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INTRODUCTION

A great deal of research has focused on how parental marital conflict and divorce affects children. This research has pointed out some of the short-term effects of marital difficulty on children. However, very little has been written about what long-term effects may occur as a result of parental marital difficulty. This area of study should not be ignored, for it may introduce significant knowledge of use to both theorists and clinicians.

Most of the research on parental marital conflict and children supports the proposition that family break-up and subsequent divorce is a painful time for the child (Landis, 1960; Kelly and Wallerstein, 1976; McDermott, 1970; Wallerstein and Kelly, 1974, 1975). While younger children generally have feelings of guilt, as if they had caused the conflict, adolescents tend to react with great anger at their parents (Wallerstein and Kelly, 1974).

Adolescents whose parents experience marital conflict and divorce also tend to show a great deal of concern about their own future as marital partners. Wallerstein and Kelly (1974) explain this by pointing out that when parents divorce, the adolescent is presented with the possibility that divorce may occur in his/her future marital relations. Adolescents in the Wallerstein and Kelly (1974) study exhibited two different reactions to this concern. Some of them stated that they would never marry, thus completely avoiding the pain of divorce. The others, rather than rule out marriage completely, had decided that they would marry later and would be more selective of a marital partner.
The Wallerstein and Kelly study, as well as many others in this area, is a qualitative study; the sample was selected from a population of adolescents who had been referred for clinical counseling. Thus, with such a small sample (21 adolescents) from a select population, it is questionable at best to generalize from this study.

Using a larger, more representative sample, Ganong et al. (1981) focused on three areas: 1) attitudes toward marriage, 2) attitudes toward divorce, and 3) marriage role expectations. Subjects of the study were high school students enrolled in psychology, family living, or home economics courses in three Kansas public senior high schools. The sample consisted of 127 males and 194 females, 15 to 17 years old. Of the 321 respondents, 48 were from single-parent families, 48 from reconstituted families and 225 from intact families. Attitudes toward marriage did not differ significantly between the three groups, although adolescents from intact families were slightly more favorable. When comparisons were made by sex, there were no significant differences among females. Among males, there was a significant difference, with males from reconstituted families being less favorable toward marriage than those from single-parent or intact families. In addition, adolescents from reconstituted and single-parent families expressed more cynicism about why people marry when completing sentence stems.

Attitudes toward divorce differed significantly, with adolescents from reconstituted families being more favorable toward divorce than those from single-parent or intact families. This may be due to the
adolescent from a reconstituted family perceiving divorce as a positive way out of a negative situation (Ganong, et al., 1981).

The most significant difference in marriage-role expectations was not between adolescents from the three family types. It was between the sexes, with females being more egalitarian than males. Even adolescents from single-parent families seemed to stick to the more traditional concept of marriage roles.

Ganong et al. (1981) make the same assumption that many researchers have made when looking at the effects of divorce. They compare adolescents from divorced families to those from intact families without controlling for conflict within the intact family. When conflict has been controlled in other studies, the results have shown that those from divorced families may be better off than those in an unhappy, intact family (Burgess, 1970; Nye, 1957; Raschke and Raschke, 1979).

In a study of long-term effects of divorce, Bumpass and Sweet (1972) found evidence that marital instability may be socially inherited. They found that women whose parents had divorced or separated had a ten-point higher rate of marital disruption than women from intact families. Other studies have shown similar results (Greenberg and Nay, 1982; Heiss, 1972; Mueller and Pope, 1977; Pope and Mueller, 1976).

Pope and Mueller (1976) posit several possible rationales for why this "transmission of marital instability" occurs. The first argues that parental personality characteristics cause both the parents'
divorce and personality characteristics of the child, which cause the child's marital adjustment problems. The second uses an argument from economics, stating that the family's reduction in resources and downward mobility in social class make it less likely for the child to enter a high-status marriage. This subjects the child's marriage to the stresses associated with lower-class marriages. The third was the argument that family members provide "social control" over the child. A break in the family reduces the size of the network and thus, its effectiveness in social control. The fourth rationale argues that parents who are tolerant of divorce are more likely to divorce, and transmit these tolerant attitudes to their children.

The most common model used is the role model rationale (Pope and Mueller, 1976). This rationale stems from social learning theory and uses the notion that appropriate sex and marital roles are learned in the family. Children who come from unhappy or broken homes will not learn these roles as well as those from happy intact homes.

Greenberg and Nay (1982) focused on two possible explanations for the "transmission of marital instability." One of these is the role model rationale, the possibility that children may learn "maladaptive styles of marital interaction." The second is the communication of values regarding romanticism, marriage, and divorce from one generation to the next.

The first explanation, the role model rationale, was dismissed by the authors as unsubstantiated by their research. Their behavioral
measures of students' dating experience and of students' ability to resolve marital-conflict situations resulted in no significant difference between students from intact homes and those from broken homes. As they say, "just because children remember their parents' marriage as unhappy, does not necessarily mean that they received inadequate training in marital and/or parental roles" (Greenberg and Nay, 1982:344).

With regard to the communication of values, some support was found. The only significant difference among the three categories (intact, separated/divorced, and parent-deceased family) was with respect to attitudes toward divorce. Those who came from separated/divorced families showed a more favorable attitude toward divorce even when compared to those from unhappy-unbroken families. These findings suggest that students who come from families which were disrupted by divorce or separation may view divorce as a better alternative than remaining in a bad marriage because of their early experience. Those from unhappy-unbroken families are more likely to follow the parental role model of clinging to a relationship, even if it is unsatisfactory. Thus, part of the "transmission of marital instability" may be due to the desensitizing of children to divorce.

It is in this last area, the communication of values from one generation to the next, that the present study focuses. It is the purpose of this paper to determine the extent to which parental divorce or marital conflict affects the college student's attitudes toward
marriage and divorce. In addition, this study will look at other concepts related to marital attitudes, including attitudes toward cohabitation, ideal family size and childlessness, and attitudes toward singlehood. These will be examined not only in light of differences based on parental marital status, but also by examining differences based on demographic factors such as sex, urban-rural, religious background, etc. Significant differences in attitudes toward marriage and divorce, as well as the other concepts, based on parental marital status would have important ramifications for those in the counseling profession. This area cannot be ignored.

Control Factors

While the study will focus on the two independent measures parents' marital status and parents' marital happiness, other factors will be used in the data analysis as controls or background factors. These include age, sex, race, etc. Information on these factors is presented in the literature review to give the reader background knowledge on how these factors are likely to affect dependent measures.
LITERATURE REVIEW

This review of literature will focus on the four main areas discussed previously, namely, attitudes toward marriage and divorce, ideal family size and childlessness, attitudes toward cohabitation, and attitudes toward permanent singlehood.

Attitudes toward Marriage and Divorce

Two research efforts in this area were mentioned earlier (Ganong et al., 1981; Greenberg and Nay, 1982). Both of these reports found no significant difference in marital attitudes between those from intact, separated/divorced, or deceased parent families. The only exception was among males in the Ganong et al. (1981) study. The males who came from reconstituted families were less favorable toward marriage than those from single-parent or intact families.

A study by Wallin (1954) gives different results. Wallin's results support the idea that marriage attitudes are dependent on the family structure from which a respondent comes. The effects also are different depending on the sex of the respondent.

Wallin used a Guttman scale developed by Richard J. Hill to measure the respondents' attitude toward marriage. The scores were plotted against the respondents' evaluation of their parents' marital happiness. The age of the respondents ranged from 16 to 27, with the median age being 20.
For the men, a linear relationship is evident in the mean scores for the four categories. Men who came from "very happy" homes had the highest mean score (5.15). Men from "happy" homes were next with a score of 4.25, followed by "average to unhappy" and "divorced" with 3.56 and 3.03, respectively.

The same relationship did not occur for women as for men. The first two categories were "very happy" and "happy" (5.75 and 5.27), just as they were for the men. However, the next highest score was among women whose parents had divorced (5.24), with the women from "average to very unhappy" homes having the lowest score (4.18). Wallin accounted for this difference by maintaining that for women, marriage is perceived as a large part of their life. Thus, if their parents' marriage ends in divorce, women are more likely to use what they have learned from their parents' marital failure to make their own marriage successful. Another possibility is that females saw their mothers as much happier after the divorce and thus perceived the divorce in a more positive manner than males, who may have lost a role model due to the divorce. The first explanation deals with differential socialization of males and females, and would also account for the fact that in all four categories, women scored higher than men.

Attitudes toward divorce also appear to be dependent on family structure. Ganong et al. (1981) found that adolescents from reconstituted families were significantly more tolerant of divorce than those from single-parent or intact families. Greenberg and Nay (1982)
concluded that college students who came from separated/divorced families showed more tolerance for divorce than any other group. While these two seem to indicate different results, it must be noted that Greenberg and Nay (1982) did not distinguish between those whose custodial parent remarried and those whose custodial parent did not remarry. Only the Ganong study looked at differences in divorce attitudes based on the sex of the respondent.

Ideal Family Size

The concept of ideal family size became popular in the Gallup poll starting in the mid-1950s. Ideal family size deals with what the respondent believes the ideal number of children is for an average couple, as well as the ideal number of children they would like to have. Gustavus and Nam (1970) point out that the significance of this concept has increased as the availability of effective contraceptives has made it easier to attain the ideal.

While Gustavus and Nam (1970) found that girls in grade 12 reported a higher ideal family size than boys, other studies have shown little or no gender difference in ideal family size. Greenglass and Devins (1982) discuss the possibility of a relationship between family size ideals and employment of women. It seems logical to assume, as Greenglass and Devins did, that as women achieve more rewarding employment and begin to place more emphasis on careers, their ideal family size will decrease. Whether this decrease in expectations on the
part of women will lead to a gap between men and women in family size ideals is a matter of conjecture. It may be that men will adjust their expectations as they realize that a smaller family will benefit them also. If so, gender will continue to play a small role in differences in family size ideal.

