

THE EFFECTS OF A PREMARITAL
INVENTORY ON IDEALISM
IN ENGAGED COUPLES

By

JANIS ROBERTS SHARPE

Bachelor of Science

Oral Roberts University

Tulsa, Oklahoma

1978

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
May, 1983

Thesis
1983
S532e
cop. 2



THE EFFECTS OF A PREMARITAL
INVENTORY ON IDEALISM
IN ENGAGED COUPLES

Thesis Approved:

David Fournier

Thesis Adviser

Althea Knight

John Rusco

Norman N. Durham

Dean of Graduate College

PREFACE

The author wishes to express her appreciation to her major thesis adviser, Dr. David Fournier, for his guidance, assistance and encouragement throughout this study. Appreciation is also expressed to Dr. Althea Wright and Dr. John Rusco for their assistance in preparation of the final manuscript.

Appreciation must also be expressed to Mrs. Chris Jamieson for her hard work and invaluable assistance in typing both the rough and final copies of the manuscript. A final word of appreciation goes to my husband, Brent, for his assistance, support and more importantly, encouragement throughout this endeavor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem.	2
Purpose	3
Definitions of Terms.	4
Hypotheses.	7
Outline of Thesis	7
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	9
Idealism.	10
Origin of Idealism.	10
Idealism vs Conventionalization	12
Idealization vs Level of Involvement.	13
III. METHODOLOGY.	18
Research Procedures	18
Type of Research.	18
Selection of Subjects	19
Data Collection Procedures.	20
Instruments	22
PREPARE.	22
Couple Prediction Form	24
Processing and Analyzing.	25
Statistical Procedures.	28
IV. FINDINGS	30
Sample Characteristics.	30
Summary of Findings for Each Hypothesis	35
Discussion.	48
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.	50
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	
APPENDIXES.	
APPENDIX A - COUPLE PREDICTION FORM.	
APPENDIX B - PREPARE	

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Research Design	19
II. Summary of Operational Definitions of Key Dependent Variables	27
III. Background Characteristics.	32
IV. T-Test Summaries for Actual Prediction Scores for Self made by All Individuals in the Study	36
V. T-Test Summaries for Actual Prediction Scores for Self made by Males in the Study	37
VI. T-Test Summaries for Actual Prediction Scores for Self made by Females in the Study	38
VII. T-Test Summaries for Actual Partner Predictions made by All Individuals in the Study.	40
VIII. T-Test Summaries for Actual Partner Predictions made by the Males in the Study.	41
IX. T-Test Summaries for Actual Partner Predictions made by the Females in the Study.	42
X. T-Test Summaries for Actual Couple Prediction Scores made by All Individuals in the Study	43
XI. T-Test Summaries of Actual Couple Prediction Scores made by Males in the Study	44
XII. T-Test Summaries of Actual Couple Predictions made by Females in the Study.	45
XIII. Accuracy of Prediction.	46

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In 1981, approximately 1,219,000 divorces were granted in the United States. This provisional statistic represents a 3% increase over the 1980 statistics and a 65% increase over those in 1962 (Monthly Vital Statistics Reports, 1981). Not only has the number of divorces in the United States increased in the last few years, but the average length of marriages ending in divorce has decreased (Vital Statistics Report, 1978). These figures verify that more marriages are ending in divorce and they are ending much sooner. It is estimated that 39% of all divorces granted are to people who have been married less than 5 years (Vital Statistics Report, 1978). These figures suggest that major marital difficulties occur early in marriage.

Many family therapists and researchers believe that the cause of marital difficulties and therefore the incidence of divorce could be lessened if couples were given opportunities to identify and discuss potential problems in their relationship before marriage (Burgess, 1926; Baber, 1958; Markham, 1979). This belief is primarily based on the premise that many marriages fail because premarital couples are

extremely idealistic and often do not have an accurate perception of marriage or their partner (Shulman, 1974; Bienvenu, 1975; Goode, 1959; Kephart, 1966). They soon become disillusioned with their partner and the relationship and the marriage end in divorce.

Therefore, it appears that lack of preparedness for marriage is an important factor in early marital dissolution. Somehow, the courtship process in this country does not properly prepare people for marriage. The following general assumptions can be made about premarital couples:

1. couples are very idealistic and usually expect that their marriage will not encounter problems;
2. couples are naive about the sacrifice involved in developing and maintaining a satisfactory marriage;
3. couples often withhold information about themselves or their partner out of fear of rejection or of hurting their partner; and,
4. couples are often rushed into marriage before they are ready because of peer or parental pressures.

Statement of the Problem

Many couples are idealistic about marriage and their mate. After marriage, these misconceptions are challenged quickly and often lead to disillusionment and conflict.

A need exists to help couples become aware of issues in marriage and learn how to communicate on those issues. If greater awareness can be developed, perhaps idealism and

resulting disillusionment after marriage can be sharply reduced.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine if intervention in the form of a premarital inventory will reduce idealism in a premarital couple. More specifically, this study is designed to assess whether engaged couples can more accurately predict their relationship's strengths and weaknesses before or after taking a structured premarital inventory called PREPARE (The Premarital Personal and Relationship Evaluation, Olson, Fournier, and Druckman, 1982). This is done by asking the couple to complete the Couple Prediction Sheet which includes predictions of Inventory Scores for themselves, their partner, and their relationship. These predictions are then compared to their actual results on the PREPARE Inventory. Couples whose predictions are fairly consistent with their PREPARE scores are considered to be more realistic while couples whose predictions are much higher than their actual PREPARE scores are considered more idealistic.

In this study, the couples are to be divided into two groups. The first group will make its predictions before taking PREPARE. The second group does not make predictions until after it has taken the instrument but before receiving the results. A primary concern will be to examine any differences in the predictions of the two groups. If compari-

sons reveal significant differences in realism versus idealism depending on exposure to a premarital inventory, program coordinators will have valuable information concerning the benefits of using an Inventory and some insight about the effect of the accuracy of predictions made by couples.

Definition of Terms

Accuracy of Prediction. The individuals' or couples' ability to predict the strengths and weaknesses of their own relationship as identified by the PREPARE Inventory.

Idealism. The tendency to endow a person or relationship with desired enabling characteristics of one's own ideal mate or relationship, whether or not those characteristics are actually present. (Pollis, 1969; Waller, 1937)

Premarital Couple. A man and woman who are engaged to be married.

Pre-assessment. The prediction of relationship strengths and weaknesses before having taken the PREPARE Inventory.

Post-assessment. The prediction of relationship strengths and weaknesses after having taken the PREPARE Inventory.

Social Desirability/Conventionalization. The tendency to represent oneself, partner, or relationship as having characteristics that are desirable by the society, whether or not these characteristics are actually present.

The PREPARE Inventory has 12 conceptual categories related to marriage. Each has 10 items that produce raw scores converted to Individual Percentile Scores. Percentile scores reflect individual adjustment or positive relationship feelings in each category. Other couple scores include estimates of agreement and disagreement. The 12 conceptual areas with a brief description are listed below:

Realistic Expectations. This scale assesses realistic attitudes about common challenges associated with marriage. High scorers are aware of common myths about marriage and are realistic about what to expect from marriage.

Personality Issues. This scale assesses perceptions of partner, general approval of partners' behavior and adjustment to personality characteristics. High scorers perceive their partner as having few negative personality traits.

Equalitarian Roles. This scale assesses the willingness to share roles and to regard husbands and wives as equal partners in the relationship. High scorers report a desire to share tasks and to have equal power in decisions and responsibilities.

Communication. This scale assesses an awareness of constructive communication skills and an ability to satisfactorily use these skills. High scorers typically report that it is easy to talk to their partners.

Conflict Resolution. This scale assesses the couple's

orientation toward resolving conflicts in their relationship. High scorers tend to confront problems directly rather than allowing conflicts to remain unresolved.

Financial Management. This scale assesses realistic plans and attitudes about finances and satisfaction with current financial decisions. High scorers plan to keep records, adjust financial decisions according to resources, and have overall financial goals.

Leisure Activities. This scale assesses the flexibility between partners about leisure interests and satisfaction with current lifestyle preferences. High scorers tend to be involved in both individual and mutual interests.

Sexual Relationship. This scale assesses the attitudes and feelings regarding marital sexuality and affection. High scorers are willing to discuss sexual issues and are satisfied with their decisions about sexuality and family planning.

Children and Marriage. This scale assesses attitudes and feelings about having children and a realistic perception of parental roles. High scorers agree on child-rearing responsibilities and realize the impact of children on marriage.

Family and Friends. This scale assesses relationships with parents, in-laws, and friends. High scorers tend to have many mutual friends and families who are supportive of each partner and their decision to marry.

Religious Orientation. This scale assesses the accep-

tance of traditional beliefs and practices and also a commitment to religious values. Persons who regard religion as a personal decision or question traditional religious beliefs often score low to moderately low.

Idealistic Distortion. This scale identifies persons who are describing their relationship in an unrealistically positive way. High scorers are idealistic and probably distorted many answers while taking the PREPARE Inventory.

Hypotheses

Specific versions of the hypotheses in this study will be stated in Chapter IV. The general hypotheses to be investigated are:

1. Individual predictions of their own, their partner, and their couple PREPARE scores after taking PREPARE will be more realistic than persons who predict the same scores before taking PREPARE.
2. Individual predictions of their own, their partner, and their couple PREPARE scores after taking PREPARE will have higher Accuracy of Prediction scores than couples predicting the same scores before taking PREPARE.

Outline of Thesis

The problem has been stated, the purpose for the study presented, and the pertinent terms defined in Chapter I.

Chapter II will be devoted to reviewing the current literature relevant to the study. The origin of idealism, idealism versus level of involvement, and other research relating to idealism in premarital couples will be discussed.

Chapter III will discuss the research design chosen for this study. It will also describe the instruments and procedures used in collecting and processing the data.

Chapter IV will examine the background characteristics of the sample and the results of the tested hypotheses will be discussed.

All the previous chapters will be summarized in Chapter V. Final conclusions and recommendations for future research will also be presented in this chapter.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

While premarriage inventories and programs seem to be increasing, few articles are being published that focus on engaged couples preparing for marriage. In the 1980 volume of the Inventory to Marriage and Family Literature, there were no articles on premarital couples as a stage in the family life cycle. The only articles dealing with premarital couples were on mate selection and even these comprised only 1% of the articles listed in this volume.

Although research on premarital couples was never abundant, the percentage of articles on this subject dropped from 3% in the 1900-1964 volume to 1% in the 1980 volume (Olson, 1981). Because of this decline in research on engaged couples, many articles discussed in this review of literature date back to early studies done in the 1950's and even as early as Waller's (1938) classic article on idealism.

Since the purpose of this study is to determine whether intervention in the form of a premarital inventory affects couple idealism (as measured by their ability to predict relationship adjustment scores), the major concept in this review of literature will be idealism. Idealism will be broken down further into origin of idealism, idealism versus

conventionalization, idealization versus level of involvement, and other research relating to realistic attitudes and disillusionment in marriage.

Idealism

The notion that engaged couples are idealistic seems to be a common theme of marriage educators (Beigel, 1951; Burgess, 1926; Goode, 1959; Kephart, 1966; Kolb, 1950; Mower, 1939; Schulman, 1974; Wallin, 1952).

