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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Statement of the problem

This study investigated the personality factors which are related to adult divorce adjustment. Particular emphasis was placed on the relationship of anxiety, self esteem, and locus of control to subsequent divorce adjustment.

Justification for study

Disruption of a family through the divorce process has increased dramatically in the last 20 years. In 1989 there were 2,404,000 marriages and 1,163,000 divorces and annulments (Beal & Hochran, 1991). According to Glick and Norton (1976), one in three born between 1940 and 1949 are likely to divorce during their lifetime and between 34% and 45% of those who obtain one divorce are likely to obtain a second. According to the Holmes and Rahe (1967) scale of stressful life events, divorce ranks second only to the death of a spouse in stressfulness. The crisis of divorce affects every generation, both nuclear and extended family as well as every individual member, throwing all family members into a state of chaos and disequilibrium. This condition lasts from one to three years post-divorce, according to Mavis Hetherington, a prominent divorce researcher (Carter & McGoldrich, 1988). In addition to the increasing rate of divorces occurring yearly, divorce has been found to be a highly disruptive and traumatic event for family members (Goode, 1956; Weiss, 1975; Hetherington, Cox, & Cox, 1976).
Prior to the 1970's, the nuclear family was idealized as the model for healthy functioning; whereas, divorce was seen as a failure (Kraus, 1979). According to Freund (1974), the divorced person was living a damaged life. Those who remained married were thought to be living the healthy life, and those who divorced were perceived as "fragmented, neurotic, tragic or socially destructive" (Gettleman & Markowitz, 1974, p. 74). Therefore, much of the divorce literature was focused on the relationship between divorce and psychopathology. This view of divorce as a disaster has prevailed well into the 1970's (Kraus, 1979; Freund, 1974; Epstein, 1975; Schmidt & Messner, 1975). Bloom (1977) documented that divorce, which is viewed as a stressor, is correlated with many negative psychological outcomes. Additionally, Briscoe and Smith conducted many studies relating divorce and psychiatric illness. From the evidence they compiled, they concluded that divorce was one of the five events which occurred more frequently in a seriously disturbed patient population (Briscoe & Smith, 1973; Briscoe, Smith, Robins, Maten & Gaskins, 1973; Briscoe & Smith, 1974; Briscoe & Smith, 1975). The Briscoe and Smith studies seem to represent the literature which espouse the idea of divorce as pathogenic.

An opposing perspective began to emerge in the 1970's, viewing divorce as growth-promoting rather than pathogenic (Kraus, 1979). This notion is based upon crisis theory which states that when an individual experiences an event that disturbs the equilibrium, coping with this stress in their usual manner is not possible (Rapoport, 1965). Within crisis theory, it is also assumed that the individual can develop a potential for growth in coping with the crisis (Rapoport, 1965; Kraus, 1979). In a study conducted by Brown, Feldberg, Fox and Kohen (1976), the evidence indicated that divorce had strengthened the participants,
resulting in the development of better relationships, increased autonomy, and more competence and personal control in their lives. In a parallel research effort, Finkel (1975) discovered that traumatic events could be converted into growth producing events. As a crisis can lead to either growth enhancing or pathogenic potential, the question then emerges for divorce researchers as to what factors are related to which outcome (Kraus, 1979).

Kraus (1979) noted that researchers needed to make a distinction between short-term personality disorganization and long-term psychopathology as related to divorce. Hence the stage theory of divorce began to emerge. According to this theory, an individual goes through various cycles when coping with the separation experience including denial, anger, depression, reorientation and acceptance (Herman, 1974; Weiss, 1975; Wiseman, 1976; Kaslow, 1981). These research efforts also included an emphasis on individual functioning, with both internal and external factors related to divorce adjustment (Kraus, 1979).

Goode (1956) was one of the early researchers who compiled a major project that identified which behavior factors were considered "high divorce trauma" and which factors were considered "low trauma" (Kraus, 1979, p. 114). There have been some attempts in the literature to define and measure divorce adjustment (Raschke, 1977; Raschke & Barringer, 1977; Spanier & Hanson, 1978). Raschke (1977) has been one of the most thorough in the area of divorce adjustment. She defined adjustment as having a low level of stress as the individual incorporates new roles.

Although there have been efforts in the literature to quantify divorce adjustment, Spanier and Casto (1979) noted that there have been few systematic attempts to discover what factors affect divorce adjustment among adults. Most
of the research has come from clinical case studies and counseling populations (Spanier & Casto, 1979). Price-Bonham and Balswick (1980) further added that although "there has been a vast increase in divorce research, it appears the emphasis has been on gaining breadth of knowledge, often at the expense of depth" (p. 967). The research which does exist focuses primarily on women and clinical populations (Price-Bonham & Balswick, 1980). Further, according to Price-Bonham and Balswick (1980), there exist many ill-defined concepts as well as inconsistent and nonstandardized measures and oversimplified generalizations in the area of divorce adjustment. They concluded from surveying the divorce literature that there was a need for more research for those who successfully adjusted to divorce. They noted that there was a need for multivariate analyses of variables related to divorce adjustment, and that there should be more effort to build empirically based generalizations which would also enhance theory (Price-Bonham & Balswick, 1980). Thomas (1982) stated that little research has been done on adults and their adjustment to divorce. The primary emphasis has been on children of divorce. She further noted that most of the studies related to either the causes or differences in divorce, but few investigated personality factors as related to divorce adjustment (Thomas, 1982).

The purpose of this research was to examine personality factors related to adult divorce adjustment with a particular focus on autonomy, anxiety and self-esteem.

Theoretical rationale

The development of theory regarding defining a self is evident not only in the individual psychotherapy literature, but also in the family systems literature.
One family theorist, Murray Bowen, pioneered the concept of defining a self within the family system (Bowen, 1978; Bowen & Kerr, 1988; Winter, 1992). His theoretical explication, known as Bowen Theory, represents a major contribution to an understanding of the definition of a self within a systemic context.

During the late forties and early fifties, Bowen began his investigation regarding differentiation at the Menninger Foundation where he observed mother-child symbiosis. While at the National Institute for Mental Health from 1954-1959, Bowen continued his research effort, hospitalizing whole families with schizophrenic members. He observed that mother-child symbiosis was only a fragment of a larger family emotional system (Kerr, 1981). This was a nodal point in the development of Bowen theory with regard to differentiation of a self (Kerr, 1981). Bowen then moved to the Georgetown University Family Center where he further formulated his theoretical model. Here he incorporated the theory into his teaching and "coaching" of medical students and residents (Kerr, 1981). By 1975, Bowen had developed eight theoretical constructs which became known as Bowen Theory (Winter, 1992).

Bowen Theory includes two fundamental forces: the force toward individuality and autonomy, and the force toward togetherness or fusion. Maintaining a balance or homeostasis of these forces "which are rooted in instinctual drives for autonomy and connection" are characteristic of human behavior according to Bowen Theory (Winter, 1992, p. 10). Too much togetherness often directs the person to search for individuality or separateness; whereas, too much separateness drives the individual towards togetherness. A chronic or extreme imbalance in these forces "results in fusion within
relationships wherein behavior is dictated primarily by a reactive, emotional need for more togetherness or more separateness" (Winter, 1992, p. 13).

Two factors which affect the balance between the togetherness and individuality forces are anxiety and differentiation (Carpenter, 1990; Winter, 1991). According to Carpenter (1990), anxiety is defined as a response of an organism to a possible threat. It is a complex emotional reaction which can either be inborn or learned as a response to a situation or event. In Bowen Theory, anxiety generates tension which occurs within a relationship system and can either be a functional or dysfunctional force (Carpenter, 1990; Winter, 1992). When a minimal state of anxiety exists, an individual is generally functional; whereas, in a high state of anxiety, there is a melding of the intellectual and emotional drives and thus fusion of those states occurs. Kerr noted how the pressure due to anxiety results in fusion:

The togetherness force propels people toward attachment to relieve anxiety and provide well-being but the pressures and uncertainties of the relationship generate anxiety and decrease well-being . . . An important consequence of anxiety is that it creates pressure in ways that will reduce each other's anxiety. (Kerr & Bowen, 1988, p. 78)

When there is a disturbance in the balance of a relationship system, a state of anxiety generally occurs. This phenomena results in a decreased level of differentiation or maturity level (Carpenter, 1990; Winter, 1992). Differentiation is roughly equivalent to the degree to which one is autonomous (Tobin-Ashe, 1979). The "differentiation of self" concept is a cornerstone of Bowen Theory. Bowen (1978) observed regarding the level of differentiation:
The concept defines people according to the degree of fusion or differentiation, between emotional and intellectual functioning . . . At the low extreme are those whose emotions and intellect are so fused that their lives are dominated by the automatic emotional system. (p. 362)

Bowen (1978) developed a continuum to illustrate the degree of differentiation of self which later became known as The Differentiation of the Self Scale (Tobin-Ashe, 1979; Kerr & Bowen, 1988; Winter, 1992). This scale was intended to depict an individual's ability to discern between intellectual and emotional functioning as well as balance the forces of togetherness and separateness (Kerr & Bowen, 1988; Winter, 1992). The ability to distinguish between intellectual and emotional systems is an integral aspect of the differentiation concept. Being able to maintain emotional autonomy or differentiation, while at the same time remaining connected to a family or relationship system, is a difficult but key part of the differentiation phenomena (Winter, 1992). "The capacity to be true to oneself and yet be connected to others is integral to differentiation" (Winter, 1992, p. 17).

People on the lower end of the Differentiation Scale tend to live in a feeling world where it is hard to distinguish feeling from fact. They tend to borrow or trade self so that there is a wide fluctuation in their functioning. Their expression of self tends to be dogmatic. These people tend to see themselves at the center of the universe and either undervalue or overvalue self. They are less flexible, less adaptable and have more difficulty recovering from stress. On this lower end of the scale, there exists the greatest degree of undifferentiation. So much life energy goes into seeking love or approval, or in attacking others for not
getting the love or approval, that there no energy for developing a self (Bowen, 1978; Kerr, 1981; Winter, 1992).

On the other hand, individuals who are functioning at the higher end of the Differentiation Scale develop a balance between the individuality and togetherness force that allows a person to be well-defined (Kerr, 1981; Winter, 1992). They are operationally clear about differences between feelings and intellect and are free to state their beliefs calmly without attacking beliefs of others for the enhancement of self (Bowen, 1978; Kerr, 1981). Through their ability to realistically appraise self and others, they can participate fully in emotional events knowing they can extricate themselves if needed. According to Bowen (1978), people who are well-defined have a "functional intellectual system" and "are no longer a prisoner of an emotional-feeling world. They are able to live life more freely and have more satisfying emotional lives" (p. 369).

This posture is not to be confused with that of a "rugged individualist" which is an exaggerated or "pretend" posture of a person struggling against emotional fusion (Bowen, 1978).

While the phenomena of differentiation within Bowen Theory is a critical aspect of the model, the concepts of "solid self" and "pseudo-self" also contribute to the concept of differentiation. Solid self, or the non-negotiable part of the self which stands behind its principles, makes a clear choice to become responsible for self and handles the consequences. The development of the solid self is formed slowly and can be changed from within but not from external pressure (Bowen, 1978; Kerr, 1981; Winter, 1992).

The solid self consists of "personal beliefs, principles, and that are non-negotiable, even under duress." (Winter, 1992, p. 19). According to Bowen
(1978), the solid self is able to maintain a balance between the intellectual and emotional forces and therefore the level of fusion within a system.

Essentially, the pseudo-self is an actor and can present many different faces. The list of the "pretends" is extensive. One can pretend to be more important or less important, stronger or weaker, or more attractive or less attractive than is realistic. It is easy for most people to detect gross examples of pretense, but according to Bowen (1978), "there is enough of the impostor in all of us so that it is difficult to detect lesser degrees of the impostor in others" (p. 365). The pseudo-self is unable to resist fusion and is affected by stress and anxiety. Filled with inconsistencies, the pseudo-self has difficulty maintaining the balance between the togetherness and separateness forces and often moves toward togetherness rather than hold on to opinions and beliefs (Winter, 1991).

Bowen also postulated that the level of solid self is low compared to the level of pseudo-self in humans. The pseudo-self is involved with fusion as well as the borrowing, lending, trading and exchanging of self (Bowen, 1978; Winter, 1992).

Bowen, though, goes one step further in his application of differentiation of a self theory to the relationship and the family context. He stated:

Differentiation cannot take place in a vacuum. It has to take place in relation to others, around issues important to both people . . .

Differentiation also has to be in the context of a meaningful relationship in which the other has to respect the belief and the action stand that affirms it. (Bowen, 1978, p. 496)

Bowen (1978) further described a process he termed "undifferentiated family ego mass" where the pseudo-self of one individual merges with the other
in an intense emotional relationship, including marriage. He applied his
differentiation theory not only to the family but also to the marital system by
hypothesizing that an individual's level of differentiation affects the choice of a
marital partner (Winter, 1992). Bowen espoused that an individual chooses a
partner at the same level of differentiation of self. He observed that a spouse at
an unconscious level was willing to accommodate to the other in a new
"emotional oneness" (Bowen, 1978). According to the theory, one partner
becomes the "functional" self and the other becomes the functional "no-self"

In Bowen Theory, the responsible "I" defines principles and assumes
responsibility for one's own happiness, comfort and well-being; whereas, the
narcissistic "I" makes demands and has a tendency to blame others for their own
unhappiness or failure (Bowen, 1978, p. 218). Throughout Bowen Theory, the
functional level of the emotional system is critical to the well-being of the
individual as well as the relationship context, including marriage.

Winter (1992) noted that "differentiation or autonomy, in Bowen Theory, is
not to be confused with 'being an individual'" (p. 24). If one person in a marriage
assumes a position while the other remains emotionally reactive, emotional
closeness is not achieved and that person is not functioning autonomously. This
interdependence of emotional functioning is counterproductive to the
differentiation process and may produce intense marital conflict (Kerr & Bowen,

Additionally, the two individuals locked in this projective fit due to unmet
needs, or a lower level of differentiation, are excessively dependent on the other,
tend to have a need to control the other's responses, and are intensely affected
by the other. Bowen (1978) illustrated this idea when the adaptive spouse of a
couple, over a long period, reacts to criticism and becomes so "de-selfed, he or
she is unable to make decisions and collapses in selfless dysfunction" (p. 366).
In such relationships, it is important for individuals of similar level of differentiation
to continue the balance of togetherness and separateness. If they are unable to
maintain this balance, "it is unlikely the relationship will remain viable" (Winter,

One of Bowen's main tenets is that resolution of family of origin issues is
critical to the functional level of the marital unit. The family unit of origin is the
place where the individual develops his initial impression of self. This early
formation is critical in the development of the self and becomes the "unit of
identity where the person's initial view or trance with regard to himself is formed"
(Winter & Aponte, 1987, p. 3).

