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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The subject of this research is the emergence of "mutuality", a characteristic considered by many to be the hallmark of mature close relationships. Briefly, "mutuality", as it is used here, implies a high degree of self-disclosure and an agreement between relationship partners to respect each other's individuality and treat each other as equals as they cooperate in a reciprocal exchange of feelings and ideas (Youniss, 1981). In this study, young adults' retrospective reports of child-rearing practices were examined along with descriptions of current intimate relationships (i.e., with spouse) and current interactions with parents, to determine if there are particular patterns of interaction that are associated with the normative development of the capacity for mutuality.

The study of the developmental course of the individual's capacity for mutuality in relationships is clearly an important area of investigation. On a theoretical level, it represents an attempt to broaden a body of literature in Developmental Psychology by linking the study of individual developmental processes to a focus on maturity of functioning in the domain of interpersonal relationships. This area of research has important clinical implications, since the quality of close relationships with friends and/or family has an influence on mental and...
physical health. Despite current clinical interest in families as systems, little has been done to assess objectively the impact of different levels of "relationship maturity" individuals bring to family interactions. The present research will contribute to a growing body of research validating a method for assessing relationship maturity. It was designed to extend that research by examining the developmental roots of the capacity for mutuality which forms the basis of relationship maturity.

In the introductory material that follows several topics relevant to mutuality and the role of child-rearing in its development are considered. We begin with a discussion of the special role of peers in facilitating the emergence of mutuality and Youniss' (1981) interpretation of the theories of Piaget (e.g., 1932) and Sullivan (1953). Next we consider the more subtle contribution Piaget and others suggest parents can make and Kohlberg's (1969) extension of that position to include an emphasis on role-taking opportunities in multiple contexts. What follows is a presentation of a series of theoretical and empirical research topics supporting the general premise that individual differences in parent-child relationships (not only peer relationships) can significantly influence adult outcomes in the capacity for mutuality. Reference is made to research on parental attitudes facilitating moral internalization (e.g., Hoffman, 1970), since moral judgment is an ego function which has certain elements in common with relationship maturity. The theme of the importance of role-taking opportunities continues as research tracing the developing capacity for mutuality in relationships through the adolescent period (e.g., Selman, 1981) is
considered. We then turn to a series of studies on family communication patterns promoting development in adolescents (e.g., Cooper & Grotevant, 1985) which lend support to another major premise of the present research—that progressive redefinition of close family relationships continues at least through the adolescent years. Erikson's (e.g., 1968) eight-stage developmental theory is alluded to at that point because it suggests that maturity in conceptualization and behavior in close relationships continues well beyond the adolescent period. A discussion of research on sex-based differences in child-rearing is included because these differences may help to account for a difference in orientation toward relationships in males and females. Finally, a review of theoretical issues and attempts at operationalizing the concept of "relationship maturity" in young adulthood is presented. The introductory chapter concludes with a statement of purpose and a list of hypotheses to be tested.

The Special Role of Peers in Facilitating The Emergence of Mutuality

Several writers have emphasized the contribution of the peer network in facilitating the "horizontal" aspects of mutuality, while the unequal, "vertical" nature of parent-child relationships has been characterized as a model militating against the emergence of mutuality (Piaget, 1932; Sullivan, 1953; Wenar, 1971; Youniss, 1981; Serafica, 1982). Youniss (1981) distinguishes between two worlds of childhood which teach children qualitatively different types of social understanding, related to conceptions of self, others and relationships.
These two different social worlds are represented by two structurally distinct types of relationships, originally proposed by Piaget (1932). The first of these relations is the situation of "unilateral constraint" most commonly found in adult-child interactions, in which the child plays a complementary conformist role in relation to an authority figure. The second type of relation, the "direct reciprocal" or "cooperative" one, occurs most typically between peers. In it, each partner interacts as an equal. Through experiencing what could be a continuing stalemate, the participants learn to construct positions together. They present ideas and listen to ideas. They argue, debate, discuss and compromise. The result is adoption of a general procedure of reciprocal influence.

Sullivan (1953) provides additional theoretical support for the notion of the importance of the "chum" as a means for the child to achieve intimacy and complementarity outside of the family setting. In this same-sex relation, the child for the first time experiences some of the qualities of mature intimate relationships (e.g., mutual self disclosure and unconditional acceptance). It follows that learning in this arena is applicable to the later interpersonal demands of serious commitment to someone of the opposite sex.

Deriving his theoretical framework from what Piaget and Sullivan had to say about the structural and functional differences between children's relationships with friends and their relationships with adults, Youniss (1981) conducted some important empirical research with nine to fourteen-year-olds. He concluded, on the basis of this research, that during early adolescence, child-adult relations begin to undergo a transformation which includes a redefinition of adults as individual
personalities and a switch from relations of unilateral constraint to more peerlike equality. Youniss hypothesized that the impetus for change comes primarily, if not solely, from knowledge acquired through peer relations.

The Deemphasized Role of the Parent-Child Relationship

The two social worlds of childhood are presumably just beginning to merge during early adolescence. The present research was designed, in part, to extend the findings of Youniss by focusing on the more fully resolved and integrated relationships of young adulthood, as opposed to those of adolescence. A major goal was to examine the role of the earlier relationship with one's parents in the emergence of the more mutual relationships (i.e., with parents and ultimately with intimate others) which are developmentally appropriate in adulthood. It is indisputable that there is some inequality present in all parent-child relationships during the early child-rearing years; however, in the last few decades some parents have become more like friends to their children (Gadlin, 1978), while others have remained in more traditional authoritarian, control-oriented roles. The present research was designed to explore the issue of whether or not individual differences in early parent-child interactional styles (i.e., "mutuality-oriented" versus "control-oriented"), as reported retrospectively by adult offspring, enhance or perhaps place a limit on progress towards mutuality.

In considering the possibility of cross-cultural differences in development, Piaget (1969) speculates that an extreme authoritarian environment may suppress individual initiative in the co-construction
of reality”, a process which Piaget considers crucial in development. In very paternalistic tribal societies in which individuals have been found to be limited in their capacity to develop operational thought, it can be assumed that social awareness and behavior reflect this limitation (Selman, 1981). On a smaller scale, modern-day child-rearing which is very control-oriented may also interfere with development, but perhaps in more subtle ways.

By focusing on these child-rearing issues, the present research challenges a portion of Youniss' thesis, which appears to distort or oversimplify Piaget's original position regarding the crucial role of peer experience and the perhaps more subtle contribution of the parent-child relationship to the development of the capacity for mature, mutual relationships. Youniss claims that although neither Piaget nor Sullivan deny the usefulness of studying differences in parental caretaking styles, they perceive an underlying common structure of unilateral constraint in all parent-child relationships and an egocentric confusion of the child's own perspective with that of his/her parents, which makes it unlikely that parents can have much of an impact in this area. The implication is that an individual's sense of equality, interpersonal sensitivity, need for intimacy, and capacity for mutual understanding must emanate almost exclusively from peer relations.

A Broader View of Factors in the Child's Social Environment

Fostering Mutuality

In actuality, Piaget (1932) seems to have a broader view of factors promoting development, especially when he discusses social
environments that tend to promote moral growth. He certainly emphasizes peer experience as a prime vehicle for the crucial experiences which enable a child to interact with others on a perceived equal footing employing mutual consent and cooperation. Nevertheless, contrary to Youniss' interpretation, Piaget does not rule out the possibility that parents can also make a significant contribution to development (John Gibbs, 1985, personal communication). In this regard, Piaget suggests that in child-rearing "one must place oneself on the child’s level, and give him a feeling of equality by laying stress on one’s own obligations...one’s own needs, one’s own difficulties...even one’s own blunders, and point out their consequences, thus creating an atmosphere of mutual help and understanding. In this way the child will find himself in the presence, not of a system of commands requiring ritualistic and external obedience, but of a system of social relations such that everyone does his best to obey the same obligations, and does so out of mutual respect." (1932, pp. 133-134)

Empirical Studies of Different Socialization Patterns: General Styles of Discipline and Moral Development

Piaget’s advice finds empirical support in ongoing research on moral internalization (e.g., Hoffman, 1983). It is important to note that although the present study focuses on “relationship maturity” and not moral development per se, research on the latter is quite relevant here. The present writer takes the position that both moral maturity and relationship maturity are important functions of the ego which overlap in some areas. Elements such as role-taking, mutual cooperation,
reciprocity, equity, and empathy are integral to both and make
development in one area highly relevant to the other.

According to Hoffman (1983), children learn to act out of
consideration for the needs of others, as well as their own needs,
through what he has labeled, "inductive discipline". The latter stresses
the importance of explaining to children how their transgressions have
hurt or distressed themselves or others. This includes, generally, a
reference to the covert feelings or thoughts of the other. On the other
hand, a moral orientation based on fear of external detection and
punishment is associated with the frequent use of "power-assertive
discipline", that is, physical force, deprivation of possessions or
privileges, direct commands, or threats of any of these. There is
evidence, however, that the occasional use of power-assertive discipline
to let the child know that the parent feels strongly about a particular
issue, or as a means of controlling the behavior of a child who is openly
defiant, by parents who usually employ inductions, may make a positive
contribution to moral internalization (Hoffman, 1983; Zahn-Waxler,
Radke-Yarrow, & King, 1979). Finally, Hoffman (1983) reports no
relationship between moral internalization and "love withdrawal"(i.e.,
techniques in which the parent simply gives direct, but nonphysical,
expressions to anger or disapproval of the child for engaging in some
undesirable behavior (e.g., ignores the child, turns his or her back on the
child, refuses to speak or listen to the child, explicitly states a dislike
for the child, isolates or threatens to leave the child).

To summarize, two decades of research by Hoffman and his
colleagues have led them to distinguish between two types of
non-power-assertive parenting techniques: induction and love withdrawal. The effectiveness of these techniques appears to lie more in their "empathy-arousing" capacity rather than their love-withdrawing properties. Capitalizing on the child's capacity for empathy provides "a powerful emotional and cognitive support" for moral development.

The research presented in this section is relevant to the current inquiry on child-rearing practices that facilitate relationship maturity based on mutuality. As the reader will discover shortly, it was expected that child-rearing which is "mutuality-oriented" and conveys a similar feeling of respect to the child would be associated with greater relationship maturity in young adulthood. A confirmation of this hypothesis in the present study would certainly seem consistent with the finding of positive outcomes associated with "empathy-arousing" child-rearing in the domain of moral maturity, a related ego function.

Role-taking Opportunities

Even stronger support for the position that both peer and parental relationships can make a contribution to the developing capacity for mutuality comes from Kohlberg (1969). Kohlberg has argued for a broad view of the social environment as "a total social world in which perceptions of the law, of the peer group, and of parental teachings all influence one another" (p. 402). He has suggested that the influence of various social settings on development, again specifically in the domain of moral judgment, can be understood in terms of the "role-taking opportunities" offered by them. Regarding peer-group participation, Kohlberg agrees that it does stimulate development; however, "its
influence seems better conceptualized in terms of providing general role-taking opportunities rather than having very specific and unique forms of influence" (p.401, 1969). The family setting can provide similar opportunities, according to Kohlberg.

To illustrate what he means by "role-taking opportunities", Kohlberg (1969) cites an early study of family interaction by Peck & Havighurst (1960). Peck & Havighurst reported that moral maturity is related to ratings of common participation in the family, confidence sharing, sharing in family decisions, and awarding responsibility to the child.

Other research results have been consistent with the expectation of a relationship between role-taking opportunities and maturity in the domain of moral judgment. Surveying the results from several correlational studies, Hoffman (1970) found consistently positive correlations between inductive discipline and various indices of moral maturity. Using Kohlberg's measure of moral maturity, Holstein (1968) examined the power of parental provision of role-taking opportunities in moral discussion as a predictor of moral judgment at age 13. Taped discussions between mother, father and child of moral opinions on hypothetical situations were analyzed by Holstein. In the sample of 52 middle-class families, parents who encouraged their child to participate in the discussion (i.e., who were rated as "taking the child's opinion seriously and discussing it") tended to have relatively mature or conventional-level (Stage 3 or 4) children. A much lower percentage of the non-encouraging parents had children who had reached the conventional level. Amount of paternal and maternal interaction with
the child (play, discussion, affection) was also related to the child's moral level.

Role-taking opportunities have also been considered crucial by Robert Selman who has conducted more than a decade of research on social-cognitive development. Selman (1981) assumes that the child's developing conceptualization of self and social relations can be viewed as proceeding through an invariant sequence of qualitative stages. Successive levels (i.e., levels 0-4) represent movement away from an initial single-perspective conceptualization of social relationships toward a level of social understanding which simultaneously differentiates and coordinates multiple social perspectives. Selman (1980) describes how each of these levels organizes the interpersonal conceptions children express about critical issues in friendship, peer group relations or parent-child relations. Recently, Selman (1981) has switched the focus of his research to levels of "interpersonal competence" and "negotiation strategies". In studying these constructs, he examines intended or actual methods of interaction in addition to his underlying "levels of coordination of social perspectives". He also has begun to consider the affective component of interactions.

Selman's research with children and adolescence clearly traces the developing capacity for mutuality in relationships. Unfortunately, his scoring system does not permit sufficient discrimination among adults (Kathleen White, 1985, personal communication). It is the position of the present researcher that maturity in conceptualization and behavior in close relationships continues through the adolescent period and beyond.
Harold Grotevant and his colleagues have conducted a series of studies (e.g., Cooper, Grotevant & Condon, 1983; Grotevant & Cooper, 1985) examining individual differences in role-taking skill and another crucial aspect of psychosocial competence in late adolescence, a sense of identity. Their general approach is to study entire families using a transactional framework (i.e., recognizing that “the directions of influence in the family include multiple and reciprocal pathways”). They conceptualize each person in the family as a developing individual and the whole family as “a changing mix of competencies and needs”.

The research of Grotevant and his colleagues on family interaction is based on a model of individuation which defines two factors comprising individuality—self assertion (seen, e.g., in the expression of one’s own point of view and in taking responsibility for communicating it clearly) and separateness (seen in the expression of the distinctiveness of self from others) and two other factors comprising connectedness—permeability (openness and responsiveness to other’s ideas) and mutuality (showing sensitivity or respect in relating to others). Separateness and assertion are key elements in healthy communication because they concern the ability of family members to have opinions that may differ from others. Mutuality can provide adolescents with support, acknowledgement and respect for developing their own beliefs, whereas permeability involves the management of the boundaries between self and others. Grotevant and his colleagues have attempted to operationalize these factors in terms of 14 categories of communication behaviors.
Grotevant's empirical work has involved actual observation of communication patterns in typical families who were asked to negotiate and make decisions in planning a hypothetical family vacation (i.e., Family Interaction Task). The sample was composed of 84 Caucasian, middle-class, 2-parent families, each including an adolescent and one or two siblings. The studies have generally supported the notion that adolescents who exhibit greater degrees of "identity exploration" (i.e., "the process of considering alternatives in the various domains of personal values") and role-taking skill participate in relationships (with their parents) in which there is a balance between individuality and connectedness (i.e., individuated relationships). Multiple regression analyses revealed different patterns of results for father-son, father-daughter, mother-son, mother-daughter and marital relationships as well as both positive and negative contributions of communication variables to identity exploration (Grotevant & Cooper, 1985). The specific communication variables related to identity exploration were not only different for males and females, but they were also significant for them in different family relationships. More specifically, sons scoring higher in identity exploration were more likely to be expressing direct suggestions and separateness with their fathers. Their fathers reciprocated with more expressions of mutuality and less frequent expressions of separateness (e.g., disagreement). In contrast, daughters scoring higher on identity exploration were more likely to be expressing their suggestions indirectly. Their fathers showed higher frequencies of relevant comments and separateness and lower frequencies of indirect suggestions.
In the mother-daughter relationship, identity exploration was negatively associated with expressions of mutuality from the adolescent to her mother. Higher-scoring daughters made more indirect and fewer direct suggestions, whereas mothers were more likely to express their suggestions directly than indirectly. Finally, higher-scoring daughters were more likely to express separateness toward their siblings.

To summarize, for the girls in Grotevant’s sample, communication patterns in all family relationships were associated with identity exploration, whereas for boys, only father-son interaction patterns were related to exploration scores. Grotevant & Cooper (1985) concluded that the sources of family influence on identity exploration may be more diverse for female adolescents than for males. Both genders respond favorably to a balance of individuality and connectedness, although they respond optimally to it in different forms.

The research of Grotevant et. al. lends support to the notion that progressive redefinition of close family relationships continues through the adolescent years and that parental behaviors can promote or interfere with several important aspects of adolescent maturity. Although there was less emphasis on the transactional nature of the process and the contribution made by parents in his research, Youniss’ (1981) work, which was presented earlier in this chapter, represents additional evidence for a gradual redefinition of close family relationships in adolescence. Maturity in conceptualization and behavior in close relationships probably continues well beyond the developmental period which both of these researchers studied. Erikson’s (e.g., 1968) eight-stage lifespan developmental provides strong support for
this idea of continuing development. His theory gives a "special ascendancy" to the issue of "intimacy versus isolation" in young adulthood. However, it also assumes that the achievement of intimacy with another person is an ongoing process, with antecedents and consequences in the stages before and after young adulthood. This suggests that further refinement is needed in the measurement of the developing capacity for mutuality (maturity) in relationships. A detailed discussion of issues concerning the assessment of relationship maturity in adulthood is presented at a later point in this chapter.

**Sex-Based Differences in Child-rearing**

Studies on sex-based differences in child-rearing are relevant to the present investigation because they provide an example of how differential emphases in child-rearing may have important implications for some clear differences in adult behavior patterns relevant to relationships. For example, some of the research presented below suggests that parents may model and reinforce such qualities as independence and separateness more with their male offspring and warmth and nurturance more with their female offspring. Such findings not only support the general premise of this research that individual differences in parent-child relationships (not only peer relationships) can significantly influence adult outcomes in the capacity for mutuality, but they also lend credence to the specific idea that females tend to become more relationship-oriented as adults (Gilligan, 1982).

