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Grandchildren and grandparents were the participants in this study of the ways grandparents socialize their grandchildren about love and marriage. One-hundred ninety young adult grandchildren and 107 grandparents completed separate questionnaires regarding their own attitudes and beliefs about love and marriage, and the frequency of ways the grandparents socialized and taught about love and marriage. A subset of the participants, 74 grandchildren and their own grandparents, were also studied as matched dyads.

Five grandparent socialization practices were found including grandparents’ advice-giving, grandparents’ story-telling (and others’ stories about the grandparents), grandparents’ expression of affection, observation of grandparents’ positive behaviors, and observation of grandparents’ negative behaviors. The Love Attitude Scale was used to assess the participants’ six attitudes about love including Eros, Ludus, Storge, Pragma, Mania, and Pragma. The Relational Dimensions Instrument was used to assess the participants’ beliefs about marriage, and the Sharing and Assertiveness marital dimensions were analyzed.

Results revealed that grandparents’ socialization practices and teaching were interrelated and were associated with grandchildren’s attitudes and beliefs about love and marriage. Grandchildren’s and their grandparents’ reports about the grandparents’ socialization practices were all associated. Grandchildren generally noticed that their
grandparents’ taught more often about love and marriage than their grandparents reported
teaching. Grandchildren’s attitudes about positive love such as Eros, Storge, and Pragma
was predicted by the grandchildren’s own perception of their grandparents’ advice-giving
and teaching about Eros love. Sharing in marriage was related to all the socialization
practices. Affectual solidarity between grandparents and their grandchildren interacted
with socialization to enhance the effects for predicting grandchildren’s Eros love and
Sharing marital dimension. Overall, these findings revealed that socialization about love
and marriage was constituted when communication between grandparents and their
grandchildren served to coordinate their shared interpretive schemas and orient
themselves within cultural systems of meaning.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

“...somehow we have to get the older people, grandparents... back close to growing children if we are to restore a sense of community, a knowledge of the past, and a sense of the future to today’s children” Margaret Mead, 1974, p. 245.

As the task of raising children becomes more complex, those beyond the nuclear family may become involved in the socialization process (Wamboldt & Reiss, 1991). Most grandparents (but not all) have an emotional connection to their grandchildren that predisposes them to the socializing role of value development. Teaching values about love such as friendship or kindness, or teaching values about marriage such as sharing or faithfulness are some of the ways that parents and grandparents may socialize their children. Depending upon family circumstances and the grandparents themselves, grandparents may choose to fulfill a socializing role for these values or not. Perhaps grandparents maintain a sense of generational continuity with their grandchildren through communicative practices that provide for their grandchildren a connection to the past and guidance for the future (Downs, 1989; Mead, 1970). Given the need for children to orient themselves within society, the goal of this study is to uncover if and how grandparents play a role in the socialization of their grandchildren with regards to love and marriage.

Consistent with social theorists Berger and Luckmann (1966), communication theorists O'Keefe and Delia (1985) contend that “…in the process of socialization
individuals come to share a common view of reality with other members of their culture” (p. 57). Everyday family communication practices can bring about the socialization of social-cognitive schemas and practices associated with interacting with others (Burleson, Delia, & Applegate, 1995). Communication researchers have shown that parents and peers do socialize young adults’ cultural and communicative practices (Burleson, Delia, & Applegate, 1992). But are young adults’ social-cognitive schemas and communication practices also socialized by grandparents? And if so, how does this take place in grandparent-grandchild (GP-GC) interactions?

In North America, the age of onset of grandparenthood falls between 30 years old to over 80 years old, with the average age of first-time grandparents at 48 years old. About one-third of American adults are grandparents. The macro-sociological changes of the 20th century including increased divorce rate, migration of families, and increased number of single-parent households have all contributed to the changing and numerous roles of grandparents. In addition, longer life expectancy extends the possibility for grandparenting through to the adult years of the grandchild (Bengtson, 2001; Mills, 2001).

Reflecting these changes, the study of the relationships between grandparents and grandchildren spans the fields of sociology, psychology, gerontology, anthropology, family studies, and communication. From family studies, Bengtson (2001) predicts that multigenerational bonds will rise to importance within families during the 21st century and in some cases may even replace the nuclear family structure as the primary emotional support system. He argues that over the course of life, the GP-GC relationship may be more stable and may provide the “needs of interaction, support, and mutual influence…”
From the field of communication, Downs (1989) contends that most grandparents and their grandchildren honor and value interactions within the GP-GC dyad. For grandparents, conversations with their grandchildren are opportunities to share the past and impact the future. For grandchildren, past generations become crystallized as shared stories provide a sense of identity with family history (Downs, 1989). For instance, Nussbaum and Bettini (1994) have found that when grandmothers tell stories about their marriage and stories about how they got along with their own parents, the possibility of grandchildren learning about communication and relationships occurs. When grandfathers tell war stories and how they grew up, grandchildren may learn the values of family and country (p. 70).

The focus for this study is on the interactions between grandparents and their grandchildren. Of particular interest is GP-GC communication about ways of loving and views of marriage. While love and marriage are important concepts for all age groups, most young adults are passing through the developmental stages of establishing their identity and finding intimacy (Erikson, 1968). Identity and intimacy stages pave the way for young adults to resolve their developmental crises and adopt ways of loving and preferred interpersonal behaviors in marriage. DeFrain and Olson (1999) estimate that about 90% of Americans anticipate marriage in their future. Consequently, love and marriage (or committed relationships) are particularly relevant issues for young adults.

Attitudes about love have been defined as preferences in ways of expressing and receiving love, and these ways have been categorized into six major love styles or attitudes (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986; Lee, 1977). Hendrick and Hendrick have found that even though characteristics of more than one love style may be reported by
individuals, in most cases, individuals use one style of love. In attempts to understand the
development of attitudes about love, some researchers have focused on similarities
between young adults’ love attitudes and the love attitudes of their parents and
grandparents, but without finding consistent associations (Inman-Amos, Hendrick, &
Hendrick, 1994; Neto, 2001). Family, peers, and media all may in some way socialize
young adults about what it means to love.

The institution of marriage has changed very little over the past three thousand
years. For many researchers, becoming socialized in society includes the additional task
of passing on the values and attitudes about marriage from one generation to the next
(VanLear, 1999). Marriage is one way for young adults to illustrate their love and
commitment to one another. Researchers have taken interest in the decision to marry (or
to make a lifelong commitment) and the attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors regarding
married life (e.g., Buss, Shackelford, Kirkpatrick, & Larsen, 2001; Fitzpatrick, 1988;
Gottman, Coan, Carrere, & Swanson, 1998; Surra, 1990). Parents and media serve as
models as to how to behave and communicate in a marriage (Feng, Giarrusso, Bengtson,
& Frye, 1999; Segrin & Nabi, 2002). However, given the extensive line of marital
research, no research has yet uncovered if grandparents socialize their grandchildren
about marriage and, if so, how and what do they communicate. Could it be that
grandparents and grandchildren mutually construct their ideas of love and marriage?

Given the two premises that (a) the GP-GC relationship is predominant in the
United States and (b) learning about love and marriage are salient issues to young adults,
this study proposes to link these two premises. An investigation of young adult
grandchildren’s and their grandparents’ attitudes, beliefs, and values about love and
marriage is conducted. The ways that grandparents socialize and teach their grandchildren about love and marriage is also examined. Young adults have a set of beliefs and attitudes about what love and marriage means to them, and the communication practices that take place with their grandparents about such issues may enhance those meanings. This study proposes that young adult grandchildren, in some ways, do attempt to coordinate their own perspectives with that of their grandparents (Grossberg, 1982). The study will give particular attention to the reported situated actions and communication practices of the grandparents surrounding issues of love and marriage.

Not all grandparents and grandchildren communicate on a regular basis but when they do, the conversation is often regarding the everyday topics of the weather, leisure activities, friends, education, or the most recent health checkup (Lin, Harwood, & Bonneson, 2002). Giving and receiving information is one activity of talk but other activities are also getting done (Tracy, 2002). On the occasions when GP-GC conversations turn to stories, tales, jokes, metaphors, and so on; everyday informational topics may give way to an exchange of values, attitudes, and beliefs (Harwood, 2000b). In these moments between GP-GC, philosophies and principles of life are shared by means of a process called socialization—“the process of orienting oneself within systems of meaning” (Miller, 1996, p. 183).

Family serves as a context within which culture, cognition, and communication are integrated to cultivate socialization processes (Burleson et al., 1995). Because socialization is an operation of both cognitive and emotional processes, it stands to reason that an emotional connection may exist between those parties involved in socializing.
Parents usually serve as a primary socializing entity; however grandparents may also serve as an identifying force for the internalization of attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors (Berger & Luckmann, 1966).

The primary objective of this study is to uncover how grandparents play a role in the socialization of their grandchildren in regards to love and marriage. Communication research surrounding grandparents has largely failed to address the issue of the socialization of grandchildren, focusing instead on the aspects of vocal communication (Montepare, Steinberg, & Rosenberg, 1992), stereotypes between GP-GC (Pecchioni & Croghan, 2002), closeness (Harwood, 2001), or media use (Harwood, 2000a). Broadly construed among other disciplines, the study of the socialization of grandchildren is chiefly conducted within families where the grandparents are “surrogate” parents to the grandchildren. Divorce of parents, teen-aged parents, or both parents pursuing a career often place the grandchildren in a situation where grandparents are their primary caregivers (e.g., Edwards, 2003). Therefore to fill a gap in our knowledge of grandparenting, this study inquires about socializing practices that grandparents may use with their grandchildren about the values, attitudes, and behaviors of love and marriage.

Inquiries were made of both grandparents and their grandchildren to provide a clearer view of the socializing interactions that may be occurring. The assumption is that most grandparents will report particular ways in which they socialize their grandchildren about love and marriage, and that the grandchildren will be able to recognize and report their grandparents’ socializing efforts. Congruency is not expected in all cases as perceptions of communication between GP-GC tend to differ (Holladay et al., 1998; Lin
et al., 2002). Instead, an examination of the shared socializing experiences is expected to reveal that, at some level, grandparents and their grandchildren mutually construct attitudes and beliefs surrounding love and marriage.

Another objective of this research is to uncover how values, beliefs, and communication practices relevant to love and marriage are being practiced within the context of relationships. Relationship characteristics such as GP-GC solidarity (i.e., emotional closeness), grandparents’ marital happiness, and grandparents’ relationship with the grandchild’s parents will be assessed as independent influences. The general purpose of this study, then, is to explore the specific socialization practices regarding love and marriage between grandparents and their grandchildren through explicit as well as implicit communication practices.

Preview of Chapters

In the following chapters, the study will be presented. In Chapter two, family will be defined to serve as the context within which the socialization process between grandparents and grandchildren is established. A review of the grandparenting literature that follows is not intended to be an exhaustive collection of GP-GC studies, but a refined examination of the way in which grandparents constitute relational interactions with their grandchildren. The concept of communication as an interpretive constitution will be established as the approach to the interaction between grandparents and grandchildren. This leads to some specific methods of socialization of grandchildren in the ways of loving and behaviors surrounding marriage resulting in research questions and hypotheses.
The third chapter presents the research methods that combine qualitative and quantitative approaches. Procedures are clarified and the instruments used to measure grandparents’ socialization practices, love attitudes, and marital dimensions from both grandchildren’s and grandparents’ perspectives are explained. Analyses and findings from a preliminary study are included in this chapter that provide insight into the messages that are communicated by grandparents to socialize their grandchildren. This chapter concludes with an account of the analyses performed for each research question and hypothesis.

Chapter four is a report of findings as discovered from analyses of the grandchildren’s and grandparents’ responses. Two approaches were taken with these analyses. First, the overall sample was divided into two groups of responses according to generations (i.e., grandchildren’s responses and grandparents’ responses). Analyses for each of these groups were conducted separately for the group and then comparisons were made between the two generational groups. Second, responses from a subset of the sample that included only those grandchildren who had a grandparent complete a questionnaire were analyzed. This matched set of grandchildren and their own grandparents provided the opportunity for analyses of direct similarities and differences. Finally, Chapter five concludes by discussing the relevant findings, discussing limitations, and suggesting future research within the GP-GC context.

In sum, grandparents generally desire to pass on their wisdom, values, and family culture to their grandchildren. The avenue through which this occurs is in the meanings that are mutually created in the thoughts and communication between grandparents and grandchildren. Research has shown that grandparents socialize their grandchildren in
family values, beliefs, and culture by expressing metaphors or proverbs, telling stories, and conversing. Given that grandparents socialize their grandchildren in family values such as honesty, sharing, ambitiousness, or fairness; grandparents may also, in particular ways, communicate their values about love and marriage to their grandchildren. Values of love and marriage such as supportiveness, friendship, trust-worthiness, or faithfulness may also be socialized by grandparents. The aim of this project is to investigate this uncharted area of grandchildren’s socialization.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The nuclear family is commonly thought of as a primary site of socialization for children, so socialization research has focused on parent-child interactions (e.g., Baumrind, 1980; Burleson et al., 1995; Eisenberg & McNally, 1993). However, the nuclear family is not the only site of socialization; grandparents also likely have a socializing role with their grandchildren (e.g., McWright, 2002; Norris, Kuiack, & Pratt, 2004; Pratt, Norris, Arnold, & Filyer, 1999). An investigation of the grandparenting literature reveals that five research problems have been the focus of study: (a) heterogeneity of grandparenting style, (b) quality of GP-GC communication, (c) presence of factors associated with the GP-GC relationship, (d) extent of GP-GC solidarity, and (e) GP-GC influences on attitudes and values. In some way, each of these five subjects informs the way in which socialization occurs between grandparents and their grandchildren.

The purpose of this review is to summarize relevant grandparenting literature and demonstrate that the socialization of grandchildren about ways of loving and marriage is an unexplored realm. Initially, family and grandparents will be conceptualized. Next, the grandparenting literature relevant to GP-GC socialization will be reviewed and the concept of socialization defined. An interpretive communication perspective will provide the scaffolding upon which the study is built. In particular, the discursive approach of
constructivism and sociocultural theory as well as social learning theory will form the framework for the study. The love and marriage research literatures will also be explored and the gap in the study of grandparental influence will be documented. Finally, a set of research questions and hypotheses will be presented. The review begins with a conception of what is meant by family and, more specifically, grandparent.

The Conceptualization of Family

Psychologists Wamboldt and Reiss (1991) have identified three approaches to conceptualizing family; structural, task-oriented, and transactional. Each of these approaches serves a particular purpose. A structural approach defines the family in terms of membership, such as the family of procreation (i.e., partners and children) or the family of origin (i.e., the extended family group of biological or socio-legal legitimacy by virtue of shared genetics, marriage, or adoption). The psychosocial task definition conceptualizes family according to the fulfillment of needs within a social unit, such as providing shelter or affection. Finally, the transactional process approach gives a broader classification of family to encompass the communicative practices that constitute a family identity. Given its focus on communication and interaction, the transactive approach will be used as a conceptual underpinning in the discussion of the socialization of grandchildren.

Transactive Family

According to Wamboldt and Reiss (1991), a transactive view of family is defined as “…a group of intimates who generate a sense of home and group identity, complete with strong ties of loyalty and emotion, and an experience of a history and a future” (p. 164). Transactive, in this definition, is not the linear communication model of reciprocal
sending and receiving of messages. Transactive, in this case, also is not in reference to the ecological model of individual development where the context and contact with variable within the family’s environment play a significant role (e.g., Sameroff & Fiese, 2000). Rather, these family scholars coined the term transactive for an interpersonal and interactive phenomenon where family identity is created through the situated interactions of those who consider themselves family members. Transactive family beliefs, values, and emotions come to be jointly constructed and recursively modified over time. In particular, this conception of family includes those individuals who consider themselves grandparents but may not necessarily have a biological connection to their grandchildren. Conversely, some grandparents, who are biologically related to grandchildren, may not place themselves in the grandparent role. For the purposes of this research, the transactive definition of family is taken up as a base for understanding how grandparents and grandchildren cooperatively create what it means to be family for them.

When families are described as “a group of intimates,” a sense of closeness comes to mind, including behaviors such as spending time together, confiding in one another, keeping confidences, and encouraging each other (Miller & Lefcourt, 1982). By providing the transactive viewpoint as a foundation, the intention is not to assume that all family members have high degrees of intimacy and closeness. In fact, some scholars have shown that dislike better characterizes some family relationships (Hess, 2003). However, whether close relationships or not, the interaction between family members over the years creates a sense of history, and the evaluation of these interactions may subsequently affect future relational decisions (Sroufe & Fleeson, 1988).
Over the years, scholars have posited that family members have affective, cognitive, and cultural connections. The emotional and cognitive atmosphere created by family can provide a social structure within which socialization and consequent identity development occurs (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). Anthropologist Margaret Mead (1970, 1974) proclaims in her writings that grandchildren who have an amicable relationship with their grandparents also acquire a cultural and historical sense of self. Kornhaber and Woodward (1981) have declared that grandchildren can find love, nurturance, and acceptance in the GP-GC relationship and that grandparents provide a natural social immunity that grandchildren cannot get elsewhere. Finally, Roberto and Stroes (1992) report that most grandparents desire to provide a legacy of values and traditions for younger generations.

Given the potential importance of grandparents in families, the next section reviews research surrounding GP-GC interactions. As will be seen, research on GP-GC interactions includes important issues that occur within this dyad; however, yet to be discovered is whether the attitudes, values, and beliefs surrounding love and marriage are socialized within GP-GC relationships.

Grandparent-Grandchild Research

Individuals are living longer so the chance of having a living grandparent is higher than in the past (Mares, 1995). Consequently, the study of GP-GC interactions becomes more important. Originally, research surrounding grandparents and their grandchildren was in response to social and historical changes and was conducted primarily within the traditions of anthropology, developmental psychology, and sociology. Some of the first grandparenting studies emerged during and following World
War II when the role of grandparents was studied in response to the increases in numbers of marriages, divorces, and births as well as mothers working outside the home (Teachman, Tedrow, & Crowder, 2001). This defining research uncovered the heterogeneity of grandparents’ roles in the family and stimulated additional questions about specific aspects of the GP-GC relationship. Types of solidarity, qualities of the GP-GC relationship, and grandparents’ influence on their grandchildren were a few of the areas about which researchers sought knowledge. Communication scholars, specifically, brought to the table three themes of communication and aging research: cognition, language, and relationships (Nussbaum, Hummert, Williams, & Harwood, 1996). The next section begins by synthesizing research on the role of grandparents in the family, how grandparents and grandchildren communicate, and the factors that shape the GP-GC relationship. Then research on the ways GP-GC solidarity is enacted and the reciprocal influences between grandparents and their grandchildren is summarized. Finally, a theoretical foundation to aid in understanding grandparents’ socialization of their grandchildren is provided.

*Heterogeneity of Grandparenting Styles*

Over 60 years ago, grandparent-focused research began when sociologist von Hentig (1946) recognized grandmothers as the *rescuers* of their children’s families who were touched with the economic and emotional devastation following World War II. Grandmothers from several cultures (i.e., African American, Native American, and European American) were given credit by von Hentig as functionally sustaining the nuclear family through difficult times. Increase in the number of divorces, in some circumstances, resulted in children and their mothers living with their grandparents.
These three-generational living arrangements were not generally the preference, as Albrecht’s (1954) research found that while some grandparents took pleasure in their interactions with their grandchildren, they distanced themselves from the discipline and responsibility of child-rearing.

Psychologists from this era described the grandparent’s role as the appropriate norms and behaviors which structure the grandparenting social system (Downs, 1989). For example, Neugarten and Weinstein (1964) interviewed 70 grandparent couples about the way they interacted with their pre-teen grandchildren and discovered five roles. *Formal* type grandparents were those who guarded their interactions with grandchildren so as not to extend their boundaries of discipline beyond grandparenting and into the parenting role. These formal grandparents rewarded and provided treats for their grandchildren. *Fun-seeker* grandparents avoided the authority role all together and only conducted pleasurable activities with their grandchildren. *Surrogate parent* type grandparents were those who provided full-time childcare and much of the parenting role, as both parents worked or had other extenuating circumstances. The fourth role type was the *reservoir of family wisdom*. This grandparent role (depending upon the culture but was usually the grandfather) served as the authoritative figure and power head who provided insightful instruction and bits of wisdom to the family. Finally, the *distant figure* grandparents were those who had very little contact with their grandchildren—perhaps seeing them only on holidays and very special events.

This multidimensional set of grandparenting roles as found by Neugarten and Weinstein (1964) spawned questions by other researchers about the possible difference between grandparents’ behaviors and grandparents’ ideas as to how they should behave.
with their grandchildren. Wood and Robertson (1976) interviewed grandparents about their expectations about grandparenting. They found that grandparents’ role expectations originate from two sources: meeting the needs of society and meeting the grandparents’ own personal needs. Younger grandparents were found to express greater concern in meeting society’s expectation for grandparents by encouraging their grandchildren to get a good education and to be a reliable employee. Older grandparents held more personal expectations in their role by expressing the importance of spending time with their grandchildren. Other researchers from family studies and psychology developed similar grandparent typologies (e.g., Kivnick, 1982; Kornhaber & Woodward, 1981; Troll, 1983).

Studies concerning grandparents’ roles up to this time contained small sample sizes with ethnicities or regional populations poorly represented. These limitations motivated Cherlin and Furstenberg (1985) to conduct a national study of grandparenting behaviors. In 1981, the Institute for Survey Research at Temple University interviewed parents of teen-aged children and requested the names of the grandparents for the purpose of further investigation of family interactions. Cherlin and Furstenberg (1985) contacted 510 of these grandparents and employed quantitative and qualitative measures to uncover their behavioral tendencies with their grandchildren. Significant among all the variables measured were frequency of contact with the grandchild, exchanging services with the grandchild (giving and receiving help), and “parent-like” influence on the grandchild (disciplining, advising of problems).

Combining these three grandparent variables resulted in three categories of grandparenting: detached, passive, and active. Twenty-six percent of the grandparents
interviewed were categorized as detached since they reported low activity in exchanging services and parent-like influence and had very little contact with their grandchildren (less than once or twice a month). Twenty-nine percent of grandparents were passive, as they were similar to detached but saw their grandchildren more than once or twice a month. Finally, 45 percent were active grandparents who reported high activity in both service and influence, regardless of how often they had contact with a target grandchild. Therefore, the active category was further distinguished into three types. Grandparents scoring high only on the exchange scale were called active-supportive (17% of grandparent sample); those scoring high only on parent-like influence were called active-authoritative (9%), and grandparents scoring high on both exchange and influence were called active-influential (19%; Cherlin & Furstenberg, 1985). Cherlin and Furstenberg (1986) recognized that these styles are just one way to explain and understand grandparenting; so, limiting grandparents to one particular style is not realistic. Rather, Cherlin and Furstenberg proposed that grandparenting carries with it a dynamic nature which is unique for each GP-GC relationship and evolves over the life-span of each GP-GC relationship (1986).

More recently, sociologists began questioning how current social factors relate to variations in grandparenting. For example, Mueller, Wilhelm, and Elder (2002) correlated Cherlin and Furstenberg’s (1985) grandparenting styles with sociological factors. They found that influential and supportive grandparents were more likely to have fewer grandchildren, have more education, live closer to the target grandchild, and be part of the farming community. In addition, Mueller et al. found that passive and detached grandparents did not live in close proximity, were usually paternal grandparents, lacked
the support of the parents of the grandchild, were not involved in farming, and had many grandchildren. Finally, authority-oriented grandparents were younger, were maternal, were employed full-time, and had a female grandchild. In other work, King and Elder (1998) found that less educated grandparents had more contact with their grandchildren and developed friendships with them, while more educated grandparents focused on discussing the grandchild’s future.

A global examination of grandparents from the United Kingdom, Germany, Spain, and Belgium confirmed the previous findings from the United States that there is not just one consistent role of grandparents (Attias-Donfut & Segalen, 2002; Gauthier, 2002). Gauthier (2002) proposed that contemporary grandparents have developed “open and fluid identities, which keep being rebuilt and redefined” (2002, p. 297). Ethnographers Sandel, Cho, Miller, and Wang (2005) found specific cultural distinctions when observing Taiwanese and Midwest United States grandmothers. Sixteen grandmothers from each culture were interviewed and consistently the Taiwanese grandmothers reported their role as caregivers, moral guides, advisors to mothers, and disciplinarians, while United States grandmothers saw themselves only as “fun-seekers.” The study of these distinctions between Western and Eastern cultures is growing among grandparenting researchers (e.g., Lin & Harwood, 2003; Yeh, Williams, & Maruyama, 1998).

Even though dozens of studies have examined grandparenting styles within varied contexts, this overview of grandparent typologies supports the supposition that grandparents are individuals with individuated relationships with their grandchildren. Communication scholars Williams and Nussbaum (2001) agree, concluding that
“grandparents play different roles at different times and their interaction with
grandchildren is likely to be fluid, reforming, and changing as individuals age and as
circumstances and needs change across the life span” (p. 172). Building on this line of
research, I believe that GP-GC relationships are uniquely co-constructed and not all
grandparents are capable of playing or desire to play a socializing role with their
grandchildren. Next, I review the way communication researchers have extended their
study of intergroup communication to the context of grandparenting.

**GP-GC Communication**

Knowledge of how grandparents communicate with their grandchildren has
partially evolved from studies of intergroup communication between older and younger
persons. *Communication accommodation* (Giles, Mulac, Bradac, & Johnson, 1987),
*communication predicament model of aging* (Ryan, Giles, Bartolucci, & Henwood,
1986), and the *age stereotypes in interaction model* (Hummert, 1994) are three theories
that have in early studies explained communication between older and younger persons
and later have been found useful in making distinctions in GP-GC interactions (e.g.,
Harwood, 2000b).

Communication accommodation theory (CAT; Giles et al., 1987) suggests that
persons adjust their communication in response to the perceived needs, competencies,
and expectations of interlocutors. For example, when in a conversation, persons
appropriately adjust their communication to fit the others’ needs (accommodate), alter
communication in excess of what is needed (overaccommodate), or fail to adjust
communication (underaccommodate). In the past 20 years, CAT has been used to study
communication within health facilities (Bethea & Balazs, 1997; Ryan, Hamilton, & See,
A few studies have studied CAT in relationship to grandparents and grandchildren. One prominent GP-GC dyadic study conducted by Harwood (2000b) found that the most consistent predictor of GP-GC closeness was perceived reciprocal levels of accommodation. Indicators of appropriate accommodation such as GP-GC compliments, showing attention and respect through conversations, and sharing personal thoughts and feelings with one another, were all associated with higher levels of GP-GC satisfaction, liking, and emotional closeness. These expressions of closeness were also positively predicted by the topics that the grandparents talked about (e.g., interesting stories and information about history and family; Harwood, 2000b; also see Lin & Harwood, 2003).

Conversations between older and younger persons may be perceived as unsatisfactory if negative stereotypes of older persons are held by younger persons. A conception of this misunderstanding was developed by Ryan et al. (1986) and called the communication predicament model of aging (CPA). This model suggests that when younger adults label older adults (as a group) as cognitively deficient or suffering certain sensory deficits, overaccommodation may occur in conversations even when the older person is competent. Hummert, Nussbaum, and Wiemann (1992) further suggested that the physical appearance of older persons such as facial features, gray hair, or styles of dress may lead younger adults to categorize older adults into a stereotypical group. As a consequence of this categorization, Ryan, Hummert, and Boich (1995) found that conversations between older and younger persons resulted in young adults increasing the
The CPA model has been useful in examining age-stereotypical communication between groups. Intergroup communication research has applied the CPA model primarily to groups within health (Ryan, Anas, & Friedman, 2006; Ryan & Butler, 1996), educational (Pandey & Garnett, 2006), and community (Melton & Shadden, 2005) settings. Only about 10 studies using CPA have focused on the intergroup relationship between grandparents and their grandchildren. Harwood (2000a) challenged the use of the predicament model for grandparents and their grandchildren as age differences may not be as salient for these groups. In fact, Pecchioni and Croghan (2002) found that closer GP-GC relationships were associated with more positive stereotyping than GP-GC relationships that are less close. In addition, Soliz and Harwood (2003) found that as grandchildren’s perceptions of communication with their grandparents became more diverse, grandchildren held a more complex view of older adults in general. Finally, Soliz and Harwood (2006) found that grandchildren reported greater shared family identity when they felt that their grandparents communicated more personally rather than intergroup type communication such as over- or under-accommodation.

Stereotypes and intergenerational communication was advanced by Hummert (1994) when the age stereotypes in interaction model (ASI) was developed to account for specific appearance characteristics of the communicators, the context of the communication, and the influence of positive as well as negative stereotyping in the
interaction. Hummert’s model prompted a line of research comprised of mostly intergenerational rather than GP-GC communication (for a review see Hummert, Garstka, Ryan, & Bonnesen, 2004). For example, Hummert, Garstka, and Shaner (1997) found that facial expressions moderated the strength of the association between the perceived age of the older person and negative stereotypes. When an older person smiled during intergenerational communication, negative stereotyping was reduced; however, a neutral facial expression increased negative stereotyping. In another study, Hummert, Shaner, Garstka, and Henry (1998) placed young adults in hypothetical situations of communicating with older persons within a community setting or within a hospital setting. This study found that negative stereotypes interacted with the context, resulting in young adults using more patronizing speech within the hospital setting. Even when a positive stereotype of an older person was presented in a hospital setting, young adults chose to be overly nurturing.

Most recently both CPA and ASI were tested within the context of the GP-GC relationship. Anderson, Harwood, and Hummert (2005) asked young adults to assess their communication with both their grandparents and with older adult acquaintances. Stereotypes played a mediating role in intergenerational communication as positive stereotypes were associated with reciprocal self-disclosure and relational factors such as closeness and quality of contact.

In sum, CAT, CPA, and ASI have provided frameworks for understanding how intergenerational communication may be affected by the stereotyping of older persons, the communicative context, and the physical characteristics of older persons. Young
adults may either patronize older adults by overaccommodating or neglect older adults by underaccommodating. In either case, older adults are less satisfied with the exchange and feel less competent, resulting in lower self-esteem.

Over the years, sociologists have also examined the GP-GC relationship to tease out those factors which appear to be associated with levels of closeness in the relationship. The next section reviews the findings from these studies.

*Factors Associated with the GP-GC Relationship*

Soon after variations in grandparenting were recognized, researchers turned their attention to what occurs within the GP-GC relationship. Not all GP-GC relationships are positive and a positivity bias in research may exist. Still, many grandparents and grandchildren do have relationships that result in positive reactions. For example, Kivnick (1985) has found that close GP-GC relationships benefit grandparents with enhanced mental health and increased interpersonal engagement. Other researchers have shown grandparental influence to be perceived negatively (e.g., Tinsley & Parke, 1984; Tomlin, 1998). Progressing from simple demographic issues to more complex relational issues, many factors play a role in how GP-GC relationships ensue (McKay & Caverly, 2004).

The grandparents’ relationship with the parents of their grandchildren is particularly important through the childhood years of the grandchild. Kennedy (1992) found that young adult grandchildren reported closer GP-GC relationships when, as children, their parents encouraged contact with grandparents and allowed GP-GC alone time. The first-born grandchild or only-grandchild reported the highest levels of closeness. Whitbeck, Hoyt, and Huck (1993) found that when strained relationships
between parents and grandparents occurred when the grandchild was young, the GP-GC relationship tended to remain negative as the grandchild grew up. Holladay et al. (1997) noticed that parents were reported as mediators of the opportunities for granddaughters and grandmothers to bond. Opportunities to visit their grandmothers alone and the parents’ supportive communication toward the grandmother were positively associated with GP-GC closeness. More recently, sociologists Mueller and Elder (2003) have argued that the GP-GC relationship should be investigated from a holistic perspective (i.e., consider all three generations). In their study, Mueller and Elder found the grandparent-parent relationship influenced both the quality of the GP-GC relationship and the way the grandparent reported the style of grandparenting associated with each grandchild.

Parental mediation of the GP-GC relationship is particularly noticeable when parents divorce. When divorce occurs, parents may make a greater effort to sustain the GP-GC relationship. For example, Kennedy and Kennedy (1993) found that grandchildren who were from blended families reported being closer to and more influenced by their grandparents than those from intact or single-parent families. Schutter and Scherman (1997) found that children of divorce and their grandparents reported that a positive grandparent-parent relationship was important for GP-GC emotional bonding. From in-depth interviews with just grandfathers, Roberto, Allen, and Blieszner (2001) found that the GP-GC relationship was continually reshaped through the life course and, in particular, the GP-GC relationship became stronger when challenges occurred such as divorce. From the parents’ perspective, Lussier, Deater-Deckard, Dunn, and Davies (2002) found that divorced parents reported that grandparents served as a source of support and socializing influence for grandchildren. When grandparents divorce, there is
a different reaction. King (2003) found that increased geographic distance between divorced grandparents and their grandchildren often resulted in weaker GP-GC bonds. These effects were lessened when parents made efforts to compensate for the effects of the separation from the divorced grandparents.

“Matrifocal” tilt also appears to be a moderating factor in the quality of GP-GC relationships. Hagestad (1985) defines a matrifocal tilt as the tendency for grandchildren to have closer relationships with their mother’s mother. For example, Creasey and Kaliher (1994) found that preteen grandchildren reported their closest relationships with their maternal grandmother, while paternal grandfathers were perceived as least supportive. Harwood (2000b) studied young adults and one of their grandparents, and found that maternal grandparents were reported to be emotionally closer than paternal grandparents. In a recent book chapter, Smith and Drew (2002) assessed GP-GC research and affirmed that maternal grandparents continue to be perceived to be closer to grandchildren than paternal grandparents. A couple exceptions to the matrifocal tilt can be found in the literature. For example, Roberto and Stroes (1992) found no difference between maternal or paternal closeness but grandmothers were found to be more influential in the development of their grandchildren’s values. More recently, King, Silverstein, Elder, Bengtson, and Conger (2003) found stronger GP-GC relationships with paternal grandparents in rural farm families as compared to urban families. With paternal grandparents in close proximity and frequent contact with their grandchildren, closeness followed.

Female family members are at times referred to as kinkeepers, defined as those who facilitate communication and exchanges between generations (Troll, Bengtson, &
McFarlan, 1979). The female kinkeeper role of organizing family gatherings, remembering and getting gifts for birthdays, and orchestrating holiday celebrations has appeared in some grandparent studies (e.g., Harwood, 2000b; Mills, Wakeman, & Fea, 2001). Even in the topics of talk, grandparent sex differences are found (e.g., Nussbaum & Bettini, 1994; Roberto & Stroes, 1992). Hagestad (1985) studied GP-GC relationships and found that grandfathers primarily discussed instrumental matters such as employment and finances with their grandchildren while grandmothers concentrated on more relational matters. In addition, Dubas (2001) found that same sex GP-GC relationships (e.g., grandfathers and grandsons) were reported to be closer and more important than opposite sex GP-GC relationships.

Kornhaber and Woodward (1981) have suggested that grandparents are in a position to offer grandchildren a form of unconditional love that parents, because of responsibilities, may be unable to offer. Even though the grandparent-parent relationship, divorce, and grandparent’s sex may affect the quality of GP-GC relationship, we know that family is a site where young adults and grandparents have the opportunity to develop relationships and communicate (Williams & Giles, 1996). Next, the question of how families and GP-GC relationships create and maintain intergenerational cohesion will be addressed from the literature.

**GP-GC Solidarity**

With modern social trends of smaller families, geographic mobility, and dual-career couples, researchers have began to explore levels of intergenerational cohesion, or solidarity, in families. In an early study, family studies scholar Kivett (1985) found that grandchildren who live in close proximity to their grandfathers tend to help with issues
like grandfathers’ health and economic needs. Recognizing that proximity is only one of many ways that solidarity is maintained, Bengtson and Roberts (1991) conceptualized a model of intergenerational solidarity as a multifaceted construct of family connectedness possessing six interdependent dimensions of interaction: structural, normative, functional, associational, affectual, and consensual. Structural solidarity is the family connection that is enhanced or reduced by factors like residential propinquity, marital status, age, sex, and health. Normative solidarity is defined as commitment to family roles and obligations leading to filial responsibility for older generations. Functional solidarity is the degree of helping other family members and the reciprocal exchange of resources such as financial, physical, or emotional assistance. Associational solidarity is gauged by the frequency of any type of intergenerational contact and commonly shared activities such as recreation or special occasions. Affectual solidarity, simply stated, is emotional closeness for family members and their reciprocal sentiments. Finally, consensual solidarity is the degree of agreement on values, attitudes, and beliefs among family members.

Bengtson and Roberts’ (1991) work continues to provide a conception of key dimensions of intergenerational solidarity. In the following subsections the six dimensions of solidarity are described and illustrated.

Structural, normative, functional, and associational solidarities. One assessment of structural solidarity is the geographic distance between grandparents and their grandchildren. As families progress through the life-course, intergenerational members may grow to be more independent of each other. Young adult children usually make a move away from their nuclear family to establish their own residence or gain an
education, and the farther the distance between the GP-GC homes, the less face-to-face and telephone contact (Harwood, 2000a). In fact, sociologists Lawton, Silverstein, and Bengtson (1994) discovered that grandchildren with higher levels of education were likely to move farther away from their grandparents. Many adult grandchildren live within only an hour of their grandparents (Kennedy, 1992a; Lawton et al., 1994) and grandparents who live in close proximity to their grandchildren commonly report a close emotional relationship with those grandchildren (Roberto et al., 2001). However, these findings do not necessarily mean that grandparents and grandchildren who geographically live at a distance cannot be close. In a study where young adult grandchildren were asked about their “closest” grandparents, Boon and Brussoni (1996) found that proximity did not make a difference in the distinction of who ranked as closest grandparent.

One problem with this line of research is the lack of knowledge as to whether a difference in emotional closeness depends on whether the grandparents ever lived in close proximity to the grandchild. Holladay et al. (1998) found that young adult granddaughters portrayed a change in proximity as a “turning point” in their relationship with their maternal grandmother. Greater emotional closeness was reported when granddaughters’ families moved geographically closer to their grandmothers and closeness diminished when families moved farther away. In addition, the transition to college was associated with less closeness, which may be due to greater geographic distance or may be due to increased academic responsibilities and collegiate activities (Holladay et al., 1998).

Family solidarity can also be strengthened when family members fulfill their filial responsibility of looking out for each other. One of the strongest examples of filial
responsibility is when grandparents take the role of caregiver and disciplinarian when parents are no longer able to do so. For centuries this phenomenon (sometimes called “surrogate parenting”) has existed when parents were ill or died, but more recently has gained attention as increased divorce, drug and alcohol abuse, and single-parenthood have elevated grandparent involvement. Grandfamilies are formed when biological parents can no longer care for their children and the grandparent assumes full responsibility (Edwards, 2003). Laws have been developed to establish the legal status of grandparents in these situations (Hill, 2001). According to the United States Census (2000), of the 5.8 million co-resident grandparents, 2.4 million reported being the primary caregiver to their grandchildren.

Over the past ten years, nearly sixty studies have directly examined the issues that occur when grandparents raise their grandchildren and have found both positive and negative effects. For example, Jendrek (1993) interviewed grandparents who were serving as surrogate parents to their grandchildren and found that these grandparents altered their routines and plans, felt more edgy, physically tired, and emotionally drained, lacked privacy and alone time, and had strained schedules and did fewer activities just for fun or recreation. However, more than half of these grandparents also reported having a renewed purpose for living. Goodman and Silverstein (2001) discovered that when grandparents were asked to take sole responsibility for the grandchild, a close relationship among the three generations (i.e., grandparents, parents, and grandchildren) was important to grandparents’ satisfaction. In addition, Hayslip and Kaminski (2005) recently reviewed the literature on grandparents raising their grandchildren and, overall, confirmed Jendrek’s findings. They cited 27 studies that pointed to negative affects that
custodial grandparents endure, such as poorer physical and mental health (i.e., major illnesses such as diabetes, hypertension, or depression), restricted activity, or giving up employment to raise the grandchild. Only four studies illustrated the benefits of being a caregiver grandparent, such as a close relationship with the custodial grandchild, the satisfaction of having a “second chance” at parenting, and the opportunity to edify the family’s identity.

Harwood (2000a) found that geographical distance plays a role in how grandparents and young adult grandchildren help each other. When young people move away from grandparents in pursuit of employment or college, many grandparents play a role in providing advice and emotional support. Grandparents are perceived as helpful and supportive if their grandchildren are experiencing particular difficulties (e.g., struggles with school work; Roberto et al., 2001). On the other hand, as the grandparent ages the picture may change so that the grandchildren may find themselves in the helper role. In fact, Langer (1990) found that older Jewish grandparents indicated that their adult grandchildren helped with household chores, transportation, and shopping, and also stayed in contact by phoning, sending cards, or visiting.

In addition to proximity, filial responsibility, and helping, GP-GC solidarity is also evaluated by the frequency of contact and activities that grandparents and grandchildren do together. The majority of contact between young and older adult family members occurs when contact is considered more satisfying than intergenerational contact with outside family members (Williams & Giles, 1996). However, GP-GC contact appears to vary over the life course as life’s activities engage each generation. For example, psychologists Silverstein and Long (1998) examined longitudinal data and
found that GP-GC contact declined over the years, suggesting that increases in relative wealth, earlier retirement, and better health among more contemporary grandparents may be redirecting their activities. Spence, Black, Adams, and Crowther (2001) found that 60% of grandparents reported frequent contact with their grandchildren and offered assistance by giving advice, preparing meals, and providing babysitting, as long as none of these activities interrupted their own regular activities. On the other hand, Harwood and Lin (2000) found that both grandparents and grandchildren reported that they have less contact with the other than they would like, but that grandparents placed greater emphasis on the GP-GC relationship than did grandchildren. In a study of Taiwanese grandparents and grandchildren, Lin and Harwood (2003) found that more frequent contact between the GP-GC was associated with greater relational closeness.

To maintain a quality relationship, Harwood (2000a) found that grandparents and their young adult grandchildren did not require daily contact but rather communicated at least a few times a month. The three favored means of GP-GC communication were face-to-face, telephone, and written (letters, cards, or email). Even though face-to-face contact was college students’ preference, telephone communication was their primary means of contact. As grandparents become more technologically savvy, the numerous means for communicating through email, instant messaging, cell phones, and computer video cams will require future research on GP-GC relationships to see how new media will affect relationship maintenance (Harwood, 2000a).