According to Winter and Aponte (1987), when a marriage is not able to
create the experience of "healing," an individual has to face the choice of
remaining in this unhappy state or make a decision regarding separation and
divorce. When the process of marital dissolution or divorce occurs, each
individual in the marriage has experienced unfulfilled dreams and expectations.
When individuals marry, the wish that the spouse will magically fill all the missing
parts of the self and that "they will be everything the other needs and wants, that
their love will conquer all, and that they will caress away all the old hurts and
build a glorious life together" (Kaslow, 1981, p. 665) creates an impossible reality
for the marital system.

Parallel to the development and defining a self within an individual context
is Bowen's theory of differentiation of a self within a family system (Settlage,
1974; Mahler, 1975; Bowen, 1978). When an individual is faced with the prospect of marital dissolution, he is again faced with the task of defining a new identity (Hadeed, 1986). Bohannon (1970) who has written extensively on divorce, holds that, "Divorce forces the individual to take up the work of individuation once more without the illusory support of the marriage" (Goldman & Coane, 1977, p. 362).

Further, divorce or marital dissolution surfaces the old childhood issues of separation and attachment. As a result of the divorce, or the marital dissolution, the person must face the loss of attachment, which creates a developmental predicament. The divorcing person must find a way to deal with his loss without continuing to need the former spouse. Just as the infant learns to tolerate separation of the attached object, generally mother, so must the person in divorce also tolerate separation anxiety. Yet, the divorcing person cannot rely on the old, internalized developmental learnings from childhood. In such instances, the person is irrevocably faced with defining a self. Due to this mental hiatus, the person frequently intensifies the unresolved family of origin issues. By returning to the original unit of identity, change in one's self definition is accelerated (Winter & Aponte, 1987; Hadeed, 1986).

Divorce theories hold, however, that when one faces separation, one also encounters the challenge of redefining the self. Just as in Bowen Theory, when a person differentiates a self from the family of origin, the individual also needs to move from marital fusion, where the self is dependent on the other spouse to complete the self. In attempting to gain a greater level of differentiation, an individual is able to think and act autonomously (Bowen, 1978).
This study examined personality factors related to adult divorce adjustment utilizing Bowen Theory and included a particular emphasis on autonomy or locus of control, differentiation, anxiety and self esteem. The following section includes a number of definitions which were integral to the theoretical rationale as well as terms which were significant in explicating the variables examined in this study.

Definition of terms

Autonomy. The ability to exist independently and to respond, react or to develop independently of the whole. It is the state or quality of being self-governing.

Divorce. Termination of an existing marriage or the legal dissolution of a marriage.

Locus of control. A generalized expectancy that one's outcomes or reinforcements are either more under personal control (internal locus) or more under the control of external forces (external locus).

Anxiety. An overwhelming sense of apprehension and fear often marked by physiological signs. Anxiety is characterized by extreme uneasiness of mind, usually over an impending or anticipated ill. Anxiety generates tension which occurs in a relationship system and can either be functional or dysfunctional.

Fusion. "Behavior is dictated by a reactive, emotional need for more togetherness or more separateness" (Winter, 1992, p. 13).

Differentiation of self. Equivalent to the degree one is autonomous. Depicts an individual's ability to discern between intellectual and emotional functioning while being able to balance the forces of togetherness and separateness.

Self esteem. A confidence and satisfaction in oneself.
Solid-self. The aspect of the self that is able to stand behind principles, and makes a clear choice to become responsible and handle the consequences.

Pseudo-self. The part of the self that can pretend and present many different faces. The pseudo-self is filled with inconsistencies, unable to resist fusion and easily affected by stress and anxiety.

Undifferentiated family ego mass. The pseudo-self of one individual merges with another person in an intense emotional relationship such as marriage.

Divorce adjustment. A process "by which a disruption of role sets and patterns and existing role relations, is incorporated into the individual's life pattern, such that the roles accepted and assigned do not take prior divorce into account as the primary point of reference" (Goode, 1956b, p. 19).

Research hypotheses

The following are the research hypotheses examined in the study investigating the personality factors of autonomy or locus of control, self esteem and anxiety with regard to divorce adjustment and differentiation of self:

1. Individuals with a higher degree of self esteem will exhibit a more positive divorce adjustment.

2. Individuals who manifest a lower degree of anxiety will show a more positive divorce adjustment.

3. Individuals who have a more internal locus of control will exhibit more positive divorce adjustment.

4. Individuals who have achieved a higher level of differentiation will exhibit more positive divorce adjustment.
Sample description and general data gathering procedures

The population for the study was comprised of all individuals divorced in Henrico County, a suburb of Richmond, Virginia, from January 1, 1988 through December 31, 1988. A random sample of 400 participants was obtained through the Department of Public Health, Bureau of Vital Statistics of the Commonwealth of Virginia. For purposes of this study, only those individuals who were married at least three years prior to their divorce were included in this sample population (potentially allowing for the reported variable of attachment to surface).

Subjects in this research were asked to complete self-report inventories which addressed self-esteem, anxiety, and locus of control. In addition, all subjects were asked to complete self-report inventories which address divorce adjustment and differentiation of self. Each participant was also asked to complete a demographic questionnaire.

Limitations of the study

One of the limitations of this research was inherent in the research design. Due to the correlational method utilized in this study, a cause and effect relationship could not be established (Borg & Gall, 1983). If a positive correlation is found between two variables, then other causal inferences can be discovered which may be just as likely. In correlational studies, occasionally the relationship may be due to an "artifact" (Borg & Gall, 1983). Several scales from one inventory are significant only because they contain some of the same items, not because what they measure is necessarily causally related. In that case, a correlation coefficient was used due to overlapping test items.
Another limitation with correlational studies is that they attempt to break down complex behavior into simple components. Because personality factors are highly complex, only a careful interpretation of data will be helpful in understanding the phenomenon. A major limitation of this study, though, remains the generalizability of the results.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Historical and theoretical development

The following chapter will explore the literature regarding divorce adjustment with particular emphasis on the factors of locus of control, anxiety and self esteem. Included in this review will be an historical and theoretical overview of the research on divorce. In addition, a critique of each variable will be addressed to examine the limitations in the research.

Divorce is a critical event in a person's life. From the perspective of the Bowen Theory "divorce is a modification of the family as an emotional unit" (Schara, 1986, p. 2). Although Bowen Theory does not specifically address the process of divorce, some theorists and researchers trained in Bowen Theory have expanded the theoretical concepts to address divorce.

Beal (1980) has written extensively on divorce utilizing Bowen Theory. He stated that first an understanding of the process of marriage is necessary in order to understand the process of divorce. He described four marital patterns:

1. In the first pattern, one spouse is dominant and goal directed, and the other spouse assumes an adaptive role in the marriage, usually anxious or depressed. When there is an increase in anxiety, separation can occur.

2. In the second pattern, both partners assume the dominant position with emotionally based issues and when anxiety is high, they
experience marital conflict. When they are unable to reduce the anxiety, marital dissolution may occur.

3. In the third pattern, both partners assume the adaptive position and each spouse develops symptoms. These marriages often include long term chronic symptoms and physical illness.

4. A fourth dyadic relationship pattern occurs when both spouses are emotionally distant from one another and one spouse is over-involved with the children.

Beal (1980) further stated that in order to assess marital stability, the degree of emotional attachment with the family of origin and the development of emotional attachment within the marriage must be evaluated. He added that "intense emotional attachments are more vulnerable to deterioration under stress" (p. 247).

Schara (1986), observed that divorce is a short-term adaptation to an increasing level of tension in society. She noted the relevance of understanding the divorce process as part of an evolutionary and adaptive process to deal with societal regression.

Recovery from divorce, according to Schara (1986), is a difficult process. Some view divorce as an answer to their problems while others may see divorce as a way of decreasing the anxiety and not blaming the other spouse. According to Bowen Theory, an individual has varying ability in relating as an emotionally separate person while still relating to a family emotional system (Winter, 1991).

Although divorce represents a cutoff from the Bowen perspective, it has the potential to help the family adapt if the divorcing spouses have an understanding of the role of managing anxiety within the family system. "Divorce
may promote a further breakdown in the individual's ability to relate or it may force a more thoughtful stance with relationships” (Schara, 1986, p. 2).

Fogarty (1975), pointed out that the couple, unable to fill an emotional void or emptiness through the marriage, often cannot tolerate differences in the spouse. Subsequently, this process intensifies as the couple experiences these differences. This leads to conflict and frequently the spouses face the prospect of divorce. Fogarty (1975) further indicated that divorce can be utilized as a learning experience if a person “does not see it as a problem that is totally rooted in his partner and that he is getting rid of the problem by getting rid of the other person” (p. 32). If a person can see one’s role in the dysfunction and make relevant changes to the self, the divorce can result in a gain rather than only a loss (Hadeed, 1986).

Other family systems theorists have addressed the process of divorce. Carter and McGoldrich (1988) primarily focused much of their work on family life cycles with divorce as part of the life cycle a family may experience. They noted that previous divorce literature has emphasized the relationship between divorce and psychopathology with "marital status linked to mental disorder“ (p. 337). Further, in the past decade, divorce has been viewed as a transitional crisis (Ahrons, 1980). Ahrons and Rodgers focused on the family development stage, gender differences, personality style, economic factors and parent and child subjective feeling responses (Schara, 1986).

Within the last fifteen years, several major theorists have written about the various stages of divorce. Although similar in their views regarding the definition of self within the divorce process, some systems theorists have focused their theories particularly on developmental stages of the divorce process. Weiss
(1975), who has written a seminal work on the issues revolving around marital separation and divorce, delineated two states; transition and recovery. A critical phase one goes through is a disruption of identity. According to Weiss (1975), those who had depended on their marriage as a way of completing the self have an even more difficult adjustment in this period.

Weiss further stated that some individuals go beyond the more usual integration of the marriage into the self; they feel they have meaning and worth only as they are linked to the spouse. When their marriages end they feel that they have lost more than just a part of themselves; they feel that they have lost themselves entirely (1975).

Weiss noted that one critical task in the separation process is to "battle to an autonomous self" distinct from the identity which evolved in the marriage. Recovering divorced individuals want and need to see themselves as independent and living their own lives (1975). He concluded that separation distress is a reaction to the intolerance of accessing the attachment figure. Further, in his writing on divorce, Weiss examined the emergence of the new identity after the period of separation distress and loss of attachment of the divorcing person.

Kaslow (1981), another major theorist in the developmental theory of divorce, observed after an extensive literature review of the various theories on the stages of divorce, that no theory adequately dealt with the feelings associated with each stage, and the tasks which need to be accomplished for each stage. She discussed the "roller coaster" effect of moving through divorce rather than a progressive movement from one stage to another. Kaslow described couples who regress back to an earlier stage and often become fixated there, just as one
is unable to complete an early developmental task and becomes "fixated" at that earlier stage. Kaslow (1981) described a seven stage model of divorce which begins with disillusionment and ends with autonomy.

Kaslow (1981) concluded in her discussion on the aftermath of divorce that a coalescence takes place where an individual has progressed in the search for self to form a new identity. Additionally, she observed that the emotional experience of divorce varies as if on a continuum:

No doubt the reality covers the entire spectrum, with some people finding everything associated with divorce traumatic and horrendous and others turning it into a liberating growth experience. (Kaslow, 1981, p. 678)

The theoretical literature regarding divorce is unified regarding the role of self definition. That is, when a person undergoes divorce, there is a concomitant challenge to redefine the self. As in the Bowen theory when a person differentiates a self from the family of origin, one must also move from marital fusion (when the self is needy for the other spouse to complete the self) to a state of differentiation where the individual is able to think and act autonomously (Bowen, 1978).

The issue of defining a self or differentiation within the divorce process is such a complex phenomena that it becomes a difficult concept to research. Although the literature on divorce is extensive, there are very few theorists who primarily address the process of divorce from the Bowen theoretical perspective. Much of the literature on divorce is devoted to children's adjustment within the divorce process rather than adult adjustment. Consequently there is very little
research that specifically addresses the question of how the concept of differentiation of self is applicable to adult divorce adjustment.

There are some studies in the literature which examine Bowen Theory and differentiation of self but do not include the developmental task of divorce (Tobin-Ashe, 1979 & Carpenter, 1990). While there are theorists (Beal, 1991; Schara, 1986; Carter & McGoldrich, 1988) who have written directly on the topic of divorce adjustment, there appear to be few studies which empirically examine Bowen theory in relationship to divorce adjustment. This present study attempted to expand the Bowen Theory as it relates to the divorce process.

**Divorce as pathogenic**

Thomas (1982) conducted a thorough review of the divorce literature and discovered that the literature is replete with studies which focus on the negative aspects of post-divorce adjustment. As Schara (1986), a Bowenian theorist noted, divorce can be an opportunity for further thoughtful development of relationships, or it can also be associated with a decrease in the functioning level of the individual within his relationships systems. Lambert and Lambert (1977) concluded that people will have extreme difficulty adjusting to the reality of divorce and the trauma it can cause in their lives.

There have been few studies in the literature examining sample populations who have coped successfully with divorce. Much of the research has been from a pathogenic perspective in which divorce is considered a failure (Kraus, 1979). Price-Bonham & Balswick (1980) discussed both the methodological and theoretical weakness in the divorce literature. They concluded from their review that many studies focused mostly on women and
children and those who perceived divorce as only a crisis and not a growth promoting experience. They further noted that more research is needed on the internal processes contributing to adjustment, such as personality factors. While many studies examine either the causes or differences among those who are divorced, a focus on personality variables is lacking in the research literature.

