5-1998

An Assessment of the Concurrent Validity of the Family Profile II

Denim L. Slade
Utah State University

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE CONCURRENT VALIDITY OF THE FAMILY PROFILE II

by

Denim L. Slade

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Family and Human Development

ABSTRACT

An Assessment of the Concurrent Validity

of the Family Profile II

by

Denim L. Slade, Master of Science

Utah State University, 1998

Major Professor: Dr. Thomas R. Lee
Department: Family and Human Development

This study was designed to assess the concurrent validity of the Family Profile II (FPII). The FPII is an instrument designed to measure 13 areas of family functioning. Matches for 11 of the 13 subscales of the FPII were identified from the literature. These comparison subscales were used to confirm the concurrent validity of the FPII. The sample consisted of 229 undergraduate students enrolled in summer classes at Utah State University. The factor structure of the FPII was also assessed. Four of the 13 subscales factored exactly as previously reported. Five factored with only minimal differences. The remaining four subscales were substantially different. All of the correlations between the FPII subscales and the comparison subscales were statistically significant. Five of the pairs shared 42% or more of their variance. Results indicate that the FPII has promise as an easy-to-score-and-interpret measure of the 13 aspects of family functioning it assesses.

(119 pages)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would first like to acknowledge and thank Dr. Thomas R. Lee, whose help and support were above and beyond that which was required or expected. His help was invaluable throughout the course of this project. Dr. Scot Allgood's help and suggestions, as well as his tempering effect, proved very valuable on my committee. I would also like to acknowledge Dr. Thorana S. Nelson, who pushed me to explore the intricacies of this study and hence to learn the utmost from the process.

I would like to extend special thanks to Dr. Matthew J. Taylor, Dr. James Akers, Dr. Randall M. Jones, Dr. Xitao Fan, and Lila Geddes, who served as statistical, research, and format consultants. The help I received from these individuals was extremely valuable in my being able to finish this project.

Finally and most importantly, I would like to express my deepest gratitude for the help and patience of my wife, Ellen Slade, and daughter, Rachel Slade, whose names belong on the front of this thesis.

Denim L. Slade

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Problem Statement

Much attention has been given to the characteristics or qualities that make it possible for some families to flourish and deal with life's transitions and challenges (Curran, 1983; McCubbin & Thompson, 1987; Stinnet & DeFrain, 1985). McCubbin and Thompson (1987) reported that this emphasis on family strengths falls into the mainstream of research attempting to identify the qualities of healthy families that "foster(s) their continuity or stability in the face of a host of normal and demanding changes and adversities which seem to impact on families" (p. 7). The family strengths literature reports a number of characteristics that healthy families have been found to possess, including such things as communicating well, teaching respect for one another, and having a shared religious core (Curran, 1983; Stinnet & Defrain, 1985).

Gottman (1994), from the University of Washington, has done extensive research on marital success and failure. He reported that couples who succeed share a ratio of five positive interactions to every one negative interchange. Taken in conjunction with the family strengths literature, Gottman's findings are very important. If a family can identify the strengths it currently possesses and can then increase the occurrence of those strengths, it may be assumed that the family may increase its likelihood of succeeding and become better able to deal with life's transitions and challenges.

The field of marriage and family therapy has also begun to recognize more and more the importance of capitalizing on existing strengths of clients (Berg & Miller, 1992;

de Shazer, 1994; Walter & Peller, 1992). de Shazer (1994) pointed out that in the beginning, the family therapy movement was made up of individuals who saw "a troubled family telling their troubling story to a therapist" (p. xv). Family therapists, however, began looking for "the difference that makes a difference" (Weiner-Davis, de Shazer, & Gingerich, 1987), a change or point of leverage that will set in motion behaviors with which the family will be content. Furthermore, therapists have started looking for that difference already in place in individuals and families, the strengths or exceptions to their difficulties they already possess (de Shazer, 1994). It is important to identify this difference because once change begins to occur, it builds upon itself and small changes can lead to larger, more significant changes (Walter & Peller, 1992). By using successes, abilities, and resources already in place in the lives of clients, the family can quickly gain confidence (Berg & Miller, 1992). Increased confidence can then lead to more of the difference that makes a difference and the momentum of positive success begins to build in clients' lives (Weiner-Davis et al., 1987).

However, crucial to all of these reported findings is that families need to increase both the awareness and occurrence of their strengths. Since the middle of the 1980s, efforts have arisen to create assessment instruments that measure a family's strengths and resources (McCubbin & Thompson, 1987).

Assessment Measures

There are close to 1,000 instruments for family assessment in the Handbook of Family Measurement Techniques (Touliatos, Perlmutter, & Straus, 1990). Bray (1995) reported, however, that few instruments have been developed to explore a broad-based

range of family functioning. The Family Profile II (FPII; Lee et al., 1997), however, has been developed to cover a wide range of family functioning, as well as to tap into the client's perception of where their family currently is on a number of constructs.

The FPII is comprised of 13 subscales (Lee et al., 1997). The constructs assessed by the FPII are (a) kindness, (b) unkindness, (c) communication, (d) disengaged, (e) enmeshed, (f) bridging, (g) financial management, (h) self-reliance, (i) work orientation, (j) daily chores/tasks (k) sacred/secular orientation, (l) rituals, and (m) quality of the family relationships (Lee et al., 1997).

The FPII has been found to statistically significantly predict family relationship quality, school performance, substance abuse, and family conflict (Lee et al., 1997). The FPII gives families the ability to graph their responses, which provides immediate feedback on relationship strengths and the areas in which they may wish to improve. In addition, the FPII provides practitioners with an easily scored and interpreted measure. However, the FPII is still young in its development and in order for it to be useful as a valid instrument, the validity of the instrument needs to be further established.

Conceptual Framework

This project is based on family systems concepts (Guttman, 1991). Although not theoretically driven, the concepts therein stem from the family systems framework.

Central to the family systems framework and this project is the concept of circular causality. This is the idea that by changing any part or element of a system, information is introduced into the system, to which the system must respond in some way. If the information leads to a modification in the system, the information is said to

have come in the form of positive feedback (Guttman, 1991). This change then reciprocally impacts all elements of the system (Schilson, 1991). This is a crucial concept in this study. It is assumed that by using the FPII, families will be better able to identify strengths and make the changes they desire. It is hypothesized that the Family Profile II will provide information that families and therapists can use to begin helping families make desired changes.

Falloon (1991) stated that building on the strengths already present in families will create easier and longer lasting changes in families. The FPII was developed from the literature on family strengths (Lee et al., 1997) and is designed to help families identify and amplify what is already going well. Using an earlier version of the Family Profile, Lee and Goddard (1989) found that there are many constellations of healthy, well functioning families, and what appears to be key is building on the positive traits they already possess.

Walter and Peller (1992) argued that change is inevitable. They further related that by merely identifying what is going well within families, desired change will begin to occur in the desired direction. As one member of a family makes changes and behaves more the way he/she would like to, the entire system experiences the changes and is affected.

Rationale/ Purpose

In a broad sense, the rationale for this study stems from the need for an effective, broad-based, easily scored and interpreted family assessment measure that can be used by families and practitioners to assess strengths and provide information that may be used to

increase both the awareness and occurrence of strengths currently possessed by a family. The preliminary studies on the Family Profile (Randall, 1995) and the Family Profile II (Harker, 1997) suggest that it is an instrument that accomplishes these goals. The FPII has good internal consistency, and strong content and construct validity reported in the four studies conducted thus far on the instrument's development (Beutler et al., 1996; Burr et al., in preparation; Harker, 1997; Lee et al., 1997). However, the concurrent validity of the FPII has only been assessed with outcome variables and not with external criteria designed to measure constructs similar to those assessed by the FPII (Lee et al., 1997). It cannot be assumed that the FPII is validly measuring the family strengths it purports to measure.

The FPII was developed on a 7-point Likert-type scale. However, Cox (1980) suggested that a 5-point scale is adequate for subject-centered measures like the FPII Therfore, the FPII was changed to a 5-point scale for this study. This study is interested in the differences, if any, between the FPII on a 5-point scale and the previous 7-point scale. The purpose of this project, therefore, is to assess the concurrent validity of the Family Profile II and to attempt to replicate the factor structure of the FPII with a revised 5-point response scale. Various subscales from previously established family assessment instruments designed to measure like constructs were used to determine the validity of the subscales of the FPII.

Objectives

The need for an effective measure to capture family strengths is clear. To help families make changes and reach the goals they desire to obtain, a measure shown to

identify family strengths would be very helpful. Noting this need, this project has the following two objectives:

1. To attempt to replicate the factor structure found in previous studies on a 7-point Likert-type scale with the revised 5-point Likert-type scale.

2. To evaluate the concurrent validity of the FPII by comparing the subscale scores of the FPII with the subscales of the other measures used.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

In developing a new instrument, the measure should pass through a process of establishing the instrument as reliable and valid (Anastasi, 1988). Although both reliability and validity are important, the main purpose of this project is to further examine the validity of the Family Profile II (FPII; Lee et al., 1997); therefore, the literature reviewed in this section is confined to examining validity. To present the rationale for this study in a logical manner, the development of the FPII is first presented, including the theoretical rationale from which the FPII emerged, the validity of the FPII, and why this project is the next logical step the FPII's development. A brief discussion on validity in general follows. Finally, the subscales that will be used in this project will be reviewed and the applicability of the project to marriage and family therapy will be presented.

Development of the FPII

In this section, the development of the FPII will be presented. In 1989, the Family Profile (Lee & Goddard, 1989) was developed to assess seven constructs of family functioning. In accordance with suggestions from the literature on instrument development (Anastasi, 1988), the original constructs were identified from the literature on family strengths. These constructs were (a) family communication, (b) family fun, (c) family decisions, (d) family pride, (e) family values, (f) family caring, and (g) family confidence. From the beginning, family members scored and plotted their results on a

graph that provided a visual representation of the family's strengths. In this manner the Profile is easily interpreted (Lee et al., 1997). Lee et al. reported that the Profile had been successfully used in conjunction with its accompanying educational materials in several states in the U.S. and in Montreal, Quebec, Canada in family life education and enrichment classes. In 1995, in a project similar to the current one, the concurrent validity of the original Family Profile was assessed by comparing it to three other measures to investigate its accuracy in tapping the dimensions it was created to assess from the literature (Randall, 1995). The measures Randall used were: (a) the Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scale II (FACES II; Olson, Bell, & Portner, 1982); (b) the Family Assessment Device (FAD; Epstein, Baldwin, & Bishop, 1983); and (c) the Beavers Self-Report Family Inventory (SFI; Beavers, Hampson, & Hulgus, 1985). The correlation between the respondents' overall scores on the Family Profile and FACES II was .84; with the FAD, the correlation was .61; and with the SFI, the correlation was .70. The instrument has undergone many revisions since Randall's study, and it is thus necessary to assess the concurrent validity of the FPII in its current form.

Lee et al. (1997) reported that in 1995 and 1996 an effort to further delineate the relationships among the dimensions assessed by the Family Profile was undertaken, and it underwent extensive testing with larger regional and national samples. Through this process, the Family Profile was revised extensively. The seven original subscales were revised or dropped and other scales that tapped additional dimensions of family functioning were added in order to measure more aspects of family functioning. The Family Profile essentially returned to the first step in instrument development, that of content validation based on psychological theory, prior research, or systematic

observation and analyses of the relevant behavior domains (Anastasi, 1988), and a revised instrument emerged. A review of the literature on family functioning from which the FPII was developed follows.

Theoretical Rationale

In this section the constructs on family functioning identified in the literature that led to the development of the FPII are presented. The corresponding subscales on the FPII intended to assess each construct are also presented.

Unkindness

Unkindness has been defined as "family members doing unkind things with a selfish disregard for others" (Belliston, 1998, p. 10). Burr et al. (in preparation) related unkindness as being evident in family members' relating to each other in mean, abusive, cruel, and demeaning ways. Terms such as conflict and family discord have been reported as tapping similar constructs in the literature (Belliston, 1998). Unkindness is defined on the FPII as "the extent to which family members engage in unkind, cruel acts that reflect selfish disregard for others in the family" (Lee et al., 1997, p. 468).

Burr et al. (in preparation) found kindness and unkindness to be the most salient predictors of family quality in their study. Of particular interest is the finding that families in the lowest level of unkindness (they had little unkindness) had an 87% chance of being above average in family quality. On the other hand, those scoring in the highest level of unkindness only had a 5% chance of being even average in family quality.

In the development of this instrument, it was originally thought that kindness and unkindness were merely opposite ends of the same continuum (Burr et al., in preparation). However, through various studies, the two concepts have consistently factored into separate constructs (Beutler, Lee, Burr, Olsen, & Yorgason, 1996). The two factors have been highly correlated, usually with a Pearson r of about -.7 (Burr et al.). These correlations suggest that families who have high kindness most often have low unkindness (divergent validity), but some families have been found to have high or low levels on both dimensions.

Family Strengths

An area of research that has tried to tap into the constructs of what is going well for families is the literature on the traits of healthy families. Krysan, Moore, and Zill (1990) from the Child Trends Inc. were funded by the office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation for the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to provide an overview of the constructs found in healthy families. The group identified nine traits or constructs that seemed to be prevalent throughout the research on healthy families. Curran (1983) has identified 15 characteristics of healthy families in her book, Traits of Healthy Families. Stinnet and DeFrain (1985) have also done extensive research on family strengths and identified similar constructs as those identified by Curran (1983). Furthermore, there has been a recent effort to look at the role that kindness plays in strong families (strong families are those families who possess the characteristics identified below; Burr et al., in preparation). A synthesis of the research on the characteristics found in healthy families will be presented in this section.

Kindness. After reviewing the literature on kindness, Belliston (1998) defined the concept of kindness as "family members' acts that reflect an unselfish regard for others" (p. 9). Kindness is a rather new construct to the literature on family strengths. Burr et al. (in preparation) are in the process of developing a theory on the relevance and importance of family kindness and unkindness on family functioning. They have asserted that kindness is a way of being and that it deals with the "amount family members relate to each other in respectful, caring, kind, gentle, understanding and compassionate ways" (p. 1). Burr et al. (in preparation) related that there are many other terms such as loving, caring, nurturing, support, and warmth that have been used in the literature as a way of describing similar concepts. They stated, however, that none of the previous terms encompasses what kindness is and does within a family. Lee et al. (1997) have defined kindness in the FPII as "the extent to which family members engage in kind, loving acts that reflect unselfish regard for others" (p. 468).

Communication. Good communication has been defined as that which is honest and open, clear and concise (Epstein et al., 1983; Stinnet & DeFrain, 1985). Another communication trait found in healthy families is that members listen to each other and are able to discuss both positive and negative feelings (Epstein et al., 1983; Krysan et al., 1990). Curran (1983) stated that most people react rather than respond. Reacting is the process of projecting one's own thoughts and feelings onto what is heard. Responding, on the other hand, is getting into the other person's feelings and being empathic. Curran went on to report that families who communicate effectively also recognize nonverbal messages, encourage individual feelings and independent thinking, and recognize put-downs. Communication has been defined on the FPII as Communication Ability: "the

extent to which family members have the capacity (ability or skill) to express themselves and understand others. This is not the amount of communication. It is the capacity to communicate effectively" (Lee et al., 1997, p. 468).

Encouragement of individuals. Healthy families are able to maintain a balance between encouraging individuation from the family and maintaining family ties (Damon, 1983). Krysan et al. (1990) reported that in healthy families the individuals within the family are supported to contribute and to construct a sense of uniqueness. Furthermore, family members are interested in and value each others' activities and concerns (Epstein et al., 1983). Curran (1983) referred to this trait as affirming and supporting. She identified qualities such as expecting all family members to affirm and support one another and recognizing that supporting is not accompanied by pressure. She further reported that the basic mood in healthy families is positive. In these families there is a sense of balance between the family and the individual close to but not consumed by each other (Curran, 1983).

Although the FPII does not have a factor specifically assessing encouragement of individuals, two factors on the FPII are designed to measure the balance between the individual and the family talked about in the literature under this heading. The two factors on the FPII that measure the distance or closeness between family members are the disengagement and enmeshment subscales (Lee et al., 1997). Disengagement is defined as "the extent to which family members behave without considering others in the family and fail to communicate with one another" (p. 468). Enmeshment, on the other hand, is defined as "the extent to which family members insist on being involved with each other

without allowing time or space for individual family members to lead their own lives" (p. 468).