As grandparents and grandchildren spend time together by helping each other or staying in contact, it follows that they are also doing things together (i.e., shared activities). Empirical research confirms that shared activities are often reported as a
means to remain close. For example, Kennedy (1992b) focused specifically on shared activities and found that the most characteristic shared GP-GC activity was being together with other family members at holidays, reunions, and family events. However, one-on-one time between grandparents and their grandchildren was evident as important to young adults as well. Staying overnight at the grandparent’s home, watching TV together, talking about each other’s daily activities, or just being together were reported as most characteristic. Later, sociologists Silverstein and Marenco (2001) examined sociodemographic variations across the life course on how grandparents and grandchildren engaged in joint activities such as fun and recreational activities, religious events/services, and family gatherings. Across the board, grandmothers were reported as participating in more of these activities than grandfathers. Younger grandparents shared more active time with their grandchildren in fun and recreation activities than older grandparents. Increased income of the grandparent allowed for more recreational and family events with the grandchild. Finally, the level of closeness between grandparents and the parents was found to be related to the number of GP-GC shared activities (Silverstein & Marenco, 2001).

In sum, grandparents and grandchildren who lived geographically closer, had frequent contact, and shared activities generally reported greater cohesion or solidarity in their relationships. Affectual and consensus solidarity are the two remaining types of solidarity to be reviewed.

_Affectual and consensus solidarity._ In the GP-GC literature, affectual solidarity (i.e., emotional closeness) and consensus solidarity (i.e., similarity of values) are often studied together. Past research has shown that most young adults report that they feel at
least moderately close to one (or more) of their grandparents (Hodgson, 1992; Hoffman, 1979-80; Kennedy, 1992a, 1992b).

Emotional closeness between grandparents and their grandchildren, more than any other type of solidarity, has been a focus in GP-GC studies. In the past several decades, an estimated 60 grandparent studies have examined emotional closeness. Many studies have looked at closeness as an outcome variable of GP-GC cohesiveness finding that grandparents report a greater degree of closeness in the GP-GC relationship than grandchildren, grandchildren report their closest relationships with maternal grandmothers, African American grandchildren report greater closeness with grandparents than Whites, and grandparent’s influence in grandchild childhood results in more closeness as adults (for reviews see Lawton et al., 1994; Silverstein, Giarrusso, & Bengtson, 1998). In addition, grandparent studies have focused on GP-GC closeness as an independent variable to examine qualities such as similar values and amount of GP-GC contact (e.g., Boon & Brussoni, 1996, 1998; Mueller & Elder, 2003).

Over the life course, the intensity or reported level of closeness varies in the GP-GC relationship. In a 23-year longitudinal investigation, Silverstein and Long (1998) found that grandparents reported high levels of GP-GC closeness during the childhood of the grandchild, which waned during the teen years, and then rebounded to higher levels of closeness during the grandchild’s adulthood. Holladay et al. (1997; 1998) interviewed young adult females about their maternal grandmothers and found “turning points” in GP-GC levels of closeness. One of the strongest positive predictors of perceived closeness with her grandmother was the granddaughter’s increased one-on-one time. Exclusive shared activities such as vacationing or extended holidays together were also
considered as positive turning points in the GP-GC relationship. Granddaughters felt that the support they offered to their grandmother at the time of the death or serious illness of someone important to the grandmother was also a significant positive turning point in their relationship. Negative turning points that resulted in decreased GP-GC closeness occurred when parents intervened with comments about how the grandmother was wrong in her actions or when the parents’ attempted to influence the granddaughter’s conversation or activities with the grandmother. In addition, negative turning points in the GP-GC relationship were reported when the grandmother instigated family disagreements, the grandmother made judgmental comments toward the granddaughter, or when the grandmother interfered in nuclear family situations.

Boon and Brussoni (1996) found that young adults reported that their “closest” grandparents were more influential in their lives and joined them in many more activities than grandparents who were “not close.” In addition, when a grandparent appeared to appreciate the time spent with his/her grandchild, the grandchild felt closer to that grandparent which resulted in seeing the close grandparent more often, and speaking on the phone with him/her more frequently. Later, Brussoni and Boon (1998) found that grandchildren perceived their close grandparents to be more influential in their lives such as in establishing family ideals, moral beliefs, and even sexual beliefs. About one-fifth of the grandchildren from this study reported that they talked to their closest grandparent either face-to-face or on the phone about their personal issues.

Sorting out the amount of contact, closeness, help, and similarity between grandparents and grandchildren, Lawton et al. (1994) found two factors that were positive predictors of both affectual and consensual solidarity: grandparents’ influence during the
grandchildren’s childhood, and race. First, when grandparents were influential during their grandchildren’s childhood, they continued to stay in contact as adults. And second, a higher percentage of African American responders, as compared to all other races, indicated feeling very close and similar to their family. About half of all the grandchildren indicated on a single-item query that they held similar values and opinions as their grandparents (Lawton et al., 1994).

Studying affectual and consensus together, family studies scholars Mills et al. (2001) asked young adults about their solidarity with each of their four grandparents (i.e., maternal grandmother, maternal grandfather, paternal grandmother, and paternal grandfather). Affectual solidarity was evaluated with multiple-item scales on closeness, quality of communication, amount of exchange of ideas, reciprocal understanding, and getting along with each of their grandparents. Consensus was evaluated with a single-item inquiry of the young adults’ perceived levels of similarity of values with each grandparent. Overall, maternal grandmothers were consistently viewed as being closer and more similar in values than the other three grandparents. Mills et al. found that two factors predicted greater closeness to maternal grandmothers: living biological parents of the young adult grandchildren and grandchildren still residing at home. Greater similarity of values with the maternal grandmother was found to be predicted by three situations: (a) young adults who were married, (b) unmarried young adults living at home, and (c) young adults who had living parents. Less similarity occurred when parents were divorced. Since only the grandchildren were asked to evaluate GP-GC solidarity in this study, the grandparent perspective was left unexamined.
Sociologists Giarrusso, Feng, Silverstein, and Bengtson (2001) used the same measure for affectual and consensus solidarity as Mills et al. (2001) but with GP-GC dyads and a cross-ethnic comparison of Euro-Americans and Mexican Americans. For Euro-Americans, grandparents reported higher ratings of affection for and consensus with their adult grandchildren than the grandchildren reported toward their grandparents. This was not the case with Mexican American dyads, for Mexican American grandsons reported greater affection for their grandfathers than the grandfathers reported toward them. Overall, however, Giarrusso et al. found that when grandchildren reported greater similarity in values to their grandparents, there was also greater similarity in the reported levels of affection by grandchildren and grandparents toward each other.

In sum, we know that GP-GC emotional closeness potentially varies over the life course, at times being closer than at other times. But when grandparents and grandchildren are close; they are communicatively accommodative to each other, appear to have similar values, and grandchildren report that their grandparents influence their values. While researchers recognize that ideally generations reciprocally influence one another, only a few studies have examined how grandparents influence their grandchildren. Next, the existing literature of what is known about grandparents’ influence on their grandchildren will be reviewed.

**GP-GC Influence of Attitudes, Values, and Beliefs**

Downs (1989) suggested that family is the communicative site where grandparents often serve as the family’s historians, mentors, and role models of values for grandchildren. Speculations have been made that direct, indirect, and symbolic influence all exist in GP-GC relationships. Commonly, GP-GC influence is studied in a
linear fashion by examining the transmission of generational influence from older
generations to younger even though the possibility of reciprocal influences has been
noted (Tomlin, 1998).

Tinsley and Parke (1984) have posited that research focusing beyond the nuclear
family to relationships like the GP-GC dyad would uncover grandparents as influential
and socializing agents. They viewed grandparents’ influence as both direct and indirect.
Direct grandparenting is the result of face-to-face encounters or mediated interaction
between grandparents and their grandchildren. Indirect grandparenting was defined as the
grandparent’s influence on a mediating family member, such as the one of the parents,
who in turn influences the grandchild. These influences are also considered to be
bidirectional (i.e., grandchildren also influence their grandparents). Denham and Smith
(1989) have suggested that the study of grandparents should also extend beyond direct
and indirect influences to include the grandparent’s symbolic influence by their living
presence in the family. The next section summarizes work on each of these influences.

*Indirect influences.* Very little direct GP-GC influence was studied in early
grandparenting studies, but indirect influences were studied such as grandparents
transmitting values to parents who in turn transmitted values to their children.
Recognizing the limited social scientific literature on grandparents, Cherlin and
Furstenberg (1986) conducted telephone interviews with 510 grandparents of families
from an existing parent-child survey. The teenaged grandchildren and their parents had
provided responses to inquiries regarding their attitudes about traditional and
contemporary family issues regarding marriage, marital roles, and divorce. Cherlin and
Furstenberg asked the grandparents the same set of questions that the parents and teens
were asked. Some associations were found between grandparents’ and grandchildren’s traditional and contemporary family values, however when parental influence was controlled for, GP-GC similarities diminished. Generally, Cherlin and Furstenberg found that if parents and grandparents had dissimilar values, then the grandchildren also had dissimilar values from their grandparents.

Cherlin and Furstenberg’s (1986) study revealed the significance of the parents’ role as socializers of marital values. Even though the extent of GP-GC similarity of values was not substantial, GP-GC values overlapped more than would be the case if they were not in the same family. From these findings, Cherlin and Furstenberg argued that grandparents create a sense of family continuity, at least symbolically, if not behaviorally. These researchers were among the first to examine GP-GC influences, which stimulated further interest in studies on the topic.

One way to study grandparents’ socialization of family identity and values is through parents’ stories told to their children about their own childhood experiences and the reactions of their parents (children’s grandparents). Fiese and Bickham (2004) asked parents of four-year olds to tell their children stories about when they were growing up with their own parents. Three themes were revealed in the stories; being close to others through family relationships and routines, being successful in work, and being independent which at times resulted in getting into trouble. Fiese and Bickham concluded that parents’ telling of these stories to their children likely socialized their children about life choices.

Grandchildren are inclined to be socialized through their parents, and parents often socialize in similar ways as their own parents (the grandparents) socialized them.
Potentially, aunts, uncles, or even family friends may also share stories about grandparents with grandchildren, resulting in the grandparents’ indirect socializing influence. However, not only indirect, but also direct interactions with grandparents may socialize the attitudes, beliefs, and values of grandchildren.

Direct influences. Hagestad (1985) suggested that “the creation of family continuity is a process of socialization” through the intergenerational transmission of values; but Hagestad claims that this transmission is not unilateral but an ongoing reciprocal process (p. 38). From interviews with three generations of 148 families, Hagestad found that grandparents reported their attempts to influence their grandchildren usually included two areas: (a) instrumental matters, such as getting an education, finding a job, or appropriate use of money; and (b) relational matters. These families also recounted that one way that grandparents and grandchildren maintained a positive relationship was by avoiding controversial topics in their conversations. To avoid conflict, sensitive topics were averted such as sexual behaviors, race relationships, and other sociocultural issues that have changed over the years.

From a young adult grandchild’s perspective, recalled experiences with grandparents can be important to a young adult’s process of developing values. Roberto and Stroes (1992) surveyed college students who reported that their grandparents made an impression on their beliefs about religion, sex, politics, education, and morals as well as family ideals, work ethics, and personal identity. Grandmothers were generally perceived as providing greater influence than grandfathers except in the areas of work ethics and political beliefs. Roberto and Stroes used a single-item to measure degree of influence for each of the values. Franks, Hughes, Phelps, and Williams (1993)
interviewed college students about the kind of influence grandparents had in their lives. Most grandparents were considered a positive influence on the grandchildren’s values, goals, and life choices. Young adults reported receiving a sense of intergenerational continuity with a greater understanding of self, family history, tradition, and roots.

Sharing stories with grandchildren is one way for grandparents to sustain their family culture. Through interviews with more than 100 grandparents, McKay (1993) found that most grandparents spoke of the wisdom they have gained over the years and that they feel it essential to share insights about their lives with their grandchildren. Overall, grandparents reported that they attain a sense of purpose of their own life by sharing their memories, life experiences, and advice with their grandchildren. In addition, grandparents conveyed their desire to create memorable moments with their grandchildren and give continuity of family values to their family members (McKay, 1993).

Conversations may be one avenue that grandparents and their grandchildren use to share their values and attitudes with one another. Nussbaum and Bettini (1994) asked college students to tape-record a conversation with a grandparent about the meaning of life. They found that grandparents’ stories were inclined to reflect how life was when they were growing up and the relationships that they had with family and friends. Grandfathers talked about their current health issues, events from their youth (e.g., wartime experiences), and instrumental issues such as jobs and finances. Grandmothers talked at least twice as long as the grandfathers (grandfathers tended to be reticent) and their stories were usually about family relationships such as how they met their spouse,
how their family developed, and stories about the lives of their parents and grandparents (Nussbaum & Bettini, 1994).

Grandparents may also mentor their grandchildren by sharing metaphors or proverbs which may help shape the grandchildren’s attitude toward life. For example, McWright (2002) found that African American mothers reported that their parents contributed to the socialization of their grandchildren’s values through proverbs that the grandparents shared with their family. In general, the proverbs were perceived as depicting family connectedness (e.g., “Blood is thicker than water”), spirituality (e.g., The darkest hour is just before the dawn”), and a positive racial attitude (e.g., “The blacker the berry, the sweeter the juice; p. 35). Similarly, when grandparents and grandchildren were asked to write a story, poem, or letter to each other, Ryan, Pearce, Anas, and Norris (2004) found that grandparents wrote stories about their past or metaphors about life, while grandchildren described their appreciation of their grandparents. Grandparents’ writings appeared to sort out into several themes including history, advice, and their own life story. Historical events such as the war, the depression, or how modern conveniences had changed from their childhood gave the grandparents the opportunity to situate themselves historically. Grandparents appeared to relate to the younger generation’s challenges and perhaps viewed these challenges as a form of “common ground” between them. Advice was offered in the form of metaphors such as “life is like learning alpine skiing…develop your technique to surmount life’s problems” (p. 383). Finally, grandparents shared their own life story which often concluded with a synopsis of what can be learned from life’s experiences such as the importance of honesty and hard work.
As these studies have shown, similarity of family values and beliefs and grandparents’ influence has been investigated to a limited degree both indirectly and directly. Indirectly, parents or other family members can pass on stories about grandparents that may influence the values held by their grandchildren. Tomlin (1998) concludes that grandparents directly influence their grandchildren by passing on family stories, bringing about continuity between generations, sharing salient values, and giving advice in hopes of influencing their grandchildren’s future. Intermittently throughout these studies, grandparents and grandchildren have commented on the influences by grandparents regarding sexual beliefs, marriage, and family. Lacking in these studies of influence is a specific focus on the ways grandparents teach about love or marriage. To understand the mutual shared meaning that occurs between grandparents and their grandchildren when they communicate, further probing is necessary and important. Hence before proceeding to the rationale, relevant theoretical ideas on socialization and communication will be reviewed, and will provide a scaffold upon which the specific study of how grandparents and grandchildren make sense of what it means to love and marry.

Theoretical Foundation for Socialization and Communication

Grandparents and grandchildren report that they have similar values, and that grandparents believe that they are influential in their grandchildren’s lives. But the question remains unanswered as to what grandparents and grandchildren talk about and how socialization takes place between them. In this section, socialization will be defined from a communicative perspective. Next, three theories will be reviewed that can explain GP-GC interactions and their socialization effects. Constructivism provides a conception
of communication with a lens to reveal how social interactions are coordinated through shared interpretive schemes, situated within culture, and given a sense of meaning (Delia, O'Keefe, & O'Keefe, 1982). Next, *sociocultural theory* explains how culture is instrumental in the socialization process and how social activities between generations perpetuate the ongoing beliefs, values, and attitudes of family. Finally, *social cognitive theory* focuses on behaviors learned through observations of their environment.

**Socialization Defined**

Berger and Luckmann (1966) defined socialization as the occurrence where individuals are socialized within an objective environment called society. Three functions that Berger and Luckmann contend as essential for the socialization process are *externalization, objectivation*, and *internalization*. Socialization occurs in temporal sequence that begins with observing others and participating in activities that constructs a social world, and this ongoing practice is called externalization. When the socially constructed world can be viewed objectively and as an institution outside the individual, then objectivation occurs. Externalization and objectivation continually interact and adjust to one another and when the individual is able to consciously evaluate that process, internalization transpires and socialization takes place.

Baldwin (1992) proposes that combinations of cognitive and behavioral processes are involved in socializing young adults about the beliefs, values, and skills to fit into society. He argues that young adults’ development cannot be separated from the socialization process. Similarly, Grusec (2002) contends that young adults can acquire their culture’s standards and values by self-regulating their emotions, thinking, and behavior in accordance with their social group. O'Keefe and Delia (1985) also recognize
an individual’s social group as socializing agents within which he or she comes to
differentiate his or her constructs about the way to interact in the world. This interpretive
approach acknowledges that individuals within a social group come to a “sense” of
understanding each other through a reciprocal coordination of perspectives (Grossberg,
1982). Family may be considered a “community” where its members share the same
system or network of beliefs, practices, conventions, values, skills, and know-how.
Grandparents and grandchildren may coordinate their understanding of ideas and beliefs
through their conversations and/or their perceived experiences with one another.

Gaskins, Miller, and Corsaro (1992) have argued that socialization is both a
collective and individual process. Socialization is a collective and negotiated process
which is situated within the social structure of the family and culture. This collective
meaning-making process of culture is initiated by previous generations and made
available to children through parents, grandparents, caregivers, peers, school, and so
forth. Socialization is also an individual process as the child chooses to accept or reject
the values or beliefs of previous generations and personal meaning-making takes place.
Therefore, grandparents, parents, and grandchildren are all active contributors to the ideas
about how to act in a social world. As ideas, beliefs, and values are internalized, all three
generations have a part in the production and reproduction of the family’s culture.

Miller (1996) defines socialization as “the process of orienting oneself within
systems of meaning” (p. 183). At their stage of psychological development of intimacy,
young adults are generally motivated to learn more about how to love others and how to
have a committed relationship (Erikson, 1968). Young adult grandchildren who are
emotionally involved with their grandparents may personalize their own family culture
by paying attention to any “clues” from their grandparents that might help them to understand their own experiences with love (p. 196). In her work on personal storytelling, Miller (1996) suggests that “this process of personalization lies at the heart of socialization—this is how persons and cultures create each other” (p. 196). As experiences are interpreted, they are re-contextualized within the individual’s systems of meaning. For example, when young adults talk to grandparents about how to love or how to act in a committed relationship, young adults apply the understanding of that behavioral value to their own context. Communication plays a key role in the process of socialization as shared values, beliefs, and attitudes from both perspectives of young adults and grandparents is important.

Constructivist Communication Theory

Conception of Communication

From a reflective stance, Delia, O’Keefe, and O’Keefe’s (1982) conception of communication provides a guide for the examination of how grandparents and grandchildren come to share interpretive schemes about love or marriage. These authors contend that communication is a “situated activity…a process in which persons coordinate their behavior through the application of shared interpretive schemes…a process of implicit negotiation in which strategic choices reflect the emerging consensus about the reality that participants share” (p. 159). O’Keefe and Delia (1985) proposed communication as the means to make individual cognitive processes “public and intersubjective” (p. 41). As communication takes place, meaning is constituted through talk. O’Keefe and Delia (1982) posited that coordination of perspectives and alignment of meaning produce more listener-adapted messages. Depending upon the context within
which the communication occurs, messages have purpose in the course of situated activities. From a constructivist’s perspective, Delia et al. (1982) argued that people tend to cognitively organize their experiences in order to make sense of the world. Sharing constructs or schemes about how to view the world are made possible when common ground is established within the social group.

*Communication Processes*

Shared speech codes, coordinating meaning, and cooperative practices come together to explain the processes of communication and resulting intersubjectivity. I will begin by constituting what is meant by speech codes. Bernstein (1970) distinguished speech codes from linguistic codes stating that linguistic codes were defined as a product of the rule system of language while speech codes are “a function of the culture acting through social relationships in specific contexts” (p. 161). At about the same time, Hymes (1974) proposed that distinctive communication practices exist among various cultures and in particular locales. These speech communities, as termed by Hymes, shared knowledge of how to act and how to talk. GP-GC interactions could be considered speech situations within a speech community since these interactions may not be strictly governed by a rigid set of rules but loosely constructed rules of speaking within the GP-GC context (Hymes, 1974). Philipsen (1997) drew from the writings of both of these scholars to define culture as a system of speech codes. Even though the same language may be spoken (i.e., linguistic codes), distinctive speech codes exist. Philipsen further proposed that speech codes of any particular culture implies “a view of what a person is and of how persons are constituted, of the particular kinds of social relations that persons can and should enter into, and of the appropriate and efficacious symbolic resources
available to interlocutors for constituting themselves as persons in social relationship” (p. 138). Each distinct GP-GC relationship may come to understand each other by talking, acting, and metacommunicating until shared meaning is codified.

Constituted meaning between grandparents and their grandchildren is accomplished when there is coordination of both attention and content (Clark, 1996). First, coordination occurs when one interlocutor speaks and the other attends to what is being said and attempts to understand. Second, constituted meaning of the content of conversations occurs when there is coordination between what the speaker means and what the listener takes him or her to mean. This coordination is achieved for each unique GP-GC dyad to the extent of their common ground; that is, as Clark (1996) describes, “the sum of their mutual knowledge, mutual beliefs, and mutual suppositions at the moment” (p. 327).

Clark (1996) further proposes that coordination cannot take place unless there is a collaboration of both interlocutors. Mutual meaning from conversing is established with collaboration in three ways: (a) meaning is established over time, (b) interlocutors together construct meaning, and (c) meaning requires fewer words than what is actually said (p. 331). Collaboration in conversations is linked to Grice's (1975) principles of cooperation where each person becomes cognizant of the purpose or direction of the exchange. Grice suggests that cooperation is accomplished through four distinct characteristics of the conversation including: (a) a fitting quantity of words, (b) quality in telling the truth, (c) relation refers to being relevant within the conversation, and (d) be
appropriate in the manner in which words are being said. One way that the cooperative principle is put into practice is in the form of perspective-taking, empathy, or person-centered communication.

Using Bernstein’s (1975) linguistic code theory, speech can be distinguished as one of two types based upon the degree of complexity, concreteness, and explicitness: restricted code or elaborated code. The restricted speech code assumes that all target listeners implicitly understand and agree with the speaker’s meaning. The elaborated code, on the other hand, assumes that meanings are explained and discussed among the communicators. The speaker using elaborated speech code is cognizant of the perspective of the listener and operates more analytically (Gecas, 1979). For Bernstein (1975), position-centered families hold to clearly divided roles with an inflexible power structure among its members. Closed communication styles of the restricted linguistic code are prominent. Grandparents adhering to such a power structure may not find it appropriate to discuss such matters as love or marriage with their grandchildren. In these cases, the grandchildren may only gain insight into these concepts from their grandparents through their own observations of the grandparents among others. Person-centered families, by contrast, distribute the family roles and power to its members by determining the psychological qualities of the individual rather than his/her position status. As the family evolves and develops, role flexibility is considered and adjustments are made to the family’s power structure. Primarily elaborated linguistic codes are used in person-centered families where role negotiation mandates open and extensive communication to clarify meanings, objectives, and desires. However “in the open communication patterns
characteristic of person-oriented families, children would be socializing parents as much as parents would be socializing children” (Gecas, 1979, p. 386).

Communication Purposes

Communication practices have several functional purposes. Clark and Delia (1979) purposed that objectives or tasks are evident during communication (e.g., informal communication, instructing, or socializing). Although the instrumental task needs accomplishing in conversation (e.g., socializing a grandchild on how to act with a dating partner), other objectives are also being negotiated. Clark and Delia argued that creating an interpersonal relationship between the communicators is a key objective of communication. In addition, communicators construct identities for themselves. For example, a grandparent may talk to his or her grandchild about how married couples should never end the day when angry with one another which accomplishes a task objective. But also in this communication, the grandparent may be illustrating love for the grandchild (a relational objective) and creating an image of how this grandparent acts as a marital partner (an identity objective).

Constructivist Model of Socialization

In the socialization of children, shared norms and values of the culture are co-constructed through communication (e.g., Applegate, Burke, Burleson, Delia, & Kline, 1985; Applegate, Burleson, & Delia, 1992; Burleson, Delia, & Applegate, 1992; Burleson et al., 1995; Delia & O'Keefe, 1979). Together, two people communicate their own intentions and interpret the intentions of the other to bring about a constituted “shared” meaning. Any social situation constitutes meaning when the language, the culture, and the nonverbal behavior are understood and coordinated between the
interlocutors. Coordinating moves by communicators (e.g., when grandparents guide the attention of their grandchildren and negotiate meaning of issues such as love and marriage) help create constituted “shared” meaning.

Applegate et al. (1985) argued that exposure to individually sensitive socialization practices and opportunities for social interaction contribute to the development of interpersonal and social schemas. Delia et al. (1982) have asserted that a person’s interpretive schemes organize his/her beliefs and intentions as well as give an array of choices of action. Following the constructivists’ perspective, grandparents have interpretive schemes which organize their past experiences and beliefs about love and marriage which may be illustrated in their speech codes. In communicating with each other, both grandparents and grandchildren attempt to make sense of each other by coordinating or aligning their intentions with one another. But, what speech codes are socialized and what shared practices constitute family history? As interpretations unfold the past experiences and beliefs, actions carried out in the present will meet the goals of the intentions of the individual in the future. Consequently, “In this way, every act collapses past, present, and future; and thus, every act emerges from a new past into a new future” (Delia et al., 1982, p. 156).

In sum, constructivism provides a framework of communication which contends that humans co-construct meaning. Grandparents and their grandchildren may converse about love or marriage and in doing so, an instrumental task is accomplished but their relationship and identities are affected as well.
Sociocultural Theory

The study of GP-GC interactions lends itself well to the sociocultural theory which evolved from the writings of Russian psychologist contemporaries, Vygotsky and Bakhtin. The primary premise of the sociocultural perspective is that culture and history can be passed from one generation to the next through learning processes. This theory contends that the situated actions of both generations are mediated by language which can result in a shared social reality (Wertsch, 1989). Vygotsky (1978) maintained that cultural, historical, and institutional settings shape human mental processes. Bakhtin’s ideas of language and the concept of the analytical unit of the utterance added dimension to the mental processes (Wertsch, 1989). Basic ideas of sociocultural theory which apply to the GP-GC relationship and contribute to socialization include: (a) action, (b) zone of proximal development, (c) intramental and intermental functions, and (d) voices of dialectical exchanges (Vygotsky, 1978).

Recognizing the internal maturation processes that are at play in a young adult’s development, sociocultural theory suggests that it is in actions or activities (e.g., GP-GC interactions) that young adults construct their beliefs, values, and attitudes. A leading activity or one’s goal-oriented interactions with the world initializes the next maturation phase. As a child matures to young adulthood, his/her learning readiness may be in establishing relationships, resulting in intimacy and/or commitment (Erikson, 1968). Sociocultural theorists suggest that a preponderance of learning takes place within what they call the zone of proximal development. This zone represents the distance between the actual development level and the level of potential development (Wertsch, Hagstrom, & Kikas, 1995). The young adult grandchild may be maturing to the level of
comprehending what it means to love and what marriage or commitment is all about; yet may not yet have fully developed their belief system about these concepts. Socialization occurs as young adults’ experience the beliefs, attitudes, and values interpersonally with their grandparents and then intrapersonally as the young adult internalizes the results of their communication and interactions with their environment (e.g., their grandparents; Vygotsky, 1978).

Vygotsky (1978) further suggested that culture influences the development of the mind and is distinguished by two functions: (a) intramental functions, or internal thought processes of the individual and (b) intermental functions, or exchange of mental processes with another. Young adults may have existing intramental processes about love and marriage that are based on the social structure established with their family and peers. The activity of language taking place between grandchildren and grandparents (intermental functioning) may transform the structure of intellect (intramental functioning) resulting in or confirming changing or creating particular beliefs, values, or attitudes about love and/or marriage. One aim of this study is to uncover those moments of learning where grandparents’ comments or actions have influenced grandchildren’s beliefs about love and marriage.

During the same time as Vygotsky and similarly influenced by Russian philosophers, Bakhtin (1981) coined the term voice to refer to the interlocutor’s perceptions, values, and beliefs. According to Bakhtin, voices always present in a social environment; i.e., one voice needs the other’s voice to even exist. When two voices come
in contact, meaning is the active process that takes place. An exchange of *utterances* which ultimately formulate an understanding through their interaction is called *multivoicedness* (Wertsch, 1991).

Wertsch (1989) posited that mental action is *situated* in culture, history, and institutional settings. Vygotsky’s theory has helped us understand how learning occurs, particularly when situated within social interactions such as those of grandparents and their grandchildren (Wertsch, 1991). As each generation’s voice is heard, the social meaning of actions such as how to love or how to act when married is advanced within that culture.

The creation of shared meaning through interaction as explained by constructivists and the sociocultural perspective may not be the only means by which young adults are socialized. The framework of the social cognitive theory is complementary to these two theories and also explains ways that grandparents socialize their grandchildren.

*Bandura’s Social Cognitive Theory*

Social cognitive theory (SCT) posits that an individual has a social self that internalizes values, attitudes, and behaviors predominant in his or her culture. Spanning both cognitive and behavioral frameworks, Bandura (1976, 1986) focuses on how children and adults operate cognitively on their social experiences and how these cognitions then influence behavior and development. Some concepts of SCT that contribute to socialization include: (a) the triadic influence of a person’s behaviors, personal characteristics, and environment, (b) learning by observing others (*vicarious learning*), (c) *expectations* of behavioral outcomes influence actual behavior, and (d)
social and moral standards influence self-regulation of behavior. SCT assists in understanding how GP-GC interactions, either directly or vicariously, may foster internalization of values, attitudes, or behaviors regarding love or marriage.

Bandura (1986) contends that an individual’s personal, environmental, and behavioral characteristics interact to influence his or her future cognitions, dispositions, and behaviors. The term reciprocal determinism is coined for this dynamic interaction of the environment, personal factors, and behavior. For example, grandchildren have attitudes or beliefs about how to love (personal factors) that give shape to their behavior with a significant other. And, the ways grandchildren actually express their love to others (behavior), in turn, affect their attitudes or beliefs about love. The same holds true for the interaction between behavior and environment. Grandchildren’s behavior in loving relationships may invoke particular reactions from their social environment (perhaps their grandparents), and conversely, the social structures in the environment (e.g., grandparents) may influence the way grandchildren behave in their relationships. Reciprocal interaction also takes place between environment and personal factors. With this idea in mind, young adult grandchildren may establish their own ideas of ways of loving or ways of acting in a marriage through this network of reciprocally interacting influences, one of which may be their interactions with their grandparents.

Bandura (1986) proposed that vicarious or observational learning is the capability of a person to develop an idea as to how to behave in the future without actually performing the behavior. SCT suggests that symbols or codes serve as the mechanism for thought. Therefore, a person is able to observe behavior, form a cognitive symbol or code about that behavior, and store that symbol for future recall as needed. For example,
grandchildren may observe how their grandparents love or behave in their marriage and then develop similar values, attitudes, or beliefs about love or marriage without actually having to be in love or to be married. Vicarious learning tends to be most influential when the person identifies with the observed model (i.e., someone similar to self or someone with whom a degree of emotional attachment is held).

Bandura (1986) also suggests that an observer selectively attends to and is more likely to model behaviors that are perceived as valued outcomes (expectancies). Previous experiences, as well as observations of others, create expectations of particular outcomes as a result of performing a behavior. Therefore, even before a behavior is carried out, the cognitive process of forethought allows a person to anticipate and evaluate an outcome. For example, a grandchild’s observations of his or her grandparents’ marriage may create positive and/or negative expectations about the grandchild’s own future marriage.

Finally, Bandura (1986) proposes that individuals have a cognitive self-regulating system that assesses all external influences and allows a person to take purposeful action. Self-regulation occurs through interplay of self-produced and external sources of influence. Internal motivations guide behavior through goal setting and the intrinsic fulfillment of achieving those goals. Social and moral standards also contribute to the regulation of conduct. Exercise of moral agency mediates behavior as individuals self-evaluate their actions and internalize social mores. Bandura contends that children’s internalization of morals and standards are most affected by observation of others’ behaviors and to a lesser degree by verbal instruction. Standards are also developed from institutionally organized systems, such as education, media, or religion. The degree that a model is influential depends upon whether the model is similar to the person, the value of
the activity, and the perception of the degree of control that one has over the behavior. This self-regulation of behavior is the site of the balance between the internal versus external control (cf. Rotter, 1966). Social cognitive theory is particularly well-suited as a structure for understanding the intergenerational connections that may exist within GP-GC communication and the development of ideas about love and marriage.

In conclusion, researchers have assessed styles of grandparenting, have compared GP-GC conversations with other inter-group conversations, have noted the factors that affect the GP-GC relationship, have examined GP-GC solidarity, and have discovered that grandparents influence their grandchildren. These theoretical approaches of constructivism, sociocultural theory, and social cognitive theory provide a structure upon which to create insight into how GP-GC interactions may socialize the attitudes, beliefs, and values of the young adults in regards to love and marriage. The social and cognitive approaches of these theories fit well with the developmental aspects of grandchildren’s socialization.

Rationale for the Study of Grandchildren’s Socialization

Family (e.g., parents or grandparents) serves as a context within which culture, cognition, and communication are integrated to cultivate the socialization processes offered to and internalized by children (Burleson et al., 1995). Communication researchers have focused on the family as an interaction site in which children may form their beliefs about love, relationships, and the social world (Bochner & Eisenberg, 1987; Rogers, 2001; Roloff & Anastasiou, 2001). Some studies suggest that family communication may be one important source for the development of particular beliefs about marriage and expressing love (Conger, Cui, Bryant, & Elder, 2000; Fitzpatrick &
Caughlin, 2002; Meeks, Hendrick, & Hendrick, 1998). For example, Conger et al. (2000) found that nurturant-involved parents (i.e., parents who communicated positively with their children, monitored the children’s activities, and provided consistent and positive discipline) predicted warmth and low hostility in the romantic relationships of their children. Similarities have also been reported between parents’ and children’s attitudes about what it means to love (Inman-Amos, Hendrick, & Hendrick, 1994) as well as similarities between parents’ and children’s expectations about how one should interact in a marriage (VanLear, 1992). Yet Parke and O'Neil (1997) have argued that parent-child interaction is only one site of children’s socialization about how to behave in social and marital relationships, as direct and indirect socialization can be found in interactions with extended family, community members (i.e., friends and neighbors), and work peers.

Therefore, grandparents may be another source of socialization for young adults to learn about love and to learn how to act in a marriage. Conversations between grandparents and grandchildren are encounters within which socialization may occur. For instance, two studies by Harwood and colleagues (Harwood & Lin, 2000; Lin et al., 2002) have shown that socializing processes are revealed in the topics of conversations between GP-GC dyads. Family, education, leisure activities, and friendships are key topics that take place between grandparents and their grandchildren (Lin et al., 2002). A closer examination reveals that these topic themes extend beyond everyday topics such as the weather or the local news and into the realm of values and ways to talk with others. Recounted conversations with grandparents revealed themes of affiliation, pride, and exchange of values through advice and information sharing (e.g., “I try to talk to him about life experience and to keep his focus on why he is in school”; Harwood & Lin,
2000, p. 37). However, not all conversations with grandchildren were reported as positive and socializing in nature. Feelings of distance occurred when recounted conversations indicated differences in communication styles, age differences, too great of a geographic distance, or regrettable strains in relationships (Harwood & Lin, 2000). Ways of loving and how to act in a marriage are behaviors based upon underlying values that are salient to young adults. Peers and parents may serve as role models for young adults in the development of these values, but perhaps grandparents also play a role.

Gaskins, Miller, and Corsaro (1992) have proposed that socialization is a meaning-making process that is situated, active, and constituted by language. The research literature on grandparenting suggests that grandparents are influential in their grandchildren’s lives. In particular, grandparents and grandchildren reported that they do discuss issues such as sexual behaviors and relationships; however, researchers have not uncovered the specifics of how socialization is taking place. Therefore, the initial aim of this study to uncover the ways grandparents communicated to socialize their grandchildren about love and marriage. Consequently, this research question is posed:

*RQ_{1a-c}: What grandparent socialization practices do grandchildren report and are these grandparent socializing practices (a) interrelated, or related to their (b) relationship qualities, or (c) demographics (e.g., age of grandchildren)?*

GP-GC solidarity is generally described as emotional closeness between grandchildren and their grandparents, similar to Bengtson and Roberts’ (1991) concept of affectual solidarity. A number of studies have linked grandchildren’s emotional closeness
with perceptions of their grandparents as influential in the grandchildren’s ideas about 
family values and beliefs (Boon & Brussoni, 1996; Brussoni & Boon, 1998). Given these 
findings, a first hypothesis is proposed:

$H_1$: Grandchildren’s reports of GP-GC solidarity will be associated with their reports of 
grandparent socializing practices.

Among GP-GC studies, sex of the grandchild has not been consistently found to 
make a difference in reports about grandparents’ influence (Kennedy, 1992a, Mueller & 
Elder, 2003). Therefore, analyses should be conducted to test if sex differences exist, so 
this research question is asked:

$RQ_2$: Does sex of the grandchildren make a difference in their report of grandparent 
socializing practices?

In a study of adult grandchildren’s impressions of their grandparents, Mills, 
Wakeman, and Fea (2001) found both grandparent sex and grandparent lineage made a 
difference in perceived levels of closeness and consensus of values. The findings 
revealed that grandmothers, more than grandfathers, were reported as having greater 
emotional closeness and an alignment of ideals with their grandchildren. Similar results 
were found with lineage; maternal grandparents, more than paternal grandparents, were 
perceived as emotionally closer and similar in values. In line with these studies, these 
next two hypotheses are posed:

$H_2$: Grandchildren will report that grandmothers socialize more than grandfathers.

$H_3$: Grandchildren will report that maternal grandparents socialize more than paternal 
grandparents.
Given the reciprocal nature of the GP-GC relationship, this next set of questions and hypotheses mirror the previous questions but these are posed from the grandparents’ perspective:

*RQ*$_{3a-c}$: What socialization practices do grandparents report and are these socializing practices *(a)* interrelated, or related to their *(b)* relationship qualities, or *(c)* demographics?

*H*$_4$: Grandparents’ reports of GP-GC solidarity will be associated with their reports grandparent socializing practices.

Nussbaum and Bettini (1994) found distinct differences in the themes of conversations between grandmothers and grandfathers. Grandmothers more often grandfathers discussed relationships and family; while grandfathers, more often than grandmothers, discussed historical events or stories of growing up. Therefore:

*H*$_5$: Grandmothers will report greater frequency of socializing their grandchildren than grandfathers will report.

*H*$_6$: Maternal grandparents will report greater frequency of socializing their grandchildren than paternal grandparents.

In studies of dyads of grandparents and their grandchildren, differences have been found in their reported levels of affection and consensus in values (Giarrusso et al., 2001), and in their perception of number of activities done together (Harwood, 2001). Differences may also be occurring in grandchildren’s and grandparents’ reports of frequency of grandparent socialization practices; therefore, this next research question is posed:
RQ4: Are there differences between the two generations of grandchildren’s reports and grandparents’ reports of grandparents’ socializing practices?

The next section will focus more directly on the values, beliefs, and attitudes surrounding love and marriage. While there exists an extensive literature surrounding both love and marriage, for the purposes of this study, only two approaches will be explicated and used as typologies of the attitudes and beliefs about love and marriage; love attitudes as developed by Hendrick, Hendrick, and others (1986; Lee, 1976) and the marital communication dimensions as developed by Fitzpatrick (1977, 1988).

Attitudes and Beliefs about Love and Marriage

Attitudes about Loving

Generally, love has been conceptualized as the perception of cognitions, feelings, and behaviors in a holistic subjective experience (Marston & Hecht, 1994). In recent years, relationship researchers have investigated ways of loving more systematically to uncover the various beliefs and attitudes that young people hold about love and how they form these preferences (Aron, Dutton, Aron, & Iverson, 1989; Fehr, 1988; Hatfield & Sprecher, 1986; Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986; Sternberg, 1986). Psychologists have found that choices in ways of loving may be the result of early experiences of caring and intimacy as well as types of attachment to parents (Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Rubin, 1973). Nussbaum and Bettini (1994) found that some grandparents talk to their grandchildren about relationship issues such as the way they met one another, their courtship, or their marriage. Extending the work of Nussbaum and Bettini (1994), this study will focus on the way grandparents talk about loving as related to a typology of love attitudes. The following section will describe these ways of loving and review supporting research.
Love Attitudes Defined

From his research program, Lee (1976) derived a theory of loving that has been refined by Hendrick and Hendrick (1986). Six attitudes of loving: Eros, Ludus, Storge, Pragma, Mania, and Agape were proposed. Not the same as being “in love,” the preferred love attitude of an individual is a construct that describes how one perceives love (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1988). Hendrick and Hendrick believe that love attitudes are important because they capture variability in the ways people report expressing affection toward one another. Individuals tend to express one attitude towards love, even though the other attitudes may also be influencing love choices (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986; Lee, 1976).

Individuals who define love as passionate and physically oriented have an Eros type attitude. A sense of understanding and immediate attraction toward the other is often reported by a person preferring the Eros attitude (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986; Hendrick, Hendrick, & Dicke, 1998; Lee, 1976). In contrast, people who report a Ludus attitude believe that love is an interactive game played out with multiple partners. Hendrick and Hendrick (1986; 1987b; Hendrick et al., 1998) report that those with a Ludus love attitude are more wary of emotional commitment, avoid self-disclosure, and prefer the immediate and mutual enjoyment of affection. An individual who believes that love develops from a friendship and compatibility with another has a Storge attitude (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986; Hendrick et al., 1998). Dependability and stability is expected, resulting in viewing a partner as a lifelong companion with shared values and goals. Those who have a Pragma attitude believe that love is realistic and calculated rationally. The expression of love is reserved for another who has similar goal pursuits and family
background (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986; Hendrick et al., 1998; Lee, 1976). A person reporting a Mania attitude believes that love is unpredictable, with emotional highs and lows, and can be obsessive (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986; Hendrick et al., 1998). Lee (1976) observes that those with Mania attitudes may have strained family relationships or an unhappy childhood. Finally, those who have Agape love attitudes believe love to be selfless and so typically put the needs of others before their own needs. Those with an Agape attitude believe in patience, forgiveness, and supportiveness (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986; Hendrick et al., 1998; Lee, 1976).