Waller (1938) in his early study on courtship defined idealism as:

The process of building up a complete picture of another person in one's own imagination, a picture for which sensory data are absent or to which they are definitely contradictory. One builds up an almost completely unreal picture of a person which he calls by the same name as a real person and vainly imagines to be like that person, but in fact the only authentic thing in the picture is the emotion which one feels towards it (p. 200).

Origin of Idealism

Though the terms idealism and romanticism are sometimes used interchangeably, there has been some speculation that idealism actually developed out of romanticism. The articles on this topic are mainly theoretical and though they cannot be proven or disproven, they deserve attention in this review of literature.

The origins of romanticism and idealism are believed to date back to the Middle Ages and the concept of courtly love (Beigel, 1951; Lederer & Jackson, 1968).

The following paragraphs on the origin of romanticism and idealism are based primarily on the articles by Beigel and The Mirages of Marriage by Lederer and Jackson (1968).

Noble women of the Middle Ages had little to keep them occupied. They had servants to perform household chores. Their husbands were not of their own choosing and many of them were gone for long periods of time either to war or crusades.

To alleviate boredom, romanticism and the concept of courtly love developed. An entire code for courtly love was established at the time with one of the primary rules being that one could never be in love with one's own spouse. True romantic love could not exist within marriage.

Though views differ, Beigel believes that romantic love at that time did not involve a physical relationship. Because the lovers could never have a physical relationship or even be together much, the tendency to idealize grew. Beigel believes that this idealism is a result of sexual frustration and that it can be paralleled with today's adolescent. The repression of sexual desires causes the person to fantasize and endow the "untouchable" lover with desirable, if false, attributes.

The concept of romantic love remained in the nobility and was reinforced by the Romanticists in the 18th century. However, during this time period, a physical relationship with the lover was more common.

In protest to this breach of morality in the nobility, the bourgeois of the 18th century began the concept of

marrying for love and the process of courtship.

The mate was still chosen by the parent, but the male was given a courtship period in which to try to win the young woman. Soon the concept of marrying for love and perhaps idealism became an accepted custom of the society.

Idealism vs. Conventionalization

One difficulty encountered in reviewing the literature on idealism is the tendency of some authors to confuse idealism with conventionalization. While these two terms are closely related, they represent different concepts. Conventionalization is the tendency to represent oneself, partner, or relationship as having characteristics that are desirable by the society, whether or not these characteristics are actually present. Idealization is the tendency to endow a person or relationship with desired ennobling characteristics of one's own ideal mate or relationship whether or not those characteristics are actually present.

Therefore, a person may not be idealistic in the least and yet still wish to present his/her relationship in a highly positive way to society and therefore conventionalize.

Conventionalization is not restricted to engaged couples, but is present in many areas of our society.

Coe, Curry, and Kessler (1969), looked at the estimated number of conflicts in families of psychiatric inpatients and control group families not under psychological care. The families of inpatients admitted to 4% disagreement, the control families admitted to 28% disagreement.

The actual disagreement rate of the families was 38% to 40% for the inpatient families and 32% for the control group. Therefore, the families of psychiatric inpatients tended to show a much greater tendency to present a more socially acceptable, if false, view of their family relationships.

Marriage Satisfaction Scales and Premarital Inventories appear to be extremely prone to contamination by conventionalization (Edmonds, 1967, Schulman, 1974). Most inventories do not make allowances for social desirability,

therefore, those who are most likely to idealize their mates will be most likely to receive high scores on marriage prediction tests and will be encouraged to marry (Schulman, 1974, p. 139).

There is a need to differentiate between idealism and conventionalization and make some allowance for conventionalization to be able to truly measure idealism.

Idealization vs. Level of Involvement

Most research or articles on idealism were inspired or influenced by Willard Waller's work in the Twenties and Thirties on courtship and dating. Though his work has been a great inspiration, with his definition of idealism and other ideas still being discussed, Waller's concepts were purely theoretical and were never tested empirically. Many recent researchers have tried to prove or disprove his hypotheses on idealization in dating and premarital relationships. The remainder of this section will be devoted to more recent research based on hypotheses

generated from Waller's ideas regarding idealism.

One of Waller's primary contentions is that couples become more idealistic as they become more seriously involved. He believed that couples view one another more realistically at the outset of the relationship but as they fall in love they move further and further away from reality.

Pollis (1969) examined this concept and tried to show that couples have different levels of idealism at different phases of their relationship and that idealism will be less at more casual stages of dating. The sample consisted of single students living in dormitories, sororities, and fraternity houses at Oklahoma State University. These were selected at random and then a quota sampling procedure was used to stratify the sample by levels of involvement. Idealization was determined by asking the respondent and two friends to rate the respondent's partner on a number of different areas. The respondent's score was compared against his friends' scores to determine idealism.

The results showed the opposite of Waller's theory and what Pollis had anticipated. There was a difference in idealization according to seriousness of the relationship. But this study showed that idealism is greatest at the casual stages of dating. These findings support the notion that idealism is reduced as relationships become more serious. Another finding of this study was that idealism in the serious groups is greater among women than among men. This contradicts most studies which show that men are usually more idealistic

than women.

Hobart (1958) wrote about romanticism and disillusionment in marriage and also examined idealism in couples in a variety of phases of relationship development. The sample consisted of 78 "favorite date," 66 "going steady," 54 "engaged," and 60 "married" couples chosen in a nonrandom manner from a West Coast sectarian college where at least one of the partners attended school. This study was cross-sectional rather than longitudinal.

Two primary scores were examined - the Disagreement score (D) and the Disagreement Estimate score (DE). The Disagreement score was determined by finding the difference between the partners' scores on a Likert-type scale in response to items dealing with marital-role opinions. The DE score was determined by finding the difference between the person's actual score and his prediction of his partner's score. In other words, perceived disagreement was determined from the viewpoint of both male and female partners.

Disillusionment was considered present in this study when the Disagreement score (D) remained the same but the Disagreement Estimate (DE) or perceived disagreement increased. This indicated that the couple felt they would have more disagreement than was actually present. Disillusionment would also be present if the D scores declined while the DE scores remain unchanged.

Hobart found that while a little disillusionment is found in earlier stages of a relationship, the greatest

disillusionment is found in the transition from engaged to married, with males showing a greater degree of disillusionment than females.

Premarital disillusionment appears to be particularly strong in the areas of person freedom, marital roles, having children, in-law relationships, values on neatness, values on savings and money, and attitudes toward divorce.

Therefore, in this study Hobart agrees with Waller. In another study, however, Hobart retests this same group 4 years later and finds no evidence for a greater degree of idealism during advanced courtships.

Other significant articles on idealism include Spanier (1972) discussing the positive effects of romanticism on marriage, and Burgess and Wallin (1943) predicting adjustment in marriage based on adjustment in engagement.

Spanier's article is important to this paper because of the contention that romanticism has no negative effects on marital adjustment. In Spanier's study of more than 200 married couples at Iowa State University, "romanticism did not appear harmful to marriage relationships in particular or to the family system in general; and, is therefore not generally dysfunctional in our society (p. 481)".

This conclusion is relevant to this paper because an assumption is being made that idealism can have detrimental effects. It would not make sense to reduce idealism if it was not potentially dysfunctional.

Burgess and Wallin's (1943) article on predicting

adjustment in marriage from adjustment in engagement is also important because it established that marital adjustment can be estimated for both men and women during engagement.

In summary, few recent articles have been published that focus on idealism in engaged couples. From the articles that do exist and were reviewed, the following conclusions were made:

1. idealization is a concept that has long been present in society, finding its roots in the concept of romanticism in the Middle Ages;

2. idealization is present in dating relationships. There are many conflicting studies on whether it increases or decreases with the seriousness of the relationship, but it is present in dating relationships; and,

3. idealization and conventionalization are two different concepts but both are often present when dealing with premarital couples and allowances should be made for both.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Research Procedures

The purpose of this study was to determine whether intervention in the form of a premarital inventory affects a couples' ability to predict the strengths and weaknesses of their own relationship. To accomplish this goal a research design was chosen, a sample was obtained, and instruments were selected and developed.

Type of Research

In order to answer the hypotheses posed in this study, a counterbalancing research design approximating the Campbell and Stanley (1966) Randomized Control-Group Posttest Only Design was selected. While some modifications were made, most conditions are met. Table I provides a visual image of the selected design.

As depicted above, pretesting was not pursued in this study. Treatment was defined as exposure to the items of the PREPARE marriage-preparation Inventory. Posttest was defined as completion of a Couple Prediction Form designed to assess how realistically and accurately couples predict scores on the PREPARE Inventory. Prediction scores will

be influenced only by the precondition of having taken the marriage preparation inventory or not. Although compromises were made in regard to randomization of subjects to experimental or control conditions, the couples making up each group were very similar and could have legitimately been part of either condition.

TABLE I
RESEARCH DESIGN

		<u>Pretest</u>	<u>Treatment</u>	<u>Posttest</u>
Group I	Control	.	.	X
Group II	Experimental	.	X	X

Selection of Subjects

The couples selected for use in this study could be described as coming from purposive cluster samples. Two similar marriage-preparation programs conducted in two separate locations in Oklahoma were approached regarding this

project. These programs consisted of two Saturday sessions and were required for couples wishing to be married within a particular religious denomination. The program included sessions on finances, family planning, spirituality and marriage, communication, sexuality, and the administration of the PREPARE Inventory. Experts in each of these areas conduct the sessions.

A total of 142 couples were included in the present study. Couples attended one of six separate programs over a 6-month period. The first 76 couples (152 persons) were placed in the control group and the next 66 couples (132 persons) were placed in the experimental group. Therefore, all couples comprising a particular program were treated as a cluster and put in either the experimental or control condition. The couples shared similar backgrounds and will be statistically compared for equivalence in Chapter IV.

Although the above design met the primary objectives of experimental comparison, generalizations will be limited due to the nonrandom nature of subject selection. It was decided that initial studies should be made on specific premarital populations first and to limit descriptions of findings to couples with similar backgrounds.

Data Collection Procedures

In both the experimental and control conditions, the PREPARE Inventory and the Couple Prediction Form were

administered on the first day of the seminar. Identification numbers were assigned and used to process PREPARE to allow for complete confidentiality. In all sessions, men and women were asked to sit on different sides of the room to ensure that each partner was responding without direct influence from his/her partner.

For the control group, the PREPARE Inventory question booklet, answer sheet, and Couple Prediction Form were all handed out at the same time. Instructions for completing PREPARE and the Couple Prediction Form were given. The couples were asked to first complete the Couple Prediction Form and then to begin PREPARE.

The PREPARE answer sheets, booklets, and Couple Prediction Forms were collected. The couples' answers on the Couple Prediction Forms were transferred to another form for use in the study and the original prediction forms were returned to the couples for discussion after the session. PREPARE was processed and the resulting computer printout was given to the couple at the follow-up session in 2 weeks.

For the experimental group, only the PREPARE booklets and answer sheets were distributed to the couples. Instructions for completing PREPARE, and the Couple Prediction Forms were given, but the Prediction Form was not distributed. After completing PREPARE, the person raised his/her hand and was given the Prediction Form. This eliminated the possibility of completing the Prediction Form before taking PREPARE. PREPARE booklets, answer sheets, and

Prediction Forms were then collected. The information on the Couple Prediction Form was then recorded and the original returned for later discussion. As for the control group, PREPARE was processed and the computer results were distributed at the next session.

