

PRE-DIVORCE FAMILY COHESION AND
ITS RELATIONSHIP TO POST-DIVORCE ADJUSTMENT

by
Ester Ciliv

B.A., Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, 1983

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the
Degree of Master of Arts
in
Clinical Psychology

Department of Psychology Institute of Social Sciences

Bogazici University Library



39001100317190

14

Boğaziçi Üniversitesi

1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. THEORIES ABOUT DIVORCE	3
1- CRISIS THEORY	3
2- EXCHANGE THEORY	6
3- GENERAL SYSTEMS THEORY	7
B. CAUSES OF DIVORCE	10
C. DIVORCE IN TURKEY	14
D. DIVORCE AND EMOTIONAL STRESS	18
E. FACTORS RELATED TO POST-DIVORCE ADJUSTMENT	21
F. FAMILY COHESION	28
G. RATIONALE OF THE STUDY AND HYPOTHESES	34
II. METHOD	36
A. SUBJECTS	36
B. PROCEDURE	37
C. MEASUREMENTS	38
III. RESULTS	43
IV. DISCUSSION	48
V. BIBLIOGRAPHY	53
VI. APPENDICES	62



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am happy this page gives me the opportunity to thank all those who have helped me in this study.

I owe special thanks to Doç.Dr.Güler Fişek without whose suggestions, encouragement and support this study would have never been completed. I am equally indebted to Dr.Serap Özer and Dr.Kadir Özer for their contributions.

Coya Ruso has provided me with more than ample literature about divorce, Suzan Gürkan has been more than patient in helping me scoring and programming. To them and to all of the 40 divorced women who accepted to cooperate as subjects in this study, I am grateful.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Gökçe Cansever who has always been there to encourage and support me in one way or another.

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to investigate the relationship between pre-divorce family cohesion level and post-divorce adjustment. It was suggested that divorced individuals with moderate cohesion scores will be better adjusted and will evaluate their current lives more positively than those with high or low cohesion scores.

The subjects were 40 divorced females, ages between 27-46. Pre-divorce family cohesion was measured by FACES II and post-divorce adjustment was measured both by an adjustment scale and by the Semantic Differential Scale. In general, the results did not indicate a significant difference among the different levels of cohesion in terms of post-divorce adjustment. Only one variable, "psychosomatic complaints at the time of divorce," showed a significant relation in the predicted direction.

I. INTRODUCTION

Divorce is one of the most stress producing events that adults can experience (Pais and White, 1979). Divorced persons are found to be consistently overrepresented among the mentally ill, suicides, criminals; have higher levels of alcohol consumption, demonstrate excess vulnerability to accidents and have higher physical illness and death rates than comparable married people (Bloom et al., 1978). This is the reason why, the phenomenon of divorce is receiving increasing attention as a stress inducing life crisis and it is of paramount importance to identify the factors that are correlated with adjustment to it.

There are many factors which most likely contribute to the difficulties people have in facing the adjustment process after divorce. Some say that there is emotional stress accompanying divorce which is related to stigma, age, religion, length of time one anticipates the divorce, which partner initiated the divorce, the attitudes of friends and relatives. Other factors which have been cited include difficulties in accepting the reality of life change, the

loss of the attachment figure, the change of social role, feelings such as shame, guilt and failure and problems in making new plans for the future. These are all issues arising out of focusing on the individual undergoing divorce. What is overlooked within these various individual perspectives on divorce adjustment is the notion that it may be affected by the preexisting marital structure. This study arose out of an attempt to discover if post-divorce adjustment is associated with a specific dimension of family interaction: family cohesion.

Cohesiveness refers to the intensity of the emotional ties among family members (Olson et al., 1979). High family cohesion, called enmeshment, is a situation where there is a clinging dependence and limited autonomy between the spouses. Low family cohesion, called disengagement, is a situation where there is a lot of distance and independence between the spouses. Most experts agree that the optimum level of cohesion lies about the middle level; where the spouses are able to experience balanced attachment and commitment towards each other; where they can deal more effectively with situational stress and developmental change (Olson et al., 1979).

It would seem reasonable to expect that the pre-existing cohesion level of families will play a role in their post-divorce adjustments.

Moving from this view, we will first discuss the

theories that explain divorce, then we shall define adjustment and discuss the factors that affect it and finally review the literature on family cohesion.

A. THEORIES ABOUT DIVORCE

There are three theories by the help of which we can explain divorce. They are the Crisis Theory, the Exchange Theory and the General Systems Theory.

1- CRISIS THEORY

Wiseman's theory of divorce does not emphasize the causes of divorce but rather views divorce as a process. It is a process that starts with a decision to end the marriage, takes the divorcing couple through separation and legal action and ends with the resolution they may come to about their mutual relationship, their children and the rest of the world (Wiseman, 1975).

The process of crisis resolution, as described by Rapoport (1965), begins with an upset in a steady state. If habitual problem-solving mechanisms are not adequate to return the system to its previous equilibrium, the situation is perceived as a crisis. The problem can be perceived as a threat, as a loss or as a challenge; in each situation, the response will differ in terms of the perception. Thus, a threat to basic needs or integrity will lead to a response of

anxiety; a loss will lead to a response of depression; and a challenge will lead to the mobilization of new modes of problem-solving. It is evident that divorce contains elements that may elicit all three types of responses; these responses evidence themselves progressively as the person involved in the crisis moves from perception of the unresolved marital situation through the decision to divorce, to the resolution of the situation in a new role and life-style. The divorce process may thus be seen as one of both grief and growth (Wiseman, 1975).

The process of divorce is viewed by Wiseman as a series of five overlapping stages: denial, loss and depression, anger and ambivalence, reorientation of life-style and identity, and finally, acceptance and integration.

1- The Stage of Denial has also been called the stage of "emotional divorce" (Despert, 1953) or an "empty shell" marriage (Goode, 1961); where each partner retrieves the hopes, dreams, plans and expectations that was invested in this spouse and in this marriage. This stage can also be viewed as the presence of a marital homeostasis that is not adequate to cope with more than the minimum of life stresses. At this stage, heavy use is made of denial in order to keep the relationship going; spouses are both aware of their difficulties in the marriage but use an external rationale (such as finances or the children) to keep themselves from considering divorce. Many marriages exist in this manner

indefinitely, until some stress which can not be accomodated throws the relationship out of balance.

2- The Stage of Loss and Depression starts when the spouses, with the occurence of stress, realize that being together is a problem. Overt expressions of depression, psychosomatic complaints, fatigue, a series of minor accidents etc. are common at this stage. The reaction is as to a loss; outright grief, feelings of depression and isolation, and an inability to communicate. If the couple can not discuss divorce openly; feelings of isolation are further intensified.

3- At The Stage of Anger and Ambivalence, the depression lifts and anger sets in. At this point spouses begin talking about custody, child support, division of property, financial matters, visitation rights and other legal issues; over which they argue. Feelings of overt anger toward the spouse often alternate with intense ambivalence about the idea of ending the marriage and, often at this stage, couples ask themselves if they have done enough to save the marriage, and they may even try a last attempt at marriage counseling.

4- At the Stage of Reorientation of Life-Style and Identity spouses stop looking back in anger and start to focus more on present and future planning. The idea of being divorced is now reality; ways of coping with it must be found. In this phase of crisis resolution, there is the possibility of regressing to a less adequate level of func-

tioning as well as improving to better ways. The issue of "who am I?" is also emphasized, as roles suddenly shift. Therapeutic and social support can be significantly useful at this stage.

5- The final Stage of Acceptance and New Levels of Functioning is a stage in which spouses begin feeling as a socially, sexually and vocationally adequate person. Feelings of depression and anxiety begin to abate, feelings of anger toward the spouse diminish. Each spouse sees his (or her) ex-spouse and terminated marriage as they really are. This acceptance is an important part of the resolution of the divorce process; it enables the individual to establish new relationships with the former spouse and also to see that the marriage had some value in its own time and place (Wiseman, 1975).

2- EXCHANGE THEORY

Exchange theorists (e.g., Thibaut and Kelley, 1959) assert that one evaluates one's current reward level by comparing it with feasible alternatives. From this perspective, divorce is likely when the rewards for maintaining a relationship are lower and costs are higher than those available in another relationship or in living alone.

While exchange theory is commonly used as a theoretical explanation, there have been few empirical tests of the

utility of the model. When used, such efforts have focused more on structural variables such as income, age, presence or absence of children, and employment of the wife rather than the evaluation of intrapsychic phenomena (Levinger, 1979).

The Behavioral/Social Exchange Model, on the other hand, defines a normal family in a functional sense (Walsh, 1982). According to this model, behavior is not inherently good or bad, or even normal or sick; rather, it is a vehicle for achieving relationship outcomes in regard to intimacy and distance. In well-functioning families, participants exchange benefits that outweigh costs. Since family relationships involve behavioral exchange over a wide range of possibilities, there are many opportunities for rewarding exchanges likely to maintain the relationship (Walsh, 1982).

Relationship failure is explained by deficient reward exchanges. Relationships may become distressed due to communication deficits; when there is a discrepancy between the intended communication and the impact of the message on the receiver. The concept of reciprocity is important; short term reciprocity is thought to be characteristic of distressed relationships, while long term exchanges tend to characterize more functional relationships (Walsh, 1982, p.17-18).

