

Winter 12-1-1993

Reasons for Divorce: Perspectives of Divorced Seventh-day Adventists (The First Draft of an Article)

Andreas Erben

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/hrsa>

Recommended Citation

Erben, Andreas, "Reasons for Divorce: Perspectives of Divorced Seventh-day Adventists (The First Draft of an Article)" (1993). *Human Subject Research Archive*. 23.
<http://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/hrsa/23>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Institute of Church Ministry at Digital Commons @ Andrews University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Human Subject Research Archive by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Andrews University. For more information, please contact repository@andrews.edu.

Andrews University
School of Education

REASONS FOR DIVORCE:
PERSPECTIVES OF DIVORCED
SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS
(The First Draft of an Article)

A Term Paper
Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Course
EDPC 680 Theories of Learning and Motivation

by
Andreas Erben
December 1993

LITERATURE REVIEW

When people get divorced, they often ask "Why?" They want to understand what went wrong, "to perform an autopsy upon the dead relationship (Fisher, 1992, p. 1992). To ask the question "Why?" appears to be a basic human approach to a problem at hand, not only for people getting a divorce. Is it because knowing why something happened to us gives us some sense of control over our situation and our future?

The exploration of causes of human behavior is the focus of attribution theory. Much emphasis is put on analyzing the structure of causes assigned to certain outcomes (Schunk, 1991). Heider (1958) made "the most fundamental causal distinction" (Weiner, 1985, p. 551): "In common-sense psychology (as in scientific psychology) the result of an action is felt to depend on two sets of conditions, namely factors within the person and factors within the environment" (Heider, 1958, p. 82).

Weiner (1985) pointed out that since then two more dimensions were added to the fundamental internal-external dimension of causes. The first additional dimension focused on the question of stability. Weiner et al. (1971) suggested that causes be categorized as either stable or unstable. The second additional dimension recognized the influence of control (Rosenbaum, 1972). Causes were perceived as either controllable or uncontrollable.

Therefore, three questions can be asked when one analyses the nature of a particular cause: Where is the

locus of this cause? How stable is this cause over time?
How great is one's chance to control this cause?

For the purpose of this article we will only focus on one causal dimension, the fundamental internal-external dimension (locus). Weiner, who had reviewed research on self-esteem, came to the conclusion that "there is strong evidence confirming a causal locus-esteem union" (Weiner, 1992, p. 275). In his attributional theory of motivation Weiner (1992) connected the causal dimension of control with esteem-related affects. This fits very well with the concept of divorce adjustment. Diedrick (1991, p. 35) reported that "self-esteem ... has often been used as the primary ingredient in, or an aspect of, divorce adjustment measurement". Diedrick pointed out that even other psychological measures of divorce adjustment "correlate highly with, or may be indications of, self-esteem" (p. 36). Therefore, we conclude that the internal-external distinction can be viewed as a valid construct in divorce research.

Another area of attribution theory that can be applied to research on causes of divorce is the theory of hedonic bias. Weiner (1992) explains this concept as follows: "The concept refers to people's tendency to take more credit for success than they do responsibility for failure" (p. 244). The presence of a self-serving attributional bias has been demonstrated in different research projects (Beckmann, 1970; Gilovich, 1983; Kingdon, 1967; Snyder, Stephan, & Rosenfield, 1967).

The question of perceived causes of divorce has been frequently addressed in the literature. Kitson and Sussman (1982) explored patterns of marital complaints of divorcing men and women. The responses of 209 interviewed subjects were coded according to two codes of complaints, Goode's (1956) code and a second code that had been developed especially for this particular study. The authors found that men and women differed in the types of codes mentioned and that men made significantly less complaints than women. The authors discovered that since Goode's (1956) study the types and distribution of complaints had changed very much. Sex, education, social class, length of marriage, and income were found to have an influence on the types and distribution of codes. The authors reported that some types of complaints were correlated with mental health problems. Other subjects experienced relief over the discontinuation of the relationship.

Fletcher (1983) analyzed causes of marital break-up regarding the implications for attribution theory. He employed a very sophisticated methodology. For example, Fletcher used five different attribution targets (self, ex-spouse, self-external, ex-spouse external, background factors, and reasons for marriage) for coding the core units of free-response verbal protocols that were obtained in interviews with divorced subjects. Fletcher found out that females attributed less causal responsibility to themselves than males. Fletcher pointed out that "the most powerful impact on the free-response attribution

percentages was exerted by the question of who decided to leave the marriage. Those who were left gave significantly less causal responsibility to themselves and more to external factors influencing the ex-spouse" (p. 254).

