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The purpose of this research was to determine if a structured intervention program could assist individuals in adjusting to some of the disruption associated with divorce. A secondary purpose was to determine if identity status would mediate the effects of the intervention program upon divorce adjustment. The components of the intervention program were modeled on previous research. It was hypothesized that individuals participating in a structured treatment program would manifest greater gains in areas of divorce adjustment than the control group. However, results show that while there was greater gain for the experimental group than the control group in several areas, such gain was
not at a level of significance sufficient to support the primary hypothesis. In addition, support was not generated for the mediational role of identity. Indeed, identity appeared as a rather stable construct, showing very little change from treatment effects and not seeming to influence treatment outcome. It was found that those individuals high in identity status reported less adjustment problems from the divorce than those individuals with low identity statuses. However, this was not a factor of treatment with the control group reporting the same finding. Implications for future research suggest studies in divorce adjustment focus on symptomology and problems in day-to-day living, with objective measuring devices rather than the subjective self-report instruments currently in use. Research on identity status as it relates to divorce adjustment should be longitudinal in nature tracking identity prior to divorce, and allowing for longer intervention periods.
CHAPTER I
DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

In the last few decades, divorce in American society has shown a steady and marked increase. The U.S. Bureau of the Census (1984) reports that the divorce rate per 1,000 population has increased from 3.5 in 1970, to 4.8 in 1975, to 5.2 in 1980, and finally appears to have stabilized at 5.1 in 1982. This has resulted in an increase in the number of divorces from 479,000 in 1965 to 708,000 in 1970, to 1,036,000 in 1975 up to a high of 1,189,000 in 1980. It appears divorce in America is here to stay.

In the year 1980 there were 10,240,000 families not headed by the traditional marital couple. Of these non-traditional families, over 8,534,000 were headed by females. In 1982 only 64.5% of the adult population were married.

Hetherington (1979) estimates half of all children born in the 1970's are expected to live part of their life in single parent households. While the number of children affected by the death of a parent has changed very little over the last 30 years (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1984), there is an ever increasing number of single parent families, most coming as a result of divorce.
The large number of divorces and the increase in single parent households make it vital to understand the impact of divorce on both the individual and the family, and the subsequent adjustment processes which go with divorce. It becomes evident that such families constitute an important family form in contemporary American society, regardless of whether individuals remain in this status permanently.

Researchers in the field of divorce (Chiriboga, Roberts & Stein, 1978; Lambert & Lambert, 1977) are universal in stating that divorce results in emotional pain and distress. Studies which have reviewed the literature in divorce research (Bloom, Asher, & White, 1978; Kitson & Raschke, 1981; Pett, 1982) all agree that divorce and the attending period of adjustment is disruptive. Weiss (1975) along with other researchers (Bohannon, 1970; Kitabchi, Murrell & Crawford, 1979) suggest adjustment to divorce may require months to years to complete.

The breakup of a marriage is both a public and a private event. Some gradually adjust to the divorce while others find the demands of daily living after divorce difficult to bear. The dissolution of a marriage results in changes in a person's personal and social identity. Divorce affects intimacy needs, economic well-being, occupational status, and self-worth (Loge, 1977). Often divorce results in individuals questioning who they are and whether they can love or be loved again. Divorce is associated with personal and social confusion and results in the generation of new
roles, and a resynthesis of identity (Salts, 1979; Smart, 1977).

Research in the field of divorce has long concerned itself with the etiology and impact that divorce has on both adults and children (Bachrach, 1975; Blair, 1970; Goode, 1956; Hetherington, 1979; Ilgenfritz, 1961; Pett, 1982). However, it is only in the last ten to fifteen years that divorce research has addressed the problems of adjustment. And it is only in the most recent years (Coche & Goldman, 1979; Fetsch & Surdam, 1981; Granvold & Welch, 1977; Storm & Sprenkle, 1982) that social scientists have considered intervention techniques which might shorten or ameliorate the divorce adjustment process.

A host of variables have been identified which influence divorce adjustment, such as age at divorce (Nelson, 1982), years married (Hetherington, Cox, & Cox, 1976), number of children (Kitson, & Raschke, 1981), mental health of divorcing individuals (Bloom et al., 1978), income (Blair, 1970), initiator of the divorce (Zeiss, Zeiss & Johnson, 1980), and socioeconomic status (Kitson & Raschke, 1981). Unfortunately, with the exception of mental health, these mediators of post divorce adjustment are not amenable to intervention efforts.

Recently divorce research has considered the possibility of structured interventions to decrease the distress and shorten the adjustment period accompanying divorce (Dries, 1975; Salts & Zongker, 1983; Vogel-Moline,
Studies that have attempted controlled experimental interventions suggest interventions can help to improve divorce adjustment. However, a review of the literature failed to find a single study designed to measure the impact of a structured intervention experience on the resynthesis/reorganization of identity following divorce. This is especially interesting since numerous researchers (Caldwell, Bloom, & Hodges, 1982; Hetherington et al., 1976; Nelson, 1981, 1982; Smart, 1977; Weiss, 1975; Wiseman, 1975) have commented on the crisis in identity following divorce. The current literature on divorce lacks sufficient evidence to substantiate this proposed association between divorce and identity reorganization. Further, an apparent void exists about effective interventions that might facilitate the identity reorganization and corresponding adjustment.

Problem Statement

This lack of research regarding the effectiveness of divorce adjustment techniques, and more specifically, the influence of identity status upon adjustment needs to be addressed. While theorists suggest divorce is a crisis requiring changes in identity (Salts, 1979), empirical research has not substantiated this.

Will a designed treatment intervention program significantly alter one's adjustment to divorce? Will such aspects of divorce adjustment as self-esteem, self-image, problems relating to adjustment, and daily living be
positively influenced by such an intervention? And will certain aspects of identity prove to be in a process of resynthesis? Finally, can the effects of a divorce adjustment program be mediated by a person's identity status or identity achievement?

This study addresses these questions and has as its purpose the following objectives:

1. To determine if individuals participating in a structured intervention program manifest differential divorce adjustment versus control or no treatment subjects.

2. To determine if a person's identity mediates the effects of a controlled intervention program upon certain aspects of adjustment to divorce.
CHAPTER II
PRIOR RESEARCH AND CURRENT HYPOTHESES

Literature Review

Research on divorce has shown a tremendous upsurge in recent years. The publication of the *Journal of Divorce* is only one example of this expanding interest in the study of divorce. This study, while modest in scope, will attempt to contribute to this burgeoning line of research. The following literature review will begin with a discussion of the consequences of divorce and will be followed by a brief consideration of the major steps or stages most individuals go through in the post-divorce adjustment period. Implications of divorce on social adjustment and identity will be explored, followed by an examination of the literature on the moderators affecting divorce adjustment. The literature review will conclude with an analysis of the interventions used in facilitating divorce adjustment.

Consequences of Divorce

of divorce, go so far as to say that this period of marital stress is so severe in its impact that few if any marriages dissolve without significant emotional distress. This is echoed by Hetherington et al. (1976) when speaking on the emotional consequences of divorce. They state that they not only didn't find any victimless divorces, but that adjustment to divorce was unexpectedly painful. This same conclusion was reached twenty years earlier in Goode's (1956) classic study of divorced mothers, one of the earliest and most comprehensive studies found in the divorce literature, which reported about two-thirds of those interviewed as indicating a substantial level of trauma being associated with their divorce.

Ilgenfritz (1961), Schlesinger (1969), Woodward et al. (1980) have all found a variety of problems common to the experience of divorce. Among the more serious were loss of self-esteem, loneliness, sexual problems, socialization and support problems, feelings of shame and failure, financial problems, and problems with child rearing. Weiss (1976) found loneliness, anger, and loss of attachment bonds to be common among the divorced. Likewise, Beattie and Viney (1981) indicate single parenthood is considered by divorced parents as a predominantly negative and unenviable experience.

Pearlin and Johnson (1977), in an excellent study of the relationship of marital status to depression, report that those presently married are the most free of
depression; those who are single and never married are in the middle; and the formerly married are those most burdened by depression. Chamberlin (1981), studying marital status and adjustment as predictors of depression, reports women who are divorced or separated are especially at risk for depression. Direction of causation is unknown, however.

In a major review of divorce research Bloom et al. (1978), reports that correlates of marital disruption include; (a) higher rates of psychopathology, (b) greater probabilities of automobile accidents and fatalities, (c) more frequent illness, (d) and a greater chance of suicide or homicide. They also point out that the incidence of mental disorder, as measured by psychiatric inpatient and outpatient admission rates, is lowest among married persons, higher among single persons, followed by somewhat higher rates among the widowed, and highest among the separated and divorced.

Perhaps one of the best summary statements of the consequences of divorce comes from Kitabchi et al. (1979) who write of divorce as a severe crisis of loss comparable to the grief experienced at the death of a loved one. Divorce is, in fact, the death of a relationship.

**Stages of Adjustment**

While the consequences of divorce are well documented, several researchers (Bohannan, 1970; Krantzler, 1974; Weiss, 1975; Wiseman, 1975; Salts, 1979) have developed theories
which suggest those who experience the trauma of divorce go through predictable patterns (or stages) in the process of adjustment. A review of past work reveals it was Blair (1970), who developed one of the first adjustment inventories of this process. Many others have since followed with description of this social process.

Somewhat more recently Bohannan (1970) explicated six different experiences of divorce that may overlap but do not necessarily follow a specific sequential order: (a) emotional divorce, which begins when spouses withhold emotion from the relationship, (b) legal divorce occurring with the judge's decree, (c) economic divorce or the establishment of separate households, (d) coparental divorce separation of parental roles with separate households established, (e) community divorce or the losing of old social bonds and the establishment of new ones, and (f) psychic divorce with a separation of identities taking place.

Krantzler (1974) has offered a more recent and explicit attempt to explain via stages the psychological aspects of post divorce adjustment: (a) first, a recognition that a relationship has died, (b) second, a period of mourning, and (c) third, a slow, painful emotional readjustment to the facts of single life. Krantzler has viewed the crisis of divorce as creating the possibilities of leading into a more positive life rather than necessarily resulting in a more negative one.
Weiss (1975) lists three major stages of divorce adjustment: (a) erosion of love and persistence of attachment, (b) separation, and (c) starting over. This last stage includes the sub-stages of shock and denial, a transition period which is often highlighted with disorganization, depression, and recovery, which takes two to four years to complete. Similarly, Wiseman (1975) in examining divorce adjustment, postulates five stages: (a) denial, (b) feelings of loss and depression, (c) anger and ambivalence, (d) reorientation of life-style and identity, including acceptance and integration.

A systematic integration of these varying perspectives has yet to be undertaken. However, Salts (1979) and Kaslow (1984) in two different studies have compared several models of the divorce process and conclude that the models are not in conflict with one another. Salts (1979) indicates that regardless of the particular theory or conceptualization of post-divorce adjustment, there is the general theme of an initial reaction to a crisis, a transitional stage during which various aspects of one's personality and behaviors must be reorganized, and finally, a stage of laying the past to rest and beginning a new life.

Kolevzon and Gottlieb (1983), however, in performing a multivariate study of various stages in divorce warn that there is no evidence that emotional adjustment is unique to any particular stage of divorce. They conclude that the first year of divorce appears uniquely traumatic and that it
is the physical separation that leads to identity changes which often produces feelings of low self-esteem and self-worth.

These findings are further supported by Hetherington et al. (1976) who report in a two year longitudinal study of fathers after divorce that immediately following the divorce the family system is in a state of disorganization and disrupted functioning which seems to peak at one year and restabilize within two years following divorce. They conclude that the first year of divorce is the most stressful period for both parents. Interestingly they report more disturbance and less coping skills at the end of one year than the two month period following the divorce. This may be explained, in part, by the initial tendency to deny (Wiseman, 1975) or disbelieve (Kaslow, 1984) what is happening. This occurs before attempts at reorganization actually begin.

Weiss (1975) feels total recovery may take three to four years, and Wallerstein and Kelly (1980) indicate the total restructuring of the after-effects of divorce may take five years. Kantzler and most other stage theorists (Kaslow, 1984; Kessler, 1978; Kolevzon & Gottlieb, 1983) agree that while the time span to recover from divorce varies (and some don't appear to recover), usually the first eighteen months after physical separation appear to be the most difficult. Spivey and Scherman (1981), in studying the time span for divorce adjustment of women from the time of
filing of divorce, found the first six months show the highest stress, but the time period of twelve to eighteen months shows more personality distress and a greater need for counseling. After three and one half years they found no difference in level of maladjustments from continuously married individuals.

