INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

University Microfilms International
300 N. Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Filler, Hadassa

THE ROLE OF INITIATION, LOCUS OF CONTROL, AND BLAME ATTRIBUTIONS IN THE ADJUSTMENT OF MEN AND WOMEN TO MARITAL SEPARATION AND DIVORCE

City University of New York PH.D. 1985

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark __√__.

1. Glossy photographs or pages _____
2. Colored illustrations, paper or print _____
3. Photographs with dark background _____
4. Illustrations are poor copy _____
5. Pages with black marks, not original copy _____
6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page _____
7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages __✓__
8. Print exceeds margin requirements _____
9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine _____
10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print __✓__
11. Page(s) _____ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.
12. Page(s) _____ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.
13. Two pages numbered _____. Text follows.
14. Curling and wrinkled pages _____
15. Other _____

THE ROLE OF INITIATION, LOCUS OF CONTROL, AND BLAME ATTRIBUTIONS IN THE ADJUSTMENT OF MEN AND WOMEN TO MARITAL SEPARATION AND DIVORCE

by

HADASSA FILLER

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor in Philosophy, The City University of New York.

1985

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor in Philosophy.

January 2, 1985 — date — Morton Bard — Chairman of Examining Committee

January 2, 1985 — date — Herbert D. Saltzstein — Executive Officer

Professor Morton Bard

Professor Charles Kadushin

Professor Irwin Katz

Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

Abstract

THE ROLE OF INITIATION, LOCUS OF CONTROL, AND BLAME ATTRIBUTIONS IN THE ADJUSTMENT OF MEN AND WOMEN TO MARITAL SEPARATION AND DIVORCE

by

Hadassa Filler

Adviser: Professor Morton Bard

Marital dissolution is a stressful life event which is disruptive of individual, family, and societal functioning, and is an increasing social problem. The purpose of this study was to investigate the effect that differences in locus of control, initiation of separation, gender, and blame attributions have on the process of adjustment to marital separation and divorce.

The sample consisted of 155 men and women, between the ages of 26-56, who had at least one minor child at home at the time of their marital separation, who have remained unmarried, who have been separated for five years or less, and who were members of two support organizations for single parents in Northern New Jersey.

Data was collected by the use of a questionnaire which was comprised of a number of separate measures, including: Background information, Rotter's I-E Scale, the Psychiatric Epidemiological Research Interview (PERI) as the measure of adjustment, and The Causes of Marital Failure (CMF) which

was developed specifically for this study. The questionnaires were distributed by mail, and by the researcher. Contingency tables constituted the mode of statistically testing the hypotheses.

The results indicate that those who have internal locus of control, or those who initiate the marital separation have significantly better adjustment than those who are external in their locus of control and who do not initiate. Although locus of control and initiation were significant main effects, there was no interaction effect on adjustment for these two variables. These factors, while generally applicable, when gender is considered are relevent to men only. Regardless of their locus of control, whether or not they initiated the separation, and to whom they assigned blame for the marital dissolution, women demonstrate consistently lower adjustment levels than do men. People who identify fewer problems as causative of the marital dissolution, adjust better than those who identify many problems, especially if they have an internal locus of control. However, there was no clear relationship between an internal locus of control orientation and types of blame attribution.

The implications of these findings for future research are discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express her appreciation to her advisor, Professor Morton Bard, for his inspiration and his unrelenting guidance in bringing this work to fruition; to Professors Charles Kadushin and Irwin Katz, for their invaluable comments and assistance; to Ruth Adams from Parents Without Partners and Dennis Brown from the National Institute for Child Custody and Divorce Awareness, without whom this study could not have been carried out; and especially to her husband Harvey and her daughter Shir, who never stopped believing, encouraging, loving, and cheering her on.

Hadassa Filler

February, 1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES, CONTINUED

C H A P T E R I

BACKGROUND

During the twelve months ending with June 1983, more than 1,183,000 couples divorced in the United States. In June 1983 alone, 106,000 divorces were granted; 2,000 more than in the same month a year earlier (U.S. National Center for Health Statistics, 1983). There has been a consistently increasing rate of marital dissolution since 1921 affecting all socioeconomic levels of the population (Glick and Norton, 1979).

Many factors have been offered as an explanation for this increasing rate of marital breakdown (Waller, 1930; Goode, 1956; Bohannon, 1970; Kessler, 1975; Weiss, 1975; Levinger, 1979; Glick and Norton, 1979). The ones most often mentioned are: increased longevity, decreased stigmatization and ostracism of the divorced, and growing availability of divorce. Other aspects of contemporary life have also been implicated in marital upheaval and breakdown. Rapidly changing life styles, and the growing importance of self actualization have affected the power structure of the American family, and have greatly reduced its stability and durability (Kessler, 1975; Unger, 1979).

Most of the research on marital dissolution has focused

on the antecedents of divorce, and on its psychological, physical, and economic consequences. The first major study on the impact of marital separation and its ensuing process of adjustment was undertaken by Waller (1930). Although this study was based on a small sample (N=33) and used a case study methodology, its findings served as the basis for most of the ensuing research on divorce. Waller was the first to point out the severe trauma experienced by individuals who had undergone marital separation. He also delineated the process of post-separation adjustment, and distinguished the stages of grief and reorganization that take place in its wake.

Goode (1956) was the first investigator to undertake a large scale sociological field study on the adjustment of women to marital dissolution. His major hypotheses were based on findings by Waller (1930). Goode found that the absence of role definitions resulting from marital dissolution was the greatest deterrent to post-separation adjustment. This conclusion was enhanced further by findings from Blair's (1969) and Raschke's (1974) studies, which examined Goode's hypotheses in greater detail.

Separation and Divorce as A Stressful Life Event

The loss of a significant other, through separation and divorce, results in a crisis situation which constitutes a

stressful life event. This crisis bears economic and psycho-social costs not only for the individuals involved, but also for the children, kin, friends and the community within which these individuals are embedded. The changes in patterns of functioning as the result of marital dissolution necessitate adjustment on the part of all the individuals involved and of society as a whole. An individual in distress, whose life has been disrupted, often stops being a productive member of society, if only for a short time.

Marital breakdown has been underscored as a stressful life event second in severity only to death of a spouse (Holmes and Masuda, 1974). The disruption that marital dissolution causes is seen in the over-representation of the separated and the divorced among psychiatric patients, and in suicide, homicide, and disease mortality rates (Bloom, White, and Asher, 1979). As a stressful life event, marital separation entails a process of readjustment that has been likened to that which follows bereavement (Waller, 1930; Goode, 1956; Blair, 1969; Bohannon, 1970; Kessler, 1975; Weiss, 1975; Gasser and Taylor, 1976; O'Connor, 1976; Bondurant, 1977).

However, while most investigators of post-separation adjustment have focused on the emotional upheaval that marital dissolution causes, many also see this crisis as an opportunity for change and growth for the individuals

involved (Weiss, 1975; Brown, 1976; Meyers, 1976; Doherty, 1980).

A Stage Theory of Adjustment After Separation and Divorce

The process of adjustment to separation and divorce appears to be a phased one, in which the passage of time is a most important determinant. A stage theory of post-separation adjustment has been proposed by most of its investigators (Waller, 1930; Goode, 1956; Blair, 1969; Bohannon, 1970; Kessler, 1975; Weiss, 1975; Gasser & Taylor, 1976; Meyers, 1976; Pais, 1978).

Of these accounts, Weiss' (1975) is the most succinct and comprehensive one. Weiss suggested a two-stage model of post-separation adjustment. The first stage is the grief and mourning phase. Often during this period, the individual experiences a sense of shock and disbelief. The psychic pain that is felt during this time is the outcome of a sense of loss of the ex-spouse, of loss of the individual's sense of self and of previous status. This breakdown in self-esteem and self-confidence, and the disintegration of accepted roles and habits serve as stressful events. Even when the separation is desired, along with the marked sense of relief, feelings of depression, anxiety, and pain are often experienced. This period of grief is frequently characterized by great

emotional upheaval. There appears to be an increased sense of hopelessness and bouts of crying. Sleeping and eating disturbances are common. An increase in intake of medication, drugs, or alcohol often takes place. Memory processes are affected, and efficiency and satisfaction from work and from relationships with others are reduced. Within a year, however, a semblance of balance is usually achieved, although it tends to be precarious.

The second stage is a phase of long-term reorganization of the self. It is signified by a move from preoccupation with the loss of the relationship toward the reintegration of self-worth with self-sufficiency. During this period, new and stable modes of functioning are established. This is a time of hard work, in which new goals for self-growth can be realized. Full adjustment is achieved by most individuals by the end of the fifth year after separation. For a successful resolution and reorganization of the self it is imperative that grieving of the lost relationship takes place (Kessler, 1975; O'Connor, 1976), and that the emotional attachment to the ex-spouse be severed (Weiss, 1975). The degree of long-term stability (adjustment) that is achieved frequently depends on the extent to which marital breakdown disrupted the regular modes of functioning of the individuals immediately after and during the first year after separation.

Variables Affecting Post-Separation Adjustment

The variables that are most frequently cited as important in affecting post-separation adjustment are: the time it took to reach a decision to separate, who initiated the separation, the length of marriage and its stability prior to the separation, the existence of children, the remaining anger toward the ex-spouse, and the opportunity to meet and date new people (Goode, 1956; Blair, 1969; Rose & Price-Bonhan, 1973; Rashcke, 1974; Weiss, 1975; O'Connor, 1976; Meyers, 1976; Pais, 1978). The availability of support systems or the lack of them, and the economic level of the individual after separation are also important determinants of the post-separation adaptation outcome (Dohrenwend, 1978; Levinger, 1979).

Marital dissolution calls forth changes in modes of interacting and relating to one's children, kin, and friends (Rose & Price-Bonhan, 1973; Weiss, 1975; Hetherington et al, 1976; Spanier & Casto, 1979; Hancock, 1980; Berman and Turk, 1981). The ability to re-establish new networks of friends and relationships greatly facilitates adjustment.

For individuals with children, especially minor ones, post-separation adjustment is usually exacerbated in comparison with that of couples without children. The parent who has custody has to adjust not only to being

single again, but also to being a single parent with full responsibilities in regard to the children. The non-custodial parent has to adjust to loss not only of home and spouse, but also to the loss of everyday contact with the children. In addition, where children are involved, the need to continue interacting with the ex-spouse often makes it difficult for the couple to resolve their persistent attachment (Goode, 1956; Blair, 1969; Raschke, 1974; Meyers, 1976; O'Connor, 1976; Pais, 1978).

The resolution of what Weiss (1975) called the persistent attachment to the ex-spouse (through anger or emotional dependency), is the most difficult part of adjustment to marital separation. Unless this attachment is dissolved successfully, full adjustment cannot be achieved (Bohannon, 1970; Brown, Felton, Whiteman & Manela, 1980).

Men and Women in Separation and Divorce

Early research on marital dissolution had focused primarily on its outcome for women and children. In the last few years, there has been a growing awareness among investigators of marital dissolution of the impact of divorce on men. For a man, marital separation often entails not only separation from the ex-spouse, but also from his home and children. Only a limited number of

studies have focused so far on the effect that marital breakdown has on men (Gasser and Taylor, 1976; Finkelstein, 1976; Greif, 1979; Hancock, 1980).

However, there seems to be a growing interest in the reaction of men to separation and divorce. An increasing number of studies have begun to investigate the similarities and differences in the process of adjustment of men and women (Bondurant, 1977; Spanier and Casto, 1979; Bloom and Caldwell, 1981; Berman and Turk, 1981). The interest in what happens to men after divorce has gained impetus from the growing recognition that the role of men in the family structure is equal in its importance to that of women (Hetherington, Cox, and Cox, 1976).

Although a pilot study by this researcher (Filler, 1981) did not reveal significant differences in overall adjustment of men and women, some differences in the amount of stress experienced by both groups were found by Bondurant (1977), and Bloom and Caldwell (1981). Since the data on sex differences and adjustment to marital dissolution are scant and often contradictory, the investigation of these differences served as one of the main goals of this study.

The Role of Initiation in Marital Dissolution

In comparing the process of adjustment to marital

separation to that which follows bereavement, Weiss (1975) made a distinction between the two. While one did not have control over death, Weiss sees divorce as being a voluntary action. By making this distinction, however, he neglected to take into account that even in divorce the decision to separate is not always within the control of both parties. In most situations, even when both spouses are aware that the marriage is not working, the decision to separate is usually made by only one of the members of the couple. Research on initiation of marital separation has shown that adjustment tends to be facilitated for the individuals who are responsible for making the decision to end the marriage. Adjustment is easier for initiators because they have done some of the grief work and resolution of attachment before making the decision to separate (Goode, 1956; Blair, 1969; Bohannon, 1970; Kessler, 1975; Meyers, 1976; Pais, 1978; Newman and Langer, 1981).

The ameliorative effects of initiating on post-separation adjustment have been pointed out by many of the researchers of marital dissolution. Bondurant (1977) and Darsa (1976) found that initiators reported fewer angry feelings, sleep disturbances, emotional difficulties accepting the divorce, and fewer life changes than did non-initiators. O'Connor (1976) showed that anticipation of divorce, even if not its initiation, mitigated emotional reactions and enhanced post-separation adjustment.

Peterson (1978) indicated that a significant relationship existed between initiation of separation, having an intimate relationship, and a positive resolution of the divorce crisis. Witte (1980) showed that initiators experienced less distress than did non-initiators due to increased sense of control, responsibility, and foresight in the divorce situation.

The importance of being an initiator is growing for women also. As traditional sex-roles attitudes begin to change, there has been an indication that women are more likely to become the initiators of their marital dissolution. Past research has concluded that women suffer more in divorce than do men (Goode, 1956; Bohannon, 1970; Kessler, 1975; Brown, 1976). This conclusion was often based on the belief that women were dependent on their spouses for financial support, and that they did not have as many opportunities to be gainfully employed as did men. In addition, women were seen as suffering more from learned helplessness and depression (Blair, 1969; Unger, 1979). More recent research, however, indicates that women have been joining the labor force in greater numbers than ever before. Although this is often done out of necessity, they are becoming less affected financially by divorce, and are likely to be the ones to take the initiative to end their marriage (Meyers, 1976; Hill, Rubin, and Peplau, 1976; Harvey, Wells, and Alvarez, 1978; Witte, 1980; Smith,

1980). In a pilot study (Filler, 1981), it was found that not only were women more likely to perceive themselves as the initiators of their separation, in comparison with men, women who were initiators adjusted better than did all other respondents.

Locus of Control

Most of the research on marital separation has focused on the relationship between demographic variables and adjustment. Only few studies have investigated the impact of personality factors on post-separation adaptation. One personality theory which has been useful in predicting individual differences in stress-related outcomes is the locus of control theory. The theory of perceived control as a determinant of behavior derives mostly from Rotter's social learning theory (1966). Both Rotter (1966) and Lefcourt (1980) viewed locus of control as a personality trait that involves the degree to which individuals perceive outcomes of their own actions as being within or beyond their control.

Locus of control has been construed as a cognitive mediating factor that intervenes between raw stimulus events and subsequent actions. Lefcourt (1980) indicated, in his review of the literature on this topic, that the

ways in which individuals experience potential stressors is a function of these cognitive styles and processes. He concluded that findings repeatedly showed that individuals with internal locus of control cope better with stress than do those with external orientation. Similar findings were obtained by Kobasa (1979) who investigated the role of internal control in mitigating stress reactions to physical illness.

Lefcourt's (1976) review of findings on the relationship between locus of control and psychopathology reveals that there is a correlation between an external control orientation and emotional disturbances. In general, as this review suggests, people who exhibit external locus of control tend to experience a greater sense of helplessness, depression, and anxiety than do people who perceive themselves as internals.

Although the role of locus of control has been investigated mostly in studies on expectations of future success or failure in achievement situations, this construct's importance as a predictor of affective responses has been noted by Weiner (1974). Lefcourt (1980) further elaborated on this relationship between affective states and locus of control. He attempted to define differences in emotional outcomes that resulted for internal and external individuals as a function of the success or failure nature of the situation. Thus, Lefcourt

(1980) indicated that for individuals who often experience success, internal control results in a sense of pride, positive affect, and assertive striving behaviors. On the other hand, for individuals who tend to experience more failures or setbacks, an internal locus of control is likely to result in depression, self-denigration, and eventually, surrender of ambition.

The importance of being able to control a stressful situation has been indicated not only in research on achievement, but also in other laboratory studies. The mere knowledge that one can exert control can alter the degree of stress experienced as the result of an aversive event (Langer, 1975; Miller, 1980). In generalizing from laboratory findings to control of life events, Dohrenwend (1980) pointed out that the less the control that an individual can exercise, the more stressful is the event, and the more is the readjustment that it necessitates. In relation to marital separation, she concluded that while it is a stressful event which can be anticipated by the partners, it is not necessarily within the control of both.

Although locus of control has been investigated mainly in research on achievement situations, it also serves as a useful predictor of emotional outcomes in separation and divorce. Because marital dissolution is often seen as a situation which connotes failure in fulfilling personal, societal, and role expectations, knowledge of the

individual's locus of control can assist the researcher in predicting the emotions that will be experienced and their effect on ensuing adjustment. Despite its importance, however, only few studies are available on the relationship between locus of control and adjustment to divorce. Their findings have not been able to establish unequivocally the effect of locus of control on such adaptation (Darsa 1976; Brown, 1976; Hetherington et al 1976; Doherty, 1980; Smith, 1980).

Sex differences in adjustment to marital separation as a function of locus of control have been investigated to even a lesser extent. Research on such differences have been done mostly in studies on achievement in laboratory settings. These have shown that women tend to attribute success to external causes and failure to internal ones, while the opposite is usually exhibited by men (Simon and Feather, 1973; Bar-Tal and Frieze, 1977). However, one recent study on the role of locus of control in adjustment to marital dissolution (Smith, 1980) has demonstrated that as women are gaining more control over their lives these patterns are beginning to change. Smith's findings suggest that as their sense of control increases, women tend to become more internal than do men. As a result they experience less stress after marital separation which tends to result in better adjustment outcomes.

Causal Attributions as Determinants of Adjustment to Separation and Divorce

In marital dissolution, as in any novel situations, the individuals involved attempt to understand what caused it to take place, and who was to blame for its happening. This search for attributional explanations constitutes an important part of the post-separation adjustment process. Extensive research on causal attributions has shown that the way in which people try to make sense of their world can greatly affect their psychological well-being (Jones et al, 1972). As a cognitive process, attribution of cause and of responsibility assists the individual in regaining mastery over a threatening event, and in restoring self-esteem (Heider, 1958; Kelley, 1972; Taylor, 1983). In order to make sense of the world, however, Heider (1958) pointed out that the explanation that one selects need not only to be plausible, but it also has to be consistent with the individual's self-concept.

Thus, individuals with internal locus of control would be expected to make attributions to internal causes, that is, take personal responsibility for specific outcomes in their lives. Recent research findings on locus of control and causal attributions, however, suggest that this is not always the case. When an attribution to internal causes

threatens the stability of the individual's self-esteem, an alternate incongruent explanation may be undertaken (Heider, 1958). This point was emphasized by Valins and Nisbett (1972) and Kelley (1972). They pointed out that attributions to external circumstances, rather than to something inherently wrong with the self, may serve as a useful ego-defense mechanism. This form of denial seems to be particularly important for individuals with internal locus of control in situations that connote failure. Rotter (1966) and Hochreich (1975) called these internal individuals "defensive externals". That it is possible for an individual to hold internal beliefs for success or failure in one sphere of interpersonal relations, while at the same time holding opposite expectations in another sphere was also shown by many other researchers (Langer, 1975; Lefcourt, 1976; Ickes and Layden, 1978; Peterson, 1978; Lefcourt, 1980; Abramson, Garber, and Seligman, 1980; Miller, 1980; Witte, 1980; Weiner and Litman-Adizes, 1980; Newman and Langer, 1981).

