarcastic	—	—	—
12. considerate	—	—	—	37. sincere	—	—	—
13. cruel	—	—	—	38. stable	—	—	—
14. democratic	—	—	—	39. studious	—	—	—
15. dependable	—	—	—	40. successful	—	—	—
16. economical	—	—	—	41. stubborn	—	—	—
17. efficient	—	—	—	42. tactful	—	—	—
18. fearful	—	—	—	43. teachable	—	—	—
19. friendly	—	—	—	44. useful	—	—	—
20. fashionable	—	—	—	45. worthy	—	—	—
21. helpful	—	—	—	46. broad-minded	—	—	—
22. intellectual	—	—	—	47. businesslike	—	—	—
23. kind	—	—	—	48. competitive	—	—	—
24. logical	—	—	—	49. fault-finding	—	—	—

BRONFENBRENNER PARENT BEHAVIOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions for Administration and Scoring the Bronfenbrenner Parent Behavior Questionnaire

This scale consists of 45 items with five answer choices per item. Tell the child before giving him/her the questionnaire that he/she will have as much time as needed to fill out the questionnaire. Instructions for the questionnaire appear at the top of the page, and you should not give any help except to define words. Be sure you do not indicate what you believe any of the appropriate responses to be.

When the child has completed the questionnaire, check to make sure all items have been answered. If a child purposefully omitted an item, do not force him/her to fill it out. If he/she accidentally missed the item, please ask him/her to give his/her response.

At a later time, transfer the numbers depicting each response to the column at the right side of the page. For those items which have been reversed, a score sheet with the appropriate code number will be supplied.

The Bronfenbrenner yields scores on three dimensions of parenting: loving, punishing, and demanding. When you have finished transferring the numbers, add the following numbers to obtain a score for each factor:

Loving: 1, 5, 8, 9, 13, 16, 17, 21, 24, 25, 27, 31, 34, 38, 39, 41

Demanding: 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 32, 45

Punishing : 26, 28, 29, 30, 33, 35, 36, 37, 40, 42, 43, 44

Then take the average of each total. For example, the demanding factor contains 17 questions. If a child's total score on these 17 questions is 68, the average would be 4. Be sure to omit any questions that are not answered by the child. For instance, if a child only answered 16 of the questions that measure the demanding factor and the total score was 68, the average would be 4.25. A higher score on any of the factors will be indicative of more of a certain factor.

The Father Referent Form has "father" substituted for "mother" and appropriate pronouns changed. The procedures for administration and scoring are identical to the Mother Referent Form.

BRONFENBRENNER PARENT BEHAVIOR QUESTIONNAIRE

(MOTHER REFERENT)

Child's Code Number _____

Time _____

Date _____

Examiner _____

Directions: The following questions are about different ways that mothers act toward their children. Read each statement and check the answer which is most like your mother.

1. I can talk to her about anything.
☐ always
☐ most of the time
☐ sometimes
☐ hardly ever
☐ never
2. When I go someplace for the first time, she comes with me to make sure that everything goes well.
☐ always
☐ most of the time
☐ sometimes
☐ hardly ever
☐ never
3. She says that I have to get her permission first when I want to go somewhere or be with my friends.
☐ always
☐ most of the time
☐ sometimes
☐ hardly ever
☐ never

4. She makes me work hard on everything I do .
___ always
___ most of the time
___ sometimes
___ hardly ever
___ never
5. I can talk her into most anything .
___ always
___ most of the time
___ sometimes
___ hardly ever
___ never
6. She is fair when she punishes me .
___ always
___ most of the time
___ sometimes
___ hardly ever
___ never
7. She seems to be upset and unhappy when I do not behave myself .
___ always
___ most of the time
___ sometimes
___ hardly ever
___ never
8. She is happy to be with me .
___ always
___ most of the time
___ sometimes
___ hardly ever
___ never
9. She makes me feel good and helps me when I have troubles .
___ always
___ most of the time
___ sometimes
___ hardly ever
___ never
10. She worries and is afraid that I cannot take care of myself .
___ always
___ most of the time
___ sometimes
___ hardly ever
___ never