The amount of influence size of family of orientation has on family size ideal has been much disputed. While some claim a strong relationship (Hendershot, 1969), others claim there is only a moderate relationship or no relationship at all (Duncan et al., 1965; Westoff et al., 1961; McAllister, Stokes and Knapp, 1974). Overall, most studies show a definite, though probably moderate relationship.

Clay and Zuiches (1980) tied size of family of orientation to reference group theory to explain ideal family hypothesized that the more one was exposed to the "dominant family size norms" the greater conformity there would be in family size ideals to those norms. They found that while the expected relationship occurred among women, it was absent for men. Wives who discuss family size ideals with reference group members tend to have a lower ideal family size than those who do not discuss family size ideals. It appears that socialization, through reference group discussion, as well as through early socialization (Gustavus and Nam, 1970), has an impact on family ideals expressed.

Disagreement can also be found in the area of urban-rural differences in family size ideals. Blake and Del Pinal (1979), in their study of Gallup polls from 1955 to 1973 and other studies of fertility,
conclude that the rural-urban differential has diminished to almost no influence at all. Clay and Zuiches (1980), on the other hand, still see a difference between rural and urban wives. This difference is toward larger ideal families for rural wives. The influence of reference group does not seem to apply to rural wives as it does for urban wives. It may be that urban wives are more influenced because of more frequent exposure to reference group members or that rural wives are simply reinforced toward larger family size by their discussion with reference group members.

The influence of race appears to be less disputed. Gustavus and Nam (1970) conclude that blacks want more children than whites at grade 12 level, although their data do not appear to be conclusive on this point. While blacks did express a higher mean ideal number of children for the average couple than whites (3.38 vs. 3.16), the difference in means for ideal number of children for themselves was very small (3.25 vs. 3.21). Blake and Del Pinal (1979) found that the influence of race in explaining differences in family size ideals has increased dramatically. Before 1970, race when added to age and sex, increased explained variance by only 8 percent. After 1970, the addition of race in the regression increased explained variance by 206 percent. It would appear that race is a fairly promising predictor of family size ideals and warrants further study.

Religious affiliation may be losing influence as a predictor of family size ideal (Blake and Del Pinal, 1979). When one adds religion
to age, sex and race in the regression, the amount of variance explained was increased by 104 percent before 1970 and 35 percent after 1970.

Gustavus and Nam (1970) indicate that it appears that Catholic students always chose a higher ideal family size for both themselves and for the average couple. This conclusion is suspect since only 9.2 percent of the sample respondents were Catholic. However, considering the Catholic position concerning birth control, this result may indeed hold up under further testing.

Education has an affect on the family size ideals of men and women.

Blake and Del Pinal (1979) conclude that the importance of education in predicting family size ideals has increased. Clay and Zuiches (1980) reported the same results, with higher education levels resulting in lower family size ideals. The importance of reference group discussion and size of family of origin diminishes if the woman is college educated. If she has little group discussion and a large family of origin, the tendency to select a high ideal family size can be decreased by higher educational achievement.

Finally, Blake and Del Pinal (1979) conclude that family income has little value in predicting family size ideals. They explain this by noting that two factors previously mentioned, race and education, have a great deal of influence on family income levels. Thus, the common notion that the poor want more children is not supported by their results.
Blake and Del Pinal (1979) emphasize that only a few of the demographic concepts listed are useful for predicting family size ideals. They name four as being most promising: age, race, religious affiliation, and education. None of the studies cited discussed possible affects of parents' marital status on their children's subsequent choice of ideal family size.

**Voluntary childlessness**

This section will deal with the choice of some people to not have children. Voluntary childlessness has been on the increase in recent years. Estimates and studies have indicated that the incidence of voluntary childlessness in America may range from 1 percent of all couples to 17 percent (Blake, 1979; Greenglass and Devins, 1982; Pohlman, 1970). Some of these figures represent anticipated childlessness and may therefore not reflect actual childlessness. But it is safe to assume that more couples will choose not to have children in the future for various reasons. But first, it would be good to review some of the more traditional views of voluntary childlessness.

**Traditional attitudes toward voluntary childlessness** The traditional view of childlessness and the childless couple was negative. One author states that "in the Western world, there is one expectation about which almost everyone agrees: married couples should have children" (Veevers, 1980:1). The pressure for the married couple to have children comes from several fronts. One is the pressure of parents who want to be grandparents. Another is religious or moral obligation
to produce children. The official doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church is that a couple who marry and intend to remain childless do not have a valid marriage in the eyes of God (Pohlman, 1970). Social norms, in a more general way, also put pressure on the couple to bear children. Those who are described as being intentionally childless are viewed in a negative manner as being psychologically maladjusted or selfish (Calhoun and Selby; 1980; Pohlman, 1970).

Theories from both the sociological and psychological realm lend support to this negative view of voluntary childlessness. Erikson (1950) views having children as a necessary step in psychosocial development. Without generativity, Erikson feels the individual regresses "to an obsessive need for pseudo intimacy, punctuated by moments of mutual repulsion...often with a pervading sense (and objective evidence) of individual stagnation and interpersonal impoverishment" (1950:231). Parenthood is seen as a necessary step in individual ego identity formation.

This negative view of childlessness can also be identified in social role theory as presented by Perlman (1968). Perlman includes parenthood as one of three "vital roles" and states that "parenthood is probably a major dynamic in the psychosocial development of the adult" (1969:116). The assumption of this and other views is that one cannot be fulfilled unless one has children and that to want children is a natural, instinctual trait. Pohlman (1970) argues that a great deal of what is considered parental instincts can actually be attributed to
social learning. It is quite apparent that there is a norm concerning parenthood which dictates that every "normal" couple have at least one child. This view is passed on from one generation to the next with very few questions. Recently, there have been some individuals who do raise questions, and whose answers result in their decision not to have children.

Reasons for remaining childless According to Baum (1983), there are four main orientations toward childlessness. Each of these orientations offers different reasons for remaining childless. The four orientations are hedonistic, idealistic, emotional and practical.

The couple who falls into the hedonistic category generally state freedom as being the main reason that they don't want children. Not having children was seen as a means of achieving a higher standard of living. Children are a nuisance and restrict the couple's ability to spend their money as they wish. The couple may enjoy playing with other people's children but do not wish to tie themselves down by having their own.

Couples who fall into the idealistic category are most concerned with social problems and decide not to have children for one of two reasons. They may feel that they don't want to raise children in the world as it is today since it would be unfair to the children to bring them into such a bad situation. They may also feel that with problems being as prevalent, having children would only add to the problems. This kind of couple likes children and may be most likely to adopt.
Those couples who are found in the emotional category of voluntary childlessness decide not to have children because they do not like children and the disruption they bring. The negative aspects of raising children are emphasized including lack of quiet time, smelly diapers, etc. People in this category do not spend much time playing with other people's children and tend to have very strong views of how children should be brought up. They tend to feel that children should be brought up in a strict manner and should be treated as little adults. This group is most likely to feel the pronatalist pressure to bear children and, therefore, are very aggressive in stating their reasons for not wanting children.

Those couples in the fourth category are characterized by their overall desire to have children, but their decision to not have children is based on practical reasons. One of the practical reasons mentioned is age. Those who married later in life may fear that childbirth could be dangerous for the mother. Also, older people were more likely to see children as disrupting and forcing considerable adjustment which they didn't feel capable of doing. Another reason mentioned was career aspirations. Those who wanted a career did not want children to disrupt their plans. The third reason was consideration of health. Physical handicaps and emotional problems were most frequently denoted here. All of these reasons are linked by a common concern that the couple could not satisfy the parental role due to their specific circumstances.
Other reasons have been enumerated by various authors. The realization that children may diminish the quality of the marriage relationship is one reason for not having children (Baum and Cope, 1980; Goodbody, 1977). The desire for both privacy and a serene lifestyle was important to some of the respondents (Goodbody, 1977). A general dislike of the maternal role and its subsequent loss of freedom was also frequently mentioned (Goodbody, 1977; Pohlman, 1970).

Demographics of voluntary childlessness

There are many demographic factors which correlate with voluntary childlessness. Some of these are obvious, based on the information preceding on reasons for childlessness. One is the wife's employment. Researchers have agreed that the employment of the wife results in a larger incidence of childlessness (Ritchey and Stokes, 1974; Baum and Cope, 1980; Grindstaff, Balakrishnan and Ebenks, 1981).

Income is another factor which correlates with voluntary childlessness (Gustavus and Henley, 1971; Kunz, Brinkerhoff and Hundley, 1973; Ritchey and Stokes, 1974). Contrary to the popular myth that "the rich get richer and the poor get children," two of the studies found that there is a higher incidence of childlessness at lower income levels than at higher incomes (Kunz et al., 1973; Ritchey and Stokes, 1974).

Kunz et al. (1973) also looked at income while controlling for the husband's occupation. They found that in all occupational categories, the highest rate of childlessness was in the lowest level of income. The relationship of income to childlessness is not always linear, with
increasing income bringing decreasing childlessness, but the lowest income category is consistently the highest in incidence of childlessness.

Gustavus and Henley (1971) contradict this by noting that regardless of how one measures status (occupation, income or education), the relationship between status and childlessness remains consistent. They found that childless couples tend to be of a higher status than the United States population in general. The mean income of the husband with no children was $8,860, while the mean for U.S. males was $6,159, according to 1967 Census data. The same relationship holds for women ($4,436 to $2,601).

This study may offer more insight in that it examines the childless couple side-by-side with the average couple. Thus, while lower income levels may have a large number of childless couples, when one looks at the number of people in those lower income levels, the proportion is not as impressive. For example, 30 percent of the U.S. male population earned less than $3,000 in 1967. Yet this group represented only 6 percent of the males requesting voluntary sterilization. On the other hand, 11 percent of males earned between $10,000 and $14,999 in the U.S. in 1967 and this group made up 29 percent of the males requesting sterilization.