Love Attitudes Research

Hendrick and Hendrick’s (1986) love attitudes have been related to factors such as satisfaction, sensation seeking behaviors, and personality characteristics. Demographic differences among love styles have also been assessed, with sex differences being the most prominent. A limited line of research has investigated similarities and differences of love styles between young adults and their parents (and also grandparents).

One line of relationship research shows that particular love attitudes are related to satisfaction within romantic relationships. Across various age groups, Eros, Agape, and at times, Storge love attitudes are positively associated with relational satisfaction while Ludus is negatively associated with relationship satisfaction. For example, Hendrick, Hendrick, and Adler (1988) and later Morrow, Clark, and Brock (1995) found that young adults with preferences for Eros or Agape styles reported greater satisfaction with their relationships while less satisfaction was reported among those preferring a Ludus style (also see Levy & Davis, 1988; Davis and Latty-Mann, 1987). Montgomery and Sorell (1997) compared four family life stages (i.e., young single adults, young married with no
children, married with children, and older married with children not living at home) to find that Eros was positively associated with relationship satisfaction for all groups. Other findings showed greater relationship satisfaction for those married with children who also reported either Storge or Agape ways of loving. Among all married couples, Montgomery and Sorell found that Ludus love was associated with less relationship satisfaction (also see Meeks et al., 1998).

The reciprocal effects of various love attitudes on marital adjustment during the first two years of marriage have been studied within married couples. Martin, Blair, Nevels, and Fitzpatrick (1990) found that wives’ Agape love was positively related to their husbands’ marital adjustment while wives’ Mania style was associated with their husbands’ marital maladjustment. Husband’s love attitudes were not associated with their wives’ marital adjustment.

Satisfaction with life has also been associated with love attitudes. Yancey and Eastman (1995) compared younger to middle-aged adults (over 29 years old) and found that older men and all the women with a Ludus love attitude reported less life satisfaction while young men with a Ludus style reported greater life satisfaction.

Research on love styles has also found them to predict sexual attitudes and practices. For instance, Hendrick and Hendrick (1987) found that individuals preferring a Ludus love style were sensation-seekers. Hendrick and Hendrick (1988) also found that couples who were not “in love” reported higher levels of sensation-seeking, permissiveness, and instrumentality (i.e., sex is for enjoyment) than those couples who were “in love.”
Love attitudes are also related to an individual’s personality characteristics. Mallandain and Davies (1994) found that the personality traits of emotionality and impulsivity in college students were related to Ludus and Mania love attitudes. In addition, students with an Eros love style exhibited higher levels of positive self-esteem while students with Storge, Mania, and Agape attitudes reported lower levels of self-esteem. Arnold and Thompson (1996) found that the personality functions of disclosure and depression predicted higher Ludus and Mania attitudes while disclosure and dependence predicted a higher Agape style. Most recently, Le (2005) found that a Ludus attitude was associated with the narcissistic personality trait in which there is an exclusive focus on oneself. Interestingly, Ludus and Mania love attitudes were predicted by very similar personality traits such as emotionality, impulsivity, and depression.

Analyses of sex differences of those holding particular love attitudes have also been of interest to researchers. Hendrick and Hendrick (1986) found that males reported higher Ludus while females reported higher Storge, Pragma, and Mania. Hendrick et al. (1998) also found that women reported higher scores in Eros, Storge, and Pragma attitudes while men have higher Ludus and Agape scores. Similarly, Meeks et al. (1998) and Worobey (2001) found that men reported higher Ludus and Agape love styles than women. Meeks et al. (1998) also found in heterosexual dating couples that men showed a higher correlation between an Agape love attitude and their relationship satisfaction than did the women. Worobey (2001) found other sex differences as well when temperaments were examined as predictors of love attitudes. For men, the sole predictor of Mania was the temperament of distress, with no other associations being found between temperament dimensions and love attitudes. For females, distress, anger, and fear
predicted Mania, while Agape was predicted by distress and sociability. Sociability also predicted an Eros love attitude for females. But the findings on sex differences were mixed. For example, Hendrick and Hendrick (1987) did not find any differences between the sexes when comparing love attitudes to sensation-seeking type behaviors.

Finally, young adults’ love attitudes have been found to be related to a limited degree to those of their parents and grandparents. Inman-Amos et al. (1994) first launched investigations of similarities and differences between young adults and their parents. These researchers found that young adults’ and fathers’ Storge love attitudes were positively associated while the young adults’ and mothers’ Mania love attitudes were negatively associated. When Inman-Amos et al. examined differences between generations, daughters were significantly different from both parents on all love attitudes except Eros (i.e., daughters were higher on Ludus, Pragma, and Mania and lower on Storge and Agape than parents). Sons were higher on Mania than both parents. In Portugal, Neto (2001) compared three generations of women and found that young women had higher Eros attitudes than their mothers. On the other hand, Storge, Pragma, and Agape attitudes were higher for mothers and grandmothers than the young women. Grandmothers reported higher Pragma attitude than the other two generations.

In sum, there is limited knowledge of generational similarities and differences of love attitudes and, in particular, between grandparents and grandchildren. We know that grandmothers from Portugal have higher scores than their granddaughters on three of the six love attitudes. Beyond this one finding, little is known about similarities and differences in grandparents’ and grandchildren’s love attitudes. Grandparents likely play a role in the development of values and attitudes in their grandchildren but we do not
know the specific role of grandparents in the development of attitudes toward love.

Initially, this gap in knowledge calls for an investigation of the direct relationship of love attitudes between these two generations. First from the GC’s perceptive and then from the GPs’ perspective, research questions and hypotheses will be posed to study this relationship.

From the socialization stance, more can be learned about how love attitudes are related between generations. In particular, from the behaviors that form these love attitudes, which behaviors are grandparents attempting to socialize in their grandchildren? Inman-Amos et al. (1994) and Neto (2001) compared each generation’s report of their own behaviors surrounding love attitudes with the other generation’s report. But even though grandparents may report a particular behavior, that does not denote that grandparents find this behavior pertinent enough to teach to their grandchildren. A grandparent may report an inclination to a love attitude but may not find that attitude satisfying and therefore may teach their grandchildren about the behaviors of a different love attitude that they feel is more satisfying. So, it would be useful to know what love behaviors that are perceived as being socialized by grandparents. Therefore, these research questions and hypotheses were set forth from both the grandchildren’s and grandparents’ point of view:

**RQ5a-e:** Are grandchildren’s reports of their love attitudes (a) interrelated, or related to grandchildren’s reports of (b) grandparents teaching love attitudes, (c) grandparent socializing practices, (d) relationship qualities, or (e) demographics?

**H7:** Grandchildren’s reports of GP-GC solidarity will be associated with their reports of grandparent teaching love attitudes.
RQ6: Does the sex of the grandchildren make a difference in the grandchildren’s report of grandparents teaching love attitudes?

H8: Grandchildren will report that grandmothers teach love attitudes more than grandfathers.

H9: Grandchildren will report that maternal grandparents teach love attitudes more than paternal grandparents.

RQ7a-e: Are grandparents’ reports of their love attitudes (a) interrelated, or related to grandparents’ reports of (b) grandparents teaching love attitudes, (c) grandparent socializing practices, (d) relationship qualities, or (e) demographics?

H10: Grandparents’ reports of GP-GC solidarity will be associated with their reports of teaching love attitudes.

H11: Grandmothers will report teaching love attitudes more than grandfathers.

H12: Maternal grandparents will report teaching love attitudes more than paternal grandparents.

RQ8: Are there generational differences between grandchildren’s and grandparents’ reports of their love attitudes?

RQ9: Are there differences between the two generations of grandchildren’s reports and grandparents’ reports of grandparents teaching love attitudes?

Conceptions of Marriage

With the divorce rate in the United States now in the range of 56% to 62% for all first marriages (Norton & Miller, 1992), the preferred dimensions of communication in a
marital relationship is worthy of investigation. Fitzpatrick (1977) has argued that individuals can describe their preferences for particular behaviors and ways of communicating within a marriage.

Marital Dimensions Defined

Building upon the work of Kantor and Lehr (1975), Fitzpatrick (1988) contends that basic objectives of marriage include affect, power, and meaning, which are played out through the couple’s use of space, time, and energy. Through extensive study of the preferences of marital couples, Fitzpatrick discovered that these marital goals combine to form eight relational dimensions of marital interaction. Fitzpatrick and Ritchie (1994) suggest that these dimensions reflect marital attitudes and expectations about affective and social communication. Couples reporting preferences toward ideology of traditionalism prefer a robust traditional value with conservative marital events. The ideology of uncertainty and change is connected to a preference for openness and individuality. A preference for sharing involves open communication in which marital partners freely express how much they care about each other. The importance of individual private space is a primary concern of the autonomy dimension, in which marital couples appear to prefer time to themselves. Conversely, undifferentiated space is a lack of privacy in which accessibility to the physical space of home and property is open to both spouses. Temporal regularity assesses how a couple adheres to a timed-schedule of activities. The last two marital dimensions center on the communication of conflict. The first is conflict avoidance, which shows a couple’s inclination to share good feelings and dodge differences of opinion and clashes between them. The other is assertiveness, which breaks down into two areas; the degree to which one spouse is able
to influence the other and the willingness of the couple to display their conflict toward each other in public. Fitzpatrick et al. (1993) proposed that these eight marital schemata are “knowledge structures that represent the external world of marriage and provide guidelines about how to interpret incoming messages” from one spouse to another (p. 105).

Fitzpatrick (1988) clustered these eight dimensions into three typological ideologies that may be evidence of underlying marital schemata: Traditional, Independents, and Separates. After a review of the early marital communication studies, Noller and Fitzpatrick (1990) asserted that couple types “differ in terms of the strategies they use in attempting to assert control; their general persuasive styles; the nonverbal cues they use in the expression of affect and intimacy; the linguistic strategies they use in dealing with conflict; and their degree of self-disclosure” (p. 838).

Marital Dimensions Literature Review

Most research surrounding Fitzpatrick’s (1988) typology of marital communication employ the marital types rather than individual dimensions. In fact, only about 10 studies have opted to uncover specifically what we know about marital dimensions rather than marital types. Researchers have studied marital dimensions in relationship to marital satisfaction, attachment, marital communication patterns, and generational differences and similarities.

Fitzpatrick (1988) proposed that marital satisfaction occurs when actual marital communication aligns with expectations or beliefs held about marital communication. For example, individuals who desire sharing and closeness in a marriage may have high marital satisfaction when a high degree of self-disclosure exists. Fitzpatrick also posited
that degrees of self-disclosure and expectations of marital communication differ among individuals. Regarding marital conflict, Sillars, Pike, Redmon, and Jones (1983) found that individuals who prefer to be assertive in marriage where conflict is a functional and inevitable part of marriage may have greater marital satisfaction when conflict is not avoided. On the other hand, Sillars et al. found that couples who expected harmony in their marriage were more satisfied when conflict was avoided and differences were not confronted. Later, VanLear and Zietlow (1990) found that a contingency approach to marital communication may best explain marital satisfaction. In a study of 77 couples, VanLear and Zietlow found significant interaction effects between control patterns of spouses and marital type on marital satisfaction. Couples reported increased satisfaction when their expectations of marital communication were met, while couples whose expectations and actual marital communication differed reported less marital satisfaction.

The degree of consistency between reported marital dimensions and actual marital behavior should be associated with marital satisfaction. In a study of young adult couples and both sets of their parents (N = 342), VanLear (1990) compared reports of preferences for particular marital dimensions and marital satisfaction within couples in each family. VanLear found that marital dimensions of traditionalism and sharing were associated with marital satisfaction. Greater satisfaction for husbands was reported when traditionalism was at moderate levels. For wives, either low or high levels of traditionalism were reported as most satisfying. Husbands and wives both reported satisfaction when the sharing dimension was prominent with either spouse.

Viewing media such as television programs may play a role in developing and reinforcing beliefs about marriage and subsequent marital satisfaction in young adults.
Perse, Pavitt, and Burggraf (1990) asked college students to assess the marital dimensions of and satisfaction within particular television couples. These scholars found that the young adults who reported high levels of sharing, traditionalism, and temporal regularity in both themselves and similarly in the television couple also perceived the television couple as being satisfied in their marriage. Young adults appeared to equate these three marital dimensions with marital satisfaction.

The type of relational attachment (i.e., secure, avoidant, or ambivalent) has also been associated with marital dimensions. Fitzpatrick, Fey, Segrin, and Schiff (1993) asked 162 couples (N = 324) about their marital communication and their own attachment styles (see Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Fitzpatrick et al. found that sharing and traditionalism dimensions were positively correlated with secure attachment and were negatively correlated with avoidant attachment. The sharing dimension was also negatively correlated with ambivalent attachment. Later with a sample of 72 married couples, Honeycutt (1999) found that the marital dimension of sharing also predicted secure attachment when imagined scenarios were presented to couples. The couples’ traditionalism and conflict avoidance dimensions negatively predicted their avoidant attachment.

Marital dimensions of couples have also been found to predict ways of communicating between married couples and among family members. Fitzpatrick et al. (1993) found that the sharing dimension positively predicted constructive communication in a marriage and negatively predicted other marital communication patterns such as demanding, mutual avoidance, aggression, reconciliation/withdrawal, pressure/resistance, and support seeking (see Christensen, 1988, for definitions of these communication
patterns). Guilt/hurt was the only communication pattern that sharing did not predict but autonomy did negatively predict guilt/hurt communication. Another strong predictor of Christensen’s communication patterns was the assertiveness marital dimension. Assertiveness positively predicted demanding, mutual avoidance, aggression, reconciliation/withdrawal, and pressure/resistance communication patterns. To assess if marital dimensions related to family conversation and family conformity communication patterns, Fitzpatrick and Ritchie (1994) studied 169 families of parents and their teenaged child. They found that parents’ marital dimensions of sharing and conflict acceptance (inverse of conflict avoidance) were positively correlated with the three family members’ averaged reports of open family conversational patterns, while the traditional dimension was positively correlated to conforming family patterns.

Young adults can observe the marital behaviors of their parents and choose to adhere to similar marital dimensions as their parents. However, lack of similarities of particular marital dimensions between parents and young adult children does not necessarily mean that children are not observing and drawing inferences from their parents’ marriage. VanLear (1992) compared marital communication between two generations of couples (i.e., young married couples and their parents) with the expectation that positively correlated marital dimensions between generations were an indication that the young couples had learned the behaviors from their parents. However, VanLear (1992) found no evidence that a linear relationship existed where young couples reported similar marital dimensions as their parents. What VanLear did find was that young husbands tended to marry wives whose marital conflict dimension was different from the husbands’ mothers’ approach to conflict. And, young wives tended to marry
husbands whose traditionalism dimension was similar to the wives’ fathers. Just because no direct positive correlations were found between generations, does not mean that learning did not take place between parents and children. The children may be observing their parents and learning from their mistakes, consequently choosing the marital behaviors (or lack thereof) that they believe to be the most satisfying. Another possible explanation for the lack of similarities between parents and their children is that the United States’ cultural view of marriage may have evolved over the recent past and that younger generations may prefer a more egalitarian marriage and less traditional sex role expectations. Indeed, VanLear (1992) found that young adult husbands and wives reported higher levels of sharing but lower levels of traditionalism than their parents.

These same trends held when VanLear (1992) assessed marital satisfaction and marital dimensions. For example, young wives’ sharing dimension was positively related to their marital satisfaction while the fathers’ marital satisfaction is positively associated with their wives’ traditionalism dimension. Young husbands’ reported less marital satisfaction when conflict was avoided in their marriages.

In sum, the marital dimensions of sharing and traditionalism predominantly appear to be associated with other social-psychological variables such as marital satisfaction and attachment style. In addition, sharing, conflict avoidance, and assertiveness dimensions are predictive of family communication patterns. The similarities and differences between young adult couples and their parents appear to follow particular patterns that may be learned between generations or from cultural
trends. In these cases, grandparents may serve in some way as socializing agents for young adults to observe and emulate their marital behavior and communication, but this possibility has not yet been investigated.

As was found in VanLear’s (1992) study, similarities of marital dimensions may not be the only indicator of learning. More important than the similarities between grandparents’ marital dimensions and those of their grandchildren is what the grandparents are teaching to their grandchildren. In other words, just because a grandparent behaves in a particular way, does not mean that the grandparent would suggest that behavior for their grandchild’s marriage. Therefore, these questions and hypotheses are posed from both the grandchildren’s and grandparents’ perspectives:

*RQ10a-e:* Are grandchildren’s reports of their marital dimensions (a) interrelated, or related to grandchildren’s reports of (b) grandparents teaching marital dimensions, (c) grandparent socializing practices, (d) relationship qualities, or (e) demographics?

*H13:* Grandchildren’s reports of GP-GC solidarity will be associated with their reports of grandparents teaching marital dimensions.

*RQ11:* Does the sex of the grandchildren make a difference in the grandchildren’s report of grandparents teaching marital dimensions?

*H14:* Grandchildren will report that grandmothers teach marital dimensions more than grandfathers.

*H15:* Grandchildren will report that maternal grandparents teach marital dimensions more than paternal grandparents.
RQ_{12a-e}: Are grandparents’ reports of their marital dimensions (a) interrelated, or related to grandparents’ reports of (b) grandparents teaching marital dimensions, (c) grandparent socializing practices, (d) relationship qualities, or (e) demographics?

H_{16}: Grandparents’ reports of GP-GC solidarity will be associated with their reports of grandparents teaching marital dimensions.

H_{17}: Grandmothers will report teaching marital dimensions more than grandfathers.

H_{18}: Maternal grandparents will report teaching marital dimensions more than paternal grandparents.

RQ_{13}: Are there differences between the two generations of grandchildren’s reports and grandparents’ reports of marital dimensions?

RQ_{14}: Are there differences between the two generations of grandchildren’s reports and grandparents’ reports of grandparents teaching marital dimensions?

This study’s premise is that grandparents play a role in the socialization of their grandchildren about love and marriage. In this investigation, the specific and distinct socialization practices between grandparents and grandchildren are being uncovered. Even though there is value in knowing, generally, how it is that grandparents and grandchildren view their interactions and the ways they converse or observe loving and being committed to a relationship; even more important is to study the alignment and distinction of ideas between a grandchild and their own grandparent. Therefore, this next set of research questions and hypotheses serve the purpose of directing this study to investigate this dyadic interaction:

RQ_{15}: Are there generational differences between grandchildren’s and their matched grandparents’ reports of study variables including (a) socialization practices, (b) love
attitudes and teaching about love attitudes, (c) marital dimensions and teaching about marital dimensions, and (d) relationship qualities?

RQ₁₆: Are grandchildren’s reports of grandparents’ socialization practices related to their matched grandparents’ reports of their socialization practices?

RQ₁₇: Are grandchildren’s love attitudes and their reports of grandparents teaching love attitudes related to their matched grandparents’ love attitudes and their reports of teaching love attitudes to their matched grandchildren?

RQ₁₈: Are grandchildren’s love attitudes related to their matched grandparents’ reports of their socialization practices?

RQ₁₉: Are grandchildren’s marital dimensions and their reports of grandparents teaching marital dimensions related to their matched grandparents’ marital dimensions and their reports of teaching marital dimensions to their matched grandchildren?

RQ₂₀: Are grandchildren’s marital dimensions related to their matched grandparents’ reports of their socialization practices?

RQ₂₁: What factors, or combination of factors, best predict grandchildren’s love attitudes?

RQ₂₂: What factors, or combination of factors, best predict grandchildren’s marital dimensions?

In an intergroup study of young adult conversations with an older adult, Williams and Giles (1996) found that the young adults reported their interactions with their own older family members to be more satisfying than other older adults. Therefore, I chose solidarity to test as a moderator variable to the socialization of young adults. Harwood (2000b) examined GP-GC solidarity to find that communication factors predicted GP-GC
solidarity. This study examines how GP-GC solidarity may moderate grandchildren’s socialization of values from their grandparents.

*RQ23: Do grandchildren’s reports of GP-GC solidarity modify the effects of the predictors of grandchildren’s love attitudes?*

*RQ24: Do grandchildren’s reports of GP-GC solidarity modify the effects of the predictors of grandchildren’s marital dimensions?*

Summary of Literature Review

In sum, the purpose of this review was to uncover what we currently know about how grandparents play a role in the socialization of their grandchildren in the issues of love and marriage. Socialization is a dynamic and interactive process from which identities are fashioned and ways of thinking, feeling, and acting are transformed (Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Burleson et al., 1995; Sandstrom, Martin, & Fine, 2003; Tracy, 2002). Miller (1996) argues that results of socializing interactions can be viewed in the “forms and functions of everyday discourse” (p. 184). Of the extant research on GP-GC relationships, very few consider the socialization processes that may be taking place between grandparents and their grandchildren.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

This chapter presents the methods conducted to test the hypotheses and questions posed in this study about the socialization of grandchildren by their grandparents about love and marriage. First, participants and procedures of the study are described. Next, the tasks and measures are presented. A preliminary study is also reported that was used to develop a closed-ended inventory of socializing practices. Factor analyses and reliabilities to substantiate this socialization measure and confirm other established measures used in the study are reported in Chapter 4. Finally, the analyses used to test the hypotheses and answer the research questions are suggested.

Participants and Procedures

Participants were composed of young adult grandchildren (GC) and grandparents (GP). A convenience sample of GC was recruited from undergraduate communication classes at a Midwestern U.S. university. Students were given extra course credit if they volunteered or recruited another to serve as GC participants. Subsequently, GC participants were asked to contact as many of their grandparents as were willing and able to participate. Additional extra course credit was given to students for each GP participant.

Three questionnaires were constructed for the study: (a) a GC questionnaire regarding his or her own attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors about love and marriage; (b) a GC questionnaire regarding communication with his or her grandparent about love and
marriage (one questionnaire of this type was completed for each of the GC’s grandparents with whom the GC had interaction, observed, or heard stories about); and (c) a GP questionnaire regarding communication with the GC who participated in this research and the GP’s own attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors about love and marriage (one questionnaire of this type was completed by each GP who agreed to participate).

Questionnaires were available in paper form (see Appendixes A, B, and C) or online via www.surveymonkey.com.

Instructions for participation were given in the classroom. A consent form was signed by each participant and the first GC questionnaire was completed. Next, a grandparent (male or female, paternal or maternal) was randomly assigned to each participant as a target for responses to the second questionnaire about GP-GC interactions. Participants were also encouraged to complete a questionnaire regarding each of their other GPs as well. If the GC did not have enough time to complete all questionnaires in one class period, they were permitted to complete the balance of the questionnaires at their convenience outside of class and return them to their professor in the next class period. An envelope was provided to assure confidentiality of responses. Extra credit was awarded to GC who completed their portion of the research project.

Grandparents were contacted by their GC in one of two ways: (a) GC directly requested their GPs to participate and hand-delivered the GP questionnaires or (b) GC informed GPs of the online version of the GP questionnaire. The GP questionnaire also included a set of instructions, two copies of the consent form, a stamped-addressed return
envelope, and a one-dollar gift certificate from McDonalds as an expression of appreciation for his/her willingness to participate. Grandparents were asked to return only the completed questionnaire and one of the signed consent forms.

Identification numbers unique to each participant were placed on the questionnaires. These numbers served two purposes: (a) to award extra credit to the participants, and (b) to match GC participants to their GPs while retaining the participants’ anonymity.

Two hundred twenty six GC returned questionnaires but only 109 of their GPs returned their questionnaires. This lower response rate by the GPs was due, in part, to the fact that 52 of the young adult GC reported that the GPs that they could ask to participate in the study were deceased. Recalculation of the response rate with consideration of these GC resulted in the acceptable response rate of 63%. The remaining 65 GC that did not have a GP respond reported that their GPs were either physically or mentally unable to participate, that their GPs lived a far geographical distance from the young adult GC, or that the GPs were unwilling to complete the questionnaire.

Thirty of the GC questionnaires and two of the GP questionnaires were eliminated from the study due to insufficient completion. In addition, six GC were older than 30 years and considered outliers for a young adult sample, so their questionnaires were eliminated. This resulted in 190 GC and 107 GP questionnaires that were used in the analyses. Of these 190 GC and 107 GP participants, only 148 were matched grandchildren and their grandparents (74 dyads). The characteristics of the sample are reported in Chapter 4.
Tasks and Measures

One general task of this study is to examine GC’s socialization about love and marriage that is associated with interactions with their GPs or by the stories about which others (such as their parents) have told about their GPs. Other tasks established the attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors that GC and GPs held about love and marriage and their perception of whether GPs have taught their GC regarding these attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors.

These tasks were assessed with three questionnaires. The first asked GC about their current views about love and marriage. The other two questionnaires (one for GC and one for GPs) inquired about GPs’ socialization practices concerning love and marriage. In addition, the GP’s questionnaire asked GPs about their current beliefs and behaviors concerning love and marriage. Previously, researchers have used questionnaires that mirror one another to find similarities and differences between generations (e.g., Neto, 2001; Harwood, 2001; VanLear, 1992).

Socialization Task

Previous research on socialization (e.g., Burleson et al., 1992; Burleson et al., 1995; McWright, 2002; Miller, 1996) have used various methodological strategies, including face-to-face structured interviews, open-ended questions, and participant-observations. There has not been established an inventory of GPs’ socializing behaviors regarding love. Therefore, a preliminary study about socialization was conducted to develop an initial inventory.

Preliminary study. A convenience sample of 166 young adult GC (101 females and 65 males) was drawn from two intermediate-level communication classes at the same
Midwestern U.S. university to complete a questionnaire about their interactions with one of their grandparents. Class extra credit was awarded to participating students.

To assess the way GPs socialize their GC (acts of socialization), one open-ended question was asked:

“Think about how your attitudes, beliefs, or values about love have been influenced by the interactions with this grandparent, your observations of this grandparent, or how others talk about this grandparent. Write as much about the specific communication with this grandparent or the story told to you about this grandparent that has taught you about love. Where feasible, use the exact words exchanged or what happened to communicate about love.”

One of four GPs (i.e., maternal grandmother, maternal grandfather, paternal grandmother, or paternal grandfather) was randomly assigned to each participant as a target subject for the response. If a participant did not know the GP well who was randomly assigned as a target subject, he or she was told to write about a GP that was known to him/her. Of 166 participants, 54 (34 females/20 males) responded about interactions with their maternal grandmother, 42 (24 females/18 males) about their paternal grandmother, 38 (27 females/11 males) about their maternal grandfather, and 32 (16 females/16 males) about their paternal grandfather.

To assess these responses, the way socialization was reported as taking place was categorized. Using inductive methods, participants’ responses to the task were categorized into five distinct categories that illustrated ways GC were socialized about love by their GPs. See Table 3.1 for categories, examples, and frequency of GPs’ ways of
### Table 3.1: Grandchildren’s description and frequency of grandparents’ ways of socializing their grandchildren about love (N = 166)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ways of socializing</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th># of GC reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observing positive GP interactions</td>
<td>“My family helped organize a 50th wedding anniversary for my grandparents…he (MF) took my grandmother by the hand and escorted her to the dance floor where they danced to their favorite Sinatra song. They were both absolutely glowing, and they looked like they didn’t notice that anyone else was in the room. That always stands out in my mind.”</td>
<td>98 (59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing negative GP interactions</td>
<td>“My father’s mother wasn’t exactly the sweetest person I’ve ever met. I guess I learned in general to be respectful to my future husband in watching her (FM) badmouth and boss my grandfather around.”</td>
<td>63 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPs’ telling stories</td>
<td>“They (GPs) told me the story of how he went to war and my grandma sent him a ‘Dear John’ letter. He was heartbroken. He came back and she was with another man. He dated around and eventually courted my grandma again. 60 years of marriage later, they are still madly in love.”</td>
<td>50 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPs instructing or advising</td>
<td>“Love conquerors all, and with love, one can accomplish many things that was once thought impossible.”</td>
<td>72 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing stories about GPs reported by others</td>
<td>“I never met my MM but I always heard stories about her. She was always said to be the most loving mother and adoring wife. She was from Vienna, Austria and that’s where my Grandpa met her. He was in the U.S. Military and she was an Austrian/English translator. She was engaged to my G-Pa’s Commander but fell in love with Papa. She broke it off with him, got married to my Grandpa in the church in “The Sound of Music” and then he brought her back to the U. S. where they had 3 kids. So…Romantic!”</td>
<td>34 (20%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Percentages do not add to 100% because some participants reported multiple ways that GP-GC interacted which were recorded in more than one category.
socializing. These GC reported two overall prominent ways of socialization, observing their GPs and direct GP-GC communication. Some GC also reported about stories told about GPs by others.

Socialization inventory. From the results of the preliminary study, 60 closed-ended statements were developed that reflected the five ways of socializing an. These statements were slightly modified for both the GC and the GP questionnaires. Sample statements written from GC’s perspective were: “I noticed that this grandparent says, ‘I love you’ to his/her partner regularly” (direct positive observations), “This grandparent told me stories about his/her wedding day” (stories told by GPs), and “I noticed that this grandparent ordered his/her partner around” (direct negative observations). The GP questionnaire mirrored the GC’s items but was written from the GPs’ perspective. Seven items inquired about what others tell GC about GPs were not included in the GP questionnaire, resulting in 53 closed-ended items in the GP questionnaire. Young adult GC were asked to indicate “How often this grandparent engaged in each of these practices with you” and GPs were asked to indicate “How often have you engaged in these practices with this grandchild.” Frequency of occurrence was rated with a series of 5-point scales that range from 1 (has not occurred) to 5 (often).

Love and Marriage Tasks

Love attitudes. To assess all participants’ attitudes about their current preferred ways of loving, GC and their GPs completed a modified version of Hendrick and Hendrick’s love attitude scale (LAS; Hendrick et al., 1998). This measure was developed by Hendrick and Hendrick (1986; Hendrick, 1988) to measure six love attitudes orginally proposed by Lee (1976). Twenty-four items (four items per love attitude) were rated on a
series of 5-point Likert scales that range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Sample items for each love attitude include Eros (“My partner and I have the right physical “chemistry” between us”), Ludus (“I have sometimes had to keep my partner from finding out about other lovers”), Storge (“Our love relationship is the most satisfying because it developed from a good friendship”), Pragma (“A main consideration in choosing my partner was how he/she would reflect on my family”), Mania (“Since I’ve been in love with my partner I’ve had trouble concentrating on anything else”), and Agape (“I would endure all things for the sake of my partner”).

Marital dimensions. To assess participants’ beliefs about marriage, both GC and their GPs completed a modified version of Mary Anne Fitzpatrick’s (1988) relational dimensions instrument (RDI). Twenty-four items measured eight communication factors in marriage (3 items each) which fell along one of the three continuums of ideology, interdependence, and conflict (Fitzpatrick & Indvik, 1982). Married participants responded according to the communication in their own marriage and if not married, the participants responded as they would like a marriage to be (Fitzpatrick, 1984). Each item was rated on a series of Likert scales that ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

Sample items for each of the eight relational dimensions include sharing (“My spouse/mate reassures and comforts me when I am feeling low”), autonomy (“I think it is important for one to have some private space which is all his/her own and separate from one’s mate”), traditionalism (“Our society, as we see it, needs to regain faith in the law and in our institutions”), uncertainty (“In marriage/close relationships, there should be no constraints or restrictions on individual freedom”), conflict avoidance (“If I can avoid
arguing about some problems, they will disappear), space (“I open my spouse’s/mate’s personal mail without asking permission”), temporal regularity (“In our house, we keep a fairly regular daily time schedule”), and assertiveness (“My spouse/mate forces me to do things that I do not want to do”). Since one of the goals of this study was to tap into marital communication elements that an individual prefers, each of the eight marital dimensions were examined separately rather than clustering the dimensions into marital types.

GC socialization of love and marriage beliefs by GPs. Both the GC and GP questionnaires provided the opportunity to report the GPs’ socialization of the GC’s attitudes, beliefs, or behaviors about love and marriage. GC participants were asked to reconsider each item from the LAS and the RDI and indicate which, if any, of their grandparents had influenced them about that attitude or belief. Response choices included the four grandparents representing each lineage as well as step-grandparents and a response to indicate that no grandparent had influenced the GC’s belief. GPs were also asked to review each of the LAS and the RDI items and indicate if they had taught this belief to the grandchild who asked them to complete this questionnaire. Each item was dichotomously scored with the affirmative response as 1 and the negative or no response as 0. Items were combined and averaged similarly to combinations of items to constitute the factors of the LAS and RDI. Higher scores indicated greater strength of influence or teaching.

GP-GC Solidarity Task

GP-GC affectional solidarity (emotional closeness) was assessed with a measure that Harwood (2000a, 2000b) developed from the work of Hecht (1978). Five items
measured levels of emotional closeness, liking, satisfaction with GP-GC conversations, listening, and respect. Each item was rated on a semantic differential scale with anchors on the extremes of concepts. For example, responses that rated levels of emotional closeness ranged from 1 – 7 (very distant – very close) and responses that rated levels of liking ranged from 1 – 7 (dislike very much – like very much). The five items were averaged together to form a score of GP-GC affectional solidarity with higher scores indicating greater solidarity.

**Analyses**

Because the grandchildren and their grandparents were drawn from different categories or classes of individuals, they are considered *distinguishable* dyad members (Gonzalez & Griffin, 1999). Scores of variables attained from distinguishable dyad members may differ in distributions thus yielding different means and variances for each group. Therefore, correlational analyses were conducted with these distinguishable dyad groups to evaluate the associations of socialization tasks and attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors regarding love and marriage. Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was used to assess differences in socialization, love, marriage across categorical variables such as sex and GP lineage. Generational differences were also assessed with MANOVA. Relationships between socialization, love, and marriage as reported by the matched set of GC and their GPs were appraised through correlations and regressions. See Table 3.3 for the complete list of research questions and hypotheses and the method for analyses of each.
Research questions and hypotheses | Methods of analyses
---|---

**Generational analyses – GC and GPs socialization practices**

- **RQ1a-c**: What GP’s socialization practices do GC report, and are these GP socializing practices (a) interrelated, (b) related to relationship qualities, or (c) related to demographics?

- **H1**: GC’s reports of GP-GC solidarity will be associated with their reports of GP socializing practices.

- **RQ2**: Does sex of the GC make a difference in GC’s reports of GP socializing practices?

- **H2**: GC will report that grandmothers socialize more than grandfathers.

- **H3**: GC will report that maternal GPs socialize more than paternal GPs.

- **RQ3a-c**: What socialization practices do GPs’ report, and are these socializing practices (a) interrelated, (b) related to relationship qualities, or (c) related to demographics?

- **H4**: GPs’ reports of GP-GC solidarity will be associated with their reports GP socializing practices.

- **H5**: Grandmothers will report greater frequency of socializing their GC than grandfathers will report.

---

Table 3.2: *Overview of Research Questions, Hypotheses, and Methods of Analyses*

---

Continued
Table 3.2 continued

H₆: Maternal GPs will report greater frequency of socializing their GC than paternal GPs.

RQ₄: Are there differences between the two generations of GC’s reports and GPs’ reports of GPs’ socializing practices?

Generational analyses – GC’s and GPs’ reports of love attitudes and GPs teaching love attitudes

RQ₅a-e: Are GC’s reports of their love attitudes (a) interrelated, or related to GC’s reports of (b) GPs teaching love attitudes, (c) GP socializing practices, (d) relationship qualities, or (e) demographics?

H₇: GC’s reports of GP-GC solidarity will be associated with their reports of GP teaching love attitudes.

RQ₆: Does the sex of the GC make a difference in GC’s reports of GPs teaching love attitudes?

H₈: GC will report that grandmothers teach love attitudes more than grandfathers.

H₉: GC will report that maternal GPs teach love attitudes more than paternal GPs.

Continued
Table 3.2 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Method 1</th>
<th>Method 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ7a-e</td>
<td>Are GPs’ reports of their love attitudes (a) interrelated, or related to GPs’ reports of (b) GPs teaching love attitudes, (c) GP socializing practices, (d) relationship qualities, or (e) demographics?</td>
<td>Pearson correlation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10</td>
<td>GPs’ reports of GP-GC solidarity will be associated with their reports of teaching love attitudes.</td>
<td>Pearson correlation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11</td>
<td>Grandmothers will report teaching love attitudes more than grandfathers.</td>
<td>MANOVA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12</td>
<td>Maternal GPs will report teaching love attitudes more than paternal GPs.</td>
<td>MANOVA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ8</td>
<td>Are there generational differences between GC’s and GPs’ reports of love attitudes?</td>
<td>MANOVA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ9</td>
<td>Are there generational differences between GC’s and GPs’ reports of GPs teaching love attitudes?</td>
<td>MANOVA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generational analyses – GC’s and GPs’ reports of marital dimensions and GPs teaching marital dimensions

| RQ10a-c | Are GC’s reports of their marital dimensions (a) interrelated, or related to GC’s reports of (b) GPs teaching marital dimensions, (c) GP socializing practices, (d) relationship qualities, or (e) demographics? | Pearson correlation |  |

Continued
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Test Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H_{13}$: GC’s reports of GP-GC solidarity will be associated with their</td>
<td>Pearson correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reports of GPs teaching marital dimensions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$RQ_{11}$: Does the sex of the GC make a difference in GC’s reports of GPs</td>
<td>MANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching marital dimensions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{14}$: GC will report that grandmothers teach marital dimensions more</td>
<td>MANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than grandfathers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{15}$: GC will report that maternal GPs teach marital dimensions more</td>
<td>MANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than paternal GPs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$RQ_{12a-c}$: Are GPs’ reports of their marital dimensions (a) interrelated,</td>
<td>Pearson correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or related to GPs’ reports of (b) GPs teaching marital dimensions, (c) GP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>socializing practices, (d) relationship qualities, or (e) demographics?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{16}$: GPs’ reports of GP-GC solidarity will be associated with their</td>
<td>Pearson correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reports of GPs teaching marital dimensions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{17}$: Grandmothers will report teaching marital dimensions more than</td>
<td>MANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grandfathers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{18}$: Maternal GPs will report teaching marital dimensions more than</td>
<td>MANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paternal GPs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
RQ13: Are there generational differences between GC’s and GPs’ reports of marital dimensions?  

RQ14: Are there generational differences between GC’s and GPs’ reports of GPs teaching marital dimensions?  

**Matched set of GC and their GPs – Socialization, love attitudes, and marital dimensions**  

RQ15: Are there generational differences between GC’s and their matched GPs’ reports of (a) socialization practices, (b) love attitudes and teaching about love attitudes, (c) marital dimensions and teaching about marital dimensions, and (d) relationship qualities?  

RQ16: Are GC’s reports of GPs’ socialization practices related to their matched GPs’ reports of their socialization practices?  

RQ17: Are GC’s love attitudes and their reports of GPs teaching love attitudes related to their matched GPs’ love attitudes and their reports of teaching love attitudes to their matched GC?  

RQ18: Are GC’s love attitudes related to their matched GPs’ reports of their socialization practices?  

Continued
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ19</td>
<td>Are GC’s marital dimensions and their reports of GPs teaching marital dimensions related to their matched GPs’ marital dimensions and their reports of teaching marital dimensions to their matched GC?</td>
<td>Pearson correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ20</td>
<td>Are GC’s marital dimensions related to their matched GPs’ reports of their socialization practices?</td>
<td>Pearson correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ21</td>
<td>What factors, or combination of factors, best predict GC’s love attitudes?</td>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ22</td>
<td>What factors, or combination of factors, best predict GC’s marital dimensions?</td>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ23</td>
<td>Do GC’s reports of GP-GC solidarity modify the effects of the predictors of GC’s love attitudes?</td>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ24</td>
<td>Do GC’s reports of GP-GC solidarity modify the effects of the predictors of GC’s marital dimensions?</td>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the study. First, the study’s measures are substantiated with results of factor analyses and reliability tests. Next, the characteristics of the sample are described. Finally, the analyses that test the hypotheses and respond to the research questions are presented.

Substantiation of Instruments

One important feature of research is to use instruments that will adequately measure the constructs for the study. This section explains the procedures used to substantiate the study’s instruments that were developed or selected for use. Exploratory factor analyses, reliabilities, means, and standard deviations of the variables are presented.

Socialization Measure

The 60-item socialization inventory developed from responses obtained from the preliminary study was refined through an exploratory factor analysis (EFA). A series of decisions were made for the purpose of data reduction and detecting latent constructs within the socialization measure. First, the maximum likelihood factoring method for fitting the common factor model in EFA was selected as recommended by Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum, and Strahan (1999). Conway and Huffcutt (2003) concurs that the common factor model with the maximum likelihood method is the most accurate when
researchers desire to attach meaning to a set of variables. Second, *eigenvalues greater than one* criterion for the retained number of factors was used which retains factors that give a high proportion of variance accounted for.

Statistically and conceptually, most of the items created for the socialization measure were highly correlated ($r$s ranged from .74 to -.39). Therefore, the *oblique rotation* method of *direct oblimin* was selected, since this method has been shown to be a superior simple structure when compared to loadings from an orthogonal rotation (Fabrigar et al., 1999). Factor analyses were conducted separately for the GC and GP samples. Items were retained that loaded onto one factor with a loading greater than .30 but not cross-loaded onto other factors (as suggested by Fabrigar et al., 1999). Thirty-six items remained from the GC sample with a pattern of rotated factor loadings that resulted in six meaningful factors that accounted for 61.4% of the variance in the GC scores (see Table 4.1). Each item loaded on a single factor. The oblique rotation on the socialization responses from the GP sample produced 30 items loading on five similar factors that accounted for 59.23% of the variance of the GP scores (see Table 4.1). GPs did not respond to questions regarding the stories that others’ told about them.

