

ADULT GRANDCHILDREN'S PERCEPTIONS OF GRAND-
PARENTAL SUPPORT: A COMPARISON OF
INTACT AND DIVORCED FAMILIES

By

CAROLYN COGSWELL

Bachelor of Science

University of Kansas

Lawrence, Kansas

1968

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
July, 1992

Photo
1992
C. 10/1/92

ADULT GRANDCHILDREN'S PERCEPTIONS OF GRAND-
PARENTAL SUPPORT: A COMPARISON OF
INTACT AND DIVORCED FAMILIES

Thesis Approved:

Carolyn S. Henry

Thesis Advisor

Linda C. Robinson

Daniel Fournier

Thomas C. Collins

Dean of the Graduate College

PREFACE

When I enrolled in my first class at O.S.U. with the intention of pursuing a Master's Degree in Family Relations and Child Development, I could not have known by what means I might truly attain that elusive characteristic known as "focus". I was interested in everything, and had difficulty staying within the same general subject area, even when asked to write a short paper. Over the course of time, and, largely as a result of a memorable address to graduate assistants by Professor Culp, I gradually began to develop this lovely quality. If producing a thesis accomplishes nothing else, I must say that it does develop focus. One must either love the subject matter or ultimately become discouraged, so I am thankful that this process has yielded, for me, a love for and keen interest in the impact of divorce on the kinship system, and, especially, the grandparent-grandchild relationship.

Before I came to Oklahoma, I had also read something about "mentoring" in the literature distributed by the department of which I would soon become a member. Many professors have been my mentors, but I especially want to thank Carolyn Henry, my Principal Advisor for this thesis, for her continual encouragement, affirmation, wisdom and insight, shared most generously with me whenever I needed it the most. I want to thank her also for being instrumental

in my developing an interest in grandparent issues. When I was enrolled in her class, my second year here, I had no idea the brief unit on grandparents would lead to a burning research interest, as well as the privilege of working with one who shares my interest in step-families, grandparenting and step-grandparenting. If I need an example of what a mentor should be, I have only to remember Dr. Henry.

There are so many people I wish to thank for their help in completing this work. Thanks to my committee members, Linda Robinson and David Fournier, for their accessibility and helpfulness. Thanks to Mark Payton of the Statistics Department and Jim Choike of the Math Department for their insight and interest.

There is one person I definitely could not have done this without, and I would request a public round of applause for if I could, and that is for Iris McPherson of the University Computer Center. She not only knew all the answers, and received me cheerfully day after day, but she even told me not to be too hard on myself. I could not be more grateful for all your help, Iris. Thank you.

I would like to thank everyone at the Computer Center; the Office staff, especially Rhonda, the Help Desk, especially David, and Operations. Everyone was wonderfully skillful, helpful and personable.

I wish to thank my roommate, Ladona Tornabene, not only for the use of her personal computer, but also for putting up with me during those difficult last several weeks of the

summer. You were your usual resilient self, most of the time, and I hope you can say the same about me.

In addition, I want to thank Jinnifer Gibbs and Chedra Billingsly for helping me collect data in Linda Robinson's discussion classes. Thanks, again, Linda, for allowing me to collect data in your class and especially for letting me use class time. Thank you to Dean Gorall and Kay Murphy for so graciously allowing me into your classes to collect data. With the help of all of you, I was able to collect a sizeable amount of information, and it would not have been possible if someone like you had not been willing to sacrifice in order to be involved in the process.

Thank you to Barbara Heister, my supervisor in the Child Development Labs for being patient, especially on the days when Audio Visual kept calling me during class time. Thanks also to you just for being the nurturing, supportive person that you are, throughout the year.

Thank you to Elaine Wilson, supervisor of my research assistantship this summer, for your patience, cooperation, and understanding while I was involved both with your research as well as my own.

All of the above persons have been a joy to get to know and I hope that I have made many lifetime friends. I certainly will carry positive lifetime memories of all of you with me and hope to have opportunities to associate with you in the future.

I would also like to thank Gary Strickland from New Covenant Fellowship for helping me with statistics questions, any time, night or day. I am also grateful to Bruce Wilkinson for similar availability regarding computers, data and printing and to Joe Schrader at PC Tech for the use of his laser printer. I would like to thank Susan Hackett for all her understanding, as well as her expertise and help with Table 2, and persons too numerous to name for their friendship and encouragement. Thank you to Jeremy Davis for helping me input data when the process seemed surely impossible. Most of all I wish to thank the Lord, Jesus Christ, the Author of my faith, for His steadfast love and power which has sustained me and guided me so far, and I am assured will continue to do so from now on.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
MANUSCRIPT.....	1
Abstract.....	2
Literature Review.....	4
Grandparental Roles.....	5
Personal and Social Role Meanings.....	6
Instrumental and Expressive Role Behavior.....	7
Impact of Divorce on Grandparent-Grandchild Relationships.....	7
Grandparenting Styles in Intact and Divorced Families.....	8
Methods.....	10
Subjects.....	11
Research Design.....	13
Measurement.....	14
Analysis.....	16
Results.....	17
Limitations.....	20
Discussion.....	21
References.....	26
APPENDIXES.....	38
APPENDIX A - LITERATURE REVIEW.....	39
Grandparental Roles.....	40
Link with the Past.....	42
Religious Orientation.....	42
Personal and Social Role Meanings.....	46
Instrumental and Expressive Role Behavior.....	47
Impact of Divorce on Grandparent-Grandchild Relationships.....	47
Differences in Age and Gender.....	53
Theoretical Rationale and Major Hypotheses.....	54
Summary.....	58
APPENDIX B - METHODOLOGY.....	62
Subjects.....	62
Analysis of Data.....	64
Reliability.....	69
References.....	73

APPENDIX C - INSTRUMENT.....81

APPENDIX D - CONSENT FORM AND INSTITUTIONAL
REVIEW BOARD FORM.....90

APPENDIX E - SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES.....93

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Participants' Demographic Information.....	31
II. Reliability Information for Scales.....	32
III. Comparison of Role Behaviors by Marital Status of Parent.....	33
IV. Comparison of Role Meaning by Marital Status of Parent.....	34
V. Comparison of Role Behavior by Marital Status of Parent (Contact Not Limited by Geographical Distance).....	35
VI. Comparison of Role Meaning by Marital Status of Parent (Contact Not Limited by Geographical Distance).....	36
VII. Comparison of Importance of Grandparental Relationship by Marital Status of Parent (For All Grandparents and Contact Not Limited by Geographical Distance).....	37
VIII. Comparison of Role Behavior by Marital Status of Parent (All Grandparents are Living).....	93
IX. Comparison of Role Meaning by Marital Status of Parent (All Grandparents are Living).....	94
X. Comparison of Role Behavior by Marital Status of Parent (Female Participants Only).....	95
XI. Comparison of Role Meaning by Marital Status of Parent (Female Participants Only).....	96

XII. Comparison of Importance of Grandparental Relationship by Marital Status of Parents (For Female Participants and All Living Grandparents).....97

Adult Grandchildren's Perceptions of Grand-
Parental Support: A Comparison of
Intact and Divorced Families
Carolyn Cogswell
Oklahoma State University
Family Relations and Child Development

Abstract

Self-report questionnaires were administered to 327 students in Family Relations and Child Development classes, asking the participants to rate their grandparents on five scales, Instrumental and Expressive Role Behavior, Social and Personal Role Meaning, and Importance of the Grandparental Relationship. Few significant differences were found between the responses of children from intact and divorced families, concluding that the grandparent-grandchild relationship is important to children from both backgrounds. Further research is needed to explore grandchildren's perceptions of grandparents' role behaviors and meaning, especially considering relationship type and sociodemographic variables.

Adult Grandchildren's Perceptions of Grandparental Support:
A Comparison of Divorced and Intact Families

According to family stress theory, divorce is a stressful event or hardship which increases and may possibly intensify the difficulties families face. (McCubbin & Patterson, 1983). Three kinds of resources impact upon the family's adaptation to crisis: (a) family members' personal resources; (b) the family system's internal resources; and (c) social support (McCubbin & Patterson (1983)).

In Hill's ABCX Crisis Model A (the Stressor event interacting with B (the family's crisis meeting resources) interacting with C (the definition the family makes of the event) produce X (the crisis) (cited in McCubbin & Patterson, 1983). Whereas the original ABCX Model focused upon pre-crisis variables, McCubbin and Patterson expand this concept in the Double ABCX Model by including post-crisis variables in an effort to describe the family's adaptation to crises over time (McCubbin & Patterson, 1983). Thus the A factor becomes the aA factor (Pile-Up), the B factor becomes the bB factor (Family Adaptive Resources), the C factor becomes the cC factor (Family Definition and Meaning) and the X factor becomes the xX factor (Family Adaptation).

Grandparents have the potential to serve as valuable resources for grandchildren especially during times of transition (Barranti, 1985). While some studies have

considered the impact of divorce on the kinship systems (Anspach, 1976; Duffy, 1982; Spicer & Hampe, 1975), noticeably lacking is research that deals specifically with how grandchildren of divorce perceive their grandparents to provide support. Because divorced families are a distinct family form that may have different needs from intact families (Ahrons & Rodgers, 1987), research needs to address the resources, such as grandparents, available within divorced families to assist them in their development.

Although much has been written in the past thirty years about grandparenting roles (Cherlin & Furstenberg, 1986; Hartshorne & Manaster, 1982; Kahana & Kahana, 1970; Kornhaber & Woodward, 1981; Neugarten & Weinstein, 1964; Robertson, 1976) and a few studies have addressed divorce in relation to grandparent-grandchild relationships (Ahrons & Bowman, 1982; Anspach, 1976; Furstenberg & Spanier, 1984; Gladstone, 1988; Johnson, 1988; Kalish & Visher, 1982; Matthews & Sprey, 1984; Spicer & Hampe, 1975), relatively little work has been directed at these issues relative to divorced families.

Literature Review

Research has indicated that grandparent/grandchild relationships are important to members of both the first and third generations (Hartshorne & Manaster, 1982; Kahana & Kahana, 1971; Kornhaber & Woodward, 1981; Robertson, 1976). Kornhaber and Woodward (1981) used children's drawings to study the significance of these relationships from the point

of view of children. Trained therapists interviewed children and interpreted their drawings and discovered that grandparents were functioning in the roles of teacher, caretaker, negotiator between child and parent, role model, connections between the past and future, and helped determine how the young felt about the old in society (Kornhaber & Woodward, 1981).

Grandparental Roles

Based upon interviews with 70 grandmothers Neugarten and Weinstein (1964) outlined five styles of grandparenting. These are (1) "Formal", or following what they regard as the "proper" role, (2) "Fun Seekers", whose relation to grandchildren is characterized by informality and playfulness, (3) "Surrogate Parent", or grandparents who entered into "parental" roles by request of the parent(s), (4) "Reservoir of Family Wisdom", where the grandparent is the dispenser of special skills or resources, and, (5) "Distant Figure", or grandparents who are rarely seen except on special ritual occasions such as Christmas or birthdays.

An alternative typology of grandmothers examined the significance of grandmotherhood by focusing on the conceptions of grandmothers with regard to the meaning and behaviors they associate with the role. Robertson's (1977) results indicated that grandparental roles have had different meanings for individuals. Some grandmothers perceive their role from the context of normative or societal expectations (the *Symbolic* types). Others regard

their roles in highly personal terms, addressing the joys and pleasures of grandparenting (the *Individualized* types). Those labelled the *Apportioned* types combine normative and personal meanings, while still others (the *Remote* types) place little meaning on the role and had a distant view of grandparenting.

Personal and Social Role Meanings

The social role dimension is determined by socialization; the grandparent assumes role expectations which conform to preconceived social or normative standards. The personal role dimension, on the other hand, stems from forces within the individual which meet his or her personal needs (Robertson, 1977). If grandparents scored high on both dimensions, they were assigned to the *Apportioned* type; if they scored low on both dimensions, they were labelled *Remote*. Individuals who scored high on the personal but low on the social dimension were described as the *Individualized* type, and those who scored high on the social but low on the personal dimensions were seen as *Symbolic* types.

Grandmothers in Robertson's (1977) study who were categorized as enacting the *Symbolic* role (high social role meaning, low personal role meaning) spoke of the meaning of this role in context with a norm or standard of social orientations. These women were interested in doing what was morally right or good for their grandchildren. For example, one grandmother stated that she wanted her grandchildren to get a good education and be good workers.

Instrumental and Expressive Role Behavior

Robertson (1971) identified two basic types of role behaviors among grandmothers: (a) *instrumental role behaviors*, or shared activities, child care, visits with grandchildren, providing financial assistance or gifts for grandchildren; and (b) *expressive role behaviors*, referring to nurturing or supportive behaviors toward grandchildren.

Grandparents frequently provide child care in the divorced family. In fact the grandparents' home may serve as a "neutral zone" where the divorced couple may perform much of their co-parenting. Both men and women look to their parents for child care services; they both may also request financial assistance. In-laws may even provide help to an estranged spouse who might respond with gratitude and devotion. In this way long-term family obligations may be strengthened (Furstenberg & Spanier, 1984).

Robertson's (1971, 1976, 1977) work provides a basis for studying instrumental and expressive role behaviors as well as social and personal role meanings of the grandparent model, and has been the basis of other studies (Hartshorne & Manaster, 1982; Trygstad & Sanders, 1989; Henry, Ceglian, & Matthews, 1992). The concepts developed in Robertson's work also form the basis of this study.