In conclusion, the distress experienced in divorce appears to follow certain patterns, where the individual goes through stages of adjustment before the integration process is complete. These stages do not follow any specific time line, and as Salts suggests (1979), whole steps may be omitted but, in general, it would appear designed attempts at intervention in reducing the pain and disruption following divorce would be most practical three to eighteen months following filing of divorce or physical separation.

Implications of Divorce on Identity

Divorce is a major crisis in a person's life (Smart, 1977). It disrupts one's sense of identity and requires the learning of new social roles (Loge, 1977). Wiseman (1975), writing on the stages of divorce, says of her final adjustment stage (re-orientation of lifestyle and identity) that "the primary task of this stage is the reworking of identity in all areas touched by the marriage: personal, vocational, sexual and social" (p. 209). She reports that in order for divorce adjustment to be complete there must be
a resynthesis of identity. This occurs only after self-evaluation, experimentation, and exploration of self-identity has taken place and new patterns of interaction are firmly established. Weiss (1975) also notes that until a new coherent identity develops, the ability to choose and plan are impaired.

This disruption in identity and role performance is reported by Loge (1977) as common for both sexes following divorce. After divorce both spouses must assume new roles as well as modify old ones. They must also redefine themselves as single. This process of role adjustment often results in conflict and confusion. An example would be the provider versus parent role. Prior to divorce, roles may have been divided between spouses. After divorce, the spouse with parental responsibility may also be forced to take over the provider role. This change of roles can result in emotional conflict and turmoil as individuals attempt to sort out who they are and where they are going with their lives.

Weiss (1975) suggests this reestablishment of identity is fraught with peril. The individual may move in any of a number of directions before he re-formulates his sense of identity and establishes predictability and stability. This confusion in one's identity results at times in patterns of behavior not typical for the individual (Hetherington et al., 1976), as he attempts to adjust to singlehood and the resulting loss of intimacy. This is often shown in dress
and grooming standards, along with sexual and social values, change during this time.

**Structure of identity.** Identity defines who and what a particular person is. It was Erik Erikson's (1968) assumption that identity formation is not static but constantly changing. He felt that during a person's developmental epigenesis, identity continues to grow, not only during developmental years, but throughout adulthood. During this period of growth, Erikson (1956) emphasized the importance of balancing the individual's personal needs with the opportunities and requirements of the social world in achieving mature identity.

Erikson's work on identity was advanced by James Marcia (1966, 1967) who operationalized identity formation along two dimensions. The first dimension labeled "crisis" refers to a process of exploration, of making choices from several meaningful alternatives. Second is the dimension Marcia calls "commitment", which refers to the degree of investment by the individual to ideological choices. These two dimensions have been applied to occupational choice, religious values/beliefs, and political ideology and can be used to derive four identity statuses: diffusion, foreclosure, moratorium and identity achievement. Identity statuses based on crisis include moratorium and identity achievement. Noncrisis statuses include diffusion and foreclosure. Figure 1 may help in understanding Marcia's (1966) conceptualization of identity status.
Research in identity has supported the belief that identity formation shows greater differentiation and complexity when based on an exploration or crisis period (Bourne, 1978a, 1978b; Fitch & Adams, 1983; Marcia, 1980). Those identity statuses considered "high" are identity achievement and moratorium since both either have experienced or are experiencing crisis. Those identity statuses considered "low" are foreclosure and identity diffusion statuses since there is an absence of "crisis" underlying their definition.

Marcia (1980) defines identity as "an internal, self-constructed, dynamic organization of drives, abilities, beliefs and individual history. The better developed this structure is, the more aware individuals appear to be of their own uniqueness and similarity to others. The less developed this structure is, the more confused individuals seem about their own distinctiveness from others (p. 159)."

According to Marcia, identity formation doesn't just happen;
it involves commitment to a vocational direction, a religious orientation, and an ideological stance.

In writing on the role of identity for intimacy of marriage, Marcia (1980) suggests that it is having the assurance of who one is that allows an individual to risk a merger with another. Conversely, disruption and failure of a relationship has effects on identity requiring new organization, new roles, and a resynthesis of personal and social identity.

Cheek and Hogan (1983), in a paper on the structure of identity, suggest that identity is best represented by personal and social dimensions. Cheek and Briggs (1982) write of identity as the construct that defines who or what a particular person is. Social identity involves the person's social roles and relationships. Personal identity is one's private conception of self and feelings of continuity and uniqueness.

Caldwell and Bloom (1982), in a study of the adjustment processes subsequent to divorce, report that eighteen months after filing for divorce, problems were found to exist in personal identity (such as low self-esteem, feelings of guilt, and personal failure) and social identity (such as relations with friends, family and loneliness).

**Personal identity.** There are numerous personality characteristics associated with identity. For example, Fitch and Adams (1983) and Kacerguis and Adams (1980) suggest advanced identity status is closely related to
intimate meaningful heterosexual relationships and greater interpersonal success. Likewise, other studies (Marcia, 1976; Orlofsky, Marcia, & Lesser, 1976; Orlofsky, 1976; Whitbourne, 1983) have found high identity status is associated with higher intimacy in social relationships. This would suggest resolution of identity allows for greater psychological health, and conversely, to lose one's sense of identity may interfere with maintaining healthy social relationships.

Further, Adams and Shea (1979) and Marcia (1967) report advanced stages in identity status are associated with parallel increases in internal locus of control. This is supported by Waterman, Beubel, and Waterman (1970). Adams and Shea (1979) also report an interrelationship among identity status, locus of control, and ego stage development. Marcia (1967) notes that those low in identity status were more likely to change their evaluations of themselves, both positively and negatively, in response to external feedback than were those high in identity status (identity achievement and moratorium). Foreclosures showed the greatest susceptibility to self-esteem change when the situational demands were clear that they should do so. Collectively, these investigations indicate that high identity statuses are associated with a strong sense of self-efficacy.

It has been agreed upon by most researchers studying divorce adjustment, that disruption of marriage produces
emotional distress resulting in lowered self-esteem (Fisher, 1974; Hetherington et al., 1976; Krantzler, 1974; Lewinsohn, 1975; Weiss, 1975, 1976; Wiseman, 1975). It is also reported (Blair, 1970) that women with poor self-concepts and with more anxiety seem to have more difficulty in adjusting to divorce than women with better self-concepts and less anxiety. These data would suggest not only is personal identity disrupted by divorce but that there is a relationship between identity and subsequent readjustment processes following divorces.

While the loss of self-esteem has been amply documented as a common consequence of divorce, the ability to measure and conceptualize it is another matter. For purposes of this study the variety of terms developed to explain various aspects of the self, such as self-concept, self-esteem, self-image, self-actualization, ideal self, ego strength, and so on will be restricted to self-concept as defined by Rosenberg (1979) and self-image as defined by Kinch, Falk & Anderson (1983). Rosenberg defines self-concept as the totality of the individual's thoughts and feelings having reference to himself as an object. He divides the self-concept into three parts: 1) the extant self or how the individual views one's self, 2) the desired self or how the person would like to view one's self, and 3) the presenting self or how the person shows one's self to others. Falk's definition of self-image would fit most closely to the extant self. Self-image is defined as the dispositional
description that a person attributes to himself as an object in a particular role.

Marcia (1980) notes that the development of moral reasoning parallels the development of identity. Individuals high in identity tend to function at higher levels of moral reasoning. Cheek and Hogan (1983) report that high ego-identity persons also show more independence in judgment. Also, Neuber and Guenthner (1977) report high identity status men and women take more personal responsibility for their own lives. The bulk of research evidence clearly indicates high identity status is associated with high self esteem, high moral reasoning, high internal locus of control, greater independence in judgment, greater intimacy, successful heterosexual relationships, and more willingness to take personal responsibility for one's life.

Divorce is a major life crisis (Smart, 1977), and the resulting pain and confusion requires a resynthesis of identity (Wiseman, 1975) in that it impacts on one's private conception of self (Cheek & Briggs, 1982), impairing the ability to choose and plan until a new coherent identity has developed (Weiss, 1975). But the effects of divorce go beyond the impact on personal identity. Social identity is also disrupted. Hetherington et al. (1976) reports that social activities decrease for the first two years after divorce and that forming new relationships is a strong factor in establishing feelings of happiness, self-esteem.
and competence. They report that both sexes not only feel a loss of identity following divorce but that it interferes with social situations. Women complain of the loss of identity status associated with their husband's occupational status, and men complain of not knowing who they were.

**Social identity.** The strength and type of a support network an individual has during the divorce process is a critical factor in divorce adjustment. Wallerstein and Kelly (1980) found that women with a strong support system of family and friends who offered financial help, housing, and child care services during the crisis and transition of divorce fared much better than their counterparts who lacked these supports. Further, Berman and Turk (1981), in a multivariate analysis, examined the role of coping strategies in mediating divorce distress and found interpersonal and familial problems had the major effect on overall mood state. In addition, they report involvement in social activities, expressing feelings, and developing autonomy were highly related to greater postdivorce adjustment.

Social networks surrounding a social identity can change following divorce. Rands (1981), in a study of recently divorced persons, reports an average of 41.5% of a respondent's marital associates were dropped after separation. During marriage, network members were more likely to be kin than non-kin, but after breakup, friends became equally prominent. Likewise, research on the social reinforcement network of the single mother found significant
differences in social support between married and divorced groups with single mothers possessing fewer supports (Bannon, 1981). There was also a significant relationship between measures of social support and maladjustment. Bannon found that the number of close friends was more strongly related to maladjustment in divorced mothers than in married mothers. Finally, a relationship between divorced parents' social support systems and their sense of well-being has been noted (Richardson, 1981). Divorced parents, while seeking help from many individuals, usually turn to informal support systems for help in practical matters. However, emotional problems are more likely to be handled by the use of personal resources rather than social support systems.

Other studies show a relationship between divorce adjustment and support networks. Goode (1956) found social and economic supports to be important to post-divorce adjustment. Also, Raschke (1975), and Spanier and Casto (1979) report an active social life is a critical moderator in the adjustment process. Spanier and Casto also note that dating and other social interactions outside the home are important social factors moderating adjustment.

Findings indicating the importance of informal support systems for adjustment are echoed by Chiriboga, Coho, Stein and Roberts (1979), who in analyzing helpseeking behavior after divorce, report informal social supports are sought more frequently than formal supports and that help seeking
behavior decreases with age. They report, along with Blair (1970), that the older the individual at the time of divorce the more difficult the adjustment process.

This increased vulnerability of older persons to the divorce experience may be explained by noting that as an individual ages, his accessibility to informal social support systems decreases, which may account for the decrease in helpseeking behavior and the greater difficulty in making adequate adjustments to divorce.

Nelson (1981, 1982) presents data which indicate that the formal support system, especially the relationship to the ex-spouse, is critical in the adjustment process. In two studies on the moderators of women's and children's adjustment, Nelson reported family relationships, especially the relationship to the former spouse, were the strongest of all moderators in divorce adjustment. Those women who had strong feelings of either a positive or negative nature toward their ex-spouse had more difficulty in adjusting to divorce than women whose feelings were more moderate (or mellow).

The importance of the relationship with the former spouse is also noted by Wise (1980). In this study, examining divorced women in their 30's who continued to experience emotional conflict and were unable to form new attachments, Wise found continued involvement both with former spouse and preoccupation with loss and vulnerability.
However, in a study of adjustment by women to marital separation, different results were found. Meyers (1976) divided family life into four stages: pre-child rearing, early child rearing, later child rearing, and post-child rearing. Comparisons of separated women in these four stages did not show family life as a significant variable with regard to problems experienced or adjustment to separation.

Nonetheless, overall, the available data would suggest divorce does result in a loss of social identity (Smart, 1977; Loge, 1977). This loss has serious effects on an individual's social support system (Hetherington, 1979; Rands, 1981; Bannon 1981). Conversely adjustment to divorce seems to be influenced by the strength of the social support system (Wallerstein & Kelly, 1980; Berman & Turk 1981). Caldwell and Bloom (1982), and Granvold and Welch (1977), report strong social support systems can moderate the effects of divorce stress on adjustment.

The social roles and relationships which often become confused after divorce seem to play an important role in successful post-divorce adjustment. Research indicates if the strength of one's support system could be increased, by resolving the attachment to one's former spouse, increasing support from family and perhaps, most important of all, enlarging, strengthening, and deepening one's informal support network, adjustment to the trauma of divorce would be ameliorated.
Likewise, the personal and social aspects of identity have a relationship to divorce and the adjustment process following it. Caldwell and Bloom (1982), when they observed problems in personal and social identity, found adjustment difficulties still existed eighteen months after divorce. It seems that recovery or reorganization of identity following divorce depends in part on the social support network, how it is used and developed, and on the psychological components of self-direction in personal and social identity which lend themselves to reorganization. This relationship between identity and divorce adjustment seems to work both ways, divorce influencing the disruption of identity and the strength of one's identity influencing the readjustment process.

