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ABSTRACT

THE EFFECTS OF FAMILY STRUCTURE OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD MARRIAGE, DIVORCE, AND INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP SATISFACTION AND COMMITMENT

Jennifer L. Falter, M.A.
University of Dayton, 1992

Major Professor: Mark Fine, Ph.D.

This study examined the effects of family structure (intact, divorced single-parent, and reconstituted) on attitudes toward marriage and divorce, and on interpersonal relationship satisfaction and commitment. The sample consisted of 293 university students from varying family structures who were compared on four separate scales which measured marriage and divorce attitudes and perceived levels of relationship satisfaction and commitment. Results indicated that: (a) family structure was not significantly related to attitudes toward marriage, (b) family structure was related to attitudes toward divorce, but not in the direction expected, (c) females had more favorable attitudes toward divorce than males, (d) subjects in a present romantic relationship had less favorable attitudes toward marriage than subjects not in a present romantic relationship, (e) for those in a present romantic relationship, family structure was not significantly related to relationship satisfaction, and (f) for those in a present romantic relationship, family structure was related to relationship commitment, but not in the expected direction. The present study partially supports earlier research
in this area. Taken collectively, the data obtained from this study indicate that family structure is not an influential factor in explaining university students' attitudes toward marriage and divorce and development of interpersonal relationship skills.
INTRODUCTION

It is widely assumed by many experts in family studies that the family is the primary agency for training the young for future relationships and eventually marriage and parenthood (Ganong, Coleman, & Brown, 1981; Wallin, 1954). Family members provide the necessary role models and experiences which condition attitudes, values, beliefs, and expectations. This lends credence to the idea that the parents' marital relationship affects the expectations and attitudes of their children toward interpersonal relationships, marriage, divorce, and parenthood. Coleman and Ganong (1984) wrote, "The parent's marital relationship seems especially significant in affecting the perceptions and attitudes of children toward divorce, and marriage role expectations, either by communicating values or by presenting role models for marriage and family life" (p. 425). A child has intimate knowledge of his/her parents' relationship. To the extent that marriage is perceived by the child as a highly satisfying experience, positive beliefs about relationships and marriage are reinforced. But if the marital relationship is seen by the child as fraught with conflict and unhappiness, his or her conception of marriage as a desirable goal may be challenged and enthusiasm for marriage diminished (Wallin, 1954).

The family is clearly undergoing profound change. There is no longer a typical American family unit. In the United States, over a million children each year experience the dissolution of their parents' marriage, and perhaps half of all children will
spend time in a single-parent household before they reach the age of 18 (Bumpass, 1984; Bumpass & Rindfuss 1979; Glick 1979).

The stepfamily has emerged as a significant family system in today's society. Glick (1989) indicates that in 1987, of all children under age 18 with married parents, 12.7% were stepchildren. In 1987, there were an estimated 11 million remarried families in the United States (Glick, 1989), and, annually, one-half million adults become stepparents (Ganong et al., 1981).

If marriage and family life expectations and attitudes are basically formed and reinforced by parental models, what happens to children who experience a change with respect to family living? More specifically, do varying family structures have an impact on children's later satisfaction with and commitment to interpersonal relationships and attitudes toward marriage and divorce? The present study explores this question.

**Effects of Living in a Divorced, Single-Parent Family on Attitudes Toward Marriage, Divorce, and Interpersonal Relationships**

Attitudes and expectations about marriage and divorce stemming from having lived in a divorced, single-parent family have been the focus of much research. Parental divorce appears to have a substantial impact on attitudes toward marriage, divorce, and family life. When children of divorce reach early adulthood, the time when they may form their own families, their attitudinal
differences from those raised in intact families may become apparent (Amato, 1988). Dunlop and Burns (1986) found that adolescents from divorced families expressed more caution about entering marriage than those from intact families. Adolescents whose parents are divorced frequently express anxiety over their own future marriages. Some adolescents express a desire never to marry, whereas others are determined to be more selective and wiser than their parents had been in choosing a marriage partner (Wallerstein & Kelly, 1974).

Greenberg and Nay (1982), using Hill's (1951) Favorableness of Attitude to Marriage Scale and The Reiss (1967) Romantic Love Scale, found no significant differences between children from intact and divorced families in their attitudes toward marriage. However, Booth et al. (1984) found that college students from divorced families expressed less of a desire to be engaged or married before they got out of college than did students from intact families. Kinnaird and Gerrard's (1986) findings suggest that disruption and conflict in one's family of origin may result in uncertain feelings about marriage and may delay the development of heterosexual relationships.

It appears that preadult children of divorce are apprehensive about their own ability to love and establish secure relationships. Wallerstein and Kelly (1974) report that many of the adolescents that they studied were frightened at the possible repetition of marital or sexual failure in their own lives. Some adolescents insisted that they would never marry because they were convinced that their marriages would fail. Taken together, the
findings above suggest that adult and adolescent children of
divorce may be skeptical about the institution of marriage.

Parental divorce is also presumed to have some effect on
the formation of later interpersonal or courtship relationships.
Hillard (1984), in his study of the reactions of college students
to parental divorce, found that adverse reactions to parental
divorce may continue long after the physical process of divorce
has been completed. The college student's ability to form an
independent identity and develop intimate relationships may be
particularly vulnerable to the stresses of parental divorce.
Because it is common for young adults to think about marriage or
other long term relationships for the first time during college,
college students may become concerned about their ability to make
their own relationships work. For students whose parents have
divorced in the past, attending college may bring up many
unresolved conflicts (Hillard, 1984).

In studying the effects of parental loss, Hepworth, Ryder,
and Dreyer (1984) used their Personal Relationship Questionnaire
to assess college students' timing, description, and evaluation of
present and past relationships. Their results suggested that
persons with parental loss by divorce, as compared to those with
parental loss by death, seemed to have accelerated courtship
patterns and more interest in relationships. They found that
"divorce-loss" subjects had, on the average, more relationships
than "death-loss" subjects after the loss, and that the mean
number of months between meeting and beginning to date a person
was less for "divorce-loss" subjects than for "death-loss"
subjects. They concluded that some persons may seek to demonstrate, by moving in and out of a series of relationships, that the losses do not hurt and that relationships have a diminished value. However, it is also possible that "death-loss" subjects were more avoidant of intimate relationships, possibly due to depression and grieving, than "divorce-loss" subjects. Additionally, "divorce-loss" subjects may be modeling behavior seen in parents or may be more critical of the partners they date in an effort not to replicate their parents' "failed" marriage (Booth et al., 1984).