Impact of Divorce on Grandparent-Grandchild Relationships

Because of the structural changes in society related to high divorce rates and increasing mobility there is evidence that the kinship ties between the first and third

generations have changed in recent years (Ahrons & Bowman, 1982; Ahrons & Rodgers, 1987; Anspach, 1976; Cherlin & Furstenberg, 1986; Furstenberg & Spanier, 1984; Gladstone, 1988; Johnson, 1988; Kalish & Visher, 1982; Matthews & Sprey, 1984; Spicer & Hampe, 1985). Little consensus is available regarding the roles of grandparents after parental divorce.

Ahrons and Bowman (1982) reported many grandparents saw less of their grandchildren after divorce. Out of 78 grandmothers 42 (59.2%) indicated the divorce had not altered contact with grandchildren. Seventeen percent reported increased contact while 24% reported seeing less of their grandchildren following divorce.

In interviews with 80 grandmothers, Gladstone (1988) reported that the majority of his study saw grandchildren more after divorce (Gladstone, 1988). An effort was made to determine whether there was any change in the frequency of contact between grandmothers and grandchildren after marriage breakdown of the second generation. A statistically significant increase in the frequency of face-to-face contact between grandmothers and grandchildren after the disruption of an adult child's marriage was indicated).

Grandparenting Styles in Intact and Divorced Families

Although there are numerous typologies of grandparent styles, there are no studies dealing with the similarities and differences in grandparenting styles between intact and divorced families. For a more complete understanding of the

importance of the grandparenting role in the extended family, empirical studies of the function of grandparents in the divorced family are needed. A study of the types of support given to grandchildren from grandparents in divorced families could create a new understanding of the uniqueness of divorced families and the function of the extended family after marital disruption.

Although there has been some research on grandparenting styles and the effect of divorce on grandparent-grandchild relationships, little scholarship focused on grandparent-grandchild relationships in divorced families. Particularly lacking is a detailed description of the ways in which grandparents are supportive of their grandchildren in divorced families and in what ways the perceptions of children from divorced families might differ from those in intact families.

Kornhaber's (1985) study indicated that the grandparent-grandchild bond is second only in emotional importance to the parent-child bond, and that children with close relationship to at least one grandparent had a sense of belonging to a family and community, were not sexist, and were not afraid of growing old because their grandparents provided a positive role model. In an intact marriage, a grandparent provides a role model for grandchildren that may represent an ideal, something to strive for, something that was not an element of their family of origin, but can still be viewed as a possible goal for themselves. Wallerstein

(1989, p. 111) refers to this as, "symbolic generational continuity and living proof to children that relationships can be lasting, reliable, and dependable."

Although there is a lack of consensus in the literature on the ways in which divorce impacts the grandparent-grandparent relationship, many studies have reported increased involvement of grandparents with their grandchildren after the dissolution of the children's marriage. Sufficient data (Ahrons & Bowman, 1982; Cherlin & Furstenberg, 1986; Furstenberg & Spanier, 1984; Gladstone, 1988; Johnson, 1988c) has been reported to support the hypothesis that grandchildren whose parents are divorced will rank their grandparents higher on the scales of personal and social role meaning, instrumental and expressive role meaning and importance of the grandparental relationship.

Methods

This research questioned adult grandchildren from intact and divorced families, using self-report questionnaires which measured the importance of the grandparent-grandchild relationship to the adult grandchild, the grandchild's perception of the grandparents' instrumental and expressive role behavior and social and personal role meaning perceived in the grandparental relationship.

Subjects

The sample was obtained from three large classes in the department of Family Relations and Child Development, without controlling for age or gender. Three hundred and twenty-seven questionnaires were distributed to participants during class time on several consecutive days. The students completed the questionnaires within 20 to 30 minutes and returned them.

In all there were sixty-two (62) male participants and two hundred and sixty-five (265) female participants. Racial composition of the sample follows: white (89%), Native American, (5.8%), Black (3.1%) Asian (.9%), Hispanic (.9%) and other (.3%). The range of the participants' ages was from 18 to 48; the largest number (24.2%) of the students were 19, while 22.6% were 20, 15.6% were 21, 13.2% were 18, and 11.3% were 22. The remaining ages were represented by much smaller numbers (see Table 1).

Seventy-five percent of the participants were Protestant (including both traditional denominational affiliations and those listing themselves as Christians), 12.5% were Catholic, .3 percent (one participant) was Muslim. Seven percent (7%) listed no religious preference and 4.3% were classified as "other" including Buddhism, Mormonism, and Jehovah's Witnesses. There were no Jewish participants (see Table 1).

Insert Table 1 about here

The largest number (27.5%) of the students were majoring in Family Relations and Child Development. Thirty-three students, or 10.1% of the sample, were Design, Housing and Merchandising majors and 8.3% (27 students) were Psychology majors. There were 4.9% each (16 students) who were Accounting and Business Administration majors, 3.4% each (11 students) majoring in Biological Sciences and Nutritional Sciences and 7% (or 23 students) were undecided. A variety of other majors were represented by one to seven students.

The largest group (35%) were sophomores, 25.1% were freshman, 22% were juniors, 16.5% were seniors. Only .9% were graduate or special students and one participant did not list level in school.

An interesting finding relative to the family composition of this group of students was that 44.3% or 145 participants reported having no sisters and 44% or 144 participants had no brothers. Mother's ages ranged from 33 to 81, father's ages ranged from 36 to 82; 2.5% of mothers and 2.5% of fathers (of eight participants) were reported as deceased.

Out of 327 participants, 208 or 63.6% reported that their parents were married to each other; 28.4% or 93

participants had divorced parents. In addition, seventeen (1.2%) reported a parent was widowed, four (.3%) reported that their parents were never married, and only one participant was adopted (the adoptive parents were separated).

Research Design

Similarities and differences between two groups, those from intact and those from divorced families were examined regarding their relationship with their grandparent(s), using the Causal Comparative or "Ex Post Facto" research design (Isaac and Michael, 1990) descriptive statistics, and one way analysis of variance. The following hypotheses were formulated for this study:

Hypothesis I: College students with divorced parents attribute greater importance to their relationship with their grandparents than adults whose parents are not divorced.

Hypothesis II: College students with divorced parents perceive their grandparents to attribute more personal role meaning to grandparental roles than adults whose parents are not divorced.

Hypothesis III: College students with divorced parents perceive their grandparents to attribute more social role meaning to their grandparental roles than adults whose parents are not divorced.

Hypothesis IV: College students with divorced parents perceive their grandparents to have performed more

expressive role behaviors in their grandparental roles than adults whose parents are not divorced.

Hypothesis V: College students with divorced parents perceive their grandparents to have performed more instrumental role behaviors in their grandparental roles than adults whose parents are not divorced.

Measurement

Self-report questionnaires were used, derived from an instrument used by Henry et al (1992), an instrument used by Hartshorne and Manaster (1982) and standard fact sheet items. The measures of perceptions of grandparental role behaviors and role meanings were adapted from Robertson's (1971) questions used in interviews with grandmothers (see Henry et al., 1992) Four Likert-type scales were used to measure Instrumental Role Behaviors (9 items), Expressive Role Behaviors (4 items), Social Role Meaning (5 items) and Personal Role Meaning (5 items) (Henry et al., 1992). Response choices for the Role Behavior and Role Meaning Scales were (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) occasionally agree, (4) disagree, and (5) strongly disagree.

An additional scale, Importance of the Grandparent Relationship, was developed by Hartshorne and Manaster (1982). Participants were asked to rate the importance of their relationship with each grandparent whom they could remember. Response choices were (1) extremely important, (2) somewhat important, (3) neither important nor unimportant, (4) somewhat unimportant, and (5) extremely

unimportant. The original scale had seven items, each addressing a separate grandparent type (mother's mother, mother's father, father's mother, father's father). In the current scale, grandparent types were listed across the top and participants were asked to respond to each item relative to each grandparent type. Thus, rather than asking, "How important is your relationship with your (father's father, father's mother, father's mother, father's father, etc.)?" in four separate questions, the participants were asked, "How important are the individual relationships with your grandparents to you?" The respondents then indicated their answer choice for each grandparent type listed. Thus four questions from the original scale resulted in only one item, reducing the number of items in the scale from seven to four (see Appendix C). This instrument also contained a background information section at the beginning of the questionnaire, adding items about step-siblings, half-siblings and respondent's age when parents divorced, if parents are divorced.

Reliability information was not available for the portion of the Hartshorne and Manaster (1982) scale used in this study (importance of the grandparent relationship). The previously established internal consistency reliability coefficients (Cronbach's alpha) for the Instrumental Role Behavior, Expressive Role Behavior, Social Role Meaning, and Personal Role Meaning scales were .94, .91, .91, .93, respectively (Henry et al., 1992).

Cronbach's alphas were established for each scale using data from the current project. For this study, reliability was measured for each grandparent (mother's mother, mother's father, father's mother, and father's father) and for each grandparent figure (grandparent figure number one and grandparent figure number two) for each scale (Instrumental Role Behavior [IRB], Expressive Role Behavior [ERB], Social Role Meaning [SRM], Personal Role Meaning [PRM] and Importance of the Grandparental Relationship [IGR], thus creating additional scales; i.e., IRBMM (Instrumental Role Behavior-Mother's Mother), IRBMF (Instrumental Role Behavior-Mother's Father), etc. A complete listing of the reliability coefficients, previously established alphas and number of cases for each reliability analysis is contained in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about here

Analysis

One-way analysis of variance was used to examine whether the mean scores of the adult grandchildren's perceptions of their grandparents' role behaviors, role meanings, and importance of the grandparental relationship differ between grandchildren from divorced and intact families. Separate analyses were conducted for each of the four relationship types (i.e., mother's mother, mother's father, father's mother, father's father).

Results

The hypotheses that adult grandchildren from divorced families would rate their grandparents higher on all scales (Instrumental Role Behavior, Expressive Role Behavior, Social Role Meaning, Personal Role Meaning and Importance of the Grandparent Relationship) were not supported by this study. Since participants were asked to answer questions for each of their grandparents and/or grandparent figures, a separate scale resulted for each grandparent type (i.e., mother's mother, mother's father, father's mother, father's father). On the Expressive Role Behavior Scale for Grandparent Figure Number One, there was an F-probability of .05 for a small group of grandchildren (41 from intact families and 28 from divorced families, see Table 3) with children of divorced families showing the smaller mean, indicating children of divorce perceived greater expressive role behavior from their Grandparent Figure Number One.

Insert Table 3 about here

A small group (41 from intact and 27 from divorced families) yielded an F-probability of .06, approaching significance (see Table 4) on the scale of Social Role Meaning for Grandparent Figure Number One. Again, the mean was smaller for children from divorced families. A third time, Grandparent Figure Number One rated high on the

Personal Role Meaning scale for a small number (41 from intact, 25 from divorced families), the mean being smaller (meaning a higher rating), and an F-probability of .03 (see Table 4).

Insert Table 4 about here

It would be expected that grandparent figures would rate higher for children of divorce, since one might expect children from divorce to be more likely to have them, if this grandparent figure were a step-grandparent. Since this grandparent figure could be a family friend or other relative, however, he or she was not restricted just to families whose structure may have been changed by divorce. Although children from divorced families rated their grandparent figure number one higher, there were fewer in number. This was a surprising finding. On most of the items (about two-thirds) items for grandparent figures number one and two were left blank. Similarly, about two-thirds of the sample were from intact families. But this was not indicative of which grandchildren would have grandparent figures number one and two, as indicated by the above findings.

Henry et al (1992) have noted that sociodemographic variables would predict perceptions of grandmothers' and stepgrandmothers' role behaviors and role meanings. Cherlin & Furstenberg (1986) stated that geographical

mobility in American society has made it impossible for most grandparents to live nearby. In order to examine how this might have affected findings in this study, the same analyses of variance were calculated on a portion of the sample where lack of contact with a given grandparent was not the result of geographical distance. When these analyses were run, the result was that there was a significant difference on the Expressive Role Behavior Scale for the Mother's Mother ($F=.01$, see Table 5), with the higher rating (but lower mean) belonging to the children of divorced families. With the exception of Grandparent Figure Number 1 on the scale of Personal Role Meaning for a very small group (married, 28; divorced, 9; $F=.01$, see Table 6), showing a higher rating from the children from divorced families, other significant differences were not found. Further research is necessary to explore the implications of sociodemographic variables regarding the grandparent-grandchild relationship. Greater focus on such details as amount and type of contact should be explored.

Insert Tables 5 and 6 about here

Even though a large number of significant differences were not found between the perceptions of grandchildren from divorced and intact families, much valuable information was obtained about adult grandchildren's perceptions of their grandparents' roles and the importance of the grandparental

relationship. For example, for and instrumental behavior such as, "This grandparent regularly spent a week or more with me," the largest group (28.1%) answered "strongly agree" for the mother's mother, while the largest group (38%) reported "strongly disagree" for the mother's father on this item. Similarly, on this item, (28.1%) reported "strongly disagree" for the father's mother and 35.5% reported "strongly disagree" for the father's father. This same pattern emerged in the following item, "This grandparent often took me to trips such as shopping, the zoo, movies, circus, etc.;" that is, 30.1% reported "strongly agree" for the mother's mother, 34.4% "strongly disagree" for the mother's father, 30.6% "strongly disagree" for the father's mother and 38.2% "strongly disagree" for the father's father. But, although results indicated that grandchildren may have rated certain of their grandparents "disagree" or "strongly disagree: on items in the scales measuring specific role behaviors or role meanings, they tended to rate all four of their grandparents fairly high on the scale of importance (see Table 7).

