

MARITAL PREPAREDNESS AMONG HIGH SCHOOL YOUTH

By

MARY CARR ALLEN PYLES

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1965

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
July, 1971

OKLAHOMA
STATE UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
DEC 31 1971

MARITAL PREPAREDNESS AMONG HIGH SCHOOL YOUTH

Thesis Approved:

Nick Stinnett

Thesis Adviser

Kenneth S. Sackett

Josephine Wofford

D. Durham

Dean of the Graduate College

803711

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Deep appreciation is expressed to Dr. Nick Stinnett, whose helpful suggestions, encouragement and interest throughout the study made its completion possible.

Sincere appreciation is also extended Dr. James Walters and Dr. Josephine Hoffer for their critical reading and helpful suggestions of the study.

Appreciation is sincerely expressed to the Oklahoma State University Research Foundation for support of, and interest in, this project. Thanks also go to the Oklahoma High School students who participated in the study.

Gratitude is also expressed to family and friends for their support throughout the study. Special mention to my husband, Gerald, for his understanding throughout the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Need for Research	3
Purpose of Study	3
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
Marital Adjustment and Related Factors	5
Criticism of Research in Marital Adjustment	9
Marital Preparedness	11
III. PROCEDURE	14
Selection of Subject	14
Information Sheet	14
RMC Index	15
IV. RESULTS	17
Description of Subject	17
Examination of Hypothesis	19
V. SUMMARY	29
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	32
APPENDIX A	35
APPENDIX B	51

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Characteristic of the Subjects	18
II. F Scores Reflecting Difference in RMC Index Scores Classified According to Type of Discipline Received from Mother	21
III. F Score Reflecting Difference in RMC Index Scores Classified According to Source of Most Affection During Childhood	22
IV. F Scores Reflecting Difference in RMC Index Scores Classified According to Degree to Which Respondent Feels He Can Talk with Parents Freely About Problems and Concerns	23
V. F Scores Reflecting Difference in RMC Index Scores Classified According to Degree of Affection Received During Childhood	24
VI. F Scores Reflecting Difference in RMC Index Scores Classified According to Present Dating Situation	27
VII. F Scores Reflecting Difference in RMC Index Scores According to Perception of Most Important Factor in Achieving Marital Success.	28
VIII. F Scores Reflecting Difference in RMC Index Scores According to Sex	52
IX. F Scores Reflecting Difference in RMC Index Scores According to Race	52
X. F Scores Reflecting Difference in RMC Index Scores According to Maternal Employment	53
XI. F Scores Reflecting Difference in RMC Index Scores According to Residence for Major Part of Life	53
XII. F Scores Reflecting Difference in RMC Index Scores According to Parents Marital Status	54
XIII. F Scores Reflecting Difference in RMC Index Scores According to Socio Economic Status	55

Table	Page
XIV. F Scores Reflecting Difference in RMC Index Scores According to Type of Discipline Received from Father . . .	56
XV. F Scores Reflecting Difference in RMC Index Scores According to the Degree of Closeness of Relationship With Father During Childhood	57
XVI. F Scores Reflecting Difference in RMC Index Scores According to the Degree of Closeness of Relationship With Mother During Childhood	57
XVII. F Scores Reflecting Difference in RMC Index Scores According to Degree of Praise	58
XVIII. F Scores Reflecting Difference in RMC Index Scores According to the Degree to Which Family Participate in Recreation Together in Childhood	59
XIX. F Scores Reflecting Difference in RMC Index Scores According to the Degree to Which Father Found Time to Do Things With Respondent During Childhood	60
XX. F Scores Reflecting Difference in RMC Index Scores According to Degree to Which Mother Found Time to Do Things With Respondent During Childhood	61
XXI. F Scores Reflecting Difference in RMC Index Scores According to Degree to Which Parents Encouraged Respondent to Respect Feelings of Other Children During Childhood	62
XXII. F Scores Reflecting Difference in RMC Index Scores According to Perception of Source of Greatest Parental Influence in Determining the Kind of Person the Respondent Is	63
XXIII. F Scores Reflecting Difference in RMC Index Scores According to Perception of Source of Greatest General Influence in Determining the Kind of Person the Respondent Is	64
XXIV. F Scores Reflecting Difference in RMC Index Scores According to Perception of Source of the Greatest Influence in the Formation of the Respondents Attitude Toward Marriage	65

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Marriage and family living literature has placed emphasis on the importance of selecting a marriage partner who will best fulfill one's needs, however, it is perhaps even more important for a successful marriage that an individual identify and seek to fulfill needs of a mate (Womble, 1966).

Mudd (1957) has stated that one of the purposes of marriage counseling is to promote and maintain a high degree of competence in marriage and family relationships. As Stinnett (1971) suggests the achievement of such a goal requires an awareness of those aspects of the marriage relationship which contributes to the mutual fulfillment of needs. There has been little research conducted concerning the preparation of youth to fulfill needs of a future marriage partner. The present study seeks to obtain greater knowledge concerning the preparation of youth to fulfill basic emotional needs in a future marriage partner and to determine some of the factors which are related to such preparation. This investigation is based upon the concept of marital competence.