Each of the six factors contained at least 4 items which satisfies the suggested criteria of a 4:1 item-to-factor ratio (Fabrigar et al., 1999). The six factors were labeled *GP Advice* (8 items), *Observations of GP Positive Behavior* (7 items), *Observations of GP Negative Behavior* (5 items), *GP Stories* (6 items), *Others’ Stories about GP* (6 items), and *GP Signs of Affection* (4 items).
### Table 4.1: Oblique Factor Analysis Results for Socialization ($N$ of GC = 190, $N$ of GP = 107)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socialization items</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GP advice (8 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observe GP + behaviors (7 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observe GP – behaviors (5 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observe GP stories (6 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others’ stories about GPs* (6 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observe GP affection (4 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get to know date’s family</td>
<td>.653 (.698)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others treat you right</td>
<td>.746 (.714)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love accomplishes many things</td>
<td>.585 (.553)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay faithful</td>
<td>.755 (.864)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have same values</td>
<td>.776 (.887)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be happy</td>
<td>.821 (.686)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love is unconditional</td>
<td>.598 (.779)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chivalry is not dead</td>
<td>.743 (.804)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observe GP smiling</td>
<td>.590 (.773)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observe GP physical caring</td>
<td>.692 (.681)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observe GP faithfulness</td>
<td>.869 (.492)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observe GP doing</td>
<td>.666 (.688)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observe GP happiness</td>
<td>.697 (.912)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observe GP respect</td>
<td>.800 (.862)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observe GP caring</td>
<td>.603 (.764)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. GP factor loadings appear in parentheses.

*Only grandchildren reported on this construct, $n = 190$. 

Continued
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| Observe yelling          | .640 (.427) |
| Observe ordering around  | .700 (.431) |
| GP is selfish            | .686 (.972) |
| GP is alcoholic          | .637 (.628) |
| GP is rude               | .669 (.619) |
| GP storytelling in general | .686 (.543) |
| GP stories of first meeting | .870 (.795) |
| GP stories of dating     | .915 (.756) |
| GP stories of wedding day | .594 (.840) |
| GP stories of tough times| .487 (.410) |
| GP stories of disagreements | .546 (.394) |
| Others’ stories about GP in general<sup>a</sup> | .643 |
| Others’ stories about GP wedding<sup>a</sup> | .439 |
| Others’ stories about happy times<sup>a</sup> | .758 |
| Others’ stories about GP providing<sup>a</sup> | .665 |
| Others’ stories about GP challenges<sup>a</sup> | .449 |
| Others’ stories about GPs’ love<sup>a</sup> | .666 |
| GP signs of affection    | .588 (.689) |
| GP teasing each other    | .521 (.667) |
| GP say endearing names   | .667 (.452) |
| GP say “I love you”      | .607 (.592) |

<sup>Note</sup>. GP factor loadings appear in parentheses.<br><sup>a</sup>Only grandchildren reported on this construct, n = 190.
Table 4.2: GC and GP means, standard deviations, and Cronbach standardized alphas for socializing factors (N for GC = 190, N for GP = 107)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socializing factors</th>
<th>Overall M</th>
<th>Overall SD</th>
<th>GC M</th>
<th>GC SD</th>
<th>GP M</th>
<th>GP SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GP advice</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP positive behavior</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP negative behavior</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP stories</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others’ stories about GPs</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP affection</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aOnly grandchildren reported this construct, n = 190.

Average scores for each socializing type were then calculated, with higher scores denoting greater frequency of the socializing type. Cronbach’s inter-item correlations were calculated for each socialization type, yielding standardized alphas that ranged from .78 to .92. See Table 4.2 for means, standard deviations, and alphas of socializing factors.

Love Attitude Scale

For an established scale, EFA is helpful in verifying the scale’s unidimensionality and can be effective for correlated or uncorrelated variables (Conway & Huffcutt, 2003). Therefore, all 24 items of LAS were entered in a common factor model using the maximum likelihood factoring method. The criterion for retained factors was set at
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Love items</th>
<th>Eros 4 items</th>
<th>Ludus 3 items</th>
<th>Storge 4 items</th>
<th>Pragma 4 items</th>
<th>Mania 4 items</th>
<th>Agape 4 items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eros 1</td>
<td>.690 (.805)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eros 2</td>
<td>.760 (.856)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eros 3</td>
<td>.738 (.735)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eros 4</td>
<td>.433 (.622)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ludus 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.933 (.482)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ludus 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.701 (.542)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ludus 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.495 (.342)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>storge 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.862 (.722)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>storge 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.823 (.695)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>storge 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.505 (.500)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>storge 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.831 (.906)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pragma 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.813 (.468)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pragma 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.636 (.411)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pragma 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.679 (.688)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pragma 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.662 (.760)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mania 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.876 (.652)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mania 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.343 (.672)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mania 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.604 (.617)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mania 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.470 (.891)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agape 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.602 (.761)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agape 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.771 (.759)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agape 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.733 (.829)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agape 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.732 (.537)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* GP factor loadings appear in parentheses.

**Table 4.3:** *Oblique factor analysis results for love attitude items* *(N of GC = 190, N of GP = 107)*
eigenvalues greater than one and the oblique rotation method of direct oblimin was selected. After elimination of one cross-loaded item (first Ludus item), Table 4.3 presents the remaining 23 items of the GC responses that created a pattern of rotated factor loadings that resulted in six meaningful factors that accounted for 54.58% of the variance in GC scores. Similar analyses of GP data also produced six factors that accounted for 55.52% of the variance in GP scores. These findings corresponded to the six love attitudes developed by Hendrick and Hendrick (1990). Each item loaded on a single factor. All factors resulting from the LAS measure contained 4 items per factor except Ludus which contained 3 items. Average scores for each love attitude were calculated, with higher scores denoting greater tendency toward each particular love attitude.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Love attitude</th>
<th>Overall M</th>
<th>Overall SD</th>
<th>GC M (SD)</th>
<th>GC α</th>
<th>GP M (SD)</th>
<th>GP α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eros</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>3.99 (.72)</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>4.08 (.85)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludus</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>2.28 (.90)</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>1.98 (.82)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storge</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>3.23 (1.09)</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>3.58 (.96)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragma</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>2.90 (.98)</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>2.90 (.88)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mania</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>2.86 (.90)</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>2.42 (.95)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agape</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>3.34 (.83)</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>3.71 (.84)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: GC and GP means, standard deviations, and Cronbach standardized alphas for love attitudes (N of GC = 190, N of GP = 107)
attitude. Cronbach’s inter-item correlations were calculated for each love attitude scale yielding standardized alphas ranged from .69 to .86. Refer to Table 4.4 for means, standard deviations, and alphas of love attitudes as reported by GC and GPs.

Relational Dimensions Instrument

From the GC data, the 24 items composing the RDI were entered in a common factor model using the maximum likelihood factoring method. The criterion for retained factors was set at eigenvalues greater than one and the oblique rotation method of direct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital dimension items</th>
<th>Sharing 3 items</th>
<th>Assertive 3 items</th>
<th>Autonomy 3 items</th>
<th>Temporal 3 items</th>
<th>Traditionalism 3 items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sharing 1</td>
<td>.888 (.847)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharing 2</td>
<td>.739 (.852)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharing 3</td>
<td>.404 (.785)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assertive 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.803 (1.014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assertive 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.892 (.614)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assertive 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.353 (.411)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autonomy 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.870 (.702)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autonomy 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.821 (.370)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autonomy 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.620 (.472)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temporal 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.533 (.546)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temporal 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.762 (.918)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temporal 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.605 (.510)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traditionalism 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.710 (.772)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traditionalism 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.487 (.519)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traditionalism 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.537 (.198)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. GP factor loadings appear in parentheses.*

Table 4.5: Oblique factor analysis results for marital dimension items (N of GC = 190, N of GP = 107)
oblimin was selected (see Table 4.5). Through elimination of low loading values and cross-loading items, 15 items remained and resulted in five meaningful factors that accounted for 51.75% of the variance in the scores. Each item loaded on a single factor. The same analysis was conducted for the GP data also resulting in five factors that accounted for 58.93% of the variance in the GP scores. In the early exploratory factor analyses of this measure, Fitzpatrick and Indvik (1982) decided to retain 64 items that factored into 8 distinct dimensions. The alphas of the eight dimensions ranged from .46 to .88. Decisions for the present study were based upon more stringent criteria as recommended by Fabrigar et al. (1999).

As a result of the oblique method application to the RDI measure, three items were contained in each factor. Cronbach’s alphas were calculated for each marital dimension. The autonomy, temporal, and traditional marital dimensions did not have adequate reliabilities (αs ranged from .56 to .66). Calculations on the remaining two dimensions yielded standardized alphas ranging from .70 to .89. Average scores for these dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital dimension</th>
<th>Overall M</th>
<th>Overall SD</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>GC M (SD)</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>GP M (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharing</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>6.11 (.80)</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>4.38 (1.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>2.52 (1.30)</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>2.25 (1.07)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6: GC and GP means, standard deviations, and Cronbach standardized alphas for marital dimensions (N of GC = 190, N of GP = 107)
remaining marital dimensions were calculated, with higher scores denoting greater tendency toward each dimension. Refer to Table 4.6 for means, standard deviations, and alphas of marital dimensions as reported by GC and GPs.

**GP-GC Affectual Solidarity**

All five items measuring GP-GC affectual solidarity were entered in a common factor model using the maximum likelihood factoring method. With the oblique rotation method of direct oblimin, only one factor was extracted from these five items that accounted for 58.10% of the variance of GC scores and 48.85% of the variance of GP scores. The five items were then averaged to produce an overall measure of solidarity ($M = 5.96$, $SD = 1.07$). Means, standard deviations, and Cronbach’s alphas were calculated for the two samples (GC: $M = 5.72$, $SD = 1.15$, $\alpha = .87$; GP: $M = 6.40$, $SD = .71$, $\alpha = .82$).

The next section reports findings in response to the hypotheses and research questions in two ways. First, the full sample is examined by assessing GC’s and GPs’ responses as two family groups from two generations. Second, reports from the matched set of GC and their GPs are used to assess a second set of hypotheses and research questions.

**Characteristics of the Full Sample of GC and GPs**

The study sample consisted of a total of 297 individuals, 190 GC and 107 GPs. The GC ranged in age from 15 to 29 years, with a mean age of 22 years. The distribution of the GC’s sex was 126 females and 64 males (66.3% and 33.7%, respectively). Most of GC were Caucasians (70%). The sample also included 15.8% African Americans, 7.4% Asians, 2.1% Hispanics, 1.1% Native Americans, and 3.7% represented other races. A majority of GC were enrolled in college (88.9%), one was in high school (.5%), and
10.5% of the grandchildren held a college degree. Twenty-three percent of the GC reported being single, 28.9% were casually dating, and 35.3% were seriously dating. Two percent of the GC were engaged, 7.4% were cohabitating with a romantic partner, and 3.2% were married. One hundred thirty-three (70%) of the GC reported that their parents were still married to each other, 17 (8.9%) reported that their parents were either single or in a relationship with someone other than the other parent, and 40 (21.1%) failed to report their parents’ relationship status.

Grandparents ranged in age from 53 to 94 years, with a mean age of 74 years. GPs’ sex consisted of 76 females and 31 males (71% and 29% of sample, respectively). The race composition of GPs was mostly Caucasian (72.9%). The sample also included 18.7% African Americans, 2.8% Asians, .9% Hispanics, 1.9% Native Americans, and 2.8% represented other races. Only 7.5% of GPs had not graduated from high school. About half (49.5%) of GPs reported being high school graduates, 21.5% had some college, and 21.4% held a college or technical school degree. Nearly half (47.7%) of GPs were still married to their original spouse. The balance of GPs reported their relationships as being single (4.7%), casually dating (.9%), divorced (4.7%), widowed (32.7%), and remarried (9.3%). GPs reported having a range of 1 to 13 children ($M = 4$) and a range of 1 to 37 grandchildren ($M = 9$).

*Generational Analyses of Grandchildren’s Socialization by Grandparents*

This section presents analyses of GP socialization of their GC by examining the perspectives of the two family member groups (GC and GPs). These general analyses are first conducted separately for each generation, and then analyses are presented that compare the two generations’ responses. The analyses respond to the three sets of
research questions and hypotheses to study GP socialization. In response to RQ1–4 and H1–6, GPs’ general socializing practices about love and marriage are assessed. Next, RQ5–9 and H7–12 regarding love attitudes and how GPs teach their GC about these love attitudes are examined. Finally, RQ10–14 and H13–18 on the assessment of marital beliefs and how GPs teach their GC about these beliefs are examined. The overall goal of this section on generational analyses is to report the findings from these research questions and hypotheses from the separate groups of GC and GPs.

**GP Socialization Practices**

To respond to the first set of research questions (RQ1–4) and hypotheses (H1–6), I examined six GP socialization practices: GP advice, observations of GPs’ positive behaviors, GP stories, observing GP affection, observations of GPs’ negative behaviors, and (from only GC’s reports) others’ stories about GPs.

**GC’s reports of GP socialization.** Beginning with RQ1 and 2 and H1–3, the GC’s reports of GP socialization practices, relationship qualities, and demographics were examined first. Means and standard deviations of these constructs are displayed in Table 4.7. The socialization practice reported by the GC with the greatest frequency was observations of GP’s positive behaviors ($M = 3.79, SD = 1.11$). Others’ stories about the GPs ($M = 3.29, SD = .94$) were noted by GC as the next most frequent and occurred more than occasionally. GP advice ($M = 2.71, SD = 1.21$) and observing GP affection ($M = 2.71, SD = 1.24$) both were reported by GC as occurring occasionally. GP stories ($M = 2.52, SD = 1.04$) were also reported by GC with a frequency of rarely to occasionally. Finally, GC’s reports of observing GPs’ negative behaviors ($M = 1.76, SD = .79$)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GC reports</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. GP advice</td>
<td>2.71 (1.21)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. GP + behaviors</td>
<td>3.79 (1.11)</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. GP stories</td>
<td>2.52 (1.04)</td>
<td>.68***</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. GP affection</td>
<td>2.71 (1.24)</td>
<td>.51***</td>
<td>.72***</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Others’ stories</td>
<td>3.29 (1.94)</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. GP – behaviors</td>
<td>1.76 (1.79)</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Solidarity w/ GP</td>
<td>5.70 (1.16)</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>-0.38***</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. GPs’ marital happiness&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.26 (1.80)</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.72***</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>-0.32***</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Parents’ marital happiness&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.61 (1.49)</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. GP close to Mom&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.09 (1.97)</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>-0.21**</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. GP close to Dad&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.36 (2.08)</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>-0.22***</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. GC sex (F=1, M=2)</td>
<td>1.34 (47)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. GC age</td>
<td>22.11 (1.96)</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Target GP sex (F=1, M=2)</td>
<td>1.36 (48)</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. # of GC</td>
<td>9.07 (6.19)</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>n = 180. <sup>b</sup>n = 180. <sup>c</sup>n = 186. <sup>d</sup>n = 182.

<sup>p</sup>p < .05. <sup>**p</sup>p < .01. <sup>***p</sup>p < .001.

Table 4.7: Means, Standard Deviations, and Pearson Correlations of GCs’ Reports of GP Socialization, Relationship Qualities, and Demographics (N = 190)
indicated that this socialization practice only rarely occurred, if at all. Pearson correlations and MANOVAs were conducted to assess the GC’s report of the six GP socializing practices and the other study variables.

RQ$_{1a-1c}$ asked about the relationship between GP socialization practices, relationship qualities, and demographics from the GC’s perspective. Measures of relationship qualities from the GC’s perspective included five constructs: solidarity with their GPs, GPs’ marital happiness, parents’ marital happiness, GPs’ closeness with the GC’s mother, and GPs’ closeness with the GC’s father. Demographics included four constructs: GC’s sex, GC’s age, the target GP’s sex, and the target GP’s number of grandchildren. The means, standard deviations, and relevant Pearson correlations are presented in Table 4.7.

In response to RQ$_{1a}$, the GC’s reports of the six GP socializing practices were all positively correlated with one another ($r$s ranged from .32 to .72), with the exception of GC’s observations of negative GP behaviors that was not associated with any of the other socialization practices. Among these interrelationships, the strongest of associations were between GC’s reports of observations of GPs’ positive behaviors and GP affection ($r = .72$), and between GP advice and GP stories ($r = .68$). All others of the interrelationships were moderately associated.

RQ$_{1b}$ asked whether relationship qualities were related to GP socialization practices. Assessment of solidarity is assessed in a separate hypothesis following RQ$_1$. Pearson correlations (see Table 4.7) revealed that GC’s perception of their GPs’ marital happiness was positively correlated with five of the socializing practices ($r$s ranged from -.32 to .72), with the strongest association with observing GPs’ positive behaviors. GPs’
marital happiness was negatively correlated with observing GPs’ negative behaviors to a moderate extent (r = -.32). GC’s perception of their parents’ marital happiness was positively related to three of the six socializing practices (i.e., GP advice, observation of positive GP behaviors, and others’ stories about GPs), although they were weaker in magnitude (rs ranged from .19 to .28). Also, the GC’s perception of GPs’ closeness to their GC’s parents was positively associated with all six GP socializing practices (rs ranged from .21 to .35), with only one exception (GP stories and GP closeness to the GC’s father). GP closeness to both GC’s mother and father were negatively correlated to GP’s negative behaviors (rs = -.21 and -.22, respectively). Overall, marital happiness among both GPs and parents of the GC, as well as GP closeness to the GC’s parents, was connected to GPs’ frequency of all six socializing practices.

RQ1c asked about the relationship between GP socializing practices and GC demographics. GC sex and target GP sex, as well as GP lineage (maternal or paternal) are reported later. GC’s age was weakly associated with one of the socialization practices, frequency of observations of GP affection, r = -.18. The number of grandchildren of the target GP was not associated with GC’s reports of GP socializing practices (see Table 4.7).

H1 predicted that GC’s reports of solidarity with their target GP would be correlated with GP socializing practices. H1 was supported, as all socializing practices were positively associated to a moderate degree with GP-GC solidarity (rs ranged from .33 to .47, see Table 4.7), with the exception of observation of GP negative behaviors which was negatively associated with GP-GC solidarity (r = -.38). Additional analyses
revealed that solidarity with GPs was also associated with GPs’ closeness to the GC’s mother and father ($r_s = .45$ and $.42$, respectively) and the GC’s perception of GPs’ and GC’s parents’ marital happiness ($r_s = .46$ and $.19$, respectively).

RQ2 asked if GC’s sex made a difference in their reports of GP socializing practices, while H2 predicted that GC would report that grandmothers more frequently used the six socialization practices than grandfathers. With the six GP socializing practices as dependent variables, a 2 X 2 MANOVA design was used with GC sex (1 = female, 2 = male) and target GP sex (1 = grandmother, 2 = grandfather) as the independent variables. In response to RQ2, the multivariate main effect for GC sex was not significant, Wilks $\lambda = .98$, $F(6, 181) = .78$, $p = ns$, indicating that there were no differences between the male and female GC’s reports of GP socialization. However, H2 was supported as the multivariate main effect for the target GP sex was significant, Wilks $\lambda = .86$, $F(6, 181) = 4.84$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .14$. The interaction of GC sex and target GP sex only approached significance, Wilks $\lambda = .94$, $F(6, 181) = 2.05$, $p = .06$, $\eta^2 = .06$. Three of the six socializing practices reported by the GC had significant univariate effects for differences in the sex of the target GP: GP telling stories [$F(1, 188) = 10.79$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2 = .05$], observations of GP’s affection [$F(1, 188) = 4.05$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .02$], and observing GP’s negative behavior [$F(1, 188) = 5.41$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .03$]. The GC perceived that grandmothers ($M = 2.70$, $SD = .99$) socialized by telling stories more frequently than grandfathers ($M = 2.20$, $SD = 1.05$). On the other hand, GC perceived that grandfathers ($M = 2.95$, $SD = 1.27$) socialized by showing affection more frequently than
grandmothers \((M = 2.58, SD = 1.20)\), and through GC learning more from observing negative behaviors from grandfathers \((M = 1.94, SD = .90)\) than grandmothers \((M = 1.66, SD = .71)\).

H\(_3\) predicted that maternal GPs would be perceived by their GC as socializing more frequently than paternal GPs. Once again using the six GP socializing practices as reported by GC as dependent variables, a 2 X 2 MANOVA design was used with the target GP lineage \((1 = \text{maternal GPs}, 2 = \text{paternal GPs})\) and GC sex \((1 = \text{female}, 2 = \text{male})\) as the independent variables. H\(_3\) was supported as the multivariate main effect for GP lineage was significant, Wilks \(\lambda = .91\), \(F(6, 181) = 3.06, p < .01, \eta^2 = .09\). The interaction of GC sex and target GP lineage was not significant, Wilks \(\lambda = .94\), \(F(6, 181) = 1.83, p = \text{ns}\). The GC’s report of GP telling stories \([F(1, 186) = 5.80, p < .05, \eta^2 = .03]\) was the only significant univariate effect found for GP lineage differences. Grandchildren perceived that maternal GPs \((M = 2.65, SD = 1.03)\) used stories to socialize more frequently than paternal GPs \((M = 2.35, SD = 1.04)\).

Overall findings from GC’s reports of GP socialization practices revealed that the six practices were interrelated. Also, GC’s reports of solidarity, GP and parent marital happiness, and GP closeness to GC’s parents were related to the six socialization practices. GC perceived grandmothers as socializing through telling stories more than grandfathers, and GC perceived grandfathers socializing more than grandmothers through showing affection and observing their GPs’ negative behaviors.

**GPs’ reports of GP socialization.** Turning to RQ\(_3\) and \_4 and H\(_4–6\) and only the GPs’ responses, GP reports of their own socialization practices, relationship qualities, and demographics were examined next. GPs’ also reported on the importance of teaching
their GC about love and marriage. Means and standard deviations of these constructs are reported in Table 4.8. In these analyses, GP socialization included five practices of GP advice, observing GPs’ positive behaviors, GP stories, GP affection, and observing GPs’ negative behaviors. The socialization practice that was reported by GPs with the greatest frequency was GPs’ positive behaviors ($M = 4.41, SD = .69$). Showing affection ($M = 3.67, SD = .97$) was the GPs’ next highest in frequency and occurred more than occasionally. GP advice ($M = 3.14, SD = 1.24$) and GP stories ($M = 2.90, SD = 1.03$) were also reported by GC as occurring occasionally. Finally, GP’s reports of GC observing the GPs’ negative behaviors ($M = 1.85, SD = .74$) indicated that this socialization practice rarely occurred.

RQ$_{3a–3c}$ asked about the relationship between GP socialization practices, relationship qualities, and demographics from the GP’s perspective. Measures of relationship qualities from the GP’s perspective included four constructs: solidarity with the target GC, GP marital happiness, and GPs’ closeness with the GC’s parents. Demographics for these analyses included four constructs: GPs’ sex, GPs’ age, number of their children, and number of their grandchildren. Table 4.8 show that the frequencies of GP socializing practices of giving advice, telling stories, and showing affection were all positively interrelated ($r$s ranged from .29 to .62), with the strongest interrelationship between GP advice and GP stories. GPs’ report of socializing through positive behaviors was also highly associated with GP affection ($r = .70$). GPs’ report of GC’s observing GPs’ negative behavior was negatively associated with observing GPs’ positive behaviors and GP affection ($r$s = -.34 and -.28, respectively). There were no other interrelations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GP reports</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. GP advice</td>
<td>3.14 (1.24)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. GP + behaviors</td>
<td>4.41 (.69)</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. GP stories</td>
<td>2.90 (1.03)</td>
<td>.62*** .07</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. GP affection</td>
<td>3.67 (.97)</td>
<td>.29** .70*** .33***</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. GP – behaviors</td>
<td>1.85 (.74)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.34***</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Imp to teach love</td>
<td>4.02 (.84)</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Imp teach marriage</td>
<td>3.96 (.82)</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.75***</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Solidarity w/ GC</td>
<td>6.40 (.71)</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. GPs marital happiness</td>
<td>5.79 (1.56)</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.77***</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>-.33***</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. GP close to Mom</td>
<td>5.53 (2.02)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. GP close to Dad</td>
<td>5.10 (1.94)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. GP sex (F=1, M=2)</td>
<td>1.29 (.46)</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. GP age</td>
<td>73.73 (8.57)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>-.42***</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. # of children</td>
<td>3.97 (2.33)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.32***</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. # of GC</td>
<td>8.87 (7.04)</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.81***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8: Means, Standard Deviations, and Pearson Correlations of GPs’ Reports of Socialization, Relationship Qualities, and Demographics (N = 107)
among the socializing practices. GPs’ reports of the importance of teaching about love and marriage were positively associated with GP advice-giving, story-telling, and affection \((r_s\text{ ranged from } .23\text{ to } .37)\).

RQ\textsubscript{3b} inquired about relationship qualities and their associations with GP socialization practices. Table 4.8 shows that GPs’ own marital happiness was strongly associated with GP positive behaviors and GP affection \((r_s = .77\text{ and } .62, \text{ respectively})\) but negatively associated with GP negative behaviors \((r = -.33)\). GPs’ report of closeness to the GC’s mother was negatively associated with observations of negative GP behaviors \((r = -.26)\).

RQ\textsubscript{3c} asked about GP socializing practices and demographics (Pearson correlations reported in Table 4.8). The only significant findings were the negative correlations between GPs’ age and GP story-telling \((r = -.26)\) and observations of GP negative behaviors \((r = -.25)\). Younger GPs reported telling stories more often than older grandparents reported. Also, younger GPs reported, more often than older GPs, that their GC observed their negative behaviors.

H\textsubscript{4} predicted that GPs’ reports of GP-GC solidarity would be associated with GP socializing practices. This hypothesis was partially supported GP solidarity was significantly related to GP positive behaviors, GP affection, and GP negative behaviors \((r_s = .21, .23, \text{ and } -.21, \text{ respectively}; \text{ see Table 4.8})\). GP advice-giving and telling stories were not correlated with solidarity. On the other hand, GP solidarity was positively correlated with their reports of the importance of teaching their GC about love and marriage \((r_s = .25\text{ and } .23, \text{ respectively})\). GPs’ solidarity with their GC was also
moderately associated with GPs’ marital happiness and closeness to the GC’s mother and
father (\( r_s = .25, .24, \) and .34, respectively). As the number of children and grandchildren
increased, the GPs reported less solidarity with their GC (\( r_s = -.32 \) and -.21, respectively).

H5 predicted that higher frequencies of socializing practices would be reported by
grandmothers more than by grandfathers, and H6 predicted that higher frequencies of
socializing practice would be reported by maternal GPs more than by paternal GPs. With
the five GP socializing practices as dependent variables, a 2 X 2 MANOVA design was
used with GP sex (grandmother, grandfather) and GP lineage (maternal GPs, paternal
GPs) as the independent variables. H5 was supported, as the multivariate main effect for
GP sex was significant, Wilks \( \lambda = .83, F(5, 99) = 4.19, p < .01, \eta^2 = .18 \). Significant
univariate effects were found for GP sex differences on two of the five socialization
practices: GPs giving advice \( [F(1, 103) = 5.38, p < .05, \eta^2 = .05] \) and GPs telling stories
\( [F(1, 103) = 6.05, p < .05, \eta^2 = .06] \). As expected, grandmothers reported socializing
through giving advice to their GC (\( M = 3.31, SD = 1.16 \)) more than grandfathers reported
(\( M = 2.72, SD = 1.32 \)). Grandmothers also reported socializing through telling stories (\( M =
3.05, SD = 1.00 \)) more frequently than grandfathers (\( M = 2.52, SD = 1.02 \)). H6 was also
supported as the multivariate main effect for GP lineage was significant, Wilks \( \lambda = .86,
F(5, 99) = 3.34, p < .01, \eta^2 = .14 \). A main effect for the interaction of GP sex and GP
lineage was also significant, Wilks \( \lambda = .86, F(5, 99) = 3.12, p = .01, \eta^2 = .14 \). Not any one
socializing practice brought about these two multivariate effects but the overall
combination of the socializing practices revealed significant differences.
In sum, a number of significant inter-relationships between GPs’ reports of socialization practices were present. However, also interesting is the lack of association between the two socializing practices that display direct communication (i.e., GP advice and GP stories) and the two socializing practices of observations of GP positive and GP negative behaviors. Greater importance in teaching GC about love and marriage was associated with GP advice-giving and story-telling. GP-GC solidarity and GP marital happiness was related to GP affection, observing GP positive behaviors, and observing GP negative behaviors. As expected, grandmothers reported greater frequency of advice-giving and story-telling as avenues to socialize GC than grandfathers.

**Generational comparisons of GC’s reports to GPs’ reports of GP socialization.**

RQ4 asked if there are generational differences between GC’s reports of GP socialization practices and GPs’ reports of their own socialization practices. A MANOVA design was used with the two generations (GC, GPs) as the independent factor and the five GP socializing practices as dependent variables (i.e., GP advice, observing positive GP behaviors, GP telling stories, GP affection, and observing negative GP behaviors). The multivariate main effect for differences in generational reports (GC and GPs) about GP socialization was significant, Wilks $\lambda = .86$, $F(5, 291) = 9.86$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .15$. Table 4.9 reports the univariate effects. GPs reported higher frequencies of socializing than the frequencies reported by GC for four of the five GP socializing practices, including GP advice, observing positive behaviors of GPs, GP story-telling, and GP affection.
Table 4.9: Means, Standard Deviations, and Univariate Effect Differences for GC and GP Reports of GP Socializing Practices (N of GC = 190, N of GP = 107)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socializing practices</th>
<th>Grandchildren $M (SD)$</th>
<th>Grandparents $M (SD)$</th>
<th>Univariate effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GP advice</td>
<td>2.70 (1.21)</td>
<td>3.14 (1.24)</td>
<td>$F(1, 295) = 8.77, p = .003$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP + behaviors</td>
<td>3.78 (1.11)</td>
<td>4.41 (.69)</td>
<td>$F(1, 295) = 28.18, p &lt; .001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP stories</td>
<td>2.52 (1.04)</td>
<td>2.90 (1.03)</td>
<td>$F(1, 295) = 9.37, p = .002$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP affection</td>
<td>2.71 (1.24)</td>
<td>3.67 (.97)</td>
<td>$F(1, 295) = 47.14, p &lt; .001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP – behaviors</td>
<td>1.77 (.79)</td>
<td>1.85 (.74)</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GP socialization practices summary.** The findings from the analyses of GC’s and GPs’ reports of GP socialization practices provided insights into the frequency of GP socialization and what GP socialization looks like. Overall, GPs reported greater frequency of socializing practices (with the exception of observations of GPs’ negative behaviors) than GC reported. But, GC’s perceptions of desirable GP socialization practices were consistently associated with one another while GPs’ associations of these same practices were more inconsistent. GC also viewed GP-GC solidarity, GPs’ marital happiness, and GPs’ closeness to the GC’s parents as more consistently related to all their reports of GP socialization practices than the GPs’ reports of associations between GP socialization practices and these same relationship qualities. Both generations agreed that grandmothers use story-telling to socialize more than grandfathers.
**Love Attitudes and GPs Teaching Love Attitudes**

The second set of research questions (RQ5 – 9) and hypotheses (H7 – 12) assessed love attitudes (i.e., Eros, Ludus, Storge, Pragma, Mania, and Agape) and GPs’ socialization about these love attitudes. Three perspectives on love attitudes and GPs teaching love attitudes are analyzed: GC’s reports of their own love attitudes and GC’s report of their GPs teaching each love attitude type; GPs’ reports of their own love attitudes and their indication of teaching their GC about each love attitude type, and an overall generational comparison of the GC and GP reports.

**GC’s reports of love attitudes and GPs teaching love attitudes.** This section responds to RQ5 and 6 and H7 – 9 by examining the interrelationships of the GC’s reports of their love attitudes, GPs’ teaching of love attitudes, GP socialization practices, relationship qualities, and demographics. Means and standard deviations of these constructs are reported in Table 4.10.

RQ5a – 5e asked about the relationship between GC’s love attitudes, GPs’ teaching love attitude behaviors, GP socialization practices, relationship qualities, and demographics from the GC’s perspective. The relevant Pearson correlations are presented in Table 4.10. In response to RQ5a, the GC’s reports of their own love attitudes had several moderate positive interrelationships; in particular, GC reporting a Pragma style also endorsed all the other love styles ($r$s ranged from .15 to .32).

RQ5b asked about the relationship between love attitudes and the GC’s perception of GPs teaching about love attitudes. Four of the six GC’s love attitudes (i.e., Eros, Storge, Pragma, and Agape) were directly associated with the GC’s reports that GPs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GC reports</th>
<th>( M (SD) )</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Eros</td>
<td>3.99 (.72)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ludus</td>
<td>2.19 (1.02)</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Storge</td>
<td>3.23 (1.09)</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pragma</td>
<td>2.90 (.98)</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mania</td>
<td>2.86 (.90)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Agape</td>
<td>3.34 (.83)</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. GP taught Eros</td>
<td>.14 (.14)</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. GP taught Ludus</td>
<td>.06 (.12)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. GP taught Storge</td>
<td>.13 (.14)</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.72***</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. GP taught Pragma</td>
<td>.13 (.13)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. GP taught Mania</td>
<td>.06 (.11)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>.76***</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. GP taught Agape</td>
<td>.16 (.15)</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.69***</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP advice</td>
<td>2.71 (1.21)</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP + behaviors</td>
<td>3.79 (1.11)</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.30***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP stories</td>
<td>2.52 (1.04)</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.20***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP affection</td>
<td>2.71 (1.24)</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.28***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others’ stories</td>
<td>3.29 (94)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.22***</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP – behaviors</td>
<td>1.76 (.79)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity w/ GP</td>
<td>5.70 (1.16)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPs’ marital happiness(^a)</td>
<td>5.26 (1.80)</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ marital happiness(^b)</td>
<td>5.61 (1.49)</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP close to Mom(^c)</td>
<td>5.09 (1.97)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP close to Dad(^d)</td>
<td>4.36 (2.08)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC sex (F=1, M=2)</td>
<td>1.34 (.47)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC age</td>
<td>22.11 (1.96)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target GP sex ((F=1, M=2))</td>
<td>1.36 (.48)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.16*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)\(n = 180\). \(^b\)\(n = 180\). \(^c\)\(n = 186\). \(^d\)\(n = 182\). \(^*\)\(p < .05\). \(^* *\)\(p < .01\). \(^* * *\)\(p < .001\).

Table 4.10: Means, Standard Deviations, and Pearson Correlations of GC’s Love Attitudes, Socialization, Relationship Qualities, and Demographics \(N = 190\)
taught those four love attitudes ($r$s ranged from .14 to .40, see Table 4.10). GC’s Pragma
love attitude was consistently related to GC’s perception of GPs teaching about all six
love attitudes ($r$s ranged from .22 to .40), with the strongest of these being the direct
relationship with GPs teaching about Pragma. Four other positive, but moderate,
relationships were found, including: GC’s Eros with GP teaching Agape ($r = .15$), GC’s
Ludus with GP teaching Pragma and Mania ($r$s = .15 and .17, respectively), and GC’s
Storge with GP teaching Eros ($r = .17$).

RQ5c asked about relationships between GC love attitudes and GC’s reports of GP
socialization practices. GC who reported higher Storge or Pragma love attitudes also
reported greater frequencies across all types of GP socialization practices ($r$s ranged from
.17 to .27), with the exception of the relationship between Storge and GP negative
behaviors (see Table 4.10). Three other love attitudes also were positively related to GP
socialization practices, including: GC’s Eros with GP advice and observations of GP
positive behaviors ($r$s = .20 and .17, respectively), GC’s Ludus with observations of GP
negative behaviors ($r = .15$), and GC’s Agape with observations of GP positive behaviors
($r = .16$).

In additional analyses, all six GC’s reports of GPs’ teaching love attitudes were
positively related to five of the socialization practices, with the exception of observations
of GP negative behaviors. Specifically, moderate to strong positive correlations were
found between teaching love attitudes and socialization practices, ranging from .14 to .43,
with teaching Ludus and observations of GP positive behaviors the only relationship that
was not statistically significant. The GC’s report of GP negative behaviors was positively associated with only GPs’ teaching of Pragma and Mania ($r_{s} = .20$ and .17, respectively).

RQ$_{5d}$ asked if GC’s love attitudes were related to their reported relationship qualities. The GC’s perception of their GPs’ marital happiness was related to their own Eros love attitude ($r = .15$, see Table 4.10), and related to GPs’ teaching four love attitudes; Eros, Storge, Pragma, and Agape ($r_{s}$ ranged from .15 to .24). GC’s reports of parents’ marital happiness were positively associated with their own Storge style ($r = .24$). GC’s perception of GPs’ closeness to GC’s mother was positively related to GC’s Pragma style ($r = .15$) and to their reports of GPs’ teaching of Eros, Pragma, and Mania styles ($r_{s}$ ranged from .15 to .17). GC’s Agape was the only love attitude that was related to GPs’ closeness to the GC’s father ($r = .24$).

Finally, RQ$_{5e}$ asked about whether the demographics were related to GC’s love attitudes. A positive relationship was found between the GC’s age and their Ludus love attitude ($r = .15$, see Table 4.10), indicating that older GC were more likely to have a Ludus style. Also, there was an inverse relationship between GC’s Eros style and the number of GC ($r = -.14$).

H$_{7}$ predicted that GC’s reports of GC-GP solidarity would be correlated with GPs’ teaching of love attitudes. Pearson correlations (see Table 4.10) indicated that H$_{7}$ was supported, as the GC’s reports of GP solidarity was moderately associated with GPs’ teaching of five love attitudes; Eros, Ludus, Storge, Pragma, and Agape ($r_{s}$ ranged from .14 to .25). Only GPs’ teaching Mania was not associated with solidarity.
RQ6 asked if the GC’s sex made a difference in their reports of GPs’ teaching love attitudes, and H8 predicted that GC would report that grandmothers taught about love attitudes more than grandfathers. With the GC’s reports of GPs teaching love attitudes as dependent variables, a 2 X 2 MANOVA design was used with GC sex (female, male) and target GP sex (grandmother, grandfather) the independent variables. In response to RQ6, the multivariate main effect for GC’s sex was not significant, Wilks $\lambda = .97, F(6, 181) = .95, p = ns$, indicating that there was no difference between female GC’s and male GC’s reports about their GPs’ teaching love attitudes. H8 was not supported as the multivariate main effect for target GP sex was not significant, Wilks $\lambda = .94, F(6, 181) = 1.85, p = ns$. Hence, no difference was found in GC’s reports in whether grandmother or grandfather was teaching love attitudes. The interaction of GC sex and target GP sex was also not significant, Wilks $\lambda = .98, F(6, 181) = .75, p = ns$. The sex of either the GC or GP did not make a difference in the use of GP socialization practices.

Additional analyses were conducted for RQ6 to determine if GC sex differences existed among the GC’s reports of their own love attitudes. A MANOVA design was used with GC sex (female, male) as the independent variable factor and the GC’s reports of their six love attitudes as the dependent variables. A significant multivariate main effect for sex differences was found for the GC’s love attitudes, Wilks $\lambda = .91, F(6, 183) = 2.93, p < .01, \eta^2 = .09$. Ludus and Agape had significant univariate effects for GC sex differences; $F(1, 188) = 5.06, p < .05, \eta^2 = .03$; and $F(1, 188) = 5.83, p < .01, \eta^2 = .05$,.
respectively. Male GC’s reports of Ludus and Agape attitudes \([M(SD)_{\text{Ludus}} = 2.43(1.09),
M(SD)_{\text{Agape}} = 3.58(.80)]\) were higher than the female GC’s reports of these love attitudes
\([M(SD)_{\text{Ludus}} = 2.08(.90), M(SD)_{\text{Agape}} = 3.21(.82)]\).

H₀ predicted that GC would report that their maternal GPs taught about love
attitudes more than paternal GPs. Once again using the GC’s reports of GPs teaching love
attitudes as the dependent variables, a 2 X 2 MANOVA design was used with GC sex
(female, male) and target GP lineage (maternal GPs, paternal GPS) the independent
variables. H₀ was not supported as the multivariate main effect for the target GP lineage
was not significant, Wilks \(\lambda = .95, F(6, 181) = 1.75, p = \text{ns}\). No differences were found in
GC’s reports on GPs’ teaching love attitudes, whether the target GP was a maternal GP or
a paternal GP. The interaction of GC sex and target GP lineage was also not significant,
Wilks \(\lambda = .96, F(6, 181) = 1.19, p = \text{ns}\), so various combinations of GC sex and GP
lineage among the reports did not affect the report of frequency of GP socialization
practices.

In sum, GC’s love attitudes and their reports of GPs teaching about love attitudes
were generally positively interrelated and related to their perception of GPs’ socialization
practices. GC’s Pragma love attitude was consistently and positively associated with all
other love attitudes, GPs teaching all love attitudes, and all GP socialization practices.
GC’s Storge love attitude also had numerous associations with GP socialization. Direct
associations between a love attitude and reports of GPs teaching about that same love
attitude were found for four of the six love attitudes. The two exceptions were GC’s Ludus and Mania love attitudes, indicating that the GC did not perceive that their GPs taught directly about these two styles of loving.

**GPs’ reports of love attitudes and GPs teaching love attitudes.** This next section assesses RQ7 and 8 and H7–9, which examines the interrelationships of GPs’ own love attitudes, GPs’ teaching about love attitudes, GP socialization practices, relationship qualities, and demographics. Means and standard deviations of these constructs are reported in Table 4.11.

RQ7a-e asked about the constructs stated above from the GP’s perspective. The relevant Pearson correlations are presented in Table 4.11. In response to RQ7a, most of the GP love attitudes were interrelated. The GPs’ Pragma love attitude was positively associated with GPs’ Eros, Ludus, Storge, and Mania, but not with Agape (rs ranged from .23 to .45). GPs’ Agape love attitude was moderately and positively associated with GPs’ Eros, Storge, and Mania (rs ranged from .26 to .49). Other positive associations among GPs’ love attitudes were between Eros and Storge (r = .54), and between Ludus and Mania (r = .52).