Burns (1984) used a 18 cause checklist in her research on 335 divorced and separated men and women in Sydney, Australia. She found out that for most subjects the breakdown had multiple causes. Sexual incompatibility, lack of communication, and husband's lack of time at home were the most frequent complaints. Seven clusters of marital complaints were derived from factor analysis.

Cleek and Pearson (1985) discovered seven dimensions of causes for divorce. There were gender differences in the composition of the factors and in the seven factors for males and females.

Cupach and Metts (1986) compared the personal accounts of the dissolution of 50 dating relationships with the personal accounts of the dissolution of 50 marital relationships. A free-response format was used. The authors found that the accounts of the dissolution of marital relationship are more complex than the accounts of the dissolution of dating relationships.

Davis and Aron (1988) analyzed a sample of fifty-four midlife women who had experienced a divorce. The authors expected that self-esteem would "be greater among those who attribute the cause to either situational factors or dispositions of the spouse" (p. 43). One of the

instruments that the authors used was a Perceived Causes of Divorce Checklist. The authors found that those who had checked causes that were the husband's fault or due to-what the authors called-neutral circumstances (communication problems and financial problems) had better divorce adjustment. Those women who had checked causes that were somewhat self-accusing evidenced poorer divorce adjustment. Davis and Aron pointed out that these findings conform to the theory of Hedonic bias.

Ponzetti, Zvonkovic, Cate, and Huston (1992) categorized reasons for divorce according to the locus of the reason. Four loci were established: individual/personal locus, dyadic locus, social network, and circumstantial/situational (both last mentioned loci are external to the dyad). Fourteen former couples were interviewed. They were asked to tell in their own words why their marriage did not work out. The responses were later coded. The former wives reported significantly more reasons than the former husbands. Four couples comprised a high agreement group.

Gigy and Kelly (1992) discovered nine factors underlying a 27-item checklist of reasons for divorce. For their sample of 437 men and women, unmet emotional needs/growing apart was the most frequently cited factor.

Causes of divorce among Seventh-day Adventists have only been previously studied by a project group of the North-American Division under the leadership of Monte Sahlin (n.d.). In a 'Family Life Survey' two checklists of

causes of divorce were included. Since the results of this study have not been published yet, no comments can be made.

This study appears to be the first study that analyses causes for divorce among Seventh-day Adventists that were collected using a free-response format.

METHODS

The Sample

The population for this research project was composed of all Seventh-day Adventist divorcees residing in the U.S. that were included on the mailing list of Adventist Singles Ministries in February 1993. A data file containing a list of 853 Seventh-day Adventist divorcees was provided by Adventist Singles Ministries. After removing 57 subjects that were identified as residing in Canada, the population pool for this study was reduced to 796 subjects. The sample for this research project consisted of 425 subjects, randomly selected from the population of 796 Adventist divorcees. The research package, mailed on February 26, 1993, and March 1, 1993, to these 425 subjects, contained a cover letter, a questionnaire, and a stamped, self-addressed return envelope. Accidentally, one package was sent out without containing a return envelope. On March 19, 1993, a follow-up mailing was carried out. Two hundred thirty-nine reminder postcards were sent to subjects who had not responded by that date or whose response number could not be identified.

Three subjects of the 425 names listed were lost, because 2 were undeliverable and 1 respondent indicated that she was not a divorcee, but a widow. This reduced the sample base to 422. Four subjects wrote to this researcher indicating that they did not want to participate. Two hundred fifty-three subjects sent their questionnaires back. Twelve of these responses were discarded, because too many items were missing. One subject stated that she was not a member of Adventist Singles Ministries. This individual, who had been a Seventh-day Adventist at the time of the divorce and who was attending church regularly and was taking an active part in the church during the time this survey was mailed, was not excluded from the sample. The response rate was 60%. Out of 422 questionnaires, 253 (241 usable questionnaires and 12 unusable ones) were returned.

For the purpose of this research project the responses that could be included in the analysis were further narrowed down. One survey was not used in the analysis because the respondent had indicated that she had answered the questionnaire in respect to the separation from a boyfriend. Twenty-four subjects, who had not indicated that they were Seventh-day Adventists at the time of the divorce (8 had been members of other denominations, 14 had been non-Christians, 1 had dropped from membership shortly before the divorce, and 1 had not answered that particular question) were also removed. Additionally, 2 respondents who had stated that they were remarried were excluded from

the data-set. However, the three respondents who had not answered that particular question were retained. Because 14 subjects from a total of 214 respondents that were Seventh-day Adventists at the time of the divorce did not answer the free-response format question that was the basis of this research report the sample was reduced to 200.