Other Moderators of Adjustment

Research in the field of divorce adjustment has found numerous variables which act as moderators in the adjustment process. For example, Waller (1967) found spouses who perceived the marital relationship as generally satisfactory experienced more distress and greater difficulty adjusting to divorce than the spouse who had found the relationship to be inadequate in some way. As previously, indicated Raschke (1975) reports the stronger the social support system, the easier the adjustment to divorce. In a study specifically designed to look at the impact of social support on marital disruption, Caldwell and Bloom (1982) found family, friends,
and community to be an important source of social support. They found that social support could, in fact, moderate the adjustment process.

Pett (1982), in examining predictors of adjustment to divorce, identified through an extensive review of literature on one-parent families six major moderators: (a) economic factors (those relating to social status and income); (b) personal characteristics of the custodial parent (such as, age, sex, history of marriage, and self-esteem); (c) circumstances surrounding the divorce (number of years married, anger at spouse, children, reasons for divorce, schooling and education); (d) quality of the family's relationships with the non-custodial parent (including remarriage, type, and frequency of contact with the children); (e) quantity and quality of the custodial parent's social network system (extended family, former in-laws, friends before and after divorce); and (f) children's adjustment (their response to the divorce and the resulting relationship with both parents).

Pett (1982) subjected the major variables for each of the six areas of concern to a step wise multiple regression and sought to identify the best predictors of social adjustment. One important theme which emerged was that divorce adjustment seemed to be primarily a function of the divorced individual's inner emotional state. This inner emotional state corresponds to Cheek and Briggs' (1982) conception of personal identity. Traditional divorce
moderators, such as the age of subject at the time of divorce, the sex of the subject, and the amount of time since divorce, had low predictive power for the degree of social adjustment. It was noted divorced parents reported significantly lower feelings of well being than the national married sample. Pett also noted that the source of income was a better predictor of adjustment than the level or stability of income (welfare recipients having more difficulties in adjustment, perhaps due to self-esteem).

Defrain (1981), comparing coping skills of divorced single parents, found no significant difference between males and females except for the male custodial parents having a higher income than their counterparts. Ashenhurst (1981), looking at post-divorce adjustment stress, found no statistically significant relationship to the sex of the respondents, their age, number of divorces, or to the length of their marriages. Nelson (1981), contrasting widows and divorcees with married women, found the most common positive changes identified by divorced women were increases in self-esteem and personal competence.

Kitson and Raschke (1981), in a review of divorce research, report there seem to be both modifiable and unmodifiable factors influencing adjustment. Of the variables considered unmodifiable, gender has received the most research attention. Results of the studies reviewed by Kitson and Raschke yield contradictory results. Women generally show more initial distress, but men seem to have
equal or more difficulty in long term adjustment. Most studies do not report major differences. Data suggests the presence of children results in more adjustment difficulty, while those who initiate the divorce have at least initially an easier time in adjustment. Kitson and Raschke (1981) also support previously presented data that the older one is at the time of divorce, and the longer he has been married, the more difficulty in adjustment. Length of separation was also a factor, with the longer the time separated, the less the distress.

Other factors are seen as modifiable in how they influence divorce adjustment. Kitson and Raschke (1981) report most studies show that level of education has little effect on adjustment. Income, however, is related to better adjustment, with the higher the income and the more independent the source associated with better adjustment. They also report higher social participation is related to better adjustment. They found high anxiety and low self-esteem were related to poorer adjustment, as was external locus of control, and traditional role attitudes in women.

**Interventions in Divorce Adjustment**

It is apparent from our review of the literature that the consequences of divorce are disruptive and usually painful. The work by Bloom et al. (1978), Kitson and Raschke (1981), and Pett (1982), among others give a sampling of
those moderators which have been identified as affecting adjustment to divorce. Research prior to the 1980's with only a few exceptions tends to be sociological in nature with experimental controls noticeably absent. Further, divorce adjustment research has often been drawn from material that emerged from marital therapy and which has then been reinterpreted to fit divorce theory, often with notable methodological problems (Storm & Sprenkle, 1982).

Workshops and seminars. Despite the paucity of controlled studies on interventions in divorce adjustment, counseling, and education for separated and/or divorced individuals has long been accepted as viable. Fisher (1974) reports a variety of educational procedures that have been developed over a period of several years, all aimed at providing help for the divorced individual. Weiss (1975) reports success in helping separated individuals adjust through a series of seminars relating to separation and divorce. Cognitive behavioral techniques are advocated by Granwold and Welch (1977) and remarriage education by Messinger (1976). Sobota and Cappas (1979) report public lectures on divorce as helpful while Dries (1975) indicates in his research that classes in divorce readjustment have proven helpful. Support for divorce groups has been formally made by Coche and Goldman (1979), and Fetsch and Surdam (1981). Generally single's groups, lectures on divorce, and various forms of group therapy are all promoted as helpful in the post-divorce adjustment process.
One example of the demand for workshops and seminars for the divorced individual comes from Davidoff and Schiller (1983), who report on a series of courses offered as crisis intervention for the divorced. These are comprised of six two-hour weekly workshops exploring the "realities of divorce" which in a five year period have been offered to over 500 individuals.

Several studies have been undertaken to assess intervention effectiveness. For example, Fisher (1974), in a study seeking to determine if social and emotional needs of divorced individuals can be met through a divorce adjustment seminar, ran a three hour per week, ten week seminar. His results found the adjustment seminar to be an efficient and practical method of helping people work through the divorce process. His data indicate adjustment usually takes about one year and that adjustment was easier for people having a good self-concept.

Thiessen, Avery, and Joanning (1980) used a program adapted from Weiss's (1975) adjustment seminars. Their purpose was to facilitate post-divorce adjustment among women. They reported that three hours of seminar, weekly for five weeks was sufficient training to increase general post-divorce adjustment and empathy skills. It is of interest that during the training period there was no apparent change in the level of self-esteem. Also, Goethal (1983), in a one month follow-up of the Thiessen et al. (1980) study, confirms that divorce adjustment training as
part of a seminar was helpful in post-divorce adjustment; however, no difference was noted in self-esteem.

Weiss (1975), and Sobota and Cappas (1979) reported consistent clinical impressions reinforced by questionnaire results that indicated groups and seminars helped divorced individuals to cope during their adjustment period. Dries (1975) found belonging to a divorce adjustment organization was helpful to the adjustment process, but belonging to an academic class where information was disseminated in a didactic approach was more helpful. According to Dries didactic-education appears to have an impact over and beyond just the acquisition of information.

From the literature cited, the value of lectures and seminars for the divorced certainly appears viable. Workshops and seminars seem to provide at least three contributing aspects to the process of post divorce adjustment. First, they provide a unit of support, where individuals can see others in like situations (Coche & Goldman, 1979). Second, the workshop or seminar provides information on the adjustment process including practical methods for working through problems (Fisher, 1977). Third the didactic presentation provides a forum for learning, which is very powerful (Dries, 1975).

Divorce adjustment groups. Chiriboga et al. (1979) report divorced individuals with high levels of stress are more likely to seek help from a counselor, but their data offers little support for counseling actively decreasing the
pain and distress associated with divorce. Kitson and Raschke (1981) note that while counseling has been assumed to be an aid to people in adjusting to the distress of divorce, they are aware of few studies which demonstrate its value.

Concurrent with these observations are studies which do examine the effects of groups' interventions on the divorce adjustment process. One of these studies was conducted by Tedder (1983) who while studying the effects of support groups for single parents reported that a format of information giving and discussion yielded significant results (at the .05 level) for the support group in a Solomon four group design over a six week period. Adjustment was measured by the Tennessee Self-Concept Test and the Fisher Divorce Adjustment Scale.

Kessler (1976, 1977) found the trauma of post-divorce adjustment can be eased, using a structured intervention approach. In a comparison of structured versus non-structured groups, Kessler reported structured groups were more effective than non-structured groups, which were more effective than the control group. There were three groups with ten individuals per group that met for one-day and then eight weekly two-hour sessions. Kessler suggests that skill building exercises add an important dimension in the process of divorce adjustment. These findings are echoed by Henry (1981) in studying the effects of group counseling on divorce adjustment. In addition, Henry
surmises, based on analysis of subjects who dropped out of the eight week treatment program, that group counseling may be most appropriate for persons who are past the shock and denial stage of divorce adjustment.

Petsch and Surdam (1981) found group techniques helpful in the adjustment process. Their groups were run once a week for seven weeks and were evaluated as positive. Vogel-Moline (1980) showed the effectiveness of structured group therapy when results were obtained after only eight weekly sessions. Results showed increased levels of self-esteem and decreased levels of depression.

Reid (1979), in a dissertation on the influence of group counseling upon the recently divorced, found that group counseling helps to mitigate the pain and confusion the divorced individual experiences. The theme of the study was on altering the negative way others are viewed rather than on change within the self. Participants met weekly for nine weeks with significant results.

In a study on the effects of divorce counseling groups on adjustment and self-esteem, Salts and Zongker (1983) found no significant differences in terms of improvement of self-concept or adjustment. Structured counseling groups showed the greatest amount of improvement, followed by unstructured groups, and then by minimal contact groups. Groups were stratified for sex and length of separation.

While there appears to be some contradiction with the Salts and Zongker (1983) study, it should be noted that
other studies have not shown significant improvement in self-esteem (Dries, 1975; Thiessen et al., 1980; Farenhorst, 1982). This may be explained by the lack of significance in self-esteem change as a result of weaknesses in the instrument used to measure change, rather than lack of change itself. The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale used by Thiessen et al. (1980) and Farenhorst (1982) is a global self-esteem instrument and not situation specific. The Tennessee Self-Concept also tends to measure a global self-concept.

Levin and Kurtz (1974) investigating differences between structured and non-structured groups found participants in the structured groups had greater ego involvement, greater group unity, and more self-perceived personality change. Several researchers (Lewin, 1947; Lieberman, Yalom, & Miles, 1973; Yalom, 1970) strongly espouse the belief that the most effective change for individuals takes place in a group counseling situation in which group members can experience and analyze their interactions with others who have equivalent problems.

Those who advocate lack of structure and the resulting ambiguity (Argyris, 1967; Lieberman et al., 1973) have generally been overshadowed by advocates for structure (Kessler, 1978; Levin & Kurtz, 1974). These latter studies have found a structured group experience to be more effective with divorce adjustment groups.
In an eight week pre-post-test study of the comparative effectiveness of individual and group counseling modalities for postdivorce adjustment and self-esteem, Farenhorst (1982) reported no significant difference among individual, group, or minimal contact groups on self-esteem. He does report significant differences between treatment groups and minimal contact groups on measures of divorce adjustment and no significant difference between individual and group treatment on self-esteem or divorce adjustment.

It appears that brief therapy is an effective treatment modality regardless of the therapeutic model espoused (Coche & Goldman 1979). Storm and Sprenkle (1982) report an absence of literature that specifically compares individual, conjoint, and family forms of divorce therapy. What literature is available on controlled interventions in facilitating post-divorce adjustment is reported by Storm and Sprenkle as being methodologically flawed.

In summary, workshops, seminars, structured and unstructured groups, all of brief duration, have been found effective in facilitating post-divorce adjustment. While there have been no direct comparisons of modalities, it does appear each approach has its own unique strength. Seminars and workshops by their very nature lend themselves to didactic presentation and a certain amount of structure. They can also be offered to larger numbers of participants than the usual group. Group interaction, in turn, offers its unique strength in that it supplies an informal support
network which appears crucial in reorganization of identity. In addition, problem solving components and catharsis may be of value. Research available indicates as a modality it is as viable as individual psychotherapy (Farenhorst, 1982).

It can be concluded that a hybrid, combining the best aspects of all intervention programs, would be more powerful than any alone. Such an intervention program would be brief, six to ten weeks in duration, and would limit the number of participants for maximum group interaction and support, from eight to twelve individuals. It would contain didactic elements and would include an overview of the stages of divorce. In addition, problem solving components and homework assignments would be designed to provide growth opportunities in personal and social identity.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of the present study was to determine if a structured intervention program could assist individuals in adjusting to some of the disruption divorce causes in areas of self-esteem, self-image, symptoms of adjustment, and problems resulting from the divorce. It was also the purpose of this study to determine if identity status and certain aspects of personal and social identity are influenced by such a structured intervention and whether they in turn mediate the level of adjustment which occurs.

Divorced individuals in the treatment groups received an intervention program designed to facilitate adjustment
to divorce. Specifically the program focused on changes in identity status, personal and social aspects of identity, internal locus of control, self-esteem, self-image, and symptoms of divorce adjustment.

