

**PARENTING STYLES, SOME SELECTED SOCIO
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND THE ATTITUDE OF
YOUNG ADULTS TOWARDS MARRIAGE IN SOME PRIVATE
COLLEGES OF ADDIS ABABA**

**BY
SEMPER ELIAS**

**SCHOOL OF PSYCHOLOGY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**

**MAY 2014
ADDIS ABABA**

**PARENTING STYLES, SOME SELECTED SOCIO
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND THE ATTITUDE OF
YOUNG ADULTS TOWARDS MARRIAGE IN SOME PRIVATE
COLLEGES OF ADDIS ABABA**

**BY
SEMPER ELIAS**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO SCHOOL OF PSYCHOLOGY IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS IN DEVELOPMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY**

**SCHOOL OF PSYCHOLOGY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**

**MAY 2014
ADDIS ABABA**

School of Psychology

This is to certify that the thesis prepared by Senper Elias entitled parenting styles, some selected socio demographic variables and the attitude of young adults towards marriage in some private colleges of Addis Ababa and Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of The Requirements for The Degree of Master of Arts (Developmental Psychology) Complies with the Regulations of The University and Meets the Accepted Standards.

Signed by the examining committee

_____	_____	_____
Advisor	Signature	Date

_____	_____	_____
Internal Examiner	Signature	Date

_____	_____	_____
External Examiner	Signature	Date

_____	_____	_____
Chair of department or	Signature	Date

Graduate program coordinator

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

First and foremost, I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my parents, Ato Elias Fisseha and W/ro Woinshet Atnafu who helped me unconditionally throughout my life.

I also would like to thank my advisor Dr. Ayele Meshesha for his valuable comments, suggestions and critical observations at various stages of this work.

I am also indebted to the support of Abera tibebu and Mohmed Reshid for their valuable support throughout this work.

ABSTRACT

The average age at which young adults are getting married has been slowly increasing over the last four decades. A variety of reasons have been proposed to explain why different people may have different attitudes toward marriage; however a few stick out in particular. Attitudes toward marriage in young adults have been shown to differ between the children of married parents and divorced parents as well as between young adults who were brought up from different parenting styles. The present study seeks to determine if young adults differ in their attitude towards marriage as a function of their parent's marital status and by the way they were raised. Possible mediator of the relationship between parenting styles and marriage attitudes is also explored, namely religiosity. The data on demographic characteristics, parenting styles and marital attitudes were collected through a likert type questionnaire from a sample of 80 (40 females and 40 males) post graduate first year students selected randomly from Unity university and Sri-Sai College. Pilot study was conducted on 20 students from both colleges and reliability was tested through a Cronbach's alpha of 0.765. Pearson Product Moment correlation, Independent t-test and one way ANOVA were employed to analyze the data. As a result it was found that parenting styles and the attitude toward marriage has indeed a positive correlation, though it was a weak correlation. This study also found that there is no statistical difference between male and female on their attitude towards marriage.

Table of contents

page

<i>List of tables</i>	<i>i</i>
<i>Acknowledgment</i>	<i>ii</i>
<i>Abstract</i>	<i>iii</i>
1. CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background of the study.....	1
1.2 Statement of the problem.....	3
1.3 Research questions.....	3
1.4 Objectives of the research.....	3
1.5 Significance of the study.....	4
1.6 Delimitation of the study.....	5
1.7 Operational definition of terms.....	6
2. CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	7
2.1 Theoretical Models of Parenting Styles.....	7
2.1.1 Typology of parenting styles.....	9
2.1.2 Parenting Styles in the Ethiopian Cultural Context.....	11
2.1.3 Dimensions of Parenting Style.....	15
2.2 Defining marriage.....	17
2.2.1 Types of marriage.....	17
2.2.2 Marital attitude and some socio demographic variables.....	21
3. CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY.....	24
3.1 Research design.....	24
3.2 Target population and sample.....	24
3.3 Instruments for data collection.....	25
3.4 Procedures for data collection.....	25
3.5 Data analysis.....	26
4. CHAPTER FOUR: RESULT.....	27
5. CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION.....	35
6. CHAPTER SIX: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION	40
6.1 Summary and conclusion.....	40
6.2 Recommendation.....	42
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	44
APPENDICES.....	52

List of Tables	page
Table 1 The demographic characteristics of the study sample.....	27
Table 2 Number of respondents from different parenting styles.....	28
Table 3 ANOVA test for marital attitude compared to age.....	29
Table 4 Independent t-test for marital attitude compared to sex	29
Table 5 ANOVA test for marital attitude compared to the relationship status of the participants	30
Table 6 ANOVA test for marital attitude compared to parents' marital status	31
Table 7 ANOVA test for marital attitude compared to religion.....	32
Table 8 ANOVA test for marital attitude compared to how religious respondents are.....	33
Table 9 Descriptive statistics on parenting styles and marital attitude.....	36
Table 10 Pearson product moment correlation test to test the correlation between the parenting styles and marital attitude.....	37

CHAPTER ONE

1. Introduction

1.1 Background of the study

Parenting, as defined by Bradley and Caldwell (1995), is the regulation of behavior and development of the children, with the intention that they can live a socially desirable life, adapt to their environment, and pursue their own goals. That is, parenting is a socialization process through which parents transfer their cultural values, beliefs, traditions, and norms as well as other socially and culturally desirable behaviors to their children, adolescents, and young adults to be good citizens of the society and for the attainment of adult competence. In this socialization process or while rearing a child, one might be transferring hi/her cultural values about marriage which could shape his/her attitude about marriage. According to Jowell and Park (1996), Values tend to stay unchanged and result in different groupings of attitudes.

Willoughby, Carroll, Vitas, & Hill (2011) suggested that, Parents unknowingly have significant influence upon their children's attitudes toward marriage. Parents' goals for their children are very influential in their young adult children's attitudes towards marriage.

Schwartz (2007) suggested that, in studying attitudes, one needs to look at the underlying values which in turn motivate people's behavior. In this study there are variables that can be seen such as religion and parents marital status.

Ajzen (1993) said that, an attitude is an individual's disposition to react with a certain degree of favourableness or Unfavourableness to an object, behavior, person, institution, or event – or to any other discriminable aspect of individual's world.

According to Riggio & Weiser (2008), Individuals whose parents had divorced have lower expectations for relationship success and have more negative attitudes towards marriage. When people have well-established attitudes about certain attitude objects, they also have evaluative summaries of that attitude object (e.g., how much they like it or dislike it), which make it easier to decide what to do, and are therefore very likely to guide behavior directly.

According to Ajzen (1993), attitudes can be bias or even change people's perceptions of attitude objects, because they focus attention on some particular characteristics of an object (and away from others) that are consistent with those attitudes (e.g., a favorable attitude makes positive qualities more noticeable; a negative attitude makes negative attributes more noticeable). Whatever attitude and behavior youths utilize most easily, good or bad, is the one that is exhibited outwardly first, almost like a habit.

Trotter (2010) conducted a study on how parents' romantic relationships influence college students' attitudes towards their own romantic relationships. This study proposes that marriages are in danger of failing because of the increase in unhealthy relationships based on unhealthy parental models. Trotter argues that when individuals get married, they do not expect their marriage to end in a divorce. However, because of high divorce rates, low marriage rates, a high number of non-marital cohabitations, and a high number of unmarried females with children, it is hard to demonstrate a healthy example of romantic relationships and marriage for others to emulate. Additionally, mass media is continually sending out messages illustrating examples of "casual attitudes" about relationships. In a sense, media reinforces the idea that it is normal to engage in sexual relationships with no strings attached.

A parent's attitudes and behaviors are very influential on their children, particularly those attitudes and behaviors pertaining to marriage. These have been shown to play a large role in development of their children's own views and opinions towards marriage once they reach adulthood. Ellison, Walker, Glenn, and Marquardt (2011) discovered that young adults raised in two-parent families rather than other types of families are more religious. This is especially true for young adults raised by parents in happy and low-conflict marriages (Ellison et al., 2011). For example, transference of religious practices and views is high in families with happily married parents and lower in families with unhappily married parents (Ellison, et al, 2011). This leads to following question, are marital attitudes also transmitted from parent to child?

The marital status of a child's parents has a large impact on how he or she views marriage and relationships in general (Riggio & Weiser, 2008; Willoughby et al., 2011). Young adults who grew up with parents that have remained married throughout their childhood and adult life have a much more positive outlook on relationships (Weigel, Bennett, & Ballard-Reisch, 2003). Likewise, young adults raised in homes affected by divorce view relationships as insecure and limiting (Weigel et al., 2003). Parental marriage quality has been shown to have a moderate effect on young adults' attitudes towards marriage (Willoughby et al., 2011).

Traditionally and naturally, it is expected to be married whatever peoples' attitude is towards marriage. This study investigates how much parenting style can influence and be related to the attitude of young people towards marriage including some selected socio demographic variables and recommend few points both for parents and young adults to promote a healthy perception about marriage.

1.2 Statement of the problem

Much researches were done to show the effect of parenting style on academic achievement of adolescents (Abesha, 1997; Abreham,1996; Markos, 1996; Habtamu, 1997), and the effect of parenting style on adolescents aggression (Adugna,2005),the relationship between parenting style and identity formation (Temesgen,2010).

