DIFFERENCES IN FAMILY RITUALIZATION: IMPLICATIONS FOR FAMILY FUNCTIONING AND THE SEPARATION AND ADJUSTMENT OF LATE ADOLESCENTS

by

KARLA K. HALE, B.A.

A DISSERTATION

IN

PSYCHOLOGY

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of Texas Tech University in
Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for
the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved

August, 1990

801
T3
1990
No.63
cop.2

Copyright 1990, Karla K. Hale

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It has been a special privilege to have been associated with the many talented and encouraging individuals who have contributed to this dissertation. A sincere thanks goes to each of my committee members for their interest, time, and valuable input which served to shape a collection of ideas into a worthwhile project. To my chairman, Dr. Robert Bell, whose gifts in statistics and research design are matched only by the unwavering encouragement he provided me, I am especially indebted. Dr. Nancy Bell's knowledge of the adolescent autonomy literature and Dr. Steve Jorgensen's expertise in family research enhanced the foundation for my ideas. Dr. Clyde Hendrick's critical eye for detail and Dr. Susan Hendrick's genuine warmth and support were greatly appreciated.

I want also to recognize the input and support provided by Dr. Clay George, in whose class these ideas were first conceived, and Dr. Cal Stoltenberg, my former chairman and advisor/mentor during my years in graduate school.

Many thanks are due my typist, Donna Williams, who patiently persisted through late hours and multiple changes. Judy Palmer provided invaluable assistance in computer programming, saving me countless hours and headaches.

Many friends and colleagues have provided support and encouragement along the way. The staff at The Gulf Coast Center were extremely flexible in allowing for the completion of this project; several were also a needed shoulder and source of inspiration to

continue on. Thanks to Rose and Ludy Massie who provided me a home away from home during my trips to Lubbock.

I cannot express enough gratitude to my family for the support, both emotional and financial, which allowed me the opportunity to pursue this goal: to Ted and Evelyn Kell, and Bill and Sue Hale, my deepest thanks. My husband, Price Hale, deserves special note. His supportive love and encouragement through many long months helped make the difference between frustration and eventual satisfaction in completion.

In a very special way this work on families is dedicated to my first family, wherein I learned the value of rituals and traditions: my parents, Ted and Evelyn; my brothers, Steve, Mark (now gone, but still a part of each of us), and Shawn; and my sister, Jina.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS..... ii

ABSTRACT..... v

LIST OF TABLES..... vii

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

II. METHOD..... 13

Subjects..... 13
Measures..... 14
Procedure..... 20

III. RESULTS..... 22

Sample Characteristics..... 22
Primary Analyses..... 24

IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS..... 48

Conclusions..... 57

REFERENCES..... 60

APPENDICES

A. EXPANDED LITERATURE REVIEW..... 65
B. EXPANDED DETAILS OF METHOD..... 102
C. SUPPLEMENTAL ANALYSES AND TABLES..... 110
D. FAMILY ROUTINES INVENTORY..... 113
E. FAMILY RITUALS MEASURE..... 116
F. FAMILY ENVIRONMENT SCALE..... 121
G. McMASTER FAMILY ASSESSMENT DEVICE GENERAL FUNCTIONING SUBSCALE..... 125
H. PSYCHOLOGICAL SEPARATION INVENTORY (SELECTED SUBSCALES)..... 127
I. ADJUSTMENT TO COLLEGE SCALE..... 131
J. CONSENT FOR RESEARCH PARTICIPATION..... 138
K. GENERAL INFORMATION/INSTRUCTIONS..... 141
L. DEBRIEFING SHEET..... 144

ABSTRACT

Studies have shown that an emphasis on family rituals may serve the family by promoting cohesiveness, protecting and stabilizing the family during periods of stress and crisis, and fostering and maintaining the family identity. Several family researchers have concluded that family health and strength go hand and hand with a family's establishing a valued set of rituals and traditions. Some theorists have also suggested that rituals provide benefits for the individual members in providing a link with the family during the process of adolescent separation and autonomy development.

The present study tested five hypotheses using a sample of 152 male and 183 female freshman college students, late adolescents in the process of separating from their families. These students completed the Family Rituals Measure which assesses ritualization in terms of the importance given to rituals and the flexible adaptation of the rituals practiced. Measures of family cohesion, family functioning, psychological separation, and college adjustment were also administered. Canonical correlations were conducted to assess the effects of ritual commitment and flexibility on the level of cohesion and overall functioning of the family, and on the successful separation and adjustment of members leaving the family.

The results indicated that frequency of ritualization, importance placed on rituals, and the flexibility of rituals were all positively associated with family cohesion and healthy functioning, correlating with expressiveness, organization, and low family conflict. Family ritualization was not highly predictive of psychological separateness

or college adjustment. However, the combination of ritual commitment and flexibility with healthy family functioning produced a significant association with psychological separation, with conflicting subscale results. These conflicting results concerning the assessment of psychological separation and the role of rituals in the separation process are discussed. Conclusions are drawn regarding the benefits of rituals for the family and individual members based on the findings, with suggestions for further research.

LIST OF TABLES

1. PREDICTED REGRESSION EQUATION FOR HYPOTHESIS 1..... 9

2. PREDICTED CANONICAL CORRELATION EQUATION FOR HYPOTHESIS 2..... 10

3. PREDICTED CANONICAL CORRELATION EQUATION FOR HYPOTHESIS 3..... 11

4. PREDICTED CANONICAL CORRELATION EQUATION FOR HYPOTHESIS 4..... 12

5. CANONICAL CORRELATION BETWEEN RITUAL COMMITMENT AND COHESION..... 38

6. STRUCTURE COEFFICIENTS, PERCENTS OF VARIANCE, AND REDUNDANCIES BETWEEN RITUAL COMMITMENT AND COHESION..... 39

7. CANONICAL CORRELATION BETWEEN FAMILY RITUALS AND FAMILY FUNCTIONING..... 40

8. STRUCTURE COEFFICIENTS, PERCENTS OF VARIANCE, AND REDUNDANCIES BETWEEN FAMILY RITUALS AND FAMILY FUNCTIONING..... 41

9. CANONICAL CORRELATIONS BETWEEN FAMILY FUNCTIONING AND MEASURES OF INDIVIDUAL ADJUSTMENT (PSYCHOLOGICAL SEPARATION AND COLLEGE ADJUSTMENT)..... 42

10. STRUCTURE COEFFICIENTS, PERCENTS OF VARIANCE, AND REDUNDANCIES BETWEEN FAMILY FUNCTIONING AND MEASURES OF INDIVIDUAL ADJUSTMENT (PSYCHOLOGICAL SEPARATION AND COLLEGE ADJUSTMENT)..... 43

11. CANONICAL CORRELATIONS BETWEEN FAMILY RITUALS AND MEASURES OF INDIVIDUAL ADJUSTMENT (PSYCHOLOGICAL SEPARATION AND COLLEGE ADJUSTMENT)..... 44

12. STRUCTURE COEFFICIENTS, PERCENTS OF VARIANCE, AND REDUNDANCIES BETWEEN FAMILY RITUALS AND MEASURES OF INDIVIDUAL ADJUSTMENT (PSYCHOLOGICAL SEPARATION AND COLLEGE ADJUSTMENT)..... 45

13. CANONICAL CORRELATIONS BETWEEN FAMILY RITUALS AND FAMILY FUNCTIONING PREDICTORS AND PSYCHOLOGICAL SEPARATION..... 46

14. STRUCTURE COEFFICIENTS, PERCENTS OF VARIANCE, AND REDUNDANCIES BETWEEN FAMILY RITUALS AND FAMILY FUNCTIONING PREDICTORS AND PSYCHOLOGICAL SEPARATION..... 47

B-1. SAMPLE RELIABILITIES OF SUBSCALE VARIABLES..... 109

C-1. MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR ALL SUBSCALES BY GENDER GROUP..... 111

C-2. CORRELATIONS AMONG THE PREDICTOR AND CRITERION VARIABLES..... 112

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A perusal of the literature in the areas of psychoanalytic, developmental, and family systems theory provides ample evidence for the generalization that aspects of family relations have implications for the level of healthy functioning both for the individual, as well as the family. One aspect of the family's interactional life which has been regarded by family researchers as important to the cohesion, stability, and identity of the family is the development and maintenance of rituals (Bossard & Boll, 1950; Curran, 1983; Meredith, Abbott, Lamanna, & Sanders, 1988; Wolin & Bennett, 1984; Wolin, Bennett, & Jacobs, 1988). Rituals are universally found in families, owing to the fact that family life is formed by repetitious routines and patterns of interaction which over time take on symbolic meaning beyond their functional value (Wolin et al., 1988). Yet families differ in the extent to which they participate in and emphasize rituals. Families with high levels of ritualization usually emphasize engaging in activities together, celebrating birthdays, holidays, and anniversaries, and carrying out specific traditions or routines pertaining to the particular event at hand. For example, such a family might never miss having a cake for a member's birthday or erecting and decorating a tree come Christmas time.

In the last two decades, an interest in family rituals has seen a resurgence in the popular press. Articles discussing the value of rituals have appeared in such periodicals as Newsweek (1985), McCall's

(1981), and House and Garden (1971). Yet differences in family attitudes and practices regarding rituals and traditions appear to be a phenomenon which has escaped substantive investigation in the psychological literature, as Boyce, Jensen, James, and Peacock (1983) have noted. Several case study presentations and ethnographic investigations have been published in the fields of sociology and anthropology, and family researchers have contributed significantly to this area in recent years. The results of these investigations have provided strong evidence regarding the importance of family rituals as reflections of family values, and the functions rituals serve in providing order and meaning to everyday life (Bossard & Boll, 1950; Wolin et al., 1988). However, many questions concerning the implications of family ritualization for areas of family and individual functioning remain unaddressed.

Additionally, the assessment of family rituals remains at an embryonic stage of development, due to the elusive nature of the concept and the few number of investigations which have attempted the task. While rituals have been studied in a variety of ways, the literature is lacking in a reliable and well-validated research instrument for examining this aspect of family life. Studies to date have utilized semi-structured interviews, case records and reports, student essays on the topic, and checklist inventories and questionnaires. However, no reliability or validity data for the interview approach or the inventories are available. One instrument has been published with acceptable psychometric properties (Boyce et al., 1983; Jensen, James, Boyce, & Hartnett, 1983). Unfortunately, its scope is limited to rating

the frequency and importance of daily family routines, without inclusion of the more periodic family traditions and rituals such as holidays, birthday and anniversary celebrations, and the like.

Empirical studies concerning family ritualization have yielded information concerning the functions that may be served by an emphasis on family rituals in terms of promoting cohesiveness (Jensen et al., 1983; Klapp, 1959), protecting and stabilizing the family during periods of stress and crisis (Bennett et al., 1987; Boyce et al., 1983; Wolin et al., 1980), and fostering and maintaining the family identity (Bossard & Boll, 1950; Shipman, 1982). Additionally, theorists emphasizing the importance of family rituals have suggested benefits for the individual members in providing opportunities for autonomy (Shipman, 1982) and maintaining a link with the family during the process of adolescent separation (Bossard & Boll, 1950). The literature has provided adequate documentation of the importance of rituals in the quality of family life, as has been noted by Wolin et al. (1988). Yet to be documented, however, are the effects of family ritualization on the individual functioning of family members, specifically in regards to the successful separation and adjustment of late adolescents leaving the family.

The purpose of the present study is to more fully address these relationships by focusing on two questions of interest: (a) what effects do differences in family ritualization have on the level of family cohesion and overall functioning of the family, and (b) what effect does an emphasis on family rituals have on the successful separation and adjustment of members leaving the family. As noted earlier, the first question has already received attention in the

literature, and results from this investigation would provide further tests of the relationships previously noted by these studies. This investigation seeks to add to previous research by utilizing a self-report instrument for assessing family rituals that includes a measure of the family's flexibility in the application of rituals throughout the family life cycle. Wolin and Bennett (1984) posit that the flexible adaptation of rituals is an important moderator variable in the effective functioning of the family. They assert that flexibility is essential if a family's rituals are to continue to be relevant and effective given the family's changing developmental needs.

Wolin and Bennett's position is in line with the conclusions of Bossard and Boll (1950) made decades earlier concerning the need for rituals to be flexibly adapted: "A ritual, appealing in content and manipulated wisely, becomes a powerful and constructive weapon in the integration of a family; and an ill-adapted ritual or a good ritual misused may become an agent in its disintegration" (p. 202). Prior to this investigation, no studies of family rituals have included this variable of flexibility in ritual adaptation in their assessment of family ritualization, including the work of Wolin, Bennett, and their colleagues.

The second question represents an extension of the findings concerning the impact of family rituals on family functioning to the level of the individual as well. It provides an opportunity for empirical investigation of the notions put forth by Shipman (1982) and Bossard and Boll (1950) regarding the role of rituals in individual autonomy and the adolescent separation process. From an intuitive

standpoint, these variables would seem to have some link, although no studies thus far have examined these variables in concert. However, a preponderance of concepts, cutting across theoretical boundaries, suggests a unifying theme of the importance of cohesiveness in family relationships, as would be fostered by family rituals, with equal emphasis on the importance of differentiation, uniqueness, and individual separateness for healthy individual growth and development. Such constructs as "belonging-being separate" (Minuchin, 1974), "togetherness-differentiation" (Bowen, 1978), "individuality-connectedness" (Cooper, Grotevant, & Condon 1983), and "autonomy-attachment" (Hill & Holmbeck, 1986) are evidence of this pervasive theme. This study aims to examine the role of family rituals in providing cohesion and stability as a context for the separation process, thus allowing for increased independence from parents, while serving as a link for a continuing relationship.

In order to empirically address these two questions, canonical correlations among estimates of family ritualization, cohesion, family functioning, separation, and college adjustment were evaluated. A multi-measures approach was used to operationalize these constructs. The concept of family ritualization was assessed in terms of Wolin and Bennett's (1984) two dimensions: level of importance given to family rituals (commitment), and adaptation of ritual practice throughout the family life cycle (flexibility). Two instruments, the Family Routines Inventory (Jensen et al., 1983) and the Family Rituals Measure, derived for the present study, were used as estimates of these qualities. Family cohesion and general family functioning were assessed using a

combination of the Family Assessment Device General Functioning subscale (Epstein, Baldwin, & Bishop, 1983) and several subscales from the Family Environment Scale (Moos & Moos, 1981; 1986). The separation and college adjustment of late adolescents were assessed by two instruments specifically designed to measure each of the respective constructs: the Psychological Separation Inventory (Hoffman, 1984) and the Adjustment to College Scale (Baker & Siryk, 1984; 1986).

Expectations concerning predicted relationships were derived in part from previous studies on family rituals, including a pilot study using an earlier version of the FRM, and in part from the theoretical literature. The following hypotheses were tested:

1. Late adolescents' ratings of ritual commitment (importance and frequency) in their families will be significantly correlated with a measure of cohesion for these families.

2. Late adolescents' ratings of ritual commitment and flexibility will be significantly correlated with estimates of cohesion and general family functioning (measures reflecting healthy functioning).

3. Estimates of cohesion and general family functioning will be significantly correlated with estimates of psychological separation and college adjustment in late adolescents.

4. Late adolescents' ratings concerning ritual commitment and ritual flexibility in their families will be significantly correlated with measures of psychological separation and college adjustment.

As is evident, for each of the four primary conceptual hypotheses, a significant correlation between constructs (as estimated by one or more measures) was predicted. A canonical correlation equation

summarizing the expected relationship among constructs is presented for each hypothesis in Tables 1 through 4. Given the multiple measures approach for investigating these constructs, the specific scales used in the study were delineated as the variables in each of the equations. For Hypothesis 1, however, a single measure of cohesion was used, thus a regression equation represents the predicted relationship. The specific measures noted in Tables 1 through 4 will be described more fully in the Method section under Measures.

In addition to the primary hypotheses concerning significant canonical correlations, predictions regarding the directionality of the specific scale by scale correlations used to estimate the variables of interest are also presented in Tables 1 through 4. These predictions are based on pilot data previously collected on several of these instruments as well as findings reported by Garner (1986) in her use of two of these measures (i.e., the PSI and ACS). In a few cases the directionality of the relationship between variables could not be predicted. This was due to those measures not having been previously examined together in the literature and the lack of a clear theoretical base from which to derive a prediction.

Finally, a fifth conceptual hypothesis was tested which addressed the combination of family ritualization and family functioning as predictors of individual members' psychological separation. The specific variables (i.e., subscale measures) included in this equation were selected based on the results of the analyses for the preceding hypotheses. Those variables which carried the greatest amount of

variance in the relationships tested in Hypotheses 1 through 4 were thereby chosen for Hypothesis 5.

TABLE 1

PREDICTED REGRESSION EQUATION FOR HYPOTHESIS 1

R_c^2 : Cohesion = β_0 + β_1 FRM Ritual Sum + β_2 FRM Importance + β_3 FRI Frequency

PREDICTED RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN PREDICTOR VARIABLES AND CRITERION VARIABLES FOR HYPOTHESIS 1

Ritual Commitment	Cohesion
FRM Ritual Sum	+
FRM Importance	+
FRI Frequency	+

+ = Predicted positive relationship.

TABLE 2

PREDICTED CANONICAL CORRELATION EQUATION FOR HYPOTHESIS 2

$$R_c^2 : b_1 GF + b_2 CO + b_3 EX + b_4 CF + b_5 CN + b_6 OZ =$$
$$a_1 \text{ FRM Ritual Sum} + a_2 \text{ FRM Importance} + a_3 \text{ FRI Frequency} +$$
$$a_4 \text{ FRM Flexibility}$$

PREDICTED RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN PREDICTOR VARIABLES AND CRITERION VARIABLES FOR HYPOTHESIS 2

Family Ritualization	General Family Functioning					
	GF	CO	EX	CF	CN	OZ
FRM Ritual Sum	+	+	+	-	+	+
FRM Importance	+	+	+	-	+	+
FRI Frequency	+	+	+	-	+	+
FRM Flexibility	+	+	+	-	-	0

GF = FAD General Functioning
CO = FES Cohesion
EX = FES Expressiveness
CF = FES Conflict
CN = FES Control
OZ = FES Organization
\+ = Predicted positive relationship.
\- = Predicted negative relationship.
0 = Relationship and relative influence of the variable cannot be predicted.

TABLE 3

PREDICTED CANONICAL CORRELATION EQUATION FOR HYPOTHESIS 3

$$R_c^2 : b_1\,MCI + b_2\,FCI + b_3\,MEI + b_4\,FEI + b_5\,AC + b_6\,SO + b_7\,PE =$$
$$a_1\,GF + a_2\,CO + a_3\,EX + a_4\,CF + a_5\,CN + a_6\,OZ$$

PREDICTED RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN PREDICTOR VARIABLES AND CRITERION VARIABLES FOR HYPOTHESIS 3

Family Functioning	Psychological Separation				College Adjustment		
	MCI	FCI	MEI	FEI	AC	SO	PE
General Functioning	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Cohesion	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Expressiveness	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Conflict	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Control	-	-	-	-	0	0	0
Organization	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

MCI = Mother Conflictual Independence
FCI = Father Conflictual Independence
MEI = Mother Emotional Independence
FEI = Father Emotional Independence
AC = Academic Adjustment
SO = Social Adjustment
PE = Personal-Emotional Adjustment
GF = FAD General Functioning
CO = FES Cohesion
EX = FES Expressiveness
CF = FES Conflict
CN = FES Control
OZ = FES Organization
\+ = Predicted positive relationship.
\- = Predicted negative relationship.
0 = Relationship and relative influence of the variable cannot be predicted.

TABLE 4

PREDICTED CANONICAL CORRELATION EQUATION FOR HYPOTHESIS 4

$$R_c^2: b_1\ MCI + b_2\ FCI + b_3\ MEI + b_4\ FEI + b_5\ AC + b_6\ SO + b_7\ PE =$$
$$a_1\ FRM\ Ritual\ Sum + a_2\ FRM\ Importance + a_3\ FRI\ Frequency +$$
$$a_4\ FRM\ Flexibility$$

PREDICTED RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN PREDICTOR VARIABLES AND CRITERION VARIABLES FOR HYPOTHESIS 4

Family Ritualization	Psychological Separation				College Adjustment		
	MCI	FCI	MEI	FEI	AC	SO	PE
FRM Ritual Sum	+	+	-	-	+	+	+
FRM Importance	+	+	-	-	+	+	+
FRI Frequency	+	+	-	-	+	+	+
FRM Flexibility	+	+	-	-	+	+	+

MCI = Mother Conflictual Independence
FCI = Father Conflictual Independence
MEI = Mother Emotional Independence
FEI = Father Emotional Independence
AC = Academic Adjustment
SO = Social Adjustment
PE = Personal-Emotional Adjustment
\+ = Predicted positive relationship.
\- = Predicted negative relationship.
0 = Relationship and relative influence of the variable cannot be predicted.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Subjects

Subjects for the study were freshmen college students who had left home to attend the university. These individuals were selected because they represented late adolescents who were physically separated from their parents. Thus, they also were likely to be in the initial stages of dealing with psychological separation and emancipation from their families (Arnstein, 1980; Sullivan & Sullivan, 1980). participants were recruited from introductory level psychology classes, chemistry classes, and human development and family studies classes at Texas Tech University who met the criteria for inclusion: (a) single, (b) ages 17-20, (c) freshman classification, (d) living in a two-parent family at the time they entered college, and (e) currently not residing with parents (or other relatives serving as guardians). Both males and females were included in the study. Participants received course credit for their involvement in the study. Data were collected from a total of 340 students, 156 males and 184 females. Demographic information concerning gender, ethnicity, whether one of the parents was a step-parent, and whether participants reported a history of psychiatric illness in their immediate family was collected to determine possible group differences that could affect the data. A discussion of sample characteristics is presented in Chapter III.