The relationship between level of education and incidence of childlessness is not as clear as Gustavus and Henley (1971) indicate. Other studies have shown that education is positively correlated with
childlessness only for women below age 30 (Ritchey and Stokes, 1974; Grindstaff et al., 1981). These studies indicate that the relationship between education and childlessness is not a direct relationship. Many couples postpone the bearing of children until the wife has completed her education. Thus, the college-educated woman may only be temporarily childless and may, as Grindstaff et al. (1981) put it, "catch up" once their education is complete. The data which Ritchey and Stokes (1974) present seems to indicate that the highest incidence of projected childlessness is among women with a grade-school education or less.

Religious beliefs seem to have an inverse relationship with childlessness. All the studies agreed that believers in God are more likely to be pronatalists and are therefore less likely to want to remain childless (Gustavus and Henley, 1971; Blake, 1979; Grindstaff et al., 1981). Grindstaff et al. (1981) differ from the others in stating that after age 40, presence or absence of religious belief had no significant effect on level of childlessness.

With regard to religious affiliation, the data are again mixed. Grindstaff et al. (1981) conclude that there is no difference in rates of childlessness between the various religious groups. Blake (1979) disagrees, finding that both Catholics and Jews are more pronatalist than are Protestants. Gustavus and Henley (1971) complicate things all the more by concluding that, while Catholics are under-represented among the childless, Jews and "other Protestants" (not Baptist, Methodist, or Presbyterian) are over-represented. The conclusion of Grindstaff et al.
(1981), while being the most recent, are questionable. Their conclusions are based on census data and there was no way for them to determine whether or not a couple was voluntarily childless.

Incidence of childlessness is positively correlated with community size (Veevers, 1971; Grindstaff et al., 1981). Both studies conclude that urban areas have the greatest level of childlessness, while rural areas have the lowest level of childlessness. These studies concur with previous studies on family size ideals which showed rural men and women wanting larger families.

Ascribed characteristics which have been shown to be related to levels of childlessness include sex, age (duration of marriage), and race. Blake (1979) found that men were more likely than women to express disadvantages of remaining childless. This sex difference was most pronounced in the concern that childless marriages are more likely to end in divorce. This sex difference occurs in all age groups and at all levels of education. In fact, the difference is the greatest between men and women with a college education.

Differences in childlessness based on age and marriage duration are fairly well predictable. Veevers (1971) and Grindstaff et al. (1981) both note that the incidence of childlessness decreases among women as they grow older and as they are married longer. These findings do not deal with voluntary childlessness as it correlates with age. Blake (1979) found that the young are considerably less pronatalist than the old. This indicates that the young are more likely to see childlessness
as an alternative, although pressures to bear children may decrease the actual numbers who follow through on the decision.

The popular myth that non-whites have more children finds no support in the literature. Kunz et al. (1973) discovered that non-white persons are more likely to remain childless than are whites. This relationship holds even when one compares different races at various income levels.

Of particular interest to this study is the finding of Goodbody (1977) regarding a possible relationship between an unhappy childhood and voluntary childlessness. While her study sample is very small (six women were interviewed), she indicates that four described their childhood as being primarily unhappy. While no generalizations can be made regarding a positive relationship between unhappy childhood and higher levels of childlessness from such a small sample, it does indicate that such a relationship may occur and should be studied further.

Attitudes toward Cohabitation

Studies of cohabitation, persons of the opposite sex living together outside of marriage, have become popular since the early 1970s. These studies have focused on two areas: reasons for or against cohabitation and factors correlated with cohabitation.
Reasons for or against cohabitation

Two studies have examined in detail the reasons why students live together and also the reasons why some do not choose to cohabit (Macklin, 1972; Huang-Hickrod and Leonard, 1980). The reasons for cohabiting can be divided into two parts: actual reasons that the couple lived together and perceived benefits of the relationship.

Among the reasons mentioned in favor of living together were: convenience, testing for compatibility, being in love, hope for a more permanent relationship, and economic benefits (Huang-Hickrod and Leonard, 1980). Economics could also be considered an advantage or perceived benefit of the living arrangement. Other benefits mentioned were: an increase in emotional maturity, better understanding and ability to relate to others, and a clarification of what they would want from a marital relationship (Macklin, 1972).

Reasons for not living together mainly involved the influence of others in the life of the students. Not surprisingly, the most frequently mentioned reason against cohabitating was parental disapproval (Macklin, 1972). This was followed by disapproval of the intended partner, conscience, and fear of pregnancy. All three of these can also be seen to stem from societal disapproval of the living arrangement.

Disadvantages or problems encountered within the relationship are similar to problems which may be encountered in a marital relationship. Sexual problems were mentioned by almost every respondent. There was
also a tendency for the individuals to become over-involved and become too dependent on the relationship (Macklin, 1972).

Factors associated with cohabitation

Despite the fact that many of the research studies on cohabitation have focused on students, cohabitation is not just a living arrangement popular among college age people. Lyness, Lipetz and Davis (1972), in a survey of 49 couples who were either going together or living together, found a higher percentage of students in the going-together group than in the living-together group. Peterman, Ridley and Anderson (1974) found that, for students, it was far more likely for them to have cohabiting experience if they lived off campus than if they lived in a dormitory.

When questioned about their lifestyle, cohabiters were likely to categorize themselves as liberal (Henze and Hudson, 1974). When drug use was examined, this categorization is supported, with a much larger percentage of cohabiters having experimented with both marijuana and hard drugs. Cohabiters were also more likely to continue to use drugs.

The relationship between gender and cohabitation is unclear. Peterman et al. (1974) found that men and women in their survey were equally likely to have had a cohabiting experience. However, they did find that males were more likely to have engaged in more than one such relationship (62 percent of the males versus 41 percent of females). Contradictory findings were reported by Huang-Hickrod and Leonard (1980), who found that more males cohabited than females, with male
cohabitation peaking at 33 percent in 1973 and female cohabitation peaking at 19 percent in 1975. Bower and Christopherson (1977) also found a higher percentage of males cohabiting than females. They also noted that there was no significant regional difference in cohabitation.

For the most part, religious affiliation seems to have little affect on the choice to cohabit. The only difference indicated was among women, where Catholics were disproportionately represented, that is they had a high percentage of cohabitation compared to their percentage of the total population (Peterman et al., 1974; Henze and Hudson, 1974). Henze and Hudson (1974) consider this to be a reaction by Catholic women to increased freedom after leaving home, where they assume Catholics had stricter parents than Protestants.

While religious affiliation appears to have little affect, three of the studies did indicate a connection between religion and cohabitation (Lyness et al., 1972; Henze and Hudson, 1974; Huang-Hickrod and Leonard, 1980). All three present evidence that cohabiters were infrequent attenders of church services or were not as strong in their religious beliefs. Thus, the typical cohabiter may be only a nominal Christian, with little real religious belief.

Family background factors which may have an affect on cohabitation include parents' marital stability, parental discipline, and happiness of adolescence. Two of the studies found that males whose parents were separated or divorced were more likely to be cohabiters (Peterman et al., 1974; Henze and Hudson, 1974). Henze and Hudson (1974) found that
cohabiting students were more likely to view parental discipline as too restrictive. And it was found that males who were only going steady with a female (not living together) reported a happier adolescence than all others.

Attitudes toward Singlehood

Members of our society hold a view of those who remain single which is essentially negative. This view follows along the same lines as the negative image of voluntarily childless couples. For the most part, people believe that it is "normal" for a person to get married and anyone who does not get married is "incapable of being married, and that's why they're single" (Adams, 1976:53). Early psychological and sociological theories supported the single-as-deviant outlook. Some of these theories will be examined, followed by more contemporary, less negative treatments of singlehood.

Traditional views of singlehood

Much of the early research focused on singles as being in a transitional state. The basic assumption was that they would eventually get married if they could only find the right person. Two theories of note which influenced these early studies were mentioned in a previous section on voluntary childlessness. They are Erikson's psychosocial development, and social role theory (Erikson, 1950; Perlman, 1968).

Erikson (1950) talks about stage six in psychosocial development as the conflict of intimacy vs. isolation. While he does not specifically
say that all people must marry in order to achieve proper psychosocial development, he does emphasize the need for each human to have intimate relations with a member of the opposite sex. He goes on to talk in great detail about heterosexual relationships and the need for physical intimacy. Thus, two assumptions are made by Erikson. First, he assumes that physical intimacy in the form of sexual activity is necessary for psychosocial development. Second, he assumes that an intimate relationship must be with a person of the opposite sex.

Perlman (1968) includes marriage and the marital role as one of the three vital roles in adulthood (parenthood was covered previously). There is no real discussion as to why marriage is so essential; it is simply stated as being that way. The assumption that one can draw from this emphasis on the need to marry is that a person who does not marry is in some way abnormal. Kuhn puts it very bluntly when he describes singlehood as "a failure which reflects the individual's shortcomings and inadequacies" (Stein, 1975:492).

Contemporary studies of singlehood

Recent studies have rejected the assumption that people must marry, and that those who don't are abnormal. Instead, they have tended to focus on reasons for remaining single, as well as some demographic factors associated with singlehood. They also have examined the psychological well-being of single adults. That the influence of the early theorists did not die quickly is evident in a study by Baker (1968). While Baker makes a point of showing that women who do not
marry can be as well adjusted as their married counterparts, he gives
tacit approval to Erikson and the rest by describing these women as
having been "denied a husband and children."

Motivations toward singlehood and marriage Stein (1975), in one
of the earliest new treatments of singlehood, discusses what he terms
"pushes" and "pulls" toward singlehood or marriage. "Pushes" toward
marriage include economic security, parental pressure, loneliness, etc.
"Pulls" toward marriage include influence of parents, peer examples,
love, etc. Each of these can act on a person to cause them to decide to
marry. On the other hand, some of the "pushes" toward singlehood
include poor communication with mate, sexual frustration, lack of
friends, etc. "Pulls" toward singlehood include career opportunities,
sexual availability, freedom to change and experiment, support groups,
etc. Thus, the decision to marry or to remain single is based on how
one views these "pushes" and "pulls" as they affect their life.