It was important to undertake this study for different reasons which are, this research tries to fill the gap that other researchers' did not treat locally, that is studying parenting style linking it with marital attitude. To the knowledge of the researcher no one study was done examining the relationship between the two variables.

Marriage has always been seen as a big commitment and young people today have placed a greater emphasis on its importance than in the past (Regnerus & Uecker, 2011). Also now a days, the researcher has observed that many young adults develop negative marital attitude because of the way they were brought up and because of the influence of their parents' marital status. Though there were many researches that studied parenting style with different variables, there were none which could link it with marital attitude. This research strives to see the linkage between parenting styles, some socio demographic variables and the attitude towards marriage.

1.3 Research questions

Thus, this study aims to examine the relationship between parenting style and the attitude of young adults towards marriage. Consequently, this study wants to answer the following research questions:

- Is there a relationship among young adults reared with different parenting styles and their attitudes towards marriage?
- Is there a significant difference in parents' marital status and the attitude of marriage among young adults?
- Is there a statistically significant gender difference among young adults in their attitude towards marriage?
- Is there a significant difference in attitude towards marriage across religions?

1.4 Objectives of the research

The general objective of this study is to investigate the relationship between parenting style and the attitude of young adults towards marriage on two selected colleges in Addis Ababa.

The specific objectives include:

- To examine the statistically significant gender difference among young adults in their attitude towards marriage
- To investigate the significant difference between parents marital status and young adults' attitude towards marriage.
- To investigate mean differences among young adults reared with different parenting styles in their attitudes towards marriage.

- To examine the relationship between religion and the attitude of young adults towards marriage.

1.5 Significance of the study

Achieving intimacy, making career choices, and attaining vocational success are important challenges of early adulthood (Rice, 1995). Thus, some of the key preoccupations of this life stage are summarized—echoing Freud’s reputed comments— in the words “lieben und arben” (love and work).

Young adulthood is a period of making decisions that will have long-term or possibly life-long implications: family, career decisions, Achieving intimacy, love, marriage and parenthood. It is the peak of development in many domains.

Young adults have an interaction with different contexts and different people; their attitude towards marriage is affected by these contexts. From those contexts, young adults have direct interaction with their parents which makes them the very influential contexts.

On the other hand, there have been insufficient researches that show the effect of parenting style on the attitude of marriage of young adults. Therefore, this study explores and contributes on the following areas:

- The result of this investigation will be used to show the relationship between parenting style and the attitude of young adults towards marriage
- The result of this study will be used as a source of information in the future for the deprived families to know about their parenting styles and its influence on the attitude towards marriage.

- This research work is hoped to provide a better awareness for parents and other responsible community members regarding the way children is supposed to be raised and its future implication on their attitude towards marriage.
- In addition, future researchers can use this research as a base.

1.6 Delimitation of the study

The scope of the study is delimited to two selected private colleges in Addis Ababa, namely Unity University and Sri-Sai College. Addis Ababa, which is the capital city of Ethiopia, consists of 10 sub cities. Addis Ababa is selected as a research site for the study due to the fact that, it is convenient to the researcher to get private colleges that provide post graduate programs. These colleges are located around Gerji and Megenagna. Furthermore, the study was delimited to the selected two private colleges only was because of time and financial constraints in to account. The selected young adults will be at the age range of 18-40 which is the stage of young adulthood. It is a period of making decisions that will have long-term or possibly life-long implications: family, career decisions, Achieving intimacy, love, marriage and parenthood. It is the peak of development in many domains.

1.7 Operational definition of terms

Attitude- is an individual's outlook to react with a certain degree of favorableness and un favorableness to an object or behavior. In this study's case, an individual's favorableness or un favorableness towards marriage.

Marriage – A formal union between man and woman, marriage is also a social and legal contract between two individuals that unites their lives legally, economically and emotionally.

Parenting styles- are styles that represent standard strategies that parents use in child rearing.

Young adults- students at the age range of 18-40.

Parental marital status- is the relationship status of parents who are labeled as single, cohabitating, divorced, widowed, and separated.

Religiosity- the degree of religiosity exhibited. The degree to which one perceive himself to be religious.

CHAPTER TWO

2. Review of related literature

2.1.1 Theoretical Models of Parenting Styles

Before describing the theoretical conceptualization of parenting styles it is essential to define parenting first and distinguish between parenting styles and parenting practices. Parenting, as defined by Bradley and Caldwell (1995), is the regulation of behavior and development of the children, with the intention that they can live a socially desirable life, adapt to their environment, and pursue their own goals. That is, parenting is a socialization process through which parents transfer their cultural values, beliefs, traditions, and norms as well as other socially and culturally desirable behaviors to their children, adolescents, and young adults to be good citizens of the society and for the attainment of adult competence. Although the terms parenting styles and parenting practices are often used interchangeably by researchers, there is a difference between the two concepts. Parenting styles, as defined by Baumrind, are “the consistent patterns of parental behaviors and attitudes with which parents interact and deal with their children and adolescents along two parental dimensions, that is, demandingness and responsiveness” (Baumrind, 1966, p. 889).

According to Baumrind, demandingness refers to parental behaviors and attitudes to integrate children into the family by demanding maturity in their children, supervising and disciplining their children, and showing willingness to control the behavioral problems of their children; and responsiveness refers to the degree to which parents instill independence, self-

regulation, and self-assertion in their children by agreeing to be cognizant and supportive of their children's interest, needs, and demands. Other Psychologists (e.g., Darling & Steinberg, 1993) have defined parenting styles in a more elaborated way, as a reflection of the relationships between parent and child and the qualities of these relationships among them (i.e., the emotional attachment in which parents rear their children and adolescents). Specifically, parenting style is "a constellation of parental behaviors and attitudes toward their children that are conveyed to the children and that, as a whole, create an emotional bond in which the parents' behaviors are expressed" (Darling & Steinberg, 1993, p. 488). On the other hand, parenting practices, as defined by Darling and Steinberg (1993), are the specific behaviors and attitudes demonstrated by parents in socializing their children, such as doing assignments with their children, providing their children with time to read, assisting their children when they encounter problems, and attending their children's school activities to enable them to succeed in schools.

Generally, parenting styles refer to a global construct reflecting the parental behaviors and attitudes towards their children and the qualities of interactions and relationships among parents and children and used to categorize parents typologically, whereas parenting practices refer to the specific behaviors and attitudes which are shown by parents in rearing their children. The first theoretical tripartite model of parenting style was postulated by Baumrind (1966, 1967, and 1973). She identified that parenting styles fall into three main categories (i.e., *authoritarian*- firm but not warm, *permissive*- warm but not firm, and *authoritative*- warm and firm), which focus on four important aspects of family functioning, namely, nurturance or warmth, firmness and clarity of control, level of maturity demands, and degree of communication between parent and the child. Later, by analyzing Baumrind's conceptualization of parenting styles, Maccoby and Martin (1983) elaborated and revised her typologies. They proposed a variation of

Baumrind's categorization in which parents are classified based on two dimensions. These are the degree of demand and control and the degree of acceptance/rejection. According to Maccoby and Martin, these two dimensions jointly create four types of parenting styles, three of which are quite similar to Baumrind's original classification and conceptualization of parenting styles. Their conceptualization adds the fourth type, *the neglecting or uninvolved parenting style* (i.e., neither warm nor firm).

2.1.2 Typology of parenting styles

According to Baumrind (1967, 1973) and Maccoby and Martin (1983), the four types of parenting styles and their typical characteristics are as follows:

(1) *Authoritative Parenting Style*: A parenting style characterized by an optimum balance of responsiveness and demandingness; and directing children in a rational, issue-oriented, disciplined manner by clarifying the reasoning behind rules. It is high in all four dimensions of family functioning. As noted by Maccoby (1992), authoritative parents know and understand children's independence, encourage verbal communication, allow children to participate in decision making of the family, and want the children progressively undertake more responsibility for reacting to the needs of other people in the family within their abilities. This type of parenting style consists of a constellation of parental characteristics of high standards, such as high emotional attachment and support to children, encouragement of a two-way communication between parents and children, and consistent implementation of the rules established by parents (Baumrind, 1991). According to Baumrind (1971, 1991), the authoritative parenting style is positively correlated to different developmental outcomes (e.g., academic achievement and

social behaviors) of children. In addition, Holmbeck (1996) noted that authoritative parenting style is the most beneficial for children and young adults because it is positively correlated to numerous positive outcomes (e.g., self-esteem and self-reliance).

(2) *Authoritarian Parenting Style*: A parenting style marked by parental behaviors that are highly restrictive and very demanding. It is high in control and maturity demands, but low in nurturance and bi-directional communication between parents and children. Authoritarian parents constrain their children's independence and they want their children to follow strict parental rules and orders without any question by threatening severe punishment if children violate these rules and orders. As noted by Baumrind (1967, 1971) children with authoritarian parents tend to be anxious, socially withdrawn, and unhappy.

(3) *Permissive (Indulgent) Parenting Style*: A parenting style, at the other extreme, characterized by non-restrictiveness and high levels of responsiveness. It is high in nurturance but low in maturity demands, supervision, and bi-directional communication between parents and children. According to Baumrind (1989), the permissive parenting style is a careless style in which parents make few demands, encourage their children to express their feelings, and barely use power to gain control over their behavior; and tend not to need mature behavior from their children, but encourage their children's independence instead. As noted by Hetherington and Parke (1986), children with indulgent parents are low in self reliance, achievement orientation, and self-control.