Hypotheses

1. Divorced individuals participating in a structured treatment program will manifest greater gains in their scores on self-esteem, self-image, internal locus of control and certain aspects of personal and social identity while reporting fewer adjustment problems and divorce symptomology than those individuals receiving no treatment.

2. Using pre-test identity status scores, it is hypothesized that (a) individuals having high identity status levels will manifest greater gains from receiving treatment than those high identity status individuals receiving no treatment; (b) that individuals having low identity status scores will manifest greater gains from receiving treatment than those with high identity status levels in the control group; and (c) that individuals receiving high identity status pre-test scores will manifest significantly higher adjustment scores than those receiving low identity status scores, in the same group, experimental or control.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Subjects

Forty-six recently divorced individuals were divided into an experimental and control group which constituted the sample of this study. Individuals were selected from courthouse files where divorce proceedings are a matter of public record. For purposes of this study, all divorce records examined were filed in Cache County in the state of Utah. Subjects were selected commencing with those who had filed for divorce and had been physically separated for at least three months but not exceeding eighteen months.

A total of 502 representative individuals was obtained. Of this number, addresses were obtained on 297. A letter was then sent outlining the program and qualifications to take part. Subsequent follow up by telephone and letter resulted in 133 contacts, 36 of whom refused to participate and 51 who didn't meet basic qualifications. It is recognized that subject generalizability is partially restricted due to local sampling and the voluntary nature of this type of research.

Individuals were excluded from the study on the following bases: (a) they had moved outside of the county of filing; (b) they had received counseling for personal
problems within the last three years; or (c) marital counseling prior to separation; (d) they had been physically separated less than three months or reported a chance of withdrawing the divorce petition or remarrying their former spouse; (e) they had been physically separated longer than eighteen months; and (f) the divorce was still in process.

Initially the treatment group was divided into two sections—one with twelve subjects, the other with eight. The control group was assigned seventeen subjects. Later to increase the sample size an additional treatment group of nine subjects was added. The size of treatment groups was limited to a minimum of eight and a maximum of twelve. Treatment groups of this size allow for lecture presentations, greater subject participation and involvement, and provide enough subjects for informal support units and problem solving components to be generated.

Procedure

All subjects were given pre-tests. These paper and pencil tests included questions designed to measure current levels of identity status, certain aspects of personal and social identity, levels of self-esteem, self-image, internal locus of control, and symptoms of divorce adjustment (See Appendix A for a detailed outline). After the pre-test had been administered, subjects were divided
into two groups: those who scored low and those who scored high (based on a median split) in identity status on the Marcia Incomplete Sentence Blank (EI-ISB). Subjects in each group were then assigned on a random basis into either the treatment or pre-test post-test control group. Scoring of the ISB and subsequent placement in the experimental or control group was performed by assistants trained on the ISB in order to keep the treatment leader blind and thus avoid experimenter bias.

In accordance with research findings, the intervention program was highly structured (Kessler, 1978; Levin & Kurtz, 1974; Vogel-Moline, 1980) and contained educational components (Fisher, 1974; Messinger, 1976), some of which were presented in lecture form (Sobota & Cappas, 1979; Dries, 1975; Fetsch & Surdam, 1981). The team leader sought to provide ongoing support to participants and to help them become informal social networks (Chiriboga et al., 1979; Goode, 1956; Richardson, 1981). Subject participation was emphasized (Spanier & Casto, 1979; Wallerstein & Kelly, 1980) as were techniques in problem solving (Reid, 1979; Vogel-Moline, 1980). Current research suggests an intervention program of five to ten weeks, meeting weekly for two to three hours, should be an effective treatment period (Davidoff & Schiller, 1983; Fisher, 1977; Kessler, 1978; Thiessen et al., 1980). The intervention program was developed within these parameters.
Variables previously found significant to divorce adjustment but not modifiable by treatment are: (1) presence or absence of children (Kitson & Raschke, 1981); (2) source of income (Pett, 1982); and (3) age at time of divorce (Nelson, 1982). These data were obtained from the initial pre-test questionnaire. The conclusion drawn by Bloom et al. (1978) and Bachrach (1975) that mental illness is a major moderator of divorce adjustment was controlled by ruling out all subjects who had previously participated in therapy activities. The finding by Kitson and Raschke (1981), but not supported by Pett (1982), Defrain (1981), and Ashenhurst (1981), that length of separation is a significant factor in adjustment, was controlled by the time frame for acceptable subjects in the study. A time frame of three to eighteen months of physical separation, accommodates Hetherington et al. (1976) finding of an initial denial or non-response period and Kolevzon and Gottlieb's (1983) report that the first eighteen months of separation are the most severe. The treatment group met weekly, since this particular format seems to help provide an emotional support base for participants (Tedder, 1983) and allows those not yet past the denial stage (Weiss, 1975) to process material or leave the study (Henry, 1981).

In developing a program to meet the above criteria, previous structured interventions were considered (Davidoff & Schiller, 1983; Farenhorst, 1982; Fisher, 1977; Kessler,
1978; Thiessen et al., 1980; Vogel-Moline, 1980; Weiss, 1975). The divorce adjustment groups run by Vogel-Moline (1980) seemed to meet the basic needs outlined. This treatment program was developed and refined by Hoopes, Fisher, & Barlow (1984) and is outlined in Appendix B. In brief, the program requires ten weeks to administer: the first week for pre-assessment, the next eight weeks for the structured treatment, and a final week for a post-assessment. Each session lasts two hours, and includes a detailed outline built upon the material presented in previous weeks. Program goals include teaching subjects to learn to ask for and give support, to be committed to the group, and to learn and apply problem solving skills in their lives.

Hoopes et al. (1984) report use of the program has been found helpful in decreasing depression, increasing the level of self-esteem, and decreasing hostility. They report that subjects in the experimental group have continued to maintain gains as much as fifteen months after treatment. Treatment consists of three phases: building supports, learning to problem solve, and developing interpersonal strengths. In the present study, this was supplemented by brief didactic presentations (15 to 20 minutes) on the stages of divorce and their representative challenges. These brief presentations focused on developing understanding of what normally occurs in the divorce process.
and on some of the tasks which must be worked through for adequate divorce adjustment.

Instrumentation

Measurements were chosen that would be most representative for evaluating change in levels of divorce adjustment. Each instrument chosen appears to be the most reliable available, and all but one instrument, the Kinch, Falk & Anderson (1983) Self-Image Inventory, have received extensive testing and use in previous studies.

Marcia's Incomplete Sentence Blank. In obtaining a measurement of identity achievement the Incomplete Sentence Blank (EI-ISB) was chosen because of its frequent use and ease in administration. Its inter-rater agreement (reliability), based on two scorers, typically exceeds 90%. This assessment measures the degree to which the respondent has made a personal commitment to occupational, religious and political alternatives. Subjects are asked to complete partially developed sentences with their own feelings and thoughts. Responses are rated on a 1 to 3 point scale, which are summated to give an overall measure of identity achievement. Scoring was performed by two raters with an inter-rater reliability above .80. A median split on the pre-test was used to establish high and low identity.

The Aspects of Identity Questionnaire. This version of the Aspects of Identity Questionnaire (AIQ) developed by Cheek and Hogan (1983) is a revision of Cheek and Briggs's
(1982) attempt to conceptualize identity in two parts, personal and social. Personal identity is one's private conception of self and feelings of continuity and uniqueness, while social identity is defined as the individual's social roles and relationships. The questionnaire consists of twenty-one statements which the respondent scores on a one to five scale. Both scales (personal and social) have alpha coefficient reliabilities of .70, and they correlate .22 with each other. Those items on the Personal Identity Scale have an average inter-item correlation of .27. The average inter-item correlation of the social items is .20. Cheek and Hogan (1983) conclude that personal and social aspects of identity are independent dimensions. Internal consistency (alphas) was reassessed in this study.

Internal Locus of Control. Rotter's (1966) Locus of Control scale was included to measure the relationship locus of control has to personal and social identity and to high versus low identity status as defined by Marcia (1967). Internal locus of control is also seen as modifiable based on treatment. The scale includes the fifteen items White (1979) selected out of the original 58 item scale which indicate aspects of internal locus of control. This instrument was chosen for ease of administration and years of research use.
Locus of control was established during the pre-test on both high and low identity with high identity being expected to correlate to high scores in internal locus of control. The same instrument was then administered post-test to determine what change occurs during treatment and whether changes in identity relate to changes in locus of control.

Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. Self-esteem levels were established by the use of two instruments, the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE) (1979) and the Kinch et al. (1983) Self-Image Inventory. Kernaleguen and Conrad (1980) report correlations among five different measures of self-concept and found no distinct preference. The RSE was reported to have some slight advantage in that it is easily administered and has considerable research behind it. Kernaleguen and Conrad report a reproducibility coefficient of .92 and scalability of .72. The RSE is a paper and pencil inventory of ten items utilizing a Guttman scale to measure self-esteem. Rosenberg's instrument was shown to have a test-retest reliability of .92. The Rosenberg instrument was chosen not only for its statistical qualities but also because of previous use with divorced populations (Vogel-Moline, 1980).

Rosenberg (1979) notes the self is viewed in both general and specific terms, but that these terms are not interchangeable. This means how the individual sees himself as a whole cannot necessarily be interpreted as indicative
of how he feels about himself on any one specific disposition. Perhaps this explains why Thiessen et al. (1980) and Farenhorst (1982) found no significant gains in self-esteem when using the Rosenberg scale to measure self-esteem change among divorced women. It may simply be too general to detect change. There is no consensus as to whether focusing on the general or specific self is the best technique but general measures do manifest problems due to the "self" attitude being so situational.

Kinch-Falk Self-Image Inventory. Wylie (1974) notes the use of construct validation occurs when an investigator believes his instrument reflects a particular construct which has a specific meaning attached and that it should produce two results: (a) successful prediction of group differences, and (b) studies of predicted changes over occasions. In this regard self image as formalized by Kinch should be susceptible to change by experimentation. The Kinch et al. (1983) Self-Image Inventory was developed to meet the need for a specific definitional construct in self-image. Self referent constructs have been poorly constructed in terms of instrumentation. Self-concept has been interpreted in two ways: one that the self is stable and basically inflexible and the other that it is changeable depending on role. The Kinch et al. (1983) Self-Image Inventory measures the second concept, while the Rosenberg scale measures self-esteem in the more global and stable
sense. It is for this reason the Kinch-Falk instrument was included.

Divorce results in disruption of roles (Loge, 1977; Wiseman 1975) and adjustment to it requires a reorganization process to occur (Smart, 1977). This reorganization process clearly has an effect on self-esteem as shown by Fisher (1977), Hetherington et al. (1976), and Weiss (1975, 1976). Hence, it appears that the self is changeable (Wylie, 1974) and must therefore be measured by an instrument susceptible to changing roles such as the Kinch et al. (1983) Self-Image Inventory.

Self-image is the role situated aspect of the self-concept and measures how a person sees himself in a specific role or situation. The instrument is phrased in adjectives and was originally developed by John Kinch (1959). It is composed of twelve descriptive adjectives, each followed by a seven point rating scale. Reliability is reported as high. Intercorrelation of items is moderate ranging from .03 to .62. It is predicted the Kinch-Falk scale should be successful in predicting situational changes such as those found among divorcing individuals, where a more global scale such as the RSE or MMPI ego strength scale would not allow for this sensitivity.

Symptom Checklist. The Symptom Checklist, developed by Bloom (1975), is a composite of versions of similar rating scales developed by Gurin, Veroff and Feld (1960), and the
National Center for Health Statistics (1970) which are heavily reliant for their origin on the Psychosomatic Scale of the Neuropsychiatric Screening Adjunct developed during World War II for Selective Service screening (Star, 1950). Bloom's Symptom Checklist includes items appearing in two or more of the above scales and improves overall psychometric properties by not only including only the most common items from the scales but also employing uniform response categories.

Review of the use of symptom scales (Schwartz, Myers & Astrachan, 1973) indicate they are adequate for the purposes this study intends, namely, the assessment of general emotional discomfort, neurotic symptomatology, and psychological symptoms or disorders. They conclude that symptom scales express face validity. Bloom and his colleagues (1978) have broken the Symptom Checklist into three distinct clusters: (a) depression with a coefficient of .86, (b) psychophysiological tension with a reliability coefficient of .73 and (c) a physical health and illness scale with a reliability coefficient of .80. They have used this scale extensively in their studies of divorce since its implementation. The Symptom Checklist is easily administered, and together with the Problem Checklist and the Separation Adjustment questionnaire has been used extensively as a measure of divorce adjustment. Reliability
was reassessed on the three scale clusters used by Bloom and colleagues.