Laner, Laner and Palmer (1979) use Stein's "pushes" and "pulls" and
expand on his study by looking at male/female differences, the weight
the "pushes" and "pulls" have in the decision, and by looking at
responses in light of parental marital happiness. They found that 7.8
percent of their sample planned to remain single. Their data on
"pushes" and "pulls" indicate that men and women put approximately equal
weight on all but three of the motivations. "Love" was the strongest
factor in favor of marriage for both sexes, while a variety of
experiences and self-sufficiency were strong factors toward remaining
single.
While parental happiness did not seem to affect the respondents' future marriage plans or their current courtship status, it did have an effect on the importance they placed on some of the motivations. Those whose parents were perceived as happy placed greater importance on cultural expectations, influence of parents, and economic security as motivators toward marriage than did those whose parents were perceived as unhappy. They also placed lesser importance on limitations on mobility and possibility of sexual frustration as motivators toward singlehood.

Huang-Hickrod and Leonard (1980) present an interesting comparison of traditional views of singlehood with contemporary views (see Figure 1). Model I is the result of the traditional pressures to marry. The person who makes the decision to remain single and encounters these pressures undergoes role strain and the frustrations of being socially marginal. Model II shows the outcome when the person who chooses to remain single legitimizes the choice, finds a support group, and through these develops an "ideology of singleness." This person is able to achieve personal fulfillment and psychological well-being.

Demographics of singlehood While the number of people who choose to remain single throughout their adult life is small—Laner et al. (1979) found 7.8 percent who planned to remain single—it is still important to look at these people in greater detail. Baker (1968) discounts the idea that those who don't marry will be miserable, by noting that 90 percent of women who never married said they were content with their life.
Family relations within the family of orientation may play an important role in an individual's choice to remain single. As was previously noted, Laner et al. (1979) did find a difference in emphasis on several motivators toward marriage or singlehood depending on the respondents' perception of their parents' marital happiness. Railings (1966) found two family variables which distinguished the married male from the never-married male. One was a father's work schedule which was considerably different from other fathers in the neighborhood. The other was never-married males were more likely to come from "disgraced" homes, which Railings qualifies as any family where either parent suffered from substance abuse, had been in prison, or had a reputation of infidelity. Also considered "disgraced" were families in which parents were considered poor credit risks or poor providers.

Spreitzer and Riley (1974) also deal with family relationships in their study. They found that for males, there was an association between poor relations with parents and siblings and subsequent singlehood. For females the relationship is different. Females were more likely to have bad relations with their mother but had good relations with father and siblings. A "family pathology" index, which looked at various problems in family background, was employed to further investigate this area. Those who were raised in a family categorized as
high in family pathology were two to three times more likely to remain single as those from families with low pathology scores.

Two other factors found by Laner et al. (1979) are attitudes toward divorce and respondents' current courtship status. They found that people with a negative attitude towards divorce would underemphasize the negative aspects of marriage, while those who were positive toward divorce emphasized positive aspects of singlehood. They also found that those men and women who were not currently headed toward marriage also tended to look at singlehood in a positive manner.

Some of the more "traditional" demographic factors are covered by Spreitzer and Riley (1974). One of the results they note is that white females appear to have a greater propensity toward singlehood than black females (11 percent vs. 6 percent). This relationship did not occur among males. The authors attribute this difference to the fact that a majority of black females are in lower SES categories. When socioeconomic status was controlled for, the difference diminished significantly.

A comparison of religious background uncovered a statistically significant difference between Catholics and Protestants. For both males and females, Catholics were more likely to remain single than Protestants. The difference was greater for females, where 15 percent of Catholics had never married compared to 8 percent of Protestants. Application of control variables did not change the relationship. The authors attributed these differences to the tradition in the Catholic Church of religious celibacy by priests and nuns.
Education appears to have a significant effect, particularly among the women (Spreitzer and Riley, 1974). Of those women who had some college education, 25 percent were not married. This compares favorably with intelligence as a factor, where it was found that intelligent females were most likely to remain single. Males, on the other hand, had the reverse tendency with the most intelligent males having the lowest rate of singlehood.

The same relationship is found when one examines occupational achievement. Women with high occupational achievement are most likely to remain single, while males with high occupational achievement are least likely to remain single. Several explanations are possible for these differences. First, there may be great pressure on high status women to not "marry down" or conversely, men may feel threatened by successful women. Second, it may be that the relationship is the reverse of that theorized. In other words, high achievement may be the result of remaining single and not the cause of it. Third, it may very well be that women in higher status positions may choose not to be married, achieving contentment and fulfillment through their career.

A curious relationship between birth order and singlehood is also expounded by Spreitzer and Riley (1974). They note that a male "only child" is much more likely to remain single than a male with siblings (18 percent vs. 8 percent). They also found that first-born females are also slightly more likely to remain single than any other female. They attribute these differences to more intensive socialization given the
only child or first-born child, which results in higher rates of achievement and more concentration on outside success.

Summary

The purpose of this literature review was to present some of the pertinent information available on the four subjects presented. The demographic factors which had been determined to affect the four concepts were presented as background for the data which is to come. Particular interest is on the factors of marital stability and marital happiness of respondents' parents.

On the information presented from previous studies, one can see some patterns emerging. Attitudes toward marriage appear to be affected by parents' marital stability and happiness. While the studies are somewhat contradictory in this area, not all of the studies deal with marital happiness. It is expected that marital happiness of parents will have a positive relationship with marriage attitudes, that is, the happier the parents' marriage is perceived by the respondent, the more positive the attitudes toward marriage.

With respect to divorce tolerance, the relationship to parents' marital happiness will probably be an inverse one. Thus, the happier the parents' marriage, the lower the tolerance for divorce on the part of the respondent.

While none of the studies reviewed on ideal family size relate parents' marital happiness to children's choice of how many children
they want, the study by Goodbody (1977) regarding voluntary childlessness may be helpful. This study found a possible relationship between an unhappy childhood and the subsequent decision to not have children. To the extent that marital conflict can be associated with an unhappy childhood, it is expected that this could decrease the number of children desired by the respondent.

Attitudes toward cohabitation also appear to be affected by parents' marital happiness. The relationship here is expected to be an inverse one, with respondents whose parents were very happy having the most negative attitudes toward cohabitation.

It is also expected, based on the study by Laner et al. (1979), that those who express a positive outlook toward singlehood will be more likely to have parents whose marriage was perceived as unhappy as those with a negative outlook toward singlehood.

If all these relationships hold up, then the communication of values rationale expounded in the introduction will receive some support. It may be that what children learn from their parents' marital problems is that traditional values of marriage and parenthood should be questioned, that personal satisfaction does not depend on having a spouse and children.
METHODS

Data for this study were obtained by use of a questionnaire. The questionnaire was administered to students enrolled in Introductory Sociology (Sociology 134) at Iowa State University during the fall semester of 1983.

The original survey consisted of 1385 students. Of these, twenty respondents requested that their information not be used in the study. Their request was honored, thus reducing the sample size to 1365. In addition, respondents who indicated they were or had been married and respondents from foreign countries were also removed from the data. This left the actual number of respondents whose information could be used at 1276.

Characteristics of the Sample

Of the 1276 respondents, 654 were male and 618 were female (4 respondents did not indicate their gender). The majority of the respondents were aged 20 or less, as was expected given the reputation of Sociology 134 as a freshman level class. The actual age distribution of the sample was: 739 at age 18 or less, 421 at age 19 or 20, 96 at age 21 to 24, and 16 who were 25 or older. Distribution according to class level was heavily in favor of the freshman class. Of the 1273 who indicated their class level, 892 were freshman (70.1%), 261 were sophomores (20.5%), 84 were juniors (6.6%), and 36 were seniors (2.8%).
The racial and ethnic distribution was heavily skewed, with 1149 respondents being white (90.8%), 85 who were black (6.7%), and 32 who indicated they were of some other racial background (included Hispanic, American Indian and Asian/Pacific Islander--12 respondents did not answer this question). Respondents' rural-urban background was questioned in two ways. First, respondents were asked to indicate the population size of the community they had lived in or near for the majority of their life. This distribution was: 305 lived in areas of population less than 2,500, 601 in areas of population between 2,500 and 50,000, and 360 in areas of population 50,000 or more (10 missing cases). Respondents were also asked to choose which of the following terms best described their background: rural, small town, and urban-suburban. Rural was the choice of 301 respondents, 360 chose small town, and 608 chose urban-suburban (5 missing cases).

Two questions were used concerning religion. The first was a question of religious preference. The response categories were predominantly Christian, since it was expected that most respondents would identify with some Christian denomination. The largest response category was Catholic (434), followed by Lutheran (228), Methodist (208), other Protestant (100), Baptist (93), Presbyterian (91), other religious faiths (63), and 53 had no religious preference.

Religious intensity can be measured by determining involvement in activities related to religion. This could be done by asking for the number of activities involved in, or by determining the number of
contact hours per week which the respondent has in religious activities. The latter was the choice for this study, since it better determines the time commitment involved. When respondents were asked how many hours per week they spent in religion-related activities, 353 indicated they spent no time, 603 between a half hour and a full hour, 234 spent two to three hours per week, and 83 spent four hours or more per week (3 missing cases).

The variables of most interest for this study are those concerning parent's marital status and marital happiness. Parents who were still married was the modal category, with 1,018 (80.6%) respondents indicating their parents were still married. The remaining categories were: divorced with neither parent remarried, 69 (5.5%); divorced with one or both parents remarried, 107 (8.5%); one or both parents deceased, 69 (5.5%). Thus, 176 (13.0%) of the respondents had experienced the divorce of their natural parents sometime during their life.