3- GENERAL SYSTEMS THEORY

Within the General Systems Theory paradigm (Bertalanffy,

1968), a family is viewed as a system. The members of a family are components of the system, while their attributes are the properties. The members and their relationships are what hold the system together. Since every part of the system is connected to its member parts, a change in one part causes a change in the total system. In other words, the members of a family are interdependent.

Family systems also self-regulate themselves; in other words, any change that touches the system is modified by the system via the mechanism of feedback. Stability and equilibrium is maintained through feedback among members.

The family system is non-summative in that the total system shows a unitary complexity and style that can not be explained by simply summing up the attributes of its individual members. The family system is made up of subsystems which are defined by boundaries. Boundaries are rules that define who participates in what subsystem and how (Minuchin, 1974).

In terms of General Systems Theory, divorce is a crisis which results in change. The post-divorce family system still involves the same members; it is only their attributes and relationships that change. It is still a family system, but a different one. Every member of the post-divorce family system is still related to his or her fellow members in such a way that a change in one will cause a change in the

total system. Thus, divorced spouses continue to be interdependent and to have impact on one another; especially due to child rearing functions. Despite the structural changes, tasks facing the post-divorce family remain the same as those of the married one. Changes that occur in the system generally focus around a redistribution of labor (who will do what tasks) and new methods of organization (how tasks will be accomplished) (Goldsmith, 1980).

With divorce, the family system goes into a state of marked disequilibrium. The roles and their relationships go through a transitional period of instability and it may take several years to develop a stable family system (Goldsmith, 1980).

Restoring equilibrium may have either positive or negative consequences for the family. It may be an excuse for the development of maladaptive symptoms or may enable the members to experience personal growth in a way that is not available to married couples.

Often, through remarriage, new family members might be added to the post-divorce family. According to General Systems Theory, this addition does not change the basic conceptualization of the family as a continuing system; but rather makes the step-parent family a subsystem of the original post-divorce family system (Goldsmith, 1980).

B. CAUSES OF DIVORCE

Several studies report relationship between certain sociological and psychological variables and divorce. Before we review the issues related to divorce adjustment, let us first study these variables that have been found to be associated with divorce.

In terms of occupational status; high status occupational groups have lower divorce rates than lower status occupational groups (Norton and Glick, 1979) but within occupational groups, there are also differences. Rosow and Rose (1972) report variations in divorce rates among professional occupations. Of 12 professional occupations they have examined, the rates were highest for authors followed by social scientists, architects, college faculty, lawyers and judges, engineers, chemists, editors and reporters, accountants and auditors, dentists, physicians and natural scientists who had the lowest rates. Even within occupational groups, Rosow and Rose found that physicians in specialities with more patient contact at more irregular hours were more likely to divorce. Generalizing from these findings, it may be possible to say that the likelihood of divorced will vary directly with occupational stress. Levinger (1965), on the other hand, hypothesizes that irregular work hours which disrupt home life or occupations that bring individuals into greater contact with the members of the opposite sex are more likely to lead to divorce.

Another sociological factor related to divorce is employment status. A likelihood of divorce is greater in households where the husband is periodically unemployed (Coomb and Zumeta, 1970). It would appear that it is not simply unemployment which leads to divorce, but rather that unemployment underlines other problems in the family. Since not all families with unemployed males break up, Scanzoni (1968) and Goode (1956) suggest that the answer lies in the different meanings which husbands and wives place on being employed and the type or level of employment. Scanzoni found that, compared with still married women, divorcing women were more dissatisfied with their husbands' occupational achievement, whatever it was. He also found that the meaning of work is more likely to differ when the husband and wife come from different family backgrounds.

Several researchers have found that marital dissatisfaction and divorce are more likely when husbands and wives come from different social backgrounds (Bumpass and Sweet, 1972; Goode, 1956; Levinger, 1965).

Others have studied the effect of income on divorce. Cutright (1971) found that income was the most powerful predictor of instability and that those with lower incomes were substantially more likely to divorce. Rose and Sarohill (1975), on the other hand, report that level of family income does not predict marital instability but that unemployment and lower than usual income do. Cherlin (1970) reports that

it is the instability of the income, not its amount, that is a predictor of divorce.

Glick and Norton (1979) have found that women employed outside the home are more likely to be divorced than those who are not; but the direction of causality is unclear. Scanzoni (1968) found that employed women in intact families reported approval and support of their husbands for their employment, while those who were divorced did not. Couples who divorce may have different views of marital roles than do those who remain married; or the wife's employment outside the home may be a symptom of other family conflicts. It may also be that women who are employed can afford to think about divorce since they can support themselves without a spouse. Or it may be that divorced women may have to work to make the ends meet.

Another factor which is tied to divorce is age. According to some, age at first marriage is inversely related to divorce. Couples who marry in their teens are twice as likely to divorce as those who marry in their 20s (Glick and Norton, 1979). Some others (Bauman, 1967; Glick and Norton, 1979) report that marriages are also somewhat less stable for women who marry in their 30s. Although a number of explanations have been advanced to account for these findings, the reasons for this relationship are still unclear. It has been suggested that those who marry at a younger age do not have the emotional, educational, or economic resources to make a

success of marriage. Those who marry at a later age may dissolve their marriages more readily because they have economic and educational resources and previous experience living independently so as to be able to live separately if the relationship does not work.

Premarital pregnancy has also been shown to be correlated with divorce (Coombs and Zumeta, 1970). While, as we have indicated above, divorce is inversely associated with age at marriage, when controls have been introduced for age, premarital pregnancy continues to have a small effect (Bumpass and Sweet, 1972). Furstenberg's (1976) analysis suggests that lack of preparation for marriage, truncated courtship patterns, and economic problems are the most compelling factors influencing marital stability.

A number of studies have reported a small but consistent relationship for the intergenerational transmission of marital stability (Bumpass and Sweet, 1972; Mueller and Pope, 1976). Various explanations have been advanced for this finding: that the personality problems and characteristics of the divorced parents produce similar problems in their children leading to further marital instability; that the reduced family income and downward mobility often associated with divorce reduces the kinds of choices available; that the predivorce conflict and the post-divorce broken home produce inappropriate sex role learning, which in turn, reduces the likelihood of a successful marriage. Mueller and Pope (1976)

say that parental marital instability leads to high risk mate selection. They found that children of divorce are more likely to marry at younger ages, be pregnant at marriage and marry husbands with lower status occupations. This happens, they say, because of lack of adequate parental supervision.

So far, a number of causes of divorce have been discussed. Another meaning of the term "cause" (as applied to divorce) is why the couple decided to split up. Determining the real cause(s) of a marital breakdown is not very easy. Most of the time, the perceptions of the two partners are very different, as if they are talking about different marriages!

Weiss calls these perceptions "accounts". Accounts are histories of the breakdown with a beginning, a middle and an end. Each partner's account of the breakdown is usually different. Levinger (1966) reports that women and men have different reasons for breaking a marriage. Women usually complain of physical and verbal abuse, financial problems, mental cruelty, drinking, neglect of home and children and lack of love; while husbands are more likely to complain of in-law troubles or sexual incompatability.

C. DIVORCE IN TURKEY

The literature on divorce in Turkey is very limited. The only one the writer of this study found was that of Ned

Levine. Before presenting a summary of that study, let us first review some divorce statistics published by the Prime Ministry State Institute of Statistics (1983).

Some trends of the divorced population in Turkey, according to the above mentioned source, are as follows:

1- When the divorce rate in Turkey is compared with that of some other countries, it can be observed that the divorce rate in Turkey is very low (see table below).

<u>Countries</u>	<u>Divorce Rate (per 1000)</u>	
U.S.A.	5.30	1981
U.S.S.R.	3.48	1981
Federal Republic of Germany	1.56	1980
England	3.01	1980
Egypt	1.97	1977
Sweden	2.42	1981
Finland	1.98	1980
Canada	2.59	1980
Austria	1.79	1981
Bulgaria	1.48	1980
Switzerland	1.65	1980
Japan	1.31	1981
Yugoslavia	1.00	1980
France	1.59	1979
Israel	1.16	1981
Iran	7.90	1977
Syria	5.80	1979
Greece	6.90	1980
Turkey	3.80	1983

Source: Demographic Yearbook, 1981.

2- The most important ground for divorce is incompatibility, and this becomes more pronounced every year. The second and third important reasons are adultery and desertion. 88 % of divorces are granted on grounds of incompatibility; adultery and desertion account for 3 % and 6 % each.

3- Almost half of the divorces occur in childless couples, 25 % occurs in one-child families, 15 % occurs in two-children families, 6 % occurs in three-children families, 5 % occurs in four-children families; which might indicate that children help the continuity of a marriage.

4- Almost half of the divorced male population are in the 25-34 and the female population are in the 20-29 age groups. Almost 50 % of all divorces occur in the first 5 years of marriage.

5- The majority of the divorced population lives in the cities.

Unfortunately, the statistical data related to occupational groups was not sufficient to reflect divorce trends in terms of occupation.

