

Wilfrid Laurier University

Scholars Commons @ Laurier

Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive)

2009

Made Me Who I Am: An Examination of Grandparent and Parent Value Teaching and Young Adult Generativity, Identity, and Adjustment

Elise Bisson
Wilfrid Laurier University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.wlu.ca/etd>



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bisson, Elise, "Made Me Who I Am: An Examination of Grandparent and Parent Value Teaching and Young Adult Generativity, Identity, and Adjustment" (2009). *Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive)*. 972.
<https://scholars.wlu.ca/etd/972>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Scholars Commons @ Laurier. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive) by an authorized administrator of Scholars Commons @ Laurier. For more information, please contact scholarscommons@wlu.ca.



Library and Archives
Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-64362-4
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-64362-4

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

1*1

Canada

Made Me Who I Am: An Examination of Grandparent and Parent Value Teaching and
Young Adult Generativity, Identity, and Adjustment

by

Elise Bisson

Honours Bachelor of Arts, McMaster University, 2007

THESIS

Submitted to the Department of Psychology
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for

Master of Arts

Wilfrid Laurier University

© Elise Bisson 2009

Abstract

Intergenerational value transmission plays an important role in child socialization. Although much research has been done on parent to child value teaching, there is little research on grandparent to grandchild value teaching. The purpose of this study was to explore parent and grandparent value teaching and how it relates to young adult generativity, identity development, and adjustment. This study involved 100 young adults, between the ages of 25 to 29 with a mean age of 26, taken from a longitudinal sample of participants in 2006. Participants were asked to tell parent and grandparent value teaching stories, in which they described a time that their parents and grandparents taught them the importance of a value. These stories were coded for story presence, degree of interactiveness, whether the parent or grandparent served as a positive or negative model of the chosen value, and the use of parent or grandparent quoted voice. Participants completed questionnaire measures of generativity and identity, and measures of loneliness, trust, and dispositional optimism, which are standard measures of adjustment. All participants were able to recount a parent value teaching story, and the majority of participants were able to recount a grandparent value teaching story. The results indicated that young adult grandparent to grandchild value socialization was done mostly by grandmothers, and the value tended to be taught indirectly. Parent value socialization appears to be shared between parents and taught by direct interaction. Furthermore, being able to tell a grandparent value teaching story positively predicted young adult generativity, and negatively predicted young adult loneliness. The construal of a parent as a positive model of the chosen value positively predicted young adult dispositional optimism. Finally, telling an interactive grandparent value teaching story

positively predicted young adult generativity. The results of this study help to extend the literature on the life story narrative, grandparenting, and intergenerational value transmission.

Acknowledgements

I would first like to express my deep gratitude to my Master's advisor, Dr. Joan Norris. You have provided me with endless amounts of encouragement, guidance, support, and advice, for which I am extremely grateful. Your ability to balance so many roles, and excel at all of them, inspires me to be a better student, worker, and person.

I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Michael Pratt and Dr. Tobias Krettenauer. I am extremely grateful for your valuable comments, advice, and time. I am also deeply indebted to the researchers, professors, and students involved in the Futures Study data collection in 2006. A special thank you goes out to my colleague Sean Mackinnon for his assistance with narrative coding.

I have been fortunate enough to be involved with the Pratt/Norris research lab at Laurier. Dr. Michael Pratt, Dr. Joan Norris, and my fellow lab mates have provided me with numerous collaborative research opportunities, and a supportive environment in which to learn. I know that the friendships and knowledge that I have gained by working in the lab will stay with me always.

I also wish to thank my family for their unwavering support and understanding. Thank you to my grandparents for teaching *me* the importance of all the values on the list. My parents and sister have especially been a source of unconditional love, without which I would never have made it this far.

Finally, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my fiance Mike. The support and care that you provide me could never be surpassed and is always more than expected, and I hope to be able to do the same for you when you begin your dissertation. This thesis is dedicated to you.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	Hi
Table of Contents.....	iv
List of Tables.....	vii
List of Appendices.....	ix
Introduction.....	1
Narratives.....	2
Value Teaching Narratives.....	4
Generativity and Family Socialization.....	5
Generativity, Parenting, and Value Socialization.....	6
Generativity, Grandparenting, and Value Socialization.....	9
Generativity in Young Adults.....	10
Identity.....	11
Adjustment.....	14
Purpose.....	16
Hypotheses and Research Questions.....	16
Hypotheses.....	17
Research Questions.....	18
Method.....	19
Participants.....	19
Procedure.....	20
Questionnaire Measures.....	21

Generativity.....	21
Identity Development.....	21
Adjustment.....	22
Narrative Tasks and Coding.....	24
Young Adult Value Teaching Stories.....	24
Inter-rater Reliability.....	24
Story Presence.....	24
Value Type.....	25
Moral vs. Non-Moral Value.....	25
Chosen Parent and Grandparent.....	26
Positive or Negative Model.....	26
Presence of Parent and Grandparent Quoted Voice.....	27
Interactiveness of Parent and Grandparent Stories.....	27
Analyses and Results.....	27
Descriptive Statistics for Questionnaire Measures.....	28
Descriptive Statistics for Parent Narrative Measures.....	28
Descriptive Statistics for Grandparent Narrative Measures.....	29
Hypotheses.....	30
Hypothesis 1.....	30
Hypothesis 2.....	30
Hypothesis 3.....	31
Hypothesis 4.....	31
Research Questions.....	32

Research Question 1.....	32
Research Question 2.....	32
Research Question 3.....	35
Research Question 4.....	37
Discussion.....	40
Chosen Parent and Grandparent.....	41
Hypotheses and Research Questions.....	42
Parent and Grandparent Story Presence.....	42
Parent and Grandparent Story Interactiveness.....	44
Parent and Grandparent Model Type.....	47
Parent and Grandparent Quoted Voice.....	50
Limitations.....	53
Overall Contributions.....	57
Tables.....	59
Appendices.....	72
References.....	86

List of Tables

Narrative Codes and Corresponding Levels.....	59
Descriptive Statistics for Questionnaire Measures.....	60
Zero Order Correlations between the OM-EIS Identity Maturity Index, Generativity, Loneliness, Trust in Relationships, and Dispositional Optimism.....	61
Frequencies of Values for Parent Stories.....	62
Frequencies of Values for Grandparent Stories.....	63
Zero Order Correlations between Grandparent Story Presence and OM-EIS Measures of Identity Achievement, Moratorium, Foreclosure, Diffusion, and the OM-EIS Identity Maturity Index.....	64
Zero Order Correlations between Grandparent Story Presence and Generativity, Loneliness, Trust in Relationships, and Dispositional Optimism.....	65
Zero Order Correlations between Parent and Grandparent Story Interactiveness and OM- EIS Measures of Identity Achievement, Moratorium, Foreclosure, Diffusion, and the OM-EIS Identity Maturity Index.....	66
Zero Order Correlations between Parent and Grandparent Story Interactiveness and Generativity, Loneliness, Trust in Relationships, and Dispositional Optimism.....	67
Zero Order Correlations between Parent and Grandparent Model Type and OM-EIS Measures of Identity Achievement, Moratorium, Foreclosure, Diffusion, and the OM-EIS Identity Maturity Index.....	68
Zero Order Correlations between Parent and Grandparent Model Type and Generativity, Loneliness, Trust in Relationships, and Dispositional Optimism.....	69

Zero Order Correlations between Parent and Grandparent Quoted Voice and OM-EIS
Measures of Identity Achievement, Moratorium, Foreclosure, Diffusion, and the OM-EIS
Identity Maturity Index.....70

Zero Order Correlations between Parent and Grandparent Quoted Voice and
Generativity, Loneliness, Trust in Relationships, and Dispositional Optimism.....71

List of Appendices

Contact Letter.....	72
Informed Consent Statement.....	74
Debriefing Form.....	77
Background Information.....	78
The Loyola Generativity Scale (LGS).....	79
The Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status (OM-EIS).....	80
UCLA Loneliness Scale.....	82
Trust Scale.....	83
Life Orientation Test (LOT).....	85

Made Me Who I Am: An Examination of Grandparent and Parent Value Teaching and
Young Adult Generativity, Identity, and Adjustment

The literature on parenting shows that the parent-child relationship is very complex, and that parents serve many different functions in the family, including caregiver, disciplinarian, and provider of love and affection. As noted by Kemp (2005), research on grandparenthood has mostly focused on placing grandparents into various "types". Many researchers have also examined the different functions of grandparenting. For example, Norris, Kuiack, and Pratt (2004) found that grandparents serve to build intergenerational relationships, enlighten others about family and social history, and transmit values to younger generations.

Kemp (2005) also noted that research on grandparenting has mostly focused on the relationship between grandparents and their young grandchildren, and that few studies have examined the grandparent-grandchild relationship from the grandchild's perspective. To address this gap in our understanding, Kemp (2005) examined the grandparent-adult grandchild relationship from the perspectives of both grandparents and grandchildren (aged 21-36). Through the analysis of qualitative interviews, she found that, overall, both grandparents and their adult grandchildren viewed their relationships as important, meaningful, socially significant, and unique from other family relationships. Furthermore, the grandparent-grandchild relationship was found to be based on unconditional love, support, obligation, and friendship. Finally, Kemp (2005) found that even in adulthood, spoiling and leniency are central to how a number of grandparents and their adult grandchildren think about their relationships, and there was a lack of moral judgments and criticisms on behalf of the grandparents.

Pratt, Norris, Lawford, and Arnold (in press) also note that research on the relationship between grandparenting and grandchild adjustment has mainly focused on grandparents who are raising their children in lieu of absent parents. This is problematic, as out of the 5.7 million grandparents in Canada, only 62,500 Canadian grandparents are living with at least one grandchild with no parental involvement (McPherson & Wister, 2008); consequently, there has not been enough attention given to the influence and importance of grandparenting by grandparents who are not the primary caregivers. What is even less clear is how parenting differs from grandparenting in terms of its relation to the healthy development of children and grandchildren, respectively. The examination of narrative stories, as represented by the child, is one way that may potentially shed light on the differences and similarities between parenting and grandparenting. The following literature review provides an overview of narrative research, focusing on the value teaching narrative, generativity across the life course and its relation to value socialization, identity development and its relation to the narrative, and finally adolescent and young adult adjustment.

Narratives

The past few decades have seen an upsurge in interest in narratives and the life story. According to McAdams (2001), life stories are psychosocial constructions created by individuals and are influenced by that person's culture and historical time. Therefore, life stories are not value free, but instead reflect the norms and values of the individual's culture. Life stories are in part based on real life experiences, but they are also modified, often subconsciously, based on past and predicted future experiences (McAdams, 2001).

In terms of personality development and life stories, McAdams (2001) states that personality can be viewed from three levels: dispositional traits, characteristic adaptations, and life stories. Dispositional traits, such as "extraversion" and "depressiveness", are global, stable, and linear in nature (McAdams, 2001). Characteristic adaptations, such as goals, values, and interests, are any personal characteristics within a particular time, place, or role (McAdams, 2001). The third level of personality, life stories, serves to integrate all the levels (McAdams, 2001). The characteristic adaptations of social motives for power and intimacy are relevant for life stories, as social motives for power and intimacy have been found to relate to life story content themes of *agency* and *communion* (McAdams, 2001). For example, people high in power motivation tend to emphasize agency themes in their life stories, which are characterized by a focus on self-mastery, achievement and responsibility, and empowerment, while people high in intimacy motivation tend to emphasize communion themes in their life stories, which are characterized by a focus on friendship, love, and caring for others (McAdams, 2001). Life stories can also differ in terms of their use of different narratives sequences, such as sequences of redemption, in which bad scenes are transformed into positive outcomes, and contamination scenes, in which a positive event quickly turns bad. Finally, life stories can differ from each other in terms of specificity, organization, and complexity (McAdams, 2001).

The narratives that people choose to tell are special as there are countless life experiences that one can draw from, but people often choose just one specific narrative to tell when asked in a research setting. Chosen narratives are often characterized as what Blagov and Singer (2004) refer to as self-defining memories. A self-defining memory is

a memory that is characterized by being highly significant to the individual recalling it, evoking strong emotions, vividness, being repeated often, and by revolving around personally important concerns and conflicts in the individual's life (Blagov & Singer, 2004). People also give meaning to their self-defining stories by relating them to certain life lessons; these life lessons, specifically lessons taught by parents and grandparents, are what will be explored in the present study. One type of narrative, which will be employed by this study, is called the value teaching narrative. This narrative form is important for understanding intergenerational value transmission.

Value Teaching Narratives

The use of narrative can serve many purposes, one of which is to act as a mode of transmission of values to different generations (Pratt, Norris, Arnold, & Filyer, 1999). The passing down of values from one generation to the next is not only important in the parent-child dyad, but also in the grandparent-grandchild dyad. In fact, grandparent to grandchild value teaching is one of the core functions of grandparent storytelling, and intergenerational value consistency is often greater than intragenerational (or within generational) consistency (Norris et al., 2004).

Pratt, Norris, Hebblethwaite, and Arnold (2008) explored parent and grandparent value teaching stories in adolescents. They found that the majority of the adolescents were able to recall both a parent and grandparent value teaching story, although grandparent stories were somewhat less common than parent stories. Therefore, parent value teaching episodes may be more salient to adolescents and young adults. They also found that adolescents tended to choose to talk about their maternal, rather than paternal,

grandparents, which may indicate the mothers' role as the intergenerational family gatekeeper (Pratt et al., 2008).

In terms of the differences between parent and grandparent value teaching stories, parent stories were more interactive, with a direct parent-child interaction reported in the story (Pratt et al., 2008). This interaction often revolved around disciplining the child for wrongdoings. Grandparent value teaching stories showed less direct interactions, and grandparents were often recalled as positive models of the value being taught (Pratt et al., 2008). Hence, it appears that grandparents may teach values more implicitly, while parents may teach values more explicitly. Parent value teaching stories also tended to be more specific than grandparent stories, although this difference was nonsignificant. These patterns mirror the fact that grandparents are often not as present as parents, as they are often not physically available every day and are generally not responsible for the daily care of their grandchildren (Pratt et al., 2008).

Generativity and Family Socialization

One quality that has been found to relate to value transmission in parents and grandparents is generativity. Generativity is defined by Erik Erikson (1968) as "the concern for establishing and guiding the next generation". It is the positive outcome of his seventh (out of eight) stages of psychosocial development. The negative pole of this stage is called stagnation, which can be defined as " a pervading sense of...boredom and interpersonal impoverishment" (Erikson, 1968). In *Identity: Youth and Crisis*, Erikson (1968) states that generativity is a driving force in our society and that virtually all institutions reinforce generative concern. Generativity is normally exhibited in midlife adults through their care and concern for their children; however, the presence of children

is neither necessary nor sufficient for the expression of generativity. Some parents may not possess high levels of generativity, while some childless adults may possess high levels of generativity. Generativity can be expressed through care and concern for one's children, but also through the care of other youth, care for the environment, and through the production of artwork, writings, and other mediums that will continue into the next generation thereby leaving a legacy of the self.