Commitment. Commitment is the idea that the family comes first (Stinnett & DeFrain, 1985). Lee and Goddard (1989) have described it as a sense of family pride. The Child Trends group (Krysan et al., 1990) reported that commitment was present in nearly all of the research they reviewed. Curran (1983) reported that commitment is a two-way street, that each individual in the family is valued, respected, and supported. At the same time, members are committed to the family unit as a whole. Along with commitment comes a suppression or sacrifice of personal desires at times for the good of the family (Curran, 1983). There is a reliance on the family; these families have developed ways of problem-solving that work for all members of the family (Curran, 1983). Effective problem-solving also works to foster feelings of trust in the family among family members.

Curran (1983) also identified a sense of shared responsibility in the functioning of the family. Each member of the family actively participates in tasks and chores that are necessary on a daily basis to make the family run. Three factors on the FPII flow out of commitment to each other. These three factors are self-reliance, work, and chores (Lee et al., 1997). Self-reliance is defined by Lee et al. as "the extent to which a family takes responsibility for meeting its own temporal needs insofar as possible, contributes resources to help others in need, and avoids shifting responsibility to provide" (p. 468). Work is conceptualized as "the extent to which family members labor or exert effort to accomplish given ends" (p. 468). The final factor related to commitment is chores and is

defined as "the extent to which the family is effective in accomplishing household tasks such as cooking and cleaning rooms and clothing" (p. 468).

Religious/spiritual orientation. The definition of religious or spiritual orientation presented in the literature varies. However, essentially it is the idea that families are committed to a spiritual philosophy that usually involves worship of God. The personal philosophy, however, is the most important element (Krysan et al., 1990). Having a religious or spiritual orientation is defined by others as possessing a set of moral values that guide behavior (Lee & Goddard, 1989; Stinnett & DeFrain, 1985). Curran (1983) identified three traits pertaining to spiritual orientation found in strong families. These three characteristics are (a) faith in God plays a foundational role in daily family life; (b) a religious core strengthens the family support system; and (c) the parents feel a strong responsibility for passing on the faith, but they do so in positive and meaningful ways. On the FPII, sacred/spiritual orientation is defined as "the degree to which the family emphasizes or depends on the spiritual (transcendental, mystical) part of life as opposed to being secular or rational" (Lee et al., 1997, p. 468).

Social connectedness. Social connectedness refers to the tie family members have to things that are not happening directly within the family (Randall, 1995). Otto (1975) described this construct as the ability to develop and maintain growing relationships both within the family and without. A characteristic found in families that are well connected socially is a sense of play (Curran, 1983). Curran reported that family members pay attention to the need to play and regularly utilize social organizations to fill this need. They are involved in such social groups as "mountain climbing, building model airplanes, or bowling" (p. 126). However, Curran also related that these families balance the

influence society has on them in that they do not allow work and other activities to infringe routinely on family time. Also of great importance is that these families recognize the need to get help and often tap community resources in order to obtain necessary help. This construct has been conceptually identified as bridging on the FPII and is defined as "the extent to which the family makes use of a social network of resources outside the family for pleasure and benefit" (Lee et al., 1997, p. 468).

Clear roles. Krysan et al. (1990) identified clear roles as each member of the family understanding the expectations placed on him/her and the importance of that role in the betterment of the family. Others identify this concept mainly with the parents in mind (Epstein et al., 1983). Within understanding the expectations placed on an individual in healthy families is the acceptance of participation in the daily chores required to keep the family going.

Curran (1983) identified a fostering of responsibility in strong families. She stated that in these families parents understand the relationship between responsibility and self-esteem, the family gears responsibility to capability, and responsibility is paired with recognition. As a result, children are responsible and have an orientation toward the work required to make a happy healthy family. Both the work and the chores factors (previously defined) from the FPII tap elements of this characteristic of healthy families (Lee et al., 1997).

Time together. Randall (1995) defined this construct as family members spending time together by choice and not only out of obligation. Strong families make it a priority to spend time together, which provides a sense of belonging.

Lee and Goddard (1989) reported that strong families enjoy spending time with one another and that they do not leave its occurrence to chance. Spending time together provides family members with a sense of identity (Stinnett & DeFrain, 1985). The amount of time spent together in healthy families is high in quality and quantity (Krysan et al., 1990). Curran (1983) divided this important variable into three categories: (a) the healthy family has a sense of play and humor; (b) the healthy family has a balance of interaction among members; and (c) the healthy family shares leisure time.

A very crucial element inseparably tied to time together is the construct of rituals. Curran (1983) stated that in healthy families, the family's legends and characters are treasured, the family has a person and or place that serves as locus, and the family makes a conscious effort to gather as people. Furthermore, Curran related that the family views itself as a link between the past and future, the family honors its elders and welcomes its babies, and the family cherishes its traditions and rituals (p. 216). McCubbin and Thompson (1987) identified rituals and traditions as essential in a family's ability to deal with and overcomes life's transitions and challenges. They asserted that rituals are important in ensuring that family life have a continuity, as well as evidence of family identity, belonging and uniqueness. The rituals factor on the FPII assesses this trait in families and is defined as "the extent to which family members participate in patterns of behavior, pertaining to some specific event, occasion, or situation, which tends to be repeated" (Lee et al., 1997, p. 468).

Financial management. Strong families have also been identified as being effective in the management of their financial affairs (McCubbin & Thompson, 1987). Financial management is often tied to the set of morals a family possesses. Curran (1983) stated

that in moral training, a healthy family has an environment where the husband and wife agree on important values, and teach their children specific guidelines about right and wrong. Children are also held responsible for their own behavior. These same guidelines pertain to the handling of finances of the family.

Family resource management involves planning and implementing activities at different levels (Fitzsimmons, Hira, Bauer, & Haftstrom, 1993). They included standard setting, demand clarification, resource assessment, and action sequencing in planning. Actuating and controlling activities are the parts of implementing. On the FPII, financial management is defined as "the extent to which the family is effective in the allocation and use of family financial resources" (Lee et al., 1997, p. 468).

The FPII was developed as an assessment instrument to measure the family strengths identified in the literature. The FPII was designed to provide families and practitioners with a fast and easy way to assess the presence of these constructs in families.

Phases of Instrument Development

The development of the revised Family Profile II occurred in three phases (Lee et al., 1997). The original items were created based on content validity derived from opinions of experts in the field and from the family strengths literature presented above. Because the FPII was intended to assess a broad range of family functioning, it was not possible to include all of the subscales in the instrument during the first phase. Instead constructs were gradually added during the various phases of development. In the first two phases, content-related and construct-related validity were established. Items were

created and tested using student samples from Utah State University and Brigham Young University. The third phase built upon the previous two and studied the criterion-related validity of the instrument.

A sample of 496 students completed a version of the measure in phase one, which included 160 items in 16 subscales (Lee et al., 1997). Through a series of factor analyses, the best items were identified yielding eight subscales with 78 items, each loading on their respective factors at .5 or above. The subscales identified in phase one were kindness, unkindness, quality of communication, enmeshment, disengagement, work, rituals, and decision making. There was a Cronbach's alpha of at least .84 for each subscale with the exception of enmeshment, which was .66, suggesting that the subscales were internally consistent.

The eight subscales identified in phase one were assessed again in the second phase (Lee et al., 1997). In this phase the sample comprised 561 university students from Brigham Young University and from Utah State University. In an attempt to establish other important dimensions of family functioning, 82 additional items were added to the questionnaire. These items were created based again on content validity derived from the opinions of experts in the field and from the family strengths literature. Again the process of analyzing the items using a series of non-orthogonal factor analyses confirmed the same eight subscales identified in phase one, as well as six additional subscales. Three of the new subscales represented instrumental domains of family functioning: financial management, self-reliance, and daily chores. Two subscales dealing with the family's ability to access community resources and social support were identified from the items that had been added and were labeled bridging-getting help, and bridging-socializing. Fun,

an additional relationship dimension, was also identified. The Cronbach's alpha for the enmeshment subscale with additional items was .78.

The third phase utilized a large sample of 1,800 university students (the universities used were not reported) to establish the construct-related validity of the instrument as developed to this point (Lee et al., 1997). The sample was predominantly White (83.6%). The remaining 16.4% of the respondents were Hispanic (6.2%), Black (4.5%), Asian (3.0%), American Indian (1.3%), or other (1.5%). A total of 28.2% of the sample reported Catholic affiliation, 21.7% were Protestant, 13.5% were LDS (Mormon), 2.2% were Islamic, and 1.5% were Jewish. In addition to the eight subscales from phase one, and the six subscales from phase two, three other subscales were included in phase three: (a) ability to communicate, (b) avoiding work, and (c) sacred/secular orientation (Lee et al., 1997). The items for these additional three subscales were developed by experts in the field and the healthy families literature based on content validity. The 17 subscales conceptually fell into three categories of family functioning. Family process was the first category and included kindness, unkindness, ability to communicate, quality of communication, fun, disengagement, enmeshment, and rituals. The second category was external resources, and included the bridging-getting help, bridging-socializing, and sacred/secular orientation subscales. Family management was the third category and was comprised of the subscales of decision making, work, avoiding work, self-reliance, financial management, and daily chores. In this third phase, concurrent validity was also assessed through outcome variables. Outcome variables were used to assess how the instrument correlated with other processes co-occurring in the families. Seven outcome variables were included in this round: Family Satisfaction (Randall, 1995), Family

Conflict (Strauss, Hamby, & Boney-McCoy, 1996), Substance Abuse, Juvenile Delinquency, School Achievement, Adult Crime, and Gang Involvement. Aside from the Family Satisfaction and Family Conflict Scales, the outcome scales were developed for use in this research.

Current Instrument

After several cases were dropped because of inconsistencies in response patterns, 1,722 cases from phase three were included in factor analyses with oblique rotation (Lee et al., 1997). Only items which loaded at .5 or better were retained. In this final phase, 13 subscales were identified. Further factor analyses with varimax rotation led to the dropping of additional items due to cross-loading on other scales. This was done to have items that did not load highly on different scales. Each of the seven outcome items had acceptable factor loadings of .5 or better in the factor analyses (Lee et al., 1997).

The Cronbach's outcome variables were $\alpha = .93$ Family Satisfaction, $\alpha = .85$ Substance Abuse, $\alpha = .84$ Family Conflict, $\alpha = .77$ Juvenile Crime, $\alpha = .76$ School Performance, $\alpha = .75$ Adult Crime, $\alpha = .73$ Gang Involvement (Lee et al., 1997). The Cronbach's alphas on the 13 subscales are presented in Table 1.

Regression analyses assessing the concurrent validity of the FPII on the outcome scales yielded mixed results (Lee et al., 1997). The combined FPII subscales yielded an R^2 of .78 for Family Satisfaction. However, the regression models for the negative factors were much weaker. The yielded R^2s were .26 for Substance Abuse, .29 for School Performance, .20 for Juvenile Crime, and .45 for Family Conflict. For Adult Crime and Gang Involvement, the variances of reported scores were so small that they were not included. The subscale which correlated highest with the outcome variables was

Table 1

FPII Subscales and Cronbach's Alpha

Subscale	Cronbach's alpha	No. of items
Kindness	.88	5
Unkindness	.89	5
Communication ability	.85	4
Disengagement	.80	4
Enmeshment	.78	4
Rituals	.83	5
Bridging	.80	5
Sacred orientation	.95	5
Work	.73	3
Financial mgmt.	.78	4
Self-reliance	.72	4
Chores	.81	5

unkindness. Kindness, ability to communicate, and financial management also correlated well with the outcome variables. While self-reliance was statistically significant on only one regression, it was retained due to conceptual interest. The two bridging subscales were combined into one scale labeled bridging. The result was the 13 subscales retained on the current version of the Family Profile II are presented in Table 2.

After phase three, due to the good internal consistency of the instrument, it was determined that the subscales on the FPII were effectively measuring something. However, exactly what the scales are measuring is not known because that can only be determined by analyses performed against external criteria (Anastasi, 1988).

Table 2

FPII's Subscales and Their Definitions

Construct	Definition
1. Kindness	The extent to which family members engage in kind, loving acts that reflect unselfish regard for others.
2. Unkindness	The extent to which family members engage in unkind, cruel acts that reflect selfish disregard for others in the family.
3. Communication	The extent to which family members have the capacity (ability or skill) to express themselves and understand others. This is not the amount of communication. It is the capacity to communicate effectively.
4. Disengagement	The extent to which family members behave without considering others in the family and fail to communicate with one another.
5. Enmeshment	The extent to which family members insist on being involved with each other without allowing time or space for individual family members to lead their own lives.
6. Bridging	The extent to which the family makes use of a social network of resources outside the family for pleasure and benefit.
7. Financial management	The extent to which the family is effective in the allocation and use of family financial resources.
8. Self-reliance	The extent to which a family takes responsibility for meeting its own temporal needs insofar as possible, contributes resources to help others in need, and avoids shifting responsibility to provide.
9. Work orientation	The extent to which family members labor or exert effort to accomplish given ends.
10. Daily chores	The extent to which the family is effective in accomplishing household tasks such as cooking and cleaning rooms and clothing.
11. Sacred/secular orientation	The degree to which the family emphasizes or depends on the spiritual (transcendental, mystical) part of life as opposed to being secular or rational.
12. Rituals	The extent to which family members participate in patterns of behavior, pertaining to some specific event, occasion, or situation, which tends to be repeated.
13. Quality of the family relationships	Family members' perception of family quality.

Validation Procedures Still Lacking

In summary, the development of the FPII has gone through three phases in the process of establishing it as a valid and reliable instrument. In the first stage of the development of the FPII, constructs of interest were chosen based on the literature on family strengths. Based on that literature and through the use of experts, items were initially developed. In the second and third phases of development, the concurrent validity and the construct-related validity of the measure were established through comparison with co-occuring outcome variables and factor analyses. Additionally, the concurrent validity of the test was assessed in the third phase. At this point, it has been established that FPII's 13 subscales are effectively measuring different aspects of family life. However, it is yet to be determined exactly what these domains are. Therefore, the next step in establishing the instrument's validity is to compare it to scales thought to measure similar domains in order to assess its concurrent validity.

The purpose of this project was to assess the concurrent validity and specifically the convergent validity of the Family Profile II. Several subscales from previously established family assessment instruments designed to measure like constructs were used to validate this measure.

Validity

"Validity is an integrated evaluative judgment of the degree to which empirical evidence and theoretical rationales support the adequacy and appropriateness of inferences and actions based on test scores or other modes of assessment" (Messick,

1989, p. 13). Essentially, validity concerns what a test measures and how well it is measured (Anastasi, 1988). Therefore, the validity of a test is derived from two sources: the theoretical basis of the test and its empirical evidence. Messick stated that it isn't the test or assessment device per se that is validated, but rather the inferences that one derives from the measure.

The construct being measured by a given test is definable only by examining the objective sources of information and empirical operations used in establishing its validity (Anastasi, 1988). Anastasi went on to relate that no test can be reported to have "high" or "low" validity. Rather, its validity can be established only in reference to the particular use for which the test is being considered. Messick (1989) further stated that "validity is a matter of degree, not all or nothing" (p. 13). Hence, establishing validity is a process and not an achievement. It is a process that can be enhanced or contravened by new findings over time.

While there are different ways of accruing support for the validity of an instrument, all procedures for doing so concern the relationships between test performance and other independently observable data about the characteristics under consideration (Anastasi, 1988). The methods used for exploring and investigating these relationships are categorized under three main groups: content-related, criterion-related, and construct-related procedures for compiling evidence of validity (Anastasi, 1988; Groth-Marnat, 1997; Messick, 1989). The methods of validation not directly applicable to this study will be briefly addressed.

Content-Related Validity

Content validity is centered on professional judgments about test content relevant to the content of the particular behavioral domain (Messick, 1989). In essence it involves the "systematic examination of the test content to determine whether it covers a representative sample of the behavior domain to be measured" (Anastasi, 1988, p. 140).

Face Validity

Face validity should not be confused with content validity. Where content validity pertains to what the test actually is measuring, face validity pertains to what the test appears on a superficial level to measure (Anastasi, 1988). Anastasi reported that face validity deals with the presentation of the test: whether or not it looks valid to those taking the test.

Criterion-Related Validity

An already existing measure that is accepted as an adequate and valid indicator of the target domain is called a criterion (Dooley, 1995). Criterion-related validation procedures relate to the effectiveness of the test in predicting an individual's performance in a specified activity or activities (Anastasi, 1988). To that end, performance on a given test is checked against a criterion. Hence, for an admittance test for a flight school, the criterion may be later flight performances.

