



2006-07-13

Implicit Family Process and Couples Rules: A Comparison of American and Hungarian Families

Noemi Gergely

Brigham Young University - Provo

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Family, Life Course, and Society Commons](#)

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Gergely, Noemi, "Implicit Family Process and Couples Rules: A Comparison of American and Hungarian Families" (2006). *All Theses and Dissertations*. 526.

<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/526>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

IMPLICIT FAMILY PROCESS AND COUPLES RULES:
A COMPARISON OF AMERICAN AND HUNGARIAN FAMILIES

by

Noémi Gergely

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Science

Marriage and Family Therapy Program

School of Family Life

Brigham Young University

August 2006

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE COMMITTEE APPROVAL

of a thesis submitted by

Noémi Gergely

This thesis has been read by each member of the following graduate committee and by majority vote has been found to be satisfactory.

Date

James M. Harper, Chair

Date

Jeffry H. Larson

Date

Robert F. Stahmann

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

As chair of the candidate's graduate committee, I have read the thesis of Noémi Gergely in its final form and have found that (1) its format, citations, and bibliographical style are consistent and acceptable and fulfill university and department style requirements; (2) its illustrative materials including figures, tables, and charts are in place; and (3) the final manuscript is satisfactory to the graduate committee and is ready for submission to the university library.

Date

James M. Harper
Chair, Graduate Committee

Accepted for the Program

Robert F. Stahmann
Chair, Marriage and Family Therapy

Accepted for the School

James M. Harper
Director, School of Family Life

ABSTRACT

IMPLICIT FAMILY PROCESS AND COUPLES RULES: A COMPARISON OF AMERICAN AND HUNGARIAN FAMILIES

Noémi Gergely

Marriage and Family Therapy Program

School of Family Life

Master of Science

Family life is organized by rules, and most of them are unspokenly agreed-upon by family members and may be even out of awareness. Implicit family process and couple rules may facilitate or constrain family relationship and intimate couple relationship growth. Prevalence of family rules may be different across cultures. Family members may perceive their rules and family functioning differently according to their family position and gender. Married couples may view their relationship rules differently than couples who cohabit. This study utilized the Family Implicit Rules Profile (FIRP) and the Couples Implicit Rules Profile (CIRP) Questionnaires to answer these research questions. The questionnaires were translated into Hungarian, and the content validity of the Hungarian translation was established. Hungarian non-clinical families and couples

were compared to American (U.S.) non-clinical families and couples to examine how prevalent implicit rules were in the two cultures. According to the findings, Hungarian families and couples scored lower on the total FIRP and CIRP scores. Hungarian families perceived implicit family rules regarding kindness and monitoring less prevalent, and rules regarding constraining their thoughts, feelings and self more prevalent than American families. No differences were found in expressiveness and connection and inappropriate caretaking of parents between the two cultures. Hungarian couples perceived their implicit relationship rules regarding kindness, expressiveness and connection and monitoring less prevalent than American couples. No differences in implicit rules about constraining thoughts, feelings and self and inappropriate caretaking of partner were found between the two cultures. Mothers in both cultures viewed their families in a more positive light than other family members, and female family members (mothers and daughters) were more positive than their male counterparts (fathers and sons) about rules in their families in both cultures. Sons in both cultures perceived more responsibility to protect their parents emotionally than did daughters. Married couples in both cultures perceived their relationship rules more favorably in terms of kindness and monitoring than cohabiting couples. Results were interpreted in the context of cultural differences between the American and the Hungarian cultures. Limitations and the possibility of future research are discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to my husband, Hevesi Imre, for his encouragements and endurance during my course of studies and for his many help as my research assistant while in Hungary. I would like to recognize my mother, Gergely Józsefné, for the many hours and efforts she put into this project so willingly as my research assistant in Hungary. I wish to thank Sándor Zoltán, director of Széchenyi István Elementary School, for his trust in the research project and for embracing it and organizing it in a superb manner. I wish to thank United Way Hungary, SzocHáló Társadalomtudomány On-line, the Hungary Budapest Mission for The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, and for the leaderships of Pannonhalma Benedictine High School for supporting the study in their various capacities. Most of all, I thank the families and couples who participated in this research for their time and willingness.

I would like to express my appreciation to my chair, James Harper, who provided the research topic and made it possible for me to conduct research with Hungarian families, for his guidance and patience. I would also like to thank my committee, Jeffrey Larson and Robert Stahmann for their honest and needed feedback and guidance.

Table of Contents

Graduate Committee Approval.....	ii
Final Reading Approval and Acceptance.....	iii
Abstract.....	iv
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Table of Contents.....	vii
Introduction and Statement of Purpose.....	1
Review of the Literature.....	2
Rule Theory.....	2
Implicit Family Process Rules.....	3
Measuring Implicit Family Rules.....	6
Cultural Implications.....	8
Families in Hungary.....	11
Hypotheses.....	16
Methods.....	19
Subjects.....	19
Instruments.....	27
Results.....	33
Family Rules.....	33
Couple Rules.....	38
Discussion.....	42
Culture: Hungarian vs. American.....	42
Family Positions.....	44

Gender.....	47
Marital Status: Married vs. Cohabiting.....	48
Implications for Clinical Practice.....	48
Limitations.....	49
Future Research.....	50
Reference.....	51
Appendices.....	57
Appendix A: Family Implicit Rules Profile.....	57
Appendix B: Couple Implicit Rules Profile.....	62
Appendix C: Scoring Guide.....	67
Appendix D: Family Implicit Rules Profile (Hungarian).....	70
Appendix E: Couple Implicit Rules Profile (Hungarian).....	75
Appendix F: Scoring Guide (Hungarian).....	80
Appendix G: Comparison of Back-Translations.....	83
Appendix H: Consent Form.....	87
Appendix I: Demographic Questionnaire.....	90
Appendix J: ANOVA Plots (Tables 10-22).....	92

Chapter I

Introduction and Statement of Purpose

Cross-cultural studies of family functioning attract researchers and family clinicians for several reasons. Topics of interest include discovering commonalities in families regardless of culture; meanings, values and other characteristics of cultures that affect family life; and the question of relevance of measurements assessing family functioning developed in one culture for other cultures.

The present study examined implicit family and couples rules across the European American (USA) and Hungarian (Hungary) cultures that are to do with several dimensions of family functioning (i.e. affective, problem-solving, communication, monitoring, behavior and loyalty). The purpose of this study was to translate the Family Implicit Rules Profile and the Couple Implicit Rules Profile into Hungarian, and to compare family and couple rules between non-distressed Hungarian and American families and couples. One benefit of this study was new understanding of the ways families and couples organize themselves in terms of process rules in Hungary compared to the United States, and how relatively prevalent facilitative and constraining family process rules are in the two cultures. The Family Implicit Rules Profile and the Couple Implicit Rules Profile will be available in Hungarian for clinical use in marriage and family therapy.

Chapter II

Review of the Literature

Rule Theory

Family life is organized by rules. Rules are relationship agreements which define individual behaviors within the family system. Rules are involved in many aspects of family life, and they are an important part of family and relationship processes. Rules aim to maintain balance in the family and couple systems. They have to do with intimacy, communication, parenting, the allocation of resources, boundaries around the family, coping with and handling external and internal stress, keeping the family's integrity, and decision-making, etc. Family rules help to create structure and allow families to accomplish tasks, such as nurturing and providing for individual members. They clarify interpersonal boundaries, govern communication, and regulate intimacy in families as related to closeness and distance (Larson, Taggart-Reedy, & Wilson, 2001). Rules may also express value systems underpinning family dynamics (Satir, 1972), and serve to regulate interactions and to expression of emotions.

As any kind of system has rules, so do rules. According to rule theory, the constellation of the rule-family/system is composed of five members: the rule, the counter rule, the rule about qualifications and exceptions, the rule about consequences for breaking the rule, and the rule that tells how the rule ought to be implemented (Ford, 1983). For example, if the rule is "Be friendly," the counter rule is "Be unfriendly." Both rules have qualifications and exceptions. For the rule "Be friendly," the exceptions may be "Be friendly, but not to people who take advantage of you." Furthermore, there must be a rule to how to implement the original rule and what the consequences should be in case the rule was broken. The rule to implement the rule "Be friendly" may be

“Say Hello to others” or “Do not criticize”, etc. The consequence for breaking this rule may be “Scold family members who do not say Hello to others,” or “Ignore family members who criticize.”

Family process rules are a powerful mechanism. Nuechterlein (1993) said that, “Family rules determine behavior to a greater degree than individual needs, drives, or personality characteristics.” Similarly, Minuchin (1974) stated that rules support any system’s structure, and once the structure is formed it becomes more powerful than any one person in the system. Rules maintain members’ behavior and establish the system’s power structure as well (Johnston and Zemitsch, 1988).

Implicit Family Process Rules

When we think about the rules our families have established, we might automatically think of the agreements made at family councils or ones that are often forced on teenagers by their parents. Some family rules are indeed obvious and explicitly communicated, such as the ones regarding curfew, dating, and sleep-overs. However, by far most implicit rules develop from repetitive family interactions and are unspoken and implicitly communicated, and even out of awareness (Riskin, 1963). Implicit rules arise from repetitive and organized patterns in families, which in turn help to govern and define relationships (Jackson, 1965). Ford (1983) explained that as much as family rules stay implicit they resemble secrets, and thus they have power over family members, and they may induce guilt. Unspoken family rules and individual behaviors have reciprocal effect on the other: they reinforce each other. Implicit family rules have the power “to control or limit relationships as well as to allow intimacy” (135). They are often transmitted across generations. According to Ford (1983), examples of the most common implicit family rules in American families are, “‘Be nice’,’ ‘Look good,’ ‘Say the right

thing,’ ‘Do the right thing,’ ‘Don’t say what you think,’ or ‘Don’t say what you feel’ (142).”

Implicit family rules have several additional properties (Ford, 1983). They consist of few words, such as “Be affectionate,” “Avoid pain at any cost,” etc. They have a high level of ambiguity that allows multiple choices, such as “Be nice” because it does not specify to whom to be nice, when and how much. The proximity between the rule and the counter rule is what gives room for change and growth. For example, if our rule was “Be kind, no matter what,” kindness would lose meaning and be extended to all behavior leaving little room for change and growth. Furthermore, rules perpetuate themselves and reproduce. For example, the rule “Don’t get close to other people” suggests that people would get close to others, so the expectation “Get close to others” is not only a rule, but the foundation for the existence of the rule “Don’t get close to other people.” These rules and expectations reinforce and reproduce each other.

Implicit, unspoken or covert family rules may serve or hinder the family in their several functions—organizational, affective, emotional, and developmental, etc. The functional family process rules are to the advantage of the family as a whole, and family members individually. They facilitate communication, affect, unity, allow difference and comfortable individuality, and intimacy, etc. Facilitative family rules are, for example, “Support each other,” “Be friendly,” or “Do things together.” Researchers and clinicians, on the other hand, attribute negative family and individual outcomes to dysfunctional family rules. Constraining family rules have been found to be associated with low-self esteem, relationship difficulties, emotional instability, and addictions, etc. (Ford & Herrick, 1974; Darlington, 1996; Larson, Peterson, Heath, & Birch, 2000; Guo, Hawkins, & Hill, 2001; Larson et al., 2001; Gillett, Harper, Larson, & Rasmussen, 2005, in press).

Constraining family rules may include “Don’t get close to people,” “Don’t be yourself,” or “Don’t feel or talk about feelings.”

Being aware of implicit family rules and bringing the unspoken into the open has several advantages both for families and clinicians who help families. Family rules may be transmitted from generation to generation. When a couple marries or cohabits, they tend to bring the unspoken rules of their own family-of-origins into the new couple and family relationships because people tend to be unaware of the existence of these rules. If they are aware of the implicit rules they have grown up with, some people might be convinced that since those rules worked for their families, they should work in the new relationships as well. The match or mismatch of these family-of-origin rules may be one factor that determines the success of such unions (Ford, 1983). For example, a wife’s family-of-origin may have lived by the rule of “Allow others to help you solve problems.” Her husband’s family on the other hand may have operated by the rule “Rely on yourself—not on other family members.” By bringing these apparently opposing rules into their new relationship without being aware of them, the couple may have difficulty adjusting to each other’s resistance of and demand for help from the other, possibly resulting in a pursue-withdrawal pattern on the long-run (Gottman, 1994). Thus, it is in the interest of couples and families to be more conscious of what rules they bring into and follow in their relationships.

Clinicians on the other hand can define and understand the family system by knowing their unspoken rules (Ford, 1983). Bringing the unspoken into the open may be an intervention in itself. Ford et al. (1974) pointed out that “In commenting upon the family rules, i.e. making them explicit, the therapist breaks yet another rule: ‘It’s what cannot be talked about in the family that hurts’” (69). Further interventions may be

directed to encourage or oppose, and to specify or generalize existing implicit family process rules.

Measuring Implicit Family Rules

For a long time, clinicians had no better way to assess family life processes and to recognize family rules that control and limit the system other than by personal observation and interviewing family members. Family rules were inferred from repetitive family behavior (Ford, 1983). Observation of the family, however, may take a long time and be biased by the observer. To aid clinicians, self-report measurements of family rules have been developed to gather information more quickly than does observation, to take the different views of family members into consideration, and to provide an empirical tool for further research on implicit family rules. In recent decades, researchers have examined various implicit family process rules to determine whether they would prove to be advantageous or disadvantageous for families in general (Harper and Hoopes, 1991; Parks, 1997; Stoll, 1999; Larson, Parks, Harper, & Heath, 2001; Harper, Stoll, & Larson, in press; Gillett et al., 2005). As a result, the self-report Family Implicit Rules Profile (FIRP; Harper and Hoopes, 1991; Stoll, 1999; Harper, et al., in press; Larson et al., 2001; Gillett et al., 2005, in press) and the Couple Implicit Rules Profile (Harper, 2005) were developed for marriage and family therapists to assess the overall rule system of their clients in a systematic way.

In recent years, the effects of dysfunctional implicit family process rules on family and individual outcome have been studied by comparing non-clinical families with no apparent dysfunction with clinical families who presented with particular problems for which they had sought professional help. These studies utilized the present and earlier editions of the Family Implicit Rules Profile.

Raymond-Jensen (1993) studied female adults and found that the rigidity of dysfunctional implicit family rules—‘Rather than be who you are, be good, right, strong and perfect,’ ‘Don’t be selfish—take care of others even if you have to neglect yourself,’ and ‘Don’t trust other people or yourself’—result in internalizing shame. Furthermore, dysfunctional family rules were found significantly correlated with sexual abuse in the family no matter who the perpetrator was. This could mean either that rigid, dysfunctional rules leave a family vulnerable to sexual abuse from in and outside of the family, or that sexual abuse in the family may generate rigid dysfunctional rules to cope with the situation or to maintain the status quo.

Dysfunctional implicit family-of-origin rules may have adverse effects on the dating relationships of young adults (Larson et al., 2000, 2001; Peterson, 1995). For example, studying college students, Larson et al. (2001) had found that “young adults from families with more dysfunctional rules reported significantly more dating anxiety, less relationship satisfaction and less commitment in their dating relationships than those from families with less dysfunctional rules. Their relationships were less likely to progress to more intimate and committed dating stages (e.g., seriously dating) than those from families with more functional family-of-origin rules” (503-4).

Stoll (2004), using a national sample, hypothesized that clinical families have more constraining and less facilitative implicit family process rules than non-clinical families. In his study of clinical adolescents, mothers, and fathers were matched with non-clinical adolescents, mothers, and fathers. The results demonstrated clear differences between clinical and non-clinical families on three of the subscales of the FIRP: (1) Kindness, Expression and Connection, (2) Family Monitoring, and (3) Constraining Thoughts, Feelings and Self. The findings in this study gave empirical support for rule

theory, meaning that implicit family rules that guide the family's approach to resolving problems may be different for clinical and non-clinical families, and they produce different outcomes. Stoll says that "non-clinical families appear to have more facilitative and less constraining family process rules and are therefore better equipped to handle emotional processing in a growth promoting way."

Gillett et al. (2005) hypothesized that eating-disordered families (having a daughter in an inpatient program or outpatient therapy for an eating disorder) score lower on the Family Implicit Rules Profile than non-eating-disordered families (a lower score on the family rules profile indicates more constraining family rules, and a higher score suggests more facilitative family rules). The primary hypothesis was strongly supported. Results showed that the mean scores for the Total FIRP Score, for all subscales, and for the Total FIRP and Eating Disorder Scale Combined for the eating-disordered families were significantly lower than those of the non-eating disordered families.

Cultural Implications

There is reason to believe that implicit family process rules in a particular culture may be different from those in another culture. Culture, here, is defined as a particular ethnic group sharing common historical ties and values. Jackson (1965) assumes that some family process rules are more common in one culture than another. Rules in one culture may also be prevalent to a different extent in another culture. Finally, cultural values may attribute different meanings to similar family rules across cultures (Mikulincer et al., 1993). For this study, we are mindful of the fact that while similarities may exist within a culture and differences may be observed across cultures, yet each family is unique.

Keitner, Ryan & Fodor (1990, 1991) suggested that cultural values can affect family functioning. In their cross-cultural study, the Family Assessment Device (FAD), a 53-item self-report questionnaire, which measures the several dimensions of the McMaster Model of family functioning developed in the United States (Epstein, Bishop & Levin, 1978; Epstein, Baldwin & Bishop, 1983), was used to compare patterns of family functioning in two cultural settings: North America (USA and Canada) and Hungary. The sample size consisted of 95 North American families and 58 Hungarian families. The North American sample was randomly selected from a list of university employees (technical, professional and service occupations included). Hungarian participants were solicited through the public school system in a mid-sized Hungarian city. All family members over the age of 12 were asked to complete the FAD.