Levine, in his study "Social Change and Family Crisis -- The Nature of Turkish Divorce", investigates the nature of divorce in Turkey from the point of view of social change. He considers divorce a barometer of social change and says that divorce in Turkey is encouraged by the interaction of four social conditions:

1- Changes in fertility and mortality, 2- alternative social roles for women, 3- economic vulnerability and, 4- opportunities for separating households.

In terms of geographical distribution, Levine has found that divorce is much higher in the urban population of Turkey than in rural areas. He has also found that the more developed the area is, the higher the rate of divorce becomes. Since the western part of the country is more developed than the east, divorce rates seem to rise consistently from east to west and provinces with higher divorce rates seem to be the ones that have higher income levels. Apart from the level of development, Levine has found that divorce is associated with changes in women's roles. As women change their "traditional" roles and become more "modern", they begin to see the alternative sex roles that emphasize equality and increasing public participation. This seems to cause conflict in the family.

As a third characteristic associated with the distribution of divorce, Levine says that divorce is higher where there is developed agriculture rather than where there is industrialization. The reason for this is that agriculture develops through mechanization, which means large numbers of people are left without jobs and are forced to search employment in the urban areas. When people leave their communities and migrate to urban areas and as external societal values are brought in from the outside; they clash with the

already existing values and roles; thus preparing grounds for all kinds of conflict.

According to Levine its these people that are caught in the middle of this transition and material conflict that are subject to most stress. They are not the most "modern", nor the most "traditional"; they are not the "literate" nor the "illliterate". These are the people who have either been forced to change against their will or have tried to change but have been unsuccessful.

In short, the highest divorce rates are in the more developed provinces, especially in those with developed agriculture and the people who are most likely to divorce are those who are the barely educated and who are economically vulnerable; in other words, the urban poor.

Finally, since the Turkish family is patriarchal and authoritarian; Levine views divorce as a liberating act, as an act of emancipation on the part of the female.

D. DIVORCE AND EMOTIONAL STRESS

The helping professions have historically viewed divorced people as pathological and psychologically maladjusted (Bergler, 1948; Fisher, 1973; Jacobson, 1973). Here is some evidence that a certain degree of emotional stress is present in people who divorce.

Gove (1972) in a review of 11 studies using samples from psychiatric inpatients, outpatients and records from mental institutions reported that the rate of mental illness for divorced men was over five times higher than the rate for married men and nearly three times higher for divorced women than for married women. Furthermore, in a review of studies on suicide using both psychiatric and non-psychiatric subjects, he reported that suicide rates were nearly 4.5 times higher for divorced men than for married men, and 3.2 times higher for divorced women than for married women.

Using again nonpsychiatric and psychiatric subjects, Carter and Glick (1970) presented evidence that when compared with other marital status groups; divorced men and women have uniformly higher rates of violence, accidental falls, homicide, accidental fires or explosions, pneumonia, tuberculosis and cirrhosis of the liver.

Briscoe, Smith, Robins, Marter and Gaskin (1973) did an extensive study on psychiatric illness and the divorced. Their results indicated that divorced females were significantly more likely to have a psychiatric "disease" than were married controls. Psychiatric illness was also more frequent among divorced men; 68% compared to 34% of the married men.

Loeb (1966) tested the hypothesis that people who divorce possess personality traits which may predispose them to marital disruption. Though she did not get overall signifi-

cant statistical differences, she did get significantly higher scores on the Psychopathic Deviant (Pd) of the MMPI scale, for the divorced group, than for the married group.

Goode (1956) in his pioneer study of 425 divorced urban mothers, concluded that three-fifths of the subjects appeared to show various kinds of personal disorganization during marital dissolution; difficulty in sleeping, poorer health, feelings of loneliness, low work efficiency, memory difficulties, and increased smoking and drinking.

McMurray (1970) analyzed the driving records of 410 persons who were either suing or were being sued for divorce in Washington during 1966-1967. She found that persons involved in divorce proceedings had from 43% to 82% more accidents, and from 78% to 195% more violations than average drivers. The time of greatest accident and violation involvement was the three month period immediately following the filing of a divorce petition.

Bloom (1975) found that men from broken marriages were nine times more likely to be admitted to psychiatric hospitals for the first time than men from intact homes. For divorced women, there was a threefold increase.

Although most people believe that those who divorce are psychologically less fit than those who don't; it may be that it's the healthier people who are able to break from their spouses when the marriage is an unsatisfactory one.

Also the fact that all these people have been interviewed after they have been divorced brings up the question of whether they were already disturbed before the divorce and therefore could not function adequately in the marriage. It's only with the help of longitudinal data that one can really determine the cause and effect relationship between divorce and mental health.

E. FACTORS RELATED TO POST-DIVORCE ADJUSTMENT

How can we define good post-divorce adjustment? While some people think that good post-divorce adjustment to divorce is remarriage; a more proper definition might be the ability to develop a self-concept for oneself that is not connected to the status of being married or to the former spouse and an ability to function adequately in facing the responsibilities of daily life, in other words family, job and social life.

According to a review of the literature on post-divorce adjustment by Berman and Turk (1981), the problems and stresses encountered by the divorced fall into 3 major categories: pragmatic concerns, interpersonal and social problems and family related stresses.

In terms of pragmatic issues it has been found that both men and women encounter problems in such areas as home maintenance, household organization and finances (Hethering-

et al., 1976; Goode, 1956; Brandwein et al., 1974). Divorced people seem to express a general feeling of being overwhelmed, of not having enough time to do things, and of not knowing what to do and how to do it.

In terms of interpersonal and social aspects, Raschke (1979) has found that social supports help to make the transition from being married to being divorced easier. The crucial factor appears to be the availability of some type of support. Spanier (1979) identified friends as making the difference whereas Raschke proposed the church as possibly being conducive to a less stressful divorce experience. Thus, according to Spanier and Raschke, having someone important to the individual appears to be an important factor associated with postdivorce adjustment.

Goode (1956) on the other hand, reports that although old friends are supportive and helpful in the beginning, they soon place themselves at a distance. This, according to Goode, happens as a result of conflicting loyalties to the two former spouses.

Brandwein et al., (1974) and Miller (1970) have found that ambivalence regarding the divorce, sexual attraction to the divorced person, stereotypes of a divorced woman and a fear in couples that the same thing will happen to them are common attitudes that develop among the friends of the divorced person. Parallel to this change of attitudes, divorced

individuals themselves also go through some change in attitudes and feelings regarding interpersonal involvements. The fear of getting involved in another long-term relationship and a sense of vulnerability influence their level of social activity, which in turn, effects their post-divorce adjustment (Bohannon, 1970; Brown, 1976; Weiss, 1975).

Family interactions is the third problem area that contributes to postdivorce distress. The tense and negative kind of contact between the spouses before, during and after the divorce often hinders effective adaptation (Hetherington et al., 1976; Weiss, 1975, 1976). Even routine child rearing practices can become disrupted during divorce. Problems of this kind usually are magnified when children, especially male children become less compliant with the custodial parent (Hetherington et al., 1976; Mendes, 1976).

Berman and Turk (1981) also say that the individual's emotional reactions to the divorce and to the life after it is a central component of the post-divorce adjustment process. Following the divorce, both men and women experience similar patterns of personal and emotional problems. During the first year following divorce, both men and women report low self-esteem, confusion concerning social and sexual roles, and feelings of anger, anxiety, ambivalence and depression. Men report a lack of both structure and coherent personal identity, feelings of rootlessness and guilt (Hetherington et al., 1976; Mendes, 1976). Women report feeling unattrac-

tive, helpless, both personally and socially incompetent (Hetherington et al., 1977).

Other variables that have been found to be associated with post-divorce adjustment are the following: timing of family events, family composition, family economic and occupational position, sex role attitudes and gender.

The two timing variables that have received the greatest attention in adjustment to divorce are length of marriage and length of separation. Goode's (1956) research on women showed that longer marital durations were associated with greater trauma in the post-divorce period. Whereas Barringer's (1973) and Raschke's (1974) studies of men and women showed no relationship between marital duration and divorce adjustment. The stress and trauma has been found to decrease as the length of time separated from spouse increases (Barringer, 1973; Goode, 1956, Raschke, 1974). Raschke (1974) found the relationship between length of separation and trauma to be much stronger for males than for females.

In terms of the relationship between children and divorce adjustment (in other words, in terms of family composition), Goode's (1956) study of women and Pearlin and Johnson's (1977) study on men and women showed an inverse relationship between the number of children and adjustment. Goode found that this relationship only held for families with two or more children. In addition, Pearlin and Johnson found that

the presence of young children lessened chances for good adjustment; while Goode's findings indicated that older children detracted from adjustment. Hetherington et al., (1978) report that separation from children contributes to the stress experienced by divorced males. Westman and Cline (1973) argue that the legal aspects of divorce are complicated by the presence of children. In contrast, Raschke's (1974) research findings indicate that both men and women with greater numbers of children experienced less trauma after divorce. When a more comprehensive scale was used, Raschke found that the positive relationship between number of children only held for men and that females with greater numbers of children were less active socially and this was found to detract from good adjustment (1974).