The Problem Checklist. The Problem Checklist consists of 24 items representing potential problem areas for divorced or separated persons. Respondents indicated the extent to which each of the items had been a problem for them since the separation on a scale from 1 (not a problem) to 4 (one of the most important problems). Higher scores reflect a poorer adjustment to separation and divorce. The Problem Checklist used in this study is modeled after the one used by Meyers (1976) and later used by Bloom and his colleagues (1978) in their studies on divorce. Meyers (1976) found a reliability coefficient of .60 on this checklist but concluded there was no reason to believe an item checklist of this sort should form a cohesive scale. Bloom et al. (1978) has used it extensively on divorced and separated populations. Two clusters of items are found: (a) financial problems and (b) socialization problems.

Separation Adjustment Questionnaire. The Separation Adjustment Questionnaire is derived from a scale developed by Blair (1970) and later modified by Meyers (1976) that was used to measure current adjustment among divorced women. Eleven questions are included which ask about feelings, attitudes, and experiences which women hold following separation and divorce. Measurement is restricted to a four item response format. High scores reflect poorer adjustment.
Meyers (1976) found a reliability coefficient of .80 with two major clusters: (a) general adjustment and (b) sexual adjustment. Scores are summated by items.

Summary. Seven instruments were chosen to reflect change in divorce adjustment as it relates to various aspects of identity. The Incomplete Sentence Blank was used to establish pre and post levels of identity achievement. The Aspects of Identity Questionnaire was intended to provide measures of personal and social identity. Measures of internal locus of control, self-image, self-esteem as well as three symptom/problem checklists were included to help assess treatment change. All instruments are self-reports, easily administered, and machine or hand scored.

Data Analysis

Subjects in both the experimental and minimal contact control groups completed identical questionnaires during the pre-test and post-test periods. Further, a median split on identity scores at time 1 was used to establish a low and high identity group comparison. The analyses were completed on the data based upon the following conceptualization.
Using pre-test scores, a series of t-tests was computed between the experimental and control groups. Given random placement, no significant differences were expected. Assuming no differences between groups on the pre-tests, a series of t-tests was also computed between groups on post-test measures. In addition a series of t-tests was computed for the seven dependent measures. Likewise, t-tests between pre-test and post-test scores for the experimental and the control groups were computed. The t-tests for the experimental but not the control group were expected to show a significant increase.

A series of one-way analyses of variance was computed, comparing the three experimental groups with each other and with the control group to avoid possible confounding. In addition, a series of analyses of variance was computed, using the pre-test dependent measures as covariates to look at treatment effects. Demographic characteristics were also

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Identity (R) T1</td>
<td>Experimental T2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimal Contact T2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Conceptualization of Analyses
included as covariates. In order to test the mediation hypothesis between identity status and treatment effects, a series of analyses of variance was also computed, using an identity status X treatment group factorial.

Cronbach alphas were used to generate internal consistency for each of the seven major instruments. The pre-test, post-test experimental control group design was the basic research design. Other analyses such as correlational matrixes were also computed.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Clinical intervention studies which draw on multivariate assessment of psychological adjustment or personality development are best undertaken with clear estimates of reliability of measurement. Estimates of reliability provide important information on the degree to which treatment (experimental/control) differences are due to experimental causation versus measurement error. In other words, acceptable levels of reliability eliminate a potential rival hypothesis that treatment differences are actually due to spurious measurement error within clinical assessments. In the present investigation, estimates of reliability were focused on internal consistency rather than test-retest reliability estimates. Test-retest reliability coefficients were not computed in that change was hypothesized as central to the clinical intervention study.

Estimates of Internal Consistency

Estimates of internal consistency were generated using Cronbach's alpha for those measures with previous limited use of standardized and reported reliabilities. Cronbach alphas for each of the seven major instruments are reported in Table 1. Estimates of reliability were computed for both pretest and post test assessment periods. In all cases the
alphas are significant and range from a low of .64 to a high of .99. The mean alpha for the pre-test measures was .81 while the mean alpha for the post-test measures was .85. Thus, the estimates of internal consistency as one indicator of reliability indicate that at both the pre-test and post-test assessment period items within each of the seven basic scales held acceptable to strong internal consistency. Therefore, the rival hypothesis that potential treatment and control group differences may be due to measurement error or spuriousness, is in general, eliminated.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Time 1 Alpha</th>
<th>Time 2 Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Image</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symptoms</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspects of Identity</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 1: Treatment Versus Control

The first hypothesis focuses on the proposed treatment effects associated with a structured group intervention for
divorce adjustment. That is, it was hypothesized that those subjects participating in a series of structured group experiences, which included building an external support network, developing an understanding of the stages and processes of divorce adjustment, and developing problem solving skills and strategies for dealing with individual stress and anxiety, would, in contrast to a control group not receiving such a treatment, manifest significantly more positive adjustment on measures of divorce adjustment and varying aspects of personality associated with social relations and interpersonal behaviors.

Pre-test measures. A basic pre-test post-test experimental control group design is ideally utilized with true randomization of a sample into the experimental and control groups. However, when clinical researchers draw on this experimental design, seldom (if ever) is it possible to use total randomization. While attempts were undertaken to randomize subject placement into the two basic research groups, the researcher was limited by the time constraints, voluntary interest, and related family life demands of the subject in completing this process. Therefore, a statistical comparison was made between subjects' pre-test scores in both the experimental and control groups to assess the degree to which the two groups (in general) were comparable from the onset. A series of t tests was computed for the seven basic dependent measures and are reported in table 2. With one exception, the two groups were highly similar in
Table 2

Mean Differences Between Experimental and Control Groups on Pre-Test Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.93 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Image</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>-.61 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symptoms</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.90 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.65 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>3.22 .003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.34 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspects of Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.11 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.21 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.06 ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Experimental cell size= 21-28. Control cell size= 11-17. A two-tailed test of significance was utilized.
their basic psychological and social adjustment profile. The single exception was observed on the separation/Adjustment measure, wherein the subjects in the experimental group, on the average, reported significantly more separation/adjustment problems than those in the control group. Therefore, one qualifier is recognized regarding subject selection. That is, subjects who were willing to engage in an eight week treatment program and two additional weeks of testing were reporting greater difficulty in the process of divorce adjustment.

Post-test measures. The basic hypothesis of this study proposes treatment effects associated with a structured group experience. The most commonly utilized strategy for testing for treatment effects in a pre-test post-test experimental control group design is to compare the two groups on post-test scores when the pre-test scores have been shown not to differ. These analyses are reported in table 3. In contrast, to much of the past reported literature on treatment effects associated with divorce adjustment, no significant differences are observed due to the experimental treatment (with one exception). The single exception is once again observed on the separation/adjustment scale. As was observed on the pre-test measure, at post-testing the experimental group is still showing higher adjustment problems. However, a comparison of the pre-test and post-test means in tables 2 and 3 reveal that the experimental group is showing approximately twice the
Table 3

Mean Differences Between Experimental and Control Groups on Post-test Measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Image</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symptoms</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspects of Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>-.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
change toward more positive adjustment than that reported by the control group.

Pre-test to post-test changes. As suggested above, a third way of looking at the data is to examine the magnitude or amount of change from pre-test to post-test measurements for the experimental and control groups. Indeed, in studies dealing with human subjects where randomization is never totally possible, comparisons of the magnitude of change may be the more realistic way in which to examine the data, given that subjects may vary between groups in their initial pre-test scores as was observed on the separation/adjustment measure. Analyses looking at degree of change on the seven basic dependent measures are summarized in table 4.

An examination of the table reveals no significant changes were observed between the pre-test and post-test measures for the control group. That is, pre-test and post-test scores were, on the average for the control group, well within the confidence interval for standard error of measurement. Any differences observed for single subjects would be recognized as spurious. However, for the experimental group, four dependent measures showed changes, on the average, between the pre-test and post-test measures that reflected significant differences. As table 4 reveals self-esteem improved, self-image increased, and self-reported symptomology declined between the pre-and post-test periods. Further, the scores on separation adjustment
Table 4

Differences Between Pre-test and Post-test Means from the Experimental and Control Group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Experimental Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Control Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2.32*</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Image</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>2.11*</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symptoms</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.98*</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.10*</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus Control</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspects Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>-.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Experimental cell size= 22-28. Control cell size= 11-17. A one-tail test of significance was utilized.

*P < .05.
showed significant improvement between the two data collection points.

Potential experimental group confound. Given the necessity to control the size of each experimental treatment group and to establish an acceptable cell size for the treatment versus control group comparison, three experimental groups were conducted. In the previous analyses the three experimental groups were collapsed into a single group for analysis. To check for possible confounding, due to collapsing, a series of one-way analyses of variance were computed comparing the three experimental groups with the basic control group and with each other. These analyses are summarized in table 5. On pre-test measures there were three significant one-way analyses. On self-image, problem checklist, and separation adjustment significant differences were observed. As previously discussed, the general trend was for the experimental groups to show more self-reported problems than the control group's subjects. However, the experimental groups differed little from each other. The single major exception was on the pre-test self-image measure, where one experimental group and the control group showed higher self-image than the remaining two experimental groups. No significant differences were observed between the three experimental and control groups on the post-test measures testing for treatment effects. In general, these analyses once again reveal little evidence for treatment effect and relatively
Table 5
Mean Difference Between the Three Experimental and Single Control Groups on Pre-test and Post-test Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Experimental Group 1</th>
<th>Experimental Group 2</th>
<th>Experimental Group 3</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem (Pre)</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>&lt;1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Post)</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Image (Pre)</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>3.96*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Post)</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>&lt;1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symptoms (Pre)</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Post)</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>&lt;1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems (Pre)</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>3.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Post)</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment (Pre)</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>3.85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Post)</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus Cntrl (Pre)</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>&lt;1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspects of Personal Identity (Pre)</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>&lt;1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Post)</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>&lt;1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social (Pre)</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>&lt;1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Post)</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>&lt;1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Pre)</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>&lt;1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Post)</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>&lt;1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
minimal evidence for a confound associated with the utilization of three experimental groups. Nonetheless, additional analyses are suggested wherein the potential differences between subjects on pre-test scores are controlled to determine if post-test differences can be observed once differences on pre-test behavior are adjusted for.

Indeed, a series of analyses of variance were computed using the various pre-test dependent variable measures as covariates to re-assess for potential treatment group effects. While many of the covariates were significant, the basic findings of no significant treatment effects as reported in table 5 were observed. Therefore, we must conclude that the first hypothesis proposing treatment versus control group differences was not supported by the data--both before and after adjustments for possible experimental confounds and pre-test differences.

Hypothesis 2: Identity X Treatment Effect

The second hypothesis proposes a mediation between identity status levels and treatment effects. That is, it was hypothesized that (a) individuals having high and low identity status that experience an eight-week divorce adjustment intervention would make greater gains from receiving such a treatment than similarly high and low identity status persons who receive no treatment; while (b)
individuals with low identity status who would receive treatment would manifest greater gains than that of the high identity status individuals receiving no treatment; also, (c) individuals with high identity status would differentially show greater gains than low identity status individuals when within the same groups, either treatment or control. To test for this hypothesis, a series of analyses of variance were computed, using an Identity Status (high versus Low) x Treatment Group (Experimental versus Control) factorial. Analyses were computed on the pre-test and post test measures, using the basic ANOVA procedures, and on the post-test measures, using a variety of covariates based on pre-test and demographic variables.

The primary analyses for this hypothesis are summarized in table 6. The Identity Status x Treatment Effects factorial provide the main effects for identity group differences, and treatment effects along with an interaction effect for the full statistical model. The basic hypothesis is tested by the interaction term in table 6. No significant interactions were observed between identity status and treatment effects. Therefore, no support is provided for the hypothesis that identity status mediates treatment effects in divorce adjustment and interventions. Further, when pre-test scores and various demographic characteristics were entered as covariates into a variety of covariance analyses of variances, no significant interactions were observed. Therefore, we must conclude
Table 6

Analysis of Variance on Pre-test and Post-test measures using an Identity X Treatment Factorial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Treatment Experimental Control</th>
<th>Interaction F Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>5.60*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pre)</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>4.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Image</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>22.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pre)</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>10.64*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symptoms</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pre)</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>10.79*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>4.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pre)</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>10.62*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pre)</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus Ctrl</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Post)</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspects Iden</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pre)</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Iden</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>4.89*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pre)</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Iden</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pre)</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
from these data that identity status at the time of entry into a divorce adjustment treatment experience has little bearing on the likely outcome for the effects of the intervention.

Several significant main effects were observed, however. While few bear directly on the major hypothesis, a few are worthy of comment. A variety of significant main effects for identity group differences indicate that high identity status subjects in this experiment were likely to hold, in contrast to low identity status subjects, higher self-esteem, more positive self-images; they reported fewer symptoms or problems regarding their divorce; and they held higher or more firm personal identities. These findings confirm the notion that individuals with higher identity status are more socially and psychologically capable individuals. Thus, the failure to find the proposed interaction between identity and treatment effects does not appear to be due to an invalid measure of identity status at pre-testing. The significant main effects for the treatment factor are consistent with findings of prior reported analyses from this study.