RQ7b asked about the relationship between love attitudes and GPs teaching about love attitudes from the GPs’ perspective. Table 4.11 shows that four of the six GPs’ love attitudes (i.e., Eros, Storge, Pragma, and Agape; see Table 4.11) were positively correlated, with the GPs’ reports of teaching these love attitudes (rs ranged from .25 to .36). So, when GPs’ reported one of these love attitudes, they also reported teaching their GC about that same love attitude. These relationships were not found for GPs’ Ludus or
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GP reports</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. GP Eros</td>
<td>4.08 (.85)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. GP Ludus</td>
<td>1.79 (.89)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. GP Storge</td>
<td>3.58 (.96)</td>
<td>.54*** .11</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. GP Pragma</td>
<td>2.90 (.88)</td>
<td>.26** .45*** .36*** 1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. GP Mania</td>
<td>2.42 (.95)</td>
<td>.11 .52*** .14 .23* 1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. GP Agape</td>
<td>3.71 (.84)</td>
<td>.49*** -.02 .37*** .15 .26** 1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. GP taught Eros</td>
<td>.19 (.33)</td>
<td>.32*** .02 .13 .19* .07 .16 1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. GP taught Ludus</td>
<td>.05 (.20)</td>
<td>.10 .07 .17 .25** .15 .11 .53*** 1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. GP taught Storge</td>
<td>.20 (.32)</td>
<td>.17 .13 .32*** .27** .16 .09 .52*** .50*** 1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. GP taught Pragma</td>
<td>.12 (.25)</td>
<td>.07 .12 .02 .36*** .11 .04 .40*** .57*** .48*** 1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. GP taught Mania</td>
<td>.04 (.15)</td>
<td>.13 .06 .18 .08 .18 .15 .41*** .71*** .35*** .47*** 1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. GP taught Agape</td>
<td>.57 (1.21)</td>
<td>.24** .00 -.02 .18 .12 .25** .50*** .37*** .36*** .41*** .38*** 1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP advice</td>
<td>3.14 (1.24)</td>
<td>.29** .20* .32*** .50*** .19* .17 .21* .18 .26** .22* .26** .12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP + behaviors</td>
<td>4.41 (.69)</td>
<td>.65*** -.16 .51*** .16 -.04 .54*** .26** .13 .17 .07 .11 .18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP stories</td>
<td>2.90 (1.03)</td>
<td>.29** .28** .24** .38*** .19 .13 .21* .11 .16 .10 .18 .13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP affection</td>
<td>3.67 (.97)</td>
<td>.71*** -.01 .48*** .20* .05 .53*** .38*** .21* .28** .10 .21* .24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP – behaviors</td>
<td>1.85 (.74)</td>
<td>-.24** .48*** -.17 .13 .32*** -.28** -.08 -.02 .05 -.05 -.04 -.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp to teach love</td>
<td>4.02 (.84)</td>
<td>.04 .08 .10 .17 .33*** .15 .19 .11 .20* .05 .17 .13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp to teach marriage</td>
<td>3.96 (.82)</td>
<td>.13 .19 .04 .26** .25** .18 .21* .05 .18 .09 .11 .23*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity w/ GC</td>
<td>6.40 (.71)</td>
<td>.30** -.11 .24** .03 .03 .18 .13 .10 .18 .02 .14 .16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPs’ marital happiness</td>
<td>5.79 (1.56)</td>
<td>.70*** -.12 .49*** .26** -.01 .48*** .35*** .13 .21* .06 .11 .24*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP close to Mom</td>
<td>5.53 (2.02)</td>
<td>.13 -.26** -.09 -.05 -.16 .09 -.04 .00 -.23* -.18 -.08 .04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP close to Dad</td>
<td>5.10 (1.94)</td>
<td>.07 -.07 .19* .04 .06 .01 .04 .02 .09 -.04 .14 .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP sex (F=1, M=2)</td>
<td>1.29 (1.46)</td>
<td>-.02 .23* .10 -.02 .06 .04 .08 .14 -.01 -.08 .02 -.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP age</td>
<td>73.73 (8.57)</td>
<td>.02 -.11 .09 .00 -.18 .00 -.24** -.21* -.20* -.23* -.20* -.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of children</td>
<td>3.97 (2.33)</td>
<td>-.21* .02 -.11 -.02 -.12 -.17 -.01 -.14 .08 -.03 -.11 -.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of grandchildren</td>
<td>8.87 (7.03)</td>
<td>-.05 .04 .03 .09 -.02 -.12 .00 -.16 .10 -.02 -.11 -.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( ^a_n = 105. ^b_n = 105. ^c_n = 100. ^d_n = 106. ^e_n = 106. \) \*p < .05. \**p < .01. \***p < .001.

Table 4.11: Means, Standard Deviations, and Pearson Correlations of GPs’ Love Attitudes, Socialization, Relationship Qualities, and Demographics (N = 107)
Mania styles. GPs’ Pragma was positively correlated with GPs’ reports of teaching Eros, Ludus, and Storge (rs ranged from .19 to .27). GPs’ Eros was also related to GPs teaching Agape (r = .24). Analyses for RQ7b found that GPs’ reports of their teaching love attitudes were moderately to strongly positive intercorrelated (rs ranged from .35 to .71). The strongest of these interrelationships was between GP teaching Mania and Ludus (r = .71).

RQ7c focused on the relationships between the GPs’ five socialization practices, their love attitudes, and teaching about love attitudes. All five GP socialization practices were associated with at least three of the GPs’ love attitudes (see Table 4.11). GP advice was positively related to five GP love attitudes (i.e., Eros, Ludus, Storge, Pragma, and Mania attitudes; rs ranged from .19 to .50), with the strongest relationship between GP advice and Pragma (r = .50). GPs’ report of socializing through GPs’ positive behaviors was strongly associated with Eros, Storge, and Agape attitudes (rs = .65, 51, and .54, respectively). GP story-telling was positively associated with GPs’ Eros, Ludus, Storge, and Pragma attitudes (rs ranged from .24 to .38). The practice of GP affection was positively associated with Eros, Storge, Pragma, and Agape attitudes (rs ranged from .20 to .71), with the strongest relationship between GP affection and GP Eros (r = .71).

Finally, the GP socialization practice of observing GP negative behaviors was negatively associated with Eros and Agape attitudes (rs = -.24 and -.28, respectively), and positively associated with Ludus and Mania attitudes (rs = .32 to .48, respectively).

Significant relationships were also found between GPs’ socialization practices and their reports of teaching love attitudes (see Table 4.11). GP affection was positively
related to GPs’ teaching Eros, Ludus, Storge, Mania, and Agape attitudes \((rs \text{ ranged from } .21 \text{ to } .38)\). GP advice was positively associated with GPs’ teaching Eros, Storge, Pragma, and Mania attitudes \((rs \text{ ranged from } .21 \text{ to } .26)\). Observations of GP positive behaviors and GP story-telling were both positively associated with GPs’ teaching Eros \((rs = .26 \text{ and } .21, \text{ respectively})\). Observing GP negative behaviors was not correlated with any of the GPs’ teaching of love attitudes. Overall, the findings for RQ7c revealed consistent relationships between GPs’ love attitudes, teaching about those love attitudes, and their socialization of their GC.

RQ7d asked whether relationship qualities were related to the GPs’ love attitudes and their teaching about love attitudes. As seen in Table 4.11, GPs’ report of their own marital happiness was positively associated with four GP love attitudes, Eros, Storge, Pragma, and Agape attitudes \((rs \text{ ranged from } .26 \text{ to } .70)\); and with GPs’ teaching about Eros, Storge, and Agape attitudes \((rs \text{ ranged from } .21 \text{ to } .35)\). The strongest of these relationships was between GPs’ marital happiness and GPs’ Eros \((r = .70)\). GPs’ report of being close to the GC’s mother was negatively associated with both the GPs’ Ludus love attitude \((r = -.26)\) and GPs’ teaching of Storge \((r = -.23)\). The only relationship found with GPs’ report of being close to the GC’s father was with Storge love attitude \((r = .19)\).

Finally, RQ7e asked if GPs’ love attitudes, GPs’ teaching of love attitudes, and demographics were related. For GP age, no relationships were found with GPs’ love attitudes (see Table 4.11); but significant negative relationships were found between GP age and GPs’ teaching about love attitudes. Younger GPs reported more teaching of Eros,
Ludus, Storge, Pragma, and Mania love attitudes ($r_s$ ranged from -.20 to -.24). Also, the number of GPs’ children was negatively related to GP Eros love attitude ($r = -.21$).

Other significant positive relationships were found in response to RQ$_7$ between GPs’ Mania love attitude and their importance of teaching about love and marriage ($r_s = .33$ and .25, respectively). GPs’ Pragma attitude was also positively related to GPs’ perceived importance of teaching about marriage ($r = .26$). For GPs’ teaching about love attitudes, GPs’ teaching Storge was positively associated with the GPs’ reports of the importance of teaching GC about love ($r = .20$). Also, GPs’ teaching Eros and Agape attitudes were both positively associated with GPs’ report of the importance to teach GC about marriage ($r_s = .21$ and .23, respectively). The significant relationships between GPs’ reports of their own love attitudes, socializing love attitudes, and other study variables were, overall, fewer in number than the significant relationships among the GC’s reports. However, noticeable trends appeared among the GPs’ reports of socializing practices and their love attitudes, and GPs’ reports of teaching about love attitudes were interrelated.

H$_{10}$ predicted that GPs’ reports of GP-GC solidarity would be associated with GPs’ teaching of love attitudes. Pearson correlations (see Table 4.11) indicated that H$_{10}$ was not supported, as GPs’ reports of solidarity with their target GC was not correlated with any of the GPs’ reports of teaching about love attitudes. Only GP Eros and Storge love attitudes were associated with GP-GC solidarity ($r_s = .30$ and .24, respectively).

H$_{11}$ predicted that grandmothers would report teaching about love attitudes more than grandfathers and H$_{12}$ predicted that maternal GPs would report teaching about love
attitudes more than paternal GPs. With the GPs’ reports of teaching the six love attitudes as dependent variables, a 2 X 2 MANOVA design was used with GP sex (grandmother, grandfather) and GP lineage (maternal GPs, paternal GPs) as the independent variables. H$_{11}$ was not supported as the multivariate main effect for GPs’ sex was not significant, Wilks $\lambda = .93, F(6, 98) = 1.32, p = ns$. H$_{12}$ was also not supported as the multivariate main effect for GP lineage was not significant, Wilks $\lambda = .97, F(6, 98) = .52, p = ns$. That is, no differences were found between grandmothers’ and grandfathers’ reports of teaching their GC about love attitudes, or between maternal GPs’ and paternal GPs’ reports of teaching their GC about love attitudes. The interaction of GP sex and GP lineage was also not significant, Wilks $\lambda = .98, F(6, 98) = .37, p = ns$; no combinations of GP sex and lineage resulted in significant differences.

Additional analyses were conducted to find if GP sex differences existed among the GP’s reports of their own love attitudes. A MANOVA analysis was used with GP sex (female, male) the independent variable and the GP’s reports of their six love attitudes the dependent variables. The multivariate main effect for GP sex differences for GP love attitudes was not significant, Wilks $\lambda = .90, F(6, 100) = 1.93, p = ns$, indicating that no differences were found between grandmothers’ and grandfathers’ love attitudes.

*Generational comparisons of GC’s to GPs’ love attitudes and reports of GPs teaching love attitudes.* The last two sections have discussed the findings from separate analyses of the two generations of GC and GPs regarding their love attitudes, GP teaching about love attitudes, and GP socialization practices. Now, generational comparisons are reported in response to RQ$_8$, which asked if there are differences
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Love attitudes and GP teaching</th>
<th>GC</th>
<th>GP</th>
<th>Univariate effect differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GP teaching</td>
<td>( M (SD) )</td>
<td>( M (SD) )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eros</td>
<td>3.99 (.72)</td>
<td>4.08 (.85)</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludus</td>
<td>2.19 (1.02)</td>
<td>1.79 (.89)</td>
<td>( F(1, 295) = 11.83, p = .001, \eta^2 = .04 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storge</td>
<td>3.23 (1.09)</td>
<td>3.58 (.96)</td>
<td>( F(1, 295) = 7.62, p = .006, \eta^2 = .03 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragma</td>
<td>2.90 (.98)</td>
<td>2.90 (.88)</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mania</td>
<td>2.86 (.90)</td>
<td>2.42 (.95)</td>
<td>( F(1, 295) = 15.56, p &lt; .001, \eta^2 = .05 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agape</td>
<td>3.34 (.83)</td>
<td>3.71 (.84)</td>
<td>( F(1, 295) = 13.75, p &lt; .001, \eta^2 = .05 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP teaching Eros</td>
<td>.14 (.14)</td>
<td>.19 (.32)</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP teaching Ludus</td>
<td>.06 (.12)</td>
<td>.05 (.20)</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP teaching Storge</td>
<td>.13 (.14)</td>
<td>.20 (.32)</td>
<td>( F(1, 295) = 6.19, p = .01, \eta^2 = .02 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP teaching Pragma</td>
<td>.13 (.13)</td>
<td>.12 (.25)</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP teaching Mania</td>
<td>.06 (.11)</td>
<td>.04 (.15)</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP teaching Agape</td>
<td>.16 (.15)</td>
<td>.14 (.30)</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.12: Means, Standard Deviations, and Univariate Effect Differences for GC and GP Reports of Love Attitudes and GPs Teaching Love Attitudes (\( N \) of GC = 190, \( N \) of GP = 107)
between GC’s reports of their own love attitudes and GPs’ reports of their own love attitudes. A MANOVA design was used with the two generations (GC, GPs) as the independent factor and the six love attitudes as dependent variables. The multivariate main effect for differences in generational reports (GC and GPs) of their own love attitudes was significant, Wilks $\lambda = .85$, $F(6, 290) = 8.56$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .15$. Table 4.12 reveals that four of the six univariate effect differences between GC and GPs were significant. GC reported higher Ludus, $M (SD)_{GC\ Ludus} = 2.19 (1.02)$, than GPs reported, $M (SD)_{GP\ Ludus} = 1.79 (.89)$, and GC also reported higher Mania, $M (SD)_{GC\ Mania} = 2.86 (.90)$, than GPs reported, $M (SD)_{GP\ Mania} = 2.42 (.95)$. GPs reported higher Storge, $M (SD)_{GP\ Storge} = 3.58 (.96)$ than GC reported, $M (SD)_{GC\ Storge} = 3.23 (1.09)$, and GPs reported higher Agape, $M (SD)_{GP\ Agape} = 3.71 (.84)$ than GC reported, $M (SD)_{GC\ Agape} = 3.34 (.83)$.

RQ9 asked if there were generational differences between GC’s reports of GPs’ teaching love attitudes and GPs’ own reports of teaching love attitudes. With GPs’ teaching the six love attitudes as the dependent variables, a MANOVA analysis was conducted with the two generations (GC, GPs) as the independent factor. The multivariate main effect for differences in generational reports (GC and GPs) about GPs’ teaching of love attitudes was significant, Wilks $\lambda = .93$, $F(6, 290) = 3.57$, $p = .002$, $\eta^2 = .07$. Table 4.12 presents the results of univariate tests; the only univariate effect difference among the GPs teaching about love attitudes was that GPs reported teaching Storge ($M = .20$, $SD = .32$) more than GC reported GPs’ teaching Storge attitude ($M = .13$, $SD = .14$). The other five reports of GPs teaching about love attitudes were not significantly different between the two generational groups.
Love attitudes and GPs teaching love attitudes summary. Results of the analyses of GC’s and GPs’ reports of love attitudes and GPs teaching about love attitudes provided insights into GC socialization about love. Overall, the findings revealed that both GC’s and GPs’ reports of GPs’ teaching about love attitudes were all interrelated. The same four love attitudes, Eros, Storge, Pragma, and Agape, were directly and positively associated with their own reports of GPs teaching about those love attitudes. For GC, GPs’ teaching of all love attitudes was related to all the GP socializing practices except for observations of GPs’ negative behaviors, while only GPs’ reports of advice-giving and showing affection were related to all their reports of teaching about love attitudes. GPs’ reports of their socialization practices were in some way associated with all their own love attitudes. On the other hand, GC’s reports of GP socialization practices were only primarily related to their own Pragma and Storge styles.

Marital Dimensions and GPs Teaching Marital Dimensions

The last set of research questions (RQ10-14) and hypotheses (H13-18) for analyzing comparisons between GC’s and GPs’ reports are on two marital dimensions, Sharing and Assertiveness, GPs teaching these two dimensions, and GP socialization practices. As before, three perspectives on marital dimensions and GPs teaching about marital dimensions are analyzed: GC’s reports of their own beliefs about these marital dimensions, GPs’ reports of these marital dimensions, and an overall generational comparison of the GC’s reports and the GPs’ reports.

GC’s reports of marital dimensions and GPs teaching marital dimensions. In this section, only GC’s reports are used to respond to RQ10 and 11 and H13–15, by investigating
the interrelationships of GC’s marital dimensions, GPs’ teaching of marital dimensions, GP socialization practices, relationship qualities, and demographics. Means, standard deviations, and Pearson correlations of these constructs are presented in Table 4.13.

RQ10a-e asked about the relationship between GC’s marital dimension beliefs, GPs’ teaching marital dimensions, GP socialization practices, relationship qualities, and demographics from the GC’s perspective. Table 4.13 shows that GC’s reports of their own marital dimensions of Sharing and Assertiveness were negatively interrelated ($r = -.34$). Neither of these marital dimensions was correlated with GC reports of GPs’ teaching about Sharing or Assertiveness. GC’s reports of their GPs’ teaching about Sharing and Assertiveness, however, were positively interrelated ($r = .48$, see Table 4.13).

In response to RQ10c that asked about the GC’s perception of GP socialization practices and their own marital dimensions, analyses found only three correlations (see Table 4.13). GC’s beliefs about sharing in marriage was related to others’ stories about GPs and observations of GPs’ negative behaviors ($rs = .15$ and $-.20$, respectively), while GC’s beliefs about assertiveness in marriage was related to observations of GPs’ negative behaviors ($r = .20$). In other analyses, the GC’s reports of GPs teaching Sharing and Assertiveness were both positively related to all the GC’s reports of their GPs’ socializing practices ($rs$ ranged from $.19$ to $.48$), with the exception of GPs’ teaching of Sharing and observing their GP’s negative behaviors.

RQ10d and 10e asked about whether GC’s marital dimensions were related to relationship qualities and demographics, respectively. In response to RQ10d, GC’s report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GC reports</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sharing</td>
<td>6.11 (.80)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Assertiveness</td>
<td>2.52 (1.30)</td>
<td>-.34***</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. GP taught Sharing</td>
<td>.18 (.16)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. GP taught Assertiveness</td>
<td>.10 (.13)</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP advice</td>
<td>2.71 (1.21)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.27***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP + behaviors</td>
<td>3.79 (1.11)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP stories</td>
<td>2.52 (1.04)</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.32***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP affection</td>
<td>2.71 (1.24)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others’ stories about GPs</td>
<td>3.29 (.94)</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.26***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP – behaviors</td>
<td>1.76 (.79)</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.25***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity w/GP</td>
<td>5.70 (1.16)</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPs’ marital happiness(a)</td>
<td>5.26 (1.80)</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ marital happiness(b)</td>
<td>5.61 (1.49)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP close to Mom(c)</td>
<td>5.09 (1.97)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP close to Dad(d)</td>
<td>4.36 (2.08)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC sex (F=1, M=2)</td>
<td>1.34 (.47)</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC age</td>
<td>22.11 (1.96)</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target GP sex (F=1, M=2)</td>
<td>1.36 (.48)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of GC</td>
<td>9.07 (6.19)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a_n = 180. b_n = 180. c_n = 186. d_n = 182.\)

\(\*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.\)

Table 4.13: Means, Standard Deviations, and Pearson Correlations of GC’s Marital Dimensions, Socialization, Relationship Qualities, and Demographics \((N = 190)\)
of GPs’ teaching about Sharing was positively correlated with GC’s perceptions of GPs’ marital happiness, GC’s parents’ marital happiness, and GPs’ closeness to the GC’s father ($r_s = .28, .22, \text{ and } .17$, respectively). No significant relationships were found for demographics other than for sex which are reported later.

$H_{13}$ predicted that GC’s solidarity with their GPs would be related to their reports of GPs’ teaching about the marital dimensions of Sharing and Assertiveness. Pearson correlations were used to test $H_{13}$ (see Table 4.13) and partial support was found for this hypothesis. GC’s report of GPs’ teaching about Sharing was positively correlated with GP-GC solidarity ($r = .25$). This finding, coupled with the findings from relationship qualities, indicates that GC perceived that GPs’ teaching about Sharing mutually existed with close GP-GC relationships and other happy and close family relationships.

RQ11 asked if GC’s sex made a difference in their reports of GPs’ teaching about marital dimensions and $H_{14}$ predicted that GC would report that grandmothers taught about marital dimensions more than grandfathers. With the GC’s reports of GPs teaching marital dimensions as dependent variables, a 2 X 2 MANOVA design was used with GC sex (female, male) and target GP sex (grandmother, grandfather) as the independent variable factors. In response to RQ11, the multivariate main effect for GC’s sex was significant, Wilks $\lambda = .96$, $F(2, 185) = 3.79$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .04$. A univariate effect difference was found for the GC’s report of GPs teaching Assertiveness, $F(1, 186) = 4.66$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .02$. Male GC reported that GPs taught about Assertiveness ($M = .12$, $SD = .15$) more than the female GC reported ($M = .09$, $SD = .12$). $H_{14}$ was not supported as the multivariate main effect for target GP sex was not significant, Wilks $\lambda = .97$, $F(2,$
No difference was found in GPs’ teaching of marital dimensions, whether the GC were reporting about their grandmothers’ or their grandfathers’ teaching of marital dimensions. In addition, the interaction of GC sex and target GP sex was not significant, Wilks $\lambda = .98, F(2, 185) = 2.11, p = ns$, so male and female GC did not perceive differences in grandmothers’ or grandfathers’ teaching of Sharing and Assertiveness.

Additional analyses were conducted for RQ11 to find if GC sex differences existed among the GC’s reports of the two marital dimensions. A MANOVA analysis was used with GC sex (female, male) as the independent variable factor and the GC’s beliefs about marital Sharing and Assertiveness as the dependent variables. A significant multivariate main effect for sex differences was found for the GC’s marital dimensions, Wilks $\lambda = .86, F(2, 187) = 15.78, p < .001, \eta^2 = .14$. Both marital dimensions had univariate effects for GC sex differences: Sharing, $F(1, 188) = 9.77, p < .01, \eta^2 = .05$; and Assertiveness, $F(2, 187) = 28.92, p < .001, \eta^2 = .13$. Female GC reported greater sharing in marriage ($M = 6.24, SD = .77$) than male GC ($M = 5.86, SD = .80$), and male GC reported greater assertiveness in marriage ($M = 3.19, SD = 1.33$) than female GC ($M = 2.19, SD = 1.15$).

$H_{15}$ predicted that GC would report that their maternal GPs taught about marital dimensions more than paternal GPs. Once again using the GC’s two reports of GPs teaching marital dimensions as dependent variables, a 2 X 2 MANOVA test was used with GC sex (female, male) and target GP lineage (maternal GPs, paternal GPs) as the independent factors. The MANOVA produced a significant multivariate main effect for the target GP lineage, Wilks $\lambda = .93, F(2, 185) = 6.69, p < .01, \eta^2 = .07$. A univariate
effect was found for GP lineage among the GC’s reports of GPs teaching Sharing, $F(1, 186) = 5.76, p < .05, \eta^2 = .03$. However, H15 was not supported as results indicated that GC reported that paternal GPs taught about Sharing ($M = .21, SD = .17$) more than maternal GPs taught ($M = .16, SD = .14$). The interaction of GC sex and target GP lineage was not significant, Wilks $\lambda = .99, F(2, 185) = .59, p = ns$, indicating that the combination of these particular variables did not effect the results of the analyses.

*GPs’ reports of marital dimensions and GPs teaching marital dimensions.*

Looking to only GPs’ reports, RQ12 and H16–18 asked whether GPs’ marital dimensions was related to their reports of teaching marital dimensions, GP socialization practices, relationship qualities, and demographics. Table 4.14 presents these correlations, means, and standard deviations for each construct.

RQ12a–e asked about the relationship between GPs’ marital dimensions, GPs’ teaching marital dimension beliefs, GP socialization practices, relationship qualities, and demographics from the GPs’ perspective. The relevant Pearson correlations are presented in Table 4.14. In response to RQ12a and b, GPs’ beliefs about Sharing and Assertiveness were not interrelated, but GPs’ Sharing belief was related to their reports of teaching about sharing in marriage ($r = .34$). GPs’ reports of teaching Sharing and teaching Assertiveness were also related ($r = .29$). When GPs’ believe in sharing in marriage, they report teaching their GC about sharing in marriage.

RQ12c asked about GP socialization practices and their relationship to marital dimensions (see Table 4.14). GPs’ Sharing dimension was positively correlated with four of the five socialization practices, including GP advice and GP stories with moderate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GP reports</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. GP Sharing</td>
<td>4.38 (1.31)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. GP Assertiveness</td>
<td>2.25 (1.07)</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. GP taught Sharing</td>
<td>.24 (.35)</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. GP taught Assertiveness</td>
<td>.03 (.14)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP advice</td>
<td>3.14 (1.24)</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP + behaviors</td>
<td>4.41 (.69)</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP stories</td>
<td>2.90 (1.03)</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP affection</td>
<td>3.67 (.97)</td>
<td>.74***</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP – behaviors</td>
<td>1.85 (.74)</td>
<td>-.33***</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to teach love&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.02 (.84)</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to teach marriage&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.96 (.82)</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity w/ GC</td>
<td>6.40 (.71)</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPs’ marital happiness&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.79 (1.56)</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP close to Mom&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.53 (2.02)</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP close to Dad&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.10 (1.94)</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP sex (F=1, M=2)</td>
<td>1.29 (.46)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP age</td>
<td>73.73 (8.57)</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of children</td>
<td>3.97 (2.33)</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of grandchildren</td>
<td>8.87 (7.03)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>n = 105. <sup>b</sup>n = 105. <sup>c</sup>n = 100. <sup>d</sup>n = 106. <sup>e</sup>n = 106. 
*<sup>p</sup> < .05. **<sup>p</sup> < .01. ***<sup>p</sup> < .001.

Table 4.14: Means, Standard Deviations, and Pearson Correlations of GPs’ Marital Dimensions, Socialization, Relationship Qualities, and Demographics (N = 107)
associations ($r_s = .33$ and $.31$, respectively), and GP positive behaviors and GP affection with strong associations ($r_s = .61$ and $.74$, respectively). GPs’ beliefs about Sharing was negatively associated with observations of GP negative behaviors ($r = -.33$). On the other hand, GPs’ Assertiveness belief about marriage was correlated with three of the five GPs’ socializing practices, observations of GPs’ negative behaviors, GPs’ positive behaviors, and GP affection ($r_s = .50$, -.28 and -.27, respectively). GPs’ teaching of Sharing was also associated with GP story-telling and GP affection ($r_s = .21$ and .28, respectively). GPs’ teaching of Assertiveness was not associated with any of the GP socialization practices. Finally, GPs’ expression of the importance of teaching GC about marriage was only associated with GPs’ Sharing ($r = .23$) and the importance of teaching GC about love was not associated with either marital dimension. Once again, greater agreement with Sharing was associated with use of the positive socialization practices, while greater agreement with assertiveness was related to less use of the positive socialization practices.

RQ_{12d} asked if marital dimensions were related to the relationship quality constructs of the study. Analyses revealed that both GP Sharing and teaching Sharing to GC were associated with the GPs’ report of marital happiness ($r_s = .59$ and .23, respectively). GP Assertiveness was negatively correlated with GPs’ marital happiness and GPs’ closeness to the GC’s mother ($r_s = -.27$ and -.28, respectively). RQ_{12e} inquired about demographic relationships with marital dimensions. Only two associations were found; GP Sharing was negatively associated with the GPs’ number of children ($r = -.22$)
and GP age was negatively associated with Assertiveness \((r = -.27)\). The fewer children that these GPs had, the greater endorsement of Sharing; and the younger these GPs were, the greater agreement in Assertiveness.

\(H_{16}\) predicted that GPs’ reports of GP-GC solidarity would be associated with teaching marital dimensions, but this hypothesis was not supported. Pearson correlations found that the only association for GP-GC solidarity was with GPs’ beliefs about Sharing \((r = .24)\).

\(H_{17}\) predicted that grandmothers would report teaching about marital dimensions more than grandfathers, and \(H_{18}\) predicted that maternal GPs would report teaching about marital dimensions more than paternal GPs. With the GPs’ reports of teaching the two marital dimensions as dependent variables, a 2 X 2 MANOVA was used with GP sex (grandmother, grandfather) and GP lineage (maternal GPs, paternal GPs) as the independent variables. \(H_{17}\) was not supported as the multivariate main effect for GPs’ sex was not significant, Wilks \(\lambda = 1.00, F(2, 102) = .11, p = \text{ns}\), indicating that there was not a difference between the grandmothers’ and the grandfathers’ reports of teaching GC about the marital dimensions. \(H_{18}\) was also not supported as the multivariate main effect for GP lineage was not significant, Wilks \(\lambda = .99, F(2, 102) = .41, p = \text{ns}\). Whether maternal or paternal, no difference in reports of teaching about marital dimensions was found. In addition, the interaction of GP sex and GP lineage was not significant, Wilks \(\lambda = 1.00, F(2, 102) = .16, p = \text{ns}\), showing that the combination of the GPs’ sex and their lineage did not create any differences in the reports about teaching marital dimensions.
Additional analyses were conducted to find if GP sex differences existed among the GPs’ reports of their own marital dimensions. A MANOVA was used with GP sex (female, male) the independent variable and GPs’ reports of Sharing and Assertiveness the dependent variables. The multivariate main effect for GP sex differences was not significant, Wilks $\lambda = 1.00$, $F(2, 104) = .20$, $p = ns$. No differences were found between grandmothers and grandfathers in their beliefs about marital Sharing or Assertiveness.

In sum, clear distinctions were detected in GPs’ reports about the two marital dimensions of Sharing and Assertiveness. GPs’ Sharing predominately related to the GPs’ teaching of Sharing and all GP socialization practices. In addition, GPs’ marital happiness was positively associated with Sharing, but negatively associated with Assertiveness. On the other hand, GC’s beliefs in sharing and assertiveness in marriage were not correlated with their reports of GPs’ teaching and socializing practices. GC’s reports of GP’s teaching and socializing were consistently related to each other.

Generational comparisons of GC’s to GPs’ marital dimensions and reports of GPs teaching marital dimensions. RQ13 asked if there are generational differences between GC’s and GPs’ reports of their own marital dimension beliefs. A MANOVA was used with the two generations (GC, GPs) as the independent factor and the two marital dimensions as dependent variables (i.e., Sharing and Assertiveness). The multivariate main effect for differences in generational reports (GC and GPs) on the marital dimension beliefs was significant, Wilks $\lambda = .56$, $F(2, 294) = 114.45$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .44$. Table 4.15 indicates that only Sharing had a significant univariate effect difference.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital dimensions</th>
<th>GC</th>
<th>GP</th>
<th>Univariate effect differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and GP teaching</td>
<td>$M (SD)$</td>
<td>$M (SD)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing</td>
<td>6.11 (.80)</td>
<td>4.38 (1.31)</td>
<td>$F(1, 295) = 200.12, p &lt; .001, \eta^2 = .40$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>2.52 (1.30)</td>
<td>2.25 (1.07)</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP teaching</td>
<td>.18 (.16)</td>
<td>.24 (.35)</td>
<td>$F(1, 295) = 4.05, p &lt; .05, \eta^2 = .01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing</td>
<td>.10 (.13)</td>
<td>.03 (.14)</td>
<td>$F(1, 295) = 18.79, p &lt; .001, \eta^2 = .06$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.15: Means, Standard Deviations, and Univariate Effect Differences for GC and GP Reports of Marital Dimensions and GP Teaching Marital Dimensions ($N$ of GC = 190, $N$ of GP = 107)

between GC and GPs. GC reported higher beliefs in sharing ($M = 6.11, SD = .80$) in marriage than GPs reported ($M = 4.38, SD = 1.31$). No difference was found in the GC’s and GPs’ reports regarding assertiveness.

RQ$_{14}$ asked if there were generational differences between GC’s reports of GPs teaching marital dimensions and GPs’ own reports of teaching marital dimensions. With GPs teaching the two marital dimensions as the dependent variables, a MANOVA design was used with the two generations (GC, GPs) as the independent factor. The multivariate main effect for differences in generational reports (GC and GPs) about GPs’ teaching of marital dimensions was significant, Wilks $\lambda = .90, F(2, 294) = 16.31, p < .001, \eta^2 = .10$. 
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Both GP teaching of Sharing and GP teaching of Assertiveness had significant univariate effect differences between GC and GPs (see Table 4.15). GPs’ reports of teaching their GC about sharing in marriage ($M = .24, SD = .35$) was greater than GC’s reports of GPs teaching sharing in marriage ($M = .18, SD = .16$). And, GCs’ reports of GPs’ teaching about assertiveness in marriage ($M = .10, SD = .13$) was greater than the GPs’ report of teaching assertiveness in marriage ($M = .03, SD = .14$).

**Marital dimensions and GP teaching marital dimensions summary.** Analyses of GC’s and GPs’ reports of marital dimensions and GPs’ teaching of marital dimensions provided further insights into GC socialization about marriage. GC’s reports of GPs’ teaching Sharing and Assertiveness in marriage were related to every GP socializing practice. But for GPs’, only their reports of teaching Sharing to GC were related to the socializing practices of story-telling and affection. On the other hand, GPs’ actual reports of their beliefs about Sharing and Assertiveness were related to all of the socialization practices. Finally, there were differences between the two generational family groups in their reports of teaching marital dimensions. GC perceived that their GPs’ taught about assertiveness in marriage to a greater extent than the GPs’ believed that they were teaching. On the other hand, GPs reported teaching Sharing to a greater extent than the GC reported.

In sum, comparing overall reports from GC and GP have resulted in numerous findings. However, these analyses were the comparisons of two family generational
groups in general and did not examine the direct connection between a GC and his or her GP. In the next section, the matched set of reports from GC and their own GPs’ was assessed.

**Characteristics of the Matched Sample of GC and their own GPs**

From the total sample, a subset consisted of 74 dyads of GC and one of their GPs (n = 148), which will be called the *matched* set of GP-GC. The balance of the sample was 116 grandchildren whose grandparents did not participate and 33 grandparents whose grandchildren did not satisfactorily complete the questionnaire. The characteristics of matched GC from this subset will be explicated first and followed by their GPs’ descriptions.

The *matched* GC ranged in age from 15 to 28 years, with a mean age of 22 years. The distribution of these GC’s sex was 41 females and 33 males (55.4% and 44.6%, respectively). Most of the matched GC were Caucasians, 71.6%, followed by 18.9% African Americans, 2.7% Asians, 1.4% Hispanics, 1.4% Native Americans, and 4.1% other races. A majority of the matched GC were enrolled in college (83.8%), one was in high school (1.4%), and 14.9% held a college degree. Nearly twenty-six percent of matched GC reported being single and not dating, 33.8% were casually dating, and 32.4% were seriously dating. Nearly three percent of matched GC were engaged, 4.1% were cohabitating with a romantic partner, and only one was married (1.4%). Fifty-four of the matched GC (73%) reported that their parents were still married, 7 (9.5%) reported that their parents were either single or in a relationship with someone other than the other parent, and 13 (17.5%) failed to report their parents’ relationship status.
Matched GPs ranged in age from 53 to 94 years, with a mean age of 74 years. These GPs’ sex consisted of 56 females and 18 males (75.7% and 24.3% of matched sample, respectively). The race composition of matched GPs primarily mirrored their GC. Most of the grandparents were Caucasians (75.7%). The sample also included 9.5% African Americans, 2.7% Asians, 1.4% Hispanics, 5.4% Native Americans, and 5.5% represented other races. Only 9.5% of matched GPs had not graduated high school. About half (51.4%) reported being high school graduates, 21.6% had some college, and 17.6% held a college or technical school degree. Thirty-one of the matched GPs (41.9%) were still married to their original spouse. The balance of GPs reported their relationships as being single (5.4%), divorced (4.1%), widowed (37.8%), and remarried (10.8%). Matched GPs reported having a range of 1 to 13 children ($M = 4$) and a range of 1 to 37 grandchildren ($M = 9$).

Among the matched participants, 28 dyads were composed of female GC and their grandmothers, 13 dyads were female GC and their grandfathers, 26 dyads were male GC and their grandmothers, and 7 dyads were male GC and their grandfathers. Lines of lineage revealed that 27 female GC participants were paired with their maternal GPs while 14 females were paired with paternal GPs, and 17 male GC were paired with their maternal GPs while 16 male GC were paired with their paternal GPs.

Analyses of Matched Sets of GC and their GPs

The last set of analyses will examine a similar set of study variables but will be limited to this matched set of GC’s and GPs’ responses. A final set of research questions (RQ15 – 20) inquires about the similarities in the responses from GC and one of their own
GPs regarding their perceptions of GPs’ socialization practices, love attitudes and GPs’ teaching about love attitudes, and marital dimensions and GPs’ teaching about marital dimensions. The other set of research questions (RQ21 – 22) asks what study variables are predictors for the GC’s love attitudes and marital dimension beliefs. This section will report the findings from these analyses with consideration given to other study variables such as relationship qualities and demographics. Welch t-tests, Pearson correlations, and multiple regression analyses are used to examine differences, similarities, and predictability of the study variables.

Pertinent to the study of dyads is an evaluation of the dyadic indexes and the most accurate form of measurement of dyadic data. My goal for the analyses of these GC’s and their matched GP’s data is to examine the correspondence in shape between the two groups, that is, the patterns of differences in scores across items. Kenny, Kashy, and Cook (2006) suggest that for investigating the similarity of dyadic data, an analysis of the shape is a notable finding and recommend correlations as the most effective form of measurement. Therefore throughout this next set of analyses, when an assessment of similarities between GC’s and their own matched GPs’ responses are called for, Pearson correlation is the measurement of choice.

Matched GP-GC Reported Differences in Study Constructs

RQ15 asked if differences existed between GC’s and their own GPs’ responses to the study’s constructs. Analyses using Welch t-tests were conducted and the means, standard deviations, and Welch t-statistic results are presented in Table 4.16. Welch’s t is recommended to correct for familywise Type I error and keep the error rate at .05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct Name</th>
<th>GC</th>
<th>GPs</th>
<th>Welch (t)-statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GP advice</td>
<td>2.76 (1.09)</td>
<td>3.15 (1.30)</td>
<td>3.82*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP + behaviors</td>
<td>3.77 (1.19)</td>
<td>4.46 (.70)</td>
<td>18.44***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP stories</td>
<td>2.60 (1.00)</td>
<td>2.84 (1.06)</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP affection</td>
<td>2.80 (1.28)</td>
<td>3.66 (1.00)</td>
<td>20.47***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP – behaviors</td>
<td>1.77 (.84)</td>
<td>1.83 (.73)</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eros</td>
<td>3.98 (.79)</td>
<td>4.08 (.92)</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludus</td>
<td>2.19 (1.01)</td>
<td>1.80 (.91)</td>
<td>5.99*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storge</td>
<td>3.16 (1.11)</td>
<td>3.58 (1.00)</td>
<td>6.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragma</td>
<td>3.06 (1.02)</td>
<td>2.90 (.98)</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mania</td>
<td>2.91 (.98)</td>
<td>2.45 (.98)</td>
<td>8.69**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agape</td>
<td>3.34 (.87)</td>
<td>3.72 (.84)</td>
<td>7.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP taught Eros</td>
<td>.42 (.42)</td>
<td>.19 (.33)</td>
<td>12.80***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP taught Ludus</td>
<td>.19 (.35)</td>
<td>.06 (.21)</td>
<td>8.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP taught Storge</td>
<td>.33 (.42)</td>
<td>.20 (.32)</td>
<td>4.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP taught Pragma</td>
<td>.38 (.36)</td>
<td>.14 (.27)</td>
<td>22.20***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP taught Mania</td>
<td>.22 (.36)</td>
<td>.04 (.16)</td>
<td>15.87***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP taught Agape</td>
<td>.42 (.42)</td>
<td>.16 (.33)</td>
<td>16.90***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing</td>
<td>6.01 (.87)</td>
<td>4.33 (1.36)</td>
<td>80.26***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>2.47 (1.36)</td>
<td>2.22 (.96)</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP taught Sharing</td>
<td>.41 (.40)</td>
<td>.23 (.34)</td>
<td>7.83**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP taught Assertiveness</td>
<td>.26 (.39)</td>
<td>.02 (.13)</td>
<td>24.24***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity w/ GP</td>
<td>5.80 (1.11)</td>
<td>6.45 (.65)</td>
<td>19.33***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPs’ marital happiness(a)</td>
<td>5.29 (1.75)</td>
<td>5.75 (1.59)</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP close to Mom(b)</td>
<td>5.51 (1.79)</td>
<td>5.89 (1.69)</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP close to Dad(c)</td>
<td>4.63 (1.85)</td>
<td>5.21 (1.84)</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\) of GC = 72, \(b\) of GP = 70. \(c\) of GC = 72. \(n\) of GC = 71.

\( *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001. \)

Table 4.16 Means, Standard Deviations, Pearson Correlations, and Welch \(t\)-test Statistics for Study Constructs of Matched GC and their GPs (\(N = 148\); i.e., 74 Matched GP-GC dyads)
Three of the GP socialization practices were reported with greater frequency by the GPs than by their GC (i.e., GP advice, observations of GP positive behaviors, and GP affection). The GPs’ reported means of these three practices ranged from 3.15 – 4.46, indicating that they engaged in these practices occasionally to often. The GC’s reported means for these same three practices ranged from 2.76 to 3.77, indicating that GC noticed their GPs engaging in these practices occasionally to fairly often. GC’s and GPs’ reports regarding observations of GPs’ negative behaviors were not significantly different and indicated that GPs engaged in this practice rarely, if at all.

RQ15b asked about differences in direct GP-GC reports of love attitudes and GPs’ teaching about love attitudes. Results of Welch t-tests (see Table 4.16) comparing the means of the degrees of agreement with each of the six love attitudes found that GC had higher means for Ludus, $M (SD) = 2.19 (1.01)$, and Mania, $M (SD) = 2.91 (.98)$ than their own GPs; while GPs had higher means for Storge, $M (SD) = 3.58 (1.00)$, and Agape, $M (SD) = 3.72 (.84)$. An examination of GC’s and GPs’ reports of GPs’ teaching about love attitudes found that significant differences were noted for all six attitudes; and in every case, the GC indicated GPs taught more about each love attitude than GPs reported teaching.