Measures

Predictor Variables: Family Ritualization

Family ritualization was measured by a total of four scores derived from two scales: the Family Routines Inventory (FRI) and the Family Rituals Measure (FRM). Two measures of family rituals' perceived importance from the FRM were used in addition to a rating for frequency of participation from the FRI to assess the dimension of commitment to family rituals. Additionally, a rating for flexibility in ritual usage was derived from the FRM. Reliability and validity information regarding these measures is described in depth in Appendix B.

Family Routines Inventory (FRI). The FRI (Appendix D) was developed by Boyce, Jensen, and their colleagues (Boyce et al., 1983; Jensen et al., 1983) as a measure of those predictable and regular family routines that promote strength in family life. Twenty-eight items are divided into categories for Work Day routines, Weekend and Leisure Time, Children's routines, Parents' routines, Bedtime, Meals, Extended Family, Leaving and Homecoming, Disciplinary routines, and Chores. Respondents indicate their endorsement and adherence to family routines by answering for each item the question "Is this a routine in your family?" with one of the following options: "almost every day," "3-5 times a week," "1-2 times a week," or "almost never." A second question, "How important is this routine for keeping your family strong?" is also rated for each item using the choices "very," "somewhat," or "not at all." Jensen et al. reported three scoring options for the FRI using only the first question, but they recommended the frequency score as optimal. They stated that the frequency score

provided the best measure of the issues of regularity and predictability in family routines usage. Whereas importance scores were deemed likely to reflect these attributes, it was suggested they do so to a lesser degree, thus these scores were not utilized. For purposes of the present study, only the frequency question was used. The frequency score is derived by summing for all endorsed items the numerical weight assigned to the particular option chosen by the respondent. Weights range from zero to three with "always every day" receiving a score of three and "almost never" being weighted zero. Total scores for the inventory range from 0 to 84.

Family Rituals Measure (FRM). The FRM (Appendix E) is a 45-item instrument that was developed for this study. It was designed to assess the two dimensions perceived by Wolin and Bennett (1984) to underlie a family's level of ritualization: commitment and flexibility. The first 31 items are a listing of common events, occasions, and situations for which families may have particular rituals. The compilation of rituals was developed partially from another researcher's pilot work in this area (James Ponzetti, University of New Mexico, personal communication, February, 1985), and also from comparison of the most frequently included rituals, traditions, and routines in studies attempting to assess family ritualization (Jensen et al., 1983; Klapp, 1959; Meredith et al., 1988). Examples of rituals from the FRM, as organized into four broad categories include: (a) Secular and Religious Holidays (e.g., Christmas, Thanksgiving, Mother's Day); (b) Family Traditions (e.g., birthdays, anniversaries, visits to relatives); (c) Rites of Passage Celebrations (e.g., weddings, graduations); and (d) Family Routines

(e.g., mealtime rituals, bedtime rituals, attending church together). Respondents rate the relative importance of each of the 31 ritual items "as practiced in your family when your were growing up." Rating values range from 1 ("not at all important") to 5 ("extremely important"). This first measure of ritual importance, labeled Ritual Sum, is derived by summing all the ratings for the first 31 ritual items.

The last two groups of items of the FRM are questions concerning an individual's overall impressions about ritual participation in his or her family. The first series of four questions (items 32-35) provides another assessment of a family's commitment to rituals by asking the respondent to rate on a 1 to 5 scale the degree of importance attributed to participation in rituals for the overall functioning of the family. Summing the ratings for these four questions provides then the Importance score. Thus, the first 35 items provide two assessments of a family's commitment to ritual usage in terms of the importance of specific rituals practiced and the overall importance of the family's rituals to the functioning of the family. The last set of 10 questions (items 36-45) addresses flexibility of ritual usage over the course of family life. Again, these questions are rated using a 5-point scale ("not at all true" to "totally true"). The sum of these 10 ratings provides the Flexibility score.

Criterion Variables: Dimensions of Family and Individual Functioning

The variables of cohesion and general family functioning were assessed by a total of six subscales taken from two family inventories,

the Family Environment Scale (FES) and the Family Assessment Device (FAD). Both of these scales were developed to reflect the multidimensional nature of a family's interactions and functioning. Cohesion was directly measured by the Cohesion subscale score from the FES, given the relatively focal nature of this construct. However, the broader concept of family functioning was measured through a combination of the FAD General Family Functioning subscale, and four additional subscales from the FES which were expected to be theoretically relevant to the concept of family ritualization. These included Expressiveness, Conflict, Organization, and Control. Three subscales of the Adjustment to College Scale (ACS) served to measure the aspects of Academic, Social, and Personal-Emotional adjustment in the college environment. The late adolescent's negotiation of the separation and emancipation process was estimated by two scales from the Psychological Separation Inventory (PSI). These scales were the Conflictual Independence and Emotional Independence scales, within which separate subscale scores were used in relation to each parent. Reliability and validity information for each of these measures may be found in Appendix B.

Family Environment Scale (FES). Developed by Moos and Moos (1981, 1986), the FES (Appendix F) measures ten dimensions within three broad domains of the family's social climate. These are the Relationship dimensions, which include the subscales for Cohesion, Expressiveness, and Conflict; the Personal Growth dimensions, assessing Independence, Achievement Orientation, Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, Active-Recreational Orientation, and Moral-Religious emphasis; and the System

Maintenance dimensions which are the subscales Organization and Control. Each subscale has nine items which respondents answer as true (scored "1") or false (scored "0"), thus subscale scores range from 0 to 9. Three forms of the FES are available which assess perceptions concerning the present family environment (Form R - "real"), the perceived ideal family environment (Form I - "ideal"), and expectations about specific family settings (Form E - "expectations"). The Form R subscales of Cohesion, Expressiveness, Conflict, Organization, and Control were selected for use in the present study. These subscales, representing the Relationship and System Maintenance domains of the FES, provided estimates of current family functioning, both generally and specifically regarding the aspect of family cohesiveness.

Family Assessment Device (FAD). The FAD (Epstein et al., 1983; Appendix D) is a 53-item inventory derived to assess families according to the McMaster Model of Family Functioning which posits that family functioning reflects systemic properties within the group and patterns of transaction among family members. Research concerning the model has identified six dimensions in family functioning which have been found to distinguish between healthy and unhealthy families (Epstein, Bishop, & Levin, 1978). These dimensions comprise six of the seven subscales of the FAD: Problem Solving, Communication, Roles, Affective Responsiveness, Affective Involvement, and Behavior Control. The last subscale, and the one selected for use in the present study, is the General Functioning Subscale which is composed of 12 items designed to assess the overall health or pathology in the family. The authors

reported intrascale correlations with the General Functioning scale ranging from .48 to .76, representing the relationship between this scale and the specific properties being assessed by the other six subscales. Respondents rate their level of agreement or disagreement with items along a 4-point scale ("strongly agree" to "strongly disagree"). High scores on the FAD reflect unhealthy functioning due to the directionality of scoring. For the purposes of this study, however, directionality was reversed so that across all measures high scores reflected higher levels of functioning or adjustment.

Psychological Separation Inventory (PSI). The PSI (Appendix H) was developed by Hoffman (1984) to measure the degree to which late adolescents (i.e., college student sample, ages 18-22) perceive themselves as having achieved psychological separation from their parents. Hoffman extrapolated from Mahler's (Mahler, Pine, & Bergman, 1975) theoretical concept of "separation-individuation," which describes a phase of development occurring during the first three years of life, to elaborate and assess a parallel process of separating psychologically from one's parents during adolescence. Four scales comprise the 138-item inventory: Functional Independence (13 items), Emotional Independence (17 items), Conflictual Independence (25 items), and Attitudinal Independence (14 items). The items are grouped first in reference to aspects of separation from mother, and then repeated in reference to father, so that a mother score and father score is derived for each of the four scales. Respondents rate the items on a 5-point scale ("not at all true of me" = 0 to "very true of me" = 4), with

higher scores representing higher levels of psychological separation. Only those scales which had evidenced acceptable reliability and validity were included for use in the present study. These were the Conflictual Independence and the Emotional Independence scales, which were scored separately for mother and father, thus yielding four subscale scores.

Adjustment to College Scale (ACS). The ACS (Baker & Siryk, 1984; 1986; Appendix I) is a 67-item multidimensional measure of college adjustment addressing four areas: Academic adjustment (24 items), Social adjustment (20 items), Personal-Emotional adjustment (15 items), and Attachment to the University/Goal Commitment (15 items). Additionally, the ACS yields a full scale adjustment score. Eight items overlap between the Social and Goal Commitment scales, and one Academic adjustment item is also included on the Goal Commitment scale. Two additional items are scored only for the full scale score. The items are rated along a 9-point Likert-type scale ranging from "applies very closely to me" to "doesn't apply to me at all," with higher scores representing better adjustment. Only the three scales which had no overlapping items, i.e., Academic, Social, and Personal-Emotional, were used in the present study.

Procedure

Subjects participated in the study during the spring semester of their freshman year in college. The six instruments were administered in a group format with all of the instruments completed during a single session. The instruments were divided into two sets of three measures

each, with accompanying computer answer sheets. The two sets were alternately distributed first and second at random to the sample to control for order effects. Following completion of the questionnaires, subjects were thanked for their participation, given their course credit for research participation, and offered the option for a follow-up report of the results of the study. Data were analyzed using canonical correlations to assess for patterns of relationships.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Sample Characteristics

Data were collected from 340 male and female freshmen college students. Of this number, 36 subjects omitted from 1-2 items on the questionnaires, resulting in a total of 41 missing responses. The sample means for these items were inserted during scoring. One student omitted 10 items from the Psychological Separation Inventory and this subject's data were excluded from the data analyses. Data from an additional four subjects were dropped from the study due to a significant number of out of range values endorsed on the computer answer sheets. Decision rules for dealing with instances of out of range values are delineated in further detail in Appendix B.

These sample restrictions resulted in a sample size of 335, with 152 males and 183 females. Subjects ranged in age from 17 to 20 years with a mean age of 18 years 7 months (91.4% of the sample was either 18 or 19 years old). The majority of participants were white (88.6%). Minorities were represented in the sample in the following percentages: Hispanic (5.7%), Asian (2.5%), Black (1.6%), and Other (1.6%). To avoid confounding factors in assessing family functioning, participants had two parents at the time the study was conducted and considered themselves as having "[grown] up in a two-parent family" (see Appendix K, Instructions). The majority of subjects reported that neither of their parents was a step-parent (80.8%), indicating that these were intact families with either natural or adoptive parents. A small

percentage of the students reported a history of diagnosis and/or treatment for psychiatric illness in their immediate family (5.4%).

A comparison of group means and standard deviations for these demographic variables, i.e., gender, ethnicity, step-parent, and psychiatric history, yielded significant differences only for gender on several of the subscale variables. Sample comparisons between males and females for each of the subscale variables are shown in Appendix C, Table C-1. An examination of these differences shows that females ranged from less than 1/3 to 1/2 of a standard deviation above males on all variables where differences occurred, including measures of ritual commitment and flexibility, general family functioning, family cohesion and expressiveness, and college social adjustment. One exception was that males reported higher levels of emotional independence for both mother and father than did females (1/2 to 3/4 standard deviation difference). Where appropriate, results are reported for gender combined and gender separate given these group differences. Sample comparisons for order effects in administering the questionnaires and for the class from which subjects were recruited (i.e., Psychology, Chemistry, or Human Development/Family Studies) yielded no significant differences.

Preliminary analyses were conducted to examine intrascale correlations and correlations among the predictor and criterion variables. These results are summarized in Appendix C, Table C-2. Reliabilities were also computed for each of the subscales for the sample of participants (Appendix B, Table B-1). These sample values compared favorably with the reliabilities previously reported in the

literature, as noted in the discussion of reliability and validity properties for the measures used in the study (Appendix B).

Primary Analyses

Canonical correlation analyses were used to correlate the predictor variables concerning family ritualization with the criterion measures for aspects of family and individual functioning. This approach was chosen because it allows for investigation of multidimensional constructs by testing the presence and significance of relationships between two sets of variables (Levine, 1977; Lindeman, Merenda, & Gold, 1980).

For each of the four primary hypotheses, a correlation between constructs (whether estimated by a univariate measure or multiple measures) was predicted. To test the basis of each hypothesized correlation between constructs, the set of estimates of these constructs was subjected to a canonical correlation analysis. Pairs of canonical variables (i.e., linear combinations of variables from each of the two original sets) were generated such that the correlation between the two was maximized. The resulting canonical correlation coefficient, when squared, produces an R_c^2 that is analogous to the R^2 in multiple regression, and can be evaluated for significance. The R_c^2 represents the amount of variance in one of the paired canonical variates that is accounted for by the other. Similar to the generating of factors in factor analysis, the least number of variables in either the predictor or criterion variable set theoretically equals the number of possible pairs of canonical variates that could be generated. However, most of

the canonical correlations generated were not statistically significant, since canonical variates are orthogonal and the first pair extracts the greatest amount of variance.

In addition to reviewing the canonical weights (analogous to beta weights in a regression equation), interpretation of the variates was aided by calculating structure coefficients. Structure coefficients are derived by correlating each original variable with the canonical variate which has been generated from that set (Tabachnik & Fidell, 1983). Thus, the relationship between the individual scales and the multivariate constructs which they are attempting to measure could be examined. Because structure coefficients are correlations between the original variables and the canonical variates, interpreting their magnitude requires selecting some arbitrary level above which the correlations are viewed as part of a pattern. According to Tabachnik and Fidell, an arbitrary cutoff is often set at .30 (accounting for 9% of variance), with more sizeable coefficients obviously representing more stable or significant patterns of relationship. The calculated structure coefficients for each of the paired canonical variates were squared and summed to indicate the percent of variance explained by the variate with respect to its original variable set (Lindeman et al., 1980).

Redundancy indices (Stewart & Love, 1968) were also calculated in order to determine the amount of variance accounted for in one of the variable sets by the canonical variate of the other set. This index of overlap between two sets of variables is calculated by multiplying the R_c^2 value for the pair of canonical variates by the percent of variance

(pv) extracted by each variate from its original variables. Redundancy values thus reflect the adjusting of the R_c^2 value by the degree of importance of each variate with respect to its own variable set. These steps in analyses were conducted for each of the five major hypotheses. In those cases in which a construct was estimated by a single measurement (e. g., cohesion), this procedure essentially reduced to a regression analysis.

Test of Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 predicted that late adolescents' ratings of ritual commitment in their families would be significantly correlated with their ratings for family cohesion. The results of the canonical correlation analysis yielded one significant canonical correlation, R_c = .57 which extracted 33% of the variance between the set of ritual commitment variables and cohesion (Table 5). This significant relationship also was found when computed separately for males (R_c = .63) and for females (R_c = .52). Only one pair of canonical variables was generated given that the criterion set was comprised of a single estimate for cohesion.

Analyses of the structure of the canonical variates for ritual commitment and cohesion are shown in Table 6. All three measures of ritual commitment were relevant to the canonical variable for the rituals set, with structure coefficients of .80 and .84, respectively, for the Ritual Sum and Importance scores from the FRM, and .81 for the FRI Frequency score. A similar pattern of high structure coefficients on all three scales held for both males and females, with differences in

the rank order among the three ritual commitment measures. The canonical variate combining these three scales extracted 61% of the within-set variance for the construct of commitment to rituals. Also a moderate amount of variance in the rituals set was explained by the single FES Cohesion measure, as indicated by a redundancy value of .22. Predicting the level of cohesion in a family was accomplished to an even greater extent by the canonical variate for ritual commitment, yielding a redundancy value of .33. As was predicted by this hypothesis, not only were ritual commitment and cohesion significantly related, but each of the measures for the aspects of importance and frequency were correlated in a positive direction with family cohesion, as was also expected (see Table 1 and Table C-2).

Test of Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 predicted that late adolescents' ratings of ritual commitment and flexibility would correlate significantly with measures of cohesion and healthy family functioning. Two significant canonical correlations emerged for the combined sample, and also for males and females. These first two correlations account for the significant linkages between the two sets of variables. The first canonical correlation was .71 for the combined sample (51% of variance), .76 for males (58% of variance), and .65 for females (43% of variance). The second canonical correlation which emerged yielded an R_c of .27 for the combined sample (7% of variance), .30 for males (9% of variance), and .36 for females (13% of variance). These results are summarized in

Table 7, along with the canonical weights for each variable on each of the two canonical variate pairs.

The pattern of relationships among the canonical variables are revealed by the structure coefficients, percents of variance, and redundancy values shown in Table 8. For the combined sample, sizeable structure coefficients (.67 or higher) occurred for each of the four rituals variables on the first canonical variate. In order of magnitude, the results were Frequency (.82), Ritual Sum (.77), Importance (.76), and Flexibility (.67). This pattern of high structure loadings on each of the rituals variables held for both males and females. Differences occurred in the relative contributions of two of the FRM variables: Ritual Sum contributed more for males (.81) than for females (.69), while the reverse was true for Flexibility which loaded higher for females (.72) than for males (.59). The percent of within-set variance explained by the first variate regarding family ritualization was .58, with 29% of the variance in the family rituals set made redundant given information concerning the level of healthy family functioning. Total redundancy for both the first and second canonical variates was .30.

In keeping with the prediction of association between family ritualization and healthy family functioning, the variables in the family functioning set which correlated highly with the first canonical variate were General Functioning (.92), Cohesion (.85), Expressiveness (.56), low Conflict (-.55), and Organization (.44). Control was not a relevant variable for any of the gender groups. This first variate accounted for 40% of the variance within the family functioning set.

The redundancy value for the criterion set shows that 20% of the variance in the family functioning variables was explained by the first canonical variate for family rituals, with a total redundancy of .22 across both the first and second variates. These patterns for structure coefficients' rankings and magnitudes, percents of variance, and level of redundancies were consistent for males and females. Only the Expressiveness variable showed some difference in relative contribution for males (.43) versus females (.60).

Interpretation of the second canonical variate, while significant, is tentative given the R_c^2 values representing 13% or less of the variance between the two sets of variables for each of the sample groups. Generally, ritual Flexibility emerged as the significant dimension with a structure coefficient of .73 (gender combined), and it was associated with a moderately high coefficient for Expressiveness (.49), low Control (-.89), and low Organization (-.44). Females showed a pattern of high ritual importance (Ritual Sum = .60) with low Flexibility (-.58), associated with high levels of Control (.63) and Organization (.77) in the family.

Providing additional support for the hypothesis is the patterning of positive and negative correlations between the predictor and criterion variables. Twenty-three directional hypotheses were predicted concerning the relationships among the variables in the two sets, as depicted in Table 2. Referring to the intercorrelation matrix in Table C-2, the results show that 20 of the 23 predictions came out in the direction expected (87% accuracy). The remaining three correlations were negligibly different from zero.

Test of Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 predicted that estimates of cohesion and general family functioning would significantly correlate with aspects of individual adjustment, specifically psychological separation and college adjustment. The canonical correlation analysis produced significant correlations for the first two pairs of canonical variates for the combined sample; canonical correlations for males and for females on the second variate were not significant. The R_c value for the combined sample was .66 (44% of variance), with an additional 7% of variance accounted for by the second canonical (R_c = .27). For males, R_c = .60 (36% of variance), and for females R_c = .71 (51% of variance). These results, along with the canonical weights, are shown in Table 9.

As shown in Table 10, the family functioning variables relevant to the first canonical variate were, in order of magnitude, General Functioning (.97), Cohesion (.77), Expressiveness (.70), and low Conflict (-.66). Organization (.31) and low Control (-.30) contributed minimally to the structure of the first variate. The first canonical variate maximized 44% of the variance shared in the family functioning variable set. Among the individual adjustment variables, Conflictual Independence for both Father (.68) and Mother (.58) and low Emotional Independence for Father (-.57) and Mother (-.50) were relevant to the first canonical variate. Less relevant were the college adjustment variables which contributed only minimally to the variate structure with correlations of .35 for Social, .33 for Personal-Emotional, and .25 for Academic. Twenty-four percent of the individual adjustment within-set variance was accounted for by the first canonical variate.

Variables which contributed to the structure of the second canonical variate were low family Cohesion (-.55) associated primarily with Father Emotional Independence (.66), Social adjustment in college (.53), and Mother Emotional Independence (.42). The remaining variables for conflictual independence and college adjustment had structure coefficients of .37 or lower.

The redundancy indices show that the first canonical variate from the individual adjustment set (within which psychological separation variables carried the majority of variance) more efficiently explained the variance in the set of family functioning variables (19%) than was explained in the psychological separation/college adjustment set by the family functioning canonical variable (10%). Total redundancy for the family functioning set with the first two canonical variates taken together was .20. Total redundancy for the criterion set was .11.

This hypothesis was well supported with respect to the relationship between healthy family functioning and individual adjustment as measured by conflictual independence. However, it was not well supported with respect to emotional independence (which loaded in the opposite direction) and college adjustment. Of the 39 directional hypotheses concerning the predictor and criterion intercorrelations (Table 3), 23 were predicted accurately (59%), eight of the correlations were near zero, and the remaining eight were in the direction opposite of the predictions (see Table C-2). The eight inaccurately predicted intercorrelations all concerned the relationship between the Emotional Independence scale of the PSI and the various family functioning variables.

Test of Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 predicted a significant relationship between ritualization and aspects of individual adjustment, i.e., psychological separation and college adjustment. Two significant canonical correlations emerged for the combined sample. The first R_c was .55, accounting for 31% of variance, and the second was .22 (5% of variance). Canonical correlations for males (R_c = .52, 27% of variance) and for females (R_c = .54, 29% of variance) were significant only for the first pair of variates. Table 11 summarizes these results along with the canonical weights for all the variables.