McAdams and de St. Aubin (1992) see generativity as a combination of seven features that revolve around the goal of care and concern for future generations. These seven features are: cultural demand, inner desire, concern, belief, commitment, action, and narration. Cultural demand and inner desire motivate generativity and together produce a concern for future generations. This concern for future generations, coupled with a belief in the inherent goodness of people, inspire a generative commitment, which in turn influences concern and belief. Generative commitment then leads to generative action and behaviour, although cultural demand and inner desire can also directly motivate generative action. The meaning of the relationship between cultural demand, inner desire, concern, belief, commitment, and action is then determined by individuals' narration of generativity, which is their generativity script within their life story (McAdams & de St. Aubin, 1992). According to McAdams and de St. Aubin (1992), all seven features must be examined in order to fully understand generativity in any person's life.

Generativity, Parenting, and Value Socialization

The majority of the research on generativity has focused on generativity in parents because parenting is the most common expression of generativity (Erikson, 1963). One

such study, by Pratt, Danso, Arnold, Norris, and Filyer (2001), examined midlife parents' levels of generativity and their relation to the parenting of adolescent children. What they found was that mothers who were more generative viewed adolescent development as more positive and growth-oriented. Therefore, these generative mothers had a more optimistic parental outlook than less generative mothers. Pratt, Danso, and colleagues (2001) also discovered that generative mothers were more likely than less generative mothers to show an authoritative parenting style. This study also found that generative mothers showed a greater usage of autonomy-encouraging practices compared to less generative mothers. It is important to note that the results for fathers were less clear than mothers, as paternal generativity did not consistently predict levels of authoritative parenting, and there was no significant relation between paternal generativity and optimism for fathers (Pratt, Danso, et al., 2001).

Peterson, Smirles, and Wentworth (1997) also examined the relation between generativity and parenting, along with its relation to personality, and political involvement. Peterson and his colleagues found that parent generativity was positively correlated with both adolescent generativity and life satisfaction. In terms of personality, this study examined the relationship between generativity and the Big Five trait-based personality factors: Factor 1 (Extraversion), Factor 2 (Agreeableness), Factor 3 (Conscientiousness), Factor 4 (Neuroticism), and Factor 5 (Openness to Experience). Generative parents scored higher on the personality trait of Openness to Experience, which indicates openness and originality, and were more interested in political issues than less generative parents. As in the study by Pratt and colleagues (2001), generative parents tended to use a positive authoritative parenting style (Peterson et al., 1997).

Peterson (2006) performed another study that examined the relation between generativity and positive parenting. What is interesting about Peterson's (2006) study is that he not only examined parents' levels of generativity, but examined offspring outcomes as well. Peterson found that parental generativity was positively correlated with positive affect and prosocial characteristics in the offspring. Generative parents also transmitted both religious beliefs and political values to their offspring, which in turn encouraged offspring generativity. The children of more generative parents were also happier than the children of less generative parents, and these children scored higher on the positive personality traits of Agreeableness and Conscientiousness; however, this correlation may be in part due to genetic transmission rather than an effect of parental generativity directly (Peterson, 2006). Generativity has also been positively linked to parental optimism, but this link has only been observed in mothers and not fathers (Pratt, Norris, van de Hoef, & Arnold, 2001).

Parental generativity and its relation to value socialization have also been explored. As midlife adults enter into Erikson's stage of generativity, they may begin to feel the need to share their valuable life experiences with those around them, especially with younger generations. Research has supported this as McAdams, Diamond, de St. Aubin, and Mansfield (1997) reported that generative middle-aged parents were more actively involved in offspring socialization compared to less generative parents. Pratt and colleagues (1999) also explored the relation between generativity and value socialization by examining value teaching stories. They found that midlife and older generative adults reported themselves as being more involved in the transmission of values to adolescents, compared to less generative midlife and older adults. Research has also shown that value

teaching stories of adolescents with generative parents were more specific, interactive, contained more caring themes, and were less likely to use the parents as negative models, as compared to the stories told by adolescents of less generative parents (Pratt et al., 2008). Therefore, generative parents may be distinct from less generative parents in the way they socialize values to their offspring, as it is evident that parental generativity tends to be correlated with positive parenting practices and positive offspring outcomes.

Generativity, Grandparenting, and Value Socialization

Unfortunately, there is considerably less research on generativity in grandparents than in parents. Some studies have examined generativity in older adults without specifically addressing the relation between generativity and grandparenting. For example, research has found that the use of generative themes in narratives was highest in an older sample of adults, thus emphasizing the importance of storytelling and value teaching for older adults (Pratt et al., 1999). This research also reported that, although Erikson believed that generativity peaks in midlife, high levels of generative concern persist into older adulthood (Pratt et al., 1999). McAdams, de St. Aubin, and Logan (1993) also reported high levels of generative commitments and generative narration in both their midlife and older adult samples. Norris and colleagues (2004) carried out one of the few studies to examine grandparent generativity and value socialization narratives. Generative grandparents recalled episodes of value teaching with greater frequency and specificity than did less generative grandparents (Norris et al., 2004). Therefore, it is evident that generative older adults may have, and recall, distinct socialization patterns with grandchildren, although it is unclear how these might differ from parent socialization patterns.

Generativity in Young Adults

Generativity has mostly been studied in midlife adults, as it was thought to be a developmental task of middle adulthood. However, research has shown that generativity can be exhibited not only by middle-aged and older adults, but also by young adults and even adolescents. Lawford, Pratt, Hunsberger, and Pancer (2005) sought to discover the developmental pathway of generativity in a sample of late adolescents. They found that generative concern was significantly related to various measures of adolescent adjustment, indicating the potential benefit of early generativity. Interestingly, they also found that levels of generativity remained consistent from the age of 19 to 23, indicating stability over time in early generative concern (Lawford et al., 2005). Community involvement in adolescence also predicted high levels of generative concern in early adulthood, which may indicate the importance of community involvement in fostering early generativity. Conversely, early generativity marginally predicted later community involvement, indicating the potential benefits of early generative concern in adolescents and young adults (Lawford et al., 2005).

Research carried out by Frensch, Pratt, and Norris (2007) explored the development of generative themes in the life stories of adolescents and emerging adults. Similar to Lawford and colleagues' study, Frensch and colleagues found that the use of generative themes in life story narratives was positively related to volunteering behaviour, prosocial reasoning, and the presence of the values "kindness and caring" and "fairness" in the adolescents' proud story narratives. There was also stability over time in terms of generative theme usage from the ages of 16 to 20. Furthermore, adolescent perception of parent authoritativeness and parent autonomy-encouraging practices were positively

correlated with generative theme usage in emerging adults (Frensch et al., 2007). In terms of value socialization, adolescents whose narratives of parent teaching were characterized as interactive, specific, and focused on caring themes, were more likely to score high on measures of generativity in young adulthood (Pratt et al., 2008).

It is evident from these studies that some form of generativity is indeed present not only in mature adults, but in adolescents and young adults as well. It is also evident that early generativity is an important quality to foster in young adults. Although connections have been found between young adult generativity and parental style, a general exploration of parent and grandparent value teaching, as described by young adults, and its relation to young adult generativity has yet to be conducted; this is what the present study seeks to uncover. It may be that young adults' generativity may promote clearer recollections of these intergenerational socialization processes; however, it is unclear if or how grandparent value teaching stories will differ from parent value teaching stories by generative young adults.

Identity

In addition to his general stages of ego development, Erikson developed one of the most utilized theories of identity development in his book, *Identity, Youth and Crisis* (1968). Erikson stated that the concept of identity can be difficult to grasp and define as one's identity is located both in the core of the individual and in his or her community. Hence identity is influenced not only by internal factors but also by external or community factors as well, such as family, friends, and school. According to Erikson (1968), the process of identity development is quite complex, as it entails both an internal reflection and an external observation using all levels of mental functioning. Individuals

whose identity is in the process of development will judge themselves in terms of how they think others view them. They will also, in turn, judge other people's ways of judging them in comparison to how they view themselves. The entire process is thus quite complicated and cyclical; however, according to Erikson (1968), the process is more or less completed in the "unconscious".

According to Erikson (1968), identity development is never fully completed: one's identity is always developing and shifting. The process may begin from one's earliest moments, the first meeting of mother and child, and ends only with the termination of one's life. Nevertheless, Erikson (1968) states that the process of identity development has its normative crisis and resolution in adolescence and young adulthood. The identity reached by adolescents and young adults in this stage includes all past significant identifications, or significant relationships with others, what they had come to be during childhood, what they promise to be in the future, what they perceive themselves to be, and how they perceive others view them (Erikson, 1968). Identifications are then made with peers and people outside of the family unit.

If this stage is not successfully completed, then the adolescent will have identity confusion. According to Erikson (1968), an individual who is identity confused is at risk for various psychological disorders and may have problems successfully completing successive stages of identity development. Identity confusion is normally expressed as a prolonged moratorium during which the adolescent or young adult refuses to make any choices that might have an impact on their future as adults. This moratorium is often concluded with irrational, sudden, and far-reaching life decisions; the repercussions of which are then denied by the identity confused young adult (Erikson, 1968). It is

therefore important for an individual to exit adolescence or emerging adulthood with a clear sense of identity. Young adults, therefore, will most likely have completed the identity stage and have a grasp of who they are, although this may change throughout their later life.

Similar to Erikson's (1968) theory of identity development, McAdams (2001) also asserts that identity development occurs primarily in adolescence and requires the integration of past, present, and future selves. More specifically, identity integrates the numerous roles and relationships in the individual's life "synchronically", or in the present, but identity also integrates "diachronically", or in time (McAdams, 2001). Therefore, according to McAdams (2001), an individual develops an identity only when the individual's self-understanding integrates both synchronically and diachronically, which in turn provides unity and purpose to their life. This ability to understand oneself synchronically and diachronically is not present in childhood and only begins to develop in adolescence or emerging adulthood (McAdams, 2001). Consequently, it may be interesting to examine the relationship between parenting and grandparenting and identity formation in young adults, as it is likely that the young adults would have progressed through identity formation (either positively or negatively).

It is after identity formation is resolved that young adults can begin to organize their lives into self-defining stories (McAdams, 2001). Young adults begin to systematize their life experiences into culturally meaningful, coherent, and organized stories. Also, young adults begin to show what McAdams (2001) calls "thematic coherence", in which they are able to identify values that integrate their life experiences and convey who they

are. Therefore, young adulthood may be the ideal time to examine the relationship between parent and grandparent value teaching stories and identity development.

Adjustment

In psychology, adjustment is generally defined as the relative degree of harmony between an individual's needs and the requirements of the environment. In this study, adjustment will be examined using measures of loneliness, trust in relationships, and dispositional optimism, as these are among standard indicators of adolescent adjustment and adaptation (Arnold, Pratt, & Hicks, 2004). Positive adjustment in adolescence and young adulthood is important, as those who show positive adjustment tend to score lower on measures of depression (Arnold et al., 2004). Correspondingly, positively adjusted adolescents and young adults also show higher levels of self-esteem and identity achievement (Arnold et al., 2004).

A positive parent-child relationship has been found to predict adolescent and young adult adjustment (e.g. Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts, & Dornbusch, 1994). Steinberg and his colleagues (1994) carried out a large-scale study with over 2,300 young adult participants. They sought to examine the long-term benefits of positive, or authoritative parenting, and the long-term repercussions of less positive parenting. What they found was that the young adult children of authoritative parents scored higher on measures of psychosocial competence and academic competence, and scored lower than the young adult children of non-authoritative parents on measures of distress. The young adult children of authoritative parents also exhibited fewer problem behaviours overall (Steinberg et al., 1994). Longitudinal findings demonstrated that the benefits for children of authoritative parents continued to rise over time, and the negative repercussions of less

positive parenting, especially by neglectful parents, continued to increase as well, thereby increasing the adjustment gap between the children of authoritative and neglectful parents (Steinburgetal., 1994).

Arnold and colleagues (2004) have examined the link between adjustment and parental influence, as measured by the use of parent quoted voice in the narratives of adolescents. According to Arnold and colleagues (2004), the use of parent quoted voice reflects responsiveness to parent influence. The representation of parent voice can range from a simple parroting of the parent voice, indicating a lack of internalization, to the complex appropriation or reconstruction of the parents' voice in the individual's own terms. This appropriation reflects a deeper internalization of the parents' views and beliefs. Arnold and colleagues (2004) found that adolescents who were responsive to their parents' influence, by directly quoting their parents, showed signs of healthy adjustment, specifically by scoring high on measures of self-esteem, optimism, and identity development, and scoring low on measures of loneliness and depression. The long-term benefit of parental influence on adolescent adjustment was also clear, as adolescents who scored high on self-esteem and optimism, and who scored low on loneliness and depression at 16 years of age, showed these same patterns in emerging adulthood at 20 years of age (Arnold et al., 2004). Unfortunately this study did not examine the relationship of grandparent influence and grandchild adjustment; this relationship will be examined in the current study. As there is this lack of research on the relationship between grandparent value teaching and young adult adjustment, this component of the study will be exploratory. It is also unclear as to how the relation of

parent value teaching stories will differ from the relation of grandparent value teaching stories to young adult adjustment.

Purpose

The purpose of the present study was to explore how, and whether, parents and grandparents transmit values to their children and grandchildren respectively, and whether parents and grandparents differ in terms of their value teaching, as described by the young adults. Through secondary analysis on an existing dataset, young adults' self reported levels of overall psychological well being, such as generativity, identity, and adjustment (using measures of loneliness, trust in relationships, and dispositional optimism), along with their stories of times when their parents and grandparents taught them an important positive value, were investigated. This study was designed to uncover the basic characteristics of the parent and grandparent value teaching stories, and to compare them on a number of characteristics. These included the ability to tell a value teaching story, whether the parent or grandparent served as a positive or negative model for the chosen value, the presence of parent or grandparent quoted voice, which may be an indication of relationship closeness and influence (Arnold et al., 2004), and the presence of a direct interaction between the young adult and their parent or grandparent.

Hypotheses and Research Questions

There is much less research on the relationship between grandparenting and young adult development than there is on the relationship between parenting and young adult development. The concepts of generativity, identity development, and value socialization have received attention in the parenting literature, but rarely are addressed in the work on grandparenting. Some researchers have examined generativity in older adults without

addressing the relation between this characteristic and grandparenting (McAdams et al., 1993; Pratt et al., 1999). There is also little research on the relationship between grandparenting and the identity development of young adults, and there has been no research that compared this relationship between grandparenting and young adult identity development to the relationship between parenting and young adult identity development. In terms of adjustment, researchers have examined the relationship between parenting and young adult and adolescent adjustment (Arnold et al., 2004; Steinberg et al., 1994), but not the relationship between grandparenting and grandchild adjustment. Further, no research has compared the relationship between parent value teaching and young adult adjustment to the relationship between grandparent value teaching and young adult adjustment. In terms of value teaching, although there is evidence that older adults show distinct socialization patterns (Norris et al., 2004), it is unclear how these differ from parent socialization patterns. Pratt and colleagues (in press) have performed one of the few studies that compare parent value teaching stories to grandparent value teaching stories, and how these stories interact with adolescent identity development, generativity, and adjustment, but these studies have yet to be replicated in a sample of young adults. Therefore, the goal of the present study was to extend the literature on grandparent-grandchild relationships, and to explore parent and grandparent value teaching as told by young adults.

