1981

An Investigation of the Effects of Parental Divorce on Third Graders and an Evaluation of a Divorce Education Program for Use in Third Grade Classrooms

Nancy Perlmutter Brody
Loyola University Chicago

Nancy Perlmutter Brody

Loyola University of Chicago

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE EFFECTS OF PARENTAL DIVORCE ON THIRD GRADERS AND AN EVALUATION OF A DIVORCE EDUCATION PROGRAM FOR USE IN THIRD GRADE CLASSROOMS

This is one of the first studies of the effects of divorce on school age children conducted in a normal, rather than a clinical setting. The sample consisted of 133 children in five intact third grade classrooms in Catholic schools in the Phoenix, Arizona area. Three of these classes were located in lower socio-economic status areas, and two were in upper socio-economic status areas.

Scores for children of parental divorce were compared with scores for children of intact families on the Separation Anxiety Test (SAT) and the Child's Behavior Traits (CBT) checklist. These comparisons were made for all the classes together and then again for School 2. School 2 was singled out because of that teacher's increased awareness of her students' home situations. The only statistically significant finding for the SAT at the .05 level of significance was that children of divorce in School 2 expressed a much greater need for individuation (self-reliance) than did children from intact families. On the CBT, no statistically significant differences in the scores for children of divorce and children of intact families were found.

This study also investigated a divorce education program for young school age children which was designed by this researcher to be presented in the classroom to all children, regardless of their parents' marital status. This program was found to be effective in increasing the children's understanding of divorce as shown by a comparison of pretest and posttest scores for the experimental and control groups. This difference was found to be statistically significant at the .01 level.

The pretest was also used as a measure of the children's knowledge of divorce. It was found that these third graders knew little about divorce, even if they had already experienced the divorce of their parents. Children of divorce in the experimental group, though, had higher gain scores than did children in intact families. Analysis of the "custody" item on the pretest gave further evidence that third graders lack knowledge about divorce.

From the results of this study, it would appear that a divorce education program in the schools is needed. This study found third graders to be uninformed about divorce, even if they had already experienced parental divorce. The divorce education program used in this study was found to be effective in teaching third graders about divorce. Further studies on the effects of parental divorce on school age children and the effects of divorce education programs in the schools in helping children cope with divorce are needed.

An Investigation of the Effects of Parental Divorce on Third Graders and an Evaluation of a Divorce Education Program for Use in Third Grade Classrooms

Nancy Perlmutter Brody

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

October

1981

Acknowledgements

I would like to express sincere thanks to Dr. Joy Rogers, Dr. Jack Kavanagh, and Dr. Ronald Morgan for all their time and efforts in my behalf as members of my dissertation committee. I also would like to express my appreciation to all the teachers and principals of the participating schools for their cooperation and allowing their students to take part in this study. I especially would like to express my thanks and gratitude to Sister Mary Bridget Ann Henderson, B.V.M., Superintendent of Schools for the Phoenix Diocese. Without her encouragement and support, this study would not have been done.

Additional thanks go to Cantor Barry Caplan of Har Zion Congregation and his students and to all the others who allowed their voices to be recorded for the divorce education program. Special thanks go to Joe Garagiola who added his professional touch. Thanks also to those who allowed themselves to be photographed as well as recorded. Extra thanks go to my husband, Marvin, my two daughters, Heather and Dina, and to John Drumm who played the major roles of the father and his three children in the divorce education program.

Finally, I would again like to thank my husband and children, this time for their understanding and encouragement and for putting up with all the emotional ups and downs that go along with completing a project such as this.

Vita

The author, Nancy Perlmutter Brody, was born May 11, 1946, in Chicago, Illinois.

Her elementary education was obtained in the public schools of Chicago, Illinois. Her secondary education was received at the Faulkner School in Chicago, from which she graduated in June, 1963.

Her undergraduate work was done at the University of Illinois in both Champaign and Chicago. She graduated from the Chicago campus in June, 1967, with a Bachelor of Arts in the teaching of French. Her work toward a Master's Degree in Guidance and Counseling was done at Northeastern Illinois University.

The author has taught high school French in Chicago, Child Development at De Paul University of Chicago, and Educational Psychology at Loyola University of Chicago.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CONTENTS OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Of all western nations, the United States has the highest divorce rate. The divorce rate per one thousand married women doubled between 1963 and 1974 from 9.6 to 19.3 (National Center for Health Statistics, 1977). For 1978, the divorce rate per one thousand married women had increased to 21.9. In 1978, 1,130,000 divorces were granted with 1,147,000 children under eighteen experiencing the divorce of their parents (National Center for Health Statistics, 1980).

The divorce rate varies from one region of the United States to another. The highest divorce rate is in the West. In some kindergarten and first grade classes, 40% to 50% of the children have divorced parents. It must be remembered that these high figures do not take into account the number of children with separated parents.

Because of the great number of children involved, research into the effects of parental divorce is needed. Existing research must be interpreted carefully with particular consideration given to the populations and samples used. Studies only including children seeking psychiatric help (Kalter, 1977; McDermott, 1970) yield different results from studies of children judged to be free of psychological disturbance. Also, comparisons of children whose parents are

divorced with children whose parents are still married (Glueck & Glueck, 1950; McDermott, 1970; Morrison, 1974) yield different results than when children whose parents are divorced are compared with children whose parents are still married, but unhappily married (Bane, 1976; Gettleman & Markowitz, 1974; Krantzler, 1974; Landis, 1960; Magrab, 1978; Nye, 1957). Although there is not one specific reaction to parental divorce, children faced with this kind of family disruption do seem to be susceptible to psychological problems (Anthony, 1974; Kapit, 1972; Kelly & Wallerstein, 1977a; Mahler & Rabinovitch, 1956).

Another problem with research studying the effects of divorce on children is the result of the existence of both immediate and longterm effects. Rohrlich, Ranier, Berg-Cross, and Berg-Cross (1977) explain, "Divorce when a child is seven may have no profound effect on latency development but characteristic difficulties may arise in adolescence" (p. 17). In other words, although a child may be found to be free from ill effects of his parents' divorce at the time of one study, we do not know if ill effects will appear later.

A great number of minor children affected by parental divorce are of school age. Surprisingly, the school age child has received little attention. Until recently, almost

all research into the effects of parental divorce on children was concerned with preschoolers and adolescents.

Wallerstein and Kelly (1976; Kelly & Wallerstein, 1976) have attempted to fill this void in the research by conducting an in-depth study of the effects of parental divorce on school age children. These researchers disagree with those who believe that the school age child is not as seriously affected by parental divorce as his or her preschool and adolescent siblings. Kelly and Wallerstein believe school age children do suffer when their parents divorce. For example, school age children with divorcing parents were found to be angry, fearful and sad. Children in the custody of their mothers missed their fathers a great deal. They spent considerable time wishing their parents would get back together again. Somatic symptoms often appeared. None of the children involved in this study was relieved by his or her parents' divorce. The omission of research into the effects of parental divorce on school age children does not seem justified.

Obviously, school plays a large part in the lives of children six to twelve years of age. Many researchers (Black, 1979; Boyer, 1979; Gardner, 1976; Hammond, 1979a, 1979b, 1979c; Kelly & Wallerstein, 1977a; Parks, 1977; Ricci, 1979; Rubin & Price, 1979; Wilkinson & Bleck, 1977) place some of the responsibility for helping children confronted

with parental divorce on the elementary schools. Hammond (1979c) and Parks (1977) believe the school is in the best position to help children of divorce. The teacher often takes on added importance because, with one parent leaving the home and the other usually unable to function well as a parent at that time of great emotional turmoil, the teacher may take on the role of parent surrogate (McDermott, 1968). Cox and Cox (1979) say, "This personal turmoil for the parents may result in a situation in which parents are least able to respond to the problems of their children when the children most need parental attention" (p. 62). Teachers can help prevent serious divorce related problems from erupting, but, according to Santrock and Tracy (1978), they must be careful not to expect certain types of negative behaviors from children of divorced parents or they could put a self-fulfilling prophecy into action.

Wilkinson and Bleck (1977) described a small group procedure for upper grade elementary school children whose parents are divorcing. Holdahl and Caspersen (1977) also use group sessions, but their groups are for all children and deal with various changes in the family, not specifically with parental divorce. This is a voluntary program.

Other measures used to help school age children of divorce are conducted in clinical settings. Hozman and Froiland (1976) developed their counseling technique based on the

assumption that children facing a parental divorce go through the same stages through which people facing the death of a loved one go. Dlugokinski (1977) also bases his program on the idea that children go through stages on the way to being able to accept their parents' divorce.

Magid (1977) uses group counseling for children and separate groups for their parents. The emphasis is on expressing feelings in relation to videotaped vignettes of family scenes. Kessler and Bostwick (1977) use a one-day six hour workshop for helping children of divorce.

Kelly and Wallerstein (1976) based their clinical program on their research into the effects parental divorce produce. They found that school age children are often unable to talk about their parents' divorce. Unlike children at other stages of development, talking about their parents' divorce often increased the children's suffering. Therefore, these researchers use "divorce monologues" in which the child is told a story about another child of the same age dealing with a divorce situation similar to his or her own. The child usually is able to identify with the feelings of the child in the story. From this, the child learns his or her feelings are acceptable and not unique.

R. A. Gardner (1976) uses a variety of ways to encourage children to make-up and tell their own stories. Gardner uses

these stories to try to gain insights into the child's problems, worries, and defenses.

The above techniques for helping school age children are not sufficient because children need someone to take them for help. It follows, then, that unless the parents recognize that their child needs help, none will be given. Therefore, at the time the child needs help the most, none may be offered. Also, a frequently overlooked by-product of parental divorce is the impact of the divorce on the child's friends.

The present investigation was undertaken with the belief that a divorce education program in the elementary schools is warranted. First, two standardized measures, the Separation Anxiety Test (SAT) and the Child's Behavior Traits (CBT) were used to determine if patterns of responding were different for children of divorce from those of children of intact families. The SAT was individually administered to each child. The classroom teachers completed the CBT checklist for their students. All the children in five intact third grade classrooms in Catholic schools in the Phoenix, Arizona area participated. Next, a divorce education program was presented to some of these children. Such a program could ultimately be presented to all children, regardless of their parents' marital status. The goals of this program would include helping those who are about to experience parental

divorce, those who are presently experiencing parental divorce, and those who have already experienced parental divorce. Those about to experience their parents' divorce are those whose parents are on the brink of making the decision to get divorced. These children often are well aware of the situation. Such children would profit from a divorce education program because much of their anxiety is based on their fear of the unknown. Learning about divorce and how other children have reacted to it could possibly help these children. Those presently experiencing their parents' divorce could hopefully find some comfort and support from a divorce education program. Those whose parents already are divorced may still have unanswered questions, perhaps questions they were too young to ask at the time of the divorce. These children may still think their feelings are unique or "bad". They may still feel they were responsible for the divorce and that they could, if they tried very hard, still bring about a reconciliation. Thus, those children could also be helped by a divorce education program.

Children from happy, intact families could also profit from this kind of program. These children probably have their own anxieties and questions about divorce. Also, divorce education could help children be more understanding of the problems their friends in divorcing families are having. In addition, children would learn there are alternative

lifestyles. In other words, such a program could promote acceptance of different lifestyles while helping to discourage the taunting and teasing some children of divorced parents have to endure.

The specific program developed by this researcher was designed for use in the third grade, although it could be used in other elementary grades. This is presently the only divorce education program addressed to all children, not just those identified as children of divorce. There is no other school program to help such young children understand and cope with divorce.

In accordance with Kelly and Wallerstein's research (1976) showing that this age child has difficulty discussing his or her parents' divorce, this is an audio-visual program. Slides consisting of scenes in the lives of three children whose parents are getting divorced and slides using puppet characters to teach concepts dealing with children and divorce are shown accompanied by cassette tapes. This researcher investigated the effects of this brief divorce education program on third graders. In addition, pretest scores were used to discover if children of parental divorce were more knowledgeable about divorce than their peers from intact families.

The present study was begun with four purposes in mind. First of all, would children of divorce respond in a

different way to separation situations than would children of intact families? Secondly, would the behavior of children of divorce be rated differently by their teachers than the behavior of children of intact families? Thirdly, would children of divorce be more knowledgeable about divorce than their peers from intact families? Finally, would the divorce education program have a positive effect on the children's understanding of divorce?

CHAPTER II

Review of Related Literature

Three major topics are discussed in this review of the related literature. This review begins with a section on attachment and separation anxiety. This section was included because when parents divorce, the child inevitably loses, in varying degrees, an attachment figure. Also, the general effects of parental divorce parallel the symptoms of separation anxiety.

The second topic presented is concerned with the effects of divorce on children. There are three parts to this discussion, beginning with a general review of the effects of parental divorce. Next comes the effects of parental divorce on the child's sexual development, an area of development that may be particularly affected by parental divorce. Finally, there is a section dealing with parental divorce as it specifically affects school age children.

The third topic of this review also consists of three parts, all dealing with ways children of divorce can be helped. First, the school's role in helping children of divorce is argued along with existing ways children of divorce are being helped in the schools. The second part discusses ways children of divorce are being helped in clinical, rather than school settings. Finally, the problems

with existing treatments for children of divorce are delineated.

Attachment and Separation Anxiety

A poor mother-child relationship is said to be detrimental to the child's development (Bender & Yarnell, 1941; Bowlby, 1940, 1944; Levy, 1937). Bowlby (1973) says that whether a child or adult is secure, anxious, or in distress is dependent, to a great degree, on the accessibility and responsiveness of his or her major attachment figure. He continues saying,

> An unthinking confidence in the unfailing accessibility and support of attachment figures is the bedrock on which stable and self-reliant personality is built. (p. 322)

Ainsworth and Bell (1970) explain attachment and attachment behaviors as follows:

> An attachment may be defined as an affectional tie that one person or animal forms between himself and another specific one -- a tie that binds them together in space and endures over time. The behavior hallmark of attachment is seeking to gain and to maintain a certain degree of proximity to the object of attachment, which ranges from close physical contact under some circumstances to interaction or communication across some distance

> under other circumstances. Attachment behaviors are behaviors which promote proximity or contact. In the human infant these include active proximity- and contact-seeking behaviors such as approaching, following, and clinging, and signaling behaviors such as smiling, crying, and calling. (p. 50)

In terms of attachment theory, Ainsworth, Bell and Stayton (1974) explain that infant attachment behaviors are adapted to reciprocal maternal behaviors. Although the infant-mother contact serves the biological need of the child for nourishment, Bowlby (1969) says that the essential biological function of the infant-mother attachment behavior is protection of the infant. He bases his view, in part, on Harlow's experimental studies with Rhesus monkeys (1958, 1961a, 1961b). In these studies, the infant monkey's attachment behaviors lead him to seek and make contact more often with the inanimate soft surrogate mother figure than with another surrogate mother figure which supplies his milk. Harlow also found that following an attachment being made to one surrogate mother figure, the infant monkey uses it as a secure base from which to explore and also as a place of safety when he is fearful.

Ainsworth, Bell, and Stayton (1974) say learning plays a part in the development of attachment. These researchers say the infant raised in a social environment with one or more

adults who are consistently accessible to him or her becomes attached to one or a few specific people around 6 months of age. Learning is said to have taken place when the child is able to discriminate his or her mother from others. Bowlby (1969) explains that during the second half of the first year, an infant's attachment behavior becomes "goal-corrected." This means the child will have a "set-goal" of proximity to his or her attachment figure, and attachment behavior will begin if he or she goes beyond that distance. The acquisition of "object permanence" (Piaget, 1937/1954) changes the infant-mother relationship. Attachments, by definition, must have time- and space-bridging qualities which can only come about after the child is cognitively capable of conceiving of the attachment figure's existence even when out of the child's perception. Phillips (1969) explains,

> Psychiatrists have coined the term "separation anxiety" to refer to the distress that is occasioned by the absence of the mother. But how can the child be distressed about being separated from her if she does not exist when she is not present? The answer is, he can't; and in point of fact, separation anxiety does not occur in Stages 1 or 2. Its development is correlated, as one might suspect, with that of object permanence; until then,

it is literally a case of "out of sight, out of mind." (p. 24)

The part cognitive development plays in separation anxiety was also discussed by Littenberg, Tulkin, and Kagan (1971). They base their work on the idea that environmental events different from the established schema (a representation of experience based on attention to important aspects of the environment) cause distress (Hebb, 1946; Mussen, Conzer & Kagan, 1969). The question raised is if the child will suffer separation anxiety when mother's leaving is discrepant with his or her schema. The authors say that the locus of the separation should be an important element to the extent of discrepancy experience.

These researchers studied the behavior of 11 month old infants in their own homes when their mothers left the room. Twelve mothers left through a familiar exit and 12 mothers left through an infrequently used exit (closet or basement door). The babies were observed for two minutes prior to the mother's return. Ten minutes later, the mothers left again. Those who had previously gone out through a familiar exit now left through an unfamiliar one, and those who had left through a rarely used exit before now went out through a familiar exit. These researchers found no difference in the children's responses based on their birth order, sex, or order of mother's exit. The door used was shown to make a

difference. Eight of the children cried when mother left through the unfamiliar exit, and six of these did not cry when she left through the familiar exit. Fifteen of the children vocalized, stared, or crawled to the unfamiliar door within four seconds after mother's departure through that door, but none of the children did so when mother left through the familiar door. Littenberg et al. (1971) believe that their data imply that cognitive factors are relevant to separation anxiety. They refer to Ainsworth's (1967) study of Ganda babies who seemed to show separation anxiety several months younger than American babies do. Ainsworth believes that the earlier onset of separation anxiety is due to a greater contact between mother and child in Ganda. Littenberg et al. (1971) believe that, because Ganda children are rarely left by their mothers, they find their mother's departure discrepant earlier than American children do.

Bowlby (1969) says, "No form of behavior is accompanied by stronger feelings than is attachment behavior" (p. 209). It should not be surprising, then, that loss of the attachment figure produces anxiety and has adverse effects on the child's development both at the time of separation and in the future (Bowlby, 1951). The way one views separation anxiety depends on his or her theory of anxiety in general. Bowlby (1961a) says six major positions for explaining separation anxiety have emerged.

First is Freud's theory of "Transformed Libido." Freud (1905) explains, "anxiety in children is originally nothing other than an expression of the fact that they are feeling the loss of the person they love" (p. 224). The child's libido remains unsatisfied when separated from the person he or she loves.

Second is the "Birth Trauma" theory advocated by Otto Rank (1924/1929). He views separation of the young child from his or her mother as a reproduction of the birth trauma.

The third theory is usually called "Signal Theory," a term Freud introduced. This theory views the mother's leaving as a traumatic event for the child. The child then uses his or her anxiety as a safety device. This anxiety is functional in that the anxiety may be expected to ensure the mother's not being gone for too long. There are three main variants of this theory. Freud (1926/1959) sees the traumatic event as an economic disturbance resulting from an excessive amount of stimulation because of unsatisfied bodily needs. Jones (1927/1948, 1929/1948) says it is a fear of extinction of the capacity for sexual enjoyment. Spitz (1950) and Joffe and Sandler (1955) explain that the traumatic situation is one of narcissistic injury.

Melanie Klein (1934/1948, 1935/1948) proposes the fourth and fifth theories. She says that neurotic anxiety comes from the child's fear and concern that his or her mother will

be or has already been destroyed because of the child's own sadistic feelings. This is the theory of "Depressive Anxiety." The theory of "Persecutory Anxiety" maintains that the child believes the mother leaves because she is angry at him or her or wants to punish him or her. The child fears she will never return or will still be angry when she does return.

Finally, there is the theory of "Frustrated Attachment." Suttie (1935) says anxiety is a reaction to fear or actual frustration of the child's need for the mother's company. Hermann (cited in Bowlby, 1961a) says anxiety comes from being left alone and results in the child's wanting to seek and cling to his or her mother. Because the viewpoints of Suttie and Hermann both say anxiety is the child's primary response to separation from his or her mother, Bowlby calls them the theory of "Primary Anxiety."

Bowlby (1961a) sees an important connection between anxiety as the reaction to fear of losing the love object and mourning the actual loss. He was surprised that Helen Deutsch (1937) separated the two saying that anxiety is an infantile response and grief and mourning are more mature responses. She wrote, "The early infantile anxiety we know as the small child's reaction to separation from the protecting and loving person." But, she says, with the older child, "suffering and grief [are] to be expected in place of anxiety" (p. 13). According to Deutsch, separation anxiety that

occurs when the person is older is a regression to infancy. Bowlby disagrees with this opinion. He maintains that infants and young children do respond with grief when separated from their mothers (1960). And, Bowlby also believes that attachment behavior continues into adolescence and adulthood. He explains (1969) that during adolescence and adulthood, attachment behavior is often directed to people, groups, and institutions outside the family. He says that the circumstances that lead to an adult's attachment behavior (such as sickness and calamity) indicate that adult attachment behavior is a continuation of childhood attachment behavior.

Therese Benedek (1946) agrees with Bowlby and says separation is traumatic and leads to anxiety and longing for the lost person. Even adults suffer with anxiety when they are separated from a love object for any length of time. She says, "The universal response to separation is anxiety" (p. 146).

Dlugokinski (1977) says our lives consist of alternating attachments and separations which he calls the engagement-disengagement process. Hansburg (1972) agrees that separation is an inevitable experience necessary to the individual's development. He explains that in order to successfully progress through developmental separation, family unity and availability are crucial. Disturbed conditions (divorce,

death, etc.) in relation to separations can, Hansburg says, result in problems with such things as giving up infantile attachments, controlling hostility, abnormal anxiety, and loss of self-esteem. All children, according to Hansburg, have some degree of trouble with separation, but the quantity and quality of their problems are of importance.

Hansburg writes of needing a balance between separation-individuation and attachment-interdependence. He lists six reactions often used to restore this balance:

1. hostility
2. painful tension
3. reality avoidance
4. loss of self-esteem
5. identity crisis
6. imbalances in intellectual functioning. (p. 8)

Hansburg constructed the Separation Anxiety Test in hopes of its successfully being used to diagnose children's reactions to separation. Some of the assumptions on which he based his test are as follows:

1. that pictures of separation experiences can stimulate children sufficiently to be able to project their reactions,
2. the children can select and report reactions to separation which genuinely reflect how they feel,

3. that these reported reactions will show patterns which can be useful in diagnosis and treatment of separation problems,
4. that it will help to reveal what mechanisms of defense against separation anxiety are mobilized. (pp. 13-14)

The Separation Anxiety Test consists of 12 pictures of separation situations. Following each picture, Hansburg lists 17 statements about the child in the picture. The subjects are asked to select as many statements as they want that reflect how the child in the picture feels. Hansburg found that if the child were sufficiently expressive to reveal them, responses to the test items would reflect his or her own emotional reactions to separation. Hansburg is convinced that reactions to the pictures of the Separation Anxiety Test are expressive of personality characteristics because "separation experiences are crucial phenomena throughout the life cycle and therefore elicit significant and fundamental facets of individual personality" (p. 140).

Freud (1926/1959) wrote of the separation anxiety, mourning, and defense sequence. He explained anxiety is the reaction to the danger of losing the love object. Mourning, he said is the reaction to the actual loss of the love object. Defenses protect the ego from instinctual demands it is more vulnerable to when the love object is lost.

Bowlby agrees there is a sequence of behavior exhibited when the love object is lost. Bowlby (1973) writes of three phases of a single process through which the separated child progresses. The first phase is protest and is the actual separation anxiety. The child tries everything to get his or her mother back. The second phase is despair and consists of the child's grief and mourning of his or her loss. The child remains preoccupied with the lost love object. The third phase is a kind of defense and is called emotional detachment. (Originally this phase was termed denial.) This loss of interest in the mother often continues after the child and his or her mother are reunited. The duration of the child's detachment correlates highly and significantly with the length of the separation. Bowlby also says there is reason to believe that if young children to 3 years old experience long or repeated separations, their detachment can persist indefinitely. In addition, Westheimer (1970) believes that lengthy separations change the mother's feelings for her child.

The effects of separation on the child are likely to persist and be increased when the child is threatened with losing his or her attachment figure before the actual separation, as in the case of marital discord (Bowlby, 1973). Such children often are violently angry after the actual separation, as are children and adolescents who experience repeated separations. Separation and threats of separation arouse

angry and anxious behavior in children and adults toward the attachment figure. Hostility can increase anxiousness and being anxious can, in turn, increase hostility.

Bowlby (1960, 1961b, 1963, 1973) discusses the frequency of angry reactions to a loss. He writes of functional and dysfunctional anger. Functional anger's goal is to assist in bringing about a reunion and help prevent the love object from going away again. Permanent loss, such as loss through death, produces anger and aggressive behavior that is without function. This dysfunctional anger occurs because in the beginning, the person cannot believe the loss really occurred and is permanent. Therefore, he or she acts as if it is possible to get the person back and also reproaches him or her for leaving.

Wolfenstein (1969) studied the responses of children and adolescents to the death of a parent. She found that anger is very common and is associated with hopes of recovering the lost parent. She said, "instead of grief the most common reaction to the loss of a parent which we find in children and adults is rage" (p. 432). Parkes (1971) also found anger to be a common reaction in his study of the responses of widows to their husband's death.

Bowlby (1944, 1951, 1973) concludes that anger and hostility directed toward an attachment figure can be understood as a response to frustration. Kestenberg (1943) writes that adolescents often have a need to retaliate when they are

separated from their parents. Often this anger and hostility is repressed or displaced. In addition, Bowlby says the person's anger is also often projected onto others. Thus, the responses toward the attachment figure become quite complicated and distorted.

To study the effects of separation from mother in early childhood, observational studies of children in hospitals and other residential institutions have been conducted. Bowlby (1973) says that the intensity of young children's responses to separation from their mothers seem to be lessened by their keeping a familiar companion or possession or getting mothering care from a substitute mother. Having a sibling with him or her has been shown to comfort the child separated from his or her mother (Heinicke & Westheimer, 1965).

Spitz (1945, 1946) says separation from the mother after the child is 6 months old produces different reactions from those of younger infants. Spitz reported the following symptoms in the infants in the second half of their first year that he observed:

> Apprehension, sadness, weepiness.
>
> Lack of contact, rejection of environment, withdrawal.
>
> Retardation of development, retardation of reaction to stimuli, slowness of movement, dejection, stupor.
>
> Loss of appetite, refusal to eat, loss of weight.
>
> Insomnia. (p. 316)

Spitz wrote of the children's prompt recovery when they were reunited with their mothers but warned that, if the separations lasted longer than three months, the children would not recover their previous personalities.

Schaffer and Callender (Schaffer, 1958; Schaffer & Callender, 1959) also found that, by 7 months of age, children seem to have established a specific relationship with their mothers as evidenced by their reactions to being separated from their mothers. Schaffer and Callender observed 26 infants under 1 year old who were in the hospital. The observations were for a period of two hours on each of the first three days of the hospital stay. The infants' responses were found to differ according to their ages. Young children (28 weeks and younger) seemed bewildered, but older children protested and fretted and seemed frightened when strangers approached. These older children clung to their mothers when they visted, but the younger children's behavior toward their mothers did not seem different from their responses to others. When mother left, the older children cried loudly, but the younger ones did not protest. When the children returned home, the differences in behavior between the younger and older children continued. The children under 28 weeks old showed little attachment behavior. Those over 28 weeks clung to their mothers and cried whenever she left. These children were afraid of strangers and even

showed fear of people they knew (fathers and siblings). Schaffer (1958) relies on Piaget's work in cognitive development to explain this behavior. In terms of Piaget's theory, it is not surprising that the older infants were the ones to exhibit the attachment and separation behaviors they did.

Freud and Burlingham (1943, 1944) observed the infants and young children they cared for in the Hampstead nurseries during World War II. They agree that the child's attachment to his or her mother begins in the child's first year of life, but they say it fully develops in the second year of life. Anxiety, despair, and detachment seemed to be the usual responses of children separated from their mothers. These researchers likened the children's behavior to the behavior of bereaved adults. These children were found to become strongly possessive of their nurse and upset when she could not be found. At other times, though, the children were hostile to their nurse and rejected her.

Heinicke and Westheimer (1965) conducted systematic observations of 10 children (13 to 32 months old) who were living in a residential nursery because of a family emergency such as mother going to the hospital to have a baby. These children refused to cooperate with the nurses and would not let the nurses comfort them. This resistence to the nurses continued, but after a few days, the children also sought some kind of comfort from the nurses once in a while.