No cross-cultural differences were found in the families' general functioning mean scores, nor in their affective involvement or responsiveness scores. However, Hungarian families perceived their functioning significantly better in problem-solving and communication, and North American families viewed themselves better in setting family rules (of particular interest of the present study) and boundaries and in meeting their family responsibilities.

The authors suggested several cultural differences among North American and Hungarian families (Keitner et al., 1990) to explain these differences. Hungarians viewed themselves as more direct and frank with each other and more likely to voice displeasure with another, than did North Americans. Hungarians reported more negative feelings among family members, and they were less likely to accept a person's individuality. Hungarian families tended to be over-involved with each other, while the American families reported a greater extent of self-centeredness in the family. Hungarian

families differed from their American counterparts in having more financial difficulties and in being less able to pursue their personal interests. Furthermore, they were more dissatisfied with their family responsibilities and more lax in ensuring that those were met.

In the Keitner et al. studies (1990, 1991), it was reported that the FAD self-report measure was successfully used in the Hungarian culture. No revisions were reported to be necessary. However, both clinical and non-clinical Hungarian families scored in the clinically unhealthy range in the Roles and Behavior Control dimensions, which may warrant an examination of the possibility of different norms for Hungarian families as the norms of the measurement were established for North American families.

The findings in the Keitner et al. (1990) study may suggest several things about implicit family process and couples rules in Hungarian families that may be different from Americans. Hungarian families and couples may operate less by implicit rules that are to do with kindness as they are reported to be more willing to voice displeasure with each other than their American counterparts. On the other hand, families in both cultures reported similar levels of affective involvement or responsiveness on the FAD, thus the prevalence of implicit family and couples rules may be similar in both cultures. As the Keitner et al. (1990) study also found that Hungarian family members reported to be more involved with each other not respecting a person's individuality and privacy as much as the more individualistic American families, it is expected that Hungarians may have to constrain themselves in the family more than American family members. Thus, Hungarians may have more implicit family rules concerning constraining themselves. For the same reason, Hungarian children may also experience more demands on them to

take care of their parents emotionally, than American children. Hungarian families may have more implicit rules about caretaking of parents.

Families in Hungary

Hungary has a moderate Western orientation. It has historical ties to the West. Hungarians consider themselves Europeans and share a primarily Judeo-Christian religious heritage. Along with Poland, the Czech Republic and Slovakia, Hungary considers herself as “Central Europe” to distinguish herself from the more Eastern orientation of Eastern Europe. Historically, the distinction refers to the split of the Catholic Church into Eastern (Orthodox) and Western (Roman) spheres of influence. Like the rest of Western Europe, the states of Central Europe had been under the influence of the Roman Catholic Church.

The population of Hungary was 10,077,000 at the end of 2005, which meant 1.7% decrease compared to the year 2004 (Central Statistical Office, KSH, 2006). The ethnic make up of Hungary is as follows: 89.9% Hungarian; 4% Roma Gypsy; 2.6% German; 2% Serb; 0.8% Slovak; and 0.7% Romanian. About two-thirds of the population are Roman Catholic (67.5%); 20% belong to the Calvinist Reformed Church; and 5% are Lutheran Evangelical (Phillips and Scotchmer, 2005). Other traditional religious denominations are Jewish, the Greek Orthodox and the Serb Orthodox Church. Considerably new denominations are the Mormons (or The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS Church), 0.0359% of the population in 1999), the Faith Congregation and the Scientological Church.

The marital status of the Hungarian population has changed dramatically since 1990 (sampling for the Keitner et al. studies was conducted in 1986-87). The 1990-2000

period was a major transition time for Hungary from communism to democracy.

Therefore, changes in family life are expected since the Keitner et al. (1990) study.

Almost one third of the population is single (29.9%), the number of divorced people has increased from 7.4% to 9.9%, and the number of married people has declined from 61.2% to 48.7% since 1990 (KSH, 2006). The number of new marriages increased by 0.7% (44,100) in the year 2005, and most people (men and women) marry in their thirties. These people were teenagers when the major political and social transition began in Hungary, therefore the insecurities of the time may have affected their future planning for marriage and family. The number of divorces was 24,700 in 2005. Divorce occurs most often among people of age 20-29, but the number of divorces of spouses over age thirty has increased as well. Since 2004, only half of the population over age 15 is married.

The number of births increased by 2.5% (97,500) in the year 2005 (KSH, 2006). Giving birth in teenage years and in the twenties has been declining, and women in their thirties give birth more often. Many of these women are highly educated, established in their careers, and part of the baby-boomers generation of the 1970s, who were in their teenage years when the societal and political transition began. In 2005, over one third of children (35%) were born out of wedlock, which has been the highest in the census history in Hungary. 85% of unmarried women were single, never married and may be cohabiting. The number of children per every 100 married women was 132. The number of abortions has declined by 3.8%, but it is still very high compared to other countries (50,500). About one third of pregnancies (52 for every 100 birth) are aborted (KSH, 2006). In the year 2004, the average life expectancy at birth was 68.59 for males and 76.91 for females (KSH, 2005).

These changes in the demographics of Hungary concerning marriages and families and the societal changes in Hungary since the Keitner et al. (1990) study conducted twenty years ago may suggest somewhat different results in Hungarian family functioning in this study as recruiting research participants for this study was conducted in 2005-06.

In a more recent cross-national study on routine activities and deviant behavior of high school and college students (15-20 years of age) comparing Hungary, the USA, the Netherlands and Switzerland, Hungarian youths reported spending a much greater time with their families than all other adolescents, while American adolescents were significantly higher in family time than their Dutch and Swiss peers (Vazsonyi, Pickering, Belliston, Hessing and Junger, 2002). Hungarian youths also reported substantially lower rates of deviance than all other adolescents in that study.

The Vazsonyi et al. (2002) study may have implications for implicit family rule differences between the American and Hungarian cultures. As Hungarian youths spend more time with their families, they may require less parental monitoring, thus their families may have less unspoken family rules concerning monitoring.

It was intriguing to find virtually no research conducted on Hungarian couple relationship functioning. Research tends to focus on family relationships. This study may be among the first to investigate some of the characteristics of intimate relationships of Hungarian couples in terms of their implicit relationship rules.

Implicit Family Rules and Family Positions

The perceptions of implicit process rules between family members (fathers, mothers, and children) were found to be different by Gillett et al. (2005, in press) and Stoll (2004). More specifically children in clinical treatment perceived more constraining

family rules than their parents and siblings who did not receive clinical treatment. In a topic review reporting on gender development, McHale, Crouter & Whiteman (2003) listed several studies that indicated that children have different experiences with their fathers versus their mothers, and that parents treat their sons and daughters differently. For example, fathers' involvement with their children tend to center around play and leisure as opposed to mothers who spend their time with more instrumental activities, such as caretaking, teaching and learning. Children in general feel closer to their mothers and can converse with them about a range of topics and have more conflicts and disagreements with their mothers but treat their fathers more with deference. Fathers also tend to focus more on gender socialization than mothers, more likely treating their sons and daughters differently than mothers. These findings may suggest that implicit family rules may be different across family position. In addition to parents and children perceiving their family functioning differently (Olson, 1986), fathers and mothers, and sons and daughters may view the implicit rules of their families differently. It may be that children's perceptions may be closer to their mothers' perceptions than to their fathers.

Implicit Rules and Gender

Goldner (1988) asserted that gender is a fundamental organizing principle in families, as is culture. Gender socialization and gender power theories may suggest differences in how males and females perceive their implicit relationship rules (family and couple). Watts and Borders (2005) found that men felt societal pressure to avoid emotional expression. O'Neil, Helms, Gable, David and Wrightsman (1986) asserted that men in general experience several gender conflict patterns, such as restrictive emotionality—difficulty and fears of expressing emotions—, conflict between work and

family relations—difficulties balancing work-school and the need to spend time with their families—and conflict regarding success, power and competition which involves persistent worry about personal achievement, obtaining authority and comparing oneself with others. Butler (1995) said that gender power inequalities base women's success in monitoring and attending to relationships, so men do not have to do that as much. Thus, women are by nature or by socialization more tuned into relationships than men are. They may value and expect more from relationships—especially from their families—than do men. In terms of implicit relationship rules, women may have more rules about expressiveness and connection and monitoring than do men, and men may have more rules about constraining their thoughts, feelings and themselves in relationships. Women may also tend to care take of their partners more readily than men.

Implicit Couple Rules and Marital Status

As cohabitation became a widely chosen form of relationship in the Western world, the social sciences had made extensive investigation on the quality and characteristics differences between marriage and cohabitation. Popenoe and Dafoe Whitehead (2002) found that cohabiting couples were less committed to their relationships than were married couples. Shackelford and Mouzos (2005) found that marriage was safer for women than cohabitation in terms of lethal and nonlethal violence by the hand of the partner. According to Marcussen (2005), married people reported lower levels of depression than people who lived in cohabiting relationships, and cohabitators reported lower levels of satisfaction, perceived equity, commitment and stability. There has been no research conducted on the implicit rule differences between marital and cohabiting couples. However, existing research on cohabiting relationships may suggest that cohabiting couples may have less facilitative implicit relationship rules

than married couples because they tend to report lower levels of relationship satisfaction. Cohabiting couples may adhere to relationship rules about kindness, expression and connection and monitoring less than married partners. They may also have less constraining rules as for their thoughts, feelings and self because the cohabiting relationship is less committed than a marriage.

Hypotheses

Culture: Hungarian vs. American

Considering the theoretical arguments of Jackson (1965) that some family process rules are more common in one culture than another and that cultural values can affect family functioning, the first main hypothesis to be tested was that the total FIRP and CIRP scores and the subscale (Kindness, Expressiveness and Connection, Constraining Thoughts, Feelings and Self, Inappropriate Caretaking of Parents / Partner, and Monitoring) scores would be different for Hungarian non-clinical and American non-clinical families. The following directional hypotheses were tested:

- Hungarian couples and families will score lower on the Kindness subscale than American couples and families;
- Hungarian couples and families will not score significantly different on the Expressiveness and Connection subscale than American couples and families;
- Hungarian couples and families will score lower on the Constraining Thoughts, Feelings and Self subscale than American couples and families;
- Hungarian couples and families will score lower on the Inappropriate Caretaking of Partner / Parents subscale than American couples and families;
- Hungarian couples and families will score lower on the Monitoring subscale than American couples and families.

Family Position: Fathers vs. Mothers vs. Sons vs. Daughters

Taking into consideration the findings of Stoll (2004) and Gillett et al. (2005) regarding the differences in the perception on family rules across family roles, the second main hypothesis to be tested was that the perception of implicit process rules between family members would be different regardless of nationality. The following directional hypotheses were tested:

- Mothers will perceive more facilitative implicit rules in the family than fathers.
- Children's perceptions of implicit rules will be closer to the mothers' perception than to the fathers' perception.

Gender: Male vs. Female

The third main hypothesis was that there would be differences in perceptions of implicit family and couple rules across gender. The following directional hypotheses were tested:

- Females and males will not score significantly different on the Kindness subscale;
- Females will score higher on the Expressiveness and Connection subscale than males;
- Males will score lower on the Constraining Thoughts, Feelings and Self subscale than females;
- Females will score lower on the Inappropriate Caretaking on Parents / Partner than males;
- Females will score higher on the Monitoring subscale than males.

Marital Status: Married vs. Cohabiting

The fourth main hypothesis to be tested was that the total CIRP score and the subscale scores would be different across marital status (particularly married vs. cohabiting). The following directional hypotheses were tested:

- Married couples will score higher on the Kindness subscale than cohabiting couples;
- Married couples will score higher on the Expressiveness and Connection subscale than cohabiting couples;
- Married couples will score higher on the Constraining Thoughts, Feelings and Self subscale than cohabiting couples;
- Married and cohabiting couples will not score significantly different on the Inappropriate Caretaking of Partner subscale;
- Married couples will score higher on the Monitoring subscale than cohabiting couples;
- Married couples will score higher on the Total CIRP scale than cohabiting couples.

Chapter III

Methods

Subjects

Hungarian sample

Hungarian families were solicited in 2005-06 from Budapest, the capitol city, and other cities and small towns to form a representative sample of Hungarian families.

Recruiting of research participants was done by advertisements through church congregations, internet websites of United Way Hungary and Szochalo, a website for the social sciences operated by the Kurt Lewin Foundation, a large public elementary school in the tenth district of Budapest, and a Roman Catholic boarding high school in Pannonhalma with students from all over the country.

Selection criteria included that subjects were to be families which included fathers and/or mothers, and their child or children of an age when they could read, understand and answer the questions without parental help (i.e. 12 years old and older). Letters inviting participants to be involved in the study were mailed until at least 50 subject families returned completed questionnaires. The mail included postage-paid, self-addressed return envelopes to encourage participation. Parents were invited to complete both the family and couple questionnaires. Participation was voluntary. Research participants from the two schools were compensated for participation. Families received super market coupons worth of \$5 or \$10, depending on whether siblings of the students participated in the study or not.

American sample

A data set of approximately 400 American couples and families already existed as a result of the research of Stoll (2004) and of Gillett et al. (2005, in press). Families in the comparison sample were selected using a quota sampling procedure (deVaus, 1995). Students within introductory Marriage, Family, and Human Development and Psychology courses were offered extra credit for recruiting families from their hometown for this study. The students who chose to participate each nominated at least one family that to their knowledge was emotionally healthy and had an adolescent between the ages of 13 and 17, and who they believed did not have an eating disorder, substance abuse or psychological disorder. Along with their nominations, they provided addresses, phone numbers, and e-mail addresses (if possible) of the families they recommended. The families were first contacted by the nominating student by phone to receive verbal consent to participate in the study. The families were then mailed consent forms, demographic questionnaires, screening instruments, and Family Implicit Rules Profiles for both parents and the adolescents between the ages of 13 and 17 who resided in the home. Postage-paid, self-addressed return envelopes for each individual questionnaire were included to facilitate return of the questionnaires and provide greater confidentiality for each individual participating.

Families and couples were selected from the American sample based on the closest match to Hungarian subjects, primarily on age of daughter and secondarily number and age of daughter's siblings, and thirdly on the marital status of her parents. For CIRP comparisons, American couples were matched with Hungarian couples on the age of husband in the couple database.

Demographic Characteristics of Hungarian and American Families

A total of 53 Hungarian families participated in the study, including 32 fathers, 34 mothers, 38 sons, and 38 daughters. Fifty three American families were matched with them, including 45 fathers, 53 mothers, 47 sons, and 44 daughters. Table 1 shows the demographics for the family sample. The mean age of Hungarian and American fathers combined was 45.6 (SD=6.29; range=31-60). The mean age of Hungarian and American mothers combined was 42.22 (SD=7.36; range=27-58). The mean age of Hungarian and American sons combined was 15.53 (SD=3.50; range=7-23). The mean age of Hungarian and American daughters combined was 15.07 (SD=3.81; range=5-30).

The marital status of Hungarian and American parents were distributed fairly similarly. Most parents were married (fathers=96.10%; mothers=83.00%). Table 2 shows the marital status and religious preferences of all participants in the family sample.

Most Hungarian participants indicated having no religion (fathers=48.40%; mothers=39.40%; sons=55.30%; daughters=50.00%). The second most widely indicated religious preference of the Hungarian sample was Catholic (fathers=25.80%; mothers=30.30%; sons=39.50%; and daughter=35.00%), and the third LDS (12.90%; 12.10%; 2.60%; and 5.00% respectively). Most of the American families were of LDS affiliation (fathers=80.00%; mothers=80.00%; sons=91.50%; daughters=72.70%). The second most widely indicated religious preference of the American sample was Protestant (6.70%; 9.10%; 2.10%; and 18.20% respectively), and the third Catholic (2.20%; 5.50%; 4.30%; and 6.80% respectively).

Table 1.

Demographic Characteristics of the Family Sample (N=333); Age

Hungarian Families												
Demographic Variable	Fathers			Mothers			Sons			Daughters		
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
Age	43.5	7.00	31-60	38.94	8.45	27-58	14.55	4.73	7-23	13.4	4.2	5-30
American Families												
Demographic Variable	Fathers			Mothers			Sons			Daughters		
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
Age	47.56	4.87	33-57	44.78	5.17	33-55	16.32	1.71	13-21	16.59	2.65	12-25
Combined Hungarian-American Families												
Demographic Variable	Fathers			Mothers			Sons			Daughters		
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
Age	45.6	6.29	31-60	42.22	7.36	27-58	15.53	3.50	7-23	15.07	3.81	5-30

Table 2.