Block (1979) summarized the results of six studies in which mothers' and fathers' descriptions of their child-rearing orientations
were compared. Her overall conclusions are consistent with the notion of sex-differentiated parental socialization behaviors and specific, consistent, sex-of-parent and sex-of-child interaction effects. For example, both mothers and fathers in several independent samples stressed achievement and competition more with their sons than their daughters. In addition, both parents encouraged their sons, more than their daughters, to control the expression of affect, to be independent, and to assume personal responsibility. Parents employed punishment more with their sons than with their daughters. In addition, fathers appeared more authoritarian than mothers in their rearing of their sons; they were more strict, firm and endorsing of physical punishment, less tolerant of aggression directed toward themselves by their sons, and less accepting of behaviors deviating from the traditional masculine stereotype.

The self-reported child-rearing emphases of parents of daughters indicated that the parent-daughter relationship, in contrast to the parent-son relationship, was characterized by greater warmth and physical closeness, greater confidence in the trustworthiness of their daughters, greater expectation by both mothers and fathers of "ladylike" behavior, greater reluctance to punish daughters, and greater encouragement of the daughter to reflect upon life. Additionally, mothers of daughters tended to be more restrictive of their daughters and to engage in closer supervision of their activities.

In several studies involving direct observation of parental behaviors, it has been shown that boys at different age levels not only receive more negative feedback, including physical punishment, from
parents but also receive more positive feedback as well (e.g., Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974; Margolin & Patterson, 1975). Block (1983) concluded from a summary of another group of studies of parent-child interactions observed in standard settings that adults, particularly fathers, act in more instrumental, task-oriented, mastery-emphasizing ways with their sons and in more expressive, less achievement-oriented, dependency-reinforcing ways with their daughters. These studies strengthen the position of Chodorow (1974), L. W. Hoffman (1977), and Gilligan (1982) that the different social contexts experienced by boys and by girls during childhood account for the development of many psychological sex differences, particularly those reflecting the greater emphasis by women on developing social relationships, in contrast to the more individualistic, mastery-emphasizing activities of men.

As the preceding discussion indicates, evidence has been accruing suggesting that parents do treat their sons and daughters differently in some areas important for subsequent development. In the present research, the dimension of "control" versus "mutuality" in child-rearing is being considered in terms of its impact on later development (i.e., adult relationship maturity). Findings about which sex experiences greater mutuality versus control in early relationships with their parents are inconclusive, probably due to conceptual, sampling, and/or measurement differences across studies. Although the data do suggest greater emphasis on interpersonal relationships in the socialization of females, it cannot be assumed that women are better prepared for mature relationships that are based on equality, mutual respect, and a clear differentiation of self and other. However, because the
socialization experiences of men and women are clearly different in areas relevant to relationship-oriented issues, data for the two genders was analyzed separately in the present study, to preclude confounding of variables when predicting relationship maturity in adulthood.

In the next section, consideration is given to the concept of "relationship maturity", beginning with a discussion of theoretical issues. Attempts at operationalizing the concept are subsequently reviewed.

**The Concept of Relationship Maturity**

In this section we will be considering briefly the literature on intimacy, prior to discussing the more recent concept of "relationship maturity" and its assessment. Intimacy has previously been defined in several different ways, suggesting that it may have a number of components. Most commonly, intimacy has been equated with depth of self-disclosure (e.g., Jourard, 1971) or with sexuality (Collins, 1974). However caring feelings, commitment and perspective-taking have also been considered as components of intimacy in the past (White, Speisman, Jackson, Bartis & Costos, 1986). The contribution of gender to an intimate adult relationship is an important issue. In the area of communication, there is a body of literature suggesting that women are more open and self-disclosing than men (e.g., Balswick, 1979). However, there is also evidence, reviewed by Cozby (1973) that any relationship between gender and self-disclosure may be quite complex. The work of Stokes, Childs & Fuehrer (1981) suggests that personality characteristics related to gender (as measured by the Bem Sex Role
Inventory) may be more powerful predictors of intimacy than gender itself. Stokes, et. al. hypothesize that "intimate self-disclosures require both the assertiveness associated the traditional masculine role and the sensitivity and expressiveness associated with the traditional feminine role".

Researchers who have examined other dimensions of intimacy have found some additional support for gender differences in the experience of intimacy. White et. al. (1986) cited two studies (i.e., Murstein & Beck, 1971; Hoffman, 1977) suggesting that men are less able to take the perspective of their mates than women. Saxon (1983) reported that men are more likely to become committed sooner and to stay committed longer than women. Finally, in studies of friendship patterns, it has been found that men's relationships with each other emphasize common tasks and shared experiences, while women's stress empathy, support, concern and confiding (e.g., Wright, 1982).

While researchers have identified components of intimacy and important gender differences in the experience of intimacy, very little previous work has been done to operationalize "maturity" in intimate relationships. There is considerable implication in the clinical literature that one or both partners in troubled relationships are functioning in "immature" ways, suggesting a need for empirical research in this area. With the benefit of support from NIMH, Kathleen White and her research team at Boston University have developed and begun validation of an empirical approach to assessing maturity in the relationships of adults with intimate partners and parents.
The interview format used by White and her colleagues was adapted from an interview originally developed by Orlofsky, Marcia, and Lesser (1973) to operationalize issues most relevant in defining Erikson's sixth developmental stage of intimacy versus isolation (e.g., mutuality, responsibility, commitment, genital maturity). Orlofsky, et. al. constructed a scoring manual for use with responses to a semi-structured interview covering extent and depth of close same and opposite sex relationships. Through the interview and coding procedures, young adults were classified into one of five "intimacy statuses": "intimate", "preintimate", "stereotyped relationship", "isolate", or "pseudointimate". In Orlofsky's system, any individual who has several close same-sex friends and who also has made a loving commitment to a heterosexual partner would be classified as intimate. From this perspective most married individuals would be considered to have "achieved" intimacy. Yet, clearly, some married, as well as unmarried, individuals engage in more "mature" forms of intimate relationships than do others. White, et. al. focused on refining Orlofsky's category of "intimate" by attempting to assess levels of maturity of close relationships.

Relationship maturity has been conceptualized as a psychological process encompassing cognition, affect and behavior (White, Speisman, Costos & Smith, unpublished manuscript, 1984). Like ego maturity (e.g., Loevinger, 1976) and moral maturity (e.g., Kohlberg, 1973), relationship maturity refers to a position on a developmental continuum. Development involves in a Wernerian sense, the movement from simple, global,
undifferentiated functioning to articulated, complex, integrated functioning (Werner, 1957).

White's basic theoretical orientation is ego developmental in that relationship development is viewed as a basic process of the ego. Although her theory shares some assumptions with Loevinger's theory of ego development (e.g., Loevinger, 1976), it was derived independently. While Loevinger emphasizes the "unitary and indissoluble ego", White and her colleagues view ego development as "including progression along two separate but interrelated pathways---individuation and attachment---which together help define relationship maturity" (1984, p. 2). Like Loevinger's theory, White's theory would be classified by Snarey, Kohlberg & Noam (1983) as a "quasi-structural" approach to ego development in that it possesses some characteristics of "structural stage models" (e.g., an emphasis on hierarchically organized and qualitatively distinct stages) along with other qualities characteristic of "functional phase theories" (e.g., attention to interpersonal functions and motives).

White and her colleagues have identified three qualitatively distinct levels of maturity in the individual's evolving experience of close relationships: "self-focused"; "role-focused"; and "individuated connected". Each of these levels contains two substages, forming a six stage description of maturity in two relationship domains of major importance: parent/adult child (i.e., filial) and intimate (e.g., marital) relationships. In general, progression to the higher stages involves an increasing ability to conceive of self and other as unique, separate individuals, to put oneself in the the other's shoes, to connect with the
other through a reciprocal, mutual bond, and to experience richer and more differentiated affect toward the other.

The three levels of relationship maturity in White's scoring system have parallels in Kohlberg's work on moral judgment (e.g., 1973). Level one, or "self-focused" scores indicate an egocentric, self-serving orientation in intimate behavior. The individual at this level (scale score 1 or 2) shows no sense of the other's equality or separateness and no concept of the other's feelings. Level two, or "role-focused", scores indicate a traditional orientation, conforming to social norms. At this intermediate level (scale scores 3 and 4) the individual has a basic understanding that the other has needs and feelings too, but descriptions lack complexity and depth. Responses rated at the conventional level tend to focus on concrete, external issues as the source of problems in a relationship or as the way to express support. They are socially acceptable responses, lacking specific examples that would demonstrate an appreciation of the other person's individuality. Level three, or "individuated-connected", scores reflect an orientation towards relationship that includes an ability to integrate conflicting needs, cope with frustrations, and value the partner for his or her unique qualities. To rate at this highest level (scale scores 5 and 6) an individual must show that a free choice is made to be close with the other person---a choice made from a position of autonomy, rather than out of need, convenience or obligation.

According to the theory, current structures of relating to close others, which arise out of past and present experience, provide a common cognitive, affective and behavioral core level of functioning in
relationships. Therefore, some consistency in functioning is expected across relationships. However, relationship maturity, like interpersonal negotiation strategies (Selman, 1981), may vary to some degree as a function of the particular other with whom the individual is relating. That is, any individual may have a more mature relationship with one person (e.g., his or her mother) than with another (e.g., his or her father). While a common underlying core is assumed to set some limits on all ego (including relationship) functioning in the individual, relationships may vary in level of maturity due to the fact that egos interact in mutually influential ways. Progress towards greater maturity in one relationship may lead to greater maturity in another relationship in which the individual might have previously been “stuck”. That is, progress toward more mature functioning with a spouse or other intimate partner may facilitate greater maturity with one’s parents. The reverse may also occur: maturity achieved with a parent may facilitate maturity with an intimate partner. (White, et. al., 1984).

Different content areas can be evaluated by means of the stage sequence outlined above. In the adult filial relationship, three qualitative areas can be evaluated: orientation(perspective-taking); communication; and caring/concern. In assessing the maturity of intimate relationships, the additional dimensions of sexuality and commitment have been considered along with the above three. The research on filial relationships coming out of the Boston University Family Relationships project thus far has focused almost exclusively on the first dimension of orientation, while all five dimensions have been considered in the intimacy (i.e., spousal) research. The present research
adopted a similar procedure. Descriptions of the scoring system as applied to each of the scales used to assess maturity in the two relevant relationship domains (i.e., orientation in the parental domain; orientation, caring/concern, sexuality, commitment and communication in the spousal domain) are presented in conjunction with representative quotes for each stage in Appendix A and Appendix B.

There is one final point to be made in this section. It is important to note that the dimensions of relationship maturity have been viewed as separate, but interrelated. That is, according to White, et. al., it is theoretically possible for an individual to have achieved greater maturity in one dimension than another. For example, a person may demonstrate a fully articulated (Stage 4) role-focused orientation to a particular other person, but be only newly role-focused (Stage 3) in the communicative aspects of the relationship with that particular other.

**Validation Studies**

To provide construct validation for the *Family Relationships Interview* (FRI) White, Speisman & Costos (1983) selected a cross-sectional sample of 156 young adults, both men and women, from three different age groups (i.e., 22, 24, and 26) and three marital status groups (i.e., single, married without children, and married with children in the two older age groups). Subjects were interviewed extensively in a university laboratory by a researcher of the same gender, as well as completing a packet of additional measures at home. An interesting finding which emerged is a pattern of stage development in adult filial relationships which varies rather dramatically by gender across age and
marital status categories. That is, 26 year-old married women, unlike
22 year-old women (single or married) were able to assume their
mothers' perspective, make inferences about the psychological bases of
their mothers' behavior, and describe their mothers as acknowledging
their (the daughters') separateness and maturity. In contrast, the 26
year-old men, whether single or married, did not differ from 22 or 24
year-old men, single or married. The emphasis for males was on
individuation and a view of parents as parents, rather than as unique
individuals. These findings suggest that the development of
relationships with parents may follow a different route for the two
sexes, at least during the 20's age period (White, Speisman & Costos,
1983).

A preliminary attempt at construct validation for the Intimate
Relationships Interview (White, et al. 1986) involved a subsample of
31 couples in their mid-to-late twenties. As already stated, the
interview format was adapted from an interview originally developed by
Orlofsky, Marcia, and Lesser(1973). White et al. (1986) found no
significant differences between husbands and wives on any of the
Intimate Relationship Interview scales. In a series of studies, patterns
of correlation among various measures of current marital satisfaction
(i.e., Spanier Dyadic Adjustment Scales) and gender role (i.e., scales
measuring the gender-related personality orientations of "agency"(i.e., a
traditionally "masculine" orientation of self-assertion, repression, and
independence) versus "communion" (i.e., a traditionally feminine
orientation of contact, openness and union) originally proposed by Bakan,
1966 and measured by the Bem Sex Role Inventory) were examined. The
patterns of correlation were very different depending on gender. One interesting finding is that intimacy maturity was associated with marital adjustment within the husband sample but not the sample of wives. Furthermore, multiple regression analyses indicated that of the variables used, the only significant predictor of husbands’ marital adjustment, wives’ marital adjustment, and couples’ marital adjustment was the husband’s level of intimacy maturity.

The findings concerning the association between gender role and intimacy maturity are directly relevant to the present research which focuses on the relationship between early socialization experiences and relationship maturity in adulthood. Gender roles are clearly associated with differing patterns of socialization for males and females. White, et al. (1986) found that for both husbands and wives, degree of communion has a moderate positive relationship with maturity on several dimensions of intimacy. However, while degree of communion in husbands had a marginal positive association with some aspects of their wives’ intimacy maturity, degree of communion in wives was negatively associated with their husbands’ maturity on all intimacy dimensions. In other words, when wives are highly “communal” (i.e., other-oriented, relationship-valuing, interpersonally responsive, traditionally “feminine”) their spouses tend to be immature on major dimensions of intimacy. In husbands, being communal (i.e., more androgynous), as opposed to exclusively “agentic” (i.e., individualistic, autonomy-seeking, traditionally “masculine”) has at least a small positive association with spouse’s maturity in several intimacy dimensions. Because of the correlational nature of the data, no conclusions can be drawn about the
causal connections between gender role (i.e., agency versus communion) and intimacy maturity.

Additional efforts at demonstrating the validity of the relationship maturity variables involved examining the association between the relationship maturity variables and more traditional approaches to individual psychological development. One such approach is Loevinger's (1976) measurement of ego development. The conceptual overlap between some of Loevinger's sketchy notions of "interpersonal style" characterizing various levels of ego development and White's more highly developed construct of relationship maturity led to a prediction of a significant positive association between the two measures. Using data from 31 couples, it was found that relationship maturity was significantly correlated with ego development in women but not in men.

White, et. al. (1984) interpreted this finding making reference to a Piagetian position regarding cognitive development, suggesting that men and women apply their "sense-making frameworks" differently, depending on the salience of the issues under consideration. Ego development may be associated with relationship development in women because women are more oriented to issues of relationships. In men, ego development may be closely associated with other developmental issues of greater concern. In support of this notion, White et. al. (1984) have additional data indicating that in men ego development is correlated with identity development.

In another study designed to explore the associations among intimacy maturity, marital adjustment, and ego development in a sample of married couples in their mid-to-late twenties White, Bartis, Sklover,
Speisman & Costos (1985) analyzed data collected longitudinally over a 2-3 year period. All three measures were completed on two separate occasions, at least a year apart. All measures showed stability over time. Results revealed that patterns of association among the variables varied considerably by gender. For the men, intimacy maturity and marital adjustment were correlated at Times 1 and 2 but none of the cross-lagged correlations was significant. In the women, intimacy maturity and ego development were correlated at Times 1 and 2; and nearly all the cross-lagged correlations were also significant.

Bartis, White, Speisman & Costos (1985) examined the relationship between congruence in intimacy maturity and marital adjustment. They calculated congruence in intimacy maturity for the sample of 31 couples by subtracting the wife's score from her husband's score on each of the five intimacy dimensions. Scores were considered congruent when they were within one scale point of each other. On the dimensions of orientation, communication and commitment, men who were congruent with their wives scored significantly higher on dyadic adjustment than did incongruent husbands. In the sample of wives, however, it was only on the dimension of communication that congruence/incongruence was associated with dyadic adjustment. Both wives and husbands who were congruent with their partners in the communication dimension were significantly higher than incongruent wives in marital adjustment. Other analyses demonstrated that overall, husbands reported greatest adjustment when they were congruent with their wives in intimacy maturity whereas wives' adjustment was higher
when husbands were most mature, regardless of whether or not the
wives' maturity was congruent with their husbands.

The preceding review of research studies demonstrates a serious
effort at validating a method of assessing relationship maturity. This
method was chosen for use in the present research as a means of
evaluating individuals' capacity for mutuality in relationships. As
previously stated, the present research shares the assumption that
development in this area is a lifelong process continuing well beyond
adolescence and that adults vary in their level of relationship maturity.
Correlational research exploring the association between measures of
individual development (i.e., ego development), marital adjustment,
gender role, and relationship maturity has been presented. Patterns of
correlation among the variables have been shown to differ significantly
as a function of gender. The findings have important implications for the
present research which focuses on the association between early
socialization experiences and relationship maturity in young adulthood.

In the section that follows, the purpose of the present research
will be reviewed. The introductory chapter then concludes with a list of
the specific hypotheses to be tested.

**Statement of Purpose**

The present research will focus on the role of the parent-child
relationship in fostering or impeding the emergence of mutuality in
relationships. Previous research has stressed the crucial contribution of
peer relations in this area of development and has generally
dehphasized the contribution made by parents. However, theoretical
support has been presented for the position that a broader view of the child's social environment should be taken, one which considers relationships more generically and assumes that the provision of role-taking opportunities in multiple contexts is a critical issue. The implication is that parent-child relations can indeed have an impact and that individual differences in interactional style may be predictive of differences in the capacity for mutuality in later relationships.

