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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

After increases in divorce during WWII, a peak shortly thereafter and a decline throughout the 1950s, the divorce rate began to rise steadily through the 1960s and 1970s. For the years 1975-1977, the rate of divorce was 37 per 1,000 married women between the ages of 14 and 44 (Norton and Glick, 1979:7). The crude divorce rate in 1979 was 5.3 per 1,000 population, up significantly from the 2.5 per 1,000 in 1965 (Price-Bonham and Balswick, 1980:959). Recent estimations put the proportion of divorces at about 4 of 10 marriages (see Norton and Glick, 1979:9).

Family researchers began in the 1960s to address the topic of divorce, although research began in earnest only in the 1970s (Price-Bonham and Balswick, 1980:959). Several research developments have been important, not the least of which are the creation of the Journal of Divorce and Raschke's compilation of unpublished and in-progress works on divorce (see Price-Bonham and Balswick, 1980:959).

One emerging area of interest is that of adjustment during separation and divorce. There is an expanding body of literature in this area, which was brought into focus by Goode (1956) and greatly expanded with the works of Blair (1969), Heritage (1971), and others (see Holley, 1981). A brief review of some of these studies is found in Price-Bonham and Balswick (1980).

Recent researchers have chided family sociologists for the recency with which attention has been given to the post-divorce experience
(Raschke and Barringer, 1977; Feldman, 1979; Welch and Granvold, 1977). Berardo lamented the citations to Goode’s (1956) early work as a major resource by many recent researchers (1980:727). However, Holley (1981) has argued that numerous studies published in the last decade can be found, if the literature is adequately searched.

Studies of adjustment to separation and divorce have taken two unique, but related, directions. First, certain researchers have sought to describe adjustment and the adjustment process. Albrecht (1980) empirically examined the extent of trauma and stress, changes in social participation, and other subjective assessments of the present life situation of the divorced. Another example is the theoretical work of Salts (1979), in which she attempted to synthesize the process of divorce and concomitant stages explored by various researchers.

Second, researchers seeking to go beyond descriptive studies have examined variables thought to be related to adjustment to divorce and separation. In these studies, one important set of activities involves the creation of empirical measures of adjustment, many of which are reviewed by Holley (1981). Variables thought to be related to adjustment include demographic variables, marriage-related variables, and several social psychological variables (see Price-Bonham and Balswick, 1980). Raschke’s (1977) research dealing with social participation and Spanier and Hanson’s (1978) treatment of involvement with extended kin indicate only some of the independent variables correlated with adjustment.
One set of variables thought pertinent is the divorced person's assessments, evaluations, observations, and feelings about the former spouse and the former marriage. Several researchers have been interested in how divorced persons assess their former marriage, although no researcher has dealt with these in a unified whole.

**Statement of the Problem**

Berger and Luckmann (1966) explored the relevance of the past for the present in the life course, in secondary socialization, and especially in resocialization. It was found that individuals attempt to resolve, interpret, and explain the past in the context of the present. In radical life transformations, referred to as alternations, the past is made meaningful, when supported by others (Berger and Luckmann, 1966:157-160).

The past is often dealt with through reinterpretation. Support for this assertion is derived from a variety of social scenes. Reinterpretation occurs in religious and other types of conversion (Lofland, 1969; Musgrove, 1977), homosexual "coming out" (Ponse, 1980), and when a person has a transsexual operation (Garfinkel, 1967). It also occurs among workers in plants where there is a change of managers (Gouldner, 1954) and in cases where those in groups deal with the suicide of one of its members (Henslin, 1970).

Divorce is an example par excellence of a radical life change. Bloom et al. (1979) conclude that separation and divorce represent
stressors of the first magnitude. Holmes and Rahe (1967) rank divorce second only to the death of a spouse among life events necessitating readjustments. Kitson et al. (1980) speculate that divorce adjustment may be more difficult than adjustment to widowhood. Divorce is traumatic and stressful, and regardless of whose idea it was, the divorce brings about adjustments of significant proportions.

Spanier and Casto place these adjustments in two areas: (1) adjusting to the dissolution of the marriage, and (2) adjusting to the process of setting up a new lifestyle (1979b:213). Making a new life involves restructuring reality, which is not unrelated to dealing with the dissolution of the former marriage. Thus, creating a new reality often involves a rebuilding of the past (Kitson et al., 1980:293).

Relative to separation and divorce, findings are partial and suggestive, but do indicate that attitudes toward the former spouse and perceptions of the former marriage have a bearing on the level of adjustment. Further, the studies indicate that other persons play an important role in adjustment.

Some researchers have described assessments of the former marriage, while others have attempted to correlate such assessments with the present level of adjustment. In the former case, Weiss has argued that divorced persons develop "accounts" or histories of the former marriage, which are of major psychological importance (1975:14-15). Those who cannot construct accounts are viewed as perplexed, unable to detach themselves from the past relationship. In the latter case, Peterson
(1978) and Newman and Langer (1981) correlated certain variables—for example, attribution of blame for the divorce—with divorce adjustment. Other researchers have only touched on, but reinforce, the importance of retrospective assessments by including variables assessing the former marriage within divorce adjustment measures (Blair, 1969).

While the literature delineates various themes in the divorced persons' accounts of the former marriage, one pervasive theme is a negative assessment of the former marriage. Weiss stated that the accounts portray a history of marital failure and include an allocation of blame and a dramatization of what went wrong (1975:14-15). Goode, in examining attribution of fault among divorcees, stated:

"...most wives felt sinned against. Almost no wives claimed that the divorce was mainly their fault.... Even when the wife admitted that she had faults, she was not likely to admit that she was the major offender (1956:133)."

Hunt and Hunt (1977) listed several explanations for the marital breakup, most involving blame of the ex-spouse. For a number, the ex-spouse was seen as the villain (Hunt and Hunt, 1977:22). For others, while incompatibility was the root of the problem, primary fault was directed at the ex-spouse (Hunt and Hunt, 1977:23). Further, the blame of the ex-spouse was prominent in cases of infidelity, open marriage experiments, and where marriages unsuccessfully attempted role changes (Hunt and Hunt, 1977:24-25). No-fault or equal fault explanations, which Hunt and Hunt identify with the recent ethic of the divorce subculture, are not always devoid of criticism of the ex-spouse (1977:26-30).
Such negative assessments of the past marriage are made no clearer than in a comparison of the divorced and the widowed. Kitson et al., in hypothesizing that widows will have "more favorable attitudes toward, or memories of, their spouses than will divorcees" (1980:297), cited evidence from Lopata to suggest that widows idealize or sanctify the memories of their former spouses, and speculated that divorced persons would vilify their former spouses and see them in a negative manner. They found significant differences between the widowed and the divorced: (1) widows had much more favorable attitudes toward their former spouses than did the divorced, and (2) divorcees who did not want the divorce had much more positive attitudes toward their former spouse than did those who wanted the divorce (Kitson et al., 1980:297-298). Weiss (1976) observed that both widows and divorcees continue to relate psychologically to the former loved one, the divorced expressing their anger by attributing responsibility for the divorce to the former spouse, while the widowed are much less likely to express anger in any attribution of responsibility.

For Hunt and Hunt, the subjective reality reflected in these assessments may be more important than the objective reality (1977:22). They state that "people frequently have a distorted and selective view of what happened" in their marriage (Hunt and Hunt, 1977:21). They go on to say:

When we have been able to interview or hear from both ex-spouses, we have found that although the same major events...are named by both, they are generally interpreted quite differently. As for
intangibles such as faulty communication, emotional conflicts, and sexual difficulties, the ex-spouses often give accounts that are not even recognizably related (Hunt and Hunt, 1977:21-22).

The arguments of Kitson et al. (1980) and Weiss (1975) appear to explain these subjective realities identified by Hunt and Hunt (1977). Kitson et al. emphasized that:

In memory, the spouse is viewed as worse than he was in reality. This, too, helps to distance the divorcee from her past, so that she is able to justify and explain to herself and others why her marriage failed (1980:293).

Weiss indicated as much in stating that the history of marital failure brings a "conceptually manageable unity" to confusion over who was responsible for what (1975:15).

Relationships with others play a critical role in adjustment, although the exact role they play in this retrospection is unclear. The overwhelming majority of studies have found that adjustment is positively related to social participation. Social participation, referring to participation in formal organizations, informal interaction with friends, and dating provide for Raschke (1977) the most important correlate of adjustment. Raschke and Barringer indicated that participation in a dating relationship aids the learning of a new role (1977:31). Spanier and Lachman found that dating was positively related to adjustment, while frequency of participation with relatives and present friends was not (1980:378-379). They speculated that the content of the relationship with friends and relatives may be negative; that is, friends and family may disapprove of the divorce, which hinders adjust-
While it is possible that associational relationships of the divorced person provide assistance in taking on the role of the divorced, it is also possible they are related to the process by which the divorced person deals with the past. Kitson et al. (1980) imply that the presence or absence of social supports is related to the process by which a divorced person looks back on the former marriage. It would also stand to reason that the extent to which one has abandoned the former spouse would be related to adjustment.

The purpose of this research is to examine the relationship between the adjustment of divorced persons and the retrospective assessments which they make about the former marriage and spouse, in the context of contributions made by associational relationships. These questions will be asked:

1. How do divorced persons retrospectively assess and evaluate their former spouse and marriage?
2. Are these assessments of the past related to the level of adjustment of divorced persons?
3. How do associational relationships influence the adjustment of divorced persons?
4. What is the nature of the relationship among involvement in associational relationships, assessments of the former marriage, and adjustment of divorced persons?

Two bodies of literature are being drawn together in this study. First, divorce adjustment literature serves as the foundation for the examination of the relationship between adjustment and the assessment
of the former marriage, as well as the relationship between adjustment and associational relationships. Second, Berger and Luckmann's (1966) social construction of reality theory and attribution theory provide the theoretical backdrop to the analysis of the resocialization process in the context of alternations.
CHAPTER II. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

While much of the literature dealing with the divorced has been atheoretical, there are several theories which are applicable to the domain, and which have been used in the past. Exchange theory, symbolic interactionism, Levinger's social psychological theory, cognitive consistency/dissonance, attribution, and the social construction of reality theory may be noted for their potential contributions (Deutsch and Krauss, 1965; Burr et al., 1979; Peterson, 1978; Price-Bonham and Balswick, 1980; Berger and Luckmann, 1966). This study will use attribution and the social construction of reality theories.

Social Construction of Reality

The selection of the social construction of reality theory as set out in Berger and Luckmann (1966) was made on the basis of (1) that theory's treatment of radical life changes, called alternations (Berger and Luckmann, 1966:157), (2) its delineation of the relationship between the past and the present, or more specifically, present interpretations of the past in the context of alternations (Berger and Luckmann, 1966:160), and (3) its recognition of the role of associational relationships within alternations (Berger and Luckmann, 1966:159). When the extent to which divorced persons have continuing encounters with the former marriage is understood, and when divorce is conceptualized as a radical life change, the social construction of reality theory appears highly relevant.
Several initial comments and clarifications must be made. This analysis is not designed to deal with all of Berger and Luckmann (1966). Only the theoretical framework surrounding the resocialization process within alternations is involved. This study violates some of their assumptions, and does not conform to their empirical but nonscientific methodology (Berger and Luckmann, 1966:20). Their empiricism is purely descriptive, avoiding any causal hypotheses. I believe that the specific treatment of alternations by Berger and Luckmann (1966) may be applied to divorce, and used to set out hypotheses which can be tested by statistical procedures.

The following discussion develops the foundation of the social construction of reality theory by examining three concepts: time, accounts, and socialization. This provides the groundwork for a treatment of resocialization.

Time

Time is important to the analysis of the process of socialization, or growing up. Moreover, according to Hewitt and Hall (1973), "quasi-theories of time" are used to explain the creation and dissolution of problems. In a more concrete sense, McLain and Weigert (1979) indicated that one procedure by which the world is made subjectively plausible is a retrospective-prospective sense of occurrence. The future may be used to give meaning to the present, or the past may provide meaning for the present (McLain and Weigert, 1979:185-186). Kitsuse delineated the retrospective interpretation of behavior, in
which, for example, a homosexual's past behavior is reinterpreted by others, after having recently gained information about the person's homosexuality (1964:96). Much the same thing occurs when an asylum resident's case history is "created" by the staff, explaining and documenting why the person is institutionalized (Goffman, 1961:145).

Accounts

Accounts refer to statements by "social actors to explain unanticipated or untoward behavior—whether that behavior is his own or that of others" (Scott and Lyman, 1968:46). Arising in interaction, accounts are of two types—excuses and justifications. They serve to relieve responsibility and neutralize the consequences of an act. For Scott and Lyman, accounts are closely tied to identities (1968:58).

Defined as apologia, for Goffman (1961), accounts delineate either success stories or sad tales. Accounts are patterned and thematic, the framework of the present determining the content of the accounts.

Time and accounts are fused in the context of the construction of the life course by an individual. Goffman stated:

Given the stage that any person has reached in a career, one typically finds that he constructs an image of his life course—past, present, and future—which selects, abstracts, and distorts in such a way as to provide him with a view of himself that he can usefully expound in current situations (1961:150).

Socialization

The social construction of reality is in fact a concern of the sociology of knowledge (Berger and Luckmann, 1966:3). In the socio-
logical treatment of what passes for knowledge as "reality" in everyday life, attention turns to the ordering of reality. Everyday life is real "as a reality interpreted by men and subjectively meaningful to them as a coherent world" (Berger and Luckmann, 1966:19).

Socialization represents a fundamental process in the social construction of reality. Being socialized, and living in society, means that individuals are world-builders. Dialectically, while humans create the world, society creates humans (Berger, 1967:4-7). Socialization involves the process by which a new generation is taught appropriate institutional programs. In the process, selves or identities are created (Berger, 1967:14-16). Associational relationships play a fundamental role in creating and maintaining these identities (Berger and Luckmann, 1966:151,173).

Resocialization

Berger and Luckmann (1966) treat three types of socialization. I will briefly consider each type of socialization, contrasting them by the extent to which there is continuity between the past and the present, although my primary interest is that of resocialization. Figure 1 presents this contrast as a continuum. As previously discussed, primary socialization refers to the introduction of the individual to society, and as such represents a high level of continuity between the present and the past. In secondary socialization, subworlds and role specific knowledge are internalized, presupposing primary socialization. Secondary socialization involves less continuity between
Figure 1. Continuity between the present and the past in socialization
the self created in primary socialization and the self developed in secondary socialization (Berger and Luckmann, 1966:141). At the other end of the continuum is resocialization, where there is little continuity between the resocialized self and the self prior to resocialization.

Resocialization involves a "near-total" transformation of reality, which is defined by Berger and Luckmann as an alternation (1966:157). To put it another way, "alternations require processes of re-socialization" (Berger and Luckmann, 1966:157). Resocialization can occur only if there are effective plausibility structures, or legitimizing apparatus for the new reality.

At this point the concept of biography is introduced. Biography is defined as the sequence of events through which one has lived and the complex of meanings that organize an actor's "sense of personal continuity, meaning, and identity over the life span" (McLain and Weigert, 1979:198; Berger, 1963). Within the biography, one's uni-
verse of meaning evolves from the various realities of present and past.

An alternation represents a rupture in the subjective biography of the individual. Berger and Luckmann state that the old reality "must be reinterpreted within the legitimating apparatus of the new reality" (1966:159). There are two components to this reinterpretation process. First, the past is "nihilated in toto by subsuming it under a negative category" (Berger and Luckmann, 1966:160). Second, there are "particular reinterpretations of past events and persons with past significance" within the context of the present reality (Berger and Luckmann, 1966:160). Contrasting secondary socialization and resocialization, Berger and Luckmann state:

In re-socialization, the past is reinterpreted to conform to present reality, with the tendency to retroject into the past various elements that were subjectively unavailable at the time. In secondary socialization the present is interpreted so as to stand in a continuous relationship with the past, with the tendency to minimize such transformations as have actually taken place. Put differently, the reality-base for resocialization is the present, for secondary socialization the past (1966:163).

Conversation represents a key plausibility structure for the new reality. While the alternation may have preceded affiliation with new associates, the new reality cannot be made plausible in the absence of community, or associational relationships. These persons mediate and maintain the new reality, and aid in abandoning and repudiating past realities. As such, these associates are "guides" into the new reality (Berger and Luckmann, 1966:157). Religious conversion clearly illustrates their role (Berger and Luckmann, 1966:158-159).
At the same time new associates are adopted, those from the old reality must be abandoned physically and psychologically (Berger and Luckmann, 1966:158-159). Continued interaction with persons from the past calls into question the new reality. Having negated the previous world, the individual must disaffiliate himself from those who were a part of it.

The discussion of resocialization may be summarized as follows: (1) alternations involve radical, almost total, changes in the lives of individuals; (2) resocialization occurs within alternations; (3) negative accounts of the past follow the alternation; and (4) persons from the past are replaced by new associates.