A recent investigation (Stinnett, 1967) sampling predominately middle class wives throughout the state of Florida, identified the previously ignored concept of marital competence as "the ability to perform marital roles in such a manner as to fulfill in the mate

certain important needs involved in the marital relationship." A factor analysis of the 46 item Marital Competence Scale which was developed in that study indicated that the four basic needs represented by the terms were: love, personality fulfillment, respect, and communication.

On the basis of the Marital Competence Scale, Stinnett developed the Readiness for Marital Competence Index (RMC Index), to provide the means for determining a single persons's self-perceived degree of readiness to fulfill each of the basic needs involved in marital competence.

RMC Index is a Lickert type scale which is based on the definition that readiness for marital competence is the degree to which an individual feels prepared to fulfill in a future mate the needs of love, personality fulfillment, respect, and communication.

The four needs represented by the items in the RMC Index are briefly defined by Stinnett (1969) as follows:

1. Love—This need includes such factors as: affection, admiration, attraction, confidence, security, and expression of a common purpose in life.
2. Personality Fulfillment—This need includes: fulfilling individual potentials, social development, improvement of personality and self confidence.
3. Respect—This need includes: being a good listener, understanding the mates point of view, accepting of differentness, avoiding habits that annoy him, letting mate know how I feel about something.
4. Communication—This need includes: expression of feelings, being observant, letting mate know what is bothering me.

Stinnett (1969) reports,

To the extent that an individual is successful in fulfilling these needs with respect to the mate,

to that extent does the individual contribute to the welfare and development of the mate and therefore to the success of the marriage.

Originally the RMC Index was a 46 item instrument. However, in a more recent study with high school youth, the RMC Index was revised in that the instrument was reduced from 46 items to 36 items with an equal number of items representing each need category (Hall, 1971).

Need for Research

Most of the research concerning marital preparedness has been done with college students. There is a serious lack of research concerning marital preparedness of high school youth. There is a definite need for such research as evidence point out a high divorce rate among those who marry at an early age (Burchinal, 1965; Burchinal and Chancellor, 1962). There is a need to determine the demographic characteristics and family relationship variables which are closely related to the degree of marital preparedness among high school youth.

Purposes of Study

The purposes of the study were to relate RMC Index scores to:

(a) demographic characteristics of the respondents, (b) selected family relationship variables, (c) present dating situation, and (d) perception of the most important factor in achieving marital success.

The following null hypotheses will be examined:

1. There is no significant difference in RMC Index scores classified according to: (a) sex, (b) race, (c) maternal employment, (d) residence for major part of life, (e) parents' marital status, (f) socio-economic status.

2. There is no significant difference in RMC Index scores classified according to: (a) type of discipline received from father, (b) type of discipline received from mother, (c) degree of closeness of relationship with father during childhood, (d) degree of closeness of relationship with mother during childhood, (e) degree of praise during childhood, (f) source of most affection during childhood, (g) degree of affection received during childhood, (h) degree to which family participated in recreation together during childhood, (i) degree to which father found time to do things together with respondent during childhood, (j) degree to which mother found time to do things together with respondent during childhood, (k) degree to which parents' encouraged respondent to respect feelings of other children during childhood, (l) degree to which respondent feels he can talk with parents freely about problems and concerns, (m) perception of source of greatest parental influence in determining the kind of person the respondent is, (n) perception of source of greatest general influence in determining the kind of person the respondent is, (o) perception of source of greatest influence in the formation of the respondents' attitudes toward marriage.
3. There is no significant difference in RMC Index scores according to present dating situation.
4. There is no significant difference in RMC Index scores according to perception of the most important factor in achieving marital success.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Since there has been much more research conducted in the area of marital adjustment than in the area of marital preparedness, most of the review of literature reported here concerns marital adjustment.

Marital Adjustment and Related Factors

Marital adjustment may be thought of as a continuum, ranging from complete adjustment to complete maladjustment. It is the process of adaption of the husband and the wife in such a way as to avoid or resolve conflicts sufficiently so that the mates feel satisfied with the marriage and with each other, develop common interests and activities, and feel that the marriage is fulfilling their expectations (Locke, 1951).

Marital adjustment has been differentiated from the prediction of marital adjustment. Marital adjustment represents a cross-sectional view of adjustment to a given time. Marital prediction indicates the expected degree of marital adjustment at a given time (Locke and Williamson, 1958).

Burgess and Cottrell (1936) define marital adjustment as the means by which the actions and attitudes of each partner produces an environment which is favorable to the functioning of each partner.