All of these children cried when the time came for their parents to leave them. Bedtime also caused the children to cry. Crying for parents, primarily mother, continued as a dominant response for the first three days and continued sporadically for all the children for at least nine days. Nine of the 10 children had brought a favorite object from home with them. The children clung to these objects for the first three days. Then their behavior was varied and at times they clung to the objects and at other times they threw them away. Hostile behavior was infrequent, but tended to increase during the two week observation period. Although some behaviors were found to be common to all or almost all of the children, other behaviors were more individual. For example, four children were continually active, but two stayed in one place. The four children who came to the nursery with a sibling cried less and showed less hostility. Especially in the first few days, siblings sought each other and stayed together.

Heinicke and Westeimer (1965) list six factors as influencing a child's reactions to separation:

1. What was the nature of the child's previous development and what in particular was his relationship to his parents?
2. Under what circumstances did the separation occur? For example, was the separation gradual or abrupt?

3. What was the age of the child and, more important, what was the developmental status of the child? Of central importance here was the question of whether or not the parents had acquired a distinctive significance for the child.
4. How long a period was the child separated, and could he expect to return to his parents?
5. How much contact with his family could he maintain? How frequently did the parents visit, and was the child accompanied by a sibling?
6. Finally, once in the new environment, what was the potential for forming substitute relationships? (p. 2)

Stress factors other than the separation from the love object probably play a part in the child's response to being placed in a residential institution. These factors include such things as a strange environment, strange caretaker, multiple caretakers, and unfamiliar food and routines. Even with all these contributing factors, the presence or absence of the mother figure is of great significance to the child's development. To try to isolate the factor of mother absence, James and Joyce Robertson (1971) tried to create a strictly controlled separation situation. Four children, one at a time, were taken into these researchers' home while the

mothers were in the hospital. Particular care was taken to ensure responsive mothering from a person already familiar to the children. For this reason, Mrs. Robertson gave fulltime care to each child during his or her stay. The child's own mother's methods were used as much as possible. Also, prior to the foster care situation, the children visited the Robertson home and the Robertsons visited them. The likes and dislikes of each child and his or her stage of development were noted. In addition, the Robertsons tried to keep alive the image of the child's mother by talking about her and showing her photograph. Fathers visited as often as possible.

These four children (ranging in age from nearly 1 1/2 to nearly 2 1/2 years old) did not seem to be as upset as children in less favorable situations. The Robertsons concluded that these children's experiences did not follow the protest, despair, detachment sequence. Bowlby (1973), though, disagrees. He says that protest was evident, especially in the two older children, and that despair and detachment were decreased, but not totally eliminated. Bowlby views the difference between these children's responses and those in other separation situations as being differences in intensity. The Robertsons and Bowlby came together in their basic opinion that separation should be avoided because of its possible dangers (Bowlby, 1973).

Shorter separations than those for days or weeks in residential institutions or foster homes have also been studied. The first and largest study of children separated from their mothers for a short time was conducted during the children's all-day visit to the research center (Shirley, 1942; Shirley & Poyntz, 1941). One hundred ninety-nine children between 2 and 8 years old were observed. The children also underwent psychological and medical examinations and played, ate their meals, and had resting time.

Half of the children from 2 to 4 years old were upset when leaving their mothers in the morning. Half of the children this age were also upset when they returned to their mothers. Even during the play period, about 40% of those 2 to 3 years old, about 20% of 4 year olds,and 15% of 5 to 7 year olds were upset. In each age group, more boys than girls were upset. Three year olds were observed to be more upset than any other age group.

Heathers (1954) studied children leaving their mothers to attend nursery school. The sample consisted of 31 children 23 to 37 months old. The children, all from middle-class homes, were said to be of above average intelligence. Observations were made during the first five days of nursery school. The children were called for at home by the observer and were to say good-bye to their mothers at the door. On subsequent days there was no difference in degree of being

upset between older and younger children, but on the first day the 30 to 37 months old children were found to be significantly more upset than those 23 to 29 months old.

Murphy (1962) observed children visiting a research center for a planned play session. As in the above study, these children were also picked up at home. In this study, though, mothers were permitted to go with their children. Most of the 15 children between 2 1/2 and 4 years old had their mothers accompany them to the research center where the mothers immediately left the child. Murphy's findings are consistent with the findings of earlier studies.

Janis (1964) studied one 2 year old little girl who began nursery school. The child was described as normal, highly verbal, and from a professional family. As time went on, the child objected more strongly to her mother's leaving than she did at first. She also became less able to play independently and sometimes exhibited uncontrolled and violent play. At home, she was more upset when her mother went out than she had been before and became disobedient. During the first session of the next school term, when she was 2 1/2 years old, she insisted on her mother staying with her. When she did accept her mother's leaving, her playing appeared to be halfhearted. She seemed preoccupied with not crying when her mother left. Janis concluded that the child was put under a terrible strain.

Experimental studies of brief separations from mother have been conducted to compare the child's behavior when the mother is absent with his or her behavior when she is present, while holding other conditions constant. Arsenian (1943) conducted the first such study by studying the play of children in a strange room. The children were 11.2 months to 30.1 months old and were from the nursery of the Massachusetts State Reformatory for Women. Sixteen of the children played in the room by themselves with the brightly colored toys provided. Eight children had their mother or mother substitute with them. Based on observations of these children, Arsenian said,

> The most certain provision that can be made for the security of young children faced with unstructured environments appears to be the presence of a familiar adult whose protective power is known. (p. 248)

Cox and Campbell (1968) and Rheingold (1969) also found that infants explore freely if mother is there, even in a strange environment. If mother is not there, though, infants explore little or not at all and exhibit attachment behavior.

Ainsworth and Wittig (1969) and Ainsworth and Bell (1970) found that, if a stranger enters the room, the infant's exploration lessens; and, if mother leaves, exploration behavior is replaced by attachment behavior. Fifty-six

1 year old children from white middle-class families were studied. Twenty-three infants of the sample had been observed throughout their first year of life. The children's social behavior, specifically attachment behavior, was of particular interest. The other 33 children were observed less intensely starting in their ninth month. All the babies were observed around their first birthday (49-51 weeks old) in the experimental situation. The babies and their mothers entered a small room that had three chairs. Two chairs were opposite each other at one end of the room -- one for the mother and one for the stranger. A small chair with toys in it was at the other end of the room. Eight experimental episodes took place in the room while the babies' behaviors were recorded by observers from behind a one-way vision window. The mothers and stranger had previously been told what they were to do.

In the first episode, the mother carried the child into the room accompanied by the observer. Then the observer left.

Episode two required the mother to place the child on the floor between the two chairs and then sit quietly on her own chair for two minutes. She was not supposed to participate in her child's play unless he or she insisted on it.

The third episode began when the stranger entered the room and sat on the chair provided for her. For one minute

the stranger remained quiet. Then, for a second minute, she spoke with the mother. While the mother sat quietly, the stranger approached the infant, showing him or her a toy. This episode lasted three minutes. Most of the children's behavior changed when the stranger entered the room. Play and exploration diminished as many of the children moved closer to their mothers. Some children cried, but most showed interest in the stranger.

Episode four involved the mother's quietly leaving the room, but leaving her purse in the chair. The stranger remained quiet if the child was playing happily. If the baby was inactive, she tried interesting him or her in a toy. If the child became upset, she tried to comfort him or her. This episode lasted three minutes. Half of the babies tried to find their mothers, usually as soon as they noticed she was gone. Thirty-nine children cried or searched for their mothers. Thirteen of these children both cried and searched for their mothers.

In episode five, the mothers returned, and then the stranger left. Each mother had been told to pause in the doorway to see how her child reacted to her return. Half of the children approached her, and six others signalled to her. Most stopped crying. Once the child resumed playing, the mother left again, this time she paused and said "bye-bye."

In episode six, the infants were alone. More searching and crying took place here than in episode four. Forty-four babies searched for their mothers. Fourteen banged on the door or tried to open it. There was much crying. Some children rocked, kicked, or made random movements. Thirty children both cried and searched, and only two did neither. This episode lasted three minutes.

Episode seven was the stranger's return. Three minutes later, episode eight began with the mother's return. When mother came back, 42 children tried to cling to her and resist being put down. Some children seemed ambivalent about mother's return. A few ignored mother for a short time before going to her. Other children approached and then turned away from mother repeatedly. Seven infants did not approach mother and showed no desire to do so. They ignored mother and would not answer when she asked them to come to her. Some even avoided looking at her.

All the children's behavior in episodes four and six when mother was absent was different from what it was in episode two when mother was there. All these 1 year old children were anxious or distressed in episodes four and six -- seemingly due to missing mother.

The following studies used experimental situations as similar to Ainsworth's as possible. The main difference is that the children were older.

Cognitive development seems to play a part in the way older children behave differently than younger children do in the same experimental situation. Macoby and Feldman (1972) did a longitudinal study of the children between their second and third birthdays. Three year olds are better able to understand that when mother leaves she will return soon. These researchers believe it is this understanding that causes 3 year olds to not cry as much and not go to the door as much as younger children whose mothers leave. Also, 3 year olds were found to feel better when a stranger came in to end their being alone, while 2 year olds remained upset.

The same researchers tested 2 1/2 year old children from an Israeli Kibbutz. These children's responses fit in between those of children 2 and 3 years old. These kibbutzim children responded like American children of the same age, suggesting that attachment behavior develops similarly on a kibbutz and in traditional families.

Marvin (cited in Bowlby, 1973) studied eight boys and eight girls at each of the three age levels. Marvin found the boys and girls to behave differently. Three year old boys were less upset than 2 year old boys, and 4 year old boys were not very much affected by the situation. Four year old girls were greatly upset, especially when left alone. Two and 3 year old girls were less affected than 1 year olds.

Bowlby (1973) came to the following conclusions based on the above and other experiments on children's separation behavior:

(a) In a benign but slightly strange situation, young children aged between eleven and thirty-six months, and brought up in families, are quick to notice mother's absence and commonly show some measure of concern, varying considerably but amounting very often to obvious, and in some cases to intense anxiety and distress. Play activity decreases abruptly and may cease. Efforts to reach mother are common.

(b) A child of two years is likely to be almost as upset in these situations as a child one, and at neither age is he likely to make a quick recovery when rejoined either by mother or by a stranger.

(c) A child of three is less likely to be upset in these situations and is more able to understand that mother will soon return. On being rejoined by mother or a stranger he is relatively quick to recover.

(d) A child of four may either be little affected by the situations or else be much distressed by mother's apparently arbitrary behavior.

(e) As children get older they are able to use vision and verbal communication as means for keeping in contact with mother; should they become upset when mother leaves the room older children will make more determined attempts to open the door and find her.

(f) Up to 30 percent of children are made angry by mother's leaving them alone in these circumstances.

(g) In some studies and at some ages no differences are observed in the behaviour of boys and girls. In so far as any differences are observed, boys tend to explore more in mother's presence and to be more vigorous in their attempts to reach her when she has gone; girls tend to keep closer to mother and also to make friends more readily with the stranger. (pp. 51-52)

One major criticism of Bowlby and others who place major emphasis on the mother-child relationship as necessary for the child's healthy development and positive mental health is their disregard of the importance of the child's father. Andry (1962) complains, "Maternal-deprivation theorists seem to ignore the possible importance of paternal and

dual-parental separation" (p. 38). Bowlby (1951), for example, explains:

> While continued reference will be made to the mother-child relation, little will be said of the father-child relation; his value as the economic and emotional support of the mother will be assumed. (p. 13)

As children grow older, though, Bowlby (1973) admits they direct their attachment behavior to others besides the mother or mother surrogate. For this reason, he suggests using the terms "attachment figure" or "support figure" in place of the traditionally used "mother figure." Holman (1959) found that the difference between the child's responses to separation from the mother and the child's responses to separation from the father are negligible. She concludes that separation from the father is as harmful for the child as separation from the mother. As the divorce rate grows, more and more children will have to cope with the loss of an attachment figure -- usually the father.

The Effects of Parental Divorce on Children

The general effects of parental divorce on children. No general agreement concerning the damaging effects of parental divorce on children has been reached. Anderson (1977) warns, "Just because a child does not overtly respond to his parents' divorce does not mean he is not affected by it" (p.

42). Some studies have reported a greater incidence of psychological problems in children with divorced parents than in children from intact families (Glueck and Glueck, 1950; McDermott, 1970; Morrison, 1974). But these comparisons were between children with divorced parents and children with married parents. When children with divorced parents are compared with children from intact, but unhappy homes, the results vary. For example, Ivan Nye (1957) found that ninth and twelfth graders from broken homes were better adjusted in terms of psychosomatic illness, delinquent behavior, and parent-child adjustment than their peers from unhappy, but intact homes. Landis' 1960 study of 295 university students with divorced parents showed that divorce affects children in many ways making it impossible to treat such children as a homogeneous group. The way the children view the home situation before the divorce is a crucial factor in their reactions to the divorce. If children perceived the home as happy, they found the divorce more traumatic than children who observed hostility and conflict.

Krantzler (1974) maintains the impact of divorce on children is less than that of living in an unbroken, troubled home. Gettlemen and Markowitz (1974) say that years of parental arguing are detrimental to a child's psychological adjustment and that divorce, by putting an end to the fighting, is beneficial to the children.

Cline and Westman (1971) caution, though, that divorce does not necessarily end the problems of the parents' relationship and that complications often do arise. They list three typical post divorce kinds of turbulence that involve the children. First of all, there may be hostile parental interaction over parenting roles in which the ability of each spouse to be an effective parent is questioned by the other. These accusations of inadequacy of the spouses as parents often lead to battles over custody of the children. Secondly, children sometimes perpetuate interaction between the divorced parents by playing one against the other. This is done either to gain self-satisfying ends ("But Mommy lets me stay up later") or to promote reunion of the parents, often by claiming one parent is in need of help ("Mommy is very sick and has to stay in bed all day"). Thirdly, sometimes one parent enters into a special alliance with the child, often to spite the other parent. Because of inevitable involvement of the children in their parents' divorce, Cline and Westman regard divorce as a family affair, not just as a marital problem. They warn that divorce does not necessarily end the disturbed marital relationship.

Steinzor (1969) is another advocate of the idea that divorce can be advantageous.

1. The emotional smog smothering the whole family in an early spiritual death is cleared away.

2. The broken home makes it possible for the child to form his own views on each parent unobstructed by the smoke screen thrown up by each in front of the other.
3. The divorce is an honest admission that the adults cannot get along and there is no pretending that they can provide their children with a model of a loving relationship.
4. The child's belief that he is guilty of causing his parents to fight and that only he can save them from hurting each other will be laid to rest by divorce. (pp. 55-56)

It appears that it is not the actual fact of the divorce that causes children to have problems. J. Louise Despert (1953) was one of the first to state that divorce is not necessarily worse for the children than an unhappy marriage. She puts emphasis on the emotional situaion in the home as the determining factor in the child's adjustment.

Mahler and Rabinovitch (1956) agree that the emotional situation in the home is an important factor, but they do not believe it is the determining factor. They say children do not respond to their parents' marital discord in any one specific way. Neurotic symptoms may not be manifested in childhood, but the parents' marital discord does affect his or her attitude and view of life. The child's future choice

of a sexual and marital partner is also affected. Mahler and Rabinovitch say,

> The child now grown to adulthood may repeat in similar or complementary way traumatic situations which the marital discord of his parents stamped on his pliable personality structure as a child. (pp. 55-56)

E. James Anthony (1974) agrees that there are many possible reactions to parental divorce depending on numerous variables. For example, the child's reaction will depend on such factors as his or her age, sex, stage of development, relationship with parents, previous experiences, etc. Anthony maintains that the divorce of a child's parents is a traumatic experience that places him or her at psychiatric risk. Anthony lists three possible risks.

> The first risk is that the child may become psychiatrically disturbed during the period of childhood either acutely, as in a traumatic neurosis, or chronically maladjusted and malfunctioning at home or at school. The second risk is that the child will turn away from marriage as an unsatisfactory mode of human relationship or repeat his parents' pattern of unsuccessful marriage ending in divorce. The third risk is that the children of divorce will

subsequently develop psychiatric disorders in adult life. (pp. 462-463)

Support is given to the above views of Mahler and Rabinovitch and Anthony by Neil Kalter (1977) who found a high incidence of children of divorce in his sample of children referred to the Youth Services Deparment of Psychiatry, University of Michigan, from October, 1974 through July, 1975. Of the first 400 children so referred, nearly one third of them had experienced their parents' divorce.

Kelly and Wallerstein (1977a) also claim that children of divorce are at psychiatric risk. They say that because of the stress involved, parental divorce, "constitutes a potential developmental interference for children in a general, nonclinical population" (p. 39).

A similar viewpoint is held by John Bowlby (1953) who says that any child of divorce or separation must be thought of as a possibly deprived child. He goes on to say that whether or not these children actually become deprived depends on the way the parents and other adults handle the situation.

Hancock (1980) believes that when a divorce occurs, the children often undergo an identity crisis. She explains that the family gives us roles (son, daughter, brother, sister) which define how we relate to others and how we belong. She says, "Disruption of the family matrix constitutes a crisis

that is perhaps the central blow of divorce -- a rupture in the integrity of a meaning system and a threat to a sense of belonging" (p. 19).

While agreeing that each child reacts to parental divorce in an individualistic way, Hanna Kapit (1972) says it is generally held that the parental separation and divorce experience is damaging to the child. Every child in such a situation suffers, not necessarily by the actual separation or divorce, but by the tension and events before and after the traumatic event. Hilary Anderson (1977), founder of Children Helped in Litigated Divorce, an organization which attempts to study the effects of divorce on children and tries to remediate the negative effects, maintains,

> Children of divorce are among the most abused members of society. They are the quiet victims of a devastating process which inevitably creates sheer havoc in their lives. As if that were not bad enough, the effects of this trauma insidiously carry over into adulthood. (p. 41)

Kelly and Wallerstein (1977a) say "divorce is stressful for most children and constitutes a potential developmental interference for children in a general nonclinical population" (p. 39). The child's sexual development is, perhaps, especially vulnerable to parental divorce.

The effects of divorce on the child's sexual development. In most western societies children ideally grow up in a two-parent, happy family. In this way, children of both sexes have the advantage of having a parent of the same sex to model and identify with and a parent of the opposite sex to lay the foundation for future male-female relationships. When children are deprived of one parent as the result of parental divorce, one might hypothesize that problems concerning the child's sexual development could occur. The earlier the girl is deprived of her father, the greater the likelihood she will have trouble relating to men. The earlier she is deprived of her mother, the more likely she will have trouble with the female identification. In the same way, the earlier the boy is deprived of his mother, the greater the probability he will have trouble relating to women. The earlier he is deprived of his father, the more likely he will have trouble with masculine identification.

A child's being born male or female does not assure the child's resultant masculinity or femininity. Learning plays a major part in sex role identification. This learning is attributed, for the most part, to the family (Brown & Lynn, 1966).

The age at which sex role identity is fixed has not been agreed upon, but the patterning of human sexual behavior is said to begin at birth. Marmor (1971) says that the child

receives cues about sex role expectations from birth until the "core gender identity" is fixed by the age of 3. Brown places the sex role identification as firmly established by or during the fifth year (Brown & Lynn, 1966). Money (1963) believes the onset of language mastery is important to sex role identification (18 months to 3 years) and says changing the identification after the age of 6 is rare. Regardless of the particular year specified as the crucial one, it is agreed that the early years in a child's development determine his or her sex role identification.

The child of divorce seems to have special problems with his or her sex role identification. Kliman (1968) writes of the problems that result from continued criticism of the same sexed parent by the other parent. It is hard, for example, for the boy to model a person his mother so intensely dislikes and who, very often, is hostile to his mother. When one parent verbally degrades the other, the child begins to feel that, if he is like the hated parent, then he too is to be hated. If this is associated with the child's sexual identity, he may be uncomfortable with his own sexual development. Gardner (1976) writes of another kind of identification problem in which the child tries to compensate for the loss of his parent by immediately becoming like him. This appears to be a way to cope with the parental loss and was noted by McDermott (1970) who found a high correlation

between children's symptoms and their descriptions of their absent fathers.

Gettleman and Markowitz (1974) agree that the process of identification is usually completed by the time a child is 5. In their opinion, sexual identification problems do not occur when divorce is delayed until after the child is 5. Evelyn Goodenough Pitcher (1967) is in accord. She maintains that the importance of both parents for the child's sexual development means that even inevitable divorces should be postponed if the child is under 5. She agrees that constant fighting is upsetting to the child, but is no worse than the child's anxiety about parental loss, guilt about separation, and confusion about belonging. But, waiting to divorce is not always possible (Despert, 1953). Gardner (1976) agrees and says that advising parents to wait until their children are 5 to divorce is often unrealistic advice, especially when there is more than one child in the family.

Many psychodynamic theorists believe that parental divorce is most detrimental to the child in the Oedipal phase of development (Sugar, 1970; Westman, 1972). Neubauer (1960) says,

> When a parent is absent, there is an absence of oedipal reality. The absent parent becomes endowed with magical power either to gratify or punish;

> agression against him and the remaining parent as well, become repressed. (p. 308)

Jones (1963) states the problem this way:

> The Oedipal period is the one time of a child's life when he definitely needs <u>two</u> parents living together. Otherwise, he cannot develop essential attitudes about sexuality at the time and in a way that is natural and usual. (p. 299)

Meiss (1952) was concerned with the problems of the child who is fatherless due to his father's death. She says,

> Since the resolution of the Oedipus Complex is the principal task of a boy during the phallic period, we may assume that the death of his father at this time would be extremely hazardous for his development. (p. 216)

Continuing Meiss' thought, the loss of the father through divorce may have similar consequences for children.

For the boy, the resolution of the Oedipus Complex comes about when the child resigns himself to the fact that he cannot have his mother. But, when divorce necessitates the father's leaving, the boy may believe he caused his father's departure by wishing he would leave. If the boy reacts in this way, he may be consumed by guilt. These boys may fantasize about restitution or punishment either in response to their guilt feelings or to appease their fathers. Another

possible reaction to the father's departure is that the boy believes that now that the father is gone, he can have his mother. Another fantasy that may occur is that the mother wanted the father to leave in order be alone with her little boy. In other words, the boy sometimes projects his own wishes onto his mother. This problem is compounded by the mother's saying such things as, "You're the man of the house now." Placing the child in the absent parent's place is,

> disproportionate to his ego strength so that warp occurs in ego and superego development. Superego development is handicapped as well by the deprivation of the social organization and regulation normally provided by the responsible father. (Forrest, 1966, p. 25)

The girl also has problems in that she may be placed in her mother's role by the father. Also, the girl is often angry with her mother. First of all, the girl is said to blame her mother for being deprived of a penis. When the father leaves, the girl again places the blame on the mother. In addition, the girl may believe the mother learned of her desire for her father and forced him to leave just so the girl could not have him. Arnstein (1962) believes another possibility is that the girl may think that getting rid of her father is the mother's means of punishing her daughter for wanting her father and planning to reject her mother.

Jones (1963) states that the child needs to see his or her parents have a happy marriage,

> as the screen against which he projects his Oedipal fantasies, the child recognizes the disparities, the grotesque incongruities and differences, between himself and his parents. There is no way out for him; he must grant that children are children, not adults. . . No other relationship but a marriage of healthy parents affords a child the opportunities and pressures he needs in order to correct his immature version of reality. (p. 300)

According to Neubauer (1960),

> The loss of a parent during the oedipal phase intensifies the fears and wishes of an already existing positive oedipus complex. Moreover, it leads to a readiness for the fixation of those conflicts which were uppermost in the parent-child relationship at the time of the parent's disappearance. (p. 292)

Cases described by Keiser (1953) and Meiss (1952) serve to exemplify Neubauer's statement. Keiser described the case of an adolescent girl whose father left when she was 4. Her father's departure did not let her desexualize the original oedipal attachment to him. The girl became fixated at this stage with her father remaining a sexualized, idealized image.

Meiss described the case of a boy who lost his father during the oedipal period. The father's departure made it impossible for his son to alter his image of an angry, powerful father. The father's leaving intensified and fixated his oedipal rivalry and castration fears. These two cases also go along with Fenichel's (1931/1954) belief that when the parent of the child's own sex leaves, it is perceived as a fulfillment of the child's oedipal wishes with resultant guilt feelings. He says that when the opposite sex parent is the one to leave, the child's oedipal longing remains unsatisfied and leads to the fantastic idealization of the lost parent and to an increase in the longing.

McDermott (1968) studied the effects of parental divorce on normal, white, middle-class children who attended a private nursery school in a university community. He examined the records of 16 children (ten boys, six girls) age 3 to 5 whose parents were separated and divorced during their nursery school experience. He found acute behavioral changes in 10 of these children, with these changes being more acute in boys. He warns, "The girls' changes may not be so easily seen as a 'problem,' yet may be even more serious signs of potential life disturbance" (p. 122). Three of the girls in this study showed no great behavioral changes but became "pseudo-adult and bossy, scolding and lecturing their peers with comments about their health and manners as well as the

rules of the games" (p. 123). McDermott believes that this kind of behavior could be a kind of identification with a real or fantasized part of the mother. He explains,

> It may represent a premature, sudden distorted freezing of personality traits with which they had been experimenting, or identification with a caricature of the mother whose husband could not find genuine warmth in her, the 'superior, nagging wife' who is always right. It suggests an identification with the 'wife of the husband who leaves home' rather than with the more positive qualities in the mother expressed in other ways and seen at other times. (p. 123)

Thus, these girls seem to be identifying with the pathological features of their mothers.

The boys in this study reacted differently. They showed more dramatic changes in behavior often characterized by the sudden release of agressive and destructive feelings. McDermott reports,

> There seemed to be an acute and violent disruption of the process of masculine identification formation at the very least in several of the boys, as contrasted with what appeared to be a consolidation of a particular form of identification in the girls. (p. 123)

Several factors could contribute to this reaction. For example, the boys could feel guilty for secretly feeling satisfied that their fathers left. Also, the loss of the person upon whom the boy focused his aggression may be upsetting. And, the boys could believe that the mother forced the father to leave as punishment for masculine aggression.

In interpreting McDermott's study, though, it must be remembered that only in-school observations were made with no indication of at home behavior. Also, the sample is extremely small, making generalizations difficult.

Wallerstein and Kelly (1975) reported on 34 school children in their study of the effects of parental divorce on children and adolescents. These children were drawn from a normal population and had no history of psychological disturbance. The children were seen at the divorce counseling service these researchers established at the Marin County Community Mental Health Center. The 34 preschoolers came from 27 families and were interviewed shortly after the parental separation.

The youngest children (2 1/2 to 3 1/4 years) all responded to the separation with observable behavioral changes. Acute regression in toilet training, whining, crying, fearfulness, sleep problems, aggressive behavior, etc. were exhibited. The degree of each child's symptoms varied, but no sex differences were observed. These researchers

likened the children's response to parental separation to those described by Anna Freud and Burlingham (1943) and Bowlby, Robertson and Rosenbluth (1952) following the separation of children from the primary caretaker. Interestingly, all but one of these children in the Wallerstein and Kelly study remained with the mother and lived in the family home. Thus, there was no disruption in maternal or environmental continuity.

The middle preschool group (3 3/4 to 4 3/4 years) consisted of five boys and six girls. Regression appeared in fewer than half of these children, but aggressive behavior and fear of aggression increased. These children seemed bewildered by the loss of one parent and suffered cognitive confusion. In agreement with McDermott (1968), Wallerstein and Kelly found that these children could not master their anxiety and depression through play. They played out threats to their survival and their helplessness. Oedipal fantasies were offered which were, in these researchers' opinions, a kind of denial, "My daddy sleeps in my bed every night" (p. 60). These children felt they were to blame for their father's departure. The child's sense of order in the world was shattered, and the child's self-image was threatened.

Nine boys and 5 girls were in the oldest preschool group (5 to 6 years). These children had a reasonable understanding of the divorce related changes in their lives, but, like

the younger children, still displayed increased anxiety and aggression, whininess, irritability, separation problems, etc. These children were sad and missed their fathers. They wanted to make the family whole again. Some of the children experienced prolonged fantasies which may have warded off a deeper depression. In addition,

> Visitation patterns often stimulated peaks of excitement, not unlike courtship, alternating with recurrent disappointments following the father's departure. The potential teasing and seductive quality of such a pattern may well have served to deter the resolution of normal oedipal conflict. (p. 609)

At the time of the follow-up, one year later, one little girl; then 6 years, 4 months old; said she still planned on marrying her father who had already remarried. The little girl maintained confidently, " 'He might get a divorce from his new wife, and <u>then</u> I would marry him' " (p. 610). Wallerstein and Kelly view this kind of nourishing of an oedipal fantasy as both self-sustaining and gratifying while, "impeding the integration of the divorce experience and the entry into latency" (p. 610).