Validity of the Criterion

Dooley (1995) related that the whole of criterion-related validation rests on the assumption that the criterion itself is valid. If the criterion is not accurately measuring the given construct, results are useless (Messick, 1989).

Anastasi (1988) reported that a test can be validated against as many criteria as there are uses for the test. Some examples of criteria commonly used are academic achievement, performance in specialized training, contrasted groups, psychiatric diagnosis, and correlations between a new test and previously available tests (Anastasi, 1988). Again, efforts need to be made to ensure that whatever criterion is used is validly measuring the construct. Because the purpose of the FPII is to assess the previously described areas of family functioning, the external criteria chosen in this study were other measures intended to measure similar constructs.

Predictive Validity

In the above aviation example, the entrance test would be an example of predictive validity. When talking about predictive validity, there is a time interval over which the prediction is made (Anastasi, 1988). Subsequent flight performance is predicted by the obtained score on the entrance examination. Predictive validity is most appropriate for tests used in selection and classification of individuals (Anastasi, 1988).

Concurrent Validity

Concurrent validation involves collecting the criterion at the same point in time as the measure being validated (Dooley, 1995). Anastasi (1988) reported that at times, concurrent validation is merely used as a substitute for predictive validation. This is often

done because it is impractical to extend the validation process over the time required for predictive validation (Messick, 1989) or when it is important to obtain a suitable preselection sample or when a construct is expected to evolve (Anastasi, 1988).

Anastasi (1988) and Dooley (1995) both reported that for certain tests, concurrent validation is the most appropriate type. The distinction between the appropriateness of predictive versus concurrent validation procedures does not merely rely on time, but also returns to the root question of the objective behind the testing (Anastasi, 1988). If one is concerned with current status, and the object of the test is to assess current status, concurrent validation is the most appropriate method.

Since the criterion is concurrently available at the time of testing, the question of why the new instrument is necessary could well be asked. Dooley (1995) provided us with one reason: "If the criterion measure requires much time or many resources, we would prefer a brief inexpensive substitute" (p. 92). A key point here is that the criterion is never expected to correlate perfectly with the measure against which it is being compared. Therefore, a concurrent validation study is actually only a partial validation. The whole picture of the way in which the results are being used or interpreted must be considered and guide validation procedures.

Convergent and discriminant validation are ways to establish the validity of a test with measures designed to measure like constructs (Anastasi, 1988; Dooley, 1995; Messick, 1989). If a new measure is designed to measure communication for example, other measures also designed to measure communication would be administered. If there were a high correlation between the new test and the other measures, there would be

convergent validation of the measure, so named as a result of the convergence of several different tests (Dooley, 1995).

To demonstrate validity, Anastasi (1988) pointed out that we must show that a test not only correlates highly with other variables with which it theoretically should, but that it also does not significantly correlate with variables from which it should differ. This is called discriminant validation (Dooley, 1995). Anastasi (1988) reported that ideally one would assess two or more traits by two or more methods.

Construct-Related Validity

Construct-related validity is defined by Anastasi (1988) as "the extent to which the test may be said to measure a theoretical construct or trait" (p. 153). Construct-related validation necessitates the gradual accumulation of supporting information from a variety of sources (Anastasi,1988; Dooley, 1995). Anastasi (1988) further stated that "any data throwing light on the nature of the trait under consideration and the conditions affecting its development and manifestations represent appropriate evidence for this validation" (p. 153). Dooley stated that, at best, information can be gathered that tends to strengthen or weaken the confidence we have in the construct-related validity. There are several ways of gathering support for construct validation.

Factor Analysis

It is useful to know whether a test measures the intended construct or something other than the intended construct (Dooley, 1995). Factor analysis identifies the number of different constructs being measured by the test items and the extent to which each test

item is related to each of the factors (Dooley, 1995). Factor analysis is essentially a refined statistical technique for analyzing the interrelationships of data (Anastasi, 1988). Dooley (1995) reported that factor analysis uses the correlations among all of the items on a test to identify groups or subgroups of items that correlate higher among themselves than they do with items outside of the group. In other words, factorial validity is essentially the correlation of the given test with whatever is common or shared by a group of tests or other indices of behavior (Anastasi, 1988). Factor analysis is basically a method of identifying the strength of causality for the construct to cause a given response on the items (M.A. Taylor, personal communication, July 28, 1998).

Internal Consistency

The core characteristic of the method of internal consistency is that the criterion used is the total score on the test itself (Anastasi, 1988; Messick, 1989). One method of establishing internal consistency is to use dichotomous groups that have been identified by their total scores on the test. The scores of those scoring high on the total test are compared item by item to those whose total scores are low. If there is not statistically significant difference on each item, with the "higher" scorers scoring higher on each item than the "lower" scorers, the item is considered invalid.

Another method to establish internal consistency is of particular interest with regards to the Family Profile II. It involves the correlation of subtest or subscale scores with the total score. In the construction of tests with multiple subscales, the scores on each subscale are correlated with the total score (Anastasi, 1988). Any subscale score that correlates too low with the total score is eliminated.

Factor analysis and internal consistency in and of themselves tell us very little of the validation of the test (Anastasi, 1988). This is due to the fact that these methods tell us that a construct is being measured, and how well that construct is being measured, but it tells us nothing about whether that construct is actually what we think is being measured (Dooley, 1995).

Constructs and Theory

The final source of construct validation presented in this thesis is the method of validating the test with theory (Dooley, 1995). It assesses the relationship of the measured construct to other constructs in the context of theory. Dooley reminded us that constructs serve as elements in theory and take their meaning from theory. Therefore, if two of the measures being used to establish the convergent validity of the aforementioned communication test were nonconvergent, which would be accurate? For example, suppose a theory stated that good communication facilitated problem resolution. Assuming the theory is correct and that a valid measure of problem resolution is held, this type of validation could be established. All three of these measures would be administered and whichever communication test correlated best with the problem resolution scale would be thought to be measuring the construct with more validity.

Summary of Establishing Validity in Instrument Development

Several methods of establishing validity have been explored. When deciding which method is appropriate at a given time, the key is asking for what purpose the test is being used. The same test, when used for different purposes, should be validated in different

ways (Anastasi, 1988). While validity has been presented under three different categories, construct-related validity is comprehensive and includes all types of validity (Anastasi; Messick, 1989). Both content- and criterion-related validation methods speak to the issue of construct validity, because all validity attempts to answer the question of how well a test is measuring a given construct (Dooley, 1995). Messick argued that when speaking to the issue of interpreting scores on a test, the term validity ought to be reserved strictly for construct validity.

Validation and Test Construction

In developing a test, establishing the validity requires multiple procedures employed in sequential manner. The process is delineated by Anastasi (1988) in the following way:

> The validation process begins with the formulation of detailed trait or construct definitions, derived from psychological theory, prior research, or systematic observation and analyses of the relevant behavior domain. Test items are then prepared to fit the construct definitions. Empirical item analyses follow, with the selection of the most effective, or valid, items from the initial item pools. Other appropriate internal analyses may then be carried out, including statistical analyses of item clusters or subtests. The final stage includes validation of various scores and interpretive combinations of scores through statistical analyses against external, real-life criterion. (p. 164)

Even after the release of an instrument for use, the interpretive meaning of its scores may continue to be altered (Messick, 1989). The interpretation continues to be honed, refined, and strengthened through the gradual process of accumulating evidence through clinical observation and research projects (Anastasi, 1988).

This project is an effort to gather more support for the validity of the FPII. This study attempts to accomplish this through the validation of the subscales of the FPII

with subscales from other measures designed to measure similar constructs.

Instruments

Of the many instruments that have been developed, few "appear to be directly linked to, or reflect any of, the major conceptual frameworks of family functioning" (Daley, Sowers-Hoag, & Thyer, 1991). From the research that has been done on healthy families, there are but few measures that have been developed to tap constructs identified as important in the literature. Subscales from several of the scales that have been identified in the literature will be highlighted for this study.

In establishing criterion-related convergent validity, constructs from tests designed to measure similar constructs as those in the new instrument are used as external data points (Anastasi, 1988). After conducting an extensive review of the instruments that have been developed to measure similar constructs as those thought to be measured by the FPII, subscales from several measures have been selected for use in this study. The instruments along with their subscales chosen for inclusion in this project are presented in Chapter III under the Instruments section of the Measurement heading.

Application to Marriage and Family Therapy

Assessing Families in Therapy

The field of marriage and family therapy has also seen a shift in focus in recent years toward identifying strengths with which clients present for therapy (de Shazer,

1994). In this section, how that shift has come about and how the FPII may be useful within the field of marriage and family therapy will be presented.

The origin of family assessment in marriage and family therapy stems back to the beginning days of the field (Broderick & Shrader, 1991). Broderick and Shrader reported that the field of family therapy and thus the assessment of families within therapy began in "a dozen places at once among independent-minded therapists and researchers in many parts of the country" (p. 21).

Among those credited for the shift in focus to the family unit in therapy are several important therapists and researchers. John Bell, John Bowlby, Nathan Ackerman, Christian Midelfort, Theodore Lidz, Lyman Wynne, Murray Bowen, and Carl Whitaker are each among those who have been credited (Broderick & Shrader, 1991; de Shazer, 1994). Broderick and Shrader (1991) also reported that there were clusters of practitioners working together in the movement toward a family focus. The Palo Alto Group, including Gregory Bateson, Jay Haley, John Weakland, Don Jackson, and Virginia Satir; and the Philadelphia Group, including Ivan Boszormenyi-Nagy and associates, are two of the groups credited with an impact on the development of the field. While the training of individuals varied from psychiatry to anthropology to sociology and the like, their emphasis became the same: to help people and to explain their problems and the role of the family in the development and maintenance of problems (Broderick & Shrader, 1991). These early theorists and practitioners were very focused on the causes of the problems their clients were having and clients' families were usually seen in light of their role in the problem. Walter and Peller (1992) identified three basic questions therapy has sought to answer in recent decades. They said that up to the 1950s the question was:

"what is the cause of the problem?" Through the 50s, 60s, and 70s the question became: "what maintains the problem?" Around 1980, they identified a new question that began to be asked by some therapists: "how do we construct solutions?"

The Mental Research Institute

In 1967 the Mental Research Institute (MRI) was established in Palo Alto, California (Segal, 1991). This represented the beginning of a shift in focus from problems toward a focus on strengths (de Shazer, 1994). The brief therapy of the MRI began with three goals: (a) to find a quick and efficient means for resolving complaints that clients bring to psychotherapists and counselors, (b) to transform therapy from an art into a craft that could be more easily taught to others, and (c) to study change in human systems (Segal, 1991).

A major shift in the field presented by the MRI group was their paradigm that rather than being a symptom of something else, the client's complaint was viewed as the problem (Segal, 1991). From here, they developed the idea that the attempted solutions (the actual behavioral interactions) used by the clients maintained their problems.

A key component in the move toward a strength focus was MRI's involvement with Milton Erickson. Considered by many to be the father of brief therapy (de Shazer, 1994; Segal, 1991; Walter & Peller, 1992), Erickson was introduced to Haley and Weakland by Bateson, who arranged for them to visit Erickson's Phoenix home to work and study (Segal, 1991). Segal reported that Erickson tailored the treatment for each patient, and through that tailoring, quickly resolved the patient's presenting complaint. de Shazer (1994) and Walter and Peller (1992) both reported that Erickson had a great

impact on the movement toward a strength or solution focus in therapy and that he spent very little time on the cause of the problems with which his clients were dealing, but rather focused his efforts on helping them construct solutions.

After defining the problem, the therapist using the MRI approach defines a goal with the client. The goal should be "formulated as increases in positive behavior rather than reduction or elimination of negative behavior" (Segal, 1991, p. 182). This focus on the presence of something positive rather than the absence of something negative is seen as fundamental in the shift toward client strengths.

Constructing Solutions

de Shazer (1994) reported, in his summary of the history of the field of family therapy, that each individual, group, or school of therapy creates its own reality. Based on the assumptions held, the therapist asks, notes, and works with information that substantiates his or her assumptions. Therefore, "meaning is arrived at through negotiation within a specific context" (de Shazer, 1994, p. 10). de Shazer went on to state that "what we talk about and how we talk about it makes a difference, and it is such differences that can be used to make a difference (to the client)" (p. 10). In other words, the elements we look for and focus on in therapy become amplified. Therefore, it stands to reason that if therapists want to help clients accomplish a given goal, focusing the therapeutic conversation on the strengths and resources that clients possess toward obtaining the goal will be helpful (Berg & Miller, 1992; de Shazer, 1994; Walter & Peller, 1992). In this way, clients' abilities are magnified.

Since the early 1980s various other therapy models have embraced terms such as strengths and resources. Behavioral family therapy (Falloon, 1991), contextual therapy (Boszormenyi-Nagy, Grunebaum, & Ulrich, 1991), strategic family therapy (Madanes, 1991), and structural family therapy (Roberto, 1991) are examples of the models that now address the importance of identifying strengths that clients possess. However, the question still remains of how to assess strengths and resources.

Selecting an Assessment Technique

Because this project is an effort to establish the concurrent validity of the FPII as an effective family assessment device, this study falls under the broader context of general assessment methodology. Filsinger (1983) pointed out that when selecting an assessment technique there are a number of issues to consider: (a) what aspects of the relationship do we want to measure? (b) at what level of analysis is the measurement appropriate (individual, couple, family)? (c) how much time and energy is required? and (d) to what use is the information gathered going to be put? If the goal in assessing families in therapy is to measure strengths, the need for methods of doing so becomes apparent. Many therapists who use a solution-focused approach do not believe that formal assessment is needed, but rather that the therapist should rely wholly on client report (de Shazer, 1994). However, in reporting findings, instruments that support information obtained from client report provide other data points and thus add validity to findings reported in family therapy through concurrent criterion-related validation (Filsinger, 1983).

In devising an assessment methodology, Olson (1981) delineated four types of assessment methods: (a) self-report methods that use the insider's frame of reference and

are subjective in nature, (b) behavioral self-reports that are also from the insider's perspective but are more objective in nature, (c) observer subjective reports that are outside and subjective, and (d) behavioral methods that are outside and objective. The FPII is an insider subjective method. Filsinger (1983) advised that a multimethod procedure should be used. This provides differing views or perspectives on the family and hence provides validity to the assessment.

Therefore, regardless of the construct being measured, the need is apparent for valid devices, including those designed to assess family strengths. Preliminary findings suggest that the FPII is such a measure (Lee et al., 1997). The current study is an effort in taking another step in establishing the FPII as a valid instrument in assessing family strengths.

Synthesis of the Literature

As has been shown, there is a movement in the literature toward a focus on the strengths that healthy families possess. If researchers and clinicians are to focus on strengths, there is a need for a reliable and valid assessment methodology. The FPII was developed from the literature on healthy families and is designed to capture a broad range of family functioning. Furthermore, the FPII has been presented as an effective insider subjective assessment device which can work as a beneficial component of a strength-based family assessment methodology.

However, the convergent validity of the FPII has yet to be adequately established. To fill this need, the convergent validity of the FPII was examined. Before running the correlations between the various subscales, factor analyses were run for each subscale.

These factor analyses were performed to assess the congruence of each subscale with the psychometric properties previously reported.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses of this study are:

1. There will be no difference between the factor structure of the subscales of the FPII used in this study on a 5-point Likert-type scale and the factor structure found in previous studies on a 7-point Likert-type scale.

2. There will be statistically significant correlations between the subscale scores of the FPII and the scores from the scales used as external criteria.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

Design

This is a correlational study wherein the relationship was examined between 11 of the subscales of the Family Profile II and subscales from seven instruments designed to measure similar constructs (Lee et al., 1997). The study was based on a nonrandom sample of undergraduate college students attending Utah State University. Participants filled out a paper-and-pencil questionnaire on a volunteer basis. No names and only minimal personal information (demographics) were coded. In this manner, the anonymity of the respondents was maintained.

Sample and Data Collection

The sample consisted of undergraduate students at Utah State University enrolled in five family and human development classes, one psychology class, one special education class, and two business administration classes in Logan, Utah. These departments were chosen because they were thought to have large numbers of students enrolled in their classes. The total number of participants was 229. The number of respondents is adequate for analysis based on how the data were reduced and analyzed. The purpose of this study was to analyze the correlation between the subscales of the FPII and those of several other instruments designed to measure similar constructs, as well as to analyze the factor structure of the subscales of the FPII on the revised five-point scale. Therefore, the largest number of items that was analyzed at any one time was

58 (the total number of items on the FPII). According to R. Jones (personal communication, August 10, 1998), the factor structure stabilizes with two and a half subjects for every one item. According to this criterion, 154 subjects were needed for factor analysis. Before collecting data, the study was approved by USU's Institutional Review Board (see Appendix B).

