

NUMBER OF FAMILIES EXPERIENCED BY COLLEGE
STUDENTS AS RELATED TO MARITAL ATTITUDES
AND RELATIONSHIP STYLE

By

LOIS THORFINNSON MICKLE

Bachelor of Science
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska
1949

Master of Arts
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan
1952

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
December, 1985

Thesis

1985D

M625r

cop. 2



NUMBER OF FAMILIES EXPERIENCED BY COLLEGE
STUDENTS AS RELATED TO MARITAL ATTITUDES
AND RELATIONSHIP STYLE

Thesis Approved:

Frances Stromberg

Thesis Adviser

Marquette Scruggs

Althea Skright

John C. McCallister

Richard Dodder

Norman N. Murken

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Being a single-parent broadened my view of family and stimulated my interest in differing family structures and their effects on children, hence this study. Our family operates differently from intact nuclear families as do most of the single-parent and stepparent families I have studied and it has taken me a while to conclude that being different is not better or worse, it is just different.

My sincere appreciation to all the members of my committee who have patiently assisted me along the way; Dr. John McCullers for stimulating my interest in research and getting me started down the road; Dr. Richard Dodder for his expertise both as a teacher and as a statistical adviser; Dr. Marguerite Scruggs for being an excellent role model of a Home Economist in research; and Dr. Althea Wright for encouragement and helpful comments. A very special thanks to Dr. Frances Stromberg, my dissertation adviser, for getting me off high center and on my way again. As a facilitator she has no peer.

It has always been a privilege to work with the faculty and staff of the Department of Family Relations and Child Development. Their supportiveness during the past several years did not go unnoticed. Special thanks to Kay Murphy and Lorene Keeler for listening at the right times and to Jane Jacob for typing assistance.

I am grateful for the cooperation of my students without whom this study would not have been possible, and to the subjects of my

longitudinal parenting project, MaryAnn, Robin and Laurie for tolerating a student-mother for so many years.

Last, but not least, I wish to thank the first home economist in my life, my mother, and the first researcher in my life, my father. Little did they know where that combination would lead.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Purpose of the Study	5
Overview of the Study	6
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	9
General Influence of Different Family Structures	9
Effects of Family Structure on Marital Attitudes	11
Effects of Family Structure on Relationship Style	13
Factors Mediating the Effects of Family Structure	14
Reason for Family Change	15
Age of Child and Age of Parent	16
Changes in Family Size	17
Family Economic Status	18
Satisfaction of Family Members	18
Summary	19
III. RESEARCH DESIGN	20
Type of Research	20
Selection of Subjects	21
Instrumentation	22
Data Collection Procedures	24
Analysis of the Data	25
Hypotheses	26
IV. RESULTS	29
Description of all Subjects	29
Description of Subjects Who Experienced More Than One Family During Childhood	31
INFORMED Scores for Demographic Subgroups	35
Gender	38
Marital Status	38
Year in College	39
College in University	39
FIRO-B Scores for Demographic Subgroups	40
Gender	40
Marital Status	40
College in University	42

Chapter	Page
Examination of Hypotheses	42
Hypothesis One	42
Hypothesis Two	46
Hypothesis Three	50
Hypothesis Four	66
Summary of Results	81
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	86
Review of Study	86
Summary	87
Marital Attitudes	87
Relationship Style	90
Financial Situation	91
Family Functioning	91
Conclusions	92
Implications for Future Research	94
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	96
APPENDIXES	102
APPENDIX A - INVENTORY FOR MARRIAGE EDUCATION (INFORMED) . .	103
APPENDIX B - FUNDAMENTAL INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS ORIENTATION-BEHAVIOR (FIRO-B)	110
APPENDIX C - FAMILY STRUCTURE QUESTIONNAIRE INCLUDING FAMILY ADAPTABILITY AND COHESION EVALUATION SCALES (FACES)	115
APPENDIX D - CORRESPONDENCE	123

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Description of All Subjects	30
II. Description of Subjects Experiencing More Than One Family .	32
III. Number of Families Experienced Related to Selected Demographic Characteristics	36
IV. Mean Scores on INFORMED for Demographic Subgroups	37
V. Mean Scores on FIRO-B for Demographic Subgroups	41
VI. Mean Scores on INFORMED for Subjects Experiencing One Versus More Than One Family During Childhood	43
VII. Mean Scores on FIRO-B for Subjects Experiencing One Versus More Than One Family During Childhood	45
VIII. Mean Scores on INFORMED for Subjects Experiencing One, Two or Three or More Than Three Families During Childhood . .	47
IX. Mean Scores on FIRO-B for Subjects Experiencing One, Two or Three or More Than Three Families During Childhood . . .	49
X. Reason for Family Change One by Number of Families and Mean INFORMED Scores	51
XI. Timing of Last Family Change by Number of Families and Mean INFORMED Scores	53
XII. Changes in Family Size by Number of Families and Mean INFORMED Scores	56
XIII. Changes in Family Financial Status by Number of Families and Mean INFORMED Scores	58
XIV. Changes in Family Satisfaction by Number of Families and Mean INFORMED Scores	60
XV. Adaptability of Last Family by Number of Families and Mean INFORMED Scores	62

Table	Page
XVI. Cohesiveness of Last Family by Number of Families and Mean INFORMED Scores	65
XVII. Functionality of Last Family by Number of Families and Mean INFORMED Scores	67
XVIII. Reason for Family Change One by Number of Families and Mean FIRO-B Scores	69
XIX. Timing of Last Family Change by Number of Families and Mean FIRO-B Scores	70
XX. Changes in Family Size by Number of Families and Mean FIRO-B Scores	72
XXI. Changes in Family Financial Status by Number of Families and Mean FIRO-B Scores	74
XXII. Changes in Family Satisfaction by Number of Families and Mean FIRO-B Scores	75
XXIII. Adaptability of Last Family by Number of Families and Mean FIRO-B Scores	77
XXIV. Cohesiveness of Last Family by Number of Families and Mean FIRO-B Scores	79
XXV. Functionality of Last Family by Number of Families and Mean FIRO-B Scores	80

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

One of the important remaining functions of the family is the socializing of its younger members. Socialization refers to all the processes by which children acquire their personality characteristics, motives, values, opinions, standards, and beliefs. Many agents and forces participate including parents, peers, neighbors, schools, churches, and mass media. Early and continued involvement makes the role of parents and family particularly crucial. The family prepares its members for life in the larger society and also provides a model of family life which is likely to be duplicated by its offspring. In the case of the traditional and presumably well-functioning family, the model is assumed to be helpful to individuals as they enter marriage and take on the responsibility of socializing yet another generation.

There has been a tendency to view the family as having universal characteristics of membership and organization. In recent history, the 'norm' has been the nuclear family, a couple in their first marriage and their biological children in one household. It was assumed that the couple remained married and that during their lifetime the only personnel changes in the family would be the entrance and exit of children. The great increases in numbers of divorces and remarriages

in the last several decades has challenged these expectations. Families are not nearly as static as portrayed. Adult members as well as children may be added or subtracted. Children may live with their mother alone or their father alone, or alternate between two homes. After a death or divorce, one or both of the parents may remarry or have a live-in companion and that new spouse or companion may have children who may or may not share the household; grandparents, aunts or uncles may at times share a household with the children. There are multiple causes for these changes in household composition; illness, death, separation, desertion, divorce, imprisonment and even wars.

The assumption that a family shares a common household at all times is increasingly incorrect. Many families extend beyond the boundaries of one household. Many separated, divorced, and remarried parents retain close ties with children living elsewhere and many low-income single parents have strong family networks that extend across several households (Cherlin, 1981).

Many prognosticators of family life predict that even greater diversity can be expected in the future. Cherlin and Furstenberg (1983) estimated that over a lifetime individuals may find themselves living in no less than 10 different family settings. These changes will begin in childhood and continue into adulthood. Masnick and Bane (1980) have predicted that more than one-third of all children born in 1970 will spend some time before they are 18 living in a single-parent household, and for children born in the 1980's the percentage will be even higher. Glick (1979), a well-known family demographer, predicted that by 1990 only slightly more than one-half of all children under 18 will have lived continuously with both of their natural parents, married

only once. The remainder will have lived in a series of units linked by a marriage-divorce-remarriage chain. If Cetron's (1983) prediction of a shortened period between marriages comes true (1 or 2 versus 3 years) that chain has the potential to be very long.

There appears to be agreement that in the future more adults and children will participate in differing family environments, perhaps a sequence of such environments. The question which is yet to be resolved is whether it will be more or less difficult for parents to perform their basic socialization mission within these structures. Will different parenting styles be required? Will children be able to adjust to differences in parenting style which result from frequent changes in adult personnel?

A strong myth system tends to build up in support of cultural 'norms.' The nuclear family enjoyed that kind of support and early attempts to determine the effectiveness of alternate family forms, not surprisingly, found them to be less desirable. Variations in family structure were compared to the nuclear family in a 'deficit' model (Bowerman and Irish, 1962; Walker, Rogers and Messinger, 1977). Events causing changes were labeled as 'disruptors,' and outcomes, other than re-establishment of a nuclear type family were labeled 'deviant.' Individuals who occupied the roles of 'single-parent' or 'stepparent' were viewed with suspicion. Studies using subjects from nursery school to adulthood assessed the relationship between family structure and such variables as mental health, self concept, school behavior, delinquency, physical illness, independence, and eventual marital happiness. A majority of these studies concluded that alternate family structures contributed to later problems. Children from other than a nuclear

family of origin were clearly 'at risk' and could be expected to develop pathological personality traits.

Researchers (Blechman, 1982; Esses and Campbell, 1984; Ganong and Coleman, 1984) have been highly critical of the research design of the early studies and have questioned their findings. They pointed out that samples were small and unrepresentative, extraneous variables as low income, social status, and educational level were not taken into account. Further, such details as cause of disruption, years in a particular household, age of individual family members at the time of disruption, size of the various units, and contact with extended family were frequently ignored. If these methodological problems were corrected, many of the supposed adverse effects of nontraditional family structures might disappear.

Partly because of these criticisms and partly because the single-parent family and the family of remarriage now rival the nuclear family in numbers, the question of effectiveness of alternate family forms as socializing agencies is being viewed with greater objectivity. Recent literature has been much more positive than earlier reports dealing with various family structures. Herzog and Sudia (1973), after a careful review of father absence literature, said it failed to support any blanket generalizations about father absence and concluded that the number of parents in the home was less critical than the functioning of the parent who was present. Virginia Satir (1972), a family practitioner, concurred. She described changes in family form as 'challenges' and concluded that what was more important than the personnel of the household (or their labels) was the quality of the relationship between parenting figures and the child. Brooks (1981)

stated that once the initial period of disorganization had passed, children functioned well in any of a variety of households. Weiss in his text Going It Alone (1979) even claimed some benefits to children living in single-parent homes. The child is offered an earlier opportunity for real responsibility and involvement in family decision making which leads to earlier self-reliance.

As change has come to be regarded as an inevitable part of modern family life the view of family as an ongoing process rather than a static institution has gained acceptance. Researchers are being encouraged to regard the present family situation as one step on a continuum of marriage-divorce/death-remarriage-redivorce (Furstenberg, Nord, Peterson and Zill, 1983; Ihinger-Tallman, 1984; Marotz-Baden, Adams, Beuche, Munro and Munro, 1979). Hunter and Schuman (1980) suggested that the traditional family pattern based on the ideal of lifelong monogamy is not being replaced by the single-parent family or the reconstituted family, but by a pattern which they called the 'chronically reconstituting family,' a series of reconstituted households interspersed with periods of single-parenting. Hareven (1978) suggested a 'life course' approach taking into account the wide range of family experiences and the frequency with which alternate paths are pursued. Emphasis would be shifted from normative stages to the processes by which individuals move in and out of different family groupings, the roles they assume, and the timing of the changes.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research was to explore the question of long term effects of experiencing multiple family settings during childhood

using the suggested 'life course' approach. Marital attitudes and relationship style were selected as the adult characteristics to be studied. These two dependent variables were identified as having a high likelihood of being influenced by early family experience and as being important to the success of the marriages which grown children would later enter.

In addition to number of families experienced, the following conditions or circumstances were utilized as independent variables:

1. The precipitator of family change
2. The timing of any changes which occurred
3. The size of the families experienced
4. The financial status of the families experienced
5. Satisfaction with the families experienced
6. The functionality of the last family unit.

The specific research questions asked were:

1. Whether and in what way experiencing more than one family setting during childhood would be reflected in the marital attitudes and relationship style of young adults

2. To what extent the outcomes might depend on the number of changes occurring and number of families experienced (many versus few)

3. To what extent accompanying conditions or circumstances might mediate the effects of experiencing a number of families.

Specific hypotheses tested in examining these research questions may be found in Chapter III.

Overview of the Study

This study examined dissolving and reorganizing families via the

recollections of their nearly adult offspring, college students, thus utilizing some of the suggestions for a 'process' or 'life course' approach. College students are particularly suitable subjects for a study on marital attitudes since they are in transition between their home (or homes) of childhood and the families they themselves will soon create. They frequently have romanticized ideas about what is necessary to create and maintain a good marriage. They are frequently analytical and critical of the family in which they were reared. The students who participated in this study had elected a marriage or parenting class so it could be concluded that family was a subject of special interest to them.

The survey method was employed since little is known, except in a very global sense, about the influence of family structural changes on marital attitudes and relationship style. Instruments were located which tapped the views of the students regarding marriage in general, Inventory for Marriage Education (Fournier, 1981); the functioning of their current family, Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales (Olson, McCubbin, Barnes, Larsen, Muxen and Wilson, 1983); and their usual manner of relating to others, Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior (Schutz, 1978). A questionnaire was developed by the researcher to collect data on number of families experienced and characteristics of those families.

In the past several decades many of the popular assumptions and stereotypes concerning families have been challenged including the idea that all family forms other than the nuclear family are inferior child rearing environments. New facts are needed to replace the older outdated beliefs. The responses of the students who participated in this

study may provide information useful to family life professionals as they teach and counsel concerning variations in the family experience. Family life educators need current information about different family settings to plan curriculum which will assist their students in making decisions about their future families. Marriage and family counselors need information on the possible short and long-term effects of family reorganization if they are to develop successful intervention programs. Participants in the family process (adults and children) need to be aware of what Knox (1985, p. 16) referred to as the "menu of life-styles," currently available around which they can organize their lives. All would benefit from a broadened view of family which should result in greater tolerance of the life-style choices of others and the direction of energies toward dealing with the various family situations in creative ways.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

General Influence of Different Family Structures

One of the primary concerns of most parents when their families experience disruption, is the well-being of their children. There is much evidence in the literature to indicate that their concern is justified. Children, like their parents, find the reorganization of their families a traumatic experience (Hetherington, Cox and Cox, 1977; Kulka and Weingarten, 1979; McDermott, 1970; Sorosky, 1977; Wallerstein and Kelly, 1976). Most parents expect some negative responses to family reorganization and could probably deal better with the effects on their children if they knew the effects to be temporary in nature. Of greater concern is the possibility of long-term damage. It is difficult to find agreement in the literature about either the beneficial or detrimental long-term effects of marital disruption on the child.

Early studies under the heading of 'father absence,' 'broken homes,' and similar negative labels tended to support the opinion that children in other than a nuclear family would suffer severe and perhaps permanent psychological damage. This conclusion, incidentally, probably convinced some unhappy marital dyads to 'stay together for the sake of the children.'

More recently, reviewers, armed with more sophisticated research techniques have reached much less pessimistic conclusions about the effects of family disruption (Blechman, 1982; Bloom, Asher, and White, 1978; Espinoza and Newman, 1979; Ganong and Coleman, 1984; Herzog and Sudia, 1973; Macklin, 1980). These reviewers were highly critical of the methodology employed in the earlier studies. Herzog and Sudia (1973) concluded that in any area of child and adult functioning, the null hypothesis of 'no difference' between children reared by one or two parents had yet to be soundly disproved. Research flaws, they felt, rendered findings of many studies useless. Espinoza and Newman (1979) noted that, as of their writing, all conclusions about step-parenting were based on white, protestant and middle class stepfamilies. Macklin (1980) summarizing research on nontraditional family forms, said this research was largely exploratory; appropriate measures were lacking; and necessary controls were not clearly understood. Blechman (1982, p. 190) looking at the question of whether children of one-parent families were at psychological risk, expressed disappointment that social scientists had "failed to guard against naive psychological biases in the choice of research design, statistical analysis and dependent measures." Ganong and Coleman (1984) summarizing 38 research articles on the effects of remarriage on children, concluded that there was a need for larger samples, control of extraneous variables and multiple methods of data collection.

Work of Kulka and Weingarten (1979) would seem to bear out the criticism of these reviewers. Looking at data from two national cross-sectional surveys conducted nearly 20 years apart, they examined differences between adults from intact and non-intact family backgrounds.

Using more sophisticated statistical procedures and controlling for contemporary life circumstances and social background factors, they reached quite different conclusions about the influence of family backgrounds than had been reached in earlier analysis of the same data. The experience of parental divorce, they concluded, had, at most, a modest effect on adult adjustment.

Kohlberg, LaCrosse, and Ricks (1972), reviewing literature linking childhood and adult mental health, commented that undesirable family conditions in childhood have much slighter effects on adult adjustment than anyone seemed to anticipate. Only if deprivation and trauma were continuous or reinforced throughout childhood was adult adjustment significantly affected. While parents should be encouraged by the more cautious statements being made today about the long-term effects of family structure changes on their children, they should also be aware that even the most critical reviewer has not ruled out long-term effects altogether.

Socialization for marriage and family life occurs primarily in the family. Of particular interest in this study is the relationship of intactness or non-intactness of the family of origin on two important characteristics related to success in marriage, marital attitudes, and relationship style.

Effects of Family Structure on Marital Attitudes

Marital attitudes have been held to be the product primarily of childhood experiences in the family (Landis, 1962; Wallen, 1954; Walters, Parker, and Stinnett, 1972). In the process of socialization,

parents communicate attitudes directly or indirectly to their children regarding the desirability of marriage, the manner in which it should be conducted, and whether or not it can be terminated (Coleman and Ganong, 1984; Greenberg and Nay, 1982).

A happy childhood relationship with parents is believed to contribute to the kind of emotional climate which will generate favorable perceptions of and readiness for marriage (Stinnett, 1971; Walters, Parker and Stinnett, 1972). The success of the parental marriage, likewise has been seen as exerting a positive influence. The intactness of the child's family of origin has generally been used as the indicator of that success. Recent literature has pointed out that family structure alone is not always an indicator of family happiness or of children's attitudes and behaviors (Fox and Inazu, 1982; Marotz-Baden et al., 1979; Raschke and Raschke, 1979; Spreitzer and Riley, 1974; Wilson, Zurcher, McAdams, and Curtis, 1975).

Only three studies were found which dealt primarily with variations in family structure and marital attitudes (Coleman and Ganong, 1984; Ganong, Coleman, and Brown, 1981; Greenburg and Nay, 1982). The Ganong study concluded that only slight differences could be attributed to family structure. Family structure was not as influential as gender (females having significantly more positive attitudes toward marriage). Male adolescents from reconstituted homes had less positive attitudes toward marriage than males from other family situations. Adolescents from reconstituted families had more positive attitudes toward divorce. Adolescents from single-parent families had the most traditional views on marriage roles. Greenberg and Nay's study (1982) showed that those from separated or divorced groups had more positive

attitudes toward divorce. Coleman and Ganong (1984) found that family structure had no effect on role expectations but subjects who rated their families as having high family 'integration' (closeness) had more positive attitudes toward marriage in general.

Effects of Family Structure on Relationship Style

No studies were found which were directly related to relationship style as investigated in this study. However, several studies dealing with family relationships and peer relationships at a more general level contained helpful information. Most found little or no difference in family relationships depending on family structure (Bohannon and Yahraes, 1979; Burchinal, 1964; Ganong and Coleman, 1984; Raschke and Raschke, 1979).

A few studies looked at the specifics of social interaction. Santrock, Warchak, Lindbergh, and Meadows (1982) found no difference in warmth, self-esteem, anxiety, demandingness, maturity, and sociability between children from single-parent, stepparent, and intact families. They did find these qualities related to parenting strategies employed (authoritative, authoritarian, laissez faire). Studies by Hetherington (1972), Nelson and Vargen (1971), and Young and Parish (1977) found that adolescent girls from divorced and widowed home situations behaved differently in heterosexual situations. Girls reared by divorced mothers were more forward while girls reared by widowed mothers were more inhibited than girls from intact homes.

Schooler (1972) interviewed adult males from a variety of backgrounds and found that those from divorced or separated backgrounds

showed greater anxiety and distrust of others. Gregory (1966) found that those who had lost a parent through death or divorce were more emotionally controlled and intellectually rigid as adults. In a study of two large data sets (NORC and YIT) Wilson et al. (1975), concluded that subjects from stepfamilies less often expressed the opinion that 'other people are helpful' or 'other people are fair' than subjects from intact families of origin. With this exception, family structural background had no effect on a variety of social interactions.

The attitude of a person toward himself plays an important part in his relationships and self-esteem is known to be tied to early family experiences. Self-esteem has been a favorite dependent variable in family structure research. With the exception of a few early studies, the conclusion has been that there are no significant differences in self-esteem related to family structural background (Kaplan and Pokorney, 1971; Parish and Taylor, 1979; Raschke and Raschke, 1979; Rosenberg, 1972). Self-esteem showed greater relationship to the general happiness of the home (Parish and Nunn, 1981) and self-esteem of parents (Parish and Copeland, 1979) than the structure of the home.

Factors Mediating the Effects of Family Structure

One of the criticisms by reviewers of family structure literature has been the failure of many researchers to take into account and control for accompanying conditions and circumstances. Behavioral problems, general adjustment and interpersonal relationships often appeared to be less affected by structure than these factors (Marotz-Baden et al., 1979). Most often mentioned as influences that needed

to be considered in connection with family structure were 1) the cause of family dissolution, 2) the age of the child and the parents at time of disruption, 3) the size and economic status of the various family units, and 4) the general happiness of the members of the family units or family harmony.