11. She wants to know exactly how I spend my money when I want to buy some little thing for myself.
_____ always
_____ most of the time
_____ sometimes
_____ hardly ever
_____ never
12. She tells me that I have to do better than other young people my age.
_____ always
_____ most of the time
_____ sometimes
_____ hardly ever
_____ never
13. She lets me off easy when I am bad.
_____ always
_____ most of the time
_____ sometimes
_____ hardly ever
_____ never
14. When I have to do something for her she explains why.
_____ always
_____ most of the time
_____ sometimes
_____ hardly ever
_____ never
15. She makes me feel ashamed when I am bad.
_____ always
_____ most of the time
_____ sometimes
_____ hardly ever
_____ never
16. She says nice things about me to other people.
_____ always
_____ most of the time
_____ sometimes
_____ hardly ever
_____ never
17. I feel that she is there for me when I need her.
_____ always
_____ most of the time
_____ sometimes
_____ hardly ever
_____ never
18. She tells me I can't roam or wander around because something might happen to me.
_____ always
_____ most of the time
_____ sometimes
_____ hardly ever
_____ never

19. She tells me exactly when I should be home.
_____ always
_____ most of the time
_____ sometimes
_____ hardly ever
_____ never
20. She tells me that I must get very good grades in school.
_____ always
_____ most of the time
_____ sometimes
_____ hardly ever
_____ never
21. She finds it hard to punish me.
_____ always
_____ most of the time
_____ sometimes
_____ hardly ever
_____ never
22. When she punishes me, she explains why.
_____ always
_____ most of the time
_____ sometimes
_____ hardly ever
_____ never
23. She tells me, "I don't want to have anything more to do with you," when I do not behave myself.
_____ always
_____ most of the time
_____ sometimes
_____ hardly ever
_____ never
24. My mother is very good to me.
_____ always
_____ most of the time
_____ sometimes
_____ hardly ever
_____ never
25. She says nice things to me when I do something good.
_____ always
_____ most of the time
_____ sometimes
_____ hardly ever
_____ never
26. She punishes me by sending me out of the room.
_____ almost every day
_____ about once a week
_____ about once a month
_____ only once or twice a year
_____ never

27. She teaches me things I want to learn.
___ almost every day
___ about once a week
___ about once a month
___ only once or twice a year
___ never
28. She tells me that other young people behave better than I do.
___ almost every day
___ about once a week
___ about once a month
___ only once or twice a year
___ never
29. She slaps me.
___ almost every day
___ about once a week
___ about once a month
___ only once or twice a year
___ never
30. She punishes me by making me do extra work.
___ almost every day
___ about once a week
___ about once a month
___ only once or twice a year
___ never
31. She goes on pleasant walks and trips with me.
___ almost every day
___ about once a week
___ about once a month
___ only once or twice a year
___ never
32. She wants me to run errands, or do favors for her.
___ almost every day
___ about once a week
___ about once a month
___ only once or twice a year
___ never
33. She punishes me by not letting me go out with my friends.
___ almost every day
___ about once a week
___ about once a month
___ only once or twice a year
___ never
34. She helps me with my hobbies or things I like to do.
___ almost every day
___ about once a week
___ about once a month
___ only once or twice a year
___ never

35. She pesters me and keeps telling me to do things.
___ **almost** every day
___ about once a week
___ about once a month
___ **only** once or twice a year
___ never
36. She hits me.
___ **almost** every day
___ about once a week
___ about once a month
___ **only** once or twice a year
___ never
37. She punishes me by not letting me do things I really enjoy.
___ **almost** every day
___ about once a week
___ about once a month
___ **only** once or twice a year
___ never
38. She enjoys talking to me.
___ **almost** every day
___ about once a week
___ about once a month
___ **only** once or twice a year
___ never
39. She wants me to keep my own things in good order.
___ **almost** every day
___ about once a week
___ about once a month
___ **only** once or twice a year
___ never
40. She punishes me by telling me to leave the room.
___ **almost** every day
___ about once a week
___ about once a month
___ **only** once or twice a year
___ never
41. She helps me with my school work when I do not understand something.
___ **almost** every day
___ about once a week
___ about once a month
___ **only** once or twice a year
___ never
42. She tells me I am bad and yells at me.
___ **almost** every day
___ about once a week
___ about once a month
___ **only** once or twice a year
___ never

43. She says she will hit me if I am bad. .
_____ almost every day
_____ about once a week
_____ about once a month
_____ only once or twice a year
_____ never
44. She punishes me by taking my favorite things away.
_____ almost every day
_____ about once a week
_____ about once a month
_____ only once or twice a year
_____ never
45. She wants me to help around the house or yard.
_____ almost every day
_____ about once a week
_____ about once a month
_____ only once or twice a year
_____ never