Empirical Analyses

Several empirical studies pertinent to the social construction of reality theory have been carried out. These include studies of the use of retrospective interpretation to resolve biographical changes in the lives of deviants (Garfinkel, 1956) and to explain admission to a mental hospital (Goffman, 1961). Religious conversion, homosexual "coming out" (Ponse, 1980), and a transsexual operation represent changes in identity, and all involve processes similar to those set out by Berger and Luckmann (1966). Changes in primary relationships—the appointment of a new plant manager and the suicide of a family member—illustrate additional reconstruction processes and set out vividly the role of associational relationships.
Deviant labels

The concept of "retrospective interpretation," used by Kitsuse (1964), refers specifically to the process by which a person is labeled a deviant. Following application of the label to the person, their prior behavior is reinterpreted consistent with the label. They are perceived to have a life course of continuity from the past to the present. Formal ceremonies often symbolize this perception. Garfinkel stated that degradation ceremonies illustrate that "What he is now is what 'after all,' he was all along" (1956:421-422).

Goffman cited the creation of a case history as a representation of the retroactive character of the patient career (1961:145). Moving one step beyond Garfinkel, Goffman's position is that the retrospectively constructed record becomes a part of the patient identity as well as being used as a means of control by hospital employees (1961:145-152).

Identity

Radical life changes are exemplified by religious conversion, homosexual "coming out," and becoming a transsexual. Musgrove's (1977) analysis of adult resocialization identifies becoming a homosexual and experiencing a religious conversion as the adoption of a marginal status. For Musgrove, the adoption of a marginal status calls into play resocialization processes since such statuses call into question previous basic definitions of reality (1977:7). In these instances,
resocialization and the processing of reality are guided by individuals with whom the new marginal person is in conversation (Musgrove, 1977: 18).

Religious and other conversions As noted before, Berger and Luckmann use religious conversion to illustrate resocialization in alternations, emphasizing the radical transformations involved in such conversions (1966:158). Travisano stated:

Conversions are drastic changes in life. Such changes require a change in the "informing aspect" of one's life or biography. Moreover, there must be a negation...of some former identity. Conversion is signaled by a radical reorganization of identity, meaning, and life (1970:600).

In testimonials, converts often make the following statements about the past—"When I was still living in sin..." (Berger and Luckmann, 1966:160), and "When I was living a life of debauchery..." (Travisano, 1970:601). Krishna converts speak of their pre-conversion hippie days as being insane, mad, unhappy, empty (Musgrove, 1977:207-212).

Beyond the symbolic process of negation of the past, the convert disaffiliates himself from past associates. This action is taken to segregate the individual from those who by their very presence question the new reality, and represent emotional ties continuing to bind the convert to persons from the past (Berger and Luckmann, 1966:159).

Lofland's study of "transformed deviants" or deviant conversion presents the same tale of regeneration, "about how terrible life was before and how wonderful it is now" (1969:282; 1966:32). Lofland stated:
...the deviant period of the biography is defined as a long stretch of acts that are incompatible with the proffered and candidate self. Actor can come to feel guilt over his history of deviance. He has, in one sense or another, "sinned," and the fact of this sinning in the past must be dealt with—defined and managed—in the present. There is, in particular, the problem of how to relate the past period as a social deviant to his present candidacy for pivotal normality (1969:282).

Management for this group means developing a sense of historic mission, after having experienced a biographical rupture. Criminals turned preachers, addicts getting religion, and alcoholics joining AA reflect this response (Lofland, 1969:283).

Homosexual "coming out" The process by which a woman comes to accept herself as a Lesbian has been examined by Ponse (1980). She identified three types of Lesbians, based upon how their identities are formed and how their biographies are constructed. For the "elective Lesbian," the woman who identifies herself as a Lesbian later in life than the "primary Lesbian," a retrospective interpretation of the past "finds it fraudulent, obscuring her true Lesbian identity" (Ponse, 1980:194). She stated:

Biographical accounts of elective Lesbians reflect a basic discontinuity in their identities and the content of their life events that is resolved by reinterpreting events that are perceived as incongruous with Lesbian identity and by selectively recounting events compatible with Lesbian identity (1980:195).

Other Lesbians, with "idiosyncratic identities," deny any continuous Lesbian identity in the past, however masked it might have been. They interpret their present identity as a Lesbian as the result of a conversion or change. These women state: "I used to be heterosexual, now I'm a Lesbian" (Ponse, 1980:195). Such women seem
to be reflective of an alternation.

Transsexuals Garfinkel's study of Agnes, an "intersexed person," a person with a feminized appearance, yet with male genitals and scrotum, is instructive (1967:118-121). At age 19, she underwent surgery to amputate the penis and scrotum, to be replaced by a "constructed" vagina. Before and after surgery, Agnes spent several hours in conversation with Garfinkel. In these discussions, she set out

...a remarkable idealized biography in which evidences of her original femininity were exaggerated while evidences of a mixture of characteristics, let alone clearcut evidences of a male upbringing, were rigorously suppressed (Garfinkel, 1967:128).

Agnes denied her "maleness" before the operation, de-emphasized her penis, and refused to recognize the 17 years of upbringing as a male. She stated:

I have always wanted to be a girl; I have always felt like a girl; and I have always been a girl but a mistaken environment forced the other thing on me (Garfinkel, 1967:130).

She was convinced that she was "naturally, originally, really after all female" (Garfinkel, 1967:164). With her identity consistently female, she became anxious while discussing male homosexuals, transvestites, and transsexuals, and refused to admit that she was in any way comparable (Garfinkel, 1967:131). Agnes negated the first identity as a male, maintaining a belief in a moral right to have a vagina and a pervasive desire to be a female (Garfinkel, 1967:131,167).

Agnes' boyfriend, who was informed of her condition only shortly before the surgery, served as an important reinforcing agent in her conception of her former penis as nonsexual (Garfinkel, 1967:157).
He was her most important referent, always coming up in her conversations with Garfinkel. Most of her success, however, in acting out the female role came from her acting out her imagination of "being a female" since beginning to dress as a female some time before the operation (Garfinkel, 1967:135).

Garfinkel summarized Agnes' situation in this way:

Time played a peculiar role in constituting for Agnes the significance of her present situation. With regard to the past, we have seen the prominence with which she historicized, making for herself and presenting us with a socially acceptable biography. We have already remarked on the fact that the work of selecting, codifying, making consistent various elements in a biography, yielded a biography that was so consistently female as to leave us without information on many important points. Two years of arduous female activities furnished for her a fascinating input of new experiences upon which this historicizing process was operated. Her attitude toward her own history required ever new rereadings of the trail that wound off behind her as she sought in reading and rereading the past for evidences to bolster and unify her present worth and aspirations. Before all, Agnes was a person with a history. Or, more pointedly perhaps, she was engaging in historicizing practices that were skilled, unrelieved, and biased (1967:178).

**Changes in primary relationships**

Changes in primary relationships bring about processes of reconstructing the past, especially the nature of the relationship and often the reason behind the changes.

**Suicide** Henslin's study of the adjustment to a suicide by surviving relatives sets out the search for "meaning" (1970:196-197).

He stated:

This search for meaning and for cause leads them continually to review their interaction with the deceased, mentally to reconstruct the past in order to determine to their satisfaction
Neutralization of guilt was the main focus of Henslin's (1970) research. In this study, guilt was associated with blaming oneself for what happened (Henslin, 1970:192). To relieve the guilt, most persons sought validation for their definitions absolving themselves of any blame from others who believed he or she was not responsible for the suicide (Henslin, 1970:223).

Beyond and obviously related to the role of supportive others is the ability to reconstruct the past. Henslin makes a distinct connection between the adjustment of the survivors of a suicide and their ability to reconstruct the past, looking back and finding clues which enabled them to understand and explain what happened (1970:199).

**Change in plant managers** Gouldner has detailed the "Rebecca myth" encountered in the context of a study of bureaucratic change (1954:79). Gouldner made this discovery when a plant underwent a change in managers, in which the workers disapproved of the new manager and ostensibly the changes instigated by him, and idealized the former manager. This idealization of the present contradicts what actually existed in the past. The former manager was not as liked as what now appears when contrasted with the new manager (Gouldner, 1954: 79-83).

Gouldner interprets this situation by suggesting that the Rebecca myth is part and parcel of the resistance to bureaucratization, in which the strictness, or rationality, of the new manager is opposed
and the leniency and informality of the former manager is extolled. While he argues that the motivation is to legitimize the past, it seems more appropriate to conclude that the assessments are designed to illustrate the illegitimacy of the present manager.

In summary, similar themes appear in these empirical studies. Where changes occur, attempts are made to make sense of present and past reality through reinterpretations and in conversations within associational relationships.

Attribution

Attribution theory is specifically relevant to the research questions since it is pertinent to analyses of past events and since it focuses on the relationship between past events and present functioning. Attribution theory was first developed by Heider (1958) and subsequently expanded by Kelley (1971), Jones and Davis (1965), Bem (1972), and others.Attributional processes are cognitive processes, which are efforts to explain causes of behavior, for self and others (Hastorf et al., 1970). Attributions of the cause of events may be made either to the person or to the environment, and may be found in the context of one's own behavior—self perception—and the behavior of others—social perception.

Kelley's analysis of causal attributions involves a covariation theory, which states that "an effect is attributed to the one of its possible causes with which, over time, it covaries" (1971:108). Possible causes include persons, entities, and time. Persons provide
checks of validity, against which the attributor may compare and con-
trast his or her own attributions (Kelley, 1971:112; Shaver, 1975:50-
53). If an attribution is similar to those made by other persons,
consensus is established as one of the criteria of validity. Such
consensus brings about confidence in attributions, which reinforces
the cognition.

Attributions may be relevant in explaining success and failure,
as well as dealing with past events. Snyder et al. (1978) focused on
egotism—the tendency to deny blame for bad outcomes and take credit
for good ones—and related it to self-esteem. Two factors are direct-
ly related to egotism: (1) a tendency to attribute the outcome to the
self, and (2) relevance for self-esteem (Snyder et al., 1978:113).
They state that "in case of failure, the threat to self-esteem will be
greater to the extent that the subject perceives the outcome as at-
tributable to self" (Snyder et al., 1978:105).

Harvey et al. explored attributions made following separation in
close relationships (i.e., marriage), specifically the attributions
employed in the "context of justification of the self and criticism of
the other" (1978:241). It was found that all persons attempt to ex-
plain and understand problems in interpersonal relationships.

Such attempts at explanation arise subsequent to the separation.
These situations are novel, devoid of scripts. During this time, if
the causal attributions are negative toward the former spouse and less
negative of the self, the "difficulty of separation [is] somewhat more
palatable" (Harvey et al., 1978:256). Such explanations are related to current levels of loneliness and depression.

Orvis et al. (1976) examined the extent of agreement of attributions in situations of conflict among dating, living-together, and married couples. While the attributional explanation of behavior holds, this interpretation goes a step beyond. Where conflicts arise in interpersonal relationships, Orvis et al. found that actors justify unfavorable behavior by using situational explanations, while observers—in this case their partners—seek redress or retribution using internal explanations (1976:363). Attributions are viewed as occurring in relationships where there is a conflict of interest, which are "obviously useful in justifying one's own actions and questioning those of the partner" (Orvis et al., 1976:378).

Hindsight and foresight were studied by Fischhoff (1976). He found that subjects exaggerate the predictability of the past through hindsight (1976:430-431). This is a process called "creeping determinism," which is the tendency to "perceive reported outcomes as having been relatively inevitable" (Fischhoff, 1975:288). When subjects underestimate the surprises in the past, and when outcomes are seen as inevitable, Fischhoff concluded that such attributions are imposed on, rather than inferred from, the evidence (1975:292-293). The past is analyzed and interpreted through the application of outcome knowledge. Fischhoff (1976) proceeded to link the present with these hindsights. He observed that with the failure of persons in recognizing, or if
recognizing, the failure to respond appropriately, ability to judge the past or learn from it is lost.

Attributional studies, in general, deal with the processes by which persons explain past behavior. Most of the literature has focused upon the cognitive dimensions of attributions and only minimally on social interaction aspects in making attributions. Attribution may be considered as a special case of the social construction of reality, in the sense that causal attributions provide meaning by which a subjective definition of reality is maintained. Persons making causal attributions often find reinforcement from associational relationships, which provides further support for attribution as a special case of social construction.

Divorce Adjustment Literature

The divorce adjustment literature continues to lack in theoretical frameworks. Studies set out empirical findings without appreciable attention being paid to their relevance for theory (see Kitson and Raschke, 1981; Price-Bonham and Balswick, 1980). Raschke (1977) has paid more attention to theory than most researchers.

The divorce adjustment literature suggests a relationship between assessments of the former marriage and the level of adjustment, or related concepts. Assessments of the past are viewed as having an impact on: identity and self (McLain and Weigert, 1979:186); conceptual and psychological processes (Weiss, 1975:14-15); resolution of the divorce crisis (Peterson, 1978); and postmarital attachment and
depression (Vernick, 1979). These studies are certainly in keeping with the work of Berger and Luckmann, in which they examine outcomes, or the extent to which resocialization is successful (1966:163).

The relevant literature argues that adjustment to divorce is closely related to how effective individuals are in understanding, explaining, and making sense of the former marriage. Peterson (1978) found that attributions of cause for the divorce to the ex-spouse were related to a negative resolution of the divorce crisis. Newman and Langer (1981) concluded that post-divorce adaptation is better if persons attribute causes of their divorce to interactive—relationship related factors—rather than personal—causes pertaining to the self or the spouse—factors. Vernick's study concluded there is a negative relationship between adjustment and assessments of the former spouse fulfilling role functions in the marriage, as well as a relationship between cause of divorce and adjustment (1979:64). These studies are consistent with Weiss' (1975) findings that persons create accounts of the marriage and attribute blame, and that these accounts have consequences for functioning.

Studies of divorce adjustment have clearly demonstrated the contributions of associational relationships to adjustment. Price-Bonham and Balswick (1980) and Kitson and Raschke (1981) provide brief reviews of the variables related to adjustment in various studies. Variables measuring social support and social participation are highly correlated with adjustment. Adjustment is associated with more social partici-
pation, dating, and being involved in an intimate relationship (see Price-Bonham and Balswick, 1980:956). Interaction with friends and family is also related to adjustment (Price-Bonham and Balswick, 1980:964–965). Organizational participation appears to be related to low levels of stress (see Kitson and Raschke, 1981:26). Further, Kitson and Raschke (1981) speculate that receiving counseling aids in adjustment.

Evidence also indicates that those who remain attached to the former spouse encounter difficulties in adjustment (Brown, 1976:189). Continuing attachment to the former spouse and stress were highly correlated in Kitson's study (1982:385). Kitson and Raschke (1981) cite studies which provide further support for this relationship, although, as Price-Bonham and Balswick (1980) indicate, the findings are somewhat equivocal.

**Divorce As Alternation**

The current analysis calls for the use of the social construction of reality theory and attribution theory to underpin the treatment of the resocialization of divorced persons. It will involve bringing together the empirical findings of divorce adjustment literature and these theoretical formulations. While it is not the goal of this research to synthesize the social construction of reality theory and attribution theory, it does seek to integrate them in the context of divorce as alternation (see Hansen, 1978:8).

Sufficient theoretical and empirical evidence has accumulated
which suggests the hypothesis that there is a relationship between assessments of the past and present functioning. The Berger and Luckmann (1966) research may legitimately be used to examine outcomes of resocialization.

It seems appropriate to posit divorce as an alternation, accepting the position of McLain and Weigert:

One effect of divorce...is to substitute a new retrospective-prospective sense of occurrence for the now former spouses as they no longer plan common futures on the basis of a shared past (1979:186).

Given the extent to which there is a disruption of subjective biography, it appears meaningful to study those who are divorced as they deal with the past. Factors related to divorce adjustment appear to include assessments of the former marriage, and relationships with present and past associates.

This study will examine the relationship between the adjustment of divorced persons and their retrospective assessments of their former marriages. It will also consider the relationship between adjustment and associational relationships. Finally, it will explore the connection among retrospective assessments, associational relationships, and adjustment.

Theoretical Hypotheses

The theoretical framework suggests that the retrospective assessments that divorced persons make about the former marriage are much more likely to be negative than positive. This reflects what Hunt
and Hunt (1977) referred to as the selective perception of the past by the divorced person. Such negative assessments would appear to re-inforce the biographical rupture, and aid in understanding the divorce. Thus, the following hypothesis will be tested.

I. In retrospection, divorced persons make more negative than positive assessments of the former marriage.

Drawing together the Berger and Luckmann (1966) research, in which it is stated that in resocialization the past is negated, with the findings from divorce adjustment literature, which indicate that divorced persons negate the past to aid adjustment to the present status (Vernick, 1979), the following hypothesis is derived.

II. There is a positive relationship between negative retrospective assessments of the former marriage and adjustment of divorced persons.