In the present research, "mutuality-oriented" child-rearing was defined in a way that combines Kohlberg's notion of providing role-taking opportunities (e.g., confidence-sharing, sharing in family decisions, awarding responsibility to the child) with an added emphasis on the affective component of the relationship (e.g., conveying a feeling of respect and a valuing of the child's individuality) which was emphasized by Grotevant et. al. (1983; 1985). "Control-oriented" child-rearing was defined in terms of control and domination of the child, a lack of respect of the child's autonomous status, and a generally unequal relationship between parent and child. Adult subjects received a score along each of these dimensions, based on responses to a retrospective self-report child-rearing inventory. Subjects also provided information via semi-structured interviews about their current relationship with both their mother and father and their current most intimate relationship with spouse. Relationship maturity stage scores were assigned to interview data. The calculation of correlations among retrospective child-rearing scores on the two scales (i.e., mutuality-oriented and control-oriented) and maturity in adult relationships in the two domains (i.e., filial and spousal) was expected to yield important information.
about perceptions of childhood experiences in mature as compared to immature adults. A review of literature suggested that the socialization experiences of men and women are sufficiently different in areas relevant to relationship-oriented issues to warrant a separate analysis of data for the two genders.
Hypotheses

The first two hypotheses focused on the role of child-rearing practices in the development of the capacity for maturity in one's relationships with one's mother and father in young adulthood. There were two related predictions:

1) First, it was expected that scores on the "mutuality-oriented" child-rearing scale (as measured by scores on a scale derived from the Block Child-rearing Practices Report) would be positively associated with maturity in the current relationship with one's parents in young adulthood (as measured by scores derived from White's Family Relations Interview).

2) Second, it was predicted that scores on the "control-oriented" child-rearing scale would be either negatively related or unrelated to maturity in relationships with one's parents in young adulthood.

The third and fourth hypotheses paralleled the first two, but focused on the role of child-rearing practices in the development of the capacity for maturity in one's relationship with an intimate other (i.e., spouse) in young adulthood.

3) It was expected that scores on the mutuality-oriented child-rearing scale referred to in the first hypothesis would be positively correlated with intimacy maturity (as measured by scores derived from White's adaptation of Orlofsky's 1973 Intimacy Interview).
4) It was predicted that scores on the control-oriented child-rearing scale would be **negatively** associated with intimacy maturity with spouse in young adulthood.

5) The fifth hypothesis was a more exploratory one, in that the information derived from the present data analysis can at best “suggest” some tentative answers and directions for future research. This hypothesis concerned a developmental process alluded to by Youniss (1981) in his research focusing on the period of early adolescence. Youniss suggested that progress towards mutuality (i.e., maturity), appearing initially in the domain of peer relationships, could trigger the beginning of a transformation in relationships with parents. Here, it was predicted that this process may continue beyond adolescence and into adulthood. Specifically, those individuals who had achieved a more mature relationship with an intimate peer in adulthood (i.e., a spouse) were expected to have more fully resolved their parental relationships into more peer-like, mutual relationships than those who had not achieved a mature relationship with their spouse. This hypothesis was tested in two steps:

5a) The first prediction was that there would be no instances of individuals who scored higher in the level of maturity characterizing their current relationships with their parents than in their spousal relationship. A confirmation of this first part of the hypothesis would suggest that if a transfer of progress toward mutuality takes place in young adulthood, it typically involves more of a transfer from the spousal domain to the parental domain, and not in the reverse direction. It should be noted that the data would only suggest this process is taking
place. Spousal and parental data were collected contemporaneously, ruling out the possibility of more conclusive support for a cause-effect relationship between the variables.

If this first part of the hypothesis was confirmed, it was predicted that:

5c) Intimacy maturity with a spouse might be a useful predictor of maturity in relationships with one's parents in young adulthood.

6) The sixth hypothesis involved the interaction between intimacy maturity with a spouse and child-rearing in relation to maturity in the adult filial relationship. It consisted of two parts:

6a) First, it was expected that the level of maturity in the adult filial relationship would be higher in those subjects who had experienced very egalitarian, mutuality-oriented child-rearing and also managed to achieve a relatively mature intimate relationship with a spouse; lower in those who were characterized by only one of those experiences; and even lower for those who had experienced neither.

6b) Second, it was expected that the level of maturity in the adult filial relationship would be lower in those subjects who had experienced child-rearing which was very focused on discipline and control and who also had an immature relationship with a spouse; somewhat higher in those who were characterized by only one of those experiences; and even higher in those who had experienced neither.
CHAPTER II

METHOD

Subjects

Subjects were drawn from a larger sample of more than 360 young adults who participated in a combined cross-sectional/longitudinal investigation of young adult development and relationships conducted with the support of a three-year NIMH grant at Boston University. A subsample of 42 males and 42 females, all of whom were married, was selected. The sample was stratified on the basis of age (22, 24 and 26 years old). All of the subjects were living in separate dwellings from their parents. All tended to have been married 3-4 years. Seventeen subjects (20 percent) had at least one child. All information reported in this research was gathered in the first year of the larger study.

Although all subjects were white and the sample was largely middle class, some diversity was achieved in a number of demographic areas. Eleven subjects (13 percent) had completed their education with a high school or technical school diploma, while 30 subjects (35 percent) had completed some graduate work. A majority of subjects (55 subjects, or 65 percent) had completed college with a B.A. or B.S. degree, with or without some graduate education.

Of the 80 subjects whose work status was known, two subjects (three percent) were classified as major professionals. Thirty-five
(44 percent) were lesser professionals, managers, administrators, or proprietors of small businesses. Fourteen subjects (18 percent) were clerical workers, sales personnel, or technicians. Almost eleven percent of the subjects were involved in skilled, semiskilled, or unskilled labor; 13 subjects (four percent) were unemployed. Seven subjects (nine percent) of the subjects were students. Finally, of the female subjects, seven (17 percent) defined themselves as homemakers.

Most subjects came from intact homes. Fifty-eight sets of parents (70 percent) were still married and living together. Nine subjects (11 percent) had parents who were divorced or separated. Fifteen subjects (18 percent) had lost one parent. Four percent of the subjects had lost their mothers and five percent had lost their fathers six or more years ago.

Finally, most parents had provided their children with some sort of religious upbringing. Thirty-one subjects (37 percent) had been reared in Catholic homes, 25 subjects (30 percent) had been reared in Protestant homes, 20 subjects (24 percent) had been brought up in Jewish homes, and seven (8 percent) had been brought up in homes that practiced some other religion or that were agnostic or atheistic.

**Procedures and Measures**

Procedures for this study involved a secondary analysis of data collected by White and her associates in their study of young adults (e.g., White, Speisman & Costos, 1983). Recorded on audio tape and available for transcribing and scoring were interviews in which subjects discussed their current relationships with their parents (White's Family
Relationships Interview—FRI) and their most intimate relationships (adaptation of Orlofsky Intimacy Interview—Orlofsky, Marcia & Lesser, 1973). It is these interviews that the current investigator included for analysis in the present study.

In addition to the taped interview data, a paper and pencil measure, the Block Child-rearing Practices Report (CRPR), completed at home by subjects, was used in the current analysis.

White's Family Relationships Interview (FRI): The FRI is a semi-structured interview covering four content areas: (a) current interactions (e.g., "What is your mother's view of you currently? How is that view reflected in her behavior toward you?") (b) resolution of differences of opinions (e.g., "When differences of opinion occur, how do you feel about your mother and her ideas?") (c) advice-giving (e.g., "How do you respond to getting advice from your mother? Why?") and (c) care-taking (e.g., "Are there some ways that you and your mother show each other you care that are quite different from the way you and your father show each other? Why?"). In each area, as illustrated, subjects are asked open-ended questions about their current relationships with their parents, their parents' view of them, and the specific behaviors, feelings and cognitions that characterize the interaction. In the present study, the "Current Interactions" section of the FRI interview (the only part of the interview analyzed thus far in the validation studies reported in Chapter 1) was included for analysis. The reader is referred to Appendix C for a complete list of questions included in that portion of the interview.
The interview data were scored separately for the developmental stage of the relationship with the mother and the developmental stage of the relationship with the father. The stage scoring system ranges from an immature self-focus and preoccupation with individuation at Stage 1 to an individuated-connected focus (i.e., a totally mutual, peer-like relationship) at Stage 6. For example, on the orientation scale, subjects scoring at the self-focused level typically are unable to see the world from their parent's view. They have virtually no perspective on their parents as people or parents. They are often caught up with separation issues and with getting their own needs met. Subjects at the role-focused level in orientation show a beginning ability to understand their parent's point of view. Typically their view of their parents is tied to stereotyped notions of duty, respect and meeting obligations. Subjects rated at the individuated-connected level in orientation describe their parents as complex people (not just parents). Their descriptions reflect an in-depth psychological perspective, an appreciation of their parent's uniqueness, and a sense of forgiveness. Interactions with parents are peer-like at this highest level.

With the inclusion of transitional stages, the stage scoring system converts to a scale scoring system with a range of 1 to 11 (i.e., 1=Stage 1, 2=Stage 1-2, 3=Stage 2, 4=Stage 2-3, etc.). A summary of the scoring manual with defining characteristics of each stage and illustrative quotes appears in Appendix A.

In the present study, the main investigator and two other trained scorers rated independently 64% (N=54) of the total number of protocols.
At least two scorers rated independently the remaining 36% (N=30). In their independent scoring, each scorer first determined the level of the response and then the stage (i.e., lower or higher) within the level. Following the independent work, scorers got together on a regular basis to discuss their scores and arrive at mutually agreed upon "resolved scores" for each subject. It is these resolved scores which were used in subsequent analyses of the data.

A random sample of 30 FRI interviews (i.e., 15 males; 15 females) was selected from the 64% that were ultimately rated by three scorers to be included in a reliability test. Reliability coefficients (Pearson r) were computed in two ways: (a) the scores of each independent scorer were correlated with those of each of the other two scorers, and (b) the scores of each independent scorer were correlated with the resolved scores. The results are summarized below.

Agreement between each pair of scorers on FRI (mother) before discussion ranged from r = .59 to r = .67 (average r = .63). Agreement between each scorer’s original score and the final compromise score on FRI (mother) ranged from r = .76 to r = .86 (average r = .81).

Agreement between each pair of scorers on FRI (father) before discussion ranged from r = .56 to r = .68 (average r = .60). Agreement between each scorer’s original score and the final compromise score on FRI (father) ranged from r = .65 to r = .81 (average r = .75).

Interrater reliability for FRI was also tested by calculating the percentage of agreement between the scores of each judge when paired with the two other judges and the percentage of agreement between each
judge and the final compromise score. A summary of this additional reliability test is presented in Table 1 in Appendix D.

**White's Intimacy Interview:** This too is a semi-structured interview which is an adaptation of the one used by Orlofsky, Marcia & Lesser (1973) to assess "most intimate relationships" with individuals of the same and opposite gender. Only those questions pertaining to the most intimate opposite sex relationship were included for analysis in the present study. The reader is referred to Appendix E for relevant questions.

The scoring system used here was developed by White and her colleagues using concepts derived from Orlofsky and others. Five components of intimacy are scored: (a) orientation to the relationship, focusing especially on the ability to take the other's perspective (e.g., "What is your husband's view of you"?), (b) caring and concern (e.g., "In what ways do you show your wife you care about her?") (c) communication (e.g., "What kinds of things do the two of you usually talk about together?") (d) sexuality (e.g., "Regarding the sexual side of the relationship, are you satisfied with the way things are?") and (e) commitment (e.g., "Do you ever think about alternatives to your present relationship?")

As in the case of the FRI, the stage scoring system for each of the content categories ranges from a pervasive preoccupation with the self at Stage 1 to an investment in a fully mutual relationship at Stage 6. For example, on the communication scale, subjects scoring at the self-focused level typically place a low value on communicating in the relationship and usually focus exclusively on concrete issues and
matters external to the relationship. Sometimes these subjects use communication skills to control or manipulate the other. Subjects at the role-focused level in communication place a value on communication in relationships. Typically they include some sharing of feelings with their partners. Sometimes their sincere efforts at communicating become blocked and end in fighting or withdrawal. Subjects rated at the individuated-connected level in communication express a very high value on communicating in their relationships. Their communication style includes concrete and external topics as well as a great deal of affective and relationship-oriented discussion. There is usually evidence of a commitment to making time to talk, despite busy schedules and other obstacles, as well as an ability to resolve conflicts meaningfully.

With the inclusion of transitional stages, the stage scoring system converts to a scale scoring system with a range of 1 to 11 (i.e., 1=Stage 1, 2=Stage 1-2, 3=Stage 2, 4=Stage 2-3, etc.). A summary of the scoring manual with defining characteristics of each stage and illustrative quotes for the five content areas appears in Appendix B.

Also as in the case of the FRI, the main investigator and two other trained scorers rated independently a portion of the total number of protocols (N=84), in this case, 80% (N=67). At least two scorers rated independently the remaining 20% (N=17). In their independent scoring, each scorer first determined the level of the response and then the stage (i.e., lower or higher) within the level. Following the independent work, scorers met on a regular basis to discuss their scores and arrive at mutually agreed upon "resolved scores" for each subject. It is these resolved scores which were used in subsequent analyses of the data.
A random sample of 30 intimacy interviews (i.e., 15 males; 15 females) was selected from the 80% that were ultimately rated by three scorers to be included in a reliability test. Reliability coefficients (Pearson $r$) were computed in two ways: (a) the scores of each independent scorer were correlated with those of each of the other two scorers, and (b) the scores of each independent scorer were correlated with the resolved scores. The results are described below.

Agreement between each pair of scorers on Orientation before discussion ranged from $r=.53$ to $r=.77$ (average $r=.67$). Agreement between each scorer's original score and the final compromise score on Orientation ranged from $r=.80$ to $r=.87$ (average $r=.83$).

Agreement between each pair of scorers on Caring before discussion ranged from $r=.75$ to $r=.82$ (average $r=.79$). Agreement between each scorer's original score and the final compromise score on Caring and concern ranged from $r=.85$ to $r=.94$ (average $r=.90$).

Agreement between each pair of scorers on Sexuality before discussion ranged from $r=.56$ to $r=.73$ (average $r=.62$). Agreement between each scorer's original score and the final compromise score on Sexuality ranged from $r=.76$ to $r=.91$ (average $r=.83$).

Agreement between each pair of scorers on Commitment before discussion ranged from $r=.74$ to $r=.76$ (average $r=.75$). Agreement between each scorer's original score and the final compromise score on commitment ranged from $r=.83$ to $r=.89$ (average $r=.86$).

Agreement between each pair of scorers on Communication before discussion ranged from $r=.75$ to $r=.80$ (average $r=.77$). Agreement
between each scorer's original score and the final compromise score on Communication ranged from $r=0.88$ to $r=0.91$ (average $r=0.90$).

Interrater reliability for the five intimacy scales was also tested by calculating the percentage of agreement between the scores of each judge when paired with the two other judges and the percentage of agreement between each judge and the final compromise score. A summary of this additional reliability test is presented in Table 2 in Appendix F.

The Block Child-rearing Practices Report (CRPR): The CRPR consists of 91 statements that describe parental socialization behaviors. These items were derived by Block (1966) from three sources: from empirical observations of mother-child interactions in various structured experimental settings, from a review of the socialization literature, and from discussions with European colleagues. Separate forms were developed so that the inventory can be administered either to the parent to describe the parent's child-rearing behavior or to the child to acquire their view of the parent's child-rearing. In the third person format which was used in the current study, the respondent was asked to rate on a seven-point scale the extent to which the item describes behavior that was or was not characteristic of the parent when the respondent was a child (e.g., My mother/father gave me comfort and understanding when I was scared or upset). Participants completed the inventory twice: once so as to describe the mother and a second time so as to describe the father. For ease of administration, 11 items were selected and dropped from the inventory reducing its length to 80
statements. A copy of the shortened version of the CRPR for rating one's mother appears in Appendix G. The item content is the same for the form used for rating one's father.

On two test-retest studies, Block demonstrated that the reliability of the CRPR was satisfactory. In one study of college students who were tested twice with an eight-month interval between tests, the average correlation across time was .71. In a second study of Peace Corps volunteers who were tested at the beginning and the end of their three-year tour of duty, the mean correlations were .64 for mother and .65 for father.

Block suggested that a variety of scoring strategies for the CRPR could be used depending on the questions being addressed. Among these strategies are criterion Q sorts and scale construction. In the present study, 16 "experts" (i.e., a group composed of mental health professionals, graduate students, and professors in Psychology who had been familiarized with the concepts of "mutuality-oriented" child-rearing and "control-oriented" child-rearing) were asked to identify in the CRPR two sets of statements: those items they considered as characterizing the control and discipline-oriented parent; and those statements they thought were representative of egalitarian, mutuality-oriented child-rearing. The remaining majority of items were to be considered not particularly salient in differentiating the two interactional styles.

In order to ensure scale reliability (i.e., the internal consistency) of the "control-oriented" and "mutuality-oriented" scales, data from the remaining portion of the NIMH sample not comprising the present study's sample was analyzed (n=266). Item-total correlations were computed
for each of the control-oriented and mutuality-oriented scale items selected by at least three of the 16 experts. There were 17 mutuality-oriented items (e.g., My mother/father respected my opinions and encouraged me to express them) and 21 control-oriented items (e.g., My mother/father did not allow me to question her/his decisions) chosen on that basis. Computations were done separately for each parent, yielding four sets of scores. Alpha coefficients for all four were computed using a target value of .70 or higher.

To increase reliability, three items with the lowest item-total correlations were deleted from the mutuality-oriented scale leaving a total of 14 items on that scale. The same items were ultimately used to rate mother's mutuality-oriented child-rearing (M-MUT) and father's mutuality-oriented child-rearing (F-MUT).

To increase the internal consistency of the control-oriented scale, 11 of the original 21 items with the lowest item-total correlations were deleted from the control-oriented scale leaving a total of 10 items on that scale. As in the case of the mutuality scales, the same items were selected to rate the control-oriented child-rearing of both mother and father (M-CONTROL and F-CONTROL). Results of the reliability analysis are summarized in Table 3.

It should be noted that in three out of four cases the alpha coefficients which were computed for the present sample were not quite as strong as those computed for the much larger scale construction sample (N=266). Nevertheless, these reliability ratings were considered adequate to proceed with the 10-item and 14-item scales as
### Table 3

**Results of Reliability Tests for Mutuality-oriented and Control-oriented Child-rearing Scales For Mothers and Fathers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Sample used (n)</th>
<th>Alpha coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M-MUTUAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14-item scale)</td>
<td>348 (includes current sample)</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>266 (excludes current sample)</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84 (current sample)</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F-MUTUAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14-item scale)</td>
<td>348 (includes current sample)</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>266 (excludes current sample)</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84 (current sample)</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M-CONTROL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10-item scale)</td>
<td>348 (includes current sample)</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>266 (excludes current sample)</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84 (current sample)</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F-CONTROL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10-item scale)</td>
<td>348 (includes current sample)</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>266 (excludes current sample)</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84 (current sample)</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
constructed. For a list of the items included in each scale, see Appendix H.