Truxal and Merrill (1953) note that a marriage is frequently

considered successful if it is not disrupted by divorce or desertion. This highly conventional definition of marital success reflects the factor of permanence as being the fundamental characteristic of a successful marriage. They also note that marriage means different things to different people. Marital success may mean permanence to some, companionship to others, to still others it may mean happiness and personality growth. Thus, when there is no consensus on the goals of marriage, no single discussion of marital success can satisfy everyone.

Of the several criteria proposed for marital success and/or adjustment, the four most generally used include: (a) permanence, (b) happiness, (c) satisfaction, and (d) adjustment (Burgess and Locke, 1953). Kephart (1961) has listed: (a) permanence, (b) children, (c) respect of community, (d) economic well being, (e) children, (f) sexual compatibility, (g) common interests, and (h) affectional relationship.

Terman (1938) reported that individuals with a happy family background were more likely to achieve marital success (as measured in terms of self-reported happiness.) Terman lists the 10 most predictive items for marital success as: (a) superior happiness of parents, (b) childhood happiness, (c) lack of conflict with mother, (d) home discipline firm but not harsh, (e) strong attachment to mother, (f) strong attachment to father, (g) lack of conflict with father, (h) parental frankness concerning sex, (i) infrequency and mildness of childhood punishment, and (j) premarital attitudes toward sex which are free of aversion.

Burgess and Locke (1953) suggest a list of nine criteria for

appraising marital success: (a) permanence, (b) happiness of couple, (c) fulfillment of community expectations, (d) personality development of mates, (e) companionship, (f) satisfaction, (g) degree of integration, and (h) consensus.

Kirkpatrick(1963) in a summary of marriage studies, lists the following factors in order of importance which have shown the strongest and most consistent association with marital adjustment: (a) marital happiness of parents, (b) length of acquaintance, (c) adequate sex information in childhood, (d) personal childhood happiness, (e) approval of marriage by parents and others, (f) engagement adjustment and normal motivation toward marriage, (g) ethnic and religious similarity, (h) high educational and social status, (i) harmonious affection with parents during childhood.

Concerning employment of the wife, Axelson's study (1963) supported previous findings of lower marital adjustment on the part of spouses in families where the wife is employed, found that approximately 60 per cent of the husbands of non-working and part-time working wives indicated good marital adjustment while only 38 per cent of the husbands of wives working full-time showed good marital adjustment. Gover (1963) reported that non-employed wives and mothers indicated higher marital adjustment scores than did the employed wives and mothers. Blood (1963) indicates that employment of mothers increases conflict in marital relationships.

Marital Prediction and Marital Adjustment. Hamilton (1929) interviewed 200 subjects to obtain answers to questions concerning dissatisfaction, desire to continue the relationship, regret of having married and

rating of adjustment and desired changes in the spouse. A fourteen point scale was derived with score intervals corresponding to five categories of success in marriage. Davis in the same year, obtained data through 10,000 questionnaires on the sexual behavior of "normal" married and unmarried women. Her analysis included a comparison of the responses of 1,000 married and 1,200 unmarried women. Bernard (1933) devised the first scientifically oriented measure of marital adjustment. She presented her respondents with terms representing virtues and defects. Adjustment was scored in terms of attributing favorable rather than unfavorable qualities to the mate.

Burgess and Cottrell (1939) constructed one of the most widely used scales. This scale included the following items that seemed to be associated with marital success. These included: (a) agreement on various issues, (b) common interests and activities, (c) demonstration of affection, (d) lack of dissatisfaction in marriage, (e) absence of feelings of loneliness and unhappiness. This study included 526 married and separated couples, 126 of whom were divorced. The conclusions based on a .51 correlation led them to believe that marital prediction was feasible.

Terman (1938) was the first to make explicit use of personality instrument in addition to background and cultural factors. Terman differed from Burgess and Cottrell in that he had both the husband and wife complete questionnaires independently. He placed a great deal of emphasis on family background variables, such as, childhood happiness and extent of attachment of parents. He found a correlation of .59 between happiness of husband and wife.

Locke (1951) devised a marital adjustment scale with the aid of

100 divorced couples and 200 happily married couples. Locke interviewed both husbands and wives for the information. He had a cross-section of the population and he also had a more objective base for selecting and weighing items in respect to their discrimination between happily marrieds and the divorced.

Karlson (1951) did a comparison study to Locke in Sweden. A sample of 205 couples was used with personal interviews with husbands and wives in separate rooms. He found a significant difference between means of happily married couples and separated men and women.

Burgess and Wallin's study, Engagement and Marriage (1953) began with data collected from 1,000 engaged couples and followed with obtained questionnaires from 666 remaining couples after three or more years of marriage. The questionnaires were filled out separately by the husband and wife under the supervision of an interviewer. Predictability correlations ranged from .26-.43. They classified items under eight components: (a) common interests, (b) consensus, (c) demonstration of affection, (d) adaptability, (e) happiness, (f) permanence, (g) satisfaction, (h) sex satisfaction. Burgess and Wallin had a correlation of .90 with Terman's marital happiness scale and .85 with Locke's prediction instrument. In 1959 Locke and Wallace constructed a short marital adjustment test along with a prediction test. They found a correlation of .47 between their short test and the reliable longer forms.