Hypotheses

1. Grandparent value teaching stories will be less readily recalled than parent stories, replicating findings by Pratt and colleagues (2008).
2. As grandparents are used as value exemplars and not direct teachers, and as they

teach values more implicitly (Pratt et al., 2008), then it can be hypothesized that young adults will report more instances of direct interactions during a value teaching episode in parent stories, as compared to grandparent stories.

3. As the grandparent-adult grandchild has been characterized by leniency, spoiling, and an absence of criticism (Kemp, 2005), then it can be hypothesized that grandparents will be more likely to be construed as positive teachers in the young adults' value teaching narratives, as compared to parents.
4. As use of voice is correlated to closeness and influence in relationships, then it can be hypothesized that young adults will be more likely to use parent voice compared to grandparent voice. Similarly, as children are often close to, and more heavily influenced by, their parents compared to their grandparents, then it can be hypothesized that there will be a greater number of quotations in the parent stories, as compared to the grandparent stories.

Research Questions

1. How is being able to tell a parent and grandparent value teaching story related to young adult identity development, generativity, and adjustment? The research on value teaching has not explicitly compared parent and grandparent stories in relation to these variables; hence, this will be exploratory.
2. How will the interactiveness of parent and grandparent value teaching stories be related to young adult identity development, generativity, and adjustment? Although research has found that interactive value teaching stories, as told by adolescents, were linked to young adult generativity, it is less clear how interactiveness will be related

to young adult identity development and adjustment. It is also unclear as to how the relationship of parent story interactiveness and young adult identity, generativity, and adjustment, will differ from the relationship of grandparent story interactiveness and young adult identity, generativity, and adjustment.

3. How will being a positive or negative parent or grandparent model be related to young adult identity development, generativity, and adjustment? It is unclear as to how the type of model will relate to these variables, and how this will differ for parents and grandparents.
4. How will the use of quoted parent and grandparent voice be related to young adult identity development, generativity, and adjustment, and how will it differ for parent and grandparent stories? Although research has found that the use of parent quoted voice is positively related to adjustment (Arnold et al., 2004), it is unclear as to how it will be related to identity development and generativity in young adults. It is also unclear as to how the use of grandparent quoted voice will be related to these variables, and how this will differ from the use of parent quoted voice.

Method

Participants

All participant data analyzed in this study were collected in 2006, as part of the SSHRC-funded longitudinal *Futures Study* at Wilfrid Laurier University (WLU).

Participants consisted of 100 predominantly white young adults: 31 men and 69 women, ranging in age from 25 to 29, with a mean age of 26.42 ($SD = .85$). In 2006, at the time of the data collection, 2% of the subsample of participants had not finished high school, 8% had completed high school but had not pursued higher education, 15% had completed

high school and gone on to complete some college or university but had not graduated, 29% had graduated from college, 27% had completed an undergraduate degree, 11% had completed some graduate work at the university level, and 8% of participants had completed graduate school. In terms of current school enrollment, 73% of the subsample of participants were not currently enrolled in an educational institute, while 27% were currently enrolled in an educational institute. In terms of employment, 74% of participants were employed full-time, 19% were employed part-time, and 7% were not currently employed. Concerning personal relationships, approximately 70% of participants reported being in a committed relationship, with a mean relationship length of 4.40 years ($SD = 3.24$). Furthermore, 14% of participants reported having one or more children. Finally, regarding the relationship of the participants' parents, 67% of participants' parents were married, 18% were divorced, 6% were separated, 5% had a widowed mother, 2% had a widowed father, and 2% of participants' parents lived in common-law relationships. These participants made up less than 12% of the original *Futures Study* sample of 896 adolescents, who were originally recruited from 16 high schools in central Ontario at the age of 17. The data collected in 2006 comprise Time 2, while the first round, or Time 1, of data collection for the *Futures Study* was done when the participants were 17 years of age.

Procedure

Participants were first contacted by letter (see Appendix A), and then by telephone using a standard phone script, and asked to come to WLU to complete a 2-hour interview about themselves and their family, and to complete several questionnaire measures (see Appendices D -1). The interviews were conducted by three graduate students and two

undergraduate students enrolled at WLU. All interviewers were consistently trained to help ensure interviewer reliability. Before the collection of data, the study was approved by the WLU Ethics Review Board. Participants were asked to sign a consent document after being informed of the risks and benefits of participation (see Appendix B). They were told that their information and responses would remain anonymous and confidential. After completing the interview and questionnaire components, participants were debriefed (see Appendix C) and given a cheque for \$50 as compensation for their participation.

Questionnaire Measures

Generativity

The Loyola Generativity Scale (LGS). Participants completed the Loyola Generativity Scale (LGS), which was developed by McAdams and de St. Aubin (1992) (see Appendix E). The LGS, a measure of generative concern, consists of 20 items, each item scored on a 9-point Likert scale from -4 ("not at all true of me") to +4 ("very true of me"). An example item is "I try to pass along the knowledge I have gained through my experiences". Cronbach's alpha for the LGS in this sample was .87.

Identity Development

The Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status (OM-EIS). Participants completed the Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status (OM-EIS), which was developed by Adams, Bennison, and Huh (1989) (see Appendix F). The OM-EIS is a 24-item self-report measure, with four subscales each containing 6 items. Each subscale measures one of Marcia's (1980) four statuses: identity achievement, moratorium, foreclosure, and diffusion. Participants rated how well they agreed with each item on a 9-point likert scale

from -4 ("very strongly disagree") to 44 ("very strongly agree"). An example item is "It took me a while to figure it out, but now I really know what I want for a career". Scores on all four subscales will be calculated separately for preliminary analyses. In order to calculate a summary measure of identity development, participants' scores on the moratorium, foreclosure, and diffusions subscales were subtracted from their scores on the identity achievement subscale, the most adaptive and sophisticated identity status, to reach an identity maturity index. In this sample, Cronbach's alphas for the subscales ranged from .46 to .70. Although these alphas are low, they are consistent with other literature (Adams et al., 1989).

Adjustment

UCLA Loneliness Scale. Participants completed the UCLA Loneliness Scale, which was developed by Russel, Peplau, and Cutrona (1980) (see Appendix G). The UCLA Loneliness Scale, which was used in this study to assess loneliness, is a 20-item, self-report measure. Participants were asked to indicate how often they felt the way described in each of the 20-items, from 1 ("never") to 4 ("often"). An example item is "I feel part of a group of friends" (reverse-scored). A total loneliness score was then calculated by summing the scores from each of the 20 items. In this sample, Cronbach's alpha was .91.

Trust Scale. Participants completed the Trust Scale, which was created by Rempel, Holmes, and Zanna (1985) to measure levels of trust in close interpersonal relationships (see Appendix H). The Trust Scale is a 26-item scale, consisting of three subscales measuring faith, predictability, and dependency. Participants were to base their answers on a spouse or romantic partner, and they were asked to indicate their agreement or

disagreement for each item, from -3 ("strongly disagree") to +3 ("strongly agree"). An example item is "My partner has proven to be trustworthy and I am willing to let him/her engage in activities which other partners find too threatening". The overall Cronbach's alpha for this sample was .87.

Life Orientation Test (LOT). Participants completed the Life Orientation Test (LOT), which was developed by Scheier and Carver (1985) (see Appendix I). The LOT was used as a measure of dispositional optimism in the present study. The LOT consists of 8 statements, and participants were asked to indicate their agreement or disagreement with each statement, from -4 ("very strongly disagree") to +4 ("very strongly agree"). A sample statement is "In uncertain times, I usually expect the best". In this sample, Cronbach's alpha was .86.

It should be noted that the CES-D Depression Scale was administered and examined for this study; however, it did not significantly predict any of the narrative measures. It was excluded from further examination in the current study, as depression may be, in part, more endogenous than the other adjustment measures employed in this study. Unlike loneliness, optimism, and trust in relationships, depression has been recognized as a clinical syndrome for many years, and has been strongly argued to be in part endogenous (internal and biological) in nature (Beck & Alford, 2009). Although it can be reasoned that all traits and behaviours are in part influenced by biological or genetic factors, the endogenous nature of depression has been argued extensively (Beck & Alford, 2009).

Narrative Tasks and Coding

Young Adult Value Teaching Stories

Participants were first asked to select the three most important values from a list of 12 moral and non-moral positive values, such as "kind and caring" and "honest and trustworthy" (see Pratt, Hunsberger, Pancer, & Alisat, 2003). They were then asked to tell a story about a time when their parents taught them the importance of one of their three chosen values, and then a time when their grandparents taught them the importance of one of their three chosen values (see Pratt et al., 1999). Participants were asked by the interviewer to tell as specific a story as possible, and the participants were informed that the story should take place in a specific time with specific characters. These parent and grandparent value teaching stories were coded on eight dimensions: (1) the presence or absence of a story, (2) which value, out of 12, was chosen, (3) whether the chosen value was moral (e.g., honest and truthful) or non-moral (e.g., independent), (4) which parent or grandparent the story was about, (5) whether the parent or grandparent served as a positive or negative model of the chosen value, (6) the presence or absence of parent or grandparent quoted voice, (7) the total number of quotations used in the story, and (8) the degree of interactiveness of the parent or grandparent in the story (see Table 1 for all narrative codes and corresponding levels).

Inter-rater Reliability

Two graduate students independently coded a randomly selected sample of 25 parent value teaching stories (25% of the sample) and 25 grandparent value teaching stories (25% of the sample) on all narrative codes in order to assess inter-rater reliability.

Story Presence

Participants' value teaching stories were examined to determine whether or not they could tell a parent or grandparent value teaching story. The stories were scored as 1 (no story) if the participant could not recall a value teaching story, or 2 (story present) if the participant could tell a parent or grandparent value teaching story. The agreement between the two independent raters on both parent and grandparent story presence was 100% ($\kappa = 1.0$, $p < .001$ for grandparent story presence). Kappa could not be calculated for parent story presence due to a lack of variance.

Value Type

The participants' value teaching stories were examined to determine which value, out of the 12 possible values, was chosen for the value teaching story. The agreement between the two independent raters for both the parent and grandparent stories was 100% ($\kappa = 1.0$, $p < .001$).

Moral vs. Non-Moral Value

The participants' chosen values were classified as either a moral value (e.g., honest and truthful, fair and just, trust-worthy, kind and caring, good citizen, and integrity) or a non-moral value (e.g., polite and courteous, careful and cautious, ambitious and hardworking, independent, be open and communicate, and loyalty) (see Pratt et al., 2003). Pratt and colleagues (2003) attempted to validate their assignment of the values into moral and non-moral categories by asking a sample of participants to rate the degree to which each value was "typical of a moral person", from 1 (almost never true) to 7 (almost always true). The percentage of the participants who rated each value as a 6 or 7 was found to be highest for the six moral values. Although Pratt and colleagues recognized that good citizen and loyalty are quite ambiguous with regards to whether

they are moral or non-moral values, they included good citizen in their moral set of values as it was thought to be linked to prosocial, community-oriented behaviours, and loyalty in their non-moral set of values as it seemed less likely to be linked to prosocial behaviours. The agreement between the two independent raters for both the parent and grandparent stories in the current study was 100% ($\kappa = 1.0$, $p < .001$).

Chosen Parent and Grandparent

The participants' narratives were examined to determine which parent or grandparent their stories were about. Parent value teaching stories were coded as 1 if the story was about the participant's mother, 2 if the story were about their father, or 3 if the story were about both parents. Grandparent value teaching stories were coded as 1 if the story were about the participant's grandmother, 2 if the story were about their grandfather, or 3 if the story were about both grandparents. The agreement between the two independent raters for both the parent and grandparent stories was 100% ($\kappa = 1.0$, $p < .001$).

Positive or Negative Model

The young adults' value teaching stories were examined to determine whether the parent or grandparent served as a positive model or a negative model of the chosen value. Value teaching stories were coded as 1 (negative) if the parent or grandparent were construed as being a negative model of the chosen value, or 2 (not negative) if the parent or grandparent were construed as being a positive model of the chosen value. The agreement between the two independent raters for the parent stories was 100% ($\kappa = 1.0$, $p < .001$). The agreement between the two independent raters for the grandparent stories was 96% ($\kappa = .83$, $p < .001$).

Presence of Parent and Grandparent Quoted Voice

Participants' value teaching stories were coded to determine whether the young adults explicitly or implicitly used quoted parent or grandparent voice. The stories were scored as a 1 (no quotes used), or 2 (literal or rephrased quote used). A tally of the number of times the participant quoted a parent or grandparent was also noted. According to (Pratt et al., 2008), the use of quoted voice is considered to be positively related to relationship closeness. The agreement between the two independent raters for the parent stories was 92% ($\kappa = .83$, $p < .001$). The agreement between the two independent raters for the grandparent stories was 87% ($\kappa = .68$, $p = .001$).

Interactiveness of Parent and Grandparent Stories

Participants' parent and grandparent value teaching stories were coded to determine the degree of interactiveness between the young adult and their parent or grandparent. The stories were scored as either 1 (vague unspecified story), 2 (indirect interaction: a story about a parent or grandparent with no direct interaction), or 3 (clear, explicit, shared interaction with a parent or grandparent). The agreement between the two independent raters for the parent stories was 96% ($\kappa = .92$). The agreement between the two independent raters for the grandparent stories was 96% ($\kappa = .91$).

Analyses and Results

The descriptive statistics, such as variable means and frequencies, for both the questionnaire and narrative measures will first be reported. Next, each hypothesis will be analyzed using chi-square tests of independence. Finally, each research question will be analyzed by reporting the zero order correlations and linear regressions of the questionnaire and narrative measures. For exploratory research, a significance level of

.10 has been deemed acceptable (Garson, 2002). Therefore, due to the moderate size and exploratory nature of the current study, a significance level of .10 will be used.

Consequently, the findings of this study should be considered with caution.

Using independent samples t-tests, it was found that there were no significant differences between the average scores of males versus females in terms of the identity maturity index, adjustment measures, or narrative measures. However, women did score approximately 10 points higher than males on the generativity measure ($t(98) = -2.403, p < .05$).

Descriptive Statistics for Questionnaire Measures

The means and standard deviations for the questionnaire measures of: generativity; the identity subscales; the identity maturity index; loneliness; trust in relationships; and dispositional optimism, can be found in Table 2. The zero order correlations of all the scales can be found in Table 3. All of the scales were significantly correlated: the identity maturity index, generativity, trust in relationships, and dispositional optimism scales were all positively correlated with each other and negatively correlated with the loneliness scale.