On the first variate, sizeable structure coefficients resulted for each of the family rituals variables across all three samples, as shown in Table 12. The rank order for the gender combined sample was Frequency (.82), Ritual Sum (.79), Importance (.72), and Flexibility (.67). Males and females differed in the relative sizes of the structure coefficients for three of the four variables, with Ritual Sum contributing more for males (.91) than for females (.61), and Frequency (.85) and Flexibility (.71) contributing more for females than for males (.74 and .57, respectively). The first canonical variate extracted 57% of the variance within the family rituals set.

The variables relevant to the first variate among the psychological separation/college adjustment set were primarily low Father Emotional Independence (-.78) and low Mother Emotional Independence (-.65). Also contributing to a lesser degree were Social (.42) and Academic (.38) college adjustment, and Father Conflictual Independence (.35). The coefficients for the remaining variables were less than .30. Patterns

for males and females were similar with differences primarily in the size of structure coefficients among the psychological separation variables. Father Conflictual Independence (.56) and low Father Emotional Independence (-.82) contributed more for females than for males (.18 and -.68, respectively), whereas low Mother Emotional Independence was more significant for males (-.77) than for females (-.42). Low structure coefficients resulted for each of the college adjustment variables for both males and females, with Academic adjustment contributing somewhat for males (.42) but very little for females (.30). Percent of variance accounted for by the first variate with respect to the individual adjustment set was .23.

An additional 16% of within-set variance was extracted from both the predictor and the criterion sets by the second canonical variate for each variable set. Variables comprising the second variate from the set of family rituals were low Flexibility (-.54) and low ritual Importance (-.47). From the individual adjustment set, one variable had a sizeable structure coefficient on the second variate, this being Social college adjustment (.80). Redundancy values show that 18% of the family rituals variance was accounted for by the first and second canonical variates for psychological separation/college adjustment. Total redundancy for psychological separation/college adjustment resulting from the first and second canonical variates for family rituals was 8%.

The hypothesis was only weakly supported by the relationships that were maximized. Significant canonical correlations emerged for the combined sample and both gender groups as predicted. However, the rituals variables were predictive of emotional dependence (rather than

independence), and the structure coefficients for college adjustment and conflictual independence, while loading in the expected direction, did not account for large amounts of variance in the overall canonical relationship. Thus, ritualization was a poor predictor of college adjustment and conflictual independence. Of the 28 directional hypotheses regarding the relationships between each of the predictor and criterion variables (Table 4), 19 were accurately predicted (68%); the remaining correlations were negligibly different from zero (see Table C-2).

Test of Hypothesis 5

The final hypothesis was designed to address the combination of family ritual and family functioning variables as predictors of individual adjustment. While the specific variables comprising the predictor and criterion sets were not identified a priori, it was proposed that the variables for inclusion would be those which had carried the greatest amount of variance in the previously tested relationships. As the previous results indicated, the college adjustment variables generally evidenced low structure coefficients in the relationships that were maximized with the constructs of family ritualization, cohesion, and family functioning. Thus, only the four variables for psychological separation were retained for the individual adjustment criterion set. All of the family rituals variables and family functioning variables were included in the analysis as predictors.

Maximizing the relationships among this grouping of variables resulted in sizeable canonical correlations. Two pairs of canonical variables were produced which were significantly correlated for the combined sample and for females. Only the first canonical correlation for males was significant. The R_c value for the combined sample on the first canonical variate was .65, accounting for 42% of the variance between the two sets of variables. An additional 14% of variance was maximized by the second canonical variate pair (R_c = .38). For males and females, the first canonical variate extracted 36% and 49%, respectively, of the variance between the predictor and criterion sets, with canonical correlations of .60 for males and .70 for females. The second pair of canonical variates for females correlated at .40, accounting for an additional 16% of variance. Table 13 depicts these results and gives the canonical weights for each of the variables.

The structure of the variate pairs which emerged is shown by the values in Table 14. Among the predictors, all of the family ritual and family functioning variables carried sizeable structure coefficients (.50 or greater), with the exception of Organization (.28) and Control (-.31). Family conflict carried a sizeable negative coefficient (-.67). Generally across all three samples, the family functioning variables (-.67 to .95) ranked higher than the rituals variables (.50 to .61). Differences occurred between males and females in the relative sizes of the structure coefficients for ritual importance, with both Ritual Sum and Importance contributing more for males (.68 and .66, respectively) than for females (.33 and .36). Females also showed a moderately negative coefficient for Control (-.40), whereas this variable

contributed very little to the structure of the first variate for males (-.14). It should be noted, however, that the results for males and females in this analysis are likely to be unstable given the ratio of sample size for each gender to the number of variables included in the hypothesis.

Among the criterion variables on the first canonical variate, high structure coefficients resulted for both Mother (.57) and Father (.67) Conflictual Independence, and high negative coefficients were produced for both Mother (-.53) and Father (-.63) Emotional Independence. The pattern of results for males and females were the same in terms of directionality, but differed somewhat in the magnitude of the coefficients. Males evidenced higher negative coefficients for both Mother (-.71) and Father (-.66) Emotional Independence than did females (-.26 and -.50, respectively), while females had more sizeable coefficients for Conflictual Independence, particularly for the Father score (.84), in relation to males (.48).

Variables which contributed to the structure of the second canonical variate for the combined sample consisted of low ritual importance (Ritual Sum, -.58, and Importance, -.54) coupled with relatively low family Control (-.39) and ritual Flexibility (-.35). These predictor variables were associated with high structure coefficients for each of the independence criterion variables (.47 to .67).

The first canonical variate extracted 39% of the shared variance from among the family functioning and rituals predictor variables. An additional 11% of variance was extracted by the second canonical

variate. The canonical variables for the criterion set extracted 36% of variance with the first variate and another 37% with the second variate. Total redundancy for predicting psychological separation given the combination of family rituals and family functioning was .20 (Table 14). This represents an increase from .08 when family ritualization alone was used to predict individual adjustment (Hypothesis 4, see Table 12), and an increase from .11 when only the family functioning variables were used as predictors (Hypothesis 3, see Table 10).

TABLE 5

CANONICAL CORRELATION BETWEEN RITUAL COMMITMENT AND COHESION

	Gender Combined[1]	Males[2]	Females[3]
Canonical Correlation (R_c)	.57****	.63****	.52****
Variance Explained (R_c^2)	.33	.40	.27
Canonical Weights[4]			
Ritual Commitment Set			
FRM Sum Score	.31	.44	.15
FRM Importance	.44	.45	.45
FRI Frequency	.47	.32	.63
Cohesion Set			
FES Cohesion	1.00	1.00	1.00

**** $p < .0001$.

[1] $n = 335$.

[2] $n = 152$.

[3] $n = 183$.

[4] Reported with standardized values.

TABLE 6

STRUCTURE COEFFICIENTS, PERCENTS OF VARIANCE, AND REDUNDANCIES BETWEEN RITUAL COMMITMENT AND COHESION

Variables	Gender Combined[1]	Males[2]	Females[3]
Ritual Commitment Set			
FRM Ritual Sum	.80	.87[a]	.66[a]
FRM Importance	.84	.87[b]	.78[b]
FRI Frequency	.81	.71[c]	.88[c]
Percent of Variance	(.61)	(.68)	(.60)
Redundancy	(.22)	(.27)	(.16)
Cohesion Set			
FES Cohesion	1.00	1.00	1.00
Percent of Variance	(1.00)	(1.00)	(1.00)
Redundancy	(.33)	(.40)	(.27)

[1] n = 335.

[2] n = 152.

[3] n = 183.

[a,b,c] Values with identical superscripts indicate that the structure coefficients for males and females are significantly different; computed on first canonical variate only ($p < .05$, Fisher's Z test).

TABLE 7

CANONICAL CORRELATIONS BETWEEN FAMILY RITUALS AND FAMILY FUNCTIONING

	First canonical variate			Second canonical variate		
	GC[1]	M[2]	F[3]	GC	M	F
Canonical Correlation (R_c)	.71****	.76****	.65****	.27**	.30*	.36**
Variance Explained (R_c^2)	.51	.58	.43	.07	.09	.13
Canonical Weights[4]						
Family Rituals Set						
FRM Ritual Sum	.30	.35	.24	-.42	-.26	.84
FRM Importance	.21	.24	.21	-.02	-.06	.01
FRI Frequency	.50	.51	.48	-.44	-.46	.05
FRM Flexibility	.30	.19	.41	1.04	1.06	-.85
Family Functioning Set						
FAD General Functioning	.63	.70	.57	-.18	-.43	.18
FES Cohesion	.42	.45	.45	.27	.23	-.27
FES Expressiveness	.06	-.09	.10	.27	.51	-.24
FES Conflict	.06	.06	.03	.25	.19	.11
FES Control	.17	.18	.14	-.79	-.78	.40
FES Organization	.16	.13	.14	-.27	.34	.82

* $p < .05$.
** $p < .01$.
**** $p < .0001$.

[1] Gender Combined $n = 335$.
[2] Males $n = 152$.
[3] Females $n = 183$.
[4] Reported with standardized values.

TABLE 8

STRUCTURE COEFFICIENTS, PERCENTS OF VARIANCE, AND REDUNDANCIES BETWEEN FAMILY RITUALS AND FAMILY FUNCTIONING

Variables	First canonical variate			Second Canonical variate			Totals		
	GC[1]	M[2]	F[3]	GC	M	F	GC	M	F
Family Rituals Set									
FRM Ritual Sum	.77	.81[a]	.69[a]	-.23	-.05	.60			
FRM Importance	.76	.79	.73	.04	.12	.10			
FRI Frequency	.82	.82	.79	-.32	-.32	.15			
FRM Flexibility	.67	.59[b]	.72[b]	.73	.80	-.58			
Percent of Variance	(.58)	(.57)	(.54)	(.17)	(.19)	(.18)	.75	.76	.72
Redundancy	(.29)	(.33)	(.23)	(.01)	(.02)	(.02)	.30	.35	.25
Family Functioning Set									
FAD General Functioning	.92	.90	.92	.24	.28	-.20			
FES Cohesion	.85	.83	.88	.14	.12	-.11			
FES Expressiveness	.56	.43[c]	.60[c]	.49	.62	-.35			
FES Conflict	-.55	-.59	-.54	.06	-.07	.03			
FES Control	-.05	.08	-.18	-.89	-.86	.63			
FES Organization	.44	.43	.42	-.44	.04	.77			
Percent of Variance	(.40)	(.37)	(.41)	(.22)	(.20)	(.19)	.62	.57	.60
Redundancy	(.20)	(.21)	(.18)	(.02)	(.02)	(.02)	.22	.23	.20

[1] Gender Combined n = 335.

[2] Males n = 152.

[3] Females n = 183.

a,b,c Values with identical superscripts indicate that the structure coefficients for males and females are significantly different; computed on first canonical variate only ($p < .05$, Fisher's Z test).

TABLE 9

CANONICAL CORRELATIONS BETWEEN FAMILY FUNCTIONING AND MEASURES OF INDIVIDUAL ADJUSTMENT
(PSYCHOLOGICAL SEPARATION AND COLLEGE ADJUSTMENT)

	First canonical variate			Second canonical variate		
	GC[1]	M[2]	F[3]	GC	M	F
Canonical Correlation (R_c)	.66****	.60****	.71****	.27**	.34[ns]	.30[ns]
Variance Explained (R_c^2)	.44	.36	.51	.07	.12	.09
Canonical Weights[4]						
Family Functioning Set						
FAD General Functioning	.65	.64	.64	.67	-.20	.98
FES Cohesion	.15	.26	.08	-1.27	-.40	-.52
FES Expressiveness	.19	.17	.15	-.01	.05	.11
FES Conflict	-.15	-.13	-.21	-.10	-.56	.20
FES Control	-.02	.10	-.10	-.47	-.87	.68
FES Organization	.05	.01	.12	.42	-.06	-.49
Psychological Separation (PSI)						
Mother Conflictual Independence	.23	.44	.19	-.14	-.50	-.31
Father Conflictual Independence	.55	.27	.69	.50	1.10	.31
Mother Emotional Independence	-.45	-.40	-.38	-.10	-.67	-.77
Father Emotional Independence	-.31	-.45	-.22	.80	.90	.40
College Adjustment (ACS)						
Academic	-.04	.03	-.10	-.34	-.45	.15
Social	.18	.20	.10	.59	.11	.64
Personal-Emotional	.12	.03	.25	.12	-.22	-.74

[1] Gender Combined n = 335.

[2] Males n = 152.

[3] Females n = 183.

[4] Reported with standardized values.

ns Not Significant.

** $p < .01$.

*** $p < .0001$.

TABLE 10

STRUCTURE COEFICIENTS, PERCENTS OF VARIANCE, AND REDUNDANCIES BETWEEN FAMILY FUNCTIONING AND MEASURES OF INDIVIDUAL ADJUSTMENT (PSYCHOLOGICAL SEPARATION AND COLLEGE ADJUSTMENTS)

Variables	Structure Coefficients: First canonical variate GC[1]	M[2]	F[3]	Second canonical variate GC[4]	M[4]	F[4]	Totals GC[5]	M[5]	F[5]
Family Functioning Set									
FAD General Functioning	.97	.96	.95	.08	.03	.25			
FES Cohesion	.77	.80	.76	-.55	-.09	-.25			
FES Expressiveness	.70	.65	.65	.01	.28	.14			
FES Conflict	-.66	-.68	-.70	-.06	-.33	.33			
FES Control	-.30	-.12[a]	-.42[a]	-.30	-.88	.53			
FES Organization	.31	.29	.38	.21	-.16	-.38			
Percent of Variance	(.44)	(.42)	(.45)	(.08)	(.17)	(.11)	.52	.42	.45
Redundancy	(.19)	(.15)	(.23)	(.01)	(.02)	(.01)	.20	.15	.23
Psychological Separation (PSI)									
Mother Conflictual Independence	.58	.59[b]	.62[d]	.24	.19	-.04			
Father Conflictual Independence	.68	.52[b]	.82[b,d]	.37	.53	-.19			
Mother Emotional Independence	-.50	-.64[c]	-.26[c,e]	.42	.05	-.60			
Father Emotional Independence	-.57	-.62	-.48[e]	.66	.39	.01			
College Adjustment (ACS)									
Academic	.25	.24	.26	-.03	-.37	-.14			
Social	.35	.21	.34	.53	-.07	.36			
Personal-Emotional	.33	.29	.44	.33	-.18	-.51			
Percent of Variance	(.24)	(.23)	(.25)	(.17)	(.09)	(.11)	.41	.23	.25
Redundancy	(.10)	(.08)	(.12)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)	.11	.08	.12

[1] Gender combined n = 335.

[2] Males n = 152.

[3] Females n = 183.

[4] Results reported for comparison only, since the canonical correlation was not significant.

[5] Results reported are for the first canonical variate only.

[a,b,c,d,e] Values with identical superscripts indicate that the structure coefficients for males and females are significantly different; computed on first canonical variate only ($p < .05$, Fisher's Z Test).

TABLE 11

CANONICAL CORRELATIONS BETWEEN FAMILY RITUALS AND MEASURES OF INDIVIDUAL ADJUSTMENT
(PSYCHOLOGICAL SEPARATION AND COLLEGE ADJUSTMENT)

	First Canonical Variate			Second Canonical Variate		
	GC[1]	M[2]	F[3]	GC	M	F
Canonical Correlation (R_c)	.55****	.52****	.54****	.22*	.34[ns]	.23[ns]
Variance Explained (R_c^2)	.31	.27	.29	.05	.11	.05
Canonical Weights[4]						
Family Rituals Set						
FRM Ritual Sum	.36	.64	.14	.73	.15	-.92
FRM Importance	.12	.03	.17	-.87	-1.07	-.03
FRI Frequency	.50	.41	.60	.50	.85	.04
FRM Flexibility	.31	.18	.41	-.54	-.01	.77
Psychological Separation (PSI)						
Mother Conflictual Independence	.10	.23	.20	-.58	-.50	.48
Father Conflictual Independence	.22	-.01	.31	.20	.25	.18
Mother Emotional Independence	-.42	-.55	-.26	.15	.21	-.34
Father Emotional Independence	-.55	-.40	-.68	.25	.18	.17
College Adjustment (ACS)						
Academic	.18	.24	.13	.17	.44	-.37
Social	.24	.25	.12	.80	.56	-.75
Personal-Emotional	.08	.15	.03	.00	.07	.12

ns Not significant
* $p < .05$.
**** $p < .0001$.

[1] Gender combined $n = 335$.
[2] Males $n = 152$.
[3] Females $n = 183$.
[4] Reported with standardized values.

TABLE 12

STRUCTURE COEFFICIENTS, PERCENTS OF VARIANCE, AND REDUNDANCIES BETWEEN FAMILY RITUALS AND MEASURES OF INDIVIDUAL ADJUSTMENT (PSYCHOLOGICAL SEPARATION AND COLLEGE ADJUSTMENT)

Variables	Structure Coefficients: First Canonical Variate GC[1]	M[2]	F[3]	Second Canonical Variate GC	M[4]	F[4]	Totals GC	M[5]	F[5]
Family Rituals Set									
FRM Sum Score	.79	.91[a]	.61[a]	.22	-.18	-.68			
FRM Importance	.72	.71	.68	-.47	-.60	-.17			
FRI Frequency	.82	.74[b]	.85[b]	.28	.45	-.13			
FRM Flexibility	.67	.57[c]	.71[c]	-.54	-.28	.49			
Percent of Variance	(.57)	(.55)	(.51)	(.16)	(.17)	(.19)	.73	.55	.51
Redundancy	(.17)	(.15)	(.15)	(.01)	(.02)	(.01)	.18	.15	.15
Psychological Separation (PSI)									
Mother Conflictual Independence	.29	.31	.40	-.34	-.21	.42			
Father Conflictual Independence	.35	.18[d]	.56[d]	.06	.13	.06			
Mother Emotional Independence	-.65	-.77[e]	-.42[e,g]	.36	.45	-.37			
Father Emotional Independence	-.78	-.68[f]	-.82[f,g]	.19	.26	.07			
College Adjustment (ACS)									
Academic	.38	.42	.30	.33	.61	-.41			
Social	.42	.33	.28	.80	.76	-.71			
Personal-Emotional	.25	.32	.23	.31	.44	-.25			
Percent of Variance	(.23)	(.23)	(.22)	(.16)	(.21)	(.15)	.39	.23	.22
Redundancy	(.07)	(.06)	(.06)	(.01)	(.02)	(.01)	.08	.06	.06

[1] Gender Combined n = 335.

[2] Males n = 152.

[3] Females n = 183.

[4] Results reported for comparison only, since the canonical correlation was not significant.

[5] Results reported are for the first canonical variate only.

a,b,c...g Values with identical superscripts indicate that the structure coefficients for males and females are significantly different; computed on first canonical variate only ($p < .05$, Fisher's Z test).

TABLE 13

CANONICAL CORRELATIONS BETWEEN FAMILY RITUALS AND FAMILY FUNCTIONING PREDICTORS AND PSYCHOLOGICAL SEPARATION

	First canonical variate			Second canonical variate		
	GC[1]	M[2]	F[3]	GC	M	F
Canonical Correlation (R_c)	.65****	.60****	.70****	.38****	.35ns	.40**
Variance Explained (R_c^2)	.42	.36	.49	.14	.12	.16
Canonical Weights[4]						
Family Rituals						
FRM Ritual Sum	-.03	.04	-.08	-.53	-.68	-.23
FRM Importance	.05	.22	-.09	-.34	-.12	-.53
FRI Frequency	.09	-.14	.17	-.15	.32	-.32
FRM Flexibility	.06	.00	.06	-.28	-.11	-.29
Family Functioning						
FAD General Functioning	.51	.51	.09	.64	.14	.68
FES Cohesion	.20	.27	.63	-.13	-.01	-.32
FES Expressiveness	.18	.16	.16	-.08	.04	.01
FES Conflict	-.17	-.18	-.12	.03	-.24	.17
FES Control	-.04	.10	.09	-.42	-.69	-.24
FES Organization	.00	-.04	.13	.53	.10	.57
Psychological Separation (PSI)						
Mother Conflictual Independence	.27	.47	.26	.10	-.41	-.12
Father Conflictual Independence	.57	.24	.76	.65	1.12	.66
Mother Emotional Independence	-.44	-.42	-.33	.24	-.19	.06
Father Emotional Independence	-.37	-.47	-.23	.58	.64	.93

ns Not significant.

** $p < .01$.

**** $p < .0001$.

[1] Gender combined $n = 335$.

[2] Males $n = 152$.

[3] Females $n = 183$.

[4] Results reported with standardized values.