Criticisms of Research in Marital Adjustment

The measurement of marital adjustment should include isolation and possible control of causive factors associated with marital

success (Kirkpatrick, 1963).

Winch (1963) and Bernard (1964) state that it is possible to achieve marital adjustment and yet not be happily married. Thus the validity and reliability of such tests have been questioned. Kirkpatrick (1963) states the high correlation between different measurements may be due to the fact that many of the different scales include common items.

Inselberg (1964) suggests open end sentence completion test might be a more fruitful method of obtaining data than the forced choice questions.

A "developmental" approach was developed by Waller and Hill (1951). This approach stressed the dynamics of the interpersonal relationship. Waller and Hill give five basic criticisms of marital success studies:

- (1) Because of the criteria used, the studies "stack the cards" in favor of a conventionality and conservatism of behavior better suited to the Victorian burgeois family situations of the day before yesterday than those of today.
- (2) The facets asserted to be most highly associated with success in marriage are unconfirmed for the most part by more than two or three studies and are questioned by other studies.
- (3) The factors, if valid, are probably valid only for the early years of marriage.
- (4) The findings from which they were drawn.
- (5) The coefficient of determination of the best associations is still small; roughly 75 per cent of the factors that account for marital success are left unaccounted for (p. 353).

Bias of responses. Responses to many questions designed to measure marital adjustment tend to be biased by the wish of respondents to appear respectable in terms of the dominant group values (Winch, 1963, Bowerman, 1964). Also the evaluation of a marriage on the basis of the report of only one mate has been questioned.

Terman (1938) with controlled separation of husbands and wives, reported a correlation of only .59 between happiness scores of husbands and wives. Locke (1951) found a correlation of only .36 between the marital adjustment scores of happily married husbands and wives, and a correlation of .04 for the divorced group. It is suggested that sources of unreliability can be minimized if anonymity is assured and spouses cannot see each other's responses. It is also noted that a halo effect frequently operated in the reaction of respondents such that the response to one stimulus tends to carry over to other stimuli without a differentiation of response. Also, the moods of the moment tends to influence responses (Kirkpatrick, 1963).

Size and representativeness of sample. One of the most frequent criticisms of marital adjustment studies is that most of the obtained data represents a middle-class, relatively well educated population with bias toward higher adjustment. Also, the small size of the samples has been cited as a limiting factor in more thorough analyses of the data (Winch, 1963, Bowerman, 1964).

Marital Preparedness

Using a sample of single undergraduate college students, Stinnett (1969) found that Readiness for Marital Competence Index scores were significantly and positively related to: happiness of childhood relationship with the parents, democratic authority pattern in the family of orientation, engagement to be married, emotional stability, and the unemployment of the mother for a major portion of the respondents life.

Hall (1971) in a study of Marital Preparedness among high school youth found Readiness for Marital Competence Index scores were significantly related to the degree of parental emphasis on each of the following values during the respondents childhood:

(a) cooperation, with those respondents who reported parental emphasis upon the value as very often receiving the most favorable RMC Index score while the respondents parental emphasis upon the value of very rarely received the least favorable score.

(b) spiritual development, with those respondents who reported parental emphasis upon the value as often receiving the most favorable RMC Index score while the respondents' parental emphasis upon the value of very rarely received the least favorable score.

(c) loyalty, with those respondents who reported parental emphasis upon the value as very often receiving the most favorable RMC Index score while the respondents' parental emphasis upon the value of very rarely received the least favorable score.

(d) feeling genuine concern and responsibility toward others, with those respondents who reported parental emphasis upon the value of very often receiving the most favorable RMC Index score while the respondents parental emphasis upon the value of very rarely received the least favorable score.

(e) expressing sincere appreciation for others, with those respondents who reported parental emphasis upon the value of very often receiving the most favorable RMC Index score while the respondents' parental emphasis upon the value of very rarely received the least favorable score.

(f) taking responsibility for the consequences of your own action,

with those respondents who reported parental emphasis upon the value of very often receiving the most favorable RMC Index score while the respondents' parental emphasis upon the value of rarely received the least favorable score.

Sporakowski (1965) with a sample of 736 university students, found that Marital Preparedness was related to marital status in that as one more closely approached the married state there was a definite increase in the feeling of being ready for marriage. Marital prediction scores were found to be related to religious affiliation, family authority pattern, and social class.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

Selection of Subjects

The 499 subjects of this study were obtained from seven high schools throughout the state of Oklahoma. They were of predominately upper-lower and lower-middle socio-economic status. The students were single and the majority were Protestant. All students were enrolled in Home Economics classes and were in the 11th and 12th grades. Cover letters explaining the research, assuring anonymity to the students, and including directions for administration of the questionnaires were sent to nine teachers representing seven high schools in the state of Oklahoma. The data were collected during the month of February.