Descriptive Statistics for Parent Narrative Measures

For the parent narrative measures, 100% of the participants were able to tell a parent value teaching story. The most popular value chosen to talk about in the parent value teaching stories was "independent", with 21% of the participants choosing this value (see Table 4 for all parent story values and their corresponding frequencies). The majority (51%) of participants chose a moral value compared to the 49% of participants who chose a non-moral value. As to whom the participants' value teaching stories were

about, 46% of the participants chose to talk about both their parents, while 33% chose to talk about their mother, and 21% chose to talk about their father. The vast majority (93%) of the parents were construed as positive models of the chosen value, while only 7% were construed as negative models of the chosen value. Approximately 57% of participants did not use any direct or indirect quotations, while 43% of participants used one or more literal or rephrased parent quotations, with the mean number of parent quotations being .73, with a standard deviation of 1.10. For parent interactiveness, 62% of the parent value teaching stories contained a clear, explicit, shared interaction between the young adults and their parents, while 34% of the stories contained an indirect interaction and 4% were classified as vague and unspecified. Story word counts were collected by a research assistant prior to this study; the average story length for the parent stories was approximately 311 words (sd = 152.56). Therefore, the majority of parent value teaching stories were about a moral value, were about both parents, construed the parents as positive models, contained few, if any, parent quotations, described a shared interaction, and were just over 300 words in length.

Descriptive Statistics for Grandparent Narrative Measures

For the grandparent narrative measures, 89% of participants were able to tell a grandparent value teaching story, while 11% of participants could not. The value of "kind and caring" was the most popular value, as 19% of participants chose to talk about this value (see Table 5 for all grandparent story values and their corresponding frequencies). Furthermore, the majority of participants (53%) chose a moral value rather than a non-moral value. Approximately 48% of participants' stories were about their grandmothers, 32% were about their grandfathers, and 20% were about both

grandparents. The majority of participants (89%) tended to construe their grandparents as positive models of the chosen value, while 11% of participants construed their grandparents as negative models of the chosen value. The majority of participants (64%) did not use any grandparent quotations in their stories, while 36% of participants used one or more literal or rephrased grandparent quotations. The mean number of grandparent quotations was .43, with a standard deviation of .66. The majority (55%) of grandparent value teaching stories contained an indirect interaction, 39% contained a clear, explicit, shared interaction, and 6% of the stories were vague and unspecified. Finally, the average story length was 224 words ($sd = 101.493$). Therefore, the majority of grandparent value teaching stories were about a moral value, were about the participant's grandmother, construed the grandparents as positive models, did not contain any quotations, contained an indirect interaction, and were 224 words in length.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1

To analyze the hypothesis that more parent value teaching stories will be recalled than grandparent value teaching stories, a chi-square test of independence was performed. As predicted, there was a significant relationship between story type (parent vs. grandparent) and story presence ($\chi^2(1) = 11.64, p < .01$). While 100% of the young adults were able to tell a parent value teaching story, only 89 out of 100 young adults (89%) were able to tell a grandparent value teaching story.

Hypothesis 2

To analyze the hypothesis that the young adults will report more instances of direct interaction during a value teaching episode in parent stories, as compared to grandparent

stories, a chi square test of independence was performed. As predicted, there was a significant relationship between the degree of interactivity and story type (parent vs. grandparent) ($\chi^2(2) = 9.730, p < .01$). While 62% of the parent value teaching stories contained a clear, explicit shared interaction, 39% of the grandparent value teaching stories contained a clear, explicit shared interaction. Furthermore, there were more instances of indirect interaction in the grandparent stories, as 34% of the parent value teaching stories were coded as containing an indirect interaction, while 55% of the grandparent value teaching stories were coded as containing an indirect interaction.

Hypothesis 3

To analyze the hypothesis that grandparents will be more likely construed as positive teachers, as compared to parents, a chi square test of independence was performed. It was found that there was no significant relationship between type of model and story type ($\chi^2(1) = 1.032, p = .310$). The majority of parents (93%) and grandparents (89%) were construed as positive models in the young adults' value teaching stories.

Hypothesis 4

To analyze the hypothesis that there will be more instances of parent quoted voice, as compared to grandparent quoted voice, a chi square test of independence was performed. This pattern was observed, as parents were quoted in 43% of all parent value teaching stories, while grandparents were quoted in 36% of all grandparent value teaching stories, however this difference was not significant ($\chi^2(1) = .976, p = .323$). A paired-samples t-test was also performed to examine whether there was a significant difference in the number of quotations used in the young adults' parent and grandparent

narratives. The results indicate that there were significantly more quotations in the parent stories, as compared to the grandparent stories ($t(88) = 2.114, p < .05$).

Research Questions

Research Question 1

To analyze how being able to tell a grandparent value teaching story relates to identity development, generativity, and adjustment, zero order correlations were calculated. Parent story presence was excluded from these calculations as the variable contained zero variance (100% of the participants were able to tell a parent value teaching story).

By calculating the zero order correlations it was found that being able to tell a grandparent value teaching story was not significantly correlated with the moratorium, foreclosure, and diffusion identity subscales, or the identity maturity index (see Table 6). However, grandparent story presence was modestly positively correlated with the identity achievement subscale ($r(98) = .170, p < .10$). Furthermore, grandparent story presence was modestly correlated with young adult generativity ($r(98) = .181, p < .10$), and loneliness ($r(98) = -.178, p < .10$), but not with young adult trust in relationships, or dispositional optimism (see Table 7). Therefore, grandparent story presence modestly correlates with young adult identity achievement, generativity, and loneliness, but not with the other identity measures, trust in relationships, or dispositional optimism.

Research Question 2

To analyze how parent and grandparent story interactiveness was related to young adult identity development, generativity, and adjustment, zero order correlations were first calculated, and then a separate linear regression was performed for each dependent

variable (identity, generativity, loneliness, trust in relationships, and dispositional optimism), with story interactivenss as the predictor variable. Parent interactivenss and grandparent interactivenss were entered on the first and second steps, respectively, to see whether including the grandparent variable improved the model significantly.

Through the calculation of zero order correlations, it was found that parent interactivenss was highly correlated with grandparent interactivenss ($r(87) = .339, p < .01$). Neither parent nor grandparent story interactivenss was significantly correlated with identity moratorium, foreclosure, diffusion, or the identity maturity index. Parent story interactivenss, however, was modestly correlated with identity achievement ($r(98) = -.184, p > .10$) (see Table 8). Grandparent story interactivenss was not significantly correlated with identity achievement. Furthermore, neither parent nor grandparent story interactivenss was significantly correlated with loneliness, trust in relationships, or dispositional optimism. Grandparent story interactivenss was modestly correlated with generativity ($r(87) = .185, p < .10$), but there was no significant relationship between parent story interactivenss and generativity (see Table 9).

Identity. A linear regression was carried out for identity development with story interactivenss as the predictor variable, and with parent and grandparent story interactivenss being entered on the first and second steps, respectively. Both grandparent story interactivenss ($\beta = .032, p = .780$) and parent interactivenss ($\beta = -.087, p = .449$) did not significantly predict young adult identity development, and the overall model including parent and grandparent interactivenss was not significant ($F(1,87) = .289, p = .789$).

Generativity. A linear regression was carried out for generativity with story interactivensness as the predictor variable, and with parent and grandparent story interactivensness being entered on the first and second steps, respectively. Grandparent story interactivensness did significantly predict young adult generativity ($\beta = .225$, $p = .050$), while parent interactivensness did not significantly predict generativity ($\beta = -.118$, $p = .300$). The overall model including parent and grandparent story interactivensness, however, did not predict young adult generativity ($F(2,87) = 2.050$, $p = .135$).

Loneliness. A linear regression was carried out for loneliness with story interactivensness as the predictor variable, and with parent and grandparent story interactivensness being entered on the first and second steps, respectively. Neither grandparent interactivensness ($\beta = -.181$, $p = .118$), nor parent interactivensness ($\beta = .048$, $p = .677$) predicted young adult loneliness. The overall model including parent and grandparent story interactivensness did not predict young adult loneliness ($F(2,87) = 1.254$, $p = .291$).

Trust in Relationships. A linear regression was carried out for trust in relationships with story interactivensness as the predictor variable, and with parent and grandparent story interactivensness being entered on the first and second steps, respectively. Neither grandparent interactivensness ($\beta = .043$, $p = .707$), nor parent interactivensness ($\beta = -.108$, $p = .349$) predicted trust in relationships. The overall model including parent and grandparent story interactivensness did not predict young adult trust in relationships ($F(2,87) = .446$, $p = .642$).

Dispositional Optimism. A linear regression was carried out for dispositional optimism with story interactivensness as the predictor variable, and with parent and

grandparent story interactiveness being entered on the first and second steps, respectively. Neither grandparent interactiveness ($f_i = .064$, $p = .577$), nor parent interactiveness ($S = -.118$, $p = .302$) predicted young adult dispositional optimism. The overall model including parent and grandparent story interactiveness did not predict young adult loneliness ($F(2,87) = .564$, $p = .571$).

Therefore, neither parent nor grandparent story interactiveness predicted identity development, loneliness, trust in relationships, or dispositional optimism. However, grandparent story interactiveness, but not parent interactiveness, did predict young adult generativity.

Research Question 3

To analyze how being a positive or negative model was related to young adult identity development, generativity, and adjustment, zero order correlations were first calculated, and then a separate linear regression was performed for each dependent variable (identity, generativity, loneliness, trust in relationships, and dispositional optimism), with type of model as the predictor variable. Parent model type and grandparent model type were entered on the first and second steps, respectively, to see whether including the grandparent variable improved the model significantly.

Through the calculation of zero order correlations, it was found that parent model type was not significantly correlated with grandparent model type. Furthermore, parent model type was not significantly correlated with identity achievement, moratorium, foreclosure, or the identity maturity index; however, parent model type was modestly correlated with identity diffusion ($r(98) = -.166$, $p = .10$) (see Table 10). Grandparent model type was not significantly correlated with the moratorium, foreclosure, or diffusion

subscales, or the identity maturity index. However, grandparent model type was, surprisingly, negatively correlated with identity achievement ($r(87) = -.245, p < .05$) (see Table 10). Furthermore, neither parent or grandparent model type was correlated with generativity, loneliness, and trust in relationships; however, parent model type, but not grandparent model type, was modestly correlated with dispositional optimism ($r(98) = .168, p < .10$) (see Table 11).

Identity. A linear regression was carried out for identity development with model type as the predictor variable, and with parent model type and grandparent model type being entered on the first and second steps, respectively. The presence of grandparent model type ($\beta = -.141, p = .189$) and parent model type ($\beta = .088, p = .410$) did not significantly predict young adult identity development, and the overall model including parent and grandparent model type was not significant ($F(2,87) = 1.347, p = .265$).

Generativity. A linear regression was carried out for generativity with model type as the predictor variable, and with parent model type and grandparent model type being entered on the first and second steps, respectively. The presence of grandparent model type ($\beta = .001, p = .995$) and parent model type ($\beta = .044, p = .688$) did not significantly predict young adult generativity, and the overall model including parent and grandparent model type was not significant ($F(2,87) = .082, p = .921$).

Loneliness. A linear regression was carried out for loneliness with model type as the predictor variable, and with parent model type and grandparent model type being entered on the first and second steps, respectively. The presence of grandparent model type ($\beta = -.006, p = .953$) and parent model type ($\beta = -.003, p = .188$) did not

significantly predict young adult level of loneliness, and the overall model including parent and grandparent model type was not significant ($F(2,87) = .886, p = .416$).

Trust in Relationships. A linear regression was carried out for trust in relationships with model type as the predictor variable, and with parent model type and grandparent model type being entered on the first and second steps, respectively. The presence of grandparent model type ($\beta = .067, p = .543$) and parent model type ($\beta = .038, p = .726$) did not significantly predict young adult trust in relationships, and the overall model including parent and grandparent model type was not significant ($F(2,87) = .229, p = .796$).

Dispositional Optimism. A linear regression was carried out for dispositional optimism with model type as the predictor variable, and with parent model type and grandparent model type being entered on the first and second steps, respectively. The presence of grandparent model type ($\beta = .028, p = .792$) did not predict young adult optimism, but parent model type did significantly predict young adult optimism ($\beta = .210, p < .10$). The overall model including parent and grandparent model type was not significant ($F(2,87) = 1.963, p = .147$).

Therefore, neither parent nor grandparent model type predicted young adult identity development, generativity, loneliness, or dispositional optimism, but parent model type alone did predict young adult dispositional optimism.

Research Question 4

To analyze how the use of quoted parent and grandparent voice was related to young adult identity development, generativity, and adjustment, zero order correlations were first calculated, and then a separate linear regression was performed for each

dependent variable (identity, generativity, loneliness, trust in relationships, and dispositional optimism), with parent and grandparent quoted voice as the predictor variable. Parent quoted voice and grandparent quoted voice were entered on the first and second steps, respectively, to see whether including the grandparent variable improved the model significantly.

Through the calculation of zero order correlations, it was found that the use of parent quoted voice was not significantly correlated to the use of grandparent quoted voice. Furthermore, neither parent nor grandparent quoted voice was significantly correlated with identity achievement, foreclosure, diffusion, or the identity maturity index; however, grandparent quoted voice, but not parent quoted voice, was modestly correlated with the identity moratorium subscale ($r(87) = .201, p < .10$) (see Table 12). The use of parent or grandparent quoted voice was not significantly correlated with generativity, loneliness, trust in relationships, or dispositional optimism (see Table 13).

Identity. A linear regression was carried out for identity development with quoted voice as the predictor variable, and with parent quoted voice and grandparent quoted voice being entered on the first and second steps, respectively. The presence of grandparent quoted voice ($\beta = -.134, p = .219$) and parent quoted voice ($\beta = -.052, p = .634$) did not significantly predict young adult identity development, and the overall model including parent and grandparent quoted voice was not significant ($F(2,87) = .808, p = .449$).

Generativity. A linear regression was carried out for generativity with quoted voice as the predictor variable, and with parent quoted voice and grandparent quoted voice being entered on the first and second steps, respectively. The presence of grandparent

quoted voice ($\beta = .009$, $p = .936$) and parent quoted voice ($\beta = -.095$, $p = .389$) did not significantly predict young adult generativity, and the overall model including parent and grandparent quoted voice was not significant ($F(2,87) = .376$, $p = .688$).

Loneliness. A linear regression was carried out for loneliness with quoted voice as the predictor variable, and with parent quoted voice and grandparent quoted voice being entered on the first and second steps, respectively. The presence of grandparent quoted voice ($\beta = .058$, $p = .602$) and parent quoted voice ($\beta = -.043$, $p = .699$) did not significantly predict young adult level of loneliness, and the overall model including parent and grandparent quoted voice was not significant ($F(2,87) = .181$, $p = .835$).

Trust in Relationships. A linear regression was carried out for trust in relationships with quoted voice as the predictor variable, and with parent quoted voice and grandparent quoted voice being entered on the first and second steps, respectively. The presence of grandparent quoted voice ($\beta = -.109$, $p = .322$) and parent quoted voice ($\beta = .041$, $p = .708$) did not significantly predict young adult trust in relationships and the overall model including parent and grandparent quoted voice was not significant ($F(2,87) = .520$, $p = .596$).