Classes were found in one of two ways. Secretaries from the Family and Human Development and Business Administration Departments were contacted and asked which of the classes being taught during summer quarter in the department were the largest and who was teaching them. The instructors of these classes were then contacted by phone. The study was briefly explained and the instructors were asked if data could be collected from their students. It was explained that if they would be willing, data could be collected in one of two ways: either by coming into their classes and taking about 20 minutes, administering it to those willing to participate immediately in class, or by coming in and explaining it to the class and returning the following class period, or periods, to gather the completed questionnaires. It was also explained that better results were expected if the survey was administered in class and that would be preferred. However, it was explained that there was an understanding of how precious class time is in the summer and that any way that they would be willing to allow for data collection in their classes would be appreciated.

To collect the data from the special education class, the course catalog was perused for instructors teaching during the summer. The class that ended up being used was the first instructor who was contacted. Permission was requested and obtained as described above. The psychology class was obtained by contacting a professor who gave

the name and number of the graduate student teaching a large undergraduate course. That instructor was then contacted and approached as above.

Eight instructors were contacted and all eight consented. In the FHD Department, four instructors and five classes were used. In four of the classes the survey was administered during class time. In the other class the questionnaire was explained and handed out in one class period and collected the following two class periods. No incentives were offered in any of these classes. The total number of subjects used from FHD was 72. There were 90 instruments distributed in the Family and Human Development Department. There were 32 students from FHD who chose not to participate, or who had filled out the survey in a previous class.

In both the business administration and special education classes, the data were collected during class time. There were no incentives offered in any of these classes. Sixty-five questionnaires were collected from the two business administration classes, and 31 were collected from the special education class. Because these were filled out during class, the numbers distributed are the same as those collected. There were an additional 67 students from the business administration classes who either chose not to participate or who had previously filled out the questionnaire. There were 15 students from the special education class who did not fill out the survey.

In the psychology class, the instrument was explained and dropped off during one class and the instructor collected them from the students the following class period. The instructor offered the students one percentage point on their final grade as an incentive for returning the questionnaire. To maintain the anonymity of the respondents, they wrote their names on the questionnaire itself but not on the scantron. They were all turned in to

the instructor together, who kept the questionnaires with the students names and returned only the scantrons for analysis. From this class, 61 surveys were collected. There were 66 surveys handed out in this class. Seven students chose not to fill out the survey in this class.

There were 272 surveys distributed, and 246 were returned for a return rate of 90%. Seventeen of the surveys returned were not used due to a misprint in the survey. This misprint was corrected and new surveys were obtained. The remaining 229 were analyzed in this study for a total of 84% of all surveys distributed. In each class there were several students who chose not to participate in the study. There were also several students who were enrolled in more than one of the participating classes. These students were instructed to fill out the measure only once.

In filling out the surveys, students were instructed to fill them out on their current families if they were married and had children. If they were married without children, they were instructed to fill them out on their families of origin. These instructions were given because several questions used relate to families with children. Furthermore, the study was only concerned with the consistency in the responses between measures.

Measurement

An extensive review was carried out of instruments that have been published that were designed to measure aspects of family functioning similar to those assessed by the FPII. Instruments were obtained through an extensive computer and hand search.

First, key words were entered into USU's libraries' Merlin Gateway Information Network and the SilverPlatter CD-ROM databases Psychological Literature

(PSYCHLIT). Words from the subscales of the FPII as well as similar words identified in the literature as measuring similar constructs were used (these constructs are presented in Chapter II under the theoretical rationale for the development of the FPII). Key words on family assessment were also entered. From this search a list of assessment instruments as well as authors who had published instruments was obtained. At that point, articles and books were obtained containing the identified instruments.

The instruments obtained were examined for items and subscales that appeared to be measuring similar constructs as the FPII. The group of possible matches was then analyzed more closely, with consideration on conceptual match, item similarity, and psychometric properties. Each of the subscales and the items considered for inclusion met the criteria of the widely held "absolute value of .3 as the minimum loading for interpretation" (Gorsuch, 1983, p. 210).

The subscales included in this study were selected from the possible matches based on their apparent fit as determined by their meeting the minimum psychometric criteria and their content validity with the subscales of the FPII. Although the subscales used for comparisons in this study are not perfect matches with those from the FPII, this is consistent with research which indicates that the external criteria should not perfectly correspond with a new measure (Anastasi, 1988). The eight instruments used in this study are

1. The Family Profile II (FPII; Lee et al., 1997);
2. The Family Concept Test (FCT; van der Veen, 1979);
3. The Family Time and Routines Index (FTRI; McCubbin & Thompson, 1987);

4. The Family Inventory of Resources for Management (FIRM; McCubbin & Thompson, 1987);

5. The Family Coping Inventory (FCI; McCubbin & Thompson, 1987);

6. The Family Crisis Oriented Personal Evaluation Scale (F-COPES; McCubbin & Thompson, 1987; Olson et al., 1982);

7. The Family Celebrations Index (FCELEBI; McCubbin & Thompson, 1987);

8. The Marital Adjustment Test (Locke & Wallace, 1959).

FPII

A thorough explanation of the FPII and its development to this point was presented in Chapter II. Therefore, that information is not repeated here. However, the factor loadings of each of the items is presented in Table 3 along with the Cronbach's alpha of the subscales.

The Family Profile II was developed on a 7-point Likert-type scale from (1) "never" to (7) "always" (Lee et al., 1997). The FPII was designed to be easily administered and scored (Lee et al., 1997) and respondents can discriminate more quickly on a 5-point scale than a 7-point scale (R. Jones, personal communication, August 12, 1998). However, if that is to be accomplished, the researcher needs to assess whether or not the psychometric properties of the instrument are statistically significantly altered by changing the measure from a 7-point to a 5-point scale. Cox (1980) suggested that a range in response choices from five to nine, with an odd number of response choices, was optimal. Cox stated that for subject-centered measures, which the FPII is, five response alternatives seems adequate. Cox further reported that alphas are only depressed when a

Table 3

Psychometric Properties of the FPII

Subscale name	Item number and item	Factor loading	Cronbach's alpha
Kindness	27. We give each other compliments.	.65	.88
	65. We are compassionate.	.49	
	40. Family members sacrifice for each other.	.73	
	53. Family members give of their time for one another.	.61	
	14. We do nice things for each other.	.72	
Unkindness	41. Some family members are cruel to one another.	.75	.89
	54. Some family members ridicule others.	.76	
	66. Some family members are verbally abusive with one another.	.74	
	15. Some family members are rude to others.	.70	
	28. Some family members are very critical of others.	.54	
Communication	29. Some members of our family are poor communicators.	.56	.85
	55. Some members can't put their thoughts into words very well.	.68	
	16. Some members of our family have difficulty expressing themselves.	.68	
	42. Some members of our family have difficulty understand others.	.76	
Disengagement	56. We do things as separate individuals rather than a family unit.	.56	.80
	30. Family members lead very separate lives.	.58	
	43. In our family everyone is on their own.	.56	
	17. When we are at home, family members usually do their own thing.	.69	

(table continues)

Subscale name	Item number and item	Factor loading	Cronbach's alpha
Enmeshment	31. Individuals in our family are not given enough freedom.	.79	.78
	44. The family puts too much pressure on us to conform to the family's way of doing things.	.75	
	57. The family discourages independence.	.59	
	18. Some members of t family want more individuality than our family allows.	.72	
Bridging	32. Our family avoids social situations	.52	.80
	67. When serious problems arise, our family is on its own.	.48	
	45. In times of need, our family has a network of people we can count on for help.	.62	
	19. Our family is uncomforatble socializing with others.	.55	
	58. Helpful neighbors are unavailable to our family in times of need.	.62	
Financial Management	59. Being in debt is a serious problem for our family.	.78	.78
	20. We live within our income.	.71	
	33. We are in debt for mthings thta are not necessary.	.78	
	46. We pay our bills on time.	.71	
Self-Reliance	47. We try to be independent financially.	.71	.72
	21. As a family, we take the responsibility to provide for ourselves.	.71	
	34. We try to be self supporting.	.78	
	60. We accept the challenge to provide for ourselves.	.78	
Daily Chores	61. Our family is good about getting daily chores done.	.71	.81
	68. Some family members fail to do their share of work.	.70	

(table continues)

Subscale name	Item number and item	Factor loading	Cronbach's alpha
	23. The quality of our work on family chores is poor.	.74	
	49. Some family members do not do their fair share of the family chores.	.72	
	36. Everyday tasks are left undone in our family.	.69	
Sacred/Secular	24. Faith in religious things are important to our family.	.93	.95
	50. Faith in God, or a higher power, is important to our family.	.92	
	69. We rely on a supreme being.	.88	
	62. We attend worship services.	.91	
	37. We pay attention to the spiritual part of life.	.89	
Work	48. Work is an important value taught in or family.	.85	.73
	22. We are taught that work is a key to success.	.76	
	35. We avoid hard work.	.63	
Rituals	63. We have some valued traditions that our unique to our family.	.63	.83
	70. We enjoy the celebration of special holidays in our family.	.56	
	25. We participate in valued traditions that are unique to our family.	.60	
	51. We give the right amount of emphasis to specal events like holidays, birthdays, and anniversaries.	.69	
	38. Our family should give more emphasis to celebrating special events.	.66	

few response alternatives are provided (two to three). The focus of this study was an analysis of the difference, if any, between the psychometric properties of the FPII in its 7-point format, and the same items presented in a 5-point Likert-type scale format. To that end, the scale was adapted to a 5-point Likert-type scale from (1) "almost never" to

(5) "almost always." The end points of "always and "never" on the 7-point scale were dropped.

Comparison Instruments

In this section the seven instruments from which the subscales used as comparison data are presented under the conceptual heading they were chosen to measure. Within each section, the overall instrument is presented, followed by the psychometric properties of the items and subscales that were used in this study. The rationale for tailoring some of the subscales to fit the needs of this project is presented next, followed by a summary of the survey used to collect the data for this study.

Kindness

Subscales from two other measures were chosen for use as external criteria with the kindness subscale. The two subscales are (a) the consideration subscale from the Family Concept Test (van der Veen, 1979), and (b) the family togetherness subscale from the Family Time and Routines Index (McCubbin & Thompson, 1987).

The Family Concept Test. The Family Concept Test (FCT) was developed in 1961 by van der Veen and Ostrander (van der Veen, 1979). It was van der Veen who suggested that the FCT was designed to conceptualize and investigate the individual in relation to the family system. He further defined the family concept as "a cognitive-emotional 'schema' that is composed of interrelated perceptions, attitudes, feelings, and expectations regarding one's family unit" (p. 171).

Three fundamental assumptions are identified regarding the Family Concept Test (van der Veen, 1979): (a) it develops principally from interaction within the family over an extended period of time, (b) it exerts a potent and lasting influence on behavior, and (c) it is subject to change and revision under a variety of conditions, including formal intervention such as family therapy. The FCT was developed to obtain a quantifiable description on a given individual's family concept (van der Veen, 1979).

The FCT is made up of 80 one-sentence descriptors of social and emotional aspects of family life. All of the items are designed to pertain to the entire family unit. The FCT uses an 8-point Likert-type scale ranging from (1) "least like" to (8) "most like" for "your family as it now is." The items were developed at a family-oriented child guidance clinic and reflect the experience and interest of social workers, psychologists, and psychiatrists in a treatment setting. Out of an original pool of 200 items, the 80 that were retained were chosen based on their clarity, relevance, and comprehensiveness as judged by 14 staff members. This method of the original creation of a measure based on content validity is consistent with the recommendations presented in the literature (Anastasi, 1988). van der Veen reported that the relationship between the FCT and several constructs had been studied. In another study, Novak and van der Veen (1970) investigated the relationship of the family concepts of fathers, mothers, and children to child adjustment. The family concepts were related to parental attitudes.

van der Veen (1979) reported acceptable test-retest reliability for the multiple-choice version of the test at $r = .80$ ($n = 77$). While psychometric properties of the individual subscales used in this study are not available, van der Veen reported that eight of the nine factors combined to account for about 30% of the item variance. Any item that

loaded higher than .3 with more than one subscale was combined into a ninth scale that was treated separately. For the same reasons presented for altering the FPII's subscales, the Likert scale was adapted for this study to a 5-point Likert-type scale with end points of (1) "almost never" to (5) " almost always."

Several scales from the Family Concept Test (van der Veen, 1979) were used in this study. The seven positively worded items from the consideration versus conflict subscale were compared to the five kindness items from the FPII. The construct of consideration represents a family concept of consideration and harmony. The psychometric properties of this subscale are presented in Table 4.

Family Time and Routines Index. The family togetherness subscale of the Family Time and Routines Index (FTRI; McCubbin & Thompson, 1987) was the second subscale used in analyzing the convergent validity of the kindness subscale of the FPII. The Family Time and Routines Index was developed in 1986 by the Family Stress and Health Project at the University of Wisconsin-Madison to assess the type of routines and activities families use and maintain as well as the value families place on these practices (McCubbin & Thompson).

In the preparation of the FTRI, it was assumed that families develop routines and make time commitments around paired relationships, around family activities and practices, and around family system activities (McCubbin & Thompson, 1987). The family togetherness subscale assesses these routines and activities developed around family system activities. The FTRI is a 30-item scale consisting of eight subscales, two of which, along with two items from a third subscale, are being used in this study. The index is set up on a 5-point Likert-type scale from (1) "false" to (5) "true," based on the

Table 4

Psychometric Properties from the Consideration Subscale of the FCT

Item	Factor loading	Cronbach's alpha
(1) We are considerate of each other.	.60	Not Reported
(2) We are usually calm and relaxed when we are together.	.53	
(3) We rarely hurt each other's feelings.	.49	
(4) We forgive each other easily.	.43	
(5) we have respect for each other's feelings and opinions,	.42	
(6) Each of us tries to be the kind of person the others will like.	.39	
(7) We respect each other's privacy.	.38	

respondent's assessment of the degree to which each statement describes her/his family's behavior. Although not used in this study, the measure also calls for an assessment of the degree to which the respondent values the routine listed. The overall reported Cronbach's alpha for the FTRI is .88 (McCubbin & Thompson, 1987). The psychometric properties of this subscale are presented in Table 5.

Unkindness

The subscale chosen for comparison with the unkindness dimension of the FPII also came from the Family Concept Test (van der Veen, 1979). The subscale is made up of the six negatively worded items from the consideration versus conflict factor. Those individuals scoring high on this subscale typically have family concepts high in anger and conflict. The psychometric properties of this subscale are presented in Table 6.

Table 5

Psychometric Properties from the Family Togetherness Subscale of the FTRI

Item	Factor loading	Cronbach's alpha
(1) Family goes some place special together each week.	.68	Not Reported
(2) Family has certain family time each week when they do things together at home.	.68	
(3) Family has a quiet time each evening when everyone talks or plays quietly.	.30	
(4) We express caring and affection for each other daily.	.39	

Table 6

Psychometric Properties from the Conflict Subscale of the FCT

Item	Factor loading	Cronbach's alpha
(1) There are many conflicts in our family.	-.67	Not Reported
(2) Each of us wants to tell the others what to do.	-.65	
(3) We often become angry at each other.	-.63	
(4) We are critical of each other.	-.60	
(5) We make demands on each other.	-.50	
(6) we often upset each other without intending it.	-.47	

Communication

Given the way communication is conceptualized in the FPII, the literature

reviewed yielded no subscales which appeared to assess this construct in a similar manner. Therefore, no attempt will be made in this project to establish the convergent validity of this particular subscale.

Disengagement and Enmeshment

The two subscales chosen as external criteria for analyses with the subscales of the disengagement and enmeshment subscales of the FPII came from the FCT (van der Veen, 1979). The two subscales are presented as positive and negative sides of the same factor: togetherness versus separateness. Individuals scoring high on togetherness tend to do many activities together as a family. It was hypothesized that those who scored high in this domain would also score high on the enmeshment subscale because the items also appear to be measuring the closeness of family members.

Those who score high on separateness tend to come from families where everyone goes their own separate ways. The scores of these individuals was expected to positively correlate with those of individuals scoring high on the disengagement subscale of the FPII. The reported psychometric properties of the togetherness items are presented in Table 7, and those of the separateness items in Table 8.