Information Sheet

An information sheet was designed to obtain information concerning the: (a) demographic characteristics of respondents such as sex, race, socio-economic class, parents' marital status and (b) perceptions of respondent concerning parent-child relationships such as parent-child communication, closeness of relationship with each parent. The McGuire-White Index of Socio-economic Status (1955), was used to assess the status of the respondents, based on the criteria of the family head's occupation, source of income, and level of education attainment.

All questions on the information sheet were fixed alternative type questions.

RMC Index

The RMC Index (1969), a Lickert type scale, was used to measure the degree to which the high school students in this study felt prepared to fulfill in a future mate the needs of love, personality fulfillment, respect, and communication. In a recent study (Hall, 1971), the RMC Index was revised in that the number of items was reduced from 46 to 36 items with nine questions representing each of the need categories of love, personality fulfillment, respect and communication. The revised RMC Index was used in this study.

An analysis of variance was used to examine the following null hypotheses:

1. There is no significant difference in RMC Index scores classified according to: (a) sex, (b) race, (c) maternal employment, (d) residence for major part of life, (e) parents' marital status, (f) socio-economic status.
2. There is no significant difference in RMC Index scores classified according to: (a) type of discipline received from father, (b) type of discipline received from mother, (c) degree of closeness of relationship with father during childhood, (d) degree of closeness of relationship with mother during childhood, (e) degree of praise during childhood, (f) source of most affection during childhood, (g) degree of affection received during childhood, (h) degree to which

family participated in recreation together during childhood, (i) degree to which father found time to do things together with respondent during childhood, (j) degree to which mother found time to do things together with respondent during childhood, (k) degree to which parents encouraged respondent to respect feelings of other children during childhood, (l) degree to which respondent feels he can talk with parents freely about problems and concerns, (m) perception of source of greatest parental influence in determining the kind of person the respondent is, (n) perception of source of greatest general influence in determining the kind of person the respondent is, (o) perception of source of greatest influence in the formation of the respondent attitudes toward marriage.

3. There is no significant difference in RMC Index scores classified according to present dating situation.
4. There is no significant difference in RMC Index scores classified according to perception of the most important factor in achieving marital success.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Description of Subjects

A detailed description of the 499 respondents is presented in Table I.

Seventy-two per cent of the sample consisted of females and 28 per cent were male. The largest proportion of the respondents (56%) were white, while 36 per cent of the sample were black. The majority of the respondents were Protestant (80%).

The greatest proportion of the respondents (46%) listed a small town under 25,000 population as their place or residence for the major part of life with the smallest proportion (3%) having lived in a city over 100,000 population. Most of the respondents were of the upper-lower socio-economic class (43%) as determined by the McGuire-White Index of Social Status (1955).

Sixty-three per cent of the respondents indicated that their parents were living together at the time of the study.

TABLE I
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SUBJECTS*

Variable	Classification	No.	%
Sex	Male	141	28.26
	Female	358	71.74
Race	Black	181	36.27
	White	279	55.91
	Indian	32	6.41
	Other	7	1.40
Employment of Mother for Major Part of Childhood	No	240	48.10
	Yes (part-time)	132	26.45
	Yes (full-time)	126	25.25
Religious Preference	Catholic	14	2.81
	Protestant	397	79.56
	Jewish	1	0.20
	Mormon	0	0.00
	None	19	3.81
	Other	65	13.03
Residence for Major Part of Life	On farm or in country	125	25.05
	Small town under 25,000	232	46.49
	City of 25,000-50,000	90	18.04
	City of 50,000-100,000	31	6.21
	City over 100,000	16	3.21
Parents' Marital Status	Living together	318	63.73
	Separated or divorced (with no remarriage)	81	16.23
	One of parents deceased (with no remarriage)	50	10.02
	Divorced (with remarriage)	28	5.61
	One of parents deceased (with remarriage)	17	3.41
Socio-Economic Class	Upper-upper	3	.60
	Upper-middle	43	8.62
	Lower-middle	135	27.05
	Upper-lower	216	43.29
	Lower-lower	100	20.04

* N = 499

Examination of Hypothesis

Hypothesis I. There is no significant difference in RMC Index scores classified according to: (a) sex, (b) race, (c) maternal employment, (d) residence for major part of life, (e) parents marital status, (f) socio economic status.

This hypothesis was examined by the use of the one way classification analysis of variance. The F values obtained showed no significant differences in the RMC Index scores according to the variables examined. For further information concerning the specific F scores, see Appendix B.