Additionally, many researchers and theorists concluded that the process of adjusting to divorce lasts from two to three years (Hetherington et al., 1978; Weiss, 1975). Prior to the termination of the three years, most divorced individuals will experience chaos and only after this period will begin to exhibit differences (Hetherington et al., 1978; Chiriboga et al., 1978). Despite this finding which has been reported in the literature, many studies analyze post-divorce adjustment immediately following divorce. The following is a review of research on the major personality factors related to post-divorce adjustment as well as concerns which have not yet been fully researched.

**Locus of control**

For purposes of this study, locus of control and degree of autonomy were regarded as synonymous. In the literature on divorce, the term "autonomy" has often been used interchangeably with "locus of control" to define this aspect of adjustment (Weiss, 1975; Johnson, 1977; Hetherington et al., 1978). Doherty (1980) conducted one of the most comprehensive studies on post-divorce adjustment and locus of control. He was also one of the first researchers who explored the idea of divorce from a growth-promoting focus rather than just as a negative life influence. Through his extensive review of the literature, he discovered many studies which supported the view of divorce as a negative
factor. Gove (1973) reported a higher mortality rate including higher suicide and accidental deaths in a divorced population. An NIMH review of studies revealed that those experiencing divorce had a higher incidence of mental disorders as well as psychological stress symptoms (NIMH, 1975; Vernbrugge, 1979).

Doherty further noted in his review of studies a recent emphasis on the positive challenges that divorce offers people. Johnson (1977) reported that divorce challenges an individual to a greater degree of "autonomous adulthood" (p. 392). After the initial difficult period of chaos in the divorce process which has been substantiated by many researchers, (Weiss, 1975; Goode, 1956a; Chiriboga et al., 1978), Doherty hypothesized that an individual is then able to enhance development of personal control and autonomy. He further added that successful coping with divorce would enable an individual to have more control over his life through the tasks of autonomous decision making and problem solving.

In his study of 904 individuals from a national probability sample of 1,333 persons 18 and older, Doherty administered the Rotter I-E Scale to assess personal control and divorce adjustment. The results indicated that there were no sex differences or age variation with locus of control. As hypothesized, divorced persons had the most internal I-E scores and that internality was positively correlated with family income and education level. An analysis of covariance indicated that the divorced group had higher internal scores than either the married or the never married group, suggesting that greater internality is not just a function of being single.

Although Doherty (1980) concluded that the most plausible explanation of his results was that divorce leads to greater internality, he also stated that the
absence of longitudinal data makes this question difficult to resolve. Other limits of his study included the unavailability of information on remarriage and length of time separated and divorced. Thus he was unable to determine those who were previously divorced in the married group.

Barnet (1990) added to the research on divorce adjustment and locus of control with her study which examined these areas in more depth. She explored divorce stress, locus of control and demographic predictors in a random sample of 39 men and 68 women. They were mostly white, not remarried and experiencing a first divorce. What she concluded was that those who exhibited internal locus of control experience more predecision stress, less stress during the actual divorce and less post-divorce stress and social maladjustment. In addition, she reported that with divorce, the relationship between locus of control and stress changes over time from "an inverse relationship (predecision stress) to a direct relationship (post-divorce stress)" (p. 107). Several of the studies reviewed by Barnet (1990) supported her hypothesis that those who tested as internal on the Rotter experienced less and shorter periods of stress during the actual divorce process and better post-divorce adjustment (Brown, Perry, & Harburg, 1977; Pais, 1979).

Another variable explored was marriage locus of control which Barnet (1990) concluded was an important factor in divorce research. According to Rotter (1975), situation specific locus of control is a significant factor in these investigations. Barnet (1990) hypothesized that higher levels of internal marriage locus of control would predict the ability to form close heterosexual relationships and thus be an indicator for greater divorce recovery and more successful future relationships.
In an earlier study, Smith (1980) designed the Marriage Locus of Control which she correlated with the Rotter. This measure assesses locus of control in the marriage. She also designed a measure to examine divorce difficulties and six stress measures of divorce stress and adjustment in her sample of 107 subjects. According to Smith (1980), internal locus of control was inversely related to onset of peak stress. She further discovered that women were more internal than men in the divorce process. Demographic variables (external factors) such as duration of marriage, sex, number of children and time after divorce influenced the adjustment process.

Along with Barnet and Doherty's exploration of locus of control and divorce adjustment, Wilder (1981) examined the question of general versus situational control and their influence on divorce adjustment. Three hundred adults were interviewed several months after separation and then 3.5 years later. Analysis of covariance indicated differences between men and women. The results indicated that both situational and general control had an impact on short term adjustment for men and not for women. In addition, only situational control was a significant variable at follow-up for men. Those identified at high risk for poor adjustment were both men and women who had low scores on both types of control.

Filler (1985) explored the variables of initiation of separation and locus of control with divorce adjustment. His results revealed that those who have internal locus of control and those who initiated the divorce process had significantly better adjustment than those who had higher external locus of control and did not initiate the divorce. An additional finding in Filler's (1985) study was that those who identified the marital separation as causing more
difficulties and who were internally oriented had poorer adjustments than those who identified fewer problems as causative. Clement (1983), on the other hand, discovered that those who blamed their spouses for the divorce reported the best adjustment. Clement (1983) in her study of 132 subjects found no correlation among the personality variables of locus of control, sex-role attitudes and conceptual styles.

Many of these studies which support the theory of divorce as a challenge to the individual's development and enhancement of autonomy are based on sample populations who are usually female, white, educated and middle class and seek therapy or self-help groups. Also, participants are often chosen from special divorce groups and therefore further limit the generalizability of the results. In reviewing the literature on locus of control, the question of whether divorced people are likely to be more internal or whether greater internality results from the divorce process remains unresolved. Only extensive longitudinal data would help resolve this issue (Doherty, 1980).

Additionally, Barnet (1990) reported that many studies underestimated the impact of locus of control and did not include specific areas of locus of control to investigate (Rotter, 1975). She further claimed that a large number of studies explored the divorce process in piecemeal fashion rather than examine several major stress points throughout the divorce process such as decision time, predecision stress, and post-divorce stress.

**Self esteem**

Although there were numerous studies which recognized self concept as a significant variable in the exploration of divorce adjustment, very few adequately
addressed this personality factor. According to Ward and Ward (1992) in their review of the self concept literature from Hamechek (1988), "self-concept is the cognitive awareness of the self, or the way people imagine how they appear to others. Self-esteem refers to the extent to which one values oneself" (p. 1).

Pais (1978) investigated several factors in her study of divorce including: self concept, various demographic variables, mother's and father's involvement with the divorce process and mother's level of satisfaction with the parent-child interaction. She concluded that self concept was the strongest predictor of divorce adjustment. In her sample of 62 women, the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, The Rotter I-E Scale, and the Blair Divorce Adjustment Inventory were administered as well as the Family Relationships Inventory to assess the mother's perceptions regarding family interactions.

Many theorists and researchers have described the feelings of failure and rejection which are part of the divorce experience (Weiss, 1975; Bohannon, 1970; Hunt & Hunt, 1977; Kessler, 1976). According to Hetherington et al. (1978), the self concepts of the divorced group in her sample were lower than the married group. Although she reported these results regarding lower self esteem of the divorced group, she noted that these symptoms disappeared over time and the two groups were observed to be more similar. One particular finding which was observed in her study was that mothers of sons only appeared to have the most difficulty with self concept. Hetherington et al. (1978), like Pais (1978), substantiated the notion that self concept and post-divorce adjustment in mothers demonstrated a strong positive correlation.

Some of the research in the area of self concept and post-divorce adjustment focused on exploring these variables with sample populations
completing particular divorce programs. Kessler (1978) examined the variable of self concept with a sample of 30 volunteers involved in three groups: structured, unstructured and control divorce groups. The 30 subjects were randomly assigned to these three groups and administered the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, the Self Description Inventory, and the Self Report Questionnaire after an eight week period. Those in the structured group were observed to have the highest overall level of self esteem as evidenced by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. They also reported a more positive self-identity and greater self acceptance.

Similarly, Goethal et al. (1983) explored the issue of self esteem and post-divorce adjustment within the context of a structured divorce group. Twenty-eight divorced women, recruited through community resources and newspaper articles, completed a five-week structured divorce adjustment training program. They were separated no more than 16 months and had received no previous divorce counseling or training. After a one month follow-up, the Fischer Divorce Adjustment Scale and the Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale were administered. The results indicated that the women who received the training did increase their level of divorce adjustment and level of empathy, but not their level of self esteem.

Several longitudinal studies examined the issue of self concept and whether this factor changed over time from the initial separation to a two to three year period following divorce. Bartley (1981) in a study of 125 men and 185 women administered four self concept resources and eight self concept deficits derived from the Adjective Rating Scale. The Symptoms Checklist was used to assess adjustment. In essence, the results revealed that self concept improved from the post-separation stage to the 3.5 year follow-up. One finding which
emerged from this study was that some of the self concept items were related to psychological functioning. These results could be useful in identifying individuals at risk for psychological dysfunction as well as dysfunction related to divorce adjustment.

Doherty et al. (1989) similarly examined post-divorce adjustment from a longitudinal vantage point. With a sample size of 501 families, he administered several instruments which evaluated self esteem, psychological well-being and mastery over a five year period. The results indicated that initially, the women seemed to lose confidence in their internal control over their lives. At the five year follow-up, there were no differences between the groups.

There were many methodological problems with these studies which investigated self concept and post-divorce adjustment. Many of these studies had such narrow samples that, therefore, the generalizability of the results was also limited. Often, only Caucasian, educated women were used for these samples and thus did not represent the general population. Additionally, the use of sample populations from structured divorce programs further limited the generalizability of the results. Researchers found it difficult to determine whether the program produced the results, or whether living through the divorce process produced enhanced self esteem.

Accurately measuring self esteem, which would include a focus on feelings and behaviors, could provide a valuable source for helping individuals improve their level of functioning. One of the difficulties, though, in assessing self esteem is bias caused by social desirability factors. Individuals tend to respond to the self-report measures with what they think is socially acceptable (Ward &
Ward, 1992). In the case of divorce, this bias can be problematic due to the stigma attached to the divorce process.

**Anxiety**

Although there were very few studies in the literature directly exploring anxiety as a personality factor related to divorce adjustment, there were several that were quite comprehensive. Dreman et al. (1990) focused on sense of competence, time perspective and state-anxiety of separated versus divorced mothers. In this study, which was conducted in Israel, competence was defined as "feeling in control of both general and specific life areas" (Dreman, Orr, & Aldor, 1990, p. 77). The authors further defined competence as having components of self-esteem and self-efficacy. One of the issues they focused on with regard to anxiety was the level of defensiveness the women in the sample population exhibited. According to Dreman et al. (1990), "defensive behavior, which is employed to protect the self rather than to respond to the environment, also protects the self against anxiety" (p. 77). This defensive response, which is a way to cope with anxiety, then hinders the individual's adjustment to the divorce.

This sample group of 121 separated and divorced mothers from Israel participated in a university sponsored group formed to help single mothers cope more effectively. The findings indicated that divorced mothers with high state-trait anxiety had a greatly diminished self esteem. Divorced mothers were also observed to be less defensive and more able to assimilate negative feedback such as anxiety. The researchers concluded that as the time lengthened after the period of separation, the mothers became less defensive. Those mothers
who were only separated four months were highly defensive, thus less able to assimilate anxiety.

In terms of the clinical implications, Dreman et al. (1990) hypothesized that the women in the sample initially were in a denial phase and thus avoided the realities of divorce which the test scores substantiated. After the sample group were separated for some time, it was evident to the researchers that these particular women were more actively integrating the divorce experience and thus were less defensive (Dreman et al., 1990).

Hetherington, Cox, and Cox (1978), major researchers in the area of post-divorce adjustment conducted a two year longitudinal study with a sample population of 72 white middle class children (36 boys and 36 girls) and their divorced parents. Among the instruments used in the study to measure adjustment were the State-Trait, the Rotter I-E Scale, the California Personality Inventory and the Adjective Checklist. The parents were administered a battery of tests, as well as involved with interviews and structured diary records. Further, they were observed in controlled laboratory settings while interacting with their children. Two raters assessed all sessions with agreement averaging 83 percent. The results in this extensive project were numerous. They included:

1. There were many differences between divorced and intact families with regard to self esteem, anxiety and satisfaction with their lives.
2. During the two year period of the study, many of these differences diminished between the divorced and the intact group.
3. Many of the parents reported feeling depressed, anxious, angry and incompetent the first year following the divorce.
4. Mothers of sons only exhibited these traits of depression, anxiety, and incompetence to a more severe degree.

5. After the one year period, the feelings of incompetency greatly diminished with the divorced parents' group.

6. Those parents involved in close heterosexual relationships reported a higher level of satisfaction with their lives and a decreased level of anxiety.

7. Unresolved resentments and attachments with ex-spouses was a negative factor in divorce adjustment as measured by satisfaction, anxiety and self esteem.

The researchers concluded in this study that by the second year, a process of stabilization and adjustment had occurred among the divorced group. Although this research was one of the major contributions in the field of divorce adjustment, one of the limitations of this project was that it only lasted two years. Therefore it is impossible to know whether this stabilization was a lasting phenomenon.

Although Carpenter (1990) conducted a study to test anxiety as it relates to Bowen Theory, she did not specifically address divorce functioning. However, her research did explore the relationship between differentiation of self and anxiety. In her study, she utilized the Personal Authority in the Family System Questionnaire (PAFS) to measure differentiation of self and the State Trait Anxiety Inventory to measure chronic anxiety. These instruments were administered to 126 volunteers from five church groups. Carpenter (1990) hypothesized that there would be an inverse relationship between differentiation of self and the level of chronic anxiety. Further, she claimed in her second
hypothesis, that a low level of differentiation is related to high state anxiety and that a high level of differentiation is related to state anxiety which varies from low to high. The results revealed the notion that there is an inverse relationship between differentiation of self and anxiety. The second hypothesis attempting to relate low level of differentiation with high state anxiety was not supported.

Despite the prevalence of generalized or chronic anxiety in mental health populations, there is very little discussion in the literature of the relationship between divorce and chronic anxiety. In fact, generalized anxiety is thought to be the most common of psychiatric problems (Carpenter, 1990). Additionally, Blazer et. al (1987) discovered that those individuals experiencing an increase in negative stressful life events were found to have a greater level of generalized anxiety.