Dispositional Optimism. A linear regression was carried out for dispositional optimism with quoted voice as the predictor variable, and with parent quoted voice and grandparent quoted voice being entered on the first and second steps, respectively. The presence of grandparent quoted voice ($\beta = -.073$, $p = .504$) and parent quoted voice ($\beta = -.035$, $p = .748$) did not significantly predict young adult optimism, and the overall model including parent and grandparent quoted voice was not significant ($F(2,87) = .249$, $p = .780$).

Therefore, the use of parent or grandparent quoted voice did not predict young adult identity development, generativity, or adjustment (i.e. loneliness, trust in relationships, and dispositional optimism).

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to extend the literature on grandparenting by examining the life stories, specifically the value teaching stories, of young adult grandchildren, and connecting the features of these stories to young adults' levels of Eriksonian generativity, identity, and adjustment. A large number of studies have focused on grandparents raising their grandchildren in lieu of parents, but the nature of the grandparent-young adult grandchild relationship has yet to be vigorously explored. For that reason, the aim of this study was to uncover some of the characteristics of the grandparent - young adult grandchild relationship. Measures of identity development and general psychological adjustment were used in this study as young adulthood is the ideal time to look at these factors; both Erikson (1968) and McAdams (2001) state that identity development occurs primarily in adolescence, during which the family can play a large role. Consequently, it may be that the young adults employed in this study have already experienced the normative crisis and resolution of Erikson's identity stage, although this sense of identity will change throughout their life course (Erikson, 1968). Furthermore, after identity formation, adolescents and young adults begin to organize their lives into self-defining stories and are able to convey these stories to others (McAdams, 2001); given that, the utilization of the life story narrative was thought to be useful and appropriate for this sample of young adults, and has been similarly used to great advantage in previous research projects (Pratt et al., in press). Young adult

Eriksonian generativity was also examined in this study as research has shown that adolescents and young adults are capable of expressing generativity (Frensch et al., 2006; Lawford et al., 2005), and that early generativity is positively related to adjustment (Lawford et al., 2005). Therefore, within the frameworks of the life story narrative and Eriksonian generativity, identity, and adjustment, the specific purpose of this study was to explore the process of value transmission from parents and grandparents to their young adult children and grandchildren, respectively. Furthermore, the goal of this study was to uncover how, and whether, parents and grandparents differ in terms of their value teaching.

In summation, a sample of young adults' stories of when their parents and grandparents taught them the importance of a value was examined in comparison with measures of the young adults' level of generativity, identity development, and overall psychological adjustment. As there is a general lack of research on grandparent to young adult grandchild value transmission, the findings of this study help to uncover the subtle differences between grandparent and parent value transmission and their relationship to young adult generativity, identity, and adjustment.

Chosen Parent and Grandparent

The value teaching narratives were coded to see whom participants' stories were about. For the parent value teaching stories, the story could be about their mother, father, or both parents. For the grandparent value teaching stories, the story could be about their grandmother, grandfather, or both grandparents. What was found was that the majority of parent stories tended to be about both parents, while the majority of grandparent value teaching stories were about the participants' grandmothers. This is consistent with the

literature on grandparenting which shows that the majority of grandparenting is performed by grandmothers, who have more contact with their adult grandchildren than grandfathers (McPherson & Wister, 2008). This increased contact between grandmothers and their grandchildren may result in more value teaching episodes to draw from, hence the increased use of grandmothers as the subject of the young adults' value teaching narratives.

Hypotheses and Research Questions

Parent and Grandparent Story Presence

Hypothesis 1 stated that grandparent value teaching stories would be less readily recalled than parent stories. This hypothesis was supported by the results of this study, as all of the young adults could recall a parent value teaching story, but not all of the young adults could recall a grandparent value teaching story. The following is an example of a participant who could not think of a time that one or both of her grandparents taught her the importance of a value.

... Hm ... I can't really, no... no, because it's too far back that I can't honestly remember a time with them.

The vast majority of participants, however, were able to tell both a parent and grandparent value teaching story.

These findings replicate Pratt and colleagues' (2008) study, wherein the majority of the adolescents (aged 16-20) were able to tell both a parent and grandparent value teaching story, but grandparent stories were recalled less readily than parent stories. Therefore, parent value teaching stories may be in general marginally more salient than grandparent value teaching stories to young adults and adolescents. This may be due to the fact that individuals who are not raised by their grandparents, such as the young

adults in this sample, have more contact with their parents and thereby have a greater store of value teaching experiences to draw from.

Research shows that as grandparents, and their grandchildren, age they are less likely to come into contact with their grandchildren and spend time with them (Silverstein & Marengo, 2001). This is in part due to the fact that they may be less physically able to participate in many shared activities with their grandchildren. Although older grandparents see their grandchildren less regularly than younger grandparents, the grandparent role tends to be more important to older grandparents, and older grandparents are also more committed to the grandparent role than younger grandparents (Silverstein & Marengo, 2001). Unfortunately grandparent age was not collected in the current study. As first grandparenthood usually occurs in middle-age, and only 2% of women and 1% of men become grandparents under the age of 45 (Milan & Hamm, 2003), it can consequently be assumed that, because the average age of the young adults was 26, the majority of grandparents in this sample were likely over 70 years old. Perhaps the fact that the vast majority of participants were able to tell a grandparent value teaching story is related not to grandparent physical proximity, but to the fact that the young adults' older grandparents were extremely committed to their grandparent role, which in turn influenced their grandchildren.

Research Question 1 asked how being able to tell a grandparent value teaching story was related to young adult identity, generativity, and adjustment. It was found that grandparent story presence moderately ($p < .10$), predicted high generativity scores and lower loneliness scores. Thus, young adults who told a grandparent value teaching story

tended to score higher on generativity and lower on loneliness than young adults who were unable to tell a grandparent value teaching story.

This trend may show that young adults who are highly generative are more receptive to their grandparents' attempts at teaching them the importance of various moral and non-moral values. Perhaps, being highly generative themselves, they are willing to be open vessels to the knowledge and legacy that their grandparents wish to pass down. The direction of this relationship, however, is unclear; it may be that being able to tell a grandparent value teaching story somehow increases young adult generativity. It may also be that the quantity of exposure to grandparent stories matters, as perhaps being more exposed to grandparent teaching influences young adult generativity. Finally, it may also be that another variable, not measured by the current study, such as a personality trait in the grandchildren, is responsible for the relationship between grandparent story presence and young adult generativity.

There was no relationship between grandparent story presence and the other outcome measures, such as identity, trust in relationships, and optimism. This is consistent with Pratt and colleagues' (in press) findings that the presence of a grandparent value teaching story was not a significant predictor of gains in adolescent identity development, using the same identity index employed by the current study on a sample of late adolescents. Perhaps merely being able to tell a grandparent value teaching story does not offer the right context for significant identity development and positive growth.

Parent and Grandparent Story Interactiveness

Hypothesis 2 stated that young adults would report more instances of direct interactions in their parent value teaching stories, as compared to their grandparent value

teaching stories. This hypothesis was supported, as the majority of parent stories described a clear, shared interaction between the parent and child, while the majority of grandparent stories described only an indirect interaction. These findings with the young adults replicate Pratt and colleagues' (2008) study, wherein adolescents' parent value teaching stories were more interactive than their grandparent value teaching stories.

The reason that the parent stories were more interactive than the grandparent stories may be in part due to the fact that the grandparent value teaching stories were often *about* grandparents but with no shared interaction. For example, one young adult recalled how hard her grandparents worked when they came to Canada for the first time.

Well, again, like the hard work, um, because when they came to this country that's all they had, like they didn't have the education, they didn't have um, the language down to a T, um, they didn't have, you know, much money or much resources or you know, a really nice house or anything like that, so, what they do have, they had to work hard for without um you know, lying and cheating and stealing from others and just being honest and doing honest work.

This story does not contain a direct interaction between the young adult and the grandparents, nor does it tell the reader anything about how physically or emotionally close the young adult is to her grandparents. Similarly, several young adults were able to tell a value teaching story about their grandparents even though they did not personally know them, due to instances of death or extreme physical distance. Despite having little direct interactions with their grandparents, these young adults were able to talk about how their grandparents taught them about the importance of a value. The fact that grandparents may have an influence on their grandchildren despite little direct interaction may be in part due to the type of memory that they are recalling.

McAdams (2001) reported that there are several different types of personal event memories, which vary in terms of importance and vividness. One type of personal event

memory that is the most instrumental for self-definition are symbolic messages, or remembered events that are interpreted by the rememberer as providing implicit lessons or guidelines", or in other words, value teaching memories (McAdams, 2001). These symbolic messages, including value teaching memories along with other types of memories instrumental for self-definition, likely hold important positions in the life story (McAdams, 2001); consequently, grandparent value teaching memories may remain salient to the individual regardless of how long ago the memory was formed or how much contact the participants may currently have with the grandparents.

Research Question 2 asked how parent and grandparent story interactiveness would be related to young adult identity development, generativity, and adjustment. The results of this study showed that neither parent nor grandparent story interactiveness predicted identity development or adjustment at age 26. However, grandparent story interactiveness, but not parent interactiveness, did positively predict young adult generativity. This is similar to what Pratt and colleagues (2008) found in another sample when they examined how adolescent stories at 16 and 20 were related to generativity scores at 24. Pratt and colleagues found that early reports of a direct grandparent-grandchild interaction positively predicted later generativity. It therefore appears that interactive and successful grandparent to grandchild value transmission positively predicts young adult generativity across both of these studies.

Pratt and colleagues (2008) also found that parent story interactiveness at 16 and 20 positively predicted young adult generativity at 24, yet in the present study there was no relationship between parent interactiveness and young adult generativity. Furthermore, another study by Pratt and colleagues (in press) found that early reports of a direct

grandparent-grandchild interaction significantly predicted identity development at age 24, while grandparent story interactiveness did not predict either young adult identity development nor positive adjustment in the current study.

Parent and Grandparent Model Type

Hypothesis 3 stated that grandparents would be more likely to be construed as positive teachers, as compared to parents, in the young adults' value teaching stories. This hypothesis was largely unsupported by the data, which showed that the vast majority of young adults construed both their parents and grandparents as positive models of the chosen values. For example, one participant recalls how her mother was a positive model of the value kind and caring.

Okay, um ... I think it's more um... teaching by example I think, rather than like having, me having done something that was, like say unkind or something and being taught to be kind... I think for me... like that's in a household that was always, my mom was always really involved with um different fundraising for different charities and like the type of thing when you um ... it seemed to me that she spent a fair bit of time going within the neighbourhood and um canvassing for different charities and you know, doing things like Daffodil Sunday for raising money for the cancer society and things like that, and I think that those things just, probably, I have memories of those things from a very early age onward, and I suspect I probably went some Saturday to help her sell daffodils or something like that... I feel that I was fortunate to grow up in that type of positive environment.

Similarly, another participant recalls how his grandparents were positive models of the value ambitious and hardworking.

Um ... Probably the hard working one as well, just through knowing the different experiences that they've had um, the rough times that they've had with challenges of you know, not earning a lot of money and um trying to raise a big family and things like that, so I see through the different kinds of sacrifices that they had to make um and sort of do without so that their kids could have things like I, I can appreciate that I would try to do the same if I was in the same situation.

These participants, along with the majority of participants, construed their family members as extremely positive teachers. Furthermore, there was no relationship between parent model type and grandparent model type. These findings may be explained by the fact that there was little variation in parent and grandparent model type; only 7 out of the 100 young adults construed their parents as negative models, and only 10 out of the 89 young adults who were able to tell a grandparent value teaching story construed their grandparents as negative models. Using a sample of 16 and 20 year olds, Pratt and colleagues (2008) found slightly higher percentages of story rejection (construing parents and grandparents as negative models) than in the current study. This may be explained by the age difference between the participants used in this study and in Pratt and colleagues' (2008) study. Research has shown that adolescence can be a conflict-riddled period, and that conflict between individuals and their family members, especially parents, increases substantially in adolescence but gradually declines in the later teenage years (Shaffer, Wood, & Willoughby, 2005). Perhaps the participants in Pratt and colleagues' (2008) study rejected their parents and grandparents in their narratives with more frequency than in the current study because they were younger, and hence in more conflict with their family members, than the young adults in the current study.

It may also be unusual for people to speak about a negative model in general when asked to talk about a time that they learned the importance of a value from their parents and grandparents. Research on family conflict supports this theory as studies have shown that, regardless of whether or not conflict actually exists in the family, individuals are unlikely to report family conflict to outsiders. Clarke and colleagues (1999) reported that there are several reasons why individuals do not report family conflict; the reason that

pertains most to this study is that of social desirability. People want to show themselves to others in the best possible light; perhaps the young adults in this study believed that telling stories about conflict with an immediate family member might make them appear less likeable or agreeable to the interviewer.

Similarly, Baumeister and Newman (1994) suggested that one of the motivations that guide the construction of narratives is to gain positive feelings of self-worth. People enjoy talking about positive experiences more than negative experiences because telling positive stories bolsters self-worth, while telling negative stories tends to do the opposite (Baumeister & Newman, 1994). Consequently, perhaps the young adults in this study did not choose to tell value teaching stories wherein their parents and grandparents served as negative models since it would have made them feel like bad children or grandchildren. Positive family relationships are encouraged in the current social culture, therefore telling stories of intergenerational conflict may serve to lower the story-tellers' feelings of self-worth. It should be noted that people who do tell stories of conflict tend to have higher self-esteem than those who do not tell stories of conflict; this is because depicting themselves in a less positive light is not as threatening to their already high sense of self-worth as it would be to those with low self-esteem and low feelings of self-worth (Baumeister & Newman, 1994). Levels of self-esteem were not assessed in the current study, but it may be interesting to investigate in future studies whether level of self-esteem is related to model construal in parent and grandparent value teaching stories.

Research Question 3 asked how being a positive or negative parent or grandparent model would be related to young adult identity development, generativity, and adjustment. The results of this study indicated that neither parent nor grandparent model

type predicted young adult identity development, generativity, loneliness, or trust in relationships, while parent model type alone positively predicted young adult dispositional optimism. Although there has been little research on these particular variables, one study by Pratt and colleagues (2008) examined the relationship between parent and grandparent model type and adolescent generativity. They found that parenting stories that contained a rejection of the parent, or in other words stories that construed the parent as a negative model of the chosen value, marginally predicted negatively to later adolescent generativity. When they examined the grandparent narratives, they found that there was no relationship between grandparent model type and later adolescent generativity. It therefore appears that depicting grandparents in a negative or positive way may have little consequence for young adult identity development, generativity, and adjustment.

Parent and Grandparent Quoted Voice

Hypothesis 4 stated that young adults would be more likely to use parent voice, as compared to grandparent voice, in their value teaching stories. When the mean number of quotations per story was examined, it was found that there were significantly more parent quotations than grandparent quotations in the narratives told by the young adults. This finding indicates that when the young adults did quote their parents and grandparents, they quoted their parents significantly more than their grandparents. This is consistent with research that has found a relationship between the use of quoted voice and relationship closeness and influence (Arnold et al., 2004). As the majority of people are generally closer to their parents than grandparents, it was assumed that this closeness would manifest itself through the increased use of parent quotations, as compared to

grandparent quotations.