**Correlations**

In order to test the specific hypotheses listed in Chapter 1, a 4 X 8 correlation matrix was examined. The four child-rearing variables and eight adult relationship variables incorporated in that analysis were the following:

**Child-rearing Variables**
- Mutuality-oriented child-rearing (degree perceived in mother)
- Mutuality-oriented child-rearing (degree perceived in father)
- Control-oriented child-rearing (degree perceived in mother)
- Control-oriented child-rearing (degree perceived in father)

**Adult Relationship Variables**
- FRI-Mother (perspective on current interactions with mother)
- FRI-Father (perspective on current interactions with father)
- Orientation (perspective on relationship with spouse)
- Caring/concern (re: spouse)
- Sexuality (re: spouse)
- Commitment (re: spouse)
- Communication (re: spouse)
- Global Intimacy with spouse (i.e., the mean of the above five)

After determining on the basis of the correlation analysis which of the four child-rearing variables were most strongly associated with the various adult relationship variables, decisions about how to proceed with a multiple regression analysis were made. Entered into regression equations were the independent variables (i.e., child-rearing variables) most likely to have the greatest predictive power. All analyses were
done three times: once for the sample as a whole; a second time for female subjects; and a third time for male subjects.

**Analyses of Variance**

Finally, in order to further test the hypotheses, a series of 2X2 ANOVA analyses were conducted. The levels of the categorical independent variables were created using a median split procedure which divided subjects into "high" and "low" groups. In the first set, the two independent variables were: a) a global measure of intimacy maturity with spouse (i.e., the average of the five dimensions) and b) a measure of mutuality-oriented child-rearing (i.e., first the score for mother, then the score for father).

In the second series of 2X2 ANOVA analyses, the two independent variables were: a) a global measure of intimacy maturity with spouse (i.e., the average of the five dimensions) and b) a measure of control-oriented child-rearing (i.e., first the score for mother, then the score for father). The dependent variable for both series of analyses was a measure of adult filial maturity (i.e., FRI (mother) or FRI (father). Data for males and females was examined separately as well as together, here as elsewhere.
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Various analyses of the experimental data were conducted. For each of the 84 subjects, twelve scores were obtained wherever possible: Two FRI scores (one for each parent); five intimacy scores (for each of the dimensions of orientation, caring/concern, sexuality, commitment, and communication); one global intimacy score (averaging the scores for the five separate dimensions of intimacy); two mutuality-oriented child-rearing scores (one for each parent); and two control-oriented scores (one for each parent). These scores were derived from three sources: coding of FRI and Intimacy interview data; and scales constructed from selected items on a written questionnaire (Block's CRPR) asking subjects to describe their retrospective impressions of their own child-rearing experiences.

Characteristics of the Measures

Family Relationships Interview (FRI): Each subject was assigned two FRI scores: one characterizing the maturity of the description of current interactions with his/her mother (FRIM); a second indexing the maturity of the current relationship with his/her father (FRIF). This continuous variable with a potential range of 1 to 11 was used in the major analyses which follow. Table 4 and Table 5...
### Table 4

**Distribution of FRIM Scores by Stage and Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>FRIM Score</th>
<th>Count (n = 83)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELF-FOCUSED (27%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROLE-FOCUSED (72%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDIVIDUATED - CONNECTED (1%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>FRIF Score</td>
<td>Count (N=72)</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5**

Distribution of FRIF Scores by Stage and Level
present the frequency of FRIM and FRIF scores and their corresponding stage and level scores.

With respect to FRIM levels, of the total sample \( (n=83) \) for which FRIM scores could be obtained, 27\% \( (n = 22) \) scored at the self-focused level, 72\% \( (n = 60) \) at the role-focused or antecedent transitional level, and 1\% \( (n = 1) \) at the individuated-connected developmental level. The mean FRIM score for the entire sample was 4.1 (SD = 1.27). For males, the mean was 4.1 (SD=1.23); for females, 4.2 (SD=1.32). These scores indicate that on the average, subjects scored at a transitional point (marking the very beginning of the role-focused level) in their relationships with their mothers, regardless of gender.

With respect to FRIF levels, of the total sample \( (n = 72) \) for which FRIF scores could be obtained, 32\% \( (n = 23) \) scored at the self-focused level, 67\% \( (n = 48) \) at the role-focused or antecedent transitional level, and 1\% \( (n = 1) \) at the individuated-connected developmental level. The mean FRIF score for the entire sample was 3.9 (SD = 1.27). For males, the mean was 4.1 (SD=1.21); for females, 3.7 (SD=1.41). These scores indicate that on the average, subjects scored at a transitional point (marking the very end of the self-focused level) in their relationships with their fathers, regardless of gender.

For information on interrater reliability, the reader is referred to the Method section. For a distribution of FRIM scores for the youngest subjects (i.e., 22 year-olds, \( n = 18 \)) and the oldest subjects (i.e., 26 year-olds, \( n = 38 \)) the reader is referred to Table 6 in Appendix I. For a distribution of FRIF scores for the youngest
subjects (i.e., 22 year-olds, n = 16) and the oldest subjects (i.e., 26 year-olds, n = 33) the reader is referred to Table 7 in Appendix J.

**Intimacy Interview**: Each subject was assigned five intimacy scores: one for each of the dimensions of orientation, caring/concern, sexuality, commitment and communication. Table 8 in Appendix K presents for males and females separately, the intercorrelations among all the intimacy scales as well as each scale's correlation with a global intimacy score (i.e., the arithmetic average of the five separate scale scores). Despite the broad scope and richness of White's conception of intimacy, the separate scales were found to be highly correlated, providing additional evidence supporting White's notion (White, Speisman, Jackson, Bartis & Costos, 1986) of "a global form of relatedness underlying such potentially diverse dimensions as sexuality, communication and concern".

As previously mentioned, a global intimacy score was derived for each subject by calculating the mean of the scores on the five intimacy components. This continuous variable with a potential range of 1 to 11 was used in the major analyses which follow. Table 9 presents a frequency distribution of Global Intimacy scores and their corresponding stage and level scores.

With respect to global intimacy levels, of the total sample (n = 84) of men and women, 13% (n = 11) scored at the self-focused level, 81% (n = 68) at the role-focused or antecedent transitional level, and 6% (n = 1) at the individuated-connected developmental level. The mean global intimacy score for the entire sample was 5.2 (SD = 1.53). For males, the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Intimacy Score</th>
<th>Count (n = 84)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELF-FOCUSED (13%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROLE-FOCUSED (81%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDIVIDUATED - CONNECTED (6%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
mean was 5.0 (SD=1.48); for females, 5.3 (SD=1.57). These scores indicate that on the average, subjects scored at the role-focused level in their intimacy maturity with spouses, regardless of gender.

For information on interrater reliability, the reader is referred to the Method section. For a distribution of global intimacy scores for the youngest subjects (i.e., 22 year-olds, n = 18) and the oldest subjects (i.e., 26 year-olds, n = 39) the reader is referred to Table 10 in Appendix L.

**Block Child-rearing Practices Report:** The scoring strategy used here aimed at characterizing each parent's child-rearing practices (with regard to the dimensions of mutuality and control) as reported retrospectively by the subject. Scores for each parent on Mutuality (14 items) and Control (10 items) were computed by summing ratings (from 1 to 7) for each of the relevant items. The closer to the maximum value of 98 the mutuality score was, the more the parent's orientation to child-rearing was perceived by the subject as mutuality-oriented. The closer to the maximum value of 70 the control score was, the more the parent's orientation to child-rearing was perceived by the subject as control-oriented.

In the total sample (n = 84), mean mutuality scores were 68 (SD = 10.55) for mothers and 67 (SD = 11.17) for fathers. Mean control score were 36 (SD = 8.63) for mothers and 38 (SD = 9.35) for fathers. The reader is referred to Table 11 for a summary of these mean values, as well as those which were calculated for males and females separately.
### Table 11

**Mean Mutuality and Control Scores for Mothers and Fathers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mutuality (14 Items)</th>
<th>Control (10 Items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mothers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire sample</td>
<td>M = 68 (SD = 10.55) M = 36 (SD = 8.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>M = 66 (SD = 11.13) M = 36 (SD = 8.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>M = 70 (SD = 9.67)  M = 35 (SD = 9.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fathers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire sample</td>
<td>M = 67 (SD = 11.17) M = 38 (SD = 9.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>M = 66 (SD = 10.82) M = 38 (SD = 7.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>M = 68 (SD = 11.63) M = 38 (SD = 10.72)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With regard to internal consistency, the respective alpha coefficients for mothers and fathers was .77 and .92 for the mutuality scale (14-items) and .69 and .85 for the control scale (10-items). Pearson product moment correlation coefficients indicated that, as expected, the child-rearing mutuality and control scales were significantly negatively correlated for reported maternal practices ($r = -.56$), as well as for reported paternal practices ($r = -.49$).

**Tests of the Hypotheses**

**The relationship between mutuality-oriented child-rearing and level of maturity in the current relationship with one's parents in young adulthood**

The first hypothesis—that scores on the mutuality-oriented child-rearing scale for both mothers and fathers would be positively associated with the level of maturity in the filial relationships in young adulthood—was tested by computing Pearson-product moment correlation coefficients among the variables in the entire sample as well as in the males and females separately. Correlations between mother's and father's mutuality-oriented child-rearing (M-MUT and F-MUT) and the level of maturity of the adult relationship with the same and the other parent (FRIM and FRIF) are reported in Table 12.

The most notable finding reported in Table 12 is that father's mutuality-oriented child-rearing was correlated ($r = +.35$, $p < .002$) with the maturity of the filial relationship with the father in young adulthood. A closer look at the findings reveals that the relationship between these variables was significant for females ($r = +.45$, $p < .05$), but only
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M-MUTUALITY &amp; FRIM</th>
<th>F-MUTUALITY &amp; FRIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entire Sample</strong></td>
<td>$r = +.11$ (n = 82)</td>
<td>$r = +.35$, $p &lt; .002$ (n = 70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td>$r = +.14$ (n = 41)</td>
<td>$r = +.45$, $p &lt; .005$ (n = 34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td>$r = +.07$ (n = 41)</td>
<td>$r = +.26$, $p &lt; .06$ (n = 36)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M-MUTUALITY &amp; FRIF</th>
<th>F-MUTUALITY &amp; FRIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entire Sample</strong></td>
<td>$r = +.04$ (n = 71)</td>
<td>$r = +.17$ (n = 79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td>$r = -.04$ (n = 34)</td>
<td>$r = +.24$, $p &lt; .07$ (n = 39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td>$r = +.19$ (n = 37)</td>
<td>$r = +.08$ (n = 40)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12
marginally significant for males ($r = +.26, p < .06$). The association between father's mutuality-oriented child-rearing and the maturity of the filial relationship with the mother in young adulthood was marginally significant in females ($r = +.24, p < .07$). The degree of mother's mutuality-oriented child-rearing was not found to be significantly related to the maturity of the relationship subjects had with mother in young adulthood. Therefore it appears that mutuality-oriented child-rearing is associated with adult outcomes in filial relationships when it comes from fathers, particularly in the case of females.

A regression analysis indicated that mother's mutuality-oriented child-rearing score was the third best predictor of FRIM in females. It significantly increased the predictive power of the two better predictors, mother's control-oriented child-rearing and intimacy maturity ($r^2 = .23, F(3,30) = 4.20, p < .05$). In males mother's mutuality oriented child-rearing was not a significant predictor of FRIM.

Father's mutuality was not found to be a significant predictor of FRIM in either males or females. Entering the two mutuality variables together into the multiple regression equation did not improve the predictive power of either variable alone.

Another regression analysis indicated that the mutuality-oriented child-rearing score for father was a significant predictor of FRIF in females ($r^2 = .18, F(1,32) = 8.15, p < .01$), but not in males. Mother's mutuality was not found to be a significant predictor of FRIF in either males or females. Entering the two mutuality variables together
into the multiple regression equation did not improve the predictive power of the paternal mutuality variable alone.

The relationship between control-oriented child-rearing and level of maturity in the current relationship with one's parents in young adulthood. The second hypothesis—that scores on the control-oriented child-rearing scale for both mothers and fathers would be negatively associated with the level of maturity in filial relationships in young adulthood—was tested by computing Pearson-product moment correlation coefficients among the variables in the entire sample and in the male and female subsamples. Correlations between mother's control-oriented child-rearing (M-CONTROL) and the adult relationship with mother (FRIM) are reported in Table 13, as are the correlations between father's control-oriented child-rearing (F-CONTROL) and the adult relationship with father (FRIF). Correlations between control-oriented child-rearing in one parent and the maturity of the adult filial relationship with the other parent were also included in Table 13, even though there were no significant Pearson r values involved as there were for mutuality-oriented child-rearing.

The most notable finding reported in Table 13 is that control-oriented child-rearing reported in mothers was significantly negatively correlated with the maturity of the relationship with one's mother in young adulthood in females ($r = -.34, p < .03$). The association between mother's control-oriented childrearing and the maturity of the relationship with mother in young adulthood was not found to be significant when males were considered alone.
Table 13

Correlations Between Control-oriented Child-rearing and Adult Filial Relationships With Mothers and Fathers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M-CONTROL &amp; FRIM</th>
<th>F-CONTROL &amp; FRIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entire Sample</td>
<td>( r = -0.23, p &lt; 0.02 ) (( n = 82 ))</td>
<td>( r = -0.17, p &lt; 0.08 ) (( n = 70 ))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>( r = -0.34, p &lt; 0.03 ) (( n = 41 ))</td>
<td>( r = -0.36, p &lt; 0.02 ) (( n = 34 ))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>( r = -0.09 ) (( n = 41 ))</td>
<td>( r = 0.07 ) (( n = 36 ))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M-CONTROL &amp; FRIF</th>
<th>F-CONTROL &amp; FRIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entire Sample</td>
<td>( r = -0.11 ) (( n = 71 ))</td>
<td>( r = 0.02 ) (( n = 70 ))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>( r = -0.14 ) (( n = 34 ))</td>
<td>( r = -0.14 ) (( n = 39 ))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>( r = -0.10 ) (( n = 37 ))</td>
<td>( r = 0.16 ) (( n = 40 ))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Control-oriented child-rearing reported in fathers, by females, was also significantly negatively correlated ($r = -0.36, p < .02$) with the maturity of the relationship with him in young adulthood. This negative correlation was not found in the male subsample. Therefore it appears that, for females only, the more control-oriented the child-rearing reported in either parent, the less maturity in the adult filial relationship with that parent.

A subsequent stepwise regression analysis, indicated that the relationship between these variables was a bit more complex than originally thought on the basis of the correlations. When M-CONTROL was entered into the equation alone, it was found to be a significant predictor of FRIM in females ($r^2 = .12, F(1,32) = 5.36, p < .05$), but not in males. Father's control-oriented child-rearing was not found to be a significant predictor of FRIM in females. In males, entering the two control-oriented variables (M-CONTROL and F-CONTROL) together into the multiple regression equation improved the predictive power of either control variable alone and accounted for a comparable 12 percent of the variance in FRIM ($r^2 = .12, F(2,32) = 5.08, p < .05$). Therefore it appears that, for males, a "double dose" of control-oriented child-rearing (i.e., control-oriented child-rearing reported in both parents) was required for it to be associated with less maturity in the adult filial relationship with mothers.

The control-oriented child-rearing variables (i.e., M-CONTROL and F-CONTROL) were not selected as significant predictors of FRIF in the stepwise regression analyses for either gender alone. These variables apparently did not significantly increase the amount of variance
accounted for by other better predictors of FRIF (i.e., F-MUT and intimacy maturity with spouse in females).

The relationship between mutuality-oriented child-rearing and intimacy maturity in young adulthood. The third hypothesis—that scores on the mutuality-oriented child-rearing scale for both mothers and fathers would be positively associated with the level of maturity in the relationship with one's spouse in young adulthood was tested by computing Pearson-product moment correlation coefficients in the entire subject sample and in the male and female subsamples. Correlations between mother's and father's mutuality-oriented child-rearing (M-MUT and F-MUT) and global intimacy maturity scores are reported in Table 14.

The most notable finding reported in Table 14 is that mutuality-oriented child-rearing reported in fathers was significantly positively correlated with global intimacy maturity with one's spouse in young adulthood. This was true for the sample as a whole (r = .22, p < .02), but the association between these two variables was only marginal when males and females were considered separately.

Mutuality-oriented child-rearing in mothers, reported by males, was significantly positively correlated (r = .26, p < .05) with global intimacy maturity with a spouse. However, this relationship did not hold true for the sample as a whole or for females.

To summarize, it appears that regardless of one's gender, the degree to which father's child-rearing practices are mutuality-oriented is associated with intimacy maturity with one's spouse in young
Table 14

Correlations Between Mutuality-oriented Child-rearing and Global Intimacy Maturity With Spouse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M-MUT &amp; INTIMACY</th>
<th>F-MUT &amp; INTIMACY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entire Sample</td>
<td>r = +.14 (n = 83)</td>
<td>r = +.22, p &lt; .02 (n = 80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>r = -.04 (n = 41)</td>
<td>r = +.24, p &lt; .07 (n = 39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>r = +.26, p &lt; .05 (n = 42)</td>
<td>r = +.20, (n = 41)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
adulthood. In males, the more mutuality-oriented the child-rearing reported in mothers, the greater the overall maturity in the relationship with one's spouse in young adulthood.