Instruments

PREPARE

PREPARE is an inventory designed especially for premarital couples. It is composed of 125 statements written in the first person. These statements fall under one of the following 12 categories: Idealistic Distortion, Realistic Expectations, Personality Issues, Equalitarian Roles, Communication, Conflict Resolution, Financial Management, Leisure Activities, Sexual Relationship, Children and Marriage, Family and Friends, and Religious Orientation. These 12 categories are considered important areas of adjustment for the engaged couple.

To complete PREPARE, the couple is asked to respond to each of the statements using a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree.

PREPARE was designed to help couples see strengths in their relationship and indicate areas that are either problem areas or areas that have not been discussed or dealt with by the couple.

The instrument was designed to be used by a premarital

counselor and can provide valuable information to help in counseling or education. When PREPARE is processed, a computerized printout is produced that shows each couples' areas of agreement and disagreement as well as how they scored in relation to other couples taking PREPARE.

Sections of particular importance to counselors are Idealistic Distortion and the Items For Discussion Section. Idealistic Distortion is one of the 12 PREPARE categories, yet is different in its use and scoring. This scale is a conventionalization scale, designed specifically to measure the couple's tendency to present themselves and their relationship in an extremely favorable way.

Moderately high scores identify individuals who are responding in a way that presents a favorable impression of their relationship. Questions are very extreme and therefore reflect a tendency that in all likelihood permeates the entire inventory and must be carefully attended (Olsen, Fournier, Druckman 1979/82, p. 11).

PREPARE compensates for this by adjusting couple scores to reduce the effect of Idealistic Distortion.

The Items For Discussion Section lists items of partner disagreement, indecision, and Special Focus. Special Focus Items are items in which the couple agree in a negative way. An example of this is the statement, "I think my partner smokes or drinks too much." If both persons agree with this, it could be an indication of problems in the relationship.

PREPARE also provides a summary of key background characteristics which may be especially helpful. These

include information about family and individual history and topics relevant to the present relationship.

Validity and Reliability. After numerous uses and revisions of PREPARE, a validation study of PREPARE was conducted (Fournier, 1979). It was based on the PREPARE results of more than 1,000 couples and 200 clergy/counselors who had used PREPARE. PREPARE was found to be a scientifically valid and reliable instrument. It was found to have both Test-Retest and Internal Consistency Reliability. Overall reliabilities range from a low of .49 to a high of .88 and met all minimum standards for research.

Couple Prediction Form. The Couple Prediction Form was originally designed for this study and a parallel project by Sharpe (1982). This version is the result of various pilot efforts (Sharpe, 1982). Improvements to the earlier versions include better descriptions of each of the PREPARE categories and clearly presented instructions. These documents can be found in Appendix B.

The Couple Prediction Form asks the person to assess self, partner, and couple strengths and weaknesses in each of the PREPARE categories. The response format ranges from "very high" to "very low" with [++] indicating high and [--] indicating low, as listed below and in Appendix B.

Response Format

Very High	High Average	Average	Low Average	Very Low
++	+=	==	--	--

Space is also allocated on the form for actual PREPARE scores to be recorded. This allows couples and counselors to compare the predictions with the actual scores.

Processing and Analyzing

The purpose of this study is to determine if intervention in the form of a premarital inventory affects idealism in a premarital couple. This will be measured in two different ways. First, the prediction scores will be examined to determine if there is a difference in the actual predictions of individuals or couples who predict their strengths and weaknesses before taking PREPARE and those couples making predictions after taking PREPARE. Second, the couple's predictions will be compared with their actual PREPARE scores to determine the accuracy of their predictions. The resulting score will be their Accuracy of Prediction Score.

Raw PREPARE Scores are actually three different scores taken from PREPARE. The Male Adjustment Score and the Female Adjustment Score are the sums of the male or female responses to questions within certain categories. The statements in PREPARE are ordered randomly, but there are 10 statements in PREPARE that fall in each of the 12

PREPARE categories. The respondent answers on a one-to-five scale and the sum total of responses for all the items in that category becomes the Individual Category Score reflecting adjustment on that topic. Since the answers to each of the 10 statements range from 1 to 5, the range of the female and male Individual Scores is 10 to 50.

The Positive Couple Agreement Score is the percentage of the questions in which the couple agree with each other in a positive manner. Since this score is a percentage, the range is from 0 to 100.

Recoded Actual PREPARE Score. In order to make comparisons between the PREPARE Scores and the Predictions Scores, both scores must be in a comparable format. To accomplish this, Individual PREPARE Scale Scores were recoded to reflect five levels of adjustment. These Recoded Actual Scores were called Male Recoded, Female Recoded, and Couple Recoded Scores. For computer processing the variable names were labeled AS, FAS, and ACPL respectively.

Prediction Scores. Since the Couple Prediction Form has a scale range from (-- very low) to (++ very high), a one to five scale was assigned with one equaling (--) and five equaling (++) . The range of scores for each category then becomes one to five and mirrors the 1 to 5 recoded Actual Scores discussed above. There are three prediction scores for each category - prediction of self, partner, and couple. For processing, these scores were labeled and

TABLE II
SUMMARY OF OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS
OF KEY DEPENDENT VARIABLES

INSTRUMENT DERIVED SCORES	DESCRIPTION	RANGE	TYPE OF MEASURE
Raw PREPARE Category Scores (33)	Summed Scores Reflecting Adjustment in Each PREPARE Category		
	1) Male Adjustment Scores (11)	10-50	Interval
	2) Female Adjustment Scores (11)	10-50	Interval
	3) Positive Couple Agreement (11)	0-100%	Interval
Recorded Actual PREPARE Scores	PREPARE Raw Scores Recorded to Reflect 5 Levels of Adjustment		
	1) Male Recorded Actual = AS (11)	1-5	Ordinal
	2) Female Recorded Actual = FAS (11)	1-5	Ordinal
	3) Couple Scores = ACPL (11)	1-5	Ordinal
Prediction Scores (66)	Predictions of PREPARE Scores Reflecting Adjustment in each Category		
	1) MS = Male prediction of own scores (11)	1-5	Interval
	2) FS = Female prediction of own scores (11)	1-5	Interval
	3) MP = Male prediction of partner scores (11)	1-5	Interval
	4) FP = Female prediction of partner scores (11)	1-5	Interval
	5) MC = Male prediction of couple scores (11)	1-5	Interval
	6) FC = Female prediction of couple scores (11)	1-5	Interval
Accuracy of Prediction Scores (44)	Summed Score reflecting ability to predict recorded PREPARE category scores. If prediction level (1-5 range) is + or -1 from Recorded Actual Scores then, the score is counted as an accurate prediction, Raw range is 0 to 11.		
	1) MACPF = Male accuracy of prediction of female (11)	0-100%	Interval
	2) FACPM = Female accuracy of prediction of male (11)	0-100%	Interval
	3) MACPC = Male accuracy of prediction of couple (11)	0-100%	Interval
	4) FACPC = Female accuracy of prediction of couple (11)	0-100%	Interval

listed in Table II.

Accuracy of Prediction Scores. With the recoded PREPARE scores and the Prediction Scores in the same 1 to 5 format, the accuracy of these predictions could be measured. If the prediction was one point from the Recoded Actual PREPARE Score, it was considered accurate. All accurate predictions were counted as one. When the prediction and recoded PREPARE score differed by more than one, the prediction was not considered accurate and no points were given. The raw range of the Accuracy of Prediction score is 0 to 11. To be useful this was recoded as a percentage with the range from 0 to 100.

Statistical Procedures

Since it is important for the research design that the two treatment groups be similar, an analysis was needed to determine if there were any significant differences between the two groups on background variables. The F-Test was used to determine the significance of difference for interval variables such as age, months until marriage, pay, etc. The Chi-square procedure was used to determine significant differences for the nominal and ordinal variables such as Education, Religion, Marital Status, Race, etc.

The purpose of the study was to determine if there was a significant difference in the Actual Prediction Scores and Accuracy of Prediction scores for the two groups on each of the PREPARE categories. This was done by the use of

t-test procedure. The t-test allowed a comparison between the means of the two groups on each of the PREPARE categories for actual predictions and a comparison between the total Accuracy of Prediction scores.

Statement of Hypotheses

Prediction scores for self, partner, and couple will be higher for the control group than for the experimental group on each of the "PREPARE" Scales.

Persons in the experimental group will have higher Accuracy of Prediction Scores than person in the control group.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

This chapter will be devoted to examining the background characteristics of the sample and the results of the tested hypotheses. The two groups in the sample will be compared to determine any significant differences in background characteristics that may influence the results.

Sample Characteristics

The sample was composed of 284 persons or 142 couples. A total of 152 persons were in the control group, 132 persons were in the experimental group. Since the sample was composed of engaged couples, there was an equal number of men and women. The average age of the sample was 23.39 with the male's average at 24.20 and the female's at 22.56 (Table III). This is consistent with the national average which is 23.4. The minimum age was 17, the maximum age 65. There was no significant difference in age between the experimental group and the control group.

Almost 80% of the sample had at least some college or technical training; 40% had at least 4 years of college; and more than 13% of the males had Graduate or Professional training. A significant difference existed between treatment groups on education level ($p < .03$). In the control

group, 35.3% had at least 4 years of college compared to 45.7% for the experimental group (Table III).

While a wide range of occupations was represented, the majority of the subjects listed students (29.7%), sales, technicians or clerical (24.2%) or other professions such as managers, teachers and nurses (21.9%). There was no significant difference in occupations. The monthly income for the sample was fairly balanced across categories. Some 44% of the sample had monthly incomes under \$600 and 55% had monthly incomes higher than \$600. There was no difference in income for persons in the experimental or control groups (Table III).

Almost 70% of the sample was Catholic with the second-largest group (only 6.3%) Methodist. There was no significant difference between the treatment groups for religion. Also, nearly 90% of the sample was Caucasian with 3.6% American Indian and 5.1% of Spanish descent. There was no significant difference on racial background among treatment groups.

The largest number of persons in the sample was the oldest child in their families. The second-largest number (24.3%) was the second child in their family. This pattern continues until the sixth birth position. There was no significant difference between the treatment groups in terms of birth position.

More than 70% of the sample came from families with four or fewer children. Almost 50% of the same had fewer than three children. No significant difference was noted between the treatment groups in terms of family size.