Marital dimensions (i.e., Sharing and Assertiveness) and GP teaching of these marital dimensions were the focus of RQ15c which asked about difference between GC’s reports and their own GPs’ reports for these constructs. Table 4.16 also presents the findings from these analyses. The Sharing marital belief was reported by more GC, $M (SD) = 6.01 (.87)$, than by their GPs, $M (SD) = 4.33 (1.36)$. No difference was found
between GC’s and GPs’ reports of agreement with Assertiveness. GPs’ teaching about both of these marital beliefs was reported to a greater extent by GC than by GPs, similar to the reports of GPs’ teaching love attitudes.

The last part of RQ15 asked about whether differences occurred in the GC’s and GPs’ reports of relationship qualities (i.e., GP-GC solidarity, GPs’ marital happiness, and GP’s closeness to GC’s parents; see Table 4.16). Solidarity was the only relationship quality reported with greater intensity by the GPs than by the GC. No differences were found in the other three relationship qualities.

In sum, this overview of comparisons of GC’s and their GPs’ reports on most of the study’s constructs presents clear distinctions on how GC and GPs perceive GP socialization. Generally, GPs reported greater frequency of socialization practices than the GC reported. While GC reported greater incidence of GP teaching about the specific beliefs about love and marriage than the GPs reported. GPs’ reports of GC-GP solidarity were greater than the GC’s perception of solidarity.

**GPs Socialization Practices for Matched GC and GPs**

RQ16 asked whether GC’s and their GPs’ reports about GP socialization practices were related. Table 4.17 reports the Pearson correlations; as can be seen, all five socialization practices were directly and positively interrelated (rs ranged from .40 to .57). These correlations can be found on the diagonal of the table. Each GC report of a socialization practice was moderately to strongly correlated with the GP report of the same practice.
Table 4.17: Pearson Correlations of Matched GCs’ and GPs’ Reports of GP Socialization Practices (N = 148; i.e., 74 Matched GP-GC dyads)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grandparents’ reports</th>
<th>GP advice</th>
<th>GP + behaviors</th>
<th>GP stories</th>
<th>GP affection</th>
<th>GP – behaviors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GP advice</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP + behaviors</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP stories</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP affection</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP – behaviors</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.57***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Three other notable relationships were found. First, GP’s reports of socializing by showing affection was associated with four of the GC’s reports of socialization, including GP advice, GP positive behaviors, GP stories, and GP affection (r’s ranged from .29 to .52). The strongest of these associations was the direct relationship between GC’s and GPs’ reports of GP affection. Also, GPs’ report of socializing with positive behaviors was positively associated with the GC’s report of GP affection (r = .52). Finally, GP’s report of giving advice was correlated with the GC’s report of story-telling (r = .37); reciprocally, GPs’ report of story-telling was correlated with GC’s reports of giving advice (r = .35).
In sum, there is an alignment between GC’s and their GPs’ responses to the kind of socializing practices in which the GPs are engaging. Hence, for all five socialization practices, as the GC report increased in frequency of GP using a practice, their GPs reported an increase in frequency of the same practice.

*Love Attitudes and GPs’ Teaching Love Attitudes for Matched GC and GPs*

*GC’s reports and their matched GPs’ reports of love attitudes and GPs’ teaching love attitudes.* RQ17 asked about how GC’s and their GPs’ love attitudes and their reports about GPs teaching these love attitudes were related. Pearson correlations were used and are reported in Table 4.18. Eros was the only love attitude that had a four-way positive interrelationship between GC’s and GPs’ beliefs about Eros, and GC’s and GPs’ reports of GPs’ teaching of Eros (rs ranged from .25 to .39). Other direct relationships found on the diagonal between GC’s and GPs’ love attitudes were with Storge and Pragma love styles (rs = .25 and .45, respectively). GC’s Storge was also positively but weakly associated with three other GPs’ love attitudes: Eros, Ludus, and Pragma (rs = .26, .25, and .26, respectively). GC’s Pragma was positively associated with their GPs’ Agape (r = .29), and GC’s Mania was positively associated with their GPs’ Pragma (r = .26).

Another set of relationships was found for GPs’ Eros and three GC’s love attitudes, Ludus, Storge, and Pragma (rs = .23, .26, and .35, respectively).

Table 4.18 also shows three direct correlations between GC’s and GPs’ reports of GPs’ teaching love attitudes, including GPs teaching Eros, Ludus, and Storge (rs = .39, .26, and .39, respectively). GPs’ report of teaching Storge was positively correlated with GC’s report of teaching all six love attitudes (rs ranged from .31 to .40). Also, three
Table 4.18: *Pearson Correlations of Matched GCs’ and GPs’ Reports of Love Attitudes, GP Socialization Practices, and Demographics* (N = 148; i.e., 74 Matched GP-GC dyads)

| GPs’ reports  | Eros   | Ludus  | Storge | Pragma | Mania  | Agape  | Teach Eros | Teach Ludus | Teach Storge | Teach Pragma | Teach Mania | Teach Agape |
|---------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|------------|------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Eros          | .25*   | .23*   | .26*   | .35**  | .10    | .18    | .28*       | .09        | .25*        | .30**        | .12         | .31**       |
| Ludus         | .12    | .10    | .25*   | .14    | .12    | .13    | -.04       | .27*       | .04         | .12          | .19         | .05         |
| Storge        | .13    | -.06   | .25*   | .18    | .02    | .16    | .25*       | .16        | .21         | .33**        | .22         | .39***      |
| Pragma        | .05    | .23*   | .26*   | .45*** | .26*   | .21    | .32**      | .35**      | .29**       | .40***       | .22         | .25*        |
| Mania         | .20    | .15    | .18    | .12    | .15    | .05    | .21        | .25*       | .26*        | .31**        | .34**       | .22         |
| Agape         | .01    | .18    | .11    | .29**  | .06    | .20    | .09        | -.08       | .15         | .18          | .07         | .21         |
| Teach Eros    | .33**  | .03    | .08    | .24*   | .00    | .05    | .39***     | .28*       | .16         | .22          | .22         | .26*        |
| Teach Ludus   | .15    | .01    | .08    | .10    | .08    | .00    | .28*       | .26*       | .10         | .27*         | .19         | .23*        |
| Teach Storge  | .31**  | -.11   | .25*   | .13    | .00    | .03    | .40***     | .37***     | .39***       | .33**        | .35**       | .31**       |
| Teach Pragma  | .08    | .18    | .02    | .08    | -.03   | -.07   | .13        | .22        | .08         | .22          | .24*        | .16         |
| Teach Mania   | .00    | .08    | .04    | .09    | -.01   | -.03   | .09        | .10        | -.01        | .18          | .17         | .14         |
| Teach Agape   | .27*   | .05    | .09    | .30**  | .19    | .08    | .25*       | .17        | .23*        | .23*         | .16         | .08         |
| GP advice     | .10    | .07    | .11    | .27*   | -.03   | -.08   | .20        | .30**      | .15         | .40***       | .33**       | .27*        |
| GP + behaviors| .17    | .11    | .20    | .19    | .02    | .06    | .10        | -.13       | .14         | .13          | -.05        | .14         |
| GP stories    | .29**  | .03    | .22    | .15    | -.01   | -.05   | .22        | .33**      | .27*        | .19          | .47***      | .20         |
| GP affection  | .17    | .01    | .20    | .33*   | -.08   | .05    | .25*       | .05        | .16         | .29**        | .11         | .29**       |
| GP – behaviors| .26*   | .04    | .10    | -.01   | .14    | .18    | -.03       | .18        | .02         | -.01         | .14         | -.14        |

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.
reciprocal relationships were found between GC’s and GPs’ reports of GP teaching. First, GC’s report of their GPs’ teaching Eros was correlated with their GPs’ report of teaching Ludus ($r = .28$); and reciprocally, GPs’ report of teaching Eros was correlated with their GC’s report of teaching Ludus ($r = .28$). Second, GC’s report of their GPs teaching Eros was associated with their GPs’ report of teaching Agape ($r = .25$), and GPs’ report of teaching Eros was associated with their GC’s report of GPs teaching Agape ($r = .26$). Finally, GC’s report of their GPs teaching Storge was correlated with their GPs’ report of teaching Agape ($r = .23$), and GPs’ report of teaching Storge was correlated with their GC’s report of teaching Agape ($r = .31$). In addition, GC’s report of GP teaching Pragma was positively correlated to GPs’ reports of teaching Ludus and Agape ($rs = .27$ and .23,
respectively), GC’s report of GP teaching Mania was correlated with GPs’ report of teaching Pragma \((r = .24)\), and GC’s report of GPs teaching Agape was associated with GPs’ report of teaching Ludus \((r = .23)\).

Other findings from Table 4.18 show GC’s Eros was not only directly related to the GPs’ report of teaching Eros \((r = .33)\), but also to GPs’ report of teaching Storge and Agape \((rs = .31 \text{ and } .27, \text{ respectively})\). Another direct relationship found was between GC’s Storge and their GPs’ reports of teaching Storge \((r = .25)\). Finally, the GC’s Pragma love attitude was correlated with both GPs’ reports of teaching Eros and teaching Agape \((rs = .24 \text{ and } .30, \text{ respectively})\).

Four of the GC’s reports of GPs teaching about love attitudes were directly correlated with the GPs’ reported beliefs about the same love attitudes: Eros, Ludus, Pragma, and Mania love attitudes \((rs = .28, .27, .40, \text{ and } .34, \text{ respectively})\). Other correlations between GP love attitudes and GCs’ reported GP teaching of love attitudes were found. GPs’ Pragma style was correlated with GC’s reports of GPs teaching of Eros, Ludus, Storge, Pragma, and Agape love attitudes \((rs = .32, .35, .29, .40, \text{ and } .31, \text{ respectively})\). GPs’ Eros style was correlated with GC’s reports of GP teaching Eros, Storge, Pragma, and Agape attitudes \((rs = .28, .25, .30, \text{ and } .31, \text{ respectively})\). GPs’ Mania love attitude was correlated with GC’s reports of GPs teaching of Ludus, Storge, Pragma, and Mania attitudes \((rs = .25, .26, .31, \text{ and } .34, \text{ respectively})\). GPs’ belief about Storge was correlated with the GC’s report of GPs teaching about Eros, Pragma and Agape attitudes \((rs = .25, .33, \text{ and } .39, \text{ respectively})\). And finally, GPs’ Agape style was not correlated with any of the GC’s reports of GPs’ teaching particular love attitudes.
GC’s love attitudes and GPs’ socialization practices. RQ18 asked about the relationship between the GC’s love attitudes and their matched GPs’ socialization practices. Table 4.18 presents the findings from the Pearson correlations. First, the GC’s Eros and Pragma love attitudes each were correlated with two GP reported socialization practices. GC’s Eros was related to the GPs’ reports of their own story-telling and negative behaviors ($r = .29$ and $.26$, respectively). GC’s Pragma style was correlated with the GPs’ reports of advice-giving and affection ($r = .27$ and $.33$, respectively). GPs’ report of their advice-giving was associated with the GC’s reports of GPs teaching Ludus, Pragma, Mania, and Agape love attitudes ($r = .30, .40, .33$, and $.27$, respectively). GPs’ report of showing affection was correlated with the GC’s reports of GPs teaching Eros, Pragma, and Agape styles ($r = .25, .29$, and $.29$, respectively). And, GPs’ report of storytelling was correlated with the GC’s reports of GPs teaching Ludus, Storge, and Mania ($r = .33, .27$, and $.47$, respectively).

The GCs’ reports of GPs’ socialization practices were also correlated with the GPs’ reports of their own love attitudes and teaching about love attitudes. GCs’ reports of GP advice and GP stories were both related to GPs’ Eros, Storge, Pragma, Mania, and Agape attitudes ($r_{GP\text{advice}}$ ranged from $.27$ to $.38$; and $r_{GP\text{stories}}$ ranged from $.28$ to $.42$). GC’s report of GP affection was positively associated with the GPs’ reports of Eros, Storge, Pragma, and Agape styles ($r$ ranged from $.26$ to $.51$). GC’s report of observing GPs’ positive behaviors was correlated with GPs’ Eros, Storge, and Agape love attitudes ($r$ ranged from $.34$ to $.51$); and GC’s report of observing negative behaviors was
correlated with GPs’ Ludus love attitude \((r = .40)\). The strongest of all these relationships appeared between the GPs’ report of Eros style and the GCs’ reports of GP socialization.

GC’s report of GPs’ socializing by giving advice was positively associated with the GPs’ reports of teaching about Eros, Ludus, Storge, and Agape styles \((rs \text{ ranged from } .23 \text{ to } .39)\). GC’s report of observing GPs’ affection also was positively associated with the GPs’ reports of teaching about Eros and Ludus love attitudes \((rs = .33 \text{ and } .24, \text{ respectively})\). Two other relationships were found between GC’s report of observing GPs’ positive behaviors and GPs’ reports of teaching Eros style \((r = .24)\), and GC’s report of GPs’ story-telling and GPs’ reports of teaching Storge style \((r = .35)\). The GC’s report of observing GPs’ negative behaviors was not associated with any of the GPs’ reports of teaching love attitudes.

Love attitudes, GPs’ teaching love attitudes, and GP socialization practices for matched GC- GPs summary. A number of direct relationships between GC’s and GPs’ reports of love attitudes, teaching about love attitudes, and GP socialization practices were found from these analyses. Overall, the GPs’ own love attitudes of Eros, Ludus, Storge, and Mania were found to be associated with the GC’s reports of their GPs’ teaching about those same love attitudes. On the other hand, the GC’s own love attitudes of Eros and Storge were associated with the GPs’ reports of teaching about those same love attitudes. The GC’s reports of GPs’ teaching about the love attitudes and GPs’ socialization practices had numerous associations with the GPs’ own love attitudes. In other words, as GPs’ held stronger attitudes about their ways of loving, the GC reported that their GPs taught and socialized more often about love.
RQ19 and 20 asked whether the matched GC’s and GPs’ reports of their own marital dimensions, GPs teaching marital dimensions, and GPs socialization practices were related. Pearson correlations were conducted and the results are presented in Table 4.19. GC’s and their GPs’ beliefs in Sharing and Assertiveness marital dimensions were not related. In fact, the GC’s beliefs in Sharing and Assertiveness were not associated with any of the GPs’ reports of teaching marital dimensions or their socialization practices. However, the GC’s reports of their GPs’ teaching about Sharing was directly associated with the GPs’ report of teaching their GC about Sharing ($r = .29$), and was also associated with the GPs’ reports of their belief in sharing in marriage ($r = .38$). In response to RQ20, GC’s reports of their GPs’ teaching about Sharing was correlated with two of the GPs’ reports of socializing their GC: GP positive behaviors and GP affection ($r_s = .29$ and $.37$, respectively). On the other hand, GC’s reports of their GPs’ teaching about Assertiveness was associated with the GPs’ reports of GP story-telling and GP negative behaviors ($r_s = .32$ and $.33$, respectively).

Also reported in Table 4.19 are the additional findings that the GPs’ own beliefs in Sharing was associated with the GC’s reports of four positive GP socialization practices: advice-giving, positive behaviors, story-telling, and affection ($r_s$ ranged from .34 to .53), with the strongest association between GP Sharing and GC’s report of their matched GPs’ showing of affection. GPs’ reports of teaching about Sharing were associated with the GC’s reports of GP advice-giving and showing affection ($r_s = .33$ and
### Table 4.19: Pearson Correlations of Matched GCs’ and GPs’ Reports of Marital Dimensions, GP Socialization Practices, and Demographics (N = 148; i.e., 74 Matched GP-GC dyads)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sharing</th>
<th>Assertiveness</th>
<th>Teach Sharing</th>
<th>Teach Assertiveness</th>
<th>GP Advice</th>
<th>GP + Behaviors</th>
<th>GP Stories</th>
<th>GP Affection</th>
<th>GP – Behaviors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharing</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach Sharing</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach Assertiveness</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP advice</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP + behaviors</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP stories</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP affection</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP – behaviors</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.*
The GPs’ report of beliefs in Assertiveness was associated with only the GC’s reports of observing GP negative behaviors ($r = .24$).

In sum, GC’s own beliefs about sharing and having assertiveness in marriage were not associated with any of the GPs’ reports about their own marital dimensions, teaching marital dimension, or their socialization practices. However, GC’s reports of their GPs’ teaching about the marital dimensions had some associations with the GPs’ reports. For example, the more that GC perceive their GPs as teaching about sharing in marriage, their GPs report greater beliefs in sharing in marriage and also that they teach about sharing. In addition, GC’s reports that GPs teach about Sharing are also positively associated with two of the GPs’ reports about their own socialization practices: positive behaviors and affection. The GPs’ belief in sharing in marriage is associated with the GC’s perceptions of their GPs’ four positive socialization practices.

*The Combined Influence of GP Socialization Practices on GC’s Love Attitudes and Marital Dimensions*

These next analyses respond to RQ$_{21}$ and $22$ which asked whether any study variables predicted the GC’s love attitudes and marital dimensions. A series of multiple stepwise regressions were employed to test the relative influence of GP socialization practices, beliefs and behaviors regarding love and marriage, and GPs’ teaching of love attitudes and marital dimensions on each of the GC’s love and marital beliefs. The analyses for the criterion variables of love attitudes and of marital dimensions are similar; therefore, the procedures of the analyses are reported for both love attitudes and marital dimensions simultaneously.
The potential predictor variables to be used in each regression were determined by examining correlation tables of study variables and the eight criterion variables of the GC’s love attitudes and GC’s marital dimensions. All significant correlates between these eight criterion variables and the GC’s and GPs’ reports of GPs’ teaching and GPs’ socialization practices were included as predictor variables. Eight relationship qualities and four demographics were included: GC’s and GPs’ reports of solidarity, GC’s perception and GPs’ reports of GP marital happiness, GC’s and GPs’ reports of the GPs’ closeness to the GC’s parents, sex of GC and GP, and age of GC and GP. The study variables that correlated with the criterion variables (not including the GC’s reports of their own love attitudes and marital dimensions), relationship variables, and demographics were all entered at once as predictor variables in the multiple stepwise regressions for each corresponding criterion to uncover any significant predictors.

Due to the small sample size, I limited the number of predictor variables as much as possible. With the procedures just mentioned, none of the regressions had more than a total of 33 variables entered as predictors. Cohen (2001) suggests that when conducting regressions, the degrees of freedom should be at least 40; therefore, the minimum sample size for an effective regression should be the number of predictors plus 41. The sample size of this study meets this expectation.

Eight stepwise regressions were conducted; one for each of the GC’s reports of their six love attitudes and two marital dimensions. Table 4.20 reports the findings from each regression.
Predictors of GC’s Love Attitudes

In response to RQ21, six stepwise regressions were conducted, with each of the GC’s love attitudes as the six criterion variables. Results from these regressions are presented in Table 4.20 and are reported next. For the GC’s Eros, the GC’s report of their matched GP’s advice-giving, GP solidarity, GPs’ reports of negative behaviors, and GP Eros combined to affect the GC’s Eros love attitude \[ F(4, 59) = 10.77, p < .001, R^2 = .42 \]. The GPs’ reports of their GC observing their negative behaviors was the most influential of these predictors (\( \beta = .41, p < .001 \)), and uniquely explains 14% of the variance for Eros. Together, the four predictors explained 42% of the variance. GC’s and GPs’ reports of teaching Eros were not found to be significant predictors.

GPs’ Pragma love attitude and GC’s reports of their matched GPs’ teaching Agape were the two significant predictors for Ludus, \( F(2, 61) = 6.08, p = .004, R^2 = .17 \) (see Table 4.20). These two equally influential predictors combined to explain 17% of the variance of the GC’s Ludus love attitude score. GPs’ teaching of Ludus was not found to be a significant predictor.

Only the GC’s reports about observing their GPs’ positive behaviors and the GPs’ Ludus were found to be predictors for the GC’s Storge love attitude, \( F(2, 61) = 7.09, p = .002, R^2 = .19 \). Observing GPs’ positive behaviors was the more influential of the two predictors (\( \beta = .36, p = .003 \)), and uniquely explained 19% of the variance. These two factors combined to explain 16% of the variance for Storge. The GPs’ teaching of Storge was not found to be a significant predictor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion variables</th>
<th>Predictor variables</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$sr^2$</th>
<th>$F$-change</th>
<th>Adjusted $R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GC Eros</td>
<td>1. GC GP advice</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>14.77</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. GP solidarity</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. GP negative behavior</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. GP Eros</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC Ludus</td>
<td>1. GP Pragma</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. GC GP teaching Agape</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC Storge</td>
<td>1. GC GP positive behavior</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. GP Ludus</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC Pragma</td>
<td>1. GC GP teaching Pragma</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>14.26</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. GC GP affection</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC Mania</td>
<td>1. GP Pragma</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>10.41</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC Agape</td>
<td>1. GC GP negative behavior</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. GC GP close to father</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. GC GP teaching Agape</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC Sharing</td>
<td>1. GC GP teaching Assertiveness</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>14.56</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. GP age</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Final adjusted $R^2$’s for each regression are italicized. All $F$-change ratios are significant at the .05 level. Betas are standardized. Betas and squared semi-partial correlations are from the final equations.

Table 4.20: *Multiple Stepwise Regressions on GC’s Love Attitudes and Marital Dimensions (N = 148; i.e., 74 Matched GP-GC Dyads)*
The GC’s Pragma love attitude also had two predictors: GC’s reports about their GPs’ teaching Pragma and GC’s reports of GPs showing affection, $F(2, 61) = 10.03, p < .001, R^2 = .25$ (see Table 4.20). Of these two predictors, the GC’s report of GP teaching about Pragma was the primary predictor ($\beta = .38, p = .001, sr^2 = .14$). The GC’s Pragma love attitude’s predictors combined to explain 25% of its variance.

The GC’s Mania love attitude was found to be predicted by only the GPs’ Pragma love attitude, $F(1, 62) = 10.41, p = .002, R^2 = .14$ (see Table 4.20). This one variable explained 14% of the variance for Mania love attitude. Finally, the GC’s Agape love attitude was found to have three predictors: the GC’s reports of observing their GPs’ negative behaviors, GC’s perceptions that GPs were close to GC’s father, and the GC’s report of their GPs teaching about Agape, $F(3, 60) = 6.77, p = .001, R^2 = .25$ (see Table 4.20). These three predictors were equally influential and combined to explain 25% of the variance for the GC’s Agape love attitude.

In sum, each of the six GC’s love attitudes was found to have at least one significant predictor from among the study variables. Pragma and Agape were predicted by the constructs of the GPs’ teaching of these same love attitudes; and GPs’ teaching of Agape predicted the GC’s Ludus. The GC’s reports of Eros, Storge, Pragma, and Agape each were predicted by one of the GPs’ socialization practices. Eros was predicted by GC’s reports of GP advice and GPs’ reports of acting negatively. Storge was predicted by the GC’s reports of GPs’ positive behaviors; while Agape was predicted by GC’s reports
of observing GPs’ negative behaviors. Pragma was predicted by GC’s reports of GP expressing affection. GC’s Mania was the only love attitude that was not predicted by GPs’ teaching or one of the GP socialization practices.

*Predictors of GC’s Marital Dimensions*

Two stepwise regressions were conducted for the marital dimensions. Table 4.20 presents these findings that respond to RQ22 which asked whether any study variables predicted the GC’s marital dimensions.

First, GC’s Sharing was found to be negatively predicted by the GC’s reports of GPs’ teaching Assertiveness and GPs’ age, $F(2, 61) = 10.90, p < .001, R^2 = .26$ (see Table 4.20). Both the GC’s reports of GPs’ teaching Assertiveness and GPs’ age were negative predictors ($\beta = -.46, p < .001$ and $\beta = -.27, p < .05$, respectively). The variance explained for GC’s Sharing was 26% by these two predictors combined. Second, the GC’s sex was found to be predictive of the GC’s Assertiveness belief, $F(1, 62) = 8.15, p = .006, R^2 = .12, \beta = .34$, and GC’s sex explained 12% of the variance.

In sum, the GC’s beliefs about sharing in a marriage are enhanced when the GPs’ teach less about assertiveness in marriage. GPs’ teaching about sharing in marriage was not predictive for either of the GC’s Sharing or Assertiveness.

*GC’s Solidarity Moderating Effects on Love Attitudes and Marital Dimensions*

With GP-GC solidarity being a relationship quality of interest among scholars who study grandparenting (Harwood, 2000b; Bengtson & Roberts, 1991), the GC’s reports of solidarity was selected to be evaluated as a moderating variable between the predictors and the GC’s love attitudes and marital beliefs. In order to test for the effects
of moderators most efficiently, Baron and Kenny (1986) recommend that the potential moderator variable be uncorrelated with both the predictor variables and the criterion variable. Therefore, a series of Pearson correlations were conducted between GC’s report of solidarity and the study variables.

Overall, Table 4.21 illustrates the relationships between GC’s and GP’s reports of solidarity with the study variables. GC’s reports of solidarity are correlated with all of their reports of positive GP socialization practices (\(rs\) ranged from .23 to .43), and GC’s solidarity is negatively correlated with their reports of observations of GPs’ negative behaviors. GPs’ reports of solidarity are also correlated to the GC’s reports of socialization practices (\(rs\) ranged from .26 to .32), with the exceptions of GC’s reports of GP affection and negative behaviors. GPs’ reports of their negative behaviors and their beliefs in Ludus love attitude are negative correlated with the GC’s reports of solidarity (\(rs = -.24\) and -.24, respectively). The GPs’ reports of solidarity are correlated to their own reports of story-telling, Eros love attitude, and Storge love (\(rs = .27, .23,\) and .33, respectively).

The GC’s and their matched GPs’ reports of solidarity were also interrelated (\(r = .44\)). GC’s solidarity was positively correlated with their own perceptions of their GPs’ marital happiness and their GPs’ closeness to their father (\(rs = .46\) and .47, respectively). GPs’ solidarity was positively correlated with their own reports of the importance to teach GC about love and marriage, their marital happiness, and their closeness to the GC’s father (\(rs = .32, .26, .24,\) and .24, respectively).
Table 4.21: Pearson Correlations for GP-GC Solidarity with GP Socialization Practices, Love Attitudes, GP Teaching Love Attitudes, Marital Dimensions, GP Teaching Marital Dimensions, and Relationship Qualities (N = 148; i.e., 74 Matched GP-GC Dyads)
In sum and for the purposes of testing GC’s solidarity as a moderator variable, the GC’s reports of solidarity did not generally correlate with love attitudes, marital dimensions, or teaching of these beliefs. Even though GC’s solidarity was correlated with other relationship qualities and GP socialization practices, the lack of correlation with the love attitudes, marital dimension, and GPs’ teaching of these beliefs gives justification to test for moderator effects.

In the next step, interaction terms were created. First, the means of all of the significant predictors of GC’s love attitudes and marital dimensions (as reported in Table 4.20) and the GC's report of solidarity were zero-centered to avoid problems of multicollinearity during calculations (Baron & Kenny, 1986). Next, each standardized predictor was multiplied by the standardized GC’s solidarity to form interaction terms.

Then a series of eight hierarchical multiple regressions were conducted. The significant predictors of the respective GC’s love attitude or marital dimension and GC solidarity were entered into the first block of the regression, and the newly created interaction terms were entered into the second block of their respective regressions. The results of the regressions found that only the criterion variables of GC’s Eros and GC’s Sharing were significantly affected by an interaction between their predictors and GC’s report of GP-GC solidarity (see Table 4.22).

For the GC’s Eros, the overall hierarchical regression found in significant results, $F(4, 59) = 10.77, p < .001, R^2 = .44$. The first block of predictors, $F(5, 68) = 5.02, p = .001, R^2 = .27$ (see Table 4.22); as well as the second block of interaction terms, $F$-change$(4, 64) = 4.89, p = .002, R^2$ change = .17, were both significant. The combination
### Table 4.22: Interaction Effects for GC Solidarity for Multiple Hierarchical Regressions on GC’s Eros Love Attitude and Sharing Marital Dimensions (N = 148; i.e., 74 Matched GP-GC Dyads)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion variables</th>
<th>Predictor variables</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$sr^2$</th>
<th>$t$-statistic</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GC Eros</td>
<td>GC solidarity</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GC GP advice</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GP solidarity</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GP negative behavior</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GP Eros</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interaction GC GP advice and GC</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interaction GP negative behavior</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and GC solidarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interaction GP solidarity and GC</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interaction GP Eros and GC solidarity</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.82</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC Sharing</td>
<td>GC solidarity</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GC GP teaching Assertiveness</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-3.55</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GP age</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-2.11</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interaction GC GP teaching</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assertiveness and GC solidarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interaction GP age and GC solidarity</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Betas are standardized. Statistical results from the final equations.
of these predictors and interactions resulted in 44% of the variance explained for GC’s Eros. The main effect of GPs’ reports of negative behaviors was positively associated with GC’s Eros ($\beta = .48, p < .001, sr^2 = .12$). Moreover, the interaction of the GPs’ reports of negative behaviors and the GC’s solidarity also had a significant influence on the GC’s Eros love attitude ($\beta = .38, p = .002, sr^2 = .09$). Decomposition of the means of this interaction term showed that when the GC reported greater solidarity with their GPs, and their GPs’ reported higher incidence of their own negative behaviors, then the GC’s Eros love attitude was higher. On the other hand, when the GC solidarity was high but their GPs’ reported less negative behavior, then the GC’s Eros love attitude was lower.

Also for GC’s Sharing marital dimension, the hierarchical regression was significant, $F(5, 68) = 6.57, p < .001, R^2 = .33$. The first model in the regression was significant, $F(3, 70) = 7.38, p < .001, R^2 = .24$ (see Table 4.22); and the second model of interaction effects was also significant, $F$-change$(2, 68) = 4.32, p < .05, R^2$ change = .09. Overall, 33% of the variance explained for Sharing was found in the combination of these predictors. The main effects for the GC’s reports of GPs teaching Assertiveness and the age of the GP were both significant ($\beta = -.37, p = .001, sr^2 = -.12$, and $\beta = -.22, p < .05, sr^2 = -.04$, respectively). These two constructs interacted with the GC’s solidarity to significantly predict the GC’s Sharing beliefs ($\beta = .31, p < .01, sr^2 = .08$, and $\beta = .24, p = .05, sr^2 = .04$, respectively). Decomposition of this interaction term showed that, as the GC solidarity increased and the GC’s reports of their GPs teaching Assertiveness diminished, the GC’s belief in sharing in marriage increased. And for the GP age, as GC solidarity increased and the GPs were younger, then the GC’s Sharing increased.
Predictors of the GC’s Positive Love Attitudes

Multiple predictors were found for the GC’s love attitudes; therefore in an attempt to simplify these findings, several of the GC’s love attitudes were combined into one variable and then analyzed in a regression analysis. Empirically, the love attitudes of Eros, Storge, and Pragma appear to have a combined set of beliefs that are culturally desirable. These three positive love attitudes were combined and served as the criterion variable for a stepwise regression. The predictor variables of the GC’s and GPs’ reports of GPs teaching love attitudes, the GPs’ love attitudes, along with the study variables that correlated with the criterion variable (not including the GC’s reports of their own love attitudes), relationship variables, and demographics were all entered at once as predictor variables in a multiple stepwise regression.

The overall regression for the positive love attitudes was significant, $F(2, 61) = 11.13, p < .001, R^2 = .27$. Two significant predictor variables combined to predict the GC’s positive love attitude: the GC’s reports of GP advice-giving ($\beta = .34, p = .006, sr^2 = .10$), and the GC’s report of their GPs teaching about the Eros love attitude ($\beta = .28, p = .02, sr^2 = .07$). These two equally influential predictors combined to explain 27% of the variance. Both of these predictors are the GC’s perspective. First, grandchildren who perceive that their GPs’ talk to them about love and marriage to give advice tend to have stronger beliefs in the three positive love attitudes of Eros, Storge, and Pragma. Second, the GC who indicated that their GPs taught about Eros love attitudes, in turn have stronger beliefs about these three attitudes.
In summary, the findings from the regression analyses revealed that GPs’ socialization practices and teaching, at least in some ways, contribute to their GC’s attitudes about love and beliefs about marriage. In the regression of the overall positive love attitudes, the GC’s perceptions of their GPs giving advice and teaching about the positive love attitudes were both found to be significant predictors. In the individual analyses of the GC’s love attitudes, GPs’ teaching and/or socialization practices served as predictors for five love attitudes (Eros, Ludus, Storge, Pragma, and Agape) and the Sharing marital dimension. GC’s Eros had the most combined predictors from the study’s constructs. For Pragma and Agape love attitudes, a key predictor was the GC’s own report that their GP had taught about these same love attitudes. Four of the GC’s love attitudes were predicted by the GPs’ own love attitudes. Ludus and Mania were both predicted by the GPs’ Pragma attitude, Storge was predicted by the GPs’ Ludus, and Eros was predicted by the GPs’ Eros. The Assertiveness dimension was only predicted by the GC’s sex. Finally, the GC’s belief in Eros was enhanced by an interaction between the GPs’ reports of their negative behaviors and GC’s solidarity; and Sharing was enhanced.
by interactions with GC’s solidarity and both GC’s report of GPs teaching Assertiveness and GP age. Table 4.23 presents a review of all the research questions and hypotheses with their primary findings.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research questions and hypotheses</th>
<th>Primary findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generational analyses – GC and GPs socialization practices</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ1a-c: Are GC’s reports of GPs’ socializing practices (a) interrelated, (b) related to relationship qualities, or (c) related to demographics?</td>
<td>All + socialization practices interrelated and related to relationship qualities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1: GC’s reports of GP-GC solidarity will be associated with their reports of GP socializing practices.</td>
<td>Hypothesis supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2: Does sex of the GC make a difference in GC’s reports of GP socializing practices?</td>
<td>No sex differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: GC will report that grandmothers (GMs) socialize more than grandfathers (GFs).</td>
<td>Hypothesis partially supported: GMs &gt; story-telling than GFs; GMs &lt; affection and – behaviors than GFs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: GC will report that maternal GPs socialize more than paternal GPs.</td>
<td>Hypothesis supported: maternal GPs &gt; story-telling than paternal GPs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ3a-c: Are GP’s reports of their socializing practices (a) interrelated, (b) related to relationship qualities, or (c) related to demographics?</td>
<td>GP’s advice-giving, story-telling, and affection interrelated. GP’s + behaviors, affection, and GP’s marital happiness related. Hypothesis partially supported: GP + and – behaviors, affection related to GP solidarity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4: GP’s reports of GP-GC solidarity will be associated with their reports GP socializing practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5: Grandmothers will report greater frequency of socializing their GC than grandfathers will report.</td>
<td>Hypothesis supported: GMs &gt; advice-giving and story-telling than GFs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6: Maternal GPs will report greater frequency of socializing their GC than paternal GPs.</td>
<td>Hypothesis supported.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.24: Overview of Research Questions, Hypotheses, and Primary Findings
Table 4.24 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ:</th>
<th>Differences between the two generations of GC’s reports and GPs’ reports of GPs’ socializing practices?</th>
<th>GPs &gt; GC on four + socialization practices.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Generational analyses – GC’s and GPs’ reports of love attitudes and GPs teaching love attitudes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ:</th>
<th>Are GC’s reports of their love attitudes (a) interrelated, or related to GC’s reports of (b) GPs teaching love attitudes, (c) GP socializing practices, (d) relationship qualities, or (e) demographics?</th>
<th>Five love attitudes interrelated. Most GP teaching and socialization practices interrelated. Pragma related to all teaching and socialization. Hypothesis supported.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**H7:** GC’s reports of GP-GC solidarity will be associated with their reports of GP teaching love attitudes.

**RQ6:** Does the sex of the GC make a difference in GC’s reports of GPs teaching love attitudes?

**H8:** GC will report that grandmothers teach love attitudes more than grandfathers.

**H9:** GC will report that maternal GPs teach love attitudes more than paternal GPs.

**RQ7:** Are GPs’ reports of their love attitudes (a) interrelated, or related to GPs’ reports of (b) GPs teaching love attitudes, (c) GP socializing practices, (d) relationship qualities, or (e) demographics?

**H10:** GPs’ reports of GP-GC solidarity will be associated with their reports of teaching love attitudes.

Continued
Table 4.24 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H₁₁: Grandmothers will report teaching love attitudes more than grandfathers.</td>
<td>Hypothesis not supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₁₂: Maternal GPs will report teaching love attitudes more than paternal GPs.</td>
<td>Hypothesis not supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ₈: Are there generational differences between GC’s and GPs’ reports of love attitudes?</td>
<td>GC &gt; GPs for Ludus and Mania. GPs &gt; GC for Storge and Agape. GPs &gt; GC for teaching Storge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ₉: Are there generational differences between GC’s and GPs’ reports of GPs teaching love attitudes?</td>
<td>GC &gt; GPs for Ludus and Mania. GPs &gt; GC for Storge and Agape.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Generational analyses – GC’s and GPs’ reports of marital dimensions and GPs teaching marital dimensions**

| RQ₁₀a-c: Are GC’s reports of their marital dimensions (a) interrelated, or related to GC’s reports of (b) GPs teaching marital dimensions, (c) GP socializing practices, (d) relationship qualities, or (e) demographics? | Marital dimensions – related. Teaching Sharing related to teaching Assertiveness, GPs’ and parents’ marital happiness. |
| H₁₃: GC’s reports of GP-GC solidarity will be associated with their reports of GPs teaching marital dimensions. | Hypothesis partially supported: Solidarity related to Sharing. |
| RQ₁₁: Does the sex of the GC make a difference in GC’s reports of GPs teaching marital dimensions? | Male GC > Female GC for reports of GPs’ teaching Assertiveness. |
| H₁₄: GC will report that grandmothers teach marital dimensions more than grandfathers. | Hypothesis not supported. |

Continued
Table 4.24 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Hypothesis not supported.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H15: GC will report that maternal GPs teach marital dimensions more than paternal GPs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ12a-e: Are GPs’ reports of their marital dimensions (a) interrelated, or related to GPs’ reports of (b) GPs teaching marital dimensions, (c) GP socializing practices, (d) relationship qualities, or (e) demographics?</td>
<td>GP Sharing related to teaching Sharing. GP teaching Sharing and teaching Assertiveness related. GPs’ marital happiness related to all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H16: GPs’ reports of GP-GC solidarity will be associated with their reports of GPs teaching marital dimensions.</td>
<td>Hypothesis not supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H17: Grandmothers will report teaching marital dimensions more than grandfathers.</td>
<td>Hypothesis not supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H18: Maternal GPs will report teaching marital dimensions more than paternal GPs.</td>
<td>Hypothesis not supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ13: Are there generational differences between GC’s and GPs’ reports of marital dimensions?</td>
<td>GC &gt; GPs Sharing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ14: Are there generational differences between GC’s and GPs’ reports of GPs teaching marital dimensions?</td>
<td>GPs &gt; GC GP teaching Sharing. GC &gt; GPs GP teaching Assertiveness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Matched set of GC and their GPs –**

**Socialization, love attitudes, and marital dimensions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Hypothesis not supported.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ15: Are there generational differences between GC’s and their matched GPs’ reports of (a) socialization practices, (b) love attitudes and teaching about love attitudes, (c) marital dimensions and teaching about marital dimensions, and (d) relationship qualities?</td>
<td>GPs &gt; GC for GPs’ advice, + behaviors, and affection. GC &gt; GPs Ludus and Mania. GP &gt; GCs Storge and Agape. GC &gt; GPs for GP teaching all love attitudes, marital dimensions, and teaching marital dimensions. GPs &gt; GC solidarity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
| RQ16: Are GC’s reports of GPs’ socialization practices related to their matched GPs’ reports of their socialization practices? | GC and GPs directly interrelated for all GP socialization practices. |
| RQ17: Are GC’s love attitudes and their reports of GPs teaching love attitudes related to their matched GPs’ love attitudes and their reports of teaching love attitudes to their matched GC? | Some direct interrelationships between GC and GPs for love attitudes and teaching love attitudes. GPs’ teaching Storge related to all GC’s reports of GP teaching. GC Eros related to GPs’ storytelling and – behaviors. GC Pragma related to GPs’ advice-giving and affection. GC’s report of GP teaching Sharing related to GP Sharing and teaching Sharing. |
| RQ18: Are GC’s love attitudes related to their matched GPs’ reports of their socialization practices? | GC Eros related to GPs’ storytelling and – behaviors. GC Pragma related to GPs’ advice-giving and affection. |
| RQ19: Are GC’s marital dimensions and their reports of GPs teaching marital dimensions related to their matched GPs’ marital dimensions and their reports of teaching marital dimensions to their matched GC? | GC’s report of GP teaching Sharing related to GP Sharing and teaching Sharing. |
| RQ20: Are GC’s marital dimensions related to their matched GPs’ reports of their socialization practices? | No relationship GC’s marital dimensions. GPs’ Sharing related to all + GP socialization practices. |
| RQ21: What factors, or combination of factors, best predict GC’s love attitudes? | All GC’s love attitudes had significant predictors. GC Eros, Ludus, Storge, Pragma, and Agape had GP socialization and/or GP teaching predictors. Both GC’s marital dimensions had significant predictors. Sharing had a GP teaching predictor. |
| RQ22: What factors, or combination of factors, best predict GC’s marital dimensions? | GC Eros was affected by interaction of GC solidarity and GPs’ reports of – behaviors. GC’s Sharing was affected by interactions of GC solidarity and both GC’s reports of GPs teaching Assertiveness and GP age. |
| RQ23: Do GC’s reports of GP-GC solidarity modify the effects of the predictors of GC’s love attitudes? |
| RQ24: Do GC’s reports of GP-GC solidarity modify the effects of the predictors of GC’s marital dimensions? |
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The goal of this study was to explore the socializing practices used by grandparents to teach their grandchildren about attitudes and beliefs concerning love and marriage. In this chapter, I discuss the results of the study and highlight the key findings from the research questions and hypotheses. Next, I point out the contributions that this study makes toward understanding grandparent socialization and the meanings constituted between grandparents and grandchildren. GP-GC communication is discussed as key to GP socialization practices. Finally, the limitations of the study are delineated followed by proposals for future directions in the study of GP-GC socializing interactions and communication practices.