TABLE 14

STRUCTURE COEFFICIENTS, PERCENTS OF VARIANCE, AND REDUNDANCIES BETWEEN FAMILY RITUALS AND FAMILY FUNCTIONING PREDICTORS AND PSYCHOLOGICAL SEPARATION

Variables	Structure Coefficients: First canonical variate GC[1]	M[2]	F[3]	Second canonical variate GC	M[4]	F	Totals GC	M[5]	F
Family Rituals									
FRM Ritual Sum	.50	.66[a]	.33[a]	-.58	-.51	-.43			
FRM Importance	.54	.68[b]	.36[b]	-.54	-.31	-.67			
FRI Frequency	.61	.49	.58	-.25	.05	-.43			
FRM Flexibility	.55	.52	.49	-.35	-.09	-.49			
Family Functioning									
FAD General Functioning	.95	.91	.94	.07	.14	-.27			
FES Cohesion	.81	.83	.76	-.13	.00	-.02			
FES Expressiveness	.70	.62	.67	.02	.30	-.04			
FES Conflict	-.67	-.67	-.67	-.17	-.25	.00			
FES Control	-.31	-.14[c]	-.40[c]	-.39	-.71	-.14			
FES Organization	.28	.25	.37	.27	.02	.28			
Percent of Variance	(.39)	(.39)	(.35)	(.11)	(.10)	(.12)	.50	.39	.47
Redundancy	(.16)	(.14)	(.17)	(.02)	(.01)	(.02)	.18	.14	.19
Psychological Separation (PSI)									
Mother Conflictual Independence	.57	.58[d]	.63[g]	.47	.39	.23			
Father Conflictual Independence	.67	.48[e]	.84[d,g]	.67	.83	.40			
Mother Emotional Independence	-.53	-.71[f]	-.26[e,h]	.64	.39	.55			
Father Emotional Independence	-.63	-.66	-.50[f,h]	.63	.47	.78			
Percent of Variance	(.36)	(.38)	(.36)	(.37)	(.30)	(.28)	.73	.38	.64
Redundancy	(.15)	(.13)	(.18)	(.05)	(.04)	(.04)	.20	.13	.22

[1] Gender combined n = 335.

[2] Males n = 152.

[3] Females n = 183.

[4] Results reported for comparison only, since the canonical correlation was not significant.

[5] Results reported are for the first canonical variate only.

a,b,c...h Values with identical superscripts indicate that the structure coefficients for males and females are significantly different; computed on first canonical variate only ($p < .05$, Fisher's Z test).

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The present study has served to highlight several important aspects of family ritualization, its relationship to family cohesion and the healthy functioning of families, and its role in the separation process of members leaving the family. The results from Hypothesis 1 provide additional confirmation to the growing literature that a strong link exists between a family's commitment to the practice of rituals and traditions and the family's level of cohesion. The strength of this association was evidenced in the sizeable amount of variance which was accounted for by the three ritual measures, given the potentially large number of other social and familial factors impinging on a family's cohesiveness.

Additionally, the combination of the FRI's assessment of frequency of ritual practice with the FRM's emphasis on the importance attributed to specific rituals (Ritual Sum score) and perceived importance of rituals in fostering family strength (Importance score) resulted in an increased correlation with cohesion than has thus far been reported by other researchers (e.g., Jensen et al., 1983; Klapp, 1959). In this regard, the Family Rituals Measure appears to be an important addition to the rather scant number of available instruments for assessing this aspect of family life. It provides a broader measure of ritualization by its inclusion of periodic traditions and events, in addition to daily family routines, which are the sole focus of the FRI.

Strong support was also found for the second hypothesis which predicted a relationship between the level of ritual commitment and flexibility and the level of healthy functioning in families. The results indicated that families whose rituals are frequently practiced, valued as important, and flexibly adapted also tend to show high levels of healthy functioning overall as well as particular characteristics of cohesiveness, expressiveness, low conflict, and organization. These findings are congruent with the conclusions recently drawn by several family researchers (Curran, 1983; Meredith et al., 1988; Stinnett & DeFrain, 1985) that family health and strength often go hand in hand with a family's establishing and maintaining a valued set of rituals and traditions from which they derive a sense of stability, identity, and solidarity.

The results from this hypothesis suggest another implication concerning our understanding of the construct of cohesion. Having examined the relationship between family ritualization and other aspects of family functioning besides cohesion may shed some light as to whether cohesion in families is generally related to effective functioning in a linear or curvilinear fashion. As noted in the literature review (Appendix A), within the family systems literature, some theorists have proposed that mid-ranges of cohesion are optimal, while higher levels result in enmeshment and loss of differentiation among members (Bowen, 1978; Minuchin, 1974; Olson, Sprenkle, & Russell, 1979). Other family researchers have shown a linear association between cohesion and family health and satisfaction (Miller, Epstein, Bishop, & Keitner, 1985;

Olson, McCubbin, Barnes, Larsen, Muxen, & Wilson, 1983), at least in "normal" or nonclinic families.

In the present study, a linear relationship linking cohesion with other healthy traits in families accounted for a substantial amount (72%) of the unit variance carried by the cohesion variable, leaving very little additional variance that could be accounted for by a nonlinear model (see Table 8, structure coefficient for Cohesion). Thus, these results would seem to lend additional support to the view that for nonclinic samples, family cohesion is generally a factor that is positively related with a family's ability to function well.

Also of note from the results in Hypothesis 2 is the importance of ritual flexibility, in addition to a commitment to rituals, in the positive association with healthy functioning in families. While other researchers have advanced the notion that flexible adaptation of rituals over time and across the family life cycle is an important aspect of a family's use of rituals (Bossard & Boll, 1950; Wolin & Bennett, 1984; 1988), no previous studies have included flexibility in their assessment of rituals. The results of this study provide empirical support for this proposition by including for the first time a measure of ritual adaptation and looking at its relationship to family functioning. The primary relationship that was maximized between aspects of family ritualization and family functioning clearly included flexibility in ritual usage as a significant dimension that was positively related to measurements of health in the family. Additionally, cautiously interpreting the second pair of canonical variables may suggest that when females perceived rituals as important but inflexible, the

associated perception of the family was one primarily characterized by control and organization, with other positive functioning variables missing from the picture.

Hypothesis 3 examined the connection between the functioning of the family as a whole and aspects of individual functioning. This hypothesis served as an intermediary step to addressing the effects of family ritualization on individual family members, as delineated in Hypothesis 4. Specific qualities of health and dysfunction within the family environment were found to be significantly related to the late adolescent's level of conflictual independence and college adjustment following his or her separation from the family. The results showed that adolescents who perceived their families to be generally well-functioning, cohesive, and expressive, with low levels of conflict, also tended to have emotionally dependent relationships with their parents which were conflict-free (i.e., evidencing "conflictual independence"). College adjustment also appeared to be a weak but positively related characteristic of these conflictually independent but emotionally dependent youths from healthy families.

Of note is the negative directionality of the structure coefficients for Mother and Father Emotional Independence which conflicted with the expectation for increased separation adjustment to correlate positively with family health. In contrast, the Conflictual Independence variables loaded in a positive direction with family health, as expected. A similar unexpected pattern of findings occurred with respect to Hypothesis 4. Ritual commitment and flexibility were strongly associated with emotional dependence (rather than

independence), but also contributing to the relationship were weaker, albeit positive, associations with college adjustment and conflictual independence.

To make sense of these apparently conflicting findings, we need to re-examine the intended meanings of the psychological separation variables of emotional and conflictual independence. As originally conceptualized by Hoffman (1984), in his derivation of the Psychological Separation Inventory, "emotional independence" refers to one's "freedom from an excessive need for approval, closeness, togetherness, and emotional support in relation to the mother and father" (p. 171). He defines "conflictual independence" as "freedom from excessive guilt, anxiety, mistrust, responsibility, inhibition, resentment, and anger" in relation to one's parents (p. 171-172). These two concepts suggest that successful separation from one's parents involves becoming free of emotional and conflictual dependencies.

However, several theorists and researchers within the adolescent autonomy literature have proposed that the separation process may be facilitated by the late adolescent's becoming more autonomous while maintaining supportive ties with the parents (Cooper et al., 1983; Hill & Holmbeck, 1986; Moore & Hotch, 1981; Steinberg and Silverberg, 1985). Thus, better separation adjustment may occur in developing a new relationship with one's parents, one that is characterized by a continued emotional connection but which is free of unresolved conflictual issues. Seen in this light, Hoffman's emotional independence construct may be less reflective of psychological separateness with respect to freedom from excessive emotional needs, and

more simply indicative of an individual's ongoing ties with his or her parents, which may be serving to facilitate the task of separation.

Indeed, in discussing these ideas with Hoffman while preparing to conduct this research (personal communication, October 3, 1988), he acknowledged that "emotional dependence" (i.e., low scores on the Emotional Independence scale) likely reflects a "closeness to parents" which is generally healthy and thus would be expected to positively correlate with adjustment in nonclinical samples. This is, in fact, the pattern of results which emerged in the present study. An examination of Table C-2 showing the correlations among the various predictor and criterion variables reveals that emotional independence bore little connection with adjustment in college, as compared with conflictual independence which significantly correlated with college adjustment. Interestingly, emotional independence also evidenced a significant inverse relationship with measures of healthy family functioning (e.g., Cohesion, Expressiveness, General Functioning) while positively correlating with family conflict. Thus, the present research appears more consistent with Hoffman's recent statements concerning the meaning of the emotional independence/dependence construct, rather than the conceptualization originally formulated.

This explanation is also harmonious with the findings from Garner's (1986) investigation with freshman college females using both the PSI and ACS and a measure of cohesion (from the FACES II). She reported that highly cohesive families tend to produce adolescents evidencing emotional dependence on their parents "well after the separation process

has begun" (pp. 94), who nevertheless evidenced conflictual independence and a positive adjustment to college.

Garner's findings in conjunction with the present findings raise additional questions as to the utility of the PSI, at least as originally formulated, in assessing the separation process of late adolescents. Both sets of results provide support for the Conflictual Independence subscale as a valid measure of Hoffman's psychological separation construct, insofar as it positively relates to adjustment. However, the validity of Emotional Independence is questionable. Nevertheless, these two subscales taken together may be one way of assessing the development of conflict-free emotional connections with one's parents as one indicator of success in the separation process. In doing so they reflect the theme of "individuality-connectedness" (Cooper et al., 1983) so prominent in the family systems and adolescent autonomy literature.

Finally, the role of family ritualization concerning individual adjustment during the separation process was examined by Hypotheses 4 and 5. As noted earlier, the results from Hypothesis 4 only weakly suggest a facilitative role for family rituals in fostering college adjustment and psychological separateness. Rituals were clearly associated with emotional ties with one's parents, but only small amounts of the overall variance were accounted for by the positive correlations with college adjustment and conflictual independence. However, Hypothesis 5 revealed a much stronger relationship when family ritualization and family functioning were combined as predictors of separation adjustment, once college adjustment was removed from the

picture. The pattern of results indicated that families which are healthy, (that is, generally well-functioning, cohesive, expressive, and low in conflict), and, as a secondary component, are committed to the practice of flexibly adapted rituals, tend to produce late adolescents who, after leaving the family, have maintained emotional connections with both parents that are generally conflict-free. The fact that college adjustment was only weakly related to family ritualization is not too surprising considering that this area of an adolescent's life is influenced by a multiplicity of factors (e.g., cognitive abilities, financial resources and/or strains, choice of major, etc.) such that very little of its variance could be accounted for by these constructs alone. Additionally, the increase in conflictual independence from Hypothesis 4 to Hypothesis 5 suggests that family rituals do not necessarily promote conflictual independence, except to the extent that they foster, or are part of the larger context of, the healthy functioning of the family.

The set of results from these two hypotheses seem to be indicating that family rituals are poor predictors per se of the individual's college adjustment or the extent to which he or she can separate in a conflict-free way. But neither do the results suggest that having a cohesive family and maintaining connections with one's parents, as may be fostered by an emphasis on rituals, impedes the late adolescent in the task of separating or adjusting to a new environment. Thus, an emphasis on family ritualization does not stand in the way of the late adolescent's efforts in developing independence, and may indeed provide one avenue for ongoing emotional connections that allow for a less

threatening separation process. These findings would seem to provide preliminary evidence supporting the notions put forth by Bossard and Boll (1950) and later reiterated by Shipman (1982) that rituals can serve to promote the development of autonomy in adolescents. Further research investigating these ideas is certainly warranted.

It was not within the scope of the present research to make specific predictions concerning differences between males and females with respect to family ritualization and the other variables with which rituals were examined. Generally males and females evidenced similar patterns across each of the major hypotheses tested. Within each hypothesis, when specific variables differed in the relative contributions made to the canonical relationships for males versus females, these differences were noted. None of the hypotheses tested showed a contradictory or inverse pattern of relationship between the gender groups on any of the first canonical variate pairs, which were those accounting for the largest amounts of variance.

Nevertheless, one pattern did emerge which, although tangential to the focus of the study, bears comment. Within the assessment of psychological separation, as it related to family rituals and family functioning, interesting "Oedipal-like" relationships emerged concerning the importance of ties or independence for both males and females in relation to the opposite sex parent. For each of the last three hypotheses involving the subscales of the PSI (Hypotheses 3, 4, and 5), males and females evidenced higher structure coefficients for the opposite sex parent's Conflictual and Emotional Independence subscales than for the same sex parent's scores. This pattern occurred in every

case for the Mother and Father scores (i.e., a total of six instances each for males and females). While for males these differences in magnitude were not statistically significant, the structure coefficients for females did differ significantly, as indicated by Fisher's Z test (Lindeman, 1980). In five of six instances, the Father scores for females were significantly higher than the Mother scores for both Conflictual and Emotional Independence. The sixth instance (Hypothesis 4, Conflictual Independence) also fits this pattern, however the difference did not reach statistical significance.

Additionally, in every case across the three hypotheses, for males the largest structure coefficient among the four PSI subscales was that for Mother Emotional Independence (always in the negative direction). For females the largest structure coefficient occurred for Father Conflictual Independence in two of the three hypotheses, with it ranking second to Father Emotional Independence on Hypothesis 4. These patterns seem to suggest that for females, attaining conflict-free relationships was of primary importance, while males placed more importance in maintaining emotional connections, and both were in respect particularly toward the opposite sex parent. Obviously, these initial observations warrant further research before definite statements can be made concerning their statistical legitimacy or clinical relevance.

Conclusions

This study was designed to address two broad questions concerning family ritualization: first, with respect to the effects of ritual commitment and flexibility on the level of family cohesion and overall

functioning of the family, and second, with respect to the successful adjustment and separation of members leaving the family. Clearly, no statements of causality can be drawn given the correlational nature of the research. However, the results indicated a strong relationship exists between the presence of cohesion, strength, and healthy functioning in a family and a family's commitment to the practice of rituals and traditions. Additionally, the flexibility of these rituals is an important dimension contributing to this relationship with healthy family functioning.

Findings from the study also indicate that healthy families who emphasize rituals tend to produce late adolescents who evidence a continuing emotional dependence on their parents after having left home. Nevertheless, these individuals do not appear to be adversely affected by this continuing relationship, and instead appear to be negotiating the task of separation generally free of conflicts with their parents and without serious difficulties in their adjustment to college. Thus, while directionality cannot be inferred, it appears that rituals and traditions as a part of the family's interactional life serve the family well. Benefits are evident not only for the family, but also for family members in maintaining emotional connections in relationships thus easing the transitions that are a part of the separation process.

One limitation of the study in making firmer conclusions concerning the positive adjustment of these late adolescents lies in the need for clearer, more valid measures of the separation process and tasks therein. Additionally, no measures of individual dysfunction were included which may have served to conversely validate or challenge the

conclusions drawn. Future research addressing these issues would certainly add to our understanding of these relationships.

The results of the present study provide further information regarding the role of rituals in the life of the family. They are powerful, observable, and measurable aspects of family interaction. Future research refining the assessment of family ritualization, including the important dimension of ritual flexibility, and examining more closely categories of rituals (e.g., traditions, rites of passage, etc.) as these relate to various family cycle transitions and adjustments are avenues which could be fruitful and worthy of pursuit.

REFERENCES

Aponte, H. J., & VanDeusen, J. M. (1981). Structural family therapy. In A. S. Gurman & D. P. Kniskern (Eds.), Handbook of family therapy (pp. 310-360). New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Arnstein, R. L. (1980). The student, the family, the university, and transition to adulthood. Adolescent Psychiatry, 8, 160-172.

Ausubel, D. P., Montemayor, R., & Svajian, P. N. (1977). Theory and problems of adolescent development. New York: Grune & Stratton.

Baker, R. W., & Siryk, B. (1984). Measuring adjustment to college. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31, 179-189.

Baker, R. W., & Siryk, B. (1986). Exploratory intervention with a scale measuring adjustment to college. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33, 31-38.

Barcai, A. (1981). Normative family development. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 7, 353-359.

Bennett, L. A., Wolin, S. J., Reiss, D., & Teitelbaum, M. A. (1987). Couples at risk for transmission of alcoholism: Protective influences. Family Process, 26, 111-129.

Blos, P. (1967). The second individuation process of adolescence. Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 22, 162-186.

Bossard, J. H., & Boll, F. S. (1950). Ritual in family living. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Bowen, M. (1978). Family therapy in clinical practice. New York: Aronson.

Boyce, W. T., Jensen, E. W., James, S. A., & Peacock, J. L. (1983). The family routines inventory: Theoretical origins. Social Science Medicine, 17, 193-200.

Cooper, C. R., Grotevant, H. D., & Condon, S. M. (1983). Individuality and connectedness in the family as a context for adolescent identity formation and role-taking skill. In H. D. Grotevant & C. R. Cooper (Eds.), Adolescent development in the family (pp. 43-59). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

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

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

Epstein, N. B., Bishop, D. S., & Levin, S. (1978). The McMaster model of family functioning. Journal of Marriage and Family Counseling, 4, 19-31.

Erikson, E. H. (1968). Identity: Youth and crisis. New York: Norton.

Farley, J. E. (1979). Family separation-individuation tolerance--A developmental conceptualization of the nuclear family. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 5, 61-67.

Freud, A. (1969). Adolescence. Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 13, 255-278 (originally published 1958).

Fulmer, R. H., Medalie, J., & Lord, D. A. (1982). Life cycles in transition: A family systems perspective on counseling the college student. Journal of Adolescence, 5, 195-217.

Garner, H. D. (1986). Effects of marital and cross-generational alliances on the adjustment and separation of late adolescents (Doctoral dissertation, Texas Tech University, 1986). Dissertation Abstracts International, 47, 2162B.

Gough, H. G., & Heilbrun, A. B. (1980). The adjective check list manual. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Gustav, A. (1971). Ritual in families of dissident and nondissident students. Psychological Reports, 28, 563-567.

Hill, J. P., & Holmbeck, G. N. (1986). Attachment and autonomy during adolescence. In G. J. Whitehurst (Ed.), Annals of child development (Vol. 3, pp. 145-190). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Hoffman, J. A. (1984). Psychological separation of late adolescents from their parents. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30, 170-178.

Hoffman, J. A., & Weiss, B. (1987). Family dynamics and presenting problems in college students. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34, 157-163.

Jensen, E. W., James, S. A., Boyce, W. T., & Hartnett, S. A. (1983). The family routines inventory: Development and validation. Social Science Medicine, 17, 201-211.

The joy of family rituals. (1981). McCall's, 110, pp. 8-12.

Kantor, D., & Lehr, W. (1975). Inside the family. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Klapp, O. E. (1959). Ritual and family solidarity. Social Forces, 212-214.

Levine, M. S. (1977). Canonical analysis and factor comparison. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Lindeman, R. H., Merenda, P. F., & Gold, R. Z. (1980). Introduction to bivariate and multivariate analysis. Dallas: Scott, Foresman, & Company.

Lopez, F. G., Campbell, V. L., & Watkins, C. E. (1986). Depression, psychologial separation, and college adjustment: An investigation of sex differences. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33, 52-56.

Mahler, M. S., Pine, F., & Bergman, A. (1975). The psychological birth of the human infant. New York: Basic Books.

Meredith, W. H., Abbott, D. A., Lamanna, M. A., & Sanders, G. (1988). The value of rituals to strengthening families: A three generation study. Unpublished manuscript.

Miller, I. W., Epstein, N. G., Bishop, D. S., & Keitner, G. I. (1985). The McMaster family assessment device: Reliability and validity. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 11, 345-356.

Minuchin, S. (1974). Families and family therapy. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Minuchin, S., & Fishman, H. C. (1981). Family therapy techniques. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Moore, D., & Hotch, D. F. (1981). Late adolescents' conceptualizations of home-leaving. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 10, 1-10.

Moore, D., & Hotch, D. F. (1983). The importance of different home-leaving strategies to late adolescents. Adolescence, 18, 413-416.

Moos, R. H., & Moos, B. S. (1981). Family environment scale. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Moos, R. H., & Moos, B. S. (1986). Family environment scale manual (2nd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Nichols, M. P. (1984). Family therapy: Concepts and methods. New York: Gardner Press.

Olson, D. H., McCubbin, H. I., Barnes, H., Larsen, A., Muxen, M., & Wilson, M. (1983). Families: What makes them work. Los Angeles: Sage Publishing.

Olson, D. H., Portner, J., & Bell, R. Q. (1982). FACES II: Family adaptability and cohesion evaluation scales. Family Social Science, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Olson, D. H., Portner, J., & Lavee, Y. (1985). FACES III. Family Social Science, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Olson, D. E., Sprenkle, D. H., & Russell, C. S. (1979). Circumplex model of marital and family systems: I. Cohesion and adaptability dimensions, family types, and clinical application. Family Process, 18, 3-29.

Reiss, D. (1982). The working family: A researcher's view of health in the household. American Journal of Psychiatry, 139, 1412-1420.

Schvaneveldt, J. D., & Lee. T. F. (1983). The emergence and practice of ritual in the American family. Family Perspective, 17, 137-143.

Shipman, G. (1982). Handbook for family analysis. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Steinberg, L., & Silverberg, S. B. (1985, August). The vicissitudes of autonomy in early adolescence. Paper presented at the meeting of the Americal Psychological Association, Los Angeles, CA.

Stewart, D. K., & Love, W. A. (1968). A general canonical correlation index. Psychological Bulletin, 70, 160-163.

Stinnett, N., & DeFrain, J. (1985). Secrets of strong families. Boston: Little, Brown, & Company.

Sullivan, K., & Sullivan, A. (1980). Adolescent-parent separation. Developmental Psychology, 16, 93-99.

Tabachnik B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1983). Using multivariate statistics. New York: Harper & Row.

Traditions: Why some live with it and others can't. (1971). House & Garden, 140, pp. 52-86.