Although the mean number of quotations was significantly higher for the parent stories, as compared to the grandparent stories, there was no difference in terms of the presence or absence of quoted voice in the parent and grandparent stories. Therefore, the young adults were no more likely to quote their parents one or more times than quote their grandparents. It may be that the link between quoted voice and relationship closeness exists primarily in the narratives of younger participants. Silverstein and Marenco (2001) found that grandparents are more involved in the lives of younger rather than older grandchildren. Perhaps as people age, they become less close to, and less easily influenced by, their grandparents, thereby reducing the relationship between quoted voice and closeness. Although the literature shows that parent-child relationship closeness tends to persist from childhood through to adulthood (McPherson & Wister, 2008), perhaps as people age and form family units of their own they become less influenced by, and dependent on, their own parents, thereby also reducing the relationship between the use of quoted voice and closeness.

Research Question 4 asked how the use of quoted parent and grandparent voice would be related to young adult identity development, generativity, and adjustment. The results showed that the use of parent or grandparent quoted voice did not predict young adult identity development, generativity, or adjustment (i.e. loneliness, trust in relationships, and dispositional optimism).

These results are not consistent with other studies using similar methods. For example, Pratt and colleagues (in press) found that the use of grandparent quoted voice at ages 16 and 20 was a near-significant predictor of gains in identity development at age

24. Research has also found that there is a clearer depiction of parent voice in adolescent narratives about generative adults, although there is little research on the relationship between parent and grandparent quoted voice and young adult generativity (Pratt et al., in press). Arnold and colleagues (2004) examined the link between adjustment and parental influence, measured by the use of parent quoted voice, and found that adolescents who directly quoted their parents scored high on measures of self-esteem and optimism, and scored low on measures of loneliness and depression. These same 16-year-old adolescents who scored high on self-esteem and optimism and low on loneliness and depression showed similar patterns at age 20, controlling for age 16 scores, indicating the possible long-term benefit of parental influence on adolescent adjustment. This study did not examine grandparent influence, as measured by the use of grandparent quotations.

That the current study found no relationship between the use of parent and grandparent quoted voice and young adult identity development, generativity, and adjustment may be linked to the age of the participants. The participants used in Pratt and colleagues' (in press) and Arnold and colleagues' (2004) studies were 16-year-old adolescents, while the participants in the current study are 26-year-old young adults. According to Erikson (1968), someone aged 16 would be in the identity vs. role confusion stage of development. Young adults at this stage would be working on integrating their past, present, and future identifications, or significant relationships with others in order to develop a sense of self. Although many of these significant relationships are with peers, McAdams (2001) reported that family members, along with peers, teachers, and others, greatly influence adolescent identity development.

According to Erikson (1968), the participants in the current study would be in the intimacy vs. isolation stage of development. This stage is characterized by seeking out meaningful and reciprocal adult relationships, including romantic partners. The family, although an important part of identity development throughout the life course, may not be as influential to the young adult as they are to the adolescent. As parent and grandparent influence is related to the use of quoted voice in narratives, perhaps the absence of a link between quoted voice and identity, generativity, and adjustment can be partially explained by the age of the participants in the current study, and the corresponding stage of psychosocial development in which they find themselves.

However, it may simply be that as the participants are recalling past experiences, the memories of these experiences may become attenuated, characterized by a loss of intensity, over time. McAdams (2001) notes that both the encoding and the recollection of autobiographical memories, such as value teaching memories, are influenced by personal goals and concerns. Furthermore, the reconstruction of autobiographical memories can somewhat distort the memory, which is especially true for older memories (McAdams, 2001). Therefore, it may be that compared to adolescents' memories, the past value teaching memories of the young adults are less salient and more distorted, consequently making it more difficult to quote their parents and grandparents in their narratives.

Limitations

There are several limitations to the present study. First, descriptive data about the participants' grandparents, such as physical proximity, emotional closeness, whether their grandparents were living, and frequency of visits, were not collected. Studies have found

that the frequency of grandparent-grandchild interaction and how important the grandparent-grandchild relationship is to both parties is influenced by such factors as how close the grandparents live to their grandchildren, whether the grandparents have jobs, and how many grandchildren the grandparents have (McPherson & Wister, 2008). Self-report grandparent data such as these would have been very helpful to employ as control variables in the current study.

Another limitation is that grandparent personality variables, such as level of generativity, were not assessed. It would have been interesting to determine whether the stories of young adults with highly generative grandparents differ from the stories of young adults with less generative grandparents. In terms of the parent-child relationship, Peterson and colleagues (1997) examined parent generativity and its relationship with certain adolescent outcome measures, and found that parent generativity was positively correlated with both adolescent generativity and life satisfaction. Another study by Peterson (2006) found that parent generativity was positively correlated with both positive affect and prosocial characteristics in their children. It may be that grandparent generativity also positively correlates with grandchild generativity, life satisfaction, positive affect, and prosocial characteristics, although research is required to substantiate this hypothesis.

In terms of parent generativity and adolescent narratives, research by Pratt and colleagues (2008) found that value teaching stories of generative parents, as told by their adolescent children, were more specific, interactive, contained more caring themes, and were less likely to construe parents as negative models, as compared to stories about less generative parents. It would have been interesting to replicate these results in the current

study and also see how level of grandparent generativity relates to the young adult narrative variables and questionnaire measures employed in the present study.

The number of interviewers is another limitation to this study. There were five interviewers employed in this study, and although they were all similarly trained in order to increase reliability, it is inevitable that each interviewer has his or her own style of questioning. This variability may have influenced story quality, which in turn may have influenced narrative coding, and ultimately the results of this study.

In terms of the sample of participants, the majority of young adults were quite homogeneous: they were predominantly white and had completed at least some college or university training. This is problematic, as previous research has found ethnic differences in grandparenting style. For example, in the United States certain ethnic groups, namely African Americans, Hispanic Americans, Asian Americans, and Italian Americans, were found to be more involved in the lives of their grandchildren compared to other ethnic groups (Cavanaugh, Blanchard-Fields, & Norris, 2008). However, it should be noted that there is a lack of Canadian research on ethnic differences in grandparenting style and the relationship between different life transitions and the grandparent-grandchild relationship.

Researchers have also found that certain life course transitions also impact the grandparent-grandchild relationship. For example, Crosnoe and Elder (2002) examined how, and if, the transition of grandchildren to higher education changes the grandparent-grandchild relationship. Using a sample of 316 grandparent-grandchild pairs in a longitudinal study, Crosnoe and Elder found that the grandparent-grandchild relationship improved significantly when grandchildren transition to higher education. This is an

important finding, as many other life transitions, such as marriage, parenthood, and employment, do not significantly change the grandparent-grandchild relationship (Crosnoe & Elder, 2002). This study, however, did not examine how the grandparent-grandchild relationship changes if the grandchild does not transition to higher education. From these findings, it can be gathered that as the majority of young adults in the current study were white and quite highly educated, their relationships with their grandparents may be characterized as more distant yet more positive compared to other ethnic groups or with less educated young adults.

An additional limitation is that the current study employed only a single story for each generation, namely the value teaching narrative. This one narrative may not be representative of the relationship between the young adults and their parents and grandparents. The use of several types of young adult stories about their parents and grandparents may be more representative of their complex relationships, and therefore helpful in uncovering any link between the narrative measures and young adult identity development, generativity, and adjustment.

The sample size of this study was also a limitation. Although this sample was not extremely small as it employed 100 participants, several of the results of the present study were moderately significant. A larger sample would provide a higher power for detecting relationships between the narrative and questionnaire measures.

Overall it is generally unclear why many of the results of this study were not significant and did not show the same patterns as other studies (see Pratt et al., in press). The limitations of this study indicate that the older age of the participants, and the use of a single story may have contributed to the lack of significant results.

Overall Contributions

Despite the limitations, the current study does help to illuminate the similarities and differences in how values are transmitted to young adults by their parents and grandparents. All of the young adults in this sample were able to talk about a time that one or both of their parents taught them the importance of a value, and the vast majority of young adults were able to tell a similar story about their grandparents. From this it may be concluded that both parent and grandparent value teaching episodes are important and meaningful to grandchildren, even at age 26, and likely hold important positions in the life story of the young adults.

The narratives told about grandparents were also different from the narratives told about parents in important and distinct ways. According to the young adults' stories, young adult grandparent to grandchild value socialization appears to be done mostly by grandmothers, and the value tends to be taught without a direct interaction between the grandparent and the grandchild (i.e. the story was about the grandparent with no grandparent-grandchild interaction). By contrast, parent value socialization seems to be shared between parents and taught by direct interaction. Although some of the literature on grandparenting asserts that there is no significant difference in how grandmothers and grandfathers interact with their grandchildren (McPherson & Wister, 2008), the findings of this study indicate that grandmothers may indeed be the purveyors of family values. That grandparents are successful at value socialization without directly interacting with their grandchildren is indeed remarkable.

In terms of how value socialization and the narrative story relate to young adult psychological outcomes, the majority of relationships that this study uncovered were

between grandparent story variables and young adult generativity, and adjustment; only parent model type positively predicted young adult dispositional optimism. Being able to tell a grandparent value teaching story positively predicted young adult generativity, and negatively predicted young adult relationship loneliness. Telling an interactive grandparent value teaching story also positively predicted young adult generativity. It is evident that young adult Eriksonian generativity is an important component of successful grandparent to grandchild value transmission.

The general goal of this study was to extend the research on intergenerational value transmission, the functions of the life story narrative, family relationships, and especially on the grandparent-grandchild relationship. There is little research examining the relationship between grandparents and older grandchildren, such as the young adults in this sample, and therefore the majority of this study was exploratory in nature. Although several of the hypotheses and research questions did not find effects that reached conventional significance levels, the results of this study do help to extend the research on grandparenting and value socialization. It is evident, however, that further research is needed on grandparent to young adult grandchild value transmission and its relation to young adult identity development, generativity, and adjustment. Longitudinal studies with a larger sample size may help to further illuminate the importance and influence of grandparenting, beyond the influence of parents, on successful and meaningful value transmission and its effects.

Table 1

Narrative Codes and Corresponding Levels

Narrative Code	Levels
Story Presence	1 = no story 2 = story present
Value Type	1 = polite and courteous 2 = trust-worthy 3 = good citizen 4 = honest and truthful 5 = ambitious and hardworking 6 = be open and communicate 7 = careful and cautious 8 = independent 9 = kind and caring 10 = fair and just 11 = loyalty 12 = integrity
Moral vs. Non-Moral	1 = moral = honest and truthful, fair and just, trust-worthy, kind and caring, good citizen, integrity 2 = non-moral = polite and courteous, careful and cautious, ambitious and hardworking, independent, be open and communicate, loyalty
Chosen Parent	1 = mother 2 = father 3 = both parents
Chosen Grandparent	1 = grandmother 2 = grandfather 3 = both grandparents
Positive or Negative Model	1 = negative 2 = not negative (positive)
Quoted Voice	1 = no quotes used 2 = literal or rephrased quote used
Interactiveness	1 = vague, unspecified story 2 = indirect interaction (story about a parent/grandparent with no direct interaction) 3 = clear, explicit, shared interaction with a parent/grandparent

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for Questionnaire Measures

Questionnaire Measures	M	SD	Range
Loyola Generativity Scale (LGS)	114.33"	19.80	20-180
Achievement Subscale of OM-EIS	31.72	6.42	6-54
Moratorium Subscale of OM-EIS	17.56	9.11	6-54
Foreclosure Subscale of OM-EIS	8.44	6.87	6-54
Diffusion Subscale of OM-EIS	17.40	8.37	6-54
OM-EIS Identity Maturity Index	-11.68	21.11	-156-36
UCLA Loneliness Scale	12.74	9.80	0-60
Trust Scale	122.29	18.86	26-182
Life Orientation Test (LOT)	43.88	10.37	8-72

Table 3

Zero Order Correlations between the OM-EIS Identity Maturity Index, Generativity, Loneliness, Trust in Relationships, and Dispositional Optimism

	Identity Maturity Index	Generativity	Loneliness	Trust in Relationships	Dispositional Optimism
Identity Maturity Index	1.00	.30*	--	.31*	.44*
Generativity		1.00	-.60*	.34*	.46*
Loneliness			1.00	-.53*	-.46*
Trust in Relationships				1.00	.28*
Dispositional Optimism					1.00

p<.01

Table 4

Frequencies of Values for Parent Stories

Value	Frequency	Percent
Independent	21	21
Honest and Truthful	14	14
Ambitious and Hardworking	12	12
Kind and Caring	12	12
Trust-worthy	11	11
Polite and Courteous	7	7
Fair and Just	7	7
Integrity	7	7
Be Open and Communicate	5	5
Loyalty	4	4

Table 5

Frequencies of Values for Grandparent Stories

Value	Frequency	Valid Percent
Kind and Caring	17	19.1
Ambitious and Hardworking	12	13.5
Loyalty	11	12.4
Trust-worthy	10	11.2
Honest and Truthful	8	9.0
Be Open and Communicate	8	9.0
Integrity	7	7.9
Polite and Courteous	6	6.7
Fair and Just	5	5.6
Independent	5	5.6

Table 6

Zero Order Correlations between Grandparent Story Presence and OM-EIS Measures of Identity Achievement, Moratorium, Foreclosure, Diffusion, and the OM-EIS Identity Maturity Index

	Grandparent Story Presence	Achievement	Moratorium	Foreclosure	Diffusion	Maturity Index
Grandparent Story Presence	1.00	.17*	-.01	-.07	-.11	.12
Achievement		1.00	.27***	-.13	-.34***	.60***
Moratorium			1.00	.21**	.52***	-.79***
Foreclosure				1.00	.18*	-.53***
Diffusion					1.00	-.79***
Maturity Index						1.00

^
 ** p < .05
 * p < .10

Table 7

Zero Order Correlations between Grandparent Story Presence and Generativity, Loneliness, Trust in Relationships, and Dispositional Optimism

	Grandparent Story Presence	Generativity	Loneliness	Trust in Relationships	Dispositional Optimism
Grandparent Story Presence	1.00	.18=!	.18*	.08	.16
Generativity		1.00	-.50***	.34***	.46**=!
Loneliness			1.00	.53***	.46***
Trust in Relationships	-	-	-	1.00	.28***
Dispositional Optimism					1.00

*** p < .01
** p < .05
* p < .10

Table 8

Zero Order Correlations between Parent and Grandparent Story Interactiveness and OM-EIS Measures of Identity Achievement, Moratorium, Foreclosure, Diffusion, and the OM-EIS Identity Maturity Index