Conclusion

Two hypotheses were advanced and tested in this study. First, it was proposed that a divorce adjustment treatment program would have a positive and enhanced effect on adjustment, including increased levels of personal and
social identity. Second, it was hypothesized that levels of identity status would mediate the treatment effect. The analyses of the pre-test post test experimental control design data, however, do not support the directional hypotheses of this study. While evidence can be found to show that there were some changes between the pre-test and post-test scores for divorce adjustment for the experimental group, the overall findings are that little differences can be observed between the experimental and control groups at the end of the study, even after possible experimental confounds and pre-test differences are carefully examined. The hypothesized mediation of identity status on treatment effect is also left without support. Identity status, including aspects of personal and social identity, evidenced no significant change either on the treatment effect or by the treatment.
Past Findings

A large volume of past research (see Chapter II, Review of Literature) suggests divorce is inevitably accompanied by emotional pain and distress. It has been associated with both personal and social confusion and is reported (Salts, 1979) as resulting in the generation of new roles and in the restructuring of identity.

It has been suggested by a number of social scientists (Bohannan, 1970; Weiss, 1975; Salts, 1979) that the process of adjustment to divorce follows certain stages or patterns: generally incorporating a crisis period, a transition period, and then a new beginning. Time appears to play a role, with divorce adjustment usually taking anywhere from a few months to two or three years. However, Kolevzon and Gottlieb (1983) are representative of researchers who emphasize the first year as being most traumatic.

That divorce has implications on one's identity is suggested by Wiseman (1975), Loge (1977), and Smart (1977), who state unequivocally that there is a disruption of identity followed by confusion and then a time of resynthesizing. Thus, it would appear that both the divorce itself and then the period of readjustment are accompanied by changes in identity.
While there is some evidence to indicate divorce adjustment programs are effective, there are too many testimonials and not enough empirical evidence to substantiate it. Thus, this study had two major objectives. First, to determine if the effects of a structured intervention experience did, in fact, increase the level of divorce adjustment. Second, to determine if identity status or achievement played a mediation role upon the effects of the treatment program for divorce adjustment. Analyses of the results indicate while there is some change from treatment effects, it is not statistically significant. In addition, identity status, or identity achievement, does not seem to have a mediation effect on treatment results.

Methodological Issues

A variety of methodological issues was addressed in this study. Issues of reliability were addressed first. Internal consistency was established, using Cronbach's alpha on the measurements, and generally was very strong. There were only two instruments reporting alpha scores below the mean of .81, Rotter's locus of control at .64, and the Kinch-Falk self-image inventory at .69. Thus, reliability was acceptably good, therein minimizing concerns about consistency in the measurements.

Difficulties in true randomization of subjects was encountered in the initial selection and assignment to groups. Therefore, a statistical comparison using t-tests
was made on subject's pre-test scores between the experimental and control groups to determine experimental control group comparability. Findings (with the exception of the separation adjustment measure) showed the groups as comparable. In the exception, the experimental group was found to report more adjustment problems than the control group.

While there was some concern with collapsing the three experimental groups into one group due to fear of confounding, the ideal treatment size based on research findings appeared to be eight to twelve subjects in each treatment group. In testing for group differences, the experimental groups showed three significant one-way analyses. Self-image, problem checklist, and separation adjustment measures all reported significantly more difficulties than the control group in the pre-test. However, the experimental groups differed little from each other, and post-test experimental control group comparisons reported no significant treatment effects. Hence, collapsing of experimental groups for further analyses was justifiable.

Possibilities of confounding were also tested by the use of covariates. The seven dependent variables were used as covariates in looking for treatment effects. While some of the covariates were significant, no treatment effects were evident even after covariate adjustments.
Post-test analyses of the dependent measures reveal one significant difference between experimental and control groups, that being the separation adjustment measure, where the experimental group reported significantly more problems than the control group. However, it should be noted the experimental group reported this same difference in the pre-test measure.

When magnitude, or the amount of change is considered, the scores on the separation adjustment measure reveal greater change among experimental subjects than control subjects in terms of decreasing the problems measured. Indeed, when magnitude of change is considered, no significant change is found in any pre-test to post-test control measure, while in the experimental group four dependent measures showed significant pre-test to post-test changes. Self-esteem improved; self-image increased; symptomology decreased; and as mentioned, adjustment problems with divorce decreased (see table 4).

In conclusion, this study, while selecting what seemed to be the most optimal components for an intervention in adjustment to divorce, was not able to replicate the findings of others. There was change in the hypothesized direction but not at a traditionally acceptable level of significance. Therefore the hypothesis that an intervention program would facilitate adjustment to divorce cannot be supported. In addition, support cannot be generated for the mediation effect of identity status, and it must be
concluded that if there is a mediation effect, the time period over which this effect is measured must be greatly extended. Support is present, however, to suggest that high identity status subjects experience less distress from the divorce than low identity status subjects, but again there is little support to suggest the intervention itself effects or is effected by identity status. Finally, while subject response was almost universally positive to the intervention program such subjective responses cannot qualify as objective data.

Theoretical and Clinical Implications

The lack of significant results reflects the greatest disappointment of this study but also contains the most clear clinical implications. While divorce inevitably causes pain, distress, and confusion, programs designed to ameliorate these and other problems would be most effective focusing on the symptomology itself. Change should be sought where the discomfort is greatest, in day-to-day living. Identity status may be disrupted by divorce, but identity status itself does not appear to change or to mediate the amount of change in divorce adjustment that comes from a short term intervention program.

These results suggest a short term intervention program focusing on day-to-day problems, and current symptomology might prove to be more effective, especially if those
instruments used to measure change were capable of more objective assessment rather than the traditional client self-report instruments. Results would also suggest the effects of an intervention program on identity have not been sufficiently explored and that longitudinal studies of changes in adult identity would be of value. Future workshops might also focus on building strengths in participants during initial group sessions rather than toward the end. If the initial sessions are spent in problem solving, there may not be sufficient time for positive self-image to be built.

The problem with subject randomization also has implications. Without a "captured" population randomization will almost always be tainted. Therefore the need to consider magnitude of change becomes important. If the magnitude or amount of change was established in both experimental and control groups, then comparisons could be made without the groups necessarily starting out equally. Hence, a more idiographic versus nomothetic perspective may be called for in such research. In addition, pre/post designs, such as the one used in this study, are most difficult to maintain and may offer reduced data from which to generalize at the conclusion of the study.

While identity status did not appear to play a mediational role in treatment effects upon adjustment, its resistance to change certainly lends impetus to regard it as
a stable construct. Aspects of personal and social identity do not appear transitory. Rather, data from this study support previous research, indicating that high identity status subjects hold higher self-esteem, higher self-image, report fewer divorce symptoms and problems than do low identity status subjects. In addition, in this study high identity status subjects scored significantly higher in personal identity than low identity status subjects. These findings confirm previous research wherein high identity subjects are reportedly socially and psychologically more capable persons.

Thus, it appears high identity status individuals who experience divorce also experience less pain and discomfort than those who are low in identity status. Several questions, however, remain unanswered. Do those high in identity experience fewer divorces? Does identity change at the time of divorce? And why doesn't identity play a role in divorce adjustment? Perhaps the last question can be answered in two ways: first, sufficient time to identify possible mediational effects of identity is not available in a ten week program, and second, identity may not be effected by the "crisis of divorce".

Limitations

It is assumed that most research projects have some limitations which affect the generalizability of results. This study is no exception. Despite best efforts, there
were problems with subject randomization. Real life subjects seem to have real life problems which interfere with ready-made assignments. While subject differences were controlled for statistically, true random selection was only an approximation.

Another concern had to do with the small size of the study. Subject participation was difficult to obtain and to maintain, especially in the control group. It is estimated that a larger number of subjects might have had a different effect on the outcome. Fourteen subjects dropped out at some time during the study. Of these, three experimental subjects quit in the first two weeks citing other commitments, while one was asked to leave because of obvious pathology (this individual was referred to psychotherapy and is currently involved in treatment). Four other experimental subjects, while completing treatment, did not complete the post-test material within the time limitations. The remaining six subjects who dropped out of the study were all in the control group and did not respond to the second questionnaire.

There was only one subject who did not complete and return all materials who received a high identity status pre-test score; all others, including the six control group subjects who did not complete the post-testing, were in the low identity status range.

Generalizability from this study should be restricted to heuristic value due to randomization problems, the small
group size, and the geographic area from which the sample was taken.

Future Research

Current research seems to be built on a nomothetic perspective using levels of significance as the base. It is hoped future studies might develop measurement techniques which can successfully evaluate magnitude of change, especially in a pre/post test design in order to allow for greater subject uniqueness. Additionally, the subject self-report instrument might be replaced with some form of objective measurement criteria or at least be complimented by it.

Data from this study would also suggest an eight-week program is not sufficient to examine identity changes. It appears identity is too stable to experience change in such a restrictive time limit. The question remains to be answered as to whether identity status or other aspects of identity actually experience change at the time of divorce. Certainly there is significant role disruption in both personal and social areas resulting from divorce, but to what extent they impact basic identity remains unknown.

While identity status or achievement may prove too stable to respond to a short-term treatment intervention, the amount of change in symptomology areas provides direction for future studies. Adjustment to divorce should
be considered in terms of more temporary feelings, actions, and symptoms. The subjective input from participants who were in the group sessions was overwhelmingly positive. It appears dependent measures need to be based more on helping the individual make it through the day and less on making personality changes.
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Appendix A
Divorce Adjustment Questionnaire

1. Name ___________________________ Age ______

2. Address: __________________________

   How long have you lived there? _____ Years _____ Months
   _____ No. of children under age 12 in household

3. Since we will need to be in contact for the next few months, is there someone who is always likely to know where you will be living? Who is this person?
   Name ___________________________ Telephone ___________
   Address ___________________________

4. Date of marriage ______ Date of separation ______
   Date divorce was finalized ________________________
   Were there previous separations in this relationship? 
   If yes, how many others? ______
   What are the chances of your reuniting?___________

5. Have you received professional counseling for problems other than marital within the last three years? ______
   Have you received professional marital counseling prior to your divorce? ______
   Have you received divorce counseling since the divorce? ______
   If yes, how long? ________________________

6. Were (are) your parents divorced from each other? ______
   If yes how old were you at the time of divorce? ______

7. Religion:
   _____ Catholic (1) _____ Other (4) Specify ______
   _____ Protestant (2) _____ None (5)
   _____ L.D.S. (3)

8. What is the source of your income?
   Self-employed ______ Spouse ______
   Salaried ______ Other ______
   Public Assistance ______
Separation/Divorce data

1. Initially whose idea was it to separate/Divorce?____

2. Can you tell me the major difficulties that you feel led to the divorce? (Check one or more categories:)
   ____ Communication difficulties
   ____ Extra-marital affair(s)
   ____ Personality conflicts
   ____ Value or goal differences
   ____ Background or class differences
   ____ Inevitable from the beginning
   ____ Sexual differences
   ____ I don't know
   ____ Other: Specify

3. How would you characterize the present relationship with your spouse/ex spouse?
   ____ Very negative
   ____ Moderately negative
   ____ Neither positive or negative
   ____ Moderately positive
   ____ Very positive

4. On a scale of 0 (None) to 4 (Extreme) could you please rate the following for the degree of difficulty that they have presented for you personally since your separation/divorce?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Mild</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Considerable</th>
<th>Extreme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loneliness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(psychological aspects)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living alone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(practical aspects)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social reintegration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual reintegration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-identity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilt, self-blame</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial stress</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaking difficulties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parenting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(including child care difficulties)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Leave blank if not a parent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Using the same scale, could you please rate the following statements for the degree to which you feel you have benefitted in these ways since your separation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Mild</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Considerable</th>
<th>Extreme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal growth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and increase in self-knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased happiness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence and freedom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Other: Specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale

Please indicate on the following ten questions whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At times I think I am no good at all</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel I do no have much to be proud of.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I certainly feel useless at times.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I take a positive attitude toward myself.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kinch-Falk Self-Image Inventory

On this page we are interested in knowing how you would evaluate yourself on the following set of descriptive adjectives. Remember that this is how you see yourself. If you find it difficult to rate yourself on an adjective, because you do not ordinarily think of yourself in those terms, circle the X at the far right of that adjective. Consider four (4) to be the average for most individuals who are separated and filing for divorce. Please circle the number you think appropriate for yourself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADJECTIVES</th>
<th>Most</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Least</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Intelligent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self-confident</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Selfish</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mature</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Physically Attractive</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Leadership</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Friendly</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Aggressive</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Honest</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cooperative</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Talkative</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Foolish</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Circle X if you don't think of yourself in terms of this adjective.
Marcia's Incomplete Sentence Blank

Please finish the following partially completed sentences.