Slater and Calhoun (1988) used the Conflict subscale of the Family Environment Scale (Moos, 1974) to measure the amount of discord subjects perceived in their home. They also used The Background Information Questionnaire, devised for the study, to obtain subjects' dating history. Their findings showed that subjects varied in their ability to develop and maintain supportive friendships and dating relationships as a function of family structure and levels of family conflict.

Additionally, Slater and Calhoun (1988) found that subjects' perceptions and expectations of their relationships differed according to family structure. Subjects from divorced high-conflict homes reported being more satisfied with the quality of their relationships and more seriously involved than those in divorced low-conflict homes. The authors suggested that the former may have developed lower expectations of what an intimate relationship can offer. Furthermore, because the subjects perceived a decrease in conflict following the divorce, they may
have learned that divorce is an effective means of alleviating tension. Hence, they may have entered their own relationships with the understanding that termination is a viable alternative. Although college students from divorced high-conflict backgrounds reported more positive dating experiences than subjects from divorced low-conflict backgrounds, they were less likely to have a boyfriend or girlfriend. This suggests that they may not have developed skills relevant to maintaining more intimate relationships. Other possible explanations are that these subjects ended relationships which were not satisfying or simply were not interested in forming relationships at this time.

On the other hand, individuals from divorced low-conflict homes may have had high expectations, but may have come to believe that relationships are unpredictable and can terminate even when they appear to be going well. Therefore, these individuals were not satisfied with their own relationships and, perhaps because of this, were not as seriously involved as were those from divorced high-conflict families.

Booth et al. (1984) found that persons living with single parents were more likely than individuals from intact or reconstituted families to be unhappy with a steady dating relationship, and to report difficulty in dating people with whom they felt they could become serious. Of those subjects reporting high levels of conflict during their parents' marital dissolution, and not presently in a steady relationship, those living with a single parent were more likely to report dating within the last
two weeks and having dated a greater number of people than those from intact or reconstituted families. These nonexclusive relationships with a large number of people may reduce the probability of forming a long-term exclusive tie or may indicate a more active quest for a satisfying heterosexual bond (Booth et al. 1984).

Considerable evidence indicates that in the United States persons whose parents divorced are more likely to divorce than are those whose parents had intact marriages (Glenn & Kramer, 1987). Greenberg and Nay (1982) propose that, as a result of personal experience with parental divorce, children may view divorce as a possible positive alternative to remaining in a dysfunctional marriage. Their research revealed that college students from divorced families showed more favorable attitudes toward divorce than did students from intact families. It is plausible that the divorce-proneness of adult children of divorce may be, in part, due to their willingness to end an unhappy marriage, as did their parental role models, rather than cling to a dissatisfying marriage as do some adult children from unhappy intact homes.

Another plausible explanation for the greater divorce-proneness of children of divorce is that they find it unusually hard to make a strong commitment to marriage. Since their preadult experiences have taught them how fragile marriages can be, they may marry without an expectation that the marriage will be successful and stable. Low expectations of success in marriage may, in turn, make it hard for those who experienced parental divorce to make the kind of investments that are necessary to
develop and maintain a good marriage. The commitment to the marriage may often be tentative, qualified, and tempered by a need to prepare, emotionally and otherwise, for marital failure (Glenn & Kramer, 1987).

Effects of Living in Remarried Families on Attitudes Towards Marriage, Divorce, and Interpersonal Relationships

Research into socialization for marriage and divorce among children and adolescents from reconstituted families has been limited. Ganong et al. (1981) used Hill's (1951) Favorableness of Attitude to Marriage Scale, The Hardy Divorce Scale (1957), and a Marriage Role Expectations Scale developed for their study, to assess the effect of different family structures on marital socialization of adolescents. They found that adolescents from intact, single parent, and reconstituted families did not differ significantly on attitudes toward marriage, although those from intact families viewed marriage slightly more favorably. They also found that females expressed more favorable attitudes toward marriage than males regardless of family type. Adolescents from reconstituted families expressed greater concern about happiness in marriage and held significantly more favorable attitudes toward divorce than those from single parent or intact families.

Similarly, Kinnaird and Gerrard (1986) reported that subjects from reconstituted families were more skeptical about marriage and more accepting in their attitudes toward divorce than were those
from intact families. Subjects from stepfather families were more accepting of divorce than subjects from divorced single-parent families, possibly because they viewed their mother's remarriage as a positive outcome of divorce. Subjects from reconstituted families were more likely to state that divorce is a possible option for them should they get married than were subjects from divorced single-parent families and intact families. This finding suggests that those subjects whose parents had remained single after divorce were not exposed to the possibly positive effects of remarriage, and consequently had retained their negative attitudes toward divorce. It is also possible that the subjects from reconstituted families were favorable to divorce because they did not want the second marriage of their parent to be successful.

Visher and Visher (1979) found that regardless of how well-adjusted and close children may be to their step-parents they appear to harbor fantasies of the reconciliation of their natural parents for years after marital dissolution.

Those individuals who remarry after divorce appear to be prone to second divorces. Furstenburg and Spanier (1984) found that remarried couples are less likely than those in first marriages to stay in an unsatisfactory marriage. The subjects in their study reported that the experience of an unhappy first marriage convinced them that divorce was a better alternative than staying in an unsatisfactory marriage. Additionally, they found that persons who remarry are more likely to view marriage as a conditional contract than those in first marriages.

The effects of parental remarriage on interpersonal
relationship formation were explored in several studies. Booth et al. (1984) found, in the study described above, that children of remarried parents were less likely to cohabitate and more likely to have premarital sexual intercourse than were children of divorced single parents. Wilson, Zurcher, McAdams, and Curtis (1975) studied the effects of growing up with a stepfather as opposed to a biological father on selected social and psychological characteristics of children. The measures used consisted of selected items from the General Social Survey (Davis, 1973) and the Youth in Transition Survey (Bachman, Kahn, Mednick, Davidson, & Johnston, 1967). They found no difference between subjects with stepfathers and those who had lived with biological fathers in the proportion married, the age they first married, nor the incidence of divorce. Those who were raised by stepfathers did not avoid marriage any more than those raised by their biological fathers, nor did they marry more quickly.

Collectively, these studies suggest that growing up in a reconstituted family simulates somewhat the effects of living in an intact family in the areas of interpersonal relationship formation. Those reared with stepparents seem to marry and divorce in the same proportions as those reared by both of their biological parents.