The parental happiness variable was measured by asking respondents for their opinion of the happiness of their parents in their marriage up to the time the respondent was age 12. This method was used by Wallin (1954) and has been determined (Burr, Swenson and Cannon, 1976) to be a valid means of measuring parental happiness. The reason for asking the respondent directly rather than questioning the parents is that the child's perception of his/her parents' marital happiness will have more effect than the actual happiness of the parents. While most respondents indicated that their parents were either "happy" (409 or 32.4%) or "very
happy" (374 or 29.7%), a significant number saw their parents' marriage in a negative manner. "Very unhappy" was used by 134 (10.6%) respondents and "unhappy" was used by 62 (4.9%) respondents to describe their parents' marital happiness. The remainder indicated "average" happiness (211 or 16.7%) or that their parents were no longer living together when they were age 12 (71 or 5.6%).

**Measurement of Dependent Variables**

There are five main dependent variables, each dealing with some aspect of the family. The five variables are: attitudes toward marriage, divorce tolerance, ideal age for marriage, ideal family size, and attitudes toward cohabitation.

Measurement of attitudes toward marriage was accomplished through the use of a scale developed by Richard J. Hill and reported by Paul Wallin (1954). The scale consists of nine items which are scored with a one (1) if the respondent's answer is favorable toward marriage and a zero (0) if the response is negative or less favorable toward marriage. Total scores for the scale ranged from zero to nine. The reliability of this scale was reported by Straus (1969) as being 0.92.

Divorce tolerance was measured by using the divorce opinionaire developed by K. R. Hardy and reported by Shaw and Wright (1967). This scale consists of twelve items, half of which express attitudes favorable toward divorce and half unfavorable toward divorce. Each item was scored from zero to four, with zero representing the most negative
attitude towards divorce and four the most positive attitude toward divorce. Scale scores can range from 0 to 48. Straus (1969) reported the reliability for this scale, with a split-half r of 0.85.

Ideal age for marriage was determined by asking the respondent what would be the ideal age of marriage for them. Of particular interest are those respondents who answered that they would never marry.

Ideal family size was measured by asking the respondent how many children they planned to have. Response categories ranged from zero to six or more. Special interest in this area is on those who expressed a desire to have no children.

Attitudes toward cohabitation were measured by questioning respondents on their expected behavior concerning cohabitation. They were asked if they would: 1) live with a person of the opposite sex prior to marriage, 2) live with a person of the opposite sex but never marry, or 3) not cohabit at all (marriage or live alone). Thus, the response could indicate a negative attitude toward cohabitation, a view of cohabitation as part of the courtship process, or a view of cohabitation as an alternative to marriage.

Hypotheses

Several hypotheses can be made regarding relationships between independent and dependent measures. The main focus of the study is on long-term affects of parents' marital instability, therefore, most of the hypotheses deal with the independent measures "parents' marital
status" and "parents' marital happiness." Other factors mentioned in the literature review will be used as control variables. An attempt will be made to fit all variables into a total model which will aid in determining factors which affect the dependent variables.

Hypothesis 1: Respondents whose parents have divorced will show less adherence to traditional values on all of the dependent measures than respondents whose parents are still married.

Hypothesis 1A: Respondents whose parents have divorced will have a lower attitude-toward-marriage scale score than respondents whose parents remained married.

Hypothesis 1B: Respondents whose parents have divorced will have a higher divorce-tolerance-scale score than respondents whose parents remained married.

Hypothesis 1C: Respondents whose parents have divorced will express a higher ideal age for marriage than respondents whose parents remained married.

Hypothesis 1D: Respondents whose parents have divorced will express a smaller ideal family size than respondents whose parents remained married.

Hypothesis 1E: Respondents whose parents have divorced will express greater tolerance for cohabitation, either as an alternative to marriage or as a part of the courtship process, than respondents whose parents remained married.
Hypothesis 2: A direct relationship exists between parents' marital happiness and traditional views on all the dependent measures. The happier their parents' marriage was perceived by the respondents, the more traditional the respondents will be on the dependent measures.

Hypothesis 2A: The happier their parents' marriage was perceived by the respondents, the higher the attitude-toward-marriage scale score.

Hypothesis 2B: The happier their parents' marriage was perceived by the respondents, the lower the divorce-tolerance scale score.

Hypothesis 2C: The happier their parents' marriage was perceived by the respondents, the lower will be the expressed ideal age for marriage.

Hypothesis 2D: The happier their parents' marriage was perceived by the respondents, the larger will be the expressed ideal family size.

Hypothesis 2E: The happier their parents' marriage was perceived by the respondents, the lower will be their tolerance for cohabitation as an alternative or as part of the courtship process.

Hypothesis 3: Of the two independent measures mentioned, parents' marital status and happiness of parents' marriage, the latter will have more influence on the dependent measures than the former.

Statistical Techniques

All statistical techniques employed in this study utilized the SPSSX program on the ISU main-frame computer. The data were first examined in simple frequencies form, in order to eliminate missing
values, inappropriate responses, and the responses of those which the study does not address. Frequencies of all variables are reported in the Appendix.

The two scales used in the questionnaire will be examined in two ways. Both the attitudes-toward-marriage scale and the divorce tolerance scale items will be tested by using the reliability test. They also will be tested together and separately using factor analysis to determine the number of factors involved in each scale. Both of these tests will be used to determine whether the scales are actually reliable and if they can be used as scales. Both tests are reported in the Appendix.

The next step involves the use of a Pearson correlation matrix and breakdowns of the dependent variables by certain independent variables. Pearson's correlation was used for all independent variables in which there was order in the responses. The breakdowns procedure was used for all independent variables in which the responses had no logical order. Results of the Pearson correlation matrix are reported in the Appendix along with those breakdowns which proved significant through analysis of variance.

Finally, all variables which appear significant in the above tests will be used in regression analysis to determine the contribution of each independent variable to the variance of each dependent variable. All variables which make a significant difference will be incorporated into a model to explain differences in the various attitudes examined.
Special emphasis will be placed on the contributions of parents' marital status and the happiness of the parents' marital relationship to determine if divorce or marital conflict significantly affects later adult attitudes.
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

This section serves two purposes. First, the hypotheses will be examined in light of the data collected. Second, all variables will be examined to determine their impact on the dependent variables. By doing so, the relative impact of parental marital status and happiness can be examined to determine if they are worthwhile for future study.

Before doing this, it is important to note the tests performed on the two scales (Attitudes-toward-marriage scale and divorce-tolerance scale) to determine their feasibility as scales. Information on reliability is presented in the Appendix in Tables A-20 and A-21. To summarize, the alpha for the marriage scale was .701 and the alpha for the divorce tolerance scale was .834. None of the items from either scale could be deleted without lowering the alpha for the scale. Both scales are reliable measures.

Factor analysis of the scales revealed some interesting information on the scales. The nine items of the attitude-toward-marriage scale were found to group into two factors. Factor 1 (future-marital-adjustment factor) consisted of V44 through V47, while factor 2 (future-marital-happiness factor) consisted of V48 through V52. The twelve items of the divorce-tolerance scale were found to group into three factors. Factor 1 (pro-divorce factor) consisted of V32, V37 to V39, and V43; factor 2 (anti-divorce factor) consisted of V33, V35, V40, and V42; factor 3 (child-welfare factor) consisted of V34, V36, and V41. The significance of these factors and their implications will be discussed in the last section of this paper.
Tests of the Hypotheses

Since the hypotheses presented in the previous section deal with the two independent variables "parents' marital status" and "parents' marital happiness", these two will be looked at first to see if they have a significant affect on the dependent measures. Examination of the Pearson correlation matrix (Table A-22) and the summary of F-tests for the breakdowns procedure (Table A-23) show that the two independent variables have a significant affect on cohabitation attitudes and on divorce-tolerance-scale scores, but there is no significant affect on attitudes toward marriage, family size ideal, or ideal age for marriage. This relationship holds for both independent measures.

Examination of the results of the breakdowns reveals an interesting trend with regard to parents' marital status. For both cohabitation attitudes and divorce-tolerance-scale scores, the less traditional attitudes are held by those whose parents have divorced. The mean for divorce-tolerance-scale scores is lowest for those respondents who lost one or both parents to death (22.62), followed closely by those whose parents were still married (22.70). Both the parents-divorced group and the parents-divorced-remarried group had significantly higher tolerance for divorce (26.35 and 26.32).

In order to use the regressions procedure, it was necessary to create dummy codes for the independent variable parents' marital status, since it is not a continuous variable. Three dummy codes were created in order to compare the various categories. The first code, D1,
compares those respondents whose parents divorced (1) with those whose parents remained married or were separated by death (-1). The second code, D2, assigns a value of zero (0) if parents were married or separated by death, a value of one (1) if parents divorced and did not remarry, and a value of negative one (-1) if parents divorced and one or both remarried. This was done to compare the two divorce groups to determine if remarriage has any affect on the dependent variables. The third code, D3, assigns a value of zero (0) to the two divorce categories, a value of one (1) to respondents whose parents were still married, and a value of negative one (-1) if one or both parents were deceased. This was done to determine if parental death has a significant impact on attitudes.

Examination of the regression results (Table A-24) reveals that parents' marital happiness is not significant for any of the dependent variables when all variables are included in the equation. However, parents' marital status, in the form of the dummy codes just created, does have some effect on all of the dependent variables. The dependent variable ideal age for marriage is significantly affected by D1 (T=1.813; Sig T=.0701), attitudes-towards-marriage-scale scores are affected by D3 (T=1.982; Sig T=.0477), and divorce tolerance scores are affected by D1 (T=2.993; Sig T=.0028).

The affect of D3 on marriage attitudes is interesting, since it means that respondents whose parents were separated by death have a lower attitude toward marriage than those whose parents are still
married. This would indicate that any parental separation, not just those by divorce, is a significant factor.

The relationship between D1 and divorce tolerance is in the expected direction, with those from divorced families showing higher tolerance for divorce. The relationship between D1 and ideal age for marriage is not as expected (see Hypothesis 1C). Instead of parental divorce being associated with an increase in the respondents' ideal age for marriage, it appears that it is associated with a decrease in ideal age for marriage. This may be significant, since it indicates that those who come from homes disrupted by divorce may be predisposed toward earlier marriage, which is associated with higher divorce rates. Of the hypotheses presented in the previous section, only 1B and 1E receive support based on the regression procedure. Hypothesis 3 is not supported since the data show parents' marital status has more influence on the dependent measures than parents' marital happiness.