Bridging

The subscale chosen for comparison with the bridging subscale of the FPII came from the FCT (van der Veen, 1979), and is labeled community sociability. This dimension is characterized by sociability, friendships, being liked, and getting along well

Table 7

Psychometric Properties from the Togetherness Subscale of the FCT

Item	Factor loading	Cronbach's alpha
(1) We do many things together. and	.60	Not Reported
(2) Our home is the center of our activities.	.49	
(3) Our activities together are usually planned and organized.	.41	
(4) We depend on each other too much.	.40	

Table 8

Psychometric Properties from the Separateness Subscale of the FCT

Item	Factor loading	Cronbach's alpha
(1) Usually each of us goes his own separate way.	-.55	Not Reported
(2) we do not spend enough time together.	-.42	

in the community. The reported psychometric properties of the community sociability subscale are presented in Table 9.

Financial Management

The financial well-being subscale from the Family Inventory of Resources for Management (FIRM) instrument (McCubbin & Thompson, 1987) was developed to provide information about which resources a given family has, does not have, or has depleted (McCubbin & Thompson, 1987). McCubbin and Thompson hypothesized that families who possess a larger repertoire of resources will manage more effectively and will

Table 9

Psychometric Properties from the Community Sociability Subscale of the FCT

Subscale name	Item	Factor loading	Cronbach's alpha
Community Sociability	(1) We are sociable and really enjoy being with people.	.62	Not Reported
	(2) We get along very well in the community.	.58	
	(3) We have a number of close friends.	.53	
	(4) We are liked by most people who know us.	.49	

be able to adapt more effectively to stressful situations. The financial well-being factor of the FIRM assesses the family's perceived financial efficacy, defined as (a) ability to meet financial commitments, (b) adequacy of financial reserves, (c) ability to help others (relatives, the needy), and (d) optimism about the family's financial future.

The items selected for use on the FIRM were influenced by literature and theory in three areas: (a) personal resources, (b) family system internal resources, and (c) social support. McCubbin and Thompson (1987) reported that from an initial item pool of 98 self-report items, 68 items on four scales were retained after factor analysis of data from 322 families (McCubbin & Thompson, 1987).

The subscale of the FIRM used in this study is the financial well-being subscale (McCubbin & Thompson, 1987). This scale consists of 16 items that tap perceived financial efficacy. The scale is on a 4-point Likert-type scale from (1) "not at all" to (4) "very well." Due to the length of the survey, items from this scale included in this study

are only those which loaded at .5 or better. The psychometric properties for these items are presented in Table 10.

Self-Reliance

The development self-reliance and self-esteem subscale of the Family Coping Inventory (FCI; McCubbin & Thompson, 1987) was compared to the self-reliance subscale of the FPII. The FCI was designed to record the behaviors husbands or wives find helpful in managing family life when spouses are separated. McCubbin and Thompson also reported that the FCI can be used with intact families in order to compare coping strategies. The development self-reliance and self-esteem subscale is intended to assess active self-development and growth behaviors. The instrument is situated around a 4-point Likert-type scale from (1) "not helpful" to (4) " very helpful." The reported psychometric properties of the FCI are presented in Table 11.

Work Orientation

Work orientation is another subscale for which a good comparison subscale was not found in the literature reviewed. Therefore, one was not included in this study.

Daily Chores

The items used for comparison with the daily chores subscale of the FPII came from the family chores subscale of the Family Time and Routines Index (FTRI; McCubbin & Thompson, 1987). Two items from the family management subscale of the FTRI were also used. Both of these subscales are conceptually designed to measure those

Table 10

Psychometric Properties from the Financial Well-Being Subscale of the FIRM

Item	Factor loading	Cronbach's alpha
(1) When we need something that can't be postponed, we have money in savings to cover it.	.78	.85
(2) We feel we have enough money on hand to cover small, unexpected expenses (under $100).	.77	
(3) If a close relative were having financial problems we feel we could afford to help them out.	.67	
(4) we feel we are able to go out to eat occasionally without hurting our budget.	.60	
(5) We worry about how we would cover a large, unexpected bill (for home, auto repairs, etc. for about $100).	.56	
(6) We feel we are financially better off now than we were five years ago.	.54	
(7) We feel we are able to make financial contributions to a good cause (needy people, church, etc.).	.53	
(8) We seem to have little or no problem paying our bills on time.	.52	

Table 11

Psychometric Properties of the Dev. Self-Reliance and Self-Esteem Subscale of the FCI

Item	Factor loading	Cronbach's alpha
(1) Learning new skills.	.55	.71
(2) Developing myself as a person.	.54	
(3) Becoming more independent.	.63	
(4) Showing that I am strong.	.49	

routines and time commitments that families make around family activities and practices. The psychometric properties of those items used in this study are presented in Table 12.

Sacred/Secular Orientation

The Church/Religious Resources of the Family Crisis Oriented Personal Evaluation Scales (F-COPES; McCubbin & Thompson, 1987) was chosen for use in evaluating the convergent validity of the sacred/secular orientation subscale of the FPII. F-COPES was developed to identify effective problem-solving and behavioral strategies used by families in problematic or difficult situations (Olson et al., 1982; McCubbin & Thompson, 1987). F-COPES draws upon coping dimensions in which the factors of (a) pile-up, (b) family resources, and (c) meaning/perception are integrated (McCubbin & Thompson, 1987).

Conceptually, the F-COPES falls into two major areas, three subscales falling under the heading of Internal Family Coping Patterns, and five subscales composing the External Family Coping Patterns (McCubbin & Thompson, 1987). The church/religious resources subscale falls under the umbrella of the external family resources and reflects the

Table 12

Psychometric Properties from the Family Chores and Family Management Subscales of the FTRI

Item	Factor loading	Cronbach's alpha
(1) Children do regular household chores.	.85	Not Reported
(2) Teenagers do regular household chores.	.76	
(1) Mothers do regular household chores.	.30	Not Reported
(2) Fathers do regular household chores.	.47	

family's involvement with religious activities and ideology in dealing with difficulties (Olson, Bell, et al., 1982).

F-COPES was designed by McCubbin, Olsen, and Larsen to integrate family resources and meaning perception factors into coping strategies (McCubbin & Thompson, 1987; Olson, McCubbin, et al., 1982). Forty-nine items were originally generated and then pretested on a convenience sample of 119 family members. After analysis, the number of items retained dropped to 30. Factor analytic procedures were used to identify the underlying dimensions. Eight subscales grouped into internal and external family coping patterns were identified. The subscale is situated on a 5-point Likert-type scale from (1) "strongly disagree" to (5) "strongly agree." The psychometric properties of this subscale are presented in Table 13.

Table 13

Psychometric Properties from the Church/Religious Resources Subscale of the F-COPES

Item	Factor loading	Cronbach's alpha
(1) Seeking advice from a minister.	.85	.87
(2) Attending church services.	.83	
(3) Participating in church activities.	.70	
(4) Having faith in God.	.70	

Rituals

The scale chosen for use in comparison with the rituals subscale of the FPII was also developed by the Family Stress Coping and Health Project at the University of Wisconsin-Madison (McCubbin & Thompson, 1987). The measure is called the Family Celebrations Index and was developed to measure the degree to which families practice each of the types of celebrations listed. It is designed to measure the degree to which the family is involved in the family process of celebrating traditional, special, transitional, and situational events (McCubbin & Thompson). Celebrations are conceptually thought to be those special events which are marked by a family in a given way.

The Family Celebrations Index (FCELEBI) is a 9-item scale (McCubbin & Thompson, 1987) that was developed on a 4-point Likert-type scale from (1) "never" to (4) "always." The scale is organized into Unique and Intra-family categories (McCubbin

Table 14

Psychometric Properties of the FCELEBI

Item	Factor loading	Cronbach's alpha
(1) Special changes and events (i.e., graduation, promotion).	.67	.69
(2) Special surprises and successes (i.e., passed a test, good report card).	.65	
(3) Relative birthdays/ anniversaries.	.63	
(4) Friend's special events.	.60	
(5) Religious occasions (holy days, etc..).	.29	
(6) Yearly major holidays (4th of July, New Year's).	.75	
(7) Occasions (i.e., Valentine's Day, Mother's Day).	.71	
(8) Children's birthday(s).	.63	
(9) Spouse's birthday.	.40	

Quality of the Family Relationships

The Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test (MAT; Locke & Wallace, 1959) was chosen for comparison with the quality of the family relationships subscale of the FPII. The MAT is designed to measure marital adjustment. The authors refer to adjustment within a marriage as the accommodation of a husband and wife to each other at a given time. The scale is a 15-item test (Locke & Wallace, 1959). The instrument consists of one global adjustment question, eight questions measuring possible disagreement; and six questions assessing conflict resolution, cohesion, and communication. The reported

Cronbach's alpha for the entire scale is .73. The global adjustment question is situated on a 7-point Likert-type scale from (1) "very unhappy to (7) "perfectly happy" (Locke & Wallace, 1959). The Likert scale of this question was also altered to fit a 5-point scale with the same end-points.

The global adjustment question, written to elicit a response about the overall happiness being experienced in the marriage, was altered for this study. Instead of asking about the marriage, the term family or family life was substituted wherever the question now reads marriage. This was done because the unit of interest in this study is the entire family. This item reads as follows: "Mark the letter of the dot on the scale line below which best describes the degree of happiness, everything considered, of your present family. The middle point, 'Happy,' represents the degree of happiness which most people get from their family. The scale gradually ranges on one side to those few who are very unhappy in their family and on the other side, to those few who experience extreme joy or felicity in their family" (Locke & Wallace, 1959, p. 253).

Survey

The entire survey consisted of 127 items: 13 demographic items and 114 items from the instruments (see Appendix A). To break up the instrument for the subjects, the questionnaire was divided into six separate sections, labeled only as sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. The first section consisted of the 58 items from the FPII (Lee et al., 1997) and 23 items from the FCT (van der Veen, 1979). The second section comprised the eight questions from the FIRM (McCubbin & Thompson, 1987). The third section was made up of the eight questions from the FTRI (McCubbin & Thompson, 1987). The fourth

section was four questions from the FCI (McCubbin & Thompson, 1987). The fifth section contained the eight questions from the FCELEBI (McCubbin & Thompson, 1987). The final section consisted of the five questions from the F-COPES (McCubbin & Thompson, 1987; Olson et al., 1982) and the item from the Marital Adjustment Test (Locke & Wallace, 1959). The number of items of the subscales from the FPII and those subscales and/or items used as comparison with each FPII subscale are presented in Table 15.

Data Reduction and Transformation

The completed surveys were coded and data were scanned into the computer and analyzed using SPSS. Each of the measures was scored separately, as was each of the subscales. Where necessary, coding was reversed to facilitate comparison of the data.

The scores were first summarized using descriptive statistics. The number, range, mean, and standard deviation for each variable were calculated. Before assessing the factor structure of the subscales of the FPII on a 5-point Likert-type scale, the items 19, 22, 23, 32, 33, 36, 38, 49, 58, 59, 67, 68, and 101 were first reversed. This was done so that all of the items within a subscale corresponded (so that a high score on the items within every subscale was high or low on the measured construct). The data from the FPII were then recorded, and factor analyses were run on those items. Next a secondary factor analysis was calculated. Each subject's score on the 13 subscales was summed and a factor analysis was performed on the various subscales. Cronbach's alphas were calculated next to compare the FPII on the 5-point scale to the previous 7-point scale.

Table 15

FPII Subscales and Subscales Used as External Criteria

FPII subscale	# of items	Comparison subscales	# of items
Kindness	5	1. Consideration-FCT 2. Family togetherness-FTRI	7 4
Unkindness	5	1. Conflict-FCT	6
Disengagement	4	1. Separateness-FCT	2
Enmeshment	4	1. Togetherness-FCT	4
Bridging	5	1. Community sociability-FCT	4
Financial management	4	1. Financial well-being-FIRM	8
Self-reliance	4	1. Development self-reliance and self-esteem-FCI	4
Daily chores	5	1. Family chores and family management-FTRI	4
Sacred orientation	5	Church/religious resources-F-COPES	4
Rituals	5	1. FCELEBI	8
Quality of the family relationships	5	1. Global adjustment question-marital adjustment test	1
Work Orientation	3	No Comparison	
Communication	4	No Comparison	

To test whether or not there were statistically significant correlations between the subscale scores of the FPII and the scores from the subscales used as external criteria, Pearson's product moment correlations were calculated. The correlations were run between each mean score of the subscales of the FPII and the mean scores of the subscales used to validate the subscales of the FPII.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Factor Structure of FPII on a 5-Point Scale

Sample

Before presenting the results of this study, the characteristics of the sample will be described. A 127-item survey was administered to 229 undergraduate students at Utah State University. The sample consisted mostly of Latter-day Saint (83%) Caucasian (90%) females (67%) in their early 20s (50%). Fifty-one percent of the sample had never been married. The majority of respondents, 71%, filled out the survey on their family of origin. Forty-five percent of the sample reported incomes of $35,000 or more annually. Demographic information is presented in Table 16. This sample is not representative of the average American family.

Hypothesis One

Hypothesis one stated that there would be no difference in the factor structure of the subscales of the FPII used in this study on a 5-point Likert-type scale and the factor structure found in previous studies on a 7-point Likert-type scale.

A series of oblique rotations were run to assess the factor structure of the FPII on the five-point scale for this sample. Because the constructs assessed by the FPII are conceptually interrelated, oblique, rather than orthogonal, rotations were most appropriate. The resulting factor structure did not wholly support hypothesis one.

Table 16

Sample Description

Variable	n	Percentage
Age		
18-21	57	25
22-25	115	50
26-30	35	15
31-40	8	4
41 and Above	13	6
Total	228	100
Gender		
Male	74	33
Female	153	67
Total	227	100
Ethnicity		
African American	1	<1
Asian	18	8
Caucasian	203	90
American Indian	2	1
Spanish or Hispanic	2	1
Total	226	100
Current Marital Status		
Single, Never Married	116	51
Married	96	42
Separated/Divorced	15	7
Widowed	0	0
Remarried	1	<1
Total	228	100
Family of Origin		
Two parents who were married and never divorced	178	79
Two parents where one or both were remarried	39	17
A single parent	8	4

(table continues)

Variable	n	Percentage
A family where a grandparent or another person was the main parent	1	<1
Total	226	100
Income		
Under $5,000	8	3
$5,000 to $15,000	44	20
$15,000 to $25,000	40	18
$25,000 to $35,000	32	14
$35,000 and above	101	45
Total	225	100
Religion		
Roman Catholic or Eastern Orthodox	8	3
Protestant	5	2
Latter-Day Saint (Mormon)	189	83
None	11	5
Other	15	7
Total	228	100
The Family You are Answering About is:		
The family you grew up in (if a, then skip questions 9, 10, 11)	160	71
The family you are a parent of (if b, then answer questions 9, 10, 11)	65	29
Total	226	100
Marital Status in the Family You Parent		
Married (first marriage)	63	58
Remarried	8	7

(table continues)

Variable	n	Percentage
Divorced/Separated	15	14
Widowed	7	6
Never Married	15	14
Total	108	100
Age of Oldest Child		
Under 5 years old	43	52
6 to 11 years old	8	10
12 to 15 years old	3	4
16 to 19 years old	6	7
Over 20 years old	22	27
Total	82	100
No. of Children at Home		
None	22	24
1	37	41
2	15	17
3	7	8
4 or more	8	9
Total	89	100
Level of Education		
Under 12	1	5
high School Graduate	68	31
Trade or Vocational School (13-15)	51	23
College Graduate (16)	84	38
Post College Training (>16)	17	8
Total	221	100
Employment Status		
Not Employed	65	29
Employed Part-Time	115	51
Employed Full-Time	44	20
Total	224	100

Instead of 13 subscales as was shown in previous studies (Lee et al., 1997), the factor structure revealed 14 subscales. As is shown in Table 17, four of the factors (sacred/ secular orientation, disengagement, enmeshment, and financial management) were made up of the same items as the previous sample. These subscales will not be elaborated upon further. An additional five subscales factored out only partially different items as the previous study. The remaining five factors identified in this study were substantially different than identified in the national sample.

Kindness

The five items previously identified as the kindness items splintered across four separate factors. Two items loaded onto the quality of the family relationships factor, one loaded with rituals, one with daily chores, and one with unkindness.

Unkindness

All of the previously identified five unkindness items factored together along with an additional three items. The additional items included two from the daily chores subscale and one from the kindness subscale.