(4) *Neglecting or Uninvolved Parenting Style*: The style of parenting low in both dimensions (i.e., the degree of responsiveness and demandingness) and which is believed to be the most

detrimental of the four types of parenting styles on children's and adolescents' development (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Specifically, children with neglectful parents have several negative developmental outcomes (i.e., they are impulsive, aggressive, non-compliant to rules and orders, moody, and low in self-esteem, in general). As noted by Hetherington and Parke (1986), children from the families of neglectful parents are more likely to have alcohol problems, spend most of time on streets with their peers from similar parents, and are more likely to be truant and precociously sexually active, with records of arrest.

Research has documented that children and adolescents from the families of authoritative parents are more competent and efficient socially and academically compared to those whose parents are non-authoritative (Baumrind, 1991; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Miller et al., 1993; Weiss & Schwarz, 1996). Generally, in the past three decades, much of the research has examined the effect of parenting on the different developmental outcomes of children, adolescents, and young adults by employing a three or four typological approach, in which the influences of the main dimensions of parenting behavior are aggregated to form the four types of parenting styles (i.e., authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful parenting styles) or specific dimensions of parenting behavior approach.

2.1.3 Parenting Styles in the Ethiopian Cultural Context

It is evident that parents in all cultures (i.e., in both individualistic and collectivistic cultures) are the primary socialization agents responsible for transmission of cultural values, beliefs, traditions, and norms which are necessary for the attainment of cultural standards of

competence to their children. Ethiopia is no exception, and thus Ethiopian parents employ child-rearing practices in socializing their children in accordance with their cultural and religious beliefs, traditions, norms, and value systems.

There is a lack of research literature on parenting styles and their effects on children's, adolescents', and young adults' development in Ethiopia. However, there are studies which can provide some insights into the issue (Abesha, 1997; Abraham, 1996; Birhanu, 1996; Cox, 1967; Habtamu, 1979, 1995; Haile, 1971; Kassahun, 2005; Levin, 1965; Markos, 1996; Ringness & Gander, 1974; Seleshi, 1998; Seleshi & Sentayehu, 1998; Sentayehu, 1998; Tilahun, 2002; Yekoyealem, 2005). Some of these studies reported that an authoritarian parenting style was predominantly employed among the families of Ethiopia (Abraham, 1996; Cox, 1967; Habtamu, 1979, 1995; Haile, 1970; Levine, 1965, Ringness & Gander, 1974). However, in other studies it has been consistently found that the type of parenting style predominantly practiced in the families of the country was authoritative (Abesha, 1997; Birhanu, 1996; Markos, 1996; Seleshi, 1998; Seleshi & Sentayehu, 1998; Sentayehu, 1998; Yekoyealem, 2005).

Some studies have also shown that the most commonly practiced parenting style in Ethiopian families differs as a function of children's sex. For instance, studies with a sample of junior secondary school students have demonstrated that parents were authoritative for their daughters, but authoritarian for their sons (Seleshi, 1998; Seleshi & Sentayehu, 1998; Sentayehu, 1998). Another study with a sample of high school students reported that an authoritative parenting style was the most commonly employed parenting style for daughters whereas neglectful parenting style was the most predominantly adopted parenting style for sons

(Kassahun, 2005). On the other hand, this researcher, in the same study, with a sample of elementary school students revealed that irrespective of children's sex, an authoritative parenting style was the most commonly employed parenting style in the families of Ethiopia.

Kassahun explained the predominance of neglectful parenting style for high school aged males by saying that when males enter high school the parents may believe that their sons can manage themselves, and thus they reduce their control as well as their close relationships. However, this explanation may not be justifiable when Ethiopian cultural beliefs regarding children's development are concerned. This is because, as demonstrated by some empirical studies in Ethiopia (Atsedo, 1994; Ringess & Gander, 1974; Seleshi, 1998; Seleshi & Sentayehu, 1998; Teshome, 1976), parents attach very high values to their children, and thus they are not expected to use a neglectful parenting style, which is detrimental for the developmental outcomes of their children, in rearing their sons. Therefore, it is premature to conclude that Ethiopian parents employ a neglectful parenting style for their sons; and to accept that there are traditions and customs in the Ethiopian culture that foster more distant parenting for sons.

A probable explanation for the findings of the early studies which documented that an authoritarian parenting style was the most commonly practiced parenting style could be the then socio-political system which adhered to authoritarianism in every area of human activities. On the other hand, a likely reason for the findings of the studies in the last two decades which reported that an authoritative parenting style was the most predominantly employed parenting style could be, as noted by numerous researchers (e.g., Atsedo, 1994; Ringess & Gander, 1974; Seleshi, 1998; Seleshi & Sentayehu, 1998; Teshome, 1976), Ethiopian parents attach very high

values to their children in the hope that they will provide social, economic, and psychological support for their parents especially when they become older, and to ensure the continuity of family lineage. Another possible explanation could be that the rapid socio-political changes that have been induced in the country in the drive for modernization and globalization may have resulted in some cultural changes including child-rearing practices. This is why some investigators affirmed that a change in the sociopolitical system is accompanied by cultural changes (Laosa, 1981; Pauswang, 1970). For these reasons, parents may employ more accepting, firm, and democratic child rearing practices (i.e. authoritative parenting style). Even so, if we evaluate the findings of the studies which have been conducted after 1995, we find that there are mixed findings regarding the type of parenting style predominantly practiced in the families of Ethiopia. For instance, Abraham (1996) in his study on child-rearing practices in Siltigna-speaking community (i.e., Silte ethnic group) found that an authoritarian parenting style was the most common.

In addition, some other studies (Kassahun, 2005; Seleshi, 1998; Seleshi & Sentayehu, 1998; Sentayehu, 1998) documented differences in the most commonly practiced parenting styles as a function of the children's sex, although the findings regarding the most commonly practiced parenting style for sons are equivocal. In contrast, some of the remaining studies after 1995 reported that an authoritative parenting style was the predominantly practiced parenting style in the families of Ethiopia (Abesha, 1997; Birhanu, 1996; Markos, 1996; Yekoyealem, 2005).

Consequently, the studies conducted so far do not provide clear evidence to conclude which parenting style (i.e., authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, or neglectful parenting style) is

commonly adopted in the families of Ethiopia. This calls for further study, which uses a large sample of diverse ethnic groups of the country, to fully understand which type of parenting style is dominantly practiced in the families of Ethiopia.

2.1.4 Dimensions of Parenting Style

Because of differing methods, theoretical approaches and developmental foci, there has been no general agreement on the most significant axes along which to compare parents (Gronlick & Ryan, 1989). Despite this, the most popular work in describing parenting dimensions has been that of Schaeffer's (Schaeffer, 1965). Schaeffer (as cited in Schaeffer, 1965) identified two major dimensions of parenting style.

The first one refers to the degree of love versus hostility or acceptance versus rejection, or loving versus rejecting. The positive terminal of this dimension refers to parenting behavior which is characterized by acceptance, affection, approval, understanding and frequent use of explanations, extensive use of reasons in discipline, and limited use of physical punishment. At its negative terminal, the dimension refers to parenting behaviors like hostility, rejection or punitiveness.

The second dimension pertains to autonomy versus control or permissiveness versus restrictiveness. At its restrictive or controlling end, this dimension refers to parental behaviors that involve strict enforcement of demands including rigid instance on neatness, orderliness, obedience and inhibition of aggression towards parents, siblings or peers. On the autonomy or

permissiveness end, the dimension refers to democratic and encouraging nature of parents. Becker cited in Duncan (1971) also proposed the existence of the two dimensions as parenting behaviors.

Studies on child and adolescent socialization processes have applied this model to explain variations in child development. Among the studies that adopted the two dimensions model of parenting style are Dornbusch et al. (1987) and Steinberg et al. (1994). However, it appears that current studies are including other dimensions that can explain parenting style.

For example, Steinberg et al. (1992) found out that a factor analysis of items pertaining to parenting behaviors yielded three distinct parenting dimensions. These were

- 1) Parental acceptance / involvement,

- 2) Parental strictness / supervision and

- 3) Psychological autonomy. These researches compared parents along the three dimensions to classify them in to authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful. However later, Steinberg et al. (1994) used only parental acceptance and parental control dimensions for describing parenting styles.

All in all, reviews of parent child interaction effects of parenting styles reveal that majority of the studies use the two dimensions (i.e., parental acceptance and parental control) models to classify parents in to distinct parenting styles.

Table 1: Classification of four patterns of parenting along the dimensions of Warmth/ Acceptance in conjunction with the dimensions of Control/ Demandingness.

	Warmth/ Acceptance	Unresponsive/Rejecting
Control/ Demanding	AUTHORITATIVE	AUTHORITARIAN
Uncontrol/Undemanding	INDULGENT	NEGLECTING

2.2Defining Marriage

Marriage is a socially recognized and approved union between individuals, who commit to one another with the expectation of a stable and lasting intimate relationship. This relationship usually involves some kind of contract which defines the partner's rights and obligations to each other. The usual roles and responsibilities of the husband and wife include living together, having sexual relations with one another, sharing economic resources, and being recognized as the parents of their children (Encarta, 2007).