> At the follow-up, Wallerstein and Kelly said, Our finding that nearly half of the preschool children deteriorated in functioning in the year

> following parental separation, if applicable to the large numbers of young children involved in divorce each year, has sobering implications. (p. 61)

Parental dating is another problem faced by boys and girls which makes resolving the Oedipal Complex more difficult. Boys and girls may resent the opposite sex parent's dating, particularly if the child is exposed to a variety of the parent's dates. Gardner (1976) says,

> It is common in such situations for a child to become very antagonistic to both the parent and the date and to utilize various maneuvers to prevent dating or alienate the date. (p. 307)

Gardner lists such things as temper tantrums, illness, and fierce sibling fighting as some such maneuvers. Overt hostility is sometimes used to make the date not want to return. Some children may purposely ask embarrassing questions to alienate the date, such as, "Are you going to be my new daddy?" or, "Are you sleeping here tonight like some of Mommy's dates?"

Wallerstein and Kelly (1974) say that some adolescents become anxious about their parents' sexuality which becomes more visible as dating occurs. They say,

> Having a mistress, frequent dates, or a boyfriend sleep overnight inescapably presented the adolescent with more evidence than he cared to see that

> his parent was indeed a sexual being and now very much in the same market place as the adolescent in terms of heterosexual object-finding. Undoubtedly the anxiety was due to increased sexual and reawakened incestuous fantasies: the parent was no longer a "safe" object. (p. 492)

An adolescent girl who observes her mother's numerous affairs may imitate her mother's behavior. She may come to believe that the important thing is to attract many men rather than form a deeper, more continuing relationship. Oedipal rivalry with her mother may lead her to compete with her own mother. Sometimes their competition results in her seeking older men as dates, even her mother's dates. Resolution of the Oedipal Complex in such a case is very difficult.

In Wallerstein and Kelly's (1974) study of a nonclinical population of children who were adolescents at the time of their parents' divorce, all 21 subjects experienced their parents' divorce as an extremely painful experience. These adolescents were angry at their parents and were very sad. They felt a sense of loss and believed they were betrayed by their parents. They also were ashamed and embarrassed by their parents' divorce and many did not even tell their best friends about it.

Parental divorce in adolescence occurs at the time when the child is in the process of heterosexual object-finding. Thus, the impact of parental divorce affects the adolescent's thinking in many ways. Some adolescents realize that divorce may be in their futures. In response to this, some decide they will never marry. Others say they will marry at an older age than their parents did and will be more selective and wiser than their parents in choosing a husband or wife. Rubin and Price (1979) propose, "Education in family life, parenting and interpersonal relationships are especially necessary for the children of divorce who are at greater risk for marital disruption in their own adult lives" (p. 555). Some adolescents were also concerned about their adequacy as a sexual partner. Identification with the parent as a sexual failure served to increase the anxiety -- especially when one parent has told the child of the other parent's sexual inadequacies or peculiarities. Parental divorce at this stage may, therefore, affect the adolescent's self esteem as a sexual being and in turn affect his heterosexual relationships. In addition, Wallerstein and Kelly explain that,

> the disruption of the family structure, the loss of the father's physical presence, the discovery of sexual, aggressive, and "amoral" behaviors in parents with the consequent sense of disappointment and betrayal triggered acute anxiety and intense

> conflict. It seemed clear that the controls and tenuous indentification and ego ideals of these young people were unable to contain heightened sexual and aggressive impulses in the absence of the familiar external reinforcement and threats. (p. 501)

Typically, it is the father who leaves the home following divorce. The boy's need for his father to serve as a role model has been discussed. The girl also needs a father. Forrest (1966) says the girl's need for her father begins in infancy when he serves as an aide in her developing a separate identity from her mother's. The father is also needed to enable the girl to see herself as a feminine person and to learn to relate to men. Forrest maintains,

> The infant girl needs the impact of the masculine touch and sound, tenderness and strength, if she is to develop basic trust and security in a man and in herself in relation to a man. (p. 29)

Without an early contact with her father, the girl often fears men as strangers. A natural relationship with her father, on the other hand, can later be transferred to other males. In addition, from infancy through adolescence, the father provides the girl with direction and guidance and sets the standards of behavior. A girl with divorced parents is usually deprived of the kind of male comments and feedback

about the kind of woman she is that is necessary for her healthy development.

Hetherington (1973) researched the effects of the father's absence during the girl's childhood on her later behavior in adolescence. She reasoned that if one major problem of girls raised without fathers is their difficulty in relating to men, then their behavior during adolescence, when such interactions begin, is the time to study this effect of parental divorce. She found that girls whose parents were divorced, "exhibited tension and inappropriate assertive, seductive, or sometimes promiscuous behavior with male peers and adults" (p. 49). These girls sought more attention from male adults and spent more time in the "boys' areas" of the recreation center in which this study took place than did the girls from intact homes or the girls whose fathers had died. The girls with divorced parents dated earlier and were more likely to have sexual intercourse than girls from intact homes or homes in which the father died. It follows, according to Hetherington, that,

> It may be that the daughter of divorce views her mother's separated life as unsatisfying and feels that happiness requires a man. Her hostile memory of an absent father may make her particularly apprehensive, ambivalent, and inept in pursuit of the goal. (p. 52)

Hetherington's research must be interpreted in terms of the sample she studied. The girls were first born daughters then between 13 and 17 who had no brothers. The girls with divorced parents lived with their mothers who did not remarry and no males were living in the house. Thus, different findings might result when divorced mothers remarry and a man is brought into the girl's life.

Girls without fathers due to their parents' divorce may, because of not learning how to act with men in childhood, find that the only way to get attention from men is to become sexually available. The girl's lack of a father while growing up may interfere with her superego development and, therefore, contribute to her lack of inhibition in her sexual behavior. Wallerstein and Kelly (1974) believe that adolescents whose parents divorce may enter into heterosexuality prematurely. They state,

> To the extent that the sexual activity occurs under the dominance of an incestuous tie to the parents or as an extension of the parents' subconscious or conscious needs and impulses, the adolescent can be said to be living out a pseudo-adolescence rather than a true emancipating experience. (pp. 499-500)

Girls who are rejected by their fathers at an early age may dislike and distrust all men, thus making meaningful

relationships difficult. They may fear that just as their fathers rejected them, all men will eventually abandon them. If such a girl marries, and many do not, marital problems are likely to develop.

Other kinds of problems with marriage may also result from having divorced parents. Children of divorce often are extremely dependent on the remaining parent, possibly in fear of abandonment. This could result in the so-called "momma's boy" who either never marries or who is so involved with his mother that if he does marry, marital problems are almost inevitable. The girl in this kind of dependent situation may never marry in order to stay loyal to and be with her mother. Also, Mahler and Rabinovitch (1956) warn that,

> The child now grown to adulthood may repeat in a similar or complementary way traumatic situations which the marital discord of his parents stamped on his pliable personality structure as a child. (p. 460)

Anthony (1974) also warns of possible marital problems in the futures of children of divorce, if these children do not reject marriage totally. He says that one of the risks for a child of divorce is that the child, "may turn away from marriage as an unsatisfactory mode of human relationship or repeat his parents' pattern of marriage and divorce" (pp. 462-463).

The above statements were made by those knowledgeable in the field, but even the adolescents directly involved in a parental divorce situation realize they are, perhaps, likely to be divorced themselves. Grollman (1967) asked teenagers with divorced parents if divorces were in their futures. One girl, Barbara, answered, "Definitely . . . Divorce is really the only pattern I know."

Another possibility is that the child of divorce may reject a heterosexual relationship in favor of a homosexual relationship. Bieber (1962) says that homosexuality is most likely to occur when the child is deprived of a loving, affectionate parent which is the case with children of divorce. Usually the boy is deprived of his father and is, therefore, hindered in his identification with him while making a feminine identification with his mother more likely. According to Bieber's analysis, this makes a homosexual orientation quite possible. Also, if the boy strives to gain affection from the father who does not offer it or only offers affection infrequently, the boy may continue to try to gain affection from another male. This is another contribution to a homosexual orientation for boys with divorced parents.

The girl may also develop a homosexual orientation. She may grow to distrust all men and seek females as love objects. If her mother does not offer her affection and

seems to the daughter to always be hoping for the father's return, the girl may assume a male identification in order to gain her mother's love. Freud (1905) wrote about his patient saying that when one parent is lost early in life, the sex of the remaining parent determines the sex of the eventual love object. Often the result is, according to Freud, permanent inversion. Thus, Freudian theory would suggest that having divorced parents predisposes children to having homosexual orientations.

The actual causes of homosexuality are still not known, but the central importance of family is accepted. Broderick (1966) places importance on the parents saying, "It is universally agreed that the foundation for later heterosexual attachments is laid in early childhood in the interaction between the child and his parents" (p. 31). He lists the following four conditions for normal heterosexual development:

> First, the parent or parent-surrogate of the same sex must not be so punishing on the one hand or so weak on the other hand to make it impossible for the child to identify with him.

But, the oedipal stage boy whose father leaves, for example, often has intensified castration fears.

> Second, the parent or parent-surrogate of the opposite sex must not be so seductive, or so punishing,

> or so emotionally erratic as to make it impossible for the child to trust members of the opposite sex.

But, the oedipal stage boy, for example, sometimes believes that his mother wanted his father to leave so she could be alone with her little boy. Also, the intermittent relationship with her divorced father makes the girl's relationship with him emotionally erratic.

> Third, the parents or parent-surrogates must not systematically reject the child's biological sex and attempt to teach him cross-sex role behavior.

But, a divorced woman who hates all men may have a son who believes she would love him more if he were a girl. He may take on a somewhat feminine identification, as may any young boy who does not have a father with whom to identify.

> A fourth factor in normal heterosexual development is the necessity of establishing a positive conception of marriage as an eventual goal. (p. 31).

But, children of divorce usually do not have a positive marriage to teach them this. They often see divorce in their own futures. Also, Joseph Garai (1972) says divorced and separated parents often perpetuate unhealthy attitudes toward love, sex, intimacy, and marriage. Thus, it appears that children of divorce are especially vulnerable to problems with normal heterosexual development.

It seems clear that the parents' divorce is a definite factor in their child's sexual development. In particular, parental divorce may induce problems with sex role identification, difficulty in resolution of the oedipal conflict and development of the superego, and rejection of or problems with heterosexual relationships.

The effects of parental divorce on school age children.

There are few studies of the effects of parental divorce on school age children. McDermott (1970) wrote of the need to study divorce as a mental health issue in children's lives. He examined the records of 1,487 children under the age of 14 who had been evaluated at the University of Michigan's Children's Psychiatric Hospital from 1961 to 1964. Children whose parents were separated but not divorced were excluded. The other children were divided into two groups -- 116 with divorced parents and 1,349 with legally intact families. There was no indication of the nature of the stability or happiness of the intact families. McDermott found significantly more depression in children of divorce than in children from intact families. In addition, it was reported that the children's personality development appeared to be affected by parental divorce. These children commonly viewed themselves as small, weak, and vulnerable. A high correlation was found between the child's symptoms and his or her description of the absent parent. McDermott interpreted this

as suggesting the child's identification with the absent parent or fantasized absent parent and represented the child's way of dealing with the parental loss and conflict concerning it. McDermott's findings must be considered in terms of the specific, psychiatric population studied.

Kelly and Wallerstein (1976, 1977a) are conducting what they believe to be the first in-depth look at children of divorce who have had no history of psychological problems. They are attempting to find the immediate consequences and long term effects of divorce on children. These researchers began their study of 131 children and adolescents from 60 divorcing families in 1970. Their study is being conducted at the Divorce Counseling Service they established at the Community Mental Health Center, Marin County, California. In addition to trying to observe and record the major responses and experiences of the children regarding their parents' divorces, these researchers are trying to construct clinical intervention procedures specific to divorce. They hope to provide suggestions for ways community programs can help divorcing families.

School age children comprise the largest, single group affected by parental divorce. Kelly and Wallerstein (1976) found that the central event for school age children seems to be the parental separation. Following the separation, the family structure rarely stabilizes in the first year.

Children of this age are often found to be fearful following their parents' divorce. Kelly and Wallerstein attribute this fear to the fact that the child's world had been severely shaken, and the child may believe there is no longer any safe place for him or her. School age children of divorce were seen to be filled with sadness and grief. Kelly and Wallerstein found no child who was relieved by his or her parents' divorce, even those who had witnessed violent marital conflict. This is in accord with Gardner's (1976) observation that if the child were to be given the choice between his or her parents having an unhappy marriage and being divorced, the child would always choose the unhappy marriage.

The idea that children blame themselves for their parents' divorce has been suggested by many, including Gardner (1976), Grollman (1967) and Krantzler (1974). This idea was not confirmed by Hammond's (1979a, 1979b, 1979c) study of 165 children in grades three through six, half of whom had separated or divorced parents. The children in Hammond's study, both those in the divorced or separated and those in the intact group, agreed that children do not cause parental divorce. She also found no significant difference between the groups in self-concept, mathematics and reading achievement, immaturity, withdrawal, and peer relations. Boys with divorced parents said they were less happy and were more dissatisfied with the time and attention they received.

Girls with divorced parents did not differ from girls with intact parents on this. Hammond explained that her finding of a greater reaction to parental divorce by boys than by girls goes along with Hetherington (1973) who suggested that the girls' reactions to father absence do not emerge until adolescence. Kelly and Wallerstein also found that this age child does not usually feel responsible for his or her parents' divorce. School age children, they say, are primarily concerned with wishes for their parents' reconciliation. These reconciliation wishes must be dealt with because, as Thies (1977) explains, "Remarriage validates the finality of divorce, flying in the face of any reconciliation fantasies still harbored by the child" (p. 60). These children miss their fathers (the parent who usually leaves the home).

Anger plays a large part in the school age child's response to parental divorce. Rohrlich et al. (1977) wrote, "All latency age children are more likely to engage in aggressive and antisocial behavior as a result of the divorce" (p. 15). Despert (1953) wrote of the anger directed toward the child's mother. Despert interpreted the boy's anger at his mother as a reaction to his trying to free himself from his infantile need for her. She viewed the girl's anger at the mother as resulting from the girl's belief that the mother had driven her father away or that the mother had not been a good enough wife to him. Kelly and

Wallerstein, though, found that the school age boy is the one to believe the mother was responsible for the father's leaving and that she had failed as a good wife. More than anger, Kelly and Wallerstein say that children are afraid of getting their mothers angry at them. They fear that if their mother does get angry, she may send them away, too. Sugar (1970) agrees that school age children fear being sent away just as their fathers were. Sugar also says that children may also be fearful that they were the ones to have caused their father's departure because they had wished it. The anger children feel for their parents and themselves is, according to Kelly and Wallerstein, often displaced onto their friends, siblings, or teachers.

Staying loyal to both parents is an additional problem with which children of divorce must cope. By school age, the child is old enough to be enlisted by his or her parents to take sides. Sometimes a special relationship is formed with one parent that deliberately excludes and rejects the other parent. Wallerstein and Kelly (1976) believe children, by around the age of 9, can use such alignments to serve their own needs and help them handle the divorce situation by dividing their parents into the "good parent" and the "bad parent". In other words, such relationships become a kind of coping behavior.

Children of divorce also appear to feel deprived. This feeling of deprivation is expressed by the child's becoming possessive and finding it difficult to share. Eventually, children do accept their parents' divorce. At their one year later follow-up, Kelly and Wallerstein (1976) discovered that the children were still sad, but they were resigned to the divorce.

Blaine (1967), in writing of the effects of divorce on children, claimed that parental divorce has little or no effect on children under 3. Those in the 3 to 6 year old age group, he maintained, are most in need of both parents. He did not seem concerned with the 12 to 18 year olds who, he believed, are capable of understanding the need for their parents' divorce. Blaine perhaps underestimated the effects of divorce on 6 to 12 year olds by saying children in this age group are not in as much need for both parents as other age children are. Rita Turow (1977) agrees with Blaine's evaluation. She said 6 to 12 year olds are not as traumatized by parental separation as younger children and are better able to tolerate change. But, Despert (1953) said that trouble in the home produces tension, and the school age child's need for his or her mother increases. The school age child has the same need as the younger child for the love of both parents. She says,

> It is not rare to find in children who are troubled about their parents' relationship a greater outward show of independence to compensate for a greater inner need to be dependent. (p. 49)

Bornstein (1951) cautioned against environmental interruptions in latency. He said the latency child is greatly afraid of having his or her precarious equilibrium upset. Certainly parental divorce qualifies as a major environmental interruption that does upset the child's "precarious equilibrium".

Many school age children are in what Erikson (1950) calls the Industry vs. Inferiority period of development. Erikson said, "The child's danger, at this stage, lies in a sense of inadequacy and inferiority" (p. 260). Unfortunately, children of divorce often do feel inadequate and inferior. Support is also given to the view that school age children are affected by parental divorce by Erikson's stating, "Many a child's development is disrupted when family life has failed to prepare him for school" (p. 260). In other words, the central developmental task of this stage is, in our culture, doing well in school. Without a stable family life, the child is at a disadvantage to successfully resolve the Industry vs. Inferiority crisis. Rohrlich et al. (1977) put it this way, "The danger of divorce is that it can focus all of the child's energy into the family and restrict the growth of newly acquired but unstable autonomy" (p. 17).

Although some believe school age children are not as troubled by parental divorce as older and younger children, this does not appear to be true. Wallerstein and Kelly (1976) explained that school age children have a difficult time because they do not use denial as well as younger children and do not have the defense mechanisms adolescents have.

Lowered academic achievement often occurs, following a school aged child's parents' divorce (Gardner, 1976; Wallerstein & Kelly, 1976). Krantzler (1974) said a child's getting bad grades may reflect his or her anxiety about the divorce or may be the child's way of being punished for causing the divorce.

Isakson (1979) reports that some educators blame the drop in reading scores in recent years directly on the changes in the family situation. In addition, Black (1979) reports that a panel commissioned by the College Entrance Examination Board lists the increase in one-parent families as one of the factors possibly to blame for the continuous decline of Scholastic Aptitude Test scores since 1964. It seems logical that the child's performance in school is sometimes affected by his or her parents' divorce. As Black (1979) explains, "Working people report that their performance on the job is affected. And if we consider that the children's major work is their school performance, we, by

analogy, should not be surprised to find that, for some, school work suffers" (p. 25). Kelly and Wallerstein (1979) explain that divorce produces stress which often affects school performance. Again, though, there is no one way that children respond to their parents' divorce. Kelly and Wallerstein (1979) report,

> Students who showed real change at school were not necessarily the same ones who expressed vigorous responses at home, or with us in the office. And some angry youngsters, newly irritable and difficult to manage at home, continued their exemplary behavior at school. (p. 56)

Schools must understand the possible effects parental divorce has on the school age child. Kelly and Wallerstein (1979) say,

> Divorce-engendered stress may compromise children's receptivity to learning, their willingness to venture into new materials, their ability to concentrate, and their overall attitude toward learning and the school setting. Children in the earliest stages of mastering reading may be most vulnerable to the disorganizing effects of family disruption, but older children also need a continuing sense of achievement to maintain positive attitudes toward learning. (p. 58)

The child's response to parental divorce inevitably goes to school with him or her.

Help for Children of Divorce

The school's role in helping children with divorcing parents. The school plays a major part in the school age child's life. The school is instrumental to the child's development and adjustment, even when they are hampered by the divorce of his or her parents.

Hammond (1979b) calls for the schools to help children of divorce saying, "With millions of school-age children experiencing the dissolution of their parents' marriages it is imperative that school personnel make themselves aware of the possible effects of divorce on children and ways of helping pupils" (p. 55). Parks (1977) expects the schools to help those involved with divorce and says "Probably the agency that has the potential of being the most supportive of the single-parent family is the public school" (p. 46). Hammond (1979c) agrees saying, "The schools, which are part of the child's natural environment, may be in the best position to provide support for children experiencing this crisis" (p. 219).

Richard Gardner (1976) maintains that the child's teacher should be told of parental separation and divorce. Teachers are, Gardner insists, in the best possible position to substitute, to some extent, for the parent who left home.

McDermott (1968) explains that with the father's physical absence and the mother's preoccupation and possible emotional absence, the teacher may be forced into the role of an interim parent surrogate. In addition, the teacher is bound to find out sooner or later as other children and parents learn of the divorce. Also, teachers aware of the divorce may be more tolerant of behavioral reactions to the divorce and not so quick to punish as teachers unaware of the turmoil in the child's life (Gardner, 1976).

Teachers must take care, though, to avoid perceiving the child of divorce as different from children from intact families. Santrock and Tracy (1978) used videotapes to investigate if teachers rate children of divorce according to a stereotyped view of such children. Thirty subjects, teachers and students who were completing their student teaching requirements, participated in this study. The child described as being a child of divorce was rated more negatively on happiness, emotional adjustment and coping with stress than was the child described as coming from an intact family. Santrock and Tracy conclude, "The present results suggest that the child from a father-absent home is likely to be perceived more negatively by his teachers than a similar child from an intact family" (p. 757).

The responsibility of the teacher and the school to help these children of divorce has been stated quite emphatically. Kelly and Wallerstein (1977a) said,

> Teachers become a central stable figure in the lives of several children in the months following the separation, in some cases the only stable figure in the children's environment. (p. 28)

Rubin and Price (1979) say, "Assisting children in developing appropriate coping skills for dealing with their new problems is an area with enormous potential for the schools" (p. 554). Black (1979) agrees, "While divorce is an individual and personal decision, we as educators need to concern ourselves with its implications for the intellectual and psychological development of children and the school's capability to help children cope with it" (p. 24).

McDermott (1968) says that the schools not only can help, but states that they must help. He wrote,

> It may even be argued that the school has an obligation to intervene at this time in order to prevent reactions from going underground and thus to prevent future disorders. (p. 1431)

What can schools do to comply with this demand that they help children of divorce? As Ricci (1979) says, "Schools have a responsibility to relate knowledgeably to new family situations" (p. 510). She complains that school forms are

designed for intact families, ignoring the possibility of two homes and stepparents. Tickets for school events are sent out for one family, as are report cards and school notices. Ricci explains the problem saying,

> a "one-home" view of family life after divorce can trap a child in the middle. Told to bring things "home," a child must choose which home, Mom's or Dad's. As a result, some children feel pushed into divided loyalties or pushed out of step with "real" families (p. 510).

Boyer (1979) suggests that teachers need to redefine "family" in the classroom. The term, "single-parent home," she says, is preferable to "broken home." Hammond (1979a, 1979b, 1979c) and Black (1979) agree saying that teachers should deal openly with different family situations and should avoid terms such as "broken home." Black (1979), Boyer (1979) and Hammond (1979a, 1979b, 1979c) suggest that instead of making presents in school for a particular person, such as making a present for mother for Mother's Day, children should be told to make a present for someone who is important to them. If they wish, children should be allowed to make more than one present in order to avoid having the child choose between two mother figures.

Kenneth Magid (1977) advises teachers to establish classroom libraries dealing with divorce. Marian Bartch

(1976) discusses some possible books for this purpose in her article, "Divorce -- Children's Literature Style." She explains that books dealing with divorce exist at all levels of comprehension and reading ability. She believes reading such books can help children understand their own divorce situation and provide some comfort by helping children deal with their own feelings and accept them as legitimate.

Louis Bates Ames (1969) believes teachers must learn that school is not just about teaching. She puts emphasis on the child's feelings and says teachers should especially encourage children of divorce to express their feelings. Magid also advises teachers to give support to children of divorcing parents and reccomends using the techniques of Teacher Effectiveness Training (Gordon, 1974). Magid wants teachers to educate children about divorce, but he does not suggest how this should be done. In general, "Schools can no longer relate to children and parents as though it could be assumed that there are two parents in the home." (Falk, 1979, p. 76).

Wilkinson and Bleck (1977) complained that there are few, if any published methods for elementary schools to help children of divorcing parents. These reserchers believe schools need to be involved in helping children face all critical life situations, including divorce. They described the Children's Divorce Group (CDG) that is offered in some

elementary schools and is led by elementary school counselors. These groups are for fourth and fifth graders with divorcing parents. Six students attend a series of eight forty-five minute development group sessions. Approximately 100 children were reported to have participated in this series of group sessions. The goals of these groups were stated as clarifying the child's feelings about divorce, helping the child understand others are experiencing similar feelings, helping the child realistically view divorce, and helping the child learn new ways of dealing with his or her feelings associated with divorce. Wilkinson and Bleck gave the following general description of these eight sessions as follows:

Session 1: Introduction and Ground Rules

Session 2: Non-divorce Related Self-Disclosure

Session 3: Filmstrip on Divorce and Discussion

Session 4: Divorce Related Self-Disclosure

Session 5: Role Playing the Problems of Divorce

Session 6: Puppet Play of Coping Behaviors

Session 7: Positive Aspects of Divorce

Session 8: Summary and Ending.

These authors concluded,

> If public education has the responsibility to teach children how to realize their own potential and, by so doing, to cope with developmental crises as they

> occur, then it cannot ignore such a large influence on a child's life as the divorce of his or her parents. The CDG provides one means of dealing with this particular developmental crisis in a way that is familiar and acceptable to many elementary schools. (p. 213)

Holdahl and Caspersen (1977) developed a program for all interested children with the purpose of helping them understand and cope with changes in the family. While this program does not specifically deal with divorce, the subject of divorce is included as one of the family changes considered. This program consists of one hour group sessions on five consecutive days for children eight to twelve years old. The sessions for younger children, five to seven, last one-half hour and are held on ten consecutive days. According to Holdahl and Caspersen, the curriculum of Children's Family Change Group consists of, "Definition of a family, personal loss within the family context, conflict inherent in change, mixed emotions accompanying change, the new family situation and the relationship with the absent or new family member" (p. 474). Family changes such as divorce, death, and residential moves are identified. Then the children are encouraged to discuss how these events relate to them. Role playing, readings, and puppets are used in addition to the discussions. These classes are optional and are meant to be

educational classes, not counseling sessions. Holdahl and Caspersen conclude that schools need to offer more supportive experiences for children.

It seems clear that schools need to take an active role in helping children cope with divorce. As Black (1979) says, "The fact of divorce is with us. The schools as well as the one-parent families must learn to cope with this in a way that enables our children to continue to develop in a healthy fashion" (p. 28).

Therapeutic techniques being used in clinical settings for helping children of divorce. In 1977, Froiland and Hozman wrote,

> An examination of the literature indicates that very little has been written on divorce counseling, and that most professional training programs have offered no courses in this area. (p. 525)

Many writers (Fisher, 1973; Kliman, 1968; Krantzler, 1974; Sugar, 1970) believe, as do Froiland and Hozman, that divorce is the death of a relationship, and people react to divorce in much the same way they react to death. Froiland and Hozman view dealing with a loss by divorce as needing more counseling than dealing with a loss by death because of the deleterious affect divorce has on one's self-concept.

Hancock (1980) also believes that divorce is sometimes harder to deal with than death because, "There is nothing comparable to a funeral, no divorce ceremony to punctuate this shift in meaning, and give it social recognition" (p. 20). She also cites the difficulty involved when the child of divorce visits the noncustodial parent, "The loss is renewed with each reunion and parting, and a child grieves alone, his sadness unsharable" (p. 25). Kelly and Wallerstein (1977b) also refer to this problem, "Nowhere is the difference in the child's experience between loss following the death of a parent and loss subsequent to divorce more clearly highlighted than in the post-divorce parent-child relationship" (p. 51).

Froiland and Hozman believe that those involved in divorce go through the same stages as those delineated by Elizabeth Kubler-Ross as stages people go through on the way to the acceptance of a loved one's death. In other words, the loss of a loved one by death or by divorce is often dealt with by progressing through stages of denial, anger, bargaining, depression, and finally, acceptance. Hozman and Froiland (1977) extended this model to children of divorcing parents. Children, they say, go through these stages just as adults do and can be helped to constructively work through them.

The first stage is denial. In this stage the child chooses not to accept reality and often pretends his or her

parents are still together. Parents are often models for this kind of reaction when they hide any indication of the approaching separation from their children. School age children in this stage are said to often engage in isolation kinds of behaviors, such as not inviting friends to their houses. Hozman and Froiland advocate the use of role palying and modeling for children in this stage. They also recommend books about children with divorced parents.

In stage two, the child often tries to strike out at those in the situation. The child's anger can take many forms and be directed at many different people. The child's angry feelings need to be expressed and channeled. Hozman and Froiland suggest using Play-Doh and punching toys.