Communication

The four communication items as previously identified also stayed together. An item from the quality of the family life subscale was picked up by this factor. It was interesting that the item that factored with communication was an item assessing the degree to which the family was "the way we want it to be."

Table 17

Factor Structure of the FPII on 5-Point Scale Compared to 7-Point Scale

Items	Previous factor	Current factor	Factor loading
Factor One			
40. Family members sacrifice for each other.	Kindness	Quality of the family life	.43
52. The overall quality of our family life is very poor.	Quality of the family life	Quality of the family life	.40
39. We are satisfied with how we get along in our family.	Quality of the family life	Quality of the family life	.34
26. The overall quality of our family life is very good.	Quality of the family life	Quality of the family life	.30
65. We are compassionate.	Kindness	Quality of the family life	.30
Factor Two			
69. We rely on a supreme being.	Sacred orientation	Sacred orientation	.90
62. We attend worship services.	Sacred orientation	Sacred orientation	.88
24. Faith in religious things are important to our family.	Sacred orientation	Sacred orientation	.86
50. Faith in God, or a higher power, is important to our family.	Sacred orientation	Sacred orientation	.84
37. We pay attention to the spiritual part of life.	Sacred orientation	Sacred orientation	.78
Factor Three			
21. As a family, we take the responsibility to provide for ourselves.	Self-reliance	Self-reliance	.81
34. We try to be self supporting.	Self-reliance	Self-reliance	.69
47. We try to be independent financially.	Self-reliance	Self-reliance	.59
22. We are taught that work is a key to success.	Work	Self-reliance	.54

(table continues)

Items	Previous factor	Current factor	Factor loading
60. We accept the challenge to provide for ourselves.	Self-reliance	Self-reliance	.51
48. Work is an important value taught in our family.	Work	Self-reliance	.36
Factor Four			
25. We participate in valued traditions that are unique to our family.	Rituals	Rituals	.91
63. We have some valued traditions that are unique to our family.	Rituals	Rituals	.77
51. We give the right amount of emphasis to special events like holidays, birthdays, and anniversaries.	Rituals	Rituals	.50
70. We enjoy the celebration of special holidays our family.	Rituals	Rituals	.50
14. We do nice things for each other.	Kindness	Rituals	.29
Factor Five			
32. Our family avoids social situations.	Bridging	Bridging 1	.72
19. Our family is uncomfortable socializing with others.	Bridging	Bridging 1	.67
35. We avoid hard work.	Work	Bridging 1	.37
71. Overall the family gets along well.	Quality of the family life	Bridging 1	.35
Factor Six			
61. Our family is good about getting daily chores done.	Daily chores	Daily chores	.77
23. The quality of our work on family chores is poor.	Daily chores	Daily chores	.76
53. Family members give of their time for one another.	Kindness	Daily chores	.29
Factor Seven			
31. Individuals in our family are not given enough freedom.	Enmeshment	Enmeshment	-.78
18. Some members of the family want more individuality than our family allows.	Enmeshment	Enmeshment	-.66

(table continues)

Items	Previous factor	Current factor	Factor loading
57. The family discourages independence.	Enmeshment	Enmeshment	-.46
44. The family puts too much pressure on us to the family's way of doing things.	Enmeshment	Enmeshment	-.42
Factor Eight			
59. Being in debt is a serious problem for our family.	Financial mgmt.	Financial mgmt.	.85
33. We are in debt for many things that our not necessary.	Financial mgmt.	Financial mgmt.	.74
20. We live within our income.	Financial mgmt.	Financial mgmt.	.67
46. We pay our bills on time.	Financial mgmt.	Financial mgmt.	.51
Factor Nine			
45. In times of need, our family has a network people we can count on for help.	Bridging	Bridging/ daily chores	.46
36. Everyday tasks are left undone in our family.	Daily chores	Bridging/ daily chores	-.44
Factor Ten			
67. When serious problems arise, our family is on its own.	Bridging	Bridging 2	-.51
Factor Eleven			
55. Some members can't put their thoughts into words very well.	Communi-cation	Communi-cation	.79
16. Some members of our family have difficulty expressing themselves.	Communi-cation	Communi-cation	.74
29. Some members of our family are poor communicators.	Communi-cation	Communi-cation	.63
64. Our family is about the way we want it to be.	Quality of the Family Life	Communi-cation	-.50
42. Some members of our family have difficulty understanding others.	Communi-cation	Communi-cation	.37

(table continues)

Items	Previous factor	Current factor	Factor loading
Factor Twelve			
38. Our family should give more emphasis to celebrating special events.	Rituals	Rituals	.70
Factor Thirteen			
43. In our family, everyone is on their own.	Disengage-ment	Disengage-ment	.84
30. Family members lead very separate lives.	Disengage-ment	Disengage-ment	.60
56. We do things as separate individuals rather than as a family unit.	Disengage-ment	Disengage-ment	.57
17. When we are at home family members usually do their own thing.	Disengage-ment	Disengage-ment	.50
Factor Fourteen			
15. Some family members are rude to others.	Unkindness	Unkindness	.78
54. Some family members ridicule others.	Unkindness	Unkindness	.74
41. Some family members are cruel to one another.	Unkindness	Unkindness	.72
28. Some family members are very critical of others.	Unkindness	Unkindness	.65
66. Some family members are verbally abusive with one another.	Unkindness	Unkindness	.63
49. Some family members do not do their fair share of the family chores.	Daily chores	Unkindness	-.45
68. Some family members fail to do their share of work.	Daily chores	Unkindness	-.38
27. We give each other compliments.	Kindness	Unkindness	-.33

Bridging

The bridging subscale factored out onto three separate factors. Two of the bridging items formed their own factor. Two other items combined to form a factor with one item each from the work orientation and quality of the family relationships subscales.

Three of the items (the two bridging and the work orientation item) have to do with avoiding things, social interactions, and work. The final bridging item loaded with a daily chores item.

Self-Reliance

The four self-reliance items remained factored together. This subscale also picked up two additional work orientation items. Each of these items deal with taking responsibility for oneself.

Work Orientation

As mentioned, two work orientation items factored with self-reliance. The third item from the work orientation subscale factored with two bridging and one quality of the family relationship items.

Daily Chores

The original five items that made up this subscale were distributed onto three different factors. Two of the five items paired with one kindness item. The two daily chores items combined with the kindness item hung together with strong loadings. One of the daily chores items factored with a bridging item, and two more factored with unkindness.

Rituals

Four of the five ritual items factored together with one kindness item. The final ritual item factored out all by itself.

Quality of the Family Relations

Three of the Quality of the Family Relationships (QFR) items loaded with two kindness items. One of the QFR items factored with two bridging and one work orientation item. The final item loaded onto communication.

Correlation Between Factors

Each of the 14 factors appears to be measuring different constructs in this sample. The paired correlations between these factors are relatively weak, indicating the presence of different constructs. The correlations between the factors are presented in Table 18.

Secondary Factor Analysis

To further assess the factor structure of the FPII on the 5-point Likert-type scale, a secondary factor analysis was run. This analysis was performed to assess the meta or secondary relationships among the subscales. This analysis was performed by submitting the scale scores for each of the subscales as conceptualized on the FPII to further factor analysis. The results give greater understanding to the relationship between the constructs assessed by the FPII, as they report the relationships between the subscales.

As the results presented in Table 19 show, the subscales grouped onto three factors. Communication, factor loadings = (-.83), unkindness (.82), disengagement (.69), enmeshment (.63), and kindness (-.58) factored together on a factor assessing family relationships. Rituals, factor loadings = (.82), sacred/secular orientation (.74), bridging (.72), and quality of the family relationships (.48) factored onto an external resources factor.

Table 18

Correlation Between Factors

Factor	Quality	Sacred	Self-Rel	Ritual 1	Bridge 1	Daily Ch	Enmesh	Fin Man	Brid/ DC	Bridge 2	Comm	Ritual 2	Disen	Unkind
Quality	--	.12	.13	.17	.11		.10	.14			.13		-.12	-.18
Sacred		--	.13	.32	.25	.12	.15	.13	.12	-.11	.25		-.24	-.24
Self-Rel			--		.15	.18		.25						-.18
Rituals 1				--	.25	.14	.12	.12	.15		.25		-.30	-.18
Bridge 1					--	.11	.17	.13			.25		-.19	-.15
Daily Ch						--		.14			.19		-.17	-.25
Enmesh							--				.25		-.19	-.27
Fin Man								--			.13			-.24
Brid/DC									--					
Brid 2										--				
Commun											--		.34	-.39
Rituals 2												--		
Disengag													--	.27
Unkind														--

Table 19

Secondary Factor Analysis

Factor	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Relationship Dimension			
Communication	-.83		
Unkindness	.82		
Disengagement	.69		
Enmeshment	.63		
Kindness	-.58	.51	
External Resources			
Rituals		.82	
Sacred/Secular		.74	
Bridging		.72	
Quality	-.47	.58	.41
System Maintenance			
Financial Man.			.81
Self-Reliance			.75
Work			.60
Daily Chores	-.44		.54

Finally, financial management, factor loadings = (.81), self-reliance (.75), work orientation (.60), and daily chores (.54) grouped with each other on a System Maintenance dimension.

Hypothesis Two

Hypothesis two stated that there would be statistically significant correlations between the subscale scores of the FPII and the scores from the subscales used as external criteria. Several of the factors ended up being different in this sample from the FPII conceptually postulated. However, when the items were grouped into the original subscales as defined on the FPII, each of the subscales statistically significantly correlated with the subscales chosen as external criteria at the $p < .01$ level. The subscales and their

correlations are presented in Table 20. This indicates that although there are some differences in the way the factors loaded in this sample, the constructs conceptually identified on the FPII and the subscales used as comparison data points appear to be measuring similar constructs.

More important than statistical significance is the strength of the relationship. For five of the subscales the strength of the relationships was strong (Dooley, 1995). The kindness subscale from the FPII and the consideration subscale from the FCT (van der Veen, 1979) correlated at $r = .68$, or shared 46% of their variance. Kindness shared 30% of the explained variance ($r = .55$) with the family togetherness subscale of the FTRI (McCubbin & Thompson, 1987). The strongest relationship was between the sacred/secular orientation subscale of the FPII and the church/religious resources subscale of the F-COPES (McCubbin & Thompson, 1987). The strength of this relationship was 56% shared variance ($r = .75$).

The other three relationships that correlated strongly were: (a) unkindness from the FPII with the conflict subscale of the FCT, which shared 57% variance ($r = .72$); (b) disengagement from the FPII and the separateness subscale of the FCT, which shared 43% of the variance explained ($r = .65$); and (c) the quality of the family relationships subscale of the FPII correlated highly with the Global Adjustment Question of the MAT (Locke & Wallace, 1959), sharing 48% of their explained variance ($r = .69$).

Also of interest is the fact that the subscales chosen as comparison scales for the enmeshment, self-Reliance, and financial management subscales from the FPII correlated poorly with their comparison subscales. The magnitude of their relationship was (a) 3% shared variance between enmeshment and the togetherness subscale of the FCT ($r = -.19$),

Table 20

Correlation Between FPII Subscales and Comparison Subscales

Variable	Consid-eration	Family together	Conflict	Separa-tion	Together-ness	Comm-unity soc.	Fin. well-being	Dev. self-reliance	Family chores	Church/ religion	FCELE BI	Global adjust-ment
Kindness	**.68****	**.55****	-.57**	-.50**	.53**	.61**	.21**	.43**	.21**	.36**	.41**	.60**
Unkindness	-.61**	-.42**	**.72****	.44**	-.31**	-.39**	-.16*	-.33**	-.13	-.30**	-.25**	-.47**
Disengagement	-.44**	-.53**	.37**	**.65****	-.59**	-.44**	.00	-.30**	-.12	-.32**	-.45**	-.53**
Enmeshment	-.48**	-.18**	.57**	.36**	**-.19****	-.38**	-.09	-.35**	-.11	-.27**	-.19**	-.41**
Bridging	.37**	.24**	-.36**	-.24**	.29**	**.60****	.13	.32**	.13	.40**	.35**	.42**
Financial management	.29**	.03	-.34**	-.13*	.06	.24**	**.32****	.15*	.19**	.15*	.09	.23**
Self-reliance	.37**	.15*	-.30**	-.20**	.16*	.33**	.04	**.22****	.16*	.23**	.04	.23**
Daily chores	.50**	.34**	-.54**	-.39**	.29**	.42**	.17*	.27**	**.36****	.30**	.21**	.36**
Sacred/secular	.38**	.29**	-.32**	-.33**	.39**	.49**	.03	.23**	.18**	**.75****	.40**	.29**
Rituals	.44**	.45**	-.35**	-.51**	.47**	.51**	.05	.35**	.20**	.31**	**.50****	.46**
Family quality	.61**	.52**	-.54**	-.38**	.51**	.63**	.26**	.50**	.24**	.35**	.45**	**.69****
Communication	.46**	.42**	-.54**	-.44**	.40**	.47**	.10	.42**	.21**	.37**	.43**	.50**
Work	.37**	.21**	-.28**	-.27**	.23**	.40**	.19**	.36**	.25**	.32**	.25**	.37**

Note. Bold cells indicate those relationships with which this study is concerned.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

(b) 5% shared variance between the self-reliance subscale and the development self-reliance subscale of the FCI (r = .22), and (c) the financial management subscale and the financial well-being items from the FIRM shared 10% of their variance (r = .32). These relationships would indicate the presence of different constructs in this sample.

Table 21 shows the Cronbach's alphas for the subscales used in this study and the previously reported Cronbach's alphas for those which had been reported. As is shown in Table 17, the respondents answered consistently in their responses within each of the subscales. This indicated reliability in the responses reported in this sample.

Summary of Findings

The factor structure of the FPII on the altered 5-point Likert-type scale for this particular sample was somewhat different from the factor structure previously reported for the FPII on the 7-point Likert-type scale on the national sample. There were 14 factors identified in this study rather than the previous 13. However, when the items were placed into the subscales previously identified on the FPII, the majority of the subscales had a moderate to strong similarity to their comparison subscale. All of the comparison scales statistically significantly correlated with their intended FPII match subscale.

Table 21

Cronbach's Alpha

Subscale	Current alpha	Previous alpha
Kindness	.83	.88
Consideration	.75	
Family togetherness	.75	
Unkindness	.87	.89
Conflict	.87	
Communication	.82	.85
Disengagement	.78	.80
Separateness	.60	
Enmeshment	.71	.78
Togetherness	.40	
Bridging	.66	.80
Community sociability	.72	
Financial management	.74	.78
Fin. well-being	.71	.85
Self-reliance	.73	.72
Dev. self-reliance	.85	.71
Daily chores	.78	.81
Family chores	.63	
Sacred/secular	.92	.95
Church	.90	.87
Work	.66	.73
Rituals	.80	.83
FCELEBI	.77	.69
Quality	.49	

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

This project had two main objectives: (a) to assess the factor structure of the FPII (Lee et al., 1997) on a 5-point Likert-type scale instead of its original 7-point scale, and (b) to asses the concurrent validity of the subscales of the FPII by correlating them with subscales from instruments designed to measure similar constructs. Given a sample size of 229 drawn nonrandomly from undergraduate university classes at Utah State University, the findings of this study appear to partially support both of these objectives. The majority of the subscales behaved very similarly to how they were conceptually thought to on the 5-point scale. Four of the subscales factored out with exactly the same items as before. Five more of the subscales behaved very closely to how they were conceptualized, maintaining similar items with only minor differences. The final four subscales did not behave the way they were expected to factor.

The secondary factor analysis of the FPII indicated that the subscales of the FPII are tapping three more general aspects of family functioning. The subscales factored into three meta-factors assessing a family relationships dimension, an external resources factor, and a system maintenance dimension.

Finally, in the correlations calculated between the subscales of the FPII and those subscales chosen as external criteria, the relationships between the matched subscales were all statistically significant. The majority of the correlations calculated indicate that the subscales of the FPII and those chosen as external data points assessed similar aspects

of family functioning in this sample. This yields support for the validity of the interpretation of the scores gathered in the FPII.

Discussion

Factor Analysis

The most confidence in the interpretation of the factor analysis results from the FPII on this study is held for the sacred/secular orientation, enmeshment, financial management, and disengagement subscales. Each of these subscales factored with and only with the items they were previously thought to. Therefore, confidence can be placed in interpreting the correlations between the subscales of the FPII and those chosen as external criteria.