In relation to family economic and occupational position, in one of the first studies of adjustment to divorce, Waller (1930) found economic independence to be an important factor in readjustment. He also observed that economic difficulties often pushed women into unsuitable second marriages. Goode's (1956) study revealed that steadiness of income was an important factor for the divorced mother's feelings of security and adjustment.

Raschke (1974) found that female divorcees who were economically independent experienced lower stress and easier transitions into the divorced status. Other research has shown that economic resources play an important role in the

divorce adjustment of both men and women (Pearlin and Johnson, 1977; Spanier and Casto, 1979; Spanier and Lackman, 1980).

Sex role attitudes is another variable that contributes to post-divorce adjustment. Research shows that women with non-traditional sex role attitudes experience fewer problems in adjusting to divorce (Brown et al., 1977). Pearlin and Johnson (1977) found that divorced men who received custody of the children, and by so doing, performed non-traditional roles were more depressed than married men with parental responsibility or single men with no family responsibilities. Granvold, Pedler and Schellie (1979) found that women with more equalitarian sex role expectations were found to be better adjusted than women with less equalitarian attitudes. Brown, Perry and Harburg (1977) have found that traditional women (those women who get their basic satisfaction and sense of identity from the wife and mother roles; feel that the woman's role is subordinate to the man's etc.) report significantly more distress during marital dissolution than non-traditional women.

Another variable that plays a role on post-divorce adjustment is gender. Some of the researchers examining the effects of gender on divorce adjustment have found women to be disadvantaged in this process. Brandwein, 1974; Brown and Fox, 1978; Stein, 1970). As indicated before, custody of children, role strain, lack of time for social activities, economic dependence in alimony and child support detract from

women's chances for adjustment after divorce (Raschke, 1974). Some others have found that men, as compared to women, appeared to show increased vulnerability to stress measured by emotional indices (Chiriboga and Cutler, 1977). The timing of adjustment problems also seems to vary by sex. Bloom and Caldwell (1981) suggest that women experience greater problems prior to the separation while men experience greater problems after the separation.

Another study that has been conducted on post-divorce adjustment is by Newman and Langer (1981). They have tried to explore the possible relationship between post-divorce adjustment and the attributions divorced women make for the failure of their marriages. The results revealed that significantly more subjects who attributed their divorces to interactive rather than personal factors were more active, more socially skilled, happier, more optimistic, and less likely to blame themselves rather than outside forces for failures. Their findings were also analyzed to see whether or not subjects had initiated their divorce proceedings. They found that those subjects who were asked for a divorce and who made person attributions for the divorce were the least self-satisfied. They also found that subjects who were asked for the divorce, as opposed to those who did the asking, blamed themselves more for failures rather than blaming outside forces.

F. FAMILY COHESION

Recently many theorists have developed concepts describing various dimensions of marital and family behavior. One such dimension is family cohesion. In a review of the literature Olson, Sprenkle and Russell (1979) report that more than 40 terms that are related to this concept have been developed by investigators who have been observing families and that this dimension is being utilized by psychiatrists, family sociologists, small group theorists, group therapists, social psychologists and anthropologists as well as family therapists. The fact that the dimension is being utilized by so many social science disciplines is seen as a cross-validation of its importance and significance (Olson et al., 1979).

Let us now review some of the investigators that have utilized the cohesion dimension in their works and have coined terms for it.

Historically, Wynne et al., (1958) were the first to announce that schizophrenic families have a "predominant concern with fitting together at the expense of developing personal identities". They described this process as "pseudomutuality" (cited in, Olson et al., 1979).

Stierlin (1974) clarified the struggle to balance separateness and togetherness in families by identifying two opposing forces; "centripetal" and "centrifugal". High family cohesion, i.e., "centripetal force" pulls family members to-

gether into an intellectual and emotional unity; whereas "centrifugal force" pulls family members away from the system. According to Stierlin, of the three transactional modes that characterize parent-adolescent relationships, the two (binding and delegating) are centripetal, while the third (expelling) is centrifugal. Families are dysfunctional when these modes are in appropriately timed or too intense so that only one extreme predominates. Stierlin says that a family system operates most effectively when these opposing forces are in balance (cited in Olson et al., 1979).

Minuchin is another investigator that has contributed to the topic. According to Minuchin, the sense of "belongingness" and the sense of "separateness" come from transactional patterns in the family structure. The sense of belongingness occurs through belonging to the family system, while the sense of separateness occurs through participation in systems outside the family or in different family subsystems.

Family structure is defined as the "invisible set of functional demands that organize the ways in which family member interact" (Minuchin, 1974, p.51). Its these interactions that, when repeated, develop into transactional patterns and enable the members of a family to define who they are in relation to others.

A family carries out its functions via subsystems which are made up of family members and each member can belong

to a number of subsystems; the father can belong to the husband-wife dyad, as well as the father-son dyad.

Subsystems are separated from each other by boundaries. Boundaries are the rules that define who participates and how he participates in a subsystem. Boundaries protect the differentiation of the system and allow each subsystem to function without being interfered with the other subsystems.

For families to function properly, it is very important that the boundaries between the subsystems are well-defined and clear. When boundaries are blurred, there is no more differentiation among the subsystems. Couples, for example, want to be close to each other, but they would also need to have a sense of separateness and some emotional space around themselves. Whereas when boundaries are blurred, the level of emotionality and mutual expectations increase. When this increase is more than what can be tolerated, anxiety appears. And the reaction to this kind of anxiety is usually wishing for some distance, in other word, separateness. This represents the enmeshed/too highly cohesive end of the interaction continuum.

In some others, the boundaries are overly rigid. Communication across subsystems becomes difficult, the protective function of the family disappears. While in the former there is a lot of dependency and limited autonomy; in the latter, families may function autonomously but have a skewed

sense of independence and lack a feeling of loyalty and belonging, the capacity for interdependence and for sharing support when needed. There is a lack within the family supportive system (Minuchin, 1977). Both extremes indicate areas of possible pathology.

Bowen (1978) has also contributed to the topic of family cohesion. According to Bowen, the degree of fusion and differentiation between emotional and intellectual functioning is very important. He emphasizes the concept of "differentiation of the self" saying that the more differentiated individuals are, the more the relative separation between their emotional and intellectual functioning and thus the more flexible and adaptable they will be. For him, high cohesion is an indifferentiated family ego mass" or an "emotional fusion" while low cohesion is "emotional divorce". The optimal level for Bowen is where there is a balanced cohesion, i.e., "differentiated self". Bowen is in a way different from all other theorists that have developed concepts on this topic in that "differentiation" is an infinite search, rather than an optimal midpoint or a bipolar curvilinear continuum (Beavers, Voeller; 1983).

Social psychologists interested in the family as a small group have also used the concept of cohesion. Levinger's (Olson et al., 1979) definition of cohesion is similar to that from small group research. Levinger sees marital cohesion as a direct function of psychological attraction and

barrier forces inside the marriage and an inverse function of the attractiveness of alternative relationships.

A sociologist, Colette Carisse (Olson et. al., 1979) has developed a typology of leisure styles that utilizes cohesion as one of the major dimensions. She describes extreme cohesion as "pathogenic pursuit of consensus, or total identification" while she defines extreme separateness as "pathogenic pursuit of interpersonal distance".

Rosenblatt, who comes from a social psychology and anthropology orientation, has also contributed to the dimension of family cohesion. He calls the two extremes "togetherness" and "aportness" and adds that families should find the optimal balance between the two. Rosenblatt has also identified the ways in which families avoid togetherness inspite of being together. While Rosenblatt and Titus explain how family members isolate themselves from each other when they are at home, Rosenblatt and Budd demonstrate how territoriality and privacy are maintained in married versus cohabiting couples. In another study, Rosenblatt and Russell describe how families cope with the problem of togetherness in vacations (all cited in Olson et al., 1979).

Yalom has also emphasized the importance of cohesion as a therapeutic factor in group psychotherapy and developed his own scale that proved to be useful in group psychotherapy (Olson et al., 1979).

Hess and Handel developed the terms "connectedness" and "separateness", Reiss developed the term "consensus - sensitive", while Kantor and Lehr called the high cohesion extreme "bonding" (Olson et al., 1979). The reason most of the terms developed by therapists describe the two extremes of the cohesion rather than its middle range, is because the two extreme points are more representative of the problematic kind of families who were seen by these therapists.

Finally, Olson and his associates who have contributed to the topic by developing a model, define family cohesion as "the emotional bonding members have with one another and the degree of individual autonomy a person experiences in the family system" (Olson et al., 1979, p.5). According to Olson's Model, cohesion is a continuum. At one extreme lies high family cohesion called enmeshment; where the boundaries between the spouses are diffused, where spouses overidentify with each other, where there is extreme bonding and limited individual autonomy. At this extreme lives are dominated by the emotional system, which leads to a less flexible, less adaptable family interaction pattern. At the other extreme lies disengagement, which is characterized by low bonding and high autonomy between the spouses. In contrast to the other extreme, at this extreme there's an emotional distance between the spouses and a high relative separation between their emotional and intellectual functioning which makes the family members unable to interact interdependently. Olson hypothesizes that it is the

moderate degree of cohesion which is most conducive to effective family functioning and optimum individual development. It is expected that when the levels of cohesion are balanced, the family will deal with stress more effectively; whereas the extreme ends are seen as problematic and maladjusted. Mental illnesses are mostly seen at extreme ends rather than the moderate levels (Olson et al., 1979).