The relationship between each of the five components of global intimacy maturity (i.e., orientation, caring/concern, sexuality, communication, commitment) and the mutuality-oriented child-rearing variable was also examined. The most significant finding emerging from those analyses was that the dimension of communication with spouse, by itself, was significantly positively correlated with mutuality-oriented child-rearing in both parents, regardless of the subject's gender. Correlations between mother's and father's mutuality-oriented child-rearing (M-MUT and F-MUT) and communication scores are reported in Table 15. As can be seen in Table 15, scores for mutuality-oriented child-rearing in mothers and fathers were significantly positively correlated with communication with one's spouse in young adulthood in all cases except for one. Mutuality-oriented child-rearing reported in mothers by females was not significantly associated with mature communication with a spouse.

The relationship between control-oriented child-rearing and intimacy maturity in young adulthood. The fourth hypothesis—that scores on the control-oriented child-rearing scale for both mothers and fathers would be negatively associated with the level of maturity in the relationship with one's spouse in young adulthood was tested by computing Pearson-product moment correlation coefficients in the entire sample and in the male and female subsamples. Correlations
Table 15

Correlations Between Mutuality-oriented Child-rearing and Communication With Spouse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M-MUT &amp; COMMUNICATION</th>
<th>F-MUT &amp; COMMUNICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entire Sample</td>
<td>$r = +.22, p &lt; .03$ $(n = 82)$</td>
<td>$r = +.31, p &lt; .003$ $(n = 80)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>$r = +.09$ $(n = 41)$</td>
<td>$r = -.34, p &lt; .02$ $(n = 39)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>$r = +.33, p &lt; .02$ $(n = 42)$</td>
<td>$r = +.27, p &lt; .04$ $(n = 41)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
between mother's and father's control-oriented child-rearing (M-Control and F-Control) and global intimacy maturity scores are reported in Table 16.

The most notable finding reported in Table 16 is that scores for control-oriented child-rearing in fathers were significantly negatively correlated with global intimacy maturity with one's spouse in females (r = -.26, p < .05) but not in males. Scores for control-oriented child-rearing in mothers were not significantly correlated with intimacy maturity in males or females.

To summarize, it appears that the degree to which father's child-rearing practices are seen as control-oriented is negatively associated with intimacy maturity with one's spouse in young adulthood. The relationship between these variables is significant for females and marginally significant for males. The degree to which mother's child-rearing is perceived as control-oriented was not found to be significantly related to intimacy maturity.

The relationship between each of the five components of global intimacy maturity (i.e., orientation, caring/concern, sexuality, communication, commitment) and the control-oriented child-rearing variable was also examined. It was found that the intimacy dimension of communication with spouse, by itself, was significantly negatively correlated with father's control-oriented child-rearing, in the sample as a whole (r = -.22, p < .05) and in females, considered separately (r = -.27, p < .05). The dimension of caring/concern for spouse was likewise significantly negatively correlated with father's control-oriented child-rearing, in the sample as a whole.
Table 16

Correlations Between Control-oriented Child-rearing and Global Intimacy Maturity With Spouse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M-CONTROL &amp; INTIMACY</th>
<th>F-CONTROL &amp; INTIMACY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entire Sample</td>
<td>$r = -0.09$ (n = 83)</td>
<td>$r = -0.19, p &lt; .05$ (n = 80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>$r = -0.10$ (n = 41)</td>
<td>$r = -0.26, p &lt; .05$ (n = 39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>$r = -0.08$ (n = 42)</td>
<td>$r = -0.09, (n = 41)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(r = -.20, p < .04) and in females, considered separately (r = -.29, p < .03). Finally, the dimension of orientation toward spouse was also significantly negatively correlated with father's control-oriented child-rearing, in the sample as a whole (r = -.19, p < .04). Mother's control-oriented child-rearing was not significantly correlated with these or any of the other components of intimacy maturity.

The relationship between intimacy maturity with spouse and maturity in relationships with one's parents in young adulthood. The fifth hypothesis had three parts to it. The first part proposed a modest test of a developmental process—that progress toward a conventional level of mutuality achieved initially with a spouse would be generalized to the domain of relationships with parents. To provide tentative and, admittedly, only suggestive data in support of a tendency to "transfer" in that direction (rather than the reverse), it was predicted that there would be no instances of individuals who scored higher on FRI (for both mother and father) than on global intimacy maturity with spouse. In actuality, it was found that 20% (n = 17) of the entire sample (n = 83) had FRIM scores which were higher than their global intimacy scores. In ten of the 17 cases, FRIM was higher by only a half-stage (e.g., role-focused "3" versus transitional "2-3"), leaving a remaining 8% (n = 7) with FRIM scores that were higher than intimacy scores by a full stage or more. In terms of the relationship with father, it was found that 17% (n = 12) of the entire sample (n = 72) had FRIF scores which were higher than their global intimacy scores. In nine of the 12 cases, FRIF was higher by only a half-stage, leaving a remaining
4% (n = 3) with FRIF scores that were higher than intimacy scores by a full stage or more.

Two Sign tests were used to examine the statistical probability that individuals would score higher on FRI (for mother or father) than on global intimacy maturity with spouse, thereby failing to support the hypothesis. For each subject, the FRIM score was subtracted from the global intimacy score. The sign of the difference (i.e., plus or minus) was recorded. Whenever a tie (i.e., a difference of zero) was noted, it was appropriately eliminated from the sample. The observed number of unexpected minus signs (implying FRIM was higher by a half-stage or more in those cases than global intimacy) was then converted to a z-score. For FRIM, out of 67 comparisons, there were 16 ties, 17 minus signs, and 50 plus signs. The z score for FRIM was -3.91 (p < .0001). When the same procedure was followed for evaluating the differences between intimacy scores and FRIF, out of 59 comparisons, there were 11 ties, 12 minus signs, and 47 plus signs. The z score for FRIF was -4.43 (p < .0001).

On the basis of these findings, the null hypothesis—that subjects were equally likely to score higher on FRIM or FRIF than on the measure of global intimacy maturity with spouse—could be rejected. That is, there was a highly significant difference between the frequency of pluses and minuses in the sample, implying that subjects were far more likely to achieve greater maturity in their relationships with their spouses prior to achieving it with their parents than the reverse. Whether or not a transfer of progress toward mutuality from the spousal domain to the parental domain takes place cannot be surmised from the
data. However if any transfer of progress takes place, the data suggest that it is likely to be in the predicted direction from the spousal relationship to the relationships with parents. An alternative interpretation is offered in the Discussion section.

The second part of the fifth hypothesis—that the level of maturity in the relationship with one's spouse would be a useful predictor of maturity in the relationships with one's parents (FRIM and FRIF scores) in young adulthood—was tested by first computing Pearson-product moment correlation coefficients among the variables and then performing the appropriate regression analyses. All analyses were performed for the entire sample as well as for the male and female subsamples separately.

Correlations between global intimacy maturity scores and FRIM and FRIF scores are reported in Table 17. The relationship between communication with spouse (i.e., an important component of global intimacy that was previously found to be significantly correlated in its own right to mutuality-oriented child-rearing, an aspect of the earlier relationship with parents), and FRIM and FRIF scores was also examined. Those correlations are reported in Table 18.

The most striking finding reported in Table 17 is that global intimacy with spouse was significantly positively correlated with the level of maturity in the relationships females had with both their fathers ($r = +.42, p < .007$) and their mothers ($r = +.25, p < .05$). There was no significant relationship, not even marginal, between these two variables in males.
Table 17

Correlations Between Global Intimacy Maturity With Spouse and Relationship Maturity With Mothers and Fathers in Young Adulthood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INTIMACY &amp; FRIM</th>
<th>INTIMACY &amp; FRIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entire Sample</td>
<td>$r = +.10$ ($n = 83$)</td>
<td>$r = +.19$ ($n = 80$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>$r = +.25$, $p &lt; .05$ ($n = 42$)</td>
<td>$r = +.42$, $p &lt; .01$ ($n = 35$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>$r = -.09$ ($n = 41$)</td>
<td>$r = -.003$ ($n = 37$)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18

Correlations Between Communication With Spouse and Relationship Maturity With Mothers and Fathers in Young Adulthood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COMMUNICATION &amp; FRIM</th>
<th>COMMUNICATION &amp; FRIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entire Sample</td>
<td>$r = +.13$ (n = 83)</td>
<td>$r = +.16$ (n = 80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>$r = +.28$, $p &lt; .04$ (n = 42)</td>
<td>$r = +.38$, $p &lt; .01$ (n = 35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>$r = -.06$ (n = 41)</td>
<td>$r = -.14$ (n = 37)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using the dimension of communication with spouse as a measure of intimacy and correlating it with FRIM and FRIF (see Table 18), a similar finding emerged. As expected, communication with spouse was significantly positively correlated with the level of maturity in the relationships females had with both their fathers \((r = +.38, p < .01)\) and their mothers \((r = +.28, p < .04)\); however, again, there was no significant relationship, not even marginal, between these two variables in males.

In subsequent regression analyses, intimacy maturity score emerged as a positive and significant predictor of FRIF score for females. When added to F-MUT, a better predictor, it increased the FRIF variance accounted for (from 18 percent to 26 percent, i.e., \(r^2 = .26, F(2,31) = 6.70, p < .01\)), in females, but not in males. Global intimacy maturity score was again found to be a significant predictor of FRIM score, for females but not males. When added to M-CONTROL, a better predictor, it increased the FRIM variance accounted for in females (from 12 percent to 16 percent, i.e., \(r^2 = .16, F(2,31) = 4.57, p < .05\)), but not in males.

To summarize, it appears that there is a real gender difference in the association between intimacy maturity with spouse and the maturity of the relationships young adults have with their parents. While a significant association between the two relationship domains can be found in women, there is no association between level of maturity in the two domains in men.
The cumulative effect of child-rearing and intimacy maturity with a spouse on the level of maturity in the adult filial relationship. The sixth hypothesis had two parts to it. The first part—that the level of maturity in the adult filial relationship (FRIM or FRIF) would be higher in those subjects who had a high score on the mutuality-oriented child-rearing scale associated with the particular parent and a high intimacy maturity score; lower in those who had a high score in only one of those areas; and even lower in those who had low mutuality and low intimacy scores—was tested by a series of two-way (2 X 2) analyses of variance. The independent variables were: mutuality-oriented child-rearing perceived in mother or father (i.e., high or low) and level of intimacy maturity (i.e., high or low). For each of these variables, subjects assigned to the "low" group scored below the median value for the entire sample; subjects assigned to the "high" group, above the median. The effect of mutuality-oriented child-rearing group membership and intimacy maturity group membership was considered in relation to two different dependent variables—FRIM and FRIF (i.e., the relationship with mother or father in young adulthood). In all, eight of these 2 X 2 analyses were performed for each of the three relevant samples: the entire sample; males separately; and females separately.

The second part of the hypothesis—that the level of maturity in the adult filial relationship (FRIM or FRIF) would be lower in those subjects who had a high score on the control-oriented child-rearing scale associated with the particular parent and a low intimacy maturity score; higher in those who were characterized by only one of those; and
even higher in those who had low control and high intimacy scores—was tested by a second series of two-way (2 X 2) analyses of variance. The independent variables were: control-oriented child-rearing perceived in mother or father (i.e., high or low) and level of intimacy maturity (i.e., high or low). For each of these variables, subjects assigned to the "low" group scored below the median value for the entire sample; subjects assigned to the "high" group, above the median. The effect of control-oriented child-rearing group membership and intimacy maturity group membership was considered in relation to two different dependent variables—FRIM and FRIF (i.e., the relationship with mother or father in young adulthood). In all, eight of these 2 X 2 analyses were performed for each of the three relevant samples: the entire sample; males separately; and females separately.

A summary of the 2 X 2 analyses of variance of FRIM and FRIF examining the effects of the mutuality and control variables in combination with global intimacy are reported in Tables 19 to 24. Significant effects will be discussed as the independent variables and their interactions are considered in turn.

**Effect of Mother's Mutuality-oriented Child-rearing on FRIM and FRIF:** A significant main effect for mutuality-oriented child-rearing perceived in mothers was not found in relation to either FRIM (F = .01, df = 1--males, n = 41; F = .16, df = 1--females) or FRIF (F = .11, df = 1--males, n = 37; F = .01, df = 1--females).

**Effect of Father's Mutuality-oriented Child-rearing on FRIM and FRIF:** A significant main effect for father's mutuality-oriented child-rearing (i.e., high versus low) on the adult filial relationship with
Table 19

Four Analyses of Variance of FRIM in Entire Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Mother’s Mutuality (MM)</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Intimacy (I)</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM X I</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>3.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Father’s Mutuality (FM)</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>4.95*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Intimacy (I)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM X I</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Mother’s Control (MC)</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Intimacy (I)</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC X I</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Father’s Control</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Intimacy (I)</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC X I</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < .01
** p < .05
*  p < .07 (borderline)

Degrees of Freedom for all = 1
### Table 20

**Four Analyses of Variance of FRIM in Females**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Mother’s Mutuality (MM)</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Intimacy (I)</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM X I</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Father’s Mutuality (FM)</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Intimacy (I)</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM X I</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Mother’s Control (MC)</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Intimacy (I)</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC X I</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Father’s Control</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Intimacy (I)</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC X I</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**** $p < .01$  
** $p < .05$  
* $p < .07$ (borderline)  

Degrees of Freedom for all = 1
### Table 21

**Four Analyses of Variance of FRIM in Males**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Mother’s Mutuality (MM)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Intimacy (I)</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM X I</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Father’s Mutuality (FM)</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>3.96**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Intimacy (I)</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM X I</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Mother’s Control (MC)</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Intimacy (I)</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC X I</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Father’s Control</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Intimacy (I)</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC X I</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p < .01
**p < .05
*p < .07 (borderline)

Degrees of Freedom for all = 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Mother's Mutuality (MM)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Intimacy (I)</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM X I</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>3.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Father's Mutuality (FM)</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>9.22***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Intimacy (I)</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM X I</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Mother's Control (MC)</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Intimacy (I)</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC X I</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Father's Control</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Intimacy (I)</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC X I</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < .01
** p < .05
* p < .07 (borderline)

Degrees of Freedom for all = 1
### Table 23

**Four Analyses of Variance of FRIF in Females**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Mother's Mutuality (MM)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Intimacy (1)</td>
<td>12.95</td>
<td>7.34***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM X I</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Father's Mutuality (FM)</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>5.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Intimacy (1)</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>3.88**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM X I</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Mother's Control (MC)</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Intimacy (1)</td>
<td>13.83</td>
<td>8.04***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC X I</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Father's Control</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Intimacy (1)</td>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>6.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC X I</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < .01  
**  p < .05  
*   p < .07 (borderline)
Table 24

Four Analyses of Variance of FRIF in Males

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Mother's Mutuality (MM)</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Intimacy (I)</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM X I</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Father's Mutuality (FM)</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>4.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Intimacy (I)</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM X I</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>3.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Mother's Control (MC)</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Intimacy (I)</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC X I</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Father's Control</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-lo Intimacy (I)</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC X I</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < .01
**  p < .05
*   p < .07 (borderline)

Degrees of Freedom for all = 1
mother (i.e., FRIM) was found in males ($F = 3.96$, $df = 1$, $p < .05$), but not in females ($F = .93$, $df = 1$). In males, the mean FRIM score was higher for those men rated "high" on father's mutuality ($m = 4.44$, $n = 22$) than those placed in the "low" father's mutuality group ($m = 3.77$, $n = 18$).

A significant main effect for father's mutuality-oriented child-rearing (i.e., high versus low) on the adult filial relationship with father (i.e., FRIF) was found in the sample as a whole ($F = 9.22$, $df = 1$, $p < .01$), as well as in both male ($F = 4.06$, $df = 1$, $p < .05$) and female ($F = 5.38$, $df = 1$, $p < .05$) subsamples considered separately. In the sample as a whole, the mean FRIF score was higher for those individuals placed in the "high" F-MUT group ($m = 4.44$, $n = 34$) than those assigned to the "low" F-MUT group ($m = 3.44$, $n = 36$).

**Effect of Mother's Control-oriented Child-rearing on FRIM and FRIF:** A significant main effect for mother's control-oriented child-rearing (i.e., high versus low) was not found in relation to either FRIM ($F = .70$, $df = 1$--males; $F = 3.12$, $df = 1$--females) or FRIF ($F = .28$, $df = 1$--males; $F = 1.43$, $df = 1$--females).

**Effect of Father's Control-oriented Child-rearing on FRIM and FRIF:** The predicted main effect of father's control-oriented child-rearing (i.e., high versus low) was not found in relation to either FRIM ($F = .28$, $df = 1$--males; $F = .22$, $df = 1$--females) or FRIF ($F = .32$, $df = 1$--males; $F = .21$, $df = 1$--females).

**Effect of Intimacy Maturity With Spouse on FRIM and FRIF:** The predicted main effect of intimacy maturity with spouse (i.e., high versus low) on the adult filial relationship with father (i.e., FRIF) was found in females, but not in males. The significant $F$ value for the intimacy main
effect for females varied, depending on which child-rearing variable was used as the other variable in the 2 X 2 ANOVA design: when intimacy was paired with mother's control, $F = 8.04$, $df = 1$, $p < .01$; when mother’s mutuality was used, $F = 7.34$, $df = 1$, $p < .01$; when father’s control was used, $F = 6.25$, $df = 1$, $p < .05$; when father’s mutuality was used, $F = 3.88$, $df = 1$, $p < .05$. The $F$ value for the intimacy main effect appeared to increase, as the variance contribution from the other variable (i.e., the included child-rearing variable) decreased. In the females, the mean FRIF score was typically higher in those rated as "high" on the measure of intimacy maturity with their spouse ($m = 4.40$, $n = 15$) than those placed in the "low" intimacy group ($m = 3.16$, $n = 19$). The means reported were those resulting from the pairing of intimacy with the maternal control variable. Mean values varied, depending on the particular child-rearing variable incorporated along with intimacy in the analysis. For males, $F$ values for the intimacy main effect on FRIF ranged from .21 to .69, $df = 1$ (again, depending on which of the four child-rearing variable was used as the other variable in the 2 X 2 ANOVA design) and were not statistically significant.

The expected main effect of intimacy maturity (i.e., high versus low) on FRIM was not found in either males ($F$ ranged from .43 to 1.8, $df = 1$) or females ($F$ ranged from 1.30 to 2.94, $df = 1$).