Marriage is by nature a multifaceted institution. According to Olson & DeFrain (2000), it is emotional and legal commitment of two people to share emotional and physical intimacy, various tasks and economic resources. According to other scholars / (Seccomber and Rebecca 2004), marriage is legally and socially recognized relationship between a woman and a man that includes sexual, economic and social rights and responsibilities for partners.

Recent definitions may not specify marriage as a union between a woman and a man in trying to include same-sex marriages. According to (Bentley, 2007) what most of us visualize by the terms marriage or partnering is the sharing of one's life and building of a shared future with a chosen, significant other person.

2.2.1 Types of marriage

The basis underlying in classifying marriage is diversified. Some scholars use the number of partners involved in a relationship, while others base their classification on the level of marital satisfaction. Others on the other hand focus on shared responsibilities of couples.

Olson and Fowers (cited in Olson & DeFrain, 2000) identified five significant types of married couples based on the basis of level of marital satisfaction among couples in their studies. This typology was mainly based on scores of couple inventory. The inventory evaluated 10 relationship domains: personality issues, communication, conflict resolution, financial management, leisure activities, sexual relations, children and parenting, family and friends, equalitarian roles, and religious orientation. So, the types are:

1. Vitalized couples: - are couples who had the highest level of satisfaction across all of the aspects of their marriage. They have high level of communication and conflict resolution.

2. Harmonious Couples: Were the second most satisfied types with moderate scores on the scales assessing marital satisfaction. Like vitalized couples, they tended to be more educated and have higher-status jobs. Harmonious couples have the fewest number of children, yet satisfying parenting with their children.

3. Traditional Couples: They have high score in the traditional areas of children and parenting, equalitarian roles and religion. These couples agreed that religion is the most important aspect of their marriage. They have lower scores in relationship areas of communication and conflict resolution, and tended to dislike personality of their partner; marry younger; have more children; less educated and women rarely employed. Distinctive feature of such couples is their tendency to stay married even when dissatisfied.

4. Conflicted Couples: They are low in areas of equalitarian roles and religious orientation. Besides, they have inadequacies in communicating and solving problems; tended to be younger, have been married for fewer years, less educated, and lower job status.

5. Devitalized Couples: They are characterized by pervasive unhappiness in almost all areas of marriage and in turn highly likely to be divorced than any other groups.

Duberman (cited in Bentley, 2007) produced a different set of three types of marriage: based on responsibility and decision-making

1. Traditional marriages have the authority vested in the man, he is the responsible decision-maker except maybe in matters relating to children and domestic things. This view is exemplified in the old German saying of the proper duties of a woman/wife – ‘kinder, kuchen und kirche’ (children, kitchen and church).

2. Companionship marriages have an emphasis on shared decisions and responsibilities, on equality between the couple, and on companionship and satisfaction. Typically they do not divide things into male and female roles as either partner may be involved in any area of their shared life.

3. Colleague marriages also greatly emphasize sharing and personal satisfaction, but there are fewer sharing roles than in the companionship marriage. Instead the couple here accepts role differences as each one takes responsibility for different parts of the shared life in line with their personal abilities and interests.

Cuber and Harroff's model

Five types of marriage were identified by Cuber and Harroff (1965):

1. Conflict-habituated marriages are the fighting relationships often depicted in the entertainments media. To outsiders the relationship seems one of constant strife, but in actual fact the two people involved have an implicit routine and understanding, and though the marriage seems stressful the couple would not in fact be thinking of divorce, and would probably not be happier if they did part.
2. De vitalised marriages are basically relationships based on routine; though the couple still profess love for each other they share few activities or interests and the marriage seems to be one of convenience, a comfortable habit, so it is presumably not worth the turmoil of changing or ending it.
3. Passive/congenial marriages also seem to be ones of comfortable habit and convenience, but here the couples do share contentment as well as each other's interests.
4. Vital marriages involve the couple sharing equally their involvement in and commitment to the joint and family activities such as the family finances, parenting, recreational interests and activities.
5. Total marriages are where the couple is totally bound up with each other in complete commitment, sharing personal, emotional and work confidences, fantasies even, as well as their family interests and organization.

Interestingly, Cuber and Harroff considered marriage number 3, the passive or congenial marriage, to be rather undesirable, whereas now, forty years on, many people think of it as one

with great positive potential; an example of the importance of seeing research in its own time context, perhaps. Another example of time context is the attitude to marriage number 5 which today could be regarded as confining, unhealthy and stifling of the essential and unique personalities of each member of the couple, whereas the term 'total' marriage seems to imply 'ideal'. A further psychological problem with this type of marriage is that by the parents focusing so closely on each other their children could be emotionally excluded. This means that children of such a marriage might suffer by being prevented from forming the normal, healthy, strong emotional parental bond or attachment which psychologists feel is the best predictor of a happy adult life.

2.2.2 Marital attitude and some socio demographic variables

Literature indicates that schemas and materials produced by various social structures help shape the expected attitude and behavior regarding marriage. Some of these schemas are: *religious affiliations* (Carroll et al. 2000; Mahoney et al. 2001; Lehrer 2004, 2004b; Xu, Hudspeth, & Bartkowski 2005; Kalmijn & Luijkx 2005; Pearce & Thornton 2007; Eggebeen & Dew 2009); *Gender* (Thornton, 1989; Thornton & Young- DeMarco, 2001, Pearce & Thornton 2007; Thornton & Freedman 1982; Fan & Marini 2000; Miller & Stark 2002; Crissey 2005; Willoughby 2010); *Parental marital status*, (Thornton & Freedman 1982; Jennings et al. 1992; Starrels & Holm 2000; Kalmijn & Luijkx 2005; Crissey 2005; Manning et al. 2007; Raley et al. 2007; South 2011; Willoughby et al. 2012);

One's ideas surrounding timing, best conditions, necessity and gender differences regarding marriage, as well as the acceptance of marriage dissolution form the so called attitudes toward marriage (Pearce and Thornton, 2007).

Marital attitudes and expectations form a cognitive schema about relationships brought about by experience (Fletcher & Thomas, 1996; as cited in Riggio & Weiser, 2008). Attitudes and expectations about relationships are important cognitions regarding perceptions of and behaviors in personal relationships (Riggio & Weiser, 2008). One may form attitudes and expectations regarding marital life through observing one's parents, or by watching others negotiate the process of courtship and marriage. Highly embedded positive marriage attitudes may influence behavior and highly embedded negative marriage attitudes may also affect beliefs about relationships (Riggio & Weiser, 2008). Individuals with highly embedded positive attitudes about marriage view their own current and future marriages as happy and successful but those with highly embedded negative attitudes have less positive expectations (Riggio & Weiser, 2008).

Higher religiosity is also associated with greater expectations to get married (Manning, Longmore & Giordano, 2007). For young adults, high religiosity was positively associated to agreeing that marriage is an important goal and marriage is a lifetime relationship (Willoughby & Carroll, 2010). Certain cultural values within a religion may emphasize the importance of getting married for some individuals more than others.

There are other life experiences, such as divorce, which may influence the attitudes and expectations one has for a marital relationship. For example, adult children of divorce have more negative attitudes towards marriage as an institution and are more opposed to the idea of a long-

lasting, healthy marriage (Amato & DeBoer, 2001; Gabardi & Rosén, 1991; Gabardi & Rosén, 1992; Johnston & Thomas, 1996; Riggio & Weiser, 2008). Divorce may affect the degree to which one holds expectations for marriage. Individuals from intact homes had a higher degree of positive expectations for marriage than individuals from single divorce or multiple divorce families (Boyer-Pennington, Pennington, & Spink, 2001).

It has also been suggested that fear of divorce deters couples with children from getting married (Gibson-Davis, Edin & McLanahan, 2005; Waller & McLanahan, 2005; Waller & Peters, 2008). Johnston and Thomas (1996) found that many children of divorce have an overall lack of trust in their romantic partners and expected their marriages to fail. Similarly Gabardi and Rosén (1991; 1992) revealed that students from divorced families had significant intimacy issues as demonstrated by their number of sexual partners and attitudes towards marriage. Overall, it is clear that experiencing divorce has negative effects on one's expectations for marriage.

CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

In this chapter, the research design, target population and sample, instruments for data collection, procedures for data collection as well as data analysis will be dealt with.

3.1 Research design

The research is quantitative in nature as its data were secured by quantifying questionnaire consisting of mostly close-ended Likert type items. In terms of the statistical procedures used for data analysis, the research is mostly correlational in nature as its main purpose is determining the relationship between the dependent and independent variables selected for the study, and the direction of the relationship.

The research is a cross sectional one as its data were collected at once from young adults of different ages and in that it was used to capture knowledge and attitudes from postgraduate male and female college students at one point in time.

3.2 Target population and sample

The target population of this study is post graduate students of two private colleges in Addis Ababa, Unity University and Sri Sai College. Both colleges are located around Megenagna. This study focuses on young adults who are at the age range of 18-40, the target population for the study had to be first year and second year students of the college students of 2013 academic year.

The participants of this study are the first year and second year MBA students of the two colleges. They are at the age range of 18-40. 40 students from Unity University which is (20

female and 20 male) and 40 students from Sri Sai College (20 female and 20 male) had participated on this study.

The non-random probability sampling design was used for this study because the sampling took place in classroom settings where all students were included. This study used purposive sampling because the purpose was to obtain an equitable number of males and females in general education classes on their attitudes towards marriage.