Purpose of the Present Study

Favorableness of attitude to marriage and divorce, interpersonal relationship satisfaction, and perceived levels of
relationship commitment are variables of interest for a number of reasons. They may be important in accounting for mate selection, success of interpersonal relationships and marriage, and divorce and remarriage rates. The purpose of this study was to examine how attitudes toward marriage and divorce, interpersonal relationship satisfaction, and perceived levels of relationship commitment vary by family structure (intact, divorced single -parent, and reconstituted).

This study expanded the existing literature in two ways. First, as in some previous studies (Hillard, 1984; Slater & Calhoun, 1988), college students were used. This is advantageous because college students are at an age when they are beginning to form serious interpersonal relationships themselves, and consequently, the effects of divorce and remarriage on their attitudes may emerge at this time. Second, this study explored, in addition to marriage and divorce attitudes, the relationship between students' satisfaction with and commitment to their own interpersonal relationships and family structure. Relatively few studies have explored this relation.

**Hypotheses:**

It was proposed that socialization in varying family structures (intact, divorced single-parent, and reconstituted) affects the attitudes of preadults toward marriage and divorce, their interpersonal relationship formation, and overall perceived satisfaction with and commitment to these relationships.

**Hypothesis I:** Subjects from intact families and reconstituted
families were expected to have more favorable attitudes toward marriage than subjects from divorced single-parent families. This hypothesis was based upon evidence from Dunlop and Burns (1986), who found that adolescents from divorced single-parent families expressed more caution about entering into marriage than those from intact families. Additionally, Wallerstein (1983) reported that many adolescents from divorced homes were frightened at the possible repetition of marital failure in their own lives.

**Hypothesis II:** Subjects from reconstituted families were expected to have more favorable attitudes toward divorce than subjects from divorced single-parent and intact families. This hypothesis was based upon evidence from Ganong et al. (1981), who found that subjects from reconstituted families reported significantly more accepting attitudes toward divorce than subjects from divorced single-parent and intact families.

**Hypothesis III:** Of those in current romantic relationships, subjects from reconstituted and intact families are expected to be more satisfied with and have more perceived commitment to these relationships than subjects from divorced single-parent families. This hypothesis was based upon evidence from Booth et al. (1984), who found that persons living with single parents were more likely than persons from intact or reconstituted families to be unhappy with a steady dating relationship and to report difficulty finding someone with whom they could become serious. Additionally, Wilson et al. (1975) found that there were no differences between subjects who lived with their biological fathers and those who lived with stepfathers in the proportion married, age at their
first marriage, or incidence of divorce.

Gender differences in the hypothesized relations will be explored for two reasons. First, experiences in different family structures may vary significantly for males and females. Second, previous studies of attitudes toward marriage have found different expectations of marriage for males and females. Ganong et al. (1981) found that females held more favorable attitudes toward marriage than did males, regardless of their family type (intact, single-parent, reconstituted).

Further, subjects' relationship status (in a present relationship vs. not in a present relationship) was also included as an independent variable. Although there is no empirical support for the assumption that current involvement in a romantic relationship is related to attitudes toward marriage or divorce or interpersonal relationship satisfaction or commitment, there is evidence that family factors related to relationship status are associated with the ability to form and maintain relationships. For example, Slater and Calhoun (1988) found that subjects from divorced high-conflict backgrounds were less likely than subjects from divorced low-conflict backgrounds to have a boyfriend or girlfriend. Additionally, Booth et al. (1984) found that those subjects living with a single parent were more likely than those living with intact or reconstituted parents to report dating within the last 2 weeks and to report dating a greater number of people.

Additionally, subjects' perceptions of the level of conflict in their parents' divorce was examined, due to the possible
confounding effects of this variable. Slater and Calhoun (1988) found that subjects varied in their ability to form and maintain friendships and dating relationships as a function of reported levels of family conflict. In addition, Booth et al. (1984) studied differences in courtship behavior as a function of the level of conflict between parents during the course of marital dissolution. They found that those who reported high conflict during their parent's divorce had higher levels of heterosexual activity and were more likely to be cohabitating than those who reported low levels of conflict during their parents marital dissolution.
METHOD

Subjects:

Subjects were 293 unmarried University of Dayton students enrolled in an introductory psychology course. They received course credit for their participation. The socioeconomic classes represented are likely to be middle and upper class. The mean age range of the participants was 18 to 20 years. Ninety-seven males and 196 females participated. There were 234 subjects from intact families, 29 subjects from divorced single-parent families, 11 subjects from reconstituted families, and 19 subjects from other family structures.

Instrumentation

All subjects completed a demographic questionnaire (See Appendix A) to assess family structure (intact, divorced single-parent or reconstituted), gender, present relationship status, and if applicable, age at time of parent's separation, age at time of parent's remarriage, and subjects' perceptions of the level of conflict in their parent's divorce.

All subjects also completed a modified version of the Hill Favorableness of Attitude to Marriage Scale (Hill, 1951) (See Appendix B). The scale is comprised of nine Likert-type items that tap subjects' expectations and desires regarding their future marital status. The topic areas include: the extent to which the subject anticipates marital happiness, difficulty in adjusting to married life, being burdened by marital responsibilities, and
missing his or her life as a single person (Greenberg & Nay, 1982). A sample question is, "If you marry to what extent will you miss the life you had as a single person?" The response options are, "not at all" (4), "very little" (3), "to some extent" (2), or "very much" (1). The numbers in parentheses indicate the scores given to the various responses. As used by Greenberg and Nay (1982), total scores range from 9 to 36, with higher scores representing more favorable attitudes toward marriage. In Hill's original scale, total scores ranged from zero to nine, as each question was given a coded score of zero or one.

Kinnaird and Gerrard (1986) report that the test-retest reliability (over a two week interval) for this scale is .87 ($p < .001$). A number of studies (Coleman & Ganong, 1984; Greenberg & Nay, 1982; Wallin, 1954) have found that Hill's scale validly assesses attitudes towards marriage. For example, Greenberg and Nay (1982), as they expected, found that the mean attitude toward marriage score on Hill's instrument for subjects in intact families was higher than for subjects from divorced families.