Demographic Characteristics of the Family Sample (N=333); Religion and Marital Status in percentages

Demographic Variables	Hungarian Families (%)				American Families (%)				Combined Hungarian-American Families (%)			
	Fathers	Mothers	Sons	Daughters	Fathers	Mothers	Sons	Daughters	Fathers	Mothers	Sons	Daughters
Family Roles	22.50	23.90	26.80	26.80	23.60	28.80	24.60	23.00	23.10	26.70	25.50	24.60
Marital Status												
Single parent never married	0.00	3.00			2.20	1.80			1.30	2.30		
Married	96.80	84.80			95.60	81.80			96.10	83.00		
Divorced	0.00	3.00			0.00	9.10			0.00	6.80		
Separated	0.00	0.00			0.00	3.60			0.00	2.30		
Remarried	0.00	0.00			2.20	1.80			1.30	1.10		
Widowed	0.00	3.00			0.00	1.80			0.00	2.30		
Cohabiting	3.20	6.10			0.00	0.00			1.30	2.30		
Missing Information												
Religion												
Protestant	3.20	0.00	0.00	2.50	6.70	9.10	2.10	18.20	5.30	5.70	1.20	10.70
Catholic	25.80	30.30	39.50	35.00	2.20	5.50	4.30	6.80	11.80	14.80	21.20	19.00
Jewish	3.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.30	0.00	0.00	0.00
LDS	12.90	12.10	2.60	5.00	80.00	80.00	91.50	72.70	52.60	54.50	51.80	40.50
Eastern	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.40	1.80	2.10	0.00	2.60	1.10	1.20	0.00
No religion	48.40	39.40	55.30	50.00	6.70	3.60	0.00	2.30	23.70	17.00	23.50	26.20
Other	6.50	18.20	2.60	7.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.60	6.80	1.20	3.60

Demographic Characteristics of Hungarian and American Couples

There were 46 husbands and 55 wives in the Hungarian sample that filled out the couple questionnaire only or in addition to filling out the family questionnaire. They were matched primarily by age of husband with a corresponding number of American husbands and wives from the American database. Table 3 shows the demographic characteristics of the two samples in terms of age and length of relationship. Matching resulted in close mean values for age and length of relationship for both genders. The mean age of Hungarian and American husbands combined was 40.03 (SD=7.88; range=25-60). The mean age of Hungarian and American wives combined was 37.25 (SD=8.21; range=23-58). The mean length of relationship of Hungarian and American husbands combined was 14.64 (SD=8.85; range=0.5-38). The mean length of relationship of Hungarian and American wives combined was 14.52 (SD=8.89; range=0.5-38).

Both Hungarian and American couples were either married (89.10% of Hungarian husbands and 87.30% of Hungarian wives; and 93.50% of American husbands and 92.70% of American wives), or cohabiting (10.90% of Hungarian males and 12.70% of Hungarian females; and 6.50% of American males and 5.50% of American females). For simplicity, cohabiting partners are referred to as husbands and wives in this study. Table 4 shows the marital status and religious preferences of all participants in the combined Hungarian-American couple sample. Considering the prevalence of cohabitation in both cultures, it was surprising that very few cohabiting couples participated in the study.

In terms of religious affiliation, similarly to the family sample, almost half of the Hungarian couples indicated having no religion (husbands=43.50%; wives=41.80%). The second most widely indicated religious preference of Hungarian couples was LDS

Table 3.

Demographic Characteristics of the Couple Sample (N=202); Age; Length of Relationship

Demographic Variable	Hungarian Couples						American Couples					
	Males			Females			Males			Females		
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
Age	41.20	7.90	25-60	37.77	8.58	23-58	38.84	7.57	30-57	36.73	7.87	25-56
Length of relationship	14.13	8.9	0.5-38	14.27	9.14	0.5-38	15.13	8.87	1-36	14.79	8.71	1-36
Demographic Variable	Combined Hungarian-American Couples											
	Males			Females								
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range						
Age	40.03	7.88	25-60	37.25	8.21	23-58						
Length of relationship	14.64	8.85	0.5-38	14.52	8.89	0.5-38						

Table 4.

Demographic Characteristics of the Couple Sample (N= 202); Religion and Marital Status in percentages

Demographic Variables	Hungarian Couples (%)		American Couples (%)		Combined Hungarian-American Couples (%)	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
Gender						
Marital Status						
Married	89.10	87.30	93.50	92.70	91.30	90.00
Cohabiting	10.90	12.70	6.50	5.50	8.70	9.10
Missing information				1.80		0.90
Religion						
Protestant	4.30	1.80	23.90	21.80	14.10	11.80
Catholic	15.20	18.20	8.70	7.30	12.00	12.70
Jewish	2.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.10	0.00
LDS	26.10	21.80	37.00	32.70	31.50	27.30
Eastern	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
No religion	43.50	41.80	21.70	25.50	32.60	33.60
Other	8.70	14.50	8.70	10.90	8.70	12.70
Missing information		1.80		1.80		1.80

(husbands=26.10%; wives=21.80%), and the third was Catholic (husbands=15.20%; wives=18.20%). One-third of the American couples were of LDS affiliation (husbands=37.00%; wives=32.70%). One in five American couples indicated to have Protestant background (husbands=23.90%; wives=21.80%), or had no religious affiliation (husbands=21.70%; wives=25.50).

Instruments

Demographic Questionnaire (Hungarian sample)

Each individual in the Hungarian sample completed a brief demographic questionnaire (see Appendix I) which asked for information about age, gender, marital status, number of years in marriage or cohabiting relationship, and religious preference.

Family Implicit Rules Profile (FIRP)

The *Family Implicit Rules Profile* used in this study is an 85-item, Likert-type self-report instrument that identifies both facilitative and constraining implicit family process rules and the frequency of the occurrence of the various rules in the family (see Appendix A). The FIRP yields a total score and 5 subscale scores, three of which contain facilitative rules: (1) Kindness, (2) Expressiveness and Connection, and (3) Monitoring—and two of which consist of constraining or dysfunctional rules—(4) Inappropriate Caretaking of Parents and (5) Constraining Thoughts, Feelings, and Self. Subjects could receive a Total FIRP score that ranges from 85-425. Possible ranges for the Kindness, Expressiveness, Monitoring, Constraint, and Inappropriate Caretaking were 20-100, 15-75, 4-20, 40-200, and 6-30, respectively (see Scoring Guide in Appendix C). A high score means more facilitative rules, and a low score indicates more constraining rules.

The Kindness subscale includes items such as “Be sensitive to others,” “Be fair,” and “Be grateful.” The Expressiveness and Connection subscale includes rules such as

“Support each other,” “Be open with each other,” and “Share your feelings.” These rules provide for emotional closeness. The Monitoring subscale has items such as “Let family members know when you will be home,” “Check in with family members when you get home,” and “Let family members know who you are with.” The Inappropriate Caretaking of Parent subscale, which is reverse scored, includes items such as “Protect your father even when he does not deserve it” and “Protect your mother emotionally even if you have to sacrifice yourself.” Finally, the Constraining Thoughts, Feelings, and Self subscale, which is reverse scored, has items such as “If anyone is angry, it is your fault,” “Avoid pain at any cost,” and “You are only okay, if others approve of you.” This kind of rules tends to push families either toward disengagement or enmeshment impeding the healthy growth of the family.

Stoll (1999) reported that the content validity of the FIRP was assessed by having three expert judges evaluate each item according to how much they agreed it was an implicit process rule from a systemic viewpoint and according to how well the rule was worded. Gillett et al. (2005) stated that “All correlations except for the Inappropriate Caretaking subscale were in the expected direction and ranged from .58 to .74 indicating adequate concurrent validity for the FIRP.” Construct validity of the FIRP was evaluated using principle components factor analysis with orthogonal rotation, and stable factors were identified that correspond to the subscales with loadings ranging from .41 to .89 (Stoll, 1999). Gillett et al. (2005) also found that the test-retest coefficients were .94 for the total scale and ranged from .75 to .92 on individual subscales. Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for FIRP scores in this study ranged from .82 to .94 and split half reliability coefficients from .75 to .95” (Gillett et al., 2005, in press).

Couple Implicit Rules Profile (CIRP)

The Couple Implicit Rules Profile (CIRP) used in this study is an 85-item, Likert-type self-report instrument that identifies both facilitative and constraining implicit couple process rules and the frequency of the occurrence of the various rules within the couple relationship (see Appendix B). Similarly to the FIRP, the CIRP yields a total score and 5 subscale scores, three of which contain facilitative rules: (1) Kindness, (2) Expressiveness and Connection, and (3) Monitoring—and two of which consist of constraining or dysfunctional rules—(4) Inappropriate Caretaking of Partner and (5) Constraining Thoughts, Feelings, and Self. Subjects could receive a Total CIRP score that ranges from 85-425. Possible ranges for the Kindness, Expressiveness, Monitoring, Constraint, and Inappropriate Caretaking were 20-100, 15-75, 4-20, 40-200, and 6-30, respectively. A high score means more facilitative rules, and a low score indicates more constraining rules.

Similarly to the FIRP, the Kindness subscale includes items such as “Be friendly,” “Be gentle with each other,” and “Look for the best in each other.” The Expressiveness and Connection subscale includes rules such as “Make decisions together as a couple,” “Express what you think and feel,” and “Be affectionate.” The Monitoring subscale has items such as “Let your partner know when you will be home,” “Let your partner know who you are with,” and “Make sure your partner knows who your friends are.” The Inappropriate Caretaking subscale, which is reverse scored, includes items such as “Protect your partner even when he does not deserve it” and “Your partner should protect you emotionally even if he has to sacrifice himself.” Finally, the Constraining Thoughts, Feelings, and Self subscale, which is reverse scored, has items such as “Lie if necessary to keep marital secrets,” “Do whatever you have to do to look good to others,” and

“Being perfect is good.” Using data from this study, we calculated Cronbach’s alpha and split half reliability scores. The Cronbach’s alpha reliability scores ranged from .78 to .94, and the split half reliability coefficients ranged from .74 to .92.

The Hungarian Translation

The Family Implicit Rules Profile and the Couple Implicit Rules Profile were translated into Hungarian by the researcher, who is a bilingual native Hungarian with a baccalaureate degree from Brigham Young University (see Appendices D and E). Following Carroll’s recommendations (Carroll, 2001), the Hungarian translation was back-translated by two bilingual native Hungarian translators independently, who also have baccalaureate degrees from Brigham Young University and several years of translation experience as translators for the LDS Church. The Hungarian version was administered to three native Hungarians (two females and one male) for feedback on clarity, and then re-checked by the researcher and one of developers of the FIRP and the CIRP to ensure that the translation of all items was culturally relevant and comparable to the original meaning (see Appendix G).

The translation and the back-translation of most of the items were fairly void of difficulties. However, some of the items needed particular attention in terms of clarification of possible meanings for Americans and Hungarians. For example, item # 1 says: “Support each other.” In the context of family and couple relationships, Americans understand it as “Support each other emotionally.” Hungarians, on the other hand, would associate this rule more with financial support, so the word *emotionally* needed to be put into the phrase.

Furthermore, some of the items included idioms or phrases that were more common in the English language with their nuances in meaning to which the appropriate

Hungarian idioms or phrases needed to be found. For example, item # 77 says “Don’t grow, change, or in any way ‘rock your marital boat.’” The closest Hungarian phrase for the English idiom ‘to rock the boat’ was ‘to shake the ground.’ For more examples, see Table 5.

Table 5.

Original	Back Translation I	Back Translation II
Support each other	Support each other emotionally	Support each other emotionally
Be sensitive to each other	Be tactful with others	Be sensitive toward each other
Avoid pain at any cost	No matter what avoid emotional pain	Avoid emotional pain by all means
Be careful to say the right thing when you offer your opinion	When expressing your opinion, pay attention to saying what is expected	Pay attention to saying the right thing when expressing opinions
Your physical appearance is extremely important	The way I look is extremely important	My looks are extremely important
Meet each others expectations even if it’s not a good thing for you	Please your partner (meet your partner’s expectations), even if it is not good for you	Meet my spouse’s expectations even if it’s not good for me
Be gentle with each other	Be affectionate to each other	Be tender to each other
Get input from your partner about major decisions in your life	In major decisions of your life, ask for the opinion of your partner	Ask my spouse’s opinion in major life decisions
If your partner’s feelings are hurt, it is your fault	If your partner gets offended, it is your fault	If my spouse gets hurt it’s my fault
What your partner doesn’t know won’t hurt him/her	What my partner doesn’t know about, does not bother him/her	If my spouse doesn’t know it, it won’t become a problem
Don’t talk to your partner about things that make them uncomfortable	Do not talk about things with your partner that would make him/her feel embarrassed	Don’t talk to my spouse about things that would make him feel uncomfortable
Don’t inconvenience your partner	Do not embarrass your partner	Don’t trouble my spouse
Don’t let your partner know how you spend your money	Do not tell your partner how much money you have spent	Don’t tell my spouse what I spend money on
Don’t be direct	Do not be straightforward	Don’t be straightforward
Don’t blame others unfairly	Do not blame others incorrectly	Don’t blame others incorrectly

Don't grow, change, or in any way 'rock your marital boat	Do not improve, change or 'shake the ground' under your marriage in any way	Don't improve, change, or shake the grounds of my marriage
Don't call each other harmful names	Do not make bad comments about each other	Don't say anything bad to each other
Don't talk about anything that makes your partner feel uncomfortable	Do not talk about things that can be embarrassing for your partner	Don't talk about anything that would make my spouse feel uncomfortable
Don't trust yourself, your feelings, or your conclusions	Do not trust yourself, your feelings or your intuitions	Don't trust myself, my emotions or my conclusions
Don't have fun; don't be silly or enjoy life	Don't be cheerful, playful, or enjoy life	Don't be happy, don't be playful, and don't enjoy life
Don't mess up	Don't spoil anything	Don't make mistakes

Chapter IV

Results

Family Rules

Culture: Hungarian vs. American

The main hypothesis was that the Total FIRP score and the subscale scores would be different for Hungarian non-clinical and American non-clinical families. Two-by-four factorial analysis of variance was used to compare mean scores on the FIRP with nationality (Hungarian vs. American) as one factor and position in the family (father, mother, son and daughter) being the second factor. Six analyses were conducted using one of the six FIRP scores as the dependent variable in each analysis.

The primary hypothesis was partially supported. Results reported in Table 6 show that the means for the Total FIRP scale and for three subscales (Kindness Subscale, Constraining Thoughts, Feelings and Self Subscale, and Monitoring Subscale) were lower for Hungarian families than for American families, regardless of family position. Significant differences were reported for the Total FIRP Scale ($F = 38.30, p < .001$), Kindness Scale ($F = 68.06, p < .001$), Constraining Thoughts, Feelings, & Self Scale ($F = 15.23, p < .001$) and the Monitoring Scale ($F = 22.28, p < .001$) (See Appendix J for ANOVA Tables 10-15). No significant differences were found on the Expressiveness and Connection and Inappropriate Caretaking of Parents subscales. There was no significant interaction between nationality and family positions.

Family positions: Fathers vs. Mothers vs. Sons vs. Daughters

The second main hypothesis was that the Total FIRP score and the subscale scores would be different across positions in the family (father, mother, son or daughter). Hypothesis 2 was strongly supported. As can be seen in Table 5, family members'

Table 6.

Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranges for FIRP Scales for Group Type by Family Position.

Fam Memb	USA			Hungary			Marg. M
	M	SD	Range	M	SD	Range	
<i>Kindness Subscale***</i>							
Overall Mean	80.69	9.68	57-100	70.96	11.55	28-94	
Father	79.42	10.06	57-99	69.53	11.99	34-91	75.31 ^M
Mother	83.69	9.08	63-99	74.67	10.26	49-94	80.24 ^{F,S,D}
Son	78.55	8.64	58-96	70.20	10.28	43-88	74.81 ^M
Daughter	80.50	10.43	61-100	69.59	13.08	28-94	75.44 ^M
<i>Constraining Thoughts, Feelings, & Self Subscale***</i>							
Overall Mean	155.34	21.81	77-191	145.90	22.36	72-197	
Father	152.33	20.07	102-188	142.47	26.18	72-185	148.23 ^{M,D}
Mother	159.48	20.25	91-191	149.19	20.63	85-188	155.55 ^{F,S}
Son	146.71	25.38	77-191	142.97	21.52	98-177	145.04 ^{M,D}
Daughter	162.45	17.94	118-191	148.76	21.24	105-197	156.10 ^{F,S}
<i>Expressiveness and Connection Subscale</i>							
Overall Mean	58.89	9.99	25-75	58.71	11.15	19-75	
Father	57.13	9.93	36-75	57.09	10.76	26-74	57.12 ^M
Mother	63.22	8.31	40-75	62.29	8.83	33-75	62.86 ^{F,S,D}
Son	54.91	9.90	25-75	57.10	11.73	19-74	55.89 ^M
Daughter	59.52	10.16	32-72	58.50	12.35	22-74	59.05 ^M
<i>Inappropriate Caretaking of Parents Subscale</i>							
Overall Mean	10.99	4.52	4-20	10.73	4.66	4-20	
Father	11.43	3.96	4-20	10.61	4.65	4-20	11.09 ^S
Mother	12.53	4.36	4-20	11.70	4.72	4-20	12.21 ^{S,D}
Son	8.72	4.05	4-20	10.45	5.04	4-19	9.50 ^{F,M}
Daughter	11.05	4.91	4-20	10.25	4.28	4-20	10.67 ^M
<i>Monitoring Subscale***</i>							
Overall Mean	26.61	3.31	15-30	24.64	4.23	13-30	
Father	25.53	3.60	15-30	23.56	4.46	13-30	24.71 ^{M,D}
Mother	27.83	2.20	21-30	25.66	4.00	18-30	27.00 ^{F,S}
Son	26.09	3.42	15-30	24.59	3.98	17-30	25.42 ^M
Daughter	26.77	3.62	17-30	24.69	4.42	14-30	25.81 ^F
<i>Total FRP Scale***</i>							
Overall Mean	332.52	35.23	228-408	310.94	27.39	245-384	
Father	325.86	36.78	259-390	303.26	25.19	256-354	316.47 ^{M,D}
Mother	346.74	30.08	248-389	323.51	27.39	250-384	337.87 ^{F,S}
Son	314.99	34.61	228-375	305.31	26.87	245-365	310.66 ^{M,D}
Daughter	340.29	31.27	276-408	311.79	26.59	250-380	327.08 ^{F,S}

*** Significant at p<0.001 level.

^FMean score for father is significantly different (p<0.05) from score of family member on row.^MMean score for mother is significantly different (p<0.05) from score of family member on row.^SMean score for son is significantly different (p<0.05) from score of family member on row.^DMean score for daughter is significantly different (p<0.05) from score of family member on row.

reports on all subscales and the total FIRP scale were significantly different from each other. However, the argument that children's perceptions of implicit family rules would more closely resonate with mothers' perceptions than fathers' was not supported.