TABLE III
BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS

Background Characteristics and Type of Statistic	Control		Experimental		Totals	
AGE (MEAN)	23.57		23.16		23.39	
SEX (FREQUENCY)						
MALES	76		66		142	
FEMALES	76		66		142	
EDUCATION(frequency,%)	F	%	F	%	F	%
GRADUATE/PROFESSIONAL	13	9.2	11	8.7	24	8.9
FOUR YEAR COLLEGE	37	26.1	47	37.0	84	31.2
SOME COLLEGE/TECHNICAL	55	38.7	52	40.9	107	39.8
FINISHED HIGH SCHOOL	35	24.6	14	11.0	49	18.2
SOME HIGH SCHOOL	2	1.4	3	2.4	5	1.9
TOTAL						
MONTHLY PAY (Frequency, %)	F	%	F	%	F	%
Less than \$100	22	14.8	23	18	45	16.3
\$101-600	42	28.2	36	28.1	78	28.2
\$601-1000	41	27.5	37	28.9	78	28.1
Over \$1000	44	35.5	32	25.1	76	27.3
TOTAL	149	100.0	128	100	277	100.0

TABLE III (Continued)

Background Characteristics and Type of Statistic	CONTROL		EXPERIMENTAL		TOTAL	
Current Residence (frequency, %)	F	%	F	%	F	%
Farm	4	2.8	3	2.5	7	2.7
Rural, but not Farm	4	2.8	10	8.3	14	5.3
Town, 2500 people or less	6	4.2	3	2.5	9	3.4
Town, 2500 to 25,000	21	14.7	16	13.2	37	14.0
Small City, 25,000 to 100,000	45	31.5	38	31.4	83	31.4
Large City, Over 100,000	63	44.1	51	42.1	114	43.2
Total	143	100.0	121	100.0	264	100.0
Parents Marital Status	F	%	F	%	F	%
Single, Engaged	119	80.4	119	92.2	238	85.9
Single, Not Engaged	4	2.7	1	0.8	5	1.8
Divorced, Not Engaged	1	0.7	1	0.8	2	0.7
Divorced, Engaged	14	9.5	8	6.2	22	7.9
Married, Living Together	10	6.8	-	-	10	3.6
Total	148	100.0	129	100.0	277	100.0
Months Known Partner (MEAN)	24.22		27.76		25.86	
Months Until Marriage (MEAN)	3.69		3.68		3.69	

More than 43% of the sample lived in a large city (more than 100,000). More than 31% of the population lived in a small city (25,000 to 100,000). Fewer than 12% of the sample lived in towns smaller than 2,500. No significant difference was noted between the treatment groups (Table III).

More than 44% of the population were raised in a large city. Almost 21% lived in a small city. More than 20% of the sample were raised in a town of 2,500 or smaller. This shows that a number of the people in the sample were raised in the country, but later moved to a larger town.

Some 56% of the sample said that their parents reacted "very positively" towards their marriage, and 57% said that their friends reacted "very positively". Only 1.1% showed negative parental response and 0.4% showed negative response of friends.

Almost 86% of the sample were single and engaged, while 8% were divorced and engaged. Again, there were no differences between the treatment groups.

The majority of the samples' parents (76.6%) were married and living together. The second most common response (6.8%) was "single, partner deceased." There was no significant difference between treatment groups on marital status of parents.

In summary, 14 background factors were assessed and compared for difference between the experimental and control groups. Since the research design is based on randomness and equivalence of groups, these demographic comparisons are

crucial. Of the 14 factors, only 1 showed a significant difference between the groups. The experimental group had slightly higher educational attainment than the control group. While this could be important, other factors suggest that the groups are highly equivalent in overall background.

Summary of Findings for Each Hypothesis

Each person in the study was asked to predict adjustment scores for self, for partner, and for their relationship. Therefore, each hypothesis will be discussed in terms of these three scores.

Actual Self-Predictions. The difference identified in each category was the opposite of what was anticipated in the hypothesis. Only two categories, Realistic Expectations and Equalitarian Roles, showed significant differences between the experimental and control groups when looking at Prediction of Self Scores for all persons in the sample (Table IV). Instead of the Prediction scores being lower after taking PREPARE, indicating a reduction in idealism, each score is slightly higher with two scores being significantly higher.

When dividing the sample by male and female, the same tendency for predictions to increase occurs. More categories showed significant difference for male than for either the group as a whole or for females only. Male Predictions for Self do not show a significant difference between treatment groups in the Realistic Expectations category, but do so in

TABLE IV
 T-TEST SUMMARIES FOR ACTUAL PREDICTION SCORES
 FOR SELF MADE BY ALL INDIVIDUALS

PREPARE CATEGORY	MEAN		STANDARD DEVIATION		t-value	PROBABILITY & SIGNIFICANCE	
	Control	Experimental	Control	Experimental			
Realistic Expectation	3.87	4.16	.78	.75	-3.22	.00	*
Personality Issues	4.00	4.13	.80	.72	-1.45	.15	n.s.
Equalitarian Roles	4.03	4.28	1.0	.90	-2.18	.03	*
Communication	4.07	4.12	1.01	.86	-0.40	.69	n.s.
Resolving Conflict	3.87	4.01	1.00	.79	-1.35	.17	n.s.
Financial Management	3.83	3.86	.97	.98	-0.27	.79	n.s.
Leisure Interests	4.32	4.35	.84	.77	-0.38	.70	n.s.
Sexual Attitudes	4.19	4.27	.89	.85	-0.71	.48	n.s.
Children and Marriage	4.17	4.17	.92	.89	-0.01	.99	n.s.
Family and Friends	4.01	4.21	1.05	.87	-1.76	.08	n.s.
Religious Orientation	3.54	3.44	1.12	1.06	.81	.42	n.s.

*=p. < .05;

TABLE V
 T-TEST SUMMARIES FOR ACTUAL PREDICTION SCORES
 FOR SELF MADE BY MALES
 IN THE STUDY

PREPARE CATEGORY	MEAN		STANDARD DEVIATION		t-value	PROBABILITY & SIGNIFICANCE	
	Control/Experimental	Control/Experimental	Control/Experimental	Control/Experimental			
Realistic Expectations	3.92	4.16	.72	.72	-1.94	.55	n.s.
Personality Issues	3.91	4.19	.84	.66	-2.16	.03	*
Equalitarian Roles	3.83	4.20	1.13	.94	-2.12	.04	*
Communication	4.07	3.98	1.03	.88	0.50	.62	n.s.
Resolving Conflict	3.84	3.95	1.0	.76	-0.73	.47	n.s.
Financial Management	3.95	3.93	.98	.96	0.06	.96	n.s.
Leisure Interests	4.25	4.26	.84	.84	-0.09	.93	n.s.
Sexual Attitudes	4.09	4.40	.89	.75	-2.20	.03	*
Children & Marriage	4.01	4.12	.99	.90	-0.69	.49	n.s.
Family & Friends	3.95	4.34	1.17	.78	-2.31	.02	*
Religious Orientation	3.41	3.43	1.22	1.14	-0.08	.94	n.s.

*=p.< .05;

TABLE VI
T-TEST SUMMARIES FOR ACTUAL PREDICTION SCORES
FOR SELF MADE BY FEMALES
IN THE STUDY

PREPARE CATEGORY	MEAN		STANDARD DEVIATION		t-value	PROBABILITY & SIGNIFICANCE	
	Control/Experimental	Control/Experimental	Control/Experimental	Control/Experimental			
Realistic Expectations	3.81	4.17	.84	.79	-2.56	.01	*
Personality Issues	4.09	4.08	.76	.77	0.11	.91	n.s.
Equalitarian Roles	4.22	4.35	.81	.86	-0.88	.38	n.s.
Communication	4.08	4.25	1.0	.82	-1.11	.27	n.s.
Resolving Conflict	3.89	4.08	.99	.81	-1.19	.26	n.s.
Financial Management	3.72	3.79	.95	1.0	-0.42	.67	n.s.
Leisure Interests	4.38	4.44	.83	.69	-0.48	.63	n.s.
Sexual Attitudes	4.29	4.13	.88	.92	1.06	.29	n.s.
Children & Marriage	4.33	4.22	.83	.88	0.74	.46	n.s.
Family & Friends	4.06	4.08	.91	.94	-0.09	.93	n.s.
Religious Orientation	3.67	3.44	1.01	.98	1.33	.18	n.s.

*=p. < .05;

Personality Issues, Equalitarian Roles, Sexual Attitudes, and Family and Friends (Table V). Female Predictions for Self show a significant difference only for Realistic Expectations (Table VI).

Actual Partner Prediction. Equalitarian Roles is the only category that showed a significant difference between treatment groups for Actual Partner Predictions for all persons (Table VII). It was also significant for Male Predictions of Partner Scores (Table VIII) but not for Female Prediction of Partner Scores (Table IX). The only category significant for Female Prediction of Partner was Realistic Expectations. As in the self-predictions, all categories showed a tendency for the experimental group's predictions to be consistently higher than the control group's prediction even though not always a significant difference.

Couple Predict. Equalitarian Marital Roles is the only category that shows a significant difference between treatment groups for all persons predicting couple scores (Table X). For Male Prediction of Couple Scores, Equalitarian Marital Roles shows significant differences with the control group being more equalitarian (Table XI). Couple Predict-Female again showed significance in the Realistic Expectation Category (Table XII). Again, the categories that showed significance showed an increase in the prediction scores after taking PREPARE, therefore showing couples to be slightly more idealistic after taking PREPARE. All other categories showed no significant differences between the two groups.

TABLE VII
 T-TEST SUMMARIES FOR ACTUAL PARTNER PREDICTIONS
 MADE BY ALL INDIVIDUALS
 IN THE STUDY

PREPARE CATEGORY	MEAN		STANDARD DEVIATION		t-value	PROBABILITY & SIGNIFICANCE	
	Control	Experimental	Control	Experimental			
Realistic Expectations	3.90	4.15	.85	.75	-2.46	.15	n.s.
Personality Issues	3.96	4.08	.89	.67	-1.25	.21	n.s.
Equalitarian Roles	3.89	4.20	1.03	.88	-2.70	.01	**
Communication	4.08	4.12	1.03	.92	-0.35	.72	n.s.
Resolving Conflict	3.93	4.02	.95	.78	-0.78	.44	n.s.
Financial Management	3.86	3.84	.97	.95	0.19	.85	n.s.
Leisure Interests	4.24	4.32	.93	.79	-0.71	.48	n.s.
Sexual Attitudes	4.19	4.23	.86	.85	-0.43	.67	n.s.
Children & Marriage	4.25	4.20	.89	.90	0.49	.62	n.s.
Family and Friends	4.01	4.10	1.00	.82	-0.80	.42	n.s.
Religious Orientation	3.63	3.70	1.08	.98	-0.58	.56	n.s.

*=p.<.05;

TABLE VIII
T-TEST SUMMARIES FOR ACTUAL PARTNER PREDICTIONS
MADE BY THE MALES
IN THE STUDY

PREPARE CATEGORY	MEAN		STANDARD DEVIATION		t-value	PROBABILITY & SIGNIFICANCE	
	Control	Experimental	Control	Experimental			
Realistic Expectations	3.76	4.00	.97	.77	-1.54	.12	n.s.
Personality Issues	3.89	4.10	.97	.69	-1.39	.17	n.s.
Equalitarian Roles	3.97	4.34	.99	.79	-2.36	.02	*
Communication	3.96	4.00	1.14	.96	-0.22	.82	n.s.
Resolving Conflicts	3.86	3.93	1.06	.79	-0.43	.67	n.s.
Financial Management	3.74	3.79	1.09	.91	-0.27	.79	n.s.
Leisure Interests	4.11	4.21	1.00	.83	-0.62	.53	n.s.
Sexual Attitudes	4.01	4.22	.91	.88	-1.37	.17	n.s.
Children and Marriage	4.01	4.24	.91	.90	-0.89	.17	n.s.
Family and Friends	3.86	4.11	1.07	.87	-1.47	.14	n.s.
Religious Orientation	3.80	3.85	1.01	.95	-0.26	.79	n.s.