Stage three is the bargaining stage. In this stage, the child tries to manipulate his or her parents, perhaps with the hoped for outcome of the parents' reconciliation. Children need to learn they are only responsible for their own behavior. Hozman and Froiland suggest the school can help with such things as group projects in which each child is responsible for one part of the whole project. Children must accept that they neither caused the divorce, nor can they reunite their parents.

Depression is the stage that occurs when the child learns he or she is powerless to control or change this situation that affects his or her life so completely. At

this point, Hozman and Froiland maintain it would be helpful for the child to meet and model other children whose parents have divorced.

Finally there is acceptance. Here the child accepts the existing reality, even if he or she does not like it.

While all children may not go through every stage, nor must the stages be experienced in any specific order, identifying the stage the child's feelings are in is, according to Hozman and Froiland (1976), important to counseling the children of divorcing parents.

Dlugokinski (1977) also believes that children and adults follow a regular pattern when learning to cope with divorce. He views divorce as an engagement-disengagement process and proposes a three step process of re-engagement for those dealing with divorce. He says, "In divorce adults and children must disengage from one life style and engage again, with a new direction and focus" (p. 27). According to Dlugokinski, divorce is one of many separations in life which begin with the separation from the mother's body at birth and end with the final separation of death. Each separation means the loss of one way of life and a reorientation to another. He lists such things as changed relationships with parents, altered economic status, new residential setting, and frequent babysitters or time spent in day care centers as some changes in their lives that children of parental divorce often must learn to accept.

Dlugokinski's three-step process begins with Orientation. Stress accompanies the changes in one's life that occur because of divorce, and some of these changes are blocked out until the child or adult is ready to accept them. Dlugokinski says that denial and depression occur in this stage. For children, school performance and peer relationships sometimes change at this time. Dlugokinski maintains that the counselor's job at this stage is to be supportive and express a caring attitude while helping the client become oriented to his or her new life situation.

Dlugokinski's second stage is Integration. This stage usually begins a few weeks or months following the divorce. In this stage, the divorce becomes personalized, and anger and sadness is to be expected. Depression may be used to lessen the anxiety of this stage. Counselors do the most good at this time by helping children and adults express and accept their emotions.

The final stage, according to Dlugokinski, is Consolidation. By this time, a realistic identity and coping skills have been achieved. Children and adults are now ready to go on with their new lives.

In their comprehensive study of children of parental divorce, though, Kelly and Wallerstein (1977a) did not find a progression of defined stages in response to the divorce. They contend that the child's response is tied to his or her

developmental stage, environment, and relationship with both parents. The intervention program they propose has the following goals:

1) reduction in suffering, where suffering was defined as intense anxiety, fearfulness, depression, anger, longing, or other symptoms causing distress;
2) reduction in cognitive confusion in relation to the divorce and its sequelae;
3) increase in psychological distance between the divorce situation and the child, or a divorcing parent and his child, where the child has become directly involved in the parental conflict; and
4) successful resolution of various idiosyncratic issues, for example, dealing more comfortably with a mentally disturbed noncustodial parent, or working through the dilemma of having to choose between parents. (p. 30)

The kind of intervention program they use for young school age children is based on these researchers' earlier findings regarding the effects of parental divorce on school age children. These children have great trouble talking about their parents' divorce. It was found that many children experienced an increase in suffering from discussing the divorce.

Because these researchers believe that respecting the child's defenses is necessary, they used "divorce monologues", stories told by the counselor about a child dealing with a similar divorce situation. This technique enables the child to maintain psychological distance and also serves as a permission granter for the child's expressing his or her own feelings. Each monologue is shaped to correspond to the child's particular response to parental divorce. Many children found relief from hearing about other children that shared their problems, and they began to feel less lonely. The effectiveness of this treatment method is being evaluated through observations done four years after treatment of the 131 children in this study.

Children Facing Divorce is another treatment program for parents being divorced and their children. Kenneth Magid (1977), the Director of this program in Evergreen, Colorado, lists three goals of Children Facing Divorce. The first goal is to provide a non-threatening atmosphere in which the child can express his or her innermost feelings and fears. Secondly, the alternatives to old, no longer working role patterns are found. Thirdly, effective communication skills between parent and child are promoted. Finally, this is a group procedure that encourages participation in constructive, interpersonal relationships with peers. The program continues for six weeks with children meeting together once a

week and parents meeting together once a week. The last session is a combined session for parents and children. Within the groups, seven vignettes of family scenes children facing divorce can relate to are shown. The children discuss each one. Hopefully, they come to view divorce as a terminating event between their parents and see their own role realistically. Emphasis is put on expressing feelings, especially repressed feelings. Later, the children create and discuss their own vignettes. The major areas dealt with include,

Why Are We Here?

Divorce and Variability of Human Perception

Children Facing Guilt and Loneliness

Looking Ahead. (P. 535)

The effects of this program are still being studied.

R. A. Gardner's (1976) approach to treating children of divorce is, "individual child therapy with parental observation and intermittent participation" (p. 51). Gardner believes there are advantages to be gained by having the parents in the room with a child under 11 who is undergoing therapy. He says that children of this age have little that their parents do not know or that should be kept secret from them. Sometimes siblings are also included. He asks children to bring a cassette tape recorder to each session and tape the entire conversation so that the children can listen to the tape between sessions.

Gardner utilizes many approaches throughout the sessions. In his Mutual Storytelling Technique, he uses children's storytelling to gain insight into the child's inner conflicts, frustrations, and defenses. The child first tells a story, and then Gardner tells one using the same characters and setting. Gardner alters the child's story, though, to do such things as show healthier resolutions of the conflicts the child expressed. In order to get the children to make up stories, he plays games such as asking the child to be the guest of honor on a pretend television show. If the child agrees, Gardner says,

> Good morning, boys and girls, I'd like to welcome you once agin to Dr. Gardner's "Make-Up-A-Story Television Program." As you all know, we invite children to our program to see how good they are at making up stories. Naturally the more adventure or excitement a story has, the more interesting it is to the people who are watching at their television sets. Now, it's against the rules to tell stories about things you've read or have seen in movies or on television, or about things that really happened to you or anyone you know. (pp. 58-59)

Gardner then introduces the child and asks him or her a few simple, interview type questions to lessen his or her anxiety before making up a story. Sometimes the child's stories are

reenacted as plays. This is Gardner's Dramatization techinque.

For children unwilling or too inhibited to reveal themselves in the above ways, Gardner uses a variety of games. These games are all used as vehicles for the child's storytelling in that at some point in each game the child is required to tell a story or describe his or her own feelings. Gardner's procedures are extensively described in his book, Psychotherapy with Children of Divorce.

Kessler and Bostwick (1977) describe a workshop model for children ten to seventeen years old who are children of parental divorce. Some of the children who participated had just experienced their parents' divorce, and others had parents who had been divorced as long as six years. Kessler and Bostwick met with the group on one Saturday from ten in the morning until four that afternoon. The stated therapeutic goals were,

> (1) To explore their own and others' values/assumptions about marriage/divorce; (2) to recognize, express and cope with their own and their parents' emotions constructively; and (3) to develop communication skills for handling difficult situations. (p. 39)

Kessler and Bostwick explain, "The model we have shared is by no means statistically substantiated, cross-validated, or

otherwise proven; but based on the productive growth we have personally witnessed, we encourage other professionals to serve this overlooked and deserving population" (p. 41).

Although all of the procedures for helping children of divorce discussed above certainly have some merit, they are not sufficient.

Problems with presently used procedures for helping children of divorce. The first problem with existing procedures concerns the question of when therapy should start. Louise Despert (1953) says children need help as soon as parents are aware of trouble between themselves, not when the divorce is granted or just before. Unfortunately, according to Kelly and Wallerstein (1977a), "the greatest period of stress or crises for the child may be out of synchrony with the timing of the intervention" (p. 30). Kapit (1972) agrees asserting that the child's first problem is that,

> he rarely is helped -- by parent or professional -- when his anxieties first start, when he first begins to sense conflicts around him. This may be before the parents are aware, or have admitted to themselves, that their relationship is in difficulty. (p. 207)

Louise Bates Ames (1969) wrote that the biggest part of meeting trouble takes place before trouble occurs. Could this

mean that some kind of intervention should begin before marital problems begin?

The child's dependence on parents for taking him or her for therapy produces another problem with existing techniques for helping school age children. Parents need to observe a need for their child's getting help before they provide it. Wargotz (1972) studied fathers who were raising their children in motherless homes. She concluded it was the fathers' need to show they were doing a good job that, "they tend to overlook danger signals in their children of impending emotional distress" (p. 64). Kapit (1972) described the case of an 8 year old girl, for example, who was having many problems related to her parents' divorce. When she was brought for therapy the mother said she brought her daughter for therapy,

> Not because she has any problems, she is very well adjusted. The divorce didn't affect her at all, but because all the others in the family are in some form of treatment and she feels left out, she wants to have somebody to talk to also. (p. 201)

Thus, no matter how effective a technique is, it is useless for the child not presented with it.

Another problem that needs attention is that the friends of the children whose parents are divorced may also need help in coming to terms with divorce. These "innocent bystanders"

often become anxious and concerned. Gardner (1976) explained,

> Parental separation creates anxiety among peers. The other children cannot but become frightened that the same calamity will befall themselves if it can happen so close to home. (pp. 33-34)

Gardner believes that these children's intense interest or complete disinterest in their friend's parents' divorce is not so much trying to be helpful and kind or inconsiderate and cold as a response designed to alleviate their own anxieties. Parker Damon (1979) explains, "The fear of losing a parent via separation or divorce is very much part of the awareness of many children who live in stable homes and environments" (p. 69). In 1970, Margaret Mead wrote,

> Each American child learns, early and in terror, that his whole security depends on that single set of parents ... "What will happen to me if anything goes wrong, if Mommy dies, if Daddy dies, if Daddy leaves Mommy or Mommy leaves Daddy?" are questions no American child can escape. (p. 102)

A program that takes the needs of these children into consideration is necessary.

In conclusion, there are insufficiencies in existing programs designed to help children cope with parental divorce. First, how can children get help when (or even

before) marital conflict begins? Second, how can children be provided with necessary assistance even if their parents and teachers are unaware of their need for help? Third, what can be done to help friends of children of divorce deal with their anxieties? With the high rate of children with divorced parents, the large number of children with separated parents, and the numerous children who are friends of those in the first two categories, the total number of children who could profit from some kind of assistance is staggering. This researcher believes that the best way to reach so many children would be in an educational program conducted in elementary school classrooms. The research indicates that most children need divorce education rather than intense therapy. The importance of the classroom teacher at the time of divorce makes her the best person to conduct such a program. And, all children would, hopefully, learn what divorce is and what usually happens to children when their parents divorce. In this way, the children's fears of the unknown could be diminished. Children would be shown the kinds of feelings children of divorce often experience which would help those who are afraid their feelings are unique. It helps just to know others are involved in similar situations and share their feelings. Thus, this kind of program could bring about results similar to those achieved by clinical procedures. Also, such a program could prompt children to initiate

conversations about their problems with caring teachers or counselors. Children could, in essence, take themselves to appropriate school personnel for counseling. When necessary, conferences with parents could be arranged, sometimes producing referrals to outside agencies. An elementary school divorce education program could help to reduce the number of children's divorce related problems and promote clinical help when it is indicated.

Summary of Literature Review

The loss of an attachment figure, for an adult as well as for a child, precipitates a variety of responses often grouped together under the name separation anxiety. A discussion of attachment and separation anxiety was presented because parental divorce does indeed mean the loss of an attachment figure. It follows, then, that at least part of the child's response to parental divorce could be termed separation anxiety.

The way one explains separation anxiety is dependent on his or her view of anxiety in general. Therefore, the six major positions for explaining anxiety were presented. Regardless of the theory one accepts, it seems that experiencing separations in our lives is inevitable, as is the anxiety that accompanies the loss of an attachment figure.

Research dealing with ways one reacts to separation was discussed, including reactions to short and long separations

by various aged subjects. The age of the subject and his or her level of cognitive development was found to make a difference in the child's responses.

Discussion of the research into the effects of parental divorce on children also showed this variety of responses dependent on the child's age. No one pattern of responding emerged, although anger was most often reported. Some researchers delineate a series of stages through which children of divorce progress on their way to accepting their parents' divorce. These theories were included in the discussion.

The sexual development of a child appears to be especially prone to being affected when his or her parents divorce. Sex role identification, resolution of the Oedipal conflict and superego development, and heterosexual relationships are all areas potentially affected by being a child of parental divorce.

Because it has been shown that the age at which the loss of an attachment figure occurs is important to the child's reaction, it seems to follow that school age children would react to parental divorce differently than preschoolers and adolescents. This age child is certainly affected by parental divorce and needs to be included in the research into the effects of parental divorce on children.

A school age child's reaction to parental divorce undoubtedly affects his or her school life. The argument that the school must play an active role in helping children of divorce was presented along with the importance of teachers learning to help children cope with their new family situations. Ways the school can help were explained, and existing programs in the schools for helping these children were outlined. Other programs for helping the children of divorce, outside of a school setting, were also discussed.

While the presently used techniques for helping children of divorce do have merit, there are problems with them. These problems and insufficiencies were explained and include the child's not getting help at the time he or she needs it most; the child's not getting help because parents and teachers do not recognize his or her need for help; and finally, all children, not just those identified as being children of divorce, need help with their own anxieties about divorce. To correct these problems, a divorce education program for the schools to be presented to all children was suggested.

CHAPTER III

Method

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were investigated:

1. There is no difference between children who have experienced parental divorce and those in intact families as shown on Separation Anxiety Test (SAT; 10 patterns and total) scores and Child's Behavior Traits (CBT; 5 subscales and total) scores;
2. Children of divorce are not more knowledgeable about divorce than children in intact families as shown by pretest scores;
3. The term "custody" is not better understood by children of divorce than by children in intact families as shown by answers to item six on the pretest;
4. The divorce education program presented had no effect on the children's knowledge of divorce as shown by a comparison of pretest and posttest results.

Subjects

One hundred forty-one third graders from four Catholic elementary schools in the Phoenix, Arizona area participated in this project. This investigator chose to focus on third graders because of the lack of research concerning the effects of divorce on this age child (7, 8, 9). Third

graders are too old to have research with preschoolers applied to them, and too young to have research with adolescents applied to them.

The participating schools were selected by the Superintendent of Catholic Schools in the Phoenix Diocese who used socio-economic factors as the basis for her choices. One school, located in an upper socio-economic status area, had two third grade classes, both of which took part. The three other cooperating schools were in lower socio-economic status areas. Each of these schools had one third grade class. The two third grade classes in the upper SES school and the three third grade classes from the lower SES schools comprised the sample. The three classes in the lower SES schools were randomly assigned to the experimental or control group as were the two classes in the upper SES school. The children were simply told that the researcher was studying third graders' opinions and needed their help.

Overall, one hundred forty-one subjects originally participated in this study. Eight of these children had to be omitted because they were unable to complete valid tests either because of unwillingness to cooperate, a lack of sufficient English language skills, or school absence. Scores for 133 children (63 boys; 70 girls) were gathered for both the SAT and CBT. When comparing pretest, posttest, and gain scores, 13 more children were eliminated, either because of

completing invalid tests (choosing more than one answer for a question or skipping a question) or school absence. Therefore, 120 students (55 boys; 65 girls) completed this part of the study (see Table 1).

Parts of this study focused on School 2 because the participating teacher there was confident of her knowledge of her students' family situations. Twenty-five children (14 boys; 11 girls) completed the custody question in the pretest, of which 10 had divorced parents, and 15 came from intact homes. When comparing pretest, posttest and gain scores for School 2, twenty-three children (12 boys; 11 girls) were studied. Two of the boys with intact families were eliminated from this part of the study because of absence (see Table 1).

Instrumentation

Separation Anxiety Test (SAT). The first step of this project was individually administering Henry G. Hansburg's Separation Anxiety Test (Hansburg, 1972). This test consists of twelve pictures showing a child in scenes ranging from mild and usual separations to more traumatic ones. There are two forms of this test -- one for boys and one for girls. The pictures are titled to avoid problems with the child not understanding what is supposed to be happening in the pictures. Seventeen statements describing how the child in the picture might feel follow each picture. The child is to

TABLE 1

A Numerical Description of Subjects Taking Part in this Study

	Group	
Subjects	Control	Experimental
Total	67	53
Sex		
Male	26	29
Female	41	24
SES		
Lower	30	21
Upper	37	32

	Tests			
Subjects	SAT/CBT	Pretest	Pre/Post/Gain	Custody Question
Total	133	133	120	133
Sex				
Male	63	63	55	
Female	70	70	65	
Home Situation				
Divorced	19			19
Intact	114			114

	School 2		
Subjects	SAT/CBT	Pre/Post/Gain	Custody Question
Total	23	23	25
Sex			
Male	12	12	14
Female	11	11	11
Home Situation			
Divorced	10	10	10
Intact	13	13	15

select as many of these statements as he or she believes tell how the child in the picture feels. Quantitative scores consist of the number of responses for each of the seventeen possible reactions (represented by statements), the number of responses for each picture, the total number of statements marked for the twelve pictures, the percentage of particular kinds of responses (attachment need, individuation, hostility, painful tension, reality avoidance and reality testing affects, and identity stress) over the total number of responses, and the percentage of the picture responses over the total responses.

The titles of the twelve pictures are:

1. The child will live permanently with his grandmother and without his parents;
2. The child is being transferred to a new class;
3. The family is moving to a new neighborhood;
4. The child is leaving his mother to go to school;
5. The child is leaving his parents to go to camp;
6. After an argument with the mother, the father is leaving;
7. The child's brother is a sailor leaving on a voyage;
8. The judge is placing the child in an institution;
9. The mother has just put this child to bed;
10. The child's mother is being taken to the hospital;

11. The child and the father are standing at the mother's coffin;

12. The child is running away from home. (pp. 14-15)

Reliability data is only available for 250 children aged 10 to 15, and run in the .70s and .80s, using the Spearman-Brown split-half method. Validation is continuously being checked and is derived by comparisons of responses of those in residential care with those in normative populations; and by comparison of test results with psychiatric opinions, case histories, and other psychological tests.

Child's Behavior Traits (CBT). The participating classroom teachers completed the CBT checklist which provides a total score and the following five subscale scores for each child:

1. Responsible Independence
2. Social Cooperation
3. Cognitively Related Skills
4. Emotional Stability
5. Task Orientation

Four items comprise each subscale. The teacher indicated the degree a trait is present in each child on a Likert type scale ranging from almost not present to markedly present. The subscale scores range from four to twenty. The total CBT score ranges from 20 to 100.

Internal reliability was shown in 1974 for 390 children when the coefficient Alpha was .95. Validity was shown by: 1) the coefficient of -.70 when correlating CBT total scores with the presence of school problems as indicated by the same teacher who completed the CBT, 2) coefficients of .58 and .58 respectively for math teachers' CBT scores correlated with indications of school problems by classroom teachers, and vice versa, and 3) the correlation of .43 between CBT scores and IQs of 273 children aged four to ten.

Pretest. The children in all the participating classes completed a pretest to determine their knowledge of divorce. This test, written by this researcher, consists of descriptions of situations followed by statements relating to these situations. For each of the statements, the children circled if they Strongly Agreed, Agreed, were Uncertain, Disagreed, or Strongly Disagreed with the statement.

Divorce education program. Following the pretest, the children in the experimental group were presented with the divorce education program written by this researcher. This program consists of six presentations, each consisting of 35mm slides and accompanying cassette tapes (see Appendix C).

This divorce education program is an audio-visual program that does not solicit class participation. Research conducted by Wallerstein and Kelly (1976) found that school age children are not helped by discussing their parents'

divorce. On the contrary, they found it too painful to probe the subject. It was for this reason that the combination of slides and cassette tapes was chosen for the media of the program. An explanation of this program and how it developed appears in Appendix D.

Procedure

First, the subjects individually responded to the Separation Anxiety Test. This researcher tape recorded the seventeen statements following each picture, enabling the child to hear the statements while he or she was reading them silently. The tapes were made in order to lessen the effects of the child's reading ability on the test results. Each child was told to select as many of the seventeen statements as he or she believed represented how the child in the picture felt. The child indicated his or her choice of a statement as soon as it was heard by saying "yes", "that one", or the number of the statement. When all seventeen statements had been read, the child was asked if he or she had anything to add about how the child in the picture feels. This researcher recorded the child's responses on a recording chart.

Before giving this test to the children in the sample, this researcher practiced its administration with two other third grade classes. At that time it was learned that some children needed help understanding the vocabulary of the test. The tape recorder was easily stopped in order to

explain those words that needed explanation. Two words "institution" and "suicide" were routinely defined for all the children. Others needed help with such words as "permanently", "transferred", and "coffin".

Testing took placed in a variety of settings including a storeroom, assembly hall, lunch room, and an outside corridor. All these areas were unused while testing was taking place which provided a quiet testing setting with a minimum of distractions. Each child was with this researcher for approximately 1/2 hour. No direct questioning of the child about his or her parents' marital situation was allowed, but some freely gave this information without being asked.

Two of the children were absent too often to be tested. Six of the children were unable to be tested either because of an inadequate knowledge of English or because of a refusal to cooperate.

Next, the classroom teachers completed the CBT for each student. The scores on the SAT and CBT were compared for children whose parents were married and those whose parents were divorced and live with their mother. Children who have suffered the death of one parent, whose mothers were never married, whose parents were separated, or who live with their father or neither of their natural parents were omitted from this study.

The teachers were aware of present family situations of their students, but were not sure that they knew what took place years before, such as a divorce and remarriage which could make the child appear to be in an intact family. The teacher in School 2 was more confident than the other teachers that she correctly identified all children of parental divorce in her class because of her work with her students' families. Because of this, in addition to the comparison already mentioned, a comparison of children of divorce with children of intact families on SAT and CBT scores was also done just for the 23 children tested in School 2. A more thorough individual analysis of the test protocols for the children of divorce in school 2 was also done to see if any systematic patterns emerged.

Then, all the participating children were given the pretest. Before beginning the test, this researcher asked if anyone knew what it meant to agree or disagree with something. The two upper SES classes had no trouble with these words, but the lower SES classes needed full explanations. The classroom blackboards were used to help the children remember the meanings of the answer choices in the following way:

Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
YES!!!	YES	?	NO	NO!!!

The children were reminded to refer to the blackboard.

This pretest was a printed test which was read aloud to the students by this researcher on a previously recorded cassette tape. The children were told the test was about the experiences of Gertrude and Alvin, brother and sister puppets which were brought to the classes and displayed throughout the testing.

Children who were absent or who completed tests that could not be used because they chose more than one answer for a question or they skipped a question were eliminated from this study. Again the children of School 2 were separated out for additional comparisons.

The experimental group viewed the divorce education program. One program a week was to be presented for six consecutive weeks, but the final program and the posttest had to be postponed until after Christmas vacation because the schools were unexpectedly closed early for vacation due to flooding and a flu epidemic.

The teachers and principals of the schools never saw the program prior to the class presentations for fear of contaminating test results. All they knew was that the program dealt with divorce and had been approved by the Superintendent of Schools for the Phoenix Diocese.

This program was presented to all the children in the experimental group, regardless of the parents' marital status. There were three major reasons for choosing to

present the program to all the children. First of all, singling out children of divorce for a program just for them could do more harm than good. The children of divorce already carry the burden of being "different". Calling these children out of class would draw more attention to this difference. Secondly, there is no way to know which children need such a program the most. Some children might not yet be aware of impending marital separations. And even finalized divorces might not be brought to the school's attention, especially in the Catholic schools. Thus any selection process for determining the group to see the program would eliminate some of those who should be included. Thirdly, with the large numbers of children experiencing divorce and the extensive portrayal of divorce situations in the media, few children escape being exposed to divorce in one way or another. Children of intact families have their own questions and anxieties about divorce. It was hoped that these children would also be helped by the divorce education program.

The divorce education program presented consisted of six parts. Following the program's presentation, children in both the experimental and control group were given the posttest, which was the same as the pretest, to determine if the program had any effect on the experimental group.

Design and Statistical Analysis

A pretest-posttest control group design was used for determining the effectiveness of the divorce education program. Analysis of variance was used to study the relationship of the independent variables (sex, home situation, group, SES, sex/home situation, sex/group, SES/group) and the scores on the dependent variables (pretest, pre/post/gain, custody question, SAT and CBT). When applicable, analysis of variance was also used to study the relationship of the above independent and dependent variables specifically for School 2.

CHAPTER IV

Results

Null Hypothesis I: There is no difference between children who have experienced parental divorce and those in intact families as shown on Separation Anxiety Test (SAT; 10 patterns and total) scores and Child's Behavior Traits (CBT; 5 subscales and total) scores.

Analysis related to the Separation Anxiety Test responses. The SAT scores were analyzed in three ways. First, the mean scores of the children of divorce were compared with the mean scores of children of intact families for children in all the participating classes. Second, the mean scores of children of divorce were compared with the mean scores of children in intact families for just those children in the third grade from School 2. Third, individual evaluations of SAT protocols for children in School 2 identified as being children of divorce were done.

Table 2 presents the mean scores for children in all the participating classes. The SAT total indicates the mean number of responses the children made on the entire test. All the other scores are percentages of that total.

An analysis of variance showed no statistical differences between children of divorce and children of intact families on these scores (see Table 3). Nevertheless, the

TABLE 2

SAT Mean Scores for Children of Divorce and Children of Intact Homes

	Divorce	Intact	Divorce Female	Divorce Male	Intact Female	Intact Male
N	19	114	11	8	59	55
SAT Total	57	57	60	53	55	58
Attachment	23	24	23	22	25	24
Individuation	28	24	27	28	23	25
Hostility	11	12	11	12	11	13
Painful Tension	17	18	16	18	20	16
Reality Avoidance	10	11	10	9	11	10
Concentration Impairment & Sublimation	13	12	15	10	12	13
Self-Love Loss	6	6	7	6	6	7
Identity Stress	6	5	7	4	5	6
Attachment-Individuation Balance	26	29	31	21	28	30
Mild-Strong Difference	10	11	10	11	11	11

TABLE 3

Analysis of Variance Results for SAT Responses and Home Situations of All Subjects

	Type IV SS	F Value	PR>F
SAT Total	23.50	0.02	0.88
Attachment	0.00	0.45	0.50
Individuation	0.01	0.47	0.49
Hostility	0.00	0.44	0.51
Painful Tension	0.00	0.04	0.84
Reality Avoidance	0.00	0.14	0.71
Concentration Impairment & Sublimation	0.01	1.84	0.18
Self-Love Loss	0.00	0.46	0.50
Identity Stress	0.00	0.50	0.48
Attachment-Individuation Balance	0.00	0.00	0.96
Mild-Strong Difference	0.00	0.45	0.50

Note: df = 1

following scores deserve attention. The girls as a group, regardless of home situation, scored below the adequate range on Hostility. This may indicate repressed hostility. Males who are children of divorce scored lower than the adequate range on reality avoidance and may be denying denial.

When the Concentration Impairment and Sublimation score is much higher than the Self-Love Loss score, a feeling of ineffectiveness and a lacking of confidence is indicated. Inadequacy because of the absence of someone the child depends on is also suspected. Female children of divorce seem to fit this pattern. All of the groups were below average on Identity Stress, but that could be because these children are a few years younger than those who usually are given this test. Male children of divorce indicated a problem that needs further investigation by scoring well below the adequate score on the Attachment-Individuation Balance score. All the Mild-Strong Difference scores were weak. These scores are of interest even though they are not statistically significant, because, as Hansburg (1976) says,

> "The pathological significance of a small difference between the frequency of reactions to mild and strong pictures would suggest an increasing degree of insensitivity. Decreasing sensitivity in terms of undifferentiation of responses to varying stimuli would be most characteristic in situations of

personality constriction, depression, and psychopathic individuals". (p. 6)

Table 4 shows the mean scores for children in School 2 on the SAT. Except for the total score which is the mean number of responses, the scores are percentages of that total. An analysis of variance pointed out one statistically significant difference between children of divorce and children in intact families in School 2 (see Table 5). The Individuation score was high for children of divorce as a group, and even higher for male children of divorce, indicating these children's strong need for self-reliance. This Individuation score when correlated with the children's home situations yielded an F-value of 6.04 and a P-value of .03.