Because there were only minimal changes in five more of the subscales, moderate to high confidence is mereited in the interpretation of the results. The quality of the family relationships, self-reliance, rituals, communication, and unkindness subscales all remained very similar to their originally conceived subscales. These subscales mostly maintained their original items and picked up one or two items from other subscales. Due to interesting pairing of items, some of the items that factored into these factors deserve a closer look.

Two items previously identified as work orientation grouped with self-reliance. All of the items on this new factor assess the family's valuing and taking on the challenge of the family's providing for itself.

A kindness item assessing the doing of nice things for each other factored with the rituals items. Rituals are defined in the FPII as "the extent to which family members participate in patterns of behavior, pertaining to some specific event, occasion, or situation, which tends to be repeated" (Lee et al., 1997, p. 468). Therefore, it makes sense that as the family engages in rituals there would be a connection with doing nice things for each other.

After reversing the communication items, there was a positive relationship between these items and the quality of the family relationship (QFR) item this factor picked up. Each of the communication items is stated negatively, with higher scores indicating poorer communication. The QFR item assessed the subjects' perceptions of their families' being about the way they would like it to be. This may indicate that as quality in communication increases there is an increase in the family being how one would like it to be.

Finally, all of the unkindness items factored together along with two daily chores items and a kindness item. Of particular interest is the inverse association between the daily chores items and the unkindness items. Family members' participation in family chores is negatively related with the unkindness items. The kindness item assesses the giving of compliments and also inversely corresponds with the unkindness items on this factor.

Although these factors are not precisely the same as those previously reported in the FPII, they are quite similar. Therefore, moderate confidence is held for the interpretation of the results from the QFR, self-reliance, rituals, communication, and unkindness subscales.

The least amount of confidence is found in the results for the kindness, bridging, daily chores, and work orientation subscales. Each of these factors behaved substantially different in this sample than in previous studies. Of particular interest is the kindness subscale. The five kindness items were distributed across four different factors. Two items went with QFR, one with rituals, one with daily chores, and one with unkindness. While the possible reasons for this splintering are many (discussed in limitations section), one possible explanation is particularly conceptually interesting. If the five kindness items are indeed assessing "kindness" in families, it would be conceptually logical and interesting that kindness would be dispersed throughout these other areas of family functioning. It was expected that kindness would be interrelated with these other constructs; therefore, it is not too surprising that they were assessing the presence of the same construct in the families represented in this sample. However, due to the items' lack of factoring in the way expected for kindness, bridging, daily chores, and work orientation, the least amount of confidence is held in the interpretation of the results from these four subscales. In other words, this project failed to yield support that the results from these subscales may be validly interpreted.

Secondary Factor Analysis

The secondary factor analysis yielded conceptual support for the FPII on a 5-point scale for this particular sample. The 13 subscales of the FPII factored onto three second-order factors. Communication, unkindness, disengagement, enmeshment, and kindness all factored onto a family relationship dimension. Rituals, sacred/secular orientation, bridging, and QFR factored together on an external resources factor. Financial

management, self-reliance, work orientation, and daily chores factor with one another onto a factor that appears to be assessing system maintenance.

That the 13 factors would factor onto these three factors is conceptually consistent with Harker's (1997) findings which indicated that the FPII factored into three secondary factors. Therefore, while the items did not load precisely onto factors using the 5-point scale as previously reported on the 7-point scale, the measure does appear to be tapping important dimensions of family functioning. These variations could also be due to the differences between the samples, or due to the variability inherent in self-report measures.

Concurrent Validity of the FPII

The second hypothesis of this study was that there would be statistically significant correlations between the subscales of the FPII and those subscales chosen as external criteria. This hypothesis was supported because there was a statistically significant relationship between all relevant subscales at least at the $p < .01$ level. In and of themselves, these findings indicate that the subscales of the FPII and those used as external criteria are measuring similar aspects of family functioning. However, the strength of the relationships between the subscales ranged from a shared variance of less than 1% to 56%.

The correlation that showed the strongest relationship was between the sacred/secular orientation subscale of the FPII and the church/religious resources of the F-COPES ($r = .75$). The unkindness subscale of the FPII and the conflict subscale of the Family Conflict Test (van der Veen, 1979) ($r = .72$) and the quality of the family

relationship subscale of the FPII and the Global Adjustment Question from the Mental Adjustment Test (Locke & Wallace, 1959) (r = .69) also correlated strongly with each other. There was also a strong correlation between the kindness subscale of the FPII and the consideration subscale from the FCT (r = .68), and between the disengagement subscale of the FPII and the separateness subscale of the FCT (r = .65). Each of these pairs shared at least 42% of their variance. This suggests that there is a strong relationship between these subscales and that they are measuring similar constructs.

The factor structures on the above variables were very similiar to those reported in previous studies. Furthermore, the correlations between these scales and those used as external criteria were high. Therefore, it is concluded that these subscales are measuring similar aspects of family functioning, and that greater confidence can be had in the interpretation of the results from the FPII on these subscales. In other words, the validation of the concurrently obtained data in this study lends support for the validity of the interpretation of the results for these subscales.

The exception to this is the kindness subscale. Because of this subscale's inability to factor with the expected items in the factor analysis, the results of this correlation should be interpreted with caution. While the kindness items from the FPII and the consideration items from the FCT share 46% of their variance, indicating that they are measuring a similar aspect of family life, exactly what that construct is cannot be determined from this study.

There were moderate correlations between four more of the pairs of subscales analyzed in this study. Bridging from the FPII correlated with the community sociability subscale of the FCT at .60. Kindness from the FPII correlated with the family

togetherness subscale of the Family Time and Routines Index (FTRI; McCubbin & Thompson, 1987) at $r = .55$. The correlation between rituals from the FPII and the FCELEBI (McCubbin & Thompson, 1987) was $r = .50$. Finally, daily chores from the FPII and the family chores and family management items from the FTRI correlated with each other at $r = .36$.

These scores in and of themselves would lend support to the hypothesis that these pairs of subscales are, in part, measuring similar aspects of family life. However, due to some of the inconsistencies in the subscales from the FPII in these pairs, only moderate confidence should be used in interpreting these results. It does appear that the subscales of the FPII in these pairs and the comparison subscales are assessing what they purport to measure.

The relationship between the other remaining subscales of the FPII and their comparison subscales yielded results of $r = .32$ or lower. It is therefore concluded that the enmeshment, financial management, and self-reliance subscales of the FPII are measuring different constructs than those subscales chosen as comparison subscales for this study.

Summary

Establishing the validity of an instrument is a process of gradually accumulating evidence that the interpretations made from the scores on the measure accurately represent the extent of the given construct in the subject (Anastasi, 1988). This study was designed to contribute data supporting the interpretations made from the 13 subscales of the FPII. This was done by comparing these subscales to similar subscales from other measures to gather concurrent validity on the FPII's subscales. Additionally,

this study attempted to demonstrate that the factor structure for this sample on a 5-point response set of the FPII was equivalent to the previous 7-point scale. The data gathered in this study supported the interpretation of the results from several of the subscales of the FPII, because they correlated well with the subscales used as external criteria. Furthermore, while there were differences in the factor structure found in this study on the 5-point scale and that which was reported previously on the 7-point scale, several of the factors were similar to those reported previously on the seven-point scale.

Based on the results of this study, the FPII appears to be a promising measure. Its ease of use, scoring, and interpretation make it a useful instrument in clinical and educational settings.

Limitations

There are three main limitations in interpreting the results from this study. These limitations are (a) the 5-point Likert-type response set instead of the 7-point scale used in previous studies, (b) the fact that there were no comparable comparison subscales for two of the FPII subscales, and (c) the sample. Each of these will be treated below.

Response Set

Because the Likert-type scale of the FPII was altered from its 7-point scale to a 5-point scale for this study, the data may differ. Restricting the respondents' choices to five possibilities instead of the previous seven could have inflated the reliability coefficients due to the potential decrease in variability. When respondents have fewer options, the consistency between the responses of the subjects is likely to increase. However, only

four of the subscales in this study had higher Cronbach's alphas than those previously reported. There were Cronbach's alphas previously reported on 16 of the 24 subscales used in this study. Out of those 16 subscales, 12 had lower Cronbach's alphas in this study. Three of the four subscales with higher Cronbach's alphas in this study were on subscales without altered response sets. Eleven of the 12 subscales with lower alphas were on subscales with altered scales. This indicates that the altering of the response sets in this study may have lowered the reliability coefficients. This lowered reliability, however, may also be due to the relatively small size of the sample.

As the number of subjects increases, so does the reliability in their responses. This limitation does not affect the correlations between the subscales used in the effort to establish the concurrent validity of the FPII. Correlations are not affected by differing response sets because correlations are calculated by comparing means. The factor analyses should also have remained unaffected by altering the response set (factor analysis also uses mean scores). How much of the difference is due to the response set and how much is due to sampling could only be determined by replication of the study with different and larger samples.

Another potential limitation is inherent in self-report measures (Dooley, 1985). There is a certain amount of variability introduced into any sample where self-report is the mode of data collection. The reliability of the responses is questionable with this mode of data collection. The extent of the influence of the insider subjective methodology could be assessed by replication of this study with the exact population.

No Comparable Subscales

After an extensive and thorough review of the available instruments assessing similar constructs as those assessed by the subscales of the FPII, no comparable subscales were found for comparison with the communication and work orientation subscales of the FPII. In establishing the concurrent validity of a measure, which this study was an attempt to do, it would have been helpful to have external criteria for each of the subscales.

Sample

The sample used in this study was perhaps the biggest limitation. The sample is limiting in the following ways:

1. The sample was not random. This lack of randomness prohibits the generalizability of these results to any group.

2. The sample consisted of undergraduate students enrolled in summer quarter at Utah State University. The effects of this limitation are not known, due the lack of information on differences between students enrolled in summer quarter versus those taking classes during other quarters.

3. The sample was young, largely female, mostly Mormon (LDS), and Caucasian. These characteristics are not representative of the average American family, and different than the national sample previously used.

4. The majority of respondents filled out the survey on their families of origin. Many of the students, therefore, were not currently living in the family on which data

were collected, and hence, answers were retrospective. This was also the method in the national sample, however.

Implications

These limitations prohibit any kind of generalizations to be made. However, this study does appear to have contributed evidence that some of the subscales of the FPII are indeed validly measuring the presence of these constructs in families. Additionally, the 5-point Likert-type scale does not appear to have substantially altered the results of this study. The importance of this finding is that a 5-point scale is easier to administer and interpret on the part of individuals and clinicians (Cox, 1980).

Research

The implications of this study on research indicate that while results may not fully support all of the hypotheses of a study, findings are still useful. In a study on instrument development designed to contribute to the validity of the interpretation of the results, the current study reminds that validity is a continual process of accumulating support for conclusions drawn from the results of a test. Support was not obtained for the interpretation of the results from all of the subscales of the FPII. However, several of the subscales not only factored as expected, but they also correlated well with external criteria tapping similar aspects of family functioning. Therefore, this study contributed to the process of the validation of the results drawn from the FPII.

The results also indicate that the FPII could be used in research as an outcome measure of family perception on the subscales for which the results were favorable. If a

study were designed to impact family members' perceptions of their family on these constructs, the FPII could be used as a pre- and posttest measure. It could also be used to measure progress throughout the project.

Clinical/Practical Implications

There are many possible implications of this study in a clinical or practical sense. This study has supported the interpretation of the results from several of the subscales as representing the intended constructs. Therefore, if a clinician were looking for an insider subjective method of assessing clients' perceptions of their family's functioning on sacred/secular orientation, disengagement, financial management, quality of the family relationships, rituals, and unkindness, the clinician could have increased confidence in interpreting the results of his/her clients' responses on these subscales as a result of this study. This would be dependent on the clients being similar to this population. Likewise, in workshops or retreats where the presenter is interested in measuring these constructs, the same implications are true. Additionally, if families are interested in the differences between the perceptions of family members on these subscales, they could use the FPII with increased confidence in the results of these subscales.

Furthermore, if clinicians or practitioners are interested in an outcome analysis of a family's perception on these constructs, the FPII could be used, perhaps as a pre- and posttreatment assessment.

There are also implications regarding the concepts measured by the FPII which may be drawn from this study. Results lend support that the FPII is indeed assessing the presence of several aspects of family functioning. However, that kindness failed to factor

with the items it was hypothesized to with this sample may indicate that while it may be an important factor in family life, it is represented in various characteristics in the family.

Further Development of the FPII

Results of this study indicate that the process of establishing the FPII as a family assessment device that produces valid results needs to continue. An additional study is recommended to reexamine the subscales that failed to replicate earlier findings in the factor analytic procedures performed in this study. A more representative sample chosen in a random fashion would contribute greatly to the interpretation of these findings in future research.

The FPII needs to be further validated by other sources of external criteria as well to be able to more accurately determine exactly what its 13 subscales are assessing. Direct expert interviews, or such subjective outsider reports, as friends, neighbors, or clergy, would be possible ways of corroborating the findings in this study, as well as a way to assess the results of self-report on the FPII. While the criteria chosen for this study were other subscales reportedly measuring the same constructs, another way of analyzing the validity of the FPII would be to administer it to a clinical and a nonclinical population and to compare the results.

REFERENCES

Anastasi, A. (1988). Psychological testing (6th ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Berg, I.K., & Miller, S.D. (1992). Working with the problem drinker. New York: Norton.

Beavers, W.R., Hampson, R.B., & Hulgus, Y.F. (1985). The Beaver's systems approach to family assessment. Family Process, 24, 398-405.

Belliston, L. (1998). Program evaluation of the effectiveness of Family Connection II. Unpublished master's thesis, Utah State University, Logan.

Beutler, I.F., Lee, T.R., Burr, W.R., Olsen, J.A., Yorgason, F., & Westien, M.J. (1996, November). Methodology and development of a measure of loving in family systems. Paper presented at Theory Construction and Research Methodology Workshop, Annual Meeting of the National Council on Family Relations, Kansas City, MO.

Boszormenyi-Nagy, I., Grunebaum, L., & Ulrich, D. (1991). Contextual therapy. In A.S. Gurman & D.P. Kniskern (Eds.), Handbook of family therapy (Vol. 2 pp. 200-238). New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Bray, J.H. (1995). Family assessment: Current issues in evaluating families. Family Relations, 44, 469-477.

Broderick, C.B., & Shrader, S.S. (1991). The history of professional marriage and family therapy. In A.S. Gurman & D.P. Kniskern (Eds.), Handbook of family therapy (Vol. 2, pp. 3-40). New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Burr, W.R., Beutler, I.F., Lee, T.R., Klein, S.R., Yorgason, F., & Harker, B. (In preparation). Kindness and unkindness in families. Family Relations.

Cox, E.P., III, (1980). The optimal number of response alternatives for a scale: A review. Journal of Marketing Research, 17, 407-422.

Curran, D. (1983). Traits of a healthy family. Mineapolis, MN: Winston Press.

Daley, J.D., Sowers-Hoag, K.M., & Thyer, B.A. (1991). Construct validity of the circumplex model of family functioning. Journal of Social Services Research, 15, 131-147.

Damon, W. (1983). Social and personality development, infancy through adolescence. New York: Norton..

de Shazer, S. (1994). Words were originally magic. New York: Norton.

Dooley, D. (1995). Social research methods (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Epstein, N. B., Baldwin, L. M., & Bishop, D. S. (1983). The McMaster family assessment device. Journal of Marriage and Family Therapy, 9, 171-180.

Falloon, I. R. H. (1991). Behavioral family therapy. In A. S. Gurman, & D. P. Kniskern (Eds.), Handbook of family therapy (Vol. 2, pp. 65-95). New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Filsinger, E.E. (1983). Assessment: What it is and why it is important. In E.E. Filsinger (Ed.), Marriage and family assessment: A sourcebook for family therapy (pp. 11-22). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Fitzsimmons, V.S., Hira, T.K., Bauer, J.W., & Haftstrom, J.L. (1993). Financial management: Development of scales. Journal of Family and Economics Issues, 14(3), 257-274.

Gorsuch, R.L. (1983). Factor analysis (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Gottman, J. (1994). Why marriages succeed or fail: And how you can make yours last. New York: Fireside.

Groth-Marnat, G. (1997). Handbook of psychological assessment (3rd ed.). New York: Wiley.

Guttman, H.A. (1991). Systems theory, cybernetics, and epistemology. In A.S. Gurman & D.P. Kniskern (Eds.), Handbook of family therapy (Vol. 2, pp. 41-62). New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Harker, H. B. (1997). Family profile: Development of family assessment tools for family life educators and clinicians. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT.