The sample was composed of 54 males and 146 females. Three of the 200 subjects did not state their marital status. The majority of respondents were between 40 and 59 years old (69.9%). Information about the age of the subjects of this sample is presented in Table 1.

Three subjects of the 200 did not state how much time had elapsed since they had begun living without their former spouse. The majority of this sample had been separated from their former spouse for more than 5 years. Only 41.6% had been separated for 5 or less years. Information about the length of separation of the subjects of this sample is presented in Table 2.

Regarding length of marriage, the majority of this sample (56.5%) had been married for more than 10 years. Information about the length of marriage of the subjects of this sample is presented in Table 3.

The majority of subjects indicated that they had children (85.5%). Of those 171 subjects, 18% had one child, 42% had two children, 21% had three children, and 19% had more than three children. One subject of those 171 did not state whether the child(ren) was(were) still living in the household. Forty-seven percent of the 170 subjects

who had answered this particular question indicated that they had at least one child still living with them.

Regarding the question as to who decided to end the marital relationship, 38.1% stated that they had made the decision to divorce, 45.7% said that their former spouse had made that decision, and 16.2% expressed that they had made the decision together. Three subjects of the 200 did not answer this particular question.

When asked about the religion of the former spouse at the time of the divorce, 75% stated that their former spouse was a Seventh-day Adventist, 6.5% expressed that their former spouse was a member of another denomination, 17.5% said that their former spouse was a non-Christian,

Table 1

Age

Age group	Frequency	Percentage
20-29	4	2.0
30-39	29	14.6
40-49	71	35.7
50-59	68	34.2
60 and older	27	13.6

Note. Frequency missing = 1.

Table 2

Length of Separation

Length of separation	Frequency	Percentage*)
One year	9	4.6
2-3 years	31	15.7
4-5 years	42	21.3
6-10 years	58	29.4
More than 10 years	57	28.9

Note. Frequency missing = 2.

*) Because of rounding percentages do not add up to 100%.

Table 3

Length of Marriage

Length of marriage	Frequency	Percentage
1-5 years	45	22.5
6-10 years	42	21.0
11-20 years	61	30.5
21-30 years	39	19.5
31-40 years	13	6.5

1 subject (0.5%) indicated that his/her former spouse dropped from membership shortly before the divorce, and 1 subject (0.5%) stated that his/her former spouse was an ex-Seventh-day Adventist.

Regarding the number of divorces, 72.4% stated that they had been divorced once, 21.6% expressed that they had been divorced twice, and 6% indicated that they had been divorced more than twice. One did not respond.

There were 2.5% Blacks, 5% Hispanics, 92.0% Whites, and 1 subject (0.5%) who marked the answer "Other" in this sample. Information on the income of the subjects of this sample is presented in Table 4. Three subjects did not answer this particular question. All 200 subjects in this sample answered the question regarding the highest level of formal education. All 200 people completed at least high school. Information about the level of formal education of the subjects of this sample is presented in Table 5.

In the questionnaire one question concerned the amount of time spent in the Seventh-day Adventist school system. One hundred and seven divorcees had attended Adventist elementary schools for 1 or more years, 120 divorcees had attended Adventist academies for 1 or more years, 114 had been enrolled in Adventist colleges for 1 or more years, and 15 had been enrolled in graduate programs at Seventh-day Adventist institutions for 1 or more years.

Regarding the total amount of time spent within the Seventh-day Adventist school system, 51 subjects had spent between 1 and 5 years in Adventist educational institutions, 26 subjects had spent between 6 and 10 years in Adventist educational institutions, and 71 subjects had spent between 11 and 20 years in Adventist educational

institutions. There was 1 subject who had spent 23 years in the Seventh-day Adventist school system.

Table 4

Income

Income range	Frequency	Percentage
Under \$10,000	20	10.2
Between \$10,000 and \$19,999	43	21.8
Between \$20,000 and \$29,999	51	25.9
Between \$30,000 and \$39,999	37	18.8
Between \$40,000 and \$49,999	26	13.2
\$50,000 and more	20	10.2

Note. Frequency missing = 3.

Table 5

Highest Level of Formal Education

Level of education	Frequency	Percentage
Completed high school	27	13.5
Some college	82	41.0
Completed college	65	32.5
Graduate school	26	13.0

The Measure

The free-response format question "What do you think has contributed to the failure of your marital relationship?" was included in an survey on divorce problems. The responses to this question ranged from a single word like "incest" to comprehensive paragraphs like the following one:

I believe the root of the problem was my ex-husbands' very low self-esteem. No matter how much approval or acceptance he received, it was never enough-because he didn't feel good about himself. The resulting behavior was a string of affairs to boost his ego-finally divorced to marry his secretary. (He's been married 3 times since.) He had deep emotional problems that were not apparent to me when we married. We also had a widely divergent background and it was hard to merge our different values-specially on finances and child rearing. There was also a strike against the marriage created by a child on the way before the wedding day. I loved him or I would not have gone ahead with the marriage. However, except for the baby, I would have waited much longer and probably have accessed the red flags better.