The negative emotional impact, that internal causal attributions often have, has also been elucidated in recent investigations. Abramson, Garber, and Seligman (1980) found that blame that is directed toward the self (internal attribution) increases helplessness and hopelessness, and exacerbates depression. Weiner and Litman-Adizes (1980) showed that internal attributions for failure maximize

feelings of inadequacy and decrease self-esteem. Ickes and Layden (1978) indicated, that in order to maintain their stable view of the self, subjects who have a high need for maintaining positive self-esteem tend to attribute failure to external causes and success to internal ones. In order to avoid intense discomfort which is associated with lack of control, Langer (1975) suggested that the preference for an external explanation of a failure event represents a need by the individual to maintain the "illusion of control" over outcomes.

Despite the extensive amount of investigation that it received in achievement situations, little systematic research has been done on the role of causal attributions in adjustment to separation and divorce. Findings from these studies have been mostly contradictory and often inconclusive. Peterson (1978) found that the larger the number of attributions that were utilized to explain marital dissolution, the more positive the adjustment outcome. This positive effect, however, was only gained when attributions were made to external circumstance, but not when the ex-spouse was blamed. Contrary to expectations, people who blamed their ex-spouse for their marital failure did not adjust well to separation and divorce. Witte (1980), on the other hand, indicated that attribution of marital failure to the ex-spouse did result in significantly less affective disturbances. Newman and

Langer (1981) showed that attribution of responsibility to something wrong in the relationship, as opposed to attributions to either self or spouse, led to better post-separation adjustment. All these researchers pointed out that only a minute number of subjects, if any at all, had blamed themselves for their marital dissolution.

Some research has been done on the role of locus of control in the ensuing process of adjustment after marital dissolution. In addition, a small body of studies exists on the effect of causal explanations on post-separation adaptation. None of the available research to date have attempted to investigate the interaction effect of locus of control and causal attributions on adjustment to marital breakdown.

In some research on marital separation strong support was provided for the conceptualization of divorce as a crisis life event. While much of this research has focused on the impact of a variety of demographic factors on post-divorce adaptation, little has been done to investigate the effect of personality and psycho-social elements such as sex differences, locus of control, initiation of separation, and blame attributions on the process of adaptation.

The importance of experiencing a sense of control in a stressful situation has been emphasized by many investigators. In research on marital dissolution making

the decision to end the marriage is often seen as an exercise of such control. Thus, the locus of control of the individual, who initiated the separation, and how these factors were likely to interact in producing a more satisfactory adaptation were central points of interest in this study. It was predicted that while having an internal locus of control orientation and being an initiator would result in the best adaptation, exhibiting external locus of control and not initiating would result in the greatest sense of helplessness, and thus, lead to more difficulties in adaptation. The implication of support of such a prediction is the possible development of intervention strategies to increase these people's sense of control.

Sex differences, in conjunction with this issue were also hypothesized to exist. As women increasingly gain control over their lives through gainful employment, and over most of their ex-spouses' assets and their children after the divorce (Smith, 1980); and since they are more likely than previously to become the initiators of their marital dissolution, it was predicted that they would adjust better than men to this crisis experience.

The possible interaction between locus of control and locus of causality has been investigated to a greater extent in research on achievement than in research on marital dissolution. In most cases, however, when causal attributions to success or failure were studied, locus of

control was not examined. While it is logical to infer that individuals with internal locus of control would be more likely to blame themselves for perceived failure in order to maintain a consistent positive self-image, it was predicted that instead, they would be more likely to find an external source of blame. Whether this is the case in marital separation, a situation that connotes failure, and whether this incongruence between one's locus of control and the type of blame attributions that one makes indeed occurs in marital breakdown needs further exploration.

C H A P T E R I I

PURPOSE AND HYPOTHESES

The Study's Objectives

The primary purpose of this research was to investigate the effect of social-psychological and personality factors on the process of adjustment which follows marital dissolution. The most important goal of this study was to combine findings from research on locus of control and causal attributions in a manner that has not been attempted before in investigations of marital separation and divorce. This kind of an investigation also had the objective of applying findings from studies on locus of control and causal attributions in achievement settings to the situation of marital breakdown. For this purpose, marital separation was conceptualized as a crisis situation, which connotes failure, and which calls forth a process of readjustment.

In addition to these goals, this study aimed at examining systematically other variables that have been shown to be important in determining the adjustment outcome to separation and divorce. One such variable is initiation of separation. Another pertains to the possible

interaction between having an internal locus of control and the likelihood of being an initiator. None of the current research has investigated the effect that locus of control in conjunction with initiation of separation may have on adjustment. Yet another is the factor of sex differences. Central to this investigation was the question of whether women, in comparison with men, are becoming more internal, are more likely to initiate their marital separation, and therefore, are more apt to achieve better adjustment.

The underlying assumption of this study is that, rather than what actually took place, it is the subjective perception of who was the initiator, and of who was to blame for causing the marriage to dissolve that which is of importance in determining the outcome of adjustment.

The Study's Hypotheses

Based on existing theory and research, the following hypotheses were constructed:

Hypothesis 1.

> Individuals who initiate their marital separation will adjust significantly better over time than will non-initiators.

Hypothesis 1a.

Women who initiate their marital separation will adjust significantly better over time than will non-initiator women, and both initiator and non-initiator men.

Hypothesis 2.

Maritally separated individuals who exhibit internal locus of control will adjust significantly better over time than will individuals who exhibit external locus of control, regardless of gender.

Hypothesis 2a.

Maritally separated women who exhibit internal locus of control will adjust significantly better over time than will all other respondents.

Hypothesis 3.

Individuals who exhibit internal locus of control and who initiate their marital separation will adjust significantly better over time than will individuals who exhibit external locus of control, and who are non-initiators.

Hypothesis 3a.

Women who exhibit internal locus of control, and who initiate their marital separation will adjust significantly better over time than will all other respondents.

Hypothesis 4.

The lower the extent of problems attributed as the cause of marital separation, the better the adjustment of respondents over time.

Hypothesis 5.

Individuals with internal locus of control, who attribute a lower extent of problems as a cause of their marital separation, will adjust significantly better over time than will all other respondents.

Hypothesis 6.

Individuals who exhibit internal locus of control, and who blame their spouse for the extent of problems which led to marital separation, will adjust significantly better over time than will all other respondents.

C H A P T E R I I I

METHOD AND PROCEDURES

The following is an overview of the methodological approach taken:

The process of adjustment to marital dissolution was assessed through the use of a questionnaire. The questionnaire was comprised of a number of separate measures that aimed at determining subjects' demographic background, locus of control, initiation of separation, blame attributions, and adjustment. The questionnaire was distributed to members of two social support organizations for single parents in Northern New Jersey. Two modes of questionnaires distribution were utilized. The researcher handed the instrument directly to members of Parents Without Partners (PWP). Members of the National Institute for Child Custody and Divorce Awareness (NICCDA) received the questionnaire through the mail. Subjects were men and women who had at least one minor child at home at the time of their marital dissolution, who had not remarried, and who have not been separated for more than five years.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Before specifics of the procedure are discussed, the following terms, which are repeatedly used in this study, are defined:

Crisis

A period of threat which severely disrupts an individual's patterns of living and of experiencing the self (Caplan, 1964).

Marital Separation

The point in time when the decision to terminate the marriage is made by one of the partners. This decision to separate marks the beginning of the adjustment process.

Adjustment

A term used interchangeably with adaptation to refer to behavior that enables individuals to cope effectively with a new situation.

Initiator

An individual who attributes the decision to terminate the marriage to him/her self.

Non-Initiator

An individual who attributes the decision to end the marriage to the ex-spouse.

Locus of Control

A personality trait that involves the degree to which individuals attribute outcomes to their own actions or to circumstances beyond their control.

Attribution of Responsibility

The cognitive process by which the individual arrives at a causative explanation for the purpose of understanding behaviors and events (Jones et al, 1972).

SAMPLE

The sample consisted of 155 members of Parents Without Partners (PWP) and the National Institute for Child Custody and Divorce Awareness (NICCDA). Both NICCDA and PWP are social support organizations for separated and divorced parents in Northern New Jersey. Subjects were men and women who had at least one minor child at home at the time of their marital separation, who had not remarried, and who have not been separated for more than five years. These criteria were selected for the following reasons: 1) The investigation of sex differences in locus of control and

adjustment constituted a major premise of this study. 2) Prior research has shown that individuals with at least one minor child at home are usually expected to experience more difficulties in adjustment than would divorced individuals who have no children, or whose children are already independent. 3) The establishment of an intimate love relationship after marital separation has been found to greatly facilitate adjustment. The two latter criteria were chosen because this study aimed at investigating the process of adjustment of individuals who were most likely to be at risk. And 4) The closer an individual is to the actual experience of marital dissolution, the lower the degree of recall distortions and forgetting.

An attempt by the investigator to establish a random sample of the general population of separated and divorced individuals failed. The study, therefore, focused on a unique population, that is, the population of members of social support organizations for separated and divorced parents. These were two organizations with whose members the researcher had conducted a pilot study, and with whom she had permission to continue her investigation. It was hoped that findings from this study would assist these organizations in being able to better gear their services to the specific needs of their members.

PROCEDURE

Subjects were contacted in two ways. Members of PWP were approached directly by the researcher during a weekly meeting. At that time, the researcher explained briefly what the study was about, and handed the questionnaires to be filled out immediately by everyone present. Only the responses of individuals who met the study's criteria were used. Members of NICCDA were mailed the same questionnaire. In addition, included were letters from both the researcher and NICCDA's executive director which explained the study's purpose and encouraged members to participate (see Appendix B for copies of these letters). It was not possible to approach members of NICCDA directly, because this organization does not hold group meetings. The mailing was done directly by NICCDA, so that the anonimity of members who did not wish to participate could be preserved.

One hundred questionnaires were mailed initially to members of NICCDA. These produced only 10 responses. Follow-up letters from the researcher and NICCDA's director were then sent to these same 100 members (see copies in Appendix B). The letters thanked members who have already participated, and urged others to respond. Only two additional questionnaires were received as the result of this mailing. A second mailing, to 100 additional NICCDA

members, followed the first three months later. Only 4 filled-out questionnaires were returned from this mailing. In total, 16 questionnaires were obtained from NICCDA's members. Follow-up letters were not sent after the second mailing failed to produce sufficient response. It was decided that tracking of the individuals who did not respond was not a cost-effective procedure.

The same questionnaires, but without the introductory letters, were distributed directly by the investigator to PWP members during weekly social meetings. Before the questionnaires were distributed, the chairperson of the meeting endorsed the study and introduced the researcher. The researcher then described briefly the purpose of the study using the same words that appeared on the letters to NICCDA's members. The rate of return of questionnaires by PWP members was somewhat better than that of NICCDA's, although not as high as was expected. Of the approximately 100 members who were usually present in each social meeting only 25-30 people agreed to participate. Only 20 of these, on the average, met the study's criteria and could be used. This resulted in a 20% return rate. While this rate was 10%-16% higher than the one obtained from NICCDA, a higher rate than that was anticipated from PWP members because of the direct contact they had with the investigator and the endorsing chairperson. That a greater rate of return was not achieved may have been due to the situation in which

the data was collected. Members of PWP attend these meetings because they give them the opportunity to socialize and meet people. A request to take time from these activities, in order to remember an experience that may reawaken the pain associated with it, may have been the basis of resistance and resentment.

It is not clear why NICCDA members did not respond at the same rate as did members of PWP. The lack of direct contact with the researcher at the time of data collection may have been responsible for this difference. Because such a small number of NICCDA's members responded, the two groups of subjects (PWP and NICCDA) were combined to form one sample.

THE INSTRUMENT

The primary data collection device was a questionnaire. This questionnaire was made of separate measures, most of which have been widely used in research on achievement and marital separation. Each of these measures aimed at assessing the dependent and independent variables of this study. For a copy of the complete questionnaire see Appendix A. The instrument was relatively short because length of questionnaires has been found to be inversely related to rate of response (Smith, 1980). It took 30 minutes on the average to fill out.

The following measures were the components of this instrument:

Demographic Information

This part, which included items 1-12 on the questionnaire, consisted of standard questions regarding age, sex, length of marriage, length of separation, education, income, occupation, religion, number of children, ages of children, and custody arrangements. Age, length of marriage, length of separation, and age of children were measured in years.

Psychiatric Epidemiological Research Interview (PERI)

The Psychiatric Epidemiological Research Interview (the PERI demoralization scale) was the measure used in this study to assess adjustment. The score obtained on this measure constituted the dependent variable. The short form of the PERI was utilized. This form is composed of the 26 most reliable items out of eight long subscales that measure nonspecific psychological distress (Dohrenwend, Shrout, Egri, and Mendelsohn, 1980). These items assess poor self-esteem, hopelessness, helplessness, dread, confused thinking, sadness, anxiety, psychophysiological symptoms, and perceived physical health. These are the

most prevalent psychological, physiological, and behavioral disturbances that occur as a reaction to marital dissolution. The underlying assumption of this measure is that the higher the score an individual obtains on it, the less the post-separation disruption, and therefore, the higher the degree of adjustment achieved.

The PERI was chosen for the following reasons: It is the most widely validated, reliable (Alpha at .90), and easily administered self-report measure of nonspecific distress. Its close to zero correlations with measures of social desirability and acquiescence indicate that these biases cannot account for the high internal consistency of this scale. In addition, it is the epidemiological tool that seems most suited for research with a general, non-psychiatric populations.

The items of the PERI scale have two fixed-alternative formats: (1) very often, fairly often, sometimes, almost never, never; and (2) very much like you, much like you, somewhat like you, very little like you, not at all like you. For the format of the PERI see Appendix A. The time reference of the symptom questions is usually the previous year. In this study, three time references were selected. First, respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they experienced each symptom during the first three months after marital separation (PERI I). Next, they were asked to indicate the extent to which they experienced

these symptoms of nonspecific distress during the first year after the separation (PERI II). And last, participants were asked to indicate whether they were experiencing any of these symptoms at the time when they were filling out the questionnaire (PERI III). These three time periods were selected as significant milestones during the process of adjustment to marital separation for the following reasons:

The first three months after marital separation were shown to be the time of greatest upheaval and disorganization in the life of a separating individual. This was both indicated in extensive research by Weiss (1975) and by comments provided for this researcher during the piloting of this questionnaire. The extent of disruption during this period was found to be a good predictor of the outcome of the adjustment process. The greater the disruption, the more difficult is the adjustment process expected to be (Waller, 1930; Goode, 1956; Blair, 1969; Weiss, 1975; O'Connor, 1976; Pais, 1978). The second time period was chosen because it marks the beginning of renewed stability. The third time period of the PERI was used as a baseline measure for control purposes. The use of current experience as measure of baseline functioning is predicated on the assumption that disruption caused by crisis is transient (Caplan, 1964; Dohrenwend, 1978).

Rotter's I-E Scale (LOC)

The most widely used tool for the assessment of locus of control (LOC) as a personality trait is Rotter's Internal-External (I-E) scale (1966). Despite some psychometric shortcomings, this scale has generated most of the important research on locus of control (Lefcourt, 1980). Early studies, mainly in achievement situations, have demonstrated that internal-external LOC can be assessed reliably with paper and pencil tests such as the Rotter's scale.

Rotter's I-E Scale consists of 29 items, of which 23 items measure locus of control, and 6 are filler items (see Appendix A). Each of the locus of control items includes two forced choices: an external and an internal choice. The individual's final score on this measure is the total number of external answers. The higher the score, the more external is the locus of control of the individual. The items deal with people's generalized beliefs about the degree to which they can influence what happens to them (Rotter, 1966). The scale, as a whole, aims at measuring internal-external control in a wide range of situations.

Relatively recent norms, including some cross-cultural ones, are available for Rotter's I-E LOC Scale (in Lefcourt's Appendix, 1976). The scale's internal

consistency ranges from .65 to .79, and test-retest reliability ranges from .49 to .83. This is a reasonably high internal consistency for an additive scale. In extensive studies, using a wide range of subjects and situations, good construct and descriminant validity were demonstrated. However, as in all personality measures, the I-E LOC Scale is subject to some measurement fluctuations due to the conditions of testing and the nature of the participants.

This scale was chosen for this study because it is the most widely used measure of LOC in research on both achievement situations and on marital dissolution.

Attribution Measure - The Causes of Marital Failure (CMF)

Although some research has been done on blame attributions in marital breakdown, no standardized tool exists for measuring this variable. A special measure was therefore developed for this study. This scale consists of a list of problems that have been cited most frequently by divorced individuals as being the causes of their marital dissolution (Goode, 1956; Levinger, 1966; Harvey, Wells, and Alvarez, 1978; Witte, 1980). A 5-point Likert-type scoring scale was used in order to indicate the extent to which each item was seen as a problem that contributed to the dissolution of the marriage. A similar scoring scale

was then used twice by subjects to demonstrate whom they blamed, themselves or their ex-spouse, for causing each problem. For the structure of the CMF see Appendix A.

Because this is a new measure, no validity or reliability scores are available for it. The merit of this tool can be found solely in its face validity and the theoretical underpinnings on which it is based.

In addition to measuring blame attributions in marital dissolution, this tool assisted in clarifying the following: 1) which problems had the greatest impact on the process of adjustment; 2) Was there a consistent pattern of blame attribution to self, spouse, or both as a function of the nature of the problem? 3) Were there any subjects at all who attributed blame to self, and if so, were these problems more likely to be ones that did not threaten self-esteem?

Initiation of Separation

Initiators and non-initiators were determined from their answers to question 13 on the questionnaire (see Appendix A). The number circled on this item indicated whether the subject perceived the self, the spouse, or both as having been responsible for making the decision to end the marriage.

C H A P T E R I V

RESULTS

SAMPLE DESCRIPTION

The subjects were 155 members from two social support organizations for separated and divorced individuals. These organizations, which are located in Northern New Jersey, were Parents Without Partners (PWP) and the National Institute for Child Custody and Divorce Awareness (NICCDA). The sample consisted of 74 women and 81 men whose ages ranged from 26-56 years with a median age of 40. Time since separation was one year for 27 participants, two years for 23, three years for 28, four years for 30, and five years for 47 respondents. The median duration of marriage was 14 years with a range of 1 - 27 years.

All subjects had at least one minor child at home at the time of their marital separation. The number of children involved in the separation, per family, ranged from 1 - 6 with a median of 2. Eighty two individuals stated that they had sole custody of their children, 49 indicated that their spouse had primary responsibility for the children, and 24 had joint custody arrangements.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS	FREQUENCY
A. Gender	
Men	81
Women	74
B. Age (by categories)	
26 - 36	39
37 - 39	33
40 - 44	44
41 - 56	39
C. Income (by categories)	
0 - 14,999	39
15,000 - 19,999	37
20,000 - 24,999	16
25,000 - 29,999	21
30,000 - above	41
D. Occupation (by categories)	
Professional/Managerial	52
Sales/Clerical	59
Craft/Service/Homemaking	27
Unemployed/Other	15
E. Education	
Grades 1-8	0
Some high school	5
High school graduate	37
Some college or technical school	49
Graduate college or tech. school	40
Graduate school	23

Table 1, Continued

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS	FREQUENCY
F. Religion	
Catholic	81
Jewish	18
Protestant	40
None	13
Other	3

All the participants were white, but from diverse religious, occupational, educational, and economic backgrounds. It is important to note, however, that the sample consisted of a disproportionately large number of Catholics. For more details of the sample characteristics, and for mean scores on all independent variables see Table 1 in the text, and Tables 19 and 20 in Appendix C.