Hypothesis II. There is no significant difference in RMC Index scores classified according to: (a) type of discipline received from father, (b) type of discipline received from mother, (c) degree of closeness of relationship with father during childhood, (d) degree of closeness of relationship with mother during childhood, (e) degree of praise during childhood, (f) source of most affection received during childhood, (g) degree of affection received during childhood, (h) degree to which family participated in recreation together during childhood, (i) degree to which father found time to do things together with respondent during childhood, (j) degree to which mother found time to do things together with respondent during childhood, (k) degree to which parents encouraged respondent to respect feelings of other children during childhood, (l) degree to which respondent feels he can talk with parents freely about problems and concerns, (m) perception of source of greatest parental influence in determining the kind of person the

respondent is, (n) perception of source of greatest general influence in determining the kind of person the respondent is, (o) perception of source of greatest influence in the formation of the respondent's attitudes toward marriage.

The F values obtained indicated that the only variables listed above which were significantly related to RMC Index scores were: type of discipline received from mother, source of most affection during childhood, degree to which respondent feels he can talk with parents freely about problems and concerns, degree of affection received during childhood.

For further information concerning the variables that were not significantly related to RMC Index scores, see Appendix B.

Those variables that were significantly related to RMC Index scores will now be discussed

Type of Discipline Received from Mother. A significant difference was found to exist at the .05 level in RMC Index scores classified according to the type of discipline received from mother. As Table II indicates, the obtained F score was 2.39. Those that described the type of discipline received from mother as moderate received the lowest mean score (reflecting the most favorable mean RMC Index score) while those that described the type of discipline as permissive received the highest mean score (reflecting the least favorable mean score).

This finding is consistent with the finding of other researchers that marital adjustment is positively associated with moderate discipline during childhood (Kirkpatrick, 1963).

TABLE II
F SCORES REFLECTING DIFFERENCE IN
RMC INDEX SCORES CLASSIFIED
ACCORDING TO TYPE OF
DISCIPLINE RECEIVED
FROM MOTHER

Description	No.	\bar{X}	F	Level of Sig.
<u>Discipline (Mother)</u>				
Very Permissive	22	65.59	2.39	.05
Permissive	77	72.96		
Moderate	301	64.25		
Strict	79	69.49		
Very Strict	16	72.19		

Source of Most Affection During Childhood. When this hypothesis was subjected to the one way classification analysis of variance, an F score of 3.22 was obtained. As Table III indicates this is significant at the .05 level. Those respondents who indicated both parents as the source of most affection during childhood received the most favorable mean RMC Index score, while those who reported the father as the source of most affection received the least favorable mean RMC Index score.

This finding seems to be related to other research studies, e.g., (Kirkpatrick, 1963) which indicate that marriage adjustment is positively related to affectionate relationships with parents (both mother and father about equally) during childhood. The finding that

those who reported receiving the most affection during childhood from both parents about equally may simply suggest that these respondents came from happier families and experienced more positive relationships with both parents.

TABLE III

F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCE IN
RMC INDEX SCORES CLASSIFIED
ACCORDING TO SOURCE OF MOST
AFFECTION DURING CHILDHOOD

Description	No.	\bar{X}	F	Level of Sig.
<u>Affection</u>				
Mother	227	66.84		
Father	46	77.67		
Both Parents About Equally	177	64.88	3.22	.05
Other	41	65.51		

Degree to which respondent feels he can talk with parents freely about problems and concerns. When this hypothesis was subjected to the one way classification analysis of variance, it was found that an F score of 2.38 existed. As Table IV indicates, this is significant at the .05 level. The group receiving the most favorable mean score

indicated they could talk with their parents very often while the group receiving the least favorable score indicated very rarely.

This finding is related to other research studies which indicate that marriage adjustment is significantly and positively related to open, free communication between parent and child during childhood (Chilman, 1965). Then it is logical that positive parent-child communication patterns provide a good foundation for one to communicate in a satisfying manner with a future marriage partner.

TABLE IV

F SCORES REFLECTING DIFFERENCE IN RMC INDEX
SCORES CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO DEGREE TO
WHICH RESPONDENT FEELS HE CAN TALK
WITH PARENTS FREELY ABOUT
PROBLEMS AND CONCERNS

Description	No.	\bar{X}	F	Level of Sig.
<u>Talk with Parents</u>				
Very Rarely	83	72.18		
Rarely	78	70.14		
Average	147	66.71	2.38	.05
Often	82	64.00		
Very Often	99	67.34		

Degree of affection received during childhood. A significant difference was found to exist at the .05 level in RMC Index scores classified according to the degree of affection. As Table V indicates an F score of 2.80 was obtained when the one way classification analysis of variance was employed. Those obtaining the most favorable mean RMC Index score indicated receiving affection during childhood very often and the least favorable mean RMC Index score was obtained by those who indicated receiving affection during childhood rarely.

This finding coincides with the research of other investigators which indicates that marriage adjustment is significantly and positively associated with an intimate, expressive, warm parent-child relationship (e.g., Chilman, 1965).