These written responses were analyzed, and core elements were identified and listed as separate verbal units of causes. A particular cause could be identified in a single unit like "incest" or in a series of two or more units like "I believe the root of the problem was my ex-husbands' very low self-esteem. No matter how much approval or acceptance he received, it was never enough-because he didn't feel good about himself". In making decisions about what statement constituted a separate verbal unit the context of the entire written response was considered. For example, for the above presented paragraph the following verbal units of causes were identified:

husband's low self-esteem
a string of affairs to boost his ego
He had deep emotional problems
divergent background

different values
pregnancy before marriage

Every unit was categorized according to the content of the complaint and the locus of the complaint (attribution target). The content categories of the causes that were first developed were very specific. Later different specific categories of causes were summarized into broader categories. Five attribution categories were developed:

- (0) No attribution of cause expressed.
- (1) Attributed to self.
- (2) Attributed to spouse.
- (3) Attributed to both of the spouses.
- (4) Attributed to others outside of the marriage or to an environmental condition

For example, the above presented set of units of causes was categorized according to the 5 attribution targets as follows:

- (2) husband's low self-esteem
- (2) a string of affairs to boost his ego
- (2) He had deep emotional problems
- (3) divergent background
- (3) different values
- (0) pregnancy before marriage

The 25 final categories of causes that were developed to systematize the data are presented in Table A in the appendix. All causes that were mentioned less than three times and that could not be assigned to a broader category were categorized as "Other Causes."

FINDINGS

The total number of causes reported by women was 655. The total number of causes reported by men were 153. Women reported an average of 3.4 causes, while men reported an average of 2.8 causes. Women appear to report more causes of the marital breakdown than men.

There were six categories of causes that were mentioned by females, but not by males (see appendix, Table A): gambling, lack of acceptance or respect/criticism, lack of support, one spouse grew/growing apart, pre-marital sex/pregnancy, and problems with parenting/children. The five most frequently mentioned causes mentioned by males and females are presented in Table 6. One should note that a number of individuals reported more than one cause pertaining to a certain category of causes.

Females reported much more extramarital affairs as causes for the breakup than males. A complete list of causes with frequencies of causes for the total sample, for males, and for females is presented in the appendix in Table A. Problems with communication or understanding, personality and emotional problems, religious problems, and 'Other Causes' were among the five most frequently mentioned causes for both males and females.

When the causes were ranked according to how many females mentioned a cause pertaining to a certain category, no changes were found for females (see Table 7). However, the picture changed for males (see Table 8). "Other causes" became the most important category for males.

Instead of 'childhood problems/deficits' in this list the category 'relationships with or interference of others' became one of the most important factors. A complete list of all categories of causes and the number and percentage of subjects responding in a certain category is presented in the appendix (Table B).

Tables C and D in the appendix show the frequency of causes mentioned in connection with a certain direction of attribution. Table C shows the total number of causes mentioned in connection with each of the five directional codes. Twenty-six percent of causes were mentioned without an attribution of direction, 11% of causes had their locus in the respondents, 50% of the causes were attributed toward the former spouse, 9% of the causes were attributed to both of the spouses, and 4% of the causes were attributed to others outside the marital relationship or to environmental conditions. Since a number of respondents answered the research question by providing disconnected nouns or phrases, the number of causes that were mentioned without an attribution of direction was relatively high. Problems with communication or understanding were mentioned 46 times (out of a total of 64) without referring to a locus of attribution.

Table D in the appendix shows the number of causes mentioned by males and females in connection with each of the five directional codes. Table 9 presents the percentage of causes mentioned by females and males within the five attribution categories. There was only a slight

difference of 2 points between the percentage of males and females who mentioned a cause without locus of attribution. The same was true for the percentage of males and females who mentioned causes attributed to both of the spouses-- there was only a .7 difference between males and females. Males appeared to mention more causes with attribution to themselves than females (3.7 difference). Males also mentioned more (3.8 difference) causes attributed to others outside of the marital relationship or to environmental conditions. Females mentioned more causes pertaining to their former spouses. There was a difference of 10.9 points between the percentages of males and females who mentioned causes that were attributed to their former spouse. Therefore, females in this sample tended to blame their former spouse more than males.