The PWP and NICCDA sub-samples were combined to form one sample when the rate of response from NICCDA's members turned out to be very small. The two sub-samples were combined after a Chi Square test showed that they differed significantly only on 8 out of the 153 items of the questionnaire.

SCORING

Before testing of the hypotheses was undertaken, each measure of the instrument (the questionnaire) was scored and categorized in the following manner:

Demographic Information

Frequency distributions of all the demographic (Demo) variables were performed. From these distributions, for

each Demo variable, categories were developed. These were established in such a way so as to include as equal a number of subjects as was possible without distorting the data. This procedure was performed for all the Demo variables except for age of children. This variable was omitted from all further analysis because only the existence of minor children was hypothesized to influence adjustment of single divorced parents. This, however, was controlled for by limiting the sample to individuals who met this criterion. The categories of the demographic variables, and their frequencies appear in Appendix C.

These categorized Demo factors were then used as the basis for construction of contingency tables which aimed at investigating whether any of these variables had a significant effect on the PERI and LOC. Such an effect, if found but not controlled for in further analysis may have produced significant differences in adjustment that were erroneously attributed to the study's hypothesized independent variables.

Each of the categorized demographic variables was first tabulated with the PERI III categories, and then with the LOC categories. PERI III was used for these tabulations because it constituted the control measure. Different tests of significance of associations between variables were utilized depending on whether the demographics constituted nominal or ordinal categories. For summary of

Table 2

Summary of Demographic Variables by PERI III Categories

DEMO VARIABLES (by categories)	MEASURES of ASSOCIATION		DF	PROB.	N
1) Age	Kendall's Tau B	= .070	N/A	.065	155
2) Length of Marriage	Stuart's Tau C	= -.006	N/A	.070	155
3) Length of Separation	Somers's D-C-R	= .126	N/A	.060	155
4) Number of Children	Kendall's Tau B	= -.058	N/A	.070	155
5) Income	Stuart's Tau C	= .167	N/A	.070	154!
6) Occupation	Chi Square	= 6.318	9	.710	153!
7) Gender	Chi Square	= 7.175	3	.070	155
8) Religion	Chi Square	=16.025	12	.190	155
9) Education	Stuart's Tau C	= .081	N/A	.070	154!
10) Custody	Chi Square	= 5.933	6	.431	155

- Significance measured at p. < .05
- N/A = Not Applicable
! = Missing data

Table 3

Demographic Variables by Categories of Locus of Control

DEMO. VARIABLES (by categories)	MEASURE of ASSOCIATION		DF	PROB.	N
1) Age	Stuart's Tau C	= -.062	N/A	.093	146!
2) Length of Marriage	Stuart's Tau C	= .032	N/A	.092	146!
3) Length of Separation	Stuart's Tau C	= -.036	N/A	.093	146!
4) Number of Children	Stuart's Tau C	= -.030	N/A	.090	146!
5) Income	Stuart's Tau C	= -.115	N/A	.091	145!
6) Occupation	Chi Square	= 1.420	3	.700	144!
7) Gender	Chi Square	= .013	1	.910	146!
8) Religion	Chi Square	= 3.651	4	.455	146!
9) Education	Stuart's Tau C	= -.031	N/A	.092	145!
10) Custody	Chi Square	= .107	2	.950	146!

- N/A = Not Applicable
! = Missing data

the results from these statistical analyses see Table 2 and Table 3.

These contingency tables revealed that of all the Demo variables, only length of separation approached significance in its effect on adjustment scores, but not on LOC. Because adjustment is a process in which improvement occurs as a result of the mere passage of time, in all further analysis, when PERI III was the dependent measure, length of separation was controlled for.

The Psychiatric Epidemiological Research Interview (PERI)

Principal components factor analysis was performed on the PERI for the purpose of assessing its dimensions. This analysis indicated that there was only one general factor in this scale, which corresponded to what Dohrenwend et al (1980) called 'demoralization'. The existence of one general dimension indicates that this scale's internal consistency is high. Because all the items on the scale appeared to measure one construct, a total score could be computed for each subject for each of the PERI times. The underlying assumption of the PERI is that the lower the score, the more is the demoralization experienced by the individual, and hence, the worse the adjustment. The higher the score, the better the ensuing adjustment is

conceptualized to be.

The average scores for men and women on the PERI I in this investigation were then compared to similar findings by Dohrenwend et al (1979) in their study of the Three Mile Island accident. Dohrenwend et al investigated the degree of demoralization of people in the Three Mile Island area during the 1-3 months immediately following this stressful incident. They found, that for that time period, women in their sample had a mean score of 30.46, and the men an average score of 25.56 on the PERI. These scores were similar to the overall mean score of 28.3 of clients of community mental health centers in the same area, most of whom were suffering from chronic mental disorders. The mean scores of the sample from this study, in comparison, were markedly higher than these close to clinical levels of demoralization, and therefore, indicate that divorce is not quite as stressful an event as is the threat of loss of life in a nuclear disaster. As can be seen in Table 20 in Appendix C, the average scores for the men in this study are 86.85, 69.84 for the women, and 78.57 for the sample as a whole during the three months period which immediately followed the stressful event of marital separation.

While Dohrenwend et al (1979), however, used the PERI in its total scores (or average scores) form, it was necessary in this study to convert the total scores into a categorized measure so that contingency tables analysis

could be performed. Thus, a frequency distribution of the total scores on PERI III was executed. On the basis of this distribution, adjustment categories were established for each of the PERI times. These categories were formed so that they were approximately equal in number of subjects who were included in them. The categories for all the PERI times included the same individuals. The PERI adjustment categories were determined in the following manner:

	Category Number	N
If PERI total score was less than 95 than	= 1	36
If total was more than 95 but less than 108	= 2	39
If total was more than 108 but less than 118	= 3	42
If total was more than 118 then	= 4	35

The highest score subjects could obtain on the PERI was 130.

After preliminary contingency tables analysis with the three PERIs in their categorized form were performed, it became clear that the categories that were established from the PERI III scores did not overlap well with those from PERI I and PERI II. While at PERI III all the categories included about the same number of observations, at PERI I and PERI II most individuals were concentrated at the category which included the people with the lowest adjustment scores, with few others dispersed over the 3

remaining categories. The four categories of the PERI, therefore, were collapsed into two so that a clearer differentiation in adjustment outcomes could be obtained at the beginning of the adjustment process. These two categories were developed in the following manner: The PERI's first category was left intact. Adjustment categories I, II, and III were combined to form a new second category. The first category was termed "Low Adjustment"; the second was called "Hi Adjustment". In testing the hypotheses, the PERI in its two-categories form was used as the dependent measure, unless otherwise specified.

Rotter's I-E (LOC) Scale

Principal components factor analysis was performed on the Rotter's I-E scale. One general factor was found to describe the data adequately. This dimension conformed to Rotter's (1966) concept of locus of control. However, another factor loaded heavily on two items of this scale (the 6th and 21st items). These factor loadings suggested that these items had a significantly unique meaning for this study's subjects. Since items that have a special meaning for a sample cannot be used for generalization purposes, these two were deleted for all subjects before a total LOC score was computed. This resulted in an Alpha =

.89 which indicates high internal consistency.

After the 6th and 21st items were dropped from the scale, each subject's external choices were added up to form a total score. A median split was done on the frequency distribution of the total scores, resulting in the creation of the following two categories of LOC:

	Category	N
A score of 8 or below	= 1 = Internal LOC	70
Any score above a score of 8	= 2 = External LOC	85

In all statistical analyses which included LOC, this independent variable was used in its categorized form.

Causes of Marital Failure (CMF)

Factor analysis, which was performed on the CMF, revealed four distinct clusters of problems. Despite slightly incomplete overlap of clusters across the measure's three columns, the following clusters of problems were established:

I) Cluster I, the "Life-style" cluster, included problems 6 = Life-style; 7 = Values and Beliefs; 8 = Financial Problems; and 11 = Relatives. These problems seemed to have as their common

denominator issues of differing beliefs, attitudes, and life-style expectations.

II) Cluster II, the "Relatedness" cluster, was composed of items 9 = Drinking and Gambling; 10 = Sexual problems; and 12 = Lack of Intimacy. All three items share the dimension of problems within a marriage that pertain to people's inability to establish closeness and relatedness.

III) Cluster III, The "Abandonment" cluster, consisted of items 3 = Desertion; and 4 = Infidelity. Both items have as their common factor forms of "leaving" the marriage.

IV) Cluster IV, the "Personality" cluster, included items 1 = Personality, and Character; 2 = Cruelty and Abuse; and 5 = Dealing with Children. All three items pertain to modes of dealing with the world that appear to be a function of personality factors.

Within each cluster subjects' scores from the 5-point scale were then dichotomized. This was done because this was not a ratio scale for which it could be determined that an answer of (5) was truly 3 units more than an answer of (2). The scores were dichotomized in the following way: if a subject circled a (1) or a (2) on the scale, s/he was given a score of (1). When a subject circled either (3), (4), or (5), s/he was given a score of 2. These dichotomized scores were then added up to form a total

cluster score. When a subject indicated that a problem did not apply to her/his experience, s/he received a score of 0 (zero) for the blame attribution columns (column 2 and 3). In a few cases, where subjects indicated in column 1 that a particular item was not a problem in their marriage, but did attribute it to self or spouse, these scores were also converted to 0 (zero). This was based on the assumption that these scores were circled by mistake because the subject did not completely understand the way the scale worked. When a score was missing from column 1 (Extent of Problem), the whole cluster was deleted.

The clusters' scores were then used to construct a new variable, the Blame variable. For each cluster separately, four categories of Blame were determined in the following manner:

1) If the score on a cluster's second column was greater than the score on its third column = Blames Self category.
2) If the score on a cluster's second column was equal to the score on its third column = Blames Both category.
3) If the score on a cluster's second column was less than the score on its third column = Blames Spouse category.
4) If scores from both the second and third column of each cluster were equal to zero = No Blame category.

All statistical analyses in which the CMF constituted one of the independent measures utilized it in its clusters' form. When effect of blame attribution was tested, the Blame categories for each cluster separately were used as the units of analysis.

Questions 14-17 on the questionnaire (see Appendix A) were designed to obtain information on blame attributions in case the CMF did not work. Since more information could be gathered through the use of the CMF, questions 14-17 were not included in any of the statistical analyses.

Initiation of Separation

Three categories of initiation of marital separation were established from subjects' answers to question 13 on the questionnaire (see Appendix A). Subjects who circled (1) or (2) on the five-point scale were included in category I, the Non-Initiator category. These participants perceived the spouse to be the one who was completely responsible for making the decision to break the marriage. When subjects circled a score of (3) on the scale, they were included in the second category of initiation, the Both category. These subjects saw themselves and their spouse as being mutually responsible for making the decision to end the marriage. When participants circled

(4) or (5) on the scale, they fell within category III, the Initiator category. These subjects perceived themselves as having had sole responsibility for making the decision to separate.

None of the hypotheses dealt specifically with the Both category. The Both category was seen as sharing with the Initiator category the dimension of responsibility taking in making the decision to dissolve the marriage. It did not share this common factor with the Non-Initiator category, and thus, differed from it qualitatively. In all discussions of findings on Initiation of Separation, the Both category is treated as if it is a part of the Initiator category.

The following is a list of the categories which were established, and their frequency distribution:

Category			Frequency
Non-Initiator	=	I	57
Both	=	II	35
Initiator	=	III	63

There was a small percentage of missing data for each measure on the questionnaire. Where missing data were encountered, the subject's total scores were omitted when categories were established. Of all the measures, the CMF

had the largest number of missing items. 29 participants were missing at least one score. However, because the CMF included such a large number of items, these missing scores were not expected to distort findings. This relatively larger number of missing items on the CMF could be the outcome of the complexity of the measure. In addition, items may have been omitted because of their painful nature.

Testing the Hypotheses

Multiple regression analysis was considered initially to be the most appropriate procedure for testing the hypotheses. First to be tested were hypotheses 1 through 3a. The PERI total scores, rather than the PERI categories, were used for this analysis. PERI II was chosen to be the dependent factor. PERI I scores, LOC categories, Initiation of Separation categories, their interaction terms, and Length of Separation categories constituted the predictor variables. Natural log transformations of the PERI I and II scores were used, rather than the raw scores, because their distribution was slightly skewed. Separate regression equations were constructed for men and women. Although the obtained R Square was significant, only the PERI I's Beta weight

contributed significantly to this finding (see Figures 1 and 2 in Appendix C). It would appear that the immediate effect of the crisis of marital separation was so severe that it masked the effect of the other independent variables. Because the degree of disruption in functioning immediately after the separation is considered the best predictor of later adjustment, PERI I scores, however, could not be omitted from the regression equation. PERI II, rather than PERI III was used as the predicted variable because the former was a period in which best differentiation between low and high adjustors could be determined. At PERI III, almost everyone has already achieved full adjustment.

The results from this multiple regression analysis suggest that its focus on scores around the means may have masked significant effects at the tails of the sample's distribution. When contingency tables were constructed in order to test these hypotheses, it was found that differences between individuals in the HI and Low categories were indeed significant. Contingency tables analysis (cross-tabulations) was chosen as the next best procedure to multiple regression analysis for testing the hypotheses (Zeisel, 1968). Since this difficulty with utilizing multiple regression analysis was expected to occur for hypotheses 4-6, it was not performed for them.

Before the testing of the hypotheses could proceed,

Table 4

Summary of Adjustment at PERI II, Controlling for PERI I, Collapsed Over Initiation Categories

		PERI II LOW	PERI II HI	SOMERS'S D	SIG.	TOTAL N
PERI I	LOW	70 63%	41 37%	.11	.08	111 100%
	HI	2 5%	42 96%	.12	.01	44 100%

Table 5

Summary of Adjustment at PERI III, Controlling for PERI II, Collapsed Over Initiation Categories

		PERI III				
		LOW	HI	SOMERS'S D	SIG.	TOTAL N
PERI II	LOW	32 44%	40 56%	-.10	.16	72 100%
	HI	4 5%	79 95%	-.001	.50	83 100%

however, another statistical step needed to be undertaken. In this procedure the goal was to verify whether subjects continued to progress over time from less adequate levels of adjustment (as indicated by low PERI scores, or by being in the Low Adjustment category) to higher levels of adaptation (as indicated by high PERI scores, or by being in the Hi Adjustment category). If subjects did not continue to progress over time to a higher adjustment level (as measured), then, each time the PERI categories were used, the categories of a previous PERI time would have had to be controlled for. Cross-tabulations of each of the independent variables with the PERI categories, with previous PERI categories controlled for, showed that mostly all subjects have advanced to the Hi Adjustment category as time went on. Summary Tables 4 and 5, which use as an example tabulations with Initiation of Separation as the independent variable, demonstrate that only a negligible percentage of participants failed to do so. Therefore, controlling for prior PERI period categories was not deemed necessary.

While controlling for Previous PERI categories proved unnecessary, controlling for Length of Separation at PERI III remained essential. In order to simplify this analysis, new categories of the Length of Separation variable were computed. This was done in the following

manner: All individuals who have been separated for a year or less were excluded from this process of categorization. These participants were covered by the analysis which used PERI I and II as the dependent measures. Controlling for Length of Separation was necessary only for people who have been separated longer than one year. Of these subjects, those who have been separated for 2 and 3 years became a part of the first category of the new Length of Separation variable. Respondents who have been separated for 4 or 5 years composed the second category of this variable.

The following are guidelines that were utilized in the tabulations of the results from the testing of hypotheses 1-3a:

1) Most of the tables in this text are summary tables, that is, they condense information from 2 or more tables in the most succinct and clear way possible.
2) Where percent signs (%) do not appear, the numbers reported signify percentages. The numbers in parentheses represent the total N from which these percentages were computed.
3) To simplify tabulations of interactions between variables, only the figures from the "Hi Adjustment" category of the PERI times were included.
4) Whenever PERI III is the dependent measure, the two new Length of Separation categories were controlled for.
5) Only results for PERI II appear in the text proper.

Results for PERI I and PERI III appear in Appendix D, regardless of their level of significance.

6) The asymmetric Somers's D was the test of significant associations between variables.

7) The significance level for this study was set at P.< .05. Any findings that exceeded this cutoff point led to non-acceptance of the hypothesized differences.

8) Due to rounding of numbers, percentages at times add up to slightly more or less of 100%.

Hypothesis 1.

Individuals who initiate their marital separation will adjust significantly better over time than will non-initiators.

To test this hypothesis, cross-tabulations were constructed in which categories of initiation constituted the independent measure, and PERI at its three time periods was the dependent variable. Hypothesis 1. was confirmed for PERI I and PERI II, but not for PERI III. For results see Table 6 in the text, and Tables 21 and 22 in Appendix D.

The results show that the relationship of Initiation of Separation to adjustment changes over time. Initiation had

Table 6

Adjustment at PERI II, as A Function of Initiation of Separation

INITIATION CATEGORIES	LOW	HI	ROW TOTALS
NON-INITIATOR	36 63%	21 37%	57 37%
BOTH	14 40%	21 60%	35 3%
INITIATOR	22 35%	41 65%	63 41%
Column Total	72 47%	83 54%	155 100%

Somers's D = .20

Sig. at: .001

a mitigating effect on the immediate impact of marital dissolution. At PERI I, with Somers's D = .16, Initiators adjusted significantly better than did Non-Initiators (sig. at .004). This relationship held for PERI II also (Somers's D = .20, sig. at .001). While Initiators were represented in larger percentages in the Hi Adjustment category than were Non-Initiators, these differences were no longer significant at III (Somers's D = -.12, significant at .14, 2-3 years after separation, and Somers's D = .10, significant at .08, 4-5 years after separation). These findings suggest, that the impact of Initiation of Separation is greater at the beginning of the adjustment process than it is at its end.

Hypothesis 1a.

> Women who initiate their marital separation will adjust significantly better over time than will non-initiator women, and both initiators and non-initiator men.

The same contingency tables that were used for testing Hypothesis 1. were utilized here. This time, however, Gender was controlled for. The findings showed that the hypothesis could not be supported. These cross-tabulations revealed that the hypothesized

relationship between Initiation of Separation and adjustment was confirmed for the men, but not for the women of this sample. Male Initiators were represented significantly more often in the Hi Adjustment category of the PERI than did their Non-Initiator counterparts. The women, on the other hand, had difficulty achieving a high degree of adjustment regardless of the Initiation of Separation category that they were in (for results see Table 7 in text, and Tables 23 and 24 in Appendix D).

At PERI I, male Initiators adjusted significantly better than did Non-Initiators, with Somers's D = .31, significant at .0003. At PERI II Somers's D was = .40, which was significant at .0000. When Length of Separation was controlled for at PERI III, male Initiators adjusted significantly better than did male Non-Initiators. This relationship, however, only approached significance for men who have been separated 4-5 years (2-3 years after separation, Somers's D = .24, significant at .025, and at 4-5 years, Somers's D = .16, significant at .06).