TABLE V
F SCORES REFLECTING DIFFERENCE IN
RMC INDEX SCORES CLASSIFIED
ACCORDING TO DEGREE OF
AFFECTION RECEIVED
DURING CHILDHOOD

Description	No.	\bar{X}	F	Level of Sig.
<u>Affection (degree)</u>				
Very Rarely	27	68.96		
Rarely	44	77.13		
Moderate	152	67.76	2.80	.05
Often	155	65.98		
Very Often	105	62.18		

Hypothesis III. There is no significant difference in RMC Index scores classified according to present dating situation. Table VI indicates a significant difference at the .001 level in RMC Index scores classified according to the present dating situation. An F score of 8.09 was obtained. The group receiving the most favorable mean score was the engaged group while the moderately date group received the least favorable mean score. The present finding is consistent with Stinnett's (1969) finding that RMC Index scores were significantly related to dating status of college students, with those who reported being engaged receiving the most favorable mean RMC Index score. This finding also coincides with Sporakowski's (1968) results. As Stinnett (1969) has indicated, the finding of a positive relationship between RMC Index scores and dating status may support the thesis that dating is a learning experience which assists youth to prepare for marriage by providing an opportunity to develop skills in interpersonal relationships. It is logical that the engaged respondents may have had more experience in meeting the needs of a potential future marriage partner and therefore feel better prepared to fulfill these needs in a future marriage relationship.

Hypothesis IV. There is no significant difference in RMC Index scores classified according to Perception of Most Important Factor in Achieving Marital Success.

The one way classification analysis of variance was employed to test this hypothesis. An F score of 4.14 was obtained which is significant at the .01 level. As Table VII shows the most favorable mean score was received by those who perceived mutual respect and

consideration as the most important factor in achieving marital success. The least favorable mean score was received by those who perceived having common interests as the most important factor in achieving marital success. This finding supports Womble's (1966) suggestions that mutual respect and consideration are important factors contributing to the success of the marriage relationship. This finding may also be related to Stinnett (1971) finding that a high proportion of single college students perceived mutual respect as the most important characteristic of a marriage relationship.

TABLE VI
F SCORES REFLECTING DIFFERENCE IN
RMC INDEX SCORES CLASSIFIED
ACCORDING TO PRESENT
DATING SITUATION

Description	No.	\bar{X}	F	Level of Sig.
<u>Dating Situation</u>				
Seldom Date	120	73.22		
Moderately Date	94	75.56		
Date Often	74	67.84	8.09	.001
Going Steady	129	62.89		
Engaged	50	54.88		

TABLE VII
F SCORES REFLECTING DIFFERENCE IN RMC
INDEX SCORES ACCORDING TO PERCEPTION
OF MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR IN
ACHIEVING MARITAL SUCCESS

Description	No.	\bar{X}	F	Level of Sig.
<u>Factors in Marital Success</u>				
Being in Love	147	69.50		
Determination to Make Marriage Succeed	137	66.58		
Having Common Interests	28	82.86	4.14	.01
Compatibility of Personality	33	64.51		
Mutual Respect and Considera- tion	133	63.12		

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to relate Readiness for Marital Competence Index scores obtained from high school students to selected factors.

The sample was composed of 499 high school students in seven towns throughout the state of Oklahoma. The subjects were single, the majority were Protestant and in the 11th or 12th grade. The data were obtained during February, 1971.

The one way classification analysis of variance was used to examine the hypotheses. The results of the study are as follows:

1. A significant difference was found to exist at the .05 level in the RMC Index score classified according to the type of discipline received from mother. Those who reported a moderate method of discipline received the most favorable mean RMC Index score.
2. There was a significant difference at the .05 level in RMC Index scores classified according to the degree to which respondents believed they could talk with parents freely about problems and concerns. Those who felt they could talk very often received the most favorable mean RMC Index score
3. There was a significant difference at the .05 level in RMC Index scores classified according to source of most

affection received during childhood. Those respondents who indicated receiving most affection from both parents about equally received the most favorable mean RMC Index score.

4. There was a significant difference at the .05 level in RMC Index scores classified according to degree of affection received during childhood. Those who felt they had received affection very often received the most favorable mean RMC Index score.
5. A significant difference existed at the .001 level in RMC Index scores classified according to present dating situation. Those persons who were engaged received the most favorable mean RMC Index score.
6. A significant difference was found to exist at the .01 level in RMC Index scores classified according to perception of the most important factor in achieving marital success. Those who perceived mutual respect and consideration as the most important factors in achieving marital success had the most favorable mean RMC Index score.