Reason for Family Change

The most common reason for family breakup until the mid-1970's was the death of one of the parents (Cherlin, 1981). Since that time, divorce has been the primary cause. The frequent occurrence of divorce rather early in the life of the family (average is seven years) increases the likelihood of involvement of children. The effects of either death or divorce are similar in that the organization of family living is disrupted. As Brooks (1981, p. 296) stated "Divorce is the death of the family as it was structured and all members have to form new relationships with each other." Findings as to the relative impact of the two causative events are conflicting. Bowerman and Irish (1962) reported death as the greater problem; Duberman (1973) concluded divorce to be more traumatic. Other researchers (Langner and Michael, 1963; Rosenberg, 1972) reported very little difference between the effects of the two factors.

Results depended upon the particular child or family characteristic under study. Hetherington (1972) found daughters of divorcees were more forward and daughters of widows more inhibited in heterosexual situations than adolescents from intact families. Duberman (1973) found higher family integration achieved by stepfamilies in which a partner had been widowed rather than divorced. Parish and Kappes (1980)

looking at stepchildren's attitudes toward stepfathers, found they were more apt to be favorable if he replaced a deceased father than a divorced father. Parish (1982) also found that males from divorced remarried families were more external in locus of control than males from intact families or families where fathers were deceased. Kaplan and Pokorney (1971) concluded that the gender of the child made a difference in the effect of family structure on 'self derogation' (strong negative feelings about oneself). 'Self derogation' was more related to death of a father for females and divorce of parents for males.

Age of Child and Age of Parent

The child's age at the time of family disruption has been under frequent investigation. Several studies have concluded that early family disruption (before the age of five or six) is most detrimental (Biller and Bahm, 1971; Hetherington, 1972; Santrock et al., 1982). However, Blechman (1982) in reviewing these studies proposed that the adverse effects were not due so much to losing a father while very young, as to having mothers who were young, poor, and less well educated. Kaplan and Pokorney (1971) also found the effect of subject's age at time of marital dissolution contingent on race, sex, and social class. However, they did conclude that for their population as a whole, the age category of 13 or above most closely related to their dependent variable 'self derogation.'

Any study of age of onset of disruption has to take into account the recency of the event. Conclusions that parental loss is more detrimental to teenagers might really be reflecting that they had not

had sufficient time to recover. Recovery time is measured in years, not months (Hetherington, 1972; Wallerstein and Kelly, 1976).

Along with the age of the child one should also consider the age of the parents. Relative youth of parents predicted negative adjustment of children in a study by Hodges, Weschler, and Ballentine (1979). Youth of parents also increases the likelihood that a child will be living with a never-married mother (Bachrach, 1983). Glick (1979) noted that the average age of divorced mothers had been decreasing. The proportion of divorced mothers under age 35 has gone up from 43 percent in 1970 to 51 percent in 1977.

Changes in Family Size

Families become temporarily smaller with the exit of one parent (usually the father) but three out of four divorced women and five out of six divorced men remarry (Cherlin, 1981). The families thus formed are frequently larger than the original family (Bachrach, 1983; Kellam, Ensminger, and Turner, 1977). Remarriage families with fewer members and more simple structures reported higher marital quality than remarried families with more complicated structures (Clingempeel, 1981). This in turn very likely affects parenting quality. Elder and Bowerman (1963) and Schooler (1972) found that larger families are more apt to model an authoritarian decision making style. Schooler also found that individuals from large families were more distrustful of others and more accepting of the externally oriented values of getting along with people. As a variable, family size is very closely tied to family economics.

Family Economic Status

Larger families make heavier demands on family resources which may already be strained in the family of divorce or remarriage. Economic problems faced by divorced persons, particularly women, have been extensively documented (Bane and Weiss, 1980, Hetherington, Cox, and Cox, 1977). Hetherington, Cox and Cox noted that the problem was due in part to having to spread the previous income over two households. Also as Marotz-Baden et al. (1979) pointed out, women are discriminated against. Divorced women who are less likely to be employed and who earn less if they are employed are usually given custody of the children. Noncustodial fathers commonly fail to contribute financial support (Brandwein, Brown, and Fox, 1974). This situation led Cherlin (1981, p. 81) to comment that "the most detrimental aspect of absence of the father from single-parent families headed by a woman, is not the lack of a male presence, but the lack of a male income."

Typically the standard of living increases at remarriage due to the fact that financial resources which formerly maintained two residences are combined to support only one (Goetting, 1982). The problem now becomes not so much insufficient funds as one of financial instability and resource distribution. The instability is due to uncertainties about incoming and outgoing child support payments as well as to changes in employment status of the family members.

Satisfaction of Family Members

A number of studies have suggested that family harmony may be more important than family structure or at least may mitigate the effects of changes in family structure (Bane, 1976; Parish and Nunn, 1981;

Raschke and Raschke, 1979; Ross and Sawhill, 1975). All concluded that living in an intact family characterized by unresolved tension and conflict was more stressful for children than living in some other type of family. Termination of one family structure may or may not eliminate the conflict but if separated or divorced parents do succeed in cooperating, children may be better off (Hess and Camara, 1979; Wallerstein and Kelly, 1980).

Summary

Views are mixed concerning the long-term effects on a child of growing up in multiple families. Reviewers are inclined to attribute earlier negative findings to poor quality research. More recent research has found few significant effects. With regard to the characteristics of interest in this study, marital attitudes and relationship style, the following rather sparse results were found.

1. Adolescents from single-parent homes have more traditional views of marriage than those from intact or remarriage homes.
2. Adolescents from remarriage homes have the most positive view of divorce.
3. Early loss of a parent by death may cause an adolescent to be more inhibited, emotionally controlled, and intellectually rigid.
4. Early loss of a parent by divorce may cause an adolescent to be less inhibited, more anxious, and distrustful of others.
5. Self-esteem may or may not be damaged by frequent changes in family structure.
6. An initially poor or declining economic situation or unresolved tension in the first or subsequent homes, rather than family structural changes may be the cause of later problems.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

Type of Research

The survey method is one of the most frequently used methods in social science research. It is commonly used to obtain opinions and attitudes of individuals and to study social structures (Kerlinger, 1964). It is a relatively efficient way to gather large amounts of information in a short period of time. Communicating with a representative sample yields information about the larger group.

For survey results to be considered credible, subjects must be asked the same questions in exactly the same way, subjects must be knowledgeable (have or remember the information), instructions must be understood, questions must appear as neutral in value as possible (thus avoiding a tendency to give socially desirable answers), any instruments used should have established reliability and validity (assuring that they measure what they are supposed to measure, consistently), and subject matter cannot be unduly sensitive (lest the respondent feel compelled to lie). It was felt that the questionnaire, subject matter, and instruments used in this study met these criteria with one possible exception. The Family Structure Questionnaire asked respondents to recall attitudes and events that happened during their childhood and data dependent on recall is always open to question. Recall of feelings is not so questionable as recall of facts, however,

because currently held perceptions are based on recall of feelings and attitudes.

In order that information acquired from a survey be generalizable, care should be taken that the sample be a random one. Since this criterion was not met, results of this study should be considered tentative. In defense of the subject selection it should be noted that this was not just a case of what Snedecor and Cochran (1967, p. 509) called "restricting the sampling to those members that are conveniently accessible." Two of the instruments were already being used in marriage classes to improve student 'self knowledge,' and the other two instruments expanded the experience. This was, then, an opportunity to combine research and educative experience for a large number of students who were majors in the six colleges across one university. While not a random sample of the students on one campus, the subjects did represent a variety of majors and a variety of backgrounds.

Selection of Subjects

Students enrolled in Marriage and Parenting classes during the Fall and Spring semester of 1984-1985 at Oklahoma State University served as subjects. These classes were not required for any major in any department on the campus, but may be taken as supportive elective courses for a number of majors in the Department of Family Relations and Child Development, in other departments in the College of Home Economics, and in a number of departments in other colleges in the university. Thirteen international students were eliminated from the original number resulting in a sample of 419 individuals. Of these, approximately one-fourth (105) had experienced more than one family in

the process of their childhood. These subjects will be described more fully in Chapter IV and suffice to say here that they were largely, 1) 18 to 24 year olds, 2) single, 3) female, 4) juniors and seniors.

Instrumentation

Four instruments were utilized in this study, INFORMED, FIRO-B, FACES II, and a Family Structure Questionnaire. Copies of these and scoring instructions are located in the Appendix.

INFORMED (Inventory for Marriage Education) is a diagnostic tool designed by Fournier (1981) to measure attitudes and beliefs of single nonengaged persons. It consists of 120 items divided into 12 content areas known to be important to marital functioning. The questionnaire responses are based on Likert-type scaling. Respondents circle one of six choices ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Scores in any one area thus range from 10 to 60 with higher scores generally indicating more realistic attitudes. One category, 'Idealism' serves as a check against the tendency to give socially desirable answers. Two categories 'Roles' and 'Religion' are descriptive. High 'Roles' scores indicate more equalitarian views; high 'Religion' scores indicate more traditional religious views and practices.

Cronbach Alpha reliability figures for the 12 content areas have been reported (Fournier, 1981) as follows:

Idealism	.82	Resolve conflict	.78
Expectations	.61	Finances	.62
Personality	.81	Leisure	.76
Roles	.84	Children	.68
Communication	.71	Family/friends	.63
Religion	.87	Sexuality	.72

FIRO-B (Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior) is a 54-item questionnaire developed by Schutz (1978) which measures three fundamental dimensions of interpersonal relationships, 'Inclusion,' 'Control,' and 'Affection.' For each question, respondents indicate a choice on a six-point scale, 'Never' to 'Usually' or 'Nobody' to 'Most people.' For each dimension there is an 'e' (expressed) score and a 'w' (wanted) score. Thus the FIRO-B is a group of six ordinal-level Guttman Scales. For each of the three dimensions there are 'sum' and 'difference' scores. These were the particular scores used in this research. The mean coefficient of reproducibility of the scales has been reported to be .94, split-half reliability (Spearman-Brown formula) .72, the Kuder-Richardson coefficient for internal consistency .71, and the coefficient of stability .76 (Gluck, 1983).

FACES II (Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales) is a 30-item diagnostic tool designed by Olson and his associates (Olson, McCubbin, Barnes, Larsen, Muxen, and Wilson, 1983). It assesses two dimensions of family behavior known to be important to family functioning identified as 'Cohesion' (the degree to which family members are separated from or connected to each other) and 'Adaptability' (the extent to which the family is able to change with regard to power, roles, and rules). Mid-range scores on both 'Cohesion' and 'Adaptability' result in the family being classified as 'Functional' while scores at either end of the continuum suggest the likelihood of less effective functioning.

Reliability using Cronbach Alpha has been reported as .87 for the subscale 'Cohesion,' .78 for the subscale 'Adaptability,' and .90 for the total scale. Test-retest reliability using Pearson correlation was

available only for the original 50 item FACES scale and was .83 for 'Cohesion,' .80 for 'Adaptability,' and .84 for all items (Olson et al., 1983).

The Family Structure Questionnaire was developed by the researcher as a part of this dissertation project to collect such general personal data about the subjects as age, gender, and marital status. It also asked questions concerning the number of family changes the student had experienced, the timing of those changes, and the parenting situation, size, financial status, and happiness of each family unit experienced.

Data Collection Procedures

All instruments were completed by students during regular class periods. INFORMED and FIRO-B have been routinely used as part of a 'self knowledge' unit in the marriage classes and were administered on separate days. INFORMED took approximately 30 minutes and the FIRO-B took approximately 20 minutes. FACES II was combined with the Family Structure Questionnaire which was administered during a third class period. Time involved was 10 to 20 minutes for most students. Students in the parenting class completed all instruments in one two-hour session. Since no significant differences were found between scores of the parenting and the marriage classes it was assumed that fatigue was not a problem and that the two classes were tapping the same population.

Student ID numbers were originally used so that the results could be shared with the students. Once students had viewed the results of all instruments, another number was assigned each set of data to assure anonymity.

Analysis of the Data

Responses to all of the instruments were coded and entered into a computer. The SPSSX Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (1983) was used for analysis of the data.

Frequency counts and percentages were produced for all descriptive variables. Means were calculated for the variables for which they would be meaningful and for instrument scores. Frequencies and means were calculated for all subjects (N=419) and also for the subgroup who experienced family changes while growing up (N=105).

Analysis of variance determines the significance of differences among means when data have been categorized into two or more subgroups. One-way analysis of variance (SPSSX Command word = ONEWAY) looks at the relationship between one dependent variable and one independent variable. This statistical procedure was used to compare mean scores on all instruments of students classed according to gender, marital status, year in school, college and place of residence while growing up. It was also used to compare students who had experienced 1) one, 2) two or three, or 3) more than three family settings during childhood on a number of characteristics such as mother's age at student's birth, family size, family finances, and family satisfaction. The Tukey H.S.D. test was used for comparison between groups when more than two groups were involved.

Multiple analysis of variance (SPSSX Command word = ANOVA) looks at the relationship between one dependent variable and up to five independent variables. One can test for the relationship between the dependent variable and each of the independent variables singly (main effects), and for interactive effects between the dependent variable

and all independent variables. This statistical procedure was used to compare mean scores on all instruments of students who had experienced different numbers of families while growing up, while also considering certain conditions associated with those families (reason for change, timing of change, size, finances, and satisfaction). The .05 level of significance was chosen for interpreting results of statistical tests.

Hypotheses

Hypotheses tested in this study were:

H₁: There will be no significant difference in mean scores of students who remained in their family of origin throughout their childhood versus those who did not, with regard to

- a) Marital attitudes as measured by INFORMED
- b) Relationship style as measured by FIRO-B.

H₂: There will be no significant difference in mean scores of students who remained in their family of origin throughout their childhood versus those who experienced two or three versus more than three families, with regard to

- a) Marital attitudes as measured by INFORMED
- b) Relationship style as measured by FIRO-B.

H₃: There will be no significant difference in mean scores on marital attitudes of students who experienced two or three versus three or more families during their childhood, with regard to the following characteristics

- a) The reason for the first family change (divorce versus death)

- b) The timing of the last family change (before versus at or after age 13)
- c) Changes in family size (remained the same or got smaller versus got larger)
- d) Changes in family financial status (remained the same or improved versus worsened)
- e) Changes in family satisfaction (remained the same or improved versus reduced)
- f) 'Adaptability' of last family (functional versus non-functional range)
- g) 'Cohesiveness' of last family (functional versus non-functional range)
- h) 'Functionality' of last family (functional versus non-functional category).

H₄: There will be no significant difference in mean scores on relationship style of students who experienced two or three families versus three or more families during their childhood, with regard to the following characteristics

- a) The reason for the first family change (divorce versus death)
- b) The timing of the last family change (before versus at or after age 13)
- c) Changes in family size (remained the same or got smaller versus got larger)
- d) Changes in family financial status (remained the same or improved versus worsened)

- e) Changes in family satisfaction (remained the same or improved versus reduced)
- f) 'Adaptability' of last family (functional versus non-functional range)
- g) 'Cohesiveness' of last family (functional versus non-functional range)
- h) 'Functionality' of last family (functional versus non-functional category).

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Description of all Subjects

Table I presents frequencies and means for demographic data concerning the 419 students in marriage and parenting classes who participated in this study. Since all were enrolled in upper division classes it is not surprising that most (75.9%) were juniors and seniors. The classes are offered by the College of Home Economics but attract students from a wide variety of disciplines. In fact, Business majors (33.9%) and Arts and Science majors (25.8%) outnumbered Home Economics majors (24.1%). Other majors were represented to a lesser degree.

There were approximately three times as many females as males participating in the study (76.1% and 23.9% respectively). As might be expected of a college sample, most of the students were in the 'single never married' category (82.8%), the remainder were 'married' (15.5%) or 'formerly married' (1.7%). Despite the supposed rural nature of Oklahoma, only 14 percent of the students listed farm or rural places of residence; 31.0 percent listed a small or large town and 54.9 percent, small or large cities.

Almost all (97.4%) of the original family settings were of the 'mother-father' type. Only a handful of individuals (11) started out in other parenting situations and of these 'mother-alone' was the most

TABLE I
DESCRIPTION OF ALL SUBJECTS
(N=419)

Characteristic	f	%	Characteristic	f	%
<u>Sex</u>			<u>Original Family Setting</u>		
Female	319	76.1	Mother-father	408	97.4
Male	100	23.9	Mother alone	5	1.2
			Father alone	2	.5
<u>Age</u>			Mother-grandmother	2	.5
18-24	397	95.2	Mother-stepfather	1	.2
Over 24	20	4.8	Father-stepmother	0	.0
			Other	1	.2
<u>Year in School</u>			<u>Total Number Families Lived in</u>		
Freshman	9	2.1	1	316	75.4
Sophomore	89	21.2	2	51	12.2
Junior	107	25.5	3	33	7.9
Senior	211	50.4	4	11	2.6
Other	3	.7	5	4	1.0
			6	2	.5
<u>College</u>			7	1	.2
Agriculture	12	2.9	8	1	.2
Arts & Science	108	25.8			
Business	142	33.9	<u>Size Original Family</u>		
Education	25	6.0	2-3	20	4.7
Engineering	30	7.2	4-5	279	66.6
Home Economics	101	24.1	6-7	90	21.5
Other	1	.2	8-9	23	5.4
			10-11	7	1.7
<u>Marital Status</u>					
Single, never married	347	82.8	<u>Financial Situation Original Family</u>		
Married	65	15.5	Poorer than most	16	3.8
Formerly married	7	1.7	Same as most	273	65.2
			Better than most	130	31.0
<u>Residence</u>			<u>Satisfaction Original Family</u>		
Farm	40	9.5	1-2	3	.7
Rural, non-farm	19	4.5	3-4	16	3.8
Small town	43	10.3	5-6	41	9.8
Large town	87	20.8	7-8	129	30.9
Small city	101	24.1	9-10	229	54.8
Large city	129	30.8			

frequently occurring type. Those who remained in their families of origin accounted for 75.4 percent of the total subjects. Reports of other researchers (Bumpass and Rindfuss, 1979; Furstenberg, Nord, Peterson, and Zill, 1983; and Glick, 1979) led to the expectation that anywhere from one-third to one-half would experience family change. The smaller percentage (24.6%) found in this study may be due to the fact that most were not from poor families (they could afford to send their children to college) and most were citizens of a conservative state.

The original families ranged in size from two to eleven with families of four to seven members accounting for 88.1 percent of the total. Mean size was 5.11. These families were apparently adequately financed as 96.2 percent of the students rated their situations as 'the same' or 'better than most.' Students were generally very satisfied with their families of origin. On a scale of one to ten, 85.7 percent gave their families ratings of between seven and ten.

Description of Subjects Who Experienced More Than One Family During Childhood

Table II presents frequencies and means for demographic data pertaining only to the 24.6 percent (N=105) of the respondents who experienced more than one family while growing up. As with those who remained in their families of origin, most of these students started out in mother-father households. The most usual reason for the initial change was divorce (68.8%). Death was a distant second at 22.9 percent. The reversal in importance of these two causes is one of the notable changes in family instability statistics of this century (Cherlin, 1981).

TABLE II
DESCRIPTION OF SUBJECTS EXPERIENCING
MORE THAN ONE FAMILY
(N=105)

Characteristic	f	%	Characteristic	f	%
<u>Original Family Setting</u>			<u>Second Family Setting</u>		
Mother-father	97	92.4	Mother-father	3	2.9
Mother alone	3	2.9	Mother alone	80	76.2
Mother-grandmother	2	1.9	Mother-grandmother	2	1.9
Mother-stepfather	1	1.0	Mother-stepfather	3	2.9
Father alone	2	1.9	Father alone	10	9.5
Mother-other	0	0.0	Mother-other	2	1.9
Father-grandmother	0	0.0	Father-grandmother	1	1.0
Father-stepmother	0	0.0	Father-stepmother	1	1.0
Father-other	0	0.0	Father-other	1	1.0
Grandmother-other	0	0.0	Grandmother-other	1	1.0
Other	0	0.0	Other	1	1.0
<u>Size Original Family</u>			<u>Size Second Family</u>		
2-3	13	12.4	2-3	13	12.4
4-5	71	67.6	4-5	71	67.6
6-7	18	17.2	6-7	18	17.2
8-9	2	1.9	8-9	2	1.9
10-11	1	1.0	10-11	1	1.0
<u>Financial Situation Original Family</u>			<u>Financial Situation Second Family</u>		
Poorer than most	10	9.5	Poorer than most	19	18.1
Same as most	68	64.8	Same as most	64	61.0
Better than most	27	25.7	Better than most	22	21.0
<u>Satisfaction Original Family</u>			<u>Satisfaction Second Family</u>		
1-2	2	1.9	1-2	9	8.6
3-4	11	10.5	3-4	16	15.3
5-6	16	15.4	5-6	26	24.8
7-8	32	30.7	7-8	31	29.5
9-10	43	41.3	9-10	23	21.9
<u>Reason for First Change</u>			<u>Reason for Second Change</u>		
Separation	2	1.9	Separation	0	0.0
Divorce	72	68.6	Divorce	5	9.1
Death	24	22.9	Death	0	0.0
Marriage	7	6.7	Marriage	42	76.4
Other	0	0.0	Other	8	14.5
<u>Age at Change One</u>			<u>Age at Change Two</u>		
Under 5	13	13.4	Under 5	2	3.6
5-12	46	47.4	5-12	30	54.5
Over 12	38	39.2	Over 12	23	41.1
<u>Third Family Setting</u>			<u>Fourth Family Setting</u>		
Mother-father	1	1.8	Mother-father	1	5.3
Mother alone	5	9.1	Mother alone	3	15.8
Mother-grandmother	0	0.0	Mother-grandmother	1	5.3
Mother-stepfather	39	70.9	Mother-stepfather	5	26.3
Father alone	2	3.6	Father alone	3	15.8
Mother-other	0	0.0	Mother-other	0	0.0
Father-grandmother	1	1.8	Father-grandmother	0	0.0
Father-stepmother	7	12.7	Father-stepmother	3	15.8
Father-other	0	0.0	Father-other	0	0.0
Grandmother-other	0	0.0	Grandmother-other	1	5.3
Other	0	0.0	Other	2	10.5

TABLE II (Continued)

Characteristic	f	%	Characteristic	f	%
<u>Size Third Family</u>			<u>Size Fourth Family</u>		
2-3	11	20.0	2-3	5	26.3
4-5	30	54.6	4-5	11	57.9
6-7	10	18.2	6-7	3	15.8
8-9	4	7.3	8-9	0	0.0
<u>Financial Situation Third Family</u>			<u>Financial Situation Fourth Family</u>		
Poorer than most	6	10.9	Poorer than most	3	15.8
Same as most	26	47.3	Same as most	9	47.4
Better than most	23	41.8	Better than most	7	36.8
<u>Satisfaction Third Family</u>			<u>Satisfaction Fourth Family</u>		
1-2	6	10.9	1-2	0	0.0
3-4	9	16.4	3-4	2	10.5
5-6	9	16.4	5-6	2	10.5
7-8	19	34.6	7-8	10	52.6
9-10	12	21.8	9-10	5	26.4
<u>Reason for Third (last) Change</u>					
Separation	0	0.0			
Divorce	7	36.8			
Death	2	10.5			
Marriage	7	36.8			
Other	3	15.8			
<u>Age at Change Three</u>					
Under 5	0	0.0			
5-12	2	10.5			
Over 12	17	89.5			

The mean age of the student at the time of the first disruption was 10.64 years. The mean size of the original family was 4.74.