Table 6

The Five Most Frequently Reported Causes for Divorce Ranked According to Frequency of Causes Mentioned by Females and Males

Females		Males	
Cause	Frequency	Cause	Frequency
Emotional/ Personality	121	Emotional/ Personality	22
Extramarital Affair(s)	49	Other Causes	20
Communication/ Understanding	46	Communication/ Understanding	17
Other Causes	41	Religious Problems	16
Religious Problems	37	Childhood Problems	14

Note: The frequency of causes is pertaining to the total number of causes that could be identified in each category. Some respondents made more than one statement pertaining to a category of causes.

Table 7

The Five Most Frequently Found Categories of Causes Ranked for Females

Cause	Subjects Responding	Percentage of Females
1. Emotional/ Personality	76	52.1%
2. Extramarital Affair(s)	49	31.0%
3. Communication/ Understanding	39	26.7%
4. Other Causes	35	24.0%
5. Religious Problems	30	20.5%

Note: This table presents the number of subjects who mentioned at least one cause pertaining to certain category. Some subject reported more than one cause in a certain category.

Table 8

The Five Most Frequently Found Categories of Causes Ranked for Males

Cause	Subjects Responding	Percentage of Males
1. Other Causes	17	31.0%
2. Communication/ Understanding	15	27.8%
3. Emotional/ Personality	13	24.1%
4. Religious Problems	12	22.2%
5. Relationships with or Interference of Others	9	17.0%

Note: This table presents the number of subjects who mentioned at least one cause pertaining to certain category. Some subject reported more than one cause in a certain category.

Table 9

Percentages of Causes Mentioned by Females and Males within the Five Attribution Categories

Females* (N=146)	Attribution Category	Males (N=54)
25.5%	0	27.5%
10.0%	1	13.7%
52.2%	2	43.1%
9.2%	3	8.5%
3.2%	4	7.2%

Note. *) Because of rounding percentages do not add up to 100%.

Table E in the appendix presents a list of causes that were mentioned by subjects married to spouses who were Seventh-day Adventists at the time of the divorce (N=150) and respondents who were married to non-Seventh-day Adventists at the time of the divorce (N=50). There were five categories of causes that were not applicable to subjects who had been married to non-Seventh-day Adventists: interest in individual(s) of opposite sex, lack of acceptance or respect/criticism, medical problem/mental illness, premarital sex/pregnancy, and problems with sex/intimacy. Problems with substance abuse appeared to be predominantly mentioned by subjects who had been married to non-Seventh-day Adventist spouses. The category 'Lack of judgement/not knowing enough prior to the marriage was mentioned 12 times by subjects who had been married to

Seventh-day Adventist spouses, but only once by subjects who had been married to non-Seventh-day Adventist spouses.

DISCUSSION

Women reported more causes of divorce than men. There was a difference of .6 points between the average number of causes mentioned by males and females. This finding supports previous research (Cleek and Pearson, 1985; Cupach and Metts, 1986; Kitson and Sussmann, 1982; Ponzetti, Zvonkovic, Cate, and Huston, 1992). Ponzetti et al. (1992) pointed out that "these findings may be due to women's greater awareness (or recall) of the problems that contributed to the demise of their marital relationships" (p.197).

Emotional/personality problems were the most frequently mentioned cause for divorce for the total group of 200 divorcees. Seventy-six females and 13 males reported causes in this category. Kitson, Barbi and Roach (1985), who listed the five most important reasons for divorce reported by 9 different studies, found that personality problems were mentioned by four of the nine.

Extramarital affair(s) were found to be the second most frequently mentioned cause of divorce for women for this sample. Kitson et al. report that nine of the studies they listed mentioned extramarital sex among the five most frequently mentioned causes. Many more women than men reported an extramarital affair as a cause of the marital breakup (49 times mentioned by females, 6 times mentioned

by males). This has also been found by Cupach and Metts (1986) and by Kitson and Sussman (1982). Cupach and Metts (1986) offer the following explanation:

We believe that affairs are more salient in the accounts of divorced women because of their interpretation of extra-marital sex. It seems likely that women more frequently view extra-marital sex as a clear violation of an established relationship definition. A woman sees an affair, whether her own or her partner's, as a threat to emotional attachment and hence, relationship cohesion. Consequently, women more frequently report that their affairs are associated with a decline in marital satisfaction. (p. 327)

The greatest number of males in this sample reported causes related to the category 'Other Causes'. It appears for the males in this sample that causes of divorce tend to be rather unique in their characteristics. A relatively high percentage of males (17%) reported causes pertaining to the category 'Relationships with or Interference of Others', while only 8% of the women mentioned a cause related to this category. This finding supports what has been reported by Kitson and Sussman (1982).