Other scores are also of interest. Male children of divorce scored lower than average on Hostility, possibly indicating a repression of normal anger and resentment. On the other hand, female children of divorce scored in the strong range on Hostility. Male children from intact families also scored in the strong range on Hostility. Male children of divorce appear to deny denial in that their Reality Avoidance score was in the weak range. Female children of divorce seem to be overdependent on an absent person and may feel ineffective and lack confidence as indicated by their Concentration Impairment and Sublimation score being much greater than their Self-Love Loss score. Male children

TABLE 4

SAT Mean Scores for Children of Divorce and Children of Intact Homes in School 2

	Divorce	Intact	Divorce Female	Divorce Male	Intact Female	Intact Male
N	10	13	4	6	7	6
SAT Total	56	66	71	46	50	86
Attachment	23	24	23	23	28	17
Individuation	29	20	26	31	22	19
Hostility	12	14	15	10	9	21
Painful Tension	17	17	16	18	18	17
Reality Avoidance	10	11	12	8	11	12
Concentration Impairment & Sublimation	12	12	15	10	13	11
Self-Love Loss	6	9	8	5	7	11
Identity Stress	3	4	3	3	4	4
Attachment-Individuation Balance	27	32	37	20	43	19
Mild-Strong Difference	10	10	10	11	12	9

TABLE 5

Analysis of Variance Results for SAT Responses and Home Situations of Children in School 2

	Type IV SS	F Value	PR>F
SAT Total	1504.30	0.99	0.37
Attachment	0.00	0.44	0.52
Individuation	0.06	6.04	0.03
Hostility	0.01	0.66	0.43
Painful Tension	0.01	1.26	0.28
Reality Avoidance	0.00	0.12	0.73
Concentration Impairment & Sublimation	0.01	1.18	0.29
Self-Love Loss	0.01	0.96	0.34
Identity Stress	0.00	1.11	0.31
Attachment-Individuation Balance	0.11	1.00	0.33
Mild-Strong Difference	0.00	0.01	0.91

Note: df = 1

of divorce had a low Reality Avoidance score and a high Individuation score higher than their Attachment score (Reality Avoidance 8%, Individuation 31%, and Attachment 23%) which indicates a pattern of denying that they are needful. Low Identity Stress scores for this group is probably a function of the children's age and does not seem to be a cause for concern.

The only statistically significant difference between children of divorce and children of intact families on the SAT that was found was the Individuation score for School 2.

The third way in which SAT scores were analyzed was by evaluating the individual student protocols. The protocols of the ten children identified as children of divorce in School 2 were evaluated. These scores and a summary of each child's protocol is presented in Appendix B. It is interesting to note that denial was evident in seven of the ten protocals either in the form of a constricted protocol, affect blunting or high reality avoidance scores. All of these protocols indicate the possibility of some kind of emotional disorder.

Analyses related to the Child's Behavior Traits responses. The analysis of CBT scores was also done in three ways. First, the mean scores of children of parental divorce were compared with those of children from intact families for children in all the participating classes. Second, the same

comparisons were made, but this time only the scores for the children in School 2 were compared. Third, the score sheets for the children of divorce in School 2 were individually discussed.

No statistically significant differences were found between the scores for children of divorce and those for children of intact families (see Table 6). It is important to note that the girls from intact families scored the highest on all CBT scales except the Cognitively Related Skills scale on which they were the second highest score. The Intact Female group scored a full point over all others on the Social Cooperation and Emotional Stability scales (see Table 7).

The child's sex, not home situation, was found to be statistically significant for the group from School 2, which may indicate the way teachers stereotypically view boys and girls (see Table 8). For the total score, the F-value is 11.82 and the P-value is .00. There also was a statistically signficant difference between the scores for boys and the scores for girls on Responsible Independence, Social Cooperation, and Emotional Stability. It is important to note that the Intact Female group scored highest on all scales followed by the Divorce Female group on all scales except Cognitively Related Skills (see Table 9). The group of Intact Males scored the lowest of all groups on all scales and the total

TABLE 6

Analysis of Variance Results for CBT Responses and Home Situations for all Subjects

	Type IV SS	F Value	PR>F
CBT Total	0.02	0.00	0.99
Responsible Independence	3.14	0.44	0.51
Social Cooperation	2.37	0.25	0.62
Cognitively Related Skills	4.51	0.68	0.41
Emotional Stability	0.73	0.08	0.78
Task Orientation	3.69	0.29	0.60

Note: df = 1

TABLE 7

CBT Mean Scores for Children of Divorce and Children of Intact Homes

	Divorce	Intact	Divorce Female	Divorce Male	Intact Female	Intact Male
N	19	114	11	8	59	55
CBT Total	79.7	81.2	79	80	84	77
Responsible Independence	15.8	16.2	15.4	16.4	16.6	15.8
Social Cooperation	16.5	16.6	16.6	16.3	17.7	15.5
Cognitively Related Skills	16.5	16.1	16.3	16.8	16.4	15.7
Emotional Stability	15.7	16.6	16.0	15.4	17.2	16.1
Task Orientation	15.2	15.5	14.7	15.9	16.1	14.8

TABLE 8

Analysis of Variance Results for CBT Responses and Home Situation and Sex for the Children in School 2

	Type IV SS		F Value		PR>F	
	Home	Sex	Home	Sex	Home	Sex
CBT Total	359.40	1183.23	3.59	11.82	0.08	0.00
Responsible Independence	4.56	22.75	0.94	4.71	0.35	0.04
Social Cooperation	24.24	124.21	2.66	13.62	0.12	0.00
Cognitively Related Skills	7.64	4.81	1.27	0.80	0.28	0.39
Emotional Stability	28.01	120.83	3.39	14.61	0.09	0.00
Task Orientation	14.77	28.04	1.46	2.77	0.25	0.12

Note: df = 1

TABLE 9

CBT Mean Scores for Children of Divorce and Children of Intact Homes in School 2

	Divorce	Intact	Divorce Female	Divorce Male	Intact Female	Intact Male
N	10	13	4	6	7	6
CBT Total	82	80	85.8	79.5	89.9	69.8
Responsible Independence	16.3	16.1	16.5	16.2	17.7	14.2
Social Cooperation	17.3	16.6	19.3	16.0	19.4	13.3
Cognitively Related Skills	16.4	16.1	16.0	16.7	17.0	15.2
Emotional Stability	16.1	16.5	17.8	15.0	19.0	13.7
Task Orientation	15.9	15.2	16.3	15.7	16.7	13.5

score. It must be remembered that the CBT is a checklist with scoring done on a Likert type scale filled out by the teacher.

Four items comprise each of the five subscales. Each item may be scored from one to five. The highest possible score for each subscale is twenty; the lowest is five. Because of this scoring procedure, it is possible for a child to have an appropriate score for a subscale but still have a very low score on one of the items in it. In this way, a child could score five points on three items, but only one point on the fourth and end up with a score of sixteen. The item with the score of one needs to explored. For this reason, the item scores were examined for the children of divorced parents in School 2. These scores and summaries of individual protocols are presented in Appendix B. Generally, their lowest scores indicate anger, lack of self-confidence, moodiness and inability to concentrate and be creative.

Although differences in SAT and CBT results were found between children of divorce and children of intact families, the only statistical significant difference found was on the Individuation scale of the SAT for School 2. Except for the Individuation pattern we must not reject the first null hypothesis, "There is no difference betwen children who have experienced parental divorce and those in intact families as

shown on SAT scores (10 patterns and total score) and CBT scores (5 subscales and total score)."

Null Hypothesis II: Children of divorce are not more knowledgeable about divorce than children in intact families as shown by pretest scores.

Analysis related to the pretest responses. The pretest written by this researcher was given to all participating classes. Children absent on the day of the pretest and those whose tests were invalid due to skipping a question or marking more than one answer for a question were eliminated from this study. This pretest score is an indicator of the knowledge children possess about divorce. Table 10 contains the results for all classes and also the results for School 2.

This pretest was made up of twelve questions each with a possible score of one to five. The answers were scored on a Likert type scale. If a child was uncertain of an answer he or she was to circle that answer choice which would still earn a score of three. If the child answered all twelve questions by circling "uncertain" he or she would still have a total score of 36. No statistically significant differences were found with the above groups of children (see Table 11). It appears that none of the groups has a great knowledge of divorce. Of all the groups, the highest group mean was earned by the girls from intact families in School 2. The lowest group mean was for the girls with divorced parents

TABLE 10

Pretest Mean Scores for Children of Divorce and Children of Intact Homes

	All Schools		School 2	
	Mean Score	N	Mean Score	N
Divorce	37.5	19	35.4	10
Intact	37.2	114	38.5	13
Female	37.5	70	37.5	11
Male	36.9	63	36.8	12
Divorce Female	37.8	11	34.5	4
Divorce Male	37.0	8	36.0	6
Intact Female	37.4	59	39.3	7
Intact Male	36.9	55	37.5	6

TABLE 11

Analysis of Variance Results for Pretest Scores and Home Situation, Sex and Home Situation/Sex for all Participating Subjects and Subjects in School 2

	SS	F Value	PR>F
All Schools			
Home Situation	8.18	0.32	0.57
Sex	8.39	0.33	0.57
Home Situation/Sex	0.30	0.01	0.91
School 2			
Home Situation	7.19	0.24	0.63
Sex	0.11	0.00	0.95
Home Situation/Sex	2.14	0.07	0.79

Note: df = 1

in School 2. Based on these results, the second null hypothesis, "Children of divorce are not more knowledgeable about divorce than children in intact families as shown by pretest scores," cannot be rejected.

Null Hypothesis III: The term "custody" is not better understood by children of divorce than by children in intact families as shown by answers to item six on the pretest.

Analysis related to the custody item responses. Because "custody" is the divorce term most directly affecting children, it seemed logical to use the child's knowledge of that term as another indicator of the child's knowledge of divorce in general. Below is item six from the pretest:

Now that their parents are divorced, Gertrude and Alvin live with their mother and visit their father.

6. Gertrude and Alvin's mother has custody of them.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNCERTAIN DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

Table 12 shows the mean scores for all schools and School 2 on this item. Considering a score of 3.0 on this question indicates the child chose "uncertain" as his or her response, the above mean scores hovering around 3.0 suggest a lack of understanding of the term "custody" by all the children, although the children of divorce did score a few tenths of a point higher than their peers in intact families. Sex and socio-economic status had no effect on the children's knowledge of the word "custody". Based on analysis of variance

TABLE 12

Mean Scores for the Custody Item for Children of Divorce and Children of Intact Homes for all Participating Subjects and those in School 2

	All Schools		School 2	
	Mean Score	N	Mean Score	N
Divorce	3.4	19	3.6	10
Intact	3.2	114	3.0	15
Female	3.2	75	3.2	11
Male	3.2	65	3.3	14
Upper SES	3.2	76	-	-
Lower SES	3.3	64	3.3	25

results (see Table 13), the third null hypothesis, "The term 'custody' is not better understood by children of divorce than by children in intact families as shown by answers to item six on the pretest," must not be rejected.

Null Hypothesis IV: The divorce education program presented had no effect on the children's knowledge of divorce as shown by a comparison of pretest and posttest results.

Analysis related to the divorce education program. Following the pretest, the children in the experimental group viewed the six presentations of the divorce education program. Only those children in the experimental group who were in class for all the presentations and completed a valid pretest and posttest were included in this study. Those in the control group were included if they completed valid pretests and posttests. Table 14 displays the pretest, posttest, and gain scores for the children in all the schools.

From Table 15, it can be seen that those in the experimental group did learn from the divorce education program presented. There is a statistically signficant difference between the experimental and control groups on their posttest scores ($F=6.4$; $P=.01$). All the children in School 2 were in the experimental group discussed above. School 2 scores were studied separately in terms of the effect of the divorce education program on children of parental divorce compared

TABLE 13

Analysis of Variance Results for Custody Item on Home Situation, Sex and SES for all Participating Subjects and those in School 2

	SS	F Value	PR>F
All Schools			
Home Situation	0.54	0.79	0.37
Sex	0.00	0.00	0.95
SES	0.34	0.50	0.48
School 2			
Home Situation	1.31	2.02	0.17
Sex	0.06	0.09	0.77

Note: df = 1

TABLE 14

Mean Pretest, Posttest and Gain Scores for all Participating Subjects

	N	Pre	Post	Gain
Control	67	35.6	38.3	2.7
Experimental	53	38.2	42.5	4.4
Lower SES Control	30	34.5	37.5	2.9
Lower SES Experimental	21	37.3	40.8	3.5
Upper SES Control	37	36.5	39.0	2.5
Upper SES Experimental	32	38.8	43.7	4.9
Female Control	41	36.0	38.5	2.5
Male Control	26	35.0	38.0	3.0
Female Experimental	24	39.4	42.9	3.5
Male Experimental	29	37.2	42.2	5.0
Lower SES	51	35.7	38.8	3.2
Upper SES	69	37.5	41.2	3.6
Mexican Control	24	35.0	36.8	1.8
White Control	33	36.6	39.3	2.7
Mexican Experimental	13	36.0	39.1	3.0
White Experimental	34	38.9	43.5	4.7

Note: Other nationalities had too little representation to be included.

TABLE 15

Analysis of Variance Results of Pretest, Posttest and Gain Scores for Children in the Control Group and those in the Experimental Group

	SS	F Value	PR>F
Pre	56.65	2.38	0.13
Post	154.35	6.42	0.01
Gain	23.98	0.72	0.40

Note: df = 1

with children of intact families. Table 16 shows the pretest, posttest and gain scores for the children in School 2. From those scores, it is obvious that those children who have experienced parental divorce learned a great deal more from the divorce education program than did those from intact homes. Children of divorce were probably more able to identify with the concepts being taught than were those who had never encountered such experiences. The female children of divorce started out less knowledgeable than male children of divorce, but gained 7.3 points pushing them a little ahead of males on the posttest. For each category, children of intact families scored higher on the pretest than did those with divorced parents. But the children of divorce in all categories gained more from the divorce education program than did the children with intact families. For this reason, the children of divorce in all categories scored higher on the posttest than did those with intact families. None of these comparisons, though, were statistically significant (see Table 17). Although statistical significance was not attained, children of divorce and children of intact homes scored better on the posttest than on the pretest, and the children of divorce had higher gain scores.

Because there was a significant statistical difference between the experimental group and the control group on their posttest scores, the null hypothesis, "The divorce education

TABLE 16

Mean, Pretest, Posttest and Gain Scores for the Children of Divorce and Children in Intact Homes in School 2

	N	Pre	Post	Gain
Divorce	10	35.4	41.3	5.9
Intact	13	38.5	39.8	1.3
Divorce Female	4	34.5	41.8	7.3
Divorce Male	6	36.0	41.0	5.0
Intact Female	7	39.3	40.7	1.4
Intact Male	6	37.5	38.7	1.2

TABLE 17

Analysis of Variance Results of Pretest, Posttest and Gain Scores and Home Situation and Home Situation/Sex for Children of School 2

	SS	F Value	PR>F
Home Situation			
Pre	7.19	0.24	0.63
Post	20.61	0.43	0.52
Gain	52.14	1.04	0.32
Home Situation/Sex			
Pre	2.14	0.07	0.79
Post	0.45	0.01	0.92
Gain	0.62	0.01	0.91

Note: df = 1

program presented had no effect on the children's knowledge of divorce as shown by a comparison of pretest and posttest results," is rejected.

CHAPTER V

Discussion

Any study of children of divorce in a normal, rather than a clinical, setting is hampered by the inability of being sure which children rightfully fall into that category. In this study, the teacher may be unaware, for example, that a child now living in what appears to be an intact family may in fact be living with a step-parent. In addition, some families, especially those with children in Catholic schools, intentionally try to keep the divorce a secret from the children's school. Other children may be on the verge of becoming children of divorce and are already suffering from divorce related problems. While the teacher may know a child is from an intact family, there is no way for that teacher to know if it is a happy family. Research has shown different results depending on if children of divorce are compared with children of happy or unhappy intact families (Landis, 1960; Nye, 1957). For these reasons, although all scores are reported, those of children in School 2 were studied in greater depth because the teacher in that school had done work with the families of her students and was confident of her knowledge of her students' home situations. Even in School 2, it is possible some students were erroneously

placed in the intact home situation group, although we were positive that all children classified as children of divorce had truly experienced parental divorce. Unfortunately, the only ways to avoid such problems bring on others. Using volunteers or a clinical setting defeats the purpose of assessing the effects of divorce on "normal" school age children. These problems were accepted as inevitable when this study was begun and should be kept in mind.

Null Hypothesis I: There is no difference between children who have experienced parental divorce and those in intact families as shown on Separation Anxiety Test (SAT; 10 patterns and total) scores and Child's Behavior Traits (CBT; 5 subscales and total) scores.

Parental divorce is usually a strong separation experience for the child. For this reason, the child's reactions to the separation experiences pictured in the Separation Anxiety Test should reflect his or her reactions to parental divorce. The composite scores for the children of divorce as a group give an indication of the most common reactions to parental divorce for that group. The individual test protocol evaluations indicate the ways in which each particular child responds to parental divorce.

Male children of divorce in School 2 scored lower than average on Hostility. Hansburg (1976) says,

> It is to be expected that degrees of resentment and anger will normally be aroused as such normal hostilities should be expected in the test patterning and when absent or low, should be considered with suspicion as evidence of attempts to repress normal resentments. (pp. 26-27)

Female children of divorce in School 2 scored in the strong range on Hostility which goes along with the research (Despert, 1953; Kelly and Wallerstein, 1976; Hozman and Froiland, 1977) showing anger as a typical response to parental divorce.

Male children of divorce from all the schools and also from School 2 had low Reality Avoidance scores. Hansburg (1976) explains such low scores saying, "In a sense, a low level of separation denial could be called a denial of denial. This individual is saying, 'since I do not have any need to be concerned with separation problems, I have no need to deny them'" (p. 30). In addition, Hansburg says, "If such a low level of separation denial is accompanied by a high degree of individuation responses which are far above the attachment level, one would have to suspect that the individual must constantly deny that he is needful" (p. 30). The male children of divorce in School 2 fit this pattern. It should be remembered that denial is one of the stages Hozman

and Froiland (1977) say that children go through on the way to reaching acceptance of their parents' divorce.

When the scores of Concentration-Impairment and Sublimation are much higher than Self-Love Loss, a feeling of being ineffective and lacking in confidence is suggested. Hansburg (1976) says this may be an, "Overdependence on a supportive figure whose absence reduces the feeling of effectiveness" (p. 36). This pattern is evident in female children of divorce for all the schools and also for female children of divorce in School 2. This is in keeping with Erikson (1950) who says that school age children are in the Industry vs. Inferiority stage of development and that without a stable family life, the crisis of this stage will not be resolved. Without successfully resolving this crisis, the child may develop feelings of inadequacy and inferiority.

The one statistically significant difference found between children of divorce and children of intact families in School 2 was the Individuation score. This score was high for the children of divorce as a group, and even higher for the male children of divorce. This could be an example of Despert's (1953) belief that children with divorced or divorcing parents often have a strong outward show of independence which is really just a compensation for a greater inner need to be dependent.

That one particular pattern of responding to the SAT by all children of divorce did not emerge goes along with Anthony (1974), Kapit (1972), Kelly and Wallerstein (1977a), and Mahler and Rabinovitch (1956), who said that there are many possible reactions to parental divorce, but these children are susceptible to psychological problems. Although there was not one specific response pattern, the individual protocols evaluated do indicate that these children do have problems pertaining to their separation experiences. This is not to say that all their problems have their origins in their parents' divorce, but it does mean that this age child does need help dealing with divorce and should not be left out of the research into the effects of divorce on children.

The Child's Behavior Traits is a checklist of behaviors completed for the children by their classroom teachers. Although no significant differences were found between the scores of children of divorce and children of intact families, the Intact Female group scored the highest of all groups for all the schools and for School 2.

Each subscale of the CBT is made up of four items that can earn a score of from one to five points. The study of these items scores for the children of divorce in School 2 revealed the items that earned each child's lowest scores of one or two points. The following items received these lowest scores:

1. Protects own rights appropriately for his (her) age group;
2. Seems self-confident, not timid;
3. Is spontaneous without being explosive;
4. Seems free of sudden, unpredictable mood changes;
5. Seems generally cheerful and content;
6. Is attentive and concentrates on tasks;
7. Is creative, inventive.

The low scores on the first two items listed above reflect a lack of confidence, feelings of inadequacy and inferiority, and fearfulness. Erickson (1950) wrote of the feelings of inferiority that could result from a school age child's not having a stable family life. Kelly and Wallerstein (1976) discussed the fearfulness children feel when their world is shaken by parental divorce. Hansburg (1976) explained that feelings of ineffectiveness may come about with the absence of a supportive figure on whom the child depends.

The low score on the third item seems to indicate a child with a temper who suddenly gets angry. Despert (1953), Kelly and Wallerstein (1976), and Hozman and Froiland (1977) all wrote of the part anger plays when a child experiences parental divorce.

Kelly and Wallerstein (1976) wrote about the sadness and grief that accompanies parental divorce. Hozman and Froiland

(1977) include depression in their list of the stages through which children pass on their way to accepting their parents' divorce. Low scores on items four and five appear to exemplify the theories of these two researchers.

The final two items that received the lowest scores may reflect the belief of Gardner (1976), Krantzler (1974) and Wallerstein and Kelly (1976) that academic achievement often suffers when parents divorce. These scores could also represent the children's wasting their energies in trying to bring about a reconciliation of their parents which, Kelly and Wallerstein (1976) say, is school age children's primary concern.

These scores would have more meaning if there were some way to compare them to the same scores on a CBT filled out prior to the child's becoming a child of divorce.

Null Hypothesis II: Children of divorce are not more knowledgeable about divorce than children in intact families as shown by pretest scores.

The pretest scores and custody item score for all groups indicate that third graders do not know very much about divorce, even if they have experienced parental divorce. By including the choice "uncertain" and giving that answer three points, these test scores are inflated scores. Nevertheless, it seemed better to include this answer choice to eliminate

guessing. At least this way, if children did not know an answer, they circled "uncertain".

Null Hypothesis III: The term "custody" is not better understood by children of divorce than by children in intact families as shown by answers to item six on the pretest.

The children's answers to the custody item in the pretest lend credence to the idea that third graders, regardless of their parents' marital status, are not knowledgeable about divorce.

Although this test item could be considered ambiguous by those aware of the recent work to promote awarding of joint custody, it is highly unlikely that third graders would be aware of this. None of the children involved in this study were part of a joint custody situation. Thus, it was assumed that any knowledge of custody these third graders had would be limited to the traditional idea that one parent is awarded custody, with the children living with that parent.

Null Hypothesis IV: The divorce education program presented had no effect on the children's knowledge of divorce as shown by a comparison of pretest and posttest results.

Unfortunately the posttest could not be administered when it was originally scheduled. Area flooding and a flu epidemic caused the early closure of the schools for Christmas vacation. Instead of the posttest being given five weeks after the pretest, it was given more than seven weeks

after the pretest. For the experimental group, this also meant that instead of viewing the divorce education programs once a week for six consecutive weeks, the final presentation took place more than three weeks after the fifth presentation. It is not known if this delay had any effect on the posttest scores.

Considering that parental divorce is a major upheaval in a child's life, and that a great number of children are experiencing parental divorce, it is logical that a divorce education program is needed. The divorce education program used in this study is an audio-visual one, but it may be beneficial to transform it into book form to make it more readily accessible to the children when they want it. The major point is that the program, regardless of the form it takes, needs to have a place in the schools. Gardner (1976), Kelly and Wallerstein (1977a), Ricci (1979), Rubin and Price (1979) and Wilkinson and Bleck (1977) agree that elementary schools should accept at least some of the responsibility for helping children cope with divorce. By placing the program in the classroom, all children could benefit from it. Out of school programs are of no help to children of intact families who, nevertheless, have their own concerns and questions about divorce. These out of school programs place on parents, who often are already in a state of turmoil

themselves, the entire burden of recognizing that their child needs help and then providing that help for him or her.

The statistically significant posttest score differences between the experimental group and the control group seem to attest to the program's effectiveness. That the control group also gained on the posttest indicates the value of bringing up the subject of divorce in the classroom. The pretest may have prompted peer discussions or asking adults questions dealing with the subject of divorce. Familiarity with the test, having taken it before, may also have caused these increased scores. That the upper SES experimental group gained more than the lower SES experimental group and that the White children in the experimental group gained more than the Mexican children in the experimental group may be a function of language abilities coupled with academic achievement. Interestingly, the male experimental group had the highest gain score. Typical problems with gain scores such as ceiling effect, regression toward the mean and assuming equal intervals at all points of the test are not applicable to the pretest and posttest given. Reliability, though, may be a problem.

Additional factors make this program's success even more meaningful. First, there is the delay in presenting the final part of the program and giving the posttest. Second, many of the children may have had somewhat of a language

handicap because the language spoken at home is Spanish. Finally, the program was disruptive of the regular school day routine in that this researcher entered the classroom with a cassette tape recorder and slide projector to present the program. Especially in the lower SES schools, the children were fascinated with the equipment used. Also, it is not known what attitudes the teachers expressed to the children about having this program interrupt the normal course of the day. It is not known what discussions took place before or after the presentations, although the teachers were asked not to bring up any subject concerning divorce with the children, although they could answer questions put to them.

Finally, it was rewarding that in addition to learning from the program the children seemed to enjoy it. After the posttest was given, this researcher asked each class in the experimental group which part of the program was most liked and which was least liked. Interestingly, each class had a different answer. There were even conflicting opinions over whether the parts using the puppets or the parts with real children were more enjoyable. The responses gathered in this informal way were extremely positive.

Mention must be made of the fact that some peoples' initial reaction to a divorce education program is fear that such a program could encourage divorce. Some of the teachers involved in this study did have such apprehensions before

viewing the programs. The programs present situations without condoning or condemning them. They reflect what is already taking place in the lives of millions of children. Following these programs, these same teachers accepted the programs as strictly educational. If we accept that today's children cannot avoid knowing that divorce exists, then we should also accept that correct information about divorce can only be beneficial. If children learn to understand and handle their parents' divorces better, perhaps they will end the cycle of children of divorce later becoming divorced adults.

Implications for Further Research

Effects of divorce on children. This research was undertaken with certain problems inherent to it. For example, it was accepted that errors in placing children in the intact group may have been made. Thus, further research needs to be done in which complete family histories can be taken.

Complete family histories would also give valuable information about factors such as the child's age and stage of development when the divorce occurred; age, sex, and number of siblings; availability of a parent surrogate; and access to the absent parent. The child's reaction to his or her parents' divorce may be contingent on these factors. The personality of the parents and their own reactions to the

divorce probably influence their children's reactions. Thus, information gained through testing and interviewing the parents would be beneficial to research into the effects of parental divorce on children. It could be found that certain children, based on such factors as those mentioned above, are more at risk than others.

Studies in a normal, not a clinical, setting are needed. Finding a sample willing to provide the complete family histories needed may be difficult because using volunteers would negate the normal setting.

To truly comprehend the effects of parental divorce in children, it is not enough to do a study at one point in time. Long term studies are indicated. We need to see if immediate effects of parental divorce are different from long term effects. Also, we need to see if these effects are stage dependent, or, for example, if certain effects dormant in latency present themselves in adolescence. Such research would be hampered by such typical difficulties of long term studies as the continued availability of subjects.

In any study of the effects of divorce on children, it is hard to attribute the results solely to the divorce and not to other factors. For this reason, research needs to be done comparing the same subjects before their parents' divorce and then again after. With the divorce rate as high as it is, it would be possible, though admittedly difficult,

to test children who presently are from intact homes and then retest those children whose parents divorce in subsequent years. A Separation Anxiety Test profile, for example, would then be able to be compared for the same child before and after his or her parents' divorce. The results of such testing still would not be completely attributable to parental divorce, but it would be useful to see if such test results remained constant or changed following parental divorce.

Ways to help children deal with divorce. The schools must be willing to get involved in that it has been shown that the schools are in the best position to help children understand and accept divorce. New programs designed for this purpose need to be implemented and evaluated. All children, regardless of their parents marital status, need to be included.

CHAPTER VI

Summary

This is one of the first studies of the effects of divorce on school age children conducted in a normal, rather than a clinical setting. The sample consisted of 133 children in five intact third grade classrooms in Catholic schools in the Phoenix, Arizona area. Three of these classes were located in lower socio-economic status areas, and two were in upper socio-economic status areas.