In terms of the Kindness Subscale, mothers perceived the family rules significantly different than anyone else in the family in both the Hungarian and the American samples (mothers & fathers, $p < 0.01$; mothers & sons, $p < 0.01$; mothers & daughters, $p < 0.05$, $F = 4.02$). Mothers scored significantly higher than fathers, sons and daughters. There were no significant differences between the perceptions of the rest of the family members.

In terms of the Constraining Thoughts, Feelings, & Self Subscale, Hungarian and American mothers and daughters saw the implicit family rules significantly different than fathers and sons (mothers & fathers, $p < 0.05$; mothers & sons, $p < 0.01$; daughters & fathers, $p < 0.05$; daughters & sons, $p < 0.01$ $F = 4.81$). Mothers and daughters scored higher on this subscale, indicating that they see the family as having less constraining thoughts and feelings than do the male family members.

In terms of Expressiveness and Connection, Hungarian and American mothers viewed the unspoken family rules significantly different than everybody else in the family (mothers & fathers, $p < 0.001$; mothers & sons, $p < 0.001$; mothers & daughters, $p < 0.05$, $F = 6.97$). Mothers scored significantly higher than the rest of the family meaning that they see the family as more expressive and connected than do other family members. There were no significant differences between the perceptions of the rest of the family members.

On the Inappropriate Caretaking of Parents Subscale, significant differences were found among several family members (fathers & sons, $p < 0.05$; mothers & sons, $p < 0.001$;

mothers & daughters, $p < 0.05$, $F = 4.55$) in both Hungarian and American families. In terms of Monitoring, significant differences were found among several family members in both cultures as well (fathers & mothers, $p < 0.001$; fathers & daughters, $p < 0.05$; mothers & sons, $p < 0.05$, $F = 4.95$).

ANOVA results for the Total FIRP Scale showed significant gender differences. Both Hungarian and American mothers and daughters perceived their implicit family rules differently from how fathers and sons saw them (mothers & fathers, $p < 0.001$; mothers & sons, $p < 0.001$; daughters & fathers, $p < 0.05$; daughters & sons, $p < 0.001$, $F = 11.35$). Both daughters and mothers saw their family rules in more positive light than sons and husbands.

Gender: Males vs. Females

The third main hypothesis was that there would be gender differences in perceptions of implicit family rules. The main effect of gender indicated whether there were significant differences between genders on any of the FIRP subscales and the total scale. Table 7 shows the means for the total FIRP score and the subscale scores. No interaction appeared between nationality and gender. The hypothesis was partially supported. Hungarian and American female family members scored significantly higher than the male family members on the total scale ($F = 28.711$, $p < 0.001$) and all five subscales (Kindness Subscale, $F = 7.449$, $p < 0.01$; Constraining Thoughts, Feelings, & Self Subscale, $F = 11.187$, $p < 0.001$; Expressiveness and Connection Subscale, $F = 15.568$, $p < 0.001$; Inappropriate Caretaking of Parents Subscale, $F = 5.045$, $p < 0.05$; and Monitoring, $F = 12.030$, $p < 0.001$). It appears that females in general view their families more positively than males.

Table 7.

Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranges for FIRP Scales for Group Type by Gender.

Gender	USA			Hungary			Marg. M
	M	SD	Range	M	SD	Range	
<i>Kindness Subscale***</i>							
Overall Mean	80.69	9.68	57-100	70.96	11.55	28-94	
Male	78.74	9.29	57-99	69.63	10.87	34-91	74.87**
Female	82.49	9.73	61-100	72.18	12.08	28-94	78.08**
<i>Constraining Thoughts, Feelings, & Self Subscale***</i>							
Overall Mean	155.34	21.81	77-191	145.90	22.36	72-197	
Male	149.69	23.08	77-191	143.20	23.47	72-185	146.93***
Female	160.59	19.23	91-191	148.37	21.15	85-197	155.36***
<i>Expressiveness and Connection Subscale</i>							
Overall Mean	58.89	9.99	25-75	58.71	11.15	19-75	
Male	56.08	9.96	25-75	56.86	11.21	19-74	56.41***
Female	61.51	9.33	32-75	60.41	10.89	22-75	61.04***
<i>Inappropriate Caretaking of Parents Subscale</i>							
Overall Mean	10.99	4.52	4-20	10.73	4.66	4-20	
Male	9.98	4.22	4-20	10.57	4.89	4-20	10.23*
Female	11.93	4.61	4-20	10.88	4.47	4-20	11.48*
<i>Monitoring Subscale***</i>							
Overall Mean	26.61	3.31	15-30	24.64	4.23	13-30	
Male	25.82	3.50	15-30	23.98	4.18	13-30	25.03***
Female	27.36	2.95	17-30	25.26	4.22	14-30	26.46***
<i>Total FRP Scale***</i>							
Overall Mean	332.52	35.23	228-408	310.94	27.39	245-384	
Male	320.30	35.91	228-390	304.24	26.32	245-365	313.48***
Female	343.87	30.63	248-408	317.10	27.07	250-384	332.42***

*** Significant at p<0.001 level.

** Significant at p<0.01 level.

* Significant at p<0.05 level.

Couple Rules

Culture: Hungarian vs. American

The first main hypothesis was that the total CIRP score and the subscale scores would be different for Hungarian non-clinical and American non-clinical couples. Two-by-two analysis of variance was used to compare mean scores on the CIRP with nationality (Hungarian vs. American) as one factor and gender (husband vs. wife) being the second factor. Six analyses were conducted using one of the six CIRP scores as the dependent variable in each analysis.

The primary hypothesis for couples was partially supported. Table 8 shows that the means for the Total CIRP scale and for four subscales (Kindness Subscale, Expressiveness and Connection Subscale, Inappropriate Caretaking of Partner Subscale and Monitoring Subscale) were lower for Hungarian couples than for American couples, regardless of gender. Four analyses using a 2 X 2 ANOVA yielded significant differences (Total CIRP Scale, $F = 42.446$, $p < 0.001$; Kindness Scale, $F = 72.210$, $p < 0.001$; Expressiveness and Connection Scale, $F = 33.170$, $p < 0.001$; and Monitoring Scale, $F = 22.301$, $p < 0.001$). Although statistically significant differences were found on the Inappropriate Caretaking of Partner Subscale ($F = 4.323$, $p < 0.05$), the actual difference was so small that it is probably not meaningful in practical terms. No significant differences were found on the Constraining Thoughts, Feelings and Self subscale. There was no interaction between nationality and gender (see Tables 16-22 in Appendix J).

Table 8.

Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranges for CIRP Scales for Group Type by Gender.

Couple	USA			Hungary			Marg. M
	M	SD	Range	M	SD	Range	
<i>Kindness Subscale***</i>							
Overall Mean	84.62	9.62	63-99	71.57	12.15	34-96	
Husband	85.00	8.79	66-99	70.35	12.08	34-91	77.67
Wife	84.31	10.33	63-99	72.60	12.21	35-96	78.45
<i>Constraining Thoughts, Feelings, & Self Subscale</i>							
Overall Mean	140.37	15.19	97-186	139.80	17.23	94-182	
Husband	135.77	14.02	97-166	138.67	16.47	105-182	137.22*
Wife	144.22	15.18	113-186	140.76	17.94	94-182	142.49*
<i>Expressiveness and Connection Subscale***</i>							
Overall Mean	67.51	7.29	45-75	60.54	10.05	27-75	
Husband	66.52	7.41	47-75	58.37	10.48	27-75	62.45*
Wife	68.35	7.15	45-75	62.36	9.38	33-75	65.35*
<i>Inappropriate Caretaking of Partner Subscale*</i>							
Overall Mean	7.05	1.90	5-12	7.84	3.49	3-15	
Husband	6.74	1.83	5-12	7.96	3.60	3-15	7.35
Wife	7.31	1.93	5-12	7.75	3.43	3-15	7.53
<i>Monitoring Subscale***</i>							
Overall Mean	27.43	2.62	20-30	24.99	4.50	11-30	
Husband	27.11	2.59	20-30	24.43	4.44	11-30	25.77
Wife	27.69	2.64	21-30	25.45	4.55	11-30	26.57
<i>Total CIRP Scale***</i>							
Overall Mean	326.99	25.80	257-394	304.75	23.07	253-357	
Husband	321.14	23.42	260-363	299.78	21.92	259-354	310.46**
Wife	331.88	26.87	257-394	308.92	23.37	253-357	320.40**

*** Significant at p<0.001 level.

** Significant at p<0.01 level.

* Significant at p<0.05 level.

Gender: Males vs. Females

The third main hypothesis was that there would be differences in perceptions of implicit couple rules across gender, regardless of nationality. This hypothesis was also partially supported. Table 8 shows that significant differences were found between mean scores of husbands and wives regardless of culture for the Total CIRP Scale ($F=8.537$, $p<0.01$) and for two subscales (Constraining Thoughts, Feelings, & Self Subscale, $F=5.413$, $p<0.05$; and Expressiveness and Connection Subscale, $F=5.620$, $p<0.05$). Husbands scored significantly lower on these scales. No significant differences were found on the Kindness, the Inappropriate Caretaking of Partner and the Monitoring subscales.

Marital Status: Married vs. Cohabiting

The fourth main hypothesis was that the total CIRP score and the subscale scores would be different across marital status (particularly married vs. cohabiting). Independent samples T-test was used to support this hypothesis. As Table 9 shows, this hypothesis was partially supported. Even though only about ten percent of the combined Hungarian-American couple sample lived in a cohabiting relationship, there was a significant difference in the mean Kindness Subscale scores ($F=11.69$, $p<0.001$) and the mean Monitoring Subscale scores ($F=9.064$, $p<0.05$). Married couples scored higher on both scales (see Table 22 in Appendix J).

Table 9.

Means and Standard Deviations for All CIRP Scales for Group Type by Marital Status.

	marital status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Kindness ***	married	183	78.3060	11.94283	.88284
	cohabitation	18	75.8889	19.62258	4.62509
Constraining	married	183	138.9392	15.51952	1.14724
	cohabitation	18	150.8333	19.32158	4.55414
Expressive	married	183	64.3169	9.08677	.67171
	cohabitation	18	60.7778	12.37434	2.91666
Inappropriate	married	183	7.3934	2.76126	.20412
	cohabitation	18	8.0556	3.53923	.83420
Monitoring *	married	183	26.3552	3.59174	.26551
	cohabitation	18	24.6111	6.01116	1.41684
Total CIRP	married	183	315.3108	26.74394	1.97697
	cohabitation	18	320.1667	28.19731	6.64617

*** Significant at $p < 0.001$ level.

** Significant at $p < 0.01$ level.

* Significant at $p < 0.05$ level.

Chapter V

Discussion

Culture: Hungarian vs. American

The findings of this study indicate that Hungarian families and couples differ from American families and couples in terms of unspoken family process and couple rules. In this study, non-distressed Hungarian and American families and couples were compared by the aid of a questionnaire (FIRP/CIRP) that was originally created in the United States, taking into consideration implicit family process rules prevalent in the European-American culture. Therefore, differences in the prevalence of these family rules between the Hungarian and American cultures were expected.

Kindness

Some of the findings resonated with the Keitner et al. (1990) study. They found that Hungarians viewed themselves as more direct and frank with each other and more likely to voice displeasure with each other than did North Americans. This present study found that Hungarian families and couples perceived fewer implicit family and couple rules in the home than American families that promoted kindness, such as “If you don’t have anything kind to say, don’t say anything” or “Look for the best in others.” Hungarian families tend to live by the rule of “What’s on my heart is on my lips,” which translated into English means that “I say what I think or feel.” Hungarians are indeed very frank and direct with others, including family members. It is a matter of honesty for them. Americans in general, on the other hand, tend to consider first the possible impact of their communications to others, and they give others the reason of the doubt more readily.

Expressiveness and Connection

In terms of expressiveness and connection, the findings of the present study were consistent with Keitner et al. (1990), in that no cross-cultural differences were found in the families' perception on unspoken family rules that govern affective involvement or responsiveness scores. However, significant difference was found in how couples viewed these implicit rules in intimate relationships. Hungarian couples perceived the particular unspoken rules included in the CIRP regarding connection and expressiveness in their love relationships less prevalent than American couples, such as "Ask my spouse's opinion in major life decisions" or "Encourage my spouse to share his/her feelings." It may be a future research topic worth to investigate as to what implicit couple rules may operate in intimate relationships in the Hungarian culture other than the ones prevalent in the American culture as represented in the questionnaire used in this study.

Constraining Thoughts, Feelings and Self

The present study contributes to the understanding of differences between the more individualistic American family and the more collectivistic Hungarian family. According to the Keitner et al. (1990) study, Hungarians were less likely to accept a person's individuality. Hungarian families tended to be over-involved with each other, while American family members reported a greater extent of self-centeredness in the family. Findings of this study indicated that Hungarians perceived having to constrain themselves, their thoughts and feelings in the family more than Americans did, if it was for the family unit. Constraining rules, such as "Listen to your parent if they complain about your other parent" or "Please others (meet the expectations of others), even if it is

not good for you,” seemed to be more prevalent for Hungarian families (but not couples) than for their American counterparts.

Monitoring

Unspoken rules regarding monitoring family members and spouses or partners were viewed as less prevalent by Hungarian families and couples than by Americans. Vazsonyi et al. (2002) found that Hungarian youths reported spending a much greater time with their families than all other adolescents in the USA, the Netherlands and Switzerland, thus they may require less parental monitoring. However, of all the above mentioned countries, Hungarian families and couples most likely have the more financial difficulties as well, and consequently adults and children may be less able to pursue their personal interests. In the demands of making their everyday living, Hungarian couples and parents may also have difficulty enforcing rules, such as “Tell your family when you will be coming home” or “Let my spouse know where I’m going.”

Family Position: Fathers vs. Mothers vs. Sons vs. Daughters

The finding in this study that the perceptions of implicit process rules between family members (fathers, mothers, sons and daughters) are different (regardless of nationality) is consistent with the findings of Stoll (2004) and Gillett et al. (2005, in press). It also resonates with studies that had found that children have different experiences with their fathers versus their mothers and that parents treat their sons and daughters differently (McHale et al., 2003).

Kindness, Expressiveness and Connection

In terms of kindness, expressiveness and connection, both Hungarian and American mothers were found to perceive the family to have more facilitative unspoken rules than did the rest of the family. They seemed to expect their families to “Be fair,”

“Be kind and compassionate” and “Be friendly.” Women tend to identify themselves more in terms of their family roles than men do, especially as mothers and wives (Philpot, 2001). Their life revolves more around their family as nurturing caregivers than does men’s in general as men spend more time outside the home. Therefore, mothers may expect more kindness and connection from their families or they may report their experience in a more positive way because they may take more responsibility for how their families are.

Constraining Thoughts, Feelings and Self

On the other hand, fathers and sons in both cultures viewed the family as having more constraining rules as to their thoughts, feelings and their own self. They felt expected to “[Be] responsible for how others feel,” “If [they] have problems or difficulties, [to] hide them or avoid them,” or “No matter what, [to] avoid emotional pain.” This finding seems to be consistent with gender-socialization theory: men are socialized, even in their families, to be tough and hide their feelings and solve problems rather than deal with vulnerable emotions because those are viewed as a sign of weakness (O’Neil et al., 1986). Implicit family rules seem to contribute to this gender-socialization trend.

Inappropriate Caretaking of Parents

Sons in both cultures indicated that they perceived the need to take care of their parents emotionally. They felt they needed to “Defend [their] mother, even if she does not deserve it” or “Even if it costs [them], provide [their] father with emotional protection.” According to the emotional security hypothesis (Cummings and Davies, 1996), children attempt to control parental emotionality and behaviors before disputes escalate and result in more serious, negative consequences for the family. Various forms

of caretaking roles, such as acting as a confidante, peacekeeper, protector and supporter in interparental difficulties, may be effective in reducing family stress and preserving children's security in the short-term (Davies, 2002). These caretaking roles, however, reflect considerable emotional investment, forethought, concern and preoccupation with complicated adult problems (Davies, 2002). Extensive caretaking of parents may result in parentification, where children comfort their parents emotionally and shape their own personalities to meet the expectations of their parents, thereby increasing the parents' self-esteem (Jones and Wells, 1996). The findings of this study suggest that sons may experience more of the need or demand to take care of their parents emotionally which in turn means security for the children (Byng-Hall, 2002), than do daughters. Future research is warranted to investigate what might make sons more vulnerable to emotional caretaking of parents than daughters.

Monitoring

In terms of monitoring family members, both Hungarian and American mothers perceived the most unspoken rules in the family. They may expect from their families that "When [they] have got home, let [their] family (her) know" or "Let [their] family members, especially your parents (her) know who [their] friends are." Fathers viewed these rules the least prevalent among family members, which may mean that they promoted more autonomy and independence in the family, which finding is consistent with gender power and socialization theories. As Gilligan (1982) pointed out in the context of gendered power, females are directed toward nurturance, relational orientation, and connectedness, and males toward achievement, autonomy, and separateness. Children's perceptions on monitoring family rules were in the middle between their mothers' and fathers' view points.