It is expected that the extent to which the divorced person has physically and emotionally abandoned or been abandoned by others from the past will be related to divorce adjustment. Specific associational relationships from the past are perceived as sustaining the reality of the former marriage, while certain associational relationships do not sustain that reality. Adjustment should improve as the divorced person distances himself from past intimates who sustain that marriage (Brown, 1976; Brown et al., 1980). This hypothesis states:

III. There is a positive relationship between abandoning past associational relationships and adjustment of divorced persons.
Support from associational relationships has been demonstrated by various researchers (Raschke, 1977) to be positively related to adjustment. It is expected that present associational relationships will aid in sustaining the present reality, in their presence and their acceptance and understanding of the divorced person. This leads to the following hypothesis.

IV There is a positive relationship between support from present associational relationships and adjustment of divorced persons.

Berger and Luckmann (1966) imply that involvement in associational relationships not only sustains the new reality, but in so doing, provides a negation of the past reality. In making the present reality "real," the past reality is evaluated negatively. This hypothesis states:

V There is a positive relationship between support from associational relationships in the present and abandonment of past associational relationships and negative retrospective assessments of the former marriage.

The final hypothesis refers to the relationship among the assessments of the former marriage, involvement in associational relationships, and adjustment. It represents a test of the model, which is set out as follows:

Assessments of the past marriage → Associational relationships → Adjustment of divorced persons

The theoretical and empirical background has not provided a clear position regarding the ordering of the variables in the model. While
the variable of adjustment is the dependent variable, the sequence of variables otherwise is unspecified. It seems plausible that negative assessments of the former marriage lead to both physical and psychological abandonment of the former spouse. It would follow that such divorced persons would also seek out associational relationships in which support for these negative assessments is in evidence.

Consequently, for heuristic purposes, the model proposes that negative assessments are first in the order of causality, and that these assessments lead the divorced person to abandon the former spouse and others from the past that sustain that reality. It would also lead to adopting new affiliates who provide support for these negative assessments while providing support and aid in sustaining the new reality. This in turn leads to higher levels of adjustment. The hypothesis is stated as follows.

VI When controlling for participation in associational relationships, the relationship between the negative assessment of the former marriage and adjustment of divorced persons will be reduced or eliminated.
CHAPTER III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This chapter includes a discussion of the population, sample, data collection, questionnaire construction, and methods of statistical analysis.

Population

The population or universe for the study includes all individuals receiving divorces in Custer County, Oklahoma, during the period from January 1, 1979, through August 17, 1981. Annulments are not included in the data, since they are extremely rare. Table 1 presents the number of divorces granted during this period.

Table 1. Divorces granted in Custer County, Oklahoma, from January 1, 1979, through August 17, 1981.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All available information was obtained from court records on the 487 divorces, which could represent up to 974 divorced persons. The actual number of persons is slightly less, since a few individuals received divorce decrees twice during the specified period. This
situation arises in two ways. First, an individual may divorce, re­mARRY, and divorce the second spouse during 1979-1981. Second, a couple granted a decree of divorce is provided a six months period during which the marriage may be reinstated, automatically vacating the divorce, and at some later time they may file another divorce petition and be granted another decree of divorce. No more than 15 individuals were identified in these latter circumstances.

The selection of the population was based upon convenience, and is justified in several ways. First, the research was designed to examine relationships between variables, not to generalize to divorced persons in Oklahoma or the United States. Second, several researchers have carried out worthwhile studies using data collected from a single county (Pais, 1978; Spanier and Hanson, 1978; and others). Third, the divorce rate in Custer County has been fairly close to that for the entire state. For example, for the year 1975, the county rate was 7.0 per 1,000 population, while the state rate was 7.5 per 1,000 popu­lation (Statistical Abstract of Oklahoma, 1978). For 1980, the county rate of divorce was 7.4 per 1,000 population with the state rate of divorce at 8.0 per 1,000.1 Fourth, although the county is small, having a State University and a large manufacturing plant employing a number of professionals located within it moderates the rural character of surrounding counties.

1Personal communication with State of Oklahoma Health Department, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, June, 1981.
Sample

The target sample was set at 400 persons, based upon financial limitations and upon the expectation that less than half the population could be located. It was hoped that it would be possible to contact every one in this group, which would provide a sufficient sample size for meaningful statistical analysis. All available information—date of filing and date of decree, name of plaintiff and defendant, party to whom the divorce was granted, number of minor children involved, any address of either party—was obtained from the Custer County Court Records in Arapaho, Oklahoma. Only in a minority of cases was there information regarding the home or mailing address of the divorced persons. Current addresses were beneficial only for those divorced within the 12 months prior to August, 1981, since the post office forwards mail no longer than a year following a move.

Names and what were believed to be current addresses were compiled for 375 divorced persons during January 1, 1979, through August 17, 1981. This number fell short of the 400 set as a goal, although all means of acquiring addresses were exhausted in compiling this number. Approximately 55 questionnaires were returned by the post office as undeliverable. It is estimated that an additional 20 were mailed to incorrect addresses and were not forwarded or were mailed to the wrong persons. This estimation is made upon the basis of several contacts—by mail and telephone—indicating several
questionnaires were received by individuals not included in the target sample. Thus, approximately 300 were delivered to the target sample.

Through November 10, 1981, 87 responses had been received. This represents a response rate of 29 percent of delivered questionnaires. Such a response rate, while less than desired, is not inconsistent with other similar surveys of divorced persons (see Peterson, 1978).

Sample Characteristics

This section will present a brief review of characteristics of the sample. A more detailed description of the sample is found in Appendix F. Most of this material serves as background information.

Slightly over half (54%) of the respondents were male. The sample was overwhelmingly white, with less than five percent non-white respondents. Mean age of the respondents was 32.5 years. Median number of years of education completed was 14.4.

A majority—77 percent—of the sample remains unmarried. Most of these (66.3%), however, have resumed dating or are now engaged to be married.

The length of time since the divorce for the sample is slightly over a year, with a mean of 14.9 months. For the majority of the respondents--approximately 76 percent--the most recent divorce terminated their first marriage, which lasted a mean length of 8.4 years.

The majority (57.5%) of the respondents were the ones who filed

---

2Although the respondents do not constitute a random sample, treating the data as a sample is legitimized in this exploratory study as a meaningful way of ordering data. See Anderson (1961).
for the divorce. The divorces were most often granted to both spouses (37.9%), almost as often to the respondent (34.5%), and least often to the former spouse (27.6%). Most of the respondents—approximately 90 percent—identified incompatibility as the legal ground for the divorce.

Comparisons between the population and the sample were carried out where the data were available for both. Generally, the sample appears to be unrepresentative for both race and education. The sample consisted of significantly more respondents from divorces where both spouses were granted the decree than was true for the population. While other comparisons—such as number of children, length of time since divorce, and sex of filer—produced no statistically significant differences between the population and the sample, it cannot be concluded that the sample is representative of the population. Further, considering the low response rate, the findings cannot be generalized to the population. Since the study was designed to examine the relationships between variables as hypothesized, no effort will be made to generalize the findings to either divorced persons in the population or in the United States as a whole.

Method of Data Collection

The data were collected through the use of mailed questionnaires. Prior to mailing the questionnaires, approval for use of the instrument
on human subjects was obtained from Iowa State University, and Southwestern Oklahoma State University, Human Subjects Committees. Southwestern Oklahoma State University was included since it provided partial funding for the research.

After the names and any past or recent addresses were obtained from the court records by the researcher, the researcher and a student helper matched names and addresses from a comprehensive telephone directory for Western Oklahoma, which covers all of Custer County. When a recent or current address and telephone number was listed, it was recorded on a master list. For those couples divorcing within the last 12 months, each was listed separately in order to mail the survey to both. Both would be forwardable by the post office if the party had moved.

Prior to the mailing of questionnaires on September 4, 1981, a press release was issued through Southwestern Oklahoma State University Office of Public Relations, to all newspapers and radio stations in Custer County. The text of this press release is located in Appendix A. It described the research, discussed the extent of divorce, and generally sought to legitimize the research (see Spanier and Hanson, 1978).

During the first week of September, 1981, the researcher, a student helper, and two student secretaries made phone calls during the evenings to as many on the list as possible. The text of this conversation is found in Appendix B. The original intentions for the
Phone calls were to (1) determine correct mailing addresses, (2) encourage response to the questionnaire, (3) obtain basic demographic data that would make possible a comparison of the respondents and the non-respondents, and (4) elicit interviews with a small group of former spouses, matching husbands and wives, in order to compare their perceptions of their former marriage. After the first few calls, it became apparent that the latter two goals would not be achieved. Over 75 percent of the attempted calls resulted in finding an unlisted, disconnected, or wrong number. Of those who were contacted, the refusal rate was less than 5 percent. It was readily apparent to the researcher and the other callers that among those contacted, the divorce was too recent an event and too sensitive a topic to be dealt with in a telephone conversation.

The primary benefits from the phone calls were to legitimize the study, gain consent in mailing the questionnaires, eliminate those unwilling to participate, and verify mailing addresses. In the latter case, it was possible to obtain box numbers, and in cases where relatives were inadvertently contacted, the exact address of the divorced person was often provided by them.

Following the mailing of the questionnaires on September 4, 1981, a post card—which is found in Appendix C—was mailed on September 29, 1981. The followup post card thanked those who had responded and encouraged those who had not to do so. This resulted in the receipt of 21 additional replies, which was 24 percent of the total received
Development of the Survey Instrument

The instrument was designed to cover several major areas of importance. They are: (A) Assessments of the Former Marriage and Spouse, (B) Present Associational Relationships, (C) Associational Relationships of the Past, (D) Adjustment of Divorced Persons, and (E) Demographic Characteristics of the Sample. The survey instrument was especially constructed for this research, combining established items and measures with measures developed for this research. The instrument is located in Appendix E.

The instrument was a self-administered, mostly structured, questionnaire of 48 items, some of which contained multiple parts. Item 1—"Where do you think marriage is going today?"—was open-ended, and was included in order to create interest and increase motivation for completing the entire questionnaire. It was presumed that divorced persons would have strong feelings about marriage, and would be highly motivated to answer this and subsequent questions (see Babbie, 1979:117).

The remaining 47 items included fixed-choice responses along with some items that might be referred to as open-ended, structured responses. The latter refers to responses of a discrete nature, such as the questions pertaining to number of years married, and number of years and months since the divorce. While most of the items required Likert responses, several allowed multiple responses.
Assessments of the former marriage and spouse

Several items dealt with the retrospective assessments made about the former marriage and spouse. These items were designed to measure subjective assessments—evaluations, descriptions, and explanations—of what happened in the former marriage, as well as an assessment of the former spouse. All of the measures indicate subjective evaluations and perceptions of the past. They are not meant to reflect "actual" past reality.

Marriage Assessment Scale This scale was developed in this research from items suggested in previous research. Blair (1969) suggested the measurement of feelings about the marriage at the beginning, as well as the closeness of married life. Vernick's (1979) research identified certain assessments of the former marriage as being important, such as satisfaction with sharing in marriage and the level of satisfaction with the fulfillment of role functions by the spouse. Several researchers have identified the attribution of cause of the divorce as a critical variable (see Peterson, 1978).

These existing measures were adapted as single items for use in this research. One item sought an assessment of the former marriage at the beginning, while another at the middle. Other items asked the respondent to evaluate their satisfaction with the fulfillment of roles by the spouse and extent of sharing in the marriage. The respondent was asked to specify which partner was the "cause" of the divorce and whose "idea" was the divorce. Three additional items
were added by the researcher. One item explored the extent to which the respondent believed his marriage allowed him to be the kind of person he wanted to be. An item examined the extent to which the respondent believed the spouse tried to save the marriage, while another asked them to make the same evaluation of their own efforts to save the marriage. Refer to Appendix E, in Items 25-28, 30a, and 30c-30f.

Factor analysis—principal component with orthogonal rotation—was used to determine if there were any underlying dimensions in the items. This was carried out as a measurement construction technique, as discussed by Nie et al. (1975:469). The purpose was to use the dimensions to create measures to be used in the analysis.

Table 2 provides the factor loading coefficients for the three factors that were elicited from the items. Factor 1 seemed to represent an assessment of the former marriage, thus was labeled "Marriage Assessment." Since four items loaded quite high on this factor, they were used to create the "Marriage Assessment Scale" (MAS). The cutoff point used was .65. Factor score coefficients for the items which had the highest loadings were used to create the scale (see Nie et al., 1975:488). Item scores were translated into "z" scores and multiplied by the factor score coefficients, then summed for each of the items to represent the scale score. The scale was created as follows:

$$\text{MAS} = .26012 \left( \frac{\text{MSHSAT} - \bar{X}}{\text{SD}} \right) + .11907 \left( \frac{\text{MSPEXP} - \bar{X}}{\text{SD}} \right) +$$
Table 2. Factor loading coefficients of items assessing the former marriage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>item</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30a</td>
<td>&quot;My former marriage never let me be the kind of person I wanted to be.&quot;</td>
<td>0.376</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30e</td>
<td>&quot;I tried to save my former marriage until there was no hope.&quot;</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30f</td>
<td>&quot;My former spouse tried to save the marriage until there was no hope.&quot;</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30c</td>
<td>&quot;When married, my former spouse did what I expected as a marriage partner.&quot;</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30d</td>
<td>&quot;When married, I was satisfied with how much my former spouse and I shared.&quot;</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>0.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>How would you assess your former marriage at the beginning?</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>-0.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>How would you assess your former marriage at the middle?</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Considering your divorce, who would you say was the cause?</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>0.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item number</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>Factor 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Whose idea was the divorce?</td>
<td>0.481</td>
<td>-0.227</td>
<td>0.264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of variance explained

|                    |                  | 65.8     | 22.3     | 11.9     |
\[ .12221 \ (MBEGIN - \bar{X}) / SD + .52456 \ (MMID - \bar{X}) / SD \]

where MSHSAT = satisfaction with how much shared with the spouse in marriage

MSEPXP = how much spouse did what was expected as a marriage partner

MBEGIN = assessment of the marriage at the beginning

MMID = assessment of the marriage at the middle

For the individual items, those measuring satisfaction with sharing in marriage and what the spouse did as a marriage partner were scored so that a high score indicated a negative assessment. Items assessing the marriage at the beginning and at the middle were reverse coded, so that a high score reflected a "very poor marriage." The scale was scored so that the higher the score, the more negative the assessment.

**Single item indicators** Since Factors 2 and 3 accounted for a small percentage of the variance (22.3 and 11.9 percent, respectively), and since only two items loaded heavily on Factor 2 and one item on Factor 3, these factors as such will not be utilized in the study. Item 28, assessing the cause of the divorce, will be used as a single item indicator. This item was scored so that a high score reflects attribution of cause to the former spouse, while a low score indicates attribution of cause to the self.

Item 30b asked: "How do you feel about the following statement? I feel guilty because my former marriage ended?" In keeping with Henslin (1970), this item was used as an indirect measure of the
extent to which one blames the self for the divorce. The higher the score, the less guilt was indicated.

Attributed idea for the divorce—Question 25—will also be used as a single item indicator. It was scored so that a high score reflects the idea being attributed to the self.

Item 31 dealt with an assessment of the relationship with the spouse at the time of divorce. It asked: "How was your relationship with your former spouse at the time of divorce?" This item was designed to measure the extent to which hostility is retrospectively perceived to have been present in the relationship. It was scored so that a higher score reflected more hostility.

Feelings toward the spouse  Item 33 dealt with feelings toward the former spouse at the time of divorce. Previous measures—the Marriage Assessment Scale (MAS) and the hostility measure mentioned above—represent assessments of the relationship. This measure focuses upon the divorced person's reported feelings toward the former spouse at the time of divorce. Assessment of feelings toward the former spouse was operationalized to refer to the extent of retrospective assessments of positive and negative feelings toward the former spouse. It asked: "What were your feelings about your spouse at the time of divorce? Mark as many as apply."

_____ I respected my spouse
_____ I found my spouse attractive
_____ I adored and cherished my spouse
_____ I loved my spouse
_____ I distrusted my spouse
I disliked my spouse
I hated my spouse
I never wanted to see my spouse again

The items were examined by Guttman scale analysis. Positive items were reverse coded, so that the responses would be consistent with the negative items. This analysis determined that three of the items—dislike, love and adore—fit together sufficiently to form a Guttman scale. The coefficient of reproducibility was .95, with a coefficient of scalability of .84. The "Negative Feelings toward the Spouse at Divorce Scale" (NFSDS) was developed as follows:

\[
NFSDS = DIVDISLK \times 1 + DIVLOVE \times 1 + DIVADORE \times 1
\]

where \(DIVDISLK\) = disliked spouse at divorce

\(DIVLOVE\) = did not love spouse at divorce

\(DIVADORE\) = did not adore and cherish spouse at divorce

The items in the scale were ranked so that disliking the spouse was the least checked item and not adoring the spouse was the most checked item. The theoretical range was 0-3. It was scored so that the higher the score, the more negative feeling toward the spouse.