All subjects also completed The Hardy Divorce Scale (Hardy, 1957) (See Appendix C) which measures favorableness of attitudes toward divorce. This scale contains 12 Likert-type items, half of which express attitudes favorable toward divorce and the other half express attitudes unfavorable toward divorce. A sample item is, "I feel that divorce is a sensible solution to many unhappy marriages". On a scale of 1-5, subjects indicate whether he/she "strongly agrees", "mildly agrees", "is more or less neutral", "mildly disagrees", or "strongly disagrees" with each item. After
recoding, total scores range from 12 to 60, with high scores indicating more favorable attitudes toward divorce.

The split-half reliability for The Hardy Divorce Scale, using the Spearman-Brown formula, is reported to be .85 (Touliatos, Perlmutter, & Straus, 1990). With respect to validity, Greenberg and Nay (1982) found a significant effect for family structure on attitudes toward divorce. As they expected, subjects from divorced families scored higher on Hardy's Divorce Scale than subjects from intact families.

Subjects who reported being in a current romantic relationship also completed the Relationship Assessment Scale (Hendrick, 1988) (See Appendix D). This 7-item Likert-type scale is a generic measure of relationship satisfaction that is appropriate for married, cohabitating, dating, and homosexual couples. A sample question is, "In general, how satisfied are you with your relationship?" The questions are scored on a 5-point scale with one representing "low satisfaction" and five representing "high satisfaction." Total scores range from 7 to 35, with higher scores indicating greater relationship satisfaction.

Hendrick (1988) reported that the Cronbach's alpha for the scale was .86, indicating excellent internal consistency. Additionally, he found that The Relationship Assessment scale correlated .80 with the total scale score of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Spanier, 1976), a widely used instrument which assesses adjustment and satisfaction in couples. The scale also was (with a subsample of 30 couples) slightly more effective than the Dyadic
Adjustment Scale in discriminating between couples who stayed together and those who did not.

Subjects who reported being in a current romantic relationship also completed The Lund Commitment Scale (Lund, 1985) (See Appendix E). This instrument is a 9-item Likert-type scale designed to measure the extent of a person's commitment to and sense of permanence in a romantic relationship. A sample question is, "How likely is it that your relationship will be permanent?" The questions are scored on a 5-point scale with one representing "low commitment" and five representing "high commitment." An overall commitment score is obtained by adding the coded scores associated with responses to each item. Total scores range from 9 to 45, with higher scores indicating greater relationship commitment.

Lund (1985) found that Cronbach's alpha for The Commitment Scale was .82. Validity assessments indicate that the scale was correlated .36 with the length of a person's relationship (Lund, 1985). Additionally, as predicted, using factor analysis the scale was found to measure commitment as a construct distinct from love in a longitudinal questionnaire study of university students.

Procedure

Before testing, subjects were asked the following question by telephone, "Are you currently in a steady dating relationship?" Students in each category (in a present relationship, not in a present relationship) were tested separately because of ethical concerns related to possible
embarrassment of those subjects not in a current romantic relationship. The questionnaires were administered in groups which ranged from 20 to 30 people. Subjects were told that the study was designed to examine attitudes toward marriage and divorce and that their responses would be kept confidential. Private desk space was available for each student. Subjects took approximately 1/2 hour to complete the series of questionnaires. Subjects who did not appear for their scheduled testing session were contacted by telephone and given an additional opportunity to participate.

All students completed the demographic questionnaire first. The Hill Favorableness of Attitude toward Marriage Scale (Hill, 1951) and The Hardy Divorce Scale (Hardy, 1957) were presented next because the responses to these questionnaires were of primary interest to the study and all subjects completed them. Half of the subjects completed the Hill scale first and half completed the Hardy scale first to control for the possible confounding effects of order. Those subjects who reported being in a current romantic relationship additionally completed The Relationship Assessment Scale (Hendrick, 1988) and The Lund Commitment Scale (Lund, 1985), with the order of administration counterbalanced.
RESULTS

Preliminary Analyses

In order to explore for potential mediating variables, total scores on the revised Hill Favorableness of Attitudes Toward Marriage Scale (Hill, 1951) and the revised Hardy Divorce Scale (Hardy, 1957) were correlated with items on the demographic questionnaire. Significant correlations were found between three demographic questions and the attitudinal measures. A negative relationship was found between subject's responses to the question "How satisfied are you with your present life in regards to romantic involvements?" and total scores on the Hill Favorableness of Attitudes Toward Marriage Scale (r = -.28, p < .001). Higher general satisfaction with romantic life was related to a less favorable attitude toward marriage.

Among those whose fathers remarried (n = 22), there was a significant negative correlation between the subjects' age at the time their father remarried and total scores on The Hardy Divorce Scale (Hardy, 1957) (r = -.43, p = .047). A younger age at the time of father's remarriage was related to a more favorable attitude toward divorce. Among those subjects whose parents had divorced (n = 39), there was a significant positive correlation between the amount of conflict subjects perceived in their parents' divorce and total scores on the Hardy scale (r = .37, p = .002). A higher amount of perceived conflict in the divorce was related to a more favorable attitude toward divorce. Only satisfaction with romantic involvement was used as a covariate in
the analyses reported below because it was completed by all subjects.

Tests of Hypotheses

The first hypothesis predicted that subjects from intact and reconstituted families would have more favorable attitudes toward marriage than subjects from divorced single-parent families. A 3(family structure: intact, divorced single-parent, vs. reconstituted) x 2(gender) x 2(relationship status: in a present relationship vs. not in a present relationship) analysis of variance was computed on the total scores on the revised Hill Favorableness of Attitudes Toward Marriage Scale (Hill, 1951). No support for this hypothesis was found.

There was, however, a significant main effect for relationship status ($F(1, 260) = 5.80, p = .017$). Subjects who reported being in a current romantic relationship had significantly less favorable attitudes toward marriage than subjects who reported not currently being in a romantic relationship (See Table 1 for means and standard deviations). No other significant main effects or interactions were found (See Table 2 for means and standard deviations).

In addition, a 3(family structure: intact, divorced single-parent, vs. reconstituted) x 2(gender) x 2(relationship status: in a present relationship vs. not in a present relationship) analysis of covariance was computed on the Hill scale. The covariate was satisfaction with romantic involvement. The significant
# Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations on the Revised Hill Favorableness of Attitudes Toward Marriage Scale by Relationship Status

| Relationship       | Total  |  |  |
|--------------------|--------|  |  |
|                    | mean   |  |  |
|                    | 18.49  |  |  |
|                    | s.d.   |  |  |
|                    | 2.93   |  |  |
|                    | N      |  |  |
|                    | 174    |  |  |
| Not in a present   | mean   |  |  |
|                    | 19.37  |  |  |
|                    | s.d.   |  |  |
|                    | 3.29   |  |  |
|                    | N      |  |  |
|                    | 119    |  |  |

# Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations on the Revised Hill Favorableness of Attitude Toward Marriage Scale by Family Structure and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intact</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>19.08</td>
<td>18.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s.d.</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>19.91</td>
<td>19.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single-parent</td>
<td>s.d.</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstituted</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>20.60</td>
<td>20.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s.d.</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
relationship status effect found in the analysis without the
covariate was not present. This indicates that subjects' general
satisfaction with their romantic involvement mediates the
relationship between their relationship status and their attitudes
toward marriage. Overall, Hypothesis I was not supported.