**Effect of Mother's Mutuality-oriented Child-rearing X Intimacy Interaction on FRIM and FRIF:** The effect of the interaction between mother’s mutuality-oriented child-rearing (i.e., high or low) and intimacy maturity with spouse (i.e., high or low) was marginally significant in relation to both FRIM ($F = 3.28$, $df = 1$, $p < .07$) and
FRIF ($F = 3.21$, $df = 1$, $p < .07$). This finding of marginal significance emerged only when males and females were analyzed together, thereby doubling the sample size, and not when they were considered separately. For males alone, $F = 2.13$, $df = 1$ (FRIM) and $F = 1.07$, $df = 1$ (FRIF). For females alone, $F = .39$, $df = 1$ (FRIM) and $F = .67$, $df = 1$ (FRIF).

Effect of Father's Mutuality-oriented Child-rearing X Intimacy Interaction on FRIM and FRIF: The effect of the interaction between father's mutuality-oriented child-rearing (i.e., high or low) and intimacy maturity with spouse (i.e., high or low) was marginally significant in relation to FRIF in males ($F = 3.43$, $df = 1$, $p < .07$) but not in females ($F = 2.72$, $df = 1$). The interaction effect on the other dependent variable, FRIM, was not found to be significant in males ($F = .42$, $df = 1$) or females ($F = 1.09$, $df = 1$).

Effect of Mother's Control-oriented Child-rearing X Intimacy Interaction on FRIM and FRIF: Neither the adult filial relationship with the mother or the father (i.e., FRIM or FRIF) was significantly affected by the interaction between the variables of mother's control-oriented child-rearing (i.e., high or low) and intimacy maturity with spouse (i.e., high or low). Using FRIM as the dependent variable, the $F$ value for males was $.65$, $df = 1$; for females it was $.61$, $df = 1$. Using FRIF as the dependent variable, the $F$ value for males was $.78$, $df = 1$; for females it was $.04$, $df = 1$.

Effect of Father's Control-oriented Child-rearing X Intimacy Interaction on FRIM and FRIF: Neither the adult filial relationship with the mother or the father (i.e., FRIM or FRIF) was significantly affected by the interaction between the variables of father's control-oriented
child-rearing (i.e., high or low) and intimacy maturity with spouse (i.e.,
high or low). Using FRIM as the dependent variable, the F value for males
was .40, df = 1; for females it was .34, df = 1. Using FRIF as the
dependent variable, the F value for males was .80, df = 1; for females it
was .15, df = 1.

**Stepwise Regression Analyses**

The results of the regression analyses used to examine further the
potentially cumulative effects of child-rearing experiences with parents
and intimacy maturity level achieved with a spouse on the level of
maturity in adult filial relationships will be summarized in this section.
It was expected that the four child-rearing variables would each explain
a portion of the variance (some much more than others) in the maturity
level of the adult-filial relationship with each parent (i.e., FRIM and
FRIF). It was also expected that level of intimacy maturity with spouse
would be able to make a contribution, particularly in the females, in
predicting FRIM or FRIF. The aim of the regression analyses was to see
which single variable or combination of variables had the greatest
predictive power when entered into the regression equation.

Using the stepwise multiple regression procedure, the independent
variable that by itself had the highest correlation with the dependent
variable or criterion (i.e., FRIM or FRIF) was entered into the regression
equation. The next step was to select the variable that would make the
largest gain in prediction. At this point the computer calculated the
multiple r for the combination of the two best predictors, and then
made an F test to determine whether the new r value was significantly
greater than the correlation without the last addition. The addition of variables into the regression equation continued until the probability associated with the obtained F rose above the adopted alpha level (.05).

The reader is referred to Table 25 for a listing of the variables and combinations of variables which were found to be significant predictors of FRIM. A similar listing of significant predictors of FRIF appears in Table 26.

The most striking conclusion which can be drawn from the findings reported in Tables 25 and 26 is that a much greater percentage of the variance in both FRIM and FRIF could be accounted for by various combinations of the independent variables (i.e., the four child-rearing variables and the global intimacy maturity variable) in females than in males.

More specific interpretations of the results can be made. From the \( r^2 \) of .23, it was concluded that, in females, 23 percent of the variance in FRIM could be accounted for by a combination of the three best predictors: mother's control-oriented child-rearing score (M-Control), intimacy maturity level, and mother's mutuality-oriented child-rearing score (M-Mutuality). Adding the fourth best predictor of FRIM, father's mutuality-oriented child-rearing (F-Mutuality), did not contribute enough to the predictors already in the composite to justify its inclusion.

From the \( r^2 \) of .12, it was concluded that, in males, only 12 percent of the variance in FRIM could be accounted for by a combination of the two best predictors: father's control-oriented child-rearing score (F-Control) and M-Control. Adding the third best
## Table 25

**Stepwise Regression Analyses For FRIM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>R-squared</th>
<th>Adjusted r</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Whole Sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>4.70**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>not entered</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>5.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>1.31 entered in regression</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC + l</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>4.57**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>1.30 entered in regression</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC + l + MM</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>4.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>not entered</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>1.32 entered in regression</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.08**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC + MC</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>3.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>1.31 not entered</td>
<td></td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FM = Father's Mutuality
MM = Mother's Mutuality
FC = Father's Control
MC = Mother's Control
l = Intimacy with spouse

** p < .05
*** p < .01
### Table 26

**Stepwise Regression Analyses For FRIF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>R-squared</th>
<th>Adjusted $r$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Whole Sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td>1,67</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>8.76***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>1,66</td>
<td>entered in regression</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM + MM</td>
<td>2,66</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>5.59***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>1,65</td>
<td>entered in regression</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM + MM + MC</td>
<td>3,65</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>4.81***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>1,64</td>
<td>entered in regression</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM + MM + MC + l</td>
<td>4,64</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>4.20***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>1,63</td>
<td>not entered</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>R-squared</th>
<th>Adjusted $r$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td>1,32</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>8.15***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>1,31</td>
<td>entered in regression</td>
<td>4.38**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM + l</td>
<td>2,31</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>6.70***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>1,30</td>
<td>not entered</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>R-squared</th>
<th>Adjusted $r$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td>1,33</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>1,32</td>
<td>not entered</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FM = Father's Mutuality  
MM = Mother's Mutuality  
FC = Father's Control  
MC = Mother's Control  
I = Intimacy with spouse  

** p < .05  
*** p < .01
predictor of FRIM, intimacy maturity level, did not contribute enough to the predictors already in the composite to justify its inclusion.

A similar gender difference emerged when the other dependent variable, FRIF, was considered. From the $r^2$ of .26, it was concluded that, in females, 26 percent of the variance in FRIF could be accounted for by a combination of the two best predictors: F-Mutuality and intimacy maturity level. Adding the third best predictor of FRIF, M-Mutuality, did not contribute enough to the predictors already in the composite to justify its inclusion.

From the $r^2$ of .03, it was concluded that, in males, only three percent of the variance in FRIF could be accounted for by a single predictor, F-Mutuality. Adding the second best predictor of FRIF, F-Control, into the regression equation did not account for enough additional variance to justify its inclusion.
CHAPTER IV
DISCUSSION

Interpretation of the Results

The purpose of this study was to examine the role of the parent-child relationship in facilitating or impeding the emergence of the capacity for mature close relationships, which are based on a sense of mutuality, in young adulthood. Retrospective reports on parental child-rearing practices were used as a basis for considering possible precursors of current levels of functioning in close relationships. Implicit was the idea that young adults' developing capacity to form mutual relationships with their spouses and to redefine their relationships with their parents would be based on a "core level" of relationship maturity. However the possibility that development in different relationship domains (e.g., adult-filial, spousal) might be characterized by a horizontal décalage (à la Piaget), with developments in relationships with parents lagging behind developments in intimate relationships, was also introduced. In this section, the findings will be discussed with regard to the major hypotheses and in the context of previous research and theory.

Characteristics of Subjects' Performance on the Measures

An examination of absolute values on the various measures indicates that on the average, subjects tended to score at the
transitional stage between the self-focused and role-focused level when considering their relationships with their mothers and fathers and at the higher role-focused level for their relationships with their spouses. In contrast to the findings of White, Speisman & Costos (1983), there were no sex differences in the average levels of maturity characterizing relationships with parents. This inconsistency may be attributable to an intervening elaboration of the scoring manual. Consistent with the findings of White, et.al. (1986) there were no gender differences in average levels of intimacy maturity characterizing spousal relationships. In general, the differences among absolute levels of mutuality-oriented and control-oriented child-rearing reported by males and females were not significant. However, as in the previous studies, there were important gender differences in the patterns of relationship among the various psychosocial variables.

The relationship between mutuality-oriented child-rearing and relationship maturity in young adulthood

It was hypothesized that scores on the mutuality-oriented child-rearing scale for both mothers and fathers would be positively associated with level of intimacy maturity with spouse and with level of maturity in filial relationships in young adulthood. It was found that in both male and female subjects, degree of mutuality in father's child-rearing practices was associated with intimacy maturity with spouse in young adulthood. In males, but not females, the more mutuality-oriented the child-rearing reported in mothers, the greater the maturity in the relationship with one's spouse in young adulthood.
With regard to the maturity of young adults’ relationships with their parents, mutuality-oriented child-rearing when reported in fathers again seemed to be more crucial than when seen in mothers. In a regression analysis, it was found that the developmental stage of female young adults’ current relations with their fathers could be predicted from scores on the measure of father’s mutuality-oriented child-rearing. The association between father’s mutuality-oriented child-rearing and the maturity of the filial relationship with the mother in young adulthood was marginally significant in females. In the ANOVA analyses, it was found that both females and males scoring above the sample median on the measure of father’s mutuality-oriented child-rearing had, on the average, more mature relationships with their fathers in young adulthood. The significant effect of father’s mutuality on FRIF for males (which at first glance may seem inconsistent with the finding of only a marginal correlation between the variables in males) may in part be due to a couple of extreme scores which appeared to inflate the FRIF mean for the “high father-mutuality” group and several low scores on FRIF in the “low father-mutuality” group. Contrary to expectation, the degree of mother’s mutuality-oriented child-rearing was not found to be related to the maturity of the relationship subjects (both males and females) had with mother or father in young adulthood.

The differing pattern of correlates for mutuality-oriented child-rearing in mothers versus fathers can be understood in terms of some of the literature on gender-related parenting. According to Erikson (1968, 1982), gender-related parenting is an aspect of effective or “generative” parenting. Because of a biologically-based predisposition
toward what he refers to as the "inclusive" modality (i.e., receptivity, readiness to form protective relations), mothers parent differently than fathers, who are oriented toward the "intrusive" modality (i.e., aggressive, assertive, autonomous activities) throughout their psychosocial development. Erikson describes the maternal figure as primarily responsible for sensitivity to the child's needs and cultivation of trust in the child. The paternal figure is characterized as the authority figure and is associated with discipline and the cultivation of a sense of autonomy in the child.

Several writers have claimed that gender-related parenting (which they prefer to attribute to cultural bias or "chosen role complementarity", rather than biology) impedes the child's development (Chodorow, 1978; Baumrind, 1980; Gilligan, 1982). Erikson's theory appears to suggest that whether or not gender-related parenting interferes with development depends upon whether the parent lacks altogether cross-sex competencies or modes. Erikson implies that cross-sex competencies are actually required for positive resolution of each one of the psychosocial tasks his theory proposes.

The present study's finding that the extent to which father's (but not mother's) child-rearing is perceived as mutuality-oriented is associated with adult outcomes in filial relationships, particularly in females, is an interesting one to consider at this point. Mutuality-oriented child-rearing, as defined here, seems closely aligned with the traditional maternal role. When fathers are able to incorporate the cross-sex competency of mutuality in their parenting, it appears to go a long way in promoting development in their offspring, as predicted.
Their demonstrated access to cross-sex competencies may further imply that their resolution of other life tasks has been positive. In this way they are serving as a lifelong positive role model for their offspring. Mutuality-oriented child-rearing in mothers is more of "a given"; it does not carry with it the same implication of cross-sex competency needed for successful resolution of life crises. This is one way of interpreting the fact that mother's mutuality seemed to be a less important predictor of relationship maturity in young adulthood.

The present study's finding that mutuality-oriented child-rearing is associated with greater intimacy maturity, except in the case of mothers and daughters, can also be interpreted using the theories of gender-related parenting. In the present study, mother's mutuality was significantly correlated with intimacy maturity in males only. If it is true that males have a pre-existing (and/or culturally supported) tendency toward the "intrusive mode", then it makes sense that mothers of males may be in a crucial position to counterbalance or offset this tendency by cultivating through mutuality-oriented child-rearing their sons' countermode of inclusion (and the cross-sex competency of mutuality needed for true intimacy). Mutuality-oriented child-rearing in mothers of daughters may simply reinforce an already existing tendency and not cultivate the needed countermode. An alternative interpretation of the finding of no relationship between mother's mutuality and intimacy maturity in daughters is that there are enough other cultural supports for the development of the capacity for mutuality in females so that mother's mutuality becomes less crucial.
The relationship between control-oriented child-rearing and relationship maturity in young adulthood

It was hypothesized that scores on the control-oriented child-rearing scale for both mothers and fathers would be negatively associated with level of intimacy maturity with spouse and with level of maturity in filial relationships in young adulthood. It was found that the degree to which father's child-rearing practices were control-oriented was negatively associated with various components of intimacy maturity and global intimacy maturity with one's spouse in young adulthood in females, but not in males. The degree to which mother's child-rearing was perceived as control-oriented was not found to be significantly related to intimacy maturity with spouse in either gender.

With regard to the maturity of young adults' relationships with their parents, there were again some important gender differences associated with the earlier experience of control-oriented child-rearing. Through a regression analysis, it was found that the developmental stage of female young adults' current relations with their mothers and fathers could be predicted in the expected direction from scores on the measures of mothers' and fathers' control-oriented child-rearing, respectively.

The relationship between these variables was a bit more complex for males. Contrary to expectation, there appeared (on the basis of a preliminary correlation analysis) to be no association between the extent to which either parent's child-rearing was perceived by males as control-oriented and the maturity of their relationships with their parents in young adulthood. However, a subsequent regression analysis indicated that males who reported a higher degree of control-oriented
child-rearing in both parents, tended to have less mature adult-filial relationships, at least with their mothers. Therefore it was concluded that, for males, a "double dose" of control-oriented child-rearing (i.e., control-oriented child-rearing reported in both parents) was required for it to be somewhat associated with less maturity in adult filial relationships.

The finding that the extent to which both parents' child-rearing was perceived as control-oriented was associated with adult outcomes in the respective filial relationships of females and that males were perhaps less sensitive to the negative effects of control-oriented child-rearing was an interesting one. Also intriguing was the finding that the extent of control-oriented child-rearing was associated with lower intimacy maturity only in the case of females reflecting on their fathers' (but not their mothers') parenting. There was no relationship found between control-oriented child-rearing and males' level of intimacy maturity.

Control-oriented child-rearing as it was used here is consistent with what Erikson (1982) refers to as "authoritism...the ungenerous and ungenerative use of sheer power for the regimentation of economic and family life". Such authoritarianism has been associated with "identity foreclosures" (Bourne, 1978). Identity foreclosures represent arrested development at the psychosocial stage preceding the intimacy crisis. It follows that subsequent psychosocial development might also be disrupted by authoritarianism. In the present study, females seemed more vulnerable to authoritarian practices, a finding that seems consistent with Grotevant & Cooper's (1985) conclusion that the sources
of family influence may be more diverse for females than males. The reader will recall that Grotevant & Cooper studied the association of various patterns of family communication with identity exploration and role-taking skill in adolescence. Although they focused on earlier developmental tasks, the findings may be generalizable.

The association between relationship maturity levels in the two adult relationship domains

The data supported the prediction that subjects would be more likely to achieve greater maturity in their relationships with their spouses prior to achieving it with their parents than the reverse pattern. Whether or not the hypothesized transfer of progress toward mutuality from the spousal domain to the parental domain takes place cannot be surmised from the present data. However, if any transfer of progress takes place, the data suggest that it may very well be in the predicted direction from the spousal relationship to the relationships with parents.

This finding makes sense when one considers that the entire sample of married young adults employed in the present study had left their parental homes and had been living on their own with their spouses for several years. It seems likely that there would be more pressure to work things out on a day to day basis, presumably becoming more mature in the process, in the context of the spousal relationship. Greene & Boxer (1986) lend support to this idea in their lengthy consideration of strategies of family role renegotiation when children become young adults. A major assumption in their conceptualization of these
strategies is that "changes in the adult child's social roles outside of the family context (e.g., labor market entry, marriage, parenthood) differentially effect patterns of interaction and influence between parents and their young adult children" (p.19).

As noted earlier, there is really no way of knowing from the present data whether or not the hypothesized transfer of progress toward mutuality from the spousal domain to the parental domain actually takes place. Even if it is true that young adults are more likely to achieve greater maturity in their relationships with their spouses than with their parents, it is impossible to know from the present cross-sectional data if they ever do transfer progress toward mutuality thereby achieving greater maturity in their relationships with parents. It is possible that a transfer takes place in the reverse direction. That is, young adults may develop the capacity for mutuality by learning from their conflicted, relatively immature relationships with their parents and then transferring what they have learned to create more mature relationships with their spouses. Additional longitudinal research is needed to make a choice among these alternative interpretations.

Further analyses indicated that there was a real gender difference in the association between intimacy maturity with spouse and the maturity of the relationships young adults have with their parents. While a significant association between the two relationship domains was found in women, there was no association between level of maturity in the two domains in men. These findings seem compatible with the conclusions previously drawn by White, Costos & Speisman (1983). Women may be socialized to use their entrance into adult roles (e.g.,
marriage) to help them gain perspective on people with whom they have had very close relationships (i.e., their parents). In contrast, men—who typically may have experienced less emphasis on the value of working on close relationships in their socialization—may use their new adult role to confirm their autonomy, both to themselves and to their parents. They may be less invested in continuing to work toward a more mutual relationship with their parents while they may be very committed to maturing in the context of the spousal relationship. This is one way to interpret the correlation between level of maturity in the two relationship domains for women, but not men. It receives additional support from Greene & Boxer's (1986) review of research in which they conclude that daughters seem to maintain more involved relationships, particularly with their mothers, after leaving the parental household.