Present associational relationships

Several variables measured the relationships with present affiliates. Present relationships include organizational memberships, counseling, relationships with friends, family, the former spouse, and others. Previous research has identified each of these as relevant to divorced persons. Both dyadic and triadic relationships are included, since the divorced person may receive support from both.
Groups for divorced persons and divorced friends  Item 40 dealt with membership in organizations for divorced persons. It asked: "How often have you participated in groups for divorced persons (such as Parents-Without-Partners)?" Since groups for divorced persons seek to provide support for their members (Kitson and Raschke, 1981), involvement in such an organization was operationalized to represent an indirect measure of meaningful support for the present reality of being divorced. Such should also be the case in having friends who are divorced. Thus, Question 37 asked: "Of your close friends, how many of them are divorced?" The more friends who are divorced, the more the divorced person receives support for the present reality.

Counseling  Extent of counseling was examined by Item 39. Counseling was perceived to provide support for the "divorce" reality. According to Kitson and Raschke, the general assumption is that receiving counseling aids distress (1981:27). The item asked how much counseling had been received from a minister, marriage or divorce counselor, psychologist, or other person. Since this measure was designed to assess the extent of formal counseling, the "other" category was eliminated after determining that respondents identified friends in that category. The extent of counseling was measured by the following formula:

$$\text{COUNSEL} = \text{MIN} + \text{MDCOU} + \text{PSY}$$

where MIN = frequency of counseling from a minister

$$\text{MDCOU} = \text{frequency of counseling from a marriage or divorce counselor}$$
PSY = frequency of counseling from a psychologist

The theoretical range of scores was 3-9, with the higher score reflecting more frequent counseling.

**Family support**  
Support from family members in the present was examined in Questions 42-44. These items were used to indicate the extent of perception of support provided by family members for the divorced person as an individual. The questions asked: "How accepting of you is your family now that you have been divorced (even though you may have remarried)?"; "How understanding has your family been about the problems in your former marriage?"; "How much have you confided in your family about your former marriage and divorce?"

These three items were combined in additive fashion to create a scale of "Family Support" (FAMSUP). It was developed as follows:

\[
FAMSUP = FAMCONF + FAMUNDER + FAMACC
\]

where FAMCONF = extent to which family has been confided in

FAMUNDER = extent to which family has been understanding

FAMACC = extent to which person has been accepted by the family as a divorced person

This scale has a theoretical range of 3-15, with the higher score denoting higher levels of perceived support.

**Friend support**  
Similar questions were asked of friends at the present. The measure was designed to focus upon perceived support, not the actual number of friends. Thus, the total score was divided by the total number of friends as a control. The scale, using information from Question 45, was labeled "Support of Friends" (SUP-
FRIEND). It was developed as follows:

\[ \text{SUPFRIEND} = \frac{F_1 \ (\text{CONFIDE} + \text{UNDERSTAND} + \text{ACCEPT}) + \ldots}{N} \]

\[ F_n \ (\text{CONFIDE} + \text{UNDERSTAND} + \text{ACCEPT}) / N \]

where \( N = \text{number of friends} \)

The theoretical range of the scale was 0-15.

**Associational relationships of the past**

The study included several items designed to measure the perception of support from past others, in addition to the former spouse. These variables assess the extent to which persons from the past are viewed as supportive as well as the extent to which the past reality is legitimated in the present.

**Spouse contact** Two items explored the present relationship between the respondent and the former spouse. Item 24 asked: "How often do you presently have contact with your former spouse?" This variable was scored so that the higher score reflects more frequent contact.

The nature of the relationship with the former spouse was examined by Item 32. It asked: "How is your relationship with your former spouse today?" This item was recoded, and scored so that the higher the score the friendlier the relationship.

Questions 24 and 32 were combined in additive fashion to create a measure of "Spouse Contact," as follows:

\[ \text{SPOUSE CONTACT} = \text{SPCONT} + \text{SPRENOW} \]

where \( \text{SPCONT} = \text{frequency of contact with the former spouse} \)
SPEELNOW = degree of friendliness with the former spouse

The theoretical range was 2-10, with the higher score reflecting a more positive relationship.

**Feelings toward the spouse at present**  
Item 34 assessed the present feelings of the respondent toward his or her former spouse. This measure stands in contrast to "Spouse Contact," which included an objective measure of contact, while this measure is purely subjective. It asked: "What are your feelings about your former spouse today? Mark as many as apply."

- I respect my former spouse
- I find my former spouse attractive
- I adore and cherish my former spouse
- I love my former spouse
- I distrust my former spouse
- I dislike my former spouse
- I hate my former spouse
- I never want to see my former spouse again

Guttman scale analysis was used for all items. Positive items were reverse coded, so that the responses would be consistent with the negative items. Four of the items could be manipulated to form a Guttman scale, including hate, dislike, distrust, and find the spouse attractive. Its coefficient of reproducibility was .92, with a coefficient of scalability of .72. Labeled "Negative Feelings toward the Spouse at Present Scale" (NFSPS), the scale was created as follows:

\[
\text{NFSPS} = \text{NOWHATE} \times 1 + \text{NOWDISLK} \times 1 + \text{NOWDIST} \times 1 + \text{NOWSPMT} \times 1
\]

where \text{NOWHATE} = hate for the former spouse

\text{NOWDISLK} = dislike for the former spouse

\text{NOWDIST} = distrust of the former spouse
NOWSPATT = does not find the spouse attractive

The items in the scale were ranked so that hating the spouse is the least checked item and not finding the spouse attractive is the most checked item. The theoretical range was 0-4. It was scored so that the higher the score, the more negative the feelings toward the spouse.

Contact with the former spouse, psychological involvement, and feelings toward the spouse were used to indicate the lack of support for the "reality" of divorce. Such measures represented the failure of the divorced person to make a clean break with the former spouse. If the divorced person maintains contact with the former spouse, and if that relationship is viewed as positive, that person continues to live in the past, clinging to the former spouse and their marriage. If there is minimal contact, and the feelings toward the spouse are negative, the past reality lacks support while the present reality is affirmed.

Friends and family support Item 35 asked: "Of the joint friends that you and your former spouse had while married, how many are still your friends?" The more one continues to retain friends that were joint friends with the spouse, the more likely the past reality remains legitimate. This item is scored so that the higher the score, the more past friends have been retained to the present.

Another item—Question 36—dealt with individual friends retained from the past. It asked: "Of the friends you had while you
were married, how many are still your friends?" Continuity in one's own friends would appear to provide support and opportunity for discussion of confidential matters (Kitson, 1982). The more one has retained one's own friends from the past, the more likely the present reality is sustained. The item was scored so that the higher score reflects the larger number of friends retained from the past.

One item—Question 40—analyzed the perception of the acceptance of the family at the time of divorce. It was: "How accepting of you was your family (your parents, brothers and sisters, etc.) at the time of your divorce?" This item was designed to measure the extent to which the family is retrospectively viewed as being supportive. Being viewed as nonsupportive is an indication of the legitimacy of the past reality. It is scored so that the higher the score, the more accepting the family is perceived to have been, and the more support for the present.

Question 46 dealt with the extent to which past friends—during the last few weeks of the marriage—were viewed as accepting and understanding. The same questions were asked about past friends that asked about present friends. The scale, labeled "Support of Past Friends" (PASTFRIENDS), was created in identical fashion to "Support of Friends." It was:

\[
PASTFRIENDS = F_1 \frac{(CONFIDE + UNDERSTAND + ACCEPT)}{N} + \ldots + F_n \frac{(CONFIDE + UNDERSTAND + ACCEPT)}{N}
\]

where \( N = \) number of friends
Like "Support of Friends," "Support of Past Friends" was scored so that the higher the score, the greater the perception of support. The theoretical range was 0-15. Like the other measure of support from the family in the past, this measure is used so that the more one sees past friends as supportive, the more the past reality is illegitimate and present reality legitimate.

**Adjustment of divorced persons**

The dependent variable is "adjustment of divorced persons." It is somewhat unusual, since it is "adjustment of divorced persons," rather than "divorce adjustment." This distinction is made due to efforts to avoid contamination problems (Holley, 1981; Raschke, 1975; Price-Bonham and Balswick, 1980).

The problem of contamination is one in which the "concepts measured in independent and dependent variables overlap" (Price-Bonham and Balswick, 1980:962). In essence, the variables are not unique. A thorough review of established measures of divorce adjustment indicates the absence of any measures that would avoid contamination. Established scales, such as Raschke's (1978) Postdivorce Problems and Stress Scale or Fisher's (1976) scale, include items which assess or evaluate the former marriage. Blair's (1969) measure contains such items. Since the independent variables in this study are those which assess the former marriage, the dependent variable must not include them. While the contaminated items do not represent a majority of the items in any of the scales, it is nevertheless necessary to use
an uncontaminated measure.

The measures referred to above, such as Raschke's (1978) scale, represent only one type of divorce adjustment measure. This type deals with how the person is adapting to the new status of divorce and new roles associated with being a divorced person. The other type of measure is a global assessment of adjustment or well-being, which can be administered to and is relevant for the divorced person or persons in any other life situation. Rather than direct attention to the divorced person's functioning vis-a-vis the divorced status, these measures deal with adjustment in a generic sense. Adjustment refers to the process by which one copes with the environment, regardless of what that environment is. Utilization of such a measure that looks at subjective adjustment or well-being makes possible the measurement of adjustment while avoiding contamination problems.

Adjustment was measured in this study with the Bradburn Affect Balance Scale (Bradburn, 1969). It was selected because it has been widely used as a measure of adjustment, especially in the study of divorce and because it avoids the contamination problem (Brown, 1976; Brown et al., 1977; Kitson and Sussman, 1977; Chiriboga et al., 1978; Spanier and Hanson, 1978; and others).

Bradburn indicated that the scale measures psychological well-being, or "subjective feeling states that individuals experience in their daily lives" (1969:224-225). Spanier and Lachman stated that like other measures of happiness, morale, and life satisfaction,
subjective well-being is a measure of adjustment (1980:370).

The Bradburn scale—Question 48—is a 10 item scale, with 5 items measuring positive affect and 5 items measuring negative affect. The scale is listed as follows:

During the past few weeks, how often have you felt...

a. Particularly excited or interested in something?

b. Did you ever feel so restless that you couldn't sit long in a chair?

c. Proud because someone complimented you on something you had done?

d. Very lonely or remote from other people?

e. Pleased about having accomplished something?

f. Bored?

g. On top of the world?

h. Depressed or very unhappy?

i. That things were going your way?

j. Upset because someone criticized you?

Each of the items was scored from 1 to 4, with 4 referring to "often" and 1 referring to "never." Andrews and Withey (1976) used additional response categories beyond the two—yes and no—used by Bradburn (1969), which are adopted for this study. Otherwise, the scale scores are arrived at in identical fashion to Bradburn (1969).

The Balance score was obtained by subtracting the Negative scale score from the Positive scale score. The scale scores can range from -15 to 15. For example, if the Positive score is 20, and the Neg-
ative score is 5, the Balance score is 15. If the Positive score is 5 and the Negative score is 20, the Balance score is -15.

Bradburn designed the question "During the past few weeks, how often have you felt...?" so that responses would reflect "current environmental forces and feelings of psychological well-being," not personality dispositions (1969:55). The positive and negative items were counterbalanced in the questionnaire.

Reliability and validity for the Bradburn scale are well established in the literature. Bradburn, using repeated measurement with a 3 day interval, found sufficient stability—gamma of .83—to consider the measure reliable (1969:77). Spanier and Hanson reported Cronbach's alpha of .77 for the Bradburn scale in their sample (1978:8).

For the sample used here, the Cronbach's alpha for the Bradburn scale was .84 (N = 85). The measure seems well above the minimum level of acceptability for a reliable measure.

Validity of the Bradburn scale is established in several studies. Andrews and Withey (1976) provided an extensive analysis of indicators of well-being. Their analysis of the Bradburn scale found strong correlations with other indicators of well-being (Andrews and Withey, 1976:85-87).

Spanier and Lachman (1980) used the Cantril Self-anchoring Ladder to allow for convergent validity. The Cantril correlated .53 (p<.001) with the Bradburn scale.

Since using a valid measure is of utmost importance, the Cantril
Self-anchoring Ladder (see Cantril, 1965) was included in this study—in Question 47—for a similar validity check. It asked: "Imagine the worst possible life to be a '1' and the best possible life to be a '10.' On a scale of 1 to 10, where would you rate your present life situation?" The correlation between the Cantril measure and the Bradburn scale was .47 (p<.001; N = 74). It was concluded that the Bradburn scale is a valid measure of psychological well-being and of adjustment.

Demographic characteristics of the sample

These items were gleaned from preceding studies of divorce adjustment. Most are utilized as background information. Basic information was obtained regarding sex, age, race, and educational level of the respondents.

The remainder of the background variables were marriage-related. Several of the items referred to the most recent marriage, and the subsequent divorce. They included the length of that marriage—Question 17—and length of time since the divorce—Question 18. Where time was dealt with, the response format was "Years ___ Months ___," allowing the respondent to specify the exact time length.

Several items pertaining to the divorce itself were included. Item 19 asked: "Who filed for the divorce?" Item 20 dealt with the party to whom the divorce was granted. It asked: "To whom was the divorce granted?" Oklahoma law provides for divorce as an adversary process, in which only one party may file. However, the law allows
the judge to grant the decree of divorce to either or both parties, as the facts may determine.

Item 21 asked: "On what legal ground was the divorce granted?" The respondent was asked to write in the ground for their divorce. This question was used as a validity check, since almost 100 percent of Oklahoma divorces are granted for incompatibility.

Item 14 assessed the number of times ever married. It asked: "How many times have you ever been married, including the present?" To determine the number of marriages prior to the most recent one, which led to the divorce, the number of those identifying themselves as presently remarried—Item 10—was subtracted from the responses to Item 14.

Item 10 asked: "What is your present marital status?" If the respondent was remarried, Item 11 asked: "If you are remarried, how long have you been remarried?" The respondent was asked to specify the number of years and months. If the respondent was still divorced, Item 12 inquired about dating relationships: "If you have not remarried, are you dating anyone?" The responses ranged from "not dating at all" to "engaged."

Item 10 and Item 12 were combined into a single measure and used as an indicator of involvement in a new, intimate relationship (i.e., either dating or remarried). A variable was created to measure intimacy, ranging from being remarried to not dating at all, which is a range from high to low intimacy.
Format of the Questionnaire

The instrument was 7 pages in length, with an additional page serving as a cover letter introducing the study. Appendix D contains the cover letter and Appendix E includes the survey instrument. The letter included: (1) a brief introduction to the researcher, (2) information about how the names were selected, (3) justification for the study, (4) an emphasis on anonymity and confidentiality, and (5) an offer to provide the results to interested respondents. The cover letter was printed on a letterhead from the Social Sciences Department of Southwestern Oklahoma State University, and served as an additional legitimation to the study beyond the contents of the letter. The content of the cover letter also made possible informed consent by the respondent.

The items of the survey were placed on pages 2-8. Item one was the open-ended question, serving as a lead-in to the following items. Items 2-23 included most of the demographic and background variables, as well as some assessments of the former marriage. Most of the items assessing the former marriage were found in Items 24-33. Items 34-46 contained information about associational relationships, of both the present and the past. Item 47 was the Cantril Self-anchoring Ladder and Item 48 represented the Bradburn Affect Balance Scale.

In order to obtain as much information as possible and to insure that the questionnaire appeared unimposing, it was photographically reduced in size and printed in booklet form (c.f., Hansen, 1978). It
consisted of 8 total pages of 7" by 8½".

Pretest of the Instrument

Careful attention and consideration was given to the construction of the instrument. Over a considerable period of time, the items were written and re-written, in consultation with several sociologists. Special attention was given to the items—Questions 45 and 46—dealing with present and past friends. These questions were revised several times in order to insure clarity, readability, and maximum coverage of both number of friends and description of the relationship. Given the space limitations in the questionnaire, it was necessary to obtain as much information as possible in these two items.

The instrument was pretested in July, 1981. Divorced students at Southwestern Oklahoma State University were sought out and asked to complete the instrument and to distribute copies to divorced friends. Twenty-two of the 26 distributed questionnaires were returned. Computer analysis of the responses, coupled with a visual check, indicated the need for a few changes, all regarding Questions 45 and 46. The response format—"1" is "everything" to "5" is "nothing"—was reversed for both questions. Several phrases and words were underlined in order to highlight them. A note was placed at the end of the instrument asking the respondent to check back over the questionnaire, especially Questions 45 and 46. The pretest indicated some missing responses for Item 46, but it was concluded that the item elicited the maximum information in the available
Method of Statistical Analysis

The author constructed a codebook which was used, with the help of a student and a secretary, to code the data on datasheets. The data were transferred from the codesheets to computer cards, with verifications for each transfer. Data analysis was accomplished by SPSS—Statistical Package for the Social Sciences—on the DEC PDP 11/70 computer at Southwestern Oklahoma State University, and on the IBM 360/70 computer at Oklahoma University. The Oklahoma University computer was utilized for statistical procedures—reliability and factor analysis—not available on the DEC version of SPSS.

Statistics included percentage distributions, as well as measures of central tendency—mean and median. Further, the data were analyzed by several parametric statistical procedures, including Pearson correlation, partial correlation, and multiple regression.