	Parent Interactiveness	Grandparent Interactiveness	Achievement	Moratorium	Foreclosure	Diffusion	Maturity Index
Parent Interactiveness	1.00	.34***	-.18*	.09	.08	-.00	-.12
Grandparent Interactiveness	-	1.00	.04	.03	.12	.05	.00
Achievement	-	-	1.00	-.27**	-.13	-.14***	.60***
Moratorium	-	-	-	1.00	.21**	.51***	-.70***
Foreclosure	-	-	-	-	1.00	.18*	-.64***
Diffusion	-	-	-	-	-	1.00	-.78***
Maturity Index	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.00

*** $p < .01$

** $p < .05$

* $p < .10$

Table 9

Zero Order Correlations between Parent and Grandparent Story Interactiveness and Generativity, Loneliness, Trust in Relationships, and Dispositional Optimism

	Parent Interactiveness	Grandparent Interactiveness	Generativity	Loneliness	Trust in Relationships	Dispositional Optimism
Parent Interactiveness	1.00	.339***	-.01	-.01	-.05	-.09
Grandparent Interactiveness		1.00	.19*	-.16	.01	.02
Generativity			1.00	-.60**	.34**	.46**
Loneliness				1.00	-.53**	-.46**
Trust in Relationships					1.00	.28**
Dispositional Optimism						1.00

*** $p < .01$

** $p < .05$

* $p < .10$

Table 10

*Zxro Order Correlations between Parent and Grandparent Model Type and OM-EIS**Measures of Identity Achievement, Moratorium, Foreclosure, Diffusion, and the OM-EIS**Identity Maturity Index.*

	Parent Model Type	Grandparent Model Type	Achievement	Moratorium	Foreclosure	Diffusion	Maturity Index
Parent Model Type	1.00	-.08~"	--	.10	-.13	-.02	-.08~"
Grandparent Model Type	-	1.00	-.25**	.09	.14	.02	-.15
Achievement	-	-	1.00	-.34***	-.13	-.34***	.69***
Moratorium	-	-	-	1.00	.21**	.51***	-.70***
Foreclosure	-	-	-	-	1.00	.18*	-.53***
Diffusion	-	-	-	-	-	1.00	-.76***
Maturity Index	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.00

*** $p < .01$ ** $p < .05$ * $p < .10$

Table 11

Zero Order Correlations between Parent and Grandparent Model Type and Generativity, Loneliness, Trust in Relationships, and Dispositional Optimism

	Parent Model Type	Grandparent Model Type	Generativity	Loneliness	Trust in Relationships	Dispositional Optimism
Parent Model Type	1.00	-.10	.02	-.11	.02	.17*
Grandparent Model Type	-	1.00	.00	.01	.06	.01
Generativity	-	-	1.00	-.60**	.34**	.46**
Loneliness	-	-	-	1.00	-.53**	-.46**
Trust in Relationships	-	-	-	-	1.00	.28**
Dispositional Optimism	-	-	-	-	-	1.00

**p < .01

*p < .10

Table 12

Zero Order Correlations between Parent and Grandparent Quoted Voice and OM-EIS Measures of Identity Achievement, Moratorium, Foreclosure, Diffusion, and the OM-EIS Identity Maturity Index

	Parent Quoted Voice	Grandparent Quoted Voice	Achievement	Moratorium	Foreclosure	Diffusion	Maturity Index
Parent Quoted Voice	1.00	.16	.27***	.01	.00	.07	.60***
Grandparent Quoted Voice	-	1.00	-.01	.20*	.07	.04	.13
Achievement	-	-	1.00	.27***	-.13	-.34***	.60***
Moratorium	-	-	-	1.00	.21**	.51***	.70***
Foreclosure	-	-	-	-	1.00	.18*	-.53***
Diffusion	-	-	-	-	-	1.00	.79***
Maturity Index	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.00

*** $p < .01$

** $p < .05$

* $p < .10$

Table 13

Zero Order Correlations between Parent and Grandparent Quoted Voice and Generativity, Loneliness, Trust in Relationships, and Dispositional Optimism

	Parent Quoted Voice	Grandparent Quoted Voice	Generativity	Loneliness	Trust in Relationships	Dispositional Optimism
Parent Quoted Voice	1.00	.16	-.04	.13	.08	.11
Grandparent Quoted Voice		1.00	-.01	.05	-.10	-.07
Generativity			1.00	-.60*	.34*	.46*
Loneliness				1.00	-.53*	-.46*
Trust in Relationships					1.00	.28*
Dispositional Optimism						1.00

$p < .01$

Appendix A

Contact Letter

October 6, 2005

Dear Futures Participant

Thank you for your continued interest and participation in the Futures' project! Your contributions have been invaluable in our research on the transition from adolescence to adulthood. Many of you have participated 3 or 4 times over the past 8 years. This research continues to be sponsored by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. We wanted to provide you with an update of some of our findings thus far from the 2003 questionnaires that you completed.

Erik Erikson developed a theory of psychosocial development that stated that individuals go through 8 stages throughout the course of their life. The seventh stage, "generativity," was part of the focus of the current study. Generativity refers to the idea of making a lasting contribution to future generations. Most of the research in this area has been done on people ages 30-60. We have been interested in whether caring for the next generation (i.e., generativity) is developing at younger ages. In this study we were particularly interested in how your thoughts and ideas of generativity were developing over time, and what factors might influence that. Therefore, we compared your most recent reports about concern for future generations to your reports of your involvement in school, community and political activities when you first began participating (around age 17). We found individuals who reported being involved in more activities in high school tended to report higher levels of concern for future generations in the current data collection at age 23. This suggests that community involvement at an earlier age may have lasting effects and is important to a person's development into adulthood. We also found that those with more support and guidance from their families showed higher levels of generativity. This research was recently published in a scientific journal (the *Journal of Research on Adolescence*) with Heather Lawford as the first author (Lawford,

Pratt, Hunsberger, & Pancer, 2005). Some of you were interviewed by Heather for her master's thesis research in 2002, and may remember her. She is currently finishing her PhD thesis at Concordia University in Montreal, and still studying generativity!

In another part of the 2003 study, we examined people's feeling of optimism and hope in young adulthood, finding that these were related to their earlier reports of family support and guidance when they were teenagers, and that these hopeful feelings helped to explain current satisfaction and adjustment in their lives. This article was published in the journal *Social Development* (Jackson, Pratt, Hunsberger, & Pancer, 2005). Dr. Lynne Jackson, the first author of this paper, was a post-doctoral student on our project, and is now teaching at the University of Western Ontario.

In addition, we have been examining the stories of "personal turning points" that you wrote for us in 2003, and will be presenting some of our findings about the kinds of lessons people say they learn in life at an international conference on adolescence (McLean & Pratt, 2006). Certain kinds of turning point stories are associated with deeper learning, particularly stories about independence, and those about mortality or loss. Other stories, such as those about achievements, are less full of meaning, but may be important for other aspects of people's lives. Story meaning seems to be to the process of identity development as well, so that people who have a clearer sense of identity are more likely to tell stories with deeper meanings. If you are especially interested in finding out more about any of this research, you are welcome to call or e-mail us and ask for copies of these papers. We hope it is useful to know more about the purpose of this research and the questions it is designed to answer.

In the future, and with your help, we would like to continue to explore how these types of ideas and beliefs are developing over time, and some of the factors that may influence these developments. We hope that you will be comfortable with us contacting you again in the future. This type of longitudinal research is very important in developmental psychology, because it allows us to understand how growth and change actually happen in the life course. Of course, whether or not you participate when we contact you is entirely up to you.

Once again, thank-you for continuing to come in, answer our questions and tell us some of your stories and about your lives. We have enjoyed working on this project with you. If you have any questions or comments about this study please feel free to contact me, Dr. Michael Pratt. My email and telephone information are listed below.

Sincerely,

Dr. Michael W. Pratt
Phone: 519-884-0710 ext 2824
e-mail: mpratt@wlu.ca

Appendix B

*Informed Consent Statement***INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT**

WILFRID LAURIER UNIVERSITY

You are invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of this study is to examine the relations between feelings of the self, relationships, and concern for future generations. Dr. Michael Pratt is a professor at Wilfrid Laurier University in the Psychology Department and Dr. Joan Norris is a professor at the University of Guelph in the Department of Family Relations.

INFORMATION

First, you will be asked to read this informed consent document. If you agree to all of the terms within, you can sign and date the pages in the appropriate places to indicate your willingness to participate. To begin the study, you will be asked to fill out a questionnaire regarding your background information (e.g. age, education, etc.). You will then be asked to tell stories about high, low, and turning point experiences in your life. Next, you will be asked to describe important events in your relationships with others. Following these stories, you will be asked to describe various aspects of your work, family life, community, and religiosity/spirituality. You will also be asked to discuss your understanding and experience of morality and moral courage, and of learning values in your family. You will then be asked to consider and describe what the future may hold for yourself. Next, you will read a few dilemmas about ethical issues and answer a few questions about what you think the characters in the dilemmas should do to solve their problems. In line with this, you will be asked to tell about one dilemma that you, yourself have faced.

A series of questionnaires will then be administered. These questionnaires will ask you about your: personal feelings and life satisfaction; attachment style; friendships and family relationships; goals; values; behaviours; involvement in the community; work, religion, and politics; and thoughts about the self and others.

Finally, you will be debriefed. At this point you will learn more about the purposes of the study, you will be thanked for your participation, and you will receive your \$50 honorarium.

The study involves only one session and its total duration is expected to be approximately two hours. In total, 150 participants will take part in this study, each being tested on an individual basis.

The verbal sections (stories) will be audio recorded with your consent. This information will be kept strictly confidential; at no point will the researchers request your name or any other information that could lead to your identification.

RISKS

There is potential that participating in this study may cause you to focus attention on negative aspects of yourself, your relationships, and the events you have experienced. This may result in discomfort. To aid in minimizing this risk, please remember that you are free to leave any question blank. Also, you are free to withdraw from the study at any time without incurring a loss of benefits. Information regarding the contact numbers of local counseling services will be routinely made available.

Participant's initials:_____

BENEFITS

By participating in this study, you will be contributing to knowledge regarding feelings about the self, personal relationships and one's concern for and care of future generations. This research is important because by and large, caring for future generations is regarded as a good thing. So, by understanding when and how this concern develops, and the personality factors that influence this, we may be better able to foster caring behaviors. In addition to increasing knowledge regarding the aforementioned hypotheses, this study will also allow you to be exposed to the methods utilized in psychological research. Furthermore, you may experience positive emotions associated with recalling the specific activities and events associated with the main relationships in your life.

CONFIDENTIALITY

During the testing session you will in no way be asked to provide your name or any other information that could lead to your identification. Consent forms and questionnaires will be collected and stored separately so that your identity cannot be linked to your completed questionnaires. Your package of questionnaires will be given its own ID number that can in no way be traced back to you. Only the principal investigators and student researchers will be permitted to view your raw data. All of the completed testing materials will be kept in filing cabinets in a locked room that has limited access. An individual will be hired to transcribe the information provided in the verbal sections, but these tapes will have their own ID numbers and not your name, and will in no way be linked to you in terms of identification. The transcriber will keep all information in strict confidence. All data will be destroyed seven years after the completion of the study (in accordance with the guidelines set out by the American Psychological Association). Your data will not be individually identified in any publications or presentations that may stem from this research; only aggregated data will be presented. It is possible that a quotation may be taken from your completed package to be used for these presentations. Such quotations will in no way be linked to you individually, and we will take steps to ensure that your identity is not revealed.

COMPENSATION

For participating in this study you will receive a fifty dollar cash honorarium. If you withdraw from the study prior to its completion for any reason, you will still receive this acknowledgement.

CONTACT

If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, (or you experience adverse effects as a result of participating in this study,) you may contact the researcher, Dr. Michael Pratt, by telephone at: (519)-884-0710 extension: 2824, or by e-mail at: mpratt@wlu.ca. Alternatively, you may contact Dr. Joan Norris; telephone: (519)824-4120 extension 53782, e-mail jnorris@uoguelph.ca. This project has been reviewed and approved by the University Research Ethics Board. If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Dr. Bill Marr, Chair, University Research Ethics Board, Wilfrid Laurier University, (519) 884-0710, extension 2468.

Participant's initials:

PARTICIPATION

Your participation in this study is voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty and without loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you withdraw from the study before data collection is completed your data will be returned to you or destroyed. You have the right to omit any question(s)/procedure(s) you choose.

FEEDBACK AND PUBLICATION

Once again, please note that your data will not be individually identified in any publications or presentations that may stem from this research; only aggregated data will be presented. Further, there is the possibility that the aggregated data will be used in academic presentations and publications. If you wish to receive feedback regarding the overall findings, you can indicate so on the final debriefing form. This feedback will be distributed through the mail near the end of August, 2006.

CONSENT

I have read and understand the above information. I have received a copy of this form. I agree to participate in this study, and permit the use of anonymous quotations from my interview by the researchers.

Date: _____

Investigator's signature: _____ Date: _____

OR:

I have read and understand the above information. I have received a copy of this form. I agree to participate in this study. I request that no quotations from my interview be used by the researchers.

Date: _____

Investigator's signature: _____ Date: _____

Appendix C

Debriefing Form

First of all, I would like to thank you once again for taking part in this study. Now, I'll let you know a bit more about this investigation. As you already know, this study was part of a research project for Dr. Michael Pratt at Wilfrid Laurier University and Joan Norris at the University of Guelph. We have been studying the development of concerns for children and the next generation in young adults, in a project that you have participated in before. This time, we are interested in looking at the impact that the kinds of relationships people have in their lives may have on their concern for, and care of, the next generation. We predict that participants who have achieved a higher sense of intimacy in their relationships with others will show more concern for and care of future generations in comparison to those who have not achieved such a high level of intimacy. On the opposite side of the coin, we expect to find that individuals who score high on loneliness, will score low on measures of intimacy and will also score low on measures for the concern for and care of future generations. On average, we also expect that women will score higher than will men on both intimacy and concern and care for future generations.

Due to the fact that the questionnaires will be scored on a group, rather than an individual basis, individual scores will not be available. However, if you leave your name and address in the space provided below, a synopsis of the findings can be sent to you when the final analysis is complete.

- No, I would not like to receive a synopsis of the results of this study.
- Yes, I would like to receive a synopsis of the results of this study. My name and address is:

*Once again, thank you for your participation!

Appendix D

Background Information

1) Sex:

- Male
- Female

2) Age: _____

3) Are your parents:

- living together
- separated
- divorced
- other: (please explain _____)

4) Please list all of the people whom you are currently living with (ex: brothers, sisters, parents, grandparents, friends, etc.).

6) What is the highest level of education that you have completed to date?

D less than high school

- completed high school
- some college or university (please explain: _____ years completed)
- completed college program
- completed undergraduate university
- some graduate (Masters, PhD) university (please explain: _____ years completed)
- completed graduate school

7) Are you currently enrolled in an educational institution?

- Yes
- No

8) Are you employed?

- Full-time
- Part-time
- Not Employed

If you are employed, job:

9) Are you in a committed romantic relationship?

- Yes
- No

If yes, length of relationship: _____

10) Do you have any children?

- Yes
- No

If yes:

- How many children do you have? _____

- Do you have guardianship or custodial care of the child/children?