Vanishing rituals of childhood. (1985, March 4). Newsweek.

Wechter, S. L. (1983). Separation difficulties between parents and young adults. Social Casework: The Journal of Contemporary Social Work, 64, 97-104.

Wolin, S. J., & Bennett, L. A. (1984). Family rituals. Family Process, 23, 401-420.

Wolin, S. J., Bennett, L. A., & Jacobs, J. S. (1988). Assessing family rituals in alcoholic families. In E. Imber-Black, J. Roberts, & R. Whiting (Eds.), Rituals in Families and Family Therapy (pp. 230-256). New York: Norton Press.

Wolin, S. J., Bennett, L. A., & Noonan, D. L. (1979). Family rituals and the recurrence of alcoholism over generations. American Journal of Psychiatry, 136, 589-593.

Wolin, S. J., Bennett, L. A., Noonan, D. L., & Teitelbaum, M. A. (1980). Disrupted family rituals: A factor in the intergenerational transmission of alcoholism. Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 41, 199-214.

APPENDIX A

EXPANDED LITERATURE REVIEW

The present investigation has sought to more fully address the phenomenon of family ritualization as it impacts on the family and on members who are in the process of separating from the family. In doing so, several concepts from psychoanalytic, developmental, and family systems theories have been linked together, forming the basis for the hypotheses tested in the study. An expanded literature review addressing each of these concepts individually and in concert is presented in this section. First is a brief review of the various survey and descriptive studies which endeavor to define and categorize types of family rituals, as well as delineating the importance of rituals in the quality of family life. Attention is then directed toward empirical studies which address the link between family rituals and certain family functioning variables, such as family cohesion and stability. Finally, a conceptual bridge is formed between these studies and literature which examines family relations and the separation process of members as they reach adolescence and eventually leave the family. Thus, the relationships among family ritualization, family cohesion and family functioning, and individual autonomy and adjustment are herein presented as they have been examined thus far in the literature. This review serves as the backdrop from which the present study has emerged.

Descriptive Studies on Family Rituals

Several investigators have attempted to delineate the patterns and behaviors which constitute the phenomenon alternately labeled family rituals, traditions, or family routines. Bossard and Boll (1950) in

their classic investigation of family rituals based on over four hundred case records defined the phenomenon in this way:

> The term "ritual" is used in this study to mean a prescribed procedure, arising out of family interaction, involving a pattern of defined behavior, which is directed toward some specific end or purpose, and acquires rigidity and a sense of rightness as a result of its continuing history. (p. 29)

Similarly, Wolin, Bennett, Noonan, and Teitelbaum (1980) defined a family ritual as "a symbolic form of communication which, owing to the satisfaction that family members experience through its repetition, is acted out in a systematic fashion over time" (p. 210). While other definitions could be cited as well, these will suffice in conveying what Boyce, Jensen, James, and Peacock (1983) perceived as being key elements characterizing family rituals: prescribed group behavior which is repetitive, affirms something of value, and conveys a meaning beyond its functional purpose. Boyce et al. contrasted rituals with family routines, which are also repetitive family behaviors that occur with predictable regularity, but which lack symbolic meaning.

In an attempt to reconcile the differences among terms and observed behaviors, Wolin and Bennett (1984) provide a classification of family rituals including the subcategories celebrations, traditions, and patterned family interactions. While each category includes practices and events that vary in the level of symbolism and the particular end being served, in a collective sense, all of these family rituals seem to serve the function of promoting cohesiveness and defining the family identity. Although distinctions exist in the particular activities categorized into each type (e.g., particular holiday observances under "celebrations," a regular dinner routine under "patterned family

interactions"), this review will focus on family rituals as a more or less unitary phenomenon, and will largely ignore categorical differences among types. For example, the family routines being investigated by Boyce et al. (1983) and Jensen, James, Boyce, and Hartnett (1983) appear analogous to Wolin and Bennett's (1984) patterned family interactions. However, the implications of each of these phenomena as elucidated by these studies shall be described in this paper under the general rubric of family rituals.

Along these lines, several descriptive studies have elucidated the value of family rituals in terms of the functions they serve for the family. Reiss (1982) posited that family routines operate to conserve the family paradigm, which he defines as the "underlying assumptions, convictions, and beliefs that each family holds about its environment" (p. 1412). Bossard and Boll (1950) described the advantages of rituals in the life of the family in terms of promoting integration and harmony. Others have noted that rituals serve to promote solidarity, cohesion, continuity, and a sense of family identity and pride (Shipman, 1982); while still other investigators emphasize the stability and continuity that family routines provide the family during periods of stress or change (Boyce et al., 1983; Jensen et al., 1983). A common thread which ties all of these studies together is the emphasis on cohesion and family identity which are fostered through the family's commitment to rituals and traditions (Bossard & Boll, 1950; Schvaneveldt & Lee, 1983; Shipman, 1982; Wolin & Bennett, 1984). Not surprisingly, Bossard and Boll (1950) pronounced family rituals to be "the core of family culture" and an index to the level of family cohesion and integration (p. 11).

Empirical Research on Family Rituals and Routines

A few studies have endeavored to empirically validate the link between family rituals and the level of family cohesion and solidarity via survey and correlational approaches. In an early investigation of the phenomenon, Klapp (1959) designed a study to assess the quantity and types of ritual reported by college students concerning their families, as well as attempting to test the hypothesized relationship between family rituals and family solidarity. After providing an initial sample of 60 undergraduates from sociology classes with examples of rituals, Klapp asked these subjects to report all practices from their own families which they deemed had ritualistic significance. Responses were compiled into a check list of 26 commonly noted family activities (no criteria were reported for this compilation) that was then presented to a sample of 162 students. Examples from the checklist of rituals included Thanksgiving and Christmas dinners, birthday gifts, saying grace at meals, and visiting relatives. The students were then asked to check the activities which regularly occurred in their families and rate their importance, e.g., much, some, little, none. These ratings, which were assigned numerical values, were then correlated with the ratings obtained from a questionnaire assessing family solidarity obtained from the same sample sometime prior to the discussion of family rituals. While no group means or standard deviations were reported, Klapp noted a significant correlation coefficient of .39 for the two sets of scores, thus indicating a moderate relationship between the two variables. The author also reported a correlation of .44 obtained from a second more

heterogeneous sample of 153 individuals, including school teachers, Navy enlisted men, and upper level college students.

A second study which provides evidence of a link between family rituals and family cohesion was conducted by Gustav (1971). The study was designed to assess whether the presence of rituals gave evidence of cohesiveness, and also to investigate differences in the quantity and types of rituals practiced in the families of two differing student populations. One group was a sample of 158 university students many of whom had participated in dissident activities resulting in disruption and damage. The other group was a sample of 277 students from a neighboring college who had no history of disruptive activities other than participation in a "peaceful" student strike which involved no damage. The subjects were asked to "Describe something which has become a ritual in your family, i.e., some event, type of activity, or relationship, which has become a recurrent pattern, a set way of doing things in your family" (p. 28).

The results were categorized into 11 ritual areas. These ritual categories included meals, holidays and special events, household chores, religious observance, positive and negative communication between generations, interactions with other relatives, TV, and recreation and vacations. Gustav also included a "miscellaneous" category and one for "absence of ritual." The data were then analyzed using a chi square to test for differences in the percentages of each group responding with examples of rituals in each of the particular categories.

Gustav noted first of all that emphasis on the family and doing things together as a family appeared to be valued by both the dissident and non-dissident students. This conclusion is based on the similarly low percentage in each group reporting an absence of rituals in their families (6% for dissident subjects and 5% for nondissidents). However, results indicated a significant chi square difference (X^2 = 5.33, p <.01) in the percentage of dissident and nondissident students' (16% and 9% respectively) reporting "negative communication between spouses" as a ritual. This difference suggests that while cohesion may have been equally valued or desired by the subjects in the two groups, there were likely differences in the actual level present in each of the two groups' families.

This conclusion is strengthened by taking into account the remaining results as well. A significantly higher percentage of nondissident students reported ritual experiences involving meals, positive communication between generations, and holidays and special events, while dissident students reported a significantly higher percentage of TV watching. Further differences in the level of ritualization endorsed by the families of these two groups, might have been noted had subjects been asked to recall as many as they could, rather than one ritual as directed. Such differences might have provided further indication of cohesion level differences between the two groups.

A third study conducted by Jensen et al. (1983) provides an estimate of the relationship between ritualization and family cohesion which is comparable to that noted by Klapp (1959). Additionally, the

research conducted by Boyce, Jensen, and their colleagues emphasizes the protective and stabilizing functions served by routines in families. The purpose of the investigation was to formulate an inventory that would assess family routines. The authors had previously conducted ethnographic family observations and a pilot study that indicated family routines as a possible mediating variable affecting the family's vulnerability to stress and illness (Boyce et al., 1983). Thus the authors derived their inventory to reflect the following stated theoretical perspective:

> ...family routines may be viewed as behavioral units of family life which provide order and structural integrity to the course of daily events. The presence of these routines would be expected to buffer the impact of stressful experiences impinging on the family and to protect its members against ill health by fostering a sense of stability, cohesion, and overall satisfaction with family life. (Jensen et al., 1983, p. 201)

In the initial step in the derivation of the inventory, investigators interviewed a stratified sample of 52 families randomly chosen from a pediatric clinic. This interview data resulted in a listing of 104 family routines. The list was then presented to a stratified sample of 260 mothers who were asked to rate the routines for their importance in "keeping a family strong" along an 11-point scale. Twenty-eight routines were selected for inclusion in the inventory based on their meeting the following criteria: (1) median value for each routine was equal to or greater than 6.5 on the 11-point scale for importance in "keeping a family strong," (2) routines had a restricted range indicating a high level of consensus as to the routine's importance (interquartile range not to exceed 5.5), and (3) routines selected did not reflect significant racial or class differences, given

previous literature suggesting that the presence and importance of family routines was not dependent on racial or social class boundaries (Boyce et al., 1983).

Next, the authors investigated the reliability and validity properties of the inventory. Test-retest reliability yielded a correlation coefficient of .79 for a sample of 271 mothers who were administered the inventory on two occasions approximately 30 days apart. Inventory scores from the validity sample of 307 mothers (36 of these subjects did not return the second inventory and thus were not included in the reliability analysis) were then subjected to correlational analyses to determine the construct validity of the inventory. While no group mean scores or standard deviations were listed for the various scales being correlated with the Family Routines Inventory (FRI), several important relationships were noted. Jensen et al. correlated the FRI with several subscales from another reportedly reliable and valid family environment scale (Moos, Insel, & Humphrey, 1974--cf. Jensen et al., 1983) which included a cohesion index. Also the scores from the FRI were correlated with a scale assessing family life satisfaction. Jensen et al. reported a Spearman's rho correlation of .35 ($p < .001$) for the FRI and the cohesion index, indicating a moderate relationship similar to that noted earlier by Klapp (1959). Also of interest was the fact that the level of family routinization as assessed by the FRI correlated significantly with the level of reported family life satisfaction ($r = .33$, $p < .001$).

Studies by Curran (1983) and Stinnett and DeFrain (1985) provide further support for the importance of family rituals and traditions in

enhancing a family's strength and stability. The object of study for the researchers was families who had been identified as "strong" or "healthy," so as to elucidate those common qualities which accounted for the families' health.

Curran's (1983) approach involved surveying 551 professionals from a variety of fields who work closely with families, e.g., educators, church leaders, physicians, and family counselors. These professionals were questioned concerning their perceptions of traits commonly found in healthy families. Having derived a survey instrument listing some 56 possible traits, Curran asked her participants, based on their daily contact and work with a variety of families, to indicate those traits which they typically found in healthy families. Their responses were evaluated on a percentage basis for the frequency of selection from the 56 items. Included in Curran's final compilation of the 15 most commonly endorsed traits was the item "has a strong sense of family in which rituals and traditions abound" (p. 199). This item was ranked eighth in terms of frequency of selection by the professionals from the original 56 traits. Also included in the final 15 "traits of a healthy family" was specific emphasis on mealtime rituals as evidenced by the thirteenth-ranked item "fosters family table time and conversation" (p. 31).

In a similar vein, Stinnett and DeFrain (1985) derived a compilation of six qualities characterizing "strong families" using their Families Strength Inventory to assess a total of 3000 families. Their research has involved several national and international studies over the last decade and a half. Among the conclusions they drew, these

authors stated that strong families often made reference to their reliance on family traditions for maintaining a sense of who they were, a feeling of continuity, and as a means for staying in contact with each other. The congruence between Curran's and Stinnett and DeFrain's findings, that among those qualities characterizing healthy families was a strong commitment to rituals and traditions, is important given the multitude of possible family functioning variables which could have been included.

Another study which examined the value of rituals for strengthening families was conducted recently by Meredith, Abbott, Lamanna, and Sanders (1988). These researchers operationalized a strong family as one possessing cohesiveness, effective communication, and the ability to resolve problems. They utilized the Family Strengths Scale (Olson, Larson, & McCubbin, 1982--cf. Meredith et al., 1988) to assess these characteristics. Rituals were measured utilizing a checklist of activities which were rated for importance. Additional questions rated ritual participation for its perceived value for "building strong, successful families," and in terms of positive versus negative aspects of ritual participation. Participants in the study numbered 721 family members which included samples of students from two midwestern universities (n = 224), their parents (n = 266), and their grandparents (n = 231). Meredith et al.'s findings indicated that perceived family strength was significantly positively correlated with the number of rituals engaged in by families (r = .23), the importance given to rituals (r = .28), and the reporting of more positive than negative aspects of ritual participation, t = 11.53, $p < .001$. Significant

gender and generational differences were also reported regarding an individual's endorsement of the importance of rituals for family strength. Women across generations rated greater importance for rituals than did men, $F = 10.72$, $p < .001$. Additionally, each generation from child to grandparent reported increasingly more importance for family rituals in building strong families, $F = 11.4$, $p < .001$.

A final body of research investigating the impact of family ritualization on family functioning involves the work of Wolin, Bennett, and their colleagues. Initial studies (Wolin, Bennett, & Noonan, 1979; Wolin, Bennett, Noonan, & Teitelbaum, 1980) involved an investigation of 25 middle to upper-middle class families in which at least one parent was a problem drinker or alcoholic according to criteria outlined in the study. The research was designed to assess changes in the rituals in these families as affected by the period of heaviest drinking, and relate these changes to the occurrence of alcoholism in succeeding generations in these families. Members of the families, including both parents and any grown children who were willing ($N = 63$), were interviewed regarding alcohol history and, in a subsequent session, interviewed concerning family practices during the childrearing years in seven areas of family life (e.g., dinnertime, holidays, etc.). These interviews were coded in such a way as to answer two questions: (a) what rituals were present in what family life areas, (b) how were these rituals affected during the alcoholic parent's period of heaviest drinking.

Families were divided into three categories based on the degree of change noted in the rituals reported: distinctive families in which no

overall change occurred (n = 8), intermediate subsumptive families in which change occurred in roughly half of the family's rituals (n = 10), and subsumptive families in which generally all rituals were altered (n = 7). Chi square analyses and Fisher's Exact Test were then conducted to determine differences in the amount of alcoholism transmission to the next generation that occurred in each of these groups. No group means and standard deviation differences were presented; however, the authors reported a significantly higher percentage of alcoholic transmission in subsumptive families in which ritualization was greatly altered, as compared with the distinctive families ($p < .025$).

The authors concluded that families which have not maintained their rituals during a period of problematic parental drinking are at greater risk for producing children who later develop alcohol problems than are families whose rituals remain intact. Thus, ritual preservation in alcoholic families appears to be a specific example in which rituals serve a protective, stabilizing function. According to Wolin et al. (1979, 1980), families are able to buffer themselves from the disruptive effects of the parent's alcohol-related behavior by protecting their daily routines and most valued activities.

A later study by these researchers (Bennett, Wolin, Reiss, & Teitelbaum, 1987) replicated and extended these findings by including additional predictor variables to their model. Besides looking at ritual disruption in families of origin of alcoholic and nonalcoholic offspring, the present study included an examination of in-marrying spouses' family alcohol and ritual histories, and the new couple's process of establishing their own ritual heritage.

The sample was comprised of 68 married children from 30 origin families. The origin families had at least one problem-drinking or alcoholic parent when the children were growing up, and were also intact families during that period. Nine origin family variables addressed the ritual background of both the grown child and spouse, the sex of the alcoholic parent vis-a-vis the sex of the grown child, alcoholism history in the spouse's parents, and the birth position of the grown child. Also included in the analyses were five nuclear family variables (referring to the 68 couples) which addressed the couple's choice of family heritage for use in developing their own ritual heritage, the degree of "deliberateness" used by the couple in forming their ritual practices, and the degree of contact maintained with the grown child's origin family.

These 14 predictor variables were entered into a multiple regression analysis in order to predict the single criterion variable of transmission of alcoholism to the couple. When the variables were entered in order of the amount of variance accounted for in predicting the criterion variable, five contributed most substantially. These included: (1) child is son of an alcoholic father (risk factor; $\underline{F}$ = 10.63, $\underline{p} < .002$); (2) high level of deliberateness in family heritage (protective factor, $\underline{F}$ = 8.66, $\underline{p} < .006$); (3) spouse's family dinner ritual level high (protective factor; $\underline{F}$ = 5.30; $\underline{p} < .02$); (4) child's family dinner ritual kept distinctive (protective factor; $\underline{F}$ = 4.09, $\underline{p} < .05$); and (5) spouse's family has an alcoholic parent (risk factor; $\underline{F}$ = 3.17; $\underline{p} < .08$). From these results, the authors again emphasized the importance of ritual maintenance and the deliberateness in planning and

carrying out rituals in the formation of a new family. This study provides additional evidence that a strong ritual heritage serves to protect and stabilize the family during periods of stress and difficulty, thereby enhancing family functioning.

Models of Family Functioning and Cohesion

The previously discussed research provides validating evidence for the positive contribution of rituals to the quality of family life, particularly in fostering cohesiveness, strength and stability, and a sense of family identity. Important to consider is how the study of family rituals fits into existing models of healthy family functioning. Several family systems theorists have outlined models of family functioning which address family cohesiveness and the individuality of family members, concepts relevant to the present study of family rituals.

Perhaps the most widely familiar of the various family systems perspectives is Minuchin's (1974) structural family theory. In his discussion of a family model, Minuchin first notes that individual identity formation occurs within the family, thus he characterizes the family as the "matrix of identity" (p. 47). According to Minuchin, one's identity develops from the opposing elements of experiencing a sense of belonging and a sense of being separate. Thus, as members participate in the family as part of various subsystems (e.g., parental, marital, sibling) and also engage in extrafamilial groups, they experience the belonging aspect of identity. Separateness and individuality are experienced as members' needs for space, autonomy, and

being different from other family members are also accommodated. According to Minuchin, the family's essential tasks are to promote the individuation of its members in the context of experiencing belonging in the family (Minuchin & Fishman, 1981). In order to accomplish these functions, a family must have a workable structure.

According to Minuchin (1974), family structure is the "invisible set of functional demands that organizes the ways in which family members interact" (p. 51). The family operates by transactional patterns that serve to regulate members' behavior. Essentially, transactional patterns are repeated interactions that define who members are in relation to each other and how they are to behave in specific contexts. Both universal rules regarding family organization, such as power hierarchies distinguishing parents and children, and also idiosyncratic expectations among family members enter into the development of transactional patterns. Some similarities are evident between Minuchin's transactional patterns and the family routines (Boyce et al., 1983; Jensen et al., 1983) and patterned family interactions (Wolin & Bennett, 1984) discussed earlier. One distinguishing aspect appears to lie in the degree of symbolic meaning associated with a family's rituals. Patterned interactions and family routines, in addition to being instrumental in the smooth operation of the system, become emotionally satisfying and significant to the family as they become ritualized and come to embody a family's values.

Within Minuchin's model, a key concept for understanding family structure and for evaluating the effectiveness of family functioning is the notion of boundaries. Operating as often unstated rules concerning

participation, boundaries regulate access to and interaction between family subsystems. Subsystems consist of individuals, dyads, and larger groups into which the family divides in order to carry out it functions. In addition to each family member being a subsystem, subsystems may be formed by generation, gender, or common interests. Clear boundaries allow access while serving to protect the differentiation and integrity of subsystems.

Boundaries range from being rigid to diffuse. Too little interaction may result from overly rigid boundaries that restrict access and communication, a situation which Minuchin denotes as "disengaged." Disengagement permits individuals and subsystems to be relatively autonomous, and wide variations in family members are tolerated by the system. However, rigid boundaries also limit access to affection and nurturance. Additionally, protective functions of the family may be hampered, as noted by Minuchin (1974): "only a high level of individual stress can reverberate strongly enough to activate the family's supportive systems" (p. 55). In the other extreme, highly permeable or diffuse boundaries may result in subsystems' being "enmeshed." Enmeshment in subsystems or families is characterized by a tight interlocking and lack of differentiation of members. Opportunities for autonomy and individual mastery of problems are sacrificed due to the overemphasis on belonging and the high sensitivity to variations from what is familiar or acceptable. Most families, however, are conceived of as falling within the broad normal range between these extremes in boundaries. Minuchin (1974) also notes that movement along this

continuum is common as families adapt to developmental changes and transitions in the family life cycle.

Minuchin (1974) does not specifically make reference to the term "cohesiveness" in his discussion of family functioning. How closely related this concept is to Minuchin's concepts of disengagement and enmeshment is unclear. As discussed above, the latter represent extremes on a continuum of rigid to diffuse boundaries. In his comparative analysis of various theories of family functioning, Nichols (1984) notes that boundaries serve a critical function in protecting the cohesiveness of individuals, subgroups, and families. Presented in this light, cohesion appears to be referring to the internal integrity and connectedness of subsystems, while boundaries address issues of differentiation and access between subsystems. Aponte and VanDeusen (1981) in their analysis of structural family therapy state "the ability of a family to function well depends on the degree to which the family structure is well-defined, elaborated, flexible, and cohesive" (p. 315).