Change one resulted in a single-parent home usually headed by a mother (76.2%). Father-headed households accounted for a much smaller percentage (9.5%). According to a 1983 Bureau of Census report (Saluter, 1983), the father, nationwide, is less apt to head a single-parent home. The percentages at that time were 8.8 percent father-only versus 91.1 percent mother only. The mean size of family two was 3.80 reflecting the exit of one adult family member. A higher percentage rated their second families as 'poorer than most.' Their satisfaction rating was also lower.

Marriage (76.4%) was the most common reason for the second change. At this time the mean age of the child was 11.4 years. This meant an average of one year between change one and change two. Bumpass and Rindfuss (1979) predicted four and one-half years and Cherlin (1981), three years for remarriage to take place. The third family thus created was most apt to be headed by a mother-stepfather (70.9%); father-stepmother was in a distant second place (12.7%). Family size increased due to entrance of the stepparent. Fewer listed their families as 'poorer than most,' probably due to the income brought in by an additional adult. General satisfaction rose slightly.

Very few (N=19, 4.5%) of those responding experienced more than two family changes. This is considerably below the estimate of 10 percent made by Furstenberg et al. (1983). For those who did, circumstances were much more varied. Divorce and marriage each accounted for approximately one-third of the total insofar as reason for change was concerned. A greater variety of parenting situations was evident.

The percentage listing their financial situation as 'poorer than most' again increased, but interestingly, family satisfaction rose. Mean age of the child at the time of the fourth or last change was 15.5 years.

Table III compares those who experienced one, two or three, and more than three families during childhood, on certain demographic characteristics. Students whose families changed had mothers who were significantly younger at the time of their birth (23.68 and 24.11 versus 26.11 years). Young age at time of marriage has long been associated with marital instability. Mean size of the original families was significantly smaller (4.68 and 4.74 versus 5.20) for those whose families underwent change. Finances were perceived as significantly less adequate if the number of families went beyond three. Poverty and marital instability have frequently been shown to go hand in hand. Family satisfaction received a lower rating for the multiple family groups. It seems logical that families that dissolved would not be remembered as having been very satisfactory.

INFORMED Scores for Demographic Subgroups

On Table IV the mean scores for the 12 INFORMED categories are shown for those demographic subgroups for which some significant differences were found. 'Place of residence while growing up' showed no relationship to INFORMED, hence was omitted. Significance of differences were tested by analysis of variance. The Tukey H.S.D. test was used for comparison between categories.

TABLE III
NUMBER OF FAMILIES EXPERIENCED RELATED TO
SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS
(N=419)

Number of Families Experienced	Mean Age of Mother at Student's Birth	Mean Size of Original Family	Finances of Original Family	Satisfaction Original Family
One	26.1146a+	5.2025a	2.3070a	8.5285a
Two or three	24.1084b	4.7500b	2.2381a	7.6386b
More than three	23.6842b	4.6842b	1.8421b	6.7368b
F-ratio	5.4534	3.9672	7.4854	16.2356

All significant at .05 level.

+Mean scores with same letter are not significantly different.

Analysis of variance; Tukey H.S.D.

TABLE IV
MEAN SCORES ON INFORMED FOR DEMOGRAPHIC SUBGROUPS
(N=419)

Subgroup	Mean Scores on INFORMED Categories											
	Expect	Person	Comm	Resolv	Finan	Leis	Sexual	Child	Family	Roles	Relig	Ideal
<u>Sex</u>												
Female	39.10a+	47.00a	37.33a	41.14a	44.52a	43.43a	40.99a	41.08a	42.73a	41.93a	42.91	33.58a
Male	37.20b	42.90b	35.06b	38.78b	43.39b	41.01b	39.55b	38.45b	39.85b	39.19b	41.36	35.96b
F-ratio	13.73	42.93	11.56	15.19	5.48	13.82	4.89	17.04	27.18	11.29	2.03	9.10
	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		*
<u>Marital Status</u>												
Single, never married	38.62	45.84	36.54	40.32	44.18	42.72	40.38	40.14b	42.67	41.17	42.94	34.59a
Married	38.87	46.91	38.18	41.97	44.88	43.68	42.17	42.03a	42.26	41.83	40.97	31.83b
Formerly married	39.14	46.71	35.71	40.42	41.71	42.86	39.86	41.29a,b	39.14	41.14	37.29	33.86a,b
F-ratio	.1253	.9988	2.257	2.591	2.040	.8637	2.749	3.160	1.255	.2283	2.282	4.408
								*				*
<u>Year in School</u>												
Freshman	37.44	42.56b	34.00	37.67b	42.89	41.00	39.44b	36.44b	40.44	38.56b	45.78	34.56
Sophomore	37.74	44.47b	35.46	39.09b	43.45	42.21	38.68b	38.44b	41.13	39.52b	43.83	35.81
Junior	38.49	46.07a,b	36.71	40.91a,b	44.50	41.91	39.78b	40.74a	42.06	41.37a,b	42.84	34.22
Senior	39.15	46.79a	37.46	41.09a	44.51	43.60	41.90a	41.27a	42.48	42.07a	41.73	33.51
Other	42.00	47.00a	40.00	45.33c	44.33	47.66	46.00c	45.67c	43.00	42.67a	40.00	25.66
F-ratio	2.123	3.550	2.580	3.627	1.336	2.681	6.861	5.970	1.413	2.344	1.136	2.894
		*		*			*	*		*		
<u>College</u>												
Agriculture	37.75a,b	44.08a,b	34.08b	39.08b	44.25	42.92	40.92a,b	40.25a,b	40.67	39.75b	38.00b	34.58a,b
Arts & Science	39.92a	47.07a	38.55a	42.28a	44.51	43.97	42.07a	42.01a	42.92	42.90a	40.32b	33.28a,b
Business	37.59b	44.81b	35.58b	39.72b	43.72	42.26	39.53b	39.11b	41.76	40.97b	44.44a	35.64a
Education	38.68a,b	45.28a,b	36.52a,b	39.76a,b	44.68	42.80	38.32b	38.76b	41.36	39.32b	43.48a,b	35.08a,b
Engineering	37.97a,b	43.90b	36.67a,b	39.50b	43.77	42.83	41.33a,b	40.40a,b	41.43	40.27a,b	41.43a,b	33.93a,b
Home Economics	39.15a,b	47.69a	37.05a,b	40.64a,b	44.80	42.50	40.97a,b	41.09a,b	42.10	42.13a,b	42.93a,b	32.94b
Other	41.00a	44.00a,b	34.00b	45.00a	38.00	44.00	51.00c	47.00c	30.00	50.00c	33.00c	16.00c
F-ratio	3.163	4.337	3.190	3.044	1.213	.9931	3.468	3.624	1.182	2.601	2.765	3.209
	*	*	*	*			*	*		*	*	*

*Mean scores with same letter are not significantly different.

*Significant difference at .05 level within this group and category.

Analysis of Variance; Tukey H.S.D.

Expect=Expectations; Person=Personality; Comm=Communications; Resolv=Conflict resolution; Finan=Finances; Leis=Leisure; Sexual=Sexuality; Child=Children and marriage; Family=Family and friends; Roles=Roles; Relig=Religion; Ideal=Idealism

Gender

Females were significantly higher on 10 of the 12 categories of INFORMED, meaning that they were more realistic or knowledgeable about marriage and in the case of the 'Roles' category, more equalitarian in their views. No significant difference was found for gender in the category of 'Religion.' Males had significantly higher scores in only one instance, the 'Idealism' category. This meant that they tended, more than females, to present themselves and their relationships in an unrealistic (socially desirable) light. These findings show high agreement with those of Johnson (1982) and Chaudhary (1984). In a study of high school and college students, Johnson found females had significantly higher mean scores on 11 categories of INFORMED. The scores were statistically significant for nine of these eleven categories (exceptions being 'Communications' and 'Expectations'). Males were higher on 'Idealism,' but not significantly so. Chaudhary (1984), in a study of college students, found females had significantly higher mean scores on 10 of the 12 categories of INFORMED. Males had significantly higher 'Idealism' scores and differences were non-significant for 'Communications,' although female mean scores were higher.

Marital Status

Marital status was significantly related to only two categories of INFORMED, 'Children and marriage,' and 'Idealism.' The higher scores of married individuals concerning children indicated more realistic views of parenthood. Never married individuals were significantly more idealistic. They, like the males, tended to exaggerate their positive qualities in order to present themselves in a more favorable light.

Year in College

There were significant differences in five categories of INFORMED related to year in school. Seniors had higher scores than sophomores or freshmen on 'Personality,' 'Conflict resolution,' 'Roles,' and 'Sexual relationships.' They had significantly higher mean scores than all other enrollment classifications on 'Children and marriage.' This appears to reflect an age trend and is consistent with earlier findings of Johnson (1982) and Chaudhary (1984). Johnson compared high school and college students and found college students' mean scores higher on all categories except 'Idealism.' Differences were significant except for 'Religion,' 'Finances,' and 'Family and friends.' Chaudhary compared high school and college students and also subdivided college students by age and found that older students had significantly higher mean scores on all categories of INFORMED except 'Roles.'

College in University

Students enrolled in different colleges had significantly different INFORMED mean scores. Arts and Science majors had significantly higher scores than Business majors on six categories: 'Expectations,' 'Communications,' 'Conflict resolution,' 'Children and marriage,' 'Roles,' and 'Religion.' Arts and Science majors had significantly higher scores than Business and Education majors on 'Sexual relationships.' Home Economics majors had significantly higher scores on 'Personality issues' than did either Business or Engineering majors. Business majors were significantly higher than Home Economics majors on 'Idealism.' It would appear that Arts and Science, Education, and

Home Economics majors have more realistic views of marriage than students majoring in Business or Engineering. This could indicate the type of person who is attracted to the latter two fields of study and/or greater career versus family interest at this time.

FIRO-B Scores for Demographic Subgroups

Table V summarizes the FIRO-B mean scores for demographic subgroups for which significant differences were found. No significant differences were found for 'Residence while growing up,' and 'Year in school' so these were not included.

Gender

'Sum of affection' scores were significantly higher for females than for males meaning that females expressed a greater desire to be close and personal. Females had significantly lower 'Difference/control' scores indicating that they prefer to follow rather than give orders or have been socialized to tolerate control by others. The 'Total difference' scores were also significantly lower for females. This indicates a cautious stance in relationships and a tendency to let others take the initiative.

Marital Status

Both 'formerly married' and 'never married' persons had significantly higher 'Sum of inclusion' scores than married persons. This indicates a higher desire for contact with people. It seems logical that singles would socialize to a greater extent while those who are currently married would be meeting the same needs through a marriage partner.

TABLE V
MEAN SCORES ON FIRO-B FOR DEMOGRAPHIC SUBGROUPS
(N=419)

Subgroup	Mean Scores on FIRO-B Dimensions							
	Sum I	Sum C	Sum A	Totsum	Diff I	Diff C	Diff A	Totdiff
<u>Sex</u>								
Female	10.39	5.79	10.74a+	26.92	.03	-1.13b	-1.10	- 2.16b
Male	10.03	6.43	8.89b	25.46	.24	.57a	-1.31	- .32a
F-Ratio	.4829	3.32	14.03*	1.899	.53	22.03*	.9346	11.19*
<u>Marital Status</u>								
Single, never married	10.60a	5.93	10.29	26.84	.06	- .7486	-1.16	-1.78
Married	8.71b	5.86	10.43	24.98	.12	- .7846	-1.08	-1.65
Formerly married	10.85a	7.28	9.57	27.71	.57	1.1429	-1.29	.43
F-Ratio	4.700*	.6919	.1273	1.163	.1516	1.188	.0681	.7157
<u>College</u>								
Agriculture	8.25a,b	6.08	8.58a,b	22.92a,b	.58	- .58	-1.08	- 1.08
Arts & Science	9.63a,b	5.56	10.58a,b	25.59a,b	.17	- .17	- .79	- .77
Business	11.32a	6.13	10.16a,b	27.65a	-.12	- .63	-1.36	- 1.99
Education	11.64a	5.80	12.00a	29.44a	-.92	- .80	-1.04	- 2.76
Engineering	7.53b	5.78	8.03b	21.67b	.60	- .83	-1.17	- 1.23
Home Economics	10.43a	6.15	10.68a,b	27.37a	.30	-1.37	-1.22	- 2.24
Other	3.00c	7.00	7.00b	17.00b	1.00	-5.00	-5.00	9.00
F-Ratio	4.69*	.4808	2.668*	3.056*	1.2916	1.5252	1.6191	1.6179

+Mean scores with same letter are not significantly different.

*Significant difference at .05 level within this group and category.

Analysis of Variance; Tukey H.S.D.

Sum I=Sum of inclusion; Sum C=Sum of control; Sum A=Sum of affection; Totsum=Sum of sums; Diff I=Difference inclusion; Diff C=Difference control; Diff A=Difference affection; Totdiff=Total of differences.

College in University

College in which one majored was not significantly related to any of the FIRO-B 'difference' scores. There was, however, a relationship between college and several of the 'sum' scores. Mean scores of Engineering majors and those classed as 'others' (special students, graduate students) were significantly lower on 'Sum of inclusion' and 'Total of sums' than Business, Education, and Home Economics majors. Engineers had significantly lower 'Sum of affection' scores than Education majors.

Examination of Hypotheses

Hypothesis One

H_{1a}: There will be no significant difference in mean scores of students who remained in their family of origin throughout their childhood versus those who did not, with regard to marital attitudes as measured by INFORMED.

Analysis of variance (SPSSX Command word = ONEWAY) was used to determine the significance of the differences between mean scores of students grouped according to whether they spent their childhood in one or more than one family. Scores on the 12 categories of INFORMED were used to assess marital attitudes. The range of possible scores on each of the categories was 10 to 60. In general, a high score indicated a more realistic attitude toward marriage.

Table VI presents the means and F-ratios for INFORMED categories. No significant differences were found for any of the 12 categories. On the basis of these results, Hypothesis 1a could not be rejected.

TABLE VI
MEAN SCORES ON INFORMED FOR SUBJECTS EXPERIENCING ONE VERSUS
MORE THAN ONE FAMILY DURING CHILDHOOD
(N=419)

Number of Families Experienced	Mean Scores on INFORMED Categories											
	Expect	Person	Comm	Resolv	Finan	Leis	Sexual	Child	Family	Roles	Relig	Ideal
One	38.66	45.87	36.72	40.50	44.08	42.75	40.71	40.30	41.96	41.03	42.98	34.00
More than one	38.69	46.42	36.96	40.80	44.72	43.17	40.44	40.88	42.23	42.01	41.06	34.64
F-ratio	.9571	.3991	.7130	.6242	.1839	.5164	.6908	.3649	.6323	.2343	.0741	.4184

No results significant at .05 level or beyond.

Analysis of Variance

Expect=Expectations; Person=Personality; Comm=Communications;
Resolv=Conflict resolution; Finan=Finances; Leis=Leisure;
Sexual=Sexuality; Child=Children and marriage; Family=Family
and friends; Roles=Roles; Relig=Religion; Ideal=Idealism

H_{1b}: There will be no significant difference in mean scores of students who remained in their family of origin throughout their childhood versus those who did not with regard to relationship style as measured by FIRO-B.

Analysis of variance was used to determine the significance of the differences between mean scores of students grouped according to whether they spent their childhood in one or more than one family. FIRO-B was used to measure three key dimensions of relationships, 'Inclusion,' 'Control,' and 'Affection.' Sum scores for each of these dimensions could range from 0 to 18, with higher scores indicating greater desire for inclusion by others; difference scores could range from -9 to +9 with higher scores indicating a preference for taking the initiative in relationships.

Table VII presents the means and F-ratios for FIRO-B dimensions. Only one significant difference was found. 'Sum of control' scores were significantly lower for students from more than one family. This indicates a preference for less structure in authority situations, less giving and taking of orders. On the basis of these results, Hypothesis 1b would be rejected for 'Sum of control.'

The fact that Hypothesis 1a could not be rejected and Hypothesis 1b could be rejected for only one of eight dimensions could indicate that belonging to more than one family during childhood was in no way related to marital attitudes and was related to relationship style in only a limited way. It could also indicate that two categories on number of families were not sufficient to describe the data using the particular instruments chosen. The frequency data (Table I) indicated that the 'more than one' category included students who had experienced

TABLE VII
MEAN SCORES ON FIRO-B FOR SUBJECTS EXPERIENCING ONE VERSUS
MORE THAN ONE FAMILY DURING CHILDHOOD
(N=419)

Number of Families Experienced	Mean Scores on FIRO-B Dimensions							
	Sum I	Sum C	Sum A	Totsum	Diff I	Diff C	Diff A	Totdiff
One	10.30	6.12a+	10.20	26.65	.0506	-.7025	-1.2025	-1.7595
More than one	10.29	5.43b	10.52	26.22	.1748	-.6990	-.9709	-1.5049
F-Ratio	.9906	3.9413*	.5178	.6855	.6619	.9925	.2871	.6457

*Significant difference at .05 level within this category.

+Mean scores with same letter are not significantly different.

Analysis of Variance

Sum I=Sum of inclusion; Sum C=Sum of control; Sum A=Sum of affection; Totsum=Sum of sums; Diff I=Difference inclusion; Diff C=Difference control; Diff A=Difference affection; Totdiff=Total of differences.

from two to eight families. Such a broad range may have had within it differences which cancelled each other out. Pursuing this line of reasoning, the 'more than one' category was split into two groups, those who experienced two or three families and those who experienced more than three families. The remaining hypotheses therefore deal with three categories insofar as childhood family experience is concerned.

Hypothesis Two

H_{2a}: There will be no significant difference in mean scores of students who remained in their family of origin throughout their childhood versus those who experienced two or three or more than three families with regard to marital attitudes as measured by INFORMED.

Analysis of variance was used to determine the significance of the differences among mean scores of students grouped according to number of families experienced during childhood. Scores on the 12 categories of INFORMED were used to assess marital attitudes.

Table VIII presents the means and F-ratios for INFORMED categories. Significant differences were found for four categories of INFORMED. Students who had experienced more than three families showed significantly higher 'Personality,' 'Communication,' and 'Family and friends' scores than students from one or even two and three family settings. These same individuals also had significantly lower 'Religion' scores. On the basis of these results, Hypothesis 2a would be rejected for 'Personality,' 'Communications,' 'Family and friends,' and 'Religion.'

These results would seem to confirm the suspicion that two classifications of family were not sufficient. Those students from

TABLE VIII
MEAN SCORES ON INFORMED FOR SUBJECTS EXPERIENCING ONE, TWO OR THREE
OR MORE THAN THREE FAMILIES DURING CHILDHOOD
(N=419)

Number of Families Experienced	Mean Scores for INFORMED Categories											
	Expect	Person	Comm	Resolv	Finan	Leis	Sexual	Child	Family	Roles	Relig	Ideal
One	38.66	45.89b	36.73b	40.51	44.09	42.75	40.72	40.31	41.98b	41.03	43.02a	33.99
Two or three	38.39	45.69b	36.18b	40.23	44.39	42.65	39.90	40.33	41.57b	41.54	41.89a	35.36
More than three	40.00	49.63a	40.42a	43.32	46.16	45.47	42.84	43.32	45.16a	44.10	37.37b	31.47
F-ratio	.9585	4.0820*	4.1459*	2.6885	2.2247	2.0762	2.1299	2.5613	4.1827*	1.7029	3.4622*	2.7895

*Significant differences at .05 level within this category.

+Mean scores with same letter are not significantly different.

Analysis of Variance

Expect=Expectations; Person=Personality; Comm=Communications;
Resolv=Conflict resolution; Finan=Finances; Leis=Leisure;
Sexual=Sexuality; Child=Children and marriage; Family=Family
and friends; Roles=Roles; Relig=Religion; Ideal=Idealism

more than three family settings are unlike the other two categories. Belonging to multiple families during childhood is apparently not related to marital attitudes unless one belongs to a fairly considerable number (more than three families). Of this latter group, then, it can be said that their scores indicate increased understanding of the part 'Personality,' 'Communications,' and 'Family and friends' play in marriage. Religious beliefs stem from parental religious beliefs and parents who divorce more than once (divorce was the main cause of change in this study) are very likely to be less traditional in their beliefs and practices, hence their children could be expected to express less traditional religious views.

H_{2b}: There will be no significant difference in mean scores of students who remained in their family of origin throughout their childhood versus those who experienced two or three or more than three families, with regard to relationship style as measured by FIRO-B.