- Yes
- No

Appendix E

The Loyola Generativity Scale (LGS)

Please use the following scale to indicate your agreement or disagreement with each statement about your relationships with others.

-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	44
very strongly disagree	strongly disagree	moderately disagree	slightly disagree	neither agree nor disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree	very strongly agree

- 1) _____ I try to pass along the knowledge I have gained through my experiences.
- 2) _____ I do not feel that other people need me.
- 3) _____ I think I would like the work of a teacher.
- 4) _____ I feel as though I have made a difference to many people.
- 5) _____ I do not volunteer to work for a charity.
- 6) _____ I have made and created things that have had an impact on other people.
- 7) _____ I try to be creative in most things that I do.
- 8) _____ I think that I will be remembered for a long time after I die.
- 9) _____ I believe that society cannot be responsible for providing food and shelter for all homeless people.
- 10) _____ Others would say that I have made unique contributions to society.
- 11) _____ If I were unable to have children of my own, I would like to adopt children.
- 12) _____ I have important skills that I try to teach others.
- 13) _____ I feel that I have done nothing that will survive after I die.
- 14) _____ In general, my actions do not have a positive effect on others.
- 15) _____ I feel as though I have done nothing of worth to contribute to others.
- 16) _____ I have made many commitments to many different kinds of people, groups, and activities in my life.
- 17) _____ Other people say that I am a very productive person.
- 18) _____ I have a responsibility to improve the neighborhood in which I live.
- 19) _____ People come to me for advice.
- 20) _____ I feel as though my contributions will exist after I die.

Appendix F

The Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status (OM-EIS)

You will find that some of the items in this scale have more than one part and that you may agree with one part and disagree with another part. You should consider the statement as a whole, without considering the parts separately.

-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	4
very strongly disagree	strongly disagree	moderately disagree	slightly disagree	neither agree nor disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree	very strongly agree

- 1) ___ I haven't really thought about politics. It just doesn't excite me very much.
- 2) ___ I might have thought about a lot of different jobs, but there's never really been any question since my parents said what they wanted.
- 3) ___ When it comes to religion, I just haven't found anything that appeals to me and I don't really feel the need to look.
- 4) ___ My parents decided a long time ago what I should go into for employment and I'm following through with their plans.
- 5) ___ There are so many different political parties and ideals. I can't decide which to follow until I figure it all out.
- 6) ___ I don't give religion much thought and it doesn't bother me one way or another.
- 7) ___ I guess I'm pretty much like my folks when it comes to politics. I follow what they do in terms of voting and such.
- 8) ___ I haven't chosen the occupation I really want to get into, and I'm just working at whatever is available until something better comes along.
- 9) ___ A person's faith is unique to each individual. I've considered and reconsidered it myself and know what I can believe.
- 10) ___ It took me a long time to decide but now I know for sure what direction to move in for a career.
- 11) ___ I really have never been involved in politics enough to have made a firm stand one way or the other.
- 12) ___ I'm not so sure what religion means to me. I'd like to make up my mind but I'm not done looking yet.
- 13) ___ I've thought my political beliefs through and realize I can agree with some and not other aspects of what my parents believe.
- 14) ___ It took me a while to figure it out, but now I really know what I want for a career.
- 15) ___ Religion is confusing to me right now. I keep changing my views on what is right and wrong for me.
- 16) ___ I'm really not interested in finding the right job, any job will do. I just seem to flow with what is available.
- 17) ___ My folks have always had their own political and moral beliefs about issues like abortion and mercy killing and I've always gone along accepting what they have.
- 18) ___ I've gone through a period of serious questioning about faith and can now say I

- understand what I believe in as an individual.
- 19)___I'm not sure about my political beliefs, but I'm trying to figure out what I can truly believe in.
 - 20)___I'm still trying to decide how capable I am as a person and what jobs will be right for me.
 - 21)___I attend the same church as my family has always attended. I've never really questioned why.
 - 22)___I just can't decide what to do for an occupation. There are so many that have possibilities.
 - 23)___I've never really questioned my religion. If it's right for my parents it must be right for me.
 - 24) Politics are something that I can never be too sure about because things change so fast. But I do think it's important to know what I believe in.

Appendix G

UCLA Loneliness Scale

Below are a number of statements describing your feelings about yourself and relationships with others. Please use the following scale to indicate how often you have felt a certain way. Give only **one score** for each statement.

0 _____ 1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____
 never rarely sometimes often

- 1) _____ I feel in tune with the people around me.
- 2) _____ I lack companionship.
- 3) _____ There is no one I can turn to.
- 4) _____ I do not feel alone.
- 5) _____ I feel part of a group of friends.
- 6) _____ I have a lot in common with the people around me.
- 7) _____ I am no longer close to anyone.
- 8) _____ My interests and ideas are not shared by those around me.
- 9) _____ I am an outgoing person.
- 10) _____ There are people I feel close to.
- 11) _____ I feel left out.
- 12) _____ My social relationships are superficial.
- 13) _____ No one really knows me well.
- 14) _____ I feel isolated from others.
- 15) _____ I can find companionship when I want to.
- 16) _____ There are people who really understand me.
- 17) _____ I am unhappy being so withdrawn.
- 18) _____ People are around me but not with me.
- 19) _____ There are people I can talk to.
- 20) _____ There are people I can turn to.

Appendix H

Trust Scale

Below you will find a number of statements that focus on relationships with a romantic partner or spouse. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each statement using the following scale. If you currently do not have a romantic partner or spouse, please complete the scale based on the person with whom you presently have the closest relationship.

-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
strongly disagree	moderately disagree	slightly disagree	neither agree nor disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree

- . 1) When we encounter difficult and unfamiliar new circumstances, I would not feel worried or threatened by letting my partner do what he/she wanted.
- . 2) I can count on my partner to be concerned about my welfare.
- . 3) In general, my partner does things in a variety of different ways. He/she almost never sticks to one way of doing things.
- . 4) My partner has proven to be trustworthy and I am willing to let him/her engage in activities which other partners find too threatening.
- . 5) I am familiar with the patterns of behaviour my partner has established and I can rely on him/her to behave in certain ways.
- . 6) Even when I don't know who my partner will react, I feel comfortable telling him/her anything about myself; even those things of which I am ashamed.
- . 7) Though times may change and the future is uncertain; I know my partner will always be ready and willing to offer me strength and support.
- . 8) I am never certain that my partner won't do something that I dislike or will embarrass me.
- . 9) My partner is very unpredictable. I never know how he/she is going to act from one day to the next.
- . 10) I feel very uncomfortable when my partner has to make decisions which will affect me personally.
- . 11) I have found that my partner is unusually dependable especially when it comes to things which are important to me.
- . 12) My partner behaves in a very consistent manner.
- . 13) In my relationship with my partner, the future is an unknown which I worry about.
- _14) Whenever we have to make an important decision in a situation we have never encountered before, I know my partner will be concerned about my welfare.
- _15) Even if I have no reason to expect my partner to share things with me, I still feel certain the he/she will.
- . 16) I can rely on my partner to react in a positive way when I expose my

weaknesses to him/her.

- .17) I usually know how my partner is going to act. He/she can be counted on.
- .18) When I share my problems with my partner, I know he/she will respond in a loving way even before I say anything.
- .19) In our relationship, I have to keep alert or my partner might take advantage of me.
- .20) I am certain that my partner would not cheat on me, even if the opportunity arose and there was no chance that he/she would get caught.
- .21) I sometimes avoid my partner because he/she is unpredictable and I fear saying or doing something which might create conflict.
- .22) I can rely on my partner to keep the promises he/she makes to me.
- .23) I would never guarantee that my partner and I will still be together and not have decided to end our relationship 10 years from now.
- .24) When I am with my partner, I feel secure in facing unknown new situations.
- .25) Even when my partner makes excuses which sound rather unlikely, I am confident that he/she is telling me the truth.
- .26) I am willing to let my partner make decisions for me.

Appendix I

Life Orientation Test (LOT)

Below you will find a number of statements about relationships with other people, ways of coping with day to day events and your personal attitudes and beliefs. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each statement using the following scale.

-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	4
very	strongly	moderately	slightly	neither	slightly	moderately	strongly	very
strongly	disagree	disagree	disagree	agree	agree	agree	agree	strongly
disagree				nor				agree
				disagree				

- 1) _____ In uncertain times, I usually expect the best.
- 2) _____ If something can go wrong for me, it usually will.
- 3) _____ I always look on the bright side of things.
- 4) _____ I am always optimistic about my future.
- 5) _____ I hardly ever expect things to go my way.
- 6) _____ Things never work out the way I want them to.
- 7) _____ I'm a believer in the idea that every cloud has a silver lining.
- 8) _____ I rarely count on good things happening to me.

References

- Adams, G. R., Bennis, L., & Huh, K. (1989). *Objective measure of ego identity status: A reference manual*. Unpublished manual, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario.
- Arnold, M. L., Pratt, M. W., & Hicks, C. (2004). Adolescents' representations of parents' voices in family stories: Value lessons, personal adjustment, and identity development. In M. W. Pratt & B. H. Fiese (Eds.), *Family stories and the life course* (pp. 163-186). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Beck, A. T., & Alford, B. A. (2009). *Depression: Causes and treatment*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Newman, L. S. (1994). How stories make sense of personal experiences: Motives that shape autobiographical narratives. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 676-690.
- Blagov, P. S., & Singer, J. A. (2004). Four dimensions of self-defining memories (specificity, meaning, content, and affect) and their relationships to self-restraint, distress, and repressive defensiveness. *Journal of Personality*, 72(3), 481-512.
- Cavanaugh, J. C., Blanchard-Fields, F., & Norris, J. E. (2008). *Adult development and aging*. Toronto: Nelson.
- Clarke, E. J., Preston, M., Raksin, J., & Bengtson, V. L. (1999). Types of conflicts and tensions between older parents and adult children. *The Gerontologist*, 39, 261-270.
- Crosnoe, R., & Elder, G. H., Jr. (2002). Life course transitions, the generational stake, and grandparent-grandchild relationships. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64, 1089-1096.
- Erikson, E. (1963). *Childhood and society*. New York: Norton.

- Erikson, E. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York: Norton.
- Frensch, K. M., Pratt, M. W., & Norris, J. E. (2007). Foundations of generativity: Personality and family correlates of emerging adults' generative life-story themes. *Journal of Research in Personality, 41*, 45-62.
- Garson, D. G. (2002). *Guide to writing empirical papers, theses, and dissertations*. New York: Marcel Dekker.
- Kemp, C. L. (2005). Dimensions of grandparent-adult grandchild relationships: From family ties to intergenerational friendships. *Canadian Journal on Aging, 24*(2), 161-178.
- Lawford, H., Pratt, M. W., Hunsberger, B., & Pancer, S. M. (2005). Adolescent generativity: A longitudinal study of two possible contexts for learning concern for future generations. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 15*(3), 261-273.
- Marcia, J. E. (1980). Identity in adolescence. In J. Adelson (Ed.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology* (pp. 159-187). New York: Wiley.
- McAdams, D. P. (2001). The psychology of life stories. *Review of General Psychology, 5*(2), 100-122.
- McAdams, D. P., & de St. Aubin, E. (1992). A theory of generativity and its assessment through self-report, behavioral act, and narrative themes in autobiography. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62*, 1003-1015.
- McAdams, D. P., de St. Aubin, E., & Login, R. L. (1993). Generativity among young, midlife, and older adults. *Psychology and Aging, 8*(2), 221-230.
- McAdams, D. P., Diamond, A., de St. Aubin, E., & Logan, R. L. (1997). Stories of commitment: The psychosocial construction of generative lives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*, 678-694.

- McPherson, B. D., & Wister, A. (2008). *Aging as a social process: Canadian perspectives*. Don Mills: Oxford University Press.
- Milan, A., & Hamm, B. (2003). Across the generations: Grandparents and grandchildren. *Canadian Social Trends*, 77, 5-7. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Mueller, M. M., Wilhelm, B., & Elder, G. H., Jr. (2002). Variations in grandparenting. *Research on Aging*, 24(3), 360-388.
- Norris, J. E., Kuiack, S., & Pratt, M. W. (2004). "As long as they go back down the driveway at the end of the day": Stories of the satisfactions and challenges of grandparenthood. In M. W. Pratt & B. H. Fiese (Eds.), *Family stories and the life course* (pp. 163-186). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Peterson, B. E. (2006). Generativity and successful parenting: An analysis of young adult outcomes. *Journal of Personality*, 74(3), 847-869.
- Peterson, B. E., Smirles, K. A., & Wentworth, P.A. (1997). Generativity and authoritarianism: Implications for personality, political involvement, and parenting. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72(5), 1202-1216.
- Pratt, M. W., Danso, H. A., Arnold, M. L., Norris, J. E., & Filyer, R. (2001). Adult generativity and the socialization of adolescents: Relations to mothers' and fathers' parenting beliefs, styles, and practices. *Journal of Personality*, 69(1), 2001.
- Pratt, M. W., Hunsberger, B., Pancer, S. M., Alisat, S. (2003). A longitudinal analysis of personal values socialization: Correlates of a moral self-ideal in late adolescence. *Social Development*, 12(4), 563-585.
- Pratt, M. W., Norris, J. E., Arnold, M. L., & Filyer, R. (1999). Generativity and moral

- development as predictors of value-socialization narratives for young persons across the adult life span: From lessons learned to stories shared. *Psychology and Aging*, 74(3), 414-426.
- Pratt, M. W., Norris, J. E., Hebblethwaite, S., & Arnold, M. L. (2008). Intergenerational transmission of values: Family generativity and adolescents' narratives of parent and grandparent value teaching. *Journal of Personality*, 76(2), 171-198.
- Pratt, M. W., Norris, J. E., Lawford, H. L., & Arnold, M. L. (in press). "What he said to me stuck:" Adolescents' narrative representations of their grandparents as teachers. In K. C. McLean & M. Pasupathi (Eds.), *Narrative development in adolescence*. New York: Springer.
- Pratt, M. W., Norris, J. E., van de Hoef, S., & Arnold, M. L. (2001). Stories of hope: Parental optimism in narratives about adolescent children. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 18(5), 603-623.
- Rempel, J. K., Holmes, J. G., & Zanna, M. P. (1985). Trust in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49, 95-112.
- Russel D., Peplau, L. A., & Cutrona, C. (1980). The revised UCLA Loneliness Scale: Concurrent and discriminant validity evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, 472-480.
- Scheier, M. M., & Carver, C. S. (1985). Optimism, coping, and health: Assessment and implications of generalized outcome expectancies. *Health Psychology*, 4, 219-247.
- Shaffer, D. R., Wood, E., & Willoughby, T. (2005). *Developmental psychology: Childhood and adolescence*. Toronto: Nelson.
- Silverstein, M., & Marenco, A. (2001). How Americans enact the grandparent role across the

family life course. *Journal of Family Issues*, 22(4), 493-522.

Steinburg, L., Lamborn, S. D., Darling, N., Mounts, N. S., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1995). Over-time changes in adjustment and competence among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. *Child Development*, 66(3), 754-770.