Whether family cohesion is a dimension which is linearly associated with adaptive and healthy functioning, or a concept which represents levels of interpersonal involvement in which too much ("enmeshed") or too little ("disengaged") may be dysfunctional appears to be an empirical question yet unresolved. Minuchin's theoretical position appears to be the latter, and other family theorists and researchers present similar perspectives (Olson, Sprenkle, & Russell, 1979; Epstein, Bishop, & Levin, 1978). However, research addressing family cohesion levels as related to effective functioning have yielded conflicting results, as will be discussed in a later section.

Another family theorist whose views are relevant is Murray Bowen (1978). A key concept from Bowen's model of the family is the "undifferentiated family ego mass." This term is Bowen's description of families in which an extreme level of connectedness inhibits the appropriate initiative and independence of its members. Differentiation, according to Bowen, comes about as the resolution of opposing "individuality and togetherness forces." One's desires both for independence and for connection with others are counterbalanced in the "differentiated self," to the extent that one can be detached yet connected in one's own family.

Kantor and Lehr's (1975) psychopolitical model of families is an effort at comprehensively understanding and delineating normal (as opposed to clinical or pathological) family processes. These researchers' coining of the term "psychopolitics" reflects their interest in identifying the ways in which the family affects the individual and reciprocally, the individual impacts the family. Thus they note,

> the term "psychopolitics" itself - "psycho" representing the interior person and "politics" representing observable family interactions - is an expression of our concern for connecting analyses of family system matters with personal system goals and behavior. (p. 179)

Their view of the family is an open system with feedback, homeostasis, disequilibrium, and adaptation as operating principles, given the dynamic rather than static nature of families.

Kantor and Lehr (1975) identify three subsystems which interface with each other and with the environment outside the family: the family-unit subsystem, the interpersonal subsystem, and the personal

subsystem. Theirs is a "distance-regulation" model, wherein the task of the family is to negotiate connections and appropriate distances between subsystems, so that individual members and the family as a whole may pursue access to certain goals. Kantor and Lehr identify three primary goals, or target dimensions: affect, power, and meaning. Access to these goals is negotiated via family strategies. These represent the various distance-regulation patterns of members' recurring acts and interactions as they pursue their goals through the media of space, time, and energy.

Kantor and Lehr (1975) make no assertions as to appropriate, or conversely dysfunctional, levels of cohesion. Rather, ranges of closeness and distance (the terms their model uses) are negotiated according to a family's typal design. They identify three prototypic homeostatic models. These three family types have been labeled closed, open, and random. They represent three distance-regulation styles with differing core purposes, ideals, and flaws. However, within their differing styles, all are seen as pursuing the goals of affect, power, and meaning. Although family rituals are not a specific focus of Kantor and Lehr's theory, it is interesting to note the parallels between their identified target goals in families, particularly affect and meaning, and the benefits sought by a family's participation in rituals and traditions.

The three previous models, while not using the specific term "cohesion," have included in their description of normal family functioning some reference to the level of closeness or connectedness members experience within the family. As noted earlier, many family

theorists share the perspective that cohesion in families should exist in some optimal mid-range or moderate level so that members may also develop autonomy and individuality. Minuchin (1974) and Bowen (1978) in particular have elaborated this view of family cohesiveness as having a curvilinear association with health/pathology in the context of their clinical work with dysfunctional families.

Another systemic model of family functioning that makes explicit the theorists' alignment with this perspective of cohesion is the Circumplex Model of Marital and Family Systems (Olson et al., 1979). These family researchers surveyed the myriad concepts addressing marital and family dynamics within the field of family therapy. Through inductive methods and factor analysis, they developed a unifying model based on three underlying dimensions which they labeled cohesion, adaptability, and communication. Cohesion and adaptability are positioned orthogonally on axes representing ranges in pathological and healthy functioning along these two dimensions. Mid-ranges on both dimensions are considered optimal. Communication is conceptualized as a facilitating dimension that is important for movement on the other two.

Olson, McCubbin, and their associates (Olson et al., 1983) define family cohesion as "the emotional bonding that family members have toward one another" (p. 48). According to the Circumplex Model, there are four levels of cohesion, ranging from disengaged (very low), to separated (low moderate), to connected (moderately high), to enmeshed (very high). In a similar fashion, adaptability is conceived of as a curvilinear dimension, ranging from rigid (very low), to structured, to flexible, to chaotic (very high). Adaptability refers to the extent to

which a family is flexible and can change in response to developmental transitions or other situational strains and stresses.

By plotting families along the four levels of each of these two dimensions, Olson and his colleagues have developed a way of typifying family functioning into sixteen possible types. According to the model, families that score at the central levels on both dimensions are labeled "balanced" (four types) and are hypothesized as having the highest level of functioning across the family life cycle. Families whose scores place them at one of the extreme poles on each of the cohesion and adaptability axes are categorized as "extreme" (four types) and are seen as having the lowest level of functioning. "Mid-range" families (eight types) are extreme on only one dimension and fall somewhat in between the balanced and extreme groups in terms of adequacy of functioning. Assessments concerning families' levels of cohesion and adaptability are made using an instrument devised for this purpose: the Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scale (FACES) which has seen two revisions (FACES II - Olson, Portner, & Bell, 1982; FACES III - Olson, Portner, & Lavee, 1985).

Two other major investigations of family dynamics have developed models linking aspects of family functioning, and have also devised instruments for assessing these variables which include a measure of cohesion. The McMaster Family Assessment Devise (FAD; Epstein, Baldwin, & Bishop, 1983), based on the McMaster Model of Family Functioning (Epstein, Bishop, & Levin, 1978), appears to be in agreement with the Circumplex Model regarding moderate levels of family cohesiveness as being optimal. "Affective involvement," the analogous concept

identified by Epstein et al. (1983), is defined as "the extent to which family members are interested in and place value on each other's activities and concerns" (p. 173). These researchers note that the healthiest families evidence intermediate involvement levels that are neither too high ("symbiotic involvement") nor too low ("lack of involvement"). In apparent disagreement with this perspective is the Family Environment Scale (FES; Moos & Moos, 1986) which was devised to assess a family's social environment. The cohesion subscale on this instrument concerns the "degree of commitment, help, and support family members provide for one another" (p. 2). Moos and Moos (1986) cite several studies in which FES measurements of high family cohesion have been associated with marital adjustment, satisfaction with family life, and higher self-esteem among adolescents.

Research on Family Cohesion

As noted earlier, research investigating the relationships between family cohesion and health/pathology in individual and family functioning has yielded conflicting results. Olson et al. (1983) cite several studies which appear to provide empirical support for the Circumplex Model and in particular for the hypothesized curvilinear relationship between cohesion and healthy family functioning. However, Miller, Epstein, Bishop, and Keitner (1985), in their validation study of the FAD, reported a linear relationship with the FACES II cohesion and adaptability measures, such that healthy scores on the FAD fell within the chaotic and enmeshed ranges on the FACES II. These results are consistent with the linear relationship that was also found between

the FACES II and three measures of marital and family satisfaction in an extensive study of "normal" families by Olson, McCubbin, and their colleagues (Olson et al., 1983). Highest satisfaction was reported by those families whose FACES II scores placed them in the chaotic and enmeshed ranges of adaptability and cohesion, respectively. Moreover, these correlations held true for families across all stages of the family life cycle and were strongest for couples with children still in the home.

A possible explanation for the results of these two studies is offered by Olson et al. (1985). They suggested that the hypothesized curvilinear relationship between the FACES II dimensions and health/pathology may only be found with "problem" families. With "normal" families, it appears that high levels of cohesion and adaptability are linearly associated with better family functioning. Garner (1986) also found this linear relationship to exist between family cohesion levels and late adolescents' college adjustment and psychological separation (a measure of independence) from their parents. This last study's findings are particularly relevant to the current research and the variables being investigated.

A key to understanding the discrepancies in theoretical conceptualizations and research findings related to family cohesion may lie in a family's ability to adjust cohesiveness to fit the demands of the various stages across the family life cycle. Both individual and family developmentalists have identified stages through which individuals and families progress (Erikson, 1968; Barcai, 1981). Several of the above noted systems models make specific references to

the importance of looking at aspects of family functioning in the context of the family's current developmental stage and the tasks and strains therein (Minuchin & Fishman, 1981; Kantor & Lehr, 1975; Olson et al., 1983).

An application of this awareness of developmental transitions and the family's need to be adaptable is pertinent to the focus of the present study on family rituals. Family rituals which are flexibly adapted across the family life cycle would be expected to be more relevant and effective in fostering cohesion levels that are appropriate to a family's changing developmental needs. Wolin et al. (1988) refer to the adolescent period in a family's life cycle as a critical time for ritual adaptation. These researchers note:

> The flexible family, we propose, adjusts its use of ritual to meet the needs of this phase of family development. Hollow rituals are dropped or altered to make use of current interests. Membership is adjusted as appropriate to include important new friends. Some rituals are maintained in spite of protests and, perhaps, without the protesting family members. They will be encouraged, without pressure, to return next year, when their attitude may very well be changed. If the ritual works its spell they will likely return. (p.250)

The Separation-Individuation Process

Having examined the literature linking family ritualization, level of family cohesion, and healthy family functioning, we now turn our attention to the implications family rituals have for the individual functioning of family members. Several theorists and researchers have noted the importance of an emphasis on family rituals in creating and communicating a strong sense of family and the family's identity Curran, 1983; Shipman, 1982; Wolin & Bennett, 1984; Wolin et al., 1988). Of particular interest are the effects of such an emphasis and the

resulting family cohesiveness in contributing to the individual identity of family members, and in affecting members' efforts at emancipating and separating from their family of origin.

The separation of late adolescents from their parents represents an important transitional phase in the life cycle of the family and in the adolescent's development towards becoming an adult. Separation is also an important stage in the often life-long process of individuation, in which one has consolidated an identity which is distinct from one's parents' or family identity, and one has developed the capability of meeting his or her own needs. Obviously adolescent separation is not to be equated with the geographical distancing of individuals from their families. Arnstein (1980) notes, however, that physical separation often serves to facilitate the process or to highlight conflicts if the emancipation process is not going smoothly.

The earliest conceptualizations, and perhaps most extensive writings, concerning separation and individuation have emerged from theorists within a psychoanalytic perspective. Margaret Mahler's work in this area is foundational. In The Psychological Birth of the Human Infant (Mahler, Pine, & Bergman, 1975), she defines "separation-individuation" as "the intrapsychic achievement of a sense of separateness from mother, and through that, from the world at large" (p. 4). While Mahler recognizes that this process is active throughout the life cycle, she uses the terms "separation" and "individuation" as specific theoretical concepts, each with reference to a particular accomplishment occurring during a delineated developmental period (ages 4-5 months to 30-36 months). "Separation" refers to the infant's

emergence from symbiotic fusion with the mother. This sense of separateness occurs through the infant's experiencing of his or her own body as distinct from the mother's. "Individuation" involves the child's beginning to assume his or her own individual characteristics. According to Mahler, the child's "identity" is actually the child's earliest awareness of being a distinct entity, an experiencing not of "who I am," but "<u>that</u> I am." It is clear from Mahler's writing that her formulation of the separation-individuation process does not include each new separation and step-wise development in the expanding of one's sense of self and one's identity at later ages. Other writers, however, have applied these terms to the tasks and accomplishments of later developmental stages, particularly adolescence.

In applying Mahler's concepts to adolescence, Blos (1967) designated this period as the "second individuation process." For Blos, who also reflects a psychoanalytic background, this process involves the loosening and restructuring of the adolescent's early infantile ties with the parents so that progressive ego differentiation can occur. Additionally, the adolescent's disengagement from internalized love objects (i.e., the parents) allows ties with extrafamilial love objects to be formed. This process is understandably often a tumultuous period for adolescents. In her treatise on adolescence, Anna Freud (1958/1969) suggested that the presence of peaceful growth and equilibrium during this period may be construed as abnormal. In an apparent consolation directed at the reader (particularly readers who are parents), Freud writes: "Few situations in life are more difficult to cope with than an

adolescent son or daughter during the attempt to liberate themselves" (p. 277).

Another writer in this area is Ausubel (Ausubel, Montemayor, & Svajian, 1977) whose theory concerning the development of autonomy involves several stages. He states autonomy begins with infancy and toddlerhood, wherein a shift occurs from the parents' catering to all of the infant's needs and demands to their beginning to expect the child to do things for him- or herself. A period of "satellization" ensues as the child is developing cognitively and is mastering new skills in self-care, yet realizes that he or she can not be completely autonomous. The resolution of this conflict is the child's acceptance of dependence on the parents for the time being. However, as the child reaches adolescence, the push for autonomy increases. According to Ausubel's theory, for most adolescents, emancipation from the parents eventually results only after an intervening stage of "resatellization." During this period, the adolescent transfers his or her loyalties from the parents to the peer group as a new source of earned status. The final stage of desatellization, or emancipation, occurs as the adolescent becomes independent of the parents and thus less reliant on them for derived status, having found new sources of status outside of the family. Ausubel, however, does not equate emancipation with attaining adult personality status. He believes the latter requires a degree of social recognition of the individual's readiness and capacity for assuming actual adult roles and responsibilities, including those of a socioeconomic nature. According to Ausubel, emancipation allows the adolescent to establish himself "as a person in his own right, apart

from his parents, prepared to strive for adult goals and willing to assume responsibility for the direction of his own affairs" (p. 198).

Family Variables Affecting Adolescent Separation and Autonomy

Several writers in this area have combined an awareness of developmental tasks at various stages with an understanding of the family's operation as a system, affecting and being affected by changes occurring in family members (Farley, 1979; Fulmer, Medalie, & Lord, 1982). As Wechter (1983) notes, from this perspective "separation becomes a systems issue" (p. 98). Thus she states that difficulties are inherent in the separation process, both for the parents as well as the adolescent. Parents and any remaining siblings are confronted with the task of letting go and regrouping as a family unit. The separating adolescent must deal with the anxiety of leaving his or her dependent roots and developing a perspective of himself and the environment which will enable accomplishments and relating with others. Completion of the separation task is not viewed by Wechter as simply cutting ties with one's family in order to become independent. Rather, she states that the process allows for individual family members to grow and develop within the context of restructured connections and mature, richer relationships.

Fulmer et al. (1982) describe the effects an adolescent's leaving home may have on various members of the family. Given the inevitability of mixed feelings and strains involved in any major transition which

involves both growth and loss, the adolescent's separation may trigger some systemic resistance to the changes occurring. Fulmer et al. outline four possible ways in which various members of the family may indirectly attempt to forestall dealing with the task of separation. The adolescent may begin to manifest some academic, emotional, or behavior problems so that the parents feel a need to become more involved again. Secondly, one of the parents in their experiencing of loss may become overtly depressed, while the other parent may mask his or her feelings and withdraw from the spouse. The adolescent may then feel compelled to be reinvolved in the system to provide support for the overtly depressed parent. Thirdly, the marital relationship may develop difficulties which may draw the adolescent back to an old role, or perhaps a newly created role, or mediator. Finally, another sibling may develop difficulties which serve to distract the other family members from their sense of loss and sadness or from problems being manifested between the parents.

Hill and Holmbeck (1986) have reviewed the literature regarding adolescent attachment and autonomy. In their review, they question the psychoanalytic view of autonomy as breaking free from parental ties and influence. They note that such a perspective places the process within the individual rather than addressing the changes in the relationship between parents and adolescent. Additionally, this perspective focuses on the absence of what was rather than what is or will be when "freedom" occurs. They suggest that changes in the adolescent's attachments both with the family and with peers, as well as the adolescent's development

of self-governance and self-regulation constitutes a more useful concept for viewing and researching the process of autonomy.

Steinberg and Silverberg's (1985) study of autonomy development in early adolescence provides such an operationalized perspective on the changes in the relationship between adolescents and their parents and peers. They investigated patterns among boys and girls, ages 10 to 16, in the areas of emotional ties with parents, resistance to peer pressure, and subjective perceptions of self-reliance. They noted that the process of autonomy development, rather than being a unidimensional trait manifested by the adolescent across situations, more surely involves changes in several aspects of the adolescent's view of self and his or her relations with others.

In a similar vein, Cooper, Grotevant, and Condon (1983) have formulated a model of individuation which links concepts of individuality and connectedness. Their model incorporates perspectives from the field of family therapy with developmental views of the family. They hypothesize that individuation is comprised of individuality and connectedness. Individuality is defined via two communication variables: self-assertion, which is the ability to express one's view, and separateness, which involves communicating differences in one's views in relation to another's views. The connectedness aspect of individuation is reflected by two factors: permeability, that is, expressing openness to the ideas of others, and mutuality, wherein one evidences sensitivity or respect when relating with others. From their research investigating the relationship between these aspects of family communications and a measure of adolescent identity exploration, they

concluded that both individuality and connectedness in family interaction are adaptive in the adolescent's development towards individuation. Their application of these ideas to the separation of late adolescents is important to note:

> Our findings suggest that the leaving process is facilitated by individuated family relationships, characterized by separateness, which gives the adolescent permission to develop his or her own point of view, in the context of connectedness, which provides a secure base from which the adolescent can explore worlds outside the family. (p. 56)

Separation of College Students

Several who work with late adolescents in their adjustment to having left home for college echo the views just presented regarding successful separation and adjustment. Arnstein (1980) remarks that for most late adolescents at the time they enter a university, they are "still immersed emotionally, psychologically, geographically, and usually financially in their family of origin" (p. 160). However, a transition generally occurs. Greater independence and the shaping of the young adult's identity are often achieved through his or her experience in the university. Arnstein believes that exercising choices regarding career, being exposed to individuals with divergent views and backgrounds, forming serious and intimate relationships with peers, and assuming care of oneself and the regulation of one's schedule and activities away from the family all contribute to the separation and maturing process.

Sullivan and Sullivan (1980) studied aspects of the separation process of late adolescents and its effects on the adolescent-parent relationship. In harmony with Cooper et al.'s (1983) views concerning

individuation, Sullivan and Sullivan perceived the developmental goal of late adolescence to be increasing one's autonomy in relation to parents, while maintaining affection and communication ties with them. The context of their study was a comparison between groups of parents and students just prior to and soon after the students entered college. In comparing 104 late adolescent males (ages 17-18) who left home to board at college with 138 males who remained at home and commuted to college, the researchers reported several significant findings.

Adolescents who left home to attend college reported increased affection, communication, independence, and satisfaction in their relationships with their parents as compared with commuters' reports of their relationships with their parents in these areas. From these findings the authors concluded that the initial separation of leaving home to attend college facilitated late adolescents' development in becoming functionally independent of their parents. Unfortunately, no behavioral or self-report measures of actual adjustment and functioning in college were included in the study. Such measures could have strengthened the validity of the boarding students' positive perceptions regarding their successful adaptation to separation.

Noting the relatively few number of studies concerning the late adolescent's experience in separating from his or her family, Moore and Hotch (1981) studied freshman college students' perceptions of leaving home. An initial group of 36 male and female students were requested to specify "how they knew (or would know) when they had left home" (p. 3) to determine how young adults define separation from family. Moore and Hotch then performed cluster analyses on the resulting 20 compiled

definitions using additional samples of students' dissimilarity ratings and evaluations from bipolar adjective scales which had been applied to the set of home-leaving definitions. Marked distinctions emerged among the resulting eight clusters. Definition clusters that were suggestive of emotional separation or dissociation from family were evaluated negatively by the students. Economic independence and personal control clusters received high ratings, with economic independence being rated most positively on various adjective dimensions (e.g., "not homesick, separate, competent, realistic, independent"). Thus, the researchers concluded that the most highly regarded mode of home-leaving involved economic independence, while emotional separation and dissociation were regarded least favorably. These findings are concordant with the theoretical views of Sullivan and Sullivan (1980) and Cooper et al. (1983) that the separation process optimally involves both an increasing independence from parents in the context of continuing affection and connectedness.

In a later study, Moore and Hotch (1983) extended their work to investigate which of the eight home-leaving conceptualizations (in addition to the four noted above: residence, physical separation, school affiliation, and graduation) were deemed the most important indicators of parent-adolescent separation. College students (ages 18-21) were asked to rate on a 9-point scale the original 20 definitions for each's importance in deciding whether they had left home. Items which clustered in the category of personal control were given significantly higher importance ratings than all other categories by both males and females ($p < .001$). Dissociation and emotional

separation were again evaluated significantly lower than all of the others, while economic independence and the remaining categories received similar ratings of moderate levels of importance (around the neutral mid-point of "5"). The authors noted that while behavioral indicants of independence, such as those included in the economic independence category (e.g., "have a job, financial independence") are regarded as important for separation, they do not, in isolation, necessarily indicate separation has occurred. This study suggests that when evaluated at a personal level, psychological aspects of separation, such as those represented by the personal control category (e.g., "less parental control, feel mature enough") appear to be of most importance to late adolescents.

In an effort to assess the construct of psychological separation in late adolescents, Hoffman (1984) devised the Psychological Separation Inventory (PSI). Extrapolating from the theoretical views of Mahler and Blos, Hoffman proposed four aspects underlying the separation process between adolescents and parents. Functional independence represents the individual's ability to manage and direct his or her affairs without help from parents. Attitudinal independence measures the degree to which one's beliefs, values, and attitudes are perceived as his or her own, apart from those of the parents. Conflictual independence assesses the degree of freedom from experiences of excessive anger, guilt, mistrust, anxiety, inhibition, responsibility, or resentment in relation to one's parents. Emotional independence reflects the individual's freedom from excessive needs for parental approval, closeness, and support.