1. For me, success would be

2. When I consider my goals in the light of my family's goals

3. I'm at my best when

4. Sticking to one occupational choice

5. When I let myself go, I

6. I know that I can always depend on

7. (Choose one of the following)
   a. I am
   b. I am not

8. It seems I've always

9. I wish I could make up my mind about
10. Getting involved in political activity

11. What happens to me depends on

12. As compared with four years ago, I

13. I belong to

14. To change my mind about my feeling toward my faith or religion

15. If one commits oneself

16. Ten years from now, I

17. It makes me feel good when
Symptom Check List

Please indicate the extent to which the following symptoms have occurred since the time of your separation or filing for divorce.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Hardly ever</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Pretty often</th>
<th>Nearly all the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. _____ Are you ever in low spirits?
2. _____ Do you ever have personal worries that get you down physically (make you physically ill)?
3. _____ Do you ever feel somewhat apart even among friends?
4. _____ Do you ever feel that you are more apt to catch contagious diseases than most people?
5. _____ Do you ever depend on over the counter medications?
6. _____ Do you ever feel it is necessary to take vitamin pills for your health?
7. _____ Does your food ever seem tasteless and hard to swallow?
8. _____ Do you ever smoke?
9. _____ Do your arms or legs ever go to sleep?
10. _____ Do you ever tend to gain or lose weight when you have something important bothering you?
11. _____ Are you ever bothered by having an upset, acid, or sour stomach?
12. _____ Do you ever feel you are bothered by all sorts of pains and ailments in different parts of your body?
13. _____ Do you ever tend to feel tired in the mornings or find it difficult to get up in the morning?
14. _____ Do you ever have loss of or increase in appetite?
15. _____ Are you ever troubled by your hands or feet sweating so that you felt damp and clammy?
16. _____ Are you ever troubled by headaches or pains in the head?
17. _____ Do you ever feel that you are going to have a nervous breakdown?
18. _____ Have you ever fainted or blacked out?
19. _____ Have there ever been times when you couldn't take care of things because you just couldn't get going?
20. _____ Have you ever been bothered by your heart beating hard?
21. _____ Have you ever been bothered by shortness of breath when you were not exercising or working hard?
22. _____ Are you ever bothered by nightmares?
23. _____ Do your hands ever tremble enough to bother you?
24. _____ Have you ever been troubled by "cold sweats"?
25. _____ Do you ever have any trouble getting to sleep or staying asleep?
26. _____ Have you ever been bothered by feelings of nervousness or tenseness?
27. _____ Have you ever had spells of dizziness?
28. _____ Has any ill health ever affected the amount of work you do?
29. _____ Do you ever have a bad taste in your mouth?
30. _____ Are you ever a worrier?
31. _____ Do you ever wonder if life is worth while anymore?
32. _____ Do you ever think that nothing turns out for you the way you want it to?
33. _____ Do you ever feel weak all over?
34. _____ Do you ever seem to have difficulty with your memory?
35. _____ Do you ever have periods of such great restlessness that you cannot sit still very long?
36. _____ Do you ever drink more than you should?

For any symptom which the respondent indicated was present to some extent, go back and ask whether that symptom was present to approximately the same extent prior to considering divorce. Place a check mark by any symptom which was present to the same extent prior to considering divorce.
Problem Checklist

Please indicate to what extent the following issues have been a problem for you since the separation or filing for divorce? Use the following rating scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Mild Problem</th>
<th>Major Problem</th>
<th>Extreme Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.  _____ Finding a job or job-related problems
2.  _____ Career planning
3.  _____ Financial stress
4.  _____ Housing (finding or affording a place to live)
5.  _____ Homemaking (maintenance and household chores)
6.  _____ Legal matters
7.  _____ Transportation
8.  _____ Single parenting
9.  _____ Loss of material possessions
10.  _____ Your relationship with your children
11.  _____ Your relationship with your parents
12.  _____ Your relationship with your ex partner
13.  _____ Social re-integration, new relationships
14.  _____ Sexual satisfaction
15.  _____ Difficulty communicating with others
16.  _____ Loneliness
17.  _____ Self identity issues
18.  _____ Guilt, self blame
19.  _____ Jealousy
20.  _____ Rootlessness, lack of structure to your life
21.  _____ A sense of personal failure
22.  _____ Feeling incompetent
23.  _____ Your mental health
24.  _____ Your physical health
25.  _____ Other(s), please specify ______________________________
Separation Adjustment

Instructions: Please tell me which answer best represents how you have felt since the separation or divorce. Check only one.

1. ___ Is it difficult for you to tell others that you are divorced (separated)? never (1); sometimes (2); often (3); nearly all the time (4).

2. ___ Since the separation, has it been difficult to go to public or social functions? never (1); sometimes (2); often (3); nearly all the time (4).

3. ___ Since the separation and filing of divorce, have you had frustrated feelings pertaining to your sexual life? never (1); sometimes (2); often (3); nearly all the time (4).

4. ___ Is it hard for you to accept your present status without resentment? not at all hard (1); slightly hard (2); fairly hard (3); very hard (4).

5. ___ Do you feel that your sexual adjustment has been satisfactory since your separation? very (1); quite (2); somewhat (3); not at all (4).

6. ___ Is it hard for you to realize that the past is gone and that you cannot relive it? not at all hard (1); slightly hard (2); fairly hard (3); very hard (4).

7. ___ Do you feel that the separation has made you view life in a negative way? not at all (1); slightly (2); fairly much (3); very much (4).

8. ___ Do you feel happier since the divorce? a great deal (1); quite a bit (2); somewhat (3); not at all (4).

9. ___ How do you feel you got along after the separation compared to how you might have expected? much better (1); somewhat better (2); about the same (3); somewhat worse (4); much worse (5).

10. ___ How do you feel you got along after the separation in relation to other people you have known who have gone through separation? much better (1); somewhat better (2); about the same (3); somewhat worse (4); much worse (5).

11. ___ Overall, how do you feel you have adjusted to your separation? very well (1); satisfactorily (2); somewhat poorly (3); very poorly (4).
Rotter's I-E Scale

The next fifteen questions are all to be answered either true or false. For each of the statements say "true" if it is generally or usually true of you, or false if it is generally or usually false in describing how you feel (Circle T for true F for false)

1. People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make. T __ F

2. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world. T __ F

3. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense. T __ F

4. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities. T __ F

5. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action. T __ F

6. In the case of the well-prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test. T __ F

7. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it. T __ F
8. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work. T F

9. In my case getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck. T F

10. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability; luck has little or nothing to do with it. T F

11. There really is no such thing as "luck". T F

12. How many friends you have depends on how nice a person you are. T F

13. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get. T F

14. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life. T F

15. What happens is my own doing. T F
The Aspects of Identity Questionnaire

These items describe different aspects of identity. Please read each item carefully and consider how it applies to you. Fill in the blank next to each item by choosing a number from the scale below.

1 = Not important to my sense of who I am
2 = Slightly important to my sense of who I am
3 = Somewhat important to my sense of who I am
4 = Very important to my sense of who I am
5 = Extremely important to my sense of who I am

1. The things I own, my possessions
2. My personal values and moral standards
3. My popularity with other people
4. My dreams and imagination
5. The ways I have of influencing and of affecting others
6. My race or ethnic background
7. My personal goals and hopes for the future
8. My physical appearance: my height, weight, and the shape of my body
9. My emotions and feelings
10. Belonging to the various groups that I am a member of
11. My thoughts and ideas
12. My reputation, what others think of me
13. The ways I deal with my fears and anxieties
14. My attractiveness to other people
15. My work, job, or course of study (college major)
16. My feeling of being a unique person, being distinct from others

17. Knowing that I continue to be essentially the same inside even though life involves many external changes

18. My gestures and mannerisms, the impression I make on others

19. My self-knowledge, my ideas about what kind of person I really am

20. My social behavior, such as the way I act when meeting people.

21. My religion
Appendix B
Structured Intervention Program

This program is designed to help divorced individuals cope with the pain and distress they experience. The goals of the program are: (1) to establish a treatment unit which acts as an informal support group, (2) to provide a forum for learning pertinent information regarding the process of divorce and the stages involved, (3) to learn and apply problem solving skills, (4) to be committed to receiving help and profiting from it. Treatment with only a few changes is modeled on the divorce adjustment program of Hoopes et al. (1984) and used by Vogel-Moline (1980).

Treatment consists of a pre-assessment period where questionnaires and instruments are administered to subjects. This is done individually and is followed by assignment into either the experimental group or the minimal contact group. The experimental group(s) are then, over the next eight weeks, given the program outlined below, after which both the experimental and control groups receive a post-test assessment of the same materials administered during the pre-assessment.

Program Description

Facilitator instructions. In order to provide continuity, each training session should start and end on time. Supportive behaviors need to be modeled in every session. It is important to follow the order of treatment as
designated in the procedures. Contact should be made with absent members by phone the day after the group meeting.

Procedures

Support. This phase of treatment is included in the first session and is then emphasized in every remaining session. The underlying theme is that divorced persons have lost a major portion of their support system, and the group is going to help provide this support while teaching members how to develop their own independent support system. The major concept that the members learn is that, in order to feel support in one's environment, one must learn how to give, receive, and ask for support. These principles are taught and practiced in group.

Didactic. This part of the treatment intervention is included in every session. Typically it will last for twenty to thirty minutes and will take place after group members have reported on the assignments of the last week and the problems associated with them have been discussed. Didactic presentations will go through the stages of divorce as explicated by Salts (1979) and Kaslow (1984) and focus on specific problems encountered in moving from one stage of divorce adjustment to another.

Problem solving. This phase extends from sessions two through five. In this phase of the treatment intervention, the members learn a method of problem solving. One of the effects of divorce or separation is that divorced persons
find it difficult to solve the problems which accompany divorce. The process of problem solving introduced in this phase is as follows: (1) Specify what the problem is in concrete terms. (2) Discuss what has been done in the past to solve the problem. (3) Discuss how the person would like things to be. (4) Explore possible alternatives to the problem. (5) Allow the person presenting the problem to evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of each possible solution with group input. (6) Encourage the identified person to choose that alternative or combination of alternatives thought most helpful. (7) Ask for verbal commitment from the person to act upon the solution(s) chosen to solve the problem. (8) Evaluate progress weekly during the support session. The ideas about support presented in session one are utilized in this phase; that is, the members ask, give, and receive support from one another.

Strengths. In sessions six through eight, the group members learn how to develop an understanding of their personal strengths to help them in the period following the divorce. The members are helped by other group members to become aware of their strengths. If there are personal weaknesses they wish to overcome, they can discuss them with the group and receive suggestions to overcome them. However, the main focus of this phase is on the positive—to help the group members realize that they have the potential to solve their own problems and overcome their weaknesses.
Building support, dispensing information, teaching problem solving skills, and emphasizing strengths, each builds upon the other with the goal of enabling the group members to learn ways of dealing with their problems and of gaining support in their environment. Group members also become aware of their potential as self-sufficient individuals, able to help themselves and others.

PROGRAM OUTLINE

Session One

Major objectives. The initial session has as its primary objective the beginning of a sense of group identity. Group members will become acquainted with the group leader and each other. Guidelines for the course will be outlined, and group members will be asked for commitment to them. Both group members and group leader will have the opportunity to share expectations for the group. While the development of support is primary to this session, it will end with a didactic component.

Activities. Introductions began with group members introducing themselves by their first names. This is followed by the group leader providing an extensive introduction of himself and the purposes of the group. Following this introduction, group participants will be encouraged to talk about themselves in some depth. They should be asked to share who they are, how they feel about
being in a divorce adjustment group, and what they hope to receive from being members of the group.

**Group guidelines.** The following guidelines are to be presented to all group members: (a) emphasizing the importance of maintaining confidentiality, (b) avoiding all derogative comments, (c) sharing the time and everyone taking part, (d) staying with the topic until the group leader indicates time to change, and (e) committing to help other group members. Participants should then be asked to commit to the guidelines introduced.