Since few of the hypotheses are supported by the data, it is appropriate to look toward other variables to determine their impact on the dependent measures.

Tests of the Control Variables

Of the control variables, those which deal with religion show the most promise for predicting variation in the five dependent measures. There were three variables which dealt with religion. Two of them, religious intensity (V05) and influence of religion (V06), were strongly
correlated \((r=.59)\). Religious intensity was used for regressions rather than influence of religion because it is a more objective measure of religious influence. The third variable was religious affiliation \((V07)\), which was also used in regressions.

Before religious affiliation could be used in regressions, it was necessary to create dummy codes since this is not a continuous variable. Three dummy codes were created in order to examine differences within this variable. The first code, \(C1\), assigns a value of three \((3)\) to those with no religious affiliation, and a value of negative one \((-1)\) to those who were Catholic, Protestant, or of some other religious belief. This was done to compare non-religious respondents with religious respondents. The second code, \(C2\), assigns a value of zero \((0)\) to those with no religious affiliation, a value of negative one \((-1)\) to Catholics and Protestants, and a value of two \((2)\) to those of other religious beliefs. This will show any differences between Christians and non-Christians. The third code, \(C3\), assigns a value of zero \((0)\) to those with no religious affiliation and those of non-Christian religions, a value of one \((1)\) to those who are Catholic and a value of negative one \((-1)\) to those who are Protestant. This will show any differences between Catholics and Protestants on the dependent measures.

Examination of the regression results reveals that religious intensity has a significant affect on all of the dependent variables. All values of \(T\) are significant at the .01 level or higher. The relationship of religious affiliation to the dependent measures differs
depending on which dependent measure is examined. Attitudes toward cohabitation appear to be affected by none of the three dummy codes. Thus, it seems that a person's religious affiliation does not affect attitudes toward cohabitation significantly.

Ideal age for marriage is related to both C1 and C3. In the case of C1, the relationship is positive. This reveals that those who have no religious affiliation express a higher ideal age for marriage than those who express some religious preference. The relationship of C3 to ideal age is also positive. This indicates that those who are Catholic express a higher ideal age for marriage than those of Protestant denominations.

Ideal family size is also related to C1 and C3. The relationship between C1 and ideal family size is negative. This indicates that those who have some religious affiliation express a higher ideal family size than those with no religious affiliation. The relationship between C3 and ideal family size is positive. Those who are Catholic express a higher ideal family size than those from Protestant denominations. This is not surprising when one considers the Catholic stand on birth control and abortion.

Attitudes toward marriage are significantly related to C1 and C2. The relationship with C1 is negative. Those who have no religious affiliation have a lower favorableness toward marriage than those who have some religious affiliation. The relationship with C2 is positive. This indicates that those with non-Christian religious affiliations are more favorable toward marriage than those who are Christian.
All three dummy code variables are significantly related to divorce tolerance. The relationship with C1 is positive, indicating that respondents with no religious affiliation are more tolerant of divorce than those who have some religious affiliation. The relationship with C2 is also positive, indicating a higher tolerance for divorce by non-Christian religious respondents when compared to those who are Christians. The relationship with C3 is negative, indicating that Protestants are more tolerant of divorce than Catholics.

Other control variables did not show the strength of influencing all five dependent variables as did religious intensity. However, each dependent variable was affected by several of the control variables in a significant way. Cohabitation attitudes, in addition to being affected by religious intensity, were affected by the sex of the respondent, the size of the community the respondent was raised in, the race of the respondent, and the age of the respondent. Males were more likely to favor cohabitation than were females. Urban/rural differences were split in the traditional manner, with urban respondents being more favorable toward cohabitation. Racial differences, though not as strong, were evident, with non-whites being more favorable toward cohabitation. This may be due to use of cohabitation for economic reasons by non-whites, who are more likely to be economically disadvantaged. Age has a weaker affect than all the others, yet it does appear that older respondents are more favorable toward cohabitation. This is most probably a result of college education "liberalizing"
attitudes as people progress. Younger respondents are still affected by their parents' attitudes and have not been in college long enough to be affected by it.

Ideal age for marriage was affected by respondents' sex, community size, age, and race, as well as religious intensity. Differences in gender were traditional, with females expressing a younger ideal age than men. Also traditional were urban/rural differences, with rural respondents giving a younger ideal age for marriage. Age was even more powerful than religious intensity for this dependent variable. This is not surprising when you consider that all the respondents were single and older respondents would be more likely to express a higher ideal age for marriage because they are older. White respondents expressed a lower ideal age for marriage than non-white respondents.

Family size ideals were also affected by community size, age, and race, but were most significantly affected by the size of the family of orientation. Urban/rural differences were traditional, with rural respondents expressing a desire for more children than urban respondents. Also traditional was the relationship between size of family of orientation and family size ideals, with those who came from large families expressing a higher family size ideal. Older respondents were likely to express a lower family size ideal. This may also be the result of college education causing people to become more "liberal." In this case, it may mean that those with more education are more apt to see alternatives to a large family for achievement of satisfaction in
life. Racial differences followed traditional patterns, with non-whites desiring larger families.

Attitudes toward marriage were affected significantly by age and family size. Older respondents were more negative toward marriage than younger respondents, this probably being a result of increased education causing older respondents to rethink society's expectations concerning marriage. A surprising result of the data analysis is that those from large families show a lower attitude toward marriage, on the average, than those from smaller families. This somewhat contradicts the previous finding concerning family size ideals and how they are affected by size of family of orientation. A possible explanation is that those from large families are mostly of rural background. Thus, they may accept the idea of a large family for labor purposes, and may get married to achieve this end. Marriage may then be seen as something which is to be tolerated in order to have a family.

Divorce-tolerance scores were affected significantly by community size. Urban respondents were more tolerant of divorce than rural respondents. This follows the pattern of urban residents being less traditional in other attitudes.

Discussion

The purpose of this paper was to determine whether parental divorce or marital conflict has a significant impact on their children's later attitudes toward various family concepts. If there is a significant
Of the five family concepts used as dependent variables, none were affected by the respondents' perception of his/her parents' marital happiness. All were affected by parents' marital status in some way, although not all of the relationships were as hypothesized. While cohabitation attitudes and divorce tolerance were significantly influenced in the hypothesized direction, ideal age for marriage was significantly influenced in the opposite direction from that hypothesized.

Attitudes toward cohabitation were affected by whether the respondents' parents had divorced. If the respondents' parents divorced, the respondent showed a significantly more positive attitude toward cohabitation than did respondents whose parents were still married or were separated by death. This may be one of the responses that adolescents had in the Wallerstein and Kelly (1974) study. It may be that those whose parents divorced are more selective of a marriage partner, and use cohabitation as a means of determining compatibility of future marriage partners. Thus, cohabitation may be a means of protection from the pain of divorce, since cohabitation involves less of a commitment to the relationship than marriage.

The data in this study give some support for the communication-of-values hypothesis when one examines divorce tolerance. Divorce tolerance scores were significantly related to parents' marital status,
with respondents from divorced homes being more tolerant of divorce than those whose parents did not divorce. This concurs with previous findings by Ganong et al. (1981) and Greenberg and Nay (1982), and may indicate a possible predisposition toward the use of divorce. Those who enter a marriage relationship with a more positive view of divorce would be more likely to use divorce if the relationship falters. Thus, transmission of marital instability may occur due to a "desensitization" of children to divorce.

Whether this higher tolerance for divorce actually will translate into behavior is questionable. The connection between attitudes and behavior has been addressed by psychologists and sociologists. At best, it can be said that an attitude may translate into future behavior.

The finding that parental divorce also affects respondents' ideal age for marriage may be important in looking at the transmission of marital instability. It was found that respondents whose parents had divorced had a lower ideal age for marriage than respondents whose parents did not divorce. Mueller and Pope (1977) found that women from divorced homes tended to marry earlier. This accounted for a significant portion of the transmission of marital instability in their study. Thus, a lower ideal age for marriage, if acted upon, may account for some transmission of marital instability, since those who marry younger are more likely to experience conflict and divorce.

Of more importance for all the dependent variables was the religious intensity of the respondent. The data indicate that the more
a respondent is involved in religious activities, the more traditional
they are with regard to the five dependent measures. Thus, high
religious activity is associated with low tolerance for cohabitation and
divorce, a high opinion of marriage, lower ideal age for marriage, and
higher ideal family size.

This relationship is not unusual, since those who are more involved
in religious activities receive more exposure to traditional religious
teachings concerning the family. Also, those who do not attend
religious services, though they may express a religious preference, are
likely to be weaker in their beliefs. They are more likely to be
influenced by others since they don’t receive support from a religious
group.

While religious affiliation did not have as profound an impact on
attitudes, some interesting relationships were found. All the dependent
variables, with the exception of cohabitation attitudes, were affected
by whether the respondents had a religious affiliation. Those who were
not affiliated with any religion were less traditional in their views.
This finding is expected considering the influence that religion has on
family life.

Comparison of non-Christian religious respondents with Christian
respondents reveals that non-Christians are more favorable toward
marriage and more tolerant of divorce. This may seem like a
contradiction, but it may well be that high tolerance of divorce leads
to increased favorableness toward marriage. If people view marriage as
something from which they cannot escape, they may hold a lower opinion
toward marriage. If, on the other hand, they see divorce as a viable
alternative, they may then view marriage in a more favorable manner.

Catholics and Protestants differ in three areas. Catholics express
a higher ideal age for marriage, a higher ideal family size, and a lower
tolerance for divorce. These differences can be explained by noting
differences in doctrine. The Catholic Church views marriage as a
sacrament, a sacred institution. Therefore, its members would be less
tolerant of divorce. Because divorce is less of an alternative, late
marriage is more desirable. Catholics have always expressed a larger
ideal family size. This reflects their belief that children are a
blessing from God and that nothing may be done to prevent conception or
birth.