In initial investigations using the scale, Hoffman (1984) reported a positive relationship between conflictual independence and adjustment in love relationships for males and females, and emotional independence from parents was positively related to better academic adjustment for both sexes. However, an inverse relationship was evidenced between attitudinal independence and a measure of general personal adjustment. Hoffman suggested this finding may mean that having similar attitudes as one's parents may foster a better parent-adolescent relationship with resultant better personal adjustment for the adolescent. The functional independence scale evidenced no significant correlation with the measure of personal adjustment, nor with the questions concerning academic problems or problems in love relationships.

In a later study, Hoffman and Weiss (1987) utilized two of the scales, emotional and conflictual independence, to investigate relationships between these aspects of psychological separation and college students' reports of problematic symptoms for themselves and also their reports of parental symptoms and conflict. Results indicated that the degree of conflictual dependence on either or both parents was positively related to the amount of emotional problems reported by the student, both for him- or herself and for the parents.

While these findings show some consistencies for the conflictual independence scale and its positive relationship with individual adjustment in various areas, relationships between the other scales and various aspects of individual adjustment and functioning remain unclear at present. In particular, studies investigating the relationship between psychological separation, as assessed by the attitudinal and

emotional independence scales, and measures of college adjustment have yielded conflicting results, as noted by Garner (1986). A study conducted by Lopez, Campbell, and Watkins (1986) found a significant negative correlation between college adjustment and scores on the functional, attitudinal, and emotional independence scale of the PSI for women only. No significant correlations between psychological separation and college adjustment emerged for men. However, Lopez et al. reported men evidenced significantly greater mean separation scores on the PSI than did women in their study. The size of their sample (N = 42) limits the reliability of their findings. However, this study, in conjunction with Garner's reports of contradictory findings, suggests the need for further investigation of these constructs and the relationships which may exist between them.

APPENDIX B

EXPANDED DETAILS OF METHOD

Reliability and Validity of Measures

Family Routines Inventory (FRI). Test-retest reliability for the frequency score over 30 days is reported as .79 (Jensen et al., 1983). Validity studies conducted by the authors indicated the FRI correlated significantly with a question concerning family life satisfaction (r = .33), and with several subscales from the Moos Family Environment Scale, including Cohesion (r = .35), Organization (r = .36), Control (r = .20), and Conflict (r = -.18).

Family Rituals Measure (FRM). A pilot study using an earlier version of this instrument provided some preliminary evidence of its utility in terms of reliability and validity. Spearman-Brown split-half correlation coefficients for the flexibility measures (i.e., three questions concerning changes in a family's rituals) ranged from .84 to .92, and from .87 to .89 for the level of commitment measures (i.e., two questions concerning frequency and importance of endorsed rituals). The scale also correlated significantly with a measure of cohesion from the FACES II, which replicates the relationship between family rituals and cohesion previously noted in the literature (Jensen et al., 1983; Klapp, 1959). The format of the FRM's earlier version was somewhat unwieldy and confusing to subjects in the pilot study, thus it was changed to the present form.

Family Environment Scale (FES). Reliability coefficients for internal consistency range from .67 to .78 for the five subscales used in the study (i.e., Cohesion, Expressiveness, Conflict, Control, and Organization). Test-retest reliabilities are reported as ranging

from .76 to .86 over a two-month period, .66 to .78 at 4 months, and .63 to .81 for 12 months. The authors also report low to moderate subscale intercorrelations (-.17 to .41). Several validity studies are reported in the FES manual (Moos & Moos, 1986) which provide support for the construct validity of the scale, including its utility in discriminating among types of families.

Family Assessment Device (FAD). The authors reported a Cronbach's alpha of .92 for the General Functioning subscale. Test-retest reliability for the General Functioning subscale at one week is reported as .71. The scale has also demonstrated adequate concurrent and predictive validity. Miller et al. (1985) reported the General functioning subscale correlated significantly with a "family integration" factor (r = .75) and an "adaptive coping" factor (r = .48) from another factor-analytically derived family assessment instrument, the Family Unit Inventory. Additionally the General Functioning subscale correlated significantly with the Adaptability (r = .61) and Cohesion (r = .50) dimensions of the FACES II. The FAD has also shown utility in distinguishing between psychiatric and nonclinical families (Miller et al., 1985).

Psychological Separation Inventory (PSI). Hoffman (1984) reported Cronbach's alphas for the scales ranging from .84 to .92 indicating high internal consistency. The mother scales correlated highly with the father scales in each of the four independence attributes (.71 to .91). Test-retest correlations for a sample of 26 males and 28 females over a two- to three-week period evidenced adequate reliability with a range of .74 to .96, excluding the Mother

Functional Independence scale. This scale evidenced the lowest test-retest reliability with correlations of .49 and .69 for males and females, respectively.

To evaluate the construct validity of the PSI, Hoffman (1984) correlated the scales with the Adjective Check List (ACL) Personal Adjustment scale (Gough & Heilbrun, 1980) and two questions designed to globally measure adjustment in the areas of work and love: (1) "I have problems with my academic courses," and (2) "I have problems with my love relationships" (p. 175). Higher PSI scores were expected to correlate significantly with better personal adjustment as measured by the ACL subscale, and with reports of fewer problems on the academic and love relationships questions.

Only the Conflictual Independence and the Emotional Independence scales evidenced correlations in line with Hoffman's predictions. Scores for Mother and Father Conflictual Independence correlated significantly with the love problems question for males and females (-.25 to -.38). Females also evidenced a significant relationship between Conflictual Independence from mother and father and personal adjustment on the ACL (.37 and .41). Emotional Independence from mother and father correlated significantly with fewer academic problems for males and females (-.25 to -.33). The Attitudinal Independence scale for both mother and father scores evidenced significant correlations with the love problems question for males and with the ACL Personal Adjustment scale for males and females. However, these relationships were in the opposite direction from Hoffman's prediction (i.e., Attitudinal Independence was negatively

associated with adjustment), thus calling into question the validity of this scale as Hoffman has originally conceptualized it. Similarly, the Functional Independence scale for mother and father failed to evidence construct validity in that no significant correlations with any of the adjustment measures emerged for either males or females. Thus, the PSI has been shown to have adequate reliability, with the exception of the Mother Functional Independence scale, and evidence of validity in regards to the Conflictual and Emotional Independence scales. Only the Conflictual and Emotional Independence scales were used in the present study.

Adjustment to College Scale (ACS). Baker and Siryk (1986) reported Cronbach's alphas for the full scale ranging from .93 to .95 across three administrations. Alpha levels for each of the subscales ranged from .84 to .91. Interscale correlations are reported as .36 to .64 for the three subscales that do not share common items (i.e., Academic Social, and Personal-Emotional). Baker and Siryk demonstrated construct and discriminant validity for the scale with significant correlations among the four aspects of college adjustment and several criterion variables which were expected to be differentially relevant to the various subscales. Criterion variables included attrition, freshman GPA, requests for psychological services, election to an academic honor society, involvement in social activities checklist, and applications for dormitory assistant positions. Additionally, several studies have provided support for the utility of the ACS in reflecting predicted

differences among students in terms of various college adjustment variables (see Baker & Siryk, 1986, for a review of these studies).

Reliability values were computed for each of the subscales used in the study for the sample of participants. Cronbach's alphas for the sample, as well as alpha values previously reported in the literature, are presented in Table B-1.

Out of Range Values

The original sample of 340 participants was administered six questionnaires with a total of 281 test items, resulting in a data set of 95,540 responses. One subject was dropped from the analyses due to 10 items being omitted from the PSI. Of the remaining participants, 42 individuals marked a total of 175 responses on the computer answer sheets which were outside the numerical ranges given for the test items. These out of range values represented less than .2% of the total data set and affected 12% of the sample. The following decision rules were used to accommodate these out of range values for the four questionnaires affected (i.e., ACS, FAD, FRI, and FES):

1. ACS--17 subjects used a range of 0 to 9 instead of 1 to 9. All 0's were converted to 1's, thus constricting the range for these subjects.

2. FAD--13 subjects used a range of 0 to 3 instead of 1 to 4. For these individuals, a constant of 1 was added to the ratings chosen to convert the range. An additional four subjects used a range of 0 to 4. The data from these four subjects was excluded from the analyses.

3. FRI--5 subjects used a range of 0 to 4 instead of 0 to 3. All 4's were converted to 3's, thus constricting the range for these subjects. An additional two subjects used a range of 1 to 4 instead of 0 to 3; a constant of 1 was subtracted to convert the range.

4. FES--2 subjects filled in a "2" on the answer sheets instead of using "0" or "1" for True/False. These responses were treated as missing data, and the sample mean for those test items was inserted.

TABLE B-1

SAMPLE RELIABILITIES OF SUBSCALE VARIABLES

Variables	Number of Items	Alpha[1]	Previously Reported Alpha
FRM			
Ritual Sum	31	.91	-
Importance	4	.89	-
Flexibility	10	.62	-
FRI			
Frequency	28	.85	.79[2]
FAD			
General Functioning	12	.89	.92
FES			
Cohesion	9	.78	.78
Expressiveness	9	.59	.69
Conflict	9	.78	.75
Control	9	.64	.67
Organization	9	.64	.76
PSI			
Mother Conflictual Independence	25	.91	.92
Father Conflictual Independence	25	.92	.88
Mother Emotional Independence	17	.91	.88
Father Emotional Independence	17	.92	.89
ACS			
Academic Adjustment	24	.82	.84
Social Adjustment	20	.88	.90
Personal-Emotional Adjustment	15	.80	.81

[1] $\underline{n}$ = 335.

[2] Coefficient reported is for test-rest reliability.

APPENDIX C

SUPPLEMENTAL ANALYSES AND TABLES

TABLE C-1

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR ALL SUBSCALES BY GENDER GROUP

Variables	Gender Combined[1]		Males[2]		Females[3]	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
FRM						
Ritual Sum	101.12	17.03	96.91****	16.67	104.66****	16.57
Importance	13.05	3.54	12.32***	3.24	13.66***	3.66
Flexibility	32.48	4.99	31.63**	5.26	33.19**	4.66
FRI						
Frequency	48.91	12.56	45.32****	12.73	51.92****	11.63
FAD						
General Functioning	3.21	0.55	3.10***	0.55	3.31***	0.54
FES						
Cohesion	6.71	2.27	6.37*	2.45	6.99*	2.07
Expressiveness	5.02	2.11	4.50****	2.02	5.45****	2.10
Conflict	3.24	2.36	3.35	2.42	3.15	2.31
Control	4.62	2.21	4.67	2.34	4.57	2.10
Organization	5.83	2.09	5.77	2.17	5.87	2.01
ACS						
Academic	140.27	23.14	138.40****	21.39	141.84****	24.46
Social	125.33	25.43	118.53****	23.81	131.05****	25.40
Personal-Emotional	81.91	19.17	82.92	19.15	81.06	19.20
PSI						
Mother Conflictual Independence	77.95	14.66	78.93	13.45	77.13	15.60
Father Conflictual Independence	76.60	17.88	77.52****	16.80	75.82****	18.76
Mother Emotional Independence	35.37	14.50	40.63****	13.63	30.94****	13.73
Father Emotional Independence	39.30	15.00	43.22****	13.81	35.99****	15.20

* $p < .05$.

** $p < .01$.

*** $p < .001$.

**** $p < .0001$.

[1] $n = 335$.

[2] $n = 152$.

[3] $n = 183$.

TABLE C-2

CORRELATIONS AMONG THE PREDICTOR AND CRITERION VARIABLES
(n = 335)

	FRM			FRI	FAD	FES					PSI				ACS		
	SUM	IMP	FLX	FRQ	GF	CO	EX	CF	CN	OZ	MCI	FCI	MEI	FEI	AC	SO	PE
SUM	1.00	.61****	.38****	.46****	.49****	.46****	.26****	-.28****	.04	.26****	.06	.07	-.32****	-.34****	.18***	.22***	.09
IMP		1.00	.49****	.45****	.48****	.48****	.27****	-.24****	-.01	.22****	.13*	.09	-.30****	-.35****	.12*	.09	.05
FLX			1.00	.31****	.47****	.45****	.37****	-.26****	-.20***	.12*	.15**	.14*	-.30****	-.29****	.10	.05	.06
FRQ				1.00	.54****	.47****	.31****	-.37****	.03	.30****	.15**	.22****	-.22****	-.35****	.20***	.24****	.17**
GF					1.00	.67****	.60****	-.55****	-.23****	.25****	.37****	.42****	-.32****	-.35****	.17**	.26****	.22****
CO						1.00	.47****	-.53****	-.22****	.27****	.28****	.32****	-.28****	-.38****	.15**	.07	.15**
EX							1.00	-.27****	-.36****	.03	.25****	.31****	-.26****	-.27****	.10	.16**	.10
CF								1.00	.22****	-.38****	-.27****	-.33****	.18***	.24****	-.07	-.11*	-.17**
CN									1.00	.15**	-.16**	-.24****	.02	.03	.00	.01	-.10
OZ										1.00	.16**	.20***	.01	-.08	.16**	.13*	.16**
MCI											1.00	.51****	-.12*	.11*	.23****	.11*	.33****
FCI												1.00	.21****	-.13*	.19***	.15**	.35****
MEI													1.00	.49****	-.01	-.02	.18**
FEI														1.00	-.02	-.05	.08
AC															1.00	.34****	.53****
SO																1.00	.37****
PE																	1.00

* p < .05.
** p < .01.
*** p < .001.
**** p < .0001.

SUM = Ritual Sum
IMP = Importance
FLX = Flexibility
FRQ = Frequency
GF = General Functioning

CO = Cohesion
EX = Expressiveness
CF = Conflict
CN = Control
OZ = Organization

MCI = Mother Conflictual Independence
FCI = Father Conflictual Independence
MEI = Mother Emotional Independence
FEI = Father Emotional Independence

AC = Academic Adjustment
SO = Social Adjustment
PE = Personal-Emotional

APPENDIX D

FAMILY ROUTINES INVENTORY

FRI

The following list of items are routine family events that may occur as a part of a family's every day life. For each item, please answer the following question using the ratings provided. The ratings deal with the frequency with which the specific family routines were incorporated into your family. Your selection should be based on your experience when you were growing up. On the computer answer sheet provided you (please DO NOT write on the questionnaire), fill in the appropriate circle corresponding to the number rating that best describes your family's practice of these routines.

HOW OFTEN WAS THIS A ROUTINE IN YOUR FAMILY?

ALMOST NEVER	1-2 TIMES A WEEK	3-5 TIMES A WEEK	ALWAYS-EVERY DAY
0	1	2	3

Work day routines

____ 1. Parent(s) have sometime each day for just talking with the children .
____ 2. Parent(s) have certain things they do every morning while getting ready to start the day.
____ 3. Working parent(s) has a regular play time with the children after coming home from work.
____ 4. Working parent(s) takes care of the children sometime almost every day.
____ 5. Children do the same things each morning as soon as they wake up.
____ 6. Parent(s) and children play together sometime each day.
____ 7. Non-working parent and children do something together outside the home almost every day (e.g. shopping, walking, etc.).
____ 8. Family has a 'quiet time' each evening when everyone talks or plays quietly.

Weekend and leisure time

____ 9. Family goes some place special together each week.
____ 10. Family has a certain 'family time' each week when they do things together at home.

Children's routines

____ 11. Parent(s) read or tell stories to the children almost every day.
____ 12. Each child has some time each day for playing alone.
____ 13. Children take part in regular activities after school.
____ 14. Young children go to play-school the same days each week.
____ 15. Children do their homework at the same time each day or night during the week.

Parent(s)' routines

____ 16. Parents have a certain hobby or sport they do together regularly.

Bedtime

____ 17. Children have special things they do or ask for each night at bedtime (e.g. a story, a good-night kiss, a drink of water).

____ 18. Children go to bed at the same time almost every night.

Meals

____ 19. Family eats at the same time each night.

____ 20. At least some of the family eats breakfast together almost every morning.

____ 21. Whole family eats dinner together almost every night.

Extended family

____ 22. At least one parent talks to his or her parents regularly.

____ 23. Family regularly visits with the relatives.

Leaving and homecoming

____ 24. Family checks in or out with each other when someone leaves or comes home.

____ 25. Working parent(s) comes home from work at the same time each day.

____ 26. Family has certain things they almost always do to greet the working parent(s) at the end of the day.

Disciplinary routines

____ 27. Parent(s) have certain things they almost always do each time the children get out of line.

Chores

____ 28. Children do regular household chores.

APPENDIX E

FAMILY RITUALS MEASURE

FRM

FAMILY RITUALS are defined as any behaviors or activities family members engage in together on a regular and predictable basis because they hold special meaning or satisfaction for them. Family rituals range from activities which are common to many families (e.g. eating daily meals together) to activities which are unique to a particular family (e.g. going out each evening prior to bedtime to say good night to the moon). They can also range from very simple behavior and activities (e.g. singing a child to sleep) to a rather elaborate activity (e.g. family gatherings at the grandparents or Christmas).

The following list consists of events, occasions, and situations when families may have a particular ritual. Over the years, has your family had any special routines, rituals, or traditions which they enacted during these times? For each of the following items, rate the relative importance of the ritual as practiced in your family when you were growing up. On the computer answer sheet provided, please fill in the appropriate circle corresponding to your number rating from the scale below. Please DO NOT record your answer in the blanks below or write on the questionnaire. If your family did not observe any rituals for one of the items listed, enter a rating of "1" (Not at all important).

NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	MODERATELY IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT	EXTREMELY IMPORTANT
1	2	3	4	5

Secular & Religious Holidays

____ 1. New Year's Day

____ 2. Valentine's Day

____ 3. Easter/Passover

____ 4. Mother's Day

____ 5. Father's Day

____ 6. Fourth of July

____ 7. Memorial Day

____ 8. Labor Day

____ 9. Halloween

____ 10. Thanksgiving

____ 11. Christmas/Hanukkah

Family Traditions

____ 12. Birthdays

____ 13. Anniversaries

____ 14. Visits to Relatives

____ 15. Family Vacations

____ 16. Family Reunions

____ 17. Special Meals

Rites of Passage Celebrations

____ 18. Weddings

____ 19. Graduations

____ 20. Baptism/Confirmation

____ 21. Funerals

Family Routines

____ 22. Family Meetings or Rap Sessions

____ 23. Mealtime Rituals

____ 24. Household Chores

____ 25. Rituals for Showing Affection or Comfort

____ 26. Family Activity Night

____ 27. Evening or Weekend Leisure Activities

____ 28. Bedtime Rituals

____ 29. Discipline Rituals

____ 30. Family Prayer or Devotionals

____ 31. Attending Church Together

Keeping in mind the ritual activities you indicated above, please responding to the following questions about ritual participation in your family, using the ratings provided:

____ 32. How important have family routines and traditions been for maintaining strength and stability in the family?

NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	MODERATELY IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT	EXTREMELY IMPORTANT
1	2	3	4	5

____ 33. To what degree do the rituals practiced in your family foster a sense of a "family identity" (in other words, who you are as a family)?

NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	MODERATELY IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT	EXTREMELY IMPORTANT
1	2	3	4	5

____ 34. How important are rituals and traditions in promoting cohesiveness in your family?

NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	MODERATELY IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT	EXTREMELY IMPORTANT
1	2	3	4	5

____ 35. How much has a participation in family rituals contributed to the overall functioning of the family?

NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	MODERATELY IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT	EXTREMELY IMPORTANT
1	2	3	4	5

____ 36. Over time, our family has changed its way of engaging in rituals to fit changes in family membership.

NOT AT ALL TRUE	SOMEWHAT TRUE	MODERATELY TRUE	VERY TRUE	TOTALLY TRUE
1	2	3	4	5

____ 37. In carrying out our family's traditions, the children's suggestions are followed.

NOT AT ALL TRUE	SOMEWHAT TRUE	MODERATELY TRUE	VERY TRUE	TOTALLY TRUE
1	2	3	4	5

____ 38. Different persons act as leaders in carrying out the rituals in our family.

NOT AT ALL TRUE	SOMEWHAT TRUE	MODERATELY TRUE	VERY TRUE	TOTALLY TRUE
1	2	3	4	5

____ 39. The children's interests and ages have not had much to do with the particular rituals in our family.

NOT AT ALL TRUE	SOMEWHAT TRUE	MODERATELY TRUE	VERY TRUE	TOTALLY TRUE
1	2	3	4	5

____ 40. We know who will carry out which role in the traditions we practice, even though these roles sometimes change.

NOT AT ALL TRUE	SOMEWHAT TRUE	MODERATELY TRUE	VERY TRUE	TOTALLY TRUE
1	2	3	4	5

____ 41. Parents and children seldom discuss together how we will celebrate holidays and other special occasions.

NOT AT ALL TRUE	SOMEWHAT TRUE	MODERATELY TRUE	VERY TRUE	TOTALLY TRUE
1	2	3	4	5

____ 42. We shift the responsibilities for planning and carrying out various rituals from person to person.

NOT AT ALL TRUE	SOMEWHAT TRUE	MODERATELY TRUE	VERY TRUE	TOTALLY TRUE
1	2	3	4	5

____ 43. Routines change in our family from time to time.

NOT AT ALL TRUE	SOMEWHAT TRUE	MODERATELY TRUE	VERY TRUE	TOTALLY TRUE
1	2	3	4	5

____ 44. Children usually do not have a say in the rituals we practice in our family.

NOT AT ALL TRUE	SOMEWHAT TRUE	MODERATELY TRUE	VERY TRUE	TOTALLY TRUE
1	2	3	4	5

____ 45. It is not hard to identify the rituals in our family, even though they may have changed over time.

NOT AT ALL TRUE	SOMEWHAT TRUE	MODERATELY TRUE	VERY TRUE	TOTALLY TRUE
1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX F

FAMILY ENVIRONMENT SCALE

FES

Please read carefully the statements below about families. You are to decide which of these statements are true of your family and which are false. If you think the statement is True or Mostly True of your family, fill in the first space for the corresponding lettered item on your computer answer sheet (A). If you think the statement is False or Mostly False of your family, fill in the second space (B) for that item.