While the Briscoe and Smith studies (1973; 1974; 1975) reveal a preponderance of divorced individuals in the mental health population, and divorce is certainly a stressful life event (Goode, 1956; Weiss, 1975; Hetherington et. al, 1978), there is relatively little research on the area of divorce adjustment and anxiety. Although several studies include measuring level of anxiety and divorce adjustment, very few of them included this data in their discussion of results. Again, as with many of the other studies on divorce adjustment, populations generally included only white, middle class, educated females which greatly limits the generalizability of the results.

Summary

The preceding sections explored the literature on post-divorce adjustment and various personality factors as well as methodological weakness in these
areas of research. In sum, this study will attempt to expand the exploration of anxiety and differentiation of self as defined by Bowen Theory and whether these aspects relate to divorce adjustment. Additionally, the factors of autonomy or locus of control and self esteem will be included in this investigation of how individuals cope in the divorce process.
CHAPTER 3
COLLECTION OF DATA

This chapter will focus on the methodology for this study. Included will be a description of the sample population, the data gathering procedures as well as the research design. The research hypotheses will be noted and the instrumentation and statistical analyses employed to assess these various hypotheses will be described. Finally, the ethical considerations will be indicated.

Sample population

The population for this study included all individuals divorced in Henrico County, a suburb of Richmond, Virginia, from January 1, 1988 through December 31, 1988 and who have been married a minimum of three years prior to their divorce. This will allow for the variable of attachment to occur. The target population was restricted to those individuals who have been divorced approximately three years, due to the research regarding the evaluation of divorced subjects. According to Hetherington and Cox (1978), a minimum of three years is required to adequately address post-divorce adjustment due to the chaotic process which ensues in the divorce process within the first three years after the marital dissolution. These individuals were obtained through the Department of Public Health, Bureau of Vital Statistics of the Commonwealth of Virginia utilizing random sampling from a table of random numbers.

Initially, packets of questionnaires were sent to 300 divorced men and women chosen randomly in Henrico County from a target population of 1052 (all divorced individuals in Henrico County in 1988). Because individuals often
relocate as part of the divorce process and are difficult to find, every effort was undertaken to obtain a random sampling of a minimum of 100 participants for purposes of this study. When necessary, follow-up phone calls were made to encourage participation.

**Data gathering**

All qualifying divorced individuals were mailed a cover letter explaining the nature and scope of the research and asking for their participation, a consent form to be signed and returned, as well as a packet containing research questionnaires for completion. Also included in the packet was a self-addressed, stamped envelope for the return of each mailing. Because of the anticipated difficulty of locating 100 people willing to devote the time to completing six questionnaires, a card and a one dollar bill were included to provide an added incentive. The card offered each participant a seminar on divorce adjustment provided by the researcher, entitled "Life After Divorce," at no cost to the individual, and the dollar bill was included for them to spend on needy children of their choosing who were from divorced homes.

Each divorced individual was asked to complete a brief demographic questionnaire to obtain information such as age, educational status, income level, number of times divorced and remarried and number of children. In addition, each consenting participant was asked to complete two adjustment measures, the Blair Divorce Adjustment Inventory (BDAI) (modified version) and the Haber Level of Differentiation of Self Scale (LDSS). Subjects were also asked to complete three personality inventories, the Rotter Locus of Control Scale (RLCS), the Stait-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI), and the Tennessee Self Concept Scale
(TSCS). Instructions detailing how the instruments were to be completed were included in the packet.

Upon completion of the enclosed questionnaires, each participant was thanked in a separate letter for their willing cooperation. Additionally, in the event that the instruments generated some concern or questions, the participants were given the researcher's and college advisor's name and address for any referral information if needed. Subjects were encouraged to contact the researcher if they wished to inquire further about the study or had some need for counseling which was beyond the scope of this study. The researcher would furnish appropriate referral information regarding requests for counseling from participants should the need arise.

A trial project was conducted in order to obtain information about what participants might experience while taking this battery of tests. The packet of questionnaires was sent to eight subjects, four men and four women. They were asked to complete the six questionnaires as well as respond to questions regarding what time it took to take the tests, what the experience of taking these tests was like and any recommendations they would make regarding specific changes. The subjects indicated that the time frame for the test taking was from one hour to one hour and twenty minutes.

Overall, the participants commented that completing these instruments regarding their divorce adjustment was thought-provoking and encouraged them to experience feelings about their own particular divorce, which they found helpful. Some of the respondents indicated that the Blair Divorce Adjustment Inventory did not completely encompass their own individual experience. One person commented that the Blair did not make allowances for those who had
divorces that were in constant court litigation. Finally, some of the subjects noted that it was somewhat confusing to take a battery of tests when the scales were not all uniform in the same direction.

Instrumentation

Demographic data was collected through a questionnaire specifically designed for use for this study. Information was determined through variables defined in the research literature which are related to divorce adjustment. The data collected included: age, gender, educational level completed, length of time married, length of time divorced, number of children, participation in therapy, data on remarriage status, economic status and age at onset of first marriage.

The dependent variable investigated in this research was divorce adjustment. The instrument utilized to measure this variable was the Blair Divorce Adjustment Inventory (Modified Version). The measurement was developed by Dr. Maudine Blair, Florida State University, as partial fulfillment for her Ph.D. Dissertation. The original instrument included 120 items and was developed for women only. Based on Waller and Hill's theory on family development, this instrument encompasses the four stages of this theory including: breaking old habits, beginnings of reconstruction of life, seeking new love objects and readjustment completed. Adjustment was assessed both currently and at the time of divorce in two subscales. With the test-retest method, a reliability of 94 percent agreement was achieved after a one week period. A panel of six judges determined the content validity.

Salts (1976) modified the instrument to include males. The yes and no responses were changed to a five point scale from strongly agree to strongly
disagree. Pais (1978) further modified the instrument to make the language more distinct with regard to the adjustment both current and at the time of the divorce. The wording was changed from "when your divorce was a certainty" to "when your divorce became final" to clarify the timing. Internal reliability in the Pais (1978) study was assessed using the Pearson correlation procedure to test the interrelationships with each of the subscale items. Strong relationships were discovered between most of the items. For purposes of this study, the Blair Divorce Adjustment Inventory (BDAI) modified by Pais (1978) was utilized to measure divorce adjustment.

The other dependent variable measured in this study was differentiation of self through the use of the Haber Level of Differentiation of Self Scale (LDSS). The LDSS consists of 24 items that measure aspects of intellectual and emotional functioning as defined by the concept of differentiation in Bowen Theory. This unidimensional scale, consists of a 4-point Likert scale. The higher an individual scores on this test, the higher the level of differentiation with the scores ranging from 24-96.

The LDSS has demonstrated evidence of content and construct validity as well as internal consistency reliability. The instrument was administered both to a pilot sample of 257 volunteer subjects and in the second stage of formation to a volunteer sample of 168 married couples. The reliability of the LDSS was established using coefficient alpha. The data reveal an alpha at .86 for the EM scale and .83 for the ED scale. The Content Validity Index (CVI) was utilized to establish content validity. The data reveal a score of .95 for the EM scale and a score of .92 for the ED scale, which indicates a satisfactory level of content validity (Haber, 1984; Haber, 1990).
Anxiety, one of the personality factors investigated in this study, was measured with the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI). This instrument includes two self-report scales for measuring state anxiety (A-State) and trait anxiety (A-Trait) (Spielberger, Gorsuch, & Lushene, 1970). The A-State scale measures the level of anxiety an individual feels at a given moment, whereas the A-Trait measures the level of anxiety an individual reports in general. Subjects are asked to complete 20 items on each scale, using a four point Likert scale.

The scores of the STAI were correlated with both the IPAT Anxiety scale developed by Cattell and Scheier and the Taylor Manifest Anxiety scale indicating concurrent validity with coefficients of .75 and .80. With the use of a multitrait multimethod matrix (Martuza & Kallstrom, 1974), discriminant and convergent validity was also established with an A-Trait coefficient of .82 and an A-State coefficient of .55 (Carpenter, 1990). Internal consistency tests were used and demonstrated good internal inconsistency with A-State scores ranging from .83 to .93 and A-Trait scores ranging from .86 to .92 (Spielberger, et al., 1970; Metzler, 1976; Carpenter, 1990).

The personality dimension of autonomy or locus of control was rated through the use of the Rotter Internal-External Locus of Control Scale. The Rotter Scale, developed by Julian Rotter (1966), consists of a 29-item scale in which the participant is asked to circle the item that is the closest to his particular belief with the higher the score indicating more external control (Rotter, 1966). Internal control refers to an individual's perception which is related to his own personal behavior, and external control is an individual's perception that outcome is a result of fate or chance.
A value of 1 is given for each statement to obtain the score, with scores varying from 0, which is internal, to 24 which is an external score. Test-retest reliability according to Rotter (1966), ranged from .49 to .83. Additionally, Rotter reported a correlation range from .55 to .61 with other instruments.

The final personality factor, self esteem, was measured by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale developed by William Fitts (1964). The purpose of this scale is to measure an individual's self concept in terms of identity, feelings and behavior. This measurement consists of 100 self-description items, 90 of them which assess the internal and external dimensions of self-concept and 10 which assess self criticism. The self criticism items come from the MMPI Lie Scale and provide a measure of the subject's level of defensiveness in taking the TSCS (Walsh, 1984). The subject gives from one to five responses ranging from completely true to completely false.

The TSCS is the most widely used and the most comprehensive self-concept instrument that is utilized in current research (Walsh, 1984). On a test-retest study over a two week period, reliability scores ranged from .61 to .92 on many of the subscales (Pais, 1978). With regard to convergent and discriminant validity, the TSCS is reported to correlate significantly with the MMPI, the Edward's Preference Test and many other widely used instruments (Walsh, 1984). The final items were chosen after seven clinical psychologists classified each item and only those were included which had unanimous agreement.

Research design

The basic research design for this study utilized a correlational method of analyzing the research data. The purpose of this design was to explore the
degree of relationship between measures of divorce adjustment and
differentiation, and measures of the personality factors of autonomy, anxiety and
self esteem. An attempt was made to both clarify the relationships among these
variables and to discover the magnitude of these relationships through the use of
correlation coefficients.

One of the limitations of this type of research is that it cannot establish
cause-and-effect relationships between the variables correlated (Borg & Gall,
1983). If one finds a positive correlation between two variables, then one can
also find other causal inferences which are just as likely. Another limitation of the
correlational design is that when a relationship is discovered, it may be due to an
"artifact." The relationship may be due to a similarity of scales between
instruments rather than the personality factors being similar (Borg & Gall, 1983).

Specific research hypotheses

The following section will include the research hypotheses to be evaluated
in this present study on divorce adjustment and personality factors:

1. There will be a statistically significant positive correlation between
   self esteem scores on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale and
   individuals' overall divorce adjustment as measured by the Blair
   Divorce Adjustment Inventory and differentiation scores as
   measured by the Haber Level of Differentiation Scale.

2. There will be a statistically significant negative correlation between
   anxiety scores of the State Trait Anxiety Inventory and individuals' overall divorce adjustment as rated by the Blair Divorce Adjustment
Inventory and differentiation scores as measured by the Haber Level of Differentiation of Self Scale.

3. There will be a statistically significant negative correlation between internal locus of control scores on the Rotter Locus of Control Scale and individuals' overall divorce adjustment scores as measured by the Blair Divorce Adjustment Inventory and differentiation scores as measured by the Haber Level of Differentiation of Self Scale.

4. There will be a statistically significant positive correlation between the participants' overall divorce adjustment scores as measured by the Blair Divorce Adjustment Inventory and overall differentiation scores as measured by the Haber Level of Differentiation of Self Scale.

Statistical analysis

The data for this study was analyzed utilizing multivariate correlations. Frequency distributions were generated for all socio-demographic variables in order to provide a description of the sample population and included, where applicable, means, standard deviations, and ranges. The Pearson product moment correlations were utilized to explore pairs of variables to determine bivariate relationships.

Additionally, multiple regression procedures were employed to predict adjustment from the three personality factors of autonomy, self esteem and anxiety. These statistical procedures attempted to ascertain whether adjustment is mitigated by these personality factors. The Level of Differentiation of Self Scale was also used to assess levels of adjustment among this divorced
population. A .05 level of probability was utilized on all tests to determine statistical significance.

**Ethical considerations**

An informed consent was utilized to assure each participant about the purpose and scope of the project. The consent form was also helpful in providing the subjects with an explanation of the instrumentation and to advise them that their participation is voluntary, important and desirable (Borg & Gall, 1983). Anonymity was assured in this study as no information on the subjects' names were provided on the returned questionnaires. In order to further protect the participants, the researcher did not have the knowledge of which subject completed which questionnaire. Because divorce adjustment is a personally sensitive issue, every effort was made to reassure the participant about the scope of the project and the use of the results. This study is seen as providing "minimal risk" to subjects (Borg & Gall, 1983) in that data was recorded in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified.

Permission for the list of randomly selected subjects of divorced individuals was obtained from the Commonwealth of Virginia, Bureau of Vital Statistics. In addition, this study was submitted to the School of Education Human Subjects Review Committee for review.

**Summary**

A volunteer random sample of men and women divorced in 1988 was obtained from Richmond, Virginia from the records of the Bureau of Vital Statistics, Commonwealth of Virginia. These participants were administered a
series of instruments which explore the areas of post-divorce adjustment and differentiation of self, as well as the factors of locus of control, self esteem and anxiety. The data from these measurements were recorded anonymously. Upon tabulation of these scores, the data was then analyzed using various statistical procedures. Through the use of multivariate correlations, an attempt will be made to determine the degree of relationships between these adjustment and personality factors. After compilation of data, results were reported in accordance with professional and ethical standards of doctoral research in the School of Education at the College of William and Mary.
CHAPTER 4
ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to test empirically how the personality factors of anxiety, self esteem, and locus of control were related to adult divorce adjustment. Adult divorce adjustment was investigated by two measures: one which tested for divorce adjustment, and another one which assessed level of differentiation. This chapter will include a summary of the difficulties involved in obtaining a divorced population sample, and a description of this research sample derived from the demographic data. Additionally, the findings from each hypothesis will be addressed, as well as the results obtained from the multivariate correlations used to determine degree of relationships among the personality and adjustment variables tested in this study.