Overview of Findings

The findings from this study show that young adults’ perceptions of love and marriage are partially associated with the socialization practices of their grandparents. This section presents the findings from the analyses of the grandchildren’s and grandparents’ perceptions of (a) grandparents’ socialization practices about love and marriage, (b) their attitudes toward love and how grandparents teach about those attitudes, and (c) their beliefs about marriage and how grandparents teach about those
beliefs. Where possible, I discuss the connections that these findings have to existing literature, and I suggest how these findings add to the knowledge of the grandparents’ role in socializing their grandchildren about love and marriage.

**GP Socialization Practices**

One task of this study was to uncover the ways in which grandparents socialize their grandchildren about love and marriage. These GP socialization practices included: GP advice-giving, GP story-telling and others’ stories about GPs, observations of GPs’ positive and negative behaviors, and grandparents’ expression of their affection for one another. Four of these socialization practices are ones that involve communication as the primary vehicle in the co-construction of attitudes and beliefs about love and marriage: advice-giving, story-telling, others’ stories, and expressions of affection. Two examples of advice-giving included grandparents suggesting for grandchildren to get to know the family of the person they are interested in romantically and to stay faithful to whom they marry. In the grandparents’ stories and stories told by others, participants reported grandparents talking about their dating experiences and the tough times they faced together as a couple. Expressions of affection referred specifically to grandparents’ calling each other endearing names such as “Sweetheart” or “Honey,” or grandparents teasing and joking with one another. The final two socialization practices were reports of the direct observations of the grandparents’ behaviors made by grandchildren. Grandparents showing faithfulness and physically caring for one another were among the positive observations; while, yelling or ordering each other around were among the observations of negative behaviors.
In sum, these findings extend the existing literature regarding the socialization of grandchildren by their grandparents. Story-telling, proverbs, and topics of conversations have been the focus for many grandparent studies regarding the ways that grandparents influence their grandchildren (Harwood, 2000b; McWright, 2002; Ryan et al., 2004). Delineating the GP socialization practices has in more specific ways defined how it is that GPs’ socialize their grandchildren about how to act and how not to act in love and marriage.

**Perspectives on GP socialization practices.** For the socialization practices of GP advice-giving, expressions of affection, and positive behaviors, grandparents indicated that they engaged in these socializing behaviors more than the grandchildren noticed. However, the grandchildren’s and the grandparents’ responses to the frequency of the GP socialization practices were positively associated. Therefore, even though differences were noted between occurrences of these practices, when grandchildren noticed more socialization, then the grandparents reported more socialization as well. These findings were similar to those of King and Elder (1997) who studied family legacies and found that even when the grandparents remembered their own grandparents’ negative behaviors, they reported that they learned how not to act as a grandparent. I also found that both grandchildren and grandparents reported that the grandparents acted in negative ways at times. The conjecture may be made that as grandchildren are observing their own grandparents’ socialization practices about love and marriage, that when the grandchildren fall in love and get married, that these practices help grandchildren know how to act and how not to act in their own relationships.
Separate assessments from the grandchildren and the grandparents about GP advice-giving, story-telling, and expression of affection socialization practices were all positively inter-related, and related between the reports from the matched dyads of grandchildren and their grandparents. Interestingly, these three socialization practices are all communicative practices. Norris et al. (2004) specifically studied GP stories and found that they were used by grandparents to build GP-GC relationships, to educate grandchildren about historical events, and to transmit their values to their grandchildren; however, these scholars admit that less is known about whether the grandchild actually receives the moral message of the story. I surmise from the results of this study that, at the very least, grandchildren are noticing that their grandparents are communicating about love and marriage through these socialization practices of advice-giving, story-telling, and expressing affection.

One other relationship between grandchildren’s and grandparents’ reports of socialization practices was the positive association of GP affection and observing GPs’ positive behaviors. This connection appears logical since grandchildren observe the verbal expressions of affection between the grandparents, and they observe their grandparents’ positive behaviors, such as their willingness to do almost anything for each other or smiling when speaking about the other.

The grandparents for this study were asked to indicate how important it is to teach grandchildren about love and marriage. Grandparents’ reported levels of importance for teaching both love and marriage were positively associated with their own advice-giving
and story-telling socialization practices. These two socializing practices may be the avenue through which grandparents believe that they can most effectively teach their grandchildren about love and marriage.

Solidarity and GP socialization practices. Solidarity between grandparents and their grandchildren was assessed in this study as a combination of levels of emotional closeness, liking, respect, listening, and overall satisfaction with their conversations with one another. Grandparents indicated higher levels of GP-GC solidarity than the grandchildren reported; yet the two groups’ reports about GP-GC solidarity were positively associated. This finding is consistent with previous research focusing on GP-GC solidarity (e.g., Giarrusso et al., 2001; Silverstein et al., 1998). For grandchildren, solidarity with their grandparents was positively associated with each of their assessments of GP socialization practices. For grandparents, the associations between their own socialization practices and their feelings of solidarity were not as strong as the grandchildren’s. A viable speculation might be that, for grandparents, levels of closeness with their grandchild do not have a bearing on whether they socialize their grandchild or not, especially for the practices of advice-giving and story-telling which were not associated with GP-GC solidarity.

Relationship qualities and GP socialization practices. For purposes of this study, relationship qualities were assessed by both grandchildren and their grandparents, and included: perceptions of GPs’ marital happiness, GPs’ closeness to the GC’s mother, and GPs’ closeness to the GC’s father. Grandchildren’s reports for these three relationship qualities were related to all of their own reports of GP socialization practices. As the
grandchildren indicated higher levels of the GPs’ marital happiness and closeness to their parents, the grandchildren also reported higher frequency of positive socialization practices. The GC’s reports of these relationship qualities were all negatively associated with observing GPs’ negative behaviors. The deduction from these findings is that positive family relationships perhaps add to a positive environment where GP socializing practices may be more frequented.

*Sex and lineage of grandparents with socialization practices.* Analyses of sex and lineage across the GC and GP reports of socialization practices revealed some differences. First, male and female grandchildren perceived the overall frequency of their GPs’ socialization practices similarly. However, the GC perceived that their grandmothers told more stories than their grandfathers and that their grandfathers expressed more affection and behaved more negatively than their grandmothers. From the grandparents’ perspective, grandmothers also reported telling more stories, as well as, giving more advice than grandfathers reported. When Nussbaum and Bettini (1994) asked grandchildren to have their grandparents tell them a story about the meaning of life, the grandchildren reported that their grandmothers talked about twice as long as the grandfathers talked. In this study, grandmothers could be perceived as telling more stories when, in fact, there is a possibility that grandmothers are just telling longer stories that include more topics upon which the grandchildren can report.

A second noteworthy finding was that grandchildren perceived their maternal grandparents as telling more stories than their paternal grandparents. Mills et al. (2001) found that maternal grandparents, more than paternal, were closer to their grandchildren
and held similar values. Harwood (2000b) also found that among GP-GC dyads, maternal grandparents were closer to the grandchildren than paternal grandparents. Story-telling may be a socialization practice that occurs when grandparents and grandchildren are close enough to take the time to talk and listen.

**GP socialization practices summary.** Discovering ways that GPs socialize about love and marriage and what that socialization looks like had not been examined prior to this study. So, conclusions from the findings of this portion of the study of GP socialization practices are enlightening.

Overall, grandparents socialize their grandchildren about love and marriage with two types of learning approaches: communication (through advice-giving, story-telling, and expressions of affection) and observation (both positive and negative behaviors). For communication scholars, the finding that three of the GP socialization practices directly use communication for co-constructing ideas and beliefs about love and marriage is a key addition to our knowledge of grandparenting. Constructivists’ propose that meaning is co-constructed and constituted in the communication of situated interactions. Grandparents and their grandchildren expressed alignment in reports of the GPs’ socialization practices and further investigation of these interactions are called for to understand the full measure of what is taking place. Vygotsky and Bakhtin believed that cultural ideas were passed on through social activities and the resulting cognitive attainment. These GP socialization practices perhaps are the activities that are being used
to pass on the values concerning love and marriage. And, the frequent reports of observations as a way of socializing confirm Bandura’s (1986) ideas from his social cognitive theory.

Now that the GP socialization practices have been discussed, I will next discuss the two constructs of love and marriage. This study’s initiative was to not only discover GP socialization practices; but to also examine the attitudes and beliefs held by young adult grandchildren about love and marriage, and if grandparents were teaching about these beliefs.

Socialization of GC’s Love Attitudes

Young adult grandchildren and their grandparents hold attitudes about their preferred ways of loving and beliefs about love (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986). The primary aim of this study was not to distinguish similarities and differences between grandchildren and their grandparents love attitudes, but to discover whether grandparents are teaching their grandchildren about these beliefs.

GC’s and GPs’ love attitudes. In the overall comparison of grandchildren’s and grandparents’ preferred love attitudes, two main differences were found. First, grandchildren reported stronger beliefs in Ludus and Mania love attitudes than the grandparents reported. Both of these results align with the findings of Montgomery and Sorell (1997) who studied love attitudes across family life stages. Inman-Amos et al. (1994) also found stronger beliefs in Ludus and Mania love attitudes among the female children than their parents. The stronger beliefs of these two love styles may be conceived as being preferred by the grandchildren merely due to the transitions of their
young adult development (Erikson, 1968; Hendrick, 2004). Someone with a stronger Ludus love style may keep their partner from finding out about other lovers or may believe in concealing their behaviors that would be upsetting to their partner. Beliefs in Mania are dichotomous emotions of highs and lows. Examples of Mania love attitudes include being so in love that the individual has trouble concentrating on anything else, to the low emotions of when the partner does not pay attention to the individual that they feel sick.

The second difference found was that grandparents recorded stronger beliefs for Storge and Agape love attitudes than the grandchildren recorded. Montgomery and Sorell (1997) also found that Agape love attitudes were lowest among the youngest family group, and Inman-Amos et al. (1994) found parents to have higher Storge attitudes than their daughters. The Storge and Agape attitudes concern values of friendship and self-sacrifice. If the grandparents have longevity in their marriage, they may perceive their relationship as a long enduring friendship, such as the love attitude of Storge. And, an Agape belief such as the willingness to endure all things for the sake of the partner may be stronger as a result of overcoming the types of challenges that grandparents have faced.

The strengths in the attitudes of Eros and Pragma love were not different between the grandchildren’s and grandparents’ reports, and were also consistent with Inman-Amos et al. (1994) in their study of parents and children. Eros is coined as passionate love; and as it turns out, both grandchildren and grandparents reported the strongest belief in Eros love attitude over all of the other five attitudes. Pragma is the more practical
approach to a loving relationship. Grandchildren’s beliefs in Pragma and Storge were both positively associated with their grandparents’ beliefs in these two, indicating some alignment in attitudes across these two generational groups.

The studies of love attitudes over the years have, at times, yielded inconsistent findings concerning reports from differing age groups. For example, Neto (2001) studied three generations of females and found that Pragma love differed for each generation and increased in strength of reports from granddaughter, mother, to grandmother. Also, Neto found the strongest beliefs in Eros in the youngest generation. The analyses of my study did not find differences between grandchildren and their grandparents for Eros or Pragma. On the other hand, Neto found stronger beliefs in Storge and Agape among the older generations than the granddaughters, which is consistent with the findings of this study.

**Grandparents’ teaching about love attitudes.** More pertinent to the objective of this study are the analyses on whether or not grandparents teach about love attitudes. Both grandchildren and grandparents indicated that the grandparents taught about love. When comparing grandparents’ teaching of love attitudes, as reported by the two generational groups of the overall sample, reports of teaching Storge was the only difference found with grandparents reporting more often that they taught about Storge than the grandchildren reported. Other than this finding, no other differences were found between grandchildren’s and grandparents’ reports of teaching love attitudes.

Interestingly, a stark difference in results was found with the dyadic subset that matched grandchildren with their own grandparents. In this case of direct comparisons
within families, the grandchildren reported a significantly higher incidence of grandparents’ teaching about love than their own grandparents reported teaching about love. The inference could be made that grandparents may be unintentionally teaching about these love attitudes. Intentional socialization is the result of deliberate and purposeful teaching of grandchildren by grandparents, while unintentional socialization is the unplanned and perhaps inadvertent socializing that results from interactions with grandparents, of which grandparents are unaware. Beliefs about love are cognizant to grandchildren who are developing their beliefs about love through their own experiences, observing others, and their expectations (Bandura, 1986). In one way, grandparents intentionally socialize their grandchildren, but unintentional socialization may be taking place as well. The grandparents may be creating an environment for the grandchildren to learn about love without the grandparents’ intentional and purposeful practice of socializing.

Looking at matched dyadic analyses, direct associations were found between the grandchildren’s reports of grandparents’ teaching of Eros, Ludus, and Storge, and their own grandparents’ reports of teaching these same love attitudes. In addition, the grandparents’ reports of teaching Storge was positively associated with all six of the grandchildren’s reports of GPs’ teaching love attitudes. When grandparents teach about Storge, the grandchildren perceive that the grandparents are also teaching about every other love attitude. Some reciprocal relationships also were found between the grandchildren’s and grandparents’ reports of teaching. For example, the grandchildren’s reports of GPs’ teaching Eros was associated with the grandparents’ reports of teaching
Ludus; and the grandchildren’s reports of GPs’ teaching Ludus was associated with the grandparents’ reports of teaching Eros. This same type of circular relationship occurred between Eros and Agape, and between Storge and Agape.

Alignment was found between grandchildren’s and grandparents’ reports about their own love attitudes and the grandparents teaching about love attitudes. Two sets of direct associations were found for the love attitudes of Eros and Storge. For Eros, the grandparents’ Eros love attitude was associated with their own report of teaching about Eros love ($r = .32$). Grandparents’ reports of teaching about Eros love was associated with the grandchildren’s perceptions of their grandparents’ teaching about Eros ($r = .39$). Grandchildren’s reports of grandparents’ teaching about Eros was associated with their own beliefs about Eros love ($r = .22$). And finally, the grandchildren’s Eros love attitude was associated with their own grandparent’s Eros love attitude ($r = .25$). This same pattern occurred for the Storge love attitude; that is, the grandparents’ attitude was associated with their teaching about Storge ($r = .32$), the grandparents’ teaching of Storge was associated with the grandchildren’s perception of their grandparents’ teaching Storge ($r = .39$), the grandchildren’s reports of grandparents’ teaching was associated with their own attitudes about Storge ($r = .14$), and finally, the grandchildren’s attitude was associated with their own grandparents’ attitude about Storge ($r = .25$). These findings reveal that grandchildren’s and their grandparents’ reports of socialization about love appears to be coordinated between these two generations. In future research, a pertinent question to ask of both grandchildren and grandparents is what they actually learned from one another.
GP socialization practices and love attitudes. Looking at teaching love attitudes and GP socialization practices (as discussed earlier), the grandparents’ reports of their direct communication acts of advice-giving, GP stories, and expressing affection are all associated with grandchildren’s reports of GP teaching about love attitudes in some particular ways. And, grandparents’ reports of their socialization practices are also associated with the grandchildren’s reports of beliefs in Eros and Pragma love attitudes. The grandchildren’s reported beliefs in Ludus, Mania, and Agape were not associated with any of the grandparents’ reports of teaching about love attitudes or their socialization practices.

Solidarity, relationship qualities, demographics, and GP teaching of love attitudes. Grandchildren’s solidarity with their grandparents was associated with five of their reports about their grandparents’ teaching about love attitudes, including teaching about Eros, Ludus, Storge, Pragma, and Agape. So the closer that grandchildren feel to their grandparents, the more the grandchildren also notice that their grandparents are teaching them about ways of loving. Grandparents’ solidarity was not associated with their teaching of love attitudes. Similar to GP socialization practices, whether a grandparent feels close to their grandchild or not, the grandparents still are in the role of teaching about love.

Grandparents’ marital happiness was associated with several reports of teaching about love attitudes. For grandchildren, their perception of their grandparents’ marital happiness was associated with their own reports of GPs’ teaching about Eros, Storge, Pragma, and Agape. These love styles carry beliefs about how love is enacted between
two persons, love is friendship, love is compatibility, and love is self-sacrificing. If grandchildren perceive their grandparents as being happy in their marriage, then they may also be impressed that their grandparents are teaching about these and perceive them as positive ways of loving. Grandparents’ own reports of happiness were also associated with their reports of teaching Eros, Storge, and Agape.

The grandparents’ relationship with the GC’s parents has also been found to affect GP-GC interactions. Consistent with Holladay et al. (1997), my analyses found that the grandchildren’s perception that their grandparents were close to the grandchild’s mother was associated with their reports of GPs’ teaching about Eros, Pragma, and Mania. For grandparents, the levels of closeness with the parents did not appear to affect their teaching about the love attitudes to any great extent. Finally, the grandparents’ age was associated with their reports of teaching about love. Younger grandparents reported teaching about Eros, Ludus, Storge, Pragma, and Mania love attitudes more than older grandparents.

Socialization of Marital Dimensions

To assess the beliefs that the grandchildren and grandparents held about marriage, Fitzpatrick’s (1988) relational dimensions assessment was employed. Unfortunately, the responses from this sample did not have adequate levels of reliability for six of the eight dimensions and consequently they were removed from the analyses. Only Sharing and Assertiveness marital dimensions were able to be used to assess the grandchildren’s and grandparents’ beliefs about marriage.
GC’s and GPs’ marital dimensions. The two marital dimensions that were examined in this study were Sharing and Assertiveness. Sharing depicts the beliefs about marriage that expresses mutual comfort, reassurance, caring, and joy for the couple. Assertiveness dimension is an indication that couples attempt to influence each others’ decisions and attempts to force the other to do things that he/she would rather not do.

For grandchildren, these two dimensions are inversely related and grandparents’ reports of these two dimensions were not related to one another. Among the matched GP-GC dyads, the grandchildren expressed greater belief in sharing in marriage than the grandparents’ reported about their own marriage. This finding confirms the speculation made by VanLear (1992) that younger generations (more than their parents) would carry more egalitarian ideas about marriage, and the grandchildren’s increased beliefs in sharing in marriage over their grandparents’ beliefs may be one indication of such. No difference was found between the grandchildren’s and grandparents’ Assertiveness dimensions. No associations were found between the Sharing and Assertiveness dimensions reported by grandchildren and their grandparents.

GPs’ teaching of marital dimensions. From the overall sample, both grandchildren’s and grandparents’ reports of GPs’ teaching about Sharing and Assertiveness were positively related to one other. When compared, grandparents indicated that they taught about Sharing more than the grandchildren reported, and the grandchildren indicated higher incidence of their grandparents’ teaching Assertiveness than the grandparents reported.
However, in the matched dyads of grandchildren and their own grandparents, assessments of teaching marital dimensions looked differently from the separate GP-GC groups. Here, the grandchildren reported a greater incidence of their matched grandparents’ teaching for both Sharing and Assertiveness than their grandparents reported. However, a positive association was found between the matched dyads’ reports of GPs teaching sharing in marriage. So, as grandchildren reported more GP teaching sharing in marriage, the grandparents reported that they taught more as well. Also, grandchildren’s reports of their grandparents’ teaching about Sharing was associated with their own grandparents’ belief of sharing in marriage. Responses from the matched GP-GC dyads reflect the direct relationship between grandchildren and their own grandparents; therefore, results have greater ecological validity. From a social learning point of view (Bandura, 1986), the grandchildren noticed that their grandparents are teaching about the beliefs of sharing and having assertiveness in marriage and report their perceptions. But, the grandparents may not actually verbalize their own beliefs, and so they do not realize that they are teaching their grandchildren to the extent that their grandchildren notice.

**GP socialization practices and marital dimensions.** Grandchildren’s reports of their grandparents teaching about sharing and assertiveness were positively related to all their own reports of their grandparents’ socialization practices. So, grandchildren may see the socialization practices as a way of teaching about the marital dimensions. For grandparents, the belief in Sharing was related to all reports of their own socializing practices. With the Sharing belief, grandparents may also view the socialization practices
as a way to share their beliefs about marriage with their GC; positive socialization practices were positively related to Sharing, and negatively related to Assertiveness. And, the negative socialization practice was positively related to the GP’s Assertiveness.

GPs’ socialization practices were also associated with teaching about the marital dimensions. For the matched dyads, the grandchildren’s indication that their own grandparents taught about sharing in marriage was positively related to their grandparents’ reports of socializing with positive behaviors and expressing affection. On the other hand, grandchildren’s reports of grandparents’ teaching about assertiveness in marriage were positively related to the grandparents’ reports of story-telling and socializing with negative behaviors. Also, the grandchildren who noticed more often that their grandparents gave advice, behaved in positive ways, told stories, and expressed affection, had grandparents who expressed stronger beliefs in Sharing. The grandchildren who observed more often that their own grandparents exhibited negative behaviors, had grandparents who expressed stronger beliefs in Assertiveness. Finally, the grandchildren who reported more often that their grandparents gave advice and expressed affection, had grandparents who reported a greater incidence of teaching their grandchildren about Sharing.

These findings in some ways confirm and extend the work of VanLear (1992). First, VanLear found that young married couples reported higher sharing beliefs than their parents, which was confirmed by my study. VanLear also found that parents’ beliefs about marriage were passed to their married children when the parents were satisfied.
However, my results begin the process of unpacking what is taking place between generational groups that cultivate the co-construction of marital beliefs.

Solidarity, relationship qualities, demographics, and GP teaching of marital dimensions. The grandchildren’s reports of GP-GC solidarity, their perceptions of their GPs’ and parents’ marital happiness, and their grandparent’s closeness to the GC’s father were all positively associated with their reports that their grandparents were teaching about sharing in marriage. The grandparents’ reports of solidarity, as well as their reports of marital happiness, were associated with their own beliefs in Sharing. Overall, the beliefs and behaviors regarding sharing in marriage are regarded by both grandparents and grandchildren in positive ways. The Sharing dimension has been shown in previous research to be highly associated with marital satisfaction (VanLear, 1990); consequently, Sharing logically connects to these types of relationship qualities. Counter to Sharing, grandparents’ beliefs in Assertiveness are negatively associated with their own reports of marital happiness and closeness to the GC’s mother.

Assessments of the marital dimensions with demographics found that female grandchildren reported higher Sharing beliefs than males; while male grandchildren reported higher Assertiveness beliefs than females. Also, younger grandparents tended to report higher beliefs in Assertiveness than older grandparents.

Combined Influence of GP Love Attitudes, GP Teaching Love Attitudes, and GP Socialization Practices on GC’s Love Attitudes

Some of the most informative findings of this study are the factors that influenced the strength of grandchildren’s beliefs in the love attitudes. Each of the grandchildren’s
love attitudes were predicted by GP socialization practices, GP teaching, and/or GP love attitudes. Among the six attitudes, the grandchildren’s Eros attitude was influenced by the most predictors, four, which combined and resulted in the most variance explained (42%). The grandchildren’s report that their grandparents talked to them and gave them advice about love and marriage was the first predictor influencing their Eros love beliefs. The other three predictors were reports from the grandparents: solidarity, negative behaviors, and Eros. Therefore, as grandparents reported greater solidarity (emotional closeness, liking, respect, listening, and satisfaction with conversations) with their grandchildren, the grandchildren’s beliefs about Eros love also increased. Also, as grandparents’ confessed more often that their grandchildren had observed them acting in negative ways, the more GC Eros love attitude. The last predictor for the grandchildren’s Eros attitude was their matching grandparents’ Eros attitude; therefore, as the grandparents’ expressed greater belief in Eros love attitude, their grandchildren also expressed greater belief in Eros love. Interestingly, the strongest of these predictors was the grandparents’ reports of the grandchildren’s observations of them acting in negative ways. This could be the case that grandchildren are observing behaviors of their grandparents that they are choosing not to do when they express their own love beliefs.

The grandchildren’s belief in Agape love attitude was associated with their own observations of their grandparents socializing and teaching. Grandchildren with tendencies toward the self-sacrificing beliefs of Agape may also have a heightened awareness of others’ behaviors and interaction. Such is the case here where three of the grandchildren’s own reports combined to predict their Agape attitude: GPs’ negatives
behaviors, GPs’ closeness to GC’s father, and GP teaching beliefs about Agape. Slightly different from their Eros love associations, the grandchildren’s Agape attitude was related to the incidence of when they noticed that their grandparents’ were acting negatively. Once again, these grandparent actions may be revealing to their grandchildren how not to act, and the grandchildren’s beliefs in being more selfless and giving to their love partner increases. Secondly, the grandchildren’s Agape attitude was associated with their grandparents’ closeness to their father. And finally, as the grandchildren indicated to greater extent that their grandparents were teaching them about the Agape love attitude, they also increased in their own Agape love beliefs.

The grandchildren’s Pragma love attitude was also found to be associated with the grandparents’ teaching of Pragma attitude. When the grandchildren’s own accounts of their grandparents’ teaching them about Pragma love increased, beliefs of their Pragma love attitude also increased. In addition, the grandchildren’s observations of their own grandparents’ affection also combined with grandparents’ teaching of Pragma and were related to the grandchildren’s own Pragma attitude. Those who have beliefs about Pragma love attitude usually have specific ideas about what they would like their partner to be like, that is, a good provider, a good parent, etc. When the grandchildren observed their grandparents expressions of affection, their own desire to also have this type of relationship may have been enhanced and then set as a quality to look for in a partner.

The grandparents’ own beliefs in Pragma love attitude were associated with two of the grandchildren’s love attitudes, Ludus and Mania. When grandparents’ beliefs in having a partner with specific qualities were enhanced, then the grandchildren’s beliefs in
Ludus and Mania were also higher. These two love attitudes, often found in young single adults (see Montgomery & Sorell, 1997), may be an indication of the grandchildren’s efforts to find and hold onto a partner that meets their ideals. Those with stronger beliefs in Ludus love attitude tends to date many people, sometimes at the same time. This may be an attempt by the grandchild to find the perfect partner for them. And, for those with stronger Mania attitude may hold to the beliefs that when they do find the perfect partner, they will need to desperately hold onto that relationship. The grandchildren’s Ludus love was also predicted by their own indication that their grandparents taught them about Agape. So grandchildren with greater beliefs in Ludus attitude also have grandparents who are actively teaching the grandchildren about ideas of self-sacrifice in love. This also may be a rejection of ideas that the grandparents are teaching; what not to do in relationships. For example, if the grandchildren observe their grandparents being too self-sacrificing and too giving, then the grandchildren may find that is not what they desire in a relationship and act in opposite ways.

Finally, the grandchildren’s beliefs in Storge love attitude were predicted by the combination of their own reports of observing their grandparents positive behaviors and their grandparents’ beliefs in Ludus. The grandparents’ behaviors of caring for one another or being willing to do things for one another vary together with the grandchildren’s beliefs in being friends with the one you love. On the other hand, when grandparents have beliefs about concealing things that they have done from their partner, then grandchildren hold beliefs about being a good friend with a love interest.
In sum, only one of the grandchildren’s love attitudes was predicted by their grandparents’ same love attitude (Eros). Previous researchers (Inman-Amos et al., 1994; Neto, 2001) have examined how one generation to the next matched in their love attitudes, and consequently showing alignment. My findings provide more insight into what might be happening among the beliefs about love of one generation and another. Socialization provided by grandparents was not a direct transmission of ideas, but these findings indicated that meanings and beliefs about love are co-constructed between grandchildren and their grandparents. The results from this study found that, in the case of several of the love attitudes, when grandparents acted negatively, the grandchildren increased their beliefs in love in positive ways (increased beliefs in passionate love and selfless love). Ways to behave in love were constituted in the interactions between grandchildren and their grandparents, both in how to act and in how not to act.

*Solidarity as a moderator of the influence on GC’s love attitudes.* With the numerous studies examining the emotional closeness between grandparents and grandchildren, the extent of the grandchildren’s report of solidarity with their own grandparent was assessed as a moderator of the predictors of the grandchildren’s love attitude. Of the six love attitudes, only the grandchildren’s Eros love attitude was found to have a predictor interact with the grandchildren’s solidarity. My findings indicated that the grandchildren’s feelings of solidarity toward their grandparent moderated the relationship between the grandparents’ reports that their grandchildren have observed their own negative behaviors and the grandchildren’s Eros love attitude. Increased solidarity combined with very little negative behavior reported by the grandparents
resulted in lower beliefs in Eros love. Conversely, increased solidarity combined with increased number of grandparents’ reports of negative behaviors resulted in higher beliefs in Eros love. When the grandchildren feel emotionally closer to their grandparents (as indicated in their solidarity responses), then negative behaviors as reported by their grandparents may become more salient and the grandchildren choose not to behave in these negative ways. If the grandchildren are close with their grandparents and grandparents report very little negative behaviors, the grandchildren’s beliefs about Eros love attitude are actually reduced.

*Combined Influence of GP marital dimensions, GP teaching marital dimensions, and GP socialization practices on GC’s marital dimensions*

The grandchildren’s beliefs in the two marital dimensions of Sharing and Assertiveness were found to be predicted by several of the study constructs but in interesting ways. Grandchildren’s Sharing belief was found to be negatively predicted by the combined influence of the grandchildren’s own reports that their grandparents taught them about Assertiveness belief and the grandparents’ age. When the grandchildren indicated that their grandparents did not teach them about having assertiveness in marriage, then their beliefs in sharing in marriage were enhanced. Also, when the grandparents were younger, then the grandchildren’s beliefs in sharing were greater.

The grandchildren’s Assertiveness dimension was only predicted by the sex of the grandchild. In this case, male grandchildren tend to be an indication that greater belief in assertiveness in marriage will be present.
Solidarity as a moderator of the influence on GC’s marital dimensions. In testing the moderating effects of the grandchildren’s solidarity, interactions were found with both of the predictors of the Sharing marital dimension. First, when the grandchildren’s reports of solidarity increased and the grandchildren’s reports of their grandparents teaching about Assertiveness were diminished, then the Sharing beliefs were enhanced. But even if the grandchildren felt close to their grandparents, if the grandparents’ teaching about Assertiveness increased, then the beliefs about Sharing were decreased. A similar interaction occurred with the grandparents’ age and solidarity. That is, when grandchildren reported greater solidarity with their grandparents and the grandparents were younger in age, then the grandchildren’s beliefs in Sharing were increased. But even if the grandchildren were closer to their grandparents, if the grandparents were older, then the grandchildren’s beliefs in Sharing were decreased. The sex of the grandchildren did not interact with solidarity for the Assertiveness dimension.

Socialization of Positive Love Attitudes

Empirically and culturally, the positive love attitudes include Eros, Storge, andPragma. These three combined are predicted by grandchildren’s perception of both GP advice-giving and GPs’ teaching of Eros love attitude. Three things are worth mentioning here. First, both predictors of positive love beliefs are the grandchildren’s perceptions of what is occurring. As grandchildren cognitively recognize that grandparents are giving advice or teaching, then they also have stronger beliefs in the positive love attitudes. Second, both of these predictors are processed through communication. Grandchildren and their grandparents coordinate what it means to love through talking, acting, and
meta-communicating. And finally, the percentage of variance of these positive love attitudes explained by these two predictors of the grandchildren’s perceptions of their grandparents’ socialization was 27%. Since grandchildren are one generation removed from their grandparents, and since grandchildren perhaps have fewer interactions with grandparents than with peers or parents; this percentage of variance explained for socializing these love attitudes is significant.

Stepwise regression is a tool that allows researchers to uncover what variables predict the greatest variance in the criterion. Consequently, I found that grandchildren’s perceptions of their grandparents’ socialization practices and teaching were among the most significant of predictors of the grandchildren’s attitudes and beliefs about love and marriage. But stepwise regressions may mask other effects that are present among these relationships. While it is sensible from these regressions that the stronger predictors of grandchildren’s own behavior is their perception of others’ communication, it is also important to note the moderately strong correlations between the grandchildren’s perception of their grandparents’ teaching and what the grandparents reported teaching. The best predictor of grandparent love attitude socialization is associated with the grandparents’ perceptions that they do teach these very love attitudes. This shows a direct effect for purposeful communication that has uptake in the attention and minds of grandchildren. This alignment and coordination between the grandchild-grandparent dyads in their reports of socializing and teaching about love and marriage is useful for the extension of the study of the grandchild-grandparent socialization practices.
GP Socialization Practices, GP Teaching Love Attitudes, and GP Teaching Marital Dimensions Summary, and Connections to Theory

This study investigating grandparents’ socialization of their grandchildren’s attitudes and beliefs about love and marriage has provided further insight into ways in which grandparents’ socialize about love and marriage, and what that socialization looks like. Grandchildren report six ways that they have been socialized by their grandparents and the grandparents’ reports aligned with those of the grandchildren. Numerous interrelationships were found between socialization practices and grandparents’ teaching, and the knowledge gained from the examination of these constructs enhances the understanding of grandparenting.

Theoretical implications were discovered in the findings where alignment was noted between the grandparents’ attitudes about Eros and Storge, the grandparents’ reports of teaching these love attitudes, the grandchildren’s perception of grandparents also teaching Eros and Storge, and the grandchildren’s own attitudes towards these same love attitudes. Socialization here is the product of the coordination of intentions that provide a useful framework for the implication of what it means to love. From the constructivists’ framework, this discovery extends our understanding of the grandparents’ role in the socialization of their grandchildren. Previous grandparenting research and grandparenting theory have not revealed these coordinations between grandparents and their grandchildren.

All the grandchildren’s love attitudes and the Sharing marital dimension were predicted in some way by their grandparents. Of particular interest is the distinction that
for all but one of these sets of beliefs (exception of Mania), the grandparents socialized or taught the grandchildren in some way. In addition to socializing and teaching, the grandparents’ own beliefs in love attitudes were noticed by the grandchildren and, in some cases, were shown to have a predictive effect on the grandchildren’s love attitudes. The grandparents’ relationships with their grandchildren and with the grandchildren’s father also were influential to a couple of the love attitudes.

Theory also provided a framework within which the findings of this study may be interpreted. The premise of constructivism assisted in the recognition that attitudes and beliefs are not just passed on from one generation to the next, but attitudes and beliefs are co-constructed and constituted in every situated interaction between grandparents and their grandchildren. Results from this study found that GP socialization practices and GP teaching both are associated with grandchildren’s attitudes and beliefs about love and marriage. Mutual meaning about what it means to love may be established over time, and when there is a coordination of attention and content (Clark, 1996). So, when grandchildren attend to what their grandparent socialized about love or that they taught about marriage, coordination between the two begins and time and communication will assist in mutual meaning. This concept provides further understanding about when grandparents act in negative ways that grandchildren interpret these actions and develop positive beliefs. Also, as grandparents’ communicate with their grandchildren through advice-giving, expressions of affection, story-telling, and teaching; meaning is negotiated and consensus about what it means to love and to be married is established over time.
The relevant findings associated with the grandparents’ negative behaviors certainly give credence to Bandura’s ideas of social learning. In this case, as grandparents’ behaved in negative actions, the grandchildren learned what not to do and responded with positive beliefs. That is not to say that grandparents’ positive behaviors did not have an affect. In fact, grandchildren’s observations of their grandparents’ positive behaviors have also been associated with the grandchildren’s own beliefs of being a friend with the one they love.

Finally, sociocultural theory aids in interpreting the findings of this study. The activities taking place between the grandchildren and their grandparents serve in orienting both groups within the meanings established in their culture. Each generation has a voice in the creation of meaning. So as grandparents express affection by calling each other endearing names or by holding hands or kissing; the grandchildren cognitively processes what constitutes a loving relationship in their family.

Limitations and Future Directions

Reflecting upon this study of grandchildren and their grandparents, I am honored to have had the opportunity to share in their lives by examining their interactions, attitudes, and beliefs about love and marriage. But with any study, I also can enumerate shortcomings of the design and implementation of a study of this magnitude.

My perspective assumes that socialization is co-constructed between grandchildren and grandparents. However, in this study, only the grandparents’ socialization of their grandchildren was explored. Future research is needed to encompass the dialogic interactions of grandparents and their grandchildren. I propose conducting
interviews in which both the grandchild and grandparent can be present to negotiate and respond to inquires jointly. Not only would this method provide a richer set of data, but the grandchildren and grandparents would have the opportunity to constitute their shared meaning of their interactions.

According to Miller (1996), “language, or more precisely, talk, is recognized to be not only reflective of meaning but constitutive of meaning, with the implication that an adequate model of socialization must incorporate talk in a principled way” (p. 184). Indeed as reflected in the findings, this study found that communication was imperative to the grandchildren’s socialization. Consequently, a shortcoming of this study was that responses from the grandchildren and their grandparents were retrospective. To develop a deeper understanding of the socialization between grandchildren and grandparents, perhaps a causal design could be implemented in future research. Structural equation modeling could be employed to capture an accurate view of causation, even if causation is flowing in both directions between a pair of variables and latent variables are present (Cohen, 2001).

Along these same lines, Pratt and Fiese (2004) propose that family stories are messages containing valuable lessons to both children and adults. Telling or writing a family story is a meaning-making process for both the author and receiver. A family story can evolve over time, integrate experiences along the way, and assist in developing identities consistent with the family’s culture. Recently, Kellas and Trees (2006) found that joint family storytelling regarding difficult family experiences uncovered communicative behaviors that distinguished family-unit sense-making and individual
family member sense-making. How grandparents socialize their grandchildren about love and marriage is a co-constructed experience therefore should be examined through actual grandchild-grandparent conversations. Joint storytelling is one communicative practice that will be pursued in the future.

Communication scholars Williams and Nussbaum (2001) proposed that “grandparents play different roles at different times and their interaction with grandchildren is likely to be fluid, reforming, and changing as the individuals age and as circumstances and needs change across the life span” (p. 172). One limitation of this study is that the participants were asked to recall, in general, the ways and frequency of grandparents’ socialization and teaching about love and marriage. As Williams and Nussbaum purport, socialization is a process that takes place over time, with ebbs and flows for numerous reasons. Therefore, more extensive investigations of the socialization processes over the life span are called for.

Grandchild-grandparent relationships are uniquely co-constructed and not all grandparents are capable or desire to play a socializing role with their grandchildren. Another limitation of this study is the lack of control for social desirability bias that may have occurred in the responses. VanLear (1990) found that social desirability bias tended to inflate correlations between sharing, traditionalism, and marital satisfaction. I used the measure of grandchild-grandparent solidarity as a means to control for outcomes but given the cultural bias that grandchildren and grandparents should have positive relationships, a means of controlling for the positivism that perhaps may occur in response would be wise. Some researchers have found that the GP-GC relationship is not
always positive and some grandparental interactions can be perceived negatively (e.g., Tinsley & Parke, 1984; Tomlin, 1998). Whether positive or negative, the study of GP-GC relationships is a vital research premise and controlling for social desirability may allow for a more accurate account of these relationships.

Due to the homogeneity of this GP-GC sample, caution should be taken in generalizing these results and predictions to the overall population with various and unique cultural influences and ethnicity legacies. The communication between any particular GP-GC dyad is contextually situated and the meaning is constituted in their actions; therefore, results of communicative and relationship studies may be affected by the particular dyadic choice for study (Nussbaum & Bettini, 1994). Ideally, various ethnicities and cultures should be included in future studies.

**Conclusion**

Anthropologist Margaret Mead (1970, 1974) proclaims in her writings that when grandchildren do not have a relationship with their grandparents, there is a resulting lack of cultural and historical sense of self in the younger generation. As young adults experience life events, they may recall how their own grandparents acted in similar situations or what their grandparents said to them. Findings from this study have increased the understanding of the ways that grandparents socialize their grandchildren about love and marriage. We know from this study that both grandparents and grandchildren recognize that grandparents socialize about love and marriage through such situated practices as giving advice, telling stories, expressing affection, and exhibiting both positive and negative behaviors. Grandparents also teach their grandchildren about
love and marriage. These socialization practices and teaching of beliefs combine to predict some of the grandchildren’s own attitudes and beliefs. Grandparents and grandchildren communicate and meaning is constituted about attitudes and beliefs about love and marriage.
APPENDIX A

GRANDCHILDREN’S QUESTIONNAIRE ABOUT THEMSELVES

GRANDCHILDREN’S OWN VALUES, BELIEFS, AND BEHAVIORS ABOUT

LOVE AND MARRIAGE
GRANDCHILD QUESTIONNAIRE

ASSESSMENT OF GRANDCHILD'S OWN VALUES, BELIEFS, AND BEHAVIORS

Your Initials and LAST 4 DIGITS OF SS#: ________________________________

The class for which you would like extra credit applied: ____________________

Thank you for agreeing to complete this questionnaire. All your responses will remain confidential. Please respond with honesty and as accurately as possible—there are no right or wrong answers, different people have different views on life, we are simply interested in your views.

1. Attitudes and Beliefs about Love:
Whenever possible, respond to the following statements with your current partner in mind. If you are not romantically involved, respond with your most recent partner in mind. If you have never been in love, answer in terms of what you think your responses would most likely be according to the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My partner and I have the right physical “chemistry” between us 1 2 3 4 5
I feel that my partner and I were meant for each other 1 2 3 4 5
My partner and I really understand each other 1 2 3 4 5
My partner fits my ideal standards of physical beauty/handsomeness 1 2 3 4 5
I believe that what my partner doesn’t know about me won’t hurt him/her 1 2 3 4 5
I have sometimes had to keep my partner from finding out about other lovers 1 2 3 4 5
My partner would get upset if he/she knew of some of the things I’ve done with other people 1 2 3 4 5
I enjoy playing the ‘game of love’ with my partner and a number of other partners 1 2 3 4 5
Our love is the best kind because it grew out of a long friendship 1 2 3 4 5
Our friendship merged gradually into love over time 1 2 3 4 5
Our love is really a deep friendship, not a mysterious, mystical emotion 1 2 3 4 5
Our love relationship is the most satisfying because it developed from a good friendship 1 2 3 4 5
A main consideration in choosing my partner was how he/she would reflect on my family 1 2 3 4 5
An important factor in choosing my partner was whether or not he/she would be a good parent 1 2 3 4 5
One consideration in choosing my partner was how he/she would reflect on my career 1 2 3 4 5
Before getting very involved with my partner, I tried to figure out how compatible his/her hereditary background would be with mine in case we ever had children 1 2 3 4 5
When my partner doesn’t pay attention to me, I feel sick all over 1 2 3 4 5
Since I’ve been in love with my partner I’ve had trouble concentrating on anything else 1 2 3 4 5
I cannot relax if I suspect that my partner is with someone else 1 2 3 4 5
If my partner ignores me for awhile, I sometimes do stupid things to try to get his/her attention back 1 2 3 4 5
I would rather suffer myself than let my partner suffer 1 2 3 4 5
I cannot be happy unless I place my partner’s happiness before my own 1 2 3 4 5
I am usually willing to sacrifice my own wishes to let my partner achieve his/hers 1 2 3 4 5
I would endure all things for the sake of my partner 1 2 3 4 5
2. Your Grandparents’ Influence on Your Attitudes and Beliefs about Love:

Now we are interested in the ways in which your grandparents have influenced your opinions regarding love. Please reconsider these same beliefs as above. Indicate if your grandparent(s) have influenced you; either through talking to you directly or by your observations of your grandparent.