35. She pesters me and keeps telling me to do things.
___ almost every day
___ about once a week
___ about once a month
___ only once or twice a year
___ never
36. She hits me.
___ almost every day
___ about once a week
___ about once a month
___ only once or twice a year
___ never
37. She punishes me by not letting me do things I really enjoy.
___ almost every day
___ about once a week
___ about once a month
___ only once or twice a year
___ never
38. She enjoys talking to me.
___ almost every day
___ about once a week
___ about once a month
___ only once or twice a year
___ never
39. She wants me to keep my own things in good order.
___ almost every day
___ about once a week
___ about once a month
___ only once or twice a year
___ never
40. She punishes me by telling me to leave the room.
___ almost every day
___ about once a week
___ about once a month
___ only once or twice a year
___ never
41. She helps me with my school work when I do not understand something.
___ almost every day
___ about once a week
___ about once a month
___ only once or twice a year
___ never
42. She tells me I am bad and yells at me.
___ almost every day
___ about once a week
___ about once a month
___ only once or twice a year
___ never

43. She says she will hit me if I am bad.
☐ almost every day
☐ about once a week
☐ about once a month
☐ only once or twice a year
☐ never
44. She punishes me by taking my favorite things away.
☐ almost every day
☐ about once a week
☐ about once a month
☐ only once or twice a year
☐ never
45. She wants me to help around the house or yard.
☐ almost every day
☐ about once a week
☐ about once a month
☐ only once or twice a year
☐ never

APPENDIX E



Table A-3

Reliability Coefficients for Mother's Instruments

Instrument and Variable	Divorced ^a	Intact ^b
Tennessee Self-Concept Scale		
Total	.91	.93
Family Relations Inventory (for Intact Families)		
Quantity of father-child interaction	.85	.77
Quantity of mother-child interaction	.82	.78
Quality of (ex)husband-(ex)wife interaction	.80	.73
Quality of father-child interaction	.81	.76
Quality of mother-child interaction	.83	.79
Blair's Divorcedes Adjustment Instrument		
Past adjustment	.80	-
Present adjustment	.86	-
Index of Adjustment		
Past adjustment	-	.90
Present adjustment	-	.87

^aN = 45.^bN = 44.

Table A-4

Reliability Coefficients for Children's Instruments

Instrument and Form	Divorced ^a	Intact ^b
Self-Concept Referents Test		
Self	.68	.62
Index of Adjustment and Values (self score)		
Adult	.91	-
High school	.95	.91
Junior high school	.89	.87
Elementary school	.93	.86
Bronfenbrenner Parent Behavior Questionnaire		
Loving	.90	.88
Demanding	.82	.69
Punishing	.89	.86

^aN = 77.

^bN = 79.

APPENDIX F

INFORMED CONSENT FOR MOTHERS FROM PAIS SAMPLE

The purpose of this study is to find out more about the post-divorce experience of children. Particular interests of the study are how the children perceive the parent-child relationships and their adjustment. The tests we will use with your child (children) are well known tests which have been used with children from many backgrounds and different types of family situations. The tests are to see how a child views himself/herself and other family members. Divorce is not mentioned in these tests in any way. These tests have been used in the past primarily with children who have not experienced divorce. Some of the questions may ask your child to think about areas not currently satisfying to you or them; however, it is hoped that such thought may prove constructive.

By agreeing to participate in this study I understand:

1. The testing will take between one and two hours of my time and will be done at my convenience.
2. There are no specific risks or benefits associated with the testing, but that the group results may provide useful information to me.
3. My child's confidentiality as a participant will be maintained by the use of code numbers instead of names.
4. No information regarding my child's specific answers will be released to me or anyone else.
5. I may ask any questions about the procedures of this study at any time I wish.
6. I may withdraw my child from this study any time I desire.

Date: _____

INFORMED CONSENT FOR ADDITIONAL DIVORCED MOTHERS

I agree to participate in this study based on my understanding of the following conditions:

1. The purpose of this study is to find out more about divorced mothers and their children.
2. My child will not be told why my family is being studied.
3. The questionnaires both my child(ren) and I will complete have been used with people from many different family situations. The questions pertain to how my child(ren) and I perceive ourselves and parent-child relationships. They are standardized questionnaires with no right or wrong answers.
4. The questionnaires will take about 1 hour for me to complete and between 30 minutes and 1 hour for (each of) my child(ren) to complete.
5. All testing will be done in my home at a time convenient to me and my child(ren).
6. Children between the ages of 3 and 9 will be asked to complete two tests (about 20-30 minutes) and children between the ages of 10 and 21 will be asked to complete three tests (about 45 minutes).
7. There are no specific benefits or risks for me or my child(ren) associated with completing these questionnaires. However, the group results given to me at the completion of the study may provide me with useful information. The information should be helpful to professionals who work with families and children.
8. All information given by me or my child(ren) will remain confidential. The researcher will use code numbers instead of names.
9. I may ask any questions about the process of this study at any time I wish. I can call 584-5244 after 7:00 (ask for Korrel Kanoy) or 974-5316 during the day (ask for Jo Lynn Cunningham or Priscilla White).
10. I am free to withdraw myself and/or my child(ren) at a later time if I decide I do not want to participate.

Date _____

Signature _____

INFORMED CONSENT FOR INTACT-FAMILY MOTHERS

I agree to participate in this study based on my understanding of the following conditions:

1. The purpose of this study is to find out more about family relationships, in particular, parent-child relationships.
2. The questionnaires both my child(ren) and I will complete have been used with people from many different family situations. The questions pertain to how my child(ren) and I perceive ourselves and parent-child relationships. They are standardized questionnaires with no right or wrong answers.
3. The questionnaires will take about 1 hour for me to complete and between 30 minutes and 1 hour for (each of) my child(ren) to complete.
4. All testing will be done in my home at a time convenient to me and my child(ren).
5. Children between the ages of 3 and 9 will be asked to complete two tests (about 20 to 30 minutes) and children between the ages of 10 and 21 will be asked to complete three tests (about 45 minutes).
6. There are no specific benefits or risks for me or my child(ren) associated with completing those questionnaires. However, the group results given to me at the end of the study may provide me with useful information. The information should be helpful to professionals who work with families.
7. All information given by me or my child(ren) will remain confidential. The researcher will use code numbers instead of names.
8. I may ask any questions about the process of this study at any time I wish. I can call 584-5244 after 7:00 p. m. (ask for Korrel Kanoy) or 974-5316 during the day (ask for Jo Lynn Cunningham or Priscilla White).
9. I am free to withdraw myself and/or my child(ren) at a later time if I decide I do not want to participate.

Date _____

Signature _____

INFORMED CONSENT FOR CHILDREN

A lot of people talk about parent-child relationships and family situations. The purpose of this study is to find out how children from different types of families perceive themselves and the parent-child relationships. If you are between the ages of 3 and 9, you will be asked to complete two tests and if you are between the ages of 10 and 21 you will be asked to complete three tests. These tests are not like the kind you may have in school and should be fun for you to do!

By agreeing to participate in this study I understand:

1. The testing will take between one and two hours including a break and will be done at a time I like.
2. There are no good or bad side effects of the testing.
3. Any information I give will remain private because the interviewer will use a code number instead of my name.
4. No information about my specific answers will be given to my mother, me or anyone else.
5. I may ask any questions about the process of this study at any time I wish.
6. I can change my mind later if I decide I do not want to participate.

Date: _____ Signature: _____

Witness: _____

APPENDIX G

OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS FOR MOTHER
AND CHILD VARIABLES

Divorced Mothers

Self-concept: The average numerical value of items 1-69, 71-90, 95, 97, and 99 on the TSCS.

Past adjustment: The average score of items 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 44, 46, 48, 52, 54, 56, 58, 60, 62, 64, 66, 70, 72, 74, 76, 78, 80, 82, 84, 88, 90, and 92 on the BDAI.

Present adjustment: The average score of items 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 41, 43, 45, 47, 49, 53, 55, 57, 59, 61, 63, 65, 67, 71, 73, 75, 77, 79, 81, 83, 85, 89, 91, and 93 on the BDAI.

Mother's perceptions of the quantity of father-child interaction:
The average score of items 32, 35-38, and 40-44 of the FRI.

Mother's perceptions of the quantity of mother-child interaction:
The average score of items 68, 72-74, and 77-80 on the FRI.

Mother's perceptions of the quality of father-child interaction:
The average score of items 46, 48, 49, 56, 57, 62, and 63 on the FRI.

Mother's perceptions of the quality of mother-child interaction:
The average score of items 52, 53, 54, 64, 82, and 83 on the FRI.

Mother's perceptions of the quality of exspouse interaction: The
average score of items 47, 50, 51, 55, 58, and 59 on the FRI.

Intact-Family Mothers

Self-concept: The average score of items 1-69, 71-90, 95, 97, and 99 on the TSCS.