Scores for children of parental divorce were compared with scores for children of intact families on the Separation Anxiety Test (SAT) and the Child's Behavior Traits (CBT) checklist. These comparisons were made for all the classes together and then again for School 2. School 2 was singled out because of that teacher's increased awareness of her students' home situations. The only statistically significant finding for the SAT at the .05 level of significance was that children of divorce in School 2 expressed a much greater need for individuation (self-reliance) than did children from intact families. On the CBT, no statistically significant differences in the scores for children of divorce and children of intact families were found. It should be noted, though, that girls in intact families were given the highest scores, and that there were statistically significant

differences between the boys' and girls' scores. A more complete evaluation of the individual test protocols for the children of divorce in School 2 revealed no one pattern of behaviors for these children. This variety is consistent with the research, as is the finding of the following traits on these children's CBT protocols: anger, denial, sadness and depression, feelings of ineffectiveness, and lack of self-confidence.

This study also investigated a divorce education program for young school age children which was designed by this researcher to be presented in the classroom to all children, regardless of their parents' marital status. This program was found to be effective in increasing the children's understanding of divorce as shown by a comparison of pretest and posttest scores for the experimental and control groups. This difference was found to be statistically significant at the .01 level.

The pretest was also used as a measure of the children's knowledge of divorce. It was found that these third graders knew little about divorce, even if they had already experienced the divorce of their parents. Children of divorce in the experimental group, though, had higher gain scores than did children in intact families. Analysis of the "custody" item on the pretest gave further evidence that third graders lack knowledge about divorce.

Four null hypotheses were tested. Except for the Individuation (self-reliance) pattern, the first null hypothesis, "There is no difference between children who have experienced parental divorce and those in intact families as shown on SAT scores (10 patterns and total score) and CBT scores (5 subscales and total score)", was not rejected.

Both the second and third null hypotheses were also not rejected. "Children of divorce are not more knowledgeable about divorce than children in intact families as shown on pretest scores." "The term 'custody' is not better understood by children of divorce than by children in intact families as shown by answers to item six on the pretest."

Only the fourth and final null hypothesis, "The divorce education program presented had no effect on the children's knowledge of divorce as shown by a comparison of pretest and posttest results," was rejected.

In conclusion, more systematic research needs to be done on the effects of divorce on school age children. Long term studies, such as comparing SAT and CBT results gathered before the child's parents begin to have serious marital problems with SAT and CBT results following parental divorce, would be especially meaningful. Studies done in which the researcher has access to such information as the age of the child at the time of divorce, siblings in the family, access to the parent not living with the child and the availability

of a surrogate for the absent parent are needed, but almost impossible to do in a normal setting.

From the results of this study, it would appear that a divorce education program in the schools is needed. This study found third graders to be uninformed about divorce, even if they had already experienced parental divorce. The divorce education program used in this study was found to be effective in teaching third graders about divorce. Studies on the effects of such a program in helping children cope with parental divorce are also needed.

REFERENCES

Reference List

Ainsworth, M. D. S. Infancy in Uganda. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1967.

Ainsworth, M. D. S., & Bell, S. M. Attachment, exploration and separation: Illustrated by the behaviour of one-year-olds in a strange situation. Child Development, 1970, 41, 49-67.

Ainsworth, M. D. S., Bell, S. M., & Stayton, D. J. Infant-mother attachment and social development: 'Socialization' as a product of reciprocal responsiveness to signals. in Richards, M. P. M. (ed.), The Integration of a Child into a Social World. London: Cambridge University Press, 1974.

Ainsworth, M. D. S., & Wittig, B. A. Attachment and exploratory behaviour of one-year-olds in a strange situation. in Foss, B. M. (ed.), Determinants of Infant Behaviour (Vol. 4). London: Methuen, 1969.

Ames, L. B. Children and divorce -- what the teacher can do. Instructor, August/September, 1969, pp. 66, 80.

Anderson, H. Children of divorce. Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, Summer, 1977, 41-44.

Andry, R. G. Paternal and maternal roles and delinquency. in, Ainsworth, M. D. S.; Andry, R. G.; Harlow, R. G.; Lebovici, S.; Mead, M.; Prugh, D. G.; & Wooton, B. Deprivation of Maternal Care: A Reassessment of Its Effects. Geneva: World Health Organization, 1962.

Anthony, E. J. Children at risk from divorce: A review. in Anthony, E. J., & Koupernik, C. (eds.), The Child in His Family: Children at Psychiatric Risk (Vol. 3). New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1974.

Arnstein, H. S. What to Tell Your Child. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1962.

Arsenian, J. M. Young children in an insecure situation. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1943, 38, 25-249.

Bane, M. J. Marital disruption and the lives of children. Journal of Social Issues, 1976, 32, 103-117.

Bartch, M. Divorce -- Children's literature style. Language Arts, May, 1976, 53, 574-576.

Bender, L., & Yarnell, H. An observation nursery: A study of 250 children on the psychiatric division of Bellevue Hospital. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1941, 97, 1158-1172.

Benedek, T. Insight and Personality Adjustment: A Study of the Psychological Effects of War. New York: Ronald Press, 1946.

Bieber, I. Homosexuality: A Psychoanalytic Study. New York: Basic Books, 1962.

Black, K. What about the child from a one-parent home? Teacher, January, 1979, 24-28.

Blaine, G. B., Jr. The effect of divorce upon the personality development of children and youth. in, Grollman, E. A. (ed.), Explaining Divorce to Children. Boston: Beacon Press, 1967.

Bornstein, B. On latency. Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 1951, 6, 279-285.

Bowlby, J. The influence of early environment in the development of neurosis and neurotic character. International Journal of Psycho-Analysis, 1940, 21, 154-178.

Bowlby, J. Forty-four juvenile thieves: Their characters and home life. International Journal of Psycho-Analysis, 1944, 25, 19-52, 107-127.

Bowlby, J. Maternal Care and Mental Health Geneva: World Health Organization, 1951.

Bowlby, J. Child Care and the Growth of Love. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1953.

Bowlby, J. Grief and mourning in infancy and early childhood. Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 1960, 15, 9-52.

Bowlby, J. Separation anxiety: A critical review of the literature. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 1961, 1, 251-269. (a)

Bowlby, J. Process of mourning. International Journal of Psycho-Analysis, 1961, 42, 317-340. (b)

Bowlby, J. Pathological mourning and childhood mourning. Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association, 1963, 11, 500-541.

Bowlby, J. Attachment and Loss (Vol. 1, Attachment). London: Hogarth Press, 1969.

Bowlby, J. Attachment and Loss (Vol. 2, Separation Anxiety and Anger). New York: Basic Books, 1973.

Bowlby, J., Robertson, J., & Rosenbluth, D. A two-year old goes to the hospital. Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 1952, 7, 89-94.

Boyer, S. Tips for working with single parents. Instructor, September, 1979, p. 79.

Broderick, C. B. Sexual behavior among preadolescents. Journal of Social Issues, April, 1966, 22, 6-21.

Brown, D. G., & Lynn, D. E. Human sexual development: An outline of components and concepts. Journal of Marriage and the Family, May, 1966, 28, 155-162.

Cline, D., & Westman, J. The impact of divorce on the family. Child Psychology and Human Development, Winter, 1971, 2, 78-83.

Coddington, R. D. The significance of life events as etiologic factors in the diseases of children - II. A study of normal population. Journal of Psychosomatic Medicine Research, 1972, 16, 205-213.

Cox, F. N., & Campbell, D. Young Children in a new situation with and without their mothers. Child Development, 1968, 39, 123-132.

Cox, M. J., & Cox, R. D. Socialization of young children in the divorced family. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 1979, 13 (1), 58-67.

Damon, P. When the family comes apart: What schools can do. The National Elementary Principal, October, 1979, 66-75.

Despert, J. L. Children of Divorce. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1953.

Despert, J. L. Children of Divorce. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1953.

Deutsch, H. Absence of grief. Psychoanalytic Quarterly, 1937, 6, 12-22.

Dlugokinski, E. A developmental approach to coping with divorce. Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, Summer, 1977, 27-30.

Elias, J., & Gebhard, P. Sexuality and sexual learning in childhood. in Juhasz, A. M. (ed.), Sexual Development and Behavior: Selected Readings. Homewood Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1973.

Erikson, E. Childhood and Society. New York: W. W. Norton, 1950.

Falk, P. L. C. One out of five and largely ignored. The National Elementary Principal, October, 1979, 76-80.

Fenichel, O. Specific forms of the Oedipus Complex. The Collected Papers of Otto Fenichel (Vol. 1). New York: Norton, 1954. (Originally published, 1931.)

Fisher, E. A guide to divorce counseling. The Family Coordinator, 1973, 22, 53-63.

Forrest, T. Paternal roots of female character development. Contemporary Psychoanalysis, 1966, 3, 21-38.

Freud, A., & Burlingham, D. War and Children. New York: Medical War Books, 1943.

Freud, A., & Burlingham, D. Infants without Families. New York: International Universities Press, 1944.

Freud, S. Three essays on sexuality. The Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud (Vol. 7), 135-243. London: Hogarth Press, 1905.

Freud, S. Inhibitions, symptoms, and anxiety. The Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud (Vol. 20), 87-172. London: Hogarth Press, 1926. (English Translation, 1959.)

Froiland, D., & Hozman, T. Counseling for constructive divorce. Personnel and Guidance Journal, May, 1977, 55, 525-529.

Garai, J. E. Sex education. in Stuart, I. R., & Abt, L. E. (eds.), Children of Separation and Divorce. New York: Grossman Publishers, 1972.

Gardner, R. A. The Boys and Girls Book about Divorce. New York: Bantam Books, 1970.

Gardner, R. A. Psychotherapy with Children of Divorce. New York: J. Aronson, 1976.

Gettleman, S., & Markowitz, J. The Courage to Divorce. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1974.

Glueck, E., & Glueck, S. Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Howard University Press, 1950.

Gordon, T. Teacher Effectiveness Training. New York: Peter H. Wyden, 1974.

Grollman, E. A. (ed.). Explaining Divorce to Children. Boston: Beacon Press, 1967.

Hammond, J. Children of divorce: Implications for counselors. The School Counselor, September, 1979, 7-14. (a)

Hammond, J. Children of divorce: A study of self-concept, academic achievement, and attitudes. Elementary School Journal, 1979, 80 (2), 55-62. (b)

Hammond, J. A comparison of elementary children from divorced and intact families. Phi Delta Kappan, November, 1979, 61 (3), p. 219. (c)

Hancock, E. The dimensions of meaning and belonging in the process of divorce. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1980, 50, 18-27.

Hansburg, H. G. Adolescent Separation Anxiety: A Method for the Study of Adolescent Separation Problems. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publishers, 1972.

Hansburg, H. G. Separation Disorders: A Manual for the Interpretation of Emotional Disorders Manifested by the Separation Anxiety Test. Unpublished manuscript, 1976.

Harlow, H. F. The nature of love. American Psychologist, 1958, 13, 673-683.

Harlow, H. F. The development of affectional patterns in infant monkeys. in Foss, B. M. (ed.), Determinants of Infant Behaviour (Vol. 1). London: Methuen, 1961. (a)

Harlow, H. F. The maternal affectional system. in Foss, B. M. (ed.), Determinants of Infant Behaviour (Vol. 2). London, Methuen, 1961. (b)

Heathers, G. The adjustment of two-year-olds in novel social situations. Child Development, 1954, 25, 147-158.

Hebb, D. O. On the nature of fear. Psychological Review, 1946, 53, 259-276.

Heinicke, C. M., & Westheimer, I. J. Brief Separations. New York: International Universities Press, Inc., 1965.

Hetherington, E. M. Girls without fathers. Psychology Today, February, 1973, 47-52.

Holdahl, S., & Caspersen, P. Children of family change: Who's helping them now? The Family Coordinator, October, 1977, 26 (4), 472-477.

Holman, P. Some factors in the aetiology of maladjustment in children. Journal of Mental Science, 1959, 99, 654-688.

Hozman, T., & Froiland, D. Families in divorce: A proposed model for counseling children. Family Coordinator, 1976, 2, 271-276.

Hozman, T., & Froiland, D. Children: Forgotten in divorce. Personnel and Guidance Journal, May, 1977, 55, 530-533.

Isakson, R. L. Whatever happened to the Waltons? Changes in the American family and how they affect the kids you teach. Instructor, September, 1979, 77-79.

Janis, M. G. A Two-Year-Old Goes to Nursery School. London: Tavistock, 1964.

Joffe, W. G., & Sandler, J. Notes on pain, depression and individuation. Psycholanalytic Study of the Child, 1955, 20, 394-424.

Jones, E. The early development of female sexuality. in Jones, E., Papers on Psycho-Analysis (5th ed.). London: Bailliere, Tindall and Cox, 1948. (originally published, 1927).

Jones, E. Fear, guilt and hate. in Jones, E., Papers on Psycho-Analysis (5th ed.). London: Bailliere, Tindall and Cox, 1948. (originally published, 1929.)

Jones, E. Raising Your Child in a Fatherless Home. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1963.

Kalter, N. Children of divorce in an outpatient psychiatric population. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, January, 1977, 47, 40-1.

Kapit, H. E. Help for children of separation and divorce. in Stuart, I. E., & Abt, L. E. (eds.), Children of Separation and Divorce. New York: Grossman Publishers, 1972.

Keiser, S. A manifest Oedipus Complex in an adolescent girl. Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 1953, 8, 99-107.

Kelly, J., & Wallerstein, J. The effects of parental divorce: Experience of the child in early latency. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, January, 1976, 46, 20-32.

Kelly, J., & Wallerstein, J. Brief intervention with children in divorcing families. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, January, 1977, 47, 23-39. (a)

Kelly, J., & Wallerstein, J. Part-time parent, part-time child: Visiting after divorce. Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, Summer, 1977, 51-54. (b)

Kelly, J., & Wallerstein, J. Children of divorce. The National Elementary Principal, October, 1979, 59 (1), 51-58.

Kessler, S., & Bostwick, S. Beyond Divorce: Coping skills for children. Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, Summer, 1977, 38-41.

Kestenberg, J. S. Separation from parents. Nervous Child, 1943-1944, 3, 20-35.

Klein, M. On criminality. in Klein, M., Contributions to Psycho-Analysis 1921-1945. London: Hogarth Press, 1948. (originally published, 1934.)

Klein, M. A contribution to the psychogenesis of manic-depressive states. in Klein, M., Contributions to Psycho-Analysis 1921-1945. London: Hogarth Press, 1948. (originally published, 1935.)

Kliman, G. W. Divorce and separation. in Kliman, G. W., Psychological Emergencies of Childhood. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1968.

Krantzler, M. Creative Divorce. New York: M. Evans, 1974.

Landis, J. T. The trauma of children when parents divorce. Marriage and Family Living, 1960, 22, 7-13.

Levy, D. Primary affect hunger. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1937, 94, 643-652.

Littenberg, R., Tulkin, S. R., & Kagan, J. Cognitive components of separation anxiety. Developmental Psychology, 1971, 4, 387-388.

Macoby, E. E., & Feldman, S. S. Mother-attachment and stranger-reactions in the third year of life. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 1972, 37, (1, Serial No. 146).

Magid, K. Children facing divorce: A treatment program. Personnel and Guidance Journal, May, 1977, 55, 34-36.

Magrab, P. For the sake of the children: A review of the psychological effects of divorce. Journal of Divorce, Spring, 1978, 1, 233-245.

Mahler, M. S., & Rabinovitch, R. The effects of marital conflict on child development. in Eisenstein, V. W. (eds.), Neurotic Interaction in Marriage. New York: Basic Books, 1956.

Marmor, J. "Normal" and "deviant" sexual behavior. in Juhasz, A. M. (ed.), Sexual Development and Behavior: Selected Readings. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1973.

McDermott, J. F. Parental divorce in early childhood. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1968, 124, 1424-1432.

McDermott, J. F. Divorce and its psychiatric sequelae in children. Archives of General Psychiatry, November, 1970, 23, 421-428.

Mead, M. Anomalies in American postdivorce relationships. in P. Bohannan (ed.), Divorce and After. New York: Doubleday, 1970.

Meiss, M. The oedipal problem of a fatherless child. Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 1952, 7, 216-229.

Money, J. Sex hormones and other variables in human eroticism. in Young, W. C. (ed.), Sex and Internal Secretions. Baltimore: Williams and Williams, 1961.

Morrison, J. R. Parental divorce as a factor in childhood psychiatric illness. Comprehensive Psychiatry, 1974, 15, 95-102.

Murphy, L. B. The Widening World of Childhood. New York: Basic Books, 1962.

Mussen, P. H., Conger, J. J., & Kagan J. Child Development and Personality (3rd ed.). New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

National Center for Health Statistics, Final divorce statistics, 1975. Vital Statistics Report, Supplement 2, May 19, 1977, 26, 1-2.

National Center for Health Statistics, Final divorce statistics, 1978. Vital Statistics Report, Supplement 2, July 31, 1980, 29, 1-3.

Neubauer, P. B. The one parent child and his oedipal development. Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 1960, 15, 286-309.

Nye, I. F. Child adjustment in broken and in unhappy unbroken homes. Marriage and Family Living, 1957, 19, 356-361.

Parkes, C. M. The first year of bereavement: A longitudinal study of the reaction of London widows to the death of their husbands. Psychiatry, 1971, 33, 444-467.

Parks, A. Children and youth of divorce in Parents without Partners, Inc. Journal of Clinical Psychology, Summer, 1977, 44-47.

Phillips, John L., Jr. The Origins of Intellect: Piaget's Theory. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1969.

Piaget, J. The Construction of Reality in the Child. New York: Basic Books, 1954. (Originally published, 1937.)

Pitcher, E. G. Explaining divorce to young children. in Grollman, E. A. (ed.), Explaining Divorce to Children. Boston: Beacon Press, 1967.

Rank, O. The Trauma of Birth. London: Kegan Paul, 1924. (English Translation, 1929.)

Rheingold, H. L. The effect of a strange environment on the behaviour of infants. in Foss, B. M. (ed.), Determinants of Infant Behaviour (Vol. 4). London: Methuen, 1969.

Ricci, I. Divorce, remarriage and the schools. Phi Delta Kappan, March, 1979, 60 (7), 509-511.

Robertson, J., & Robertson, J. Young children in brief separation: A fresh look. Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 1971, 26, 264-315.

Rohrlich, J., Ranier, R., Berg-Cross, L., & Berg-Cross, G. The effects of divorce: A research review with a developmental perspective. Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, Summer, 1977, 15-20.

Rubin, L., & Price, J. H. Divorce and its effects on children. The Journal of School Health, December, 1979, 552-556.

Santrock, J., & Tracy, R. Effects of children's family structure status on the development of stereotypes by teachers. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1978, 70 (5), 754-757.

Schaffer, H. R. Objective observations of personality development in early infancy. British Journal of Medical Psychology, 1958, 31, 174-183.

Schaffer, H. R., & Callender, W. M. Psychological effects of hospitalization in infancy. Pediatrics, 1959, 24, 528-539.

Shirley, M. M. Children's adjustments to a strange situation. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1942, 37, 201- 217.

Shirley, M. M., & Poyntz, L. Influence of separation from the mother on children's emotional responses. Journal of Psychology, 1941, 12, 251-282.

Spitz, R. A. Hospitalism: An inquiry into the genesis of psychiatric conditions in early childhood. Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 1945, 1, 53-74.

Spitz, R. A. Hospitalism: A follow-up report on investigation described in Vol. 1. Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 1946, 2, 113-117.

Spitz, R. A. Anxiety in infancy: A study of its manifestations in the first year of life. International Journal of Psycho-Analysis, 1950, 31, 138-143.

Steinzor, B. When Parents Divorce. New York: Pantheon Books, 1969.

Sugar, M. Children of divorce. Pediatrics, October, 1970, 46, 488-595.

Suttie, I. D. The Origins of Love and Hate. London: Kegan Paul, 1935.

Thies, J. M. Beyond divorce: The impact of remarriage on children. Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, Summer, 1977, 59-61.

Turow, Rita. Daddy Doesn't Live Here Anymore. Matteson, Illinois: Greatlakes Living Press, 1977.

Wallerstein, J., & Kelly, J. The effects of parental divorce: The adolescent experience. in Anthony, E. J., & Koupernik, C. (eds.), The Child in His Family: Children at Psychiatric Risk (Vol. 3). New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1974.

Wallerstein, J., & Kelly, J. The effects of parental divorce: Experience of the preschool child. Journal of Academy of Child Psychiatry, Autumn, 1975, 14, 600-616.

Wallerstein, J., & Kelly, J. The effects of parental divorce: Experience of the child in later latency. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, April, 1976, 46, 256-269.

Wargotz, H. D. The adjustment of children raised by separated or divorced fathers. in Stuart, I. and Abt, L. E. (eds.), Children of Separation and Divorce. New York: Grossman Publishers, 1972.

Westheimer, I. D. Changes in response of mother to child during period of separation. Social Work, 1970, 27, 3-10.

Westman, J. C. The effect of divorce on a child's personality development. Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality, 1972, 6, 30-55.

Wilkinson, G., & Bleck, R. The children's divorce groups. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, February, 1977, 11, 204-213.

Wolfenstein, M. Loss, rage, and repetition. Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 1969, 24, 432-460.

Instruments Used

Hansburg, H. G. The Separation Anxiety Test. 1972.

Levenstein, P. Child's Behavior Traits. 1976.

APPENDIX A

RECORDING AND SCORING FORM
FOR
THE SEPARATION ANXIETY TEST

NAME_____ BIRTHDATE_____

DATE OF TEST_____ AGE_____

STATUS

Intake____ Foster Home_____ Group Residence_____ Pleasantville_____

Hawthorne_____ Childville_____ Other_____

This form is to be used with a book entitled "Adolescent Separation Anxiety: A Method for the Study of Adolescent Separation Problems" by Henry G. Hansburg PhD, Consultant in Research and Psychotherapy in the Psychiatric Clinic of the Jewish Child Care Association. The book is published by Charles C. Thomas Publishing Co. of Springfield, Illinois. This form was created with the assistance of Miss Christine Duplak, Staff Psychologist.

EXAMINER _____

Picture Number	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	TOTAL	MILD	STRONG
Mental Set Response															
Separation Intensity	S	N	M	M	N	S	N	S	M	S	S	S			
Rejection	2	8	15	4*	13	10*	14*	11	15	11*	6	5			
Impaired Concentration	17	11	11	1	6	4	11	15	16	17	16	15			
Phobic Feeling	8	2	9	3	3	3	4	6	2	15	8	11			
Anxiety	9	16	1	2	11	5	13	12	12*	9	2	10			
Loneliness	5	15	5	16	17	9	6	16	17	16	15	17			
Withdrawal	3	12	8	13	7	12	8	7	3	4	9	14			
Somatic	4	14	2	10	12	11	15	8	14	7	13	7			
Adaptive Reaction	7	7	13	14	14	15	12	4	10	8	11	8			
Anger	11	13	14	6	2	1	5	14	1	1	5	2			
Projection	10	17	3*	17*	8	6	9*	1	6	14	10	6			
Empathy	16	3*	12	9*	1*	13	1	5	13*	10	14	12*			
Evasion	6	1	6	5*	10	14	16	9	4	5	7	4			
Fantasy	14	10	7	15*	5*	17	3	2	9	6	12	9			
Well-Being	1	9	4	8	16	2	17	10*	7	3	4	1			
Sublimation	15*	5	16	7	9	7	10	13	11	12	17*	13			
Intrapunitive	13	4	17	12*	15	16*	2*	3*	8	13	3*	3			
Identity Stress	12	6	10	11	4	8	7	17	5*	2	1	16			
TOTAL															

PATTERN SUMMARY CHART

Response Pattern	Number of Responses		Total	% of Total Protocol	Area of Emphasis	Comment
	Mild II, III, IV, V, VII, IX	Strong I, VI, VIII, X XI, XII				
Attachment (Sum of rejection, loneliness and empathy)						
Individuation (Sum of adaptation, well being and sublimation)						
Hostility (Sum of anger, projection and intra-punitiveness)						
Painful Tension (Sum of phobic, anxiety, and somatic reactions)						
Reality Avoidance (Sum of withdrawal, evasion and fantasy)						
Concentration Impairment and sublimation (Self-esteem preoccupation)						
Self-love Loss (Sum of rejection and intra-punitiveness)						
Identity Stress						
Absurd Responses						
Attachment-Individuation Balance						
Mild-Strong Scores & %	Score %	Score %	Diff.	Diff.		

EXPLANATION FOR ATTACHMENT-INDIVIDUATION BALANCE PERCENT

Point 1 Under mild separation deduct the attachment responses from the individuation responses.

Point 2 Under strong separation deduct the individuation responses from the attachment responses.

Point 3 Deduct the attachment responses under mild separation from the attachment responses under strong separation.

Point 4 Deduct the individuation responses under strong separation from the individuation responses under mild separation.

Point 5 Deduct the total individuation responses from the total attachment responses.

If any of the above scores are minus, record as such and deduct from the total positive score. Add all points making certain to deduct minus scores. Divide the final figure by the total number of test responses. The resultant percentage is the attachment-individuation balance.

Points

	1	2	3	4	5	Total Score	% of Total Responses
Score							

PICTURE LEGEND

I Grandmother

II Class Transfer

III Moving

IV Going to School

V Going to Camp

VI Parental Argument

VII Brother's Departure

VIII Judge

IX Sleep

X Maternal Hospitalization

XI Death of Mother

XII Running Away

SEPARATION ANXIETY TEST NORMS *1

FACTORS	WEAK RANGE OF SCORES	ADEQUATE RANGE	STRONG RANGE	AREA OF EMPHASIS
ATTACHMENT	less than 20%	20-25%	more than 25%	LONELINESS
INDIVIDUATION	less than 15%	16-20%	more than 20%	ADAPTATION
HOSTILITY	less than 12%	12-14%	more than 15%	ANGER
PAINFUL TENSION	less than 15%	15-17%	more than 17%	PHOBIC
REALITY AVOIDANCE	less than 10%	10-13%	more than 13%	WITHDRAWAL
CONCENTRATION IMPAIRMENT AND SUBLIMATION	LOwer % than self-love loss	higher % than self-love loss	much higher % than self-love loss	*2
SELF-LOVE LOSS	less than 5%	5-8%	more than 8%	INTRAPUNITIVE
IDENTITY STRESS -AGE 11-12	less than 7%	7-9%	more than 9%	
AGE 13-14	less than 10%	10-12%	more than 14%	
ATTACHMENT-INDIVIDUATION BALANCE	less than 28%	28-38%	more than 38%	
ABSURD RESPONSES	----------	0-3	more than 4	*5
TOTAL RESPONSES	less than 40 (constricted)	40-50-FAIR 50-65-GOOD	more than 65	
DIFFERENCE SCORE (MILD-STRONG)	less than 18 % *3	18-22%	more than 22% *4	

*1 These figures are approximate-figures on individual factors must be considered in relation to each other.
*2 This category indicates whether intellectual functioning is disrupted by a high sensitivity to separation. It can also be thought of as concern with self-esteem.
*3 Examine reactions to cards to determine whether there is excessive reactivity to the mild cards or inadequate reactivity to the strong cards.
*4 Examine the cards to determine whether there is inadequate reactivity to mild cards or excessive reactivity to the strong cards.
*5 Indicates reality testing

CHILD'S BEHAVIOR TRAITS (CBT)

CHILD_____ SCHOOL_____

INSTRUCTIONS TO RATER: Circle number, at right of behavior trait which best rates the amount you judge that that trait to be present in the child from your specific or general observations. Your ratings may range from 1 (almost not present) to 5 (markedly present). Please consult the accompanying guide as often as you wish.