Data gathering methods

Due to the logistical difficulties in obtaining an adequate sample size from the target population of divorced people, a specific sampling procedure was devised to randomly sample an experimentally accessible divorced population of 1052 people. The original sample consisted of all individuals divorced in Henrico county, in Virginia, in 1988. A sample of 300 divorce decrees (which pertained to 600 individuals) was generated with the use of a table of random numbers from the Bureau of Vital Statistics in Virginia. Of that list, 300 individuals were selected from the decrees, including 150 men and 150 women (only one from each terminated marriage). In order to further establish population validity, information was gathered from the National Center for Health Statistics (1991) on all
individuals divorced in 1988 in the United States to determine similarities among the national group and the Henrico sample group.

Obtaining an adequate number of subjects for purposes of analysis was a difficult hurdle to overcome. Three hundred packets of questionnaires were mailed to a random selection of the experimentally accessible population of divorced individuals. Initially, the completion rate was low. Only 23 packets from the original 300 mailings were completed and returned after one month.

The review of divorce literature revealed that to evaluate effective divorce adjustment, individuals needed to be divorced a minimum of three years in order to live through the initial chaos a divorce process entails. (Hetherington, Cox, & Cox, 1976). Because of the nature of divorce, one or both individuals from the dissolved marriage generally move from the home residence during this period of chaos. This creates difficulties in locating sample populations for purposes of research. Many families may have relocated several times during that three year period. In addition, women often change their names either due to a remarriage or return to the use of their maiden names. This adds substantially to the problem of finding these individuals. Due to the difficulty of locating divorced individuals, finding sample populations for divorce research continues to be a timely and costly problem according to Hetherington (1992).

Of the 300 packets mailed, 160 were returned, unable to be delivered. Among these, 158 were stamped with "addressee unknown," and two were deceased. In order to increase the likelihood of a higher return rate, an additional 100 packets from the original random list were mailed out. This increased the total number of packets mailed to 400, including 200 men and 200 women. An attempt was then made to locate the 158 individuals who had moved
and left no forwarding address. Toward this end, several methods were utilized including the phone book, directory assistance, and city and county directories that provided cross-referencing information as to particular streets, phone numbers and names. In the case of women who had changed their names, cross-referencing directories had to be examined in order to discover similar first names and middle initials with different last names. In those instances where the individuals from the random sample list could not be found, potential family members with similar names were discovered who provided information regarding their son or daughter's whereabouts.

Once correct addresses were found, which involved comparing several different sources, then acquiring completed questionnaires was undertaken in order to insure a large enough sample for analysis. Over 250 phone calls were generated, both to locate the 158 individuals who had moved, as well as the remaining 217 whose status was also unknown (by this time, only 23 had responded by returning completed questionnaires). Once individuals were located by phone, they were requested to complete the packet of information for purposes of the research. The phone calls proved to be effective. After considerable time was allotted toward this endeavor, 40 more packets were completed and returned to the researcher for analysis, thus increasing the sample to a total of 62 (n = 62). Of a random sampling of 400 individuals from Henrico County (not including the 160 whose packets were returned), there was a return rate of 15.5%. After an extensive search for the subjects from the random list, 250 were never found. Thus, of the 150 individuals in the random sample who were located from the original sample of 400, the final return rate was approximately 41%.
Description of sample

For those subjects studied in this sample (n = 62), the age range was between 25 to 66 years with a mean age of 41 years. Twenty-six men (41.9%) responded to this study, whereas 36 women (58.06%) completed questionnaires of the equal numbers mailed out. At the time of this study, 42 (67.74%) of the participants were divorced and single, 18 (29.03%) were remarried and one (1.61%) participant was separated from the second marriage. Forty-four (70.97%) of the respondents had children and 18 (29.03%) reported having no children. Twelve subjects (19.35%) stated that they had step-children. Twenty-seven (56.45%) of those sampled stated that they had received therapy during the process of obtaining a divorce, while 35 (43.55%) had received no therapy. The frequency distributions of present age and age at the time of marriage, race, number of children and duration of marriage as well as other demographic variables are summarized in Table 4.1.

As illustrated in the detailed description of the sample regarding occupation, education and income (Tables 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4), the majority of the individuals studied were middle-class and employed at the time of the study. Only one participant (n = 1) had not graduated from high school with the remainder of the sample being evenly distributed among those who had completed high school (n = 22, 35.4%), those who had attended college (n = 15, 24%), those who had completed college degrees (n = 14, 22%), those who had attended graduate school (n = 11, 14%), and those who received graduate degrees (n = 8, 16%). Only two participants (n = 2) were unemployed at the
time of this study. The majority reported employment in business, management or professional occupations (66%). Nineteen (30.65%) of the respondents reported combined incomes of over $20,000, and 30 (48.39%) of those sampled reported combined incomes of over $30,000. (Table 4.4)

Frequency distributions of race for divorced individuals in the Henrico County sample were almost identical to national racial statistics. The present sample reported 87.10% as white, 11.29% as black and 1.61% as "other." Similarly, the National Center for Health Statistics for those divorced in 1988 reported 87% as white, 12% as black, and 2% as "other" (NCHS, 1991). See Table 4.5 for a comparison of both the national statistics as well as statistics of this sample on various demographic variables such as race, number of children, age at time of marriage, and duration of marriage.

The largest percentage of divorces in this 1988 sample occurred for those who were married between the ages of 20 to 24 years (51%). According to the national statistics reported by the National Center for Health Statistics (1991), 38.5% were divorced from this particular age group nationally in 1988. Over 66% of those divorced were married less than 10 years, according to national averages, whereas 54.84% of this sample had marriages of less than a 10 year duration. According to both national health statistics and the statistics from this study, the divorce rate in 1988 gradually declined as the duration of the marriage increased.

The mean age for those divorced in this sample population was 33.86. The National Center for Health Statistics (1991) reflected a slightly higher mean age of 35.65 at the time of divorce. Although men tended to be older (men divorced at a higher rate from the 20-24 year age group, whereas women tended
to reflect higher rates in the 15-20 year age group), 67.75% of divorces occurred in the 20 - 39 age group in this sample, with the national average being slightly less (65%). According to national figures, a little over half of the subjects had children under 18 years of age while this study indicated that 46.76% of the participants had children under 18. The number of children per divorce was also similar to statistics from national samples. Thirty percent of participants from this sample had one child, 27% had two children, and 9% had three or more children. In the NCHS data, 26% had one child, 20% had two children and 7% had three or more children (1991). The percentages of divorcing couples with children in the NCHS statistics varied widely by state, with the higher percentages coming from the Western and Midwestern states and the lower percentages reported from the Southern and Northeastern states.

Reliability and summary of the Instrumentation

The reliability of each of the instruments was assessed by the researcher prior to analyzing the data from the sample. Reliability measures, which were utilized to assess these measures, were the Guttman and the Alpha coefficients, and the Spearman Brown formula for split-half analysis. All data from reliability measures reported high reliability coefficients for each of the instruments utilized in this study. See Table 4.6 for the summary of the reliability data.

The instruments which were completed in this study had very few items unanswered. Out of 93 possible items on the Blair Divorce Adjustment Scale, only two respondents failed to respond to two items. Both the State Trait (out of 40 possible items) and the Haber Level of Differentiation of Self Scale (with 24 possible items) reported only three respondents with one unanswered item each.
From the entire sample (n = 62), out of 100 possible responses on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS), seven participants each omitted a single item. Similarly, the Rotter Internal-External Scale also had seven participants with one missing item each. Only one instrument was not completed by one respondent (Haber Scale), and the Trait Scale from one respondent was incomplete. In both these instances, the data were not used. In order to statistically incorporate the missing scores, each score was multiplied by a weighting factor of \( \frac{N}{N-m} \) where \( N \) represented the number of items in the scale and \( m \) was the number of missing items on the instrument. This formula assumes that respondents would have answered the missing items in a similar fashion as they did for the remainder of the items on the instruments.

The Haber LDSS, one of the two instruments which measured adjustment, demonstrated high internal consistency with the Guttman, reflecting a reliability level of .82 and an alpha coefficient of .80. The Haber LDSS ranges from a score of 24 to 96, with the larger score indicating a higher level of differentiation or a higher level of adjustment. The Haber scores in this sample ranged from 51 to 94 with a mean of 77.68 and a standard deviation of 8.68. See Table 4.7 for the compilation of descriptive statistics for each of the instruments.

The Blair Divorce Adjustment Inventory demonstrated high internal reliability scores with a Guttman coefficient of .87 and an alpha coefficient of .89. On the Blair, larger scores are indicative of more effective overall adjustment to divorce. The scores on the Blair from the sample studied yielded a range from 21.2 to 85 with a mean of 60.43 and a standard deviation of 13.90.

The Blair Adjustment Inventory is divided into two subscales. Blair Subscale A (47 items) measures perceptions of adjustment at the time of divorce,
whereas Blair Subscale B (46 items) measures perceptions of adjustment at the current time. For purposes of this sample, this time frame is approximately three and one-half years post divorce. When statistics for both subscales were compared, the scores indicated that adjustment improves with time. The mean difference in scores reached statistical significance with a $p$-value of $<.001$. No further reliability studies were conducted on the subscales with the exception of the Spearman-Brown analysis which indicated a coefficient of $.80$ as compared to a full scale of $.89$. Both subscales are highly correlated with the total Blair score as indicated on the Pearson correlation matrix with scores of $.92$ (Blair A) and $.85$ (Blair B). The scores from Blair Subscale A which relate to adjustment at the time of the divorce yielded a range from 11 to 42, with a mean of 28.06 and a standard deviation of 8.82. Similarly, Blair Subscale B which relates to functioning post divorce exhibited a range from 10 to 44 with a mean of 32.36 and a standard deviation of 6.81. The mean of Blair B was slightly higher, indicating a higher rate of adjustment post divorce rather than at the time of divorce (Blair Subscale A).

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) had one of the highest reliability levels of all the instruments used. The results yielded a .97 coefficient from the Guttman analysis and a .95 alpha coefficient. On the TSCS, the scores ranged from 247 to 411, with a mean score of 354.60, and a standard deviation of 33.23. For a normative sample on the TSCS, the mean was calculated at 345.57 with a standard deviation of 30.70 (Roid & Fitts, 1991).

Similarly, the State Trait Anxiety Inventory (State-Trait) exhibited excellent internal consistency, with a Guttman coefficient of .96 and an alpha coefficient of .95. On the State-Trait, the scores from this sample were similar to the normative
samples with 36.08 for the mean and 11.33 for the standard deviation from this study as compared to 35.72 and 10.40 from the normed population (Spielberger, 1970). Higher scores reflect a higher level of anxiety, which generally indicates a lower level of functioning. Scores on the State Anxiety Scale, which measures acute anxiety, and the Trait Anxiety Scale, which measures chronic anxiety, tended to be highly correlated. That is, individuals having high State Anxiety often reported having high Trait Anxiety.

The Rotter Internal-External Scale which measures locus of control reported high reliability coefficients of .79 and .77 for the Guttman and alpha coefficients. Higher scores on the Rotter indicate less internal control. For a summary of statistics regarding reliability and input data for personality as well as adjustment measures, see Tables 4.6 and 4.7.

**Summary of hypotheses testing**

The two adjustment measures utilized were the Blair Adjustment Inventory which measured divorce adjustment (Blair), and the Haber Level of Differentiation of Self Scale (LDSS), which measured level of differentiation or adjustment. The personality measures used to predict adjustment were the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS), the State Trait Anxiety Inventory (State-Trait), and the Rotter Internal-External Scale (Rotter). The following represents a description of the statistics from the personality and adjustment measures regarding the sample. Additionally, the data analysis from each of the hypotheses predicted in this study will be included as to whether, and to what extent, each of the personality factors were related to the adjustment measures. Regression equations were computed on all the variables, including analysis of variance.
(ANOVA). The independent variables were then entered into step-wise procedures to determine predictive values for the two adjustment variables of divorce adjustment and level of differentiation. A .05 level of probability was utilized to determine statistical significance.

The profile of this sample regarding self concept, as measured by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, revealed a mean score of 354.58, which indicated a moderate level of self concept. When the Tennessee was originally normed on patient, non-patient and high personality integration groups, the results revealed a range of mean scores from 323.0 for patient groups, 345.57 for non-patient groups, and 376.01 for high personality integration groups. Over half (56%) of this sample obtained scores of 360 or higher. The mean for this sample was lower for patient groups (low self esteem) and higher for those more personally integrated (high self esteem).

With regard to level of anxiety, as measured by the State-Trait, this sample reflected a lower level of State Anxiety (36.08) than Trait Anxiety (37.40). Both means revealed low scores of anxiety which indicated low levels of acute and chronic anxiety. When normed on working adults and college students, the State Trait Anxiety Inventory revealed mean scores of 35.72 and 36.47 (State), and 34.89 and 38.30 (Trait), respectively.

On the Rotter Internal-External Scale, the results indicated a sample who were internally directed. When the Rotter was normed on a large population of college students, high school students and peace corps trainees, the scores ranged from 5.48 for college students to 10.0 for peace corps trainees. The participants from this sample revealed a mean score of 8.68 with 64.5% obtaining scores of 9.0 or below, indicating internal direction.
When the variables of divorce adjustment (Blair) and level of differentiation (LDSS) were computed, the results indicated that the sample in this study exhibited high levels of differentiation and moderate to strong levels of divorce adjustment. The scores for the LDSS range from 24 to 96 with the higher score reflecting a higher level of differentiation. The mean score for differentiation (LDSS) for this sample was 77.65 with 45% of the participants obtaining scores of 70 to 80, and 40% obtaining scores of 81 and above. With regard to divorce adjustment, 29% of this sample scored 61 to 70 on the Blair, and 22% scored 71 and above (out of a possible score of 87). These scores reflected moderate to strong levels of divorce adjustment.

H 1

There will be a statistically significant positive correlation between self esteem scores on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale and individuals' overall divorce adjustment as measured by the Blair Divorce Adjustment Inventory and differentiation scores as measured by the Haber Level of Differentiation Scale.

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale exhibited the strongest correlation coefficient (.58) when measured with the Blair Divorce Adjustment Inventory. A level of <.001 was achieved when the probabilities were tested. Since a .05 level of significance was obtained, this hypothesis is accepted. Thus as divorce adjustment increases, self concept also increases and vice versa. When the Tennessee Self Concept Scale was correlated with the two subscales of the Blair Divorce Adjustment Inventory, similar findings were observed. Scores from the
Tennessee indicated a higher correlation with Blair B (adjustment post divorce) rather than Blair A (adjustment at time of divorce). These scores reflect a higher level of self concept for respondents three years after the divorce, rather than at the time the divorce was finalized. Table 4.8 summarizes the findings regarding the correlation coefficients and levels of probability for the personality and adjustment variables.