According to this key, circle all grandparents who have influenced your beliefs:

- MM = Mother’s Mother
- FM = Father’s Mother
- SGM = Step-grandmother
- MF = Mother’s Father
- FF = Father’s Father
- SGF = Step-grandfather
- OTH = Another person who acted as a grandparent to you
- N/A = No grandparent has influenced this belief/behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Belief about Love</th>
<th>Grandparents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My partner and I have the right physical “chemistry” between us</td>
<td>MM MM MF FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my partner and I were meant for each other</td>
<td>MM MM MF FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner and I really understand each other</td>
<td>MM MM MF FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner fits my ideal standards of physical beauty/handsomeness</td>
<td>MM MM MF FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that what my partner doesn’t know about me won’t hurt him/her</td>
<td>MM MM MF FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have sometimes had to keep my partner from finding out about other lovers</td>
<td>MM MM MF FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner would get upset if he/she knew of some of the things I’ve done with other people</td>
<td>MM MM MF FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy playing the ‘game of love’ with my partner and a number of other partners</td>
<td>MM MM MF FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our love is the best kind because it grew out of a long friendship</td>
<td>MM MM MF FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our friendship merged gradually into love over time</td>
<td>MM MM MF FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our love is really a deep friendship, not a mysterious, mystical emotion</td>
<td>MM MM MF FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our love relationship is the most satisfying because it developed from a good friendship</td>
<td>MM MM MF FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A main consideration in choosing my partner was how he/she would reflect on my family</td>
<td>MM MM MF FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An important factor in choosing my partner was whether or not he/she would be a good parent</td>
<td>MM MM MF FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One consideration in choosing my partner was how he/she would reflect on my career</td>
<td>MM MM MF FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before getting very involved with my partner, I tried to figure out how compatible his/her hereditary background would be with mine in case we ever had children</td>
<td>MM MM MF FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When my partner doesn’t pay attention to me, I feel sick all over</td>
<td>MM MM MF FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since I’ve been in love with my partner I’ve had trouble concentrating on anything else</td>
<td>MM MM MF FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I cannot relax if I suspect that my partner is with someone else</td>
<td>MM MM MF FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If my partner ignores me for awhile, I sometimes do stupid things to try to get his/her attention back</td>
<td>MM MM MF FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would rather suffer myself than let my partner suffer</td>
<td>MM MM MF FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I cannot be happy unless I place my partner’s happiness before my own</td>
<td>MM MM MF FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am usually willing to sacrifice my own wishes to let my partner achieve his/hers</td>
<td>MM MM MF FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would endure all things for the sake of my partner</td>
<td>MM MM MF FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Attitudes and Beliefs about Marriage (or lifelong commitment):
(a) Please indicate your evaluation of the importance of marriage (or lifelong commitment). Circle one:

Not important at all 0 1 2 3 4 5 Very important to be married/committed

(b) If you are presently not married (or no lifelong commitment), please indicate your desire to get married (or your desire to make a lifelong commitment) at some point in the future according to this scale:

Do not desire to get married 0 1 2 3 4 5 Highly desire to get married
(or do not desire to make a lifelong commitment) (or highly desire to make a lifelong commitment)

(c) Indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements as to how true or important it is for your own marriage or your future marriage (or lifelong commitment). Please circle one number according to this key. (Note that the term “partner” can be exchanged for the term “spouse”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We will tell each other how much we love or care about each other 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
My spouse will tell me (i.e., try to influence) what magazines or books to read and/or what television shows to watch 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I will open my spouse’s personal mail without asking permission 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I will tell (i.e., try to influence) my spouse which magazines or books to read and/or what television shows to watch 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
My spouse will reassure and comfort me when I am feeling low 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
My spouse will force me to do things that I do not want to do 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
We will eat our meals (i.e., the ones at home) at the same time every day 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I will have my own private workspace (study, workshop, utility room, etc.) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
In our house, we will keep a fairly regular daily time schedule 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
If I can avoid arguing about some problems, they will disappear 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
My spouse will have his/her own private workspace (workshop, utility room, study) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
My spouse will complain if I open his/her personal mail without permission 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
It will bother me if a guest goes into our refrigerator or fixes himself/herself some coffee in our home 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Our time schedule will vary quite a bit from day to day 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Life is filled with so many contradictions that I will not be certain how to interpret what it all means 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I think that we will joke around and have more fun than most couples 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Relationships should not interfere with each person’s pursuit to discover their own potential 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
It is important for a couple (or a family) to attend church (synagogue) and, when possible, to attend together 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I think it is important for one to have some private space which is all his/her own and separate from one’s spouse 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Our society, as we see it, needs to regain faith in the law and in our institutions 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
In marriage/close relationships there should be no constraints or restrictions on individual freedom 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
A woman should take her husband’s last name when she marries 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
It is better to hide one’s true feelings in order to avoid hurting your spouse 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Spouses should be frank and spontaneous in conversations with one another even if it leads to disagreements 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. Your Grandparents’ Influence on Your Beliefs about Marriage:
Now we are interested in the ways in which your grandparents have influenced your opinions regarding marriage/a lifelong commitment. Please reconsider these same beliefs as above. **Indicate if your grandparent(s) have influenced you; either through talking to you directly or by your observations.**

According to this key, **circle all grandparents who have influenced your beliefs:**
- MM = Mother’s Mother
- FM = Father’s Mother
- SGM = Step-grandmother
- MF = Mother’s Father
- FF = Father’s Father
- SGF = Step-grandfather
- OTH = Another person who acted as a grandparent to you
- N/A = No grandparent has influenced this belief/behavior

### Your Belief about Marriage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief</th>
<th>Grandparents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We will tell each other how much we love or care about each other</td>
<td>MM MF FM FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My spouse will tell me (i.e., tries to influence) what magazines or books to read and/or what television shows to watch</td>
<td>MM MF FM FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will open my spouse’s personal mail without asking permission</td>
<td>MM MF FM FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will tell (i.e., try to influence) my spouse which magazines or books to read and/or what television shows to watch</td>
<td>MM MF FM FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My spouse will reassure and comfort me when I am feeling low</td>
<td>MM MF FM FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My spouse will force me to do things that I do not want to do</td>
<td>MM MF FM FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We will eat our meals (i.e., the ones at home) at the same time every day</td>
<td>MM MF FM FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will have my own private workspace (study, workshop, utility room, etc.)</td>
<td>MM MF FM FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In our house, we will keep a fairly regular daily time schedule</td>
<td>MM MF FM FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I can avoid arguing about some problems, they will disappear</td>
<td>MM MF FM FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My spouse will have his/her own private workspace (workshop, utility room, study, etc)</td>
<td>MM MF FM FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My spouse will complain if I open his/her personal mail without permission</td>
<td>MM MF FM FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will bother me if a guest goes into our refrigerator or fixes himself/herself some coffee in our home</td>
<td>MM MF FM FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our time schedule will vary quite a bit from day to day</td>
<td>MM MF FM FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life is filled with so many contradictions that I will not be certain how to interpret what it all means</td>
<td>MM MF FM FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that we will joke around and have more fun than most couples</td>
<td>MM MF FM FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships should not interfere with each person’s pursuit to discover their own potential</td>
<td>MM MF FM FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important for a couple (or a family) to attend church (synagogue) and, when possible, to attend together</td>
<td>MM MF FM FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it is important for one to have some private space which is all his/her own and separate from one’s spouse</td>
<td>MM MF FM FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our society, as we see it, needs to regain faith in the law and in our institutions</td>
<td>MM MF FM FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In marriage/close relationships there should be no constraints or restrictions on individual freedom</td>
<td>MM MF FM FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A woman should take her husband’s last name when she marries</td>
<td>MM MF FM FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is better to hide one’s true feelings in order to avoid hurting your spouse</td>
<td>MM MF FM FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouses should be frank and spontaneous in conversations with one another even if it leads to disagreements</td>
<td>MM MF FM FF SGM SGF OTH N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Relationship Styles:

(a) Following are four general relationship styles that people often report. Read all four styles and then place a checkmark next to the letter corresponding to the one style that best describes you or is closest to the way you are.

___ Style A. It is easy for me to become emotionally close to others. I am comfortable depending on them and having them depend on me. I don’t worry about being alone or having others not accept me.

___ Style B. I am uncomfortable getting close to others. I want emotionally close relationships, but I find it difficult to trust others completely, or to depend on them. I worry that I will be hurt if I allow myself to become too close to others.

___ Style C. I want to be completely emotionally intimate with others, but I often find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like. I am uncomfortable being without close relationships, but I sometimes worry that others don’t value me as much as I value them.

___ Style D. I am comfortable without close emotional relationships. It is very important to me to feel independent and self-sufficient, and I prefer not to depend on others or have others depend on me.

(b) Next, although you were asked to choose only one style that best describes how you relate to others in the section above, each style may describe you in some way. For this reason, please re-read and please rate each of the relationship styles above to indicate how well or poorly each description corresponds to your general relationship style. Circle one number for each Style...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style A</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Neutral/ Mixed</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style B</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Neutral/ Mixed</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style C</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Neutral/ Mixed</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style D</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Neutral/ Mixed</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please respond to the following short answer questions:

1. What is your relational status?
   O Single – not Dating     O Casually Dating
   O Seriously Dating        O Cohabitating w/ romantic partner
   O Engaged                 O Married
   O Separated               O Divorced
   O Widowed                 O Remarried
   O Other________________________

2. The relational status of your parents:

   (a) Complete ONLY if your parents are married to each other, then…

   Taking all things together, how would you describe your parents’ marriage/relationship? Circle one
   Very Unhappy  1  2  3  4  5  6  7     Very Happy

   (b) Complete ONLY if parents are NOT married to each other:

   Father’s relational status:________________________
   Mother’s relational status:________________________

   Since your parents are not married …explain your living arrangements, with who is your primary
   residence?________________________

   (If mother is married…)

   Taking all things together, how would you describe your mother’s marriage/relationship? Circle one
   Very Unhappy  1  2  3  4  5  6  7     Very Happy

   (If father is married…)

   Taking all things together, how would you describe your father’s marriage/relationship? Circle one
   Very Unhappy  1  2  3  4  5  6  7     Very Happy

3. Circle the number below to illustrate your level of spirituality:

   Not spiritual at all    1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10 More spiritual than most people

4. Circle the number below to illustrate your mother’s level of spirituality:

   Not spiritual at all    1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10 More spiritual than most people

5. Circle the number below to illustrate your father’s level of spirituality:

   Not spiritual at all    1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10 More spiritual than most people

6. What is your age? ________________ years

7. What is your sex? (Circle one) MALE     FEMALE

8. What is your race? (check all that apply one generation removed)

   O Native American    O African American   O India
   O Hispanic           O Asian              O Other ________________
   O Latino             O White
9. What is your religion?
   O No religious affiliation   O Jewish   O Catholic
   O Protestant               O Muslim   O Confucianism
   O Hindu                    O Evangelical Christian
   O Other

10. What is your highest educational level?
    O did not Graduate High School   O High School Graduate
    O Some College                   O School of Technology
    O College Graduate               O Graduate School – (circle) MA, MS, PhD, MD, or Other
    O Other

Thank you for completing this questionnaire and making a valuable contribution to the communication research field. Please return this questionnaire to Naomi Bell O’Neil or Dr. Susan L. Kline to receive the credit for your class.
APPENDIX B

GRANDCHILDREN’S QUESTIONNAIRE ABOUT THEIR GRANDPARENTS

GRANDCHILDREN’S PERCEPTIONS OF GRANDPARENTS’
GRANDCHILD QUESTIONNAIRE

ASSESSMENT OF GRANDCHILD'S PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR OWN GRANDPARENTS

Your Initials and LAST 4 DIGITS OF SS#: __________

Grandparent – Grandchild Communication

Thank you for agreeing to complete this questionnaire. All responses will remain confidential. Your grandparents will not be permitted to view any of your responses so please respond with honesty and as accurately as possible—there are no right or wrong answers.

COMPLETE ONE OF THESE QUESTIONNAIRES FOR EACH OF YOUR GRANDPARENTS:

Check the one grandparent about which you will be responding on this particular questionnaire form:
- O My Mother’s Mother (MM)
- O My Father’s Mother (FM)
- O My Mother’s Father (MF)
- O My Father’s Father (FF)
- O Step-Grandmother (SGM)
- O Step Grandfather (SGF)
- O Other (OTH) – This would include any other relationships that you consider as a grandparent.

Please specify:

NOW, please check one of the following about the grandparent that you checked above:
- O This grandparent is living
- O This grandparent passed away when I was _______ years old

Respond to ALL of the following questions with this grandparent in mind.

1. Grandparent Interactions about Love and Marriage

   Below are listed a number of ways that grandparents show or communicate to us about love and/or marriage. Please indicate how often this grandparent engaged in each of these practices with you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did Not Occur</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Fairly Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   I was able to directly observe this grandparent’s ways of loving or acts of marriage 1 2 3 4 5
   I noticed that this grandparent was a giving person 1 2 3 4 5
   I noticed that this grandparent showed unconditional support 1 2 3 4 5
   I noticed that this grandparent showed signs of affection toward his/her partner regularly (e.g., held hands, kissed, danced on occasion, and so forth) 1 2 3 4 5
   I noticed that this grandparent did the duties of a traditional gender role in his/her marriage:
   If a Grandmother: She cooked, cleaned, and took care of the children 1 2 3 4 5
   If a Grandfather: He had a job, repaired the house/car, cared for the lawn
   I noticed that this grandparent talked openly to his/her partner 1 2 3 4 5
   I noticed that this grandparent teased or joked with his/her partner in a loving way 1 2 3 4 5
   I noticed that this grandparent called his/her partner by endearing names regularly (e.g., “honey”, “sweetheart”, and so forth) 1 2 3 4 5
   I noticed that this grandparent says, “I love you” to his/her partner regularly 1 2 3 4 5
   I noticed that this grandparent yelled at or fought with his/her partner regularly 1 2 3 4 5
   I noticed that this grandparent smiled when speaking of his/her partner 1 2 3 4 5
   I noticed that this grandparent physically cared for his/her partner when partner was ill 1 2 3 4 5
   I noticed that this grandparent was faithful to his/her partner 1 2 3 4 5
   I noticed that this grandparent ordered his/her partner around 1 2 3 4 5
   I noticed that this grandparent was willing to do almost anything for others 1 2 3 4 5
   I noticed that this grandparent seemed very happy in his/her relationship 1 2 3 4 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I noticed that this grandparent seemed to show a great deal of respect for his/her partner</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I noticed that this grandparent cared deeply for partner and family</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This grandparent told me stories, in general, about love and/or marriage</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told me stories about how he/she met spouse or partner</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told me stories about his/her own dating experiences</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told me about his/her wedding day</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told me about their happy times in marriage</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told me stories of the tough times and struggles of their marriage</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told me stories of their disagreements and challenges of marriage</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told me funny stories about his/her life with his/her partner</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told me stories about how he/she has taken care of/provided for his/her family</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This grandparent directly talked with me about relationships</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told me that he/she cannot imagine being married to anyone other than his/her partner even in a fight</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told me what he/she thinks of the person I am dating</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told me that his/her partner was his/her best friend</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told me to get to know the family of the person I am interested in romantically</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am (was ) close to this grandparent but we have never talked about love in a romantic relationship</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other people (like my parents) have told me stories about this grandparent</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others have told me stories about how these grandparents met and/or their wedding day</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others have told me stories about happy times with this grandparent</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others have told me how this grandparent was a good provider</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others have told me the challenges that this grandparent had with their partner</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others have told me about how this grandparent expressed love</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others have told me that this grandparent abuses alcohol and/or drugs</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This grandparent has given me advice about love and/or marriage</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told me to choose a person who treats me right and respects me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told me not to rush love but just wait for the right person</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told me to have a career before falling in love</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told me; with love, one can accomplish many things that were once thought impossible</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told me to stay faithful to the one I marry</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told me to choose a person with my same values and same religion as our family</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told me to find someone with whom I can be happy</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told me that true love will grow with time and never fade</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told me that love is unconditional</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told me that making love is an important part of a relationship</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told me that chivalry is not dead; e.g., a guy should always hold a door open for a lady</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This grandparent has tried to teach me about the ways of love and/or marriage</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From this grandparent’s actions, I learned how not to act in love and/or marriage</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This grandparent was victimized by his/her partner</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This grandparent selfishly seemed to only care about himself/herself</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This grandparent was/is an alcoholic or drug user and was/is difficult to live with</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This grandparent was a martyr and rarely did anything pleasurable for himself/herself</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When this grandparent got upset with his/her spouse/partner, he/she left the room (even when family was visiting)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I noticed that this grandparent seemed to live a separate life from his/her partner</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. LOVE in a Romantic Relationship:
Think about how your attitudes, beliefs, or values about love in romantic relationships have been influenced by either
(1) your interactions with this grandparent,
(2) your observations of this grandparent, or
(3) how others talk about this grandparent.

(a) Write as much about the specific communication with this grandparent or the story told to you about this grandparent that has taught you love. This communication can be positive (what to do) or negative (what not to do)! Where possible, use the exact words exchanged or what happened to communicate about love.
This is a time I was taught about love in a romantic relationship to the best of my memory:

(b) What was the lesson you learned from this grandparent?

(c) What were you doing when this teaching moment occurred?

(d) How far away did this grandparent live from you at the time of this interaction: (Circle one)
We lived together < 1 hour 1 2 3 4 5 6 7+ hours away

(e) Emotional Closeness to this grandparent at the time of this interaction: (Circle one)
Emotionally Very Distant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Emotionally Very Close
(f) **More generally,** tell about what this grandparent taught you about love: ____________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

(g) Looking back, in what ways have **your expectations about love changed** because of what **this grandparent** has said or done or what you have been told about this grandparent? ____________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

3. MARRIAGE or an Enduring Committed Relationship:
Think about how your attitudes, beliefs, or values about marriage have been influenced by either
(1) **your interactions** with this grandparent,
(2) **your observations** of this grandparent,
or
(3) **how others talk about** this grandparent.

(a) Write as much about the specific communication with this grandparent or the story told to you about this grandparent that has taught you about marriage. This communication can be **positive (what to do)** or **negative (what not to do)!** Where possible, use the exact words exchanged or what happened to communicate about marriage. **This is a time I was taught about marriage to the best of my memory:**

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

(b) What was the **lesson** you learned from this grandparent? ____________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

(c) What were you doing when this teaching moment occurred? ____________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

(d) **How far away** did this grandparent live from you at the time of this interaction: (Circle one)
- We lived together < 1 hour
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7+
- hours away

(e) **Emotional Closeness** to this grandparent at the time of this interaction: (Circle one)
- Emotionally Very Distant
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- Emotionally Very Close
(f) **More generally**, tell about what this grandparent taught you about marriage: ____________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

(g) Looking back, in what ways have **your expectations about marriage changed** because of what **this grandparent** has said or done or what you have been told about this grandparent? ____________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

4. WHAT HAVE I NOT TALKED ABOUT?

Like all relationships, there may be issues we would like to talk to our grandparents about but are left unsaid.

(a) Can you think of some things that you would like to share with or ask **this grandparent**, in particular, about **communication in love or marriage** but have been **unable to do so**?

With as much detail as possible, **please explain what you would like to tell or ask this grandparent about the communication in love or marriage.** (Please complete even if this grandparent is deceased.)

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

(b) Issues such as geographical distance, emotional distance, family interference, and so on may disrupt the communication between grandparents and their grandchild. **What prevents you from asking about or sharing this issue with this grandparent?**

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________
5. Are you satisfied with your level of closeness in your relationship with this grandparent? YES or NO

Check one:
Ο  If yes; in what ways do either you or this grandparent keep your relationship to this level of closeness?
Ο  If no, because you want to be closer; what does your relationship lack? What might help you to be closer?
Ο  If no, because you are too close; what would you like to be different about your relationship with this grandparent?

Circle Yes or No according to your interaction with this grandparent:

1. Over the past 12 months, have you asked this grandparent for help with something you were doing or making? YES or NO
2. Over the past 12 months, have you run errands or chores for this grandparent? YES or NO
3. Over the past 12 months, has this grandparent asked you for help with something he/she was doing or making? YES or NO
4. Over the past 12 months, has this grandparent helped you with your errands or chores? YES or NO
5. Over the past 12 months, has this grandparent disciplined you? YES or NO
6. Over the past 12 months, has this grandparent given you advice? YES or NO
7. Over the past 12 months, have you discussed your problems with this grandparent? YES or NO

Circle one:
8. When this grandparent sees you do something that he/she may disapprove of, does he/she correct you? Often Sometimes Hardly Ever Never
9. Do your parents consult this grandparent before making an important decision about you? Often Sometimes Hardly Ever Never
10. Over the past 12 months, about how often have you talked to this grandparent? times
11. Your Emotional Closeness to this grandparent: Emotionally Very Distant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Emotionally Very Close
12. Your Liking of this grandparent: Dislike Very Much 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Like Very Much
13. Your Overall Satisfaction with Typical Conversations with this grandparent: Not Satisfied at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Completely Satisfied
14. What is your level of Listening with this grandparent? Do not Care to Listen 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Completely Listen
15. Your level of Respect for this grandparent: No Respect 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Complete Respect
16. What is your frequency of any contact with this grandparent?
   O at least once a week   O at least once every two months
   O at least once a month   O at least once a year
   O other __________________

17. Who generally initiates the contact between you and this grandparent? You / this grandparent / equal

18. What is your mode of contact with this grandparent? Please indicate frequency with which you have contact with this grandparent through these media.
   Face-to-face? ______ x’s per _____ Telephone? ______ x’s per _____ Email? ______ x’s per _____
   Sending a card? ______ x’s per _____ Writing a letter? ______ x’s per _____ Instant Message? ______ x’s per _____

19. From your perspective, how emotionally close is this grandparent to your father?
   Emotionally Very Distant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Emotionally Very Close

20. From your perspective, how emotionally close is this grandparent to your mother?
   Emotionally Very Distant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Emotionally Very Close

21. What is the relational status of this grandparent?  
   O Single – not Dating   O African American
   O Dating               O Native American
   O Cohabitating w/romantic partner O Hispanic
   O Married (to the other grandparent) O Latino
   O Separated/Divorced O Asian
   O Widowed               O White
   O Remarried            O India
   O Other ______________ O Other ______________

22. What is this grandparent’s race? (check all that apply)
   O Single – not Dating   O African American
   O Dating               O Native American
   O Cohabitating w/romantic partner O Hispanic
   O Married (to the other grandparent) O Latino
   O Separated/Divorced O Asian
   O Widowed               O White
   O Remarried            O India
   O Other ______________ O Other ______________

23. What is this grandparent’s religion? (check only one, closest to his/her faith)
   O Jewish               O Catholic   O Protestant   O Muslim
   O Confucianism         O Hindu      O Buddhism     O Evangelical Christian
   O Other ______________ O No religious affiliation

24. Circle the number below to illustrate your perception of this grandparent’s level of spirituality:
   Not spiritual at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 More spiritual than most people

25. How many grandchildren does this grandparent have? ______________

26. Is there one grandchild who is closer to this grandparent than the other grandchildren?
   (circle)   YES / NO ; If yes, Who? ______________

27. Taking all things together, how would you describe this grandparent’s marriage/relationship?
   (circle)
   Very Unhappy 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Happy
Respond to the following statements about your relationship with this grandparent...circle one number:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I share personal thoughts and feelings with this grandparent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk about topics this grandparent enjoys</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliment this grandparent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know what to say to this grandparent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look for ways to end the conversation with this grandparent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to leave when conversing with this grandparent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have to “bite my tongue” with this grandparent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid certain ways of talking with this grandparent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t always say what I think to this grandparent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t act like myself with this grandparent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid certain topics with this grandparent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I show respect for his/her age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel respect for his/her knowledge and wisdom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I speak louder to this grandparent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I speak slower than normal with this grandparent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This grandparent compliments me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This grandparent shows affection for me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This grandparent shows respect for me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This grandparent shares personal thoughts and feelings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This grandparent is attentive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This grandparent is supportive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This grandparent negatively stereotypes me as a young person</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This grandparent talks down to me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This grandparent complains about his/her life circumstances</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This grandparent complains about his/her health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This grandparent is closed-minded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This grandparent talks about his/her health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This grandparent expresses racist/prejudiced opinions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This grandparent makes angry complaints</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This grandparent gives unwanted advice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This grandparent tells interesting stories</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This grandparent provides interesting information about history</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This grandparent provides interesting information about my family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for completing this questionnaire and making a valuable contribution to the communication discipline. Please return this questionnaire to Naomi Bell O’Neil or Dr. Susan L. Kline to receive the credit for your class.
APPENDIX C

GRANDPARENTS’ QUESTIONNAIRE ABOUT THEMSELVES;
GRANDPARENTS’ OWN VALUES, BELIEFS, AND BEHAVIORS ABOUT LOVE
AND MARRIAGE; AND GRANDPARENTS’ SOCIALIZATION AND TEACHING
OF THEIR GRANDCHILDREN
GRANDPARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

ASSESSMENT OF GRANDPARENTS’ OF THEIR OWN VALUES, BELIEFS, AND BEHAVIORS
AND THEIR SOCIALIZATION AND TEACHING OF THEIR OWN GRANDCHILDREN

Grandchild’s ID #: ________________________________

Grandparent – Grandchild Communication

Thank you for agreeing to complete this questionnaire. All responses will remain confidential. Your grandchild will not be permitted to view any of your responses so please respond with honesty and as accurately as possible—there are no right or wrong answers. Use the back of the questionnaire any time you need more space to complete your responses.

This questionnaire primarily centers about love in romantic relationships and/or marriage. If you are widowed or no longer married, please respond to the questions as to how your relationship was when you were married or had a partner.

1. Your Interactions with this Grandchild about Love in Romantic Relationships and Marriage

Below are listed a number of ways that grandparents show or communicate about love and/or marriage. Please indicate how often you have engaged in these practices with this grandchild according to this key:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has Not Occurred</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Fairly Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This grandchild has directly observed my ways of loving or acts of marriage

I am(was) a giving person

I show(ed) unconditional support

I show(ed) signs of affection toward my spouse or partner regularly (e.g., we held hands, kissed, danced on occasion, and so forth)

I do(did) the traditional duties for my role in my marriage:
If female: Cooked, cleaned, and took care of the children
If male: Worked a job, repaired the house/car, cared for the lawn

I talk(ed) openly to my spouse or partner

I tease(ed) or joke(ed) with my spouse or partner in a loving way

I call(ed) my spouse or partner by endearing names regularly (e.g., “honey” or “sweetheart”)

I say (said), “I love you” to my spouse or partner regularly

I yell(ed) at or fight(fought) with my spouse or partner regularly

I smile when speaking of my spouse or partner

I physically cared for my spouse or partner when partner was ill

I am(was) faithful to my spouse or partner

I order(ed) my spouse or partner around

I am(was) willing to do almost anything for my spouse or partner

I am(was) very happy in my relationship

I show(ed) a great deal of respect for my spouse or partner

I care(d) deeply for my spouse or partner and family

I have told this grandchild stories, in general, about love and/or marriage

I have told this grandchild stories about how I met my spouse or partner
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have told this grandchild stories about my own dating experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have told this grandchild about my wedding day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have told this grandchild about happy times in marriage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have told this grandchild stories of the tough times and struggles of my marriage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have told this grandchild stories of the disagreements and challenges of my marriage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have told this grandchild funny stories about my life with my spouse or partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have told this grandchild stories about how I have taken care of/provided for my family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have talked directly to this grandchild about relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have told this grandchild that I cannot imagine being married to anyone other than my spouse or partner even when we fight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have told this grandchild what I think of the person he/she is dating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have told this grandchild that my partner is/was my best friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have told this grandchild to get to know the family of the person he/she is interested in romantically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am close to this grandchild but we don’t talk about love in a romantic relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have given advice about love or marriage directly to this grandchild</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have told this grandchild to choose a person who treats him/her right and gives respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have told this grandchild not to rush love but just wait for the right person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have told this grandchild to have a career before falling in love</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have told this grandchild that; with love, one can accomplish many things that were once thought impossible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have told this grandchild to stay faithful to the one he/she marries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have told this grandchild to choose a person with his/her same values and same religious faith as our family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have told this grandchild to find someone with whom he/she can be happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have told this grandchild that true love will grow with time and never fade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have told this grandchild that love is unconditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have told this grandchild that making love is an important part of a relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have told this grandchild that chivalry is not dead; e.g., a guy should hold a door open for a lady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have tried to teach this grandchild about the ways of love and/or marriage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not communicate very well with my spouse so this grandchild should not act like me when interacting in love and/or marriage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was victimized by my spouse or partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I only care about myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was/am an alcoholic or drug user and was/am difficult to live with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was a martyr and rarely did anything pleasurable for myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I get(got) upset with my spouse or partner, I leave(left) the room (even when family is/was visiting)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I live(d) a separate life from my spouse or partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. LOVE in a Romantic Relationship:

Have your attitudes, beliefs, or values about love in a romantic relationship influenced this grandchild?

Think about your interactions with this grandchild...have you spent any time indirectly or directly talking about love in romantic relationships to this grandchild OR showing this grandchild how to express love? (Or, have you pointed out your observations about others’ ways of loving to this grandchild?)

(a) Write as much about the specific communication with this grandchild or the story you told to this grandchild about love. This communication can be positive (what to do) or negative (what not to do)!

Where possible, use the exact words exchanged or what happened to communicate about love.

This is a time I taught this grandchild about love in a romantic relationship to the best of my memory:

(b) What was the lesson you wanted to teach to this grandchild?  

(c) What were you doing when this “love teaching moment” occurred?

(d) How far away did this grandchild live from you at the time of this interaction: (Circle one)

We lived together< 1 hour 1 2 3 4 5 6 7+ hours away

(e) Emotional Closeness to this grandchild at the time of this interaction: (Circle one)

Emotionally Very Distant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Emotionally Very Close

(f) More generally, tell about what you taught this grandchild about love:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________
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(g) Looking back, in what ways do you think that your interactions with this grandchild (either in what you said or what you did) have changed this grandchild’s expectations about love?


3. MARRIAGE or an Enduring Committed Relationship:
How have your attitudes, beliefs, or values about marriage influenced this grandchild?

Think about your interactions with this grandchild...have you spent any time indirectly or directly talking about marriage or how to communicate in marriage to this grandchild OR showing this grandchild how to communicate in marriage? (Or, have you pointed out your observations about others’ marriage to this grandchild?)

(a) Write as much about the specific communication with this grandchild or the story you told to this grandchild about marriage. This communication can be positive (what to do) or negative (what not to do)! Where possible, use the exact words exchanged or what happened to communicate about marriage. This is a time I taught this grandchild about marriage to the best of my memory:


(b) What was the lesson you wanted to teach to this grandchild?


(c) What were you doing when this marriage teaching moment occurred?


(d) How far away did this grandchild live from you at the time of this interaction: (Circle one)

We lived together <1 hour 1 2 3 4 5 6 7+ hours away

(e) Emotional Closeness to this grandchild at the time of this interaction: (Circle one)

Emotionally Very Distant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Emotionally Very Close
(f) **More generally**, tell about what you taught this grandchild about marriage:

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

(g) Looking back, in what ways do you think that your interactions with this grandchild (either in what you said or what you did) have **changed this grandchild’s expectations about marriage**?

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

4. **WHAT HAVE I NOT TOLD MY GRANDCHILD!**
Like all of us in relationships, there may be issues about which we would like to talk to our grandchildren but are left unsaid or stories left untold.

You may have some things that you would like to share with **this grandchild**, in particular, about **communication in marriage or love** but have been **unable to do so**.

(a) With as much detail as possible, **please explain what you would like to tell or demonstrate to this grandchild about the communication in marriage or love**. What lesson would you teach or share?

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

(b) Issues such as geographical distance, emotional distance, family interference, and so on may disrupt the communication between grandparents and their grandchild. **What prevents you from teaching or sharing this untold lesson or story with this grandchild?**

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________
5. Attitudes and Beliefs about LOVE in a Romantic Relationship:
Whenever possible, respond to the following beliefs with your current partner in mind. If you do not have a living partner or not dating someone, please respond with a former partner in mind. If you have never been in love, answer in terms of what you think your responses would most likely be according to the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My partner and I have the right physical “chemistry” between us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my partner and I were meant for each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner and I really understand each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner fits my ideal standards of physical beauty/handsomeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that what my partner doesn’t know about me won’t hurt him/her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have sometimes had to keep my partner from finding out about other lovers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner would get upset if he/she knew of some of the things I’ve done with other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy playing the ‘game of love’ with my partner and a number of other partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our love is the best kind because it grew out of a long friendship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our friendship merged gradually into love over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our love is really a deep friendship, not a mysterious, mystical emotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our love relationship is the most satisfying because it developed from a good friendship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A main consideration in choosing my partner was how he/she would reflect on my family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An important factor in choosing my partner was whether or not he/she would be a good parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One consideration in choosing my partner was how he/she would reflect on my career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before getting very involved with my partner, I tried to figure out how compatible his/her hereditary background would be with mine in case we ever had children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When my partner doesn’t pay attention to me, I feel sick all over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since I’ve been in love with my partner I’ve had trouble concentrating on anything else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I cannot relax if I suspect that my partner is with someone else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If my partner ignores me for awhile, I sometimes do stupid things to try to get his/her attention back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would rather suffer myself than let my partner suffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I cannot be happy unless I place my partner’s happiness before my own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am usually willing to sacrifice my own wishes to let my partner achieve his/hers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would endure all things for the sake of my partner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Have you taught or shown any of these love beliefs listed above to this grandchild?
Please review the above statements and only place an “X” in the box at the beginning of the statement(s) which are the belief(s) you have taught, either directly or indirectly, to this grandchild.
6. Behaviors and Beliefs about MARRIAGE or Lifelong Committed Relationships:

(a) Respond to each of the following statements according to what is true for you and your spouse (or lifelong committed relational partner). If you are not presently married, respond as in a previous marriage. Please circle the number that best shows how you feel about the statement according to this KEY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- We tell each other how much we love or care about each other
- My spouse/mate tells me (i.e., tries to influence) what magazines or books to read and/or what television shows to watch
- I open my spouse's/mate's personal mail without asking permission
- I tell (i.e., try to influence) my spouse/mate which magazines or books to read and/or what television shows to watch
- My spouse/mate reassures and comforts me when I am feeling low
- My spouse/mate forces me to do things that I do not want to do
- We eat our meals (i.e., the ones at home) at the same time every day
- I have my own private workspace (study, workshop, utility room, etc.)
- In our house, we keep a fairly regular daily time schedule
- If I can avoid arguing about some problems, they will disappear
- My spouse has his/her own private workspace (workshop, utility room, study, etc)
- My mate complains if I open his/her personal mail without permission
- It bothers me if a guest goes into our refrigerator or fixes himself/herself some coffee in our home
- Our time schedule varies quite a bit from day to day
- Life is filled with so many contradictions that I am not certain how to interpret what it all means
- I think that we joke around and have more fun than most couples
- Relationships should not interfere with each person’s pursuit to discover their own potential
- It is important for a couple (or a family) to attend church (synagogue) and, when possible, to attend together
- I think it is important for one to have some private space which is all his/her own and separate from one’s mate
- Our society, as we see it, needs to regain faith in the law and in our institutions
- In marriage/close relationships there should be no constraints or restrictions on individual freedom
- A woman should take her husband’s last name when she marries
- It is better to hide one’s true feelings in order to avoid hurting your spouse/mate
- Partners should be frank and spontaneous in conversations with one another even if it leads to disagreements

(b) Have you taught or shown any of these marital beliefs listed above to this grandchild? Please review the above statements and only place an “X” in the box at the beginning of the statement(s) which are the belief(s) you have taught, either directly or indirectly, to this grandchild.
7. **Circle one number** in response to the following statements about your relationship with **this grandchild** using this key:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I share personal thoughts and feelings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk about topics this grandchild enjoys</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliment this grandchild</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know what to say</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look for ways to end the conversation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to leave</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have to “bite my tongue”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid certain ways of talking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t always say what I think</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t act like myself</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid certain topics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to give advice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to provide guidance to my grandchild</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk about family history</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This grandchild compliments me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows affection for me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows respect for me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shares personal thoughts and feelings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is attentive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is supportive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This grandchild negatively stereotypes me as an old person</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talks down to me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please respond to the following statements by circling the most accurate number:

1. **Emotional Closeness** to **this grandchild**:
   - Emotionally Very Distant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Emotionally Very Close

2. **Liking** of **this grandchild**:
   - Dislike Very Much 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Like Very Much

3. Your **Overall Satisfaction** with **Typical Conversations** with **this grandchild**:
   - Not Satisfied at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Completely Satisfied

4. What is your level of **Listening** with **this grandchild**?
   - Do not care to Listen 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Completely Listen

5. Your level of **Respect** for **this grandchild**:
   - No Respect 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Complete Respect

6. Who usually **initiates** the contact between you and **this grandchild**?
   - (circle one) You / this grandchild / equal

7. What is your mode of contact with **this grandchild**? Please indicate the **frequency** you have contact with this grandchild through these media?
   - Face-to-face? x’s per  Telephone? x’s per  Email? x’s per  
   - Sending a card? x’s per  Writing a letter? x’s per  Instant Message? x’s per
8. What is your frequency of any contact with this grandchild?
   - O at least once a week
   - O at least once every two months
   - O at least once or twice a month
   - O at least once a year
   - O other __________________

9. Are you satisfied with your level of closeness in your relationship with this grandchild? YES or NO
   Please explain your response:
   - O If yes; what is it that you or this grandchild does that keeps your relationship to this level of closeness?
   - O If no, because you want to be closer; what does your relationship lack? What might help you to be closer?
   - O If no, because you are too close; what would you like to be different about your relationship with this grandchild?

Circle one:

10. How important is it to talk to grandchildren about issues surrounding and/or communicating love?
   Not important at all 1 2 3 4 5

11. How important is it to talk to grandchildren about marriage and/or communicating in marriage?
   Not important at all 1 2 3 4 5

12. How emotionally close are you to the father of this grandchild?
   Emotionally Very Distant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Emotionally Very Close

13. How emotionally close are you to the mother of this grandchild?
   Emotionally Very Distant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Emotionally Very Close

Circle Yes or No:

1. Over the past 12 months, has this grandchild asked for your help with something he/she was doing or making? YES or NO

2. Over the past 12 months, has this grandchild run errands or chores for you? YES or NO
3. Over the past 12 months, have you asked this grandchild for help with something you were doing or making? YES or NO
4. Over the past 12 months, have you helped this grandchild with his/her errands or chores? YES or NO
5. Over the past 12 months, did you discipline him/her? YES or NO
6. Over the past 12 months, did you give this grandchild advice? YES or NO
7. Over the past 12 months, did this grandchild discuss his/her problems with you? YES or NO
8. When you see this grandchild do something you disapprove of, do you correct him/her? Circle one: Often Sometimes Hardly Ever Never
9. Do your children consult you before making an important decision about this grandchild? Circle one: Often Sometimes Hardly Ever Never
10. Over the past 12 months, about how often have you talked to this grandchild? times

Please respond to the following short demographic questions:
1. (a) Are you married to this grandchild’s grandmother/grandfather? YES or NO
   (b) If not married to this grandchild’s grandmother/grandfather, then what is your relational status? Choose all that apply:
   O Single – not dating O Single but dating O Cohabiting w/romantic partner
   O Married O Separated O Divorced
   O Widowed O Remarried O Other

3. Taking all things together, how would you describe your marriage/relationship? Circle one
   Very Unhappy 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Happy

4. How many children do you have? How many are married?

5. How many grandchildren do you have?

6. Do you have a higher quality relationship (closer) with one grandchild? (circle) YES or NO
   If so, who

7. What is your age? years

8. What is your Race? (check all that apply one generation removed)
   O Native American O Hispanic O Latino
   O African American O Asian O White
   O India O Other

9. Household Income?
   O up to $25,000/year O up to $75,000/year O up to $125,000/year
   O up to $50,000/year O up to $100,000/year O over $125,000/year
10. What is your **Educational Level**?

- O did not graduate High School
- O High School Graduate
- O Some College
- O School of Technology
- O College Graduate – Major
- O Graduate - Degree MA / MS / PhD / MD / Other ______

11. Circle the number below to illustrate your **Level of Spirituality**:  
Not spiritual at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 More spiritual than most people

12. What is your **Religion**? (check only one, closest to your faith)

- O Jewish
- O Protestant
- O Catholic
- O Muslim
- O Confucianism
- O Hindu
- O Evangelical Christian
- O Buddhism
- O No religious affiliation
- O Other ______

13. In relationship to **this grandchild, I am his/her**

- O Father’s Father (Paternal Grandfather)
- O Father’s Mother (Paternal Grandmother)
- O Mother’s Father (Maternal Grandfather)
- O Mother’s Mother (Maternal Grandmother)
- O Step-Grandfather: (Please explain relationship:______________________________)
- O Step-Grandmother: (Please explain relationship:______________________________)
- O Other type of Grandparent relationship: (Please explain:______________________________)

**Thank you for completing this questionnaire and making a valuable contribution to the communication discipline. Please place this questionnaire inside the stamped envelope provided.**

**Be sure to include the separate consent form with your signature allowing the aggregate use of this information for research purposes.**

**Sincerely,**  
Naomi Bell O’Neil  
4636 Tuttle’s Woods Drive,  
Dublin, OH 43016
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