Half of the causes mentioned in this research project were attributed toward the former spouse. Since a number of subjects answered only by using single words or phrases the real number of attributions made toward the former spouse might be higher. The tendency to attribute more responsibility to the former spouse than to oneself has been previously found in research (Cupach and Metts, 1986; Fletcher, 1983; Kitson and Sussman, 1982).

In this research project women reported more causes that attributed responsibility to the former spouse than

men. There was a difference of 10.9 points between the percentages of males and females who mentioned causes that were attributed to their former spouse. Therefore, females in this sample tended to blame their former spouse more than males. This finding is in line with what had been previously found (Kitson and Sussman, 1982).

Interestingly enough, the responses to the Fisher Divorce Adjustment Scale item No. 61 (I blame my former love partner for the failure of our love relationship) held the most negative score for males (average 2.9) and females (average 2.5) than any other item on the Fisher Divorce Adjustment Scale. This confirms the finding that the subjects in this sample tended to assign more responsibility to their former spouse than to themselves.

When the scores on the six subscales of the Fisher Divorce Adjustment Scale for the male and the female sample were computed, it was found out that there were significant differences on three subscales between males and females. Males had significantly less Feelings of Anger ($p \leq .0001$), less Symptoms of Grief ($p \leq .05$), more Social Trust ($p \leq .01$), and a better total score on the Fisher Divorce Adjustment Scale ($p \leq .05$) than women. This researcher suggests that this finding should be interpreted in connection with the high frequency of extra-marital affair(s) mentioned by females. Kitson and Sussman (1982) had found that subjects who mentioned extra-marital sexual relations of their former spouses were more depressed and anxious than others.

The assignment of responsibility for the divorce to the former spouse seems to a self-serving interpretation of a traumatic event that allows the divorcee to preserve his/her self-esteem. In general, the subjects in this sample had a relatively positive score on the total Fisher Divorce Adjustment Scale, therefore, it can be assumed that the majority was rather well adjusted. The attribution of failure toward the former spouse as dominant direction of attribution spouse may have helped them to come to terms with their divorce. However, as the scores to item No. 61 suggest there seems to be some unfinished business. The dominant attribution of failure toward the former spouse that has been found for this sample appears to be a double-edged sword. Fisher (1992) points out:

Those who have worked on their rebuilding enough to have dealt with the anger begin to realize that failure, blame, and responsibility are two-way streets. What happened was part of a complicated interaction that did not work, rather than the fault of one person.

Taking responsibility for anger takes a long time for some of us. It requires a great deal of maturity and strength to do that. It is so much easier to blame the other person! The stage of forgiveness is actually learning to forgive ourselves, and letting go of our anger. (p. 125)

The attribution of responsibility for the divorce toward the former spouse may enhance or secure self-esteem. On the other side, however, it may obstruct working through anger and pain.

CONCLUSIONS

This research project investigated causes for the divorce as provided by respondents who were Seventh-day

Adventists at the time of the divorce. Since the sample that was used is not representative for all Seventh-day Adventists in the U.S., the results should be applied with caution. For further research on causes of marital breakup of Seventh-day Adventists, a large, representative sample should be obtained that includes not only White Seventh-day Adventists, but also Black and Hispanic Adventists. Special attention should be paid to possible connections between certain causes and divorce adjustment.

Table A

Causes Listed According to Categories for the Total Sample, the Female Sample, and the Male Sample

Category	Frequency		
	Total	Female	Male
1. Abuse	35	29	6
2. Childhood problems/deficits	32	18	14
3. Emotional/personality problems	143	21	22
4. Extramarital affair(s)	55	49	6
5. Financial problems-rel. to lack or use of finances	13	7	6
6. Gambling	3	3	
7. Incompatibility/differences	32	25	7
8. Interest in individual(s) of opposite sex	3	2	1
9. Lack of acceptance or respect/criticism	12	12	
10. Lack of commitment/not working on relationship	30	22	8
11. Lack of judgment/not knowing enough prior to marriage	13	7	6
12. Lack of support	5	5	
13. Medical problem/mental illness	3	2	1
14. One spouse grew/growing apart	6	6	
15. Other causes	61	41	20
16. Pre-marital sex/pregnancy	3	3	
17. Problems related to work/job	13	9	4
18. Problems with communication/understanding	63	46	17
19. Problems with parenting/children	6	6	
20. Problems with sex/Intimacy	5	3	2
21. Rejection or lack of counseling/help	12	10	2
22. Relationship(s) with or interference of others	23	13	10
23. Religious problems/differences	53	37	16
24. Spouse homosexual	4	2	2
25. Substance abuse	27	24	3
Total Number of Causes	655	502	153
Mean of Causes	3.3	3.4	2.8