Similarly, when the Tennessee was evaluated with the LDSS, the results revealed a moderate correlation coefficient of .51 and a significant probability of <.001. Since the .05 level of significance was achieved, this hypothesis is accepted. Hence, when level of differentiation increases, self concept also increases.

H 2

There will be a statistically significant negative correlation between anxiety scores of the State Trait Anxiety Inventory and individuals’ overall divorce adjustment as rated by the Blair Divorce Adjustment Inventory and differentiation scores as measured by the Haber Level of Differentiation of Self Scale.

When anxiety was assessed by the State-Trait with divorce adjustment, measured by the Blair, the results indicated moderate levels of correlation coefficients for both the State (-.46) and the Trait (-.58) variables as well as significant probabilities. A p-value of <.001 was achieved for each of the State and the Trait levels of anxiety. Since the .05 level of confidence was obtained, this hypothesis is accepted. The results supported the hypothesis that a
significant negative correlation exists between anxiety and divorce adjustment, particularly Trait or chronic anxiety. Therefore, as the level of divorce adjustment increased, the level of anxiety decreased. See Table 4.8 for a summary of these findings.

Similarly, the Trait level of anxiety correlated more strongly than the State level of anxiety with both Blair Subscale A and Blair Subscale B. Thus, chronic anxiety appears to have a stronger correlation with adjustment at the time of divorce, as well as adjustment post divorce. Additionally, Blair Subscale B (adjustment post divorce) indicated a higher negative correlation of -0.49 as opposed to Blair Subscale A (adjustment at time of divorce) which reached a score of -0.34 when correlated with the State level of anxiety. In effect, as situational anxiety decreased (State anxiety), adjustment post divorce increased (Blair B).

When the State Trait Anxiety inventory was computed with the Haber LDSS, the results revealed moderate correlations with the State level (-0.32) and the Trait level (-0.38) of anxiety. Both types of anxiety (State and Trait) also reached levels of statistical significance with probabilities of .013 and .003, respectively. Since the .05 confidence level was attained, this hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, as the level of differentiation increased, the level of anxiety decreased.

H 3

There will be a statistically significant negative correlation between internal locus of control scores on the Rotter Internal-External Scale and the individual's overall divorce adjustment scores as measured
by the Blair Divorce Adjustment Inventory and differentiation as measured by the Haber Level of Differentiation of Self Scale.

When the correlations were calculated for the locus of control variable (Rotter) and the overall Blair adjustment score, the findings revealed a moderate correlation coefficient of -.34 and a p-value of .008. Having attained a .05 level of significance, this hypothesis is accepted. As the score on the Blair increased which reflects greater divorce adjustment, the score on the Rotter was reduced, which indicates greater internal control. Although Blair Subscale A and Blair Subscale B both reflected a significant level of probability (.02), there appeared to be very little difference between the two subscales. Table 4.8 includes a summary of the Pearson Correlation Matrix and the matrix of probabilities for the correlations.

When locus of control (Rotter) was assessed with level of differentiation (LDSS), there was no significant correlation. The findings revealed a low negative correlation coefficient of -.04 and a confidence level of .74. The .05 level of significance was not achieved, and the hypothesis is rejected. According to these results, locus of control did not appear to predict or effect level of differentiation.

**H 4**

There will be a statistically significant positive correlation between the participants' overall divorce adjustment as measured by the Blair Divorce Adjustment Inventory and differentiation scores as measured by the Haber Level of Differentiation of Self Scale.
When the Blair Divorce Adjustment Inventory was correlated with the Haber Level of Differentiation of Self Scale, the findings revealed a moderate correlation coefficient of .35 with a p-value of .006. As this result indicated a .05 level of significance, this hypothesis is accepted. Thus, as level of differentiation increases, divorce adjustment also increases.

After separately investigating each of the personality variables including self esteem, anxiety, and locus of control, all variables were computed utilizing stepwise regression to determine level of predictive value with divorce adjustment and level of differentiation. Tables 4.9, 4.10, 4.11, and 4.12 summarize the calculations from the multiple and stepwise regressions for Blair, Blair A, and Blair B.

Step-wise analysis indicated that both the Tennessee, with a t-ratio of 2.220 and p-value of .030, and the Trait level of anxiety, with a t-ratio of -2.156, and a p-value of .035, resulted in high predictive values with the Blair. The State level of anxiety, the Rotter, and the LDSS were all eliminated as having little predictive effect. Thus, self concept and Trait or chronic anxiety correlated more with divorce adjustment than any of the other personality variables.

Stepwise regression also indicated that the Tennessee had the strongest predictive value with Blair B with a p-value of <.001. Therefore, self concept exhibited a greater correlation with adjustment post divorce than adjustment at the time of divorce. Further, when Blair A was assessed with all three personality variables through stepwise regression, only the Trait level of anxiety was reported as having a significant correlation with divorce adjustment. More specifically, as Trait level of anxiety decreased, adjustment at time of divorce also increased.
When computing stepwise regression analysis for the LDSS and the three personality variables, the results were similar to the Blair analysis. The Tennessee obtained the strongest predictive value. All other personality measures (Rotter, State, and Trait), were eliminated since the data revealed that they had little predictive value. See Tables 4.13 and 4.14 for a compilation of the multiple regression and stepwise analysis for the LDSS. Hence, as with divorce adjustment, self concept was the strongest predictor of level of differentiation.
Table 4.1

Descriptive Characteristics of Subjects (n = 62)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRESENT AGE (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>58.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>87.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATUS*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/Single</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>67.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarried</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated, 2nd Marriage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LENGTH OF TIME REMARRIED (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>64.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER OF CHILDREN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE OF CHILDREN (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One subject did not report status.
Table 4.1

Descriptive Characteristics of Subjects, cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEX OF CHILDREN</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>56.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NUMBER OF STEPCHILDREN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGE OF STEPCHILDREN (years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEX OF STEPCHILDREN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGE FIRST MARRIED (years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LENGTH OF FIRST MARRIAGE (years)</strong>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One subject did not report sex of children.
** One subject did not report length of first marriage.
Table 4.1

Descriptive Characteristics of Subjects, cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGE DIVORCED FROM FIRST MARRIAGE (years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LENGTH OF TIME DIVORCED FROM FIRST MARRIAGE (years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARTICIPATION IN THERAPY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In therapy since separation/divorce</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in therapy since separation/divorce</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>56.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Four subjects did not report age from first marriage.

** Sixteen subjects did not report length of time divorced from first marriage.
Table 4.2

**Occupation of Subjects**

**OCCUPATION AT TIME OF FIRST MARRIAGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Occupation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business or Management</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry, Manufacturing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Promotion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRESENT OCCUPATION STATUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Occupation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business or Management</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry, Manufacturing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Promotion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3
Level of Education of Subjects

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL AT TIME OF FIRST MARRIAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than grade 8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed grade 8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended high school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from high school</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended college</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from college</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended graduate school</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received graduate degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL AT TIME OF SECOND MARRIAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attended high school</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from high school</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended college</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from college</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended graduate school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received graduate degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRESENT EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Program</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Those not presently attending school</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>88.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma or GED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4

Total Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Annual Household Income ($)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-20,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000-30,000</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥30,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.5

Comparison Between National Statistics and Subjects in Present Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Characteristics</th>
<th>Present Sample Percentage</th>
<th>National Statistics Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean age at time of divorce</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce rate at age of divorce in 20-39 age group</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children under 18 years of age</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children per divorce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 child</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 children</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥3 children</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Information reported to National Center for Health Statistics (1991) in 1988 for each state.
Table 4.6
Reliability of the Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Coefficient</th>
<th>Blair</th>
<th>LDSS</th>
<th>TSCS</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>Rotter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Split-half</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td>0.963</td>
<td>0.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guttman, Rulon</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td>0.926</td>
<td>0.963</td>
<td>0.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Coefficient</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td>0.769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.7

Descriptive Statistics of Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Blair</th>
<th>BlairA</th>
<th>BlairB</th>
<th>TSCS</th>
<th>LDSS</th>
<th>Rotter</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Trait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>21.200</td>
<td>11.000</td>
<td>10.000</td>
<td>247.000</td>
<td>51.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>20.000</td>
<td>20.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>85.000</td>
<td>42.000</td>
<td>44.000</td>
<td>411.000</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>20.000</td>
<td>65.000</td>
<td>74.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>60.431</td>
<td>28.065</td>
<td>32.366</td>
<td>354.597</td>
<td>77.648</td>
<td>8.679</td>
<td>36.079</td>
<td>37.398</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.8

Pearson Correlation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Blair</th>
<th>BlairA</th>
<th>BlairB</th>
<th>TSCS</th>
<th>LDSS</th>
<th>Rotter</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Trait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BlairA</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BlairB</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td>0.574</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSCS</td>
<td>0.582</td>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>0.586</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDSS</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>0.508</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotter</td>
<td>-0.340</td>
<td>-0.300</td>
<td>-0.305</td>
<td>-0.242</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>-0.456</td>
<td>-0.344</td>
<td>-0.487</td>
<td>-0.646</td>
<td>-0.318</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait</td>
<td>-0.579</td>
<td>-0.513</td>
<td>-0.518</td>
<td>-0.738</td>
<td>-0.377</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>0.695</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Probabilities for Correlation Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Blair</th>
<th>BlairA</th>
<th>BlairB</th>
<th>TSCS</th>
<th>LDSS</th>
<th>Rotter</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Trait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BlairA</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BlairB</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSCS</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDSS</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotter</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.9
Multiple Regression: All Variables Forced

Dependent Variable: BLAIR (n = 62)
Mult. R = 0.646
Squared Mult. R = 0.418
Std. Error of Estimate = 11.018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>p(2-tail)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>26.498</td>
<td>30.147</td>
<td>0.879</td>
<td>0.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSCS</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>2.124</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotter</td>
<td>-0.521</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>-1.426</td>
<td>0.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>-0.133</td>
<td>0.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait</td>
<td>-0.307</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>-1.473</td>
<td>0.146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>4861.600</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1215.400</td>
<td>9.986</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>6815.785</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>121.710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.10

**Stepwise Regression: BLAIR**

Dependent Variable: BLAIR \((n = 62)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mult. R = 0.629</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Squared Mult. R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Estimate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>p(2-tail)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>24.187</td>
<td>28.358</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>0.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSCS</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>2.220</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait</td>
<td>-0.393</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>-2.156</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>4612.711</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2306.356</td>
<td>18.935</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>7064.674</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>121.805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Using stepwise regression with \(\alpha\) of 0.15 to enter and remove.*
Table 4.11

Stepwise Regression: BLAIRA

Dependent Variable: BLAIRA (n = 62)

Mult. R = 0.511
Squared Mult. R = 0.262
Std. Error of Estimate = 7.679

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>p(2-tail)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>42.333</td>
<td>3.301</td>
<td>12.823</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait</td>
<td>-0.384</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>-4.563</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1227.434</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1227.434</td>
<td>20.818</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>3478.678</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58.961</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.12

**Stepwise Regression: BLAIRB**

Dependent Variable: BLAIRB \( (n = 62) \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>p(2-tail)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-5.735</td>
<td>8.201</td>
<td>-0.699</td>
<td>0.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSCS</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>5.306</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotter</td>
<td>-0.286</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>1.671</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1117.773</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>558.887</td>
<td>19.200</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>1717.406</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>29.109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.13

Multiple Regression: All Variables Forced. Haber LDSS

Dependent Variable: LDSS (n = 61)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>p(2-tail)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>28.009</td>
<td>21.654</td>
<td>1.294</td>
<td>0.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSCS</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>2.845</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotter</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td>0.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>-0.282</td>
<td>0.779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1239.139</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>309.785</td>
<td>4.973</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>3426.293</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62.296</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.14

Stepwise Regression: Haber, LDSS*

Dependent Variable: LDSS (n = 61)
Mult. R = 0.491
Squared Mult. R = 0.241
Std. Error of Estimate = 7.763

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>p(2-tail)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>30.655</td>
<td>10.889</td>
<td>2.815</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSCS</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>4.334</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1131.790</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1131.790</td>
<td>18.780</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>3555.602</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60.264</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Using stepwise regression with α of 0.15 to enter and remove.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSIONS

This chapter will focus on the summary of the methodology which was utilized to examine specific personality factors of self esteem, anxiety, and locus of control, as well as their relationship to adult divorce adjustment and level of differentiation in a sample of divorced individuals. Additionally, the results obtained from this correlational study and discussion regarding those results will be explicated. Finally, the limitations of this study, as well as recommendations for future research will be addressed.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the personality factors of self esteem, anxiety, and locus of control as these variables relate to adult post divorce adjustment. Bowen Theory, with particular emphasis on the concept of differentiation of self, provided the theoretical rationale for this study. According to Winter (1992), Bowen Theory postulated the two fundamental forces of individuality or autonomy and togetherness or fusion. Two variables which affect the balance between these two forces are anxiety and differentiation (Carpenter, 1990; Winter, 1992). While Bowen related these factors to family and marital functioning, the theory did not address the process of divorce. However, some theorists have applied Bowen Theory to the divorce process (Beal, 1980; Schara, 1986; Carter & McGoldrich, 1988). Further, while these clinicians have added to the literature on divorce from a Bowenian model, no quantitative research was found which explored the divorce process from this perspective.
Similar to Bowen's concept of differentiation of self, many divorce theorists hold that when a person faces marital separation, the challenge of redefining the self emerges (Bohannon, 1970; Weiss, 1975; Goldman & Coane, 1977). While these theorists enhanced the divorce literature, there still existed a dearth of research which included both comprehensive theoretical concepts as well as empirical evidence regarding divorce. Additionally, many of the studies which investigated divorce focused primarily on women, children, and clinical populations. According to Thomas (1982), little research has been conducted with regard to adults and their adjustment to divorce. Further, she noted that many of the studies explored either causes of divorce or personality differences among married and divorced populations, but few investigated personality factors related directly to divorce adjustment.