Krysan, M., Moore, K.A., & Zill, N. (1990). Identifying successful families: An overview of constructs and selected measures. Washington, DC: Child Trends.

Lee, T. R., Burr, W. R., Beutler, I., Yorgason, F., Harker, H.B., & Olsen, J.A. (1997). The family profile: A self-scored, brief family assessment. Psychological Reports, 81, 467-477.

Lee, T. R., & Goddard, W. A. (1989). Developing family relationship skills to prevent substance abuse among high risk use. Family Relations, 38, 301-305.

Locke, H.J., & Wallace, K.M. (1959). Short marital adjustment and prediction tests: their reliability and validity. Marriage and Family, 19, 251-255.

Madanes, C, (1991). Strategic family therapy. In A.S. Gurman, & D.P. Kniskern (Eds.), Handbook of family therapy (Vol. 2, pp. 41-62). New York: Brunner/Mazel.

McCubbin, H. I., & Thompson, A. I. (1987). Family assessment inventories for

research and practice. Madison, WI: H. McCubbin, Family Stress Coping and Health Project University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Messick, S. (1989). Validity. In R.L. Linn (Ed.), Educational measurement (3rd ed., pp. 13-104). New York: Macmillan.

Novak, A.L., & van der Veen, F. (1970). Family concepts and emotional disturbance in families of disturbed adolescents with normal siblings. Family Process, 9, 157-171.

Olson, D.H. (1981). Family typologies: Bridging family research and family therapy. In E.E. Filsinger & R.A. Lewis (Eds.), Assessing marriage: New behavioral approaches. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Olson, D.H., Bell, R., & Portner, J. (1982). FACES-II family adaptability and cohesion evaluation scales. In D. Olson, H. McCubbin, H. Barnes, A. Larsen, M. Muxen, & M. Wilson (Eds.), Family process (Vol. 2, pp. 5-24). St. Paul: University of Minnesota Press.

Olson, D.H., McCubbin, H.I., Barnes, H., Larsen, A., Muxen, M., & Wilson, M. (1982). Family inventories: Inventories used in a national survey of families across the family life cycle. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Otto, H.A. (1975). The use of family strength concepts and methods in family education: A handbook. Beverly Hills, CA: Holistic Press.

Randall, T. D. (1995). Assessing family strengths using the family profile: A study to validate and evaluate constructs across four models of family functioning. Unpublished master's thesis, Utah State University, Logan, UT.

Roberto, L. G. (1991). Symbolic-experiential family therapy. In A. S. Gurman & D. P.

Kniskern (Eds.), Handbook of family therapy (Vol. II, pp. 444-476). New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Schilson, E. A. (1991). Strategic therapy. In A. M. Horne & J. L. Passmore (Eds.), Family counseling and therapy (2nd ed., pp. 141-178). New York: Peacock.

Segal, L. (1991). Brief therapy: The MRI approach. In A.S. Gurman & D.P. Kniskern (Eds.), Handbook of family therapy (Vol. 2, pp. 171-199). New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Stinnet, N., & DeFrain, J. (1985). Secrets of strong families. New York: Berkeley.

Strauss, M.A., Hamby, S.L., & Boney-McCoy, S. (1996). The revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2): Development and preliminary psychometric data. Journal of Family Issues, 17, 283-316.

Touliatos, J., Perlmutter, B.F., & Straus, M.A. (1990). Handbook of family measurement techniques. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

van der Veen, F. (1979). Dimensions of the family concept and their relation to gender, generation, and disturbance. In J.G. Howells (Ed.), Advances in family psychiatry (Vol. 1, pp. 171-190). New York: International Universities Press.

Walter J.L., & Peller, J.E. (1992). Becoming solution-focused in brief therapy. New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Weiner-Davis, M., de Shazer, S., & Gingerich, W.J. (1987). Building on pretreatment to construct the therapeutic solution: An exploratory study. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 13, 359-363.

APPENDIXES

Appendix A: Informed Consent Survey

Utah State UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT
College of Family Life
Logan, UT 84322-2905
Phone: (801) 797-1501
FAX: (801) 797-3845

Informed Consent Letter

July 10, 1998

Dear Participant:

We request your help in a study to identify the key factors that contribute to strengthening families. Problems in families do play an important role in many of the problems facing our society, and considerable research has been done on family problems. We know less, however, about family strengths and how we can foster those in families. We need to know more about those qualities of families that help them be successful. Your participation can help us to do this.

You are under no obligation to complete this survey or participate in this research. Choosing not to participate will have no effect on your grade in this class. We do not think that your participation will be harmful to you in any way, but if you become uncomfortable in answering these questions, you can stop at any point.

If you choose to participate, just answer the questions on the following pages in an honest and open fashion. Mark your answers on the scantron answer sheet. Do not write your name on the survey or answer sheet. Your answers will be completely anonymous.

Thanks again for your willingness to help us learn more about families. This research will help us serve families better.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please call Dr. Lee at (435)797-1551.

Sincerely,

Thomas R. Lee, Ph.D.
Professor

Denim L. Slade
Graduate Student

Family Strengths Survey

Instructions

Mark your responses to these questions about how you see the relationships in your family on the scantron answer sheet provided. Answer the questions in terms of your present family. Usually your first impression to a question is your best response. There are no right or wrong answers, and we will have no way to identify your responses.

Because family relationships normally differ depending on the stage of life the family is in, these first few questions are to get a little background about your family.

1. Your age is:
   a. 18-21
   b. 22-25
   c. 26-30
   d. 31-40
   e. 41 and above

2. Are you a male or a female?
   a. Male
   b. Female

3. To which group do you belong?
   a. African American
   b. Asian
   c. Caucasian
   d. American Indian
   e. Spanish or Hispanic

4. What is your present marital status?
   a. Single, never married
   b. Married
   c. Separated/Divorced
   d. Widowed
   e. Remarried

5. Which of the following best describes the family you grew up in?
   a. Two parents who were married and never divorced
   b. Two parents where one or both were remarried
   c. A single parent
   d. A family where a grandparent or another person was the main parent.

6. What was the total income in your household last year?
   a. Under $5,000
   b. $5,000 to $15,000
   c. $15,000 to $25,000
   d. $25,000 to $35,000
   e. $35,000 and above

7. Your religious affiliation is:
   a. Roman Catholic or Eastern Orthodox
   b. Protestant
   c. Latter-day Saint (Mormon)
   d. None
   e. Other

8. The family you are answering the questionnaire about is: (please mark your response)
   a. The family you grew up in.
   (If a, then SKIP questions 9, 10, 11)
   b. The family you are a parent of.
   (If b, then answer questions 9, 10, 11).

9. What is your marital status in the family you parent?
   a. Married (first marriage)
   b. Remarried
   c. Divorced or separated
   d. Widowed
   e. Never married

10. How old is your oldest child?
    a. Under 5 years old
    b. 6 to 11 years old
    c. 12 to 15 years old
    d. 16 to 19 years old
    e. Over 20 years old

11. How many children do you have living at home?
    a. None
    b. 1
    c. 2
    d. 3
    e. 4 or more

12. What is the highest grade of education you have completed?
    a. Under 12
    b. High school graduate
    c. Trade or vocational school (13-15)
    d. College graduate (16)
    e. Post college training (> 16)

13. What is you employment situation?
    a. Not employed
    b. Employed part-time
    c. Employed full-time (40 hours or more)

The rest of the questionnaire is divided into three more sections. If you are not able to finish the whole questionnaire, it would help if you could complete whole sections, especially SECTION I.

Thank you!

SECTION 1

a Almost Never	b Once in a while	c Sometimes	d Frequently	e Almost Always

Mark the letter of the response on your answer sheet that best describes your family.

_____ 14. We do nice things for each other.
_____ 15. Some family members are rude to others.
_____ 16. Some members of our family have difficulty expressing themselves.
_____ 17. When we are at home family members usually do their own thing.
_____ 18. Some members of the family want more individuality than our family allows.
_____ 19. Our family is uncomfortable socializing with others.
_____ 20. We live within our income.
_____ 21. As a family, we take the responsibility to provide for ourselves.
_____ 22. We are taught that work is a key to success.
_____ 23. The quality of our work on family chores is poor.
_____ 24. Faith in religious things are important to our family.
_____ 25. We participate in valued traditions that are unique to our family.
_____ 26. The overall quality of our family life is very good.
_____ 27. We give each other compliments.
_____ 28. Some family members are very critical of others.
_____ 29. Some members of our family are poor communicators.
_____ 30. Family members lead very separate lives.
_____ 31. Individuals in our family are not given enough freedom.
_____ 32. Our family avoids social situations.
_____ 33. We are in debt for many things that are not necessary.
_____ 34. We try to be self supporting.
_____ 35. We avoid hard work.
_____ 36. Everyday tasks are left undone in our family.
_____ 37. We pay attention to the spiritual part of life.
_____ 38. Our family should give more emphasis to celebrating special events.
_____ 39. We are satisfied with how we get along in our family.
_____ 40. Family members sacrifice for each other.
_____ 41. Some family members are cruel to one another.
_____ 42. Some members of our family have difficulty understanding others.
_____ 43. In our family, everyone is on their own.
_____ 44. The family puts too much pressure on us to conform to the family's way of doing things.
_____ 45. In times of need, our family has a network of people we can count on for help.
_____ 46. We pay our bills on time.
_____ 47. We try to be independent financially.

a Almost Never	b Once in a while	c Sometimes	d Frequently	e Almost Always

_____ 48. Work is an important value taught in our family.
_____ 49. Some family members do not do their fair share of the family chores.
_____ 50. Faith in God, or a higher power, is important to our family.
_____ 51. We give the right amount of emphasis to special events like holidays, birthdays, and anniversaries.
_____ 52. The overall quality of our family life is very poor.
_____ 53. Family members give of their time for one another.
_____ 54. Some family members ridicule others.
_____ 55. Some members can't put their thoughts into words very well.
_____ 56. We do things as separate individuals rather than as a family unit.
_____ 57. The family discourages independence.
_____ 58. Helpful neighbors are unavailable to our family in times of need.
_____ 59. Being in debt is a serious problem for our family.
_____ 60. We accept the challenge to provide for ourselves.
_____ 61. Our family is good about getting daily chores done.
_____ 62. We attend worship services.
_____ 63. We have some valued traditions that are unique to our family.
_____ 64. Our family is about the way we want it to be.
_____ 65. We are compassionate.
_____ 66. Some family members are verbally abusive with one another.
_____ 67. When serious problems arise, our family is on its own.
_____ 68. Some family members fail to do their share of work.
_____ 69. We rely on a supreme being.
_____ 70. We enjoy the celebration of special holidays in our family.
_____ 71. Overall the family gets along well.
_____ 72. We are considerate of each other.
_____ 73. There are many conflicts in our family.
_____ 74. We are sociable and really enjoy being around each other.
_____ 75. We do many things together.
_____ 76. Usually each of us goes our own separate way.
_____ 77. We are usually calm and relaxed when we are together.
_____ 78. Each of us wants to tell the others what to do.
_____ 79. We get along very well in the community.
_____ 80. Our home is the center of our activities.
_____ 81. We do not spend enough time together.
_____ 82. We rarely hurt each other's feelings.
_____ 83. We often become angry at each other.
_____ 84. We have a number of close friends.

a	b	c	d	e
Almost Never	Once in a while	Sometimes	Frequently	Almost Always

_____ 85. Our activities together are usually planned and organized.
_____ 86. We forgive each other easily.
_____ 87. We are critical of each other.
_____ 88. We are liked by most people who know us.
_____ 89. We depend on each other too much.
_____ 90. We have respect for each other's feelings and opinions.
_____ 91. We make demands on each other.
_____ 92. Each of us tries to be the kind of person the others will like.
_____ 93. We often upset each other without intending it.
_____ 94. We respect each other's privacy.

SECTION 2

a	b	c	d
Not At All	Minimally	Moderately	Very Well

Mark the letter of the response on your answer sheet that best describes your family.

_____ 95. If a close relative were having financial problems, we feel we could afford to help them out.
_____ 96. We seem to have little or no problem paying our bills on time.
_____ 97. We feel we have enough money on hand to cover small unexpected expenses (under $100).
_____ 98. We feel we are able to go out to eat occasionally without hurting our budget.
_____ 99. We feel we are able to make financial contributions to a good cause (needy people, church, etc.)
_____ 100. When we need something that can't be postponed, we have money in savings to cover it.
_____ 101. We worry about how we would cover a large unexpected bill (for home, auto repairs, etc. for about $100).
_____ 102. We feel we are financially better off now than we were 5 years ago.

SECTION 3

a	b	c	d
False	Mostly False	Mostly True	True

Read the following statement and decide to what extent each of these routines listed below is false or true about your family.

_____ 103. Family has a quiet time each evening when everyone talks or plays quietly.
_____ 104. Our family goes some place special together each week.
_____ 105. Our family has a certain family time each week when they do things together at home.
_____ 106. We express caring and affection for each other daily.
_____ 107. Children do regular household chores.
_____ 108. Mothers do regular household chores.
_____ 109. Fathers do regular household chores.
_____ 110. Teenagers do regular household chores.

SECTION 4

a	b	c	d
Not Helpful	Minimally Helpful	Moderately Helpful	Very Helpful

Describe the family support you feel in coping with the following situations.

_____ 111. Learning new skills.
_____ 112. Developing myself as a person.
_____ 113. Becoming more independent.
_____ 114. Showing that I'm strong.

SECTION 5

a Never	b Seldom	c Often	d Always	e Not Applicable

Please read each special event/occasion and decide how often your family celebrates (i.e., takes time and effort to appreciate the event/social situation, etc.) on these occasions.

_____ 115. Friend's special events.
_____ 116. Children's birthday(s).
_____ 117. Relative birthdays/anniversaries.
_____ 118. Spouse's birthday.
_____ 119. Religious occasions (holy days, etc.)
_____ 120. Yearly major holidays (4th of July, New Year).
_____ 121. Special changes and events (i.e., graduation, promotion).
_____ 122. Special surprises and successes (i.e., passed a test; good report card).

SECTION 6

a Strongly Disagree	b Moderately Disagree	c Neither Agree nor Disagree	d Moderately Agree	e Strongly Agree

When we face problems or difficulties in our family, we respond by:

_____ 123. Attending church services.
_____ 124. Participating in church activities.
_____ 125. Seeking advice from a minister.
_____ 126. Having faith in God
_____ 127. Mark the letter of the dot on the scale line below which best describes the degree of happiness, everything considered, of your present family. The middle point, "happy", represents the degree of happiness which most people get from their family. The scale gradually ranges on one side to those few who are very unhappy in their family and on the other side, to those few who experience extreme joy or felicity in their family.

a. Very Unhappy • b. • c. Happy • d. • e. Perfectly Happy

Appendix B: Approval Letter From USU Institutional Review Board

Utah State
UNIVERSITY

VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH OFFICE
Logan, Utah 84322-1450
Telephone: (801) 797-1180
FAX: (801) 797-1367
INTERNET: (pgerity@champ.usu.edu)

February 23, 1998

MEMORANDUM

TO: Thomas Lee
DenimSlade

FROM: True Rubal, Secretary to the IRB

SUBJECT: Validation of the Family Profile II

The above-referenced proposal has been reviewed by this office and is exempt from further review by the Institutional Review Board. The IRB appreciates researchers who recognize the importance of ethical research conduct. While your research project does not require a signed informed consent, you should consider (a) offering a general introduction to your research goals, and (b) informing, in writing or through oral presentation, each participant as to the rights of the subject to confidentiality, privacy or withdrawal at any time from the research activities.

The research activities listed below are exempt from IRB review based on the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) regulations for the protection of human research subjects, 45 CFR Part 46, as amended to include provisions of the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, June 18, 1991.

2. Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless: (a) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through the identifiers linked to the subjects; and (b) any disclosure of human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

Your research is exempt from further review based on exemption number 2. Please keep the committee advised of any changes, adverse reactions or termination of the study. A yearly review is required of all proposals submitted to the IRB. We request that you advise us when this project is completed, otherwise we will contact you in one year from the date of this letter.

Memorandum

TO: True Rubal

FROM: Thomas R. Lee

RE: Revised questionnaire for research project

DATE: July 2, 1998

On February 23, 1998, you informed us that our "Validation of the Family Profile II" project was exempt from further review. Our data collection has been delayed and the questionnaire instrument that was reviewed at that time has been revised. We will now begin data collection using this version of the instrument and wanted to have it on file with you. No changes in procedures or risks to human subjects are anticipated.