Analysis of variance was used to determine the significance of differences among mean scores of students grouped according to number of families experienced. FIRO-B was used to measure three key dimensions of relationships, 'Inclusion,' 'Control,' and 'Affection.'

Table IX presents the means and F-ratios for FIRO-B dimensions. No significant differences were found. On the basis of these results Hypothesis 2b could not be rejected.

'Inclusion' assessed the degree to which a person moves toward or away from people. 'Control' measured the assumption of responsibility and decision making style. 'Affection' measured the degree to which a person becomes emotionally involved with others. These personality qualities are formed early in life and probably are to some extent

TABLE IX
MEAN SCORES ON FIRO-B FOR SUBJECTS EXPERIENCING ONE, TWO OR THREE
OR MORE THAN THREE FAMILIES DURING CHILDHOOD
(N=419)

Number of Families Experienced	Mean Scores for FIRO-B Dimensions							
	Sum I	Sum C	Sum A	Totsum	Diff I	Diff C	Diff A	Totdiff
One	10.32	6.11	10.22	26.68	.05	-.73	-1.21	-1.79
Two or three	10.48	5.51	10.49	26.48	.14	-.40	-.99	-1.26
More than three	9.47	5.05	10.68	25.11	.31	-2.00	-.89	-2.58
F-Ratio	.3629	2.1029	.2000	.2655	.1319	1.8949	.6027	.7030

No results significant at .05 level

Analysis of Variance

Sum I=Sum of inclusion; Sum C=Sum of control; Sum A=Sum of affection; Totsum=Sum of sums; Diff I=Difference inclusion; Diff C=Difference control; Diff A=Difference affection; Totdiff=Total of differences.

innate (Chess, Thomas, and Birch, 1965). External circumstances occurring later in the child's life (the average age of change one was 10.64 years) probably have limited and temporary effects on the dimensions of relationship style measured by the FIRO-B. It seems logical that an individual experiencing recent trauma (as parental divorce) might assume a defensive or cautious posture (low scores in all dimensions). If this was true, apparently the subjects of this study had had sufficient time to recover from whatever trauma they may have experienced.

Hypothesis Three

H_{3a}: There will be no significant difference in mean scores on marital attitudes of students who experienced two or three versus more than three families during their childhood with regard to the reason for the first change.

Multiple analysis of variance (SPSSX Command word - ANOVA) was used to determine the significance of the differences between mean scores of students for whom the initial change was caused by divorce and those for whom the initial change was caused by death. It was reasoned that, regardless of the number of changes, the first change would be the most important since it triggered all the following changes. INFORMED was used to measure marital attitudes.

Table X presents the means and F -ratios for reason for change one and the two classifications for students who experienced more than one family during childhood. A significant main effect was found for number of families experienced for three categories of marital attitudes, 'Personality,' 'Communications,' and 'Family and friends.'

TABLE X
REASON FOR FAMILY CHANGE ONE BY NUMBER OF FAMILIES
AND MEAN INFORMED SCORES
(N=105)

Reason for Initial Change By Number of Families	Mean Scores for INFORMED Categories											
	Expect	Person	Comm	Resolv	Finan	Leis	Sexual	Child	Family	Roles	Relig	Ideal
<u>Divorce</u>	38.31	46.32	36.81	40.21	44.43	42.63	40.43	40.83	42.06	41.69	41.71	35.14
2-3 Families	38.10	45.85	36.35	39.95	44.18	42.22	40.03	39.58	41.53	41.18	41.70	35.40
More than three Families	39.33	48.67	39.08	41.50	45.67	44.67	42.42	41.42	44.67	44.25	41.75	33.83
<u>Death</u>	39.78	46.66	36.91	41.83	44.96	44.83	41.04	40.43	42.35	43.35	40.22	34.74
2-3 Families	39.47	45.74	35.42	41.11	44.89	44.37	40.58	39.58	41.84	43.63	41.84	35.68
More than three Families	41.25	51.00	44.00	45.25	45.25	47.00	43.25	44.50	44.75	42.00	32.50	30.25
<u>F-Ratio</u>												
Subclass	1.298	2.865	3.330	2.006	0.692	2.288	1.275	0.599	2.561	0.987	0.566	0.691
Main Effect												
No. Families	1.928	5.660*	6.654*	2.343	1.106	2.265	2.358	1.121	5.062*	0.990	0.718	1.339
Reason for Change	1.548	0.060	0.003	1.636	0.268	2.272	0.182	0.182	0.051	0.967	0.393	0.040
Interactive Effect	0.030	0.539	2.423	0.612	0.182	0.002	0.006	1.220	0.005	1.131	2.270	0.585

*Significant at .05 level

Multiple Analysis of Variance

Expect=Expectations; Person=Personality; Comm=Communications;
Resolv=Conflict resolution; Finan=Finances; Leis=Leisure;
Sexual=Sexuality; Child=Children and marriage; Family=Family
and friends; Roles=Roles; Relig=Religion; Ideal=Idealism

Students who had experienced over three families had significantly higher mean scores in these areas (indicating more realistic attitudes) regardless of the reason for the first change. No main effect was found for reason for first change of family structure. No interactive effect was found between number of families experienced and the reason for the change. On the basis of these results, Hypothesis 3a could not be rejected.

Researchers disagree about the relative effect of the two principle causes of marital dissolution. Very likely it depends upon the characteristics under study. For the particular characteristics investigated in this research, reason for change made very little difference. This result would agree with the findings of Langner and Michael (1963) and Rosenberg (1972).

H_{3b}: There will be no significant difference in mean scores on marital attitudes for students who experienced two or three versus more than three families during their childhood with regard to the timing of the last change.

Multiple analysis of variance was used to determine the significance of the differences between mean scores of students for whom the last family change occurred before age 13 and those for whom the last change occurred at or after age 13. The age of 13 was chosen because the literature often makes a distinction between the responses of teenagers and the responses of younger children. INFORMED was used to measure marital attitudes.

Table XI presents the means and F-ratios for the timing of the last change and the two classifications for students who experienced more than one family during childhood. A significant mean effect for number

TABLE XI
TIMING OF LAST FAMILY CHANGE BY NUMBER OF FAMILIES
AND MEAN INFORMED SCORES
(N=105)

Timing of Last Change By Num- ber of Families	Mean Scores for INFORMED Categories											
	Expect	Person	Comm	Resolv	Finan	Leis	Sexual	Child	Family	Roles	Relig	Ideal
Before Age 13	37.61	45.41	36.15	40.71	44.98	42.00	38.85	39.71	41.32	41.73	40.56	36.41
2-3 Families	37.50	45.38	36.02	40.70	44.97	41.90	38.82	39.75	41.22	41.47	40.82	36.57
More than three Families	42.00	47.00	36.39	41.00	45.00	46.00	40.00	38.00	45.00	52.00	30.00	30.00
After Age 13	40.08	47.60	37.88	41.24	45.20	44.26	42.10	42.34	43.32	42.92	40.96	33.02
2-3 Families	39.94	46.36	36.39	39.88	44.61	43.42	41.45	41.67	42.06	42.52	42.70	34.09
More than three Families	40.35	50.00	40.76	43.88	46.35	45.88	43.35	43.65	46.06	43.71	37.59	30.94
F-Ratio												
Subclass	3.405	4.857	4.354	3.152	0.889	2.921	3.973	2.895	6.396	0.857	1.827	3.399
Main Effect												
Number of Families	0.316	5.614*	6.780*	6.072*	1.699	2.427	1.178	1.048	8.440*	1.011	3.620	2.414
Timing of Change	4.496*	0.859	0.062	0.280	0.082	1.175	3.854	2.553	0.596	0.140	0.847	1.721
Interactive Effect	0.708	0.138	0.009	0.446	0.143	0.072	0.013	0.379	0.002	1.728	0.281	0.178

*Significant at .05 level

Multiple Analysis of Variance

Expect=Expectations; Person=Personality; Comm=Communications;
Resolv=Conflict resolution; Finan=Finances; Leis=Leisure;
Sexual=Sexuality; Child=Children and marriage; Family=Family
and friends; Roles=Roles; Relig=Religion; Ideal=Idealism

of families experienced was found for the categories of 'Personality,' 'Communications,' 'Conflict resolution,' and 'Family and friends.' When timing of the last change was controlled, the additional category of 'Conflict resolution' became significant. Students who experienced over three families had more realistic views in these areas regardless of the timing of the last change. A significant main effect was found for timing of the last change for the 'Expectations' category. Students for whom the last family disruption occurred at or after age 13 had significantly higher scores regardless of the number of families experienced. No significant interactive effect was found for number of families experienced and timing of changes. On the basis of these results, Hypothesis 3b would be rejected for 'Expectations.'

Timing of change, in this study, showed very little relationship to mean scores. Earlier studies were divided on this topic. It may very well be, as Blechman (1982) and Kaplan and Pokorney (1971) concluded, the apparent relationship between age of family disruption and later problems for the individual may actually be a relationship between race, sex or social class and those problems.

H_{3c}: There will be no significant difference in mean scores on marital attitudes for students who experienced two or three versus more than three families during their childhood with regard to changes in family size.

Multiple analysis of variance was used to determine the significance of differences between the mean scores of students whose families became larger as a result of family changes and those whose families remained the same size or got smaller. INFORMED was used to measure marital attitudes.

Table XII presents the means and F -ratios for the change in family size and the two classifications of students who experienced more than one family during childhood. A significant main effect was found for number of families experienced and 'Personality,' 'Communications,' and 'Family and friends.' Controlling changes in family size resulted in no new categories becoming significant. A significant main effect was found for changes in family size for 'Communications,' and 'Leisure.' Mean scores were higher if the family size of the last family was larger than the family size of the first family regardless of number of families experienced. An interactive effect between number of families experienced and changes in family size was found for 'Leisure.' Among those whose family size remained the same or got smaller, respondents with more than three families had lower 'Leisure' scores; but among those whose family size got larger, respondents with more than three families had higher 'Leisure' scores. On the basis of these results, Hypothesis 3c would be rejected for 'Communications,' and 'Leisure.'

The literature suggests that family size is related to the functioning of families of remarriage in particular. Remarriage families are often larger in size and consequently may be cumbersome operating units. The mean size of the families of the students participating in this study was not large enough to put this question to the test. For students who experienced more than one family, the mean size of the first family was 4.74 members; family two, 3.80; family three, 4.78; and the fourth or last family, 4.21. A different population with larger families at every stage of change could yield quite different results.

TABLE XII
CHANGES IN FAMILY SIZE BY NUMBER OF FAMILIES
AND MEAN INFORMED SCORES
(N=105)

Changes in Family Size by Number of Families	Mean Scores on INFORMED Categories											
	Expect	Person	Comm	Resolv	Finan	Leis	Sexual	Child	Family	Roles	Relig	Ideal
Size Same or Smaller	38.64	45.91	35.91	40.12	44.17	42.27	39.88	40.21	41.44	41.52	42.16	35.40
2-3 Families	38.42	45.52	35.60	39.87	43.97	42.42	39.93	40.06	41.28	41.58	42.52	35.54
More than three Families	40.50	49.13	38.50	42.25	45.88	41.00	39.50	41.50	42.75	41.00	39.13	34.25
Size Larger	38.82	47.79	39.79	42.61	46.18	45.61	41.96	42.68	44.36	43.32	38.11	32.61
2-3 Families	38.29	46.35	38.47	41.65	46.06	43.59	39.82	41.41	42.71	41.35	39.41	34.65
More than three Families	39.64	50.00	41.82	44.09	46.36	48.73	45.27	44.64	46.91	46.36	36.09	29.45
F-Ratio												
Subclass	0.908	4.535	6.703	3.898	2.723	4.218	2.555	2.806	6.145	1.277	2.508	2.462
Main Effect												
Number of Families	1.787	6.496*	4.084*	3.037	0.968	1.323	2.432	2.086	4.702*	1.237	1.595	2.299
Family Size	0.077	0.461	4.931*	2.215	2.809	4.586*	1.068	1.689	3.573	0.517	1.776	1.067
Interactive Effect	0.082	0.000	0.021	0.000	0.483	4.640*	3.601	0.313	1.131	2.150	0.000	0.869

*Significant at the .05 level

Multiple Analysis of Variance

Expect=Expectations; Person=Personality; Comm=Communications;
Resolv=Conflict resolution; Finan=Finances; Leis=Leisure;
Sexual=Sexuality; Child=Children and marriage; Family=Family
and friends; Roles=Roles; Relig=Religion; Ideal=Idealism

H_{3d}: There will be no significant difference in mean scores on marital attitudes for students who experienced two or three versus more than three families during their childhood with regard to changes in family financial status.

Multiple analysis of variance was used to determine the significance of differences between the scores of students whose financial situation worsened as a result of family changes as opposed to those for whom finances stayed the same or improved. INFORMED was used to measure marital attitudes.

Table XIII presents the means and F-ratios for change in family financial status for the two classifications of students who experienced more than one family during childhood. Controlling changes in family financial status resulted in many more categories becoming significant. A significant main effect was found for number of families experienced for nine of the twelve categories of INFORMED. Higher mean scores for those who experienced over three families were found for the categories of 'Personality,' 'Communications,' 'Conflict resolution,' 'Sexual relations,' 'Children and marriage,' and 'Family and friends' (indicating more realistic views) regardless of changes in family financial status. Lower mean scores for 'Religion' indicated less traditional views and practices. Lower mean scores on 'Idealism' indicated less of a tendency to give socially acceptable answers. A significant main effect was found for changed financial status and 'Roles.' Persons whose last family had a 'worsened' financial status had significantly more equalitarian views about 'Roles' regardless of the number of families experienced. No interactive analysis could be made since no student who had experienced over three family situations indicated a

TABLE XIII
CHANGES IN FAMILY FINANCIAL STATUS BY NUMBER OF FAMILIES
AND MEAN INFORMED SCORES
(N=105)

Changes in Financial Situations by Num- ber of Families	Mean Scores on INFORMED Categories											
	Expect	Person	Comm	Resolv	Finan	Leis	Sexual	Child	Family	Roles	Relig	Ideal
Finances Same or Better	38.52	46.31	36.70	40.72	44.49	43.28	40.10	40.53	42.07	41.32	41.44	35.03
2-3 Families	38.10	45.38	35.66	40.00	44.03	42.66	39.34	39.75	41.21	40.54	42.57	36.03
More than three Families	40.00	49.63	40.42	43.32	46.16	45.47	42.84	43.32	45.16	44.11	37.37	31.47
Finances Worse	39.63	47.00	38.38	41.19	45.94	42.63	42.31	42.81	43.13	45.75	39.00	32.50
2-3 Families	39.63	47.00	38.38	41.19	45.94	42.63	42.31	42.81	43.13	45.75	39.00	32.50
More than three Families	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
F-Ratio												
Subclass	1.555	4.999	5.627	3.118	2.614	1.779	3.744	3.783	5.316	4.766	2.488	3.318
Main Effect												
Number of Families	2.373	9.763*	10.115*	6.128*	3.686	3.392	5.500*	5.509*	9.983*	3.960	4.148*	5.178*
Financial Status	1.332	1.234	2.867	0.685	2.583	0.001	3.456	3.544	2.053	7.381*	1.705	2.710
Interactive Effect - Not computed due to empty cell												

*Significant at the .05 level

Multiple Analysis of Variance

Expect=Expectations; Person=Personality=Comm=Communications;
Resolv=Conflict resolution; Finan=Finances; Leis=Leisure;
Sexual=Sexuality; Child=Children and marriage; Family=Family
and friends; Roles=Roles; Relig=Religion; Ideal=Idealism

worsened financial status. Based on these results, Hypothesis 3d would be rejected for 'Roles.'

Family financial status is related to more categories of INFORMED than any other variable considered. The literature (Brandwein, Brown, and Fox, 1974; Cherlin, 1981; and Weiss, 1979) suggests that poverty may be the real cause of many problems commonly attributed to the presence or absence of certain adults in a family. With the death of one adult the family is deprived of one, sometimes the only, and usually the largest, income. Divorce requires the same income to support two households.

H_{3e}: There will be no significant difference in mean scores on marital attitudes of students who experienced two or three versus more than three families during their childhood with regard to changes in family satisfaction.

Multiple analysis of variance was used to determine the significance of differences between the mean scores of students who experienced a decrease in family satisfaction while undergoing family changes and those for whom satisfaction remained the same or improved. INFORMED was used to measure marital attitudes.

Table XIV presents the means and F-ratios for change in family satisfaction for the two classifications of students who experienced more than one family during childhood. A significant main effect was found for numbers of families experienced for 'Personality,' 'Communications,' 'Conflict resolution,' 'Children and marriage,' and 'Family and friends.' Controlling changes in family satisfaction resulted in two additional categories becoming significant. Students who had experienced more than three families had significantly higher mean scores on all these categories regardless of changes in family

TABLE XIV
CHANGES IN FAMILY SATISFACTION BY NUMBER OF FAMILIES
AND MEAN INFORMED SCORES
(N=105)

Changes in Family Satisfaction by Number of Families	Mean Scores for INFORMED Categories											
	Expect	Person	Comm	Resolv	Finan	Leis	Sexual	Child	Family	Roles	Relig	Ideal
Satisfaction Same or Better	38.57	46.15	36.15	40.32	44.57	42.09	39.45	40.81	41.15	42.00	40.96	35.30
2-3 Families	38.32	45.63	35.76	40.05	44.49	42.29	39.39	40.83	41.07	41.85	41.07	35.27
More than three Families	40.33	49.67	38.83	42.17	45.17	40.67	39.83	40.67	41.67	43.00	40.17	35.50
Satisfaction Decreased	38.80	46.64	37.62	41.15	44.78	44.16	41.33	40.93	43.15	41.98	41.05	33.91
2-3 Families	38.48	45.71	36.52	40.31	44.21	43.07	40.43	39.81	42.02	41.17	42.60	35.24
More than three Families	39.85	49.62	41.15	43.85	46.21	47.69	44.23	44.54	46.77	44.62	36.08	29.62
F-Ratio												
Subclass	0.855	4.270	4.479	2.916	1.340	3.049	2.879	1.988	5.839	1.030	1.603	2.041
Main Effect												
Number of Families	1.654	8.329*	7.371*	5.194*	2.622	2.785	3.118	3.966*	7.265*	2.060	3.204	3.269
Family Satisfaction	0.003	0.003	0.756	0.225	0.000	2.465	1.858	0.032	2.907	0.045	0.089	0.411
Interactive Effect	0.062	0.002	0.240	0.255	0.539	4.046*	1.139	2.321	2.581	0.350	1.087	1.952

*Significant at the .05 level

Multiple Analysis of Variance

Expect=Expectations; Person=Personality; Comm=Communications; Resolv=Conflict resolution; Finan=Finances; Leis=Leisure; Sexual=Sexuality; Child=Children and marriage; Family=Family and friends; Roles=Roles; Relig=Religion; Ideal=Idealism

satisfaction. There was no main effect found for changes in family satisfaction. A significant interactive effect was found for 'Leisure' and changes in family satisfaction. A combination of lowered satisfaction and the experiencing of a greater number of families resulted in higher mean scores (more realistic views) about family leisure activities. This was not true if satisfaction remained the same or improved. Based on these results Hypothesis 3e would be rejected for 'Leisure.'

Individual questions on 'Leisure' dealt with expectations of togetherness versus a reasonable amount of separation. Family disruption apparently shatters any illusions about family members spending much of their time together. In the family or families which follow, time, as well as money, may be in short supply.

H_{3f}: There will be no significant difference in mean scores on marital attitudes of students who experienced two or three versus more than three families during their childhood with regard to the 'Adaptability' of the last family experienced.

Multiple analysis of variance was used to determine the significance of differences between the mean scores of students who rated their last family in the functional range of 'Adaptability' and those who rated their last family in the nonfunctional range of 'Adaptability.' INFORMED was used to measure marital attitudes. FACES was used to measure 'Adaptability.'

Table XV presents the means and F-ratios for those in the functional and nonfunctional range of 'Adaptability' who had experienced two or three, or more than three families during childhood. A significant main effect was found for number of families experienced for

TABLE XV
ADAPTABILITY OF LAST FAMILY BY NUMBER OF FAMILIES
AND MEAN INFORMED SCORES
(N=105)

Adaptability of Last Family by Number of Families	Mean Scores for INFORMED Categories											
	Expect	Person	Comm	Resolv	Finan	Leis	Sexual	Child	Family	Roles	Relig	Ideal
Functional Range	38.48	46.94	37.23	41.69	45.17	43.77	40.65	41.06	42.48	42.75	39.27	34.23
2-3 Families	38.25	46.44	36.50	41.14	44.86	43.89	40.44	40.47	41.92	43.00	39.81	34.33
More than three Families	39.17	48.42	39.42	43.33	46.08	43.42	41.25	42.83	44.17	42.00	37.67	33.92
Non-Functional Range	38.87	45.96	36.73	40.02	44.33	42.65	40.27	40.73	42.02	41.36	42.62	35.00
2-3 Families	38.50	45.13	35.94	39.54	44.04	41.73	39.50	40.23	41.31	40.44	43.46	36.13
More than three Families	41.43	51.71	42.14	43.29	46.29	49.00	45.57	44.14	46.86	47.71	36.86	27.29
F-Ratio												
Subclass	1.078	4.534	4.083	3.607	1.557	2.127	1.988	1.928	4.232	1.358	2.696	1.995
Main Effect												
No Families	1.982	8.176*	7.976*	4.526*	2.152	3.275	3.870	3.775	8.232*	1.706	2.426	3.733
Adaptability	0.402	0.232	0.000	1.647	0.543	0.478	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.618	2.116	0.038
Interactive Effect	0.646	2.848	1.152	0.329	0.202	6.691*	3.001	0.245	1.677	5.113*	0.748	4.366*

*Significant at the .05 level

Multiple Analysis of Variance

Expect=Expectations; Person=Personality; Comm=Communications;
Resolve=Conflict resolution; Finan=Finances; Leis=Leisure;
Sexual=Sexuality; Child=Children and marriage; Family=Family
and friends; Roles=Roles; Relig=Religion; Ideal=Idealism

'Communications,' 'Conflict resolution,' and 'Family and friends.'