Gender: Males vs. Females

Gender was found to be a determinant factor in the perception of implicit family process rules in both the Hungarian and the American cultures. The findings may be explained by the gender socialization (Philpot, 2001) and gender power theories (Zuk, 1972, Gilligan, 1982, Hare-Mustin, 1991, Butler, 1995).

Women experienced their families having more facilitative rules that promoted healthy growth for the family in terms of showing kindness, affection and connection. Butler (1995) said that gender power inequalities base women's success in monitoring and attending to relationships, so men do not have to do that as much. Thus, women are by nature or by socialization more tuned into relationships than men are. They seem to value and expect more from relationships—especially from their families—than do men.

Gender power theory explains that society sanctions an imbalance of power in favor of men (Butler, 1995). Women, who typically have less power in society, construct their power most likely interactionally. It is more imperative for them to please others, and thus they attend more to relationships (Hare-Mustin, 1991). Relational orientation may be a self-protective response to powerlessness (Zuk, 1972).

Men in both cultures, on the other hand, perceived more constraining rules in their families and in their intimate relationships. Watts and Borders (2005) found that men felt societal pressure to avoid emotional expression. O'Neil et al.(1986) asserted that men in general experience conflict between work and family relations—difficulties balancing work-school and the need to spend time with their families—and conflict regarding success, power and competition which involves persistent worry about personal achievement, obtaining authority and comparing oneself with others. Men may look at

family and intimate relationships as a compromise to their autonomy, independence and individuality.

Marital Status: Married vs. Cohabiting

There has been no previous research on implicit relationship rule differences between married and cohabiting couples. The findings of this study contribute to what is already known about cohabiting versus marital relationships. The findings showed that married couples reported having more unspoken rules about being kind to each other, such as “Be nice and kind” and “Be tender to each other.” Furthermore, married couples monitored each other more than did couples who cohabited. Future research may be warranted to involve a greater sample size of cohabiting couples to examine implicit couple rules in cohabiting relationships.

Implications for Clinical Practice

As a result of this study, the *Family Implicit Rules Profile* and the *Couple Implicit Rules Profile* questionnaires will be available for clinical use in Hungarian for marriage and family therapists and other professionals working with families and couples in Hungary. Marriage and family therapists may use the questionnaires as an assessment tool and/or an intervention in various counseling settings, such as premarital counseling, couple counseling, family therapy, in cases of remarriage and blended families, interracial and international marriages, and in individual counseling as an aide to family-of-origin work, etc.

As this study has shown, there are significant cultural differences in family and couple relationship processes between Hungarian and European American families and couples. It is assumed that implicit family and couples rules across any two cultures may be significantly different as well. In this era of increased international relationships even

at the family level, as people marry into other cultures, the findings of this study may be invaluable for couples and families. It is essential for spouses and family members to learn about each other's cultural values, traditions, social and political background before and during their relationships in order to increase mutual understanding and respect for each other and enjoy satisfaction in their relationships. Implicit family and couples rules are an integral part of this learning process in interracial and international marriages and families.

The findings of this study suggest several significant tendencies of how family members may perceive their family and couple relationships depending on their position in the family and their gender, regardless of culture, that may be invaluable for clinical practice. Clinicians may bring the unspoken into the open by addressing implicit process rules in the family and/or couple relationship that may be more powerful than any one individual in the relationship. Once families and couples are aware of their relationship rules, they can change them more readily.

Limitations

The *Family Implicit Rules Profile* and the *Couple Implicit Rules Profile* were created in the United States including various unspoken family rules that are prevalent in the European-American culture. Although the list of items on the profiles is very exhaustive, this study did not include the possible unspoken family and couple rules that may exist in Hungarian families other than the ones in the two questionnaires. Even though the profiles were translated and edited by bilingual, native Hungarian translators to ensure that the items were culturally meaningful and relevant, some of the items may still be less prevalent in the Hungarian culture than in North-America which may have little to do with the quality of family functioning in that culture.

Another limitation was the small sample size, especially the lack of a representative number of cohabiting couples. Both the Hungarian and American samples were homogeneous making it difficult to apply the findings to other ethnic groups in the United States and Hungary.

Future Research

The psychometric evaluation of the Hungarian versions of the *Family Implicit Rules Profile* and the *Couple Implicit Rules Profile* is warranted to establish the construct validity, concurrent validity, and the test-retest reliability of the translations, using a greater sample size. Furthermore, in order to establish norms for the Hungarian measurement, future investigation may compare family and couple implicit rules between Hungarian clinical and non-clinical families and couples.

It may be a future research topic worth investigating as to what implicit family and couple rules may operate in family and intimate relationships in the Hungarian culture other than the ones prevalent in the American culture as represented in the questionnaires used in this study.

Future research may be warranted to investigate what might make sons vulnerable to emotional caretaking of parents more so than daughters.

Future research is warranted to involve a greater sample size of cohabiting couples to examine implicit couple rules in cohabiting relationships.

Future research may be conducted involving other ethnic groups living in the United States (Asian Americans, Native Americans, African Americans, Hispanics, Islanders, Arab Americans, etc.) and in Hungary (the various Roma tribes, etc.). It may also be worth to duplicate this study comparing another country to the United States and/or Hungary.

References

- Andrus-Parks, A. (1997). Family Rules From The Past. Unpublished master's thesis, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.
- Barber, B.K., & Buehler, C. (1996). Family cohesion and enmeshment: Different constructs, different effects. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 58, 433-441.
- Butler, M.H. (1995). Systems theory, gender, and power: Irreconcilable differences? Unpublished manuscript, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX.
- Byng-Hall, J. (2002). Relieving parentified children's burdens in families with insecure attachment patterns. *Family Process*, 41(2), 375-388.
- Carroll, J.S., Holman, T.B., Segura-Bartholomew, G., Bird, M.H. & Busby, D.M. (2001). Translation and validation of the Spanish version of the RELATE Questionnaire using a Modified approach for cross-cultural translation. *Family Process*, 40(2), 211-231.
- Cummings, E.M. & Davies, P. (1996). Emotional security as a regulatory process in normal development and the development of psychopathology. *Development and Psychopathology*, 8, 123-139.
- Darlington, M.T. (1996). The effects of unhealthy family of origin rules on the dating relationships of young adult. Unpublished master's thesis, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.
- Davies, P.T. (2002). Commentary: Conceptual links between Byng-Hall's Theory of parentification and the emotionl security hypothesis. *Family Process*, 41(3), 551-555.
- Epstein, N.B., Baldwin, L.M., & Bishop, D.S. (1983). The McMaster Family Assessment Device. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 9, 171-180.

- Epstein, N.B, Bishop, D.S, & Levin, S. (1978). The McMaster model of family functioning. *Journal of Marriage and Family Counseling*, 4, 19-31.
- Ford, F.R. (1983). Rules: The invisible family. *Family Process*, 22, 135-145.
- Ford, F.R. & Herrick, J. (1974). Family rules: Family life styles. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 44(1), 61-69.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gillet, K.S., Harper, J.M., Larson, J.H. & Rasmussen, K. (in press, 2005.). Implicit Family Process Rules in Eating-Disordered and Non-Eating-Disordered Families.
- Goldner, V. (1988). Generation and gender: Normative and covert hierarchies. *Family Process*, 27, 17-31.
- Gottman, J.M. (1994). *The Marriage Clinic: A Scientifically-Based Marital Therapy*. Norton Professional Books.
- Guo, J., Hawkins, J.D. & Hill, K.G. (2001). Childhood and adolescent predictors of alcohol abuse and dependence in young adulthood. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 62(6), 754-762.
- Gyorstájékoztató a Központi Statisztikai Hivatal Legfrissebb Adataiból (2006), 34.
<http://portal.ksh.hu/pls/ksh/docs/hun/xftp/gyor/nep/nep20512.pdf>
- Hare-Mustin, R.T. (1991). Sex, lies, and headaches: The problem is power. In T.J. Goodrich (Ed.), *Women and power: Perspectives for family therapy* (pp. 63-85). New York: Norton.
- Harper, J.M. (2005). Couples Implicit Rules Profile. Unpublished Manuscript. Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.

- Harper, J., & Hoopes, M. (1991). *Family Rules From the Past Questionnaire*.
Unpublished survey, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT.
- Harper, J.M, Stoll, R.W., & Larson, J.H. (in press). Development and psychometric properties of the Family Rules Profile.
- Higgins, M.P. (1998). Alcoholic families: The crisis of early recovery. *Family Therapy*, 25(3), 203-219.
- Jackson, D.D. (1965). The study of the family. *Family Process*, 4(1), 1-20.
- Johnston, J.C.& Zemitzsch, A. (1988). Family power: An intervention beyond the classroom. *Behavioral Disorders*, 14(1), 69-79.
- Jones, R.A. & Wells, M. (1996). An empirical study of parentification and personality. *American Journal of Family Therapy*, 24(2), 145-152.
- Keitner, G.I., Fodor, J. & Ryan, C.E. (1991). A cross-cultural study of major depression and family functioning. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 36(4), 254-259.
- Keitner, G.I., Ryan, C.E. & Fodor, J. (1990). A cross-cultural study of family functioning. *Contemporary Family Therapy: An International Journal*, 12(5), Special issue: First world conference of family therapy: II. 439-454.
- Larson, J.H., Parks, A.A., Harper, J.M., & Heath, V.A. (2001). A psychometric evaluation of the Family Rules From The Past questionnaire. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, 23(1), 83-103.
- Larson, J.H., Peterson, D. J., Heath, V. A. & Birch, P. (2000). The relationship between perceived dysfunctional family-of-origin rules and intimacy in young adult dating relationships. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 26, 161–175.

- Larson, J., Taggart-Reedy, M. & Wilson, S.M. (2001). The effects of perceived dysfunctional family-of-origin rules on the dating relationships of young adults. *Contemporary Family Therapy: An International Journal*, 23(4), 489-512.
- Marcussen, K. (2005). Explaining differences in mental health between married and cohabiting individuals. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 68(3), 239-257.
- McHale, S.M., Crouter, A.C. & Whiteman, S.D. (2003). Topic review: The family contexts of gender development in childhood and adolescent. *Social Development*, 12(1), 125-148.
- Mikulincer, M., Weller, A. & Florian, V. (1993). Sense of closeness to parents and family rules: A study of Arab and Jewish youth in Israel. *International Journal of Psychology*, 28(3), 323-335.
- Minuchin, S. (1974). *Families and family therapy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Minuchin, S. & Nichols, M.P. (1974). Structural family therapy. In Dattilio, F.M.(1998): *Case studies in couple and family therapy: Systemic and cognitive perspectives*, pp. 108-131. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Népmozgalom (2006). Központi Statisztikai Hivatal (KSH).
<http://portal.ksh.hu/pls/ksh/docs/hun/xftp/idoszaki/nepmozg/nepmoz05.pdf>
- Nuechterline, A.M (1993). *Families of alcoholics: A guide to healing and recovery*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress.
- Olson, D. H., Sprenkle, D. H., & Russell, C. S. (1979). Circumplex model of marital and family systems I: Cohesion and adaptability dimensions, family types, and clinical applications. *Family Process*, 18, 3–28.

- Olson, D. H. (1986). Circumplex model VII: Validation studies and FACES III. *Family Process, 25*, 337-351.
- O'Neil, J.M., Helms, B.J., Gable, R.K., David, L. & Wrightsman, L.S. (1986). Gender role conflict scale: College men's fear of femininity. *Sex Roles, 14*, 335-350.
- Peterson, D.J. (1995). The relationship between family of origin rules and intimacy in college students. Unpublished master's thesis, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.
- Phillips, A. & Scotchmer, J. (2005). *Bradt Hungary*. The Globe Pequot Press:USA.
- Philpot, C.L. (2001). Some day my prince will come. In McDaniel, S.H., Lusterman, D.D. & Philpot, C.L. (Eds). *Casebook for integrating family therapy: An ecosystemic approach*, (pp. 253-263). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Popenoe, D. & Dafoe Whitehead, B. (2002). *Should We Live Together? What Young Adults Need to Know About Cohabitation Before Marriage: A Comprehensive Review of Recent Research*. Rutgers, NY: Rutgers Marriage Center.
- Raymond-Jensen, S. (1993). The relationship between internalized shame and family-of-origin rules for adult women. Unpublished master's thesis, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.
- Riskin, J. (1963). Methodology for studying family interaction. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 8*(4), 343-348.
- Satir, V. (1972). *Peoplemaking*. Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books.
- Satir, V. (1988). *The new peoplemaking*. Mountain View, CA: Science and Behavior Books.
- Shackelford, T.K. & Mouzos, J. (2005). Partner killing by men in cohabiting and marital

- relationships: A comparative, cross-national analysis of data from Australia and the United States. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 20(10), 1310-1324.
- Stoll, R.W. (1999). Validity and Reliability of the Family Rules Profile. Unpublished master's thesis, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.
- Stoll, R.W. (2004). Family process rules in clinical and non-clinical families. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.
- Vazsonyi, A.T., Pickering, L.E., Belliston, L.M., Helsing, D. & Junger, M. (2002). Routine activities and deviant behaviors: American, Dutch, Hungarian and Swiss youth. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 18(4), 397-422.
- Watts, R.H. & Borders, D. (2005). Boys' perceptions of the male role: Understanding gender role conflict in adolescent males. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 13(2), 267-280.
- Zuk, G.R. (1972). Family therapy: Clinical hodgepodge or clinical science? *Journal of Marriage and Family Counseling*, 2, 229-304.

Appendix A

Family Implicit Rules Profile

Family Implicit Rules Profile

Instructions: The items below are about <i>unspoken</i> rules in your families. These rules do not have to be talked about to operate in families. When answering each item, please ask, How much has the unspoken rule, (insert rule) operated in my family during the last year? Then using the scale on the right put a check mark over the number that represents your answer. For example on number 1, please ask How much has the unspoken rule, (“Support each other”) operated in my family during the last year? If you believe it was most of the time, place a check on 5.	Never	Seldom	With Some Regularity	Often	Most of the Time
How much has the unspoken rule, (Insert rule from below) operated during the last year?					
1. Support each other.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Be open with each other.	1	2	3	4	5
3. If anyone is angry, it is your fault.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Be sensitive to others.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Stand up for others in the family.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Be fair.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Avoid pain at any cost.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Share your feelings.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Show physical affection within the family.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Encourage others to share their feelings.	1	2	3	4	5
How much has the unspoken rule, (Insert rule from below) operated during the last year?					
11. Be careful to say the right thing when you offer your opinion.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Your worth is dependent on how much acceptance you get from the opposite sex.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Talk things out; don't withdraw.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Be grateful.	1	2	3	4	5
15. If you have a problem or difficulty, face it head on.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Do things together.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Play, have fun together.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Share the happenings of your day with family members.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Looking good is what brings success and happiness.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Be in control of yourself at all times.	1	2	3	4	5
How much has the unspoken rule, (Insert rule from below) operated during the last year?					
21. Be kind and compassionate.	1	2	3	4	5
22. You are only okay if others approve of you.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Give others a chance to speak.	1	2	3	4	5
24. Rely on yourself--not on other family members.	1	2	3	4	5
25. Share as little information as possible with other family members.	1	2	3	4	5
26. You are responsible for how others feel.	1	2	3	4	5
27. Allow others to help you solve problems.	1	2	3	4	5
28. Talk to each other.	1	2	3	4	5
29. What you do is who you are.	1	2	3	4	5
30. Be friendly.	1	2	3	4	5
How much has the unspoken rule, (Insert rule from below) operated during the last year?					
31. Be affectionate.	1	2	3	4	5
32. Express what you think and feel.	1	2	3	4	5

33. Your physical appearance is extremely important.	1	2	3	4	5
34. Meet others' expectations even if it's not a good thing for you.	1	2	3	4	5
35. Be flexible enough to entertain others' views and opinions.	1	2	3	4	5
36. Rather than be who you are, act good, right, strong, or perfect.	1	2	3	4	5
37. If you talk to anyone about the family, you are being disloyal.	1	2	3	4	5
38. Make decisions together as a family.	1	2	3	4	5
39. Be gentle with others.	1	2	3	4	5
40. Lie if necessary to keep family secrets.	1	2	3	4	5

	Never	Seldom	With Some Regularity	Often	Most of the Time
--	-------	--------	----------------------	-------	------------------

How much has the unspoken rule, (Insert rule from below) operated during the last year?

41. Work out problems with other family members.	1	2	3	4	5
42. Look for the best in others.	1	2	3	4	5
43. If you have a problem or difficulty, hide it or avoid it.	1	2	3	4	5
44. Get input from other family members about major decisions in your life.	1	2	3	4	5
45. Make sure you maintain a positive family image at any cost.	1	2	3	4	5
46. Be supportive of others during difficult times.	1	2	3	4	5
47. Do whatever you have to do to look good to others.	1	2	3	4	5
48. If you can't say something nice, don't say anything at all.	1	2	3	4	5
49. Being perfect is good.	1	2	3	4	5
50. Let family members know who you are with.	1	2	3	4	5

How much has the unspoken rule, (Insert rule from below) operated during the last year?