3.3 Instruments for data collection

The instruments that were used for data collection were a structured questionnaire; w/c was filled by the students. The subjects were given closed-ended statements based on a five-point Likert scale, measuring respondents' attitudes ranging from one (*strongly disagree*) to five (*strongly agree*). The questionnaire that was used for data collection contains three parts, which are the background information of the students and his/her own family, questions that concern participants' perception of their parents' involvement on child rearing and finally questions concerning the attitude of young adults towards marriage. In this study two different questionnaires were used. The first questionnaire taps data on parenting style where as the other taps data on marital attitude.

In the current study, parenting styles were defined as the post graduate students' perception of their parents' behaviors toward them with respect to parental acceptance/involvement and parental strictness/supervision (i.e., authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful/uninvolved parenting styles). The Parenting Styles Scale (PSS), developed by Lamborn et al. (1991) based on Maccoby and Martin's (1983) revision of Baumrind's (1967, 1971) parenting style conceptual framework, was employed to measure

parenting styles. In the current study, for the parenting styles scale, the reliability were Cronbach's alpha (α) = .88. This reliability is greater than the recommended Cronbach alpha (α) $\geq .70$ and thus acceptable.

The questionnaire about marital attitude of young adults was adopted from Kroeger (2012). The questionnaire consisted of 15 questions and the reliability was cronbach's alpha (α) = .83 and thus it was acceptable.

3.4 Procedures for data collection

The survey process began with taking a contribution letter from Addis Ababa University, school of psychology to the respective colleges. Stating the purpose of the study and asking permission to survey their students during class time, Data was then collected for the study once the researchers received permission to come into the classrooms of MBA students in each of the colleges. A purposive sampling design was used in order to achieve an equitable number of male and female college students.

3.5 Data analysis

In analyzing the data collected for this study, both descriptive and inferential statistical analyses were employed. That is, frequency counts and simple percentage were used to analyze respondents' personal information in section A. The independent samples t-test, one way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), Pearson product moment correlation and post hoc pair wise comparison statistical tools were used to test the research hypotheses arising from the research questions for the study.

Regarding this Kothari (2004) described that the major purpose of descriptive research is description of the state of affairs as it exists at present. Which means that the researcher has no control over the variables; he can only report what has happened or what is happening.

The computer program called the *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences* (SPSS) was used to analyze the collected data. The unit of analysis in this study was the individual. Given that groups were being compared based on their demographic data, data analysis included: frequencies, cross- tabulations, mean-comparisons, independent t-tests, and a reliability analysis.

CHAPTER FOUR

Result

This chapter deals with the presentation of the data gathered through close ended questionnaire, analysis of the data based on the selected appropriate statistical methods and interpretations based on reporting styles of each statistical method.

Table 1: The demographic characteristics of participants

sex	Frequency	Percent
female	40	50.0
male	40	50.0
Total	80	100.0
age	Frequency	Percent
18-25	27	33.8
26-30	31	38.8
31-40	22	27.5
Total	80	100.0
Relationship status	Frequency	Percent
single	39	48.8
dating	20	25.0
engaged	8	10.0
married	12	15.0
divorced	1	1.3
Total	80	100.0
Parents' marital status	Frequency	Percent
divorced	24	30.0
widowed	6	7.5
cohabitating	3	3.8
married	35	43.8
single	9	11.3
other	3	3.8
Total	80	100.0
Religion	Frequency	Percent
		43.8
orthodox	35	
muslim	6	7.5
protestant	11	13.8
jehova's witness	2	2.5
catholic	8	10.0
no religion	18	22.5
Total	80	100.0

As one can see from Table 1 there are 50 percent (40) of male participants and 50 percent (40) of female participants in this study. The study also involved young adults of different age levels, the lowest age being 18 and the highest 40 years old. For the sake of comparison, age is classified into three categories, 18-25, 26-30 and 31-40. About 33.8 percent (27) are at the age range of 18-25 years, 38.8 percent (31) are at the age range of 26-30years and the rest 27.7 percent (22) are at the age range of 31-40years. As one can observe from Table1 the relationship status of the students, 48.8 percent (39) are single, 25 percent (20) are dating, 10 percent (8) are engaged, and 15 percent (12) are married, 1.3 percent (1) is divorced. And the parents' relationship status of the students, 30 percent(24) are from a divorced family,7.5 percent (6) are widowed, 3.8 percent (3) are cohabitating, 43.8 percent (35) are married, 1.3 percent (9) are single, 3.8 percent (3) are who responded to others. As one can see from Table 1 the religion of students, 43.8 percent (35) are orthodox, 7.5 percent (6) Muslim, 13.8 percent (11) are protestant, 2.5 percent (2) are Jehovah's witnesses, 10 percent (8) are catholic and 22.5 percent (18) has no religion.

Table 2: Number of respondents from different parenting styles

Parenting styles	Frequency	Percent
Permissive	19	23.8
Authoritative	23	28.8
Neglectful	18	22.5
Authoritarian	20	25.0
Total	80	100.0

As shown on the above Table 2, 23.8 percent (19) of the respondents are from a permissive parenting style, 28.8 percent (23) are from authoritative parents, 22.5 percent (18) are from a neglectful parenting style and the rest 25.0 percent (20) are from authoritarian parents.

Table 3 ANOVA test for marital attitude across deferent age groups

Age of respondents	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	f	sig
18-25	26	37.8077	6.44372	2		
26-30	31	34.8710	5.50601	76	2.393	.098
31-40	22	34.0909	7.30889			
Total	79	35.6203	6.46748			

As shown on table 3, there is no significant difference in mean among respondents marital attitude related with their age. (18-25 = 37.8077, 26-30 =34.8710 and 31-40 =34.0909). The mean of the age of the participants seem to decrease as the age increases, this shows that attitude towards marriage increases as the age of young adults' increases. [F (2, 76) =2.393, P < .05].

Table 4: Independent t-test for marital attitude compared to sex

sex of students	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	F	Sig.	t
male	39	35.3846	6.41797	77	.070	.792	-.318
female	40	35.8500	6.58884	77			

As shown on Table 4, there is no significant mean difference among participants marital attitude related with their sex. (Male = 35.3846 and Female =35.8500).This may mean that Gender has no influence on marital attitude ($t = -.318$, $p = .792$).

Table 5: ANOVA test for marital attitude compared to the relationship status of the participants

Relationship status of respondents	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	F	Sig
Single	39	36.4474	6.59524	4	1.588	.187
Dating	20	34.0500	6.49271			
Engaged	8	33.2500	7.04577			
Married	12	37.9167	4.73782			
Total	79	35.6203	6.46748			

As shown on Table 5, there is no significant mean difference among participants' marital attitude and their relationship status. (Single = 36.4474, Dating =34.0500, Engaged =33.2500, and Married =37.9167). This means participants who are currently married, dating, engaged, single or divorced may have different attitude irrespective of their relationship status [$F(4, 74) = 1.588$, $P < .05$].

Table 6: ANOVA test for marital attitude compared to parents' marital status

Parents' marital status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Df	F	sig
Divorced	24	34.6667	6.65071	5	2.807	.023
widowed	6	42.1667	5.11534			
cohabitating	3	36.0000	7.00000			
Married	34	35.6765	6.34236			
Single	9	31.5556	4.44722			
Other	3	41.3333	1.52753	73		
Total	79	35.6203	6.46748			

As shown on Table 6, there is a significant difference among respondents' marital attitude and their parents' marital status. (Divorced =34.6667, widowed =42.1667, cohabitating =36.0000, Married =35.6765, Single =31.5556, and other =41.3333). There is significant mean difference between widowed parents and other parents from other marital statuses. Comparing the means, participants from single family can have a lower marital attitude or more negative marital attitude from participants of other family statuses [$F(5, 73) = 2.807, P < .05$]. Furthermore, Tukey Post hoc pair wise Comparison test shows that (see appendix-A) there is significant difference between widowed and single parents (sig. = 0.019).

Table 7: ANOVA test for marital attitude compared to religion

Religion of respondents	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	F	Sig
Orthodox	34	38.6765	6.31362	5		
Muslim	6	33.8333	6.76511			
Protestant	11	34.4545	4.74054		3.825	.004
Jehova's witness	2	27.0000	7.07107	73		
Catholic	8	34.6250	4.50198			
no religion	18	32.5556	6.06070			
Total	79	35.6203	6.46748			

As shown on Table 7, there is significant mean difference among respondents' marital attitude and their religion. (Orthodox =38.6765, Muslim =33.8333, Protestant =34.4545, Jehova's witness =27.0000, Catholic = 34.6250, and no religion =32.5556). Comparing the means, the participants with no religion may seem to have negative or less marital attitude than with those who has religion [$F(5, 73) = 3.825, P < .05$]. Tukey's Post hoc Comparison test also shows that (see appendix-A); the mean difference between orthodox religion and those who have no religion was significantly different from each other (sig. =0.011).

Table 8: ANOVA test for marital attitude compared to how religious respondents are

How religious	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	F	sig
not religious	23	34.3043	6.87178	74	1.830	.132
somewhat religious	10	37.6000	8.05812			
moderately religious	24	34.2917	5.29544			
very religious	15	38.9333	6.46382			
extremely religious	7	34.5714	4.39155			
Total	79	35.6203	6.46748			

As shown above on Table 8, there is no significant mean difference among respondents' marital attitude and their degree of religiosity [$F(4, 74) = 1.830, P < .05$].