Students who had experienced more than three families had significantly higher mean scores on these categories than those from two or three families (indicating more realistic views) regardless of 'Adaptability.'

No significant main effect was found for 'Adaptability.' A significant interactive effect was found for 'Adaptability' and number of families experienced for 'Leisure,' 'Roles,' and 'Idealism.'

'Leisure' mean scores were somewhat higher for individuals from families in the functional versus nonfunctional range of 'Adaptability.' The means for those in the functional range were very similar regardless of number of families experienced. Those in the nonfunctional range of 'Adaptability' had considerably higher mean scores (49.00 versus 41.73) if they had experienced over three families. Those from a functional and nonfunctional range of 'Adaptability' had very similar mean scores on 'Roles.'

For those whose families were rated in the functional range, the mean was slightly lower if over three families were experienced. For those from a nonfunctional range, the mean score was considerably higher (47.71 versus 40.00) if more than three families were experienced.

'Idealism' mean scores were slightly higher for those from families in the nonfunctional versus functional range of 'Adaptability.' For those from families in the functional range of 'Adaptability,' the mean scores were about the same regardless of number of families experienced. For those from the nonfunctional range 'Idealism' scores were much lower if over three families were experienced. For all three categories of INFORMED the relationship between family size and 'Adaptability' existed only for those from families in the nonfunctional range of 'Adaptability.'

Persons from families rated toward either end of the

'Adaptability' spectrum (too rigid or too loose) had much more realistic views on leisure, were significantly more equalitarian and significantly less idealistic. On the basis of these results, Hypothesis 3f would be rejected for 'Leisure,' 'Roles,' and 'Idealism.'

H_{3g}: There will be no significant difference in mean scores on marital attitudes of students who experienced two or three versus more than three families during their childhood with regard to the 'Cohesiveness' of the last family experienced.

Multiple analysis of variance was used to determine the significance of differences between the mean scores of students who rated their last family in the functional range of 'Cohesiveness' and those who rated their last family in the nonfunctional range of 'Cohesiveness.' INFORMED was used to measure marital attitudes. FACES was used to measure 'Cohesiveness.'

Table XVI presents the means and F-ratios for those in the functional and nonfunctional ranges of 'Cohesiveness' who had experienced two or three or more than three families during childhood. A significant main effect was found for number of families and 'Personality,' 'Communications,' 'Conflict resolution,' 'Sexual relations,' and 'Family and friends.' Students who had experienced more than three families during childhood had significantly higher mean scores on these categories (indicating more realistic views) regardless of the 'Cohesiveness' rating of their family. There was no significant main effect for 'Cohesiveness' and no significant interactive effect for 'Cohesiveness' and number of families experienced. On the basis of these results, Hypothesis 3g could not be rejected.

TABLE XVI
COHESIVENESS OF LAST FAMILY BY NUMBER OF FAMILIES
AND MEAN INFORMED SCORES
(N=105)

Cohesiveness of Last Family by Number of Families	Mean Scores of INFORMED Categories											
	Expect	Person	Comm	Resolv	Finan	Leis	Sexual	Child	Family	Roles	Relig	Ideal
<u>Functional Range</u>	38.39	46.33	37.47	40.92	44.92	43.22	41.14	41.53	42.06	42.86	40.08	34.00
2-3 Families	37.97	45.57	36.32	40.30	44.52	42.72	40.82	41.05	41.45	42.60	40.95	34.85
More than three Families	40.22	49.67	42.56	43.67	46.67	45.44	42.56	43.67	44.78	44.00	36.22	30.22
<u>Non-Functional Range</u>	38.96	46.50	36.50	40.69	44.54	43.13	39.81	40.30	42.39	41.24	41.94	35.22
2-3 Families	38.77	45.80	36.05	40.16	44.27	42.59	39.07	39.68	41.68	40.57	42.75	35.82
More than three Families	39.80	49.60	38.50	43.00	45.70	45.50	43.10	43.00	45.50	44.20	38.40	32.60
<u>F-Ratio</u>												
SubClass	1.058	4.299	4.494	2.758	1.380	1.764	2.639	2.502	4.223	1.674	2.061	2.223
Main Effect												
Number of												
Families	1.744	8.571*	8.273*	5.465*	2.563	3.522	3.944*	3.898	8.331*	2.024	3.219	3.819
Cohesiveness	0.368	0.026	0.725	0.054	0.201	0.007	1.342	1.113	0.112	1.330	0.910	0.632
Interactive												
Effect	0.251	0.011	1.632	0.039	0.105	0.004	0.602	0.054	0.039	0.380	0.006	0.125

*Significant at the .05 level

Multiple Analysis of Variance

Expect=Expectations; Person=Personality; Comm=Communications;
Resolv=Conflict resolution; Finan=Finances; Leis=Leisure;
Sexual=Sexuality; Child=Children and marriage; Family=Family
and friends; Roles=Roles; Relig=Religion; Ideal=Idealism

H_{3h}: There will be no significant difference in mean scores on marital attitudes of students who experienced two or three versus more than three families during childhood with regard to the 'Functionality' of the last family unit experienced.

Multiple analysis of variance was used to determine the significance of differences between the mean scores of students who rated their last family in the functional range of both 'Adaptability,' and 'Cohesiveness' (Functionality), and those who did not. INFORMED was used to measure marital attitude. FACES was used to measure family 'Functionality.'

Table XVII presents the means and F-ratios for those students who rated their families in a functional range of both 'Adaptability,' and 'Cohesiveness,' who had experienced two or three or more than three families during childhood. A significant main effect was found for number of families and 'Expectations,' 'Personality,' 'Communication,' 'Conflict resolution,' 'Leisure,' 'Sexual relations,' and 'Family and friends.' Students who had experienced more than three families during childhood had significantly higher mean scores on these categories (indicating more realistic views) regardless of family 'Functionality.' There was no significant main effect for family 'Functionality' and no significant interactive effect for family 'Functionality' and number of families experienced. On the basis of these results, Hypothesis 3h could not be rejected.

Hypothesis Four

H_{4a}: There will be no significant difference in mean scores on relationship style dimensions of students who experienced two or three

TABLE XVII
FUNCTIONALITY OF LAST FAMILY BY NUMBER OF FAMILIES
AND MEAN INFORMED SCORES
(N=105)

Functionality of Last Family by Num- ber of Families	Mean Scores for INFORMED Categories											
	Expect	Person	Comm	Resolv	Finan	Leis	Sexual	Child	Family	Roles	Relig	Ideal
Functional	38.48	46.76	37.91	41.67	45.06	43.61	41.12	41.06	42.55	43.33	39.64	33.85
2-3 Families	37.96	46.11	36.85	41.04	44.70	43.48	40.85	40.74	42.04	43.52	40.63	34.33
More than three Families	40.83	49.67	42.67	44.50	46.67	44.17	42.33	42.50	44.83	42.50	35.17	31.67
Non-Functional	39.15	46.18	36.79	40.28	44.21	42.74	39.90	40.00	42.41	41.15	43.28	35.25
2-3 Families	38.69	45.37	36.20	39.83	44.00	41.94	39.03	39.69	41.71	40.34	44.14	36.20
More than three Families	43.25	53.25	42.00	44.25	46.00	49.75	47.50	42.75	48.50	48.25	35.75	27.25
F-Ratio												
Subclass	2.662	3.905	4.225	2.925	1.168	2.239	2.674	0.806	3.902	1.466	2.861	2.314
Main Effect												
Number of Families	4.960*	7.625*	7.842*	4.608*	1.677	4.018*	4.610*	1.117	7.790*	1.264	3.526	4.014*
Functionality	0.728	0.013	0.206	0.743	0.434	0.198	0.370	0.335	0.039	1.334	1.582	0.301
Interactive Effect	0.270	1.201	0.000	0.069	0.000	3.645	2.795	0.087	1.506	3.246	0.164	1.366

*Significant at the .05 level

Multiple Analysis of Variance

Expect=Expectations; Person=Personality; Comm=Communications;
Resolv=Conflict resolution; Finan=Finances; Leis=Leisure;
Sexual=Sexuality; Child=Children and marriage; Family=Family
and friends; Roles=Roles; Relig=Religion; Ideal=Idealism

versus more than three families during their childhood with regard to the reason for the first change.

Multiple analysis of variance was used to determine the significance of the differences between mean scores of students for whom the initial change was caused by divorce and those for whom the initial change was caused by death. FIRO-B was used to measure relationship style.

Table XVIII presents the means and F -ratios for reason for change one and the two classifications for students who experienced more than one family during childhood. No significant main or interactive effects were found. On the basis of these results, Hypothesis 4a could not be rejected.

H_{4b} : There will be no significant difference in mean scores on relationship style dimensions for students who experienced two or three versus more than three families during their childhood with regard to the timing of the last change.

Multiple analysis of variance was used to determine the significance of the differences between mean scores of students for whom the last family change occurred before age 13 and those for whom the last change occurred at or after age 13. FIRO-B was used to measure relationship style.

Table XIX presents the means and F -ratios for the timing of the last change and the two classifications for students who experienced more than one family during childhood. No significant main or interactive effects were found. On the basis of these results, Hypothesis 4b could not be rejected.

TABLE XVIII
REASON FOR FAMILY CHANGE ONE BY NUMBER OF FAMILIES
AND MEAN FIRO-B SCORES
(N=105)

Reason for Initial Change by Number of Families	Mean Scores for FIRO-B Dimensions							
	Sum I	Sum C	Sum A	Totsum	Diff I	Diff C	Diff A	Totdiff
<u>Divorce</u>	10.65	5.65	10.72	27.03	-0.01	-0.82	-0.97	-1.82
2-3 Families	10.50	5.67	10.55	26.72	0.00	-0.60	-1.02	-1.63
More than three Families	11.42	5.58	11.58	28.58	-0.08	-1.92	-0.75	-2.75
<u>Death</u>	10.13	5.17	10.00	25.22	0.74	0.17	-0.78	0.32
2-3 Families	10.89	5.37	10.32	26.58	-0.58	0.58	-0.84	0.32
More than three Families	6.50	4.25	8.50	18.75	1.50	-1.75	-0.50	-0.75
<u>F-Ratio</u>								
Subclass	0.147	0.314	0.257	0.325	0.809	1.836	0.266	1.693
Main Effect								
Number of Families	0.092	0.175	0.069	0.041	0.058	2.407	0.337	0.666
Reason for Change	0.200	0.449	0.448	0.605	1.555	1.295	0.191	2.743
Interactive Effect	2.984	0.302	0.988	2.484	0.395	0.187	0.004	0.000

No results significant at .05 level

Multiple Analysis of Variance

Sum I=Sum of inclusion; Sum C=Sum of control; Sum A=Sum of affection; Totsum=Sum of sums; Diff I=Difference inclusion; Diff C=Difference control; Diff A=Difference affection; Totdiff=Total of differences.

TABLE XIX
TIMING OF LAST FAMILY CHANGE BY NUMBER OF FAMILIES
AND MEAN FIRO-B SCORES
(N=105)

Timing of Last Change by Number of Families	Mean Scores for FIRO-B Dimensions							
	Sum I	Sum C	Sum A	Totsum	Diff I	Diff C	Diff A	Totdiff
Before Age 13	10.22	5.32	10.88	26.41	0.17	0.00	-0.80	-0.66
2-3 Families	10.13	5.35	10.85	26.32	0.17	0.05	-0.82	-0.63
More than Three Families	14.00	4.00	12.00	30.00	0.00	-2.00	0.00	-2.00
After Age 13	10.36	5.40	10.62	26.34	0.32	-1.10	-1.32	-2.10
2-3 Families	10.91	5.55	10.52	26.97	0.30	-0.61	-1.33	-1.64
More than Three Families	9.29	5.12	10.82	25.12	0.35	-2.06	-1.29	-3.00
F-Ratio								
Subclass	0.342	0.184	0.084	0.127	0.042	2.030	1.122	1.427
Main Effect								
Number of Families	0.667	0.351	0.090	0.252	0.002	2.037	0.047	0.932
Timing of Change	0.197	0.127	0.141	0.027	0.060	0.554	2.096	0.798
Interactive Effect	1.069	0.087	0.033	0.285	0.007	0.024	0.204	0.000

No results significant at .05 level

Multiple Analysis of Variance

Sum I=Sum of inclusion; Sum C=Sum of control; Sum A=Sum of affection; Totsum=Sum of sums; Diff I=Difference inclusion; Diff C=Difference control; Diff A=Difference affection; Totdiff=Total of differences.

H_{4c}: There will be no significant difference in mean scores on relationship style dimensions for students who experienced two or three versus more than three families during their childhood with regard to changes in family size.

Multiple analysis of variance was used to determine the significance of differences between the mean scores of students whose families became larger as a result of changes and those whose families remained the same size or got smaller. FIRO-B was used to measure relationship style.

Table XX presents the means and F -ratios for the change in family size and the two classifications of students who experienced more than one family during childhood. A significant main effect was found for number of families experienced and 'Difference/control.' Those who experienced the greater number of families had significantly lower mean scores which indicated a tendency to let others take the initiative in authority situations. This was true regardless of changes in family size. No significant main effect was found for change in family size and no interactive effect was found for number of families experienced and changes in family size. On the basis of these results, Hypothesis 4c could not be rejected.

H_{4d}: There will be no significant difference in mean scores on relationship style dimensions for students who experienced two or three versus more than three families during their childhood with regard to changes in family financial status.

Multiple analysis of variance was used to determine the significance of differences between the scores of students whose financial situation worsened as a result of family changes as opposed to those

TABLE XX
CHANGES IN FAMILY SIZE BY NUMBER OF FAMILIES
AND MEAN FIRO-B SCORES
(N=105)

Changes in Family Size by Number of Families	Mean Scores on FIRO-B Dimensions							
	Sum I	Sum C	Sum A	Totsum	Diff I	Diff C	Diff A	Totdiff
<u>Size Same or Smaller</u>	10.32	5.48	10.60	26.53	0.24	-0.85	-1.05	-1.67
2-3 Families	10.46	5.45	10.55	26.46	0.19	-0.60	-1.09	-1.49
More than Three Families	9.13	5.75	11.00	27.13	0.63	-3.00	-0.75	-3.13
<u>Size Larger</u>	10.21	5.29	10.32	25.39	0.00	-0.29	-0.75	-1.07
2-3 Families	10.53	5.76	10.24	26.53	-0.06	0.35	-0.59	-0.35
More than Three Families	9.73	4.55	10.45	23.64	0.09	-1.27	-1.00	-2.18
<u>F-Ratio</u>								
Subclass	0.333	0.193	0.081	0.226	0.196	2.463	0.300	1.023
Main Effect								
Number of Families	0.656	0.297	0.080	0.166	0.198	4.416*	0.002	1.741
Family Size	0.031	0.010	0.131	0.138	0.315	1.862	0.556	0.912
Interactive Effect	0.040	0.918	0.009	0.470	0.045	0.162	0.620	0.006

*Significant at the .05 level.

Multiple Analysis of Variance

Sum I=Sum of inclusion; Sum C=Sum of control; Sum A=Sum of affection; Totsum=Sum of sums; Diff I=Difference inclusion; Diff C=Difference control; Diff A=Difference affection; Totdiff=Total of differences.

for whom finances stayed the same or improved. FIRO-B was used to measure relationship style.

Table XXI presents the means and F -ratios for change in family financial status for the two classifications of students who had experienced more than one family during childhood. A significant main effect was found for changed financial status and 'Sum of inclusion,' 'Sum of affection,' and 'Total of sums.' The mean scores on these dimensions were significantly lower for those who had experienced a greater number of families regardless of number of families experienced. This indicated less desire to socialize, to develop deep relationships and, in general, to be involved with others. No main effect was found for number of families experienced and no analysis for interactive effect could be made since no subjects who had experienced over three family situations indicated a worsened financial status. On the basis of these results, Hypothesis 4d would be rejected for 'Sum of inclusion,' 'Sum of affection,' and 'Total of sums.'

H_{4e} : There will be no significant difference in mean scores on marital attitudes of students who experienced two or three versus more than three families during their childhood with regard to changes in family satisfaction.

Multiple analysis of variance was used to determine the significance of differences between the mean scores of students who experienced a decrease in family satisfaction while undergoing family changes and those for whom satisfaction remained the same or improved. FIRO-B was used to measure relationship style.

Table XXII presents the means and F -ratios for change in family satisfaction for the two classifications of students who experienced

TABLE XXI
CHANGES IN FAMILY FINANCIAL STATUS BY NUMBER OF FAMILIES
AND MEAN FIRO-B SCORES
(N=105)

Changes in Financial Situation by Number of Families	Mean Scores on FIRO-B Dimensions							
	Sum I	Sum C	Sum A	Totsum	Diff I	Diff C	Diff A	Totdiff
<u>Finances Same or Better</u>	10.79	5.59	10.97	27.32	0.01	-0.66	-0.94	-1.60
2-3 Families	11.16	5.74	11.04	27.94	-0.07	-0.28	-0.96	-1.32
More than Three Families	9.47	5.05	10.68	25.11	0.32	-2.00	-0.89	-2.58
<u>Finances Worse</u>	7.56	4.56	8.13	20.25	1.06	-0.94	-1.13	-1.00
2-3 Families	7.56	4.56	8.13	20.25	1.06	-0.94	-1.13	-1.00
More than Three Families	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<u>F-Ratio</u>								
Subclass	4.050	1.237	3.034	4.688	1.462	1.740	0.080	0.597
Main Effect								
Number of Families	1.869	0.812	0.105	1.408	0.383	3.396	0.018	0.989
Financial Status	7.412*	2.091	6.035*	9.033*	2.844	0.433	0.118	0.057
Interactive Effect	-	Not computed due to empty cell						

*Significant at the .05 level

Multiple Analysis of Variance

Sum I=Sum of inclusion; Sum C=Sum of control; Sum A=Sum of affection; Totsum=Sum of sums; Diff I=Difference inclusion; Diff C=Difference control; Diff A=Difference affection; Totdiff=Total of differences.

TABLE XXII
CHANGES IN FAMILY SATISFACTION BY NUMBER OF FAMILIES
AND MEAN FIRO-B SCORES
(N=105)

Changes in Family Satisfaction by Number of Families	Mean Scores for FIRO-B Dimensions							
	Sum I	Sum C	Sum A	Totsum	Diff I	Diff C	Diff A	Totdiff
<u>Satisfaction Same or Better</u>	9.89	5.51	10.79	26.40	0.23	-0.85	-0.83	-1.45
2-3 Families	10.02	5.51	10.85	26.39	0.17	-0.51	-0.90	-1.24
More than Three Families	9.00	5.50	10.33	26.50	0.67	-3.17	-0.33	-2.83
<u>Satisfaction Decreased</u>	10.58	5.35	10.33	26.04	0.11	-0.55	-1.09	-1.55
2-3 Families	10.86	5.50	10.17	26.52	0.10	-0.26	-1.07	-1.26
More than Three Families	9.69	4.85	10.85	24.46	0.15	-1.46	-1.15	-2.46
<u>F-Ratio</u>								
Subclass	0.628	0.199	0.164	0.157	0.086	1.766	0.320	0.564
Main Effect								
Number of Families	0.769	0.320	0.054	0.277	0.108	3.351	0.097	1.118
Family Satisfaction	0.663	0.039	0.302	0.013	0.088	0.456	0.598	0.002
Interactive Effect	0.003	0.159	0.251	0.172	0.107	0.553	0.458	0.022

No results significant at .05 level

Multiple Analysis of Variance

Sum I=Sum of inclusion; Sum C=Sum of control; Sum A=Sum of affection; Totsum=Sum of sums; Diff I=Difference inclusion; Diff C=Difference control; Diff A=Difference affection; Totdiff=Total of differences.

more than one family during childhood. No significant main or interactive effects were found. On the basis of these results, Hypothesis 4e could not be rejected.

H_{4f}: There will be no significant difference in mean scores on relationship style dimensions of students who experienced two or three versus more than three families during their childhood with regard to the 'Adaptability' of the last family experienced.

Multiple analysis of variance was used to determine the significance of differences between the mean scores of students who rated their last family in the functional range of 'Adaptability' and those who rated their last family in the nonfunctional range of 'Adaptability.' FIRO-B was used to measure relationship style and FACES was used to measure 'Adaptability.'

Table XXIII presents the means and F-ratios for those in the functional and nonfunctional range of 'Adaptability' who had experienced two or three, or more than three families during childhood. No significant main or interactive effects were found. On the basis of these results, Hypothesis 4f could not be rejected.

H_{4g}: There will be no significant difference in mean scores on relationship style dimensions of students who experienced two or three versus more than three families during their childhood with regard to the 'Cohesiveness' of the last family experienced.

Multiple analysis of variance was used to determine the significance of differences between the mean scores of students who rated their last family in the functional range of 'Cohesiveness' and those who rated their last family in the nonfunctional range of 'Cohesiveness.' FIRO-B was used to measure relationship style. FACES was used to measure 'Cohesiveness.'