For women there was no significant relationship at PERI I, PERI II, or PERI III 4-5 years after separation between Initiation of Separation and adjustment. At PERI III, 2-3 years after the separation, it was the Non-Initiator women who adjusted significantly better than did their Initiator counterparts. These latter findings, however, should be interpreted very cautiously because of the very small

Table 7

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI II, as A Function of Initiation of Separation and Gender

INITIATION CATEGORIES	MEN	WOMEN
NON-INITIATOR	34 (35)	41 (22)
BOTH	74 (19)	44 (16)
INITIATOR	89 (27)	47 (36)
Somers's D	.40	.05
Sig. at:	.0000	.32

number of women who were represented in the cells of this analysis. It appears that for women, contrary to prediction, the impact of marital dissolution is so severe that Initiation of Separation cannot help mitigate this experience for them.

Hypothesis 2.

> Maritally separated individuals who exhibit internal locus of control will adjust significantly better over time than will individuals who exhibit external locus of control, regardless of gender.

Cross-tabulations of the LOC categories with the three PERI times revealed that Internal LOC had a significant effect on adjustment only at PERI I. Thus, this hypothesis could be confirmed only when PERI I constituted the dependent measure (for results see Table 8 in text, and Tables 25 and 26 in Appendix D).

At PERI I, individuals who exhibited Internal LOC (internals) were represented significantly more often in the Hi Adjustment category than were individuals with External LOC (externals). For PERI I, Somers's D was = -.18, sig. at .005. When PERI II was the dependent measure, the effect of LOC on adjustment no longer had a significant effect (Somers's D = -.12, sig. at .073). At

Table 8

Adjustment at PERI II, as A Function of Locus of Control

LOC CATEGORIES	LOW ADJUST.	HI ADJUST.	ROW TOTAL
INTERNAL	28 40%	42 60%	70 45%
EXTERNAL	44 52%	41 48%	85 55%
Column Total	72 47%	83 54%	155 100%

Somers's D = -.12

Sig. at .07

PERI III, there were no significant differences in adjustment between internals and externals. However, at 4-5 years after the separation, the effect of LOC on adjustment began to approach significance (2-3 years after separation, Somers's D = .05, sig. at .34, and at 4-5 years, Somers's D = .13, sig. at .06. This may indicate that the effect of LOC is curvilinear in nature. With most of its impact on adjustment occurring immediately after marital separation, internality may again become an important factor as the individual returns to stabilized modes of functioning.

Hypothesis 2a.

> Maritally separated women who exhibit internal locus of control will adjust significantly better over time than will all other respondents.

When Gender was controlled for, contingency tables of the LOC categories with the three PERI times revealed that this hypothesis could not be accepted. Significant differences in degree of adjustment occurred for men only. There were no significant differences in the adjustment of women, regardless of their LOC. The differences between men with Internal and External LOC were significant only at PERI I and PERI III, 4-5 years after the separation. Thus,

Table 9

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI II, as A Function of Locus of Control and Gender

LOC	MEN	WOMEN
INTERNAL	65 (40)	53 (30)
EXTERNAL	59 (41)	39 (44)
Somers's D	-.06	-.15
Sig. at:	.28	.11

an Internal LOC has a significant impact immediately after marital separation, and toward the end of the adjustment process. For results see Table 9 in the text, and Tables 27 and 28 in Appendix D.

With PERI I as the dependent measure, men with Internal LOC adjusted significantly better than did men with External LOC (Somers's D = -.26, sig. at .009). At PERI II and PERI III, 2-3 years after marital separation, there were no significant differences in the adjustment of either men or women as a function of their LOC. At PERI III, 4-5 years after separation, internal men were represented significantly more often in the Hi Adjustment category than did their external counterparts (Somers's D = -.25, sig. at .02).

Hypothesis 3.

> Individuals who exhibit internal locus of control and who initiate their marital separation will adjust significantly better over time than will individuals who exhibit external locus of control, and who are non-initiators.

Two sets of contingency tables were constructed in order to test this hypothesis. The first set consisted of tables in which LOC was the independent measure, PERI times the

Table 10

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI II, as A Function of Locus of Control and Initiation of Separation

	INITIATION				
	NON-INIT.	BOTH	INIT.	SOMERS'S D	SIG.
LOC: INTERNAL	36 (22)	69 (13)	71 (35)	.25	.007
LOC: EXTERNAL	37 (35)	55 (22)	57 (28)	.15	.05
Somers's D	.008	-.15	-.14		
Sig. at:	.48	.20	.12		

dependent measures, and Initiation of Separation categories were controlled for. The second set consisted of tables in which Initiation of Separation categories were the independent variable, and LOC categories were controlled for. The results from these tabulations appear in summary Table 10 in the text, and Tables 29, 30, and 31 in Appendix D.

The findings show that Hypothesis 3 could not be supported. While internals, more often than externals, were represented in the Hi Adjustment category of the three PERI times, these differences were rarely significant. When they did occur, they were not in the predicted direction. At PERI I, internal Non-Initiators and external Initiators achieved a significantly higher degree of adjustment than did all other individuals (Somers's D = -.26, sig. at .005, and Somers's D = .19, sig. at .004 respectively).

At PERI II there were no significant differences in adjustment of individuals as a function of their LOC. However, there was a significant effect of Initiation of Separation on adjustment outcome. Both internals and externals who were Initiators achieved a significantly higher degree of adjustment than did Non-Initiators. For internals, Somers's D = .25 was significant at .007, and for externals, Somers's D = .15 was significant at .05.

With PERI III as the dependent measure, there were no significant differences in the adjustment of respondents regardless of their LOC, who initiated the separation, or time since separation.

Hypothesis 3a.

> Women who exhibit internal locus of control, and who initiate their marital separation will adjust significantly better over time than will all other respondents.

Cross-tabulations of the LOC categories with PERI times, in which Initiation of Separation categories and Gender were controlled for revealed that this hypothesis could not be confirmed. Contrary to prediction, the men, at each of the PERI times, were represented proportionately more often in the Hi Adjustment category than were the women. This was the case irrespective of the LOC or Initiation of Separation categories that they were in. When an interaction between LOC and Initiation of Separation did affect the adjustment of women, it did not occur in the hypothesized direction. Thus, women who exhibited Internal LOC and who were Non-Initiators, and women who had External LOC and were Initiators achieved a significantly higher degree of adjustment than did all other female respondents. For details of these results see Tables 11 and 12 in the

Table 11

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI II, as A Function of Locus of Control, Initiation of Separation, and Gender

MEN

	INITIATION				
	NON-INIT.	BOTH	INIT.	SOMERS'S D	SIG.
LOC INTERNAL	29 (17)	83 (6)	94 (17)	.51	.0000
LOC EXTERNAL	39 (18)	69 (13)	80 (10)	.30	.01
Somers's D	.09	-.14	-.14		
Sig. at:	.28	.30	.13		

Table 12

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI II, as A Function of Locus of Control, Initiation of Separation, and Gender

WOMEN

	INITIATION				
	NON-INIT.	BOTH	INIT.	SOMERS'S D	SIG.
LOC: INTERNAL	60 (5)	57 (7)	50 (18)	-.08	.33
LOC: EXTERNAL	35 (17)	33 (9)	44 (18)	.07	.30
Somers's D	-.25	-.24	-.06		
Sig. at:	.17	.18	.37		

text, and Tables 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, and 37 in Appendix D.

At PERI III, very few meaningful results could be obtained. Because of the large number of categorized variables that were being controlled for, the resulting cells in this analysis were so small that in most cases tests of significance could not be computed.

Contingency tables were also the form of statistical analysis used for testing Hypotheses 4., 5., and 6. In these tables, cluster scores and the Blame categories constituted the independent variables. Slightly different guidelines, in addition to the ones mentioned previously in the text, apply to the tabulation of results from these analyses. The following is a summary of these additional guidelines:

1) Each cluster of problems, and the Blame categories associated with it were tested and tabulated separately.
2) For Hypotheses 4., and 5., the asymmetric Somers's D was the reported test of significance.
3) For the testing of hypothesis 6., Chi Square served as the measure of significance of association, because the Blame categories are nominal and do not imply a hierarchical ranking.
4) Only significant findings were tabulated in the text and Appendix D.

Hypothesis 4.

> The lower the extent of problems attributed as the cause of marital separation, the better the adjustment of respondents over time.

This hypothesis was tested by constructing contingency tables which consisted of the clusters' scores as the independent variables, and the PERI times as the dependent measure. Results from this statistical analysis showed that the hypothesis was supported. The lower the Extent of Problems experienced, the higher the degree of adjustment achieved. These differences, however, were not always of significant magnitude. Each cluster revealed a somewhat different pattern of findings. These differing patterns of significance indicated that adjustment tended to vary with the nature of the problems which formed each cluster.

For Cluster I, the Life-style cluster, the lesser the Extent of Problems attributed as cause of marital failure, the higher the degree of adjustment achieved by respondents at PERI I (Somers's D = -.09, sig. at .05). The hypothesized effect of the Extent of Problems on adjustment closely approached significance at PERI II (Somers's D = -.09, sig. at .06). A significant effect of Cluster I on the outcome of adjustment was found at PERI III, 2-3 years after marital separation (Somers's D = -.16, sig. at .04).

Table 13

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI I, II, and III, as A Function of Cluster I Extent of Problems (Life-style Problems)

CLUSTER SCORES	PERI I	PERI II	2-3 YEARS PERI III	4-5 YEARS PERI III
4	29 (24)	58 (24)	83 (6)	92 (13)
5	47 (32)	59 (32)	80 (10)	89 (18)
6	22 (32)	53 (32)	62 (13)	50 (10)
7	24 (46)	57 (46)	71 (14)	88 (25)
8	20 (20)	30 (20)	38 (8)	80 (10)
Somers's D:	-.09	-.09	-.16	-.03
Sig. at:	.05	.06	.04	.29

At PERI III, 4-5 years after separation, these differences were no longer significant (Somers's D = -.035, sig. at .29). For results see Table 13.

Statistical analysis with Cluster II, the Relatedness cluster, demonstrated a pattern of adjustment similar to that of Cluster I. At PERI I, subjects who attributed a lesser Extent of Problems as a cause of their marital dissolution achieved a significantly higher degree of adjustment than did respondents with higher cluster scores (Somers's D = -.09, sig. at .05). With PERI II as the dependent measure, these differences were not significant (Somers's D = -.07, sig. at .13). For PERI III, 2-3 years after the separation, with a Somers's D = -.26, sig. at .005, clearly, the lesser the Extent of the Problems, the higher was the degree of adjustment achieved. At PERI III, 4-5 years after the separation, these differences were no longer significant (Somers's D = -.01, sig. at .41). See Table 14 for results.

The Extent of Problems relating to Abandonment, Cluster III problems, had a significant effect on adjustment at PERI I (Somers's D = -.18, sig. at .001), and PERI II (Somers's D = -.16, sig. at .009). At PERI III these findings were no longer significant. For PERI III, 2-3 years after separation, Somers's D was = -.001, sig. at .50, and at 4-5 years after separation, Somers's D was =

Table 14

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI I, II, and III, as A Function of Cluster II Extent of Problems (Relatedness Problems)

CLUSTER SCORES	PERI I	PERI II	2-3 YEARS PERI III	4-5 YEARS PERI III
3	38 (29)	52 (29)	91 (11)	93 (15)
4	30 (44)	64 (44)	73 (15)	78 (18)
5	29 (55)	51 (55)	59 (17)	77 (30)
6	15 (26)	42 (26)	38 (8)	92 (13)
Somers's D:	-.09	-.07	-.26	-.01
Sig. at:	.05	.13	.005	.41

Table 15

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI I, II, and III, as A Function of Cluster III Extent of Problems (Abandonment Problems)

CLUSTER SCORES	PERI I	PERI II	2-3 YEARS PERI III	4-5 YEARS PERI III
2	38 (56)	61 (56)	63 (16)	83 (35)
3	35 (49)	61 (49)	73 (15)	84 (35)
4	9 (45)	36 (45)	63 (19)	80 (20)
Somers's D:	-.18	-.16	-.001	-.02
Sig. at:	.001	.009	.50	.42

-.02, sig. at .42. For results see Table 15.

For Cluster IV, the Personality Characteristics cluster, there were no significant differences in adjustment as a function of the Extent of Problems at any of the PERI times.

Because significant sex differences were found while testing previous hypotheses, contingency tables were constructed for the clusters in which Gender was controlled for. This statistical analysis was executed even though sex differences were not initially predicted in this hypothesis. When Gender was controlled for, previous patterns of adjustment for each cluster were replicated. However, these patterns occurred as the result of significant differences in the adjustment of women but not of men. For the men, findings were significant only for Cluster III at PERI I (Somers's D = -.17, sig. at .04). The men, regardless of the Extent of Problems that they attributed as the cause of their marital dissolution, were represented in higher percentages in the Hi Adjustment category than were the women. Thus, while the Extent of Problems in Clusters I, II, and III was a better predictor of adjustment outcome for women, having had experienced a lesser degree of problems did affect the adjustment of men. The findings from this analysis of sex differences, however, should be interpreted cautiously. Significance

occurred in such small number of cases that the ability to generalize from them is limited. For significant results only see Tables 38-43 in Appendix D.

Hypothesis 5.

> Individuals with internal locus of control, who attribute a lower extent of problems as the cause of their marital separation, will adjust significantly better over time than will all other respondents.

As with Hypothesis 4., the same contingency tables were constructed, only this time LOC was controlled for. The findings from these tables proved to be rather sparse. When each cluster was examined separately, Hypothesis 5. could not be supported for Cluster I. There were no significant differences in adjustment of either internal or external individuals as a function of the Extent of Problems that they attributed as the cause of their marital dissolution. Although a pattern of lesser Extent of problems leading to a higher degree of adjustment could be seen, these differences were not significant at any of the PERI times.

In Cluster II, an interaction between Internal LOC and Extent of Problems affected adjustment significantly only at PERI III, for individuals who have been separated 2-3

years (Somers's D = -.39, sig. at .01). These results, however, pertain only to a relatively small number of the subjects, and should be interpreted with great caution.

Findings for Cluster III revealed that at PERI I, the lesser the Extent of Problems the higher the degree of adjustment achieved by both internals and externals (for internals Somers's D = -.20, sig. at .03, and for externals, Somers's D = -.13, sig. at .04). These results suggest that experiencing less of a problem in this possibly ego-devastating area (Abandonment) may have had more of an impact on adjustment outcome than did individuals' LOC. At PERI II significant findings were obtained for individuals with Internal LOC, thus lending some support to this hypothesis (Somers's D = -.18, sig. at .04). There were no significant results for PERI III.

When Cluster IV was investigated, there were no significant results at any of the PERI times. For significant results from the analysis with clusters I-III, see Tables 16 and 17. Hence, Hypothesis 5. could be supported only for two of the clusters, and even then, only at some of the PERI times.

An attempt at controlling for Gender resulted in a few significant findings. These results appear in Tables 44 - 50 in Appendix D. The findings suggest that an interaction between LOC and Extent of Problems affected adjustment significantly mostly for women. However, this interaction

Table 16

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI III, as A Function of Cluster II Extent of Problems (Relatedness Problems), Locus of Control, and Length of Separation

	2-3 YEARS		4-5 YEARS	
CLUSTER SCORES	INTERNAL	EXTERNAL	INTERNAL	EXTERNAL
3	100 (4)	86 (7)	100 (8)	86 (7)
4	83 (6)	67 (9)	88 (8)	70 (7)
5	63 (8)	56 (9)	81 (16)	71 (14)
6	0 (2)	50 (6)	100 (6)	86 (7)
Somers's D:	-.39	-.19	-.03	.004
Sig. at:	.01	.08	.35	.49

Table 17

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI I and PERI II, as A Function of Cluster III Extent of Problems (Abandonment Problems) and Locus of Control

	PERI I		PERI II	
CLUSTER SCORES	INTERNAL	EXTERNAL	INTERNAL	EXTERNAL
2	48 (31)	24 (25)	68 (31)	52 (25)
3	41 (22)	30 (27)	64 (22)	59 (27)
4	14 (14)	7 (31)	36 (14)	36 (31)
Somers's D:	-.20	-.13	-.18	-.12
Sig. at:	.03	.04	.04	.09

occurred in a direction opposite to prediction. A lesser Extent of Problems had a significant impact more on the adjustment of external Women than on that of internal ones. Only once did the interaction between Internal LOC and a lower Extent of Problems produce a significant differential adjustment outcome for men (Cluster II, PERI II).

Attempting to also control for Initiation of Separation, a variable that was shown previously to affect adjustment significantly, was unsuccessful. The cells which resulted from these tabulations were too small to allow for either meaningful interpretations to be made, or for significance tests to be performed.

Hypothesis 6.

> Individuals who exhibit internal locus of control, and who blame their spouse for the extent of problems which led to marital separation, will adjust significantly better over time than will all other respondents.

Contingency tables in which the Blame categories constituted the independent factors, PERI times the dependent measure, and LOC was controlled for were constructed for testing this hypothesis. Findings from these statistical analyses showed that the hypothesis could

not be confirmed. Although significant differences in adjustment of internals were found for one of the Clusters (Cluster I), no clear relationship between internality and a specific pattern of Blame Attribution could be established. At PERI I and PERI III, 4-5 years after separation, internals who blamed themselves or their spouse adjusted significantly better than did those who attributed mutual blame. However, there were no significant differences in degree of adjustment between internals who blamed themselves and those who blamed their spouse. For these results see Table 18. There were no significant findings for either Cluster II, III, or IV.

An attempt to control for Gender revealed similar results. Significant findings were obtained mostly for Cluster I problems. For Cluster I, at PERI I, internal men who did not blame both parties achieved a significantly higher degree of adjustment. But internals who blamed self or spouse did not appear to differ much from each other in the degree of adjustment that they achieved. This same pattern occurred for women for Cluster I and II problems at PERI III, 4-5 years after the separation. For these results see Tables 51, 52, and 53 in Appendix D. There were no significant findings for either Cluster III or IV problems. Thus, investigating sex differences did not prove to be useful in clarifying the findings from the testing of this hypothesis.

Table 18

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI I, and PERI III, 4-5 Years after Separation, as A Function of Blame Attribution for Cluster I Problems (Life-style Problems) and Locus of Control

	PERI I		PERI III	
BLAME CAT.	INTERNAL	EXTERNAL	INTERNAL	EXTERNAL
NO BLAME	75 (4)	33 (3)	100 (2)	100 (1)
BLAMES SELF	45 (20)	15 (27)	85 (13)	75 (12)
BLAMES BOTH	0 (8)	11 (19)	50 (4)	63 (8)
BLAMES SPOUSE	40 (38)	28 (36)	100 (20)	82 (17)
Chi Square:	7.63	3.21	9.75	1.51
DF:	3	3	3	3
Sig. at:	.05	.36	.02	.68

When controlling for Initiation of Separation was attempted, the contingency tables which resulted included such a few number of observations in each cell that meaningful tests of significance could not be performed.

The most interesting findings from the testing of this hypothesis could be found, however, in the patterns of blame attributions that were made for each cluster of problems. Contingency tables of the Blame categories with the three PERI times revealed the following patterns:

The spouse was most likely to be blamed for Cluster I, Cluster II, and Cluster III problems. Yet while in Cluster I and II only about half the participants blamed the spouse (74 and 64 respectively), for Cluster III, almost everyone did (141 out of 155 participants). Cluster IV was the only cluster for which a large majority of the respondents blamed themselves (116 out of 155). For these patterns see Tables 54-57 in Appendix D.