Past adjustment: The average score of items 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 41, 43, 45, 47, 49, 51, 53, 55, 57, 59, 63, 65, 67, 69, 71, 73, 75, 79, 81, and 85 on the IA.

Present adjustment: The average score of items 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 44, 46, 48, 50, 52, 54, 56, 58, 60, 64, 66, 68, 70, 72, 74, 76, 80, 82, and 86 on the IA.

Mother's perceptions of the quantity of father-child interaction:
The average score of items 28, 31-34, and 36-40 on the FRIIF.

Mother's perceptions of the quantity of mother-child interaction:
The average score of items 68-70, and 73-76 on the FRIIF.

Mother's perceptions of the quality of father-child interaction:
The average score of items 42, 44, 45, 52, 53, 58, and 59 on the FRIIF.

Mother's perceptions of the quality of mother-child interaction:
The average score of items 48, 49, 56, 60, 78, and 79 on the FRIIF.

Mother's perceptions of the quality of husband-wife interaction:
The average score of items 43, 46, 47, 51, 54, and 55 on the FRIIF.

Children

Self-concept: The average score of items 1-3, 5, 7, 8, and 10-13 on the SCRT. The average score of items 1-13 and 17-18 on the Elementary School IAV. The average score of items 1-3, 5, 7-14, 16, 18-24, and 28-33 on the Junior High School IAV. The average score of items 2, 6-8,

10-20, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, and 31-37 on the High School IAV. The average score of items 1-3, 5-18, and 21-49 on the Adult IAV.

Mother loving: The average score of items 1, 8, 9, 16, 17, 24, 25, 31, 34, 38, 39, 41, and 45 on the Mother Form of the BPBQ.

Mother demanding: The average score of items 2, 3, 4, 7, 10, 11, 12, 15, 18, 19, 20, and 32 on the Mother Form of the BPBQ.

Mother punishing: The average score of items 26, 28, 29, 30, 33, 35, 36, 37, 40, 42, 43, and 44 on the Mother Form of the BPBQ.

Father loving: The average score of items 1, 8, 9, 16, 17, 24, 25, 31, 34, 38, 39, 41, and 45 on the Father Form of the BPBQ.

Father demanding: The average score of items 2, 3, 4, 7, 10, 11, 12, 15, 18, 19, 20, and 32 on the Father Form of the BPBQ.

Father punishing: The average score of items 26, 28, 29, 30, 33, 35, 36, 37, 40, 42, 43, and 44 on the Father Form of the BPBQ.

Perceived distance between the child and mother: The average distance between the child and woman figures in sets 1, 4, 5, and 8 on the SS.

Perceived distance between the child and father: The average distance between the child and man figures in sets 2, 4, 6, and 8 on the SS.

Perceived distance between the mother and father: The average distance between the man and woman figures in sets 3, 4, 7, and 8 on the SS.

Perceived nonhuman barriers between the child and mother: The number of times the rectangles are placed between the child and woman figures in sets 5 and 8 on the SS.

Perceived nonhuman barriers between the child and father: The number of times rectangles are placed between the child and man figures in sets 6 and 8 on the SS.

Perceived nonhuman barriers between the mother and father: The number of times rectangles are placed between the man and woman figures in sets 7 and 8 on the SS.

VITA

Korrel Woody Kanoy was born Marie Korrel Woody on February 12, 1955, in Martinsville, Virginia. She attended elementary school in Bassett, Virginia, and graduated from Bassett High School in June, 1973. She received her Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology from the University of Richmond in 1977. She received her Master of Science (August, 1978) and Doctor of Philosophy (June, 1980) degrees in Home Economics from the Department of Child and Family Studies at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

While studying for the graduate degrees, Korrel worked as a Graduate Teaching Assistant in The University of Tennessee Child Development Laboratories, and as a Graduate Research Assistant for The University of Tennessee Transportation Center. In addition, she served as a Graduate Teaching Assistant for the Department of Child and Family Studies and taught courses in both the child development and family relations areas. She also directed a program for children from abusing families.

The author has published manuscripts in the areas of child development and family relationships. In addition, several presentations have been made to local, state, regional, and national groups in the areas of divorce and parenting education.

The author is a member of Omicron Delta Kappa, Psi Chi, Phi Beta Kappa, Phi Kappa Phi, and Mortar Board honorary societies. Professional memberships include National Council on Family Relations, National Association for the Education of Young Children, American Association of

Marriage and Family Therapy, and National Committee for the Prevention
of Child Abuse.