Table B

Number of Causes, Number of Reporting Subjects, and Percentages of Repondents for the Female and Male Sample

Category	F e m a l e s (N=146)			M a l e s (N=54)		
	Number of Causes reported	Reporting subjects	Percentage of females	Number of Causes reported	Reporting subjects	Percentage of males
1. Abuse	29	22	15	6	2	4
2. Childhood	18	14	10	14	6	11
3. Emotional/Personality	121	76	52.1	22	13	24.1
4. Affair(s)	49	49	31	6	6	11
5. Finances	7	7	5	6	5	9
6. Gambling	3	3	2			
7. Incompatibility/Diff.	25	23	16	7	6	11
8. Inter. in opp. sex	2	2	1	1	1	2
9. Lack of acceptance	12	10	7			
10.Lack of commitment	22	20	14	8	7	13
11.Lack of judgment	7	6	4	6	6	11
12.Lack of support	5	5	3			
13.Medical/Mental	2	2	1	1	1	2
14.Growing apart	6	6	4			
15.Other Causes	41	35	24	20	17	31
16.Pre-marital sex/pregn.	3	3	2			
17.Work/Job	9	8	5	4	3	6
18.Communic./Understanding	46	39	26.7	17	15	27.8
19.Parenting/Children	6	6	4			
20.Sex/Intimacy	3	3	2	2	2	4
21.Rej. or lack of couns./help	10	10	7	2	2	4
22.Interference	13	11	8	10	9	17
23.Religious	37	30	20.5	16	12	22.2
24.Spouse homosexual	2	2	1	2	2	4
25.Substance Abuse	24	18	12	3	2	4

Table C

Causes Listed According to Direction of Attribution for the Total Sample

Category	Direction of Attribution				
	Code 0	Code 1	Code 2	Code 3	Code 4
1. Abuse	10		23		2
2. Childhood	1	9	17	4	1
3. Emotional/Personality	30	20	82	11	
4. Affair(s)	9		45	1	
5. Finances	7		5	1	
6. Gambling			2	1	
7. Incompatibility/Diff.	12		5	15	
8. Inter. in opp. sex			3		
9. Lack of acceptance	3	1	6	2	
10.Lack of commitment	7	2	20	1	
11.Lack of judgment	3	6	1	3	
12.Lack of support	1		2		2
13.Medical/Mental	1		2		
14.Growing apart	1	3		2	
15.Other Causes	12	15	21	3	10
16.Pre-marital sex/pregn.	2	1			
17.Work/Job	2	2	7	2	
18.Communic./Understanding	46	5	9	3	
19.Parenting/Children	1		5		
20.Sex/Intimacy	1		4		
21.Rej. or lack of couns./help	3	1	8		
22.Interference			13		10
23.Religious	11	6	25	9	2
24.Spouse homosexual			4		
25.Substance Abuse	7		19	1	
Total	170	71	328	59	27

Table D

Causes Listed According to Direction of Attribution for the Female and the Male Sample

Category	Direction of Attribution									
	Code 0		Code 1		Code 2		Code 3		Code 4	
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
1. Abuse	8	2			19	4			2	
2. Childhood	1		6	3	6	11	4		1	
3. Emotional/Personality	27	3	15	5	70	12	9	2		
4. Affair(s)	9				39	6	1			
5. Finances	3	4			3	2	1			
6. Gambling					2		1			
7. Incompatibility/Diff.	10	2			4	1	11	4		
8. Inter. in opp. sex					2	1				
9. Lack of acceptance	3		1		6		2			
10.Lack of commitment	4	3	1	1	17	3		1		
11.Lack of judgment	2	1	3	3		1	2	1		
12.Lack of support	1				2				2	
13.Medical/Mental	1				1	1				
14.Growing apart	1		3				2			
15.Other Causes	4	8	12	3	15	6	3		7	3
16.Pre-marital sex/pregn.	2		1							
17.Work/Job		2	1	1	7		1	1		
18.Communic./Understanding	34	12	2	3	7	2	3			
19.Parenting/Children	1				5					
20.Sex/Intimacy		1			3	1				
21.Rej. or lack of couns./help	2	1	1		7	1				
22.Interference					10	3			3	7
23.Religious	8	3	4	2	19	6	5	4	1	1
24.Spouse homosexual					2	2				
25.Substance Abuse	7				16	3	1			
Total	128	42	50	21	262	66	46	13	16	11