Age was also significant for four of the dependent variables.
Older respondents were more positive toward cohabitation, more negative
toward marriage, and expressed a lower ideal family size. The data
indicate that older respondents are less traditional than younger
respondents. As was noted previously, this is probably caused by
exposure to more liberal attitudes with increasing education. As
students progress through college, they are exposed to alternate views
and are more likely to accept them. Students in their first year or two
have received less exposure to these influences and have also been away
from parental influence for a shorter period of time. Thus, they are
more likely to express the traditional values of their parents.
While the variables mentioned are significantly related to the dependent variables, an examination of the R-square values in Table A-24 indicates that much of the variance in the dependent measures is still unexplained. Future studies will need to introduce other variables to increase explained variance.

Limitations of the Study

There are several things which may limit the interpretation of the data from this study. One of these is the racial/ethnic distribution of the respondents. A large percentage of the respondents were white, with less than 10 percent who were nonwhite. With such a small number who were non-white, it is difficult to make any generalizations concerning racial differences in the five dependent variables.

Another limitation is that the data were collected from college students only. This limits generalizations to college students and prevents generalizations about all college-age young people who have experienced parental divorce or marital strife. It may be that college students see divorce more positively since it did not hinder their advancement. Those who may have experienced more difficulty in advancing because of their parents' divorce may have a more negative view of divorce.

Also limiting generalizations is that most students tend to be from middle-class backgrounds. Those who are from the lower class may not be representative of the lower class in our country. This may be why
status variables were not significant in relationships with the dependent variables.

A further problem was mentioned in the previous section. The questionability of the relationship between attitudes and behavior makes it difficult to generalize concerning divorce tolerance and future marital stability. While the data support the possibility that parental divorce leads to greater tolerance of divorce, it is not known whether this increased tolerance will actually make the respondent more likely to have marital disruptions.

The last possible limitation deals with the factor analysis performed on the attitudes-toward-marriage scale and the divorce tolerance scale. The marriage scale was found to consist of two factors, while the divorce-tolerance scale contained three factors.

The first factor of the attitudes-toward-marriage scale consisted of V44 through V47 of the questionnaire. This factor could be called a future-marital-adjustment factor, since all these questions deal with the respondents' perception of how well they will adjust to married life (see Appendix). The second factor consisted of V48 through V52 of the questionnaire. This factor could be called a future-marital-happiness factor, since these questions deal with the respondents' perception of how well they will enjoy being married.

Factor one of the divorce-tolerance scale consists of V32, V37, V38, V39, and V43. These statements were all pro-divorce, that is, they all saw divorce as a good thing. This factor could be called the pro-
divorce factor. Factor two consisted of V33, V35, V40, and V42. All of these statements were negative toward divorce. This factor could be called the anti-divorce factor. Factor three consisted of V34, V36, and V41. While these three contain both positive and negative statements concerning divorce, their common element is a concern for the children of the divorcing couple. Factor three could be called the child-welfare factor.

While both scales tested to be quite reliable, the presence of different factors in both scales may also limit inferences made from the data. The question must be raised as to whether the scales are actually measuring more than one attitude. If they are, then it would be better to deal with each factor separately. It would appear that the three elements of factor three (child-welfare factor) of the divorce-tolerance scale should be treated separately. These three are the only items which talk about children (or "a home"). The other nine deal only with the couple involved. Therefore, people may react differently to divorce if children are involved than if no children are affected.

Summary and Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of parents' divorce or marital conflict on their children's attitudes toward family concepts. This was undertaken to determine if there is any support for the proposition that intergenerational transmission of marital instability is caused by the communication of values concerning family, marriage, and divorce (Greenberg and Nay, 1982).
The data supported the communication-of-values hypothesis only for the measures of divorce tolerance and cohabitation values. While this may not seem like a great deal of support, it does have some significant implications. If it is true that parental divorce causes their children to be more tolerant of divorce, and if this tolerance makes them more likely to divorce, then those in the counseling profession should be aware of this link between generations.

Recommendations for Future Research

Future research efforts should overcome some of the limitations of the present study. Some of these limitations can be eliminated by expanding the sample, not limiting the sample to college students. This would help to eliminate problems of racial imbalance and under-representation of the lower class.

If the scales used in this study to measure attitudes toward marriage and divorce tolerance are used in future research efforts, serious consideration should be given to separating the factors. Specifically, factor three of the divorce tolerance scale (child-welfare factor) should be used separately, since it specifies a different situation than the other two factors.

The problem of connecting attitudes to behaviors in this case, may be best accomplished by using a longitudinal research design. This study would begin by looking at students' attitudes toward marriage and divorce, comparing those from happy, intact families; unhappy, intact families; and divorced families. It would resume after a period of time
(ten years?) to investigate the marital history of the same respondents. If there is a transmission of marital instability across generations, this type of study would be better equipped to explain the causes than a cross-sectional study, since it connects attitudes to behaviors more directly.
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APPENDIX

Questionnaire Items

Items marked with (R) were recoded before data analysis.

V01. Your sex:
   1. Male
   2. Female

V02. Your age:
   1. 18 or younger
   2. 19-20
   3. 21-24
   4. 25 or older

V03. What is the population size of the community you have lived in or near most of the time while you were growing up?
   1. under 150
   2. 150 to 499
   3. 500 to 999
   4. 1000 to 2499
   5. 2500 to 9999
   6. 10,000 to 19,999
   7. 20,000 to 49,999
   8. 50,000 to 499,999
   9. 500,000 or more

V04. Which term best describes your background?
   1. Rural
   2. Small town
   3. Urban-Suburban
   (R) V05. If a U.S. citizen:
   1. White/Anglo
   2. Black/Negro
   3. Hispanic (Spanish, Mexican, Chicano, Puerto Rican)
   4. American Indian
   5. Asian/Pacific Islander
   6. Other
   7. International Student, not permanent U.S. resident

V06. The influence of religion on my life has been:
   1. None
   2. Minimal
   3. Moderate
   4. Quite high
   5. Very great
(R) V07. My religious preference is:
1. Catholic
2. Baptist
3. Methodist
4. Presbyterian
5. Lutheran
6. Other Protestant
7. Jewish
8. Other
9. None

(R) V08. Approximately how many hours per week do you spend in religion-related activities?
1. None
2. 1/2 to 1 hour
3. 2 to 3 hours
4. 4 to 6 hours
5. 6 to 9 hours
6. 10 to 15 hours
7. 16 or more hours

V10. Your year in college as of Fall semester, 1983, classification:
1. Freshman
2. Sophomore
3. Junior
4. Senior
5. Other

V11. What is your current marital status?
1. Single
2. Married
3. Separated
4. Divorced

(R) V18. What is the marital status of your (natural) parents?
1. Married to each other
2. Divorced, neither remarried
3. Divorced, father only remarried
4. Divorced, mother only remarried
5. Divorced, both remarried
6. One or both parents deceased

(R) V20. In your opinion, up to the time you were 12, were your parents on the average happy or unhappy in their marriage?
1. Very unhappy
2. Unhappy
3. Average
4. Happy
5. Very happy
6. Not applicable because parents were not living together at that time
(R) V21. Find your FATHER'S occupation in one of the following nine groups, AND THEN record the letter of that group. Use your father's previous occupation if he is retired or deceased.
1. Unemployed
2. Homemaker, housewife, househusband
3. Unskilled worker
4. Farmer, semi-skilled worker and machine operator
5. Skilled manual worker and foreman
6. Proprietor of a small business, technician, sales clerk
7. Proprietor of a small business, lower-level official and manager, semi-professional, etc.
8. Proprietor of a medium business, middle-level executive, lower-level professional, etc.
9. Proprietor of a large business, top-level executive, top-level professional

(R) V22. Using the same categories as in question 21, find your MOTHER'S occupation in the appropriate group and then record the letter of that group.

(R) V26. With regard to cohabitation, do you think you will:
1. Live with a person of opposite sex prior to marriage
2. Live with a person of opposite sex but never marry
3. Not cohabit at all (marriage or live alone)

V27. If you are single, what do you think the ideal age for marriage will be for you?
1. 18 or less
2. 19-20
3. 21-22
4. 23-25
5. 26-30
6. 31-35
7. Over 35
8. Never marry

(R) V28. How many children do you plan to have?
1. One
2. Two
3. Three
4. Four
5. Five
6. Six or more
7. None
V29. How many children are (were) in your family (count yourself as well as brothers and sisters)?
1. One
2. Two
3. Three
4. Four
5. Five
6. Six or more
Divorce Tolerance Scale

Please answer the following questions as follows:

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral or indifferent
4. Agree
5. Strongly agree

**V32.** I feel that divorce is a sensible solution to many unhappy marriages.
**V33.** Marriage is a sacred covenant which should be broken only under the most drastic circumstances.
**V34.** Children are better off living with one parent rather than with two who cannot get along well together.
**V35.** Most divorces are a farce and ought to be stopped.
**V36.** It is better for a couple to stay together, to struggle along together if necessary, than to break up a home by getting a divorce.
**V37.** Divorce is a fine social institution since it alleviates much misery and unhappiness.
**V38.** Although some people abuse the divorce privilege, it is fundamentally a good thing.
**V39.** Marriage is essentially an agreement between two interested parties, and if they wish to conclude that agreement, should be permitted to do so.
**V40.** Divorce is no real solution to an unhappy marriage.
**V41.** Children need a home with both a father and a mother even though the parents are not especially suited to one another.
**V42.** Divorce is one of our greatest social evils.
**V43.** If a couple find getting along with each other a real struggle, then they should not feel obligated to remain married.

*These items were recoded as follows:  1=0, 2=1, 3=2, 4=3, 5=4.