 Insert Table 7 about here

Limitations

Because the sample is selected from classes in the Department of Family Relations and Child Development, it is not random; thus, generalizability is limited.

Generalizability is also limited by the fact that the sample was mostly female (see Table 1).

The age of the participants might also be a limitation, as they are widely discrepant. Certainly it would be expected that adult grandchildren in their twenties might respond differently than much younger or much older persons. Since the study is limited by dependence upon recall and retrospect, this factor must be taken into consideration.

Another limitation of this study is the fact that, with the exception of the Importance of the Grandparent Relationship, the instrument was originally designed to query grandmothers. Therefore the expectations of the grandchildren were not taken into account in developing the instrument. For future study this factor should be considered.

In addition, there are limitations to the Causal-Comparative (Ex Post Facto) Research Design. The primary weakness of this design is the lack of control over independent variables. The investigator must take the facts as he or she finds them with no opportunity to arrange or manipulate the conditions or variables that have influenced the facts (Isaac & Michael, 1981).

Discussion

Since there were few real differences found between the perceptions of children of divorced families and children of intact families regarding the role behaviors, meanings and importance of the grandparental relationship, it appears

that the role of grandparents after divorce may not be clearly different from the perspective of the children. Since differences were found in perceptions of grandmothers in previous studies (Ahrons & Bowman, 1982; Furstenberg & Spanier, 1986; Gladstone, 1988) researchers may have found different results in a similar study directed at grandmothers.

Since grandparents are a resource in both married and divorced families, researchers and family practitioners might continue to explore the specific ways in which grandparents contribute to the welfare of their adult children and grandchildren.

As Kivnick (1982) observed, grandparenting experience can be characterized by happiness and fulfillment, or, if the grandparent is not recognized, by disappointment. The importance of this role as experienced by all three generations, deserves greater attention by researchers and family practitioners.

Hagestad (1985) stated that the grandparent role may be more salient to women than men during the middle and later years. Certainly, in this study mother's mothers were the grandparent type receiving the most frequent ratings of "strongly agree" on all five scales (Instrumental Role Behavior, Expressive Role Behavior, Social Role Meaning, Personal Role Meaning and Importance of the Grandparent Relationship).

Research has already shown that grandparents are involved in the lives of their grandchildren by providing emotional support, baby-sitting and help in time of emergencies or crises, including illness or divorce (Bengston & Robertson, 1985; Cherlin & Furstenberg, 1986; Johnson, 1988, Presser, 1989). The findings of this study are consistent with the findings of earlier research. Adult grandchildren perceived their grandparents as involved and important in their lives whether or not their parents were divorced.

In this study children from both intact and divorced families reported grandparent figures other than their natural grandparents. Thus, the need for the grandparent role is apparent, even when all four grandparents are living. While it was expected that this person would be a step-grandparent in most cases and to appear mostly in divorced families, we found that this was not necessarily the case. Other persons, including but not limited to step-grandparents, fulfilled this role. Grandparent figures included family and friends, aunts, uncles and great-grandparents. Thus we see that to adult grandchildren, the roles of persons in the extended family and even outside the family are important and fulfill a vital function in fulfilling the role of a grandparent in their lives.

Further research is needed to explore in greater detail what differences might exist in the perceptions of grandchildren from intact and divorced families. Possibly

with a more detailed research instrument, addressing key variables, and with more specificity, greater differences might be detected. Related to this, research should address some of the variables that affect the grandparent-grandchild relationship in the divorced and remarried family, such as geographical distance and contact with a noncustodial parent, controlling for these variables when possible, and looking closer at the Instrumental and Expressive Role Behaviors, perhaps with more detailed and more numerous items in the scales (the Expressive Role Behavior scale and the Importance of the Grandparent Relationship scale had only four items each). Quite possibly more detailed information could be obtained with more items in each scale, addressing more behaviors than the ones used in this study.

Since results indicated that although grandchildren may have rated certain of their grandparents "disagree" or "strongly disagree" on items in the scales measuring specific role behaviors or role meanings, they tended to rate all four of their grandparents fairly high on the scale of importance (see Table 7), this might indicate that there are questions that our research did not address as completely as they could be.

Apparently, there are elements of the grandparent-grandchild relationship that may not be as tangible as those addressed in the scales used in the current study. Further study is needed to explore the "symbolic" functions of

grandparenthood, as well as behavior that is directly observable (Bengston, 1985).

2

References

- Ahrons, C. R., & Bowman, M. E. (1982). Changes in family relationships following divorce of an adult child: Grandmother's perceptions. Journal of Divorce, 5, 49-68.
- Ahrons, C. R., & Rodgers, R. H. (1987). Divorced families: A multidisciplinary developmental view. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Anspach, D. F. (1987). Kinship and divorce. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38, 323-330.
- Barranti, C. C. R. The grandparent/grandchild relationship: Family resource in an era of voluntary bonds. Family Relations, 34, 343-352.
- Brubaker, T. H. (1990). Families in later life: A burgeoning research area. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52, 959-981.
- Cherlin, A. J., & Furstenberg, F. F. (1986). The new American grandparent: A place in the family, a life apart. New York: Basic Books.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika, 16, 297-334.
- Denham, T. E., & Smith, C. W. (1989). The influence of grandparents on grandchildren: A review of the literature and resources. Family Relations, 38, 345-350.

- Duffy, M. (1982). Divorce and the dynamics of the family kinship system. In E. O. Fisher (Ed.), Impact of divorce on the extended family (pp. 3-18). New York: Haworth Press.
- Foster, H. H., & Freed, D. J. (1982). Grandparent visitation: Vagaries and vicissitudes. Journal of Divorce, 79-99.
- Furstenberg, F. F. Jr., & Spanier, G. B. (1984). Recycling the family: Remarriage after divorce. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Gladstone, J. W. (1988). Perceived changes in grandmother-grandchild relations following a child's separation or divorce. The Gerontologist, 28, 66-72.
- Hagestad, G. O. (1985) Continuity and connectedness. In V. L. Bengston & J. F. Robertson (Eds.), Grandparenthood (pp. 31-48). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hartshorne, T. S., & Manaster, G. J. (1982). The relationship with grandparents: Contact, importance, role conceptions. International Journal of Aging and Human Development, 15, 233-244.
- Henry, C. S. Ceglie, C. P., & Matthews, D. W. (1992). The role behaviors, role meanings, and grandmothering styles of grandmothers and stepgrandmothers: Perceptions of the middle generation. Journal of Divorce and Remarriage, 17, 1-21.

- Hetherington, M. E. (1989). Coping with family transitions: Winners, losers, and survivors. Child Development, 60, 1-14.
- Isaac, S., & Michael, W. B. (1990). Handbook in research and evaluation: Second edition. San Diego: Edits.
- Johnson, C. L. (1988). Active and latent functions of grandparenting during the divorce process. The Gerontologist, 28, 185-191.
- Johnson, C. L. (1988). Ex Familia. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Johnson, C. L. (1988). Postdivorce reorganization of relationships between divorcing children and their parents. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 50, 221-231.
- Kalish, R. A., & Visher, E. (1982). Grandparents of divorce and remarriage. Journal of Divorce, 5, 127-140.
- Kivnick, H. Q. (1982). The meaning of grandparenthood. Ann Arbor, MI: Umi.
- Kornhaber, A. (1985). Grandparenthood and the new "social contract". In V.L. Bengston & J.F. Robertson (Eds.), Grandparenthood (pp. 159-171). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Kornhaber, A., & Woodward, K. L. (1981). Grandparents/grandchildren: The vital connection. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Matthews, S. H., & Sprey, J. (1984). The impact of divorce on grandparenthood: An exploratory study. The Gerontologist, 24, 41-47.

- McCubbin, H. I., & Patterson, J. M. (1983). Family transitions: Adaptations to stress. In H.I. McCubbin & C.R. Figley (Eds.), Stress and the family: Coping with normative transitions (Vol. 1, pp. 5-25). New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Neugarten, B. L., & Weinstein, K. K. (1964). The changing American grandparent. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 26, 199-204.
- Presser, R. (1989). Some economic complexities of child care provided by grandmothers. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 51, 581-591.
- Ponzetti, J. J., & Folkrod, A. W. (1989). Grandchildren's perceptions of their relationships with their grandparents. Child Study Journal, 19, 41-50.
- Robertson, J. F. (1971). Grandparenthood: A study of role conceptions of grandmothers. (University Microfilms No. 71-25, 213).
- Robertson, J. F. (1976). Significance of grandparents: Perceptions of young adult grandchildren. The Gerontologist, 16, 137-140.
- Robertson, J. F. (1977). Grandmotherhood: A study of role conceptions. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 39, 165-174.
- Sanders, G. F., & Trygstad, D. W. (1989). Stepgrandparents and grandparents: The view from young adults. Family Relations, 38, 71-75.

- Spicer, J. W., & Hampe, G. D. (1975). Kinship interaction after divorce. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 37, 113-119.
- Troll, L. E., Miller, S. J., & Atchley, R. C. (1979). Families in later life. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.
- Trygstad, D. W. & Sanders, G. F. (1989). The significance of stepgrandparents. International Journal of Aging and Human Development, 29, 119-134.
- Visher, E. B., & Visher, J. S. (1979). Stepfamilies: A guide to working with stepparents and stepchildren. New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Wallerstein, J. S., & Blakeslee, S. (1989). Second chances: Men, women, and children a decade after divorce. New York: Ticknor & Fields.
- Wallerstein, J. S. & Kelly, J.B. (1980) Surviving the breakup. New York: Basic Books.
- Wechsler, H. J. (1985). Judaic perspectives on grandparenthood. In V. L. Bengston & J. F. Robertson (Eds.), Grandparenthood (pp. 185-194). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Group	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Marital Status of Parent		
Married	208	63.6
Divorced	93	28.4
Widowed	17	5.2
Never Married	4	1.2
Adoptive	1	.3
Missing Cases	<u>4</u>	<u>1.2</u>
Total	327	100
Age		
18	43	13.1
19	79	24.2
20	74	22.6
21	51	15.6
22	37	11.1
23	12	3.7
24	4	1.2
25	2	.6
26	1	.3
27	5	1.5
28	2	.6
29	2	.6
31	1	.3
32	1	.3
33	1	.3
34	1	.3
36	1	.3
37	2	.6
38	1	.3
39	1	.3
40	1	.3
41	2	.6
42	1	.3
48	1	.3
Missing Cases	<u>1</u>	<u>.3</u>
Total	327	100
Religious Preference		
Catholic	41	12.5
Protestant	247	75.8
Muslim	1	.3
None	23	7.1
Other	14	4.3
Missing Cases	<u>1</u>	<u>.3</u>
Total	327	100

Table 2

Reliability Information for Scales in Instrument

Variables	Scale	No of Items	Previously Established Alpha	Reliabilities for Relationship Types					
				<u>MM</u>	<u>MF</u>	<u>FM</u>	<u>FF</u>	<u>GPF1</u>	<u>GPF2</u>
Instrumental Role Behavior	IRB (Henry, et al , 1992)	9	94	93 (295)	94 (273)	93 (279)	94 (266)	98 (246)	99 (239)
Expressive Role Behavior	ERB (Henry, et al , 1992)	4	91	89 (302)	92 (279)	82 (273)	83 (273)	98 (254)	99 (245)
Social Role Meaning	SRM (Henry, et al , 1992)	5	91	83 (287)	82 (266)	81 (277)	80 (262)	94 (242)	95 (233)
Personal Role Meaning	PRM (Henry, et al , 1992)	5	93	87 (299)	90 (273)	88 (285)	90 (267)	97 (254)	98 (246)
Importance of Grandparent Relationship	IGR (Hartshorne and Manaster, 1982)	4	Not Available	88 (294)	92 (259)	90 (281)	91 (258)	95 (254)	94 (246)

() = number of responses for reliability analyses

Table 3

Comparison of Role Behaviors by Marital Statusof Parent (Lower scores indicate higher levels)

<u>Grand-Parent</u>	<u>Group</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>
<i>Instrumental (Range=9-45)</i>					
Mother's	Married	201	24.03	10.91	
Mother	Divorced	89	23.04	10.58	.47
Mother's	Married	188	28.64	11.62	
Father	Divorced	81	30.42	11.75	.25
Father's	Married	277	27.16	10.83	
Mother	Divorced	86	11.41	11.41	.84
Father's	Married	186	30.32	11.06	
Father	Divorced	83	29.63	12.33	.65
<i>Grandparent</i>					
Figure	Married	41	32.02	8.81	
No. 1	Divorced	28	26.96	9.80	.03*
<i>Grandparent</i>					
Figure	Married	21	31.81	9.57	
No. 2	Divorced	17	32.29	11.53	.88
<i>Expressive (Range=4-20)</i>					
Mother's	Married	198	12.78	5.22	
Mother	Divorced	89	11.82	5.52	.16
Mother's	Married	184	14.93	5.10	
Father	Divorced	81	14.64	5.44	.67
Father's	Married	192	14.26	4.87	
Mother	Divorced	85	14.22	4.84	.95
Father's	Married	184	15.40	4.60	
Father	Divorced	83	14.96	4.67	.48
<i>Grandparent</i>					
Figure	Married	41	15.83	4.81	
No. 1	Divorced	28	13.46	5.10	.05*
<i>Grandparent</i>					
Figure	Married	21	15.14	4.81	
No. 2	Divorced	17	15.29	5.15	.93