Table 9: Descriptive statistics on parenting styles and marital attitude

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
TOT_p.s	40.85	15.485	80
TOT_m.a	35.6203	6.46748	79

Table 10 Pearson product moment correlation test to test the correlation between the parenting styles and marital attitude

		TOT_p.s	TOT_m.a
Total score of parenting styles	Pearson Correlation	1	.011
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.924
	N	80	79

*TOT p.s= total score of parenting styles

*TOT m.a= total score of marital attitude

As shown above on table 10, the Pearson correlation between parenting styles and the attitude towards marriage is .011. So that means there is very weak positive correlation. We can therefore conclude that there is weak relationship between the two variables ($r = .011$, $p = .924$).

CHAPTER FIVE

Discussion

This chapter attempts to present the discussion of the data presented in the previous chapter. In doing so, it attempts to discuss the relationship found among parenting styles, parents marital status, sex, religion with the attitude of young adults towards marriage.

The relationship between religion and the attitude of young adults towards marriage

Higher religiosity is associated with greater expectations to get married (Manning, Longmore & Giordano, 2007). For young adults, high religiosity was positively associated to agreeing that marriage is an important goal and marriage is a lifetime relationship (Willoughby & Carroll, 2010). Certain cultural values within a religion may emphasize the importance of getting married for some individuals more than others.

In other words, the personal importance of one's religion contributes to how a person views the values of the faith and influences what behaviors they engage in. Because of the abstinent rule, society has come to the assumption that religious young people marry early so that they can end their period of waiting for sex. Non-religious young people on the other hand have no reason to marry early if they are already having sex.

In this study, in order to show the relationship between religion and marital attitude, ONE WAY ANOVA, comparison of means and standard deviation difference was used and also pearson product moment correlation was employed.

And as can be seen from table 7, there is a significant difference among religious groups and marital attitude. When we see the mean scores of the young adults' religion, there is only little

significant mean difference. Again when we see on table 8, the degree of religiosity and its relationship with the attitude towards marriage, there is no significant mean difference among respondents' marital attitude and their degree of religiosity.

When correlation was employed it shows that there is in fact a weak negative correlation between religion and marital attitude ($r = -.377$, $p = .001$). This means that the more religious a young adult becomes the less the attitude towards marriage is.

The statistical difference in Gender among young adults in their attitude towards marriage

Abowitz et al. (2009) examined the differences of gender in the way college students view romantic relationships. They found that males are more likely to believe that cohabitation will improve marriage.

There was partial support found for the hypothesis that females will have stronger attitudes than males that people marry mostly for love; although both genders agreed that people marry mostly for love, females expressed stronger attitudes. Indeed, Campbell and Wright (2010) found that the principal purpose of marriage in the United States is love and satisfaction; more so, 81% of newlyweds asserted that their primary reason for marriage was love. We predicted females would be more in support of marriage than males. However, no gender differences were found.

A large amount of both genders agreed and/or strongly agreed that one of their goals is to be married; no gender differences were found; having a high quality marriage continues to be a primary life goal for many Americans (Campbell & Wright, 2010).

The finding of the present study in the relationship of gender and marital attitude is same as the above studies. There is no significant mean difference among respondents marital attitude related with their sex. (mean 1= 35.3846 and mean 2=35.8500).see on table 9, where mean 1 is male and mean 2 is female.

The relationship between parental marital status and attitude of marriage among young adults

Individuals whose parents had divorced have lower expectations for relationship success and have more negative attitudes towards marriage (Riggio & Weiser, 2008). Some studies have indicated that this is not always the case. One study indicated it is only women, not men, whose parents had divorced that demonstrate lower relationship commitment and less confidence that a relationship would last (Whitton, Rhoades, Stanley & Markman, 2008). Another study found that adults, regardless of whether or not their parents stayed together, had a divorce, or had multiple divorces, expected to get married and were more optimistic about their marriage lasting than other peoples' marriages (Boyer-Pennington, Pennington & Spink, 2001).

Parents unknowingly have significant influence upon their children's attitudes toward marriage. While the parents goals for their children are very influential in their young adult children's attitudes towards marriage (Willoughby, Carroll, Vitas, & Hill, 2011), their marital status is even more significant. The marital status of a child's parents has a large impact on how he or she views marriage and relationships in general (Riggio & Weiser, 2008; Willoughby et al., 2011). Children who grew up with parents that have remained married throughout their childhood and adult life have a much more positive outlook on relationships (Weigel, Bennett, &

Ballard-Reisch, 2003). Likewise, young adults raised in homes affected by divorce view relationships as insecure and limiting (Weigel et al., 2003). Parental marriage quality has been shown to have a moderate effect on young adults' attitudes towards marriage (Willoughby et al., 2011). In order for parental marital quality to have a large effect on young people's marital attitudes, they must actually observe, not just perceive, healthy relationships. Young adults from homes affected by divorce often delay marriage until later in life because of their personal experiences with divorce (Liu, Elliott, & Umberson, 2010).

The quality of their parents' relationship has important implications for youth. Past work has shown that parents' marital hostility is associated with behavioral and emotional problems in their children (Buehler et al. 2007; Sturge-Apple et al. 2006). Some work suggests that it is worse for children for their parents to remain in a conflict-ridden marriage than for their parents to divorce (Amato et al. 1995; Morrison and Coiro 1999).

The parents' relationship may also affect teens' views on marriage and relationships and the quality of their later relationships. For example, a recent study found that adolescent girls with more negative perceptions of the level of conflict in their parents' relationship had greater expectations of unhappiness and divorce in their own future marriages (Steinberg et al. 2006). Similarly, parental conflict after a divorce has been linked with less positive attitudes about marriage among adolescents (Peltz and Koerner 2006).

The diverse family structures, in which young adults are raised, as well as their early experiences with romantic relationships and dating, may have important implications for their attitudes and expectations concerning adult relationships and marriage. For example, teens that grow up living with both of their biological parents are more likely than other teens to disapprove of divorce or premarital cohabitation (Flanigan et al. 2005). In addition, attitudes

toward marriage are a strong predictor of later relationship outcomes in adulthood (Fein et al. 2003). For this reason, encouraging healthy, positive attitudes toward marriage has been a common goal of recent adolescent relationship and marriage education programs (Karney et al. 2007).

The finding of the present study in the relationship of parental marital status and the attitude towards marriage is that there is a significant mean difference among respondents' marital attitude and their parents' marital status. And also by using Pearson's correlation it can be seen that there exists a positive correlation between parents' marital status and marital attitude of young adults ($r = .009$, $p = .934$).

The significant difference and relationship among young adults reared with different parenting styles and their attitudes towards marriage

Baumrind, Maccoby, and Martin (cited in Nancy, 2003) reveal that parenting is complex activity manifested in various behaviors that work together and individuals to influence child outcomes.

Parenting style provides a good indication of parents' function to predict a child's behavior, because developmental process from early life through adolescence directly related to the type parenting styles (Steinberg, 1993).

Young adults who rated their parents as authoritative, authoritarian, permissive and neglectful revealed that parenting styles indeed have relation with young adults' attitude towards marriage though the relation is very weak. The way they were brought up has an impact on their

marital attitude but it doesn't have immense influence. This means that parenting styles may be related to the attitude of young adults' towards marriage.

The evidence from the result of this investigation that had been presented in the previous chapter (table10) indicated that there is a very weak correlation between parenting styles and the attitude of young adults towards marriage. We can therefore conclude that there is weak positive correlation between the two variables ($r = .011$, $p = .924$).

CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

6.1 Summary and conclusion

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between perceived parenting style and the attitude of young adults towards marriage. In addition to the above basic purpose, the relationship between parental marital status with marital attitude of young adults, and gender difference on marital attitude were examined in this study.

Based on the above purpose, the following leading questions were raised to conduct investigation regarding the research problem. Those questions were:

- Is there statistical difference among young adults reared with different parenting styles in their attitudes towards marriage?
- Is there a significant relationship between parental marital status and attitude of marriage among young adults?
- Is there statistical difference in Gender among young adults in their attitude towards marriage?
- Is there a relationship between religion and the attitude of young adults towards marriage?

To answer the above research questions and to meet the objective, necessary data was gathered by a likert type questionnaire about both parenting styles and marital attitudes. The

investigation was carried out on 80 postgraduate students of two colleges, Unity University and Sri Sai College. The selected young adults were between the age range of 18-40.

After the data was collected by using non- random sampling, the collected data were analyzed by using mean, frequencies, percentages, standard deviations, one way ANOVA and Pearson product moment correlation. From the inspection of the data analysis the following findings are obtained.

1. It was found that there is weak positive correlation between parenting styles and young adults' attitude towards marriage.
2. It was found that there is a significant mean difference among respondents' marital attitude and their parents' marital status. i.e. there exists a positive correlation between the two variables.
3. This study found that there is no significant mean difference among respondents marital attitude related with their gender.
4. It was found that there is no significant mean difference among respondents' marital attitude and religion, and also their degree of religiosity.

6.2 Recommendation

- Additional research should be done with the inclusion on suburban individuals as a separate category so that their political affiliation, religiosity and traditionalism can be compared with that of the rural and urban population.
- Future research should include a large, random sample in order to generalize the findings nationwide.