The second hypothesis predicted that subjects from
reconstituted families would have more favorable attitudes toward
divorce than subjects from divorced single-parent families and
intact families. The analysis of variance used total
scores on the revised Hardy Divorce Scale (Hardy, 1957) and a
3(family structure: intact, divorced single-parent, vs.
reconstituted) x 2(gender) x 2(relationship status: in a present
relationship vs. not in a present relationship) design.

A significant main effect was found for family structure (F
(2, 260) = 12.10, p < .001). Post hoc analyses (based on Tukey's
multiple range procedure) indicated that subjects from divorced
single-parent families and reconstituted families had
significantly more favorable attitudes towards divorce than
subjects from intact families (See Table 3 for means and standard
deviations). In addition, a significant main effect was found for
gender (F (1, 260) = 3.84, p = .05). As shown in Table 3, females
had significantly more favorable attitudes toward divorce than
males.

Additionally, a statistically significant interaction was
found between gender and relationship status (F (1, 259) = 3.81, p
= .05). Tests for simple effects indicated that males not in a
Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations on the Revised Hardy Divorce Scale by Family Structure and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intact</strong></td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>33.07</td>
<td>35.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s.d.</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>7.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Divorced single-parent</strong></td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>40.91</td>
<td>39.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s.d.</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>6.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reconstituted</strong></td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>43.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s.d.</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>34.52</td>
<td>35.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s.d.</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>7.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
current romantic relationship had significantly less favorable attitudes toward divorce than males in a current relationship. Females who reported being in a current romantic relationship did not differ significantly from females who were not in a current romantic relationship in their attitudes toward divorce (See Table 4 for means and standard deviations).

Consequently, these findings indicate that Hypothesis II was partially supported because subjects from reconstituted families had more favorable attitudes toward divorce than subjects from intact families. However, contrary to the hypothesis, subjects from reconstituted families did not have more favorable attitudes toward divorce than did subjects from divorced single-parent families.

The third hypothesis in this study involved only those subjects who reported being in a current heterosexual romantic relationship. Subjects in this subgroup completed The Relationship Assessment Scale (Hendrick, 1988) and The Lund Commitment Scale (Lund, 1985) in addition to the marriage and divorce attitudinal measures mentioned above. Two significant relations were found when the demographic questions were correlated with these two measures to explore for potential mediating variables. A positive correlation was found between the question, "How satisfied are you with your present life in regards to romantic involvements?" and both the Hendrick ($r = .69$, $p < .001$) and Lund ($r = .65$, $p < .001$) scales. High satisfaction and commitment in present relationships were related to general
Table 4
Means and Standard Deviations on the Revised Hardy Divorce Scale
by Relationship Status and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s.d.</td>
<td>s.d.</td>
<td>s.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Reseller</td>
<td>35.87</td>
<td>35.83</td>
<td>35.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>7.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in a Mean</td>
<td>32.74</td>
<td>36.04</td>
<td>34.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present s.d.</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
satisfaction with romantic involvement. This variable, however, was not used as a covariate in the analyses because it conceptually overlaps with the constructs measured by the Hendrick and Lund scales.

The third hypothesis predicted that, among those subjects currently in romantic relationships, subjects from reconstituted families and intact families would be more satisfied with and committed to those relationships than subjects from divorced-single parent families. Relationship satisfaction (total scores on The Hendrick Relationship Assessment Scale) was analyzed using a 3(family structure: intact, divorced single-parent, vs. reconstituted) x 2(gender) analysis of variance. No significant main effects or interactions were found for gender or family structure. However, it is interesting to note that the main effect for family structure approached significance ($F(2, 122) = 2.80, p = .065$). An examination of the mean scores on The Relationship Assessment Scale (Hendrick, 1988) broken down by family structure (See Table 5 for means and standard deviations) shows that subjects from intact families and divorced single-parent families reported slightly higher levels of relationship satisfaction than subjects from reconstituted families.

Relationship commitment (total scores on The Lund Commitment Scale) was analyzed using a 3(family structure: intact, divorced single-parent, vs. reconstituted) x 2(gender) analysis of variance. A statistically significant main effect for family structure was found ($F(2, 119) = 5.74, p = .004$). Post-hoc
Table 5
Means and Standard Deviations on the Hendrick Relationship
Satisfaction Scale by Family Structure and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>29.34</td>
<td>29.04</td>
<td>28.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.d.</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Divorced single-parent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>28.14</td>
<td>27.36</td>
<td>27.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.d.</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>6.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reconstituted</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>25.25</td>
<td>24.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.d.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10.69</td>
<td>9.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6
Means and Standard Deviations on the Lund Relationship
Commitment Scale by Family Structure and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>36.86</td>
<td>37.53</td>
<td>37.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.d.</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Divorced single-parent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>36.29</td>
<td>31.55</td>
<td>33.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.d.</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>8.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reconstituted</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>29.25</td>
<td>29.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.d.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>10.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
analyses indicated that subjects from intact families were significantly more committed to their present relationships than subjects from reconstituted families and slightly (but not significantly) more committed to their relationships than subjects from divorced single-parent families (See Table 6 for means and standard deviations). No other significant main effects or interactions were found. Hypothesis III was not supported.
DISCUSSION

In this study of the effects of family structure on attitudes toward marriage and divorce, relationship satisfaction, and commitment the role model or social learning perspective was partially supported. Partial support was found in the relationship between family structure and attitudes toward divorce and relationship commitment. However, family structure was not significantly related in the hypothesized direction to attitudes toward marriage or, for those subjects in a current relationship, to relationship satisfaction.