TABLE XXIII
ADAPTABILITY OF LAST FAMILY BY NUMBER OF FAMILIES
AND MEAN FIRO-B SCORES
(N=105)

Adaptability of Last Family by Number of Families	Mean Scores for FIRO-B Dimensions							
	Sum I	Sum C	Sum A	Totsum	Diff I	Diff C	Diff A	Totdiff
<u>Functional Range</u>	9.33	5.44	9.79	25.56	0.17	-0.92	-0.83	-1.58
2-3 Families	9.28	5.47	9.64	24.39	0.22	-0.67	-0.81	-1.25
More than Three Families	9.50	5.33	10.25	25.08	0.00	-1.67	-0.92	-2.58
<u>Non-Functional Range</u>	11.13	5.42	11.16	27.67	0.18	-0.51	-1.09	-1.44
2-3 Families	11.38	5.54	11.13	28.04	0.08	-0.21	-1.13	-1.27
More than Three Families	9.43	4.57	11.43	25.14	0.86	-2.57	-0.86	-2.57
<u>F-Ratio</u>								
Subclass	1.881	0.195	1.359	1.416	0.041	1.556	0.273	0.562
Main Effect								
Number of Families	0.274	0.389	0.188	0.096	0.081	2.785	0.008	1.101
Adaptability	3.103	0.017	2.687	2.510	0.006	0.090	0.504	0.000
Interactive Effect	0.724	0.287	0.018	2.518	0.595	0.518	0.165	0.000

No results significant at .05 level

Multiple Analysis of Variance

Sum I=Sum of inclusion; Sum C=Sum of control; Sum A=Sum of affection; Totsum=Sum of sums; Diff I=Difference inclusion; Diff C=Difference control; Diff A=Difference affection; Totdiff=Total of differences.

Table XXIV presents the means and F -ratios for those in the functional and nonfunctional ranges of 'Cohesiveness' who experienced two or three or more than three families during childhood. No significant main or interactive effects were found. On the basis of these results, Hypothesis 4g could not be rejected.

H_{4h} : There will be no significant difference in mean scores on relationship style dimensions of students who experienced two or three versus more than three families during childhood with regard to the 'Functionality' of the last family unit experienced.

Multiple analysis of variance was used to determine the significance of differences between the mean scores of students who rated their last family in the functional range of both 'Adaptability,' and 'Cohesiveness' (Functionality), and those who did not. FIRO-B was used to measure relationship style and FACES was used to measure family 'Functionality.'

Table XXV presents the means and F -ratios for those students who rated their families in a 'Functional' range of both 'Adaptability,' and 'Cohesiveness,' and who had experienced two or three versus more than three families during childhood. A significant main effect was found for number of families experienced and 'Difference/control.' Students who had experienced more than three families during childhood had significantly lower mean scores (indicating a desire to let others take the initiative) regardless of family 'Functionality.' There was no main effect for 'Functionality' and no interactive effect. On the basis of these results, Hypothesis 4H could not be rejected.

TABLE XXIV
COHESIVENESS OF LAST FAMILY BY NUMBER OF FAMILIES
AND MEAN FIRO-B SCORES
(N=105)

Cohesiveness of Last Family by Number of Families	Mean Scores for FIRO-B Dimensions							
	Sum I	Sum C	Sum A	Totsum	Diff I	Diff C	Diff A	Totdiff
<u>Functional Range</u>	10.08	5.63	9.92	25.84	0.08	-1.29	-1.18	-2.39
2-3 Families	10.32	5.80	10.02	26.15	0.13	-0.88	-1.07	-1.82
More than Three Families	9.00	4.89	9.44	24.44	-0.11	-3.11	-1.67	-4.89
<u>Non-Functional Range</u>	10.48	5.24	11.07	26.57	0.26	-0.17	-0.78	-0.70
2-3 Families	10.61	5.25	10.91	26.77	0.16	0.02	-0.91	-0.75
More than Three Families	9.90	5.20	11.80	25.70	0.70	-1.00	-0.20	-0.50
<u>F-Ratio</u>								
Subclass	0.402	0.413	0.911	0.231	0.105	2.813	0.711	2.197
Main Effect								
Number of Families	0.637	0.373	0.030	0.313	0.076	3.104	0.043	1.189
Cohesiveness	0.169	0.451	1.790	0.151	0.133	2.534	1.377	3.211
Interactive Effect	0.059	0.329	0.437	0.017	0.384	0.446	2.129	1.866

No results significant at .05 level

Multiple Analysis of Variance

Sum I=Sum of inclusion; Sum C=Sum of control; Sum A=Sum of affection; Totsum=Sum of sums; Diff I=Difference inclusion; Diff C=Difference control; Diff A=Difference affection; Totdiff=Total of differences.

TABLE XXV
FUNCTIONALITY OF LAST FAMILY BY NUMBER OF FAMILIES
AND MEAN FIRO-B SCORES
(N=105)

Functionality of Last Family by Number of Families	Mean Scores for FIRO-B Dimensions							
	Sum I	Sum C	Sum A	Totsum	Diff I	Diff C	Diff A	Totdiff
<u>Functional</u>	9.00	5.52	9.36	24.18	0.03	-1.24	-1.18	-2.39
2-3 Families	9.26	5.70	9.70	24.67	0.07	-0.78	-1.04	-1.74
More than Three Families	7.83	4.67	7.83	22.00	-0.17	-3.33	-1.83	-5.33
<u>Non-Functional</u>	10.64	5.23	11.21	27.03	0.18	-0.15	-1.05	-1.05
2-3 Families	10.94	5.73	11.29	27.60	0.03	0.11	-1.11	-1.00
More than Three Families	8.00	4.00	10.50	22.00	1.50	-2.50	-0.53	-1.50
<u>F-Ratio</u>								
Subclass	1.581	0.696	2.405	1.358	0.200	3.044	0.117	1.731
Main Effect								
Number of Families	1.359	1.240	1.051	1.284	0.332	4.430*	0.123	2.007
Functionality	1.442	0.265	3.272	1.122	0.104	1.080	0.084	1.075
Interactive Effect	0.179	0.024	0.151	0.177	1.021	0.001	1.490	0.896

*Significant at the .05 level

Multiple Analysis of Variance

Sum I=Sum of inclusion; Sum C=Sum of control; Sum A=Sum of affection; Totsum=Sum of sums; Diff I=Difference inclusion; Diff C=Difference control; Diff A=Difference affection; Totdiff=Total of differences.

Summary of Results

1. Using two classifications of childhood family situation (one versus more than one family), no significant differences were found for any of the 12 categories of marital attitudes measured by INFORMED. Only one significant difference was found for any of the eight FIRO-B sum and difference scores examined. 'Sum of control' scores were significantly lower for students who had experienced more than one family indicating less desire for structure or giving and taking of orders (a laissez faire approach).

2. The 'more than one family' category was divided into two groups thus creating three classifications of families experienced - one family, two or three families, and more than three families. Significant differences were then found for several INFORMED categories. Students from the 'more than three families' classification had higher mean scores on 'Personality,' 'Communication,' and 'Family and friends' (indicating more realistic attitudes); and lower mean scores on 'Religion' (indicating less traditional views and practices). The change in classification of family background resulted in no significant differences in any FIRO-B scores.

3. When mean scores on INFORMED categories for students from the two multiple family groups (two or three and more than three families) were considered in connection with other variables the following relationships were evident:

- a) Reason for first change (divorce versus death). A significant main effect was found for number of families experienced on 'Personality,' 'Communications,' and 'Family and friends' (mean scores higher for greater number of families).

No main effect was found for reason for change. No interactive effect was found between number of families and reason for change.

b) Timing of last change (before versus at or after age 13).

A significant main effect was found for number of families experienced on 'Personality,' 'Communications,' 'Conflict resolution,' and 'Family and friends' (mean scores higher for greater number of families). A significant main effect was found for timing of change on 'Expectations' (higher mean scores if change at or after 13). No interactive effect was found between number of families and timing of change.

c) Change in family size (last family smaller or same versus larger than first).

A significant main effect was found for number of families experienced on 'Communications,' and 'Family and friends' (mean scores higher for greater number of families). A significant main effect was found for change in size on 'Communications,' and 'Leisure' (mean scores higher if last family larger). An interactive effect was found between number of families and family size for 'Leisure' (mean scores much higher if greater number of families and increased size).

d) Change in financial status (last family same or better versus worse than first).

A significant main effect was found for number of families experienced on 'Personality,' 'Communications,' 'Conflict resolution,' 'Sexual relations,' 'Children and marriage,' 'Family and friends,' and 'Roles'

(mean scores all higher for greater number of families).

A significant main effect was found for changed financial status for 'Roles' (mean score higher). No interactive analysis was possible.

- e) Change in family satisfaction (last family same or better versus less than first). A significant main effect was found for number of families experienced on 'Personality,' 'Communications,' 'Conflict resolution,' 'Children and marriage,' and 'Family and friends' (mean scores all higher for greater number of families). No significant main effect was found for family satisfaction. An interactive effect was found between number of families and family satisfaction on 'Leisure' (mean scores higher if satisfaction less; lower if satisfaction same or better).
- f) 'Adaptability' of last family (functional versus nonfunctional range). A significant main effect was found for number of families experienced on 'Communications,' 'Conflict resolution,' and 'Family and friends' (mean scores all higher for greater number of families). No significant main effect was found for 'Adaptability.' A significant interactive effect was found between number of families and 'Adaptability' on 'Leisure,' 'Roles,' and 'Idealism' (higher mean scores on 'Leisure' and 'Roles;' lower on 'Idealism' if nonfunctional and greater number of families).
- g) 'Cohesiveness' of last family (functional versus nonfunctional on both 'Adaptability' and 'Cohesiveness'). A significant main effect was found for number of families

on 'Personality,' 'Communications,' 'Conflict resolution,' 'Sexual relations,' and 'Family and friends' (higher mean scores for greater number of families). No significant main effect was found for 'Cohesiveness.' No interactive effect was found between number of families and 'Cohesiveness.'

- h) 'Functionality' of last family (functional versus nonfunctional on both 'Adaptability' and 'Cohesiveness'). A significant main effect was found for number of families experienced on 'Expectations,' 'Personality,' 'Communications,' 'Conflict resolution,' 'Leisure,' 'Sexual relations,' and 'Family and friends' (higher mean scores for greater number of families). No significant main effect was found for family 'Functionality.' No interactive effect was found between number of families and family 'Functionality.'

4. When mean scores on FIRO-B dimensions for students from the two multiple family groups (two or three versus more than three families) were considered in connection with other variables the following relationships were evident:

- a) Reason for change (divorce versus death). No significant main effect was found for number of families or reason for change. No interactive effect was found between the two.
- b) Timing of change (before versus at or after age 13). No significant main effect was found for number of families or timing of change. No interactive effect was found between the two.
- c) Change in family size (last family smaller or same versus larger than first). A significant main effect was found

for number of families on 'Difference/control.' No significant main effect was found for change in family size. No interactive effect was found between number of families and change in family size.

- d) Change in financial status (last family same or better versus worse than first). No significant main effect was found for number of families. A significant main effect was found for financial status on 'Sum of inclusion,' 'Sum of affection,' and 'Total of sums.' No interactive analysis was possible.
- e) Change in family satisfaction (last family same or better versus less than first). No significant main effect was found for either number of families or change in satisfaction. No interactive effect was found between the two.
- f) 'Adaptability' of last family (functional versus nonfunctional range). No significant main effect was found for either number of families or 'Adaptability.' No interactive effect was found between the two.
- g) 'Cohesiveness' of last family (functional versus nonfunctional range). No significant main effect was found for either number of families or 'Cohesiveness.' No interactive effect was found between the two.
- h) 'Functionality' of last family (functional versus nonfunctional category for both 'Adaptability' and 'Cohesiveness'). No significant main effect was found for number of families. A significant main effect was found for 'Functionality' on 'Difference/control.' No interactive effect was found between number of families and 'Functionality.'

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Review of Study

The purpose of this research was to determine what relationship existed between the number and characteristics of families experienced while growing up and the relationship style and marital attitudes of college students. Four instruments were utilized in this study; INFORMED, to measure marital attitudes, FIRO-B, to measure relationship style, FACES, to measure family functionality, and a Family Structure Questionnaire which was designed to measure:

1. Demographic data
2. Number of families experienced
3. Timing of changes in family
4. Reason(s) for family change
5. Characteristics of each family experienced
 - a) parenting situation
 - b) size
 - c) perceived financial situation
 - d) general satisfaction.

These instruments were administered to all students in Marriage and Parenting classes at Oklahoma State University in the Fall semester of 1984 and the Spring semester of 1985. The total number of students

participating was 419 and of these, 105 had experienced more than one family setting.

The families of origin of those who had experienced family changes differed significantly in several ways from the families of origin of those who experienced no change:

1. Mothers were younger at time of student's birth
2. Families were smaller
3. Finances were perceived to be less adequate
4. Family satisfaction rating was lower.

Analysis of variance was used to determine the significance of differences between the mean scores for INFORMED and FIRO-B of students grouped according to number of families experienced. Multiple analysis of variance was used to determine the additional effect of timing of change, reason for change, and other characteristics of the families experienced.

Summary

Marital Attitudes

1. For the students participating in this study and using the instrument INFORMED it appears that one must belong to a considerable number of families (over three) before a significant relationship is found between marital attitudes and number of families experienced. The most usual situation in this sample (and nationwide, according to the literature) is for a divorce or death to occur, followed by a remarriage. This results in the children of those families experiencing three families during childhood. The marital attitudes of the respondents in this study who had experienced two or three families did

not differ significantly from the marital attitudes of their contemporaries who remained in their families of origin. The students who had significantly different marital attitudes were those who experienced four to eight different families in the course of their childhood. This could be interpreted to indicate that children can adapt to family change so long as it is not excessive. It might also indicate that although adults today demand or expect some flexibility with regard to their marital status, they still succeed in providing a stable home environment for their children.

2. Those individuals who experienced over three families while growing up had significantly more realistic views (higher mean scores) about the importance played by 'Personality,' 'Communications,' and 'Family and friends' in marriage and this was true regardless of the reason for changes, timing of changes and changes in family size, finances, and satisfaction. The persistence of these results serves to confirm their reality. Lower mean scores on 'Religion' (indicating less traditional views) were not similarly persistent.

3. Controlling family financial changes resulted in significant findings for six additional categories of INFORMED. Controlling family 'Functionality' resulted in significant findings for five additional categories of INFORMED. Apparently variations in these two characteristics may mask differences in marital attitudes which may occur due to experiencing increased numbers of families.

4. Two of the variables (other than number of families experienced) had independent effects; timing of last changes and changes in family size. Students who experienced family change at or after age 13 had significantly higher 'Expectations' scores (indicating

greater realism) regardless of number of families experienced. Students whose families got larger as a result of family change had higher mean scores on 'Communications' and 'Leisure' regardless of number of families experienced. It would be very easy to confuse the effects of experiencing multiple families with these variables.

5. Interactive effects were found between number of families experienced and changes in family size, changes in family satisfaction, and 'Adaptability.' 'Adaptability' and number of families interacted to influence three categories of INFORMED, 'Leisure,' 'Roles,' and 'Idealism.' The combinations of nonfunctional 'Adaptability' scores and a greater number of families was related to dramatically higher 'Leisure' and 'Roles' mean scores and dramatically lower 'Idealism' scores. With regard to family size changes, a combination of increased family size and a greater number of families was related to much higher 'Leisure' scores. A combination of lowered family satisfaction and a greater number of families had the same effect.

6. Only one category of INFORMED, attitudes about 'Finances,' showed no relationship to any of the variables considered. This is interesting since a change in financial status was significantly related to so many variables. One might expect that having participated in families which experienced a worsened financial situation (as was true for many respondents) would be reflected in some way in their views of money and how it should be handled. However, the questions on finances were quite specific and factual in nature. If insufficiency of funds is the real problem, questions concerning who should control the money, whether family members should be given allowances and the importance of savings may have seemed irrelevant.

In general, the effect of membership in a greater number of families while growing up was associated with more realistic attitudes about marriage. Unrealistic attitudes frequently result in disappointment and a feeling of failure in marriage so realistic attitudes could have an opposite effect, contributing to greater satisfaction in marriage. It is also possible that a large dose of realism could cause individuals to proceed with more caution, marrying later or choosing a partner more carefully or refraining from marrying altogether. A certain degree of optimism may be required to enter marriage and deal with the problems which arise.

Relationship Style

It appears that in most instances, relationship style as measured by the FIRO-B is not significantly related to number of families lived in during childhood. The variables examined contained the possibility of 80 significant findings and only six proved significant. Of these, three were main effects due to worsened finances. Only the 'Control' category of FIRO-B was related to number of families experienced, operating independently, and this was significant in only three of the ten possible cases. Students from more than one family versus those from intact families of origin had lower 'Sum of control' scores indicating less desire for structure in authority situations. Those from more than three families, when changes in family size were controlled for, had significantly lower mean scores on 'Difference/control' indicating a desire to let others take the initiative in authority situations. This was also true when family 'Functionality' was controlled for.

Discipline is frequently mentioned as a sensitive area in both single-parent and remarriage families. In the single-parent home, children may function as partners with the custodial parent. In remarriage families, the legitimacy of the authority of the stepparent is questionable. In both instances, if confrontations are to be avoided a very loose (*laissez faire*) authority system may be employed. Having experienced a less structured situation, the child may prefer this system (hence the lower 'Sum of control' scores). The lower 'Difference/control' scores which became apparent when changes in family size or family 'Functionality' were controlled for indicates a preference that others take the initiative in authority situations. This would seem consistent with the authority situation described above.

Financial Situation

For both marital attitudes and relationship style, changing financial situation had the greatest number of significant relationships. This would appear to support the findings of those researchers who have claimed that family finances are at the root of many of the problems attributed to participating in more than one family. It is unfortunate that the sample did not allow an interactive analysis as there seems to be a strong likelihood that such an effect existed.

Family Functioning

Of the three categories of family functionality considered, 'Cohesiveness,' 'Adaptability,' and overall 'Functionality,' only 'Adaptability' was significantly related to number of families experienced during childhood. Second and third families were less likely

than first families to be rated as functional on this dimension while families beyond three had the highest likelihood of being in a functional range of 'Adaptability.' Perhaps what is regarded as functional for intact families is not necessarily functional for families in the process of reorganizing (and second and third families might be in transition). A certain loosening up of boundaries might be necessary. Once the reorganization is complete, the family may again begin to operate more like the original family.

Conclusions

The significant differences in marital attitudes which were found in this study could indicate that participating in several family groupings during childhood provided individuals with more experience in close personal relationships which was reflected in behavior and attitudes. Dealing with more adults and children in a greater variety of situations and observing their parents coping with whatever problems disrupted the household might have created greater awareness of the realities of family living.

The lack of relationship between number of families experienced and relationship style, as was discussed earlier, may indicate that this attribute is partially innate or developed early enough in life to be relatively unaffected by later family disruption.

The fact that it was necessary to go beyond three families to find significant differences and that nonsignificant findings outnumbered significant findings might indicate one or a combination of the following:

1. Circumstances and conditions not investigated in this study have a greater influence on marital attitudes and relationship style

than number of families experienced during childhood and accompanying circumstances.

2. Children may be more resilient and better able to cope with a variety of situations than some have imagined, especially if their parents and surrogate parents are able to maintain a stable environment. Experiencing a number of families, therefore, would have little or no effect on marital attitudes and relationship style so long as the number of changes was not excessive.

3. Changing families may have only temporary effects on family members and only when changes were recent, could they be expected to be reflected in the behavior or attitudes of the family members.

4. Hitherto reported effects of participating in multiple families may have resulted from studies which failed to control adequately for accompanying circumstances. In this study, the number of significant findings changed when other variables were controlled and a number of main and interactive effects were noted for other variables.

5. College students in general may be too preoccupied with 'self' to have given much thought to their family or families of origin. The particular students in this study attended a university where a large percentage of the student body live close enough to go home every weekend. They may not be as emancipated from their families as one might expect and, therefore, may not be able to view their families objectively. Perhaps if asked the same questions a few years in the future, these individuals would respond differently.

6. The particular students in this study may not have been representative of college students at large. Respondents were predominantly from the colleges of Arts and Science, Business, and Home

Economics. Other colleges were less well represented. The subjects were also predominantly female.

7. The number of students experiencing multiple families during childhood may have been too small. Although the total sample was fairly large ($N=419$), the subsample who had experienced family changes accounted for only about one-fourth of the total ($N=105$). This meant small cell size in some analysis.

8. The instruments used in this study were designed as diagnostic instruments and while very adequate for that purpose may lack the precision necessary in research instruments used for prediction. The INFORMED inventory is relatively new and may still need refinement. It is also possible that the originators of any or all of the instruments had a traditional bias which is reflected in the interpretation of scores.

Implications for Future Research

A logical 'next step' for this research would be to find a population in which there was a larger number of multiple family subjects who had experienced a wider variety of parenting situations. This would serve to confirm (or refute) the findings from the present study. It would also make it unnecessary to collapse categories and thus allow a more thorough analysis.

The parts of the Family Structure Questionnaire pertaining to composition of families other than parents proved confusing to the respondents and results were as a consequence, unusable. It is possible that some of these other persons present in the household (older siblings, grandparents) played important parent roles. A revision of the questionnaire could provide this information.

Several authors have stressed the importance of the affective relationship between whoever performs the parenting role and the child, regardless of biological relationship or custody. No attempt was made in the present study to tap this dimension, nor was any attempt made to classify parenting style with regard to another key dimension, discipline (permissive, autocratic, etc.). These would be worthwhile additions to future replications of this research.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bachrach, C. A. (1983). Children in families; Characteristics of biological, step and adopted children. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 45, 171-179.
- Bane, M. J. (1976). Marital disruption and the lives of children. Journal of Social Issues, 32(1), 103-117.
- Bane, M. J., & Weiss, R. S. (1980). Alone together: The world of single parent families. American Demographics, 2(5), 11-15, 48.
- Biller, H. B., & Bahm, R. M. (1971). Father-absence, perceived maternal behavior and masculinity of self concept among junior high boys. Developmental Psychology, 4, 178-181.
- Blechman, E. A. (1982). Are children with one parent at psychological risk? A methodological review. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 45, 179-195.
- Bloom, B. L., Asher, S. J., & White, S. W. (1978). Marital disruption as a stressor: A review and analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 85(4), 867-894.
- Bohannon, P., & Yahraes, H. (1979). Stepfathers as parents. In E. Corfman (Ed.), Families today: A research sampler on families and children (NIMH Science Monograph, pp. 347-362). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- Bowerman, C. E., & Irish, D. P. (1962). Some relationships of step-children to their parents. Marriage and Family Living, 24, 113-121.
- Brandwein, R. A., Brown, C. A., & Fox, E. M. (1974). Women and children last: The social situation of divorced mothers and their families. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 36, 498-514.
- Brooks, J. B. (1981). The process of parenting (p. 286). Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield Publishers.
- Burchinal, L. G. (1964). Characteristics of adolescents from unbroken, broken and reconstituted families. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 26, 44-51.