- In order to make the idea of marriage more positive, the environment in which a young person was raised has a significant influence on his or her attitudes towards marriage. Not only is the home environment in which a young person is raised important but the larger socio-cultural environment is important as well (i.e. the factors like religiosity) When combined, these factors influence what value-systems a person endorses and what set of eyes a person will see the world through. These consequently will influence the persons more specific attitudes and behaviors such as when they desire to get married. So, positive thoughts should be transmitted through the mass media in order to bring positive attitudes.

Bibliography

- Abesha, A. (1997). *Impact of parenting practices on scholastic performance of high school students in Wolayta and Amhara cultures*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Amato, Paul R. "Children of Divorce in the 1990s: An Update of the Amato and Keith (1991) Meta-Analysis." *Journal of Family Psychology*, vol. 15, no. 3, 2001, pp. 355-370.
- Amato, Paul R. "Explaining the Intergenerational Transmission of Divorce." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, vol. 58, 1996, pp. 628-640.
- Amato, Paul R., David R. Johnson, Alan Booth, and Stacy J. Rogers. "Continuity and Change in Marital Quality between 1980 and 2000." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, vol. 65, 2003, pp. 1-22.
- Amato, Paul R., Laura Spencer Loomis, and Alan Booth. "Parental Divorce, Marital Conflict, and Offspring Well-Being During Early Adulthood." *Social Forces*, vol. 73, no. 3, 1995, pp. 895-915.
- Baumrind, D. (1989). Rearing competent children. In W. Damon (Ed.), *Child development today and tomorrow* (pp. 349-378). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence substance use. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 11(1), 56-95.
- Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence substance use. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 11(1), 56-95.

- Baumrind, D. (1989). Rearing competent children. In W. Damon (Ed.), *Child development today and tomorrow*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, pp. 349–378.
- Baumrind, D. (1973). The development of instrumental competence through socialization. In A. Pick (Ed.), *Minnesota Symposium on Child Psychology* (vol. 7, pp. 3-46). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Baumrind, D. (1972). An exploratory study of socialization effects on Black children: Some Black White comparison. *Child Development*, 43, 261-267.
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology Monographs*, 4(1-2).
- Baumrind, D. (1967). Child care practices anteceding three patterns of pre-school behavior. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 75(1), 43-88.
- Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of authoritative parental control on child behavior. *Child Development*, 37, 887-907.
- Baumrind, D., & Black, A. E. (1967). Socialization practices associated with dimensions of competence in preschool boys and girls. *Child Development*, 38(2), 291- 328.
- Birhanu, A. (1996). *The relationship of parenting styles with academic achievement among senior secondary school students: With particular reference to the Kafficho Zone*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Buehler, Cheryl, Garrett Lange, and Karen L Franck. "Adolescents' Cognitive and Emotional Responses to Marital Hostility." *Child Development*, vol.73, no. 3, 2007, pp. 775-789.
- Duncan, P. (1971). Parental attitudes and interrelations in delinquency. *Child Development*, 42, 1751-1765.

- Caldwell, T., & Obasi, E. M. (2010). Academic performance in African American undergraduates: Effects of cultural mistrust, educational value, and achievement motivation. *Journal of Career Development, 36*(4), 348-369.
- Crissey, Sarah R. 2005. "Race/Ethnic Differences in the Marital Expectations of Adolescents: The Role of Romantic Relationships." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, vol. 67, 2005, pp. 697-709.
- Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin, 113*(3), 487-496.
- Dornbusch, S. M., Ritter, P. L., Liderman, P.H., Roberts, D.F. & Fraleigh, M. J. (1987). The relation of parenting style to adolescent school performance. *Child Development, 58*, 1244-1257.
- Flanigan, C., R. Huffman, and J. Smith. "Teens' Attitudes Toward Sexual Activity, 2002." *Science Says*, no. 14. Washington, DC: National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy, 2005.
- Habtamu, W. (1995). *Dominant values and parenting styles: Major limiting factors on the development of entrepreneurship in Ethiopia*. In Z. Ayalew & H. Habteselassie (Eds.), *Proceedings of the First Annual Conference on Management in Ethiopia: On the Theme Entrepreneurship*. Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Kassahun, H. (2005). *The relationship of parenting styles and academic performance among primary and secondary school students in Debre-Markos town*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Karney, Benjamin R., Megan K. Beckett, Rebecca L. Collins, and Rebecca Shaw. "Adolescent

Romantic Relationships as Precursors of Healthy Adult Marriages: A Review of Theory, Research and Programs.” Technical Report. Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 2007.

Kroeger, A. (2012) wedding bells- when and where they might be ringing: an analysis of urban and rural students’ attitudes towards marriage. Talk presented at central college, Pella, IA

LeVine, R. A. (1977). Child-rearing and cultural adaption. In P. H. Leiderman, S. R. Tulkin, & A. Rosenfeld (Eds.), *Culture and infancy: Variations in the human experience* (pp. 15-28). New York: Academic Press.

Maccoby, E.E, & Martin J.E.,(1983). Socialization in the context of family: parent child interaction. In P.H., mussen (Ed.). *Hand book of child psychology* (fourth Ed.) vol.4
New York: John Wiley

Markos, T. (1996). *The relationship between parenting style and school performance among high school students in Makalle*. Unpublished Master“ s Thesis, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Maynard, R. A. “The Costs of Adolescent Childbearing.” In *Kids Having Kids: Economic Costs and Social Consequences of Teen Pregnancy*, edited by R. Maynard. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute Press, 1996.

Morrison, Donna Ruane, Mary Jo Coiro. “Parental Conflict and Marital Disruption: Do Children Benefit When High-Conflict Marriages are Dissolved?” *Journal of Marriage and Family*, vol. 61, 1999, pp. 626-637.

Peltz Dennison, Renee, and Susan Silverberg Koerner. 2006. “Post-Divorce Interparental

Conflict and Adolescents' Attitudes About Marriage: The Influence of Maternal Disclosures and Adolescent Gender.” *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage*, vol. 45, no. 1/2, 2006, pp. 31-49.

Qu, L, and Weston, R. (2007). Family statistics and trends: Attitudes towards marriage and cohabitation. Family relationships quarterly, from

[www.aifs.gov.au/afrc/pubs/newsletter / newsletter and html/](http://www.aifs.gov.au/afrc/pubs/newsletter/newsletter_and_html/)

Ringness, T. A., & Gander, M. J. (1974). Methods of child-rearing in rural Ethiopia and a comparison with methods in America lower socioeconomic families. *The Ethiopian Journal of Education*, 7, 55-64.

Schaeffer, E. S. (1965). Children reports of parental behavior: an inventory. *Child Development*, 36(2), 413-426.

Seleshi, Z., & Sentayehu T. (1998). *Parenting style differences among selected ethnic groups in Ethiopia*. Unpublished Research Paper, Forum on Street Children – Ethiopia in Cooperation

Seleshi, Z. (1998). An exploratory study of parenting styles among four ethnic groups in urban settings. *Ethiopian Journal of Development Research*, 20(2), 1-24.

Steinberg, Sara J., Joanne Davila, and, Frank Ficham,. 2006. “Adolescent Marital Expectations and Romantic Experiences: Associations with Perceptions About Parental Conflict and Adolescent Attachment Security.” *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, vol. 35, no. 3,pp. 333-348.

Steinberg, L. (2001). We know some things: Parent-adolescent relationships in retrospect and prospect. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 11(1), 1-19.

- Steinberg, L. (1990). Interdependency in the family: Autonomy, conflict, and harmony. In S. Feldman & G. Elliot (Eds.), *At the threshold: The developing adolescent* (pp. 255-276). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Steinberg, L., Dornbusch, S. M., & Brown, B. B. (1992a). Ethnic differences in adolescent achievement: An ecological perspective. *American Psychologist*, 47, 723-729.
- Steinberg, L., Elmen, J. D., & Mounts, N. S. (1989). Authoritative parenting, psychological maturity, and academic success among adolescents. *Child Development*, 60, 1424-1436.
- Steinberg, L., Lamborn, S. D., Darling, N., Mounts, N. S., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1994). Overtime changes in adjustment and competence among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. *Child Development*, 65, 754-770.
- Steinberg, L., Lamborn, S. D., Dornbusch, S. M., & Darling, N. (1992b). Impact of parenting practices on adolescent achievement: Authoritative parenting school involvement and encouragement to succeed. *Child Development*, 63(5), 1266-1281.
- Steinberg, L., Mounts, N. S., Lamborn, S. D., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1991). Authoritative parenting and adolescent adjustment across various ecological niches. *Journal of Research on Adolescent*, 1, 19-36.
- Sturge-Apple, Melissa L., Patrick T., Davies, and E. Mark Cummings. "Impact of Hostility and Withdrawal in Interpersonal Conflict on Parental Emotional Availability and Children's Adjustment Difficulties." *Child Development*, vol. 77, no. 6, 2006, pp. 1623- 1641.
- Teachman, Jay D. "Childhood Living Arrangements and the Intergenerational Transmission of Divorce." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, vol. 64, 2002, pp. 717-729.