51. Let family members know when you'll be home.	1	2	3	4	5
52. Check in with family members when you get home.	1	2	3	4	5
53. Let family members know where you are going.	1	2	3	4	5
54. If anyone's feelings are hurt, it is your fault.	1	2	3	4	5
55. Admit it when you are wrong.	1	2	3	4	5

Section B--Instructions: Rules 56-63 focus on your immediate family, NOT the family you grew up in. If you are a parent in your immediate family, you should approach each rule according to whether your children and spouse might consider it as operating. Example: On # 56, If you are the Mom and you think the rule for your children and your husband is “to protect you even if you don’t deserve it,” you might answer most of the time. On #67, if you are the Dad and you believe your children and wife “try not to upset you by expressing their feelings” , you would answer most of the time. On # 67, If you are the Mom and you believe you protect your husband by not expressing your feelings , you would answer most of the time.	Never	Seldom	With Some Regularity	Often	Most of the Time
How much has the unspoken rule, (Insert rule from below) operated during the last year?					
56. Protect your mother even when she doesn’t deserve it.	1	2	3	4	5
57. Regardless of whether he deserves it, protect your father.	1	2	3	4	5
58. Listen to a parent when they need to complain about the other parent.	1	2	3	4	5
59. Protect your father emotionally even if you have to sacrifice yourself.	1	2	3	4	5
60. Protect your mother emotionally even if you have to sacrifice yourself.	1	2	3	4	5
61. What your father doesn’t know won’t hurt him.	1	2	3	4	5
62. What your mother doesn’t know won’t hurt her.	1	2	3	4	5
63. Make sure family members, especially parents, know who your friends are.	1	2	3	4	5
64. How much has the unspoken rule “Don’t talk to your parents about things that make them uncomfortable” operated in the last year?	1	2	3	4	5
65. How much has the unspoken rule, “Don’t inconvenience a parent” operated in the last year?	1	2	3	4	5
66. How much has the unspoken rule “Never upset your mother by expressing your feelings” operated in the last year?	1	2	3	4	5
67. How much has the unspoken rule “Never upset your father by expressing your feelings” operated in the last year?	1	2	3	4	5

Section C--Instructions: Some unspoken rules in families are about NOT doing things. These rules usually begin with “ <i>Don’t</i> ” or “ <i>Never</i> ”, and because of this, they are more difficult to answer. To help you with this, the question is included with each rule.	Never	Seldom	With Some Regularity	Often	Most of the Time
68. How much has the unspoken rule “ <i>Don’t let other family members know how you spend your money</i> ” operated in last year?	1	2	3	4	5
69. How much has the unspoken rule “ <i>Don’t feel or talk about feelings</i> ” operated in the last year?	1	2	3	4	5
70. How much has the unspoken rule “ <i>Don’t think or talk about thoughts</i> ” operated in the last year?	1	2	3	4	5
71. How much has the unspoken rule “ <i>Don’t get close to people</i> ” operated in the last year?	1	2	3	4	5
72. How much has the unspoken rule “ <i>Don’t be direct</i> ” operated in the last year?	1	2	3	4	5
73. How much has the unspoken rule “ <i>Don’t blame others unfairly</i> ” operated in the last year?	1	2	3	4	5
74. How much has the unspoken rule “ <i>Don’t criticize</i> ” operated in the last year?	1	2	3	4	5
75. How much has the unspoken rule “ <i>Don’t be yourself; pretend to be someone you are not</i> ” operated in the last year?	1	2	3	4	5
76. How much has the unspoken rule “ <i>Don’t identify, talk about, or solve problems</i> ” operated in the last year?	1	2	3	4	5
77. How much has the unspoken rule “ <i>Don’t grow, change, or in any way ‘rock your family’s boat’</i> ” operated in the last year?	1	2	3	4	5
78. How much has the unspoken rule “ <i>Don’t call each other harmful names</i> ” operated in the last year?	1	2	3	4	5
79. How much has the unspoken rule “ <i>Don’t trust others, including family members</i> ” operated in the last year?	1	2	3	4	5
80. How much has the unspoken rule “ <i>Don’t talk about anything that makes family members feel uncomfortable</i> ” operated in the last year?	1	2	3	4	5
81. How much has the unspoken rule “ <i>Don’t talk about family relationships with other family members</i> ” operated in the last year?	1	2	3	4	5
82. How much has the unspoken rule “ <i>Don’t trust yourself, your feelings, or your conclusions</i> ” operated in the last year?	1	2	3	4	5
83. How much has the unspoken rule “ <i>Don’t use physical force with other family members</i> ” operated in the last year?	1	2	3	4	5
84. How much has the unspoken rule “ <i>Don’t have fun; don’t be silly or enjoy life</i> ” operated in the last year?	1	2	3	4	5
85. How much has the unspoken rule “ <i>Don’t mess up</i> ” operated in the last year?	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix B

Couples Implicit Rules Profile

Couples Implicit Rules Profile

Instructions: The items below are about *unspoken* rules in your relationship. These rules do not have to be talked about to operate. When answering each item, please ask, **How much has the unspoken rule, (insert rule) operated in my relationship?** Then using the scale on the right put a check mark over the number that represents your answer. For example on number 1, please ask **How much has the unspoken rule, (“Support each other”) operated in my relationship?** If you believe it was most of the time, place a check on 5.

Never	Seldom	With Some Regularity	Often	Most of the Time
-------	--------	-------------------------	-------	---------------------

How much has the unspoken rule, (Insert rule from below) operated in our relationship?

1. Support each other.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Be open with each other.	1	2	3	4	5
3. If your spouse is angry, it is your fault.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Be sensitive to each other.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Stand up for each other.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Be fair.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Avoid pain at any cost.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Share your feelings.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Show physical affection to each other.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Encourage your partner to share feelings.	1	2	3	4	5

How much has the unspoken rule, (Insert rule from below) operated in our relationship?

11. Be careful to say the right thing when you offer your opinion.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Your worth is dependent on how much acceptance you get from your partner.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Talk things out; don't withdraw.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Be grateful.	1	2	3	4	5
15. If you have a problem or difficulty, face it head on.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Do things together.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Play, have fun together.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Share the happenings of your day with each other.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Looking good is what brings success and happiness.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Be in control of yourself at all times.	1	2	3	4	5

How much has the unspoken rule, (Insert rule from below) operated during the last year?

21. Be kind and compassionate.	1	2	3	4	5
22. You are only okay if your partner approves of you.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Give your partner a chance to speak.	1	2	3	4	5
24. Rely on yourself--not on your partner.	1	2	3	4	5
25. Share as little information as possible with your partner.	1	2	3	4	5
26. You are responsible for how your partner feels.	1	2	3	4	5
27. Allow your partner to help you solve problems.	1	2	3	4	5
28. Talk to each other.	1	2	3	4	5
29. What you do is who you are.	1	2	3	4	5
30. Be friendly.	1	2	3	4	5

How much has the unspoken rule, (Insert rule from below) operated during the last year?					
31. Be affectionate.	1	2	3	4	5
32. Express what you think and feel.	1	2	3	4	5
33. Your physical appearance is extremely important.	1	2	3	4	5
34. Meet each others expectations even if it's not a good thing for you.	1	2	3	4	5
35. Be flexible enough to entertain your partner's views and opinions.	1	2	3	4	5
36. Rather than be who you are, act good, right, strong, or perfect.	1	2	3	4	5
37. If you talk to anyone about your marriage, you are being disloyal.	1	2	3	4	5
38. Make decisions together as a couple.	1	2	3	4	5
39. Be gentle with each other.	1	2	3	4	5
40. Lie if necessary to keep marital secrets.	1	2	3	4	5
	Never	Seldom	With Some Regularity	Often	Most of

How much has the unspoken rule, (Insert rule from below) operated during the last year?					
41. Work out problems with each other.	1	2	3	4	5
42. Look for the best in each other.	1	2	3	4	5
43. If you have a problem or difficulty, hide it or avoid it.	1	2	3	4	5
44. Get input from your partner about major decisions in your life.	1	2	3	4	5
45. Make sure you maintain a positive marital image at any cost.	1	2	3	4	5
46. Be supportive of each other during difficult times.	1	2	3	4	5
47. Do whatever you have to do to look good to others.	1	2	3	4	5
48. If you can't say something nice, don't say anything at all.	1	2	3	4	5
49. Being perfect is good.	1	2	3	4	5
50. Let your partner know who you are with.	1	2	3	4	5

How much has the unspoken rule, (Insert rule from below) operated during the last year?					
51. Let your partner know when you'll be home.	1	2	3	4	5
52. Check in with your partner when you get home.	1	2	3	4	5
53. Let your partner know where you are going.	1	2	3	4	5
54. If your partner's feelings are hurt, it is your fault.	1	2	3	4	5
55. Admit it when you are wrong.	1	2	3	4	5

Section B--Instructions: Rules 56-63 focus on your immediate family, **NOT** the family you grew up in. If you are a parent in your immediate family, you should approach each rule according to whether your children and spouse might consider it as operating. **Example:** On # 56, If you are the Mom and you think the rule for your children and your husband is **“to protect you even if you don’t deserve it,”** you might answer most of the time. On #67, if you are the Dad and you believe your children and wife **“try not to upset you by expressing their feelings”**, you would answer most of the time. On # 67, If you are the Mom and you believe you **protect your husband by not expressing your feelings**, you would answer most of the time.

Never
Seldom
With Some
Regularity
Often
Most of
the Time

How much has the unspoken rule, (Insert rule from below) operated during the last year?

56. Protect your partner even when s/he doesn’t deserve it.	1	2	3	4	5
57. Leave Blank.	1	2	3	4	5
58. Listen to your partner when they need to complain even if you don’t have time.	1	2	3	4	5
59. Protect your partner emotionally even if you have to sacrifice yourself.	1	2	3	4	5
60. Leave Blank.	1	2	3	4	5
61. What your partner doesn’t know won’t hurt him/her.	1	2	3	4	5
62. Leave Blank.	1	2	3	4	5
63. Make sure your partner knows who your friends are.	1	2	3	4	5
64. How much has the unspoken rule “Don’t talk to your partner about things that make them uncomfortable” operated?	1	2	3	4	5
65. How much has the unspoken rule, “Don’t inconvenience your partner” operated?	1	2	3	4	5
66. How much has the unspoken rule “Never upset your partner by expressing your feelings” operated?	1	2	3	4	5
67. Leave Blank	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix C
Scoring Guide

For each numbered item, fill in the score from the FIRP/CIRP. For items from the Constraining Thoughts, Feelings and Self and Inappropriate Caretaking of Parents/Partners subscales, reverse score according to the following formula: Subtract the item raw score from 6 = reverse score. Enter reverse score on scoring sheet. The Total Score is the sum of the subscale scores.

Kindness	Constraining Thoughts Feelings and Self	Expressiveness and connection	Inappropriate Caretaking	Monitoring
	(reversed scoring)		(reversed scoring)	

Item number	Item number	Item number	Item number	Item number
4. _____	3. _____	1. _____	56. _____	50. _____
5. _____	7. _____	2. _____	57. _____	51. _____
6. _____	11. _____	8. _____	59. _____	52. _____
14. _____	12. _____	9. _____	60. _____	53. _____
15. _____	19. _____	10. _____		63. _____
20. _____	22. _____	13. _____		68. reversed scoring _____
21. _____	24. _____	16. _____		
23. _____	25. _____	17. _____		
30. _____	26. _____	18. _____		
35. _____	29. _____	27. _____		
39. _____	33. _____	28. _____		
41. _____	34. _____	31. _____		
42. _____	36. _____	32. _____		
46. _____	37. _____	38. _____		
48. _____	40. _____	44. _____		
55. _____	43. _____			
73. _____	45. _____			
74. _____	47. _____			
78. _____	49. _____			
83. _____	54. _____			
	58. _____			
	61. _____			
	62. _____			
	64. _____			
	65. _____			
	66. _____			
	67. _____			
	69. _____			
	70. _____			
	71. _____			
	72. _____			
	75. _____			

76. _____
77. _____
79. _____
80. _____
81. _____
82. _____
84. _____
85. _____

Subtotal _____ Subtotal _____ Subtotal _____ Subtotal _____ Subtotal _____

Total: _____

Appendix D

Family Implicit Rules Profile (Hungarian)

Íratlan Családi Szabályok Kérdőív

	Soha	Ritkán	Rendszeresen	Gyakran	Legtöbbször
<p>Kitöltési Útmutató: Az alábbi pontok az Ön családjában előforduló <i>íratlan</i> szabályokról adnak képet. Ezek a szabályok családokban működnek anélkül, hogy a családtagok beszélnének róluk. Az egyes pontokra való válaszadás közben, kérjük, kérdezze meg magától: Az adott íratlan szabály (helyettesítse be a szabályt) milyen sűrűn fordult elő a családban az elmúlt egy év alatt? Majd a jobb oldalon található táblázatot használva jelölje meg a válaszának leginkább megfelelő számot. Például az első pontban, kérjük, kérdezze meg magától: Az adott íratlan szabály (“Támogassuk egymást érzelmileg!”) milyen sűrűn fordult elő a családban az elmúlt egy év alatt? Ha úgy gondolja, hogy ez legtöbbször előfordult, akkor jelölje meg az 5-ös számot.</p>					
<p>Az adott íratlan szabály (helyettesítse be a megfelelő pontot) milyen sűrűn fordult elő a családban az elmúlt egy év alatt?</p>					
1. Támogassuk egymást érzelmileg!	1	2	3	4	5
2. Legyünk nyíltak egymással!	1	2	3	4	5
3. Ha valaki mérges, az az én hibám.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Legyünk érzékenyek mások iránt!	1	2	3	4	5
5. Álljunk ki egymásért a családban!	1	2	3	4	5
6. Legyünk korrektek!	1	2	3	4	5
7. Mindenáron kerüljük az érzelmi fájdalmat!	1	2	3	4	5
8. Osszuk meg az érzéseinket!	1	2	3	4	5
9. Mutassuk ki fizikailag a szeretetünket a családon belül!	1	2	3	4	5
10. Bízassunk másokat, hogy osszák meg az érzéseiket!	1	2	3	4	5
<p>Az adott íratlan szabály (helyettesítse be a megfelelő pontot) milyen sűrűn fordult elő a családban az elmúlt egy év alatt?</p>					
11. Figyeljek arra, hogy vélemény-kinyilvánításkor a helyes dolgot mondjam!	1	2	3	4	5
12. Az én értékem attól függ, hogy mennyire vagyok elfogadott a másik nem szemében.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Beszéljük meg a dolgokat; ne vonuljak vissza!	1	2	3	4	5
14. Legyünk hálásak!	1	2	3	4	5
15. Ha problémám vagy nehézségem van, nézzek szembe vele!	1	2	3	4	5
16. Csináljunk együtt dolgokat!	1	2	3	4	5
17. Játsszunk, szórakozzunk együtt!	1	2	3	4	5
18. Osszuk meg a nap történéseit a család többi tagjával!	1	2	3	4	5
19. Kívülről jónak látszani sikerhez és boldogsághoz vezet.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Mindig tanúsítsak önuralmat!	1	2	3	4	5
<p>Az adott íratlan szabály (helyettesítse be a megfelelő pontot) milyen sűrűn fordult elő a családban az elmúlt egy év alatt?</p>					
21. Legyünk kedvesek és jószívűek!	1	2	3	4	5
22. Csak akkor vagyok rendben, ha mások elismernek.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Adjunk másoknak lehetőséget, hogy beszéljenek!	1	2	3	4	5
24. Magamra támaszkodjak—ne a család többi tagjára!	1	2	3	4	5
25. Lehetőleg minél kevesebb információt osszunk meg a család többi tagjával!	1	2	3	4	5
26. Felelős vagyok azért, hogy mások hogyan érzik magukat.	1	2	3	4	5
27. Engedjem, hogy mások segítsenek a problémák megoldásában!	1	2	3	4	5
28. Beszélgessünk egymással!	1	2	3	4	5

29. A cselekedeteim határozzák meg, hogy ki vagyok.	1	2	3	4	5
30. Legyünk barátságosak!	1	2	3	4	5
Az adott íratlan szabály (helyettesítse be a megfelelő pontot) milyen sűrűn fordult elő a családban az elmúlt egy év alatt?					
31. Legyünk szeretőek!	1	2	3	4	5
32. Mutassuk ki azt, amit gondolunk és érzünk!	1	2	3	4	5
33. A külsőm kimondhatatlanul fontos!	1	2	3	4	5
34. Feleljek meg mások elvárásainak még akkor is, ha az nekem nem jó!	1	2	3	4	5
35. Legyünk eléggé rugalmasak ahhoz, hogy elfogadjuk mások nézőpontját és véleményét!	1	2	3	4	5
36. Ahelyett, hogy saját magamat adom, viselkedjek jól, helyesen, legyek erős és tökéletes!	1	2	3	4	5
37. Ha bárkivel beszélek a családról, akkor nem vagyok lojális a családhoz	1	2	3	4	5
38. A család együtt hozza meg a döntéseket!	1	2	3	4	5
39. Legyünk gyengédek egymással!	1	2	3	4	5
40. Ha kell hazudjunk, hogy megtartsuk a családi titkokat!	1	2	3	4	5
	Soha	Ritkán	Rendszeresen	Gyakran	Legtöbbször
Az adott íratlan szabály (helyettesítse be a megfelelő pontot) milyen sűrűn fordult elő a családban az elmúlt egy év alatt?					
41. Oldjunk meg problémákat a család többi tagjával!	1	2	3	4	5
42. A legjobbat keressük másokban!	1	2	3	4	5
43. Ha problémám vagy nehézségem van, takarjam el vagy kerüljem el!	1	2	3	4	5
44. Az életem főbb döntéseinél kérjem ki a családtagok véleményét!	1	2	3	4	5
45. Bármilyen áron őrizzem meg a család pozitív arculatát!	1	2	3	4	5
46. Nehéz időkben támogassuk egymást!	1	2	3	4	5
47. Kövessek el mindent, hogy mások szemében jónak látszódjak!	1	2	3	4	5
48. Ha nem tudok valami kedveset mondani, akkor ne is mondjak semmit!	1	2	3	4	5
49. Tökéletesnek lenni jó!	1	2	3	4	5
50. Mondjam meg a családtagoknak, hogy kivel vagyok!	1	2	3	4	5
Az adott íratlan szabály (helyettesítse be a megfelelő pontot) milyen sűrűn fordult elő a családban az elmúlt egy év alatt?					
51. Mondjam meg a családtagoknak, hogy mikor jövök haza!	1	2	3	4	5
52. Szóljak a családtagoknak, amikor hazaértem!	1	2	3	4	5
53. Tudassam a családtagokkal, hogy hova megyek!	1	2	3	4	5
54. Ha valaki megbántódik, az az én hibám.	1	2	3	4	5
55. Ismerjem be, amikor nincs igazam!	1	2	3	4	5