*=p. < .05;

TABLE IX

T-TEST SUMMARIES FOR ACTUAL PARTNER PREDICTIONS
MADE BY THE FEMALES

PREPARE CATEGORY	MEAN		STANDARD DEVIATION		t-value	PROBABILITY & SIGNIFICANCE	
	Control	Experimental	Control	Experimental			
Realistic Expectations	4.04	4.30	.70	.70	-2.16	.03	*
Personality Issues	4.03	4.06	.80	.65	-0.31	.76	n.s.
Equalitarian Roles	3.80	4.06	1.07	.95	-1.50	.13	n.s.
Communications	4.20	4.24	.91	.87	-0.32	.75	n.s.
Resolving Conflict	4.00	4.10	.83	.77	-0.71	.48	n.s.
Financial Managment	3.97	3.88	.82	1.00	0.56	.57	n.s.
Leisure Interests	4.37	4.43	.83	.74	-0.42	.67	n.s.
Sexual Attitudes	4.36	4.24	.78	.83	0.82	.41	n.s.
Children and Marriage	4.40	4.15	.75	.90	1.76	.08	n.s.
Family and Friends	4.14	4.08	.92	.78	0.42	.67	n.s.
Religious Orientation	3.46	.356	1.12	1.09	-0.52	.60	n.s.

*= $p < .05$;

TABLE X
 T-TEST SUMMARIES FOR ACTUAL COUPLE PREDICTION
 SCORES MADE BY ALL INDIVIDUALS
 IN THE STUDY

PREPARE CATEGORY	MEAN		STANDARD DEVIATION		t-value	PROBABILITY & SIGNIFICANCE	
	Control	Experimental	Control	Experimental			
Realistic Expectations	3.90	4.10	.76	.71	-2.31	.22	n.s.
Personality Issues	3.91	4.07	.82	.67	-1.74	.08	n.s.
Equalitarian Roles	3.92	4.17	.89	.85	-2.37	.02	*
Communication	4.06	4.06	.93	.84	-0.06	.95	n.s.
Resolving Conflict	3.87	4.01	.92	.77	-1.43	.15	n.s.
Financial Management	3.83	3.87	.90	.89	-0.38	.70	n.s.
Leisure Interests	4.21	4.28	.89	.75	-0.69	.49	n.s.
Sexual Attitudes	4.19	4.28	.85	.79	-0.86	.39	n.s.
Children and Marriage	4.19	4.10	.83	.91	0.74	.46	n.s.
Family and Friends	3.93	4.08	.92	.81	-1.48	.14	n.s.
Religious Orientation	3.59	3.51	.96	.92	0.61	.54	n.s.

*=p. < .05;

TABLE XI
 T-TEST SUMMARIES OF ACTUAL COUPLE PREDICTION
 SCORES MADE BY MALES
 IN THE STUDY

PREPARE CATEGORY	MEAN		STANDARD DEVIATION		t-value	PROBABILITY & SIGNIFICANCE	
	Control	Experimental	Control	Experimental			
Realistic Expectation	3.85	4.01	.80	.74	-1.26	.21	n.s.
Personality Issues	3.91	4.07	.82	.67	-1.55	.08	n.s.
Equalitarian Roles	3.92	4.17	.89	.85	-2.05	.02	*
Communication	4.06	4.06	.92	.83	0.38	.91	n.s.
Resolving Conflict	3.87	4.01	.91	.77	-0.80	.15	n.s.
Financial Management	3.83	3.87	.90	.90	-0.07	.70	n.s.
Leisure Interests	4.21	4.28	.89	.74	-0.43	.49	n.s.
Sexual Attitudes	4.19	4.28	.85	.78	-1.63	.39	n.s.
Children and Marriage	4.19	4.10	.83	.91	-0.75	.46	n.s.
Family and Friends	3.93	4.08	.92	.80	-2.02	.14	n.s.
Religious Orientation	3.59	3.52	.96	.92	-.36	.54	n.s.

*=p. < .05;

TABLE XII
T-TEST SUMMARIES OF ACTUAL COUPLE PREDICTIONS
MADE BY FEMALES
IN THE STUDY

PREPARE CATEGORY	MEAN		STANDARD DEVIATION		t-value	PROBABILITY & SIGNIFICANCE	
	Control	Experimental	Control	Experimental			
Realistic Expectation	3.94	4.20	.71	.68	-2.09	.04	*
Personality Issues	3.97	4.08	.73	.70	-0.89	.37	n.s..
Equalitarian Roles	3.97	4.17	.89	.83	-1.29	.19	n.s..
Communication	4.16	4.23	.86	.85	-0.51	.61	n.s.
Resolving Conflict	3.93	4.12	.87	.78	-1.27	.20	n.s..
Financial Management	3.83	3.90	.85	.91	-0.47	.64	n.s..
Leisure Interests	4.35	4.43	.81	.67	-0.60	.55	n.s.
Sexual Attitudes	4.31	4.25	.82	.79	0.47	.63	n.s.
Children and Marriage	4.37	4.10	.76	.92	1.84	.06	n.s..
Family and Friends	4.05	4.05	.81	.82	0.01	.99	n.s..
Religious Orientation	3.56	3.48	.99	.87	0.51	.61	n.s.

*=p. < .05;

TABLE XIII
 ACCURACY OF PREDICTION
 SELF-ACCURACY OF PREDICTION

	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	SIGNIFICANCE
CONTROL	152	59.74	21.45	0.01
EXPERIMENTAL	132	53.14	22.75	
TOTAL	284	56.68		

PARTNER-ACCURACY OF PREDICTION				
	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	SIGNIFICANCE
CONTROL	152	50.26	22.10	0.08
EXPERIMENTAL	132	45.73	20.79	
TOTAL	284	48.15	21.58	

COUPLE-ACCURACY OF PREDICTION				
	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	SIGNIFICANCE
CONTROL	152	54.10	19.34	0.7
EXPERIMENTAL	132	53.13	19.20	
TOTAL	284	53.65	19.25	

Accuracy of Prediction - Self, Partner, and Couple. The second hypothesis for this study compares the Accuracy of Predictions for Self, Partner, and Couple. The Accuracy of Prediction score was determined by finding the difference between the prediction and the actual PREPARE score.

For the variable Accuracy of Prediction for Self, the mean for the entire population was approximately 57, or each person was 57% accurate on the predictions of his/her own PREPARE scores (Table XIII).

The Experimental group was significantly ($p < .01$) less accurate in predicting their own scores than the Control group. This would appear to show that taking PREPARE influenced persons to be less accurate in predicting their actual scores. While this may be a temporary effect, couples seem less aware of their own preparedness for marriage immediately after taking the Inventory.

The mean Accuracy of Prediction for Partner Score was approximately 48. This is considerably lower than the mean of the Accuracy of Prediction for Self, showing that the sample could more accurately predict their own score than their partner's score. There was no significant difference between treatment groups for this variable.

The mean Accuracy of Prediction Score for Couples was approximately 54. No significant difference was noted between treatment groups for the Accuracy of Prediction for Couples. Though there was only a significant difference on Accuracy of Prediction for Self, it is interesting to note

that for all three scores the Experimental group is less accurate in their predictions than the Control group.

Discussion

Assessments were made of engaged couples predicting their actual scores on a marriage-preparation inventory. Several couples made predictions after having taken the Inventory and other couples made their predictions prior to seeing the items. It was hypothesized that persons exposed to the items would make a more realistic prediction than couples not familiar with the Inventory contents.

Findings generally did not support the hypotheses. In fact, consistent trends were found in the opposite direction. Self-predictions were generally more idealistic for the experimental group even though only two scales were significantly different. Partner Predictions showed a significant difference for only one scale, even though the same trend existed for persons to over-estimate scores for those who took the PREPARE Inventory. Couple Predictions followed a similar pattern.

These findings were surprising yet several potential explanations might account for the trends. The one scale that was significant for self, partner, and couple was Equalitarian Roles. This scale is slightly different from the others in that a high score indicates a more equalitarian view of marriage while a low score indicates a more traditional view. The experimental group then may not be

more idealistic, just more equalitarian. This tendency could perhaps be explained by the significantly higher education level of the experimental group. The assessments were made in a very short period of time, not allowing respondents much time to process the information. Experimental subjects went directly from the PREPARE Inventory to the Prediction Form. Perhaps if subjects were given several hours, days, or even 2 weeks to fully process the material in the Inventory, their prediction scores would be more realistic. At this time, it does not appear that the Inventory has an immediately noticeable effect on helping couples more accurately predict their scores.

In terms of the generally nonsignificant yet consistent trend for the Experimental Group to have more inflated prediction scores, it is possible that exposure to inventory items identified important concerns and in turn raised subject defense mechanisms to deal with this perceived threat. Defensive behaviors such as denial or rationalization may create a temporary overcompensation to protect against a recognition of potential conflicts. This cognitive dissonance may be reduced in time or increase to higher levels. In short, important followup research needs to be done to examine the effect of time on subsequent predictions.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

At this point in the thesis, it would be helpful to summarize the preceding chapters and state the final conclusions of the study.

The number of divorces in the United States has been rapidly increasing in the last few decades. Corresponding with this increase in number of divorces, there has been a decrease in the length of marriages ending in divorce. It is estimated that 39% of all divorces are granted to persons who have been married less than 5 years (Vital Statistics Reports, 1978). Not only, then, are more marriages ending, but they are ending earlier than most persons expected.

Many family therapists and researchers believe that a large number of marriages end in divorce because couples enter marriage with false expectations and misconceptions of marriage and their partner. When their expectations are not fulfilled, they become disillusioned creating severe stress in the marriage. There is a need to help couples become aware of potential issues in marriage and perhaps help lessen their idealism.

The purpose of this study was to determine if idealism

in premarital couples could be lessened by intervention in the form of a premarital inventory. The hypotheses for the study were:

1. Individual prediction of their own, their partner and their couple PREPARE scores after taking PREPARE will be more realistic than individuals who predict the same scores before taking PREPARE.
2. Individual predictions of their own, their partner and their couple PREPARE Scores after taking PREPARE will have higher Accuracy of Prediction Scores than couples predicting the same scores before taking PREPARE.

The review of the current literature on idealism in premarital couples showed that though some work has been completed on idealism, there appears to be a decrease in its popularity. Many studies still frequently referred to research dating back a couple of decades and even to Waller's 1938 article. The origin of idealism was traced back to the Middle Ages and the concept of romanticism and courtly love. The difference between idealization and conventionalization was discussed. Idealization was said to be a tendency to endow a person or relationship with characteristics of one's own ideal mate. Conventionalization is the tendency to present a person or relationship in a highly positive or socially acceptable way.

Previous studies on idealization versus level of involvement were discussed. Waller's hypothesis that idealism increases with seriousness of the relationship was presented. This was followed by a brief summary of Pollis's study testing Waller's hypothesis and Hobart's work in the same area.

A counterbalancing research design approximating the Campbell and Stanley (1966) Randomized Control-Group Posttest Only Design was selected. A total of 284 persons or 142 couples participated in the study. The couples were divided into two groups. Both treatment groups completed the premarital inventory PREPARE. The control group made a prediction before taking PREPARE on their own, their partner, and their couple score on PREPARE. The experimental group completed the same worksheet after taking PREPARE but before receiving any results. All the couples participating were in a premarital group in either a large city in Oklahoma or a small city in Oklahoma.