Olson and his associates have developed a Circumplex Model of Marital and Family Systems to identifying the 16 types of marital and family systems based on the family dimension of cohesion and adaptability. In terms of cohesion, families can be divided into four groups: very low, low to moderate, moderate to high and very high. The variables that are used to assess the degree of family cohesion are emotional bonding, independence, boundaries, coalitions, time, space, friends, decision-making, interests and recreation.

G. RATIONALE OF THE STUDY AND HYPOTHESES

Since divorce is one of the most stress-producing events; it is of paramount importance to identify the factors that may be related to it. As indicated above, cohesion is a variable that serves as a clinical indicator for diagnosis of interactive functioning in couples and families. There's no previous research to support the idea that spouses belonging to different points along the cohesion continuum would react differently to divorce. However, since divorce is a stress -

producing event, and since according to many, those at the extreme points of the cohesion continuum happen to be less flexible and less capable of dealing with stress; we could assume that those with balanced cohesion would also do better at the post-divorce adjustment period. Knowledge of such a relationship may prove in future research to be a powerful therapeutic tool in post-divorce adjustment counseling. The study may also help to fill the gap on divorce literature, since research on divorce in Turkey is very limited.

HYPOTHESES

The hypotheses underlying this study have been structured as follows:

HYPOTHESIS I

Individuals whose cohesion scores lie at the extreme ends of the cohesion continuum will have a higher post-divorce readjustment score than those individuals whose scores are moderate.

HYPOTHESIS II

Individuals whose cohesion scores lie at the extreme ends of the cohesion continuum will rate their current lives more negatively than those individuals whose scores are moderate.

II. METHOD

A. SUBJECTS

40 divorced females served as subjects in this study. It was felt that 40 would yield a suitable number for statistical analyses. The group consisted only of females to avoid further complications; since it is hard to have access to male subjects who seem to be less willing to participate in such studies. The subjects were recruited by the help of a divorce lawyer.

All subjects had to meet the following criteria:

- 1- They had not lived through a separation period before the legal divorce.
- 2- The length of time since divorce was not less than 1,5 yrs and not more than 3,5 yrs.
- 3- They were not remarried.

The reason divorced women who had gone through a separation period before the legal divorce were not included

in the study is because it is easier to operationalize the length of time when it begins with the date of the legal divorce.

The reason the length of time since divorce had to be 1,5-3,5 yrs is because it has been found (Hetherington, Cox, Cox 1977) that it takes minimum of 2 yrs after the divorce for the family to readjust to its new structure and proceed to the next developmental stage... They are also apt to forget more about the marriage if the period in between is more than 4 yrs.

The reason remarried women were not included is because remarriage entails its own adjustment problems and we did not want to confound it with post-divorce adjustment problems.

A non-probability, purposive sampling was utilized because of the difficulty in obtaining subjects that had the above qualifications. Since the sample was a purposive one, it is not possible to generalize the findings to all divorced persons - we can only talk about upper-middle class divorced women residing in Istanbul and fulfilling these criteria.

B. PROCEDURE

Except a few, most of the 40 women that were eligible and who agreed to participate were seen at their place of work. They all received a set of assessment data which took

about 15 minutes to complete. Instructions as to how to rate the scales were given by the writer. The measures included Faces II (Olson, Porter and Bell, 1978) an adjustment scale (a questionnaire developed for this study) and the Semantic Differential Scale (Osgood, Tannenbaum and Suci, 1957).

C. MEASUREMENTS

The independent variable of this study is the pre-divorce family cohesion level as perceived by the women. This variable was measured by Faces II (See Appendix A).

The dependent variable of the study is post-divorce adjustment and it was measured both by an adjustment scale and by the Semantic Differential Scale. The dependent variable was made up of 9 sub-variables 6 of them were derived from the adjustment questionnaire:

Questions 13-20 were concerned with the post and present problems caused by the divorce. When the post scores were compared with the present scores; the individuals who showed decrease in problems were rated "adjusted", those who showed increase in problems were rated "maladjusted", and those who showed no change were rated "no change".

Thus, the new variable that is the difference score between past a present problems that was derived from the information obtained from questions 13-20 consisted of three groups.

The second variable was derived from questions 20-22. These were questions concerning contact with ex-husband and old friends.

The third variable was derived from question 24, which asked about the frequency of contact with ex-husband.

The fourth variable was derived from question 25, which asked about the psychosomatic complaints at the time of divorce.

The fifth variable was derived from question 27, which asked about the present psychosomatic complaints.

And finally the sixth variable was derived from question 35, which asked about the present social life (See Appendix B).

The last three variables (evaluation, potency and activity) are those derived from the Semantic Differential Scale (See Appendix C).

The three assessment measures are described below:

- 1- The assessment of pre-divorce family cohesion level was made by a self-report scale called FACES II. Family cohesion, as indicated earlier, was defined as "the emotional bonding that family members have toward one another" (Olson et al., 1979).

Faces II was developed by Olson, Porter and Bell (1978) to empirically test the Circumplex Model which was constructed by Olson et al. (1974). The scale measures the adaptability and cohesion dimensions of family functioning. In this study, while both the adaptability and the cohesion items were administered, only the cohesion items were taken into consideration in scoring.

Faces II was designed so that individual family members can describe how they perceive their family. The scale contains 16 cohesion items for each of the following eight concepts related to the cohesion dimension emotional bonding, family boundaries, coalitions, time, space, friends, decision making, and interest and recreation. The reading level of the items is about seventh grade so that every individual above twelve years old can understand the items.

According to its scoring procedure, the individual total score on cohesion could be between 16-80. The four levels of family cohesion are; disengaged (extreme low cohesion) is 56.9 or below, separated is 57.0 to 65.0, connected is 65.1 to 73.0 and enmeshed (extreme high cohesion) is 73.1 and above according to American norms. As indicated earlier, while the two extremes are considered problematic; the separated and connected levels are considered to be the moderate and healthy levels of cohesion (Olson et al., 1978).

The norms on Faces II are based on 2,082 parents and 416 adolescents who participated in The National Survey in the USA. The scale was translated into Turkish through the use of the translation method by Fişek and was used in Turkish samples by Tunalı (1983) and Fıfşiloğlu (1984) (See Appendix A).

2- The assesment of post-divorce adjustment level was made through an adjustment scale that was developed by the author of this study.

The questionnaire was made up of 35 questions. The first 12 were those concerning demographic variables, personal and marital history. The remaining 23 were either 5 point scales or yes/no questions which aimed to find out the difference in the intensity of problems right after divorce and currently (The variables that were derived from the questionnaire were explained earlier).

3- The way the subjects view their life 1,5-3,5 years after the divorce was assessed by The Semantic Differential which has been developed by Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum (1957).

The Semantic Differential is a scale that differs from problem to problem by its factor composition. In the current study, the respondents rated bipolar adjectives in relation to their lives, as they currently felt about their lives. 12 bipolar adjectives were included; these items provide scale

scores on 3 factors which have been shown to have high factorial stability. These three factors are evaluation, potency and activity.

The rationale for using a second measurement (Semantic Differential) is as follows: Since the measure of post-divorce adjustment was newly developed for this study, there is no information yet as to its effectiveness. No other existing measure could be located. Therefore it was felt that a cross-check on the adjustment factor should be done by some other existing scale. The Semantic Differential is a scale which measures emotional connotations of concepts. It was reasoned that if a subject rates her current life highly on the SD, i.e., the emotional connotation is positively loaded, then this should reflect at least an aspect of positive post-divorce adjustment and vice versa. It was felt that the SD would provide a short of construct validity check for the construct of post-divorce adjustment.

III. RESULTS

Descriptive Findings

The sample was predominantly upper-middle class. The average age of the participating women was 35.5, ranging from 27 to 46. 48% of the women had one child, 35% were childless and 17% had two children. More than half of the women were university graduates, 40% were lycee graduates and only 10% were secondary school graduates. In terms of occupation, except for 5 housewives, all of them were employed. More than half of the women had been married for 2-10 years, and more than half of them had been divorced for 2.5-3,5 years at the time of the interview.

Hypothesis I stated that individuals whose cohesion scores lie at the extreme ends of the cohesion continuum will have a higher post-divorce adjustment score indicating maladjustment, than those individuals whose scores are moderate.

Hypothesis II stated that individuals whose cohesion scores lie at the extreme ends of the cohesion continuum will rate their current lives more negatively than those individuals whose scores are moderate.

The independent variable of the study was pre-divorce family cohesion level as perceived by the women. This variable was to be measured by Faces II, but since Faces II has not been standardized for Turkish population and because our sample was mostly loaded on the disengaged end of the distribution; we did not use the cut-offs provided by Faces II. Instead, based on the present sample's distribution, post hoc, we decided to divide the group into three levels. We called the lower third (0-38) the disengaged group, the middle third (39-45) the moderate group and the upper third (47-highest) the enmeshed group.