You may feel that some of the statements are true for some family members and false for others. Mark the statement "True" if it is true for most members. Mark the statement "False" if it is false for most members. If the members are evenly divided, decide what is the stronger overall impression and answer accordingly.

Remember, we would like to know what your family seems like to you. So do not try to figure out how other members see your family, but do give us your general impression of your family for each statement.

DO NOT record your answer in these blanks; use the computer sheet.

T	F		
___	___	1.	Family members really help and support one another.
___	___	2.	Family members often keep their feelings to themselves.
___	___	3.	We fight a lot in our family.
___	___	4.	We don't do things on our own very often in our family.
___	___	5.	We feel it is important to be the best at whatever you do.
___	___	6.	We spend most weekends and evenings at home.
___	___	7.	We often talk about political and social problems.
___	___	8.	Family members attend church, synagogue, or Sunday School fairly often.
___	___	9.	Activities in our family are pretty carefully planned.
___	___	10.	Family members are rarely ordered around.
___	___	11.	We often seem to be killing time at home.
___	___	12.	We say anything we want to around home.
___	___	13.	Family members rarely become openly angry.
___	___	14.	In our family, we are strongly encouraged to be independent.
___	___	15.	Getting ahead in life is very important in our family.
___	___	16.	We rarely to to lectures, plays, or concerts.
___	___	17.	Friends often come over for dinner or to visit.
___	___	18.	We don't say prayers in our family.
___	___	19.	We are generally very neat and orderly.
___	___	20.	There are very few rules to follow in our family.
___	___	21.	We put a lot of energy into what we do at home.
___	___	22.	It's hard to "blow off steam" at home without upsetting somebody.
___	___	23.	Family members sometimes get so angry they throw things.

___ ___ 24. We think things out for ourselves in our family.
___ ___ 25. How much money a person makes is not very important to us.
___ ___ 26. Learning about new and different things is very important in our family.
___ ___ 27. Nobody in our family is active in sports, Little League, bowling, etc.
___ ___ 28. We often talk about the religious meaning of Christmas, Passover, or other holidays.
___ ___ 29. It's often hard to find things when you need them in our household.
___ ___ 30. There is one family member who makes most of the decisions.
___ ___ 31. There is a feeling of togetherness in our family.
___ ___ 32. We tell each other about our personal problems.
___ ___ 33. Family members hardly ever lose their tempers.
___ ___ 34. We come and go as we want to in our family.
___ ___ 35. We believe in competition and "may the best man win."
___ ___ 36. We are not that interested in cultural activities.
___ ___ 37. We often go to movies, sports events, camping, etc.
___ ___ 38. We don't believe in heaven or hell.
___ ___ 39. Being on time is very important in our family.
___ ___ 40. There are set ways of doing things at home.
___ ___ 41. We rarely volunteer when something has to be done at home.
___ ___ 42. If we feel like doing something on the spur of the moment we often just pick up and go.
___ ___ 43. Family members often criticize each other.
___ ___ 44. There is very little privacy in our family.
___ ___ 45. We always strive to do things just a little better the next time.
___ ___ 46. We rarely have intellectual discussions.
___ ___ 47. Everyone in our family has a hobby or two.
___ ___ 48. Family members have strict ideas about what is right and wrong.
___ ___ 49. People change their minds often in our family.
___ ___ 50. There is a strong emphasis on following rules in our family.
___ ___ 51. Family members really back each other up.
___ ___ 52. Someone usually gets upset if you complain in our family.
___ ___ 53. Family members sometimes hit each other.
___ ___ 54. Family members almost always rely on themselves when a problem comes up.
___ ___ 55. Family members rarely worry about job promotions, school grades, etc.
___ ___ 56. Someone in our family plays a musical instrument.
___ ___ 57. Family members are not very involved in recreational activities outside work or school.
___ ___ 58. We believe there are some things you just have to take on faith.
___ ___ 59. Family members make sure their rooms are neat.

___ ___ 60. Everyone has an equal say in family decisions.
___ ___ 61. There is very little group spirit in our family.
___ ___ 62. Money and paying bills is openly talked about in our family.
___ ___ 63. If there's a disagreement in our family, we try hard to smooth things over and keep the peace.
___ ___ 64. Family members strongly encourage each other to stand up for their rights.
___ ___ 65. In our family, we don't try that hard to succeed.
___ ___ 66. Family members often go to the library.
___ ___ 67. Family members sometimes attend courses or take lessons for some hobby or interest (outside of school).
___ ___ 68. In our family each person has different ideas about what is right and wrong.
___ ___ 69. Each person's duties are clearly defined in our family.
___ ___ 70. We can do whatever we want in our family.
___ ___ 71. We really get along well with each other.
___ ___ 72. We are usually careful about what we say to each other.
___ ___ 73. Family members often try to one-up or out-do each other.
___ ___ 74. It's hard to be by yourself without hurting someone's feelings in our household.
___ ___ 75. "Work before play" is the rule in our family.
___ ___ 76. Watching T.V. is more important than reading in our family.
___ ___ 77. Family members go out a lot.
___ ___ 78. The Bible is a very important book in our home.
___ ___ 79. Money is not handled very carefully in our family.
___ ___ 80. Rules are pretty inflexible in our household.
___ ___ 81. There is plenty of time and attention for everyone in our family.
___ ___ 82. There are a lot of spontaneous discussions in our family.
___ ___ 83. In our family, we believe you don't ever get anywhere by raising your voice.
___ ___ 84. We are not really encouraged to speak up for ourselves in our family.
___ ___ 85. Family members are often compared with others as to how well they are doing at work or school.
___ ___ 86. Family members really like music, art, and literature.
___ ___ 87. Our main form of entertainment is watching T.V. or listening to the radio.
___ ___ 88. Family members believe that if you sin you will be punished.
___ ___ 89. Dishes are usually done immediately after eating.
___ ___ 90. You can't get away with much in our family.

APPENDIX G

McMASTER FAMILY ASSESSMENT DEVICE

GENERAL FUNCTIONING SUBSCALE

FAD - GF Scale

Read the following statements and rate your agreement or disagreement regarding how well an item describes your family. The four alternative responses, Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D), Strongly Disagree (SD) correspond to the numbers 1, 2, 3, 4 on your computer answer sheet. Please fill in the appropriate circle corresponding to your choice. DO NOT mark your selection on the questionnaire; please use the computer sheet provided.

SA	A	D	SD	1.	Planning family activities is difficult because we misunderstand each other.
SA	A	D	SD	2.	In times of crisis we can turn to each other for support.
SA	A	D	SD	3.	We cannot talk to each other about the sadness we feel.
SA	A	D	SD	4.	Individuals are accepted for what they are.
SA	A	D	SD	5.	We avoid discussing our fears and concerns.
SA	A	D	SD	6.	We can express feelings to each other.
SA	A	D	SD	7.	There are lots of bad feelings in the family.
SA	A	D	SD	8.	We feel accepted for what we are.
SA	A	D	SD	9.	Making decisions is a problem for our family.
SA	A	D	SD	10.	We are able to make decisions about how to solve problems.
SA	A	D	SD	11.	We don't get along well together.
SA	A	D	SD	12.	We confide in each other.

APPENDIX H

PSYCHOLOGICAL SEPARATION INVENTORY

(SELECTED SUBSCALES)

PSI

The following statements describe different aspects of students' relationships with both their mother and father. Imagine a scale ranging from 1 to 5 that tells how each statement applies to you. In the appropriate circle on your computer answer sheet, please fill in one of the number from "1" (Not at all true of me) to "5" (Very true of me) for each item below ("1" = "A", "2" = "B", etc.) Please DO NOT record your choice in the blanks below; use the computer sheet provided. If the statement does not apply, enter "1". Please be completely honest. Your answers are entirely confidential and will be useful only if they accurately describe you.

Not at all true of me	A little bit true of me	Moderately true of me	Quite a bit true of me	Very true of me
1	2	3	4	5

____ 1. I like to show my friends pictures of my mother.
____ 2. Sometimes my mother is a burden to me.
____ 3. I feel longing if I am away from my mother for too long.
____ 4. I feel like I am constantly at war with my mother.
____ 5. I blame my mother for many of the problems I have.
____ 6. I wish I could trust my mother more.
____ 7. My mother is the most important person in the world to me.
____ 8. I have to be careful not to hurt my mother's feelings.
____ 9. I wish that my mother lived nearer so I could visit her more frequently.
____ 10. I sometimes feel like I'm being punished by my mother.
____ 11. Being away from my mother makes me feel lonely.
____ 12. I wish my mother wasn't so overprotective.
____ 13. I wish my mother wouldn't try to manipulate me.
____ 14. I wish my mother wouldn't try to make fun of me.
____ 15. I sometimes call home just to hear my mother's voice.
____ 16. I feel I have obligations to my mother that I wish I didn't have.
____ 17. My mother expects too much from me.
____ 18. I wish I could stop lying to my mother.
____ 19. While I am home on vacation I like to spend most of my time with my mother.
____ 20. I often wish that my mother would treat me more like an adult.
____ 21. After being with my mother for a vacation I find it difficult to leave her.
____ 22. I am often angry at my mother.
____ 23. I like to hug and kiss my mother.
____ 24. I hate it when my mother makes suggestions about what I do.
____ 25. I decide what to do according to whether my mother will approve of it.
____ 26. Even when my mother has a good idea I refuse to listen to it because she made it.
____ 27. When I do poorly in school I feel I'm letting my mother down.

____ 28. I wish my mother wouldn't try to get me to take sides with her.
____ 29. My mother is my best friend.
____ 30. I argue with my mother over little things.
____ 31. I seem to be closer to my mother than most people my age.
____ 32. My mother is sometimes a source of embarrassment to me.
____ 33. Sometimes I think I am too dependent on my mother.
____ 34. I am sometimes ashamed of my mother.
____ 35. I care too much about my mother's reactions.
____ 36. I get angry when my mother criticizes me.
____ 37. I sometimes feel like an extension of my mother.
____ 38. When I don't write my mother often enough I feel guilty.
____ 39. I feel uncomfortable keeping things from my mother.
____ 40. I often have to make decisions for my mother.
____ 41. I'm not sure I could make it in life without my mother.
____ 42. I sometimes resent it when my mother tells me what to do.

____ 43. I like to show my friends pictures of my father.
____ 44. Sometimes my father is a burden to me.
____ 45. I feel longing if I am away from my father for too long.
____ 46. I feel like I am constantly at war with my father.
____ 47. I blame my father for many of the problems I have.
____ 48. I wish I could trust my father more.
____ 49. My father is the most important person in the world to me.
____ 50. I have to be careful not to hurt my father's feelings.
____ 51. I wish that my father lived nearer so I could visit him more frequently.
____ 52. I sometimes feel like I'm being punished by my father.
____ 53. Being away from my father makes me feel lonely.
____ 54. I wish my father wasn't so overprotective.
____ 55. I wish my father wouldn't try to manipulate me.
____ 56. I wish my father wouldn't try to make fun of me.
____ 57. I sometimes call home just to hear my father's voice.
____ 58. I feel that I have obligations to my father that I wish I didn't have.
____ 59. My father expects too much from me.
____ 60. I wish I could stop lying to my father.
____ 61. While I am home on vacation I like to spend most of my time with my father.
____ 62. I often wish that my father would treat me more like an adult.
____ 63. After being with my father for a vacation I find it difficult to leave him.
____ 64. I am often angry at my father.
____ 65. I like to hug and kiss my father.
____ 66. I hate it when my father makes suggestions about what I do.
____ 67. I decide what to do according to whether my father will approve of it.
____ 68. Even when my father has a good idea I refuse to listen to it because he made it.
____ 69. When I do poorly in school I feel I'm letting my father down.

____ 70. I wish my father wouldn't try to get me to take sides with him.
____ 71. My father is my best friend.
____ 72. I argue with my father over little things.
____ 73. I seem to be closer to my father than most people my age.
____ 74. My father is sometimes a source of embarrassment to me.
____ 75. Sometimes I think I am too dependent on my father.
____ 76. I am sometimes ashamed of my father.
____ 77. I care too much about my father's reactions.
____ 78. I get angry when my father criticizes me.
____ 79. I sometimes feel like an extension of my father.
____ 80. When I don't write my father often enough I feel guilty.
____ 81. I feel uncomfortable keeping things from my father.
____ 82. I often have to make decisions for my father.
____ 83. I'm not sure I could make it in life without my father.
____ 84. I sometimes resent it when my father tells me what to do.

APPENDIX I

ADJUSTMENT TO COLLEGE SCALE

ACS

Below are several statements which will apply to you in greater or lesser degree. Each has beneath it a scale ranging from "1" (Applies very closely to me) to "9" (Doesn't apply to me at all). Please select a number at the point in the continuum which best represents your judgment concerning how closely the statement applies to you at the present time, i.e., within the last few days. Since your judgment may vary considerably from item to item, you should feel free to use any one (but no more than one) of the numbers in the scale for each item. On the computer answer sheet provided, fill in the appropriate circle corresponding to the number you have selected (positions 1 through 9). Please DO NOT mark your answers on the questionnaire.

1. I feel that I fit well as part of the Tech environment.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

2. I have been feeling tense or nervous lately.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

3. I have been keeping up to date on my academic work.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

4. I am meeting as many people, and making as many friends, as I would like at Tech.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

5. I know why I'm in college and what I want out of it.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

6. I am finding academic work at Tech difficult.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

7. Lately I have been feeling blue and moody a lot.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

8. I am very involved with social activities in college.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

9. I am adjusting well to college.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

10. I have not been functioning well during examinations.
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
    Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

11. I have felt tired much of the time lately.
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
    Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

12. Being on my own, taking responsibility for myself, has not been easy.
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
    Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

13. I am satisfied with the level at which I am performing academically.
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
    Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

14. I have had informal, personal contacts with Tech professors.
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
    Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

15. I am pleased now about my decision to go to college.
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
    Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

16. I am pleased now about my decision to attend Tech in particular.
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
    Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

17. I'm not working as hard as I should at my coursework.
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
    Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

18. I have several close social ties at Tech.
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
    Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

19. My academic goals and purposes are well-defined.
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
    Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

20. I haven't been able to control my emotions very well lately.
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
    Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

21. I'm not really smart enough for the academic work I am expected to be doing now.
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
    Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

22. Lonesomeness for home is a source of difficulty for me now.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

23. Getting a college degree is very important to me.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

24. My appetite has been good lately.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

25. I haven't been very efficient in the use of study time lately.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

26. I enjoy living in a college dormitory. (Please omit if you do not live in a dormitory; any University housing should be regarded as a dormitory.)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

27. I enjoy writing papers for courses.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

28. I have been having a lot of headaches lately.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

29. I really haven't had much motivation for studying lately.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

30. I am satisfied with the extracurricular activities available at Tech.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

31. I've given a lot of thought lately to whether I should ask for help from the University Counseling Center, or from a psychotherapist outside of Tech.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

32. Lately I have been having doubts regarding the value of a college education.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

33. I am getting along very well with my roommate(s) at Tech. (Please omit if you do not have a roommate.)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

34. I wish I were at another college or university rather than Tech.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

35. I've put on (or lost) too much weight recently.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

36. I am satisfied with the number and variety of courses available at Tech.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

37. I feel that I have enough social skill to get along well in the college setting.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

38. I have been getting angry too easily lately.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

39. Recently I have had trouble concentrating when I try to study.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

40. I haven't been sleeping very well.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

41. I'm not doing well enough academically for the amount of work I put in.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

42. I am having difficulty feeling at ease with other people at Tech.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

43. I am satisfied with the quality or the caliber of courses available at Tech.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

44. I am attending classes regularly.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

45. Sometimes my thinking gets muddled up too easily.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

46. I am satisfied with the extent to which I am participating in social activities at Tech.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

47. I expect to stay at Tech for a bachelor's degree.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

48. I haven't been mixing too well with the opposite sex lately.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

49. I worry a lot about my college expenses.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

50. I am enjoying my academic work at college.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

51. I have been feeling lonely a lot at Tech lately.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

52. I am having a lot of trouble getting started on homework assignments.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

53. I feel I have good control over my life situation at Tech.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

54. I am satisfied with my program of courses for this semester.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

55. I have been feeling in good health lately.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

56. I feel I am very different from other students at Tech in ways that I don't like.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

57. On balance, I would rather be home than here.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

58. Most of the things I am interested in are not related to any of my coursework at Tech.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

59. Lately I have been giving a lot of thought to transferring to another college.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

60. Lately I have been giving a lot of thought to dropping out of college altogether and for good.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

61. I find myself giving considerable thought to taking time off from college and finishing later.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

62. I am very satisfied with the professors I have now in my courses.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

63. I have some good friends or acquaintances at Tech with whom I can talk about any problems I may have.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

64. I am experiencing a lot of difficulty coping with the stresses imposed upon me in college.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

65. I am quite satisfied with my social life at Tech.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

66. I'm quite satisfied with my academic situation at Tech.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

67. I feel confident that I will be able to deal in a satisfactory manner with future challenges here at Tech.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Applies very closely to me Doesn't apply to me at all

APPENDIX J

CONSENT FOR RESEARCH PARTICIPATION

CONSENT FOR RESEARCH PARTICIPATION

In the present study, you will be asked to fill out six questionnaires that relate to various aspects of your family life and perceptions of yourself as a member of that family. Your responses will be accorded strict professional confidentiality. Questionnaires will be completed anonymously and the anonymity of responses will be ensured by your removing the signed consent form from the questionnaires and returning these to the experimenter separately. You will be asked to fully complete all questionnaires as honestly and frankly as possible. Your answers will be useful only if they accurately describe you.

Participation in this project may be used to receive experimental bonus credit for Psychology 1300 (or extra credit points in another class, as indicated by your instructor). Participants may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. If requested, any data collected from such participants will be destroyed. Interested participants may receive information as to the results of the study upon request.

_____

Dr. Bell (742-3737) who is in charge of this study, has agreed to answer any inquiries I may have concerning the procedures and has informed me that I may contact the Texas Tech University Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects by writing them in care of the Office of Research Services, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX, 79409, or by calling 742-3884. Dr. Bell can

be reached at the Department of Psychology by calling 742-3737.

If this research project causes any physical injury to participants in this project, treatment is not necessarily available at Texas Tech University or the Student Health Center, nor is there necessarily any insurance carried by the University or its personnel applicable to cover any such injury. Financial compensation for any such injury must be provided through the participant's own insurance program. Further information about these matters may be obtained from Dr. Donald R. Haragan, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research, 108 Administration Building, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX, 79409 (742-2184).

_____ _____

(Principal Investigator) (Research Participant)

Date: _____

APENDIX K

GENERAL INFORMATION/INSTRUCTIONS

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Participant #____
2. Age ____
3. Sex ____
4. Ethnicity (Anglo=0, Black=1, Hispanic=2, Asian=3, Other=4) ____
5. Is either parent a step-parent to you? Y N
6. Have you, or has any member of your immediate family, ever been diagnosed and/or treated for a psychiatric illness? Y N

INSTRUCTIONS

As indicated on the sign-up sheets, the criteria for participating in this study include the following:

- single
- freshman classification
- age 17 to 20
- not living at home with parents (or with another relative serving as a guardian)
- grew up in a 2-parent family

If you do not meet these criteria, please let the examiner know at this time.

The six questionnaires in this study vary in length, requiring from approximately 45 minutes to 1 hour 15 minutes to complete. They are divided into 2 sets with three (3) being completed using an ORANGE computer answer sheet, and three (3) answered on a BLUE computer sheet. The starting and stopping points for where each questionnaire is to be answered on the computer sheet are indicated

at the top of each page of each questionnaire. The questionnaires ARE NOT answered one right after another on the computer sheets. Instead, several spaces are left in between each questionnaire, so that if you should omit an item or lose your place, you can tell in which test the error occurred.

The following BLANK SPACES should occur between questionnaires on the answer sheets (by color):

ORANGE: 91-100, 146-150, 235-240

BLUE: 68-70, 99-100, 113-120

When you finish, be sure and double check that you stopped and started each questionnaire in the right place on the answer sheets, leaving the blank spaces noted above. I will be looking over your answer sheets when you turn them in, to make sure there are no errors or skipped items.

Some of you will begin with the ORANGE sheet and corresponding 3 questionnaires, and some of you will begin with the BLUE set (also 3 questionnaires). After completing the first set, return it to me and pick up the second set.

APPENDIX L

DEBRIEFING SHEET

THANKS FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!

The purpose of the study is to collect data concerning family patterns as they occur in ritualized events (e.g., holidays, birthdays, anniversaries, mealtimes). This information will be related to other variables assessing how close family members perceive the family to be, and how functional the family appears to be. Additionally, these variables will be compared with the individual's ability to begin separating from his/her family, developing his/her own identity, and adjusting to an environment apart from the family (such as college).

Final results of the study will not be available until this summer. If you desire information concerning results of the study or have any questions concerning the study and your participation therein, you can contact me at 799-3488 (during the next several weeks) or via letter to the following permanent address: Karla Hale, 1505 Postoffice, Galveston, TX 77550. An information sheet about the study's findings will be available beginning in the fall semester 1990 in Dr. Bell's office on the third floor of the Psychology building.

Please do not discuss this study with others (they could be potential participants), as I will be collecting data for several weeks.

Thank you,

Karla Hale