To administer PREPARE and the Prediction Form, the men and women were separated to ensure independent responses. The information on the Prediction Form was recorded and given back to the couple for later discussion.

The instruments used were PREPARE, a premarital inventory consisting of 125 statements, and a Couple Prediction Form. The couple was asked to respond to the PREPARE statements on a five-point Likert-type scale. The topics covered were 12 areas of concern to premarital

couples. The Couple Prediction Form is a form designed specifically for use with PREPARE in this and a similar study.

The sample consisted of engaged couples participating in a premarital program. The majority of the sample was from a town of 25,000 or more. Ages of the sample ranged from 17 to 65 with the mean age of 23.39. A variety of occupations were represented. Almost 80% of the group had at least some college, more than 40% had more than 4 years of college. The majority of the sample was Caucasian and stated their religious preference as Catholicism.

The results of the data analysis showed the opposite of the anticipated outcome. It was anticipated that the couples in the experimental group would have lower prediction scores than the control groups and that their predictions would be more accurate. It was found, however, that there was little difference between the groups. But, when a difference did occur, the experimental group was shown to have higher prediction scores and were less accurate in their predictions.

Several possible explanations were mentioned to explain why the experimental group had higher prediction scores and were less accurate in predicting. One factor that must be considered is that the one category that was consistently significant was Equalitarian Roles. Since a high score in Equalitarian Roles indicates a more equalitarian view of marriage, the experimental group may just be more equalitarian

not necessarily more idealistic. Another factor that may have influenced the results was the lack of time between taking PREPARE and making predictions. The couple was not allowed enough time to fully process the information in PREPARE.

A third factor could be the element of threat involved with a premarital inventory. If the inventory exposed areas of disagreement that the couple had not dealt resulting in personal threat, or discomfort, the person may compensate by predicting higher scores than he actually expects as a form of denial or rationalization.

The primary recommendation for future research would be a study that allows the couple more time between taking PREPARE and making their predictions. This would give couples time to think about PREPARE and discuss it with their partner, thereby, it is hoped, lowering any defensiveness that might be caused by taking the instrument.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baber, R. Marriage and the Family. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1958.
- Beigel, H.B. Romantic love. American Sociological Review, 1951, 16, 326-334.
- Bernard, J. Factors in the distribution of success in marriage. American Journal of Sociology, 1934, 40, 49-60.
- Bienvenu, M.J., Sr. A measurement of premarital communication. Family Coordinator, 1975, 24, 65-68.
- Blazer, J.A. Complimentary needs and marital happiness. Marriage and Family Living, 1963, 25, 89-95.
- Bolten, C.D. Mate selection as the development of a relationship. Marriage and Family Living, 1961, 23, 234-240.
- Bowerman, C.E. A test of the theory of complimentary needs as applied to couples during courtship. American Sociological Review, 1965, 21, 602-605.
- Burchinal, L.G. Ages at marriage, occupations of grooms and interreligious marital rates. Social Forces, 1962, 40, 348-354.
- Burgess, E.W. The romantic impulse and Family Disorganization. Survey, 1926, 57, 290-294.
- Burgess, E.W., & Cottrell, L., Jr. Predicting success or failure in marriage. New York: Prentice, 1939.
- Burgess, E.W., & Wallin, P. Predicting adjustment in marriage from adjustment in engagement. American Journal of Sociology, 1943, 49, 737-751.
- Campbell, D.T. & Stanley J.C. Experimental and quasi-experimental design for research. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1966.
- Coe, W.C., Curry, A.E. & Kessler D.R. Family interaction of psychiatric inpatients. Family Process, 1969, 8, 119-130.

- Coombs, R.H. A value theory of mate selection. The Family Coordinator, 1961, 10, 51-54.
- Dean, D.G. Romanticism and emotional maturity: a preliminary study. Marriage and Family Living, 1961, 23, 44-45.
- DeLissovoy, V. High school marriage. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1973, 35, 245-255.
- Dymond, R. The relationship of accuracy of perception of the spouse and Marital happiness. American Psychologist, 1965, 8, 355.
- Edmonds, V.H. Marital conventionalization: definition. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1967, 29, 681-688.
- Folsom, J.K. Steps in love and courtship in family, marriage, and parenthood. Boston: D.C. Heath Company, 1965.
- Fournier, D.G. Validation of PREPARE: A premarital counseling inventory. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1979, 40, 6, 2385-2386B.
- Freeman, D.R. Counseling engaged couples in small groups. Social Work, 1965, 10, 36-42.
- Furgeson, E.H. The aims of premarital counseling. Journal of Pastoral Care, 1952, 6, 30-39.
- Goode, W.J. The theoretical importance of love. American Sociological Review, 1959, 24, 38-47.
- Gross, L. A belief pattern scale for measuring attitude towards romanticism. American Sociological Review, 1944, 9, 463-472.
- Guldner, C.A. The post-marital: an alternative to pre-marital counseling. The Family Coordinator, 1971, 20, 115-119.
- Hobart, C.W. Disillusionment in marriage and romanticism. Marriage and Family Living, 1958, 20, 156-162.
- Hobart, C.W. Some effects of romanticism during courtship on marriage role opinions. Sociology and Social Research, 1958, 42, 336-343.
- Hobart, C.W. The incidence of romanticism during courtship. Social Forces, 1958, 36, 362-367.
- Hollingshead, A.S. Cultural factors in mate selection. American Sociological Review, 1950, 15, 619-627.

- Kephart, W.M. The family, society, and the individual. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966.
- Kolb, W.L. Family sociology, marriage education, and the romantic complex: a critique. Social Forces, 1950, 29, 65-72.
- Lederer, W.J. & Jackson, D.D. The mirages of marriage. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1968.
- Locke, K.J. & Wallace, K.J. Short marital adjustment and prediction tests: their reliability and validity. Marriage and Family Living, 1959, 21, 251-255.
- Mace, D. Getting ready for marriage. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972.
- Markman, H.J. Application of a behavioral model of marriage in predicting relationship satisfaction of couples planning marriage. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology. 1979, 47, 743-749.
- Mowrer, E. Family disorganization: an introduction to sociological analysis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.
- National Center for Health Services. Monthly Vital Statistics Report, Vol, 30, 1982.
- National Center for Health Services, Vital Statistics Report, 1978
- Olson, H. (Ed.). Inventory of Marriage and Family Literature. London: Sage Publications, 1981.
- Olson, D.H., Fournier, D.G., and Druckman, J.M. PREPARE-ENRICH Counselors Manual (Rev. Ed.). Stillwater, OK: PREPARE-ENRICH Inc., P.O. Box 1363, Stillwater, OK, 74076, 1982. (Originally published, 1979).
- Pineo, P.C. Disenchantment in the later years of marriage. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1963.
- Pollis, C.A. Dating involvement and patterns of idealization: a test of Waller's hypotheses. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1969, 31, 765-771.
- Rolfe, D. Marriage preparation manual. New York: Paulist Press, 1975.
- Schulman, M. Idealization in engaged couples. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1974, 36, 139-147.

Sharpe, R.B. "Prediction Accuracy as a determinant of idealism in engaged couples." (Unpub. M.S. thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1982).

Spanier, G.B. Romanticism and marital adjustment. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1972, 34, 481-487.

Waller, W. The family: a dynamic interpretation. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1938.

Wallin, P. Two conceptions of the relationship between love and idealization. Research Studies of the State College of Washington, 1952, 20, 21-25.

Winch, R.F. The modern family. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1952.

APPENDIX A

COUPLE PREDICTION FORM



COUPLE WORKSHEET

THIS WORKSHEET WAS DESIGNED TO HELP YOU BEST USE THE INFORMATION THAT YOU WILL RECEIVE FROM TAKING THE PREPARE II INVENTORY. YOU MAY KEEP THIS FORM FOR FUTURE REFERENCE. BEFORE YOU HAVE THE FOLLOWUP SESSIONS TO DISCUSS THE PREPARE II COMPUTER PRINTOUT, YOU MAY FIND IT INTERESTING TO COMPLETE PART 1 OF THIS FORM SO THAT YOU CAN COMPARE YOUR GUESSES WITH THE ACTUAL RESULTS FOR YOU AND YOUR PARTNER.

INSTRUCTIONS:

COUPLE ID # _____ M F

1. **FIRST**, NOTE EACH OF THE CATEGORIES IN PREPARE II.
 2. **SECOND**, BASED ON YOUR EXPERIENCES AS A COUPLE, TRY TO PREDICT HOW EACH OF YOU WILL SCORE ON THE 11 PREPARE II CATEGORIES.
 3. **THIRD**, BASED ON YOUR EXPERIENCES, TRY TO PREDICT YOUR OVERALL COUPLE AGREEMENT IN EACH OF THE 11 PREPARE II AREAS.
 4. YOUR PREPARE II ADMINISTRATOR WILL SHARE WITH YOU THE RELEVANT RESULTS IN A COUPLE OF WEEKS. YOU MAY USE THIS FORM TO HELP YOU DISCUSS THE INVENTORY BETWEEN NOW AND WHEN THE RESULTS ARE RETURNED. WE HOPE THAT COMPARING YOUR IMPRESSIONS WITH EACH OTHER WILL BE CHALLENGING FOR YOU. BEST OF LUCK !!!
-

PREPARE II CATEGORIES	PART 1 -- PREDICTED SCORES									PART 2 -- RESULTS		
	MAN			WOMAN			COUPLE AGREEMENT			MAN	WOMAN	COUPLE AGREEMENT
	HI	AVG	LO	HI	AVG	LO	HI	AVG	LO			
REALISTIC EXPECTATIONS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	---	---	---
PERSONALITY ISSUES	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	---	---	---
EQUALITARIAN MARITAL ROLES	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	---	---	---
COMMUNICATION	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	---	---	---
RESOLVING CONFLICT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	---	---	---
FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	---	---	---
LEISURE INTERESTS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	---	---	---
SEXUAL ATTITUDES	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	---	---	---
CHILDREN AND MARRIAGE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	---	---	---
FAMILY AND FRIENDS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	---	---	---
RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	---	---	---

COUPLE NOTES:

PREPARE

Couple Prediction Form

ENRICH

This form was designed to help couples more clearly assess and discuss their unique relationship strengths and weaknesses prior to marriage. The categories are those covered in the PREPARE II Inventory and will help guide discussion about important marital topics while the computer results are being processed. Each person should examine the statements below and rate as honestly as possible what you expect the PREPARE II results to reveal about you, your partner and your relationship. Your ratings will help you to examine your perceptions about marriage and to assess how realistically you and your partner are approaching the rewards and challenges that are vital to marriage.