Attitudes Toward Marriage

This study found that attitudes toward marriage were not significantly affected by family structure. This finding replicates the results of two previous studies (Greenberg & Nay, 1982; Ganong et al., 1981), which also found no difference in marital attitudes between children from divorced families and intact families. However, three recent studies reported contrary findings. Dunlop and Burns (1986) found that adolescents from divorced families expressed greater concern over their own future marriages than those from intact families. Kinnaird and Gerrard (1986) found that disruption in one's family of origin may result in a cautious attitude toward marriage. Additionally, Wallerstein (1983) found that subjects from divorced families feared possible
repetition of their parent's marital failure. It is possible that the findings of the present study, with regard to family structure and marital attitudes, may have been affected by the use of students from a predominantly Catholic university, who may have religious beliefs and family values that differ from the general public. Additionally, these findings may have been affected by the low statistical power that resulted from small sample sizes in the divorced single-parent and reconstituted families.

The present study found that those subjects who reported being in a current romantic relationship had significantly less favorable attitudes toward marriage than subjects not in a current romantic relationship. This relationship status effect on marital attitudes was mediated by subjects' general satisfaction with their romantic involvements. When subjects' satisfaction with their romantic involvements was controlled for, the effect of relationship status was no longer present. This suggests that subjects' general satisfaction with their romantic involvement at the time they completed the questionnaires was responsible for the relation between relationship status and attitudes toward marriage. It is possible that those subjects not currently involved in a romantic relationship, and not happy with this status, reported attitudes more favorable to marriage because of their desire to be intimately involved.
**Attitudes Toward Divorce**

The prediction that subjects from reconstituted families would have more favorable attitudes toward divorce than subjects from intact and divorced single-parent families was partially supported. Subjects from reconstituted families, in addition to those from divorced single-parent families, were found to have more favorable attitudes toward divorce than subjects from intact families. These results partially replicate the findings of Kinnaird and Gerrard (1986), who reported that subjects from reconstituted families were more accepting in their attitudes toward divorce than subjects from intact families and divorced single-parent families. It is possible that subjects from reconstituted families experienced a parent's remarriage as a positive outcome of divorce and, therefore, view divorce more favorably.

Those subjects in reconstituted families may also view divorce as an option to an unsatisfactory marriage. It is possible that these subjects are unhappy with their parents' second or current marriage and wish it to end by divorce. Visher and Visher (1979) found that regardless of how well-adjusted and close children may be to their step-parents they appear to harbor fantasies of the reconciliation of their natural parents for years after family dissolution, even if their original home life was conflictual.

Additionally, this study replicated the findings of Greenberg and Nay (1982), who found that college students from divorced
families showed more favorable attitudes toward divorce than students from intact families. It may be that children of divorced parents value divorce as a useful tool to end an unhappy marriage, as did their parental role models, rather than suffer in an unhappy marriage. Additionally, these children may have guarded opinions and expectations of the institution of marriage and, therefore, may value divorce as a viable option in the future. They may feel unable or unprepared to make a full, unqualified commitment.

The present study also found that females had more favorable attitudes toward divorce than males. This finding may be partly explained by conclusions drawn by Gove (1972a, 1972b, 1973), who found that single women are often happier than single men. He explains that single women are more likely to develop strong social ties, such as close relationships with family and friends. These women are buffered by the emotional support of others, and compared to unmarried men, report greater happiness. This may explain why males had less favorable attitudes toward divorce than females, because males may perceive being single to be more aversive than females and, therefore, view divorce less favorably.

Additionally, an interaction between gender and relationship status was found on attitudes toward divorce. Males who reported not being in a current relationship had less favorable attitudes toward divorce than males in a current relationship. It is possible that the subset of males who reported not being in a current relationship had not experienced the difficulties involved in developing and maintaining a relationship and therefore feel
unlikely to end a relationship should they become involved. Additionally, males not currently in a relationship, because they desire to be romantically involved, may have unrealistic standards and expectations about the permanence of marriage.

The finding that those subjects from intact families had less favorable attitudes toward divorce than subjects from divorced single-parent and reconstituted families is consistent with the role model or social learning perspective. In households with intact marriages, happy or unhappy, the role models may be conveying the message that it is important to stay together regardless of the circumstances. By not divorcing, despite a possibly dissatisfying marriage, parents give the message to their children that divorce is either not an option or an unsatisfactory one. Subjects from divorced single-parent and reconstituted families, by contrast, are given the message through their parents' marital separation that divorce is a viable option to an unhappy marriage.

**Relationship Satisfaction and Commitment**

In the present study, among those subjects in current romantic relationships, relationship satisfaction was not statistically significantly related to family structure, although subjects from intact and divorced single-parent families reported slightly higher levels of relationship satisfaction than subjects from reconstituted families.

Among those subjects who reported being in a current romantic
relationship, those from intact families were significantly more committed to their present relationships than subjects from reconstituted families and slightly more committed than subjects from divorced single-parent families. These results partially replicate the findings of Booth et al. (1984), who found that relationship commitment was lower for those in divorced single-parent families than for those in intact families. However, contrary to the present findings, they found that persons from divorced single-parent families were less happy with their steady dating relationships and had more difficulty committing to relationships than subjects from reconstituted families.

These findings are not consistent with those of Slater and Calhoun (1988). Although they also found that subjects varied in their ability to develop and maintain dating relationships as a function of family structure and amount of family conflict, they found that subjects from divorced high-conflict families reported being more satisfied with the quality of their relationships and more seriously involved than those subjects from intact and divorced low-conflict homes. The findings of the present study differ in that subjects from intact and divorced single-parent families were found to be slightly more satisfied with current relationships than those from reconstituted families, and subjects from intact families were found to be significantly more committed than subjects from reconstituted families and slightly more committed than subjects from divorced single-parent families.

These contradictory findings might be interpreted in terms of differing levels of family conflict. In the present study, no
distinction was made between high-conflict and low-conflict intact homes, as was done in studies described above (Booth et al., 1984; Slater & Calhoun, 1988). It is likely that there was considerable variability in the amount of conflict subjects experienced in intact families. As a result of this variability, results more consistent with those of Slater and Calhoun (1988) might have been found had subjects from intact families been divided into high-conflict and low-conflict groups. In addition, with respect to reported levels of relationship commitment, the findings of the present study may have been affected by the use of subjects from a predominantly Catholic university, as this religion traditionally does not favor divorce.

In regard to relationship satisfaction and relationship commitment, it is possible that subjects from intact families have developed the needed skills to develop and maintain a satisfying relationship. Alternatively, if they lived in an unhappy intact home, they may have low expectations from a relationship and therefore report greater satisfaction. Additionally, they may have learned, by observing their parental role models, that relationships are permanent regardless of the extent of marital conflict and, therefore, report high levels of commitment.