The Pearson correlation, "r," is a measure of association between two variables. It indicates the strength of the relationship between the two variables (Nie et al., 1975). Partial correlation is a single measure of association between two variables while controlling or adjusting for the effects of one or more additional variables (Nie et al., 1975).

Multiple regression was used to analyze the relationship between a dependent variable and a set of independent variables. Hierarchical regression allows the researcher to determine the amount of variance
in the dependent variable explained by independent variables entered in a pre-determined order (Nie et al., 1975).
CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS

This chapter will present the mean scores on the major scales and measures used in this study. It will also set out the results of the tests of the hypotheses.

Scale Scores

The Bradburn Affect Balance Scale is a measure of psychological well-being, of the subjective feeling states experienced in everyday life (Bradburn, 1969:226). In this study, it is used as a global measure of adjustment experienced by divorced persons (Spanier and Lachman, 1980), and serves as the dependent variable. The range of the Bradburn scores for the sample was -15 to 13, with a mean of 2.7 and a standard deviation of 5.9.

Comparable scores were reported by Spanier and Lachman (1980). Their divorced sample had a mean of 2.6 and a standard deviation of 5.6, using the earlier version of the Bradburn scale which contained an additional item (Spanier and Lachman, 1980:372-373). Their scores seem to be consistent with the findings in this study. Thus, it appears there is sufficient variability in this scale to permit meaningful statistical analysis.

A comparison of divorced persons with persons in the general population provides a relative assessment of adjustment of the divorced. Divorced persons in this sample are compared with persons in the general population—using results taken from previously published surveys—in Table 3. It appears that the respondents are moderately
Table 3. Comparison of the results of Bradburn items with previous studies (in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>General population</th>
<th>Divorced sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excited or interested in something</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proud after having been complimented</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplished something</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On top of the world</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having things go your way</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel restless</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonely or remote from people</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bored</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depressed or unhappy</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upset because of criticism</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a^\) Percentage of "several times" and "often" for the sample used in this study.


\(^c^\) Percentage of "several" and "a lot" (in Andrews and Withey, 1976:321).
well adjusted. Spanier and Lachman found their divorced respondents to be less well-adjusted than a sample from the general population on the Bradburn measure (1980:373). These data are consistent with previous findings which indicate divorced persons rank lower on adjustment measures—indicators of well-being—than other individuals (Bradburn, 1969; Campbell, 1981). In this study, 31 percent of the sample had negative scores, compared to 17 percent in the general population in the Andrews and Withey study (1976:321). It seems clear from Table 3 that the divorced sample studied here is subject to a wider range of affect scores. Although the response categories are not identical, some comparisons are possible. The divorced sample is slightly but consistently higher on the positive items and much higher on the negative items. This appears consistent with the findings of Weiss (1975) that divorce is often followed by mood swings from depression at one extreme to euphoria at the other extreme.

For other scales and measures created in this research, Table 4 provides information regarding the mean and standard deviation for each, along with the possible range and observed range of scores. The Marriage Assessment Scale (MAS), Negative Feelings toward the Spouse at Divorce Scale (NFSDS), Negative Feelings toward the Spouse at Present Scale (NFSPS), and Spouse Contact appear to have sufficient variation for use in the hypotheses. Family Support, Support from Past Friends, and Support from Present Friends have relatively high means—of near 12—with minimal variation. This appears to represent the perception
Table 4. Summary statistics for additional measures included in the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Observed range</th>
<th>Possible range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>3-7</td>
<td>3-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse Contact</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2-10</td>
<td>2-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Support</td>
<td>12.19</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>5-15</td>
<td>3-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage Assessment Scale (MAS)</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-1.7-(+1.45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Feelings toward the Spouse at Divorce Scale (NFSDS)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from Present Friends</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>0-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from Past Friends</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>5-15</td>
<td>0-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Feelings toward the Spouse at Present Scale (NFSPS)</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>0-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of relatively high levels of support from these relationships. Most of the respondents ranked low on Counseling frequency, with very little variation in the measure. While this measure appears to be a valid measure, the respondents in the sample are not well-distributed along the range of possible responses.

Testing of the Hypotheses

This section will translate the general hypotheses into empirical
hypotheses, and report on the tests of the hypotheses. The general hypotheses will be accepted if half or more of the empirical hypotheses are supported.

The first hypothesis stated: In retrospection, divorced persons make more negative than positive assessments of the former marriage. These assessments may be operationalized in a number of ways: positive versus negative, good versus poor, or the extent to which the respondents specify hostility, dissatisfaction, and unfulfilled expectations. They may also include an assessment of the cause of the divorce, as well as the attribution of the idea for the divorce.

It is expected that when divorced persons look back at their former marriage, the evaluations they make are likely to be negative. It is also expected that in order to protect the self, the divorced person is most likely to say their spouse caused the divorce, while saying it was their idea for the divorce.

This hypothesis may be tested, through the following empirical hypotheses, by contrasting the proportions of positive and negative assessments made to several items by the respondents.

Exploring the retrospective assessments of the former marriage at specific points in the past, the focus is directed to the "middle" and the "beginning." It predicts that divorced persons are likely to make negative assessments about their former marriage at both of these points in time. The hypothesis states:

EH I a In retrospection, divorced persons will make fewer positive than negative assessments of their former marriage both (1) at the beginning and (2) at the middle of that marriage.
Table 5. Assessment of the marriage at the beginning and at the middle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessments</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Missing data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EH I a 1:

Marriage at beginning

N | (%) | (%) | (%) | (%) | (%) |
---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
23 | (26.4) | 18 | (20.7) | 26 | (26.9) | 15 | (17.2) | 5 | (5.7) |

EH I a 2:

Marriage at middle

N | (%) | (%) | (%) | (%) | (%) | (%) | (%) | (%) |
---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
14 | (16.1) | 12 | (13.8) | 22 | (25.6) | 24 | (27.4) | 14 | (16.1) | 1 | (1.1) |

It may be observed in Table 5 that slightly less than half (47.1%) of the sample indicated they had a "very good" or "good" marriage at the beginning. By the middle of the marriage, only 29.9 percent of the sample defined their marriage as "very good" or "good." In contrast, 22.9 percent characterized the beginning of the marriage as "poor" or "very poor," while 43.7 percent characterized the middle of the marriage as "poor" or "very poor." The shift in these scores from the beginning of the marriage to the middle, in retrospection it should be noted, along with the actual proportions in the "poor" and "very poor" categories, represents a moderate degree of negative assessments.

Another hypothesis refers to the assessment of the relationship with the former spouse at divorce as friendly or hostile. It is expected that the divorced person will characterize the relationship at
divorce as hostile rather than friendly. This hypothesis states:

EH I b In retrospection, divorced persons are more likely to indicate hostile rather than friendly relations with the former spouse at divorce.

Table 6 presents the results. Over twice the number of respondents in the sample (57.4% compared to 26.4%) labeled the relations as "hostile" or "very hostile" compared to "friendly" or "very friendly."

Table 6. Assessment of the relationship with the spouse at divorce

| Assessments |
| Item | Very hostile | Hostile | Apathetic | Friendly | Very friendly |
| Relationship with the spouse at divorce | N (%) | 21 (24.1) | 29 (33.3) | 14 (16.1) | 21 (24.1) | 2 (2.3) |

In keeping with Harvey et al. (1978), attributing the cause of the divorce to the former spouse was used to indicate the extent of negative assessment of the former spouse. Attributing the idea of the divorce to the self, and lack of guilt, were used as indicators—although indirect—of a retrospection of the self as positive and the former spouse as negative. This hypothesis states:

EH I c In retrospection, the divorced person is more likely to attribute (1) the cause of the divorce to the spouse than the self, (2) the idea of the divorce to the self than the spouse, and (3) indicate low rather than high levels of guilt over the divorce.
Table 7. Assessment of cause of divorce, idea for divorce, and guilt over the marriage ending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>All self</th>
<th>Mostly self</th>
<th>Both self and spouse</th>
<th>Mostly spouse</th>
<th>All spouse</th>
<th>Missing data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EH I c 1: Cause of divorce</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1)</td>
<td>2 (4.6)</td>
<td>32 (36.8)</td>
<td>42 (48.3)</td>
<td>6 (6.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH I c 2: Idea for divorce</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>23 (26.4)</td>
<td>15 (17.2)</td>
<td>23 (26.4)</td>
<td>11 (12.6)</td>
<td>15 (17.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH I c 3: Feel guilty over the marriage ending</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>6 (6.9)</td>
<td>21 (24.1)</td>
<td>16 (18.4)</td>
<td>21 (24.1)</td>
<td>23 (26.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data found in Table 7 indicate that the respondents overwhelmingly identified the spouse as the primary cause of the divorce. Few respondents defined themselves as the cause (5.7% marked either "all self" or "mostly self") while the majority identified the spouse as being primarily responsible (55.2% marked either "all spouse" or
"mostly spouse"). Where respondents identified either self or spouse as having the idea for the divorce, the self was more often chosen than the spouse (43.6% compared to 29.8%). Further, about half (50.5%) stated they "strongly disagree" or "disagree" with the statement that they feel guilty over the marriage ending, whereas 31 percent stated they "strongly agree" or "agree" they feel guilty over the marriage ending.

Utilizing two assessments of the husband-wife relationship, it is anticipated that divorced persons will voice dissatisfaction with the sharing in marriage and indicate unfulfilled expectations of the spouse in the marriage. The hypothesis is stated as follows:

**EH 1 d** In retrospection, divorced persons are more likely to indicate (1) dissatisfaction than satisfaction with the sharing in marriage, and (2) failure than success of the spouse in fulfilling their expectations in the marriage.

The data in Table 8 suggest that essentially twice the number of respondents were dissatisfied and unfulfilled as were satisfied and fulfilled. Some 57.4 percent "disagreed" or "strongly disagreed" with the statement that they were satisfied with the sharing in marriage, compared to 27.6 percent who "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with the statement. About 67 percent "disagreed" or "strongly disagreed" with the statement that the spouse did what was expected in the marriage, compared to 26.4 percent who "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with the statement.
Table 8. Assessment of satisfaction with sharing in marriage and the former spouses' fulfillment of expectations in marriage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EH I d 1: Satisfied with sharing in marriage</td>
<td>N 4 (%)</td>
<td>20 (23.0)</td>
<td>13 (14.9)</td>
<td>29 (33.3)</td>
<td>21 (24.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH I d 2: Spouse did as expected in marriage</td>
<td>N 4 (%)</td>
<td>19 (21.8)</td>
<td>6 (6.9)</td>
<td>36 (41.4)</td>
<td>22 (25.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the empirical hypotheses are supported by the data. The general hypothesis is accepted that divorced persons make more negative assessments of the former marriage and spouse.

One further analysis was carried out in this connection. Table 9 presents the correlation coefficients among the measures assessing the former marriage. Included are the Marriage Assessment Scale (MAS), cause of the divorce, idea for the divorce, Negative Feelings toward the Spouse at Divorce Scale (NFSDS), hostile relationship at divorce, and feelings of guilt.

Of the 15 relationships, 10 are significantly related. The Marriage Assessment Scale (MAS) is significantly correlated with all
Table 9. Correlation coefficients among the measures assessing the former marriage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>MAS&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>Idea</th>
<th>NFSDS&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Hostile relationship at divorce</th>
<th>Guilt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAS</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFSDS</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile relationship at divorce</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
<td>p&lt;.008</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilt</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>MAS refers to the Marriage Assessment Scale.

<sup>b</sup>NFSDS refers to the Negative Feelings toward the Spouse at Divorce Scale.

Other variables in contrast to Guilt, which is correlated with only two of the variables. Simply stated, divorced persons who score high on the Marriage Assessment Scale (MAS) are more likely to attribute the cause of the divorce to the spouse, the idea for the divorce to themselves, to indicate a hostile relationship with the former spouse at divorce, to have more negative feelings toward the spouse at divorce,
and experience low levels of guilt. It should be noted that Guilt is positively correlated with the Marriage Assessment Scale (MAS), since Guilt is scored so that a high score indicates low levels of guilt.

The second general hypothesis predicted: There is a positive relationship between negative retrospective assessments of the former marriage and adjustment of divorced persons. The indicators for the negative assessments of the marriage are those variables treated in Table 9. The indicator of adjustment is the Bradburn scale. Six empirical hypotheses are set out, along with correlation coefficients as tests of the hypotheses. They are:

**EH II a** The higher the score in attributing the cause of the divorce to the spouse, the higher the score on the Bradburn scale.

\[ r = .03 \quad \text{NS} \]

**EH II b** The higher the score in attributing the idea for the divorce to the self, the higher the score on the Bradburn scale.

\[ r = .15 \quad \text{NS} \]

**EH II c** The higher the score on feeling guilty (i.e., less guilt) over the breakup of the marriage, the higher the score on the Bradburn scale.

\[ r = .32 \quad p<.001 \]

**EH II d** The higher the score on assessment of relations with the spouse at divorce as being hostile, the higher the score on the Bradburn scale.

\[ r = .02 \quad \text{NS} \]

**EH II e** The higher the score on the Marriage Assessment Scale (MAS), the higher the score on the Bradburn scale.

\[ r = .22 \quad p<.02 \]
The higher the score on Negative Feelings toward the Spouse at Divorce Scale (NFSDS), the higher the score on the Bradburn scale.

\[ r = .27 \quad p < .006 \]

These data provide only moderate support to the general hypothesis, given that the relationships are significant for three of the six tests. The retrospective assessments which are positively related to the Bradburn are the Marriage Assessment Scale (MAS), Guilt, and Negative Feelings toward the Spouse at Divorce Scale (NFSDS). Adjustment, then is associated with assessing the former marriage in negative terms, having negative feelings about the spouse at divorce, and experiencing low levels of guilt. It should be noted that attributing the idea of the divorce to the self is near statistical significance, and in the direction as hypothesized. Attributing the cause of the divorce to the former spouse and the assessment of the relationship with the spouse at divorce as hostile were not related to adjustment.

The three independent variables—Marriage Assessment Scale (MAS), Guilt, and Negative Feelings toward the Spouse at Divorce Scale (NFSDS)—which reached statistical significance with the dependent variable will be used further in the analysis. The other measures will be deleted from further examination.

The third hypothesis stated: There is a positive relationship between abandoning past associational relationships and adjustment of divorced persons. This hypothesis is examined using two types of relationships. First, it includes relationships which support the past
reality—the former marriage. Second, relationships which provide support for the present reality, in opposition to the reality of the former marriage, are explored. Measures of past relationships include social psychological assessment of support as well as extent of participation in certain relationships. This hypothesis is designed to examine the actual extent to which the spouse and additional social relationships from the past have been withdrawn from, and the relationships terminated. Abandonment refers to the process initiated by either "alter" or "ego," generally pertaining to the process of letting go of the past.

It is expected that success in abandoning affiliates from the past, who sustain that reality, will be related to high levels of adjustment. Maintaining a relationship with the former spouse and holding positive feelings about the spouse, as well as retaining joint friends from the former marriage, are indicators of relationships from the past in which the marriage reality is maintained. The empirical hypotheses, along with the results of the tests, are listed below:

EH III a The lower the score on contact with the former spouse at present (SPCONT), the higher the score on the Bradburn scale.

\[ r = -.17 \quad p < .06 \]

EH III b The higher the score on Negative Feelings toward the Spouse at Present Scale (NFSPS), the higher the score on the Bradburn scale.

\[ r = .30 \quad p < .002 \]

EH III c The lower the number of joint friends of husband and wife during the marriage retained as present friends by the divorced person, the higher the score on the Bradburn scale.
It is further expected that certain relationships from the past, in which the divorced person and the divorce reality is sustained, will be positively related to adjustment. These measures include actual number of the respondent's own friends from the marriage retained in the present as well as perception of support from family and friends in the past. The hypotheses, and their tests, are as follows:

**EH III d** The higher the number of friends during the marriage retained as present friends, the higher the score on the Bradburn scale.

\[ r = -.05 \text{ NS} \]

**EH III e** The higher the score on the perception of acceptance of one's family at divorce, the higher the score on the Bradburn scale.

\[ r = .08 \text{ NS} \]

**EH III f** The higher the score on perception of support from one's friends in the past, the higher the score on the Bradburn scale.

\[ r = .19 \text{ p}<.065 \]

Only one of the empirical tests is statistically significant, although two others are in the hypothesized direction and near statistical significance. Given these findings, the general hypothesis cannot be accepted.