Prépare II
P.O. Box 1363
Stillwater, OK 74076

Couple ID# _____
Respondent Man _____ Woman _____
(check one) Couple _____

Response Choices	++ Very High	+ = High Average	= = Average	- = Low Average	-- Very Low	Response Choices
PREPARE CATEGORIES						
	COUPLE PREDICTED SCORES			COMPUTER RESULTS		
	MAN	WOMAN	COUPLE	MAN	WOMAN	COUPLE
	↑↑ ↓↓	↑↑ ↓↓	↑↑ ↓↓	↑↑ ↓↓	↑↑ ↓↓	↑↑ ↓↓
	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□
Realistic Attitude On Marriage High scorers are realistic about the challenges and demands of marriage. Low scorers tend to be idealistic, too romantic or naive about married life.	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□
Approval Of Partners Behavior High scorers like the personality, behavior and habits of their partner. Low scorers usually dislike many of the personality traits of their partner.	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□
Equal Household Responsibility High scorers desire equal sharing of decision making and household responsibilities. Low scorers desire the husband to handle decisions and the wife to handle household tasks.	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□
Ease Of Couple Communication High scorers feel understood by their partner and can discuss most topics freely. Low scorers are concerned about not being able to express feelings with their partner.	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□
Ability To Resolve Conflict High scorers feel that they are able to discuss and resolve differences with their partner. Low scorers find arguments hard to resolve and usually avoid conflicts at all cost.	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□
Realistic Financial Planning High scorers have realistic financial plans and agreement with partner about money. Low scorers are undecided about money matters or are worried about disagreements.	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□
Compatible Leisure Attitudes High scorers spend time together in shared activities yet are also free to pursue individual interests. Low scorers have different preferences or seldom spend leisure time together.	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□
Compatible Sexual Attitudes High scorers have shared sexual desires, can discuss sexuality and agree on family planning. Low scorers are concerned about sexual issues and have some disagreements.	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□
Attitude About Having Children High scorers desire children and have a realistic attitude about parental roles and challenges. Low scorers disagree about children or are too idealistic.	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□
Adjustment To Family & Friends High scorers have good relations with parents and friends. Low scorers may not feel accepted by parents, are uncomfortable with in-laws or do not like each others friends.	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□
Religious Beliefs & Attitudes High scorers accept traditional religious values and practice their beliefs. Low scorers question traditional beliefs and see religion as a personal decision.	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□

APPENDIX B

THE PREMARITAL PERSONAL AND
RELATIONSHIP EVALUATION

SUMMARY ANALYSIS FOR PREPARE CATEGORIES

***** **

CATEGORY TITLE	INDIVIDUAL SCORES				COUPLE SCORES				
	MALE PCT	REVISED	FEMALE PCT	REVISED	* AGREE ITEMS	DISAGREE ITEMS	INDECISION ITEMS	POSITIVE AGREEMENT COUPLE	NORM
IDEALISTIC DISTORTION	28.		34.						
REALISTIC EXPECTATIONS	95.	89.	94.	87.	5	2	3	50.	34.
PERSONALITY ISSUES	63.	58.	75.	68.	3	4	3	30.	35.
EQUALITARIAN ROLES	46.	45.	76.	75.	8	2	0	60.	44.
COMMUNICATION	91.	85.	90.	83.	7	3	0	70.	47.
CONFLICT RESOLUTION	68.	66.	58.	56.	6	1	3	60.	45.
FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT	88.	84.	93.	85.	8	0	2	80.	34.
LEISURE ACTIVITIES	90.	88.	93.	91.	9	0	1	90.	52.
SEXUAL RELATIONSHIP	73.	71.	70.	68.	6	2	2	60.	47.
CHILDREN AND MARRIAGE	58.	55.	87.	82.	4	3	3	40.	39.
FAMILY AND FRIENDS	64.	61.	76.	72.	5	4	1	50.	47.
RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION	91.	89.	95.	91.	6	1	1	80.	34.
AVERAGE POSITIVE AGREEMENT								61.	42.

PERCENTILE SCORES --- PCT --- RANGE FROM 0 TO 100 AND HAVE AN AVERAGE SCORE OF 50. MODERATELY HIGH SCORES (50 OR MORE) REFLECT POSITIVE RELATIONSHIP ATTITUDES AND ADJUSTMENT. REVISED SCORES ARE AN ADJUSTMENT OF AN INDIVIDUALS PCT SCORE BASED ON EACH PERSONS TENDENCY TO PRESENT AN IDEALISTIC IMAGE OF THEIR RELATIONSHIP. REVISED SCORES WILL BE LOW WHEN INDIVIDUALS ARE UNREALISTIC ABOUT MARRIAGE. POSITIVE AGREEMENT SCORES REFLECT PARTNERS CONSENSUS ON ATTITUDES BELIEVED TO BE RELATED TO POSITIVE ADJUSTMENT IN MARRIAGE. RELATIONSHIP STRENGTH ARE IDENTIFIED WHEN A COUPLES POSITIVE AGREEMENT SCORE IS HIGHER THAN THE NORM SCORE FOR THAT CATEGORY.

BRIEF CATEGORY DESCRIPTIONS

SCORE RANGES	90 - 100 VERY HIGH	0 - 9 VERY LOW
	75 - 89 HIGH	10 - 24 LOW
	60 - 74 MODERATELY HIGH *****40-59 AVERAGE*****	25 - 39 MODERATELY LOW

IDEALISTIC DISTORTION

HIGH SCORES IDENTIFY INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE DESCRIBING THEIR RELATIONSHIP IN AN UNREALISTICALLY POSITIVE WAY. HIGH SCORERS ARE VERY IDEALISTIC AND PROBABLY DISTORTED MANY ANSWERS WHILE TAKING PREPARE II. REVISED SCORES CORRECT PCT SCORES FOR IDEALISTIC DISTORTION.

REALISTIC EXPECTATIONS

HIGH SCORES REFLECT REALISTIC EXPECTATIONS ABOUT COMMON CHALLENGES WITH BEING MARRIED. HIGH SCORERS ARE AWARE OF COMMON MYTHS ABOUT MARRIAGE AND ARE REALISTIC ABOUT WHAT TO EXPECT FROM MARRIAGE.

PERSONALITY ISSUES

HIGH SCORES REFLECT POSITIVE PERCEPTION OF PARTNER, GENERAL APPROVAL OF PARTNER'S BEHAVIOR AND ADJUSTMENT TO PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS. HIGH SCORERS PERCEIVE THEIR PARTNER AS HAVING VERY FEW NEGATIVE PERSONALITY TRAITS.

EQUALITARIAN ROLES

HIGH SCORES REFLECT A WILLINGNESS TO SHARE ROLES AND TO REGARD HUSBANDS AND WIVES AS EQUAL PARTNERS IN THE RELATIONSHIP. HIGH SCORERS REPORT A DESIRE TO SHARE TASKS AND TO HAVE EQUAL POWER IN DECISIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES.

COMMUNICATION

HIGH SCORES REFLECT AN AWARENESS OF CONSTRUCTIVE COMMUNICATION SKILLS AND AN ABILITY TO SATISFACTORILY USE THESE SKILLS. HIGH SCORERS TYPICALLY REPORT THAT IT IS EASY TO TALK WITH THEIR PARTNER.

CONFLICT RESOLUTION

HIGH SCORES REFLECT A POSITIVE ORIENTATION TOWARD RESOLVING CONFLICTS IN THEIR RELATIONSHIP. HIGH SCORERS TEND TO CONFRONT PROBLEMS DIRECTLY RATHER THAN ALLOWING CON-

FLICTS TO REMAIN UNRESOLVED.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

HIGH SCORES REFLECT REALISTIC PLANS AND ATTITUDES ABOUT FINANCES AND SATISFACTION WITH CURRENT FINANCIAL DECISIONS. HIGH SCORERS PLAN TO KEEP RECORDS, ADJUST FINANCIAL DECISIONS ACCORDING TO RESOURCES, AND HAVE OVERALL FINANCIAL GOALS.

LEISURE ACTIVITIES

HIGH SCORES REFLECT FLEXIBILITY BETWEEN PARTNERS ABOUT LEISURE INTERESTS AND SATISFACTION WITH CURRENT LIFESTYLE PREFERENCES. HIGH SCORERS TEND TO BE INVOLVED IN BOTH INDIVIDUAL AND MUTUAL INTERESTS.

SEXUAL RELATIONSHIP

HIGH SCORES REFLECT FLEXIBLE ATTITUDES AND FEELINGS REGARDING MARITAL SEXUALITY AND AFFECTION. HIGH SCORERS ARE WILLING TO DISCUSS SEXUAL ISSUES AND ARE SATISFIED WITH THEIR DECISIONS ABOUT SEXUALITY AND FAMILY PLANNING.

CHILDREN AND MARRIAGE

HIGH SCORES REFLECT POSITIVE ATTITUDES AND FEELINGS ABOUT HAVING CHILDREN AND A REALISTIC PERCEPTION OF PARENTAL ROLES. HIGH SCORERS AGREE ON CHILD REARING RESPONSIBILITIES AND REALIZE THE IMPACT OF CHILDREN ON MARRIAGE.

FAMILY AND FRIENDS

HIGH SCORES REFLECT COMFORTABLE RELATIONSHIPS WITH PARENTS, IN-LAWS, AND FRIENDS. HIGH SCORERS TEND TO HAVE MANY MUTUAL FRIENDS AND FAMILIES WHOM ARE SUPPORTIVE OF EACH PARTNER AND THEIR DECISION TO MARRY.

RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION

HIGH SCORES REFLECT ACCEPTANCE OF TRADITIONAL BELIEFS AND PRACTICES AND ALSO A DEEP COMMITMENT TO RELIGIOUS VALUES. PERSONS WHO REGARD RELIGION AS A PERSONAL DECISION OR QUESTION TRADITIONAL RELIGIOUS BELIEFS OFTEN SCORE LOW TO MODERATELY LOW.

RESPONSE CHOICES				
1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

1. I sometimes feel pressured to participate in activities that my partner enjoys.
2. It is very easy for me to express all my true feelings to my partner.
3. It is hard for me to have complete faith in some of the accepted practices of my religion.
4. In order to end an argument, I usually give in.
5. I am satisfied with how we have defined the responsibilities of a father in raising children.

-
6. When we are having a problem, my partner often gives me the silent treatment.
 7. Some relatives or friends have reservations about our marriage.
 8. There are times when I am bothered by my partner's jealousy.
 9. I am completely satisfied with the amount of affection my partner gives me.
 10. I would not seek help from a professional even if we had serious marital problems.
 11. Religion should have the same meaning for both of us.
 12. I believe the woman's place is basically in the home.
 13. Sometimes I am concerned about my partner's temper.
 14. I believe there is only one person in this world to whom I could be happily married.
 15. I would be willing to try almost any sexual activities my partner would like to do.

-
16. Sometimes I wish my partner was more careful in spending money.
 17. My partner does not seem to have enough time or energy for recreation with me.
 18. I would rather do almost anything than spend an evening by myself.
 19. I think we will never have problems in our marriage.
 20. After looking at our combined incomes, we have changed our minds about how much money we can spend.
-

RESPONSE CHOICES				
1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

21. We are as well adjusted as any two persons in this world can be.
22. Continuing to search out and share religious beliefs is necessary for me to have a growing relationship.
23. If both of us are working, we should equally share the household responsibilities.
24. At times I am concerned that my partner appears to be unhappy and withdrawn.
25. Sexual activities come naturally for me and do not need to be discussed in detail.

-
26. We have not yet decided how to handle the finances.
 27. Sometimes my family does not accept me as an adult.
 28. I have fewer outside interests or hobbies than my partner.
 29. It is more important that the husband be satisfied with his job because his income is more important to the family.
 30. I wish my partner would smoke and/or drink less.
 31. My partner and I do not seem to enjoy the same type of parties.
 32. Most problems experienced between my partner and I will be resolved simply by the passage of time.
 33. My idea of a good time is different than my partner's.
 34. My partner and I understand each other completely.
 35. I think having children will dramatically change the way we live.