These findings indicate that it was the nature of the problems that composed the clusters that which was most likely to determine the kind of blame attribution that an individual would adopt. As problems presented less of a threat to self-esteem, the individual's willingness to take responsibility (blame) for them increased. However, that a specific pattern of attribution occurred for each cluster did not necessarily result in significant differences in

adjustment. There were no differences in these patterns of blame attributions between men and women, or between individuals with Internal versus External LOC.

Significant differences in degree of adjustment, as a function of Blame Attributions, were found mostly for Cluster I problems (Life-style). When the small category of No Blame was disregarded, blaming the spouse for these problems resulted in a higher degree of adjustment at PERI I, II, and III, 4-5 years after separation (see Table 54 in Appendix D).

Significant differences in adjustment were also found in Cluster II at PERI I. In regard to problems of Relatedness, blaming both partners appeared to result in a significantly higher degree of adjustment during the first 3 months after separation. For results see Table 55 in Appendix D.

When controlling for Gender, significant differences in adjustment as a function of Blame Attributions were found only in Cluster I. In relation to problems of Life-style, men who blamed their spouse achieved a significantly higher degree of adjustment than did men in all the other Blame categories. These findings occurred at PERI I and II only. There were no significant differences in the adjustment of women as a function of the blame attributions that they utilized. For results on Cluster I see Table 58 in Appendix D.

C H A P T E R V

DISCUSSION

Marital separation as a stressful life event causes severe disruption in individuals' modes of functioning. As a crisis it calls forth a process of reorganization of emotions, habits, and life-style. Many factors have been identified as helpful in alleviating difficulties that slow down this adjustment process. This study aimed at investigating the role of personality (locus of control), and of psycho-social (contextual) factors such as initiation of separation, blame attribution, and sex differences in enhancing beneficial adjustment outcomes for individuals who undergo the experience of marital separation and divorce. The findings indicate that some of the study's hypotheses were supported, while others were not.

SUMMARY of FINDINGS

The following is a brief summary of this study's findings:

1) Hypothesis 1. was supported. Individuals who perceive themselves as initiators adjust significantly

better than do non-initiators during the first three months, and the first year after marital separation.

2) Hypothesis 1a. could not be confirmed. Male initiators, rather than their female counterparts, adjust significantly better than do all other respondents at three months, one year, and 2-3 years after marital separation. When significant differences in the adjustment of women are found, women who do not initiate and who are separated 2-3 years are the ones who adjust better. Only a very small number of women, however, is represented in these significant findings.

3) Hypothesis 2. was confirmed only for the three months after marital separation. These findings suggest that having an internal locus of control orientation results in better adjustment only during the period which immediately follows marital dissolution.

4) Hypothesis 2a. was not supported. Having an internal locus of control orientation seems to assist men in achieving significantly better adjustment during the first three months, and 4-5 years after marital separation. There are no significant differences in the adjustment of women, regardless of their locus of control.

5) Hypothesis 3. was not confirmed. The significant findings that were obtained are contrary to what was intuitively expected. During the three months period which follows marital separation, internals who are

non-initiators and externals who initiate adjust significantly better than do all other individuals. While both internal and external initiators adjust significantly better during the first year after separation, there are no other significant adjustment differences as a function of differing locus of control orientations.

6) Hypothesis 3a. was not supported. Men who initiate, adjust significantly better than do women, regardless of the formers' locus of control orientation. When an interaction between locus of control and initiation does occur for women, it is in the opposite direction to that which was hypothesized. Women who exhibit internal locus of control and who are non-initiators, and women who have external locus of control orientation and who are initiators adjust significantly better during the first three months which follow marital separation.

7) Hypothesis 4. was supported. Although a slightly different pattern of significance was established for each cluster of problems, in general, the lesser the degree of problems experienced as the cause of marital separation, the better the adjustment. A lesser degree of problems in issues of Life-style results in better adjustment for individuals during the first three months, and 2-3 years after separation. Significant differences in adjustment, as a function of extent of problems around issues of Relatedness are also found during the first three months,

first year, and 2-3 years after separation. A lower degree of problems relating to Abandonment results in significantly better adjustment for individuals only during the first three months after marital dissolution. There are no differences in adjustment as a function of degree of problems relating to Personality issues.

8) Hypothesis 5. was confirmed only for the Relatedness cluster of problems, at 2-3 years after the separation, and for the Abandonment cluster of issues during the first year following marital dissolution.

9) Hypothesis 6. was not supported. No clear relationship could be established between individuals' internality in their locus of control and the blame attributions they made as to who was seen as responsible for causing the marriage to end.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings from this study seem to be in line with previous research which conceptualized marital separation as a stressful life event of crisis magnitude, and which necessitates readjustment. Indeed, this study reveals that the period that immediately follows marital separation (the first three months) is the period of greatest emotional upheaval, and is characterized by the greatest number of people with low adjustment scores. As Weiss (1975)

suggested, this does appear to be the period that best determines who will be the individuals that will achieve a better adjustment. Consistently, the individuals whose life was least disrupted are the ones who continue to adjust better over time.

Pais (1978) and Weiss (1975) also pointed out that the adjustment which follows marital dissolution is a process in which the mere passage of time is of importance. Thus, regardless of which independent variables are hypothesized to facilitate this process, people are expected to get better over time. That the effects of the crisis of marital separation are alleviated over time is also seen in this study from the progressive advancement that individuals make to higher levels of adjustment. Although some individuals progress at a slower pace than do others, all do move toward a better degree of adjustment over time.

These study's findings on the role that initiation of marital separation plays in alleviating its impact on the ensuing adjustment process are consistent with results from previous research. Despite the different measures that were used in assessing who is an initiator in each of the studies cited in the introduction, this study confirms that initiators adjust better than do non-initiators.

Contrary to what was hypothesized in this investigation, but in line with prior findings by other researchers, women experience much more difficulty in adjusting to marital

separation than do men. It appears that despite apparent advancements in the conditions of women, they are the ones who are affected to the greatest extent by marital dissolution. As Goode (1956), Blair (1969), Kessler (1975), Meyers (1976), and Pais (1978) pointed out, women tend to suffer more, rather than less, from undergoing marital dissolution than do men. While the findings from this study support some of the available research, they contradict findings by Bondurant (1977) and Bloom and Caldwell (1981) which suggest that men experience more stress, and are more likely to suffer from stress-related disturbances after divorce than do women. Thus, the results from this investigation do not fully clarify these prior contradictory findings.

A similar confusion results from the findings of this study in relation to the role of locus of control in facilitating adjustment. While the importance of internal locus of control for a better adjustment outcome has been emphasized by Darsa (1976), Brown (1976), Hetherington et al (1976), Doherty (1980), and Smith (1980), the role of locus of control was not established unequivocally in these studies. The results from this investigation did not assist in clarifying these findings.

The paucity of findings from the hypothesized interaction between locus of control and blame attribution,

and the fact that no researcher of marital separation has combined these two aspects before, make it impossible to compare results from this study with prior research. Hopefully, this investigation paved the way for a clearer and more detailed research on this subject in the future.

The following is a detailed discussion of the findings of this study, the reasons for why they may have occurred, and their implications for future research.

Initiation of Separation

The attempt to replicate and refine findings from prior research on the importance of initiation of marital separation as a mediating factor in adjustment has been shown to be successful. Results from this study demonstrate repeatedly that being the person who makes the decision to end the marriage does have a significant long-term effect on adjustment. The effect of initiation of separation on ensuing adjustment over a long period of time (up to five years after the separation) was also assessed. While the mere passage of time has healing effects on adjustment, having initiated the separation enhances these effects.

The impact of initiation begins immediately after marital breakdown takes place, and it continues to have this effect, and set the pace for better adjustment for

initiators throughout this process of recovery. Thus, individuals who see themselves as the initiators of their marital breakdown, from the beginning, adjust better and faster than do other individuals. The findings from this study, and from prior research, therefore, point to the importance of the role that initiation of separation plays in affecting positive adjustment outcomes.

Locus of Control

The important role that locus of control was expected to have on affecting positive adjustment outcomes was not substantiated here. In general, people who are internal in their locus of control seem to have only a slight edge on achieving better adjustment than do individuals with external locus of control orientation. This effect has statistically significant impact, however, only during the first three months which immediately follow marital dissolution. Despite the limitation in these findings, an interesting pattern of the effect that locus of control has on adjustment can be seen. The findings suggest that locus of control may be a factor that relates curvilinearly to adjustment. It seems to assist adjustment only immediately after marital separation takes place, and toward the tail-end of the adjustment process. This change in its effect on adjustment over time seems to occur even though

locus of control is considered to be a stable personality characteristic that is not usually affected by situational changes. These findings may demonstrate that marital dissolution is a crisis of such magnitude that its impact overrides the stability of the locus of control trait. As time since separation lengthens, and patterns of functioning are stabilized and reorganized, the locus of control factor seems to again function as a determinant of individuals' behavioral patterns.

The importance of having an internal locus of control in facilitation of adjustment to marital separation, however, may lie elsewhere. Its effect may only be understood as it interplays with initiation of separation in enhancing better adjustment. Thus, when viewed in conjunction, what seems to emerge is a pattern in which, as the effect of locus of control lessens, the impact of initiation of separation seems to increase. The opposite appears to occur as the adjustment process nears its end. As initiation of separation no longer seems to differentiate effectively between adjustment outcomes, locus of control begins to approach significance in its impact. Thus, it may seem that locus of control is more salient as a factor that determines who is most likely to become an initiator. However, once initiation takes place, it is this latter factor that has the most influence on the course that adjustment will take. That the effect of locus of control

begins to regain its impact toward the end of the adjustment process may be the outcome of the return to more stable modes of functioning, as the detrimental influence of marital dissolution is reduced. The interplay between personality and contextual factors suggests that the understanding of what happens after marital separation may be enhanced by taking both these aspects into account.

When the interaction between locus of control and initiation of separation, rather than the interplay between them, is examined, some surprising findings are revealed. Counter to what was intuitively hypothesized, individuals with internal locus of control orientation who do not initiate their separation, and individuals who have external locus of control who are initiators emerge as the people who adjust best in comparison with other individuals. Even though these surprising results seem to be limited to the first three months after separation, they are interesting enough to merit special discussion. The case of individuals with external locus of control orientation appears to be somewhat easier to explain. These individuals may be ones who were pushed into making the decision to separate by their spouses' procrastination and inability to act in resolving a stressful marital situation. Although these individuals may feel reluctant to end their marriages, and although they may not feel in control of the situation, once they act on this decision

they seem to benefit from its effects nonetheless.

Much more puzzling, however, is the finding that individuals who have internal locus of control and who do not initiate adjust better than their counterparts who are initiators. The explanation for this may be that for individuals who exhibit internal locus of control the claim that they were not the initiators may be a mode of ego defense mechanism. Being an initiator may entail having to face the notion that one is inflicting pain on others. In order to protect themselves from possible permanent harm to their self-image, therefore, individuals who have internal locus of control may deny their active part in making this decision. The better the distancing of the self from one's role as an initiator, the better the ensuing adjustment for these individuals. This positive effect of what might be akin to the psychological concept of denial, however, seems to have only a short-term impact on adjustment. Once stabilization begins to take place, and self-esteem and self-confidence are regained, the image of being the one who has inflicted pain may no longer have the same detrimental effect on the adjustment of individuals with internal locus of control orientation.

In view of these findings, one can speculate that these results may pertain only to specific sub-groups from among those who were the subjects of this investigation. The

findings suggest that some of the women, rather than any of the men, are the ones that seem to benefit the most from these counter-intuitive interactions between factors. While the literature is silent on this issue, and while this information did not arise in the findings, it was suggested by the pilot phase of this study. For some of the women, initiation of separation was an action they felt pushed into making by their spouses' excessive gambling and drinking habits. The decision to dissolve the marriage, often after they and their children had suffered physical and emotional abuse, could no longer be avoided. Thus, for the women in this group who exhibit external locus of control, escaping this kind of a marriage through initiating its termination may have beneficial effects on their adjustment. For the ones who have an internal locus of control orientation, denying their responsibility for inflicting pain on their dependent spouses may also enhance a positive adjustment outcome.

Sex Differences

The most striking finding of this study, however, which was repeatedly contrary to prediction, is that marital dissolution has a very severe impact on women. Regardless of their locus of control orientation, regardless of whether they initiated or not, and regardless of who blamed

whom for the marital breakdown, women consistently demonstrate low adjustment. Even when they experience a low number and magnitude of problems as the cause of their marital dissolution, they adjust at a slower pace than do the men.

It is not clear why women experience so much more difficulty than do men in recovering from the impact of marital separation and divorce. Prior research has indicated that the lower levels of income, education, and occupation of women, in comparison to men, are often the major contributors to the formers' lower adjustment rate. Such demographic differences, however, were not found in this study.

The explanation possibly lies in differing cultural attitudes regarding men and women. It may be that in our society men are not expected to show weakness or otherwise show that they are experiencing difficulties. Thus, men may be better adapted to the denial of pain and disruptive emotions than are women, and as a result are more able to cope with the effects of marital separation. While plausible, this explanation cannot be tested directly since denial was not measured in this study.

The reason for these pronounced differences between men and women may be the result, however, not only of differing cultural attitudes toward men and women, but also possibly of how these attitudes interact with the nature of PWP as

an organization. Because women are known to be more likely than men to seek social support systems after marital separation, it may be that they join PWP while still during the initial turmoil stage of adjustment. The men, on the other hand, may join only when they have already started to experience some stability in their lives. This issue can be clarified in future research.

Blame Attributions

Findings on the role of blame attributions as determinants of adjustment outcomes are limited, but are of some interest nonetheless. One important finding is that the mere perception that one experienced few problems as the cause of marital dissolution is helpful in achieving better adjustment. This seems to be the case regardless of the nature of the problems cited. Thus, for example, individuals who experience less conflict regarding habits and life-style expectations adjust better and faster than do individuals for whom these issues constituted serious problems in the marriage.

Different patterns of adjustment over time, however, are seen as being the result of the different types of problems that people see as the cause of their marital disruption. Thus, problems that deal with issues that relate to core expectations, attitudes, and difficulties in maintaining

intimate and close relationships have the longest-term detrimental effect on adjustment. When problems deal with issues that affect self-esteem, as with problems of desertion and abuse, adjustment is initially more difficult. However, once self-confidence begins to emerge, the severity of this effect is reduced. Issues that relate to more stable and constant ways of dealing with the world, as when an individual's personality characteristics are involved, have the least disruptive effect on the process of adjustment. It is not clear why personality traits did not have an effect on adjustment. Possibly this is because the individual's personality remains the same over time, and thus, its effect is in essence controlled for.

Caution, however, should be exercised in interpreting these findings even though they make good intuitive sense. While it is possible to conceptualize the four clusters of problems as falling on a dimension of increasing threat to sense of self-esteem, ranging from personality issues to problems of infidelity and desertion, the composition of each cluster may not be uniform enough to allow such generalizations. For instance, the personality cluster is more akin to a miscellaneous group of problems than to a cluster which is unified by a common factor. In it are included issues that would seem to be quite diverse, such as personality characteristics, dealing with children, and cruelty and abuse. Although it is possible to

conceptualize these as aspects of personality traits, this interpretation may be stretching reality somewhat. It appears that grouping problems together through the use of factor analysis, rather than analyzing responses to each issue separately, may have resulted in less clear and less sensitive differentiation of blame attribution patterns than was hoped for.

Despite their limitations, these results may be of importance in an indirect way. Contrary to findings by Peterson (1978), Witte (1980), and Newman and Langer (1981), that hardly anyone blames the self for marital dissolution, this investigation reveals that there are individuals who will accept self-blame. That for some issues individuals seem to be willing to attribute responsibility to themselves suggests that there is a difference in the quality and meaning of these problems. This underlying difference may be attributable to the differing degree of threat that each cluster of issues poses to individuals self-esteem, and self-image.

An alternative explanation for why self-blame is sometimes used also suggests itself. As Bulman and Wortman (1977) found, self-blame is often associated with good coping because it can enhance a sense of control and mastery over future outcomes. The condition under which this explanation applies, however, is still unclear.

By far, the most interesting findings on the role that

blame attribution plays in adjustment to separation and divorce is demonstrated in the differing patterns of blame that result as a function of the nature of the problems to which they are assigned. Blame attributions seem to change directly from self blame to blaming the spouse, as the nature of the problems appear to become more threatening to the maintenance of a positive self-image. Hence, issues that relate to lack of intimacy or to desertion and abuse are distanced the most from the self through blaming of the spouse. More neutral issues, although of core importance, as are problems of attitudes, habits, and life-style, seem to be as likely to be blamed on the spouse as on the self. When socially acceptable problems arise, as with differing personalities and modes of behavior, most individuals are likely and willing to assume full responsibility. These differences in patterns of attributions, however, do not necessarily result in different adjustment outcomes. Just because, for instance, the majority of individuals blame their spouses for desertion and abuse does not help them adjust better. The impact of these particular problems seem to be so severe initially that denial of self-blame does not reduce the harm that their existence in causing marital breakdown has on adjustment.

Contrary to what prior research has indicated, there are problems for which individuals are willing to take personal responsibility, or assign self-blame. Clearly, however,

for people to assume such blame, the issues have to be identified as being socially acceptable, and cannot pose serious threat to self-image and self-esteem.

It is surprising that one of the central predictions did not find support in this research. The expectation that individuals with internal locus of control orientation would be more disposed to blaming the spouse, and as a result would benefit in their recovery, was not borne out. Although individuals who have an internal locus of control do experience a lower magnitude of problems than do those who have external locus of control, the formers' blame patterns do not seem to differ from those of other individuals. The reason that this prediction, which accords with the psychodynamic notion of denial, was not confirmed may be directly traceable to this study's small sample size, and the nature of the measuring instrument. These design issues may be subject to further testing under different circumstances.

Failure to find support for the hypothesized beneficial effects of denial for individuals who have internal locus of control limits the ability for drawing a meaningful analogy between achievement situations and marital dissolution. This study suggests, that although comparable in some respects, marital separation is a phenomenon that is much more complex and much more difficult to investigate

than are studies of achievement which are conducted under controlled laboratory conditions.

IMPLICATIONS AND LIMITATIONS

The major purpose of this study was to investigate the effect that personality and psycho-social (contextual-situational) factors have on facilitating adjustment to separation and divorce. Although not all of the hypothesized relationships between variables could be confirmed, the main objective of this research was obtained. Taking into account both aspects of personality and of contextual factors, rather than investigating each one of these separately, helps to illuminate the factors that facilitate adjustment after marital separation takes place.

One outcome from this study, which emerged indirectly from the data, is the identification of two groups of individuals who seem to suffer the most from marital dissolution, and who may constitute risk groups. One such group was that of the women in this sample. The other was that of individuals who have experienced a large magnitude of problems as the cause of their marital breakdown. This finding has implications for preventive mental health. Further research can assist in developing measures that can define and identify these groups as closely as possible to

the time of their separation, so that social support systems could be extended to them in an effort to facilitate their adjustment. Although this study did not provide data on the usefulness of social support systems in affecting adjustment, based on theory that has shown their importance in adaptation to other stressful life events, they are expected to help reduce the impact of marital separation and divorce.