**These items were recoded as follows:  5=0, 4=1, 3=2, 2=3, 1=4.
Attitudes toward Marriage Scale

V44. If you marry, to what extent will you miss the life you have had as a single person?
   1. Not at all
   *2. Very little
   *3. To some extent
   *4. Very much

V45. In your opinion, to what extent will it trouble you to give up your personal freedom when you marry?
   1. Not at all
   *2. Very little
   *3. To some extent
   *4. Very much

V46. In your opinion, will adjustment to married life be difficult for you?
   1. Not at all
   *2. Not too difficult
   *3. Rather
   *4. Very difficult

V47. Do you ever have doubts as to whether you will enjoy living exclusively in marriage with one member of the opposite sex?
   1. Never
   *2. Hardly
   *3. Occasionally
   *4. Frequently

V48. In your opinion, to what extent will the responsibilities of married life be enjoyable to you?
   1. Very much
   *2. Fairly enjoyable
   *3. Not too much
   *4. Not at all

V49. How happy do you think you will be if you marry?
   1. Very happy
   2. Happy
   *3. Unhappy
   *4. Very unhappy

V50. Do you ever have doubts about your chance of having a successful marriage?
   1. Never
   2. Rarely
   *3. Occasionally
   *4. Frequently

V51. Do you think you will find a person who is a suitable marriage partner for you?
   1. Yes
   *2. Maybe
   *3. No
V52. Do you think it would be advisable for you always to remain single?
*1. Yes
*2. Maybe
**3. No

*These response categories were recoded to zero.

**This response category was recoded to one.
Descriptive Statistics for Variables

Missing values include respondents who were married, non-U.S. citizens, and those who requested that their answers not be used in this study.

Table A-1. Distribution of sex (V01)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Values</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Absolute</th>
<th>Relative (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>654</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>618</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A-2. Distribution of age (V02)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Values</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Absolute</th>
<th>Relative (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 18 or less</td>
<td></td>
<td>739</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 19-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>421</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 21-24</td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 25 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A-3. Distribution of community population size (V03)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Values</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Absolute</th>
<th>Relative (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Under 150</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 150 to 499</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 500 to 999</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1000 to 2499</td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2500 to 9999</td>
<td></td>
<td>255</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 10,000 to 19,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 20,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>210</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 50,000 to 499,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>274</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 500,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A-4. Distribution of urbanity (V04)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Values</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Relative (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Rural</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Small town</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Urban</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Missing</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>1385</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A-5. Distribution of race (V05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Values</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Relative (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 White</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>90.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Black</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Other</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Missing</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>1385</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A-6. Distribution of influence of religion (V06)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Values</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absolute</td>
<td>Relative (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite high</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very great</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A-7. Distribution of religious affiliation (V07)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Values</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absolute</td>
<td>Relative (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No affiliation</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Protestant</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A-8. Distribution of religious intensity (V08)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Values</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Absolute</th>
<th>Relative (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 0 hours</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1/2 hour to 1 hour</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 2-3 hours</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 4 hours or more</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Missing</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A-9. Distribution of college class (V10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Values</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Absolute</th>
<th>Relative (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Freshman</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sophomore</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Junior</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Senior</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Missing</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A-10. Distribution of parents' marital status (V18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Values</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absolute</td>
<td>Relative (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Married</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Divorced</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Divorced, one or both remarried</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 One or both deceased</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Missing</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>1385</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A-11. Distribution of parents' marital happiness (V20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Values</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absolute</td>
<td>Relative (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Parents no longer together</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Very unhappy</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Unhappy</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Average</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Happy</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Very happy</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Missing</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>1385</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A-12. Distribution of father's occupational status (V21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Values</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absolute</td>
<td>Relative (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Lower class</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Lower middle class</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Average middle class</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Upper middle class</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Upper class</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Missing</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A-13. Distribution of mother's occupational status (V22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Values</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absolute</td>
<td>Relative (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Lower class</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Lower middle class</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Average middle class</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Upper middle class</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Upper class</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A-14. Distribution of cohabitation plans (V26)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Values</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Absolute</th>
<th>Relative (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Yes, prior to marriage</td>
<td></td>
<td>447</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Yes, without plans to marry</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 No</td>
<td></td>
<td>788</td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A-15. Distribution of ideal age for marriage (V27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Values</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Absolute</th>
<th>Relative (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 18 or less</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 19-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 21-22</td>
<td></td>
<td>186</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 23-25</td>
<td></td>
<td>725</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 26-30</td>
<td></td>
<td>276</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 31-35</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Over 35</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Never</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A-16. Distribution of family size ideals (V28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Values</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Absolute</th>
<th>Relative (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 No children</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 One child</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Two children</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Three children</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Four children</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Five children</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Six children or more</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Missing</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>1385</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A-17. Distribution of size of family of orientation (V29)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Values</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Absolute</th>
<th>Relative (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 One child</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Two children</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Three children</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Four children</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Five children</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Six children or more</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Missing</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>1385</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A-18. Distribution of attitudes toward marriage scale scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Values</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absolute</td>
<td>Relative (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A-19. Distribution of divorce tolerance scale scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Values</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absolute</td>
<td>Relative (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-13</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-20</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-27</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-34</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-41</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42-48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A-20. Reliability assessment of the attitudes toward marriage scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Alpha, if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 V44</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 V45</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 V46</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 V47</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.466</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 V48</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td>.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 V49</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 V50</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 V51</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 V52</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.694</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .701 Standardized Item Alpha = .708

Table A-21. Reliability assessment of the divorce tolerance scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Alpha, if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 V32</td>
<td>1.866</td>
<td>1.122</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 V33</td>
<td>1.248</td>
<td>1.095</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 V34</td>
<td>1.543</td>
<td>1.008</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 V35</td>
<td>2.153</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 V36</td>
<td>1.963</td>
<td>1.043</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 V37</td>
<td>1.515</td>
<td>.920</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 V38</td>
<td>1.936</td>
<td>1.021</td>
<td>.602</td>
<td>.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 V39</td>
<td>2.071</td>
<td>1.122</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 V40</td>
<td>1.855</td>
<td>1.031</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 V41</td>
<td>2.023</td>
<td>1.047</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td>.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 V42</td>
<td>2.030</td>
<td>1.072</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 V43</td>
<td>1.971</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>.824</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .834 Standardized Item Alpha = .834
Table A-22. Pearson correlation matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V26</th>
<th>V27</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>V02</th>
<th>V03</th>
<th>V04</th>
<th>V08</th>
<th>V10</th>
<th>V21</th>
<th>V22</th>
<th>V029</th>
<th>V06</th>
<th>V20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V26</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V27</td>
<td>-.11***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V28</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>-.34***</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>.15***</td>
<td>-.27***</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>.10***</td>
<td>-.27***</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td>-.11***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V02</td>
<td></td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>-.07**</td>
<td>-.16***</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.13***</td>
<td>-.08**</td>
<td>-.04*</td>
<td>-.13***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.12***</td>
<td>-.08**</td>
<td>-.03***</td>
<td>-.12***</td>
<td>.66***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>-.12***</td>
<td>-.15***</td>
<td>-.36***</td>
<td>-.04*</td>
<td>-.05**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.14***</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.09**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.10**</td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td>-.08**</td>
<td>-.05*</td>
<td>-.26***</td>
<td>-.31***</td>
<td>-.05*</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.06*</td>
<td>.15***</td>
<td>-.18***</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.15***</td>
<td>-.08*</td>
<td>.11***</td>
<td>-.12***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.16***</td>
<td>.17***</td>
<td>-.34***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .10 level or higher
**Significant at the .01 level or higher.
***Significant at the .001 level or higher.
Table A-23. F-test values for breakdowns procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Cohabit</th>
<th>Age Mar.</th>
<th>FSI</th>
<th>AttMar</th>
<th>Divtol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex (V01)</td>
<td>49.16***</td>
<td>69.39***</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>11.59**</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (V05)</td>
<td>5.09*</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel. Aff. (V07)</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>5.31***</td>
<td>4.16**</td>
<td>4.16**</td>
<td>11.12***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. Sta. (V18)</td>
<td>7.87***</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>12.09***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .01 level or higher.

**Significant at the .001 level or higher.

***Significant at the .0001 level or higher.
### Table A-24. Summary of t-tests for regression procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Cohabit</th>
<th>Age Mar.</th>
<th>FSI</th>
<th>AttMar</th>
<th>DivTol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Size</td>
<td>-.289</td>
<td>.553</td>
<td>3.843**</td>
<td>-2.199</td>
<td>- .877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Par. M. H.</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>-.572</td>
<td>1.496</td>
<td>-.964</td>
<td>1.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>4.857***</td>
<td>-5.559***</td>
<td>1.406</td>
<td>1.063</td>
<td>1.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel. Int.</td>
<td>7.852***</td>
<td>-3.045*</td>
<td>4.110***</td>
<td>4.838***</td>
<td>-11.696***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>2.212</td>
<td>-1.716</td>
<td>-2.357</td>
<td>-.407</td>
<td>1.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-2.064</td>
<td>7.356***</td>
<td>-2.131</td>
<td>-4.430***</td>
<td>- 1.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2¹</td>
<td>-.272</td>
<td>1.380</td>
<td>-1.667</td>
<td>-.841</td>
<td>.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3²</td>
<td>1.245</td>
<td>-1.047</td>
<td>-.897</td>
<td>1.982</td>
<td>-.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4³</td>
<td>-.680</td>
<td>1.813</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>1.188</td>
<td>2.993*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2⁴</td>
<td>-.431</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>-.335</td>
<td>2.804*</td>
<td>1.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3⁵</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>1.999</td>
<td>-2.788*</td>
<td>-1.278</td>
<td>- 3.748**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4⁶</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>1.988</td>
<td>-1.686</td>
<td>-2.100</td>
<td>2.647*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R Square .132 .143 .070 .073 .185

¹Comparison of parents-divorced group with parents-divorced-remarried group.

²Comparison of parents-married group with one or both parents-deceased group

³Comparison of parents-divorced groups with parents-married groups

⁴Comparison of Christians with other religious groups.

⁵Comparison of Catholics with Protestants.

⁶Comparison of non-religious respondents with religious respondents.

*Significant at the .01 level or higher.

**Significant at the .001 level or higher.

***Significant at the .0001 level or higher.