The dependent variable of the study was post-divorce adjustment which was made up to the following variables:

"difference score between past versus present problems concerning divorce"

"contact with ex-husband and old friends"

"frequency of contact with-husband"

"psychosomatic complaints at the time of divorce"

"present psychosomatic complaints"

"present social life"

"evaluation"

"potency"

"activity".

The means and standard deviations obtained from the above defined groups is given in Table I.

TABLE I. Means and standard deviations for the dependent variables for enmeshed, disengaged and moderate groups

		Enmeshed (n=15)	Moderate (n=13)	Disengaged (n=12)
Past/present problems concerning divorce	M	2.917	2.769	2.733
	SD	.289	.599	.704
Contact with ex-husband and old friends	M	1.583	1.462	1.067
	SD	.996	.967	.799
Frequency of contact with ex-husband	M	3.000	2.692	2.467
	SD	1.348	1.377	1.506
Psychosomatic complaints at the time of divorce	M	.417	.846	.467
	SD	.515	3.76	5.16
Present psychosomatic complaints	M	.750	.846	.667
	SD	.452	.376	.488
Present social life	M	.250	.462	.400
	SD	.622	.776	.632
Evaluation	M	6.167	5.385	5.067
	SD	5.921	3.798	3.240
Potency	M	2.250	-.308	2.333
	SD	4.351	3.199	3.498
Activity	M	2.583	4.077	2.467
	SD	4.358	2.813	4.121

Results Concerning Hypotheses

In general, both of the hypotheses were not supported. The results of the one way analyses of variances indicate that there is no significant difference among the three

categories of Faces II, in terms of adjustment. Only one variable, "psychosomatic complaints at the time of divorce" showed a significant relation in the predicted direction. That is, individuals who scored in the middle range on Faces II had significantly less psychosomatic complaints than the individuals in the upper and lower groups ($F=3.18$, $p<.05$). The means of "psychosomatic complaints at the time of divorce" for each group is as follows:

Enmeshed = .417

Moderate = .846

Disengaged=.467

Hypothesis II concerned the dependent variables derived from the Semantic Differential. As can be seen from Table II, there were no significant main effects. The results of the one way analysis of variances are presented in Table II.

TABLE II. One way analysis of variance summary table. F ratios and degrees of significance of the main effects for the dependent variables

	<u>F</u>	<u>Sig.</u>
Past/present problems concerning divorce	.369	.99
Contact with exhusband and old friends	1.20	.31
Frequency of contact with ex-husband	.47	.99
Psychosomatic complaints at the time of divorce	3.17*	.05
Present psychosomatic complaints	.57	.99
Present social life	.32	.99
Evaluation	.22	.99
Activity	.73	.99
Potency	2.19	.12

IV. DISCUSSION

This study hypothesized that there was a relationship between pre-divorce family cohesion level and post-divorce adjustment. The aim was to show that divorced individuals with moderate cohesion scores will be better adjusted and will evaluate their current lives more positively than those with high or low cohesion scores. As the results did not indicate a significant relationship between these variables, the hypotheses were not supported.

There maybe several possible reasons why almost no relationship was found. The first possible reason is that subjects were interviewed 1,5-3,5 years after divorce: How healthy these retrospective accounts were could be questioned. It is possible that these women remembered the unhappy years at the end of their marriages rather than the happy years in the beginning. It is also possible that they forgot how their family functioned and simply rated the scale in a way that would justify their present divorced situation. There's no way one can be sure their accounts are reliable.

Another point which is as important as the first one is the fact that since it was not possible to locate previous research on post-divorce adjustment among the available literature, we could not find a relevant adjustment measure. Therefore the author developed a post-divorce adjustment scale, but this scale of course suffers from all the inadequacies of a newly developed measure. For example it was found post hoc that certain issues which would be of importance in measuring post-divorce adjustment, have been neglected. The first of these issues is that this questionnaire did not inquire about the party that initiated the divorce. Having initiated the divorce or not, maybe one of the variables which may strongly influence adjustment after divorce. Another issue is presence/absence of social support. This questionnaire did not inquire if the woman had some kind of social support (grandparent, neighbours, maid etc.) to help her in her new role as a single. Having a social support, especially for mothers, can be a variable that would influence adjustment. It was also not asked if she herself came from a broken family. Those who come from a broken family may possibly take divorce easier than those who don't come from a broken family. A final point to inquire would be the date these divorced women started working. Almost all of the subjects were working-women at the time of the interview. But when did they start working? Are they adjusted/maladjusted because they had to start working after divorce? Or have they been working all the time? It maybe assumed that

information provided from a more adequate questionnaire would yield different results in terms of adjustment than those presently obtained.

A third possible reason arises from a methodological issue. Because of practical reasons, the sample group was a purposive one and was recruited through a divorce lawyer. The subjects were all females, divorced since 1,5-3,5 years, married only once and all coming from the same socio-economic status; i.e., a very homogeneous group. Surprisingly enough, almost all of them reported their marriage as disengaged, that is, falling at the low cohesion end of Olson's scale. One wonders if it is divorce that caused them to rate their marriages as disengaged, or if there was any cohesion in these families ever, or if it was the homogeneity of the group that produced such similar responses. In any case, more significant findings could have emerged if the sample had been more heterogeneous.

One final explanation, also of a methodological kind, is again a matter of homogeneity. Assuming that the woman rated, their marriages accurately, it appears that the majority of the marriages had very low levels of cohesion, that is, they were at the disengaged end of the Faces II scale. Thus the sample shows a high degree of homogeneity on the independent variable. Since there was little variance on the independent variable, it follows that the subjects showed little difference on the dependent variables.

Of the 6 dependent variables derived from the questionnaire, only one (psychosomatic complaints at the time of divorce) seemed to show a significant relationship to cohesion level. The moderate group seemed to have less psychosomatic complaints than the enmeshed and disengaged groups did. Little as it may be, this relationship indicates that cohesion level and post-divorce adjustment are somewhat connected.

There were a number of deficiencies in this study which may account for the negative findings. In this study, because of practical reasons, the sample group consisted only of females. But since when viewed as a system a family is more than the sum of its parts; we should look at the interaction of all the family members after divorce as well. This is one way of getting the whole picture of adjustment after divorce.

Another improvement in the present study would be to have a larger and randomly selected sample group. By doing so, we would not only be able to get more reliable results; but we would also be able to generalize those results to a larger population. As mentioned earlier, there is also room for consideration of other variables that probably affect post divorce adjustment;

Finally; this study, like manymore, can be criticized for not being a longitudinal one. The subjects have been interviewed after the event, divorce, had taken place. In

this kind of methodology one has no other choice but to assume that the response are what they are because of divorce and that they reflect the past accurately. Ideally if the subjects were interviewed while they were yet married and then after divorce, it may have been possible to see the real difference.

Despite the lack of confirmation for the hypotheses, two interesting points do emerge, which could be fruitfully explored. One has to do with the fact that the majority of the subjects rated their marriages as having been non-cohesive. One wonders whether this reflects a true difference between marriages which end up in divorce and marriages which stay intact, given comparable samples. This issue could be usefully explored and may even have implications for marital therapy. The second interesting finding has to do with the reporting of higher levels of somatic complaints among the extreme ends of the sample. It is possible that, in a culture as ours which tends to somaticize, adjustment is expressed through bodily symptoms more than psychological complaints. These findings indicate that, with appropriate methodological improvements, the relationship between family systems variables and post-divorce adjustment could be fruitfully examined.

V. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1- Barringer, K.D.: "Self Perception of the Quality of Adjustment of Single Parents in Divorce Participating in Parents - Without - Partners Organizations." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1973.
- 2- Bauman, K.E.: "The Relationship Between Age at First Marriage, School Dropout and Marital Instability." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1967, 29, 672-680.
- 3- Beavers, W.R., and Voeller, M.N.: "Family Models: Comparing and Contrasting the Olson Circumplex Model with the Beavers Systems Model." Family Process, 22:85-98, 1983.
- 4- Bergler, E.: Divorce Won't Help. New York: Harper Bros., 1948.
- 5- Berman, W.H., and Turk, D.C.: "Adaptation to Divorce: Problems and Coping Strategies." Journal of Marriage and the Family, February 1981, 179-188.
- 6- Bertalanffy, I.: General Systems Theory: Foundation, Developments, Applications. New York: Braziller, 1968.

- 7- Bloom, B.L.: Changing Patterns of Psychiatric Care. New York: Human Sciences Press, 1975.
- 8- Bloom, B.L., Asher, S.J., and White, S.W.: "Marital Disruption as a Stressor: A Review and Analysis." Psychological Bulletin, 1978, 43, 867-894.
- 9- Bowen, M.: "Theory in the Practice of Psychotherapy." In Family Therapy in Clinical Practice. New York: Aronson, 1978.
- 10- Brandwein, R.A., Brown, C.A., Fox, E.M.: "Women and Children Last: The Social Situation of Divorced Mothers and Their Families." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1974, 36, 498-514.
- 11- Briscoe, C.W., Smith, J.B., Robins, E., Marten, S., and Gaskin, F.: "Divorce and Psychiatric Disease." Archives of General Psychiatry, July, 1973, 29, 119-125.
- 12- Bohannon, P.: "The Six Stations of Divorce." pp.29-55 in P. Bohannon (Ed.), Divorce and After. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1970.
- 13- Brown, P.C., Perry, L., and Harburg, E.: "Sex Role Attitudes and Psychological Outcomes for Black and White Women Experiencing Marital Dissolution." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1977, 39, 549-61.