The cumulative effect of child-rearing and intimacy maturity with a spouse on the level of maturity in the adult filial relationship

In addition to predicting that the nature of the reported child-rearing history and the quality of the intimate relationship achieved with a spouse would individually contribute to the prediction of the level of maturity in young adults' relationships with their parents, it was further hypothesized that the interaction between these two relationship variables would be significant. This prediction was based on the assumption that stress in either of these relationships (one historical, one contemporaneous) might, at least in part, be compensated for or counterbalanced by support in the other. In order to examine the potentially cumulative effects of child-rearing experiences with parents
and intimacy maturity level achieved with a spouse on the level of maturity in adult filial relationships, a series of ANOVA and regression analyses were performed. Based on the results of the correlational analyses, it was expected that the four child-rearing variables would each explain a portion of the variance (some much more than others) in the maturity level of the adult-filial relationship with each parent (i.e., FRIM and FRIF). It was also expected that level of intimacy maturity with spouse would be able to make a contribution, particularly in the females, in predicting FRIM or FRIF. In the ANOVA analyses there were several significant main effects, although none of the predicted interaction effects were found. In the regression analyses, there were a few instances, particularly for females, in which a combination of variables resulted in increased predictive power over a single predictor variable. For example, in females, a combination of mother's control-oriented child-rearing score (M-Control), intimacy maturity level, and mother's mutuality-oriented child-rearing score (M-Mutuality) accounted for significantly more of the variance in the adult relationship maturity level with mother (FRIM) than any of the predictor variables alone. In males, entering the two best predictors of FRIM, father's control-oriented child-rearing score (F-Control) and M-Control, resulted in greater predictive power than either variable alone. The addition of the intimacy maturity variable did not improve prediction.

In females, a significantly greater percentage of the variance in the adult relationship maturity level with father (FRIF) could be accounted for by a combination of the two best predictors, F-Mutuality and intimacy maturity level, than either variable alone. In males, a very
small percentage of the variance in FRIF could be accounted for by F-Mutuality alone. Adding other predictors of FRIF into the regression equation did not account for enough additional variance to justify their inclusion. It can be concluded that the hypothesized cumulative effect of child-rearing and intimacy maturity with spouse on the level of maturity in adult filial relationships was partially supported by the present data, at least in the case of females.

**Design Limitations and Implications for Future Research**

The Block Child-rearing Practices Report (CRPR) is a forced choice self-report inventory and is subject to the limitations of such measures. Cronbach (1970) identifies problems such as response styles and response biases (i.e., acquiescence, response desirability, response deviancy, and faking). While several of these limitations (e.g., faking) apply to all self-report measures, including the open-ended interview, Cronbach reviews studies demonstrating that the subject who wants to give a favorable picture can usually recognize one of the alternatives as most likely to gain approval. Cronbach also points out that the forcing of choice may reduce the validity of criterion prediction.

Another limitation of the CRPR is that it relies on the subject's recollections of their parents' behavior when the subject was a child. With such retrospective data, there is the issue of response validity. We cannot be sure that retrospective reports are accurately portraying the actual experiences the adult respondents had while growing up. It is possible that their memories have been colored by many intervening
experiences and even current situations. It could be argued that such distortion would undermine the possibility of discriminating relationships between past experiences and present functioning, thereby distorting the presumed developmental processes. Belsky & Isabella (1985) present the counterargument that perception of the past, rather than the actual nature of the past, is what is of developmental significance. In support of this position, Belsky & Isabella cite two types of evidence: that children's perceptions of their parents' behavior may be more related to their own adjustment than is parents' actual behavior (e.g., Schaefer, 1965); and that adult reports of their own parents' marital happiness have been found to distinguish individuals whose parents were and were not divorced during the adults' childhoods (e.g., Greenberg & Nay, 1982). These findings attest to the functional utility, if not validity of retrospective reports of family experience.

The limitations associated with retrospective self-report data must be taken into account when interpreting the present findings, in terms of the influence of developmental history on relationship maturity in young adulthood. Given the correlational nature of the results, it is also possible to interpret the findings in an opposite direction, such that adults with more mature relationships tend to remember their pasts in a more positive light (i.e., more mutuality-oriented, less control-oriented child-rearing). The most obvious way to avoid this kind of confusion is to collect data longitudinally so as to be sure to distinguish actual family interactions that precede shifts in the development of offspring from perceptions of family patterns that emerge subsequent to the developmental changes.
Characteristics of the Sample

The major aim of the present research was to examine the role of the parent-child relationship in fostering the emergence of mutuality in relationships. There are several limitations associated with using a sample comprised only of young adults. White, Speisman & Costos (1983) have identified three successive steps in the achievement of fully mature relationships between adults: individuation, perspective, and mutuality. Most of the subjects in the current sample still seemed to be struggling with the first step in their relationships with their parents and the second step in their relationships with spouses. As a result, it was not possible to explore whether the observed interrelationships among child-rearing and adult relationship variables are specific to young adulthood and, if so, how these interrelationships might change as a function of age and/or higher levels of maturity. For instance, the question of whether the degree of mother's mutuality-oriented child-rearing becomes more relevant than it appeared to be in the present investigation, as a function of age and/or higher levels of maturity, was left unanswered. Another unaddressed question was whether the level of intimacy maturity with spouse ever becomes relevant in predicting the level of maturity males have with their parents in adulthood. It may be that in later years, once males feel more secure in their individuation from parents, the patterns of correlation among the relationship variables change. Including a sample of older adults would have permitted an empirical investigation of whether and
how the interrelationship between the variables changes as a function of a wider span of developmental stages.

**Future Research**

Future research should aim at providing insight into the actual process by which earlier experiences in one's family of origin might actually affect the capacity for redefining and forming new relationships based on mutuality at a later point. The ideal way to study the developmental antecedents of relationship maturity in young adulthood is through a prospective longitudinal design. Unfortunately such work is difficult to do, if only because following subjects through childhood, adolescence, and eventually marriage takes many years. Short of the ideal, one possibility is to increase the number of informants about child-rearing history to increase validity and reliability. Schwarz, Barton-Henry & Pruzinsky (1985) have demonstrated that the assessments of child-rearing behaviors of each family member contain a small proportion of true variance and a substantial proportion of factor-specific systematic error. The error variance can be greatly reduced by aggregating scores across multiple raters. Another possibility, is to include a measure of the quality of early peer relations, to obtain a more complete picture of the relative contributions of parental and peer influences in the development of relationship maturity.

In spite of the fact that reports obtained from the child have been found to be as valid as data obtained from direct observation (Golden, 1969) and that validity can be increased further by aggregating scores of several raters (Schwarz, Barton-Henry & Pruzinsky 1985), the use of
informants to study the influence of parental child-rearing behaviors on development has been on the decline in recent years. At the same time, the popularity of direct observations as a research methodology has been on the increase. A current trend in developmental psychology is to do "family research" aspiring to a transactional framework which recognizes multiple and reciprocal influences in all the interactions of family members (e.g., Grotevant & Cooper, 1985). Unfortunately researchers thus far have been unable to capture that conceptualization fully in their empirical methods. It is very difficult to collect extensive and reliably coded information which captures the full complexity of family interactions as they relate to various aspects of development in family members.

The present study employed White's interview technique, which provided the opportunity to directly observe a limited sample of behavior. What was scored was the developmental characteristics of family relationships as perceived by one person in those relationships. The underlying assumption is that both parties contribute to the relationship's development. White and her colleagues hope to obtain a more complete picture of the filial relationships by gathering data from the parents of her young adult sample in the future.

The research of Grotevant and his colleagues (e.g., Grotevant & Cooper, 1985) which was reviewed earlier involves the study of entire families, based on a transactional theoretical framework. However, methodological limitations (i.e., analysis of discrete communication behaviors of individual members in multiple regression analyses)
prevent these researchers from fully exploring the transactional influences on development which they have conceptualized so nicely.

Powers, Hauser, Schwartz, Noam & Jacobson (1983) suggest that instead of simply focusing on the one-to-one association between discrete behaviors and developmental level, family researchers should examine the overall interactive context in which a particular behavior is exhibited. In their report of longitudinal research on the link between ego development and family interactions of adolescents, these researchers may have come the closest to realizing the transactional theoretical notions fully in their empirical methods. However their highly complex "Developmental Environments Coding System", used to rate various aspects of 24 identified interaction sequences, is plagued by the interrater reliability difficulties one would expect with such a system.

Conclusions

In spite of its limitations, the present research provided some interesting findings to support the notion that young adults' perceptions of their earlier relationships with their parents can indeed be predictive of their capacity for mutuality in later relationships. The data suggested the possibility of a transfer of progress toward mutuality from the spousal domain to the parental domain, however alternative interpretations are also possible. The hypothesized cumulative effect of child-rearing and intimacy maturity with a spouse on the level of maturity in the adult filial relationship was partially supported by the present data, although the cross-sectional nature of the data precluded causal inferences. Perhaps the most interesting aspect of the results
was the pervasive pattern of gender differences in the intercorrelations among the various relationship-oriented psychosocial variables.

As suggested earlier, future research should study individuals representing a wider span of maturity to determine whether different patterns of interaction in one's family of origin become more important in facilitating relationship maturity at different stages (i.e., individuation, perspective, and mutuality). The need for multi-trait, multi-method validation (Campbell & Fiske, 1959; Cronbach, 1970) suggests that direct observational techniques, as well as self-report inventories and interviews each have their place in furthering this line of research.
SUMMARY

This investigation focused on the role of the parent-child relationship in fostering or impeding the emergence of the capacity for mutuality in interpersonal relationships. Previous research stressed the crucial contribution of peer relations and deemphasized the contribution made by parents in this area of development. However, theoretical support was presented for the position that a broader view of the child's social environment should be taken, one which considers relationships more generically and assumes that the provision of role-taking opportunities in multiple contexts is a critical issue. It was concluded that individual differences in parent-child interactional style can indeed have an impact and may be predictive of differences in the capacity for mutuality in later relationships.

In the present research, self-reported child-rearing histories were considered in terms of their association to levels of maturity achieved in the close relationships of young adults. Adult subjects received two separate scores to represent the degree of "mutuality oriented" and "control-oriented" child-rearing they had presumably experienced while growing up. These scores were based on responses to selected items on a self-report child-rearing inventory. Information about subjects' current relationships with their parents and their most intimate relationships (i.e., spousal) was acquired via semi-structured interviews. A scoring system proposed by White and her colleagues (e.g., White, Speisman & Costos, 1983) was used to assess the interview data.
in terms of level of relationship maturity demonstrated. An examination of relationships among the scores yielded important information about perceptions of childhood experiences in mature as compared to immature adults.

On the average, subjects tended to score at the transitional stage between White's "self-focused" and "role-focused" level when considering their relationships with their mothers and fathers and at the higher role-focused level for their relationships with their spouses. There were no significant sex differences in either the average levels of maturity characterizing adult relationships or the levels of mutuality-oriented and control-oriented child-rearing reported. However, as in previous studies, there were important gender differences in the patterns of relationship among the various psychosocial variables.

It was found that the degree to which father's child-rearing practices were seen by both males and females as mutuality-oriented was associated with intimacy maturity with spouse in young adulthood. In males only, the more mutuality-oriented the child-rearing reported in mothers, the greater the maturity in the relationship with one's spouse in young adulthood. The extent to which father's (but not mother's) child-rearing was perceived as mutuality-oriented was positively associated with adult outcomes in filial relationships, particularly in females.

The extent to which both parents' child-rearing was perceived as control-oriented was associated with adult outcomes in the filial relationships of females. In males, the association between these
variables was more complex. A regression analysis indicated that scores reflecting the degree of control-oriented child-rearing reported in both parents was needed to make any prediction of the level of maturity in adult filial relationships (specifically, with mothers). Also, the degree of control-oriented child-rearing was associated with lower intimacy maturity only in females reflecting on their fathers' parenting. There was no relationship found between control-oriented child-rearing and males' level of intimacy maturity.

The data supported the prediction that subjects would be more likely to have achieved greater maturity in their relationships with their spouses than with their parents. Whether or not the hypothesized transfer of progress toward mutuality from the spousal domain to the parental domain takes place could not be surmised from this study's cross-sectional data.

Further analyses indicated that there was a gender difference in the association between intimacy maturity with spouse and the maturity of the relationships young adults have with their parents. While a significant association between the two relationship domains was found in women, there was no association between level of maturity in the two domains in men.

In addition to predicting that the nature of the child-rearing reports and the quality of the intimate relationship achieved with a spouse would individually contribute to the prediction of the level of maturity in young adults' relationships with their parents, it was further hypothesized that the interaction between these two relationship variables would be significant. This prediction was based on the
assumption that stress in either of these relationships might, at least in part, be compensated for or counterbalanced by support in the other. This hypothesis was partially supported by the female data, but not the male data.

A discussion of the results included explanations of the findings, a critique of the methodology, and suggestions for future research methods and directions.
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APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF A PORTION OF FRI SCORING MANUAL
Parental Domain: Family Relationships Interview Scoring
Stages for Orientation

Level 1. Self-focused
   Global and undifferentiated orientation in all 3 areas.
   1) affect: parents are loved or hated
   2) cognition: view may be both unarticulated and inarticulate; parents seen as good or bad
   3) behavior: interactions sought when they provide benefits (i.e., love, money, comfort) and avoided when they bring pain.

Stage 1
Most adolescent, most dependent or counterdependent, least conceptual, virtually no perspective on parents as people OR parents. Dependent subjects not able to see own views as different from parents. Egocentric and unreflective.
REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT: “What do you mean, ‘What’s my view of my mother?’ She’s just my mother. I don’t know what you mean.”

Stage 2
Caught up with emphasizing separateness. Describe relationship as self-right, parent-wrong. Emphasis on being “grown up”. Self-protectiveness. “Respect” for parents tied to parental ability to supply subject’s needs rather than to meeting social expectations. Relationship often seen as different because of changes in self.
REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT: “...the beginning of my trying to do things on my own without really thinking if my mother would approve. So then it was really hard for me to approach her or talk to her at all, because I just felt that anything I was doing she wouldn’t approve”

Level 2. Role-focused
Orientation in the three areas is now quite conventional
   1) affect: affective life often seems bland and stereotyped; emphasis on control of expressions of feelings; “love” for parents seen as “natural”; ambivalence possible.
   2) cognition: view of parents tied to stereotyped notions of duty, respect, meeting obligations.

   3) behavior: interactions sought but generally in safe areas;
emphasis on keeping things nice and not rocking the boat, "getting along".

Stage 3
Increased awareness of own contribution to parent-child relationship but parents still seen only in relation to self. No perspective on parents as separate adults. New tolerance for parents. Trying to understand the relationship. Beginning ability to see how the self impacts the parents, sometimes reflect on child-rearing practices as impacts self. Change in view often brings report of changed affect and behavior.

REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT: "I can think back to the things I was made to do. They probably were strict parents growing up. I didn't always agree with all of them. I still don't...but most of them were for my own good, and really did mold me into what I am today".

Stage 4
View parents as people not just parents. Parents seen as having lives of their own, past mistakes---described in conventional terms. Trying to understand parents as separate people.

REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT: "When she [mother] worries much too much about things that affect me, I can understand her intentions and the way she feels about it but it's just annoying to me ... in the past where I might have gotten really ...angry with her, now I can just kind of deal with it and go on to the next thing. When I was a child I used to idolize my mother more than seeing her as a real person. She was always really up there on a pedestal. And now my mother is much more down on the ground."

Level 3. Individuated-connected
Orientation in the 3 areas has become more complex.
1) affect: strong positive bonds reflecting real value for parent as person.
2) cognition: in-depth psychological perspective on parents.
3) behavior: interactions peer-like.

Stage 5
Ability to put self in shoes of parents and see things through their eyes. Parent has become more human. Humanness described with complexity and forgiveness.
When my parents' marriage went through a crisis because my father had an affair, I began to see my mother a little differently. I began to feel that she was a sad woman and didn't have a lot of things going for her. And I started to feel a bit more compassionate towards her background. I began to realize she was not the bad guy I had made her out to be. She would never have been able to stay with my father if she hadn't been the way she is and that he's not exactly perfect—he has his faults too. He was always the good guy but his having an affair brought him him down to human...both...real problems of their own.

Stage 6
In-depth perspective. Now includes acknowledgement of the interactive quality of the relationship. May be insight into the way in which the parent's personality has affected the child. Along with acceptance of the faults of the parents comes a recognition that parents must settle for child's shortcomings.

They never instilled in me a complete belief in myself. I can look back now and see that the reason that was is because they never really had belief in themselves. And it showed in little ways—like when my Dad was in a restaurant he'd kind of be uncertain—something you could sense—and kind of be uncomfortable and embarrassed.
APPENDIX B

SUMMARY OF THE INTIMACY SCORING MANUAL
Spousal Domain: Intimacy Interview Scoring Stages for Orientation

Level 1. Self-focused
Global and undifferentiated orientation in all 3 areas.
1) affect: spouse loved or hated
2) cognition: view may be both unarticulated and inarticulate; spouse seen as good or bad. Spouse seen as source of supply or hostile rival.
3) behavior: interactions sought when they provide benefits and avoided when they bring pain.

Stage 1
Dependent or counterdependent, poorly differentiated, least conceptual, virtually no perspective on spouse as separate person. Egocentric and unreflective.
REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT: "I’m not in her head. I have no idea what her view of me is."

Stage 2
Judgmental, partner wrong or bad for behaving in ways that contradict own point of view or think that explaining own point of view to partner should do away with any opposition.
REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT: "Well she’s a perfectionist. So she tends to be overcritical about things. She wants everything immaculate. I try not to let it get to me, just for convenience sake---its not worth an argument."

Level 2. Role-focused
Orientation in the three areas is now quite conventional
1) affect: affective life often seems bland and stereotyped; emphasis on control of expressions of feelings; "love" for spouse seen as "natural"; ambivalence possible.
2) cognition: view of spouse tied to stereotyped notions of duty, respect, meeting obligations.
3) behavior: interactions sought but generally in safe areas; emphasis on keeping things nice and not rocking the boat, "getting along".
Stage 3
Trying to understand the relationship. Beginning ability to see how the self impacts on spouse. Descriptive as if repeating what partner has explained; somewhat judgmental. Partner has right to own point of view, but limited perspective on it. Respect spouse to maintain stable marriage. Be good spouse.
REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT: "He's very concerned about getting ahead in the company and when he talks about success it's like what he needs and naturally I think I'm a little more correct...I want to formulate what I want out of life. I'm not sure he's that kind of person."