Much of the research in the field of divorce has focused primarily on a pathogenic perspective where divorce is seen as a "failure." Price-Bonham and Balswick (1980) concluded from their review of the divorce literature that the divorce process was perceived only as a crisis and not a growth-promoting experience. In contrast, in the 1970's additional literature began to emerge which viewed divorce as an emotional process, providing individuals an opportunity for growth (Kraus, 1979; Brown et al., 1976). According to Schara (1986), a Bowenian theorist, divorce can be an opportunity for either further thoughtful development or a decrease in a person's level of functioning.

The present study attempted to fill a gap in the divorce literature by expanding Bowen Theory, with a primary investigative focus on adult post divorce adjustment and level of differentiation. Particular emphasis was placed on the personality factors of anxiety, self esteem, and locus of control.
A random sample of 400 individuals who were divorced in 1988 in Henrico County, Virginia was obtained from the Bureau of Vital Statistics. In order to determine whether the experimentally accessible divorced population (n = 1052) was similar to the target population of divorced persons, statistics were obtained from the National Center of Health Statistics (1991) for all those divorced in the United States in 1988. See Table 4.5 for a comparison of information obtained from the present Virginia sample and the national statistics. An assessment of the comparability between the Virginia sample and the national target population was undertaken in order to increase generalizability of results.

Initially, packets of questionnaires were sent to a random sample of 400 participants selected from the Virginia sample. The research packets included a consent form, a demographic questionnaire, two instruments which assessed adjustment, and three measures which evaluated personality traits of self esteem, anxiety, and locus of control. In order to protect the confidentiality of all the subjects, code numbers were utilized on the questionnaires and return packets. Additionally, subjects were offered a copy of the results at the conclusion of this study, as well as a seminar entitled "Life After Divorce" at no cost to the participants in an effort to increase participation in the research.

The subjects were asked to complete the Blair Divorce Adjustment Inventory, which assesses adult adjustment post divorce, and the Haber Level of Differentiation of Self Scale (LDSS), which measures aspects of intellectual and emotional functioning as defined by the concept of differentiation in Bowen Theory (Bowen, 1978). In addition, personality traits were evaluated by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS), which measures self esteem, the Rotter
Internal External Scale (Rotter), which assesses locus of control, and the State Trait Anxiety Inventory (State Trait), which measures level of anxiety.

Every effort was undertaken to obtain responses from 100 subjects. Due to the relocation of people as a result of the divorce process, and the limitation of obtaining subjects three years post divorce, substantial difficulties were encountered in obtaining responses. A specific sampling plan was then implemented to obtain an adequate number of subjects for purposes of analysis and to establish population validity. Toward this end, statistics were obtained from a national sample to ascertain similarity of the target population with the experimentally accessible population. All possible avenues were investigated to locate the 400 randomized divorced individuals from the sample list. Follow-up procedures, including making phone calls, utilizing telephone books, and city and county directories with cross referencing information were undertaken to obtain the identified sample.

As a result of the above sampling plan with regard to the initial random sample of 400 individuals, 62 subjects completed questionnaires (n = 62). Of the original sample of 400, 250 participants were never found, despite varied efforts to locate them. The final return rate (based on 150 subjects who were located) was 41%.

A correlational method for analyzing the research data was employed as the research design for this study. Frequency distributions and percentages were generated for all socio-demographic variables in order to provide a complete description of the sample population. The Guttman, Spearman Brown, and Alpha coefficients were calculated to determine the reliability of the five instruments. In order to explore correlational relationships and to predict
adjustment from the three personality factors, the Pearson Product Moment correlations and multiple regression were utilized. Finally, to determine the degree of relationship between the personality factors and adjustment variables, stepwise regression was employed to determine which factors correlated the most with divorce adjustment and level of differentiation.

Discussion

Data from the Demographic Questionnaire included a sample of 26 men (41.9%) and 36 women (58.1%) with a mean age of 41 years. The majority of the subjects from this sample were of middle-class status in terms of income (48.4% earned incomes of above $30,000), occupation (66% had business or professional jobs), and education (59% attended college or obtained degrees). According to Price-Bonham and Balswick (1980), the majority of the studies in the divorce literature included subjects who were primarily white, educated, middle class, and seek therapy or self-help groups. Moreover, samples tended to be chosen from special divorce groups which further limited the generalizability of results. This finding parallels the demographic data from the present study. However, efforts were undertaken to include a black population as well as a white population. In fact, the racial statistics of the present sample were identical to the national sample. (See Table 4.5).

Additional demographic information was gathered from national statistics to determine the similarity to other populations of individuals divorced in 1988. The data revealed that a large percentage of the subjects were 20 - 39 years of age (67.5%) at the time of the divorce, and their marriages tended to last a duration of less than 10 years. As the duration of the marriages increased, the
divorce rate declined as reported in both national statistics as well as statistics from the present sample. In essence, there were similarities between the present sample \(n = 62\) and the national group on key variables such as race, mean age at time of divorce, number of children under 18 years of age, number of children per divorce, and duration of marriage prior to divorce. (See Table 4.5).

The sample size \(n = 62\) of the present study was also consistent with the majority of studies from the divorce literature. Kitson and Raschke (1981) reported that most of the samples were small (many of the studies had samples of under 75) and obtained through convenience. They further noted that these easily obtained samples were potentially biased samples, yet widely used. Although Doherty (1980) was one of the few researchers in the literature to obtain a large sample size \(n = 1,333\) from a national probability sample, he did not obtain information as to length of time separated and divorced which weakened his findings.

There were differences in the literature with regard to the length of time which needs to elapse prior to assessment of adult post divorce adjustment. Weiss (1975) and Hetherington et al. (1978) hypothesized that adjustment lasts from three to four years post divorce. According to Thomas (1982), most studies examined subjects immediately after the divorce process. In effect, there exists a trade-off between obtaining an appropriate sample of those persons divorced three or more years and locating these individuals. While investigating a sample three years post divorce may reduce sample size (due to location difficulties), one can more readily determine whether the individual experienced the normal trauma associated with divorce, or whether the individual continues to have difficulties three years post divorce.
As indicated earlier, the participants in this study were assessed on the three personality factors of anxiety, self esteem, and locus of control in relationship to divorce adjustment and level of differentiation. When the personality dimension of locus of control was assessed, the results indicated that as participants exhibited more internal control, they tended to be better adjusted. Individuals who attributed outcomes resulting from their own personal behavior appeared more adjusted post divorce, as opposed to those who viewed outcomes as a result of fate or chance. Although internal locus of control was moderately correlated with positive divorce adjustment, the data revealed that this personality variable was not one of the strongest predictors of divorce adjustment. In addition, locus of control did not correlate significantly with the other adjustment variable of level of differentiation.

Doherty (1980), one of the foremost researchers on locus of control and divorce adjustment, concluded from a large sample population (n = 1,333) that divorced individuals, from a group of both married and divorced subjects, had the highest internal scores. He hypothesized, that after the initial period of chaos in divorce, individuals may develop a greater sense of personal autonomy and control as a result of resolving aspects of the divorce process. Due to the absence of longitudinal data in his study as well as a lack of information on remarriage and length of time separated and divorced, Doherty (1980) concluded that the question of whether the divorce process enhances internal control remains difficult to resolve. Barnet (1990), in her review of the literature, further substantiated the importance of the locus of control variable. She noted that those who exhibited more internal locus of control experienced less and shorter periods of stress during the divorce process and better post divorce adjustment.
The findings in the literature regarding locus of control closely paralleled the findings from the present study. Internal locus of control was found to have moderate predictive effect with post divorce adjustment.

Anxiety appeared to be a significant factor when correlated with both divorce adjustment and level of differentiation. As subjects' level of Trait anxiety (chronic or general level of anxiety) decreased, divorce adjustment and level of differentiation increased. Trait level of anxiety rather than State anxiety exhibited a stronger correlation with both post divorce adjustment and level of differentiation. Since participants were tested at an interval three years post divorce, their Trait or chronic level of anxiety would be more likely to reflect a change as opposed to their State level of anxiety which is defined as the anxiety level at the time of the event.

According to Bowen Theory, anxiety is an integral aspect of relationship systems (Carpenter, 1990; Winter, 1992). When an acute state of anxiety exists, then an individual has the capacity to remain functional. However, when a chronic state of anxiety occurs, the individual melds intellectual and emotional forces creating a state of fusion, and thus a decreased level of differentiation (Kerr & Bowen, 1988; Winter, 1992). Dreman et al. (1990), in their investigation of separated and divorced women, concluded that as the time lengthened after the separation, the mothers exhibited less anxiety, more internal locus of control, and were more adjusted. Hetherington et al. (1978) reported similar findings. These researchers observed that as the period of time increased post divorce, the subjects were more stable and less anxious. Carpenter (1990), in her study on differentiation and chronic anxiety, did find that as level of Trait, or chronic
anxiety decreases, the level of differentiation or adjustment increased. Both the research literature and the present study discovered findings which substantiated the importance of anxiety to divorce adjustment as well as level of differentiation.

Self esteem, as measured by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS), had the strongest predictive value with regard to both divorce adjustment and differentiation of self. As participants' self esteem, or "the extent to which one values oneself," (Ward & Ward, 1992, p. 1) increased, there was also an increase in divorce adjustment and level of differentiation. When self esteem was assessed three or more years post divorce (Blair Subscale B), a higher level of significance was achieved than with adjustment at the time of divorce (Blair Subscale A). Thus, participants were more likely to report that they had a higher level of self esteem three years post divorce rather than the level of self esteem they remembered at the time of the divorce.

In the divorce literature, several longitudinal studies substantiated the finding that self concept improved from the initial point of the divorce over a two or three year period. (Hetherington, et al., 1978; Bartley, 1981; Doherty et al., 1989;). Hetherington et al. (1978) reported lower self esteem results at the time of divorce when compared with a married group. Further, these researchers observed that with the divorce group, self esteem improved over a two-year period and that both married and divorce groups were observed to be similar. Parallel with this view, Doherty et al., (1989) reported similar findings. They postulated that with the onset of the divorce process, subjects initially experienced low self esteem due to the external factors which affected their lives. Pais (1978) found that subjects were able to improve over time and subsequently increase their self esteem and internal level of control. Throughout the divorce
literature, theorists and researchers have discussed the relationship between self esteem and divorce adjustment, citing the feelings of failure and rejection which often accompany the divorce process.

Moreover, in the present study, self esteem emerged as the personality factor with the most predictive power with both post divorce adjustment and level of differentiation. The stepwise regression revealed that the other two personality variables of anxiety (State Trait) and locus of control (Rotter) were eliminated as having limited predictive value with divorce adjustment and differentiation. As reflected both in the divorce literature and the present study, self esteem appears to have an integral relationship with divorce adjustment, particularly adjustment three or more years post divorce.

In sum, the results obtained in the present study revealed the importance of personality factors in relationship to adult divorce adjustment, as well as adjustment measured by level of differentiation. Although all personality and adjustment factors reflected moderate correlation coefficients, self esteem emerged as the personality factor which exhibited the strongest predictive effect with divorce adjustment and level of differentiation. In addition, Trait level of anxiety, which refers to chronic or general anxiety, also yielded predictive value when measured with divorce adjustment and differentiation. The findings of the present study underscore that as self esteem and level of chronic anxiety improve so does the level of divorce adjustment and differentiation and vice versa.
Limitations

In considering the limitations which emerged from the present study, five areas of caution were reported. The following represent limitations or areas of caution regarding the findings:

1. According to Borg and Gall (1983), a limit of the correlational method of analyzing the research data is that cause-and-effect relationships among the personality and adjustment variables cannot be clearly established. Although positive correlations were discovered among the personality variables of self esteem, anxiety, and locus of control when compared with divorce adjustment and level of differentiation, it is difficult to determine causal inferences between these factors. Thus, it is not clear whether self esteem, anxiety, and locus of control predict divorce adjustment or whether, as a result of divorce adjustment, self esteem, anxiety, and locus of control improve.

2. Because of the small and limited sample size (n = 62), one must proceed with caution with regard to generalizability of results. A larger sample which included individuals three or more years post divorce would strengthen the findings from the present study. While the initial goal was to locate 400 participants for this study, locating these individuals three years post divorce proved to be a difficult endeavor. Of the original 400, only 150 subjects were found after numerous efforts to locate these participants. This difficulty of obtaining large samples was inherent in all divorce research especially if the aim was to evaluate individuals three years post divorce. According to Kitson and Raschke (1981), the divorce literature is replete with studies which utilized easily obtained, biased samples from special divorce groups such as Parents Without Partners which greatly reduced generalizability of findings.
In order to enhance generalizability of findings for the present study, an effort was made to establish population validity (Borg & Gall, 1983). The first question which had to be determined was the similarity of the accessible population to the target population. Toward that aim, national statistics of individuals divorced in 1988 were compared with statistics of subjects from the present study to determine whether the sample was representative of the target population. Table 4.5 summarizes the comparison statistics on several key variables. Further, the sampling procedure and sampling frame were specified in detail in order to replicate future investigations on similar populations. In addition, a description of the sample, and information regarding the completion rate was provided, to establish population validity.

3. Since all personality and adjustment measures utilized in this study were self-reports, the degree of accuracy is dependent upon the awareness and honesty of the subjects' self-perceptions. Due to social desirability biases and the stigma attached to divorce, respondents may have been tempted to present themselves in a positive light. Further, the Blair Divorce Adjustment had an additional problem with the respondents having to make "time-ordered associations" by recalling previous thoughts, feelings and behaviors and then three years post divorce. When asking subjects to rate retrospective data, it is difficult to determine whether they have remembered the past accurately, or if the past becomes distorted depending upon how adjusted they feel in the present.

4. The relationships reported in this study may result from an "artifact" where the test items are similar rather than the variables being causally related. In those cases, correlation coefficients were used due to overlapping test items.
5. Results from both the Blair and the Haber LDSS are tentative due to the lack of standardization of the instruments. Although both were reported to have obtained validity and reliability, more extensive use of these instruments would enhance findings for these measures.

Recommendations

In the following section, several recommendations will be offered as possibilities for further research. Weaknesses and major issues which emerged from the divorce literature, as well as results from this study, will be highlighted and summarized.