B rész—Útmutató: Az 56-67. pontban található szabályok a mostani családjára vonatkoznak, NEM arra családra, ahol felnőtt. Ha Ön szülő a mostani családjában, akkor úgy tekintsen az egyes szabályokra, ahogy azok a gyermekei és házastársa szerint működhetnek. Például: Az 56-os pontban, ha Ön az anyuka, és úgy gondolja, hogy a gyermekei és a férje számára az a szabály, hogy “Őnt akkor is megvédjék, amikor Ön azt nem érdemli meg” , akkor válaszolja azt, hogy legtöbbször. A 67-es pontban, ha Ön az apuka, és úgy gondolja, hogy a gyermekei és felesége “nem mutatják ki az érzéseiket, nehogy megharagítsák Önt” , akkor válaszolja azt, hogy legtöbbször. A 67-es pontban, ha Ön az anyuka, és úgy gondolja, hogy “megvédi a férjét azáltal, hogy nem mutatja ki az érzéseit” , akkor válassza a <i>Legtöbbször</i> rubrikát.	Soha	Ritkán	Rendszeresen	Gyakran	Legtöbbször
Az adott íratlan szabály (helyettesítse be a megfelelő pontot) milyen sűrűn fordult elő a családjában az elmúlt egy év alatt?					
56. Védd meg az édesanyádat, még akkor is, ha nem érdemli meg!	1	2	3	4	5
57. Függetlenül attól, hogy megérdemli-e, védd meg az édesapádat!	1	2	3	4	5
58. Hallgasd meg a szülődet, ha a másik szülődről panaszodik!	1	2	3	4	5
59. Még áldozatok árán is védd meg érzelmileg az édesapádat!	1	2	3	4	5
60. Még áldozatok árán is védd meg érzelmileg az édesanyádat!	1	2	3	4	5
61. Amit édesapád nem tud, abból legalább nem csinál problémát.	1	2	3	4	5
62. Amit édesanyád nem tud, abból legalább nem csinál problémát.	1	2	3	4	5
63. Tudasd a családtagokkal, főleg a szüleiddel, hogy kik a barátaid!	1	2	3	4	5
64. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “Ne beszélj olyan dolgokról a szüleiddel, amitől kényelmetlenül éreznék magukat!” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben?	1	2	3	4	5
65. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “Ne okozz kellemetlenséget a szülőnek!” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben?	1	2	3	4	5
66. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “Soha ne haragítsd meg az édesanyádat azzal, hogy kimutatod az érzéseidet!” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben?	1	2	3	4	5
67. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “Soha ne haragítsd meg az édesapádat azzal, hogy kimutatod az érzéseidet!” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben?	1	2	3	4	5

C rész— Útmutató: Vannak íratlan szabályok a családokban, amelyek arról szólnak, hogy NE csináljanak bizonyos dolgokat. Ezek a szabályok úgy kezdődnek, hogy “ <i>Ne</i> ” vagy “ <i>Soha</i> ”, és ebből kifolyólag nehezebb rájuk válaszolni. Ezért segítségül mindegyik szabályhoz külön hozzáfűztük a kérdést.	Soha	Ritkán	Rendszeresen	Gyakran	Legtöbbször
68. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “ <i>Ne mondd meg a család többi tagjának, hogy mire költöd a pénzt!</i> ” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben?	1	2	3	4	5
69. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “ <i>Ne érezz vagy ne beszélj érzésekről!</i> ” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben?	1	2	3	4	5
70. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “ <i>Ne gondolkozz vagy ne beszélj a gondolataidról!</i> ” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben?	1	2	3	4	5
71. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “ <i>Ne kerülj közel emberekhez!</i> ” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben?	1	2	3	4	5
72. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “ <i>Ne légy egyenes!</i> ” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben?	1	2	3	4	5
73. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “ <i>Ne hibáztass másokat inkorrektül!</i> ” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben?	1	2	3	4	5
74. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “ <i>Ne kritizálj!</i> ” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben?	1	2	3	4	5
75. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “ <i>Ne légy önmagad; csinálj úgy, mintha másmilyen lennél!</i> ” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben?	1	2	3	4	5
76. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “ <i>Ne vedd észre problémákat, ne beszélj róluk, vagy ne oldd meg őket!</i> ” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben?	1	2	3	4	5
77. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “ <i>Ne fejlődj, ne változz, vagy semmiféle módon ne ‘rengesd meg a talajt’ a családod alatt!</i> ” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben?	1	2	3	4	5
78. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “ <i>Ne illessétek egymást bántó nevekkkel!</i> ” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben?	1	2	3	4	5
79. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “ <i>Ne bízz másokban, beleértve a családtagokat!</i> ” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben?	1	2	3	4	5
80. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “ <i>Ne beszélj semmi olyasmiről, amitől a családtagok kényelmetlenül éreznék magukat!</i> ” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben?	1	2	3	4	5
81. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “ <i>Ne beszélj családi kapcsolatokról a család többi tagjával!</i> ” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben?	1	2	3	4	5
82. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “ <i>Ne bízz magadban, az érzéseidben vagy a következtetéseidben!</i> ” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben?	1	2	3	4	5
83. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “ <i>Ne használj testi erőt a család többi tagjával szemben!</i> ” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben?	1	2	3	4	5
84. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “ <i>Ne légy vidám, ne légy játékos, vagy ne élvezd az életet!</i> ” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben?	1	2	3	4	5
85. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “ <i>Ne hibázz!</i> ” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben?	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix E

Couple Implicit Rules Profile (Hungarian)

Íratlan Házaspár Szabályok Kérdőív

Kitöltési Útmutató: Az alábbi pontok az Ön kapcsolatában előforduló <i>íratlan</i> szabályokról adnak képet. Ezek a szabályok anélkül működnek, hogy beszélnének róluk. Az egyes pontokra való válaszadás közben, kérjük, kérdezze meg magától: Az adott íratlan szabály (helyettesítse be a szabályt) milyen sűrűn fordult elő a kapcsolatomban az elmúlt egy év alatt? Majd a jobb oldalon található táblázatot használva jelölje meg a válaszában leginkább megfelelő számot. Például az első pontban, kérjük, kérdezze meg magától: Az adott íratlan szabály (“Támogassuk egymást érzelmileg!”) milyen sűrűn fordult elő a kapcsolatomban az elmúlt egy év alatt? Ha úgy gondolja, hogy ez legtöbbször előfordult, akkor jelölje meg az 5-ös számot.	Soha	Ritkán	Rendszeresen	Gyakran	Legtöbbször
Az adott íratlan szabály (helyettesítse be a megfelelő pontot) milyen sűrűn fordult elő a kapcsolatunkban az elmúlt egy év alatt?					
1. Támogassuk egymást érzelmileg!	1	2	3	4	5
2. Legyünk nyíltak egymással!	1	2	3	4	5
3. Ha a házastársam mérges, az az én hibám!	1	2	3	4	5
4. Legyünk érzékenyek egymás iránt!	1	2	3	4	5
5. Álljunk ki egymásért!	1	2	3	4	5
6. Legyünk korrektek!	1	2	3	4	5
7. Mindenáron kerüljük az érzelmi fájdalmat!	1	2	3	4	5
8. Osszuk meg az érzéseinket!	1	2	3	4	5
9. Mutassuk ki fizikailag a szeretetünket a másik felé!	1	2	3	4	5
10. Bízassam a páromat arra, hogy ossza meg az érzéseit!	1	2	3	4	5
Az adott íratlan szabály (helyettesítse be a megfelelő pontot) milyen sűrűn fordult elő a kapcsolatunkban az elmúlt egy év alatt?					
11. Figyeljek arra, hogy vélemény-kinyilvánításkor a helyes dolgot mondjam!	1	2	3	4	5
12. Az én értékem attól függ, hogy mennyire ismer el a párom.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Beszéljük meg a dolgokat; ne vonuljak vissza!	1	2	3	4	5
14. Legyünk hálásak!	1	2	3	4	5
15. Ha problémám vagy nehézségem van, nézzek szembe vele!	1	2	3	4	5
16. Csináljunk együtt dolgokat!	1	2	3	4	5
17. Játsszunk, szórakozzunk együtt!	1	2	3	4	5
18. Osszuk meg a nap történéseit egymással!	1	2	3	4	5
19. Kívülről jónak látszani sikerhez és boldogsághoz vezet.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Mindig tanúsítsak önuralmat!	1	2	3	4	5
Az adott íratlan szabály (helyettesítse be a megfelelő pontot) milyen sűrűn fordult elő a kapcsolatunkban az elmúlt egy év alatt?					
21. Legyünk kedvesek és jószívűek!	1	2	3	4	5
22. Csak akkor vagyok rendben, ha a párom elismer.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Adjak a páromnak lehetőséget, hogy beszéljen!	1	2	3	4	5
24. Magamra támaszkodjak—ne a páromra!	1	2	3	4	5
25. Lehetőleg minél kevesebb információt osszak meg a párommal!	1	2	3	4	5
26. Felelős vagyok azért, hogy a párom hogyan érzi magát.	1	2	3	4	5
27. Engedjem, hogy a párom segítsen a problémák megoldásában!	1	2	3	4	5
28. Beszélgessünk egymással!	1	2	3	4	5

29. A cselekedeteim határozzák meg, hogy ki vagyok.	1	2	3	4	5
30. Legyünk barátságosak!	1	2	3	4	5
31. Legyünk szeretőek!	1	2	3	4	5
	Soha	Ritkán	Rendszeresen	Gyakran	Legtöbbször
Az adott íratlan szabály (helyettesítse be a megfelelő pontot) milyen sűrűn fordult elő a kapcsolatunkban az elmúlt egy év alatt?					
32. Mutassuk ki azt, amit gondolunk és érzünk!	1	2	3	4	5
33. A külsőm kimondhatatlanul fontos!	1	2	3	4	5
34. Feleljek meg a párom elvárásainak még akkor is, ha az nekem nem jó!	1	2	3	4	5
35. Legyek eléggé rugalmas ahhoz, hogy elfogadjam a párom nézőpontját és véleményét!	1	2	3	4	5
36. Ahelyett, hogy saját magamat adjam, viselkedjek jól, helyesen, legyek erős és tökéletes!	1	2	3	4	5
37. Ha bárkivel beszélek a házasságomról, akkor nem vagyok lojális!	1	2	3	4	5
38. Hozzunk együtt döntéseket!	1	2	3	4	5
39. Legyünk gyengédek egymással!	1	2	3	4	5
40. Ha kell, hazudjunk, hogy megtartsuk a házasságunk titkait!	1	2	3	4	5
Az adott íratlan szabály (helyettesítse be a megfelelő pontot) milyen sűrűn fordult elő a kapcsolatunkban az elmúlt egy év alatt?					
41. Oldjunk meg problémákat egymással!	1	2	3	4	5
42. A legjobbat keressük a másikban!	1	2	3	4	5
43. Ha problémám vagy nehézségem van, rejtsem el vagy kerüljem el!	1	2	3	4	5
44. Az életem főbb döntéseinél kérjem ki a párom véleményét!	1	2	3	4	5
45. Bármilyen áron őrizzem meg a házasságom pozitív arcúlatát!	1	2	3	4	5
46. Nehéz időkben támogassuk egymást!	1	2	3	4	5
47. Kövessek el mindent, hogy mások szemében jónak látszódjak!	1	2	3	4	5
48. Ha nem tudok valami kedveset mondani, akkor ne is mondjak semmit	1	2	3	4	5
49. Tökéletesnek lenni jó!	1	2	3	4	5
50. Mondjam meg a páromnak, hogy kivel vagyok!	1	2	3	4	5
Az adott íratlan szabály (helyettesítse be a megfelelő pontot) milyen sűrűn fordult elő a kapcsolatunkban az elmúlt egy év alatt?					
51. Mondjam meg a páromnak, hogy mikor jövök haza!	1	2	3	4	5
52. Szóljak a páromnak, amikor hazaértem!	1	2	3	4	5
53. Tudassam a párommal, hogy hova megyek!	1	2	3	4	5
54. Ha a párom megbántódik, az az én hibám.	1	2	3	4	5
55. Ismerjem be, amikor nincs igazam!	1	2	3	4	5

	Soha	Ritkán	Rendszeresen	Gyakran	Legtöbbször
Az adott íratlan szabály (helyettesítse be a megfelelő pontot) milyen sűrűn fordult elő a kapcsolatunkban az elmúlt egy év alatt?					
56. Védjem meg a páromat még akkor is, ha nem érdemli meg!	1	2	3	4	5
57. A párom akkor is védjen meg, amikor nem érdemlem meg!	1	2	3	4	5
58. Hallgassam meg a páromat, amikor panaszkodik, még akkor is, ha nincs rá időm!	1	2	3	4	5
59. Még áldozatok árán is védjem meg érzelmileg a páromat!	1	2	3	4	5
60. A párom még áldozatok árán is védjen meg engem érzelmileg!	1	2	3	4	5
61. Amiről a párom nem tud, abból nem csinál problémát.	1	2	3	4	5
62. Amit a párom nem tudat velem, abból legalább nem csinálok problémát.	1	2	3	4	5
63. Tudassam a páromal, hogy kik a barátaim!	1	2	3	4	5

B rész— Útmutató: Vannak íratlan szabályok házasságokban, amelyek arról szólnak, hogy NE csináljanak bizonyos dolgokat. Ezek a szabályok úgy kezdődnek, hogy “ <i>Ne</i> ” vagy “ <i>Soha</i> ”, és ebből kifolyólag nehezebb rájuk válaszolni. Ezért segítségül mindegyik szabályhoz külön hozzáfűztük a kérdést.	Soha	Ritkán	Rendszeresen	Gyakran	Legtöbbször
64. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “ <i>Ne beszéljek olyan dolgokról a párommal, amitől kényelmetlenül érezné magát!</i> ” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben a kapcsolatunkban?	1	2	3	4	5
65. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “ <i>Ne okozzak kellemetlenséget a páromnak!</i> ” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben a kapcsolatunkban?	1	2	3	4	5
66. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “ <i>Soha ne haragítsam meg a páromat azzal, hogy kimutatom az érzéseimet!</i> ” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben a kapcsolatunkban?	1	2	3	4	5
67. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “ <i>A párom soha ne haragítson meg engem azzal, hogy kimutatja az érzéseit!</i> ” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben a kapcsolatunkban?	1	2	3	4	5
68. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “ <i>Ne mondjam meg a páromnak, hogy mire költöm a pénzt!</i> ” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben a kapcsolatunkban?	1	2	3	4	5
69. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “ <i>Ne érezzek vagy ne beszéljek érzésekről!</i> ” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben a kapcsolatunkban?	1	2	3	4	5
70. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “ <i>Ne gondolkozzak vagy ne beszéljek a gondolataimról!</i> ” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben a kapcsolatunkban?	1	2	3	4	5
71. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “ <i>Ne kerüljek közel másokhoz!</i> ” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben a kapcsolatunkban?	1	2	3	4	5
72. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “ <i>Ne legyek egyenes!</i> ” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben a kapcsolatunkban?	1	2	3	4	5

73. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “Ne hibáztassak másokat inkorrektül!” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben a kapcsolatunkban?	1	2	3	4	5
74. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “Ne kritizáljak!” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben a kapcsolatunkban?	1	2	3	4	5
75. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “Ne legyek önmagam; csináljak úgy, mintha másmilyen lennék!” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben a kapcsolatunkban?	1	2	3	4	5
76. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “Ne vegyek észre problémákat, ne beszéljek róluk vagy ne oldjam meg őket!” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben a kapcsolatunkban?	1	2	3	4	5
77. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “Ne fejlődjek, ne változzak, vagy semmiféle módon ne ‘rengessem meg a talajt’ a házasságom alatt!” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben a kapcsolatunkban?	1	2	3	4	5
78. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “Ne illessük egymást bántó nevekkal!” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben a kapcsolatunkban?	1	2	3	4	5
79. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “Ne bízzak másokban, beleértve a páromat!” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben a kapcsolatunkban?	1	2	3	4	5
80. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “Ne beszéljek semmi olyasmiról, amitől a párom kényelmetlenül érezné magát!” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben a kapcsolatunkban?	1	2	3	4	5
81. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “Ne beszéljek a házastársi kapcsolatomról a család többi tagjával!” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben a kapcsolatunkban?	1	2	3	4	5
82. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “Ne bízzak magamban, az érzéseimben vagy a következtetéseimben!” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben a kapcsolatunkban?	1	2	3	4	5
83. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “Ne használjak testi erőm a párommal szemben!” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben a kapcsolatunkban?	1	2	3	4	5
84. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “Ne legyek vidám, ne legyek játékos, vagy ne élvezzem az életet!” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben a kapcsolatunkban?	1	2	3	4	5
85. Az az íratlan szabály, hogy “Ne hibázzak!” milyen gyakran fordult elő az elmúlt egy évben a kapcsolatunkban?	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix F

Scoring Guide (Hungarian)

Mindegyik tételszám mellé írja be a Családi / Házaspári Szabályok Kérdőíven kitöltött pontokat. A Gondolatok, Érzések Megtartóztatása és az Önmegtartóztatás; és a Szülőkről / Partnerről Való Helytelen Gondoskodás alcsoportok alatt található tételek fordított pontozásúak az alábbi formula szerint: 6-ból vonja ki a tételhez tartozó pontot, és írja be a kapott eredményt a tételszám mellé. A Mindösszesen pontszám megegyezik az alcsoportok pontszámainak az összegével.