Table 4

Comparison of Role Meaning by Marital Status
of Parent (Lower scores indicate higher levels)

Grand-Parent	Group	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>
<i>Social</i> (Range=5-25)					
Mother's Mother	Married	198	10.79	5.01	
	Divorced	86	10.74	5.18	.94
Mother's Father	Married	183	12.54	5.58	
	Divorced	81	13.64	6.20	.15
Father's Mother	Married	192	11.86	5.28	
	Divorced	85	13.26	5.95	.05*
Father's Father	Married	178	12.13	5.44	
	Divorced	78	13.12	5.97	.20
Grandparent					
Figure No. 1	Married	41	12.80	5.28	
	Divorced	27	10.41	4.50	.06
Grandparent					
Figure No. 2	Married	21	11.86	5.89	
	Divorced	15	13.13	6.19	.53
<i>Personal</i> (Range=5-25)					
Mother's Mother	Married	198	13.19	5.78	
	Divorced	88	13.07	5.76	.87
Mother's Father	Married	183	14.92	6.30	
	Divorced	82	16.16	6.59	.15
Father's Mother	Married	190	15.09	5.90	
	Divorced	84	15.07	6.25	.98
Father's Father	Married	180	16.29	6.25	
	Divorced	81	16.15	6.60	.86
Grandparent					
Figure No. 1	Married	41	16.93	6.13	
	Divorced	25	13.68	4.99	.03*
Grandparent					
Figure No. 2	Married	21	15.86	6.73	
	Divorced	14	16.79	5.31	.67

Table 5

Comparison of Role Behavior by Marital Status
of Parent (Contact Not Limited by Geographical Distance)

Grand-Parent	Group	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>
<i>Instrumental (Range=9-45)</i>					
Mother's Mother	Married	121	22.90	9.96	.09
	Divorced	46	19.98	9.23	
Mother's Father	Married	113	28.07	11.20	.24
	Divorced	38	30.61	12.48	
Father's Mother	Married	117	24.75	10.38	.36
	Divorced	43	26.49	11.46	
Father's Father	Married	110	28.52	11.05	.97
	Divorced	40	28.45	12.38	
Grandparent					
Figure No. 1	Married	28	32.18	8.90	.01*
	Divorced	9	22.78	9.01	
Grandparent					
Figure No. 2	Married	14	32.21	10.35	.98
	Divorced	2	32.00	18.39	
<i>Expressive (Range=4-20)</i>					
Mother's Mother	Married	119	12.54	4.77	.01*
	Divorced	46	10.28	5.12	
Mother's Father	Married	111	15.05	4.75	.70
	Divorced	38	14.68	5.65	
Father's Mother	Married	117	13.52	5.00	.35
	Divorced	42	14.36	4.68	
Father's Father	Married	109	14.83	4.77	.67
	Divorced	40	15.20	4.50	
Grandparent					
Figure No. 1	Married	28	16.54	4.42	.06
	Divorced	9	13.11	5.40	
Grandparent					
Figure No. 2	Married	14	15.64	4.80	.61
	Divorced	2	17.50	3.55	

Table 6

Comparison of Role Meaning by Marital Status
of Parent (Contact Not Limited by Geographical Distance)

Grand-Parent	Group	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>
<i>Social (Range=5-25)</i>					
Mother's Mother	Married	119	12.94	3.79	
	Divorced	44	12.55	3.68	.55
Mother's Father	Married	111	14.96	5.29	
	Divorced	38	16.87	5.95	.06
Father's Mother	Married	117	13.92	4.67	
	Divorced	42	14.81	4.58	.29
Father's Father	Married	107	14.09	4.98	
	Divorced	37	14.86	4.76	.41
Grandparent					
Figure No. 1	Married	28	14.68	5.71	
	Divorced	9	11.00	3.35	.08
Grandparent					
Figure No. 2	Married	14	15.21	6.53	
	Divorced	2	18.00	9.90	.60
<i>Personal (Range=5-25)</i>					
Mother's Mother	Married	120	12.74	5.28	
	Divorced	46	11.20	5.04	.09
Mother's Father	Married	112	14.86	6.05	
	Divorced	39	15.74	7.17	.45
Father's Mother	Married	117	14.27	5.73	
	Divorced	42	14.50	6.18	.82
Father's Father	Married	108	15.61	6.03	
	Divorced	40	15.33	6.75	.80
Grandparent					
Figure No. 1	Married	28	17.39	6.20	
	Divorced	9	11.67	4.39	.01*
Grandparent					
Figure No. 2	Married	14	16.86	6.76	
	Divorced	2	19.00	8.49	.69

Table 7

Comparison of Importance of the GrandparentRelationship by Marital Status of Parent

(Range=4-20) (Lower scores indicate higher levels)

Grand-Parent	Group	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>
Mother's	Married	194	6.86	3.45	
Mother	Divorced	86	6.65	3.19	.64
Mother's	Married	176	8.48	4.99	
Father	Divorced	76	8.88	5.27	.57
Father's	Married	174	8.14	4.57	
Mother	Divorced	75	8.16	4.59	.97
Father's	Married	178	8.27	4.63	
Father	Divorced	75	7.71	4.39	.37
Grandparent					
Figure	Married	40	9.08	5.10	
No. 1	Divorced	24	6.96	3.36	.05*
Grandparent					
Figure	Married	21	9.00	5.35	
No. 2	Divorced	14	8.93	4.89	.97
<i>Contact Not Limited by Geographical Distance</i>					
Mother's	Married	119	6.58	3.44	
Mother	Divorced	45	5.76	2.31	.14
Mother's	Married	109	8.39	5.10	
Father	Divorced	35	8.74	6.02	.73
Father's	Married	108	7.81	4.65	
Mother	Divorced	34	8.26	4.78	.62
Father's	Married	109	7.89	4.70	
Mother	Divorced	28	7.79	4.78	.91
Grandparent					
Figure	Married	27	10.04	5.63	
No. 1	Divorced	8	5.63	2.07	.03*
Grandparent					
Figure	Married	14	10.29	6.03	
No. 2	Divorced	2	12.50	10.61	.66

APPENDIX A
LITERATURE REVIEW

Comprehensive Literature Review

This review of review of literature was developed to provide a framework to further study grandparents as a resource in divorced families. Because both similarities and differences may be found in the role of grandparents in intact and divorced families, further research is necessary to address the resources available within divorced families to assist in their development.

Research indicates that grandparent/grandchild relationships are important to members of both the first and third generations (Hartshorne & Manaster, 1982; Kahana & Kahana, 1971; Kornhaber & Woodward, 1981; Robertson, 1976). Kornhaber and Woodward (1981) used children's drawings to study the significance of these relationships from the point of view of children. Trained therapists interviewed children and interpreted their drawings and discovered that grandparents were functioning in the roles of teacher, caretaker, negotiator between child and parent, role model, connections between the past and future, and helped determine how the young felt about the old in society.

Kornhaber and Woodward (1981) divided 300 children into three groups relative to the amount of contact they had with their grandparents. Group I had Close Contact, Group II had Sporadic Contact and Group III had No Contact. Not surprisingly, the children in Group I reported a wide range

of ways in which their grandparents were involved in their lives. Important rituals such as Sunday dinner at Grandmother's and knowing Grandfather through stories enriched the lives of these grandchildren. Their grandparents were "Great Parents," very important people in their lives.

In Group II (Sporadic Contact) there were children who could remember when their grandparents were a vital part of their lives as well as children who had never known this relationship. There were also those whose grandparents lived close by but were not involved in their grandchildren's lives. In contrast to Group I, many children from Group II exhibited a sense of loss, deprivation or abandonment. They felt attached to grandparents who were separated from them emotionally or physically.

Group III (No Contact) seemed to experience a void in their lives, something missing but they did not know what. Their emotions ranged from longing and melancholy through confusion to barren lack of feeling. They wondered what it would be like to have a grandparent and drew images that were pure fantasy. Conspicuously absent was either any sense of family history or a sense of themselves as older people.

Grandparental Roles

Based upon a study of 70 grandmothers Neugarten and Weinstein (1964) outlined five styles of grandparenting.

These are (1) "Formal", or following what they regard as the "proper" role, (2) "Fun Seekers", whose relation to grandchildren is characterized by informality and playfulness, (3) "Surrogate Parent", or grandparents who entered into "parental" roles by request of the parent(s), (4) "Reservoir of Family Wisdom", where the grandparent is the dispenser of special skills or resources, and, (5) "Distant Figure", or grandparents who are rarely seen except on special ritual occasions such as Christmas or birthdays.

An alternative typology of grandmothers was reported by Robertson (1977). In this research the primary objective was to develop a typology from which to examine the significance of grandmotherhood by focusing on the conceptions of grandmothers with regard to the meaning and behaviors they associate with the role. She found that grandparenthood is seen as a role which has a different meaning for individuals. Some grandmothers perceive their role from the context of normative or societal expectations (the *Symbolic* types). Others regard their role in highly personal terms, addressing the joys and pleasures of grandparenting (the *Individualized* types). Those labelled the *Apportioned* types combine normative and personal meanings, while still others (the *Remote* types) place little meaning on the role and have a distant view of grandparenting.

Link with the past

Other writers have made references to behaviors and attitudes that could be called symbolic. For example, McCready (1985) proposed that grandparent-grandchild relationships can symbolize continuity and a sense of belonging, representing a chain that links families together over time. Elaborating on this theme, the writer states that even more important than being in communication with grandparents is having been in communication with them. Memories and experiences can be remembered and reintegrated "symbolically" throughout the life cycle. Hagestad (1985) also points out this function of grandparents as "symbols of connectedness" and links to the past.

Religious Orientation

A third function of grandparenting roles that might be considered symbolic is that of religious orientation. Bengston (1985) states that although the Bible contains many admonitions to parents regarding the parent-child relationships, few if any instructions are given grandparents concerning their grandchildren. However, Wechsler (1985) describes several Biblical references to the grandparent-grandchild relationship from the Judaic perspective, while Conroy and Fahey (1985) discuss some Catholic traditions derived from the Bible. One may note that although the Biblical references are not "admonitions," looking beneath the surface reveals the significance of the

grandparent-grandchild relationship in the Bible, and especially in the Old Testament, which Jews and Christians share.

Wechsler (1985) points out that in the stories of Ruth and Naomi of the Book of Ruth and of Jacob the Patriarch in the book of Genesis, both Ruth and Jacob are described as finding joy from a grandchild in their old age. When Ruth gives birth to a child the women declare, "A son is born to Naomi" (Ruth 4:17) instead of "A son is born to Ruth!" The irony of this statement lies in the fact that Naomi, the mother of Ruth's deceased first husband, is actually the child's grandmother. Elsewhere in the Bible references are made to grandparenting as a joy, most notably in the following verse: "Children's children are the crown of old men..." (Proverbs 17:6). Wechsler says of this passage, that grandchildren make grandparents feel like royalty (p. 186).

This author has observed that The Hebrew word *atarah* is the word used for "crown" in this verse, from the root *atar*, which means to "encircle (for attack or protection)," suggesting that grandchildren might be viewed as a symbolic circle of protection for the grandparent, perhaps from discouragement in old age. Wechsler (1985) develops a similar theme.

The Talmud contains many references to the ailments of old age, and yet, in the Rabbinic tradition, old age is considered a great gift (Wechsler, 1985). What is old is

good. And the Bible admonishes the young to reverence the old. Yet there is more to this than mere dutiful respect. In neither the Talmud nor the Bible is there a word for grandparent, but what has been translated into English is taken from two Hebrews words that mean "the father of his father." In Rabbinic literature the most common word for grandparent is *zachen* or *zachenah* (grandfather or grandmother, respectively), which means "sage", so in saying, "my grandparent" one is saying, "my sage." Or in modern Hebrew, the words *saba* or *sabta*, the word for grandfather and grandmother are the same words as the word for "old person." Thus, when saying, "my grandparent", one is saying, "my sage" or "my old person," with adulation and love that transcends the legalistic notion of "respect your elders." The grandparent-grandchild relationship then becomes a cherished possession for both first and third generations. The young are the "crown" of the old. The old person is the "sage" of the young. The old, says Wechsler, because of the realities of aging, need that reverence to restore their souls, and that grandchildren naturally do this. The grandparent-grandchild relationship, then, is rich symbolically in the Judaic tradition.

Conroy and Fahey (1985) have a different perspective from the Catholic tradition. They note that on the renewed liturgical calendar of the Catholic Church is the feast of Jesus Christ's grandparents (Saints Ann and Joachim). This they view as a new sensitivity to the importance of

ancestors, especially grandparents. But the primary observation of these two authors is the function of grandparents in the transmission of religious heritage and offer various suggestions for the instilling of values through seven stages of development. They further mention that grandparents fulfill the role of story persons by *being* living stories to their grandchildren, in which they also provide a link to the past.

Ahrons and Bowman (1982) reported many grandparents saw less of their grandchildren after divorce. Out of 78 grandmothers 42 (59.2%) indicated the divorce had not altered contact with grandchildren. Seventeen percent reported increased contact while 24% reported seeing less of their grandchildren following divorce.