- 14- Brown, P., and Fox, H.: "Sex Differences in Divorce." In E. Gomberg and V. Frank (eds.), Gender and Psychopathology: Sex Differences in Disordered Behavior. New York: Bruner-Mazel, 1978.
- 15- Brown, E.: "Divorce Counseling." pp.202-232 in D.H.Olson (ed.), Treating Relationships. Lake Mills, Iowa: Graphic Publishing Company, 1976.
- 16- Bumpass, L.L., and Sweet, J.A.: "Differentials in Marital Instability: 1970." American Sociological Review, 1972, 37, 754-766.
- 17- Caldwell, R.A., and Bloom, B.L.: "Sex Differences in Adjustment During the Process of Marital Separation." Journal of Marriage and the Family, August, 1981, 693-701.
- 18- Carter, H., and Glick, P.C.: Marriage and Divorce: A Social Economic Study. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1970.
- 19- Chiriboga, D., and Cutler, L.: "Stress Responses among Divorcing Men and Women." Journal of Divorce, 1977-1978, 1, 95-106.
- 20- Coombs, L.C., and Zumeta, Z.: "Correlates of Marital Dissolution in a Prospective Fertility Study." Social Problems, 1970, 18, 92-102.

- 21- Cutright, P.: "Income and Family Events: Marital Instability." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1971, 33, 291 - 306.
- 22- Despert, J.L.: Children of Divorce. Garden City, NJ Dolphing Books, 1962.
- 23- Fişiloğlu, H.: "Perceived family cohesion and its relationship to ego strength in late adolescents." Unpublished master thesis, Boğaziçi University, 1984.
- 24- Fisher, E.O.: "A Guide to Divorce Counseling." The Family Coordinator, January, 1973, 22, (1), 55-61.
- 25- Furstenberg, F.F., Jr.: "Premarital Pregnancy and Marital Instability." Journal of Social Issues, 1976, 32, 67-86.
- 26- Goode, W.J.: After Divorce. New York: Free Press, 1956.
- 27- Gove, W.R.: "Sex, Marital Status and Suicide." Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 1972, 13, 204-213.
- 28- Granvold, D.K., Pedler, L.M., and Schellie, S.G.: "A Study of Sex Role Expectancy and Female Postdivorce Adjustment." Journal of Divorce, 1979, 2, 383-394.
- 29- Hetherington, E.M., Cox, M., and Cox, R.: "Divorced Fathers." The Family Coordinator, 1976, 25, 417-428.

- 30- Hetherington, E.M.: "Beyond Father Absence: Conceptualization of Effects of Divorce." pp.149-177 in E.M.Hetherington and R.D.Parke (eds.) Contemporary Readings in Child Psychology. New York: Mc Graw Hill, 1977.
- 31- Jacobson, G.: "Family Disintegration: Divorce." Crisis Intervention in Mental Health Emergencies. Newark, New Jersey: Abbott Laboratories, 1973.
- 32- Levine, N.: "Social Change and Family Crisis: The Nature of Turkish Divorce." In Ç.Kağıtçıbaşı (ed.) Sex Roles, Family and Community in Turkey. Indiana University Turkish Studies, 3, 1982.
- 33- Levinger, G.: "Marital Cohesiveness and Dissolution: An Integrative Review." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1965, 27, 19-28.
- 34- Levinger, G.: "Sources of Marital Dissatisfaction Among Applicants for Divorce." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1966, 36, 803-807.
- 35- Levinger, G.: "Marital Cohesiveness at the Brink: The Fate of Applications for Divorce." In G.Levinger and O.C.Moles (eds.), Divorce and Separation: Context, Causes, and Consequences. New York: Basic Books, 1979.
- 36- Loeb, J.: "The Personality Factor in Divorce." Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1966, 30, 562.

- 37- Mc Murray, L.: "Emotional Stress and Driving Performance: the Effect of Divorce." Behavioral Research in Highway Safety, Summer 1970, 1, 100-115.
- 38- Mendes, H.A.: "Single Fathers." Family Coordinator, 25 (October): 439:449.
- 39- Miller, A.A.: "Reactions of Friends to Divorce." pp.46-77 in P. Bohannon (ed.), Divorce and After. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1970.
- 40- Minuchin, S.: Families and Family Therapy. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974.
- 41- Mueller, C.W., and Pope, H.: "Marital Instability: A Study of its Transmission Between Generations." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1977, 39, 83-93.
- 42- Norton, A.J., and Glick, P.C.: "Marital Instability in America: Past, Present and Future." In G. Levinger and O.C. Moles (eds.), Divorce and Separation: Context, Causes and Consequences. New York: Basic Books, 1979.
- 43- Olson, D.H., Sprenkle, D.H., and Russel, C.S.: "Circumplex Model of Marital and Family Systems. I: Cohesion and Adaptability Dimensions, Family Types and Clinical Applications." Family Process, 18:3-28, 1979.
- 44- Osgood, C.E., Suci, G.J., and Tannenbaum, P.H.: "The Measurement of Meaning". Urbana, Ill. University of Illinois Press, 1957.

- 45- Pais, J., and White, P.: "Family Redefinition: A Review of the Literature Toward a Model of Divorce Adjustment," Journal of Divorce, 2(3):271-281, Spring, 1979.
- 46- Pearlin, L.I., and Johnson, J.S.: "Marital Status, Life Strains and Depression." American Sociological Review, 1977, 42:704-715.
- 47- Rapoport, L.: "The State of Crisis: Some Theoretical Considerations." In Crisis Intervention: Selected Readings, (ed.) Howard J. Parad (New York: Family Service Association of America, 1965), pp.22-31.
- 48- Raschke, H.J.: "Social and Psychological Factors in Voluntary Postmarital Dissolution Adjustment." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1974.
- 49- Raschke, H.: "Social-Psychological Consequences of Divorce: A Comparison of Black and White Low Income Single Parent Mothers." Prepared for Presentation at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, Boston, August, 1979.
- 50- Rosow, I., and Rose, K.D.: "Divorce Among Doctors." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1972, 34, 587-598.
- 51- Ross, H.L., and Sawhill, I.V.: Time of Transition: The Growth of Families Headed by Women. Washington, D.C. The Urban Institute, 1975.

- 52- Scanzoni, J.: "A Social System Analysis of Dissolved and Existing Marriages." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1968, 30, 452-461.
- 53- Spanier, G., and Fler, B.: "Factors Sustaining Marriage; Factors in Adjusting to Divorce." Science Monographs, Families Today; U.S. Dept. of Health Services, NIMH, Vol. 11(1):205-231, 1979.
- 54- Spanier, G.B., and Lachman, M.: Factors Associated with the Adjustment of Marital Separation." Sociological Focus, 1979, 13, 369-381.
- 55- Spanier, G.B., and Casto, R.: "Adjustment to Separation and Divorce: An Analysis of 50 Case Studies." Journal of Divorce, 1982, 2, 241-253.
- 56- Stein, R.L.: "The Economic Status of Families Headed by Women." Monthly Labor Review, December, 1970, 3-10.
- 57- Stierlin, H.: Separating Parents and Adolescents, New York, Quadrangle, 1974.
- 58- Thibaut, J.W., and Kelley, H.H.: The Social Psychology of Groups. New York: Wiley, 1959.
- 59- Tunali, B.: "An Investigation on need affiliation and its relation to family cohesion in Turkish adolescents." Unpublished master thesis, Boğaziçi University, 1983.

- 60- Waller, W.: The Old Love and the New: Divorce and Readjustment. New York: Horace Liveright, 1930.
- 61- Walsch, F.: Normal Family Processes. Guilford Press, 1982.
- 62- Weiss, R.S.: Marital Separation. New York: Basic Books, 1975.
- 63- Westman, J.C., and Cline, D.W.: "Divorce is a Family Affair." pp.465-470 in Lasswell and Lasswell (eds.) Love, Marriage, Family: A Developmental Approach, 1973.
- 64- Wiseman, R.S.: "Crisis Theory and The Process of Divorce". Social Casework, 1975, April, 205-212.
- 65- Wynne, L.C., Ryckoff, I.J., Day, J., and Hirsch, S.: "Pseudomutuality in the Family Relations of Schizophrenics." Psychiatry 21:205-222, 1958.

APPENDIX A

Aşağıda ailelerin genel işleyiş tarzlarını yansıtan bazı ifadeler vardır. Her ifadeyi okuduğunuz zaman (bu ifadelerin sizin evliliğiniz sırasındaki ailenizin durumunu ne kadar yansıttığını düşünüp) aşağıdaki ölçeğe göre cevap vermenizi rica edeceğim.