The fourth general hypothesis stated: There is a positive relationship between support from present associational relationships and adjustment of divorced persons. This hypothesis emphasized that the extent of involvement in present relationships, as well as the perception of social support from others, should be related to adjustment.
Present associational relationships as measured in this study include perception of family support, support from present friends, number of friends divorced, participation in groups for divorced persons, counseling, and involvement in a new, intimate relationship. It is anticipated that the perception of support from family and friends at present is positively related to adjustment. It is also anticipated that participation in specific relationship—counseling, groups for divorced persons, friendships with other persons who are divorced, and a new, intimate relationship—by providing support for the present reality, will be positively related to adjustment. The empirical hypotheses, with the tests, are listed as follows:

**EH IV a** The higher the score on perception of support from one's family, the higher the score on the Bradburn scale.

\[ r = .18 \quad p < .05 \]

**EH IV b** The higher the score on perception of support from one's present friends, the higher the score on the Bradburn scale.

\[ r = .01 \quad NS \]

**EH IV c** The higher the frequency of participation in groups for divorced persons, the higher the score on the Bradburn scale.

\[ r = -.04 \quad NS \]

**EH IV d** The higher the score on the frequency of counseling, the higher the score on the Bradburn scale.

\[ r = -.04 \quad NS \]

**EH IV e** The higher the score on the number of friends who are divorced, the higher the score on the Bradburn scale.

\[ r = -.03 \quad NS \]
The higher the score on involvement in a new, intimate relationship, the higher the score on the Bradburn scale.

\[ r = .42 \quad p<.001 \]

Only two of the six relationships reached statistical significance, which provides only minimal support for the general hypothesis. It seems that only present participation in a new, intimate relationship and perception of support from kin are meaningfully related to adjustment.

Hypothesis 5 stated: There is a positive relationship between support from associational relationships in the present and abandonment of past associational relationships and negative retrospective assessments of the former marriage. It proposes that the more negation of the former marriage, the more one will adopt new affiliates in the present who sustain the new reality and abandon associational relationships from the past that sustain the past reality. For these tests, only measures of associational relationships and negation of the former marriage that were meaningfully related to adjustment in the previous hypotheses will be used. This includes three measures of retrospective assessments—the Marriage Assessment Scale (MAS), Guilt, and Negative Feelings toward the Spouse at Divorce Scale (NFSUDS)—and five measures of associational relationships—involvement in a new, intimate relationship, perception of support from the family at present, perception of support from friends in the past, contact with the former spouse, and Negative Feelings toward the Spouse at Present Scale (NFSPS). The empirical hypotheses are:
EH V a The higher the scores on measures of negation of the former marriage (MAS, Guilt, and NFSDS), the higher the score on involvement in a new, intimate relationship.

EH V b The higher the scores on measures of negation of the former marriage (MAS, Guilt, and NFSDS), the higher the score on perception of support from one's family.

EH V c The higher the scores on measures of negation of the former marriage (MAS, Guilt, and NFSDS), the higher the score on perception of support from friends in the past.

EH V d The higher the scores on measures of negation of the former marriage (MAS, Guilt, and NFSDS), the lower the scores on present contact with the former spouse.

EH V e The higher the scores on measures of negation of the former marriage (MAS, Guilt, and NFSDS), the higher the scores on Negative Feelings toward the Spouse at Present Scale (NFSPS).

Table 10 present the tests of the hypotheses. Since only 5 of the 15 relationships are statistically significant, the general hypothesis is not accepted. Perception of support from past friends and present family are not related to negation of the former marriage. Present negative feelings toward the former spouse are highly correlated with negative assessments of the former marriage. The Marriage Assessment Scale (MAS) appears to be associated with present involvement in a new, intimate relationship, and low levels of contact with the former spouse.

The sixth general hypothesis stated: When controlling for participation in associational relationships, the relationship between the negative assessment of the former marriage and adjustment of divorced persons will be reduced or eliminated. This hypothesis proposes that the relationship between the negative assessments of the former marriage and adjustment is indirect. It indicates that when the variables...
Table 10. Correlation coefficients between measures assessing the former marriage and associational relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Associational relationships</th>
<th>MASa</th>
<th>Guilt</th>
<th>NFSDSb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intimate relationship</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past friends</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse contact</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFSPSC</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.57*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aMAS refers to the Marriage Assessment Scale.
bNFSDS refers to the Negative Feelings toward the Spouse at Divorce Scale.
cNFSPS refers to the Negative Feelings toward the Spouse at Present Scale.

*Significant at the .01 level.

measuring associational relationships are controlled, individually, the "relationship" between assessment and adjustment will be reduced or eliminated. This argument specifies that participation in associational relationships is the result of negative assessments of the former marriage, and this in turn leads to adjustment. For the tests of this hypothesis, only those variables which were meaningfully related in the bivariates above will be used. The empirical hypotheses state:
EH VI a The positive relationship between scores on negative assessments of the former marriage (MAS, Guilt, and NFSDS), and scores on adjustment (Bradburn), will be reduced or eliminated when one controls for involvement in a new, intimate relationship.

EH VI b The positive relationship between scores on negative assessments of the former marriage (MAS, Guilt, and NFSDS), and scores on adjustment (Bradburn), will be reduced or eliminated when one controls for scores on perception of support from the family.

EH VI c The positive relationship between scores on negative assessments of the former marriage (MAS, Guilt, and NFSDS), and scores on adjustment (Bradburn), will be reduced or eliminated when one controls for scores on perception of support from friends in the past.

EH VI d The positive relationship between scores on negative assessments of the former marriage (MAS, Guilt, and NFSDS), and scores on adjustment (Bradburn), will be reduced or eliminated when one controls for scores on contact with the former spouse at present.

EH VI e The positive relationship between scores on negative assessments of the former marriage (MAS, Guilt, and NFSDS), and scores on adjustment (Bradburn), will be reduced or eliminated when one controls for scores on Negative Feelings toward the Spouse at Present Scale (NFSPS).

Table 11 presents the correlation coefficients for these relationships. It includes the correlation coefficients for the bivariate relationships between adjustment and the measures of negation, as well as the partial correlation coefficients when the associational relationships are individually controlled. While some of the relationship are statistically reduced, most were not affected by the controls. Since the relationships were not "reduced or eliminated," the general hypothesis is not accepted. Participation in associational relationships does not operate as an intervening variable in the relationship.
Table 11. Correlation coefficients between measures of adjustment of divorced persons (Bradburn) and negative assessments of the former marriage when associational relationships vary and are held constant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative assessments</th>
<th>Intimate relationship</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Past friends</th>
<th>Spouse contact</th>
<th>NFSPS(^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAS(^b)</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilt</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFSDS(^c)</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)NFSPS refers to the Negative Feelings toward the Spouse at Present Scale.

\(^b\)MAS refers to the Marriage Assessment Scale.

\(^c\)NFSDS refers to the Negative Feelings toward the Spouse at Divorce Scale.

between negative assessments of the former marriage and adjustment of divorced persons.

The model was examined further by regression analysis. Hierarchical regression was used in order to enter the variables of assessment of the former marriage prior to variables of associational relationships. Multiple measures of assessments and associational relationships were not used in order to avoid problems of multicollinearity, where independent variables are highly correlated (Nie et al., 1975:340). One measure of assessments—the Marriage Assessment Scale (MAS)—and one
measure of associational relationships—involvement in a new, intimate relationship—were used in this analysis. If the model is supported by the data, the Marriage Assessment Scale (MAS) should account for the largest proportion of variance in adjustment, with involvement in an intimate relationship following and accounting for less variance. The results are provided in Table 12. It is apparent that the Marriage Assessment Scale (MAS) accounts for only 5 percent of the variance, while involvement in an intimate relationship accounts for 12 percent of the variance. It may be concluded that the model is not supported.

Since this model was not supported, an alternative model is proposed and tested. It is as follows:

Associational relationships $\rightarrow$ Assessments of the past marriage $\rightarrow$ Adjustment of divorced persons

The model proposes that participation in associational relationships leads to negative assessments of the former marriage, which leads to
adjustment. Table 13 sets out partial correlation coefficients between adjustment of divorced persons and associational relationships controlling for negative assessments of the former marriage. The bivariate relationships which are changed are those which relate to the ex-spouse: spouse contact and Negative Feelings toward the Spouse at Present Scale. These relationships are reduced substantially, while the others are not. The model receives support from associational relationships involving the former spouse, but is not supported for past friends, family support, and intimate relationships.

Table 13. Correlation coefficients between measures of adjustment of divorced persons (Bradburn) and associational relationships when negative assessments of the former marriage vary and are held constant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Associational relationships</th>
<th>Adjustment</th>
<th>MAS(^a)</th>
<th>Guilt</th>
<th>NFSDS(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intimate relationship</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Friends</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse contact</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFSPS(^c)</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)MAS refers to the Marriage Assessment Scale.

\(^b\)NFSDS refers to the Negative Feelings toward the Spouse at Divorce Scale.

\(^c\)NFSPS refers to the Negative Feelings toward the Spouse at Present Scale.
Like the above regression, another regression was run entering the intimate relationship first, then the Marriage Assessment Scale. Table 14 indicates that as proposed, the intimate relationship accounted for the largest proportion of variance in the adjustment measure. These data lend support to the alternative model.

Table 14. Multiple regression on adjustment (Bradburn), entering intimate relationship first, then Marriage Assessment Scale (MAS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Multiple r</th>
<th>$R^2$ change</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intimate relationship</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage Assessment</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$r^2 = .17$
CHAPTER V. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter will provide a discussion of the findings, relating them back to the theory. It will also include conclusions, limitations to the research, and suggestions for future research.

Negation of the Former Marriage

The findings support the hypothesis that divorced persons make a significant and disproportionate number of retrospective negative assessments of the former marriage. Such assessments represent evaluations, descriptions, and explanations of what happened in the marriage—what existed, what went wrong, and attribution of blame. Of all the assessments which can be made regarding the former marriage, perhaps the most telling is the evaluation of the marriage at the beginning. In retrospect, the respondents characterized the marriage in less than glowing terms. Slightly over half (52.8%) rated their marriage at the beginning as no better than "average." By comparison, for Blair's divorced sample, 33 percent indicated they felt "average," "unhappy," or "very unhappy" in the beginning months of their marriages (1969:50). In another study conducted in Oklahoma, Hayes et al. found 15 percent of their divorced sample thinking their marriage was wrong from the beginning (1980:24). Although the respondents in this study are not out of line with the other studies, they did make more negative assessments of their marriages. Some of the differences may be attributed to wording differences in the various items. For the enthusiasm, optimism, and romanticism that is characteristic of
practically all persons initiating marriage, these divorced persons provide evaluations in retrospect which are noticeably different.

The pattern which emerged from the study was one in which divorced persons were more likely to make negative than positive retrospective assessments of their former marriage. The majority of the divorced retrospectively viewed the spouse as failing to perform as expected, as well as indicating dissatisfaction with the sharing in the marriage. The relationship with the former spouse was characterized by most respondents as hostile at the time of divorce.

Divorced persons were much more likely to attribute the cause of the divorce to the spouse than the self. Table 13 presents a comparison of spouse to whom cause of divorce is attributed in this study and two previous studies (in percentages).

Table 15. Comparison of spouse to whom cause of divorce is attributed in this study and two previous studies (in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spouse causing divorce</th>
<th>This study</th>
<th>Spanier and Anderson</th>
<th>Brown^a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self^c</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both self and spouse</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse^c</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a1976:53.
^b1979:608.
^cIndicates primary responsibility.
ison of the attribution of cause of the divorce with the results of two other studies. While it was the case that the divorced persons in this sample were more likely to attribute the cause of the divorce to the spouse than the other studies, these results are quite consistent with those studies. Divorced persons appear more likely to attribute primary responsibility to the spouse, rather than to attribute equal responsibility between the self and the spouse for the divorce.

While the divorced persons are more likely to attribute the cause of the divorce to their spouses, they are more likely to state it was their idea for the divorce. More persons indicate they do not feel guilty over the marriage than those who do feel guilty. However, the data did not support the expectation that cause of divorce attributed to the spouse would be related to attributing the idea of the divorce to the self.

The retrospective assessments were significantly interrelated. An important pattern emerged while examining the correlations between the Marriage Assessment Scale (MAS) and the other variables measuring the assessments of the former marriage. Persons who had high scores on the MAS were more likely to attribute the cause of the divorce to the spouse, the idea for the divorce to the self, to have more negative feelings toward the spouse at divorce, to have characterized the relationship with the spouse at divorce as hostile, and to have experienced low levels of guilt. The pattern is generally one in which the evaluations of the past are consistently negative toward the re-
relationship and the former spouse, and much less negative toward the self.

Why is there such a negation of the former marriage? The social construction of reality theory of Berger and Luckmann (1966) posits that when individuals experience alternations, they use the present to explain and make sense of the past. In situations of biographical rupture, persons deal with the past by explaining and justifying how they got to be where they are presently. For these persons, the "solution" is a negation of the past.

For divorced persons, the present reality is that of "divorce," which they attempt to explain. For many of them, it involves explaining what was wrong in the past. The marriage is described as a failure, which accounts for the divorce occurring.

For those persons who make positive assessments of the former marriage, it remains to be determined if they are resisting the divorce, clinging to some hope that reconciliation will occur, or if these positive statements represent the ambivalence of divorced persons discussed by Weiss (1975). In the latter case, the individual alternates between continuing love for the spouse and the acceptance of the divorce.

For those individuals who can find nothing wrong or negative in the past, resistance to resocialization would be likely. Just as there are religious converts unable to negate the past, there are divorced persons unable or unwilling to do so. Berger and Luckmann (1966) in-
dicate that not all outcomes of resocialization processes are successes.

Why is blame for the divorce directed primarily at the former spouse? Snyder et al. (1978) have argued that where self-esteem is at stake, persons tend to deny blame to themselves for bad outcomes. While divorced persons are willing to accept some of the blame for the divorce by sharing responsibility with the spouse, and feel guilty over the divorce, most of them indicate that the former spouse was primarily responsible for the divorce. Harvey et al. imply that the emotionality involved in conflicts prevents those involved from knowing their own and their spouse's minds, and the attributions made are often "justificatory and defensive" (1978:257). This selective perception may explain why researchers find a predominance of rejecters among the divorced (see Federico, 1979:102).

The past is "reconstructed" in terms of the present reality of divorce. For a number of divorced persons, a trajectory of events is set out, leading inevitably to the divorce. The present reality is made meaningful when previous events and persons are viewed as precursors of the divorce. After all, if one's marriage was poor from the beginning, and if the spouse did not perform as expected in marriage, no wonder the divorce occurred. One's own situation is justified as the spouse is blamed for the problems leading to the divorce.

While these responses are skewed in the direction of negative assessments, the variability in the assessments of the former marriage
and the former spouse makes possible the examination of the relationship between these assessments and adjustment of divorced persons.

This research has demonstrated that the Marriage Assessment Scale (MAS), Guilt (i.e., low guilt), and Negative Feelings toward the Spouse at Divorce Scale (NPSDS) are related to adjustment. The correlations were .22, .32, and .27, respectively.

None of the other assessments of the former marriage were significantly related to adjustment. Neither the attribution of cause nor the idea for the divorce were related to adjustment. Identifying the relationship with the spouse at divorce as hostile was not related to adjustment.

It may be concluded that only certain retrospective assessments of the former marriage are related to adjustment. Even though divorced persons make causal attributions, the extent of self-spouse blame does not appear to be related to adjustment. In this sense, these findings are not inconsistent with Peterson (1978), who found singular attribution of cause of divorce to the former spouse to be related to poor adjustment. Peterson (1978), however, did not measure the extent of self-spouse blame, and thus it is not possible to fully compare her findings to those in this study.

The implications of Newman and Langer's (1981) research are that attributions of cause of the divorce to either the self or the spouse fail to take into consideration environmental forces (i.e., interactive factors, or qualities of the relationship). Based upon their findings, better adjusted persons tend to attribute cause to interactive factors,

Although attributing the idea for the divorce to the self was not related to adjustment, Blair found poorer adjustment to be associated with the spouse "suggesting" the divorce (1969:72). Interpretation of the results are complicated with the use of similar concepts—"idea for the divorce," "suggesting the divorce," and "filing for the divorce." While similar, these ideas are conceptually distinct. That neither cause of divorce nor idea for divorce were related to adjustment is a denotation of logical consistency.

Insofar as the measure of hostility at divorce represents a retrospective account of actual behavior, it does not seem to be related to adjustment. It was related to the Marriage Assessment Scale (MAS) and other assessments of the former marriage. Hostility at divorce may serve as an antecedent to these assessments of the former marriage.

The relationships which were statistically significant involved very general negations of the former relationship, as well as the extent of negative feelings toward the former spouse at divorce. Assessments pertaining to the former spouse which were related to adjustment were specific and indirect assessments. In addition, absence of guilt, used as an indirect assessment of the self in the past—implying an absolution of the self—was positively related to adjustment. Better adjustment is related to higher levels of negative assessments of the former marriage, more negative feelings toward the spouse at divorce, and low levels of guilt.
Where divorced persons have accounts and explanations for what happened, they appear to come to terms with the past (Beatrice, 1979). For persons experiencing an alternation, and confronted with the prospects of resocialization, it appears that certain retrospective negative accounts and explanations are associated with positive outcomes. Such negative accounts of the past augment the biographical rupture (Kitson et al., 1980).