	Almost not present	Slightly present	Moderately present	Often present	Markedly present
1. Is well organized in work or play.....	1	2	3	4	5
2. Seems generally cheerful and content.....	1	2	3	4	5
3. Refrains from physically aggressive behavior toward others.....	1	2	3	4	5
4. Expresses ideas in language.....	1	2	3	4	5
5. Initiates non-destructive, goal directed activities.....	1	2	3	4	5
6. Accepts or asks for help when necessary.....	1	2	3	4	5
7. Is cooperative with adults.....	1	2	3	4	5
8. Seems to know difference between facts and make believe....	1	2	3	4	5
9. Is spontaneous without being explosive.....	1	2	3	4	5
10. Understands and completes tasks without frequent urging.....	1	2	3	4	5
11. Protects own rights appropriately for his (her) age group.....	1	2	3	4	5
12. Follows necessary rules in family or school.....	1	2	3	4	5
13. Is creative, inventive.....	1	2	3	4	5
14. Tolerates necessary frustration (e.g. awaiting turn at game).....	1	2	3	4	5
15. Enjoys mastering new tasks.....	1	2	3	4	5
16. Seems self-confident, not timid.....	1	2	3	4	5
17. Can put own needs second to those of others.....	1	2	3	4	5
18. Refrains from unnecessary physical risks.....	1	2	3	4	5
19. Seems free of sudden, unpredictable mood changes.....	1	2	3	4	5
20. Is attentive and concentrates on tasks.....	1	2	3	4	5

VIP (circle) Data Period: Pretest Post 1 Post 2 C's Foll-up #: 1 2 3 4 5 6
LOCATION (circle): Home School VIP Foll-up E F G H I J

VERBAL INTERACTION PROJECT -- Mother-Child Home Program

CODED SCHEDULE C: CHILD'S BEHAVIOR TRAITS (CBT) SCORE SHEET (In Development For VIP use only)
(CIRCLE): 1973-74 1974-75 1975-76 1976-77 1977-78 1978-79

CHILD: IBM Card #: C Column # 1
Town: School: Child's Case #: 2-6

Rater's Role: Rat.Date: Coder: Coding Date:

Replicator organization: Location: C's Schl.Grade

SCORING: 1. Enter CBT (#65) Item Ratings (actual score) under Item Score (range: 1-5)
2. Add Item Scores within each subscale to obtain and enter Subscale Scores (range: 4-20)
3. Add Subscale Scores to obtain and enter Total CBT Score (range: 20-100)

SUBSCALES FOR CHILD'S BEHAVIOR TRAITS	ITEM SCORE	SUBSCALE SCORE (Total)	
A. RESPONSIBLE INDEPENDENCE SUBSCALE			
6. Accepts or asks for help when necessary.	____		15
11. Protects own rights appropriately for his (her) age group	____		16
16. Seems self-confident, not timid.	____		17
18. Refrains from unnecessary physical risks.	____		18
SUBSCALE SCORE, RESPONSIBLE INDEPENDENCE:		____	21-22
B. SOCIAL COOPERATION SUBSCALE			
3. Refrains from physically aggressive behavior toward others	____		25
7. Is cooperative with adults.	____		26
12. Follows necessary rules in family or school.	____		27
17. Can put own needs second to those of others.	____		28
SUBSCALE SCORE, SOCIAL BEHAVIOR:		____	31-32
C. COGNITIVELY RELATED SKILLS SUBSCALE			
1. Is well organized in work or play.	____		35
4. Expresses ideas in language	____		36
8. Seems to know difference between facts and make-believe.	____		37
13. Is creative, inventive.	____		38
SUBSCALE SCORE, COGNITIVELY RELATED SKILLS:		____	41-42
D. EMOTIONAL STABILITY SUBSCALE			
2. Seems generally cheerful and content.	____		45
9. Is spontaneous without being explosive.	____		46
14. Tolerates necessary frustration (eg, awaiting turn at game).	____		47
19. Seems free of sudden, unpredictable mood changes.	____		48
SUBSCALE SCORE, EMOTIONAL STABILITY:		____	51-52
E. TASK ORIENTATION SUBSCALE			
5. Initiates non-destructive, goal directed activities.	____		55
10. Understands and completes tasks without frequent reminders.	____		56
15. Enjoys mastering new tasks.	____		57
20. Is attentive and concentrates on tasks.	____		58
SUBSCALE SCORE, TASK ORIENTATION:		____	61-62
Add Item Scores to obtain and enter CBT TOTAL SCORE:		____	65-67
(Check by adding Subscale Scores to reach same Total Score)			
(To be entered by VIP Data Dept.)-CBT STANDARD SCORE:	____		68-70

VIP/MCHP revised 11/73 Form #65. X

FIRST NAME_____

WHAT DO YOU THINK?

Alvin and Gertrude are brother and sister puppets. Your job is to listen to some of the things that happened to them. Then you will put a circle around the words that tell how you feel about what happened. You will show how you feel about each numbered sentence by circling one of these answers:

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNCERTAIN DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

Circle STRONGLY AGREE if you are sure the sentence is right or true.
Circle AGREE if you think the sentence is right or true.
Circle UNCERTAIN if you don't have any idea if the sentence is right or wrong.
Circle DISAGREE if you think the sentence is wrong or false.
Circle STRONGLY DISAGREE if you are sure the sentence is wrong or false.

This is NOT a test.
Remember, you cannot make a mistake. There are no right or wrong answers.

Now let's hear about Alvin and Gertrude.

Alvin and Gertrude's parents argue all the time.

1. Sometimes when their parents argue, Alvin and Gertrude get scared.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNCERTAIN DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

Sometimes when Gertrude and Alvin's parents argue, their mother asks them to agree with her, and their father wants them to agree with him.

2. Gertrude and Alvin should think real hard and then tell their parents who they think is right.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNCERTAIN DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

This morning, Gertrude and Alvin's parents told them they were getting divorced. Their parents were going to stop being married to each other. When told about the divorce, Alvin yelled and screamed at his parents.

3. Alvin should be punished.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNCERTAIN DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

When told about the divorce, Gertrude didn't say anything. She just went outside.

4. Gertrude doesn't care that her parents are getting divorced.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNCERTAIN DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

Later that day, Mildred asked if she could borrow Gertrude's jump rope. Gertrude yelled at her and told her to get her own jump rope.

5. Gertrude is angry at Mildred.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNCERTAIN DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

Now that their parents are divorced, Gertrude and Alvin live with their mother and visit their father.

6. Gertrude and Alvin's mother has custody of them.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNCERTAIN DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

Mildred and Clarence ate dinner at Gertrude and Alvin's house a week later. Mildred asked where their father was. Gertrude said he was working late.

7. Gertrude was kidding around.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNCERTAIN DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

A few weeks later, Gertrude and Alvin told Mildred and Clarence about their parents' divorce and asked them to help them get their parents back together.

8. Mildred and Clarence should offer to do anything they can to help their friends get their parents back together.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNCERTAIN DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

Gertrude and Alvin think they caused their parents' divorce because they were bad so often.

9. If Gertrude and Alvin start being very, very good, their parents will get back together again.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNCERTAIN DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

Now that their parents are divorced, Alvin and Gertrude don't get to see their father as much as they used to see him.

10. Alvin and Gertrude's father doesn't love them anymore.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNCERTAIN DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

Gertrude and Alvin sometimes visit their father on Sundays. Alvin's scout troop is going to the circus next Sunday, but Alvin is supposed to visit his father that day.

11. Alvin will have to miss the circus because he has to visit his father.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNCERTAIN DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

Gertrude and her friends were talking about what they will do when they grow up. Most of her friends said they wanted to get married.

12. Gertrude should not get married because she will probably get divorced.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE UNCERTAIN DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

Evaluation of Individual SAT Protocols for the Children of Divorce in School 2

Student A - Male

This child's weak Attachment score indicates an inability to establish close relationships. The Reality Avoidance score with a strong Individuation score which is well above the Attachment score indicates a denial of being needful. The strong Concentration Impairment and Sublimation score well above the Self-Love Loss score may indicate this child feels ineffectual and lacks confidence. These scores suggest an over-dependence on a supportive figure who is absent. The Identity Stress score is high for this child's age and may indicate emotional problems. The Painful Tension scores are the same for the mild and strong pictures which either indicates affect blunting or a psychotic inappropriateness. The weak Attachment-Individuation Balance may also indicate emotional problems.

Student B - Male

This child has a strong need for closeness as indicated by his strong attachment score. The hostility score is too low with more hostility expressed for mild pictures than for strong ones which suggests affect blunting. The very strong

Painful Tension score accompanied by a high Attachment score may be interpreted as a neurotic conflict. More Painful Tension responses were given for mild than strong pictures again indicating affect blunting. This child's low Reality Avoidance score shows a denial of denial. Anything below 35% on the Attachment-Individuation Balance score is considered to be indicative of a character disorder. This child scored a very weak 11%.

Student C - Female

This child only gave 22 responses to the entire test. A constricted record such as this is considered a form of denial. A denial of denial is also found in this child's score of zero on Reality Avoidance. This child's very weak score on Painful Tension is suggestive of pathology. According to Hansburg (1976), the strong Hostility score which is higher than the Painful Tension score indicates a child, "who is more likely to circumvent pain and express reactive anger before permitting the pain to be felt" (p. 28). The Concentration Impairment and Sublimation score's being much higher than the Self-Love Loss score suggests this child feels ineffective and lacks confidence. The zero Identity Stress score indicates an emotional problem. The very high Attachment-Individuation Balance score of 91% indicates the possibility of a serious emotional disorder.

Student D - Female

This child's low Attachment score may mean a failure to establish closeness. This low score paired with the high Painful Tension score, "indicates a more narcissistic concern, that is, not mourning for the lost object but fear of being on one's own" (Hansburg, 1976, p. 24). The weak mild-strong score is cause for concern, as is the very weak Attachment-Individuation Balance which indicates an emotional disorder.

Student E - Male

This child's total score of 19 is a constricted record and is a form of denial. Hansburg (1976) says, "By its very nature, a constricted record is a form of denial and therefore feelings of loss of love are more likely to be denied under such circumstances" (p. 34). This child scored a zero on Self-Love Loss again showing his denial of self-love loss. His extremely strong Individuation score is indicative of a serious emotional problem. The only Attachment responses given were to strong pictures which is a symptom of self-sufficiency. Normal pain was not reported, suggesting affect blunting. The low Hostility score is evidence of this child's attempt to repress normal resentments. This child's low Reality Avoidance score accompanied by a high Individuation score far above his Attachment score indicates his denying that he is needful.

Student F - Male

This student has a constricted record with only 22 responses given. The zero Hostility score shows repression of normal anger and is a form of affect blunting. The very strong Painful Tension score suggests neurotic or psychotic distress. The low Reality Avoidance score is a denial of denial. The strong Concentration Impairment and Sublimation score much higher than his Self-Love Loss score is symptomatic of feelings of ineffectiveness and lack of self confidence.

Student G - Male

This child has high Hostility and Painful Tension scores. The sum of these two scores is more than one third of the total responses which is evidence of strong affect reaction to separation experiences. Because the Hostility is stronger than the Painful Tension score, this child probably circumvents pain and expresses anger before allowing himself to feel any pain. This child has an extremely high Self-love Loss score about which Hansburg (1976) says, "Once an attachment has been formed between the child and such a love object, a prolonged absence from such a person could induce the notion that one is not worthy or that one is not wanted" (p. 31). This strong Self-Love Loss score is higher than this child's Concentration Impairment and Sublimation score. This pattern is found in those subject to depression and

self-destructive tendencies. This child's low Attachment-Individuation score and low Mild-Strong Difference score is also suggestive of problems such as depression. Even for his age, this child has a low Identity Stress score. Any total score over 100 (this child gave 102 responses) is likely to be obsessional.

Student H - Male

This child has a great need for self-reliance as depicted by his strong Individuation score. His weak Painful Tension score is a sign of pathology and affect blunting. Because the Hostility score is higher than the Painful Tension score, it is likely that this child gets angry before he allows himself to feel pain. His Self-Love Loss score is higher than his Concentration Impairment and Sublimation score which is a symptom of depression and self-destructive tendencies. His strong Reality Avoidance score suggests separation denial. His Identity Stress score is weak.

Student I - Female

The strong Hostility score which is higher than this child's Painful Tension score indicates this child expresses anger before permitting herself to feel pain. This child may be prone to depression and self-destructive tendencies as indicated by her strong Self-Love Loss score which is higher than her Concentration Impairment and Sublimation score. The strong Reality Avoidance score indicates the use of denial as

a defense. Weak scores for Identity Stress and Attachment-Individuation Balance may be indicators of emotional problems. Some pathology is indicated by the nearly equal number of mild and strong scores.

Student J - Female

The weak Attachment score found here may mean a failure in establishing closeness. Evidence for this child's trying to repress normal resentments is found in her low Hostility Score. The high Reality Avoidance score suggests separation denial. This child may feel ineffective and may be overdependent on an absent supportive figure as suggested by her strong Concentration-Impairment and Sublimation score being much higher than her weak Self-Love Loss score. Her high Painful Tension score coupled with her low Attachment score indicates the narcissistic concern of fear of being on her own, not mourning the absent love object. The Attachment-Individuation Balance score is weak, suggesting possible problems. The total score is very high (113). Hansburg (1976) says that total responses of of over 100 are likely to be obsessional. Pathology is suspected because of the very low Mild-Strong difference score.

TABLE 18

SAT Individual Scores for Children of Divorce in School 2

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
SAT Total	47	35	22	65	19	22	102	53	85	113
Attachment	19	26	36	15	26	23	21	21	24	18
Individuation	26	26	36	23	53	27	26	30	15	28
Hostility	13	11	18	12	5	0	20	13	18	10
Painful Tension	17	26	4	23	5	32	18	11	16	19
Reality Avoidance	6	6	0	12	5	4	10	15	18	19
Concentration Impairment & Sublimation	19	6	23	12	0	18	16	0	13	12
Self-Love Loss	4	0	4	6	0	0	17	9	18	4
Identity Stress	9	0	0	6	5	0	2	4	2	5
Attachment-Individuation Balance	23	11	91	-29	47	4	3	32	15	11
Mild-Strong Difference	23	-8	0	14	5	0	0	36	1	-3

Evaluation of Individual CBT Protocols for the Children of Divorce in School 2

Student A - Male

Student A has a Responsible Independence score of fifteen, but he only scored one on the item, "Protects own rights for his (her) age group." This student also only scored a one on "Is spontaneous without being explosive," under Emotional Stability.

Student B - Male

This child's scores are all within one of the others within each subscale except for a lower score of two on "Seems free of sudden, unpredictable mood changes," under Emotional Stability.

Student C - Female

All of this girl's scores were either fours or fives except for a low score of two on, "Seems self-confident, not timid," within the Responsible Independence subscale.

Student D - Female

This child received scores of three, four, or five for all items except one. On "Is attentive and concentrates on tasks," in the Task Orientation subscale, this girl scored a two.

Student E - Male

All of this boy's scores were fours and fives except for, "Accepts or asks for help when necessary," under the Responsible Independence subscale which has a score of three.

Student F - Male

This child had a variety of scores on the items. The two lowest scores were ones and were given for, "Is spontaneous without being explosive," under Emotional Stability and "Is attentive and concentrates on tasks," under Task Orientation.

Student G - Male

This child had all high scores except for one score of two. This low score was for "Seems generally cheerful and content," in the Emotional Stability subscale.

Student H - Male

The lowest score for this child was one score of two on, "Is spontaneous without being explosive," in the Emotional Stability subscale.

Student I - Female

This student's scores are all close within each subscale except for the Responsible Independence subscale. Three of the items here were scored four or five, but a score of two was given for "Seems confident, not timid." The only other two this child has was under Cognitively Related Skills, "Is creative, inventive."

Student J - Female

This child received all fours and fives except for two threes. One three was in the Responsible Independence subscale on the item, "Seems self-confident, not timid." The other score of three was in the Cognitively Related Skills subscale "Is creative, inventive."

TABLE 19

CBT Individual Scores for Children of Divorce in School 2

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
CBT Total	68	79	91	80	95	73	90	72	91	91
Responsible Independence	15	15	17	18	18	16	19	14	15	16
Social Cooperation	9	15	20	18	20	17	20	15	19	20
Cognitively Related Skills	17	18	17	16	19	13	18	15	13	18
Emotional Stability	12	13	18	15	20	15	17	13	18	20
Task Orientation	15	18	19	13	18	12	16	15	16	17

APPENDIX C

DIVORCE EDUCATION PROGRAM

1978

DIVORCE EDUCATION PROGRAM

INTRODUCTION

Leader — Hello boys and girls. I'm a kind of puppet called a DEP. There are lots of us DEPS, but because I'M the leader, I'm the one who gets to make the hello speech. This is my first time in a show, and I'm a little nervous -- I hope you can't tell. Anyway, I'm supposed to tell you that us DEPS have been asked to star in some shows for you. Can you imagine that? I'm a star!

I. What Is a Family?

Olivia — Oh, Oliver. I do hope we'll find one.

Oliver — Don't worry, Olivia, we will. Once we find one, we'll know what it is. Then it will be a cinch to get one of our own.

Olivia — But Oliver, how can we find a family when we don't know what it is? And how do you know we'll like it if we ever do find one?

Oliver — Hey! Cool it, Olivia. I've only heard nice things about families so I'm absolutely, positively, without a doubt sure we'll like it -- if we ever find one.

Olivia — I still don't know how we can find something when we don't know what it is.

Oliver — Olivia! Look! Look over there!

First Little DEP — Mom! Mom! The ice cream man is coming.

Second Little DEP — Please, please may we have some?

Mom — Well...

First Little DEP	It's after lunch.
Second Little DEP	And we've been good little DEPS. And...
Mom	O.K. O.K. Here's some money. Be sure to bring the change back.
Little DEPS	Thanks, mom.
Oliver	Excuse me. Are you a family?
Mom	Of course. I'm the mother, and those are my little DEPS getting ice cream.
Olivia	Isn't there a daddy DEP?
Mom	Yes, but he and I are divorced.
Olivia	Oh.
Oliver	Your mom said you were divorced.
First Little DEP	Not us! Our parents got divorced, not us.
Second Little DEP	You're not very smart DEPS, are you?
Olivia	Well, we sure don't know much about families.
Oliver	What does divorce mean?
First Little DEP	Divorce means your parents aren't happy together anymore, so they decide it's best to live in separate houses.
Oliver	Oh, then you don't have a daddy anymore.
First Little DEP	Yes we do! You little DEPS don't know anything.
Second Little DEP	We still have a daddy. He just doesn't live with us anymore. We get to go and visit him.
First Little DEP	You sure are a dippy DEPS.
Olivia	Now I get it. You still have a mother and a father, but your father doesn't live with you.

First Little DEP — Hooray! You finally understand. We are still a family.

Oliver — Well, Olivia. Now we know.

Olivia — I'm not so sure we know all there is to know about families yet.

Oliver — Look, Olivia. Maybe that's another family.

First Little DEP — Look at me, mom.

Second Little DEP — Watch me do this.

Mom — Be careful, little DEPS. Hold on tight.

First Little DEP — Oh, mom. You worry too much.

Olivia — Excuse me. Are you a family?

Mom — Yes we are -- part of it, anyway.

Olivia — What do you mean?

Mom — My husband is at home with our two youngest little DEPS.

Oliver — You have eight little DEPS?

Mom — Yes we do. Eight wonderful little DEPS.

Olivia — We didn't know families had to have so many little DEPS.

Mom — They don't. Families can be any size. There's no rule about the number of DEPS in a family. Look over there. That looks like a family -- a small family.

Oliver — Oh, yeah, Thank you.

Olivia — Good-bye.

Oliver — Excuse me. Are you a family?

Dad — Why yes we are. This is my wife, and this is our baby DEP.

Olivia — Is he an only little DEP?

Mom	Yes. We only have one little DEP.
Oliver	And you're still a family?
Mom	Definately! What a silly question.
Olivia	Now I'm really confused.
Oliver	What is a family?
Olivia	Well, we might as well go over there and see if that's a family too.
First Little DEP	Grandpa, let's play catch.
Grandpa	That's a fine idea. Come here little DEPS. Let's all play catch.
Grandma	May I play too?
Second Little DEP	Sure, grandma. C'mon.
Grandma	Don't throw the ball too hard.
Third Little DEP	O.K.
Olivia	Excuse me. Are you a family?
Grandpa	Indeed we are. These are our little grandDEPS. I'm their grandpaDEP, and this is their grandmaDEP.
Oliver	I thought families had to be little DEPS and their parents.
Grandma	Yes, but my goodness, there's more to families than just that. Little DEPS have grandmaDEPS, grandpaDEPS, aunts and uncles, and cousins too.
Olivia	Do all those DEPS have to live together in the same house?
Grandpa	Oh my goodness no. That would be too crowded.
Grandma	Besides, it's fun to visit DEPS who you love and who love you. Why don't you ask our little grandDEPS about it. They're visiting us now.

First Little DEP — I like it best when I go visiting by myself. I must admit it's sometimes fun when all of us go together, but I really have a special time when I can visit all by myself. Then I don't have to share with my brotherDEPS and sisterDEPS, and I get all the attention.

Second Little DEP — I like going alone too, unless I get to take a friend with me. Yep, I sure do like visiting the parts of our family that don't live with us.

Third Little DEP — Me too -- usually. But do you remember that time last month when we were supposed to visit grandmaDEP and grandpaDEP on the very day of the school fair?

Second Little DEP — Oh yeah. That was a mess. We sure didn't want to miss the school fair, but we didn't want to hurt grandmaDEP and grandpaDEP's feelings either.

Fourth Little DEP — But we came up with a good solution, don't you think? We just told grandmaDEP and grandpaDEP about the fair and changed our plans to visit them the next weekend. It all worked out.

Third Little DEP — Hey! That reminds me of the time Aunt Wilma and Uncle Wilbur invited us to spend a whole Saturday with them -- from early in the morning to after dinner.

Second Little DEP — Oh yeah. We all love to visit Aunt Wilma and Uncle Wilbur, but all day is a bit too much. Besides, in the morning Aunt Wilma is busy cleaning the house, and Uncle Wilbur works out in the yard. And that's no fun at all.

First Little DEP — We were smart to say we'd love to come -- after lunch.

Fourth Little DEP — Yeah. That was a good idea. All day would have been too much, but after lunch was perfect. Remember how much fun we had that day?

First Little DEP — We sure do know how to solve our problems!

Oliver — I'm glad you little DEPS can solve your problems. Olivia and I aren't having any luck with ours.

Fourth Little DEP — What's the matter?

Olivia — We're trying to find out just exactly what a family is.

Oliver — So far we've found a family with divorced parents.

Olivia — And a large family with eight little DEPS.

Oliver — And a small family with only one little DEP.

Olivia — And we found out you don't have to live with all the members of your family, even though you love them and they love you.

Oliver — And we're confused.

Olivia — Yeah. We found out lots of things, but we still don't know what a family is. And without knowing just exactly what a family is, we'll never be able to find one for ourselves.

Grandpa — Cheer up, little DEPS. You know more about families than you think you do.

Grandma — Yes, dear little DEPS. There are lots of different kinds of families. There is no one right kind that you seem to be looking for.

Grandpa — No siree. Families don't have to have any special number of little DEPS or grown-up DEPS. Any number of DEPS can be a family.

Grandma — And, little DEPS, families change in many ways. Baby DEPS are born, and DEPS die. And the members of our family we live with also can change. For instance, when

a little DEP grows up, he might move into his own house. And, sometimes more DEPS move in like when a grandmaDEP or grandpaDEP moves in with their little DEPS.

Oliver — Hey, Olivia. Are you thinking what I'm thinking?

Olivia — Yes, Oliver. I think I am. We didn't know it, but we already have our very own family.

Olivia and Oliver — What dippy DEPS we are!

II. WILL THE REAL ANGER PLEASE STAND UP?

M.C. Hi. This is Joe Garagiola and welcome to all of you in DEP land. Welcome to our show. Yes sir, it's time for another segment of Who's Telling the Truth? So, let me introduce our panel for today. First we have Zelda. Next is Hector. And then there's Bertha. And finally, we have Jasper. O.K. Let's begin. Now here are our first three contestants. Number One, who are you?

One I am Anger.

M.C. Number Two, who are you?

Two I am Anger

M.C. Number Three, who are you?

Three I am Anger

M.C. O.K., panel. Now all three DEPS claim to be Anger. And your job is to ask questions and from their answers figure out who is telling the truth. Which of these DEPS really is Anger? All right, Zelda, we'll start the questioning with you.

Zelda DEP Number One, do you yell and scream?

One Yes, I most certainly do!

Zelda DEP Number Two, do you yell and scream?

Two Oh, no. I never even raise my voice.

Zelda DEP Number Three, what about you? Do you yell and scream?

Three No, I do not.

M.C. Zelda, your time is up. I know you have 100 more questions, but right now it's Hector's turn.

Hector — DEP Number One, do you slam doors, stamp your feet, or do other things like that?

One — I don't think I have ever done those kinds of things.

Hector — Number Two, do you throw things or slam doors?

Two — Definately not.

Hector — Number Three, do you do those things?

Three — I most certainly do. I stamp my feet, bang the furniture, slam doors, and all that. Sometimes DEPS who see me get scared.

Hector — How about you, Number One. Do DEPS get scared watching you?

One — Oh yes. It's scary to see anger, no doubt about it. Children really get scared, especially when it's their parents who are angry.

M.D. — O.K., Hector. You're really getting into it, but right now, Bertha, it's your turn.

Bertha — Number One, do you make mean faces and give mean looks to DEPS?

One — Only if that's how I look when I'm yelling at someone.

Bertha — Number Two, please answer the same question. Do you give DEPS mean looks and have a scowl on your face?

Two — I always try to look my best, of course not.

Bertha — Number Three, do you scowl and give mean looks to DEPS?

Three — Absolutely! That's my job.

M.C. — That's all you can ask, Bertha. Jasper, it's up to you now.

Jasper — Number One, is it bad to be angry?

One — Oh no. Anger is a feeling just like being happy or sad. Feelings can't be bad.

Jasper — Do you agree with this Number Two?

Two — Yes, I do. Everyone has a right to his feelings. Everyone gets angry sometimes, and that's O.K. You do have to be careful though, about how you show your feelings.

Jasper — And Number Three, do you also agree?

Three — Yes. It's not wrong or bad to be angry, but sometimes the way we express or show anger is bad. What I mean is it would be O.K. to have an angry look on your face when the umpire says your out, but it would be very wrong to hit the umpire.

Jasper — I see. Then you all agree it is O.K. to be angry and that everyone gets angry. There can be problems, though, with the ways we show our anger.

M.C. — All right. With that, panel, the questioning has come to an end. And now the time has come for you to choose who you think really is Anger. Is it DEP Number One, or is it DEP Number Two, or DEP Number Three? Zelda, we'll start with you.

Zelda — Well, I'm sure it's not Number Two. It could be Number One, but I voted for Number Three because he does things like making mean faces and throwing things.

M.C. — Hey, you got it all figured out, Zelda. Hector, how did you vote?

Hector — Well, I agree with Zelda. Stamping feet, banging furniture -- it just has to be Number Three.

M.C. — Hey, that's two votes for Number Three. Bertha, it's time for you to tell us who you voted for.

Bertha — I almost voted for Number Three, but Number One yells and screams, so I voted for Number One.

M.C. — All right Jasper. The whole world is waiting. How did you vote?

Jasper — I also voted for Number One, although it could be Number Three. I'm sure it's not Number Two.

M.C. — Well, panel, the votes are all in. And now it's time to see which DEP really is Anger. Is it DEP No One, or DEP Number Two, or is it DEP Number Three? Now let's ask the great question. Will the real Anger please stand up.

(All three DEPS stand up)

Bertha — What?

Hector — That can't be!

M.C. — Yes it can, panel. We played a trick on you. All three contestants really are Anger.

Zelda — I can see Number One and Number Three both being Anger, but how can number Two be Anger?

Jasper — Yeah. Number Two doesn't even yell or scream, or make faces, or bang and stamp. Number Two can't be Anger. No way!

M.C. — But Number Two is indeed Anger. Number Two please explain to the panel.

Two — Sure. I understand your confusion, but, you see, there is more to anger than yelling and stamping feet and throwing things. I am a quiet, secret anger. There's no way to tell when I'm around because I stay hidden. I'm the Anger that take place inside of you and doesn't show.

Bertha — Oh, I get it. You're the Anger we keep hidden inside of us. Like when something makes you angry, but you don't tell anyone or show you're angry. And then when you get home, you run to your room and cry.

Two — Yes, that's it. Now you understand how I am Anger.

M.C. — See, panel. Number Two is a secret Anger kept inside of you and not shown. That is why you didn't think Number Two could possibly be Anger. When Number Two is around, the angry feeling is there, but no one knows about it. Hey. But now I have another surprise for you. Would my surprise guest please come in? Surprise guest, please tell the panel who you are.

Guest — I am Anger.

Panel — Another one?

M.C. — Yes, panel, this is another Anger. Please tell us what kind of Anger you are.

Guest — I am Displaced Anger. Displaced Anger is anger put in the wrong place. This means you seem to be angry about something or at someone, but you are really angry about something else or someone else. It's when you yell and act angry at your little sister for wrecking your model airplane, but you really know she is too young to be blamed, and you are really angry at yourself for not putting it up out of her reach like you were supposed to.

Hector — Oh, I see. It's the same as when parents have been fighting, and then they yell at their children for a little thing they usually don't get angry about. The parents are angry at each other, but they act like they're angry at the children.

Guest — Yes. Displaced Anger is anger put in a different place than where it really belongs.

Jasper — Wow. That's really something.

Zelda — Boy. There's Anger that shows with things like yelling, making mean faces, and throwing things.

Hector — There's secret Anger that stays hidden inside of you.