Kedvesség	Gondolatok, Érzések Megtartóztatása és Önmegtartóztatás (Fordított pontozás)	Nyíltság és Kapcsolat	Helytelen Gondoskodás (Fordított pontozás)	Felügyelet
------------------	---	----------------------------------	--	-------------------

Tételszám	Tételszám	Tételszám	Tételszám	Tételszám
4. _____	3. _____	1. _____	56. _____	50. _____
5. _____	7. _____	2. _____	57. _____	51. _____
6. _____	11. _____	8. _____	59. _____	52. _____
14. _____	12. _____	9. _____	60. _____	53. _____
15. _____	19. _____	10. _____		63. _____
20. _____	22. _____	13. _____		68. Fordított pontozás _____
21. _____	24. _____	16. _____		
23. _____	25. _____	17. _____		
30. _____	26. _____	18. _____		
35. _____	29. _____	27. _____		
39. _____	33. _____	28. _____		
41. _____	34. _____	31. _____		
42. _____	36. _____	32. _____		
46. _____	37. _____	38. _____		
48. _____	40. _____	44. _____		
55. _____	43. _____			
73. _____	45. _____			
74. _____	47. _____			
78. _____	49. _____			
83. _____	54. _____			
	58. _____			
	61. _____			
	62. _____			
	64. _____			
	65. _____			
	66. _____			
	67. _____			
	69. _____			
	70. _____			

- 71. _____
- 72. _____
- 75. _____
- 76. _____
- 77. _____
- 79. _____
- 80. _____
- 81. _____
- 82. _____
- 84. _____
- 85. _____

Összesen _____ Összesen _____ Összesen _____ Összesen _____ Összesen _____

Mindösszesen: _____

Appendix G

Comparison of Back-Translations

Comparison of Back-Translations

Original	Back Translation I	Back Translation II
Profile	Questionnaire	Questionnaire
Unspoken rule	Unwritten rule	Unwritten rule
With some regularity	Frequently	Regularly
Support each other	Support each other emotionally	Support each other emotionally
Be sensitive to each other	Be tactful with others	Be sensitive toward each other
Avoid pain at any cost	No matter what avoid emotional pain	Avoid emotional pain by all means
Show physical affection to each other	Show your love physically for the other person	Show our affection toward the other physically
Be careful to say the right thing when you offer your opinion	When expressing your opinion, pay attention to saying what is expected	Pay attention to saying the right thing when expressing opinions
Your worth is dependent on how much acceptance you get from your partner	My worth depends on how well I am accepted by my partner	My personal value depends on how much my spouse acknowledges me
Your worth is dependent on how much acceptance you get from the opposite sex	My worth depends on how well I am accepted by the other gender	My personal value depends on how much the other gender accepts me
Be in control of yourself at all times	Practice self-control	Always show self-control
You are only okay if your partner approves of you	I am good only if recognized by my partner	I feel good only if my spouse acknowledges me
What you do is who you are	My actions define who I am	My actions determine who I am
Be affectionate	Be loving	Be loving
Express what you think and feel	Show what you think and feel	Show what you think and feel
Your physical appearance is extremely important	The way I look is extremely important	My looks are extremely important
Meet each others expectations even if it's not a good thing for you	Please your partner (meet your partner's expectations), even if it is not good for you	Meet my spouse's expectations even if it's not good for me
Be flexible enough to entertain your partner's views and opinions	Be flexible enough to accept your partner's point-of-view and opinion	Be resilient enough to accept my spouse's point of view and opinion

Rather than be who you are, act good, right, strong, or perfect	Instead of being yourself, behave properly and be strong and perfect	Instead of being myself, I need to behave well, appropriately, be strong and perfect
Be gentle with each other	Be affectionate to each other	Be tender to each other
Work out problems with each other	Solve problems together	Solve problems together
Get input from your partner about major decisions in your life	In major decisions of your life, ask for the opinion of your partner	Ask my spouse's opinion in major life decisions
Make sure you maintain a positive marital image at any cost	No matter what, maintain a positive picture of your marriage	Protect my marriage's positive image by all means
Let your partner know who you are with	Tell your partner with whom you go out	Tell my spouse who I spend time with
If your partner's feelings are hurt, it is your fault	If your partner gets offended, it is your fault	If my spouse gets hurt it's my fault
Protect your partner even when s/he doesn't deserve it	Defend your partner, even if he/she does not deserve it	Protect my spouse even if he doesn't deserve it
Protect your partner emotionally even if you have to sacrifice yourself	Even if it costs you, provide your partner with emotional protection	Protect my spouse emotionally even if takes sacrifices
What your partner doesn't know won't hurt him/her	What my partner doesn't know about, does not bother him/her	If my spouse doesn't know it, it won't become a problem
Don't talk to your partner about things that make them uncomfortable	Do not talk about things with your partner that would make him/her feel embarrassed	Don't talk to my spouse about things that would make him feel uncomfortable
Don't inconvenience your partner	Do not embarrass your partner	Don't trouble my spouse
Never upset your partner by expressing your feelings	Never make your partner upset by showing your emotions	Never make my spouse angry by expressing my emotions
Don't let your partner know how you spend your money	Do not tell your partner how much money you have spent	Don't tell my spouse what I spend money on
Don't get close to other people	Do not become attached to others	Don't get close to others
Don't be direct	Do not be straightforward	Don't be straightforward
Don't blame others unfairly	Do not blame others incorrectly	Don't blame others incorrectly
Don't be yourself; pretend to be someone you are not	Do not be yourself; pretend to be someone else	Don't be myself, pretend I'm someone else

Don't identify, talk about, or solve problems	Do not notice problems, do not talk about them or solve them	Don't recognize, talk about or solve problems
Don't grow, change, or in any way 'rock your marital boat'	Do not improve, change or 'shake the ground' under your marriage in any way	Don't improve, change, or shake the grounds of my marriage
Don't call each other harmful names	Do not make bad comments about each other	Don't say anything bad to each other
Don't talk about anything that makes your partner feel uncomfortable	Do not talk about things that can be embarrassing for your partner	Don't talk about anything that would make my spouse feel uncomfortable
Don't trust yourself, your feelings, or your conclusions	Do not trust yourself, your feelings or your intuitions	Don't trust myself, my emotions or my conclusions
Don't have fun; don't be silly or enjoy life	Don't be cheerful, playful, or enjoy life	Don't be happy, don't be playful, and don't enjoy life
Don't mess up	Don't spoil anything	Don't make mistakes

Appendix H

Consent Form

Consent Form

Introduction

This research study is being conducted by James M. Harper, Ph.D., Professor at Brigham Young University, and Noemi Gergely, master student in Marriage and Family Therapy at Brigham Young University to assess family and couple rules in Hungary, and to compare these rules with those of American families and couples. One of the benefits of this study will be to see what the differences are in the ways families and couples organize themselves in terms of rules in Hungary compared to the United States.

Participation

Participation in this research study is voluntary. You have the right to refuse to participate entirely without any consequences or to withdraw at anytime.

Procedures

May you choose to participate in this research study, we ask you to please fill out the attached questionnaire(s) that apply to you according to your family status. If you are a married couple but do not yet have children, please, fill out the Couples Rules Profile only, and do so individually. If you are a married couple with children, please, fill out both the Couples Rules Profile and the Family Rules Profile questionnaires, again individually. Children, who can and feel comfortable to fill out the Family Rules Profile without parental help, are welcome to do so. The questionnaires consist of 85 questions each, and will take approximately 30 minutes. Questions will include details about unspoken rules in your family and/or spousal relationship. After you finish with the questionnaires, please, return them sealed in the stamped envelope provided for you.

Risks/Discomforts

There are minimal risks for participation in this study. However, you may feel emotional discomfort when answering questions about your family and/or couple relationship.

Benefits

There are no direct benefits to subjects. However, it is hoped that through your participation researchers will learn more about how families and married couples organize themselves in terms of rules and what cultural differences if any there are between the United States and Hungary.

Confidentiality

All information provided will remain confidential and will only be reported as group data with no identifying information. All data, including the questionnaires, will be kept in a locked storage cabinet and only those directly involved with the research will have access to them. After the research is completed, the questionnaires will be destroyed.

Questions about the Research

If you have questions regarding this study, you may contact Dr. James M. Harper at 00-1-801-422-6509 (U.S.), James_Harper@byu.edu or Noemi Gergely at 06-30-457-7546 (Hungary), 00-1-801-377-1356 (U.S.), ng44@email.byu.edu.

Questions about your Rights as Research Participants

If you have questions you do not feel comfortable asking the researcher, you may contact Dr. Renea Beckstrand, IRB Chair, 422-3873, 422 SWKT, renea_beckstrand@byu.edu.

I have read, understood, and received a copy of the above consent and desire of my own free will and volition to participate in this study.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix I

Demographic Questionnaire (Hungarian sample)

Demographic Questionnaire (Hungarian sample)

Name:

Age:

Circle which applies.

Gender: Male Female

Marital Status:

Minor Single Married Divorced Widowed

Number of years in marriage:

Number of years in cohabitation:

Religious: Yes No

If Yes, religious denomination:

Appendix J

ANOVA Plots (Tables 10-22)

Table 10. Two by Two ANOVA Results for Total FIRP Score as the Dependent Variable.

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	9119.327(a)	7	1302.761	12.028	.000
Intercept	1858498.787	1	1858498.787	17159.656	.000
NATIONAL	7371.236	1	7371.236	68.059	.000
FAMROLE	1307.065	3	435.688	4.023	.008
NATIONAL * FAMROLE	75.572	3	25.191	.233	.874
Error	35199.546	325	108.306		
Total	1995001.647	333			
Corrected Total	44318.873	332			

Table 11. Two by Two ANOVA Results for Kindness Rules as Dependent Variable.

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	9119.327(a)	7	1302.761	12.028	.000
Intercept	1858498.787	1	1858498.787	17159.656	.000
NATIONAL	7371.236	1	7371.236	68.059	.000
FAMROLE	1307.065	3	435.688	4.023	.008
NATIONAL * FAMROLE	75.572	3	25.191	.233	.874
Error	35199.546	325	108.306		
Total	1995001.647	333			
Corrected Total	44318.873	332			

Table 12. Two by Two ANOVA Results for Expressiveness Rules as the Dependent Variable.

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	2550.460(a)	7	364.351	3.490	.001
Intercept	1116222.112	1	1116222.112	10691.257	.000
NATIONAL	.175	1	.175	.002	.967
FAMROLE	2183.894	3	727.965	6.972	.000
NATIONAL * FAMROLE	139.791	3	46.597	.446	.720
Error	33931.668	325	104.405		
Total	1188392.277	333			
Corrected Total	36482.128	332			

Table 13. Two by Two ANOVA Results with Monitoring as the Dependent Variable.

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	537.533(a)	7	76.790	5.693	.000
Intercept	212001.216	1	212001.216	15716.183	.000
NATIONAL	300.535	1	300.535	22.279	.000
FAMROLE	200.440	3	66.813	4.953	.002
NATIONAL * FAMROLE	5.588	3	1.863	.138	.937
Error	4384.041	325	13.489		
Total	226134.506	333			
Corrected Total	4921.574	332			

Table 14. Two by Two ANOVA Results with Constraint as the Dependent Variable.

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	15715.475(a)	7	2245.068	4.786	.000
Intercept	7336729.491	1	7336729.491	15641.271	.000
NATIONAL	7143.978	1	7143.978	15.230	.000
FAMROLE	6768.239	3	2256.080	4.810	.003
NATIONAL * FAMROLE	1069.057	3	356.352	.760	.517
Error	152445.223	325	469.062		
Total	7792238.675	333			
Corrected Total	168160.699	332			

Table 15. Two by Two ANOVA Results with Inappropriate Caretaking Rules as Dependent Variable.

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	430.503(a)	7	61.500	3.063	.004
Intercept	38055.046	1	38055.046	1895.361	.000
NATIONAL	2.636	1	2.636	.131	.717
FAMROLE	274.071	3	91.357	4.550	.004
NATIONAL * FAMROLE	100.794	3	33.598	1.673	.173
Error	6525.348	325	20.078		
Total	46381.869	333			
Corrected Total	6955.850	332			

Table 16. Two by Two ANOVA Results for Couples with Total CIRP Score as Dependent Variable.

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	29940.510(a)	3	9980.170	17.218	.000
Intercept	19938347.178	1	19938347.178	34397.310	.000
SEX	4948.745	1	4948.745	8.537	.004
NATIONAL	24604.017	1	24604.017	42.446	.000
SEX * NATIONAL	31.761	1	31.761	.055	.815
Error	114770.390	198	579.648		
Total	20299112.676	202			
Corrected Total	144710.900	201			

Table 17. Two by Two ANOVA Results for Couples with Kindness (CIRP) as Dependent Variable.

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	8738.640(a)	3	2912.880	24.167	.000
Intercept	1221218.252	1	1221218.252	10131.882	.000
SEX	30.530	1	30.530	.253	.615
NATIONAL	8703.654	1	8703.654	72.210	.000
SEX * NATIONAL	108.486	1	108.486	.900	.344
Error	23865.380	198	120.532		
Total	1264694.000	202			
Corrected Total	32604.020	201			

Table 18. Two by Two ANOVA Results for Couples with Expressiveness (CIRP) as Dependent Variable.

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	2936.462(a)	3	978.821	12.976	.000
Intercept	818261.644	1	818261.644	10847.801	.000
SEX	423.921	1	423.921	5.620	.019
NATIONAL	2502.066	1	2502.066	33.170	.000
SEX * NATIONAL	58.997	1	58.997	.782	.378
Error	14935.359	198	75.431		
Total	846032.000	202			
Corrected Total	17871.822	201			

Table 19. Two by Two ANOVA Results for Couples with Monitoring (CIRP) as Dependent Variable.

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	334.125(a)	3	111.375	8.225	.000
Intercept	137268.440	1	137268.440	10137.152	.000
SEX	32.143	1	32.143	2.374	.125
NATIONAL	301.982	1	301.982	22.301	.000
SEX * NATIONAL	2.398	1	2.398	.177	.674
Error	2681.143	198	13.541		
Total	141760.000	202			
Corrected Total	3015.267	201			

Table 20. Two by Two ANOVA Results for Couples with Constraint (CIRP) as Dependent Variable.

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	1914.095(a)	3	638.032	2.483	.062
Intercept	3919558.789	1	3919558.789	15254.810	.000
SEX	1390.770	1	1390.770	5.413	.021
NATIONAL	4.071	1	4.071	.016	.900
SEX * NATIONAL	507.002	1	507.002	1.973	.162
Error	50873.964	198	256.939		
Total	4016993.486	202			
Corrected Total	52788.059	201			

Table 21. Two by Two ANOVA Results for Couples with Inappropriate Caretaking (CIRP) as Dependent Variable.

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	40.937(a)	3	13.646	1.722	.164
Intercept	11085.336	1	11085.336	1398.946	.000
SEX	1.613	1	1.613	.204	.652
NATIONAL	34.254	1	34.254	4.323	.039
SEX * NATIONAL	7.640	1	7.640	.964	.327
Error	1568.964	198	7.924		
Total	12808.000	202			
Corrected Total	1609.901	201			

Table 22. T-test Results for Married vs. Cohabiting Couples with the Five Subscales and the Total CIRP Scale as Dependent Variables.

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Kindness	Equal variances assumed	11.694	.001	.766	199	.445	2.41712	3.15706	-3.80846	8.64270
	Equal variances not assumed			.513	18.259	.614	2.41712	4.70859	-7.46521	12.29945
Constrain	Equal variances assumed	.027	.870	-3.032	199	.003	-11.89415	3.92270	-19.62953	-4.15876
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.533	19.219	.020	-11.89415	4.69642	-21.71630	-2.07200
Expressiv	Equal variances assumed	1.471	.227	1.522	199	.130	3.53916	2.32512	-1.04587	8.12419
	Equal variances not assumed			1.182	18.846	.252	3.53916	2.99301	-2.72874	9.80706
Inappropri	Equal variances assumed	2.257	.135	-.945	199	.346	-.66211	.70057	-2.04361	.71939
	Equal variances not assumed			-.771	19.090	.450	-.66211	.85881	-2.45906	1.13483
Monitor	Equal variances assumed	9.064	.003	1.830	199	.069	1.74408	.95305	-.13530	3.62346
	Equal variances not assumed			1.210	18.213	.242	1.74408	1.44151	-1.28188	4.77004
Total CIRP	Equal variances assumed	.128	.721	-.732	199	.465	-4.85590	6.63778	-17.94531	8.23351
	Equal variances not assumed			-.700	20.127	.492	-4.85590	6.93397	-19.31407	9.60228