In interviews with 80 grandmothers, Gladstone (1988) reported that the majority of his study saw grandchildren more after divorce (Gladstone, 1988). An effort was made to determine whether there was any change in the frequency of contact between grandmothers and grandchildren after marriage breakdown of the second generation. A statistically significant increase in the frequency of face-to-face contact between grandmothers and grandchildren after the disruption of an adult child's marriage was indicated). A checklist of helping behaviors was presented to grandmothers to rate the frequency with which they provided various types of support to their grandchild before and after their child's separation or divorce. On a monthly

basis, grandmothers babysat, taught family history and tradition, and provided advice on personal problems significantly more often after the breakdown of their child's marriage.

Matthews and Sprey (1984), however, indicated such relationships were different after parental divorce. Most (67%) of the 36 grandparents who had experienced the divorce of one of their children agreed that the custody decision made a difference in their relationship with their formerly married children and grandchildren. Eleven of the 20 grandparents whose own child had custody of the grandchildren reported increased contact, 7 reported no change and 2 observed that they saw their grandchildren not necessarily more or less, but in different ways. The authors do not elaborate on what this might mean. Research is needed to explore in what ways the relationships might be different before and after parental divorce.

Personal and Social Role Meanings

Robertson (1977) distinguished two dimensions of grandmotherhood, role behaviors and role meanings, and identified a set of grandmothering styles based upon combinations of social and personal role meanings. The social role dimension is determined by socialization; the grandparent assumes role expectations which conform to preconceived social or normative standards. The personal role dimension, on the other hand, stems from forces within the individual which meet his or her personal needs

(Robertson, 1977). If grandparents scored high on both dimensions, they were assigned to the *Apportioned* type; if they scored low on both dimensions, they were labelled *Remote*. Individuals who scored high on the personal but low on the social dimension were described as the *Individualized* type, and those who scored high on the social but low on the personal dimensions were seen as *Symbolic* types.

Grandmothers in Robertson's (1977) study who were categorized as enacting the *Symbolic* role (high social role meaning, low personal role meaning) spoke of the meaning of this role in context with a norm or standard of social orientations. These women were interested in doing what was morally right or good for their grandchildren. For example, one grandmother stated that she wanted her grandchildren to get a good education and be good workers.

Instrumental and Expressive Role Behavior

Robertson (1971) identified two basic types of role behaviors among grandmothers: (a) *instrumental role behaviors*, or shared activities, child care, visits with grandchildren, providing financial assistance or gifts for grandchildren; and (b) *expressive role behaviors*, referring to nurturing or supportive behaviors toward grandchildren.

Impact of Divorce on Grandparent-Grandchild Relationships

Because of the structural changes in society related to high divorce rates and increasing mobility there is evidence that the kinship ties between the first and third generations have changed in recent years (Ahrons & Bowman,

1982; Ahrons & Rodgers, 1987; Anspach, 1976; Cherlin & Furstenberg, 1986; Furstenberg & Spanier, 1984; Gladstone, 1988; Johnson, 1988; Kalish & Visher, 1982; Matthews & Sprey, 1984; Spicer & Hampe, 1985). Little consensus is available regarding the roles of grandparents after parental divorce.

Anspach (1976) sought to learn how single-parent families differed from intact families in their use of available resources (such as community services, kinship and friendship) and their patterns of child care. The sample consisted of 47 divorced, 37 remarried, and 35 married women with one or more minor children. Eighty percent of the divorced and remarried indicated less contact with their former spouse's kin following the divorce. Eleven percent thought they saw less of their own close kindred following divorce. About two-thirds of the remarried and one-third of the divorced reported more contact with their own close kindred following the divorce. Even though this is a relatively small sample, the data does indicate that single-parent families tend to see more of consanguine kin than affinal kin following divorce. This would also suggest that the children's contact with the absent parent's family would tend to be less than with that of the custodial parent, which would affect the respective grandparent-grandchild relationship.

According to Furstenberg and Spanier (1984) there are various specific functions that grandparents have been

reported to perform in divorcing families. One of them involves the maintenance of kinship ties, another the instrumental roles of child care and financial assistance. These authors also noted that grandparents assume an especially critical role in preserving family ties after their children's divorce. Grandparents may represent the interests of the noncustodial partner by reminding former in-laws and grandchildren that ties to the noncustodial parent continue. Because children are related to both their parents and consequently to their respective families, the divorced couple must acknowledge some form of relationship to their former in-laws, even if this relationship is unspecified. Sometimes relationships continue between a parent and his or her former affines, but typically this association is maintained for the children's sake. Parents usually agree that the children's best interest is served by a continued relationship between the children and their grandparents. Their conclusion is that while divorce may threaten to break lineage ties the grandparents paradoxically become "guardians of the family line" (Furstenberg & Spanier, 1984). In any case, it is important in any study of grandparent-grandchild relationships, especially for children of divorced families, to consider the problem of custodial or geographical variables and their effect on the grandparent-grandchild relationship.

One important consideration when examining the grandparent-grandchild relationship is amount of contact.

Hetherington (1989) found that in divorced families, amount of contact by children with the parents of the noncustodial parent was directly related to the amount of contact maintained by the noncustodial parent. This point was also brought out by Furstenberg (1988). For most children, contact with the noncustodial father decreased over time. Thus, contact with the grandparents decreased also. However, 6 years after divorce, half of the parents of noncustodial fathers reported they had as much or more contact with their grandchildren as before the divorce.

Grandparents frequently provide child care in the divorced family. In fact the grandparents' home may serve as a "neutral zone" where the divorced couple may perform much of their co-parenting. Both men and women look to their parents for child care services; they both may also request financial assistance. In-laws may even provide help to an estranged spouse who might respond with gratitude and devotion. In this way long-term family obligations may be strengthened (Furstenberg & Spanier, 1984).

In a study of 50 divorces of middle-class suburbs in the San Francisco Bay area, Johnson (1988c) found that the instrumental aid parents gave to children and grandchildren was extensive. Eighty-nine percent assisted by babysitting or providing some other types of services. Over 75% gave economic help, with 22% giving regular income maintenance to a divorced child. In contrast, Wallerstein's (1980) study of sixty divorced families in Orange County, California

reported three-quarters of the children were not helped by grandparents, many of whom lived in other parts of the country, but some of the grandparents who lived close by helped by providing special treats and taking children to their homes occasionally (Wallerstein, 1980). In her later work Wallerstein (1989) points out that, though many grandparents were hesitant to get involved in the crossfire, others became parents to their grandchildren. Even so, Wallerstein believes that the role grandparents play in divorced families, especially if their marriages are intact, is still symbolic: that is, they provide living proof to children that relationships can be lasting, reliable, and dependable (Wallerstein & Blakeslee, 1989).

Johnson (1988c) concludes that as grandparents come to the aid of their children and grandchildren their role in divorcing families is likely to be expanded. Since grandparents are the most stable figures in a family throughout marital changes, they are able, through the provision of emotional, psychological and material support, to provide stability to the family (Johnson, 1988b). She acknowledges that, although noninterference is the norm for grandparents and independence is the norm for grandchildren, positive benefits could come from allowing grandparents to be more involved in the lives of the family members.

Robertson (1976) studied the responses of young adult grandchildren, exploring five areas of inquiry: (1) attitudes and expectations grandchildren hold regarding

grandparents; (2) grandchildren's perceptions of the appropriate and/or expected grandparent behavior; (3) grandchildren's responsibilities toward grandparents; (4) grandchildren's perceptions of the degree of parental influence in their relationships with grandparents; and (5) conceptions of the ideal grandparent. Several aspects of support were measured by Likert-type, range of choice, and yes-no items.

Eighty-six young adult grandchildren were asked to respond. Slightly over 59% of the respondents viewed a grandparent as "somebody who gave you gifts or money or took you places" while only 18% viewed them as "somebody who aids in financial support." A larger percentage (64%) did not view a grandparent as "somebody to whom you could go for advice," but 55.8% saw a grandparent as "somebody who kept you informed of family heritage, rituals, news, folklore, etc." Only 40.7% perceived a grandparent as "somebody who you could rely on for emotional comfort" and only 27.9% saw one as "somebody who understood you when nobody else did." Only 29% thought of a grandparent as "somebody who was a liaison between you and your parents" and only 23.3%, as "somebody to whom grandchildren can turn to for personal advice." Forty-three percent perceived a grandparent as "somebody who aids in rearing of my children" and only 23.3 percent viewed them as a "role model -- somebody whose occupation I can imitate."

Robertson's (1971, 1976, 1977) work provides a basis for studying instrumental and expressive role behaviors as well as social and personal role meanings of the grandparent model, and has been the basis of other studies (Hartshorne & Manaster, 1982; Trygstad & Sanders, 1989, Henry, Ceglian, & Matthews, 1992). The concepts developed in Robertson's work also form the basis of this study.

Grandparenting Styles in Intact and Divorced Families

Although there are numerous typologies of grandparent styles, there are no studies dealing with the similarities and differences in grandparenting styles between intact and divorced families. For a more complete understanding of the importance of the grandparenting role in the extended family, empirical studies of the function of grandparents in the divorced family are needed. A study of the types of support given to grandchildren from grandparents in divorced families could create a new understanding of the uniqueness of divorced families and the function of the extended family after marital disruption.

Differences in Age and Gender

Ponzetti (1989) and Hartshorne and Manaster (1982) found that relatively few studies considered the perceptions grandchildren have of their grandparents. In Ponzetti's sample of 205 boys and 211 girls in public elementary school, differences in their perceptions were reported according to age and gender. Girls were more likely to say they loved their grandparents than boys.

Significant differences were noted between types of provisions secured from the relationship and grade levels. Younger children (grades 1 and 2) reported more attachment, nurturance and exchange of material things more often, whereas older children (grades 4 and 5) reported reliable alliance, pride in family history, and guidance from their grandparents more often. A significant gender difference was found. Girls reported more attachment, less social integration and fewer exchanges of material things. Furthermore, girls were less likely than boys to mention no provisions at all. These data would indicate that any further research on grandparent roles should take gender of the grandchild into consideration.

Theoretical Rationale and Major Hypotheses

Although there has been some research on grandparenting styles and the effect of divorce on grandparent-grandchild relationships, very little work has focused on grandparent-grandchild relationships in divorced families. Particularly lacking is a detailed description of the ways in which grandparents are supportive of their grandchildren in divorced families and in what ways the perceptions of children from divorced families might differ from those in intact families.

In Hill's ABCX Crisis Model A (the Stressor event interacting with B (the family's crisis meeting resources) interacting with C (the definition the family makes of the event) produce X (the crisis) (cited in McCubbin &

Patterson, 1983). Whereas the original ABCX Model focused upon pre-crisis variables, McCubbin and Patterson expand this concept in the Double ABCX Model by including post-crisis variables in an effort to describe the family's adaptation to crises over time (McCubbin & Patterson, 1983). Thus the A factor becomes the aA factor (Pile-Up), the B factor becomes the bB factor (Family Adaptive Resources), the C factor becomes the cC factor (Family Definition and Meaning) and the X factor becomes the xX factor (Family Adaptation).

Divorce is described as a stressful event or hardship which increases and may possibly intensify the difficulties families face. (McCubbin & Patterson, 1983). Three kinds of resources impact upon the family's adaptation to crisis: (a) family members' personal resources; (b) the family system's internal resources; and (c) social support (McCubbin & Patterson, 1983). Whereas family members' personal resources and social support are both important resources, families and family professionals will benefit by studying the family system's internal resources for coping with crises. Research should focus on ways in which grandparents are a part of this system of internal resources in normative crises, but especially on how grandparents are a support to their grandchildren in families that are experiencing divorce or other non-normative crises.

Kornhaber's (1985) study indicated that the grandparent-grandchild bond is second only in emotional

importance to the parent-child bond, and that children with close relationship to at least one grandparent had a sense of belonging to a family and community, were not sexist, and were not afraid of growing old because their grandparents provided a positive role model. In an intact marriage, a grandparent provides a role model for grandchildren that may represent an ideal, something to strive for, something that was not an element of their family of origin, but can still be viewed as a possible goal for themselves. Wallerstein (1989, p. 111) refers to this as, "symbolic generational continuity and living proof to children that relationships can be lasting, reliable, and dependable."

Although there is a lack of consensus in the literature on the ways in which divorce impacts the grandparent-grandparent relationship, many studies have reported increased involvement of grandparents with their grandchildren after the dissolution of the children's marriage. Sufficient data has been reported to support the hypothesis that grandchildren whose parents are divorced will rank their grandparents higher on the scales of personal and social role meaning, instrumental and expressive role meaning and importance of the grandparental relationship. Based on this assumption, the following hypotheses were formulated for this study:

Hypothesis I: Adults with divorced parents attribute greater importance to their relationship with their grandparents than adults whose parents are not divorced.

Hypothesis II: Adults with divorced parents perceive their grandparents to attribute more personal role meaning to grandparental roles than adults whose parents are not divorced.

Hypothesis III: Adults with divorced parents perceive their grandparents to attribute more social role meaning to their grandparental roles than adults whose parents are not divorced.

Hypothesis IV: Adults with divorced parents perceive their grandparents to have performed more expressive role behaviors in their grandparental roles than adults whose parents are not divorced.

Hypothesis V: Adults with divorced parents perceive their grandparents to have performed more instrumental role behaviors in their grandparental roles than adults whose parents are not divorced.