Tilahun, Gidey. (2002). *The interrelationship of parenting style, psychosocial adjustment and academic achievement among Addis Ababa high school students*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Yekoyealem, Desse. (2005). *the relationship between parenting style and identity status of secondary and preparatory school adolescents at Debre Berhan*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Dependent Variable: marital attitude

Tukey HSD

(I) religion of students (J) religion of students		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
orthodox	muslim	4.84314	2.63518	.448	-2.8695	12.5557
	protestant	4.22193	2.06427	.328	-1.8197	10.2636
	jehova's witness	11.67647	4.33005	.088	-.9966	24.3496
	catholic	4.05147	2.33849	.515	-2.7928	10.8957
	no religion	6.12092*	1.73469	.009	1.0439	11.1980
muslim	orthodox	-4.84314	2.63518	.448	-12.5557	2.8695
	protestant	-.62121	3.02029	1.000	-9.4609	8.2185
	jehova's witness	6.83333	4.85904	.723	-7.3880	21.0546
	catholic	-.79167	3.21395	1.000	-10.1982	8.6148
	no religion	1.27778	2.80537	.997	-6.9329	9.4885
protestant	orthodox	-4.22193	2.06427	.328	-10.2636	1.8197
	muslim	.62121	3.02029	1.000	-8.2185	9.4609
	jehova's witness	7.45455	4.57463	.582	-5.9344	20.8435
	catholic	-.17045	2.76523	1.000	-8.2637	7.9228
	no religion	1.89899	2.27752	.960	-4.7668	8.5648
jehova's witness	orthodox	-11.67647	4.33005	.088	-24.3496	.9966
	muslim	-6.83333	4.85904	.723	-21.0546	7.3880
	protestant	-7.45455	4.57463	.582	-20.8435	5.9344
	catholic	-7.62500	4.70474	.588	-21.3947	6.1447
	no religion	-5.55556	4.43567	.809	-18.5378	7.4267
catholic	orthodox	-4.05147	2.33849	.515	-10.8957	2.7928
	muslim	.79167	3.21395	1.000	-8.6148	10.1982
	protestant	.17045	2.76523	1.000	-7.9228	8.2637
	jehova's witness	7.62500	4.70474	.588	-6.1447	21.3947
	no religion	2.06944	2.52872	.963	-5.3316	9.4705
no religion	orthodox	-6.12092*	1.73469	.009	-11.1980	-1.0439
	muslim	-1.27778	2.80537	.997	-9.4885	6.9329
	protestant	-1.89899	2.27752	.960	-8.5648	4.7668
	jehova's witness	5.55556	4.43567	.809	-7.4267	18.5378

catholic	-2.06944	2.52872	.963	-9.4705	5.3316
----------	----------	---------	------	---------	--------

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

APPENDIX A

TOT_m.a (total score of marital attitude)

Tukey HSD

religion of students	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
jehova's witness	2	27.0000	
no religion	18	32.5556	32.5556
muslim	6	33.8333	33.8333
protestant	11	34.4545	34.4545
catholic	8	34.6250	34.6250
orthodox	34		38.6765
Sig.		.226	.465

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

- Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 6.201.
- The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

Dependent Variable: marital attitude

Tukey HSD

(I) parents relationship status	(J) parents relationship status	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Divorced	widowed	-7.50000	2.79457	.091	-15.6791	.6791
	cohabitating	-1.33333	3.74931	.999	-12.3067	9.6401
	married	-1.00980	1.63232	.989	-5.7872	3.7676
	single	3.11111	2.39313	.784	-3.8930	10.1153
	other	-6.66667	3.74931	.486	-17.6401	4.3067
Widowed	divorced	7.50000	2.79457	.091	-.6791	15.6791
	cohabitating	6.16667	4.32933	.712	-6.5043	18.8377
	married	6.49020	2.71113	.172	-1.4447	14.4251
	single	10.61111*	3.22689	.019	1.1667	20.0555
	other	.83333	4.32933	1.000	-11.8377	13.5043
Cohabitating	divorced	1.33333	3.74931	.999	-9.6401	12.3067
	widowed	-6.16667	4.32933	.712	-18.8377	6.5043
	married	.32353	3.68754	1.000	-10.4691	11.1161
	single	4.44444	4.08173	.884	-7.5019	16.3908
	other	-5.33333	4.99908	.893	-19.9645	9.2979
Married	divorced	1.00980	1.63232	.989	-3.7676	5.7872
	widowed	-6.49020	2.71113	.172	-14.4251	1.4447
	cohabitating	-.32353	3.68754	1.000	-11.1161	10.4691
	single	4.12092	2.29514	.475	-2.5965	10.8383
	other	-5.65686	3.68754	.644	-16.4495	5.1357
Single	divorced	-3.11111	2.39313	.784	-10.1153	3.8930
	widowed	-10.61111*	3.22689	.019	-20.0555	-1.1667
	cohabitating	-4.44444	4.08173	.884	-16.3908	7.5019
	married	-4.12092	2.29514	.475	-10.8383	2.5965
	other	-9.77778	4.08173	.171	-21.7241	2.1685
Other	divorced	6.66667	3.74931	.486	-4.3067	17.6401
	widowed	-.83333	4.32933	1.000	-13.5043	11.8377
	cohabitating	5.33333	4.99908	.893	-9.2979	19.9645
	married	5.65686	3.68754	.644	-5.1357	16.4495
	single	9.77778	4.08173	.171	-2.1685	21.7241

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Homogeneous Subsets

TOT_m.a

Tukey HSD

parents relationship status	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
single	9	31.5556	
divorced	24	34.6667	34.6667
married	34	35.6765	35.6765
cohabitating	3	36.0000	36.0000
other	3	41.3333	41.3333
widowed	6		42.1667
Sig.		.079	.296

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 5.908.

b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

APPENDIX B

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY POST GRADUATE STUDIES SCHOOL OF PSYCHOLOGY

Questionnaire to be filled by graduate students

Dear respondent:

The purpose of this study is to learn about marital attitudes in young adults pertaining to the way they were raised.

You will be asked to complete a battery of surveys pertaining to your personal attitudes towards marriage and values as well as and a demographic form. The amount of time for your participation in this study is not expected to exceed 15 minutes.

Any information obtained as a result of your participation in this research will be kept as confidential as legally possible.

Note: Please do not write your name on the demographic questions.

Part -1 Demographic items

1- Sex

A. Male ☐

B. Female ☐

2- Age

A. 18-25 ☐

B. 26-30 ☐

C. 31-40 ☐

3- What is your relationship status?

A. Single ☐

D. Married ☐

B. Dating ☐

E. Divorced ☐

C. Engaged ☐

4- With whom did you live with? Or still living with?

A. With both my father and mother ☐

B. With my mother only ☐

C. With my mother and step father ☐

D. With my father and step mother ☐

E. With other relatives (grandparents, uncle, aunt. Etc.) ☐

F. Other specify -----

5- Your parents are: (please select the one that applies to you the most)

A. Divorced ☐

B. Separated ☐

C. Widowed ☐

D. Cohabiting (living together without getting married) ☐

E. Married ☐

F. Single ☐

G. Other

6. What is your religion?

A. Orthodox ☐

B. Muslim ☐

C. Protestant ☐

D. Jehovah's witness ☐

E. Catholic ☐

F. I don't have religion ☐

G. other.....

7-How religious do you consider yourself to be?

- A. Not Religious D. very religious f. extremely religious
B. A Little Religious
C. Somewhat Religious E. Moderately Religious

Part 2- Items about parenting

Direction- please read each of the following statements carefully and for each item think about your parents or guardians attitudes and behaviors in treating and handling you as you were children/teenagers/ and then check (X) whether you

- [illegible]

No	Items	5	4	3	2	1
1	My parents or guardians give me a lot of care and attention					
2	My parents enjoy staying home with me more than going out with friends					
3	My parents / guardians/ spend time just talking to me					
4	My parents/ guardians/ know who my friends are					
5	When my parents / guardians/ want me to do something they explain why					
6	My parents /guardians/ always speak to me with a warm and friendly voice					
7	My parents allow me to tell them if I think my ideas are better than theirs					
8	My parents involve and discuss with me about most of the family decisions					
9	My parents or guardians push me to do my best in whatever I do					
10	I can count only on my parents /guardians/ to help me out if I face any problem					
11	I believe my parents/guardians/ are happily married.					

12	I consider my parents/guardians/ as controlling					
13	My parents/guardians/ consider discipline as a big factor					
14	My parents/guardians/ give more attention to me than their work					
15	My parents/guardians/ never express their conflicts in front of me.					
16	My parents/guardians/ show care and warmth to one another often.					
17	I see my parents/guardians/ as a role model for my future marriage					

Part 3- Items about marriage

Please indicate or check (X) your level of agreement for each statement.

1. Strongly agree 3. Disagree
2. Agree 4. Strongly Disagree 5. Undecided

No	Items	5	4	3	2	1
1	It is acceptable to marry the first person you date					
2	It's not a good idea to marry early because you don't really know who you are until after college.					
3	It is perfectly acceptable to be 35 and single.					
4	I think that you should have multiple romantic partners before marriage.					
5	No matter what age you are, the goal of dating is to find a spouse.					
6	It is fine for an intimate couple to live together and never marry					
7	If my marriage isn't working, I will just get a divorce.					
8	I don't believe in divorce, you should make it work.					
9	I see marriage as settling down and where the fun stops.					

10	I am afraid that if I get married it will end in divorce.					
11	I want to have marriage life just like my parents / guardians/					
12	Marriage is unnecessary in one's life.					
13	I am well prepared for marriage					
14	It is very important for me to have a good marriage and family life					
15	I believe people have fuller and happier lives when married.					

Thank you!