Of these two groups, which are not necessarily mutually exclusive, the plight of women members of PWP is especially poignant. They seem to be affected by the impact of marital separation to a much greater extent than do the men. Since many of the factors that were expected to reduce the effect of marital dissolution do not seem to have the anticipated facilitating impact on the adjustment of women, future research may be able to identify other variables that can lower the impact of this stressful life event for them.

A different study design than the one found in this present effort may illuminate the problems of women further. A comparison between a sample of members of PWP (male and female) and non-members could be carried out. Such a comparison can show whether adjustment is more difficult for women in general, or whether it is only exacerbated for women who are likely to become members of PWP. It may be that women who join PWP are the ones that

are more affected, for yet unknown reasons, by marital dissolution than are women who do not seek such social support systems. If this is indeed the case, services that are more suitable for their specific needs can be developed to help these women cope more successfully with this crisis.

In addition to female members of PWP and people with a large number of problems contributing to their marital dissolution, another group of participants should be mentioned here in greater detail. Analysis of sample characteristics revealed that the largest majority of the participants in this study is Catholic. It could be that, unlike Protestant and Jewish people, Catholics are represented in such large proportions in PWP because they cannot turn to their regular social support networks, such as their church, for comfort in the crisis of divorce. Thus, PWP possibly serves as a less threatening environmental support for individuals who do not have alternative available networks. Because of this particular aspect of its population, PWP may want to investigate in greater detail the special needs that these individuals with a Catholic religious background may have.

Another goal of this study was to assist PWP in aiming its services to better meet their members' needs in general. This study was helpful in identifying some groups that may need special attention. However, for a better

understanding of these issues, it may be useful to assess when individuals join this organization. This was not measured here. If individuals were found to join only after stabilization of functioning has already taken place, PWP may want to attempt to reach people at an earlier stage when they need a support system the most.

Of importance in this study was the attempt to expand the knowledge on the role that denial of responsibility through the process of blaming the spouse plays in the process of adjustment of individuals with internal locus of control orientation. The findings, however, were limited in their ability to elucidate this issue. Much can be gained from further investigation of this concept of denial with a larger and more diverse sample.

Despite its ability to clarify the role that personality and psycho-social factors have in facilitating adjustment to marital dissolution, the present study suffered from two major limitations which restrict the generalizability of its findings. The first major limitation is due to the small size and the specialized nature of the sample. This sample was composed of a self-selected group of people who are members of social support organizations for single parents. These individuals' psychological make-up and their personality characteristics may differ significantly from that of individuals who do not join such organizations. As a result, the findings from this study can be applied only

to those who join PWP and not to the population of separated and divorced people as a whole.

The second limitation of this study is due to the extensive use in it of a newly developed measuring instrument (the Causes of Marital Failure measure). This measure was not standardized or validated prior to its use in this study. In addition, because of its complexity, this measure resulted in a large number of missing data. The results from the use of this instrument had to, therefore, be interpreted with great caution, and had mainly a descriptive but not a conclusive function.

While it could not provide definitive solutions to all the questions that were raised in it, and while it could only address its findings to members of PWP and not to the population of separated and divorced individuals as a whole, this study's findings are helpful in pointing out possible approaches to understanding how post-separation adjustment is facilitated.

APPENDIX A

Consent Form

Marital Separation Questionnaire

CONSENT STATEMENT

I understand that this is a research project that aims at learning more about separated and divorced people, as a group, and about the process of divorce in general. I also understand that there will be no conclusions drawn about any individuals in this study.

My participation is completely voluntary, and I understand that my responses on the questionnaire are entirely confidential.

_____ _____

Date Signature of Participant

NO NAME PLEASE!

GENERAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Age:_____

2. Length of Marriage:_____

3. Length of time since separation or divorce:_____

4. Number of children:_____

5. Children's ages

1.	3.	5.
2.	4.	6.

6. Income:
   If Male: Compute income as what you earn minus child support and alimony (if you are paying them)
   If Female: Compute income as what you earn plus child support, alimony, and other resources.

   Yearly Income:_____

7. Occupation: _____

For the following questions, please circle the answer that best applies to you:

8. Sex:

   1. Male 2. Female

9. Race:

   1. White 2. Black 3. Hispanic 4. Other

10. Religion:

   1. Catholic 2. Jewish 3. Protestant 4. None

11. Education:

   1. Grades 1-8
   2. Some high school
   3. High school graduate
   4. Some college or technical school
   5. Graduated college or technical school
   6. Graduate school

12. Who has custody of the children?

   1. Self 2. spouse 3. Joint

13. To what extent was the initial decision to separate made by you?

Not at All		Somewhat		Totally
1	2	3	4	5

14. How much of a part did your personality characteristics and behavior have in causing your marital separation?

Little		Some		Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

15. How much of a part did your spouse's personality characteristics and behavior have in causing your marital separation?

Little		Some		Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

16. To what degree was your marital separation caused by incompatibility between you and your spouse?

Little		Some		Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

17. Of the following, what do you see as being most responsible for causing your separation and/or divorce?

1. Yourself
2. Your spouse
3. Other individuals
4. External circumstances

Please turn to next page

This part of the questionnaire aims at finding out the way in which certain important events in our society affect different people. Each item consists of a pair of alternatives lettered a or b. Please select the one statement of each pair (and only one) in which you most strongly believe by putting an X on the line next to it. Be sure to select the one statement which you actually believe to be more true rather than the one you think you should choose or the one you would like to be true. This is a measure of personal beliefs; obviously there are no right or wrong answers. Be sure to find an answer for every choice. In some instances you may discover that you believe both statements or neither one. In such cases, be sure to select the one you most strongly believe to be true.

I more strongly believe that:

18. ____a. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
____b. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.

19. ____a. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
____b. People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.

20. ____a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.
____b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.

21. ____a. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.
____b. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.

22. ____a. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
____b. Most students don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.

23. ____a. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.
____b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.

24. ____a. No matter how hard you try some people just don't like you.
____b. People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.

25. ____a. Heredity plays the major role in determining one's personality.
____b. It is one's experiences in life which determine what they're like.

26. ____a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
____b. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.

27. ____a. In the case of the well prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.
____b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.

28. ____a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
____b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.

29. ____a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
____b. The world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.

30. ____a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
____b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.

31. ____a. There are certain people who are just no good.
____b. There is some good in everybody.

32. ____a. In my case getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
____b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.

33. ____a. Who gets to be boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
____b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability; luck has little or nothing to do with it.

34. ____a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand, nor control.
____b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs people can control world events.

35. ____a. Most people can't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
____b. There really is no such thing as "luck".

36. ____a. One should always be willing to admit his mistakes.
____b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.

37. ____a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
____b. How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are.

38. ____a. In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.
____b. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.

39. ____a. With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.
____b. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.

40. ____a. Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.
____b. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.

41. ____a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.
____b. A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.

42. ____a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
____b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.

43. ____a. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
____b. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.

44. ____a. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.
____b. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.

45. ____a. What happens to me is my own doing.
____b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.

46. ____a. Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave the way they do.
____b. In the long run the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as on a local level.

Please continue on next page

CAUSES OF MARITAL FAILURE

The following is a list of problems that are most often cited by people as the causes of their marital breakdown. For each of the problems on the list, first indicate the extent to which it was a problem by circling a number from 1 to 5, where 1 means it was not a problem in your relationship. If you circle 2 or higher for any problem, next indicate the extent to which you were responsible for the problem by circling a number from 1 to 5 in the column marked "Self". Next indicate the extent to which your spouse was responsible for the problem by circling a number from 1 to 5 in the column marked "Spouse".

PROBLEMS	EXTENT OF PROBLEM					SELF					SPOUSE				
	Not At All		Some		Great Deal	Little		Some		Great Deal	Little		Some		Great Deal
1) Personality, Character	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
2) Cruelty, Abuse	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
3) Desertion	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
4) Infidelity	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
5) Dealing With Children	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
6) Lifestyle	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
7) Values and Beliefs	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
8) Financial Problems	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
9) Drinking or Gambling	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
10) Sexual Problems	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
11) Relatives	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
12) Lack of Intimacy	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

The items in this section are designed to gain an understanding of your feelings and behaviors after your marital separation took place. Whether you are already legally divorced, or only separated, please answer all the questions as you experienced them after your separation (not divorce). First, answer each question as you experienced it during the first three months after your marital separation, putting your answer in the column labeled 3 MOS.

PLEASE ANSWER ALL THE QUESTIONS, BEING CAREFUL NOT TO OMIT ANY.

Use the following code to answer the questions below:

1 = very often
2 = fairly often
3 = sometimes
4 = almost never
5 = never

		3 MOS
47.	How often did you feel that nothing was worthwhile?	_____
48.	How often did you feel that nothing turns out for you?	_____
49.	How often did you feel completely helpless?	_____
50.	How often did you feel completely hopeless?	_____
51.	How often did you feel like you were going crazy?	_____
52.	How often did you feel panicky?	_____
53.	How often did you feel that something terrible was going to happen?	_____
54.	How often did you feel confused?	_____
55.	How often did you feel you had trouble concentrating?	_____
56.	How often were you bothered by sadness or depression?	_____
57.	How often were you in low spirits?	_____
58.	How often did you feel like crying?	_____
59.	How often did you feel lonely?	_____
60.	How often did you have frightening dreams?	_____
61.	How often did you get physically sick?	_____
62.	How often did you feel anxious?	_____

1 = very often
2 = fairly often
3 = sometimes
4 = almost never
5 = never

3_MOS

63. How often did you experience restlessness? _____

64. How often did you feel abandoned? _____

65. How often were you bothered by a painful stomach? _____

66. How often did you have poor appetite? _____

67. How often did you break out in cold sweats? _____

68. How often did your hands tremble? _____

70. How often did you have headaches? _____

71. How often did you have costipation? _____

72. How often were you bothered by other kinds of physical ailments? _____

For the next question use the number 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 where:
1 = very much like you
2 = much like you
3 = somewhat like you
4 = very little like you
5 = not at all like you

73. Think of a person who worries a lot. How much like you was this person? _____

Now, please answer each question as you experienced it during the period from three months to the end of the first year after your separation. Put your answer for this time period in the column labeled YEAR.
You will undoubtedly notice that you are asked the same questions for this period as before. Please bear with us, even though it may seem to be burdensome.

Use the following code to answer the questions below:

1 = very often
2 = fairly often
3 = sometimes
4 = almost never
5 = never

		YEAR
74.	How often did you feel that nothing was worthwhile?	_____
75.	How often did you feel that nothing turns out for you?	_____
76.	How often did you feel completely helpless?	_____
77.	How often did you feel completely hopeless?	_____
78.	How often did you feel like you were going crazy?	_____
79.	How often did you feel panicky?	_____
80.	How often did you feel that something terrible was going to happen?	_____
81.	How often did you feel confused?	_____
82.	How often did you feel you had trouble concentrating?	_____
83.	How often were you bothered by sadness or depression?	_____
84.	How often were you in low spirits?	_____
85.	How often did you feel like crying?	_____
86.	How often did you feel lonely?	_____
87.	How often did you have frightening dreams?	_____
88.	How often did you get physically sick?	_____
89.	How often did you feel anxious?	_____
90.	How often did you experience restlessness?	_____

1 = very often
2 = fairly often
3 = sometimes
4 = almost never
5 = never

YEAR

91. How often did you feel abandoned? _____

92. How often were you bothered by a painful stomach? _____

93. How often did you have poor appetite? _____

94. How often did you break out in cold sweats? _____

95. How often did your hands tremble? _____

96. How often did you have headaches? _____

97. How often did you have constipation? _____

98. How often were you bothered by other kinds of physical ailments? _____

For the next question use the number 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 where:
1 = very much like you
2 = much like you
3 = somewhat like you
4 = very little like you
5 = not at all like you

99. Think of a person who worries a lot. How much like you was this person? _____

Once again you are being asked to answer the same questions, but this time, please answer them in relation to how you feel and behave now. You can see, hopefully, how important it is for us to know how you feel at this time, even though it may appear repetitious. Please put your answer in the column labeled NOW.

Use the following code to answer the questions below:

1 = very often
2 = fairly often
3 = sometimes
4 = almost never
5 = never

	NOW
100. How often do you feel that nothing is worthwhile?	____
101. How often do you feel that nothing turns out for you?	____
102. How often do you feel completely helpless?	____
103. How often do you feel completely hopeless?	____
104. How often do you feel like you are going crazy?	____
105. How often do you feel panicky?	____
106. How often do you feel that something terrible is going to happen?	____
107. How often do you feel confused?	____
108. How often do you feel you have trouble concentrating?	____
109. How often are you bothered by sadness or depression?	____
110. How often are you in low spirits?	____
111. How often do you feel like crying?	____
112. How often do you feel lonely?	____
113. How often do you have frightening dreams?	____
114. How often do you get physically sick?	____
115. How often do you feel anxious?	____
116. How often do you experience restlessness?	____
117. How often do you feel abandoned?	____

1 = very often
2 = fairly often
3 = sometimes
4 = almost never
5 = never

NOW

118. How often are you bothered by a painful stomach? ____

119. How often do you have poor appetite? ____

120. How often do you break out in cold sweats? ____

121. How often do your hands tremble? ____

122. How often do you have headaches? ____

123. How often do you have constipation? ____

124. How often are you bothered by other kinds of physical ailments? ____

For the last question use the number 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 where:
1 = very much like you
2 = much like you
3 = somewhat like you
4 = very little like you
5 = not at all like you

125. Think of a person who worries a lot. How much like you is this person? ____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

APPENDIX B

Letters Mailed to Members of NICCDA

The Graduate School and University Center
of the City University of New York
Graduate Center: 33 West 42 Street, New York, N.Y. 10036

To: All Interested Persons
From: Hadassa Filler, doctoral candidate in Social Psychology at the City University of New York.

The purpose of this memo is to invite you to participate in a new and important research study that is concerned with understanding some special factors that can assist in the adjustment of individuals who are undergoing the experience of separation and divorce. The results of this study can point the direction for the development of programs and facilities that can meet the needs, and help ease the situation for newly separated people.

This doctoral research is being conducted through the Psychology Department at the Graduate School of the City University of New York, and it has been approved by the University Human Research Committee.

In order to accomplish these objectives, I am asking the people who meet the following criteria to fill out the enclosed questionnaire:

1. You should be separated or divorced for no more than five years.
2. You should have at least one minor child.
3. You have not remarried.

The questionnaire only takes about 20-30 minutes to fill out. When you are done filling it out please mail it back to me in the enclosed stamped and addressed envelope.

I would like to assure you that all information will be held completely confidential. The questionnaires are anonymous; only a code number is assigned to them, so that your name will not be known even to me. Please sign your name only on the consent form which will be detached from the questionnaire.

Please fill out the questionnaire to the best of your ability without omitting any answers. If you are not sure about some questions, choose an answer that most closely expresses how you felt during the specific time period which is indicated at the beginning of each section of the questionnaire. I know from my own experience, as someone who has undergone separation and divorce, that talking about this past experience can be hard sometimes, yet also very useful and helpful.

I hope that you will be interested in cooperating with me on this project that is important to both you and me.

Hadassa Filler

The National Institute
for Child Custody and Divorce Awareness, inc.

5 SEWANOIS AVE., LINCOLN PARK, N.J. 07035 • 201/628-0924

Dennis Brown, Ed.M.
Executive Director

David Kochan, M.A.
Co-ordinator of Professional Services

June 29, 1982

TO: Past and Present Clients RE: Hadassa Filler's Survey Project

I wish to take this opportunity to thank those of you had responded to Ms. Filler's initial survey and to those of you who had also taken the time to meet with her. Ms. Filler is now at the concluding stages of her research and is one last time requesting those of you who meet the three criteria listed in her cover letter (enclosed) to respond. The only clarification I wish to add to the three criteria she lists are with respect to those who are separated or divorced for a period no longer than 5 years is that this may also include those who are living together without the presence of a marriage certificate and the term "minor child" refers to children under the age of 18 years old.

It is my understanding that Ms. Filler's secretary will separate the consent forms with your signature from the questionnaires in order to preserve anonymity. In all of my contacts with Ms. Filler I have found her to have the utmost professional standards and ethics. However, should this still be of concern to you, feel free to cross out the return address listed on the return envelope and forward your response to this office. We will then separate the consent forms from the surveys and mail them separately to Ms. Filler as an additional protection.

I would like to reiterate as I have in the past that these surveys are extremely important and furthers the state of knowledge with respect to the important issues surrounding the family in transition. And although these requests for your participation are kept at a minimum, I do urge you to take a few minutes to review the materials to see if you are eligible to respond, and if so, to encourage you to take the few moments necessary in order to help our understanding of the processes involved in such a crucial topic.

Thanking you in advance for your anticipated cooperation.

Very truly yours,

Dennis Brown

Dennis Brown

DB:ms

cc: Hadassa Filler

71 E. Willow Tree Rd.
Spring Valley, N.Y. 10977

September 9, 1982

Dear NICCDS Client:

About three months ago you received by mail a questionnaire aimed at investigating the adjustment process of individuals who have been undergoing the experience of separation and divorce. The packet which you received contained a letter from me, as well as a letter from Dennis Brown, a questionnaire, and a stamped and addressed envelope. I would like to take this opportunity to thank those of you who have filled out the questionnaire and mailed it to me. If you are one of these people, you need not read any further.

If however, you have not yet filled out this questionnaire, and you do meet the study's criteria, I would like to encourage you to take the time to complete it. Your help is greatly needed.

If you still have the questionnaire in your possession, please fill it out and mail it back to me as soon as you possibly can. If you no longer have it, and would like a new one, I can be reached by phone at 212/427-7794. In addition, a space is provided at the bottom of this letter, which you can cut out and mail to me, and I'll be happy to mail you a new copy of the questionnaire and a stamped envelope.

Thank you once more for your cooperation and help.

Sincerely,

Hadassa Filler

Please send me a:

___ questionnaire

___ stamped, addressed envelope

Name:_____

Address:_____
_____

The National Institute
for Child Custody and Divorce Awareness, inc.

5 SEWANOIS AVE., LINCOLN PARK, N.J. 07035 • 201/628-0924

Dennis Brown, Ed.M.
Executive Director

David Kochan, M.A.
Co-ordinator of Professional Services

September 24, 1982

TO: Past and Present Clients RE: Hadassa Filler's Survey Project

Please be advised that I wish to join with Ms. Filler's efforts in thanking those of who had responded to her questionnaire approximately three months ago. This research is very important to expanding our base of knowledge with respect to matrimonial and custody issues for which I thank you.

For those who have not yet filled out this questionnaire and meet the study's criteria, I would encourage your participation in this needed research. Therefore, if you can assist Ms. Filler's efforts either by responding to the questionnaire if it is still in your possession or to contact her (you may call collect) and request a new one, would be most appreciated.

If for some reason you wish to contact me in order to insure anonymity or some other questions about her research, I would be happy to make myself available.

Very truly yours,

Dennis Brown

Dennis Brown

DB:ms

cc: Hadassa Filler

APPENDIX C

Additional Sample Characteristics

Central Tendencies on Independent Variables

Table 19

Categories of Demographic Variables

Category #	Frequency
AGE	
Ages 26 - 36 = 1	39
Ages 37 - 39 = 2	33
Ages 40 - 44 = 3	44
Ages 45 - 56 = 4	39
LENGTH OF MARRIAGE	
Less than 5 years = 1	11
6 years - 11 years = 2	43
12 years - 16 years = 3	52
17 years - 21 years = 4	31
22 years - 27 years = 5	18
LENGTH OF SEPARATION	
One year = 1	27
Two Years = 2	23
Three years = 3	28
Four Years = 4	30
Five Years = 5	47
NUMBER OF CHILDREN	
If one child = 1	36
If two children = 2	65
If three children = 3	31
Four children or more = 4	23
INCOME	
0 - 14,999 = 1	39
15,000 - 19,999 = 2	37
20,000 - 24,999 = 3	16
25,000 - 29,999 = 4	21
30,000 - above = 5	41

One subject was missing income information.