- Bumpass, L. L., & Rindfuss, R. R. (1979). Children's experience of marital disruption. American Journal of Sociology, 85, 49-65.
- Cetron, M. (1983). Serial monogamy: The matrimonial pattern of the future. Marriage and Divorce Today, 8, 3.
- Chaudhary, R. (1984). Effect of readiness for marriage and age on the marital attitudes of unmarried students. Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University.
- Cherlin, A. J. (1981). Marriage, divorce and remarriage. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cherlin, A. J., & Furstenberg, F. F. Jr. (1983, June). The American family in the year 2000. The Futurist, 7-14.
- Chess, S., Thomas, A., & Birch, H. G. (1965). Your child as a person. New York: Viking Press.
- Clingempeel, W. G. (1981). Quasi-kin relationships and marital quality in stepfather families. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41(5), 890-901.
- Coleman, M., & Ganong, L. H. (1984). Effect of family structure on family attitudes and expectations. Family Relations, 33, 425-432.
- Duberman, L. (1973). Step-kin relationships. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 35, 283-292.
- Elder, G. H., Jr., & Bowerman, C. E. (1963). Family structure and child rearing patterns: The effects of family size and sex composition. American Sociological Review, 28, 891-905.
- Espinoza, R., & Newman, Y. (1979). Stepparenting. Rockville, MD: U. S. Department of Health Education and Welfare, NIMH.
- Esses, L. M., & Campbell, R. (1984). Challenges in researching the remarried. Family Relations, 33, 415-424.
- Fournier, D. G. (1981). INFORMED: The inventory of marriage education. Unpublished technical report, Oklahoma State University, Department of Family Relations and Child Development, Stillwater.
- Fox, G. L., & Inazu, J. K. (1982). The influence of mothers' marital history on mother-daughter relationships in black and white households. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 44, 143-153.
- Furstenberg, F. F., Jr., Nord, C. W., Peterson, J. L., & Zill, N. (1983). The life course of children of divorce: Marital disruption and parental contact. American Sociological Review, 48, 5.
- Ganong, L. H., Coleman, M., & Brown, G. (1981). Effect of family structure on marital attitudes. Adolescence, 16, 281-288.

- Ganong, L. H., & Coleman, M. (1984). The effects of remarriage on children: A review of empirical literature. Family Relations, 33, 389-406.
- Glick, P. C. (1979). Children of divorced parents in demographic perspective. Journal of Social Issues, 35, 170-182.
- Gluck, G. A. (1983). Psychometric properties of the FIRO-B: A guide to research. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Goetting, A. (1982). The six stations of remarriage: Developmental tasks of remarriage. Family Relations, 31(2), 213-222.
- Greenberg, E. F., & Nay, W. R. (1982). The intergenerational transmission of marital instability reconsidered. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 44, 335-346.
- Gregory, I. (1966). Retrospective data concerning childhood loss of a parent. II. Category of parental loss by decade of birth. Archives of General Psychiatry, 15, 362.
- Hareven, T. K. (1978). Transitions: The family and the life course in historic perspective. New York: Academic Press.
- Hetherington, E. M. (1972). Effects of father absence on personality development in adolescent daughters. Developmental Psychology, 7, 303-326.
- Hetherington, E. M., Cox, M., & Cox, R. (1977). The traumatic world of divorced fathers. Psychology Today, 10(11), 42-46.
- Herzog, E., & Sudia, C. E. (1973). Children in fatherless homes. In B. M. Caldwell & N. H. Ricciuti (Eds.), Review of child development research (Vol. 3, pp. 141-232). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hess, R. D., & Camara, K. A. (1979). Post divorce family relationships as mediating factors in the consequences of divorce for children. Journal of Social Issues, 35(4), 79-96.
- Hodges, W. F., Weschler, R., & Ballentine, C. (1979). Divorce and the preschool child: Cumulative stress. Journal of Divorce, 3, 55-67.
- Hunter, J. E., & Schuman, N. (1980). Chronic reconstitution as a family style. Social Work, 25(6), 446-451.
- Ihinger-Tallman, M. (1984). Epilogue, special issue remarriage and stepparenting. Family Relations, 33(3), 483-487.
- Johnson, R. E. (1982). Validation of INFORMED: An inventory for marriage education. Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University.

- Kaplan, H. B., & Pokorny, A. D. (1971). Self derogation and childhood broken home. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33, 328-337.
- Kellam, S. G., Ensminger, M. C., & Turner, J. (1977). Family structure and the mental health of children: Concurrent and longitudinal community wide studies. Archives General Psychiatry, 34, 1012-1022.
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1964). Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Knox, D. (1985). Choices in relationships: An introduction to marriage and the family. New York: West Publishing Co.
- Kohlberg, L., LaCrosse, J., & Ricks, D. (1972). The predictability of adult mental health from childhood behavior. In B. Wolman (Ed.), Manual of child psychotherapy (p. 1233). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Kulka, R. A., & Weingarten, H. (1979). The long term effects of parental divorce in childhood on adult adjustment. Journal of Social Issues, 35(4), 50-78.
- Landis, J. T. (1962). A comparison of children from divorced and nondivorced unhappy marriages. The Family Life Coordinator, 2, 61-65.
- Langner, T. S., & Michael, S. T. (1963). Life stress and mental health (pp. 173-175). New York: Free Press.
- Macklin, E. (1980). Nontraditional family forms: A decade review of research. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42, 905-916.
- Marotz-Baden, R., Adams, G. R., Beuche, N., Munro, B., & Munro, G. (1979). Family form or family process? Reconsidering the deficit family model approach. Family Coordinator, 28, 5-12.
- Masnick, G., & Bane, M. J. (1980). The nations families: 1960-1990. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Harvard Joint Center for Urban Studies.
- McDermott, J. (1970). Divorce and its psychiatric sequelae in children. Archives of General Psychiatry, 23, 421-428.
- Nelson, E. A., & Vangen, P. M. (1971). The impact of father absence literature upon heterosexual behaviors and social development of pre-adolescent girls in a ghetto environment. Proceedings of the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 6(1), 165-166.
- Olson, D. H., McCubbin, H. I., Barnes, H., Larsen, A., Muxen, M., & Wilson, M. (1983). Family inventories. St. Paul: University of Minnesota, Family Social Science.
- Parish, T. S. (1982). Locus of control as a function of father loss and the presence of stepfathers. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 140, 321-322.

- Parish, T. S., & Copeland, T. F. (1979). The relationship between self concepts and evaluations of parents and stepfathers. Journal of Psychology, 101(1), 135-138.
- Parish, T. S., & Kappes, B. (1980). Impact of father loss on the family. Social Behavior and Personality, 8, 107-112.
- Parish, T. S., & Nunn, G. D. (1981). Children's self-concepts and evaluation of parents as a function of family structure and process. Journal of Psychology, 107, 105-108.
- Parish, T. S., & Taylor, J. C. (1979). The impact of divorce and subsequent father absence on children's and adolescent's self concepts. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 8, 427-432.
- Raschke, H. J., & Raschke, V. J. (1979). Family conflict and children's self concepts: A comparison of intact and single-parent families. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41, 367-374.
- Rosenberg, M. (1972). The broken family and self esteem. In I. L. Reiss (Ed.), Readings on the family (pp. 518-530). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Ross, H. L., & Sawhill, I. V. (1975). Time of transition: The growth of families headed by women (p. 22). Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.
- Saluter, A. F. (1983). Marital status and living arrangements: March 1983. Current population reports: Population characteristics (Series P-20, No. 389). U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Santrock, J. W., Warchak, R., Lindbergh, C., & Meadows, L. (1982). Children and parents observed social behavior in stepfather families. Child Development, 53, 472-480.
- Satir, V. (1972). Peoplemaking. Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books.
- Schooler, C. (1972). Childhood family structure and adult characteristics. Sociometry, 45(2), 255-269.
- Schutz, W. (1978). The Firo scales. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Snedecor, G. W., & Cochran, W. G. (1967). Statistical methods (6th ed.). Ames: Iowa State University Press.
- Sorosky, A. D. (1977). The psychological effects of divorce on adolescents. Adolescence, 12, 123-136.
- Spreitzer, E., & Riley, L. E. (1974). Factors associated with singlehood. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 36, 533-542.

- SPSSX Users Guide. (1983). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Stinnett, N. (1971). Attitudes of college students toward marriage. Journal of Home Economics, 63, 33-36.
- Wallen, P. (1954). Marital happiness of parents and their children's attitudes toward marriage. American Sociological Review, 19, 20-23.
- Wallterstein, J. S., & Kelly, J. B. (1976). The effects of parental divorce: Experiences of the child in later latency. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 46(2), 256-269.
- Wallerstein, J. S., & Kelly, J. B. (1980). Surviving the break-up: How children actually cope with divorce. New York: Basic Books.
- Walker, K. N., Rogers, J., & Messinger, L. (1977). Remarriage after divorce: A review. Social Casework, 58, 276-285.
- Walters, J., Parker, K., & Stinnett, N. (1972). College students perceptions concerning marriage. Family Perspective, 7, 43-49.
- Weiss, R. S. (1979). Going it alone. New York: Basic Books.
- Wilson, K. L., Zurcher, L. A., McAdams, D. C., & Curtis, R. L. (1975). Stepfathers and stepchildren: An exploratory analysis from two national surveys. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 37, 526-536.
- Young, E. R., & Parish, T. S. (1977). Impact of father absence during childhood on the psychological adjustment of college females. Sex Roles, 3, 217-227.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

INVENTORY FOR MARRIAGE EDUCATION

(INFORMED)

INFORMED

THE INVENTORY FOR MARRIAGE EDUCATION

DEVELOPED BY

DAVID G. FOURNIER, PH.D.

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

INSTRUCTIONS: INFORMED contains 120 items related to marriage. Please circle the number of the response choice that best fits your opinion about each statement. Your responses are confidential and the results will help you to determine how similar or different your marital attitudes are compared to your peers. A separate answer sheet is provided for your responses.

Please write your answer to the following questions in the space provided on the top of the answer sheet

Your Age ; Your Sex ; Your Major ; Year In School ;

What do you think is a good age to marry?

Have you ever been divorced?

Write the number of the relationship type which best describes you.

1 = Married	3 = Pre-engaged	5 = Serious Dating	7 = Not now
2 = Engaged	4 = Steady Dating	6 = Casual Dating	Dating

- 001. Most individuals know themselves and what they want out of life before they get married. (A7)
- 002. It is easier to change another persons habits after a couple is married. (A12)
- 003. I believe that a womans place is basically in the home. (A4)
- 004. Married persons should be aware of their partners feelings without having to be told. (A6)
- 005. Most couples know how to fight fairly and how to resolve their problems. (A3)
- 006. If one partner is good at handling the finances it is not necessary for the other marriage partner to know how. (A1)
- 007. Increasing the amount of time together automatically improves a marriage relationship. (A8)
- 008. Most couples find it easy to fulfill expectations regarding their sexual relationship after marriage. (A9)
- 009. Keeping the family together at all costs for the sake of the children is always better than divorce or annulment. (A10)
- 010. Relatives and friends rarely interfere with a couples marriage. (A2)
- 011. Loving one's marriage partner is an extension of one's love for God. (A11)
- 012. My future marriage partner and I will be as well adjusted as any two persons in the world could be. (A5)
- 013. There is only one person in the world who is perfectly compatible with me for marriage. (A19)
- 014. After marriage it is easier to accept and live with another persons habits which may bother you. (E18)
- 015. If married partners are both working, they should equally share cooking, cleaning and other household duties. (A16)
- 016. Married partners should avoid saying anything critical to their partner. (A18)
- 017. In order to end argument it is better to give in to the other person. (A15)
- 018. Both partners must be able to balance the checkbook and pay the bills. (A13)
- 019. It is important for married couples to spend all their spare time together. (A20)
- 020. Married partners should be ready and willing to have sexual relations whenever one of them has the desire. (A21)
- 021. Married couples usually are much happier and disagree less after they have children. (B9)
- 022. After marriage a person is always treated as an adult by their family. (A14)
- 023. It is important for couples to explore the spiritual nature of their relationship by praying together. (A23)
- 024. When I get married my partner and I will be able to understand each other completely. (A17)
- 025. Even happily married couples have some problems that may never be completely resolved. (B6)
- 026. If my partner had smoking or drinking habits which bothered me I would wait until after marriage to change those habits. (C13)
- 027. The husband should have the final word in all the important decisions in the family. (B3)
- 028. Many couples find it difficult to communicate effectively after marriage. (B5)
- 029. Couples should always be able to solve even their most difficult problems without having to see a marriage counselor. (B2)
- 030. It is more important that the husband keep control over financial matters. (A25)
- 031. It is important for individuals to develop interests and hobbies even if their partner does not share these interests. (B7)
- 032. A married person should be willing to consider trying sexual activities that are suggested by their partner. (B8)
- 033. Having children dramatically reduces the flexibility in a married couple's lifestyle. (C11)
- 034. If your parents dislike your spouse it is best to not visit or see your family. (C3)
- 035. It is not necessary to include a religious aspect in the commitment a couple makes to each other. (B10)

036. My future partner will not have many faults or personality traits that are different than mine. (B4)
037. It is easier to be a best friend and companion to your partner after marriage than it is before marriage. (B18)
038. Once couples are married any problems they had during courtship about jealousy are quickly resolved. (D4)
039. The husbands occupation should be the first priority in determining where a couple should live. (B15)
040. It is easier for couples to become more clear and honest in their communication after marriage. (C7)
041. Most marital arguments are about concerns that are very important. (B14)
042. Married persons should not always have to check with their partner before buying something. (B12)
043. After marriage a person should not develop a new interest or hobby unless one's spouse is also interested. (D13)
044. Decisions regarding family planning or birth control are very easy after marriage. (B20)
045. It is best for couples to be married at least three years before starting a family. (D2)
046. It is relatively easy for married couples to decide which relatives to visit during holidays. (C16)
047. One particular church should be chosen by a couple after marriage. (B22)
048. When I marry I will be able to completely understand and sympathize with my partners every mood. (B16)
049. A person can expect a marriage partner to fulfill almost all needs for security, support and companionship. (C8)
050. A person who is stubborn before marriage usually becomes much more flexible after marriage. (D17)
051. It is more important that the husband be satisfied with his job because his income is more important to the family. (C18)
052. Even when couples become aware of poor communication habits it is difficult for them to change. (C20)
053. A married person should do anything to avoid having conflicts with their marriage partner. (C4)
054. Couples who budget their money wisely will never have financial problems. (C2)
055. Marriage partners should be willing to participate in all activities that their spouse enjoys. (B19)
056. Most couples find it easy to discuss sex after marriage. (C10)
057. Having children could have a negative effect on a couples marriage. (D15)
058. After marriage partners usually get along better with each others friends. (D7)
059. A religious commitment is not important for a couple to build a strong relationship. (C12)
060. When I marry I am sure there will be times that I will not feel very affectionate or loving toward my partner. (C6)
061. A couple will generally have fewer problems after marriage than they had before they were married. (C21)
062. It is important for married persons to do things on their own and not always rely on their spouse to be with them. (F7)
063. Even if the wife works outside the home she should have the primary responsibility for taking care of the home. (D9)
064. After a couple has been married for awhile each person will know what the other is feeling and what they want. (D11)
065. To avoid hurting a persons feelings during a disagreement it is best not to say anything. (C16)
066. Young married couples should take out some installment loans even if they have enough saved to make purchases with cash. (F7)
067. One of the best aspects about marriage is being able to spend all of one's spare time with your partner. (C9)
068. Married partners usually have very similar sex drives. (D1)
069. Raising children is a natural thing that most people need little help doing. (E3)
070. Accepting financial assistance from parents after marriage can create more problems than it resolves. (D20)

071. A couple should be actively involved and share religious beliefs with others in the community. (D3)
072. It would be difficult to imagine a happier marriage than the one I plan to have with my future partner. (D10)
073. Problems experienced during engagement will probably become worse after marriage. (D25)
074. After marriage one can rely on their spouse to get them out of a bad mood or depressed. (F21)
075. A wife should be employed outside of the home if she wants to work. (D22)
076. When there are problems to be discussed in a marriage, most partners are eager to talk about it. (F1)
077. All marital problems can be resolved by ways other than getting a divorce or annulment. (D8)
078. It makes very little difference where couples go to get a loan as long as the place has a good reputation. (D6)
079. I would rather do almost anything than spend an evening alone. (C22)
080. Sexual arousal and readiness for sexual intercourse usually takes longer for wives than for husbands. (D5)
081. Married persons will automatically feel closer to each other after having a child. (E16)
082. A persons desire to continue old personal friendships is not as important after marriage. (E8)
083. Religion is an individual matter and need not have the same meaning for both partners in a relationship. (D16)
084. I do not expect my marriage to be a perfect success. (D23)
085. Most couples are able to maintain a high level of romantic love in their relationship after marriage. (D12)
086. A bad temper during courtship is probably not going to improve after marriage. (G9)
087. The husband should be the head of the family. (E10)
088. Many married couples are unhappy about the way in which they talk with each other. (F15)
089. Most problems experienced by marriage partners will be resolved simply by the passage of time. (D21)
090. A wife's salary should be used for extras and not counted on as regular income. (E7)
091. It is important that married partners share all of the same hobbies and interests. (E1)
092. During sexual relations each partner should know what the other would enjoy without being told. (E6)
093. Most couples agree on the number of children they want and when to have them. (F5)
094. Couples having marital problems should always seek advice from relatives or friends. (E21)
095. Continuing to search out and share religious beliefs is necessary for a growing relationship. (E4)
096. There will be times in my future marriage when I will probably be very unhappy. (F14)
097. Divorce is a sure sign that a person has not tried hard enough to make their marriage work. (F2)
098. A person who is always late before marriage will probably improve after marriage to please their spouse. (F8)
099. Husbands must be able to cook, clean, and perform the same household duties as their wives. (E23)
100. It is best not to share negative feelings with a marriage partner if you think they may become angry. (G3)
101. Having an argument may help to strengthen a married couples relationship. (E9)
102. Individuals should be totally aware of both partners financial assets and liabilities before they marry. (E20)
103. Married partners should always prefer to spend time with each other rather than with other persons. (E14)
104. Couples that are sexually compatible will always reach orgasm at the same time during intercourse. (E15)
105. Most couples agree on the best form of discipline for their children. (F19)
106. Personal friendships developed before marriage will become stronger after a person is married. (F11)
107. Regular church attendance is important for spiritual growth. (E17)

108. My future marriage partner will have all of the qualities that are important in a mate. (E24)
109. Most engaged couples know their partner completely before they get married. (F16)
110. Marriage is a good solution for loneliness. (F9)
111. The wife should be willing to adapt her life to fit her husbands desires. (F13)
112. I expect that my spouse and I would be able to discuss any marital topic without difficulty. (G10)
113. Problems severe enough to end a marriage take several years to develop. (E22)
114. It is important to keep good records of purchases to help budget monthly income. (G5)
115. If partners do not share an interest in an activity it would be best for both to stay home. (F3)
116. Husbands should initiate sexual activities rather than wives. (F18)
117. If my spouse wanted a child I would agree to have one even if I was against the idea. (G7)
118. Chances for marital success are not affected by the opinions of friends or relatives. (F23)
119. I could not marry a person who did not agree completely with my views about religion. (F20)
120. I will never regret my choice in a marriage partner once I have made my final decision. (G2)

INFORMED ANSWER SHEET

ID: _____ AGE: _____ YR IN SCHOOL: _____ GOOD AGE: _____ (YEARS OLD)

SEX: M F MAJOR: _____ RELATIONSHIP: _____ EVER DIVORCED: _____

1 STRONGLY AGREE	2 AGREE	3 AGREE MORE THAN DISAGREE	4 DISAGREE MORE THAN AGREE	5 DISAGREE	6 STRONGLY DISAGREE
CIRCLE RESPONSE	CIRCLE RESPONSE	CIRCLE RESPONSE	CIRCLE RESPONSE	CIRCLE RESPONSE	CIRCLE RESPONSE
01. 1 2 3 4 5 6	21. 1 2 3 4 5 6	41. 1 2 3 4 5 6	61. 1 2 3 4 5 6	81. 1 2 3 4 5 6	101. 1 2 3 4 5 6
02. 1 2 3 4 5 6	22. 1 2 3 4 5 6	42. 1 2 3 4 5 6	62. 1 2 3 4 5 6	82. 1 2 3 4 5 6	102. 1 2 3 4 5 6
03. 1 2 3 4 5 6	23. 1 2 3 4 5 6	43. 1 2 3 4 5 6	63. 1 2 3 4 5 6	83. 1 2 3 4 5 6	103. 1 2 3 4 5 6
04. 1 2 3 4 5 6	24. 1 2 3 4 5 6	44. 1 2 3 4 5 6	64. 1 2 3 4 5 6	84. 1 2 3 4 5 6	104. 1 2 3 4 5 6
05. 1 2 3 4 5 6	25. 1 2 3 4 5 6	45. 1 2 3 4 5 6	65. 1 2 3 4 5 6	85. 1 2 3 4 5 6	105. 1 2 3 4 5 6
06. 1 2 3 4 5 6	26. 1 2 3 4 5 6	46. 1 2 3 4 5 6	66. 1 2 3 4 5 6	86. 1 2 3 4 5 6	106. 1 2 3 4 5 6
07. 1 2 3 4 5 6	27. 1 2 3 4 5 6	47. 1 2 3 4 5 6	67. 1 2 3 4 5 6	87. 1 2 3 4 5 6	107. 1 2 3 4 5 6
08. 1 2 3 4 5 6	28. 1 2 3 4 5 6	48. 1 2 3 4 5 6	68. 1 2 3 4 5 6	88. 1 2 3 4 5 6	108. 1 2 3 4 5 6
09. 1 2 3 4 5 6	29. 1 2 3 4 5 6	49. 1 2 3 4 5 6	69. 1 2 3 4 5 6	89. 1 2 3 4 5 6	109. 1 2 3 4 5 6
10. 1 2 3 4 5 6	30. 1 2 3 4 5 6	50. 1 2 3 4 5 6	70. 1 2 3 4 5 6	90. 1 2 3 4 5 6	110. 1 2 3 4 5 6
11. 1 2 3 4 5 6	31. 1 2 3 4 5 6	51. 1 2 3 4 5 6	71. 1 2 3 4 5 6	91. 1 2 3 4 5 6	111. 1 2 3 4 5 6
12. 1 2 3 4 5 6	32. 1 2 3 4 5 6	52. 1 2 3 4 5 6	72. 1 2 3 4 5 6	92. 1 2 3 4 5 6	112. 1 2 3 4 5 6
13. 1 2 3 4 5 6	33. 1 2 3 4 5 6	53. 1 2 3 4 5 6	73. 1 2 3 4 5 6	93. 1 2 3 4 5 6	113. 1 2 3 4 5 6
14. 1 2 3 4 5 6	34. 1 2 3 4 5 6	54. 1 2 3 4 5 6	74. 1 2 3 4 5 6	94. 1 2 3 4 5 6	114. 1 2 3 4 5 6
15. 1 2 3 4 5 6	35. 1 2 3 4 5 6	55. 1 2 3 4 5 6	75. 1 2 3 4 5 6	95. 1 2 3 4 5 6	115. 1 2 3 4 5 6
16. 1 2 3 4 5 6	36. 1 2 3 4 5 6	56. 1 2 3 4 5 6	76. 1 2 3 4 5 6	96. 1 2 3 4 5 6	116. 1 2 3 4 5 6
17. 1 2 3 4 5 6	37. 1 2 3 4 5 6	57. 1 2 3 4 5 6	77. 1 2 3 4 5 6	97. 1 2 3 4 5 6	117. 1 2 3 4 5 6
18. 1 2 3 4 5 6	38. 1 2 3 4 5 6	58. 1 2 3 4 5 6	78. 1 2 3 4 5 6	98. 1 2 3 4 5 6	118. 1 2 3 4 5 6
19. 1 2 3 4 5 6	39. 1 2 3 4 5 6	59. 1 2 3 4 5 6	79. 1 2 3 4 5 6	99. 1 2 3 4 5 6	119. 1 2 3 4 5 6
20. 1 2 3 4 5 6	40. 1 2 3 4 5 6	60. 1 2 3 4 5 6	80. 1 2 3 4 5 6	100. 1 2 3 4 5 6	120. 1 2 3 4 5 6

APPENDIX B

FUNDAMENTAL INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS
ORIENTATION-BEHAVIOR (FIRO-B)

FIRO-B

1977 Edition

WILL SCHUTZ, Ph.D.