A key feature to the relationship between negating the past and adjustment is the use of present reality in structuring the assessments of the past. A divorce has occurred, consequently the divorced person provides assessments of the past which emphasize and perhaps exaggerate the extent of the alternation. As the previous reality is negated, the present reality is made meaningful. While there is no continuity from the marriage situation to the divorce situation, as there is in secondary socialization, for divorced persons the reality of the past marriage and the present reality of divorce are interconnected.

Successful resocialization after divorce appears to involve the ability to retrospectively evaluate the past marriage in negative terms and describe negative feelings toward the former spouse in the past. This conclusion is consistent with the findings of several individual studies of divorce adjustment, but never before brought together into a theoretical framework. Using this approach, the findings of Weiss (1975) that accounts of the marriage are of psychological importance
are made interpretable. It is not only accounts of the past but
certain negative accounts of the past which are related to adjustment.

Hypotheses three and four dealt with associational relationships in
the present and the past. The former hypothesis was rejected for lack
of support, while the latter hypothesis was partially accepted. It
was proposed that involvement in associational relationships in the
present would be related to adjustment, as would relationships from the
past which provide support for the divorce reality. It was also pro­
posed that past relationships which support the former reality of the
marriage must be terminated in order for the divorced person to be well­
adjusted. It is instructive to examine the indicators which were re­
lated to adjustment. They include involvement in a new, intimate re­
relationship, perception of support from the family, and present negative
feelings toward the former spouse. Two other relationships of near
statistical significance—perception of support from friends in the
past and contact with the former spouse—will be briefly considered.

It is possible that the lack of variation in several of the
measures of involvement in associational relationship contributes to
the lack of support for the empirical hypotheses in which they were
used. The variables of counseling, number of friends who are divorced,
acceptance of the family in the past, number of own friends retained
from the marriage, and number of friends held jointly with the former
spouse retained after the divorce were not sufficiently discriminating
to provide meaningful analysis.
Involvement in a new, intimate relationship was by far more strongly correlated with adjustment ($r = .42$, $p<.001$) than any other measure of associational relationships. This finding is consistent with practically all other researchers, going as far back as Goode (1956). Dating and involvement in an intimate relationship have been found to be strongly correlated with adjustment (see Price-Bonham and Balswick, 1980:965). Social participation in general has also been found to be related to adjustment.

Involvement in a new, intimate relationship denotes a replacement of the former relationship, and is perhaps an indirect indication of the psychological break with the former spouse. It also suggests that the divorced person is attempting to make a new life for himself.

Perceiving the family as supportive is associated with good adjustment. Spanier and Hanson noted that mere frequency of contact with kin and number of supportive kin were unrelated to adjustment (1978:16-17). They concluded that while support from kin may be forthcoming, the kin may voice criticism and set out evaluations of the divorced person. Utilizing a social psychological measure—perception of support from the family—explores a different aspect of family relationships.

Divorced persons appear to be better adjusted when they perceive their families accept them, understand them, and serve them as confidants. Such divorced persons seem to be in conversation with the family, which provides them support for their identity as a person and as a divorced person. The family is seen as accepting the person
where they are—divorced—and in relationship to where they have been—married.

Abandonment of certain affiliates from the past who sustain the past reality appears to be related to adjustment. Adjustment was associated with abandoning the former spouse, to some degree physically but to a greater degree emotionally. Higher levels of adjustment were also associated with holding negative attitudes toward the former spouse at present. Higher levels of adjustment were associated—at near statistical significance—with low levels of spouse contact. These findings support previous research suggesting continuing attachment to the former spouse as detrimental to adjustment (Spanier and Casto, 1979a; Weiss, 1975; Brown et al., 1980; Kitson, 1982). Vernick saw attachment to the former spouse as pivotal, and used it as a measure of adjustment (1979:49).

For successful resocialization, abandoning intimates from the past who sustain that reality is essential. Such letting go may be initiated by "alter" or "ego." It is especially important for the former spouse, since it is that person, above all others, who would bring into question the present reality. Holding on to the past reality and that person with whom the former reality was constructed reduces the effect of the alternation, setting into play forces resistant to adjustment and resocialization.

Not all associational relationships from the past provide legitimation for that reality. The data suggest that the perception of
support from friends in the past may be related to adjustment—near but not statistically significant. These past associational relationships, in retrospect, provide support for the divorcing person and stand in contrast to those who sustain the marriage. Having identified these persons as friends, the divorced person is implying they offer support to themselves as persons, rather than support the marriage. In this sense, these friends provide a refuge from the marriage, along with acceptance and understanding from a confidant that family—at that time—may be unable to provide.

Failure to elicit substantial support for the general hypotheses may be in fact a result of the particular measures of social support. It would appear that certain relationships from the past—especially with the former spouse—are more crucial to a test of the theory than other relationships which have much less to do with the former marriage. Likewise, certain present relationships would be less central to support for the present reality than a new, intimate relationship. Past reality is a reality participated in with the former spouse, while the new reality of an intimate relationship represents a replacement of the former relationship. That these variables—involvement in a new, intimate relationship and abandonment of the former spouse—are positively related to adjustment is of relevance to the theory, although the general hypotheses were not substantially supported.

Hypothesis five proposed a relationship between assessments of the former marriage and support from present associational relation-
ships and the abandonment of past associational relationships. While insufficient evidence was found to support the hypothesis, it is instructive to look at the relationships which were supported. In general, negative assessments were more closely associated with the former spouse. Persons who made negative assessments about the former marriage were more likely to have abandoned the former spouse. Also, there is an indication that holding certain negative assessments of the former marriage is related to involvement in a new, intimate relationship.

Negation of the past appears, then, to be related to success in abandoning the former spouse and replacing that spouse with a new intimate. Two processes appear to be occurring with these associational relationships. First, involvement with a new intimate represents a legitimization of the new reality. Given the divorce, the divorced person accepts that status by becoming involved in an intimate relationship. In an indirect sense, this may be seen as a negation of the former relationship. In a direct sense, it could well be that the new intimate aids in negating the past reality by supporting negative assessments of the past. Second, the abandonment of the former spouse results from the rejection of the former reality. Inability to abandon the former spouse implies the maintenance of ties to the past, and positive rather than negative assessments of the past.

The sixth hypothesis sought to relate assessments of the former marriage, associational relationships, and adjustment of divorced
persons. It tested this model:

\[ \text{Assessments of the past marriage} \xrightarrow{} \text{Associational relationships} \xrightarrow{} \text{Adjustment of divorced persons} \]

When controlling for the associational relationships, for those variables in the bivariates which were statistically significant, the relationships between assessments of the former marriage and adjustment were not eliminated or reduced. Participation in associational relationships in the present and abandoning intimates in the past does not aid in interpreting or explaining the relationship between negative assessments of the former marriage and adjustment. The relationships between assessments and adjustment generally hold when the associational relationships are controlled.

When hierarchical regression analysis was performed on adjustment as the dependent variable, entering as the first variable the Marriage Assessment Scale (MAS), and then involvement in a new, intimate relationship, most of the variance was explained by the latter variable. This also failed to provide support for the model.

That only 17 percent of the variance in adjustment was accounted for in the regression raises more questions than it answers. This smaller than desired percentage of variance explained is less disconcerting than the fact that the Marriage Assessment Scale (MAS) accounted for less variance than did involvement in a new, intimate relationship. This seems to imply that both variables are to found in the model, but arranged in some other way.
While the data do not support the general hypothesis, the alternative model received some support. It proposed ordering the variables as follows:

\[ \text{Associational relationships} \rightarrow \text{Assessments of the past marriage} \rightarrow \text{Adjustment of divorced persons} \]

When controlling for assessments of the past marriage, the correlation between associational relationship with the former spouse and adjustment was meaningfully reduced. This indicates that those persons who do not continue contact with the former spouse and who have negative feelings toward the former spouse at present are likely to have negative assessments of their past marriage, and are better adjusted. Put another way, those who have negated the past have abandoned the former spouse, and are better adjusted. Alternatively, the inability to negate the past is related to a failure to give up the relationship with the former spouse, which is related to poor adjustment.

This interpretation appears to fit with previous studies which have found adjustment to be low for those persons who maintain emotional ties with the former spouse or continue to love the spouse (Vernick, 1979). Continuing to love the former spouse appears to be the key factor in the failure to develop negative assessments of the former marriage. Thus, the divorced person makes a poor adjustment to the divorced status.

Focusing upon the relationship between involvement in an intimate relationship and adjustment, as previously noted, participation in such a relationship may be most directly related to providing means of adjusting to the new reality, rather than assessing the past reality. The
role of the intimate appears to deal with the here and now, rather than the past. This is supported by the regression analysis, where the dependent variable was adjustment, entering intimate relationship first, then the Marriage Assessment Scale (MAS). The intimate relationship variable accounts for practically all of the variance in adjustment.

These findings are consistent with the discussion of the adjustment process discussed by Spanier and Casto (1979b). They indicate that two sets of adjustment must be made. First, the divorced person must adjust to the dissolution of the former marriage. In this view, abandoning the former spouse represents a determinant for successful adjustment. Second, the divorced person must make adjustments to a new lifestyle. The support of present affiliates appears to ease the adjustment process. In the former case, a negation of the former marriage is the result of abandoning the former spouse. In the latter case, present associational relationships provide more of a legitimation for the present than an assessment of illegitimacy of the past.

Divorce and Resocialization

This research has attempted to deal with divorce as an alternation and to examine the processes of resocialization following divorce. Although some of the hypotheses and the model were not supported, focusing on some of the specific relationships was meaningful. Given the pivotal position of the former spouse, as well as a new intimate, it is not surprising that both are strongly associated with adjustment. Nor is it surprising that certain negative assessments of the past are related
to adjustment.

What do these findings say about the resocialization process discussed by Berger and Luckmann (1966)? First, in keeping with their work, persons do make negative assessments of the past following an alternation. Second, some of these assessments are positively related to present levels of functioning, or adjustment. Third, these findings underscore their treatment of conversational change within alternations. Adjustment may be understood in terms of the support provided by the chorus of voices legitimizing the alternation. Factors associated with adjustment extend beyond the cognitive realm to social interaction.

Since Berger and Luckmann indicate there are several types of socialization processes between resocialization and secondary socialization (1966:161), it is worthwhile to inquire where divorce is located. Although divorce was posited as an alternation, it may be appropriately concluded that divorce is a radical transformation lacking the machinery of social support found in other situations of resocialization.

Divorce has long been seen as an ambiguous status. Goode (1956) reflected on the status ambiguity of the divorced in his classic study. Role obligations for the divorced are not specified. Divorced persons are neither taught how to act as divorced persons nor how to adjust following a divorce (Kitson et al., 1980). Given the deviant characterization of the divorced person, no community of guides is available as in the case of religious conversion, for some women accepting their Lesbianism; or for some men undergoing operations to become women. Since
dating and remarriage usually occur some time following the divorce, benefits these relationships provide in resolving the past may be minimal due to the time lapse between the divorce and involvement in the relationship. Lacking formal guides into the new reality, the divorced person stands in direct contrast to the religious convert who is often totally surrounded by a community of supportive believers from the time of conversion.

Divorce may be similar to conversion—and thus alternation—in that the past and past affiliates must be abandoned, but dissimilar in the nature of the support that present associational relationships provide. For the divorced, it appears that present affiliates are more likely guides into the present reality than they are reviewers of the former reality. In the absence of formal guides into the reality of divorce, assessments made of the past are often made alone.

Some divorced persons are not successful in resolving the past. These individuals represent failures in resocialization, at least to the extent to which they have not come to terms with the past. Divorce represents a biographical rupture, and to the degree that individuals are unable to negate the former marriage, abandon the former spouse, and lack support from present associational relationships, their resocialization may be understood as unsuccessful.

Limitations and Applications

As earlier indicated, the sampling frame does not represent a larger population. The population, one county in Oklahoma, does not
appear to be represented by the respondents. Nor may it be concluded that this county is representative of Oklahoma, or divorced persons in the United States.

Limitations were encountered in the area of methodology. The choice of certain empirical indicators proved to be both difficult to measure with such a small sample and of marginal benefit to the study. The failure to specify a limited number of indicators to represent associational relationships based upon extant literature expanded rather than restricted the focus of the study.

The analysis was limited by the lack of variability in certain of the measures, a factor to some degree related to small sample size. For example, the measurement of counseling was less than satisfactory, since most of the respondents had received no counseling since their divorce.

This study provides some implications for counseling. Adjustment appears to be enhanced when divorced persons are able to come to terms with the past and then let go of it (Beatrice, 1979:160). Much of divorce counseling is designed to aid the person in gaining "insights" into their marital conflicts (Fisher, 1974:27), which seems to be objective reflections of what happened in the marriage. Pino (1980) encourages this activity through a "marital autopsy" to be performed in divorce counseling. Insofar as the person develops an explanation of what happened that is satisfactory to them, and as long as this process of assessing the past is short-term, leading to securing an explanation, adjustment appears to be the outcome, regardless of whether or not the
individual's view of the past is veridical. These and other findings indicate that adjustment is enhanced when the divorced person explains the divorce by referring to the marriage in negative terms and explains the problems as interactive or relationship problems (Newman and Langer, 1981).

Finally, the point should be made, in keeping with the above discussion, that no assumption is made regarding the objective accuracy of the retrospective accounts. This stands in contrast to Chiriboga and Thurnher (1980), Hayes et al. (1980), and Vaughn (1979) who treat retrospective accounts and descriptions of the former marriage as veridical--accurate and objective. The past is interpreted from the view of the present situation, which may involve reinterpretations of that reality. This is certainly in keeping with Shaver, who characterizes persons making attributions as "distorters of reality" (1975:113). However accurate these subjective assessments are in reflecting the reality of the marriage, it is clear they meaningfully impact on adjustment.

Suggestions for Future Research

Raschke (1982) argues very forcefully that measures of "divorce adjustment" are in numerous way superior to measures of "adjustment of divorced persons." In divorce research, there is a pressing need for improvement of the measurement of the dependent variable, be it adjustment, stress, or whatever. Until such time as the short—15 item—version of Raschke's Post Divorce Problems and Stress Scale is validated (1982), the field is awaiting development of such a scale. Careful
attention must be paid to avoiding the specific problems with contamination presented in this study, as well as other cases of contamination. In the meantime, there appears to be a consensus that the Bradburn Affect Balance Scale successfully avoids contamination problems and serves well as a general measure of adjustment.

While a phenomenological approach to alternations is worthwhile, there appears to be legitimacy for other studies using a positivistic methodology. Researchers need to explore the relative benefits of interviews versus questionnaires. There is also a pressing need to select populations which can be effectively sampled.

Certainly additional attention should be directed toward the theory. The Berger and Luckmann (1966) thesis deserves expanded empirical treatment using divorce as the alternation. Based upon this research, attention should be directed toward categorizing types of alternations, based upon the varieties of resocialization processes in effect following alternations.

Several questions are raised with these points. Can resocialization occur in the absence of associational relationships in which support for the biographical rupture is provided? Can a person in symbolic conversation with himself effect successful resocialization outcomes? Is it possible to apply "secondary socialization" to the processes of adaptation for some divorced persons?

Improvement in measurement of the independent variables is possible following this study. It appears important to focus in on the "content" of the relationships with present others, including any involvement with
persons of the past such as the spouse. To move beyond this research, it would be helpful if the researcher determines the extent to which associational relationships in the present include evaluating, assessing, and recalling the past. Further, these inquiries should include a determination of the extent to which the past is negatively evaluated.

Much additional work should be done to replicate the relationship between negation of the past and adjustment. This is especially important, given the skepticism with which these findings are often received. For those whose preferences are for amicable divorces, these findings are especially disturbing. Raschke (1982), for example, contends that such findings perpetuate the negative connotation to divorce. Other implicitly contend that a "statute of limitations" should be attached to negative evaluations of the past.
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APPENDIX A. PRESS RELEASE

Divorce Survey About to be Carried Out

Philip D. Holley of the Social Sciences Department of Southwestern Oklahoma State University in Weatherford is planning a detailed study of those who are divorced in Custer County. Questionnaires will be mailed to all those receiving divorces in Custer County during the years 1979 and 1980 and who could be contacted with a current address. The survey will be mailed out on September 4, 1981.

Divorce is an ever-increasing problem, with Oklahoma having one of the highest divorce rates in the United States. How people experience divorce has only rarely been studied. This particular survey seeks to determine some of the factors involved in coping with divorce. It is hoped that the results of the study will benefit counselors and others who work with the divorced.

If you receive a questionnaire, you are encouraged to complete and return it. If you did not receive one, and you would like to participate, and you received your divorce in Custer County during 1979 and 1980, then contact Mr. Holley at Southwestern or call 772-6611 (extension 4207). The responses are completely anonymous, so that no one will be able to identify who filled out the questionnaire.

Mr. Holley is a Sociology instructor, and has been at Southwestern since 1974. He is currently working toward the Ph.D. from Iowa State University.
APPENDIX B. TEXT OF TELEPHONE CONVERSATION

Is this ________________? My name is ______________ and I'm calling for Professor Philip Holley of Southwestern State University in Weatherford. Mr. Holley obtained your name from records in Arapaho. He is conducting a study of divorced people. Would you be willing to complete a questionnaire that deals with how people experience divorce? It will be mailed on Friday, and the letter will include a stamped envelope, so that you can return the survey at no cost to you. It is completely anonymous and confidential.