Bertha — And there's Displaced Anger that makes it seem like we're angry about one thing when really we're angry about something else.

M.C. — Well, panel, I'll tell you, just sitting here and listening I feel like I've really learned something. And I know you've learned something. I hope that all you out there have learned something too. Unfortunately, our time is up for today. We hope you have enjoyed our show.

III. TAKING SIDES

Wilson — Everyone argues, right? I know that. And I know it sometimes makes you feel bad when you listen to DEPS argue, especially if they're DEPS you like. But, boy did I make a mistake yesterday. That was the dumbest thing I did in my whole life. Listen, listen to what happened. Ursula and Edgar were arguing.

Edgar — That's not fair Ursula. You know Wilson is my best friend. You knew I was going to pick him to be on my team.

Ursula — Sorry, Edgar. But I had first choice, and my first choice was Wilson. Those are the rules, and you know it. The captains choose the teams, and I chose Wilson -- fair and square.

Edgar — I know the rules, Ursula. But you know Wilson and I are best friends. We're always together. You know Wilson wants to be on my team. Why would you even want Wilson on your dumb old team when you know very well he'd much rather be on mine?

Ursula — Wilson knows the rules, too. He doesn't seem upset that I chose him. Maybe he wants to be on my team.

Edgar — Boy are you dippy. Go ahead and ask Wilson whose team he wants to be on.

Ursula — Wilson, are you angry I picked you, and do you want to be on my team?

Wilson — Are you beginning to see my problem? I was dumb enough to answer Ursula's question. Believe me, there was no way I could come out O.K. in this situation.

Here's what happened.

Wilson — Well, I'd really like to be on your team, Ursula...

Ursula — See, Edgar. I told you. You were so sure.

Wilson — Wait. Let me finish. I was going to add that I'd really rather be on Edgar's team. After all, Edgar is my best friend.

Edgar — See. I told you he'd rather be on my team.

Ursula — You are really a jerk, Wilson. I wish I had never even picked you in the first place. I don't even want you on my team.

Wilson — See what I mean? I answered their questions, and I should have just kept quiet after that. But not me. They were fighting about me so I thought I should help stop their argument. Yeah. I should have kept my big mouth shut. It's true they were arguing about me, but it still was their fight, not mine. I had nothing to do with it. I sure wish I had figured that out sooner, then I wouldn't be in such a big mess now.

Wilson — Ursula, please don't say that. I still think you're neat. I just would like to be on Edgar's team, that's all. You asked me, and you wouldn't want me to lie about it.

Ursula — Oh, you really do hate me. Otherwise what difference would it make if you're not on Edgar's team just this once?

Wilson — Ursula, I really do like you. And I guess you're right. I don't always have to be with Edgar. Maybe I should be on your team this one time.

Edgar — What? You'd rather be on her team than mine? What kind of weirdo are you? I thought you were my best friend.

Ursula — Forget it Wilson. It's too late now. I don't even want you on my team. Go ahead and be on Edgar's team.

Edgar — No way! I don't want you on my team.

Wilson — So, that's what happened. All because I though I was responsible for their fight. But I didn't cause Edgar and Ursula's fight, even if it was about me. I had nothing to do with their fight. But because they were fighting about me, I thought it was up to me to try to fix things up. How stupid! Ursula and Edgar started their fight, and they had to be the ones to end it. I should have stayed out of it. I tried helping, and look what happened to me. Now they are both angry at me. Boy, I'll never take sides again!

Jake — Hey, Wilson. Melvin and I are arguing about which one of us painted the best poster for the school carnival.

Melvin — Yeah. Which poster is nicer, Jake's or mine?

Wilson — You're both good artists. I can't make a choice.

Melvin — Aw, c'mon, Wilson. All you have to do is tell us which poster you like better.

Wilson — Sorry, guys. You'll have to find another way to end your argument.

Jake — Oh, Wilson. We're not asking too much. Just tell us which one of us painted the nicer poster.

Wilson — I wish I could help you, guys. But I've learned the hard way that everyone argues, and I'm not responsible for their arguments or their making up. I learned you can only cause more trouble by taking sides. I'm not taking sides ever again.

Jake — Hey, Ursula! What's with Wilson? Melvin and I asked him which one of these posters he liked better, and he refused to tell us.

Melvin — All he said was something about never taking sides again.

Ursula — Oh, I think I understand. You see, Edgar and I were having an argument, and we asked Wilson who was right. Anyway, it all ended up with Edgar and me both angry at Wilson.

Melvin — Well, now it at least makes sense. Wilson learned it is best not to take sides in other DEPS' arguments.

Ursula — Yes, that must be it. But, you know, I feel crummy. After all, Edgar and Wilson have been best friends forever -- at least since first grade. I had to have a dumb old fight with Edgar, and now Edgar and Wilson aren't even talking to each other.

Melvin — Wow! No wonder Wilson's so upset.

Ursula — I know Edgar and Wilson are probably angry at me too, but we were never such really close friends. Besides, I think it's my fault Edgar and Wilson are angry at each other. If I hadn't picked Wilson for my team, none of this would have happened. I feel just awful about ruining their friendship. Hey! I have an idea! Would you two help me try to get Edgar and Wilson to be friends again?

Melvin — We'll help Ursula. What do you want us to do?

Jake — Yeah. Whatever you say, Ursula. Do you have an idea?

Ursula — Mm... Let's see. Both Edgar and Wilson are angry at me so they'd never listen to me. You two will have to do it.

Jake — Do what, Ursula?

Melvin — C'mon, Ursula. Tell us your idea.

Ursula — Listen. Here's the plan. You two go tell Wilson and Edgar to meet you at the park after school. Say you'll play ball or something. Then no one else will show up, just them. They'll have to talk to each other.

Jake — O.K. We'll do it.

Melvin — Let's go Jake. See ya later, Ursula.

(No dialogue, just a picture of Wilson and Edgar ignoring each other. Ursula, Jake, and Melvin are hiding.)

Jake — Look! They're just going to leave.

Melvin — They're not going to say one word to each other.

Ursula — Gosh. I thought for sure they would have to say something when no one else showed up. I wanted so much for them to make up. I feel awful.

Melvin — Hey, don't feel so bad, Ursula. You aren't responsible for getting them to make up. No one can make other DEPS make up.

Jake — I don't know how we could have thought we could get them to be friends again. Edgar and Wilson have to be the ones to decide that, not us. It's not up to us at all, no matter how much we want them to make up.

Ursula — Yes. I guess you're right. They will have to make up on their own, when and if they ever want to. But I still feel so crummy. I want so much for them to be friends again.

Melvin — Yeah, but forget it, Ursula. You're just wasting your time. You can't change other DEPS' feelings.

Jake — Melvin is right, Ursula. We know you feel bad, but there is nothing you can do. You'll have to accept that Edgar and

Melvin are angry at each other and are not friends anymore. Maybe they will make up some day, and maybe they won't.

Ursula — I suppose you're right, but I still hope and wish they'll make up soon.

Jake — It's O.K. to hope and wish, Ursula, as long as you remember that wishing and hoping don't make things happen.

Ursula — I know. But maybe Edgar and Wilson will decide to make up and be friends again.

Melvin — Maybe. Just don't forget that you can't do anything about it. Whatever they do, you'll have to accept.

Ursula — I know. It's all up to them. And I have to accept whatever they do -- even if I don't like it.

IV. MOM AND DAD ARE GETTING DIVORCED

Narration

Cathy — Hi! I'm Cathy, and this is my little sister Allison.

Allison — Hi!

Billy — And I'm their brother, Billy.

Cathy — Our DEP friends asked us to tell you what's been happening to us. We've had quite a year!

Allison — We're going to start way back at the beginning.

Story

Allison — Cathy, I'm scared.

Cathy — Oh, don't be such a baby, Allison. You should be used to it by now. They're always fighting.

Billy — Yeah. They fight more than me and Tommy. What can they fight about all the time?

Cathy — You hear them, Billy. They fight about money, working late, everything.

Billy — They fight so much, I bet they get divorced.

Story

Allison — What did Billy mean about mom and dad getting divorced?

Cathy — Oh, he doesn't know anything. But it's possible, I guess.

Allison — What's possible?

Cathy — That mom and dad get divorced.

Allison — What's that?

Cathy — You know. They don't like being together anymore so they get divorced and live in different places.

Allison — What about us? If they don't live together, where would we live?

Cathy — I'm not sure, but I think kids live with one of their parents.

Allison — Won't we have a mommy and daddy anymore?

Cathy — Sure we will. But one of them won't live with us. We'll have to visit one of our parents.

Allison — That's not fair! I want to always be with mommy and daddy all the time. I want to live with both of them.

Cathy — Hey! Don't get all shook up. We don't know if that will happen. Everyone's mom and dad fight sometimes, and they don't all get divorced.

Allison — But our mom and dad fight all the time.

Narration

Billy — Well, I sure did guess what was going to happen.

Allison — I wish you had been wrong.

Cathy — We all wish it didn't happen, but it did.

Allison — I still remember when mommy and daddy asked to talk to us.

Story

Dad — This is going to be pretty hard, kids, but mom and I have something important to talk to you about.

Mom — I think you know we've always tried to do what's best for you kids, always wanting you to be happy. But this time we must do something that we know will make you very sad, and there is nothing we can do about it.

Dad — Yes. We've tried and tried, but we have no other choice. Mom and I are getting divorced.

Cathy — That's awful! Terrible! You don't care about us at all. You don't want us to be happy. I hate you both.

Allison — Daddy, daddy, no! Please tell me you don't mean it.

Dad — Oh, Allison. I wish I could, but I can't. Mom and dad are getting divorced.

Allison — Mommy. Tell daddy to stop saying that. You're not getting divorced! You're not!

Mom — Allison, we are very sorry, but it's true.

Billy — I'm going to my room.

Narration

Billy — Boy, what a scene that was.

Cathy — I sure acted like a dope.

Allison — No you didn't. You were angry, that's all. I just cried like a big baby.

Billy — You girls sure did act dumb.

Cathy — What about you? You didn't even care. You just sat there as if nothing was really happening. You're the one who acted like a real dummy.

Billy — I guess you're right, but I did care. As much as you did. I just didn't scream or cry. I don't know why, but I couldn't do anything -- just sit there.

Cathy — Well, if we didn't really understand ourselves, it's no wonder our friends couldn't figure us out.

Billy — My friends must have thought I was crazy.

Story

Boy — C'mon, Billy. Let's play ball.

Billy — Oh, go away!

Boy — What's with you? We need someone else to play.

Billy — I said no! Now go away and leave me alone.

Narration

Billy — My friends must have thought I was a real jerk. They couldn't figure out why I was so mad at them.

Cathy — How could they when you weren't mad at them at all?

Billy — No, I wasn't. Now I know I was mad at mom and dad, but for some reason I couldn't yell at them the way you did. I took out all my anger on my friends and you two girls.

Cathy — Oh, don't worry about it now, Billy. I acted just as strange. Remember when Patty slept over?

Story

Patty — How come your dad wasn't home last night? Did he have to go someplace.

Cathy — Yes. Yes. He had to go on a business trip. Hey, hurry up. Let's get to work on this project before you have to go home.

Patty — O.K.

Narration

Billy — You're right, Cathy. You acted just as dumb as I did.

Cathy — I just wasn't ready to tell anyone about the divorce. Maybe I was worried about what Patty would have said if I told her the truth. Maybe I was even ashamed that my parents were getting divorced.

Billy — I suppose so. But I think you couldn't talk about it because you didn't want to admit it was really happening.

Cathy — That sounds more like Allison. She absolutely refused to understand what was going on.

Story

Mom — Good night, honey. Pleasant dreams.

Allison — Good night, mommy. When is daddy coming home?

Mom — You know daddy doesn't live here anymore. He lives in an apartment in the city now.

Allison — Yeah, but he'll come home soon. Good night.

Mom — Allison, you know....

Allison — I'm tired, mommy. Good night.

Narration

Billy — Boy, you really acted nutty. you knew they were getting divorced, but you just wouldn't accept it.

Cathy — You just kept pretending everything would be back to the way it was.

Allison — You two did just about the same thing, always trying to get mommy and daddy back together.

Cathy — It always worked on T.V. I saw two shows where the kids got their parents back together.

Billy — But you should know by now that real life is not like a T.V. show.

Cathy — You're right. Besides, mom and dad tried real hard to stay together. They didn't want to get divorced. If there had been another way to fix things up, they would have found it.

Billy — Now we know, but at the time we couldn't help trying to get them to make up.

Cathy — We sure wasted a lot of time. We tried everything.

Story

Cathy — O.K., kids. We'll show them how good we can be. Dad will want to come back and live with us if we're good all the time.

Billy — O.K., but this won't be easy.

Allsion — They'll just think we're sick if we're always good and never even fight with each other.

Narration

Billy — That didn't work at all.

Allison — Mom just kept asking us, "What's wrong with you guys?"

Cathy — And daddy just said he was glad we were being good for mommy. He said he was proud of us.

Billy — I guess we really had nothing to do with the divorce -- just like mom and dad said. Dad did not move out of the house because of us.

Allison — Even though it didn't work, I'm glad daddy said he was proud of us. That's a lot better than when you two decided if we were bad all the time daddy would have to come home.

Story

Billy — I know. We'll be so bad, mom will need dad to take care of us.

Cathy — Great idea! I'll start goofing off in school and do real bad on tests and everything. That will get them.

Billy — And I'll start hitting kids and maybe even cheat on a test.

Allison — What about me? What can I do that's really bad?

Billy — Oh, just whine and cry all the time.

Narration

Billy — What a mistake that was.

Cathy — We didn't know it then, but we sure know now; Mom can handle us, even without daddy.

Allison — Just because dad used to the one to punish us didn't mean mom couldn't do it.

Billy — Not only didn't we get mom and dad back together, but we got in lots of trouble. I even missed the big game because I was being punished.

Narration

Cathy	It was hard, but we finally learned that mom and dad really were getting divorced, and we couldn't change that.
Billy	It was time to stop thinking about the divorce so much and start doing the things we had done before the divorce stuff started.
Allison	Even I had no choice but to accept it. Mommy and daddy got divorced.

V. MOM AND DAD ARE DIVORCED

Narration

Cathy — Mom and dad have been divorced around six months now, and we have pretty much accepted it. It's just the way things are. Mom has custody of us. That means we live with our mother.

Billy — Our lives are just about back to normal except that dad doesn't live in our house anymore.

Allison — That's the hardest part. I still miss my daddy.

Billy — But we're lucky because dad doesn't live too far away. It's hard having to visit your own father, but at least we get to be with him often.

Cathy — I suppose we'll get used to having to visit daddy to be with him, just like we got used to the divorce.

Billy — You're probably right, Cathy. After all, it is already easier than it was in the beginning. Remember?

Story

Allison — Daddy, we were ready and waiting for you an hour early.

Billy — We couldn't wait.

Cathy — Oh, daddy. We've missed you.

Dad — And I've missed you -- all of you. How would you like to go to the zoo today?

Kids — Great!

Narration

Billy — At first we just kept going to one place after another when we were with dad.

Cathy — We never even had a chance to talk.

Allison — But we sure did have fun. We went to the zoo, amusement park, we even went to the movies. But I wanted to be with daddy. You know, sit on his lap and watch T.V.

Billy — Or play ball or Monopoly.

Cathy — I'm glad we finally told daddy he didn't have to take us places whenever it was our day together.

Story

Cathy — Daddy, how come each Sunday we go places and to special things?

Dad — What do you mean, Cathy?

Cathy — Why do we always go places instead of just doing everyday kinds of things?

Dad — Well, kids, I get to be with you so little, I want to make sure you have a good time.

Allison — But daddy, we just want to be with you.

Billy — Like it was before the divorce. You know play games and watch T.V. together. That's all we want to do.

Cathy — You know, daddy, we haven't even seen your apartment yet.

Dad — You kids are absolutely right. I thought I had to keep you busy all the time, but that's not what dads are for. You all must remember, though, that it can't ever really be just like it was before. C'mon. Let's go to my apartment.

Narration

Billy — Dad understood what we said.

Cathy — It's a good thing we told him what we thought. Daddy thought we would only like our visits with him if he took us fun places.

Allison — I like going to daddy's apartment.

Cathy — But do you remember how strange it was the first time?

Story

Dad — Here we are, kids. What do you think?

Cathy — It's nice, dad.

Dad — Yes, I like it. It's not as big as the house, but it's big enough for me.

Billy — You only have one bedroom, dad.

Dad — Yes, son. But the couch opens up into a bed.

Allison — Great. Then maybe we could sleep over some time.

Dad — That's what I was hoping. You girls could sleep in the bedroom, and Billy and I could sleep on the couch.

Cathy — I can't wait till we sleep over. Daddy, who cleans the apartment and does the cooking?

Billy — And who does the laundry and washes the dishes?

Allison — What do you do when a button comes off your shirt?

Dad — My goodness, you have a lot of questions, but they are very good questions. I hope that you'll always ask me when you wonder about things. Now, getting back to your questions. I'm not nearly as helpless as you guys seem to think I am. I can do most of those things. You would love watching me thread a needle. Cooking is

the hardest part, but I'm learning. In the meantime, I visit McDonalds and Burger King a lot. Let's go to McDonalds for dinner.

Cathy — Great!

Billy — I want a cheeseburger.

Allison — Yummy!

Narration

Billy — I guess dad is managing pretty well. Mom's managing, too.

Cathy — But it hasn't been easy for either of them. Mom had to go back to work and now has to take care of us all by herself.

Allison — And daddy had to learn how to take care of his apartment and cook. It hasn't been easy for either of them.

Billy — It hasn't been easy for us either.

Story

Cathy — What should I do, kids? I need your help. Cindy's having a super party at the skating rink Sunday. And we're supposed to be with daddy, Sunday.

Allison — You really do have a problem

Cathy — I love daddy and usually want to be with him, but this is going to be a special party, and I really want to go.

Billy — Then why don't you just tell daddy. He'll understand.

Cathy — I hope he'll understand. I don't want to hurt his feelings, but it's just that I really want to go to the party.

Narration

Cathy	I told daddy about my problem, and that's all there was to it.
Billy	Dad understood and didn't seem at all upset.
Cathy	Daddy told us that there would be other times when something comes up that we want to do on the day we are supposed to be with him.
Billy	Yeah. And we're supposed to tell daddy, and then we'll just make other plans to be with him.
Cathy	Daddy wants us to be with him because we want to, not because we have to.
Allison	I like it when you two can't be with daddy and I get to be with him all by myself.
Billy	I like to be alone with dad sometimes, too.
Cathy	Me too. We're lucky we've been able to work all these problems out. Mom and dad are each trying to work things out, too.
Billy	Yes, but they must be lonely.
Allison	Mommy can't be lonely. She has us to keep her company.
Cathy	That's not the same thing. We're kids. Besides, she's used to having daddy around.
Billy	Yeah. That's why she likes going out at night with her friends.
Cathy	Sometimes someone who is divorced gets married again. You know my friend, Maryanne? Her parents got divorced, and her mom just got married again.
Allsion	That's dumb! Why would her mom want to get married again if she was married, and she didn't like it?

Cathy — It's not being married that she didn't like. It's just that she and her husband couldn't get along together.

Allison — Hey. That's fantastic!

Billy — Have you flipped? What's so great?

Allison — I always wanted to grow up and get married and have children of my own.

Billy — So?

Allison — After mom and dad got divorced, I changed my mind because if being married wasn't so great, I wasn't going to get married.

Billy — Oh, I get it.

Allison — Yeah. Now I am going to grow up and get married. I'm just going to try especially hard to marry the right person.

Cathy — Me too. I guess with all our problems, we've managed to learn something.

VI. HAPPY ENDING

DEPS — Hi, kids!

Kids — Hi, DEPS!

First DEP — You kids told your story very well. Thank you for sharing it with all of us.

Allison — You're welcome.

Cathy — Thank you for your shows, DEPS.

Allison — We learned a lot from you.

Cathy — Right. I had always thought anger was anger.

Allison — But now we know there are different kinds of anger.

Billy — Your show about anger taught me that I had secret anger when mom and dad told us they were getting divorced. And when I yelled and screamed at my friends and sisters for no reason, that was displaced anger.

Second DEP — You're absolutely right, kids. You learn quickly. Did you learn anything else?

Allison — Oh, yes. Before I saw your show about families I was afraid that I wouldn't have a mommy and a daddy anymore after the divorce.

Cathy — Me too. I mean, I already knew there are lots of different kinds of families, but I needed to be reminded that you can be part of a family even if your mom and dad are divorced.

Billy — I really liked it when the little DEPS said their parents were divorced, not them.

Cathy — That's true. Moms and dads love their children just the same after divorce as

they did before they got divorced. Their love for their children doesn't change at all.

Third DEP — I'm so glad we helped, kids.

Billy — Did you know your shows even saved us from having more problems?

Second DEP — Great! What did we do?

Billy — You showed us it was best not to take sides in other people's fights.

Allison — You meant parents' fights too, didn't you?

First DEP — We sure did.

Cathy — That's why we tried not to take sides with mom or dad when they were fighting.

Billy — Our parents didn't know how hard it was for us when mom wanted us to agree with her and dad wanted us to agree with him.

Allison — Because of what you DEPS taught us, we just told mom and dad we loved them both and didn't want to take sides in their fights.

Second DEP — That was the smart thing to do.

First DEP — Some children make the mistake of agreeing with one parent which, of course, makes the other parent feel bad.

Third DEP — We're glad you didn't do that.

First DEP — And proud that we helped you.

Second DEP — Do you kids know you helped us, too?

Allison — We helped you?

Second DEP — Yes you did. You helped us understand some of what it's like when parents get divorce.

Third DEP — We learned a lot, like cu...cu.... What is that word that means the children live with one of their divorced parents?

Allison — Oh. You mean custody.

Cathy — Yes. Custody must be the word you mean. Sometimes fathers get custody of their children, but our mother has custody of us. That means we live with our mom, and she is the one who takes care of us.

First DEP — And you visit your dad.

Billy — Right. And the little DEPS in one of your shows felt the same way about visiting members of their family as we do about visiting our dad.

Allison — They sure did. They liked to go visiting alone, just like we do.

Billy — And sometimes they didn't want to visit when they were supposed to.

Cathy — Just like when I wanted to go to Cindy's party.

Allison — I'm glad everything worked out so well for us and for the little DEPS.

Cathy — I think I felt better just knowing others had problems like ours.

Second DEP — I think all of us feel better knowing we're not the only ones with a problem. You know, it's funny, but sometimes we think we're the only ones in the whole world with our problem, but really, there's always someone else with the same problem.

Billy — Yes. It does help knowing that you're not the only one with a problem.

Cathy — But everyone can react differently to the very same problem. What I mean is the three of us all acted differently when we were told about mom and dad getting divorced.

Allison — We sure did. I even pretended it wasn't really happening.

Cathy — Yes, we all reacted in our very own way.

Billy — Now we know there is no right way or wrong way to react. It's nice knowing we weren't acting crazy.

Second DEP — Well, there's no doubt about it. You kids certainly have had a very hard year, but you managed well.

Third DEP — Yes you did. But that doesn't mean you're happy about what happened.

Cathy — No. We'll never be happy that mom and dad got divorced.

Billy — But we had no choice but to accept it.

Allison — Yes. Mom and dad got divorced, and there's nothing we can do about it.

First DEP — I'm glad you stopped wasting your time trying to get your parents back together. You kids didn't cause the divorce, and you couldn't stop it from happening.

Billy — You're right. We stopped trying to get our parents to make up because we learned we couldn't do it.

Cathy — Just like that little DEP Ursula learned she couldn't force Edgar and Wilson to be friends again.

Allison — But it sure would have been nice if we had been able to get mom and dad back together again.

Second DEP — Yes, of course. But if there was even a little chance for things to work out, your parents would not have decided to get divorced.

Allison — That's what we finally figured out.

Cathy — Right. If we decide to get married when we grow up, we'll just try especially hard to marry the right person.

Second DEP	That's what everyone should do.
Third DEP	Well kids, we learned a lot from each other.
Billy	Yes we did. I guess we work well together.
First DEP	All us DEPS are proud that we've helped you manage so well this past year.
Third DEP	You know, whenever you have a problem there's always someone around who can help.
Cathy	Yes. Mom or dad can help us with lots of our problems.
Allison	Sometimes Cathy or Billy helps me.
Billy	Friends can help with some problems.
Cathy	So can teachers or other grown-ups.
Third DEP	Right. There are many people who can help you with your problems, all you have to do is ask.
Cathy	Yes. We've learned to talk about our problems and feelings, and that really helps.
Billy	We appreciate all your help, DEPS.
Kids	Thanks, DEPS.
DEPS	Thank you, kids.
All	Good-bye.

APPENDIX D

Explanation and Development of the Divorce Education Program

The first of the six parts of this divorce education program is called, "What Is A Family?" and portrays a variety of family situations while stressing the idea that there is no one right kind of family. Kelly and Wallerstein (1976) attributed the child's fearfulness following parental divorce to the major shake-up of his or her world and possible belief that he or she no longer is safe. With this in mind, this part explains how families change and that people do not necessarily have to live together to be part of the same family. Part I utilizes puppets specifically created for this program, instead of using real people. Puppets were used because they could say and do things children would not normally say or do. In addition, the pictures of the puppets provided brightly colored, interesting slides that may have helped to keep the children's attention. These puppets are collectively called DEPS (divorce education program).

Despert (1953) and Kelly and Wallerstein (1976) wrote of the large part anger plays in the school age child's response to his or her parents' divorce. Part II tries to explain different kinds of anger in order to help children recognize and then accept their own and others' angry reactions to parental divorce. Different ways to express anger are depicted with the DEPS doing a take-off on the television show "To Tell the Truth". Joe Garagiola, the emcee on the

actual television show did the voice for the emcee puppet. Part II is titled, "Will the Real Anger Please Stand Up".

Part III is called, "Taking Sides". Children of divorce may be asked to take sides in parental disputes. School age children are also old enough to figure out that it may be to their advantage to do so. Part III again uses the DEPS, this time to show that everyone argues and the importance of not taking sides in other people's arguments. Grollman (1967), Krantzler (1974), and Gardner (1976) all wrote of children of divorce feeling they are to blame for their parents' divorce. In Part III, the DEPS stress that people are only responsible for their own actions. The futility of trying to end others' arguments is portrayed in hopes of having the children learn not only that they did not cause their parents' divorce, but that they cannot assume responsibility for getting their parents back together again.

Parts IV and V tell the two-part story of two sisters and their brother whose parents get divorced. Instead of the DEPS, real children are used to tell this story. These children talk together about their experiences pertaining to their parents' divorce. Flashbacks are then used to show the events discussed actually taking place. Part IV begins with the children thinking that their parents might get divorced because of their constant arguing. Such things as the children's reactions to the divorce and their futile attempts

to bring about their parents' reconciliation are included. Part V continues the story and deals primarily with the children visiting their father and their gradual acceptance of the divorce and custody arrangements. Major points taught in the first three parts of the program are again explained, this time directly related to the divorce situation. The titles of these parts are "Mom and Dad Are Getting Divorced" and "Mom and Dad Are Divorced".

In the final part of the program, the children and the DEPS come together to talk about divorce. Part VI draws together the first five parts of the program and serves as the program's summary. Part VI is called "Happy Ending" even though the children agree they will never be happy about their parents' divorce.

Fisher (1973), Kliman (1968), Krantzler (1974), and Sugar (1970) believe that divorce is the death of a relationship causing people to react to divorce in much the same way they react to death. Froiland and Hozman (1977) agree with this and believe that people experiencing divorce go through the same stages as those delineated by Elizabeth Kubler-Ross as stages people go through on the way to acceptance of a loved one's death. These stages (denial, anger, bargaining, depression, acceptance) Hozman and Froiland say the child goes through in order to come to terms with his parental divorce are addressed in this divorce education program.

Denial, depression, and acceptance are dealt with in the two-part story of divorce in Parts IV and V. Anger is the total subject of Part II and is also shown in part IV in the children's reactions to their parents' divorce. Bargaining is the subject of Part III and is also portrayed in Part IV. These stages are also discussed in Part VI, the program's summary. One purpose of this divorce education program is to help children work through these stages.

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Nancy Perlmutter Brody has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Joy Rogers, Director
Associate Professor
Educational Foundations, Loyola

Dr. Jack Kavanagh
Associate Professor and Chairman
Educational Foundations, Loyola

Dr. Ronald Morgan
Associate Professor
Educational Foundations, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Ph.D.

10/21/81
Date

Joy Rogers
Director's Signature