DIRECTIONS This questionnaire explores the typical ways you interact with people. There are no right or wrong answers.

Sometimes people are tempted to answer questions like these in terms of what they think a person *should* do. This is *not* what is wanted here. We would like to know how you actually behave.

Some items may seem similar to others. However, each item is different so please answer each one without regard to the others. There is no time limit, but do not debate long over any item.

NAME _____

GROUP _____

DATE _____ AGE _____

MALE _____ FEMALE _____

	I	C	A	Sum (I + C + A)
e				
w				
sum (e + w)				Total Sum
diff (+ or -) (e - w)				Total Diff



CONSULTING PSYCHOLOGISTS PRESS
577 COLLEGE AVENUE, PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA 94306

© Copyright 1967 by William C. Schutz. Published 1967 by Consulting Psychologists Press. All rights reserved. This test, or parts thereof, may not be reproduced in any form without permission of the publisher.

For each statement below, decide which of the following answers best applies to you. Place the number of the answer in the box at the left of the statement. Please be as honest as you can.

1. never 2. rarely 3. occasionally 4. sometimes 5. often 6. usually

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. I try to be with people. | <input type="checkbox"/> 9. I try to include other people in my plans |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. I let other people decide what to do. | <input type="checkbox"/> 10. I let other people control my actions |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. I join social groups | <input type="checkbox"/> 11. I try to have people around me. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. I try to have close relationships with people. | <input type="checkbox"/> 12. I try to get close and personal with people. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5. I tend to join social organizations when I have an opportunity. | <input type="checkbox"/> 13. When people are doing things together I tend to join them. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 6. I let other people strongly influence my actions | <input type="checkbox"/> 14. I am easily led by people. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 7. I try to be included in informal social activities. | <input type="checkbox"/> 15. I try to avoid being alone. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 8. I try to have close, personal relationships with people. | <input type="checkbox"/> 16. I try to participate in group activities. |

For each of the next group of statements, choose one of the following answers:

1. nobody 2. one or two people 3. a few people 4. some people 5. many people 6. most people

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 17. I try to be friendly to people. | <input type="checkbox"/> 23. I try to get close and personal with people. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 18. I let other people decide what to do. | <input type="checkbox"/> 24. I let other people control my actions. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 19. My personal relations with people are cool and distant. | <input type="checkbox"/> 25. I act cool and distant with people |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 20. I let other people take charge of things. | <input type="checkbox"/> 26. I am easily led by people. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 21. I try to have close relationships with people. | <input type="checkbox"/> 27. I try to have close, personal relationships with people. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 22. I let other people strongly influence my actions. | |

For each of the next group of statements, choose one of the following answers:

1. nobody 2. one or two people 3. a few people 4. some people 5. many people 6. most people

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 28. I like people to invite me to things. | <input type="checkbox"/> 35. I like people to act cool and distant toward me. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 29. I like people to act close and personal with me. | <input type="checkbox"/> 36. I try to have other people do things the way I want them done. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 30. I try to influence strongly other people's actions. | <input type="checkbox"/> 37. I like people to ask me to participate in their discussions. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 31. I like people to invite me to join in their activities. | <input type="checkbox"/> 38. I like people to act friendly toward me. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 32. I like people to act close toward me. | <input type="checkbox"/> 39. I like people to invite me to participate in their activities. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 33. I try to take charge of things when I am with people. | <input type="checkbox"/> 40. I like people to act distant toward me. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 34. I like people to include me in their activities. | |

For each of the next group of statements, choose one of the following answers:

1. never 2. rarely 3. occasionally 4. sometimes 5. often 6. usually

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 41. I try to be the dominant person when I am with people. | <input type="checkbox"/> 48. I like people to include me in their activities. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 42. I like people to invite me to things. | <input type="checkbox"/> 49. I like people to act close and personal with me. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 43. I like people to act close toward me. | <input type="checkbox"/> 50. I try to take charge of things when I'm with people. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 44. I try to have other people do things I want done. | <input type="checkbox"/> 51. I like people to invite me to participate in their activities. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 45. I like people to invite me to join their activities. | <input type="checkbox"/> 52. I like people to act distant toward me. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 46. I like people to act cool and distant toward me. | <input type="checkbox"/> 53. I try to have other people do things the way I want them done. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 47. I try to influence strongly other people's actions. | <input type="checkbox"/> 54. I take charge of things when I'm with people. |

SCORING FIRO-B

Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior

 Name

Instructions: Using this form as a worksheet, you will derive six scores. Each of these scores will be recorded on the appropriate chart on the front of the FIRO-B Questionnaire. The answer key to Expressed Inclusion is in the first column below. Compare your actual response to each item with the keyed responses. If your answer matches one of the numbers in the key, place a check mark in front of the item number on this worksheet. Count the number of checks and enter that score in the first cell in the chart. Score the remaining scales in the same manner.

Expressed Inclusion		Expressed Control		Expressed Affection	
Item	Key	Item	Key	Item	Key
1)	6-5-4	30)	6-5-4	4)	6-5
3)	6-5-4-3	33)	6-5-4	8)	6-5
5)	6-5-4-3	36)	6-5	12)	6
7)	6-5-4	41)	6-5-4-3	17)	6-5
9)	6-5	44)	6-5-4	19)	3-2-1
11)	6-5	47)	6-5-4	21)	6-5
13)	6-5	50)	6-5	23)	6-5
15)	6	53)	6-5	25)	3-2-1
16)	6	54)	6-5	27)	6-5

Wanted Inclusion		Wanted Control		Wanted Affection	
Item	Key	Item	Key	Item	Key
28)	6-5	2)	6-5-4-3	29)	6-5
31)	6-5	6)	6-5-4-3	32)	6-5
34)	6-5	10)	6-5-4	35)	2-1
37)	6	14)	6-5-4	38)	6-5
39)	6	18)	6-5-4	40)	2-1
42)	6-5	20)	6-5-4	43)	6
45)	6-5	22)	6-5-4-3	46)	2-1
48)	6-5	24)	6-5-4	49)	6-5
51)	6-5	26)	6-5-4	52)	2-1

For Revised Edition
January, 1977

APPENDIX C

FAMILY STRUCTURE QUESTIONNAIRE INCLUDING
FAMILY ADAPTABILITY AND COHESION
EVALUATION SCALES (FACES)

1. What is your present year in school? (Check one)
☐ 1. Freshman ☐ 2. Sophomore ☐ 3. Junior ☐ 4. Senior
2. In which college are you currently enrolled?
☐ 1. Agriculture ☐ 4. Education
☐ 2. Arts & Sciences ☐ 5. Engineering
☐ 3. Business ☐ 6. Home Economics
3. What is your sex? ☐ 1. Female ☐ 2. Male
4. What is the date of your birth? Month Day Year
5. What was the approximate age of your mother when you were born?
6. What is your marital status?
☐ 1. Single, never married
☐ 2. Currently married
☐ 3. Previously married, but not now
7. Are you an International student? ☐ yes ☐ no If yes, what country are you from?
8. Where have you resided most of your life? (Check one)
☐ 1. Farm
☐ 2. Non-farm rural residence
☐ 3. Small town (population under 2,500)
☐ 4. Large town (population 2,500 - 24, 999)
☐ 5. Small city (population 25,000 - 100,000)
☐ 6. Large city (population over 100,000)

THE QUESTIONS ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES CONCERN YOUR FAMILY OF ORIGIN AND ANY GROUPS YOU LIVED IN WHILE YOU WERE GROWING UP. DO NOT INCLUDE FAMILIES YOU FORMED BY MARRIAGE OR BY COHABITATION.

Parenting Situations*

1. mother-father
2. mother alone
3. mother-grandmother
4. mother-aunt
5. mother-stepfather
6. mother-other
7. father alone
8. father-grandmother
9. father-aunt
10. father-stepmother
11. father-other
12. grandmother-other
13. aunt-other
14. other (describe)

*add the following
suffix when
applicable

A = adoption

F = foster

9. What type of parenting situation did you start out in? (See list on center of page, put appropriate number in blank and add suffix if applicable) _____ Provide description if using category 14. _____

10. In this family, how many brother and sisters did you have? _____

11. Were there any other children besides your brothers and sisters living in this family?
_____ yes _____ no If yes, how many? _____

12. Were there adults other than those included in question 9, living in this family? _____ yes
_____ no If yes, how many adults were there? _____
Identify each such adult (cousin, grandmother, friend, etc.) _____

13. How would you characterize this family's financial situation compared to others in the community?
_____ 1. Poorer than most
_____ 2. About the same as most
_____ 3. Better off than most

14. How satisfying do you remember your family life being during this time? (Circle number corresponding to the degree of satisfaction.)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	completely									completely
	unsatisfying									satisfying

IF YOU ARE STILL A PART OF THE FAMILY DESCRIBED
ABOVE SKIP TO PAGE FIVE OF THIS BOOKLET

IF YOUR FAMILY CHANGED
PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

15. What was the second type of parenting situation in which you lived? (See list on center of page, put appropriate number in blank and add suffix if applicable) _____ Provide description if using category 14. _____

16. What was your age when this change occurred? _____

17. What was the reason for the change? (See list at center bottom of page, describe if response is 5.) _____

18. Were there any changes in the number of children in the household? ____ yes ____ no If yes, how many children now lived in the household? _____ Identify children who entered or left. _____

19. Was there any change in the adult composition of the household? ____ yes ____ no How many adults now lived in the household? _____ Identify adults who entered or left. _____

20. How would you characterize this family's financial situation compared to others in the community?

- ____ 1. Poorer than most
 ____ 2. About the same as most
 ____ 3. Better off than most

21. How satisfying do you remember your family life being during this time? (Circle number corresponding to the degree of satisfaction)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
 completely completely
 unsatisfying satisfying

IF YOU ARE STILL A PART OF THE FAMILY DESCRIBED ABOVE
 SKIP TO PAGE FIVE OF THIS BOOKLET.

IF YOUR FAMILY CHANGED
 PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

Parenting Situations*

1. mother-father
2. mother alone
3. mother-grandmother
4. mother-aunt
5. mother-stepfather
6. mother-other
7. father alone
8. father-grandmother
9. father-aunt
10. father-stepmother
11. father-other
12. grandmother-other
13. aunt-other
14. other (describe)

*add the following
 suffix when
 applicable

A = adoptive

F = foster

Reasons for Change

1. separation
2. divorce
3. death
4. marriage
5. other (describe)

Parenting Situations*

1. mother-father
2. mother alone
3. mother-grandmother
4. mother-aunt
5. mother-stepfather
6. mother-other
7. father alone
8. father-grandmother
9. father-aunt
10. father-stepmother
11. father-other
12. grandmother-other
13. aunt-other
14. other (describe)

*add the following
suffix when
applicable

A = adoptive

F = foster

Reasons for Change

1. separation
2. divorce
3. death
4. marriage
5. other (describe)

22. What was the third type of parenting situation in which you lived? (See list on center of page, put appropriate number in blank and add suffix if applicable) _____
Provide description if using category 14. _____

23. What was your age when this change occurred? _____

24. What was the reason for the change? (See list at center, bottom of page, describe if response is 5.) _____

25. Were there any changes in the number of children in the household? ____ yes ____ no If yes, how many children now lived in the household? ____ Identify children who entered or left. _____

26. Was there any change in the adult composition of the household? ____ yes ____ no How many adults now lived in the household? ____ Identify adults who entered or left. _____

27. How would you characterize this family's financial situation compared to others in the community?

- ____ 1. Poorer than most
____ 2. About the same as most
____ 3. Better off than most

28. How satisfying do you remember your family life being during this time? (Circle number corresponding to the degree of satisfaction)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	completely									completely
	unsatisfying									satisfying

IF YOU ARE STILL A PART OF THE FAMILY DESCRIBED ABOVE
PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE .

IF YOUR FAMILY CHANGED AGAIN, ASK PERSON ADMINISTERING
THIS QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ADDITIONAL PAGES

ALL STUDENTS PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING 30 QUESTIONS
CONCERNING FUNCTIONING OF THE LAST FAMILY YOU DESCRIBED

FACES II

Code of Responses:

1	2	3	4	5
ALMOST NEVER	ONCE IN A WHILE	SOMETIMES	FREQUENTLY	ALMOST ALWAYS

(Circle one)

- 1 2 3 4 5 1. Family members are supportive of each other during difficult times.
- 1 2 3 4 5 2. In our family it is easy for everyone to express his/her opinion.
- 1 2 3 4 5 3. It is easier to discuss problems with people outside the family than with family members.
- 1 2 3 4 5 4. Each family member has input in major family decisions.
- 1 2 3 4 5 5. Our family gathers together in the same room.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6. Children have a say in their discipline.
- 1 2 3 4 5 7. Our family does things together.
- 1 2 3 4 5 8. Family members discuss problems and feel good about the solutions.
- 1 2 3 4 5 9. In our family, everyone goes his/her own way.
- 1 2 3 4 5 10. We shift household responsibilities from person to person.
- 1 2 3 4 5 11. Family members know each other's close friends.
- 1 2 3 4 5 12. It is hard to know what the rules are in our family.
- 1 2 3 4 5 13. Family members consult other family members on their decision.
- 1 2 3 4 5 14. Family members say what they want.
- 1 2 3 4 5 15. We have difficulty thinking of things to do as a family.

FACES II (CONTINUED)

Code of Responses:

1	2	3	4	5
ALMOST NEVER	ONCE IN A WHILE	SOMETIMES	FREQUENTLY	ALMOST ALWAYS

(Circle one)

- 1 2 3 4 5 16. In solving problems, the children's suggestions are followed.
- 1 2 3 4 5 17. Family members feel very close to each other.
- 1 2 3 4 5 18. Discipline is fair in our family.
- 1 2 3 4 5 19. Family members feel closer to people outside the family than to other family members.
- 1 2 3 4 5 20. Our family tries new ways of dealing with problems.
- 1 2 3 4 5 21. Family members go along with what the family decides to do.
- 1 2 3 4 5 22. In our family, everyone shares responsibility.
- 1 2 3 4 5 23. Family members like to spend their free time with each other.
- 1 2 3 4 5 24. It is difficult to get a rule changed in our family.
- 1 2 3 4 5 25. Family members avoid each other at home.
- 1 2 3 4 5 26. When problems arise, we compromise.
- 1 2 3 4 5 27. We approve of each other's friends.
- 1 2 3 4 5 28. Family members are afraid to say what is on their minds.
- 1 2 3 4 5 29. Family members pair up rather than do things as a total family.
- 1 2 3 4 5 30. Family members share interests and hobbies with each other.

FACES SCORE SHEET

- | | |
|-----------|-----------|
| 1. _____ | 2. _____ |
| 3. _____ | 4. _____ |
| 5. _____ | 6. _____ |
| 7. _____ | 8. _____ |
| 9. _____ | 10. _____ |
| 11. _____ | 12. _____ |
| 13. _____ | 14. _____ |
| 15. _____ | 16. _____ |
| 17. _____ | 18. _____ |
| 19. _____ | 20. _____ |
| 21. _____ | 22. _____ |
| 23. _____ | 24. _____ |
| 25. _____ | 26. _____ |
| 27. _____ | 28. _____ |
| 29. _____ | |
| 30. _____ | |

36	+	18	+
	-		-

- (3, 9, 15, 19, 25, 29)

- (12, 24, 28)

	+ other odd + 30		+ other even + 30
--	---------------------	--	----------------------

	Total Cohesiveness		Total Adaptability
--	-----------------------	--	-----------------------

APPENDIX D

CORRESPONDENCE



Oklahoma State University

DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY RELATIONS
AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74078
241 HOME ECONOMICS WEST
(405) 624-5057

November 2, 1984

Dr. David Olson
Department Family Social Science
University of Minnesota
290 McNeal
1985 Buford Avenue
St. Paul, MI 55108

Dear Dr. Olson:

I request permission to use your instrument FACES II in my dissertation. It will be used to assess family functioning in a study examining the influence of family structural history on the marital attitudes and relationship style of college students.

Dr. David Fournier of our staff has a copy of your book "Family Inventories" which provides me with the questions, scoring and other necessary data.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) Lois T. Mickle

Lois T. Mickle
Assistant Professor
Department of Family Relations
and Child Development





UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Family Social Science
290 McNeal Hall
1985 Buford Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
(612) 373-1544

November 8, 1984

Lois T. Mickel
Dept. of Family Relations & Child Development
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK 74078

Dear Colleague:

I am pleased to give you permission to use FACES II in your research project, teaching, or clinical work with couples and families. You can either duplicate the materials directly or have them retyped for use in a new format. If they are retyped, acknowledgement should be given regarding the name of the instrument, the developer's name, and the University of Minnesota.

If you are planning to use FACES II in a research project, please complete the enclosed Abstract Form and return it to me. This way we can keep track of the various studies being done using FACES II.

In exchange for providing this permission, we would appreciate a copy of any papers, thesis, or reports that you complete using these inventories. This will help us in staying abreast of the most recent development and research with these scales. Thank you for your cooperation.

If you are planning to use FACES II in clinical work with couples or families, we would appreciate hearing from you after you have had some experience with FACES II. Clinically, we recommend that as many people as possible in the family take FACES II. They should take it once for how they "perceive" their family and once for how they would like it to be "ideally."

This data can be graphically put onto the Circumplex table using the scores for the "perceived" and "ideal" for each family member. This provides a comprehensive picture of the family system. We have found this useful information for couples and families to see and discuss. It gives you and the family members some idea regarding direction for change. Post-assessment of the same families would enable you to see what dimensions and in what ways various family members have changed over the course of your treatment program.

In closing, I hope you find FACES II of value in your work with couples and families. We would appreciate hearing from you as you make use of this inventory.

Sincerely,

(Signed) David H. Olson, Ph.D.

David H. Olson, Ph.D.
Professor

Enc.: Abstract Form

2

VITA

Lois Thorfinnson Mickle

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: NUMBER OF FAMILIES EXPERIENCED BY COLLEGE STUDENTS AS RELATED
TO MARITAL ATTITUDES AND RELATIONSHIP STYLE

Major Field: Home Economics-Family Relations and Child Development

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Stillwater, Oklahoma, October 27, 1927,
the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Theodore S. Thorfinnson.
Married James B. Mickle, December 18, 1948.

Education: Graduated from Northeast High School, Lincoln, Nebraska,
in June, 1945; received Bachelor of Science degree in Home
Economics Education from the University of Nebraska in June,
1949; received Master of Arts degree in Home Management and
Child Development from Michigan State University in June,
1952; completed requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy
degree at Oklahoma State University in December, 1985.

Professional Experience: Assistant Instructor of Foods and
Nutrition at the University of Nebraska, 1949-1950; Graduate
Assistant in the nursery school, Department of Home Manage-
ment and Child Development, College of Home Economics,
Michigan State University, 1950-1952; Instructor and lead
teacher in the nursery school, 1952-1953; Instructor in
Family Relations and Child Development, Oklahoma State
University, 1965-1974; Assistant Professor, 1974 to present.

Professional Organizations: Phi Upsilon Omicron, Omicron Nu,
Delta Kappa Gamma, American Home Economics Association,
Oklahoma Home Economics Association, Southern Association
on Children Under Six, Oklahoma Association on Children Under
Six.