Table 19, continued

Category #		Frequency
OCCUPATION		
Professional/Managerial	= 1	52
Sales/Clerical	= 2	59
Craft/Services/Homemaking	= 3	27
Unemployed/Other	= 4	15
Two subjects were missing occupation information		
EDUCATION		
Grade 1-8	= 1	0
Some High School	= 2	5
High School Graduate	= 3	37
Some College or Tech. School	= 4	49
Grad. of college or Tech.	= 5	40
Graduate school	= 6	23
One subject was missing information on this item.		
RELIGION		
Catholic	= 1	81
Jewish	= 2	18
Protestant	= 3	40
None	= 4	13
Other	= 5	3
SEX		
Male	= 1	81
Female	= 2	74
CUSTODY ARRANGEMENTS		
Self	= 1	82
Spouse	= 2	49
Joint	= 3	24

Table 20

Mean and Standard Deviation Scores on PERI, Locus of Control, Initiation of Separation, and CMF for Men and Women

	MEAN	SD	N
PERI I			
Men	86.85	23.07	78
Women	69.84	21.56	74
Entire Sample	78.57	23.85	152
PERI II			
Men	98.63	21.66	76
Women	87.34	20.92	73
Entire Sample	93.10	21.97	149
PERI III			
Men	109.03	16.61	80
Women	102.28	18.77	72
Entire Sample	105.83	17.93	152
Locus of Control			
Men	8.49	4.19	81
Women	9.51	4.66	74
Entire Sample	8.98	4.44	155
Initiation of Separation			
Men	2.77	1.65	81
Women	3.36	1.64	74
Entire Sample	3.05	1.66	155

Table 20, Continued

	MEAN	SD	N
Cluster I - Life-style (CMF-Column I)			
Men	6.01	1.30	80
Women	6.07	1.30	74
Entire Sample	6.04	1.30	154
Cluster II - Relatedness (CMF-Column I)			
Men	4.26	0.92	80
Women	4.78	0.98	74
Entire Sample	4.51	0.99	154
Cluster III - Abandonment (CMF-Column I)			
Men	2.78	0.81	76
Women	3.10	0.81	74
Entire Sample	2.93	0.82	150
Cluster IV - Personality (CMF-Column I)			
Men	4.62	0.94	78
Women	4.72	0.94	74
Entire Sample	4.66	0.94	152
Blamed Self for Cluster I Problems (CMF-Column II)			
Men	4.26	2.03	70
Women	4.30	2.10	63
Entire Sample	4.28	2.05	133

Table 20, Continued

	MEAN	SD	N
Blamed Self for Cluster II Problems (CMF-Column II)			
Men	2.28	1.27	58
Women	2.13	1.13	64
Entire Sample	2.20	1.20	122
Blamed Self for Cluster III Problems (CMF-Column II)			
Men	1.11	0.32	27
Women	1.16	0.37	37
Entire Sample	1.14	0.35	64
Blamed Self for Cluster IV Problems (CMF-Column II)			
Men	4.19	1.43	70
Women	4.20	1.67	50
Entire Sample	4.19	1.52	120
Blamed Spouse for Cluster I Problems (CMF-Column III)			
Men	4.50	2.04	74
Women	5.16	1.91	68
Entire Sample	4.82	2.00	142
Blamed Spouse for Cluster II Problems (CMF-Column III)			
Men	2.67	1.12	48
Women	2.92	1.09	53
Entire Sample	2.80	1.10	101

Table 20, Continued

	MEAN	SD	N
Blamed Spouse for Cluster III Problems (CMF-Column III)			
Men	3.00	1.13	31
Women	3.08	1.06	26
Entire Sample	3.06	1.09	57
Blamed Spouse for Cluster IV Problems (CMF-Column III)			
Men	2.15	0.66	72
Women	2.80	1.02	67
Entire Sample	2.47	0.91	139

Note. Missing data on CMF columns is due to:
1) The cluster of issues was not a problem for the individual.
2) The individual may have blamed the self on some problems and the spouse on others.
3) Missing information.

APPENDIX D

Figures 1 and 2

Supplementary Tables

FIGURE 1
WOMEN

**** MULTIPLE REGRESSION ****

DEPENDENT VARIABLE.. PERI2T NATURAL LOG OF PERI TIME 2

BEGINNING BLOCK NUMBER 5. METHOD: ENTER LG_SEP

VARIABLE(S) ENTERED ON STEP NUMBER 7.. LG_SEP

MULTIPLE R	0.69873
R SQUARE	0.48822
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	0.43394
STANDARD ERROR	0.20612

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE
REGRESSION	7	2.67496	0.38214
RESIDUAL	66	2.80495	0.04249

F = 8.99452 SIGNIF F = 0.0000

---------- VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION ----------

VARIABLE	B	SE B	BETA	T	SIG T
PERI1T	0.57283	0.08026	0.67013	7.137	0.0000
LOC1	-0.11146	0.10566	-0.20111	-1.055	0.2953
BOTH	-0.08226	0.08726	-0.12445	-0.943	0.3493
SELF	-0.06797	0.07136	-0.12486	-0.953	0.3443
BOTHINT	0.00108	0.14793	0.00116	0.007	0.9942
SELFINT	-0.03975	0.12550	-0.06268	-0.317	0.7524
LG_SEP	-0.00113	0.01770	-0.00623	-0.064	0.9493
(CONSTANT)	2.05286	0.35148		5.841	0.0000

FOR BLOCK NUMBER 5 ALL REQUESTED VARIABLES ENTERED.

FIGURE 2

MEN

**** MULTIPLE REGRESSION ****

DEPENDENT VARIABLE.. PERI2T NATURAL LOG OF PERI TIME 2

BEGINNING BLOCK NUMBER 6. METHOD: ENTER LG_SEP

VARIABLE(S) ENTERED ON STEP NUMBER 7.. LG_SEP

MULTIPLE R	0.72491
R SQUARE	0.52549
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	0.47999
STANDARD ERROR	0.17702

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE
REGRESSION	7	2.53328	0.36190
RESIDUAL	73	2.28753	0.03134

F = 11.54891 SIGNIF F = 0.0000

---------- VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION ----------

VARIABLE	B	SE B	BETA	T	SIG T
PERI1T	0.52246	0.07729	0.64360	6.760	0.0000
LOC1	-0.05782	0.06045	-0.11850	-0.956	0.3420
BOTH	0.00366	0.06815	0.00636	0.054	0.9573
SELF	0.02773	0.07452	0.05359	0.372	0.7109
BOTHINT	0.01909	0.10620	0.02049	0.180	0.8578
SELFINT	0.09950	0.09257	0.16609	1.075	0.2860
LG_SEP	-0.01165	0.01378	-0.06869	-0.845	0.4007
(CONSTANT)	2.28571	0.33228		6.879	0.0000

FOR BLOCK NUMBER 6 ALL REQUESTED VARIABLES ENTERED.

Table 21

Adjustment at PERI I, as A Function of Initiation of Separation

INITIATION CATEGORIES	LOW	HI	ROW TOTALS
NON-INITIATOR	48 84%	9 16%	57 37%
BOTH	24 69%	11 31%	35 23%
INITIATOR	39 62%	24 38%	63 41%
Column total	111 72%	44 28%	155 100%

Somers's D = .16

Sig. at: .004

Table 22

Adjustment at PERI III, as A Function of Initiation of Separation

INITIATION CATEGORIES	2-3 YEARS AFTER SEPARATION		4-5 YEARS AFTER SEPARATION	
	LOW	HI	LOW	HI
NON-INITIATOR	25 (16)	75 (16)	22 (32)	78 (32)
BOTH	31 (16)	69 (16)	25 (12)	75 (12)
INITIATOR	42 (19)	58 (19)	9 (33)	91 (33)
Somers's D	-.12		.10	
Sig. at:	.14		.08	

Table 23

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI I, as A Function of Initiation of Separation and Gender

INITIATION CATEGORIES	MEN	WOMEN
NON-INITIATOR	23 (35)	5 (22)
BOTH	42 (19)	19 (16)
INITIATOR	67 (27)	17 (36)
Somers's D	.315	.08
Sig. at:	.0003	.13

Table 24

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI III, as A Function of Initiation of Separation, Gender, and Length of Separation

INITIATION CATEGORIES	LENGTH OF SEPARATION 2-3 YEARS		LENGTH OF SEPARATION 4-5 YEARS	
	MEN	WOMEN	MEN	WOMEN
NON-INITIATOR	67 (12)	100 (4)	77 (17)	80 (15)
BOTH	86 (7)	56 (9)	67 (9)	100 (3)
INITIATOR	100 (9)	20 (10)	100 (14)	84 (19)
Somers's D	.24	-.48	.16	.03
Sig. at:	.025	.004	.06	.40

Table 25

Adjustment at PERI I, as A Function of Locus of Control

LOC CATEGORIES	LOW ADJUST.	HI ADJUST.	ROW TOTAL
INTERNAL	43 61%	27 39%	70 45%
EXTERNAL	68 80%	17 20%	85 55%
Column Total	111 72%	44 28%	155 100%

Somers's D -.18

Sig. at: .005

Table 26

Adjustment at PERI III, as A Function of Locus of Control and Length of Separation

LOC CATEGORIES	2-3 YEARS AFTER SEPARATION		4-5 YEARS AFTER SEPARATION	
	LOW	HI	LOW	HI
INTERNAL	6 30%	14 70%	4 10%	35 90%
EXTERNAL	11 36%	20 65%	9 24%	29 76%
Somers's D	-.05		-.13	
Sig. at:	.34		.06	

Table 27

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI I, as A Function of Locus of Control and Gender

LOC	MEN	WOMEN
INTERNAL	55 (40)	17 (30)
EXTERNAL	30 (41)	11 (44)
Somers's D	-.26	-.05
Sig. at:	.009	.26

Table 28

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI III, as A Function of Locus of Control, Gender, and Length of Separation

	2-3 YEARS AFTER SEPARATION		4-5 YEARS AFTER SEPARATION	
LOC	MEN	WOMEN	MEN	WOMEN
INTERNAL	79 (14)	50 (6)	95 (20)	84 (19)
EXTERNAL	86 (14)	47 (17)	70 (20)	83 (18)
Somers's D	.07	-.03	-.25	-.009
Sig. at:	.31	.45	.02	.47

Table 29

Percent Hi Adjsutment at PERI I, as A Function of Locus of Control and Initiation of Separation

	INITIATION				
	NON-INIT.	BOTH	INIT.	SOMERS'S D	SIG.
LOC INTERNAL	32 (22)	39 (13)	43 (35)	.08	.21
LOC EXTERNAL	6 (35)	27 (22)	32 (28)	.19	.004
Somers's D	-.26	-.11	-.11		
Sig. at:	.005	.25	.19		

Table 30

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI III, as A Function of Locus of Control, Initiation of Separation, and Length of Separation

2-3 YEARS AFTER SEPARATION

	INITIATION				
	NON-INIT.	BOTH	INIT.	SOMERS'S D	SIG.
LOC					
INTERNAL	71 (7)	67 (6)	71 (7)	.000	.50
EXTERNAL	78 (9)	70 (10)	50 (12)	-.20	.09
Somers's D	.06	.03	-.21		
Sig. at:	.40	.45	.19		

Table 31

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI III, as A Function of Locus of Control, Initiation of Separation, and Length of Separation

4-5 YEARS AFTER SEPARATION

	INITIATION				
	NON-INIT.	BOTH	INIT.	SOMERS'S D	SIG.
LOC					
INTERNAL	83 (12)	100 (4)	91 (23)	.05	.28
EXTERNAL	75 (20)	63 (8)	90 (10)	.07	.27
Somers's D	-.08	-.38	-.01		
Sig. at:	.30	.09	.45		

Table 32

Percent Hi Adjsutment at PERI I, as A Function of Locus of Control, Initiation of Separation, and Gender

MEN

	INITIATION				
	NON-INIT.	BOTH	INIT.	SOMERS'S D	SIG.
LOC INTERNAL	35 (17)	50 (6)	77 (17)	.33	.009
LOC EXTERNAL	11 (18)	39 (13)	50 (10)	.27	.01
Somers's D	-.24	-.12	-.26		
Sig. at:	.05	.32	.08		

Table 33

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI I, as A Function of Locus of Control, Initiation of Separation, and Gender

WOMEN

LOC	INITIATION				
	NON-INIT.	BOTH	INIT.	SOMERS'S D	SIG.
INTERNAL	20 (5)	29 (7)	11 (18)	-.11	.20
EXTERNAL	0 (17)	11 (9)	22 (18)	.17	.02
Somers's D	-.20	-.17	.11		
Sig. at:	.03	.20	.19		

Table 34

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI III, as A Function of Locus of Control, Initiation of Separation, Gender, and Length of Separation

MEN

2-3 YEARS AFTER SEPARATION

	INITIATION				
	NON-INIT.	BOTH	INIT.	SOMERS'S D	SIG.
LOC					
INTERNAL	67 (6)	67 (3)	100 (5)	.24	.11
EXTERNAL	67 (6)	100 (4)	100 (4)	.25	.06
Somers's D	.000	STATISTICS COULD NOT BE COMPLETED	STATISTICS COULD NOT BE COMPLETED		
Sig. at:	.50				

Table 35

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI III, as A Function of Locus of Control, Initiation of Separation, Gender, and Length of Separation

MEN

4-5 YEARS AFTER SEPARATION

LOC	INITIATION	NON-INIT.	BOTH	INIT.	SOMERS'S D	SIG.
	INTERNAL	88 (8)	100 (2)	100 (10)	.10	.12
	EXTERNAL	67 (9)	57 (7)	100 (4)	.14	.21
Somers's D		-.21	STATISTICS COULD NOT BE COMPUTED FOR BOTH AND INIT. CATEGORIES			
Sig. at:		.16				

Table 36

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI III, as A Function of Locus of Control, Initiation of Separation, Gender, and Length of Separation

WOMEN

2-3 YEARS AFTER SEPARATION

		INITIATION				
		NON-INIT.	BOTH	INIT.	SOMERS'S D	SIG.
LOC	INTERNAL	100 (1)	67 (3)	0 (2)	NO STATISTICS COMPUTED	
	EXTERNAL	100 (3)	50 (6)	25 (8)	-.43	.02

NO STATISTICS COMPUTED FOR INITIATION CATEGORIES

Table 37

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI III, as A Function of Locus of Control, Initiation of Separation, Gender, and Length of Separation

WOMEN

4-5 YEARS AFTER SEPARATION

	INITIATION				
	NON-INIT.	BOTH	INIT.	SOMERS'S D	SIG.
LOC					
INTERNAL	75 (4)	100 (2)	85 (13)	.03	.42
EXTERNAL	82 (11)	100 (1)	83 (6)	.02	.45
Somers's D	.07	STATISTICS COULD NOT BE COMPUTED	-.01		
Sig. at:	.39		.47		

Table 38

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI I, as A Function of Cluster I Extent of Problems (Life-style Problems) and Gender

	MEN	WOMEN
CLUSTER SCORES	HI ADJUST.	HI ADJUST.
4	29 (14)	30 (10)
5	80 (15)	18 (17)
6	31 (16)	13 (16)
7	35 (26)	10 (20)
8	44 (9)	0 (11)
Somers's D	-.05	-.11
Sig. at:	.26	.02

Table 39

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI II, as A Function of Cluster I Extent of Problems (Life-style Problems) and Gender

	MEN	WOMEN
CLUSTER SCORES	HI ADJUST.	HI ADJUST.
4	57 (14)	60 (10)
5	67 (15)	53 (17)
6	69 (16)	38 (16)
7	62 (26)	50 (20)
8	44 (9)	18 (11)
Somers's D	-.04	-.14
Sig. at:	.30	.05

Table 40

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI III, as A Function of Cluster I Extent of Problems (Life-style Problems), Gender, and Length of Separation

	2-3 YEARS HI ADJUST.		4-5 YEARS HI ADJUST.	
CLUSTER SCORES	MEN	WOMEN	MEN	WOMEN
4	75 (4)	100 (2)	83 (6)	100 (7)
5	100 (4)	67 (6)	91 (11)	86 (7)
6	71 (7)	50 (6)	80 (5)	20 (5)
7	100 (8)	33 (6)	77 (13)	100 (12)
8	60 (5)	0 (3)	75 (4)	83 (6)
Somers's D	-.04	-.37	-.07	.002
Sig. at:	.36	.009	.22	.50

Table 41

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI III, as A Function of Cluster II Extent of Problems (Relatedness Problems), Gender, and Length of Separation

	2-3 YEARS HI ADJUST.		4-5 YEARS HI ADJUST.	
CLUSTER SCORES	MEN	WOMEN	MEN	WOMEN
3	89 (9)	100 (2)	100 (9)	83 (6)
4	78 (9)	67 (6)	69 (13)	100 (5)
5	75 (8)	44 (9)	83 (12)	72 (18)
6	100 (2)	17 (6)	80 (5)	100 (8)
Somers's D	-.04	-.37	-.07	.03
Sig. at:	.36	.01	.25	.36

Table 42

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI I, as A Function of Cluster III Extent of Problems (Abandonment Problems) and Gender

	MEN	WOMEN
CLUSTER SCORES	HI ADJUST.	HI ADJUST.
2	49 (35)	19 (21)
3	52 (23)	19 (26)
4	17 (18)	4 (27)
Somers's D	-.17	-.11
Sig. at:	.04	.05

Table 43

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI II, as A Function of Cluster III Extent of Problems (Abandonment Problems) and Gender

	MEN	WOMEN
CLUSTER SCORES	HI ADJUST.	HI ADJUST.
2	63 (35)	57 (21)
3	65 (23)	58 (26)
4	56 (18)	22 (27)
Somers's D	-.04	-.24
Sig. at:	.35	.005

Table 44

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI I, as A Function of Cluster I Extent of Problems (Life-style Problems), Locus of Control, and Gender

	INTERNAL		EXTERNAL	
CLUSTER SCORES	MEN	WOMEN	MEN	WOMEN
4	22 (9)	29 (7)	40 (5)	33 (3)
5	91 (11)	13 (8)	50 (4)	22 (9)
6	57 (7)	0 (5)	11 (9)	18 (11)
7	56 (9)	22 (9)	24 (17)	0 (11)
8	33 (3)	0 (1)	50 (6)	0 (10)
Somers's D	.05	-.05	.02	-.16
Sig. at:	.34	.32	.42	.01

Table 45

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI II, as A Function of Cluster I Extent of Problems (Life-style Problems), Locus of Control, and Gender

	INTERNAL		EXTERNAL	
CLUSTER SCORES	MEN	WOMEN	MEN	WOMEN
4	44 (9)	71 (7)	80 (5)	33 (3)
5	73 (11)	38 (8)	50 (4)	67 (9)
6	86 (7)	40 ((5)	56 (9)	36 (11)
7	67 (9)	67 (9)	59 (17)	36 (11)
8	33 (3)	0 (1)	50 (6)	20 (10)
Somers's D	.05	-.04	.07	-.17
Sig. at:	.34	.40	.28	.05