Although the goal of this study was not to develop a typology of grandparent roles in the divorced family, data gathered in this and future studies could be used to formulate a typology which would be useful to family practitioners who work with divorced families. Both grandparents and grandchildren can benefit from more knowledge about the unique relationship they have and especially how grandparents serve as resources in the family's adjustment to divorce.

Summary

Although there are numerous typologies of grandparent styles, there are no studies dealing with the similarities and differences in grandparenting styles between intact and divorced families. For a more complete understanding of the importance of the grandparenting role in the extended family, empirical studies of the function of grandparents in the divorced family are needed. A study of the types of support given to grandchildren from grandparents in divorced families could create a new understanding of the uniqueness of divorced families and the function of the extended family after marital disruption.

Although there has been some research on grandparenting styles and the effect of divorce on grandparent-grandchild relationships, very little work has focused on grandparent-grandchild relationships in divorced families. Particularly lacking is a detailed description of the ways in which grandparents are supportive of their grandchildren in divorced families and in what ways the perceptions of children from divorced families might differ from those in intact families.

Although a typology of grandparent roles in the divorced family may not be necessary, data gathered in future studies could be used to develop guidelines which would be useful to family practitioners who work with divorced families. Both grandparents and grandchildren can

benefit from more knowledge about the unique relationship they have and especially how grandparents serve as resources in the family's adjustment to divorce.

Kornhaber and Woodward's (1985) study indicated that the grandparent-grandchild bond is second only in emotional importance to the parent-child bond, and that children with close relationship to at least one grandparent had a sense of belonging to a family and community, were not sexist, and were not afraid of growing old because their grandparents provided a positive role model. Children in divorced families, because they experience a unique sense of loss when their parents' marriage is dissolved, may be particularly sensitive to their need for "belonging" to a family or community, and might naturally look to their grandparents to provide this for them. However, as our society ages and the number of intact families decreases, families may need to look elsewhere for this sense of belonging.

In an intact marriage, a grandparent provides a role model for grandchildren that may represent an ideal, something to strive for, something that was not an element of their family of origin, but can still be viewed as a possible goal for themselves. Wallerstein (1989) refers to this as, "symbolic generational continuity" (p. 111). Kornhaber (1985) states that grandparents offer an opportunity "to learn about other times and other ways of living" (p. 163). This was not perhaps referring to a child

of divorce learning about an intact marriage, but certainly may be viewed as having this potential.

In summary, there are role meanings associated with grandparenting in intact families that may be similar in divorced families, but might be evident at different levels in divorcing families. Additional research is needed to delineate and describe the role of support grandparents provide in the divorced family. Specifically, practitioners and educators would benefit by researching social and personal role meanings of the grandparent-grandchild relationship in divorced families. In addition, study of expressive, instrumental and symbolic role meanings attributed to grandparents and grandchildren in divorced families would increase our understanding of the support network of the extended family when divorce occurs. Both intact and divorced families can benefit more from the support of grandparents than has possibly been realized in the past, and the study of differences between them could enhance our understanding of the special needs of each family type.

APPENDIX B
METHODOLOGY

Methodology

The goal of the study was to utilize approximately equal numbers of grandchildren from intact and divorced families (about 100 each), using self-report questionnaires which would measure the importance of the grandparent-grandchild relationship to the adult grandchild, the grandchild's perception of the grandparents' instrumental and expressive role behavior and social and personal role meaning perceived in the grandparental relationship.

Subjects

The sample was obtained from three large classes in the department of Family Relations and Child Development, without controlling for age or gender. Three hundred and twenty-seven questionnaires were distributed to participants during class time on several consecutive days. The students completed the questionnaires within 20 to 30 minutes and returned them.

In all there were 327 participants, 62 male and 265 female college students. The sample was predominantly white (89%) and Protestant (75%) (including both traditional denominational affiliations and those listing themselves as Christians). Of the remaining 25%, 12.5% were Catholic, .3 percent (one participant) was Muslim. There were 7% who listed no religious preference and 4.3% were classified as

"other" including Buddhism, Mormonism, and Jehovah's Witnesses. There were no Jewish participants.

A small percent (5.8%) were Native American, 3.1% were black, .9% were Asian, .9 % were Hispanic and .3% (one participant) was listed as "other". The range of the participant's ages was from 18 to 48; the largest group (24.2%) of students were 19. The remaining ages were represented by much smaller numbers. For a complete listing of the demographic characteristics of the participants, see Table 1.

The largest number (27.5%) of the students were majoring in Family Relations and Child Development. Ten percent (10%) were Design, Housing and Merchandising majors and 8.3 were Psychology majors. Seven percent were undecided, and 4.9%, respectively, were Accounting and Business Administration majors; 3.7% were majoring in Hotel and Restaurant Administration. Other major areas were represented by much smaller percentages.

The largest group (35%) were sophomores, 25.1% were freshman, 22% were juniors, 16.5% were seniors. Only .9% were graduate or special students and one participant did not list level in school.

An interesting finding relative to the family composition of this group of students was that 44.3% or 145 participants reported having no sisters and 44% or 144 participants had no brothers. Mother's ages ranged from 33 to 81, father's ages ranged from 36 to 82; 2.5% of mothers

and 2.5% of fathers (of eight participants) were reported as deceased.

Out of 327 participants, 208 or 63.6% reported that their parents were married to each other; 28.4% or 93 participants had divorced parents. In addition, seventeen (1.2%) reported a parent was widowed, four (.3%) reported that their parents were never married, and only one participant was adopted (the adoptive parents were separated).

Analysis of Data

The method of data analysis that was selected for this study was One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). ANOVA is a statistical procedure designed to test for the significance of variances among two or more groups (Kerlinger, 1986). It determines whether the variability among groups is large enough in comparison with the variability within groups to justify saying that the means of the population from one group is not the same as the means of the other group. The test of significance which determines if there is a significant difference depends on the F-ratio (the SPSS procedure also displays the F-probability, which is considered significant if it is in the range of .05 or less). One-way ANOVA investigates the differences of one independent variable on one or more dependent variable. This is useful in determining if the difference in the population means is a result of interaction between the independent variable and the dependent variables.

The independent variable, parental marital status, was used to examine whether or not there was a difference in the mean scores on each of the dependent variables between the grandchildren from divorced and intact families. between the grandchildren from divorced and intact families. Similarities and differences between two groups, those from intact and those from divorced families were examined regarding their relationship with their grandparent(s), using the Causal Comparative or "Ex Post Facto" research design (Isaac and Michael, 1990) descriptive statistics, and one way analysis of variance.

Based on a thorough review of the literature (see Appendix A) the following conceptual hypotheses were formulated for this study:

Hypothesis I: College students with divorced parents attribute greater importance to their relationship with their grandparents than adults whose parents are not divorced.

Hypothesis II: College students with divorced parents perceive their grandparents to attribute more personal role meaning to grandparental roles than adults whose parents are not divorced.

Hypothesis III: College students with divorced parents perceive their grandparents to attribute more social role meaning to their grandparental roles than adults whose parents are not divorced.

Hypothesis IV: College students with divorced parents perceive their grandparents to have performed more expressive role behaviors in their grandparental roles than adults whose parents are not divorced.

Hypothesis V: College students with divorced parents perceive their grandparents to have performed more instrumental role behaviors in their grandparental roles than adults whose parents are not divorced.

Please note, in the following operational hypotheses that a lower score actually represents a higher rating, because the numerical value for "strongly agree" was one (1). The corresponding Operational Hypotheses are as follows:

Operational Hypothesis #1: Mean scores on the Importance of the Grandparent Relationship for each grandparent type will be significantly lower for the adult children of divorced families than for the children of intact families.

Operational Hypothesis #2: Mean scores on the Personal Role Meaning Scale for each grandparent type will be significantly lower for the adult children of divorced families than for the children of intact families.

Operational Hypothesis #3: Mean scores on the Social Role Meaning Scale for each grandparent type will be significantly lower for the adult children of divorced families than for the children of intact families.

Operational Hypothesis #4: Mean scores on the Expressive Role Behavior Scale for each grandparent type will be significantly lower for the children of divorced families than for the children of intact families.

Operational Hypothesis #5: Mean scores on the Instrumental Role Behavior Scale for each grandparent type will be significantly lower for the children of divorced families than for the children of intact families.

Questions number 25-33 (9 items) pertained to the Instrumental Role Behavior Scale; questions number 34-37 (4 items), to the Expressive Role Behavior Scale; questions number 38-42 (5 items) to the Social Role Meaning Scale; questions number 43-47 (5 items), to the Personal Role Meaning Scale, and questions number 38-51 to the Importance of the Grandparent Relationship. Scores for the scales were computed for the scales and new variables were created, i.e., IRBMM (Instrumental Role Behavior for the Mother's Mother). These variables were used in the one-way analysis of variance that determined whether there was a difference in the responses of each group.

Frequencies on all variables were determined and one-way analyses of variance were conducted on all scales for all participants and three separate subgroups. The first analysis of variance examined all grandchildren and all grandparents and grandparent figures. The second considered only the grandparents and grandparent figures with whom geographical distance was not an obstacle to contact with

the grandchildren. A third analysis was conducted on grandchildren who had no deceased grandparents. The final analysis examined only the female participants.

Few statistically significant differences were found between the two groups from intact and divorced families, on most of the scales for most of the grandparent types. There were four groups emerging from the group of all grandchildren that showed a difference in the mean. Three of them were Grandparent Figures as opposed to biological grandparents. Instrumental Role Behavior for Grandparent Figure Number One showed a significant difference ($F=.03$) with grandchildren from divorced families rating their grandparent figure higher. Expressive Role Behavior for the Grandparent Figure Number One demonstrated a higher rating for the divorced group ($F=.05$). (There were only 41 from intact families and 28 from divorced families in these first two groups.) On Social Role Meaning for Grandparent Figure Number One, a higher rating for the divorced group ($F=.06$) emerged, with a group of 41 from intact and 27 from divorced families. Finally with a group of 41 from intact and 25 from divorced families (Personal Role Meaning for Grandparent Figure Number One), a lower mean for the divorced group ($F=.03$) was found (see Tables 3 and 4).

The most unexpected finding in this group was that on Social Role Meaning for the Father's Mother. Out of 192 grandchildren whose parents were married and 81 grandchildren whose parents were divorced, a significantly

higher rating was given by the grandchildren whose parents were married ($F=.05$) (see Table 4).

From the group for which geographical distance was not an obstacle to contact between grandparent and grandchild, the only significant difference was in Expressive Role Behavior for the Mother's Mother. In a group of 119 participants from intact families and 46 from divorced, there was an F-probability of .01, the grandchildren from divorced families giving the higher rating to their grandparent (see Table 5).

Consideration was also given to the possibility that there might be some differences if we looked only at those grandchildren who had only living grandparents. No significant differences were found (see Tables 8, 9 and 12).

Two significant differences were found in the group of female participants. Grandchildren from divorced families rated their Grandparent Figure Number One higher ($F=.04$) than the grandchildren from intact families on the scale of Instrumental Role Behavior (see Table 10). On the scale of Importance of the Grandparent Relationship, Grandparent Figure Number One was rated significantly higher ($F=.04$), but the group from divorced families was small ($N=20$) (see Table 12).

Reliability

Cronbach's (1951) alphas were established for each scale using data from the current project to examine internal consistency reliability. For this study,

reliability was measured for each grandparent (mother's mother, mother's father, father's mother, and father's father) and for each grandparent figure (grandparent figure number one and grandparent figure number two) for each scale (Instrumental Role Behavior [IRB], Expressive Role Behavior [ERB], Social Role Meaning [SRM], Personal Role Meaning [PRM] and Importance of the Grandparental Relationship [IGR], thus creating additional scales; i.e., IRBMM (Instrumental Role Behavior-Mother's Mother), and IRBMF (Instrumental Role Behavior-Mother's Father). The reliability coefficients for each scale in this study are listed on Table 2.

According to Isaac and Michael (1981), the main weakness of any ex post facto design is the lack of control over independent variables. The investigator must take the facts at face value with no chance to arrange or manipulate the conditions or variables that might have influenced the facts originally. For example, Henry et al (1992) selected a sample that consisted of women in remarried families with several specific characteristics, such as (a) at least one spouse in the marriage had been previously married, and (b) neither the husband or wife had been married more than once before the current marriage. With the current group, which was a convenience sample, it was not possible to screen the participants so thoroughly. The only requirement for the sample in this current study was that they be college

students. Thus, any manipulating of variables had to be done *after* collection of data.

In addition, a problem was discovered in the construction of the questionnaire, after collection of the data. In the Hartshorne and Manaster (1984) study, participants were told to respond "strongly disagree" if the grandparent was deceased. The present instrument instructed the participants, as did the Hartshorne and Manaster instrument, to answer, if they "remembered them (the grandparents) well enough to do so." But in the administration of the instrument the researcher verbally instructed the students to put "strongly disagree" for the deceased grandparents if they chose to. Since many grandchildren whose grandparents were deceased answered options other than "strongly disagree", we wondered how we would know which participants scored "strongly disagree" because they disagreed strongly about a particular behavior of that grandparent or because they had been instructed to state "strongly disagree" if the grandparent was deceased. Therefore, another analysis of variance was run, assigning missing values to all answers pertaining to deceased grandparents, which allowed us to simply look at the responses about grandparents who were living. Actually, this was not a solution because it only eliminated the responses to items about deceased grandparents. The only way to solve this problem would have been to design the questionnaire so that it would deal with deceased

grandparents separately. This would be difficult to do with a five-point likert scale. Nonetheless, when this analysis was run, a small group (36 from married and 26 from divorced) showed a difference in the mean on the Instrumental Role Behavior scale for the Grandparent Figure Number One, the children from divorced families showing the significantly smaller mean, or higher score, with an F-probability of .03. For Personal Role Meaning for the Granparent Figure Number One a small group (36 from married and 23 from divorced families) showed a significantly smaller mean, or higher score, with an F-value of .03. See Table 1 for descriptive statistics and results of one-way anovas.