Now let's see! What is your correct mailing address?
Dear Friend,

A short while ago I mailed you a questionnaire as a part of a research project I am conducting. If you have not completed and returned it, would you please do so soon. Getting your reply will make it possible to understand how to aid people who are dealing with the emotional strains of divorce.

If you have returned the survey, let me take this opportunity to thank you. Your help is deeply appreciated.

Phil Holley
APPENDIX D. SURVEY COVER LETTER

August 25, 1981

Dear Friend,

This social survey deals with what happens to people after divorce. It is being conducted by Philip D. Holley of Southwestern, for dissertation research for a degree from Iowa State University. I would appreciate it if you would take a few minutes to complete the questions, and return it in the postage-free envelope.

Your name was obtained from records in the Courthouse at Arapaho. Every person who could be located is being sent a copy of the questionnaire.

It is important that we learn more about the problems and needs of divorced people. The more we know the better we will be able to help those who experience divorce in the future.

This survey is completely confidential and anonymous. Please do not put your name on the questionnaire.

I would appreciate your cooperation by answering all questions. Read each question carefully, and then mark your answer. There are no right or wrong answers. Feel free to make comments anywhere on the survey.

If you would like a copy of the results, contact me at the address on the envelope, or call me at 772-6611 (extension 4207).
Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Professor Philip Holley
APPENDIX E. SURVEY INSTRUMENT

1. WHERE DO YOU THINK MARRIAGE IS GOING TODAY?

2. SEX: Male _____ Female _____

3. AGE: ________

4. RACE: White _____ Black _____ Indian _____ Other _____

5. HOW MANY YEARS EDUCATION HAVE YOU COMPLETED? Circle highest year completed. Grade School 1 2 3 4 5 6 High School 7 8 9 10 11 12 College 1 2 3 4 5 6

6. WHAT IS YOUR JOB SITUATION? _____ Fulltime job
   _____ Attend school and work
   _____ Work part-time
   _____ Attend school full-time
   _____ Do not work

7. HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE YOUR FINANCIAL SITUATION? _____ Very good
   _____ Good
   _____ Average
   _____ Poor
   _____ Very poor

8. HOW IMPORTANT IS RELIGION TO YOU? _____ Very important
   _____ Important
   _____ Somewhat important
   _____ Unimportant
   _____ Very unimportant

9. HOW OFTEN DO YOU ATTEND CHURCH? _____ 2 or more times per week
   _____ Once a week
   _____ 2 or 3 times a month
   _____ Once a month
   _____ Less than once a month

10. WHAT IS YOUR PRESENT MARITAL STATUS? Divorced _____
        Remarried _____

11. IF YOU ARE REMARRIED, HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN REMARRIED?
    Years _____ Months _____
12. IF YOU HAVE NOT REMARRIED, ARE YOU DATING ANYONE?
   _____ I am engaged
   _____ I am dating one person
   _____ I am dating several people
   _____ I am not dating at all

13. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN YOU MARRIED FOR THE FIRST TIME? _________

14. HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU EVER BEEN MARRIED, INCLUDING THE PRESENT?
   ________

15. CHILDREN: How many have you ever had? _______
    How many children do you have from your most recent
    previous marriage? _______
    How many of your children are living with you now? _______

16. FOR YOUR CHILDREN WHO ARE LIVING WITH YOUR FORMER SPOUSE, HOW
    OFTEN DO YOU VISIT THEM? _______ Very often
    _____ Often
    _____ Sometimes
    _____ Rarely
    _____ Never

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS RELATE TO YOUR MOST RECENT DIVORCE, AND THAT
MARRIAGE.

17. HOW LONG WERE YOU MARRIED? Years _____ Months _____

18. HOW LONG HAS IT BEEN SINCE YOUR DIVORCE? Years _____ Months _____

19. WHO FILED FOR THE DIVORCE? You _____ Your spouse _____

20. TO WHOM WAS THE DIVORCE GRANTED? You _____ Your Spouse _____
    Both _____

21. ON WHAT LEGAL GROUND WAS THE DIVORCE GRANTED? ___________________

22. WAS THERE A PERIOD OF SEPARATION BEFORE THE DIVORCE? Yes _____
    No _____

23. IF SO, HOW LONG DID IT LAST? Years _____ Months _____

24. HOW OFTEN DO YOU PRESENTLY HAVE CONTACT WITH YOUR FORMER SPOUSE?
    _____ Very often
    _____ Often
    _____ Sometimes
    _____ Rarely
    _____ Never
25. WHOSE IDEA WAS THE DIVORCE?
   ___ All yours
   ___ Mostly yours
   ___ Both you and your spouse equally
   ___ Mostly your spouse
   ___ All your spouse

26. HOW WOULD YOU ASSESS YOUR FORMER MARRIAGE AT THE BEGINNING?
   ___ A very good marriage
   ___ A good marriage
   ___ An average marriage
   ___ A poor marriage
   ___ A very poor marriage

27. HOW WOULD YOU ASSESS YOUR FORMER MARRIAGE AT ITS MIDDLE?
   ___ A very good marriage
   ___ A good marriage
   ___ An average marriage
   ___ A poor marriage
   ___ A very poor marriage

28. CONSIDERING YOUR DIVORCE, WHO WOULD YOU SAY WAS THE CAUSE?
   ___ All yourself
   ___ Mostly yourself
   ___ Both you and your former spouse equally
   ___ Mostly your former spouse
   ___ All your former spouse
   ___ Neither you nor your former spouse

29. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING CAUSED YOUR DIVORCE? Check as many as apply.
   ___ Family members
   ___ Children
   ___ Finances
   ___ Other things (Specify)
   ___ None of these things
   ___ Other people
   ___ Job
   ___ Bad luck

30. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS?

   a. "MY FORMER MARRIAGE NEVER LET ME BE THE KIND OF PERSON I WANTED TO BE."
      ___ Strongly agree
      ___ Agree
      ___ Unsure
      ___ Disagree
      ___ Strongly disagree
b. "I feel guilty because my former marriage ended."
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Unsure
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

c. "When married, my former spouse did what I expected as a marriage partner."
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Unsure
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

d. "When married, I was satisfied with how much my former spouse and I shared."
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Unsure
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

e. "I tried to save my former marriage until there was no hope."
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Unsure
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

f. "My former spouse tried to save the marriage until there was no hope."
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Unsure
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

31. How was your relationship with your spouse at the time of divorce?
    - [ ] Very hostile
    - [ ] Hostile
    - [ ] Apathetic
    - [ ] Friendly
    - [ ] Very friendly
32. HOW IS YOUR RELATIONSHIP WITH YOUR FORMER SPOUSE TODAY?

   ___ Very hostile
   ___ Hostile
   ___ Apathetic
   ___ Friendly
   ___ Very friendly

33. WHAT WERE YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT YOUR SPOUSE AT THE TIME OF DIVORCE?
    Mark as many as apply.

   ___ I respected my spouse
   ___ I found my spouse attractive
   ___ I adored and cherished my spouse
   ___ I loved my spouse
   ___ I distrusted my spouse
   ___ I disliked my spouse
   ___ I hated my spouse
   ___ I never wanted to see my spouse again

34. WHAT ARE YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT YOUR FORMER SPOUSE TODAY? Mark as many as apply.

   ___ I respect my former spouse
   ___ I find my former spouse attractive
   ___ I adore and cherish my former spouse
   ___ I love my former spouse
   ___ I distrust my former spouse
   ___ I dislike my former spouse
   ___ I hate my former spouse
   ___ I never want to see my former spouse again

35. OF THE JOINT FRIENDS THAT YOU AND YOUR FORMER SPOUSE HAD WHILE MARRIED, HOW MANY OF THEM ARE STILL YOUR FRIENDS?

   ___ All of them
   ___ Most of them
   ___ Several of them
   ___ A few of them
   ___ None of them

36. OF THE FRIENDS YOU HAD WHILE YOU WERE MARRIED, HOW MANY OF THEM ARE STILL YOUR FRIENDS?

   ___ All of them
   ___ Most of them
   ___ Several of them
   ___ A few of them
   ___ None of them
37. OF YOUR CLOSE FRIENDS TODAY, HOW MANY OF THEM ARE DIVORCED?
   ___ All of them
   ___ Most of them
   ___ Several of them
   ___ A few of them
   ___ None of them

38. HOW OFTEN DO YOU LOOK BACK AND TRY TO FIGURE OUT WHAT COULD HAVE BEEN DONE TO KEEP YOUR FORMER MARRIAGE TOGETHER?
   ___ Very often
   ___ Often
   ___ Sometimes
   ___ Rarely
   ___ Never

39. SINCE YOUR DIVORCE, HAVE YOU RECEIVED ANY COUNSELING? Yes ___
   No ___
   If so, indicate how much.
   Minister A lot ___ Some ___ None ___
   Marriage or Divorce Counselor A lot ___ Some ___ None ___
   Psychologist A lot ___ Some ___ None ___
   Other ___ A lot ___ Some ___ None ___

40. HOW OFTEN HAVE YOU PARTICIPATED IN GROUPS FOR DIVORCED PERSONS (SUCH AS PARENTS WITHOUT PARTNERS)?
   ___ Very often
   ___ Often
   ___ Sometimes
   ___ Rarely
   ___ Never

41. HOW ACCEPTING OF YOU WAS YOUR FAMILY (YOUR PARENTS, BROTHERS AND SISTERS, ETC.) AT THE TIME OF YOUR DIVORCE?
   ___ Very accepting
   ___ Accepting
   ___ Unsure
   ___ Unaccepting
   ___ Very unaccepting

42. HOW ACCEPTING OF YOU IS YOUR FAMILY NOW THAT YOU HAVE BEEN DIVORCED (EVEN THOUGH YOU MAY BE REMARRIED)?
   ___ Very accepting
   ___ Accepting
   ___ Unsure
   ___ Unaccepting
   ___ Very unaccepting
43. HOW UNDERSTANDING HAS YOUR FAMILY BEEN ABOUT THE PROBLEMS IN YOUR FORMER MARRIAGE?

- Very understanding
- Understanding
- Unsure
- Understands a little
- Does not understand at all

44. HOW MUCH HAVE YOU CONFIDED IN YOUR FAMILY ABOUT YOUR FORMER MARRIAGE AND YOUR DIVORCE?

- Everything
- A lot
- Some
- Very little
- Nothing

45. IN THE SPACES BELOW, LIST THE FIRST NAMES OF AS MANY CLOSE FRIENDS AS YOU PRESENTLY HAVE, UP TO 5. INDICATE WHAT RELATIONSHIP THEY ARE TO YOU AND HOW LONG YOU HAVE KNOWN THEM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship (Friend, neighbor, relative, dating partner, spouse, etc.)</th>
<th>Years Known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOW, ANSWER EACH OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS FOR EACH OF YOUR PRESENT FRIENDS. PLACE THE NUMBERS CORRESPONDING TO YOUR ANSWERS IN THE LEFT-HAND COLUMN. IGNORE THE RIGHT-HAND COLUMN UNTIL YOU GET TO QUESTION 46.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRESENT FRIEND</th>
<th>PAST FRIEND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. HOW MUCH HAVE YOU CONFIDED IN ABOUT YOUR FORMER MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE?

- Everything
- A lot
- Some
- Very little
- Nothing
### Present Friend

1. __________
   - How understanding has _______ been

2. __________
   - About the problems in your former marriage?

3. __________
   - 5 - Very understanding
   - 4 - Understanding
   - 3 - Unsure
   - 2 - Understands a little
   - 1 - Does not understand

### Past Friend

1. __________
   - How accepting is _______ of you as

2. __________
   - A divorced person?

3. __________
   - 5 - Very accepting
   - 4 - Accepting
   - 3 - Unsure
   - 2 - Accepts a little
   - 1 - Does not accept

#### Instructions

46. Now list the first names of your close friends during the last few weeks of your former marriage. If you listed any of these above as "present friends," place an "X" in the space provided after their name. Also, indicate the relationship to you and if they are still your friend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship (friend, neighbor, relative, etc.)</th>
<th>Still Friends?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Go back and answer the questions again for each past friend (even if listed as a present friend) in the spaces in the right-hand margin. Please answer the questions to reflect the friendship during the last few weeks of your former marriage.

47. Imagine the worst possible life to be a "1" and the best possible life to be a "10." On a scale of 1 to 10, where would you rate your present life situation? __________
48. DURING THE PAST FEW WEEKS, HOW OFTEN HAVE YOU FELT...

a. Particularly excited or interested in something?
   Often ____ Several times ____ Once ____ Never ____

b. Did you ever feel so restless that you couldn't sit long in a chair?
   Often ____ Several times ____ Once ____ Never ____

c. Proud because someone complimented you on something you had done?
   Often ____ Several times ____ Once ____ Never ____

d. Very lonely or remote from other people?
   Often ____ Several times ____ Once ____ Never ____

e. Pleased about having accomplished something?
   Often ____ Several times ____ Once ____ Never ____

f. Bored?
   Often ____ Several times ____ Once ____ Never ____

g. On top of the world?
   Often ____ Several times ____ Once ____ Never ____

h. Depressed or very unhappy?
   Often ____ Several times ____ Once ____ Never ____

i. That things were going your way?
   Often ____ Several times ____ Once ____ Never ____

j. Upset because someone criticized you?
   Often ____ Several times ____ Once ____ Never ____

PLEASE LOOK BACK OVER THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND BE SURE YOU HAVE ANSWERED ALL OF THE QUESTIONS. BE SURE YOU WERE CAREFUL TO FOLLOW THE INSTRUCTIONS FOR QUESTIONS 45 AND 46.
APPENDIX F. ADDITIONAL DATA ON SAMPLE

Table 16. Additional descriptive characteristics of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present age</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of marriage (months)</td>
<td>100.7</td>
<td>84.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of time since divorce (months)</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children from most recent marriage</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of remarriage (months)</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of separation (months)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17. Sex of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aPercentage totals will not always equal 100 due to rounding.
### Table 18. Age of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age categories</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage totals will not always equal 100 due to rounding.*

### Table 19. Race of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>95.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage totals will not always equal 100 due to rounding.*
Table 20. Educational level of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of education completed</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 and above</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage totals will not always equal 100 due to rounding.*

Table 21. Job situation of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Situation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not working</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work part-time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend school and works</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulltime</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage totals will not always equal 100 due to rounding.*
Table 22. Marital status of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarried</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^Percentage totals will not always equal 100 due to rounding.

Table 23. Number of previous marriages of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of marriages</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^Percentage totals will not always equal 100 due to rounding.
Table 24. Length of the marriage of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Months married</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-48</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-96</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-144</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145-192</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193-240</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241 and above</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aPercentage totals will not always equal 100 due to rounding.

Table 25. Children of the marriage of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aPercentage totals will not always equal 100 due to rounding.*
Table 26. Time since divorce of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Months since divorce</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 and above</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage totals will not always equal 100 due to rounding.*

Table 27. Remarriage length of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Months remarried</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 and above</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data or not remarried</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>78.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage totals will not always equal 100 due to rounding.*
Table 28. Dating relationships of unmarried respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dating status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engaged</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating one person</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating several people</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not dating at all</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data or remarried</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aPercentage totals will not always equal 100 due to rounding.

Table 29. Filing for divorce among respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spouse who filed</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aPercentage totals will not always equal 100 due to rounding.*
Table 30. Spouse granted the divorce among the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spouse granted divorce</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both self and spouse</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aPercentage totals will not always equal 100 due to rounding.

Table 31. Crosstabulation of sex of filer for the sample and the population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th></th>
<th>Population</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28.74</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>27.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>70.11</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>71.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data and</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unable to categorize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aChi square computation performed omitting missing data.

*Chi square is not significant.
### Table 32. Crosstabulation of number of children for the sample and the population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>56.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Computation of chi square performed omitting missing data.

*Chi square is not significant.
Table 33. Crosstabulation of time since divorce for the sample and the population[^a] ^[b]*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Months since divorce</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th></th>
<th>Population</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35.62</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>27.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32.18</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>40.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 and above</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31.03</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>32.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>99.99</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^a]: Computation of chi square performed omitting missing data.

[^b]: Chi square is not significant.
Table 34. Crosstabulation of sex of spouse to whom decree granted for the sample and the population\textsuperscript{a} *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex to whom granted</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th></th>
<th>Population</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.79</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>19.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48.28</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>55.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both male and female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36.78</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Chi square computations performed omitting missing data.

*Chi square = 11.42, 2df; p<.01.
Table 35. Crosstabulation of spouse to whom decree granted for the sample and the population*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spouse granted decree</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th></th>
<th>Population</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaintiff</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62.07</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>74.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defendant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both, either filed</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37.93</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>21.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Chi square computations performed omitting Defendant and missing data.

*Chi square = 8.708, 1 df; p<.01.