-
36. Increasing the amount of time together will automatically improve our relationship.
 37. At times I am uncomfortable with the way my partner touches me in public.
 38. I am satisfied with our decisions about how much money we should save.
 39. If my partner has any faults, I am not aware of them.
 40. My partner sometimes makes comments which put me down.

RESPONSE CHOICES				
1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

41. It is easy and comfortable for me to talk with my partner about sexual issues.
42. My partner completely understands and sympathizes with my every mood.
43. In our marriage, the wife should be more willing and able to adjust than the husband.
44. When we are with others, I am sometimes upset with my partner's behavior.
45. We have figured out exactly what our financial position will be after we marry.
-

46. It is not important to include a religious aspect in the commitment that I make to my partner.
47. I am unsure about the best method of birth control or family planning for us.
48. I think my partner is too involved with his/her family.
49. Every new thing I have learned about my partner has pleased me.
50. We agree on the number of children we would like to have.
51. We have decided to keep records of our spending so we can budget our money.
52. I expect my partner to meet almost all of my needs for security, support and closeness.
53. There is nothing that could happen that would cause me to question my love for my partner.
54. There are times when I do not feel a great deal of love and affection for my partner.
55. Even if the wife works outside the home, she should still be responsible for running the household.
-

56. My partner and I disagree about how to put our religious beliefs into practice.
57. I feel very uncomfortable with some of my future in-laws.
58. When we are having a problem, I can always tell my partner what is bothering me.
59. After we have children, we will have less time for each other.
60. My partner and I agree on the kind of honeymoon/vacations we enjoy.
-

RESPONSE CHOICES				
1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

61. In our marriage, the husband will be the head of our household.
62. It is important for me to try different sexual techniques with my partner.
63. I do not think any couple could live together with greater harmony than my partner and I.
64. My relationship is not a perfect success.
65. The husband's occupation should be first priority in determining where we live.
-

66. It seems like when there is a problem in our relationship, I am always the one who wants to discuss it.
67. I have shared all my feelings about having children with my partner.
68. I do not think anyone could possibly be happier than my partner and I when we are with one another.
69. I am sometimes reluctant to be affectionate with my partner because it is often interpreted as a sexual advance.
70. I have some needs that are not being met by my relationship.
71. Sometimes we have serious disputes over unimportant issues.
72. I am concerned that my partner and I do not spend enough of our leisure time together.
73. There are times when my partner does things that make me unhappy.
74. I go out of my way to avoid conflict with my partner.
75. It is important for me to explore the spiritual aspects of our relationship through praying together.
-

76. I believe that our marriage means active involvement in our religion.
77. If every person in the world of the opposite sex had been available and willing to marry me, I could not have made a better choice.
78. It bothers me that my partner is often late.
79. I sometimes feel our arguments go on and on and never seem to get resolved.
80. In our marriage, the wife will have almost all of the responsibilities for child rearing.
-

RESPONSE CHOICES				
1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

81. I should know what my partner is feeling without being told.
82. After marriage, it will be easier to change those things about my partner that I do not like.
83. To avoid hurting my partner's feelings during an argument, I would rather not say anything.
84. I do not seem to have much fun unless I am with my partner.
85. I am very happy with how we have decided to handle our financial matters.
-

86. Sometimes I do not like the amount of time my partner spends with friends.
87. My relationship could be happier than it is.
88. I believe that I have already learned everything there is to know about my partner.
89. In loving my partner, I feel that I am beginning to better understand the concept that God is love.
90. I am worried that accepting financial assistance or advice from our families will present a problem for us.
91. I am very satisfied with how my partner and I talk with each other.
92. I am worried that one of our families may cause troubles in our marriage.
93. We do have a general plan for how much money we can spend each month.
94. I feel pressured by my partner, parents, and/or friends, to have children.
95. Sometimes I have difficulty dealing with my partner's moodiness.
-

96. I usually feel that my partner does not take our disagreements seriously.
97. In our marriage, the husband should have the final word in most of the important decisions in the family.
98. I do not always share negative feelings with my partner because I am afraid she/he will get angry.
99. I expect that some romantic love will fade in my marriage.
100. My partner and I disagree about some of the teachings of our religion(s).
-

RESPONSE CHOICES				
1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

101. My partner and I are united by religious faith.
102. We agree on the values and goals that we want for our children.
103. I am very comfortable with all of my partner's friends.
104. I have never regretted my relationship with my partner, not even for a moment.
105. My partner has all of the qualities I have always wanted in a mate.

-
106. Sometimes I am concerned that my partner's interest in sex is not the same as mine.
107. I am satisfied with our decisions regarding birth control or family planning.
108. I am uncomfortable when my partner spends time with friends of the opposite sex.
109. My partner is always a good listener.
110. I am concerned about who will be responsible for the money.
111. Sometimes I am concerned that my partner will want me to do things sexually that I do not enjoy.
112. When we argue, I usually end up feeling responsible for the problem.
113. I believe that most difficulties experienced before marriage will fade after we are married.
114. I believe we should spend all our free time together.
115. At times I think my partner depends on me too much.

-
116. If she wants to, the wife will be encouraged to work outside the home.
117. My partner's ideas about discipline of our children might be different than mine.
118. I am sometimes afraid to ask my partner for what I want.
119. One of us has unpaid bills which causes me concern.
120. Sometimes I have trouble believing everything my partner tells me.

Please Go To The Back Page

RESPONSE CHOICES				
1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

121. My partner likes all of my friends.
122. My partner and I disagree on the religious education for our children.
123. I am satisfied with how we have defined the responsibilities of a mother in raising children.
124. When discussing problems, I usually feel like my partner is trying to force me to change.
125. Sometimes my partner is too stubborn.

WISHING YOU A HAPPY AND SUCCESSFUL MARRIAGE!!



DEVELOPED BY:
 David H. Olson, Ph.D.
 David G. Fournier, Ph.D.
 Joan ME Druckman, Ph.D.
 Phone (405) 377-9355

PREPARE II - ENRICH
Office For Research and
Program Development
 P.O. Box 1363
 Stillwater, Oklahoma
 74076-1363

Copyright © 1979 by Prepare, Inc.

PREPARE

PREMARITAL PERSONAL AND RELATIONSHIP EVALUATION

PREPARE-ENRICH
P.O. BOX 1363
STILLWATER, OK 74076

COUNSELOR'S NAME _____

DAVID H. OLSON, Ph.D.
DAVID G. FOURNIER, Ph.D.
JOAN M. DRUCKMAN, Ph.D.

Introduction: PREPARE was designed to help individuals discover some of the basic strengths and weaknesses in their relationships. PREPARE results are not intended to predict your chances for marital success but are intended to help you make decisions about your own readiness for marriage. Please answer all questions according to your point of view. The usefulness of PREPARE depends upon your willingness to respond fully and honestly. Please do not place your name on this form so that confidentiality can be maintained. (Use a no. 2 pencil and completely blacken each circle.)

Education Completed (one only)

- 1 Graduate Professional
- 2 Four Year College
- 3 Some College-Technical
- 4 Finished High School
- 5 Some High School
- 6 Finished Elementary
- 7 Some Elementary

OCCUPATION

- 1 Professionals, Doctors, Lawyers, Executives
- 2 Other Professionals, Managers, Teachers, Nurses
- 3 Skilled and Building Trades, Farmer
- 4 Sales, Technicians, Clerical
- 5 Laborer, Factory Worker, Waitress
- 6 General Service Employees
- 7 Student
- 8 Unemployed
- 9 Other _____

Write number here and darken circles
01 - 1 year

How many years have you been married?

05 - five years

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

How many months have you known your partner?

00 - less than 1 month

05 - 5 months (If married, how many months?)

What is your approximate monthly take-home pay? (Not including your partner's income.)

- 0 No Income
- 1 \$200 or less
- 2 \$200-400
- 3 \$401-600
- 4 \$601-800
- 5 \$801-1000
- 6 \$1001-1200
- 7 \$1201-1400
- 8 \$1401-1600
- 9 over \$1600

Religious Preference

- 0 Agnostic
- 1 Baptist
- 2 Catholic
- 3 Christian
- 4 Episcopal
- 5 Jewish
- 6 Lutheran
- 7 Methodist
- 8 Other Protestant
- 9 Other _____

What is your birth position in your family?

How many children in your family?

- 1 One
- 2 Two
- 3 Three
- 4 Four
- 5 Five
- 6 Six
- 7 Seven
- 8 Eight
- 9 Nine
- 0 Ten or more

Marital Status

- 1 Single engaged
- 2 Single not engaged
- 3 Divorced not engaged
- 4 Divorced engaged
- 5 Married separated
- 6 Married living together

What was your parent's general reaction to your plans to marry?

What was the general reaction of your friends to your plans to marry?

- 0 Very Positive
- 1 Positive
- 2 Neutral
- 3 Negative
- 4 Very Negative

RACE

- 1 Afro-American (Black)
- 2 Asian-American
- 3 Caucasian (White)
- 4 American Indian
- 5 Spanish Descent
- 6 Other _____

Is the woman pregnant?

Yes No

CURRENT LIVING ARRANGEMENT

- 1 Live alone
- 2 With parents
- 3 With partner
- 4 With others

Parents Marital Status

- 1 Married and living together
- 2 Separated
- 3 Divorced and single, both
- 4 Divorced and remarried, both
- 5 Divorced, one single, one remarried
- 6 Single (partner deceased)
- 7 Remarried (partner deceased)
- 8 Both parents deceased

Where did you live most of your life? Where do you currently live?

- 1 Farm
- 2 Rural but not farm
- 3 Town, 2500 people or less
- 4 Town, 2500 to 25,000
- 5 Small city, 25,000 to 100,000
- 6 Large city, over 100,000

YOUR AGE

SEX
Male (M)
Female (F)

COPYRIGHT, 1982
PREPARE-ENRICH, Inc.

COUNSELOR COMPLETE

Couple Number (start with)

0	0	1
2	2	2
3	3	3
4	4	4
5	5	5
6	6	6
7	7	7
8	8	8
9	9	9

Write number and blacken circles

Group Number

1	2	3	4	5
6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9	9

COUNSELOR'S ZIP CODE

Group Number

1	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6
7	7
8	8
9	9

Write number and blacken circles

Today's Date

Month	Day	Year
0	0	0
1	1	1
2	2	2
3	3	3
4	4	4
5	5	5
6	6	6
7	7	7
8	8	8
9	9	9

Example:
01 - January
12 - December
82 - 1982
Blacken Circles

Month	Day	Year
0	0	0
1	1	1
2	2	2
3	3	3
4	4	4
5	5	5
6	6	6
7	7	7
8	8	8
9	9	9

2
VITA

Janis Roberts Sharpe

Candidate for the Degree of
Master of Science

Thesis: The Effects of a Premarital Inventory on Idealism
in Engaged Couples

Major Field: Family Relations and Child Development

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Marysville, Kansas, June 14,
1956, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Donald E. Roberts...

Education: Graduated from Topeka West High School,
Topeka, Kansas, in May, 1974; received Bachelor
of Science degree in Telecommunication from Oral
Roberts University in 1978. Completed requirements
for the Master of Science degree at Oklahoma
State University in May 1983.