References

- Ahrons, C. R., & Bowman, M. E. (1982). Changes in family relationships following divorce of an adult child: Grandmother's perceptions. Journal of Divorce, 5, 49-68.
- Ahrons, C. R., & Rodgers, R. H. (1987). Divorced families: A multidisciplinary developmental view. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Anspach, D. F. (1987). Kinship and divorce. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38, 323-330.
- Barranti, C. C. R. The grandparent/grandchild relationship: Family resource in an era of voluntary bonds. Family Relations, 34, 343-352.
- Bengston, V. L. (1985). Diversity and symbolism in grandparental roles. In V. L. Bengston & J. F. Robertson (Eds.), Grandparenthood (pp. 11-25). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Bohannon, P. (Ed.). (1970). Divorce and after. New York: Doubleday.
- Brubaker, T. H. (1990). Families in later life: A burgeoning research area. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52, 959-981.
- Brubaker, T. H. (1985). Later life families. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Conroy, D. B., & Fahey, C. J. (1985). Christian perspective on the role of grandparents. In V. L. Bengston & J. F. Robertson (Eds.), Grandparenthood (pp. 195-207). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Cherlin, A. J., & Furstenberg, F. F. (1986). The new American grandparent: A place in the family, a life apart. New York: Basic Books.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika, 16, 297-334.
- Denham, T. E., & Smith, C. W. (1989). The influence of grandparents on grandchildren: A review of the literature and resources. Family Relations, 38, 345-350.
- Duffy, M. (1982). Divorce and the dynamics of the family kinship system. In E. O. Fisher (Ed.), Impact of divorce on the extended family (pp. 3-18). New York: Haworth Press.
- Eisenberg, A. R. (1988). Grandchildren's perspectives on relationships with grandparents: The influence of gender across generations. Sex Roles, 19, 205-217.
- Featherman, D. L. & Stevens, G. (1982). A revised socioeconomic index of occupational status: Application in analysis of sex differences in attainment. In Social structure and behavior: Essays in honor of William Hamilton Sewell (pp. 141-181). New York: Academic Press.

- Fournier, D. G., Olson, D. H., & Druckman, J. M. (1982).
Assessing marital and premarital relationships: The
PREPARE-ENRICH inventories. In E. E. Filsinger (Ed.),
Marriage and family assessment: A source book for
family therapy (pp. 229-250). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Foster, H. H., & Freed, D. J. (1982). Grandparent
visitation: Vagaries and vicissitudes. Journal of
Divorce, 79-99.
- Furstenberg, F. F. Jr., & Spanier, G. B. (1984). Recycling
the family: Remarriage after divorce. Beverly Hills,
CA: Sage.
- Gladstone, J. W. (1988). Perceived changes in grandmother-
grandchild relations following a child's separation or
divorce. The Gerontologist, 28, 66-72.
- Hagestad, G. O. (1985) Continuity and connectedness. In V.
L. Bengston & J.F. Robertson (Eds.), Grandparenthood
(pp. 31-48). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hartshorne, T. S., & Manaster, G. J. (1982). The
relationship with grandparents: Contact, importance,
role conceptions. International Journal of Aging and
Human Development, 15, 233-244.
- Henry, C. S., Ceglian, C. P., & Matthews, D. W. (1992). The
role behaviors, role meanings, and grandmothering
styles of grandmothers and stepgrandmothers:
Perceptions of the middle generation. Journal of
Divorce and Remarriage, 17, 1-21.

- Hetherington, M. E. (1989). Coping with family transitions: Winners, losers, and survivors. Child Development, 60, 1-14.
- Isaac, S., & Michael, W. B. (1990). Handbook in research and evaluation: Second edition. San Diego: Edits.
- Johnson, C. L. (1988). Active and latent functions of grandparenting during the divorce process. The Gerontologist, 28, 185-191.
- Johnson, C. L. (1988). Ex Familia. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Johnson, C. L. (1988). Postdivorce reorganization of relationships between divorcing children and their parents. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 50, 221-231.
- Kalish, R. A., & Visher, E. (1982). Grandparents of divorce and remarriage. Journal of Divorce, 5, 127-140.
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1986). Foundations of behavioral research (3rd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Kivnick, H. Q. (1982). The meaning of grandparenthood. Ann Arbor, MI: Umi.
- Kornhaber, A. (1985). Grandparenthood and the new "social contract." In V.L. Bengston & J.F. Robertson (Eds.), Grandparenthood (pp. 159-171). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Kornhaber, A., & Woodward, K. L. (1981). Grandparents/grandchildren: The vital connection. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

- Lobsenz, N. M. (1987) Grandparenting today: Guidance for parents and grandparents. New York: Public Affairs Committee.
- Losh-Hesselbart, S. (1987). Development of gender roles. In M.B. Sussman & S.K. Steinmetz (Eds.), Handbook of marriage and the family (pp. 535-563). New York: Plenum Press.
- Matthews, S. H., & Sprey, J. (1984). The impact of divorce on grandparenthood: An exploratory study. The Gerontologist, 24, 41-47.
- McCready, W. C. (1985). Styles of grandparenting among white ethnics. In V. L. Bengston & J.F. Robertson (Eds.), Grandparenthood (pp. 49-60). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- McCubbin, H. I., & Patterson, J. M. (1983). Family transitions: Adaptations to stress. In H.I. McCubbin & C.R. Figley (Eds.), Stress and the family: Coping with normative transitions (Vol. 1, pp. 5-25). New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Neugarten, B. L., & Weinstein, K. K. (1964). The changing American grandparent. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 26, 199-204.
- Pasley, K., & Ihinger-Tallman, M. (1987). Remarriage and stepparenting. New York: Guilford Press.
- Ponzetti, J. J., & Folkrod, A. W. (1989). Grandchildren's perceptions of their relationships with their grandparents. Child Study Journal, 19, 41-50.

- Robertson, J. F. (1971). Grandparenthood: A study of role conceptions of grandmothers. (University Microfilms No. 71-25, 213).
- Robertson, J. F. (1976). Significance of grandparents: Perceptions of young adult grandchildren. The Gerontologist, 16, 137-140.
- Robertson, J. F. (1977). Grandmotherhood: A study of role conceptions. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 39, 165-174.
- Sanders, G. F., & Trygstad, D. W. (1989). Stepgrandparents and grandparents: The view from young adults. Family Relations, 38, 71-75.
- Schaefer, M. T., & Olson, D. H. (1981). Assessing intimacy: The PAIR Inventory. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 7, 47-60.
- Spicer, J. W., & Hampe, G. D. (1975). Kinship interaction after divorce. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 37, 113-119.
- Troll, L. E., Miller, S. J., & Atchley, R. C. (1979). Families in later life. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.
- Trygstad, D. W. & Sanders, G. F. (1989). The significance of stepgrandparents. International Journal of Aging and Human Development, 29, 119-134.
- Visher, E. B., & Visher, J. S. (1979). Stepfamilies: A guide to working with stepparents and stepchildren. New York: Brunner/Mazel.

- Wald, E. The remarried family: Challenge and promise. New York: Family Services Association of America.
- Wallerstein, J. S., & Blakeslee, S. (1989). Second chances: Men, women, and children a decade after divorce. New York: Ticknor & Fields.
- Wallerstein, J. S. & Kelly, J. B. (1980) Surviving the breakup. New York: Basic Books.
- Wechsler, H. J. (1985). Judaic perspectives on grandparenthood. In V. L. Bengston & J. F. Robertson (Eds.), Grandparenthood (pp. 185-194). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

APPENDIX C
INSTRUMENT

ADULT GRANDCHILDREN QUESTIONNAIRE

Part 1 - Background Questions

The first part of this questionnaire asks for some basic information about you and your family. If you are not sure about some of the answers, feel free to put down an answer you think is probably right. If you do not know the answer to any question simply write "don't know" in the blank.

1. What is your age? _____
2. What is your sex? Circle your answer. 1 Male 2 Female
3. What is your race or ethnic group? Circle your answer.

1 Black	3 White	5 Hispanic
2 Asian	4 Native American	6 Other (Please specify)

4. Please indicate your level in school. Circle your answer.

1 freshman	3 junior	5 Other (Please specify)
2 sophomore	4 senior	_____
5. What is your major? _____
6. Please indicate the number of brothers, sisters, stepbrothers, stepsisters, half-brothers and half-sisters you have.

_____ sisters	_____ stepsisters	_____ half-sisters
_____ brothers	_____ stepbrothers	_____ half-brothers
7. Please indicate your religious preference:

1 Catholic	3 Jewish	5 None
2 Protestant	4 Muslim	6 Other (Please specify)

8. Please give your parents' ages in the spaces below:
 mother's age _____ father's age _____

9. Father's level of education:

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|------------------|
| 1 | less than high school | 3 | some college |
| 2 | high school | 4 | college graduate |
| 5 | professional (i.e., physician, lawyer, veterinarian, professor, etc.) | | |

10. Mother's level of education:

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|------------------|
| 1 | less than high school | 3 | some college |
| 2 | high school | 4 | college graduate |
| 5 | professional (i.e., physician, lawyer, veterinarian, professor, etc.) | | |

11. Do you have step-grandparents? 1 yes 2 no
If so, please circle all the categories of step-grandparents you have.

- | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| 1 | your mother's husband's parents | 3 | your father's stepparents |
| 2 | your father's wife's parents | 4 | your mother's stepparents |
| 5 | Other (Please explain) _____ | | |

This section asks general questions about your grandparents, or "grandparent figures" in your life. Please describe the age and occupation of each grandparent or "grandparent figure".

12. Mother's mother:

age _____ occupation _____

13. Mother's father:

age _____ occupation _____

14. Father's mother:

age _____ occupation _____

15. Father's father:

age _____ occupation _____

16. Grandparent Figure Number One. If you had a person who was like a grandparent to you (e.g., stepgrandparent, family friend or other relative) please answer the following:

age _____ occupation _____

17. Grandparent Figure Number Two. If you had a person who was like a grandparent to you (e.g., stepgrandparent, family friend or other relative) please answer the following:

age _____ occupation _____

18. Have you ever lived with any of your grandparents (or grandparent figures) or have any of your grandparents (or grandparent figures) ever lived with you? Circle your answer. 1 yes 2 no
If no, proceed to question 19.

18a. If so, please indicate which grandparent(s) you lived with. Circle your answer:

- 1 maternal grandparent(s) 3 grandparent figure #1
2 paternal grandparent(s) 4 grandparent figure #2

18b. Please indicate your approximate age(s) when you started living with your grandparents.

_____years

18c. Please indicate number of months or years you lived with your grandparents.

_____years _____months

19. If contact was infrequent or nonexistent because either of the following persons lived very far away, please indicate below:

- 1 maternal grandparent(s) 3 grandparent figure #1
2 paternal grandparent(s) 4 grandparent figure #2

20. Are your natural parents (Circle one answer):

- 1 married 3 separated 5 never married
2 divorced 4 widowed 6 Other (Please specify)

If your parents were divorced, answer #'s 21-24. If your parents are not divorced, please proceed to Part 2 of Adult Grandchildren Questionnaire.

21. How old were you when your parents were divorced? _____

22. Which parent had primary custody of you?

- 1 mother 3 joint
2 father 4 other (Please specify)

23. Contact with my noncustodial parent could best be described:

- 1 No contact with my noncustodial parent
2 Sporadically (no pattern)
3 Saw him/her one weekend a month
4 saw him/her once a week
5 saw him/her at least part of most weekends
6 saw him/her twice or three times a week
7 lived with him/her one to four months out of the year
8 lived with him/her six months or more out of the year

9 Other (Please specify) _____

24. If your parents are separated or divorced, please indicate their relationship status below:

- 1 divorced from each other and neither is remarried.
- 2 divorced from each other and both are remarried.
- 3 divorced from each other, father is remarried, but mother is single.
- 4 divorced from each other, mother is remarried, but father is single.
- 5 both parents divorced twice or more.
- 6 Other (Please specify) _____

ADULT GRANDCHILDREN QUESTIONNAIRE -Part 2

Circle your answer in each column. Circle 1 if you strongly agree, 2 if you agree, 3 if you occasionally agree, 4 if you disagree, 5 if you strongly disagree. If any of your grandparents are deceased, rate the statements for them if you feel you remember them well enough to do so. If you did not know (one or more set of) your biological grandparents, or had other "grandparent figures" in your life listed earlier, please use "GP Figure Number One" (GP=Grandparent) and/or "GP Figure Number Two". This may be an aunt/uncle, step-grandparent or individual(s) of your choice. You may indicate above "GP Figure Number One" or "GP Figure Number Two" who this person is. For grandparents with whom you have had no contact, answer 5 (strongly disagree).