First, one of the major hurdles to overcome in post divorce adjustment research is obtaining a large enough sample for purposes of analysis in order to enhance generalizability of results. Toward this end, addressing the difficulties of locating a sample, and taking all the necessary steps to insure a large group for analysis, are critical factors in divorce research. Throughout the present study, direct contact with participants by use of phone calls proved to be the most effective method. Additionally, it is essential to have effective resources for locating people, due to the many numbers of divorced individuals who relocate during the divorce process, as well as the women who often change their names, thus making it difficult to find them.

Second, one method of circumventing the difficulty of small divorced samples is to conduct a longitudinal study with a married sample and then evaluating the differences with those who eventually obtain a divorce with those who remain married. Assessing a sample at the point of marriage rather than divorce would eliminate the difficulty of locating the divorced individuals.
post measures could be utilized to assess these individuals before becoming divorced and then several years post divorce and comparing these differences with the still married group. The study could then more readily determine whether divorce, as a crisis producing event, brings on personality disorganization or the personality difficulties existed before the divorce (Kraus, 1979). Additionally, the subjects would be easier to track due to obtaining recent addresses before the individuals had an opportunity to relocate.

Third, a consistent definition of divorce adjustment is an important issue to consider in divorce research. Blair (1970), through the development of the Blair Divorce Adjustment Inventory, made one of the few attempts in the literature to quantify this factor. More extensive research is needed to address which factors contribute to adult divorce adjustment, and what is meant by effective post divorce adjustment. The consistent use of a divorce adjustment inventory would strengthen the findings as well as enhance generalizability of results in divorce research. Therefore, concepts such as adjustment and distress need to be more precisely defined (Kitson & Raschke, 1981). Price-Bonham and Balswick (1980) stressed gaps in the divorce literature with such issues as lack of definition, lack of consistent measures, and lack of empirical evidence documenting stages of development.

Fourth, a more in-depth exploration of the personality aspects which effect divorce is needed in order to delineate the factors which impact on post divorce adjustment. Within that process, it is important to make the distinction between short term personality disorganization as it relates to divorce and long term pathology. While many studies reported that divorce had an impact on physical and mental well-being, it was difficult to determine whether individuals were
disturbed before the divorce or as a result of the divorce. Lack of longitudinal data have made causal relationships difficult to assess (Kitson & Raschke, 1981). Also, this problem is further confused by the use of correlational analysis as divorce may exacerbate psychological problems that already exist with the individual (Kitson & Raschke, 1981).

A consistent approach with regard to personality factors as they relate to divorce adjustment, utilizing a comprehensive theoretical base, as well as empirical evidence to determine which factors are most predictive of divorce adjustment is needed. While the findings in the present study revealed that self esteem emerged with the strongest predictive value with adult post divorce adjustment, there exist studies which examine additional personality factors. Thus, there is little agreement in the field of divorce research as to which variables constitute the essential personality factors related to adult post divorce adjustment. Spanier and Casto (1977) reported that there were few systematic attempts to discover what factors affect adult divorce adjustment. They further commented that many studies on divorce adjustment emerged from clinical case studies or counseling populations.

In sum, this study evaluated the personality factors of self esteem, anxiety, and locus of control as these variables relate to adult post divorce adjustment. Because of the high rate of divorce, and the chaotic and disruptive nature of the divorce process, it becomes critical to study divorce in a more comprehensive manner, including a larger sample size, and the use of a divorce adjustment inventory which is more extensively and consistently utilized. Although it was determined that self concept seemed to play a major role in its' correlation with divorce adjustment in the present study, replication of these findings is required.
in order to insure generalizability of results. While many studies reported findings which reflect negative effects as a result of the divorce process, Brown et al. (1976) indicated from their study of a divorced population that the divorce process had strengthened the participants. Kessler (1978) concluded from her study that individuals can be helped to strengthen certain aspects of their personality and improve their weakness. Clearly, more in-depth study is needed in the complicated area of adult post divorce adjustment. The question which remains as an area for researchers to examine is for which individuals and which personality factors, and under what conditions, does divorce lead to positive adjustment or personality enhancement.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

CONSENT FORM
CONSENT FORM

This research project you have been asked to participate in is an effort to understand how various personality factors affect our adjustment to the divorce process. Therefore, it may help other families and professionals understand some of the factors which influence adult adjustment to divorce. Any information you provide will be maintained with absolute confidentiality. The completed questionnaires you return will be assigned a code number and will only be referred to by that number. If at any time, while answering these questions, you have personal concerns you would like to discuss, I would be glad to refer you to the appropriate resources. Also at any time should you decide to withdraw from this study for any reason, you may do so without any penalty or question.

If you agree to participate in this research, please sign in the space provided below and return in the enclosed, stamped envelope. Your efforts of relating your own divorce experience will be a valuable contribution and will be helpful to other families going through the same process.

Results of this research will be available upon request by contacting either:

Grace J. Hadeed, LCSW or, Charles Matthews Ph.D.
Family Institute of Virginia College of William and Mary
2910 Monument Avenue Counseling Department
Richmond, Virginia Williamsburg, Virginia
23221 23185
804-355-6876 804-221-2340

Thank you for your time and effort in this endeavor.

Grace J. Hadeed
Doctoral student

I have read this form and understand the procedures entailed in this research. My signature indicates my willingness to participate in this study.

Your Signature

Date
August 6, 1992

Dear Participant:

Due to the many complexities of divorce and the great effect on families, it is an important area to understand and learn more about. Because of my own divorce, I have become interested in the study of divorce for my doctoral dissertation. I suspect that you, too, have had many thoughts and feelings about your divorce experience. This study, to be conducted under the auspices of the College of William and Mary Counseling program, is designed to understand the various ways people like yourself adjust to divorce. I would like to ask for your help by your participation in this research in an effort to increase the body of knowledge we have about the effect of divorce on adults.

Your name has been chosen by a random process from the records of divorces in Henrico County. I want to assure you, in advance, that any information you provide will be maintained with absolute confidentiality. You are asked to complete six questionnaires which will take a little more than an hour of your time. Your name will be assigned a code number and only that number will appear on the forms you complete. Once you return your questionnaires I, as the researcher, will not even know who completed which questionnaire.

If you agree to participate in the research, PLEASE SIGN THE CONSENT FORM AND RETURN IT WITH THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRES IN THE ENCLOSED, STAMPED ENVELOPE. For those who are interested, I will conduct a free seminar entitled "Life After Divorce" once I complete this study. If you wish further details about the seminar, send in the enclosed pink card. If you have any questions about this research project, please call me at work 355-6876 or at home 359-5331. Thank you for your anticipated participation in this study which represents a significant effort to understand adults going through the divorce process.

Sincerely,

Grace J. Hadeed LCSW, Ed.S.
Doctoral student
College of William and Mary
GENERAL DIRECTIONS

The confidentiality of these questionnaires will be protected by the use of numbers instead of names.

Included in this packet are six questionnaires and one consent form:

Consent Form
Demographic Questionnaire
Internal-External Scale
Self-Evaluation Questionnaire
Haber Level of Differentiation of Self Scale
Tennessee Self Concept Scale
Blair's Divorce Adjustment Inventory

These questionnaires are designed to measure various aspects of personality and divorce adjustment.

Please fill out each questionnaire carefully according to the directions listed on each test. They should take a little over an hour of your time to complete.

AFTER YOU HAVE COMPLETED ALL SIX QUESTIONNAIRES AND SIGNED THE CONSENT FORM, PLACE THEM IN THE STAMPED, SELF-ADDRESSED ENVELOPE INCLUDED IN THE PACKET.

Thank you, in advance, for your cooperation and help in this research project. Your help will be a valuable contribution in the area of family relationships and adult adjustment to divorce.

Grace J. Hadeed
2910 Monument Avenue
Richmond, Virginia 23221
APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE
Demographic Questionnaire

1. Age: ______

2. Sex: ______

3. Ethnic Background:
   ____ Caucasian
   ____ Black
   ____ Hispanic
   ____ Other _______________________

4. Marital Status:
   ____ Divorced/Single
   ____ Remarried
   ____ Separated, 2nd marriage

   If remarried, how long have you been remarried? ______

5. Do you have children?
   ____ Yes  ____ No

   Number of children ______

   Ages: ______ Sex: ____ male ____ female
   Ages: ______ Sex: ____ male ____ female
   Ages: ______ Sex: ____ male ____ female
   Ages: ______ Sex: ____ male ____ female
   Ages: ______ Sex: ____ male ____ female

6. Do you have step-children?
   ____ Yes  ____ No

   Number of children ______

   Ages: ______ Sex: ____ male ____ female
   Ages: ______ Sex: ____ male ____ female
   Ages: ______ Sex: ____ male ____ female
   Ages: ______ Sex: ____ male ____ female

7. How old were you when you were first married? ______

8. How long was your first marriage?
   ____ 3-5 years  ____ 16-20 years
   ____ 6-10 years  ____ Over 20 years
   ____ 11-15 years

9. How long were you separated? ______

10. How old were you when you were legally divorced from your first marriage? ______

11. How long were you legally divorced from your first marriage? ______

12. If remarried, how old were you at the time of your second marriage? ______

13. If remarried, how long have you been in your second marriage? ______

14. If remarried, do you have children from your second marriage?
   ____ Yes  ____ No

   Number of children ______

   Ages: ______ Sex: ____ male ____ female
   Ages: ______ Sex: ____ male ____ female
   Ages: ______ Sex: ____ male ____ female
   Ages: ______ Sex: ____ male ____ female
   Ages: ______ Sex: ____ male ____ female

15. What was your occupation when you were married for the first time?

   ____ Business or management
   ____ Education
   ____ Industry, manufacturing
   ____ Professional
   ____ Sales and promotion
   ____ Service
   ____ Unemployed
   ____ Unskilled
   ____ Other _______________________


16. What is your present occupation?
   ___ Business or management
   ___ Education
   ___ Industry, manufacturing
   ___ Professional
   ___ Sales and promotion
   ___ Service
   ___ Unemployed
   ___ Unskilled
   ___ Other ______________________

17. What was your highest educational attainment when you were married for the first time?
   ___ less than grade 8
   ___ completed grade 8
   ___ attended high school, but did not graduate
   ___ graduated from high school
   ___ attended college, but did not graduate
   ___ graduated from college
   ___ attended graduate school
   ___ received graduate degree (masters, doctorate, J.D., M.D., etc.)

18. What was your highest educational attainment when you were married for the second time?
   ___ less than grade 8
   ___ completed grade 8
   ___ attended high school, but did not graduate
   ___ graduated from high school
   ___ attended college, but did not graduate
   ___ graduated from college
   ___ attended graduate school
   ___ received graduate degree (masters, doctorate, J.D., M.D., etc.)

19. If you are in school now, what degree are you presently working on?
   ___ not in school now
   ___ high school diploma or GED
   ___ undergraduate degree
   ___ graduate degree
   ___ other, please describe ______________________

20. Please check your level of annual income (include total household income):
   ___ $0-$10,000
   ___ $10,000-$20,000
   ___ $20,000-$30,000
   ___ Above $30,000

21. Have you been in therapy since the separation and divorce?
   ___ yes  ___ no

22. Thank you for your willingness to complete this questionnaire. If you have additional comments regarding your divorce adjustment or this study, please feel free to add your additional comments here: ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
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<td>Carl Whitaker, M.D. Two-day family therapy seminar under the auspices of the Family Institute of Virginia.</td>
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ABSTRACT
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Chairman: Charles O. Matthews, Ph.D.

The purpose of this study was to examine personality factors related to adult divorce adjustment with a particular focus on anxiety, self esteem and locus of control. The crisis of divorce affects every generation, both nuclear and extended families, as well as every individual member. Divorce propels all family members into a state of chaos and disequilibrium for one to three years, and has been found to be a highly disruptive and traumatic event for family members. In addition, the divorce rate has increased dramatically in the last 20 years.

Bowen Theory, with particular emphasis on the concept of differentiation of self, provided the theoretical rationale for this study. While Bowen related his concepts to marital and family functioning, the theory did not address the process of divorce. Much of the early research on divorce focused primarily on a pathogenic perspective where divorce is viewed as a "failure." Additional research emerged in the 1970's which viewed divorce as an emotional process, providing individuals with an opportunity for growth. The present study attempted to fill a gap in the divorce literature by expanding Bowen Theory, with a primary investigative focus on adult post divorce adjustment and level of differentiation.

A random sample of 62 individuals divorced in Henrico County, Virginia in 1988 were obtained from the Bureau of Vital Statistics. Additionally, Virginia statistics were compared with national statistics to determine comparability of groups and to increase generalizability of results. All research subjects
completed instrument packets which included a consent form, a demographic questionnaire, the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory, the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, the Rotter Internal-External Scale, The Blair Divorce Adjustment Inventory (modified version), and the Haber Level of Differentiation of Self Scale. A correlational method of analyzing the data was employed as the research design for this study. The Pearson Product Moment and multiple regressions were utilized in order to clarify the relationships among the three personality variables and the two adjustment variables. Frequency distributions and percentages were generated for all socio-demographic variables in order to provide a complete description of the sample.

Data from the participants included a sample of 26 men and 36 women. A large percentage of the subjects were 20 - 39 years of age (67.5%), of middle class status (59%), had marriages which tended to last a duration of less than 10 years (66%), and had children under the age of 18 (46.7%). The results from the instruments indicated a sample who were internally directed, had a moderate level of self concept, and a low level of both State and Trait anxiety. When the variables of divorce adjustment and level of differentiation were computed, the results indicated that the sample exhibited high levels of differentiation and moderate to strong levels of divorce adjustment.

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale exhibited the strongest correlation coefficient when measured with both the Blair Divorce Adjustment Inventory (58%) and the Haber Level of Differentiation of Self Scale (51%). After separately investigating each of the three personality variables including self esteem, anxiety, and locus of control, all variables were computed utilizing stepwise regression to determine level of predictive value with divorce
adjustment and level of differentiation. Step-wise analysis indicated that both the Tennessee with a $t$-ratio of 2.220 and a $p$-value of .030, and the Trait level of anxiety, with a $t$-value of -2.156 and a $p$-value of .035 resulted in high predictive values with the Blair. When the personality variables were computed with the Level of Differentiation Scale, the results were similar to the Blair analysis. The Tennessee obtained the strongest predictive value. As with divorce adjustment, self concept was the strongest predictor of level of differentiation.