1. Hemen hemen hiçbir zaman
2. Nadiren
3. Arada sırada
4. Sık sık
5. Hemen hemen her zaman

Örneğin, "Ailemizde herkesin evde yaptığı belirli görevler vardır" cümlesi sizin evliliğiniz sırasındaki aileniz için hemen hemen her zaman doğru ise 5 diyeceksiniz. Eğer nadiren doğru ise, 2 diyeceksiniz. Lütfen numaraları cümlenin önündeki boş yere yazınız.

- ... 1. Ailemizde herkes zor durumlarda birbirine destek olur.
- ... 2. Ailemizde herkes fikirlerini rahatlıkla söyleyebilir.
- ... 3. Dertlerimizi başkalarıyla konuşmak aile içinde konuşmaktan daha kolaydır.
- ... 4. Ailede önemli kararlar alınırken herkesin söz hakkı vardır.
- ... 5. Ailece aynı odada biraraya geliriz.
- ... 6. Disiplinleri konusunda çocukların da söz hakkı vardır.
- ... 7. Ailemizde birçok şey birlikte yapılır.

- ... 8. Aile sorunları birarada tartışıılır ve varılan sonuçlardan herkes memnun olur.
- ... 9. Bizim ailede herkes kendi bildiğini yapar.
- ... 10. Evdeki sorumlulukları birbirimize sırayla devrederiz.
- ... 11. Ailede herkes birbirinin yakın arkadaşlarını tanır.
- ... 12. Ailemizdeki kuralların neler olduğunu anlatmak zordur.
- ... 13. Ailemizde herkes kendi vereceği kararlar hakkında diğerlerine danışır.
- ... 14. Ailemizde herkes düşündüğünü söyler.
- ... 15. Ailemizde birlikte yapacak birşeyler bulmakta zorluk çekeriz.
- ... 16. Ailede sorunlar çözülürken çocukların önerilerine de uyulur.
- ... 17. Ailemizde herkes kendisini diğerlerine yakın hisseder.
- ... 18. Ailemizde disiplin haklı bir şekilde uygulanır.
- ... 19. Ailemizde herkes kendisini, aileye göre başkalarına daha yakın hisseder.
- ... 20. Ailemiz dertlerini halletmek için farklı yeni yollar da dener.
- ... 21. Ailemizde herkes ortak aile kararlarına uyar.
- ... 22. Ailemizde sorumlulukları herkes paylaşır.
- ... 23. Ailemizde herkes boş zamanlarını birlikte geçirmekten hoşlanır.
- ... 24. Ailemizde kurallar kolay kolay değiştirilemez.
- ... 25. Ailemizde herkes evde birlikte olmaktan kaçınır.
- ... 26. Ortaya bir sorun çıktığında orta yolu buluruz.
- ... 27. Birbirimizin arkadaşlarını uygun görürüz.
- ... 28. Ailemizde herkes aklında olanı açıkça söylemekten çekinir.
- ... 29. Ailemizdekiler hep birarada birşeyler yapmaktansa, ikişer kişilik gruplar halinde birşeyler yapmayı tercih ederler.
- ... 30. Ailemizde kişiler ilgilerini ve eğlencelerini birbirleri ile paylaşır.

APPENDIX B

1. Yaşınız
2. Son Bitirdiğiniz Okul
 1. İlkokul
 2. Ortaokul
 3. Lise
 4. Üniversite
3. Mesleğiniz
4. Boşanmış olduğunuz kocanızın yaşı
5. Boşanmış olduğunuz kocanızın son bitirdiği okul
 1. İlkokul
 2. Ortaokul
 3. Lise
 4. Üniversite
6. Boşanmış olduğunuz kocanızın mesleği
7. Kaç çocuğunuz var?
 1. Hiç
 2. Bir
 3. İki
 4. Üç
 5. Üçten fazla
8. Çocuklarınızın yaşı ve cinsiyeti

<u>Cinsiyet</u>	<u>Yaş</u>
-----	-----
-----	-----
-----	-----
-----	-----
-----	-----

9. Ne kadar evli kaldınız?
 1. 6 ay - 2 sene
 2. 2 sene - 5 sene
 3. 5 sene - 10 sene
 4. 10 seneden fazla

10. Nasıl evlendiniz?

1. Görücü
2. Okulda tanıştık
3. Aile dostu
4. Diğer

11. Niye boşandınız?

1. Maddi sıkıntı
2. Cinsel problem
3. İhanet
4. Çevredeki insanlarla ilgili problemler (kayınvalide v.s.)
5. Kaba kuvvet
6. İhmalkâr davranışlar
7. Kötü alışkanlıklar (alkol, kumar, uyuşturucu v.s.)
8. Çocukların eğitimi
9. Diğer

12. Ne zaman boşandınız?

1. Birbuçuk - iki sene önce
2. İki-iki buçu sene önce
3. İki buçuk-üç sene önce

13. Boşandığınız zaman ne ölçüde maddi sıkıntınız oldu?

1. Hiç
2. Az
3. Arasıra
4. Epey
5. Sürekli

14. Şimdi ne ölçüde maddi sıkıntınız var?

1. Hiç
2. Az
3. Arasıra
4. Epey
5. Sürekli

15. Boşandığınız zaman çocuklarınızla ne ölçüde probleminiz oldu?

1. Hiç
2. Az
3. Arasıra
4. Epey
5. Sürekli

16. Şimdi çocuklarınızla ne ölçüde probleminiz var?

1. Hiç
2. Az
3. Arasıra
4. Epey
5. Sürekli

17. Boşandığınız zaman komşularınızla ne ölçüde probleminiz oldu?

1. Hiç
2. Az
3. Arasıra
4. Epey
5. Sürekli

18. Şimdi komşularınızla ne ölçüde probleminiz var?

1. Hiç
2. Az
3. Arasıra
4. Epey
5. Sürekli

19. Boşandığınız zaman ailenizle ne ölçüde probleminiz oldu?

1. Hiç
2. Az
3. Arasıra
4. Epey
5. Sürekli

20. Şimdi ailenizle ne ölçüde probleminiz var?

1. Hiç
2. Az
3. Arasıra
4. Epey
5. Sürekli

21. Boşanmadan önce arkadaşlık ettiğiniz kimseleri halen görüyor musunuz?

1. Evet
2. Hayır

22. Boşandığınız kocanızın ailesini halen görüyor musunuz?

1. Evet
2. Hayır

23. Boşandığınız kocanızı halen görüyor musunuz?

1. Evet
2. Hayır

(Cevap EVET'se 24'e geçiniz, cevap HAYIR'sa 25'e geçiniz)

24. Boşandığınız kocanızı ne kadar sık görüyorsunuz?

1. Sık sık
2. Arasıra
3. Okazyonlarda (çocukların doğum günleri, bayramlar v.s.)
4. Mecbur olmadıkça görmüyorum
5. Hiç

25. Boşandıktan sonra herhangi bir rahatsızlığınız oldu mu?

1. Evet
2. Hayır

(Cevap EVET'se 26'ya geçiniz, cevap HAYIR'sa 27'ye geçiniz).

26. Boşandıktan sonra ne tür bir rahatsızlığınız oldu?

1. Baş ağrısı
2. Mide rahatsızlığı
3. Kalp rahatsızlığı
4. Deri hastalığı
5. Solunum sistemi rahatsızlığı
6. Aşırı kilo kaybı veya artışı
7. Diğer

27. Şimdi herhangi bir rahatsızlığınız var mı?

1. Evet
2. Hayır

(Cevap EVET'se 28'e geçiniz, cevap HAYIR'sa 29'a geçiniz).

28. Şimdi ne tür bir rahatsızlığınız var?

1. Baş ağrısı
2. Mide rahatsızlığı
3. Kalp rahatsızlığı
4. Deri hastalığı
5. Solunum sistemi rahatsızlığı
6. Aşırı kilo kaybı veya artışı
7. Diğer

29. Boşandıktan sonra uyku düzeniniz ne ölçüde bozuldu?
1. Hiç
 2. Az
 3. Arasıra
 4. Epey
 5. Sürekli
30. Şimdi uyku düzeninizde bir bozukluk var mı?
1. Hiç
 2. Az
 3. Arasıra
 4. Epey
 5. Sürekli
31. Boşandıktan sonra iştahınız ne ölçüde bozuldu?
1. Hiç
 2. Az
 3. Arasıra
 4. Epey
 5. Sürekli
32. Şimdi iştahınızda bir bozukluk var mı?
1. Hiç
 2. Az
 3. Arasıra
 4. Epey
 5. Sürekli
33. Boşandıktan sonra yeni arkadaşlar edindiniz mi?
1. Evet
 2. Hayır
- (Cevap EVET'se 34'e geçiniz, cevap HAYIR'sa 35'e geçiniz).
34. Boşandıktan sonra edindiğiniz arkadaşların cinsiyeti nedir?
1. Hepsi erkek
 2. Çoğu erkek
 3. Yarısı kadın, yarısı erkek
 4. Çoğu kadın
 5. Hepsi kadın
35. Boşandıktan sonra sosyal yaşantınız nasıl değişti?
1. Eskisinden daha iyi oldu
 2. Eskisinden daha kötü oldu
 3. Diğer