Subjects from divorced single-parent families may have lower expectations of intimate relationships than subjects from intact families, and, therefore, report more satisfaction. However, they may also have learned through role models (i.e., their divorced parents) that relationships are unpredictable and tentative and they, therefore, report less commitment than those from intact
families.

Subjects from reconstituted families, who were found to report less satisfaction with and commitment to relationships than subjects from intact families, may have experienced both positive and negative aspects of relationships when their parents divorced and remarried. As a result, they may have realistic expectations and perceptions of relationships, and report less extreme attitudes than subjects from the other two family structures. This interpretation is supported by findings from Furstenberg and Spanier (1984), who report that persons who experience remarriage are likely to view marriage as a "conditional contract." Subjects from reconstituted families may also see marriage, because their parents have divorced and remarried, as a conditional contract. This may foster realistic expectations of and less satisfaction with relationships than those from intact families. The findings with respect to relationship commitment are also consistent with the role model perspective because subjects from reconstituted families have experienced parental role models who ended their first marriages.

This lower level of commitment to relationships among subjects from divorced and reconstituted families replicates the results of a study by Lauer and Lauer (1991), who also found that family structure (intact-happy, intact-unhappy, family disruption by divorce, and family disruption by death) was not significantly related to subjects' ratings of the quality of their dating relationships. Although no significant differences were found, those subjects from intact-unhappy homes reported the least amount
of quality in their intimate relationships of all the groups. Lauer and Lauer state that, although subjects from all family structures reported similar levels of relationship quality, those from disrupted and intact-unhappy homes may have anxieties and fears that stem from their childhood experiences rather than from their present relationships, and may have considerable doubts about the viability of relationships. Additionally, those from disrupted homes reported negative effects of family disruption that may adversely affect their long-term intimate relationships. For example, they reported difficulty trusting, making commitments, and resolving difficulties in relationships. In other words, while the quality of their immediate relationships was high, they tended to see deficiencies in their ability to relate in a healthy, stable, and long-term manner. With regard to the present study, this perceived deficiency in subjects' ability to relate in a long-term manner may lessen their relationship commitment.

The role model or social learning perspective was partially supported here by the finding that subjects from intact families were significantly more committed in their relationships than subjects from reconstituted families and slightly more committed than subjects from divorced single-parent families. In households with intact marriages, happy or unhappy, role models are conveying the message that it is important to stay together regardless of the circumstances. Subjects from reconstituted and divorced single-parent families, by contrast, may be given the message that relationships are tentative and can be dissolved.
Limitations of the Present Study

Caution must be used in interpreting these findings. First, a disproportionate number of subjects in the study were from intact families (234 intact, 29 divorced single-parent, 11 reconstituted, 19 other). This ratio is most likely due to the use of a student sample from a predominantly Catholic university. Ideally, to adequately examine family structure differences, researchers should have large samples from each structure. Second, as stated above, subjects in this study were drawn from a university and not the general public. Thus, the results are generalizable only to college students. Third, all data in the study were collected through self-report methods. Self-report methods are vulnerable to social desirability responding. Fourth, some of the measures used have questionable psychometric properties.

This study places a high value on romantic relationships as important to a person's well-being. This emphasis was placed on relationships due to this researcher's belief that interpersonal relationships are essential to the healthy growth and development of psychological and physical potential and well-being. This assumption is supported by Coombs (1991), who reviewed 130 empirical studies that relate marital status to various indices of well-being. Coombs concluded that the major factor that predicts self-reported happiness is interpersonal closeness. Strong interpersonal relationships, in or out of marriage, accounted for the greatest differences between those satisfied with their
psychosocial circumstances and those who were not.

Implications for Future Research

Taken collectively, the data obtained from this study indicate that family structure is not an important factor in influencing attitudes toward marriage and divorce and the development and maintenance of interpersonal relationships.

With respect to the content that future studies might address, additional research is needed to fully understand how different family structures affect children. A more complete picture could be obtained if future studies examined the processes within families (in addition to family structure) that affect children's attitudes and interpersonal relationship skills. For example, parental conflict, either during the marriage or after divorce, is one such family process that may be influential in children's interpersonal development. In addition, future studies might focus specifically on the effect that subjects' age at the time of their parents' divorce and remarriage has on their attitudes and interpersonal relationship skills, as well as the length of time between the parent’s divorce and their remarriage.

Additionally, other factors may influence attitudes toward marriage and divorce and interpersonal relationship skills. Factors such as changing public opinion, media portrayal, religion, personal pre-adult experiences, and differing gender socialization may all affect attitudes and are worthy of further
study.

With respect to methodological concerns, future researchers might improve generalizability by using samples from populations other than university students, or by employing college samples from public universities. An additional methodological improvement would be to include measures of perceived levels of family conflict in the analyses. This would further clarify the role of family structure and family conflict in affecting attitudes toward marriage, divorce, and interpersonal relationship skills. Finally, future researchers could obtain more statistically powerful results with the use of larger sample sizes than were available for the present study.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What is your sex?  (A) Male  (B) Female

2. What is your current age?  (A) 18-20 yrs  (B) 21-23 yrs  (C) 24-26 yrs
   (D) 27-29 yrs  (E) 30 yrs or older

3. Read each of the following carefully before you pick the one that best describes your current (or just before college) living situation. Mark only one

   (A) I live (lived) with my natural mother and my natural father OR
       I am adopted and live (lived) with both of my adopted parents.

   (B) I am adopted and live (lived) with only one of my adopted parents.

   (C) My parents are separated or divorced. I live (lived) with my
       natural mother who has not remarried.

   (D) My parents are separated or divorced. I live (lived) with my
       father who has not remarried.

   (E) My parents are divorced and my mother has remarried. I live
       (lived) with my natural mother and my stepfather.

   (F) My parents are divorced and my father has remarried. I live
       (lived) with my natural father and my stepmother.

   (G) My natural father is dead. I live (lived) with my natural mother
       who has not remarried.

   (H) My natural father is dead. I live (lived) with my natural mother
       and my stepfather

(continued on next page)
(I) - My natural mother is dead. I live (lived) with my natural father who has not remarried.

(J) - My natural mother is dead. I live (lived) with my natural father and my stepmother.

If applicable, how old were you when....

(If your parent(s) has been divorced and/or remarried more than one time, state your age at the time of the first divorce and first remarriage.)