Table E

Causes Listed According to Presence and Absence of Affiliation of the Former Spouse with the SDA Church

Category	Frequency		
	Total Sample	SDA Spouse (N=150)	Non-SDA Spouse (N=50)
1. Abuse	35	28	7
2. Childhood problems/deficits	32	27	5
3. Emotional/personality problems	143	120	23
4. Extramarital affair(s)	55	43	12
5. Financial problems-rel. to lack or use of finances	13	10	3
6. Gambling	3	2	1
7. Incompatibility/differences	32	20	12
8. Interest in individual(s)of opposite sex	3	3	
9. Lack of acceptance or respect/criticism	12	12	
10. Lack of commitment/not working on relationship	30	25	5
11. Lack of judgment/not knowing enough prior to marriage	13	12	1
12. Lack of support	5	2	3
13. Medical problem/mental illness	3	3	
14. One spouse grew/growing apart	6	4	2
15. Other causes	61	45	16
16. Pre-marital sex/pregnancy	3	3	
17. Problems related to work/job	13	12	1
18. Problems with communication/understanding	63	56	7
19. Problems with parenting/children	6	4	2
20. Problems with sex/Intimacy	5	5	
21. Rejection or lack of counseling/help	12	9	3
22. Relationship(s) with or interference of others	23	20	3
23. Religious problems/differences	53	32	21
24. Spouse homosexual	4	3	1
25. Substance abuse	27	9	18
Total Number of Causes	655	509	146
Mean of Causes	3.3	3.4	2.8

REFERENCE LIST

- Burns, A. (1984). Perceived causes of marriage breakdown and conditions of life. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 46, 551-562.
- Beckman, L. (1970). Effects of students' performance on teachers and observers' attribution of causality. Journal of Educational Psychology, 61, 76-82.
- Cleek, M. G., & Pearson, T. A. (1985) Perceived causes of divorce: An analysis of interrelationships. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 47, 179-183.
- Cupach, W. R., & Metts, S. (1986). Accounts of relational dissolution: A comparison of marital and non-marital relationships. Communication Monographs, 53, 311-334.
- Davis, B., & Aron, A. (1988). Perceived causes of divorce and postdivorce adjustment among recently divorced midlife women. Journal of Divorce, 12(1), 41-55.
- Diedrick, P. (1991). Gender differences in divorce adjustment. Journal of Divorce and Remarriage, 15(?), 33-45.
- Fisher, B. F. (1992). Rebuilding. San Luis Obispo, CA: Impact Publishers.
- Fletcher, G. J. O. (1983). The analysis of verbal explanations for marital separation: Implications for attribution theory. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 13(3), 245-258.
- Gigy, L., & Kelly, J. B. (1992). Reasons for divorce: Perspectives of divorcing men and women. Journal of Divorce and Remarriage, 18, 169-187.
- Gilovich, T. (1983). Biased evaluation and persistence in gambling. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 1110-1126.
- Goode, W. J. (1956). After Divorce. Glencoe, IL: Free Press. (quoted by Kitson and Sussman, 1982)
- Heider, F. (1958). The psychology of interpersonal relations. New York: Wiley.

- Kingdon, J. W. (1967). Politicians' belief about voters. American Political Science Review, 14, 137-145.
- Kitson, G. C., & Sussman, M. B. (1982). Marital complaints, demographic characteristics, and symptoms of mental distress in divorce. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 44, 87-101.
- Kitson, G. C., Barbi, K. B., & Roach, M. J. (1985). Who divorces and why. Journal of Family Issues, 6, 255-293.
- Ponzetti, J. J., Zvonkovic, A. M., Cate, R. M., & Huston, T. L. (1992). Reasons for divorce: A comparison between former partners. Journal of Divorce and Remarriage, 17, 183-201.
- Rosenbaum, R. M. (1972). A dimensional analysis of the perceived causes of success and failure. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles. (quoted by Weiner, 1985)
- Sahlin, M. (n.d.) Family Life Survey. Unpublished manuscript.
- Schunk, D. H. (1991). Learning theories: An educational perspective. New York: Macmillan.
- Snyder, M. L., Stephan, W. G., & Rosenfield, D. (1976). Egotism and attribution. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 33, 435-441.
- Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement and motivation and emotion. Psychological Review, 92(4), 548-573.
- Weiner, B. (1992). Human motivation. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Weiner, B., Frieze, I. H., Kukla, A., Reed, L., Rest, S., & Rosenbaum, R. M. (1971). Perceiving the causes for success and failure. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press. (quoted by Weiner, 1985).