Table 46

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI III, 2-3 Years after Separation, as A Function of Cluster I Extent of Problems (Life-style Problems), Locus of Control, and Gender

	INTERNAL		EXTERNAL	
CLUSTER SCORES	MEN	WOMEN	MEN	WOMEN
4	75 (4)	-	-	100 (2)
5	100 (3)	67 (3)	100 (1)	67 (3)
6	67 (3)	-	75 (4)	50 (6)
7	100 (2)	50 (2)	100 (6)	25 (4)
8	50 (2)	0 (1)	67 (3)	0 (2)
Somers's D	-.06	STATISTICS COULD NOT BE COMPUTED	-.04	.40
Sig. at:	.35		.40	.01

Table 47

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI I, as A Function of Cluster II Extent of Problems (Relatedness Problems), Locus of Control, and Gender

	INTERNAL		EXTERNAL	
CLUSTER SCORES	MEN	WOMEN	MEN	WOMEN
3	56 (11)	0 (3)	50 (8)	14 (7)
4	33 (12)	60 (5)	24 (17)	20 (10)
5	79 (14)	13 (16)	27 (11)	0 (14)
6	50 (2)	0 (6)	20 (5)	15 (13)
Somers's D	.15	-.18	.12	-.02
Sig. at:	.12	.05	.15	.40

Table 48

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI II, as A Function of Cluster II Extent of Problems (Relatedness Problems), Locus of Control, and Gender

	INTERNAL		EXTERNAL	
CLUSTER SCORES	MEN	WOMEN	MEN	WOMEN
3	46 (11)	67 (3)	75 (8)	29 (7)
4	58 (12)	100 (5)	53 (17)	70 (10)
5	86 (14)	44 (16)	64 (11)	14 (14)
6	50 (2)	33 (6)	40 (5)	46 (13)
Somers's D	.22	-.30	-.10	-.03
Sig. at:	.04	.02	.21	.40

Table 49

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI III, 2-3 Years after Separation, as A Function of Cluster II Extent of Problems (Relatedness Problems), Locus of Control, and Gender

	INTERNAL		EXTERNAL	
CLUSTER SCORES	MEN	WOMEN	MEN	WOMEN
3	100 (4)	-	80 (5)	100 (2)
4	80 (5)	100 (1)	75 (4)	60 (5)
5	60 (5)	67 (3)	100 (3)	33 (6)
6	-	0 (2)	100 (2)	25 (4)
Somers's D	.26	STATISTICS COULD NOT BE COMPUTED	.13	-.34
Sig. at:	.08		.20	.04

Table 50

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI II, as A Function of Cluster III Extent of Problems (Abandonment Problems), Locus of Control, and Gender

	INTERNAL		EXTERNAL	
CLUSTER SCORES	MEN	WOMEN	MEN	WOMEN
2	70 (20)	64 (11)	53 (15)	50 (10)
3	73 (11)	55 (11)	58 (12)	60 (15)
4	33 (6)	38 (8)	67 (12)	16 (19)
Somers's D	-.16	-.16	.10	-.30
Sig. at:	.13	.13	.25	.01

Table 51

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI I, as A Function of Blame Attributions for Cluster I Problems (Life-style Problems), Locus of Control, and Gender

	INTERNAL		EXTERNAL	
BLAME CAT.	MEN	WOMEN	MEN	WOMEN
NO BLAME	67 (3)	100 (1)	100 (1)	0 (2)
BLAMES SELF	54 (13)	29 (7)	25 (16)	0 (11)
BLAMES BOTH	0 (5)	0 (3)	13 (8)	9 (11)
BLAMES SPOUSE	68 (19)	11 (19)	38 (16)	20 (20)
Chi Square:	7.67	6.83	4.17	3.20
DF:	3	3	3	3
Sig. at:	.05	.08	.24	.36

Table 52

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI III, 4-5 Years after Separation, as A Function of Blame Attributions for Cluster I Problems (Life-style Problems), Locus of Control, and Gender

	INTERNAL		EXTERNAL	
BLAME CAT.	MEN	WOMEN	MEN	WOMEN
NO BLAME	100 (2)	-	-	100 (1)
BLAMES SELF	88 (8)	80 (5)	71 (7)	80 (5)
BLAMES BOTH	100 (2)	0 (2)	33 (3)	80 (5)
BLAMES SPOUSE	100 (8)	100 (12)	80 (10)	86 (7)
Chi Square:	1.58	12.98	2.40	.31
DF:	3	2	2	3
Sig. at:	.66	.002	.30	.96

Table 53

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI III, 4-5 Years after Separation, as A Function of Blame Attributions for Cluster II Problems (Relatedness Problems), Locus of Control, and Gender

	INTERNAL		EXTERNAL	
BLAME CAT.	MEN	WOMEN	MEN	WOMEN
NO BLAME	50 (2)	83 (6)	67 (3)	75 (4)
BLAMES SELF	100 (4)	100 (2)	33 (3)	100 (2)
BLAMES BOTH	100 (9)	100 (4)	71 (7)	100 (1)
BLAMES SPOUSE	100 (5)	71 (7)	86 (7)	82 (11)
Chi Square:	9.47	1.98	2.77	.82
DF:	3	3	3	3
Sig. at:	.02	.57	.43	.85

Table 54

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI I, II, and III, as A Function of Blame Attributions for Cluster I Problems (Life-style Problems)

BLAME CAT.	PERI I	PERI II	2-3 YEARS PERI III	4-5 YEARS PERI III
NO BLAME	57 (7)	57 (7)	75 (4)	100 (3)
BLAMES SELF	28 (47)	49 (47)	71 (17)	80 (25)
BLAMES BOTH	7 (27)	33 (27)	55 (11)	58 (12)
BLAMES SPOUSE	34 (74)	64 (74)	68 (19)	92 (37)
Chi Square:	9.77	7.83	.99	8.07
DF:	3	3	3	3
Sig. at:	.02	.05	.80	.04

Table 55

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI I, II, and III, as A Function of Blame Attributions for Cluster II Problems (Relatedness Problems)

BLAME CAT.	PERI	PERI II	2-3 YEARS PERI III	4-5 YEARS PERI III
NO BLAME	20 (25)	56 (25)	38 (8)	73 (15)
BLAMES SELF	28 (25)	52 (25)	63 (8)	82 (11)
BLAMES BOTH	46 (41)	66 (41)	73 (11)	91 (21)
BLAMES SPOUSE	20 (64)	45 (64)	75 (24)	83 (30)
Chi Square:	9.42	4.33	4.06	1.83
DF:	3	3	3	3
Sig.:	.02	.23	.26	.60

Table 56

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI I, II, and III, as A Function of Blame Attributions for Cluster III Problems (Abandonment Problems)

BLAME CAT.	PERI I	PERI II	2-3 YEARS PERI III	4-5 YEARS PERI III
NO BLAME	20 (5)	60 (5)	50 (1)	100 (1)
BLAMES SELF	33 (3)	33 (3)	100 (1)	100 (1)
BLAMES BOTH	33 (6)	83 (6)	100 (1)	100 (2)
BLAMES SPOUSE	28 (141)	55 (141)	66 (47)	82 (73)
Chi Square:	.28	2.78	1.26	.86
DF:	3	3	3	3
Sig. at.:	.96	.43	.74	.84

Table 57

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI I, II, and III, as A Function of Blame Attributions for Cluster IV Problems (Personality Characteristics Problems)

BLAME CAT.	PERI I	PERI II	2-3 YEARS PERI III	4-5 YEARS PERI III
NO BLAME	20 (10)	50 (10)	67 (3)	80 (5)
BLAMES SELF	28 (116)	54 (116)	65 (37)	81 (58)
BLAMES BOTH	36 (22)	50 (22)	87 (8)	90 (10)
BLAMES SPOUSE	14 (7)	57 (7)	33 (3)	100 (4)
Chi Square:	1.72	.23	3.12	1.36
DF:	3	3	3	3
Sig. at:	.63	.97	.37	.71

Table 58

Percent Hi Adjustment at PERI I and PERI II, as A Function of Blame Attributions for Cluster I Problems (Life-style Problems) and Gender

	PERI I		PERI II	
BLAME CAT.	MEN	WOMEN	MEN	WOMEN
NO BLAME	75 (4)	33 (3)	50 (4)	67 (3)
BLAMES SELF	38 (29)	11 (18)	52 (29)	44 (18)
BLAMES BOTH	8 (13)	7 (14)	31 (13)	36 (14)
BLAMES SPOUSE	54 (35)	15 (39)	83 (35)	46 (39)
Chi Square:	10.44	1.70	13.35	1.08
DF:	3	3	3	3
Sig. at:	.02	.64	.004	.78

REFERENCES

Abramson, L.Y., Garber, J., & Seligman, M.E.P. Learned helplessness in humans: An attributional analysis. In J. Garber, and M.E.P. Seligman (Eds.), HUMAN HELPLESSNESS. N.Y.: Academic Press, 1980, 3-34.

Bar-Tal, D., & Frieze, I.H. Achievement motivation for males and females as a determinant of attributions for success and failure. SEX ROLES, 1977, 3, 301-313.

Berman, W., & Turk, D. Adaptation to divorce: Problems and coping strategies. JOURNAL OF MARRIAGE AND THE FAMILY, 1981, 43, 179-189.

Blair, M. Divorcees adjustment and attitudinal changes about life. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Florida State Universiy, 1969.

Bloom, B.L., & Caldwell, R.A. Sex differences in adjustment during the process of marital separation. JOURNAL OF MARRIAGE AND THE FAMILY, 1981, 43, 693-701.

Bloom, B.L., White, S.W., & Asher, S.J. Marital disruption as a stressful life event. In G. Levinger, and O.C. Moles (Eds.), DIVORCE AND SEPARATION. N.Y.: Basic Books, 1979, 184-200.

Bohannon, P. The six stations of divorce. In P. Bohannon (Ed.), DIVORCE AND AFTER. N.Y.: Doubleday, 1970.

Bondurant, S.B. The divorce process and the stress of separation. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Cincinnati, 1977.

Brown, P. A study of women coping with divorce. In D. McGuigan (Ed.), NEW RESEARCH OF WOMEN AND SEX ROLES. Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1976, 252-261.

Brown, P., Felton, B.J., Whiteman, V., & Manela, R. Attachment and distress following marital separation. JOURNAL OF DIVORCE, 1980, 3, 303-317.

Bulman, R.J., & Wortman, C.B. Attributions of blame and coping in the "real world": Severe accident victims react to their lot. JOURNAL OF PERSONALITY AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY, 1977, 53, 351-363.

Caplan, G. PRINCIPLES OF PREVENTIVE PSYCHIATRY. N.Y.: Basic Books, 1964.

Darsa, S.D. Initiation of divorce as a function of locus of control, self-actualization, and adrogyny. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, California School of Professional Psychology, 1976.

Doherty, W.J. Divorce and belief in internal versus external control of one's life: Data from a national probability sample. JOURNAL OF DIVORCE, 1980, 3, 391-401.

Dohrenwend, B.P. et al. Report of the public health and safety task force on behavioral effects. In STAFF REPORTS TO THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON THE ACCIDENT AT THREE MILE ISLAND. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979, 257-308.

Dohrenwend, B.P., Shrout, P.E., Egri, G., & Mendelsohn, F.S. Nonspecific psychological distress and other dimensions of psychopathology. ARCHIVES OF GENERAL PSYCHIATRY, 1980, 37, 1229-1236.

Dohrenwend, B.S. Social Stress and community psychology. AMERICAN JOURNAL OF COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY, 1978, 6, 1-14.

Dohrenwend, B.S. Life events and psychopathology: A partial specification of the relationship. Paper given at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Montreal, 1980.

Filler, H. The adjustment of men and women to separation and divorce. 1981, Unpublished study.

Finkelstein, H. Fathering and marital separation (A report on research in progress). In D. McGuigan (Ed.), NEW RESEARCH ON WOMEN AND SEX ROLES. Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1976, 272-280.

Gasser, R.D., & Taylor, C.M. Role adjustment of single parent fathers with dependent children. FAMILY COORDIANTOR, 1976, 25, 397-401.

Glick, P.C., & Norton, A.J. Marital instability in America: Past, present, and future. In G. Levinger, and O.C. Moles (Eds.), DIVORCE AND SEPARATION. N.Y.: Basic Books, 1979, 6-20.

Goode, W.J. AFTER DIVORCE. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1956.

Greif, J.B. Fathers, children, and joint custody. AMERICAN JOURNAL OF ORTHOPSYCHIATRY, 1979, 49, 311-319.

Hancock, E. The dimensions of meaning and belonging in the process of divorce. AMERICAN JOURNAL OF ORTHO-PSYCHIATRY, 1980, 50, 18-27.

Harvey, J.H., Wells, G.L., & Alvarez, M.D. Attribution in the context of conflict and separation in close relationships. In J.H. Harvey, W.K. Ickes, and R.F. Kidd (Eds.), NEW DIRECTIONS IN ATTRIBUTION RESEARCH. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum, 1978, 2, 235-260.

Heider, F. THE PSYCHOLOGY OF INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS. N.Y.: Wiley, 1958.

Hetherington, E.M., Cox, M., & Cox, R. Divorced Fathers FAMILY COORDINATOR, 1976, 25, 417-428.

Hill, C.T., Rubin, Z., & Peplau, L. Breakups before marriage and the end of 103 affairs. JOURNAL OF SOCIAL ISSUES, 1976, 32, 147-168.

Hochreich, D.J. Defensive externality and blame projection following failure. JOURNAL OF PERSONALITY AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY, 1975, 32, 540-546.

Holmes, T.H., & Masuda, M. Life changes and illness susceptibility. In B.S. Dohrenwend, and B.P. Dohrenwend (Eds.), STRESSFUL LIFE EVENTS: THEIR NATURE AND EFFECTS. N.Y.: Wiley, 1974.

Ickes, W., & Layden, M.A. Attributional styles. In J.H. Harvey, W.K. Ickes, & R.K. Kidd (Eds.), NEW DIRECTIONS IN ATTRIBUTION RESEARCH, Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum, 1978, 2, 119-152

Jones, E.E., Nisbett, R.E. The actor and the observer: Divergent perceptions of the causes of behavior. In G.E. Jones, D.E. Kanouse, H.H. Kelley, R.E. Nisbett, S. Valins, & B. Weiner (Eds.), ATTRIBUTION: PERCEIVING THE CAUSES OF BEHAVIOR. Morristown, N.J.: General Learning Press, 1972, 79-94.

Jones, G.E., Kanouse, D.E., Kelley, H.H., Nisbett, R.E., Valins, S., & Weiner, B. ATTRIBUTION: PERCEIVING THE CAUSES OF BEHAVIOR. Morristown, N.J.: General Learning Press, 1972.

Kelley, H.H. Causal schemata and the attribution process. Ibid, 151-174.

Kessler, S. THE AMERICAN WAY OF DIVORCE. Chicago: Nelson Hall, 1975.

Kobasa, S.C. Stressful life events, personality, and health: An inquiry into hardiness. JOURNAL OF PERSONALITY AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY, 1979, 37, 1-11.

Langer, E.J. The illusion of control. JOURNAL OF PERSONALITY AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY, 1975, 32, 311-328.

Lefcourt, H.M. LOCUS OF CONTROL. N.Y.: Halsted Press, 1976.

Lefcourt, H.M. Locus of control and coping with life events. In F. Staub (Ed.), PERSONALITY. Engelwood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1980, 200-235.

Levinger, G. Sources of marital dissatisfaction among applicants for divorce. AMERICAN JOURNAL OF ORTHOPSYCHIATRY, 1966, 36, 803-807.

Levinger, G., A social psychological perspective on marital dissolution. In G. Levinger, & O.C. Moles (Eds.), DIVORCE AND SEPARATION. N.Y.: Basic Books, 1979, 37-61.

Meyers, J.C. The adjustment of women to marital separation: The effects of sex-role identification and of stage in family life as determined by age, and presence or absence of dependent children. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Colorado, Boulder, 1976.

Miller, S.M. Why having control reduces stress: If I can stop the roller coaster, I don't want to get off. In J. Garber, & M.E.P. Seligman (Eds.), HUMAN HELPLESSNESS. N.Y.: Academic Press, 1980, 71-95.

Newman, H.M., Langer, E.J. Post-divorce adaptaion and the attribution of responsibility. SEX ROLES, 1981, 7, 223-232.

Nisbett, R.E., & Valins, S. Perceiving the causes of one's own behavior. In G.E. Jones, D.E. Kanouse, H.H. Kelley, R.E. Nisbett, S. Valins, & B. Weiner (Eds.), ATTRIBUTION: PERCEIVING THE CAUSES OF BEHAVIOR. Morristown, N.J.: General Learning Press, 1972, 63-78.

O'Connor, N.D.V. An exploration of the effects of anticipatory grief versus acute grief on recovery after loss of spouse among divorced and separated women. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oregon, 1976.

Pais, J.S. Social psychological predictors of adjustment for divorced mothers. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oregon, 1978.

Peterson, L.C. Guilt, attribution of responsibility, and resolution of the divorce crisis. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1978.

Raschke, H.J. Social and psychological factors in voluntary postmarital dissolution adjustment. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1974.

Rose, V.L., & Price-Bonhan, S. Divorce and adjustment: A woman's problem? FAMILY COORDIANTOR, 1973, 22, 291-297.

Rotter, J.B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. PSYCHOLOGICAL MONOGRAPHS, 1966, 80, 1-26 (Whole No. 609).

Rotter, J.B. Some problems and misconceptions related to the construct of internal versus external control of reinforcement. JOURNAL OF CLINICAL AND CONSULTING PSYCHOLOGY, 1975, 43, 56-67.

Simon, J.G., & Feather, N.T. Causal attributions for success and failure at university examinations. JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY, 1973, 64, 46-56.

Smith, H.V.H. Explaining divorce stress and adjustment patterns: Locus of control, demographic data, and time effects. A path analytic approach. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, New School for Social Research, 1980.

Spanier, G.B., & Casto, R.F. Adjustment to separation and divorce: A qualitative analysis. In G. Levinger, and O.C. Moles (Eds.), DIVORCE AND SEPARATION, N.Y.: Basic Books, 1979, 211-228.

Taylor, S.E. Adjustment to threatening events: A theory of cognitive adaptation. AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGIST, 1983, 38, 1161-1173.

Waller, W. THE OLD LOVE AND THE NEW. N.Y.: Horace Liveright, 1930.

Weiner, B. Achievement motivation as conceptualized by an attribution theorist. In B. Weiner (Ed.), ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION AND ATTRIBUTION THEORY. Morristown, N.J.: General Learning Press, 1974, 3-47.

Weiner, B., & Litman-Adizes, T. An attributional, expectancy-value analysis of learned helplessness and depression. In J. Garber, and M.E.P. Seligman (Eds.), HUMAN HELPLESSNESS. N.Y.: Academic Press, 1980, 35-57.

Weiss, R.S. MARITAL SEPARATION. N.Y.: Basic Books, 1975.

Witte, S.S. Attributional style and associated affect and expectancy among separated or divorced women. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, New York University, 1980.

Unger, R. FEMALE AND MALE. N.Y.: Harper & Row, 1979.

U.S. National Center for Health Statistics: Monthly Vital Statistics Report. Washington D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983, 32 (6).

Zeisel, H. SAY IT WITH FIGURES. N.Y.: Harper & Row, 1968, Fifth Edition.