	Mother's Mother	Mother's Father	Father's Mother	Father's Father	GP Figure Number One	GP Figure Number Two
25. This grandparent regularly spent a week or more with me.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
26. This grandparent often took me on trips such as shopping, the zoo, movies, circus, etc.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
27. This grandparent has taken me to church or other religious functions.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
28. This grandparent has told me about family history or customs.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
29. This grandparent has taught me how to do things she is good at, such as cooking, sewing, fishing, mechanics, etc.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
30. This grandparent often babysat with me.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

	Mother's Mother	Mother's Father	Father's Mother	Father's Father	GP Figure Number One	GP Figure Number Two
31. This grandparent often engaged in home recreation activities with me such as reading stories, playing indoor or outdoor games, etc.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
32. This grandparent often dropped in to visit or play with me.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
33. This grandparent regularly gives/gave me money or gifts.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
34. This grandparent has advised me on religious matters.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
35. This grandparent has helped me with emergencies, such as sickness, financial troubles, troubles with parents or friends.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
36. This grandparent has advised me on work plans or schooling.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
37. This grandparent has advised me on personal problems.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
38. This grandparent believes/believed members, including me, work together as a group.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
39. This grandparent spends more holidays with friends than with me.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

	Mother's Mother	Mother's Father	Father's Mother	Father's Father	GP Figure Number One	GP Figure Number Two
40. This grandparent thinks/thought it is important for me to "respect my elders".	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
41. This grandparent would tell me to always remember that love and companionship are more important to a successful marriage than money.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
42. This grandparent set/sets a good example for me of what is morally right.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
43. This grandparent expects future generations of his/her family to be carried on by me.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
44. This grandparent would be very lonely without me.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
45. This grandparent believes/believed she/he should be able to give me whatever she/he can and not be worried about spoiling me.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
46. This grandparent feels/felt young again because of her/his relationship with me.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
47. This grandparent believes/believed that I bring/brought a deep sense of emotional fulfillment to his/her life.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Instructions for questions 48-51: Using the following rating scale, circle the number (1-5) that best represents the amount of importance you associate with each of the following statements (GP=grandparent).

ratings of importance

- 1 - extremely important
- 2 - somewhat important
- 3 - neither important nor unimportant
- 4 - somewhat unimportant
- 5 - extremely unimportant

	Mother's Mother	Mother's Father	Father's Mother	Father's Father	GP Figure Number One	GP Figure Number Two
48. How important is the grandparent-grandchild role for grandchildren?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
49. How important is the grandparent-grandchild relationship for grandparents?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
50. How important are the individual relationships with your grandparents to you? (If this grandparent is deceased, answer only if you can remember him or her well enough to do so.)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
51. How important a role do your grandparents play in your life?	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

APPENDIX D
CONSENT FORM AND INSTITUTIONAL
REVIEW BOARD FORM

CONSENT FORM

I, _____,
 hereby consent to participate in a study about grandparental support conducted by Carolyn Cogswell. I agree to complete a questionnaire which I will take home and return within one week.

This is done as part of an investigation entitled "Young Adult Perceptions of Grandparental Support: A Comparison of Intact and Divorced Families."

The purpose of the procedure is to collect data about the perceptions of adult grandchildren from intact and divorced families regarding relations with their grandparents. Participants in this study will benefit by gaining greater personal understanding and appreciation of their families' resources. In addition, society will acquire useful information about the potential of intergenerational relationships as support systems during stressful events or hardships.

I understand that my participation is to remain strictly confidential. There will be no individual identification on the questionnaire, and the consent form and questionnaire will be kept separate.

I understand that participation is voluntary, that there is no penalty for refusal to participate, and that I am free to withdraw my consent and participation in this project at any time without penalty after notifying the project director. I may contact Carolyn Cogswell or Dr. Carolyn Henry at 744-5057 should I wish further information about the research. I may also contact LeAnn Prater, University Research Services, 001 Life Sciences East, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK 74078; Telephone: (405) 744-5700.

Date: _____ Time: _____ (a.m./p.m.)

Signed: _____
 (Signature of Subject)

I certify that I have personally explained all elements of this form to the subject or his/her representative before requesting the subject or his/her representative to sign it.

Signed: _____
 (Project director or authorized representative)

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
 INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
 FOR HUMAN SUBJECTS RESEARCH

Proposal Title. Young Adults' Perceptions of Grandparental Support. A
Comparison of Divorced and Intact Families

Principal Investigator: Carolyn s. Henry / Carolyn Cogswell

Date: 3-5-92 IRB # HE - 92- 032

 This application has been reviewed by the IRB and

Processed as. Exempt Expedite Full Board Review
 Renewal or Continuation

Approval Status Recommended by Reviewer(s):

Approved Deferred for Revision

Approved with Provision Disapproved

Approval status subject to review by full Institutional Review Board at
 next meeting, 2nd and 4th Thursday of each month.

 Comments, Modifications/Conditions for Approval or Reason for Deferral or
 Disapproval:

1. Change Terry MacUila on consent form to LeAnn Prater.
2. Reviewer suggests collecting surveys in a box to ensure confidentiality.

Signature: _____

Marcia S. Tilley
 Chair of Institutional Review Board

Date: 3-17-92

APPENDIX E
SUPPLEMENTAL TABLES

Table 8

Comparison of Role Behavior by MaritalStatus of Parent (All Grandparents Are Living)

Grand- Parent	Group	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>
<i>Instrumental (Range=9-45) (Lower scores=higher levels)</i>					
Mother's	Married	51	22.06	10.00	
Mother	Divorced	21	21.95	9.55	.97
Mother's	Married	50	26.28	9.70	
Father	Divorced	21	27.05	10.22	.77
Father's	Married	51	24.96	9.88	
Mother	Divorced	21	27.57	9.88	.31
Father's	Married	51	29.08	10.22	
Father	Divorced	21	30.10	10.65	.71
Grandparent					
Figure	Married	8	34.50	6.65	
No. 1	Divorced	7	28.29	9.36	.16
Grandparent					
Figure	Married	4	32.75	13.43	
No. 2	Divorced	2	31.50	.71	.91
<i>Expressive (Range=4-20)</i>					
Mother's	Married	51	11.51	4.91	
Mother	Divorced	21	11.81	5.87	.82
Mother's	Married	49	14.04	4.87	
Father	Divorced	21	13.33	5.76	.60
Father's	Married	51	14.02	4.60	
Mother	Divorced	21	15.05	4.08	.38
Father's	Married	51	14.80	4.37	
Father	Divorced	21	15.57	3.84	.49
Grandparent					
Figure	Married	8	18.25	2.05	
No. 2	Divorced	7	15.71	4.57	.18
Granparent					
Figure	Married	4	17.50	3.79	
No. 2	Divorced	2	16.00	2.83	.65

Table 9

Comparison of Role Meaning by MaritalStatus of Parent (All Grandparents Are Living)

Grand- Parent	Group	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>
<i>Social</i> (Range=5-25) (Lower scores=higher levels)					
Mother's	Married	51	12.49	3.39	
Mother	Divorced	21	12.76	3.48	.76
Mother's	Married	49	13.88	4.08	
Father	Divorced	21	14.62	4.78	.51
Father's	Married	51	13.78	3.84	
Mother	Divorced	21	15.00	4.29	.24
Father's	Married	51	13.78	3.84	
Father	Divorced	21	15.00	4.29	.24
Grandparent					
Figure	Married	8	12.75	4.10	
No. 1	Divorced	7	12.14	3.85	.77
Grandparent					
Figure	Married	4	14.25	5.12	
No. 2	Divorced	2	12.00	9.90	.72
<i>Personal</i> (Range=5-25)					
Mother's	Married	50	12.26	4.83	
Mother	Divorced	21	13.00	6.15	.59
Mother's	Married	49	13.18	4.98	
Father	Divorced	21	13.90	6.49	.61
Father's	Married	50	14.36	5.19	
Mother	Divorced	21	145.57	6.00	.39
Father's	Married	50	15.64	5.52	
Father	Divorced	21	16.48	6.13	.57
Grandparent					
Figure	Married	8	16.50	6.14	
No. 1	Divorced	6	12.83	5.33	.28
Grandparent					
Figure	Married	4	14.00	8.76	
No. 2	Divorced	2	20.00	4.24	.43

Table 10

Comparison of Role Behavior by Marital Status
of Parent (Female Participants Only)

Grand- Parent	Group	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>
<i>Instrumental (Range=9-45) (Lower scores=higher levels)</i>					
Mother's Mother	Married	161	23.86	11.02	
	Divorced	71	22.70	10.55	.46
Mother's Father	Married	151	28.58	11.68	
	Divorced	65	29.74	11.88	.51
Father's Mother	Married	154	26.63	10.87	
	Divorced	70	26.43	11.80	.90
Father's Father	Married	147	30.34	11.24	
	Divorced	67	29.28	12.74	.54
Grandparent					
Figure No. 1	Married	34	31.50	8.36	
	Divorced	23	26.48	9.99	.04*
Grandparent					
Figure No. 2	Married	16	30.56	8.13	
	Divorced	12	30.08	11.72	.90
<i>Expressive (Range=4-20)</i>					
Mother's Mother	Married	158	12.84	5.26	
	Divorced	71	11.87	5.53	.21
Mother's Father	Married	147	15.04	5.04	
	Divorced	65	14.66	5.49	.62
Father's Mother	Married	153	14.25	4.97	
	Divorced	69	14.42	4.86	.81
Father's Father	Married	146	15.47	4.51	
	Divorced	67	15.13	4.60	.62
Grandparent					
Figure No. 1	Married	34	15.68	5.01	
	Divorced	23	13.52	5.28	.12
Grandparent					
Figure No. 2	Married	16	14.44	4.86	
	Divorced	12	25.00	4.55	.76

Table 11

Comparison of Role Meaning by MaritalStatus of Parent (Female Participants Only)

Grand-Parent	Group	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>
<i>Social</i> (Range=5-25) (Lower scores=higher levels)					
Mother's	Married	158	13.35	4.12	
Mother	Divorced	69	12.99	4.15	.54
Mother's	Married	146	15.01	5.35	
Father	Divorced	65	15.69	5.63	.40
Father's	Married	153	14.14	4.66	
Mother	Divorced	69	14.74	4.80	.38
Father's	Married	141	14.30	4.76	
Father	Divorced	64	14.66	4.85	.62
Grandparent					
Figure	Married	34	13.97	4.80	
No. 1	Divorced	23	12.35	4.53	.21
Grandparent					
Figure	Married	16	13.56	5.01	
No. 2	Divorced	12	13.67	6.18	.96
<i>Personal</i> (Range=5-25)					
Mother's	Married	158	12.96	5.74	
Mother	Divorced	71	12.86	5.78	.91
Mother's	Married	146	14.76	6.19	
Father	Divorced	66	14.87	6.50	.24
Father's	Married	151	14.84	4.96	
Mother	Divorced	68	15.00	6.27	.86
Father's	Married	142	16.32	6.30	
Father	Divorced	66	16.30	6.71	.99
Grandparent					
Figure	Married	34	16.53	6.24	
No. 1	Divorced	21	13.38	5.30	.06
Grandparent					
Figure	Married	16	14.56	6.36	
No. 2	Divorced	11	16.73	5.18	.39

Table 12

Comparison of Importance of Grandparental Relationship by
Marital Status of Parent

Grand- Parent	Group	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>
<i>Female Participants Only (Range=4-20)</i>					
Mother's	Married	155	6.62	3.38	
Mother	Divorced	70	6.27	3.06	.46
Mother's	Married	141	8.31	4.97	
Father	Divorced	62	8.02	4.94	.70
Father's	Married	139	7.65	4.23	
Mother	Divorced	61	7.72	4.63	.92
Father's	Married	140	7.76	4.31	
Father	Divorced	62	7.42	4.36	.61
Grandparent Figure No. 1	Married	33	8.70	4.70	
	Divorced	20	6.25	3.01	.04
Grandparent Figure No. 2	Married	16	8.00	4.35	
	Divorced	11	7.73	4.13	.87
<i>All Grandparents Are Living (Range=4-20)</i>					
Mother's	Married	51	6.20	2.97	
Mother	Divorced	21	7.19	3.61	.21
Mother's	Married	50	7.48	4.03	
Father	Divorced	21	7.90	4.09	.69
Father's	Married	50	7.90	4.44	
Mother	Divorced	21	8.90	4.28	.38
Father's	Married	51	7.82	4.43	
Father	Divorced	21	8.90	4.28	.34
Grandparent Figure No. 1	Married	8	7.75	3.58	
	Divorced	6	6.83	3.82	.65
Grandparent Figure No. 2	Married	4	6.00	2.83	
	Divorced	2	11.00	4.24	.15

VITA

Carolyn Cogswell

Candidate for the Degree of
Master of Science

Thesis: ADULT GRANDCHILDREN'S PERCEPTIONS OF GRANDPARENTAL
SUPPORT: A COMPARISON OF INTACT AND DIVORCED
FAMILIES

Major Field: Family Relations and Child Development

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Topeka, Kansas, November 25,
1946, the daughter of Glenn D. and Jeanne
Cogswell.

Education: Graduated from Topeka West High
School, Topeka, Kansas, in June 1964; received
Bachelor of Science in Education from the
University of Kansas at Lawrence in August, 1968;
completed requirements for the Master of Science
degree at Oklahoma State University in July, 1992.

Professional Experience: Teaching Assistant, Child
Development Labs, Oklahoma State University,
August, 1991 to May, 1992. Research Assistant,
Oklahoma Cooperative Extension, May, 1992 to
August, 1992.