Group members are encouraged to share any expectations they may have for themselves or the group. The group leader will then discuss the format for the group, including: why it is important to give support, why a didactic presentation will accompany every class session, and how the group guidelines are meant to help. Group members will be encouraged to talk about themselves in depth and share some aspects of themselves, in the group setting, which would normally be reserved for friends. They will be instructed to look on the group as a means of support and will be encouraged to ask for support as well as to give it. A brief overview of the eight weeks will then be presented by the **Mini-lecture.** A brief lecture on ties to the past (Callahan, 1979) will be given emphasizing how difficult it is to let go of a relationship and exploring those factors which pull us back into the yesterdays of our life.
Commitment and challenge. A primary goal of the group leader is to seek participant commitment to group goals and guidelines. This is done in part by the group leader modeling group goals and in part by his facilitating discussion designed to reconcile possible points of blocking by class participants. Again the leader is asking for support, giving support honestly and openly to participants, and expressing appreciation for the support given. Finally, a detailed personal commitment from each participant is sought and reinforced.

Participants are then requested to practice group guidelines with other people they encounter during the week. The session will end with the challenge to be supportive to at least one other person during the week and return willing to share how this was done.

Session Two

Major objectives. Class members will learn how to ask for and give support. Verbal and non-verbal support methods will be discussed and practiced. The basic steps in problem solving will be introduced, and group members will be asked to learn and implement them. At least two class members will be asked to present problems relating to their divorce, and other group members will be asked for support and help in problem solving.

Activities. Activities should begin with group members being greeted by name and reinforced for their
presence and their being on time. The importance of class members' attendance should be emphasized.

**Review.** This segment of the session should include a review on the importance of a support system, followed by group members sharing what happened in their attempts to be supportive to someone else the previous week. Opportunity should also be made available for group members to discuss the guidelines for group interaction.

**Support.** The group leader will emphasize that a support system includes a lot of people and that support is built in two ways: by giving it to others and by asking for it. Group members will be reminded that a small group like they are in provides the opportunity for them to ask for and give support.

Instruction in both non-verbal and verbal support techniques should take place at this point with the group leader explicating and leading discussion around the following non-verbal supportive behaviors: (a) touching, (b) head nodding, (c) smiling, (d) tears, (e) voice tone, (f) body position, (g) physical distance, and (h) leaning forward. After a discussion of the various non-verbal supportive behaviors, verbal areas should be introduced for discussion, these would include: (a) expressions of concern, (b) positive statements, (c) agreement, (d) expressions of understanding, and (e) discovering areas of similarity.

Emphasize what the group leader does in showing support is only what the group members can do and that members will
get better at doing it by practice. Some of the ways both group leader and members can be supportive would include:

1. Look at the person speaking and listen carefully.
2. Take personal responsibility to understand what is being said. This means that if you don't understand, ask for or make statements designed to facilitate understanding.
3. Give verbal acknowledgements of risk taking behavior.
4. Begin taking some risks; this can be done by sharing personal problems with other group members.

Problem solving. Prior to group members sharing their concerns or problems, the group needs to be introduced to the steps of problem solving. They are as follows:

1. The person presenting the problem should be as specific and concrete as possible without being repetitive.
2. The person presenting the problem should be encouraged to discuss what he has done in the past to solve it.
3. The problem presenter is asked how he would like things to be.
4. Several possible solutions or alternatives to the problem are then presented. After this period of brain storming, the problem presenter with the encouragement of group members is asked to evaluate
each possible solution for its strengths and weaknesses.

5. The alternative most acceptable is then chosen by the problem presenter, and a commitment is made to implement the possible solution.

6. The group is then asked to role play the problem, with the problem presenter attempting to use the solution previously generated. Group members are encouraged to share their thinking and ideas during this time.

Group members should be challenged to learn the steps in problem solving and as time allows practice them with actual problems while in the group setting. Again prior to closing encourage communication skills, supportive behaviors, and problem solving attempts during the week. Problem solving will also take place in sessions three, four, five, and six.

Session Three

Major objectives. This session along with sessions four, five and six will continue problem solving. The objective is to allow group members the opportunity of focusing on some of their personal concerns and then with the support of other group members go through the steps of problem solving. This will allow group members to increase their problem solving skills while also building a support
network within the group itself. In addition, a mini-lecture on the stages of divorce will be presented.

Activities. This session and the ones that follow will begin with review. Subject assignments will be shared with the class, and participants will be encouraged to ask for and to give support. After the previous week's assignments have been discussed, a review of guidelines and problem solving steps will be led by the group leader.

Mini lecture. The major theorists on the stages of divorce adjustment will be presented to the group and will include the following points:

Krantzler

2. A period of mourning.
3. A time of readjustment.

Weiss

1. The erosion of love and the persistence of attachment.
2. The time of physical separation.
3. Starting over—shock, denial, disorganization, and depression.

Wiseman

1. A time of denial.
2. Feelings of loss and depression.
3. A period of anger and ambivalence.
4. Reorientation of life style.
5. Acceptance of self and resynthesis of identity.

Kaslow
1. Pre-divorce—a time of despair.
2. During divorce—legal involvement.
3. Post-divorce—exploration and re-equilibrium.

Salts
1. The initial reaction to a crisis
2. The transitional stage.
3. The beginning of new life.

The session will end with assignment to trace one's self through the process of divorce adjustment up to the present time and be prepared to share this the following week with group members.

Session Four

Major objectives. Session four is a continuation of session three. It will consist of a major review of class materials to this point. The primary objective is for group members to be able to place themselves somewhere within the stages of divorce previously outlined and be able to trace what has happened to them up to the present and then based on divorce stages predict what still needs to happen.

Activities. Session four will began with a review of group guidelines followed by reports on problem solving attempts, a review of the basic problem solving steps, and then an overview of the stages of divorce. Group members
will be asked to place themselves at some point on the divorce continuum and share with the group the steps they have gone through up to this point. Group members will be asked to share feelings they have experienced up to this point and will be asked to seek feedback from other group members.

**Mini lecture.** A short lecture on the impact of divorce (Callahan, 1979) will be followed by a discussion regarding the problems experienced in divorce and what needs to happen for the adjustment process to become complete.

The remainder of the session will be spent in problem resolution.

**Session Five**

**Major objectives.** Group members will become aware of the major consequences attending each stage of divorce and be able to offer some predictions in terms of their own adjustment. They will be asked to identify those feelings and behaviors which are or have interfered with their own adjustment and suggest necessary changes to overcome the problems and move ahead.

**Activities.** Review the assignments from last week and respond to any issues or concerns group members might have. Refer to Salts's (1979) and Kaslow's (1984) work on the stages of divorce and the accompanying feelings and emotions. Ask group members to identify where they are within the stages of divorce, including a description of the feelings
and emotions they have and have not experienced. In order to assist in this process, members of the group should receive feedback from other class members in terms of where they are seen in the adjustment process.

The consequences of divorce should be reviewed by the group leader and include all of the following: loss of self-esteem, loneliness, sexual problems, socialization problems, support difficulties, increased illnesses, feelings of shame, feelings of failure, financial problems, higher degrees of pathology, and more automobile accidents.

**Mini-lecture. The consequences of divorce.** Points to cover include:

1. The first year of divorce is the most traumatic.
2. Women are more at risk initially for depression.
3. Most divorced individuals restabilize after two years.
4. Often there are more problems at the end of the first year than in the first three months.
5. The first six months have the most stress.
6. Divorce results in personal, vocational, social, and sexual identity confusion
7. There is often strange behavior in dress, grooming and social values

**Session 6**

**Major objectives.** The goal of this and the remaining two sessions is to develop and reinforce supportive behavior
among the group members while building on the strengths of the individual. Group members will be encouraged to learn and accept their personal strengths and then to utilize these strengths in the process of problem solving.

Activities. The efforts of group members to problem solve will be briefly discussed, and any specific problems will be shared in the group. Review of past sessions will focus on problem solving steps, stages of divorce adjustment, and their attendant consequences. Group members will be asked to share what they view as their major problems yet remaining in the divorce adjustment process and what they see as the most likely solutions to their problems.

The value of time and persistence, combined with the group members' own attempts both inside and outside of the group, will be emphasized. Sessions to this point have focused on support and commitment along with the development of problem solving skills. In this session personal growth is the focus. Group members will be asked to make at least three positive comments about themselves to the entire group, and then group members will be asked to share positive feelings or views they have for that individual. This is designed to improve assertiveness skills as well as provide some positive stroking. After individuals have received feedback, they will be asked to share with the
group what they could do to add to their own personal strengths. They then will be asked to commit to developing themselves in their chosen areas.

Mini-lecture. A brief lecture will be given on the disruption of social identity following a divorce. Points of focus will be:

1. Activities decrease the first two years after divorce.
2. The formation of new relationships is a significant factor in getting back feelings of happiness, self esteem, and competence.
3. Women with strong social supports such as family and friends do much better than those without such supports in divorce adjustment.
4. Involvement in social activities, expressing feelings, and the development of autonomy are strongly related to positive adjustment.
5. On the average 41.5% of an individual's associates are dropped after physical separation.
6. Friends are equal in importance to family after a divorce occurs.
7. Adjustment becomes more difficult with increasing age.
Session Seven

Major objectives. The objectives for this session essentially duplicate session six. Building self-esteem and increasing one's sense of personal and social identity are the primary focus.

Activities. Start with a review. Then began with a mini-lecture on some aspects of personal identity. Points to include are:

1. There is value in the passage of time, and persistent efforts to heal one's self.
2. There is value in making choices.
3. The importance in making a commitment to a vocation, religious orientation, and ideological stance should be emphasized (if group members haven't made commitments, encourage them to do so).
4. Individuals with high identity status are also found to have high self-esteem, high levels of internal locus of control, independence in judgement, and are generally more capable of forming intimate relationships.

The lecture on personal identity is then followed by a discussion on the following questions: (a) How you see yourself? (b) How you would like to see yourself? and (c) How do you show yourself to others? The group leader should allow every group member to answer these questions and receive feedback from other group members.
The second half of the session returns to building strengths. The format in session six should be used. After two or three members have presented strengths, move into the next mini-lecture.

**Mini-lecture. Children and Divorce.** Emphasis should be placed on how the separation affects children and their different ways of reacting to it. Points to emphasize include:

1. Recognize that regardless of sex or custody parents are still parents and need to take an interest in their children's lives.

2. Recognize that anger and other negative feelings following divorce are normal and that with appropriate expression, such feelings can help compensate in the adjustment process.

3. Recognize that children need to know what is happening and should be informed.

4. Be aware that growing up has good times and bad times and that not all problems are a result of divorce.

5. Know that security comes with consistency. A regular pattern of visitation should be encouraged.

6. Reassure children that they were not the cause of the divorce.

7. Don't poison the well by subjecting children to hostility. They shouldn't be punished for the failed relationship.
8. Don't force or otherwise encourage children to choose sides. Avoid criticizing the other parent.

9. Don't over indulge children to compensate for the failed relationship.

10. Don't make children into little adults to meet single parent needs.

11. Don't make yourself out as a failure. Forgive yourself and your former spouse and get on with living.

Session eight

Major objectives. This session, while designed as a thorough review of previous objectives, also has as its central theme that of helping group members put the past aside, dealing with anger constructively, and by utilizing their potential move into tomorrow.

Activities. The role of support, techniques in problem solving, and building strengths should all be thoroughly reviewed.

Mini-lecture. How to deal constructively with anger.

Include the following points:

1. Anger is a normal part in almost all divorces.

2. Barriers to expressing anger appropriately may keep one in the past.

3. Holding in anger can and does destroy people.

4. Take responsibility for your own feelings.
5. Express your feelings when you get them.
6. Express feelings with "I" messages, not "You" messages.
7. Use non-destructive physical activity to ease the pressure and let off steam.

Activities. Review the consequences of divorce and discuss how to progress from one stage to another. Emphasize to group members the importance of developing social supports and increasing social activity levels. Discuss the following:

1. It is not necessary to be approved by everybody.
2. It is not necessary to be perfect.
3. It is not useful to punish oneself for being weak.
4. Loneliness can be a blessing.
5. Serious dating should go slow.
6. Explore the pro and con of remarriage.
7. Learn how to give yourself positive strokes.

Spend whatever amount of time is necessary to finish the strength building exercise with group participants. Before the session ends obtain commitments from group members that they will fill out the post-test instruments the following week and return them.

Close the session and class by thanking all individuals for their participation and finish any left over business.
Appendix C
Informed Consent

I understand this study is being conducted as part of a doctoral dissertation to further knowledge in areas of divorce adjustment. I further understand all identifying information of a personal nature will be treated in strict confidence and personal identifiers will not appear in the study. While I will be encouraged to complete the eight weeks involved in this study, I may withdraw at any time.

The research project itself will include a series of questions that need to be filled out both before and after the group training experience. Subjects will be randomly chosen for either the control or experimental groups. Those subjects selected for the control group will have the opportunity to receive the group experience after the initial study is completed.

I understand that in addition to being a useful research project, taking part in this study may offer some real help in resolving problems associated with my divorce.

Subject's Signature

Researcher's Signature
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