(A) less than 5 yrs  (B) 5-10 yrs  (c) 11-16 yrs  (D) 17 or older

4. your parents divorced?

5. your mother remarried?

6. your father remarried?

7. How would you rate the amount of conflict involved in your parents divorce?

(A) not at all  (B) somewhat  (C) conflictual  (D) very conflictual

8. If applicable, how would you rate the amount of conflict in your family after your custodial parent remarried and a step-parent moved into your home?

(A) not at all  (B) somewhat  (C) conflictual  (D) very conflictual

9. Are you currently involved in a heterosexual romantic relationship?

(A) Yes  (B) No

10. Are you currently involved in a homosexual romantic relationship?

(A) Yes  (B) No
11. How satisfied are you with your present life in regard to romantic involvements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A)</th>
<th>(B)</th>
<th>(C)</th>
<th>(D)</th>
<th>(E)</th>
<th>(F)</th>
<th>(G)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all satisfied</td>
<td>somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>very satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: Revision of the Favorableness of Attitude to Marriage Scale (Hill, 1951)

Mark the letter for the answer that tells most how you feel.

1. If you marry to what extent will you miss the life you had as a single person?
   (A) not at all  (B) very little  (C) to some extent  (D) very much

2. In your opinion to what extent will it trouble you to give up your personal freedom when you marry?
   (A) not at all  (B) very little  (C) to some extent  (D) very much

3. In your opinion, will adjustment to married life be difficult for you?
   (A) not at all  (B) very little  (C) to some extent  (D) very much

4. Do you ever have doubts as to whether you will enjoy living exclusively in marriage with one member of the opposite sex?
   (A) never  (B) hardly  (C) occasionally  (D) frequently

5. In your opinion, to what extent will the responsibilities of married life be enjoyable to you?
   (A) very much so  (B) fairly enjoyable  (C) not too much  (D) not at all

6. How happy do you think you will be if you marry?
   (A) very happy  (B) happy  (C) unhappy  (D) very unhappy
7. Do you ever have doubts about your chance of having a successful marriage?  
   (A) ever  (B) rarely  (C) occasionally  (D) frequently

8. Do you think you will find (or have found) a person who is a suitable marriage partner for you?  
   (A) Yes  (B) No

9. Do you think it would be advisable for you always to remain single?  
   (A) Yes  (B) No
APPENDIX C: Revision of the Hardy Divorce Scale (Hardy, 1957)

Mark the letter for the answer which tells best how you feel about the statement.

1. Divorce is a solution to many unhappy marriages.
   - (A) strongly agree
   - (B) neutral
   - (C) disagree
   - (D) strongly disagree

2. Marriage is a sacred contract which should be broken only under the most drastic circumstances.
   - (A) strongly agree
   - (B) neutral
   - (C) disagree
   - (D) strongly disagree

3. Children are better off living with one parent rather than two who cannot get along well together.
   - (A) strongly agree
   - (B) neutral
   - (C) disagree
   - (D) strongly disagree

4. Most divorces are foolish and ought to be stopped.
   - (A) strongly agree
   - (B) neutral
   - (C) disagree
   - (D) strongly disagree

5. It is better for a couple to stay together, to struggle along together if necessary, than to break up a home by getting a divorce.
   - (A) strongly agree
   - (B) neutral
   - (C) disagree
   - (D) strongly disagree

6. Divorce is a fine social institution since it stops much misery and unhappiness.
   - (A) strongly agree
   - (B) neutral
   - (C) disagree
   - (D) strongly disagree

7. Although some people abuse the divorce privilege, it is fundamentally a good thing.
   - (A) strongly agree
   - (B) neutral
   - (C) disagree
   - (D) strongly disagree
8. Marriage is essentially an agreement between two people, and if they wish to conclude that agreement, they should be permitted to do so.

   (A) strongly agree   (B) agree   (C) neutral   (D) disagree   (E) strongly disagree

9. Divorce is no real solution to an unhappy marriage.

   (A) strongly agree   (B) agree   (C) neutral   (D) disagree   (E) strongly disagree

10. Children need a home with both a father and a mother, even though the parents are not especially suited to one another.

    (A) strongly agree   (B) agree   (C) neutral   (D) disagree   (E) strongly disagree

11. Divorce is one of our greatest social evils.

    (A) strongly agree   (B) agree   (C) neutral   (D) disagree   (E) strongly disagree

12. If a couple find getting along with each other a real struggle, then they should not feel obligated to remain married.

    (A) strongly agree   (B) agree   (C) neutral   (D) disagree   (E) strongly disagree
Mark the letter that best approximates how you feel about the person you are romantically involved with.

1. How well does your partner meet your needs?
(A) not at all  (B) somewhat  (C) very well

2. In general, how satisfied are you with your relationship?
(A) not at all  (B) somewhat  (C) very much

3. How good is your relationship compared to most?
(A) not good at all  (B) somewhat good  (C) very good

4. How often do you wish you hadn't gotten into this relationship?
(A) very often  (B) often  (C) never

5. To what extent has your relationship met your original expectations?
(A) has met no expectations  (B) has met some expectations  (C) has met all expectations

6. How much do you love your partner?
(A) not at all  (B) somewhat  (C) very much

7. How many problems are there in your relationship?
(A) many  (B) some  (C) none
**APPENDIX B: Lund Commitment Scale (Lund, 1985)**

Mark the letter that best approximates how you feel about the person you are romantically involved with.

1. **How likely is it that your relationship will be permanent?**
   
   (A) Very unlikely  (B) somewhat likely  (C) very likely

2. **How attracted are you to other potential partners or a single life style?**
   
   (A) very much  (B) somewhat  (C) very little

3. **How likely is it that you and your partner will be together six months from now?**
   
   (A) very unlikely  (B) somewhat likely  (C) very likely

4. **How much trouble would ending your relationship be to you personally?**
   
   (A) very little  (B) some  (C) very much

5. **How attractive would a potential partner have to be for you to pursue a new relationship?**
   
   (A) not at all  (B) somewhat  (C) very

6. **How likely are you to pursue another relationship or single life in the future?**
   
   (A) very likely  (B) somewhat likely  (C) very unlikely

7. **How obligated do you feel to continue this relationship?**
8. In your opinion, how committed is your partner to this relationship?

(A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
not at all somewhat very

9. In your opinion, how likely is your partner to continue this relationship?

(A) (B) (C) (D) (E)
very unlikely somewhat likely very likely
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