Stage 4
Trying to understand spouse as separate individual. Not as judgmental--accepts partner's point of view. Some effort to coordinate perspectives and compromise. Other still seen in terms of role. More tolerance. Fairly concrete.
REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT: "We have different styles, and different ways of going about child-rearing. I really don't think it will get resolved; I've learned to live with it. He just tends to be the 'strict father'---he looks for things and I don't. He often gets angry over trivial things, which many times can lead to an argument if we don't agree."

Level 3. Individuated-connected
Orientation in the 3 areas has become more complex.
1) affect: strong positive bonds reflecting real value for spouse as person.
2) cognition: in-depth psychological perspective on spouse.
3) behavior: interactions based on equality.

Stage 5
Sees other outside of role. Attempt to understand other's motivations. Less judgmental. Not enough to have developed sense of why partner feels a certain way w/out some evidence of attempt to take those feelings into account by changing own behavior.
REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT: "...she has ways of doing things that she did when she lived at home and I have my ways of doing things when I lived at home---we're now able to come to a compromise. I mean I can't feel the feelings she feels, but I can understand them if we talk things over."
We can see each other's side and say, 'Can you see how I was feeling?' and 'Yeah, I can see see where you said that'.

**Stage 6**

In depth perspective. Now includes acknowledgement of the interactive quality of the relationship. Can anticipate other's needs and explain motivations partner may not be clearly aware of. Can maintain a sense of partner's point of view even during fights.

**REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT**: "There are certain things that will never change, like some of her outlooks and things... because of the way we were raised, somewhat similar, but vastly different... There are certain issues we agree on, but maybe not wholeheartedly. We can understand each other's feelings fairly well and can easily tell when each of us is bothered by something. We don't think any less of each other because of these differences. We view each other as independent people and therefore accept those differences more easily."

**Spousal Domain: Intimacy Interview Scoring Stages for Caring and Concern**

**Level 1. Self-Focused-** Little or no caring expressed

**Stage 1**

Expresses little caring. May include judgmental or negative attitude toward partner.

**REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT**: "He's got to depend on himself. I just can't keep helping him. He's got to take care of himself."

**Stage 2**

Expresses more caring. Still judgmental and hostile.

**REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT**: "I guess I should try to bring her flowers, or something like that. But I feel I've got my hands full trying to meet the bills every week and I'm supporting us, so she should know I care about her."

**Level 2. Role-Focused -** Conventional expressions of caring.

**Stage 3**

Does conventional activities expected in role of husband or wife.

**REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT**: "I show her I care by working hard so that I make enough money to support us."
Stage 4
Gives intangible types of support. No specific examples of how that would take place. Conventional role with some acknowledgement of emotional factors.
REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT: "I make sure he has clean clothes to wear and I cook his favorite things. I hug and kiss him a lot".

Level 3. Individuated-Connected – Doing things for other without having to be told.

Stage 5
Provides emotional support—example of support provided in response.
REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT: "I knew she was upset the day she found out she didn't pass the bar, so I called her at work and told her I would pick her up and take her out to dinner. I just told her I loved her and it would be O.K."

Stage 6
Combines responding to unspoken needs w/ an active, unselfish accommodation to partner's needs.
REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT: "I try to show her how much I care by remembering what's important to her, like Sunday mornings are a special time for her, so I like to plan to just have the time to ourselves. I try to be aware of times when she's got extra pressure on her...then I take on all the household chores for her. I tell her how much she means to me, and I express my caring physically."

Spousal Domain: Intimacy Interview Scoring Stages for Sexuality
Self-focused Describe sex life in terms of frequency or variety—treating partner as sex object. Lack of concern for partner's pleasure, or intolerance for partner's differing sexual need

Stage 1
Very poor sense of sexual identity.
REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT: "I was always afraid of sex—the way I was brought up made me feel very frightened. I guess I thought things would change automatically when I got married, but it hasn't really worked that way. I guess you could say we don't really have a sexual relationship".
**Stage 2**

REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT: "Sex is not extremely important...It's more a friendship relationship where each has emotional needs and they are very well satisfied."

**Level 2. Role-focused** Everything is fine. Conflict and complications coming from external factors—not enough time, tired, etc.

**Stage 3**

REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT: "Well---we can talk about sex---if one party's not up for it, or something. We don't put pressure on each other, at all. I'm getting to the age, you know, it's not as important any more."

**Stage 4**

Acknowledges tenderness and affection underlying relation. Tolerance for frustration.

REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT: "Yes, it's very satisfying...the only problem is that we both get so tired from school and work that we don't have as much energy for sex as we used to. After you've been married a few years, you're not as passionate, but there's more affection."

**Level 3. Individuated-Connected** Accepting occasional frustrations and valuing expression of tenderness. Talking freely about sexual relation. Evidence that sex is better when spend more time together. Ability to be playful. Emphasis on emotion being expressed. Emphasis on mutuality in relationship.

**Stage 5**

Valuing what is expressed through sex.

REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT: "Sex is even more wonderful now that we are trying to get pregnant. It adds a deeper meaning to what we are expressing."

**Stage 6**

Emphasizing the uniqueness of the relationship with the specific partner.

REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT: We have always had an incredibly powerful sexual attachment---that was there before we really got to know each other. And that is still there. Even when we're exhausted, or angry at each other, that feeling draws us together and helps us express how much we care.
Spousal Domain: Intimacy Interview Scoring Stages for Commitment

Level 1. Self-focused
Ready to leave the relationship. May be inconvenient to get a divorce. Very concrete. Needs to stay out of dependency or out of reasons of convenience. Strong wishes and fantasies about divorce, love affairs, or spouse's death. Perhaps having an affair, unwilling to deal with some glaring problem.
Stage 1
Little or no commitment.
REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT: "I don't think we're going to make it. We've split before and then got back together again, but all we seem to do is fight."
Stage 2
Concrete or opportunistic approach to commitment.
REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT: "I tell her if she can't stop nagging me about smoking I'll leave her. And she knows it's only half a joke. I'm just not sure I can tell, right now, what I'll feel like in a year or two."

Level 2. Role-focused
Shows a socially acceptable, role-stereotyped intention to stay in the marriage.
Stage 3
Commitment to institution of marriage, less to the individual. External signs of commitment--pregnancy, house, retirement fund may be included here. Could be considering divorce, but if devoting energy to repairing, included here.
REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT: "Yes, as I said, I've thought about divorce recently, and he knows it. That's why I want us to go for counseling, so we can see what we can do to make this work. I'm trying to talk to him openly now, about things I'm upset about."
Stage 4
Commitment to institution with more of an emotional component. Happy with way things are and wants to stay married.
REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT: My marriage means everything to me. My wife and family mean everything to me."

Level 3. Individuated-Connected
Commitment to specific individual. Intention to stay in marriage
through thick and thin—as shown by investment in concrete things like children combined with loving investment in particular partner. Not just tolerance of foibles but positive appreciation for his/her individuality.

Stage 5
Commitment to specific partner—sense of working things out.

REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT: "There's just a sense that we belong together, we're right for each other, that goes very deep. I can't think of much that would seriously threaten our marriage. I think we would always work things out."

Stage 6
Even deeper sense of commitment to specific individual revealed through comments reflecting true appreciation of partner's uniqueness.

REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT: "We were stripping the woodwork together in our house, and it was really a lot of work. And she really throws herself into that kind of project. So the place was a mess and we were both all sweaty and covered with muck. And I was just looking at her and thinking: We're going to live in this house for the next thirty years. We'll be sitting in this room when we're old together. And it made me happy."

Spousal Domain: Intimacy Interview Scoring Stages for Communication

(Involves 4 behavioral components: self-disclosure, listening, initiating, and responding. Also involves affect accompanying communication process and conception of self and others in the communication process.)

Level 1. Self-focused  Low value placed on communication in the relationship. May use communication skills to control or manipulate other. Examples: lying or attacking the other's position. Usually focus on concrete matters and matters external to relationship, not affective or relationship-centered material.

Stage 1
Sees no value in communicating with partner. Shares basic information. REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT: "I don't enjoy talking about our problems and so I avoid it. I see little value in talking about things. If something's wrong it should just be changed."
Stage 2
Will discuss concrete details affecting relationship: plans, activities.
Feels talking makes things worse.
REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT: "I don't usually bring up too many problems.
Generally I accept things at face value".

Level 2. Role-focused Topics fairly concrete and external to the relationship, but high value on sharing. Some sharing of feeling with partner.

Stage 3
Conventional, safe topics. "We talk about everything" without specifics to support the claim. Stereotyped language. May have rigid rules about how, when, about what communication can take place.
REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT: "I try to avoid subjects that may cause a disagreement, but I do talk about the house and our financial situation, stuff like that."

Stage 4
Value communication, resolution of conflict, etc. More sharing of feeling. Sincere efforts sometimes become blocked and end in fighting or withdrawal. Usually include more specifics. Can sometimes put aside own reactions to truly listen when partner expresses point of view. Communication still often broken off before any resolution of a conflict takes place.
REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT: "There are certain things that I would rather not discuss because I'm afraid we might end up fighting, but usually we talk out what's on our minds."

Level 3. Individuated-connected Content includes affective topics and the relationship itself. A great deal of affective and relationship-centered discussion. Commitment to making time to talk, despite busy schedules and other obstacles. Conflict resolution—some initial defensiveness in listening to criticism O.K. Emphasis on whether value communication enough to listen to painful material and then go on to resolve.

Stage 5
Often discloses, initiates discussion and can usually listen to partner's point of view. Usually feels positive when they talk, with the exceptions of some problems that never seem to get resolved.
REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT: "We discuss our differences, but at first I
think we are both a bit defensive. Once we relax, our discussion is much more productive.

Stage 6
Communication typically brought to a resolution with both partners satisfied. Feels extremely positive about talking with partner.
REPRESENTATIVE EXCERPT: "I usually am the first to bring up an issue if there is tension in the air, but we always talk about it; of course, sometimes the discussion becomes heated, but the problems are always resolved, nothing is ever left unresolved. It's just too upsetting not to discuss these things."
APPENDIX C

QUESTIONS CONTAINED IN THE "CURRENT INTERACTIONS" SECTION OF THE CRPR
FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS INTERVIEW

Current Interactions

1. a. Can you describe your most recent interaction with your parents? What went on between you? What kinds of things were said and done? (Was it typical?)

b. In general, what have the interactions with your mother been like for the last year or so? (past few years for 29 year olds) (Example)

c. What have the interactions with your father been like for the last year or so? (Example)

d. What is your mother's view of you currently? (How is that view reflected in her behavior toward you?)

e. What is your father's view of you currently? (How is that view reflected in the way he behaves toward you?)

f. What is your view of your mother? (How is that reflected in the way you behave toward her?)

g. What is your view of your father? (How is this view reflected in your behavior toward him?)

h. (Sometimes there are important turning points in relationships with parents. Have any specific events changed the nature of your relationship with your mother? Your father?)
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TABLE 1: FRIM AND FRIF SCALE SCORES: INTERRATER RELIABILITY
### Table 1

**FRIM and FRIF SCALE SCORES: Interrater Reliabilities Based on Scores for Reliability Sample of 30 Subjects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage of agreement between judges</th>
<th>Percentage of agreement between each judge and final compromise score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BP-KW</td>
<td>BP-SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRIM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1/2 stage</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRIF</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1/2 stage</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

QUESTIONS ASKED IN INTIMACY INTERVIEW
ORLOFSKY INTIMACY INTERVIEW (MODIFIED)

(Female form)

Basically we're interested in learning about people's closest relationships with members of the same and opposite sex. Let's start with the relationship you consider to be your closest.

Who would this be? How long have you been close?

Would you briefly describe this person? What is he like?

What is his view of you?

What kinds of activities do the 2 of you do together? That is, how do you spend your time together?

What kinds of activities do the 2 of you do separately? (yourself) (him)

How do you feel when your husband gets involved in outside or separate activities? Why?

How does your husband feel when you get involved in outside activities?

What kinds of things do the 2 of you usually talk about together? (ex.) Do you share worries and problems?

Do you talk about your relationship with one another? What things concerning your relationship do you talk about? (ex.)

Do you share problems or differences within the relationship? (ex.) (If S says don't have any problems use optional probes.)

How are these dealt with? Why this way?

Who usually initiates efforts to deal with problems? If unequal, why?
How do you react when he brings up problems or concerns to you about your relationship? Why?

How does he react when you bring up problems or concerns to him about your relationship? Why?

Are there any ways in which you could be more open with him?

Are there any ways in which he could be more open with you?

People sometimes get on each other's nerves in some way or another. Is there anything about your husband that you dislike? Have you discussed it with him? How?

Is there anything about yourself that gets on your husband's nerves? Has he expressed this to you?

How do you react to your husband's feedback? Why?

Do you ever have any fights? How do you they usually get started? How do the 2 of you deal with such differences?

In what ways do you show your husband you care about him? Would he like you to express your caring differently? (Do you do things for each other without being asked to go out of your way to help?)

Would your husband say you are as concerned about his needs as you are about your own? If no, why?

In regards to the sexual side of your relationship, are you satisfied with the way things are?

Is your husband satisfied with the sexual side of your relationship?

As a couple have you discussed the sexual aspect of your relationship with each other? (ex.)

How frequently do you have such discussions?

Would you like to see anything change? Explain.
How do you think he would view these changes?

Would your husband like to see any changes? Explain.

What do you think of these changes?

Overall, have there been any important changes in your sexual relationship?

How have you reacted to these changes?

How has he?

In reference to your relationship overall, does one of you show more involvement than the other? If yes, why so and is this a source of difficulties?

How committed to this relationship are you? Your husband?

Do you ever feel in conflict over this relationship?

Do you ever think of alternatives to your present relationship?

Given that every relationship has room to grow, how could you contribute to improving the general quality of your relationship as it currently exists?
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TABLE 2: INTIMACY SCALE SCORES--INTELLIGENT RELIABILITY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Percentage of agreement between judges</th>
<th>Percentage of agreement between each judge and final compromise score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BP-KW</td>
<td>BP-SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1/2</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1/2</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1/2</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1/2</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1/2</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX H

CRPR ITEMS SELECTED FOR MUTUALITY-ORIENTED AND CONTROL-ORIENTED CHILD-REARING SCALES
**Mutuality-oriented 14-item Scale**

1. My mother/father respected my opinions and encouraged me to express them.

30. My mother/father talked it over and reasoned with me when I misbehaved.

20. My mother/father let me make many decisions myself.

64. My mother/father encouraged me to be independent of her/him.

36. My mother/father realized she/he had to let me take some chances as I grew up and tried new things.

31. My mother/father trusted me to behave as I should, even when she/he was not around.

37. My mother/father encouraged me to be curious, to explore and question things.

44. My mother/father encouraged me to talk about my troubles.

56. My mother/father taught me that I was responsible for what happened to me.

79. My mother/father did not insist that young boys and girls have different kinds of toys or play different sorts of games.

33. My mother/father gave me a good many family duties and responsibilities.

66. My mother/father found being with her/his children interesting and educational—even for long periods of time.

4. When I got into trouble, I was expected to handle the problem mostly by myself.

29. My mother/father believed that I always told the truth.

**Control-oriented 10-item Scale**

9. My mother/father tried to keep me away from children of families who had different ideas or values from hers/his.

59. My mother/father did not allow me to question her/his decisions.

24. My mother/father did not allow me to get angry with her/him.

35. My mother/father had strict well-established rules for me.
11. My mother/father believed physical punishment was the best method of discipline.

12. My mother/father thought a child should be seen and not heard.

70. My mother/father punished me if I expressed jealousy or resentment towards my brothers or sisters.

53. My mother/father thought scolding and criticism would make me improve.

68. My mother/father expected me not to get dirty while I was playing.

72. My mother/father used to control what I did by warning me of all the bad things that could happen to me.
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TABLE 6: DISTRIBUTION OF FRIM SCORES FOR YOUNGEST AND OLDEST SUBJECTS BY STAGE AND LEVEL
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>FIML Score</th>
<th>22 year-olds</th>
<th>25 year-olds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Count(n = 18)</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-FOCUSED</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROLE-FOCUSED</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIVIDUATED - CONNECTED</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 3.78  
SD = 1.56  
Mean = 4.20  
SD = 1.16
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TABLE 7: DISTRIBUTION OF FRIF SCORES FOR YOUNGEST AND OLDEST SUBJECTS BY STAGE AND LEVEL
### Table 7
Distribution of FRIF Scores For Youngest and Oldest Subjects by Stage and Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>FRIF Score</th>
<th>22 year-olds</th>
<th>26 year-olds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Count (n = 16)</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-FOCUSED</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROLE-FOCUSED</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIVIDUATED-CONNECTED</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 3.44  
SD = 1.59  
Mean = 4.03  
SD = 1.33
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TABLE 8: INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG INTIMACY SCALES IN FEMALES AND MALES
Table 8

Intercorrelations Among Intimacy Scales in Females (n = 42)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Global Intimacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Orientation</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Caring</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sex</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Commitment</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Global Intimacy = Mean of 1 - 5

Intercorrelations Among Intimacy Scales in Males (n = 42)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Global Intimacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Orientation</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Caring</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sex</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Commitment</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Global Intimacy = Mean of 1 - 5
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TABLE 10: DISTRIBUTION OF GLOBAL INTIMACY SCORES FOR YOUNGEST AND OLDEST SUBJECTS BY STAGE AND LEVEL
Table 10

Distribution of Global Intimacy Scores For Youngest and Oldest Subjects by Stage and Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Intimacy Score</th>
<th>22 year-olds</th>
<th>26 year-olds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count (n = 18)</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Count (n = 39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-FOCUSED</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROLE-FOCUSED</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIVIDUATED - CONNECTED</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 5.18  
Mean = 5.06

SD = 1.17  
SD = 1.60