These findings indicate there is a high correlation between interpersonal family relationships during childhood and marriage preparation. This would indicate that when one internalizes a positive concept of family living as a result of experiencing positive parent-child relationships he feels better prepared to meet the emotional needs of a future marriage partner. This research supports the studies which indicate that as one's dating experiences increase and become more serious he tends to feel better prepared for marriage. The investigator recommends that this study be repeated on a larger

nationwide sample, and that such a study examine more closely the association of marital preparedness to parent-child relationships.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Axelson, L. J. "The Marital Adjustment and Role Definitions of Husbands of Working and Non-Working Wives." Marriage and Family Living, Vol. 25 (1963), pp. 189-195.
- Bayer, A. "Early Dating and Early Marriage." Journal of Marriage and the Family, Vol. 30 (1968), pp. 628-632.
- Bernard, Jessie. "An Instrument for the Measurement of Success in Marriage." Publications of the American Sociological Society, Vol. 26 (1933), pp. 94-106.
- _____. The Adjustment of Married Mates.: In H. T. Christensen (Ed.) Handbook of Marriage and the Family. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964, pp. 675-739.
- Blood, R. O. "The Husband-Wife Relationship." In F. I. Nye and Lois W. Hoffman (Eds.), The Employed Mother in America. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963, pp. 282-305.
- Bowman, H. Marriage for Moderns. New York: McGraw Hill, 1948.
- Burichinal, Lee G. "Trends and Prospects for Young Marriages in the United States." Journal of Marriage and the Family, Vol. 28 (1965), pp. 243-254.
- Burichinal, L. G., and Chancellor, L. E. "Survival Rates Among Religiously Homogamous and Inter-Religious Marriages." Bulletin 512. Agricultural Experiment Station. Iowa State University. 1962.
- Burgess, E. W. and Cottrell, L. S. "The Prediction of Adjustment in Marriage." American Sociological Review, Vol. 1 (1936), pp. 737-751.
- _____. Predicting Success or Failure in Marriage. New York: Prentice Hall, 1939.
- Burgess, E. W. and Wallin P. Engagement and Marriage. Chicago: Lippincott, 1953.
- Burgess, E. W. and Locke, J. J. The Family. (2nd ed.) New York: American Book, 1953.

- Cavan, R. The American Family. New York: Crowell, 1963.
- Chilman, Catherine. "Child-Rearing and Family Relationship Patterns of the Very Poor." Welfare in Review, Vol. 3 (1965), pp. 9-19.
- Courchaine, A. Dynamics of Marriage. Philadelphia: Dorrance, 1967.
- Davis, Katharine B. Factors in the Sex Life of Twenty Two Hundred Women. New York: Harper, 1929.
- Duvall, Evelyn. When You Marry. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co, 1945.
- Gover, D. A. "Socio-Economic Differential in the Relationship Between Marital Adjustment and Wife's Employment Status." Marriage and Family Living. Vol. 25 (1963), pp. 452-456.
- Hamilton, G. V. A Research in Marriage. New York: Boni, 1929.
- Hirning, J. L. and Hirning, A. L. Marriage Adjustment. New York: American Book Co., 1956.
- Kaufman, Ed. You and Your Marriage. New York: Hendricks House, 1950.
- Kephart, W. M. The Family, Society, and the Individual. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.
- Kirkpatrick, C. What Science Says About Happiness in Marriage. Minneapolis: Burgess Pub. Co., 1947.
- _____. The Family: As Process and Institution. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1963.
- Landis, P. Making the Most of Marriage. New York: Appelton Century Crafts, 1965.
- Lee, A. and Lee, E. Marriage and the Family. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1967.
- Locke, H. J. Predicting Adjustment in Marriage: A Comparison of A Divorced and A Happily Married Group. New York: Holt, 1951.
- Locke, H. J. and Williamson, R. C. "Marital Adjustment: A Factor Analysis Study." American Sociological Review, Vol. 23 (1958), pp. 562-569.
- Luckey, Elanore. "Marital Satisfaction and Personality Correlates of Spouse." Journal of Marriage and the Family, Vol. 26 (1964), pp. 217-220.
- McGuire, C. and White, G. D. The Measurement of Social Status. Research Paper in Human Development No. 3 (Revised), University of Texas, Austin, 1955.

- Mudd, Emily H. "Knowns and Unknowns in Marriage Counseling Research." Marriage and Family Living, Vol. 19 (1957), pp. 75-81
- Nye, F. I. "Marital Interaction." In F. I. Nye and Lois W. Hoffman (Eds.) The Employed Mother in America. Chicago: Ran McNally, 1963, pp. 263-281.
- Ray, R. Marriage is Serious Business. New York: McGraw Hill, 1944.
- Sucder, C. The Family. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1962.
- Silverman, H. Marital Counseling. Springfield: Thomas, 1967.
- Skidmore, R. A. and Cannon, A. Building Your Marriage. New York: Harper, 1951.
- Stinnett, N. "Marital Competence." Doctoral Dissertation, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, 1967.
- _____. "Readiness for Marital Competence." Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 9 (1969), pp. 683-686.
- _____. "Attitudes of College Students Toward Marriage." Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 63 (1971), pp. 33-37.
- Sproakowski, M. J. "Marital Preparedness, Prediction and Adjustment." Family Life Coordinator, Vol. 17 (1968), pp. 155-161.
- Terman, L. M. Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness. New York: McGraw Hill, 1930.
- Truxal, A. G. and Merrill, F. E. Marriage and the Family in American Culture. New York: Prentice Hall, 1953.
- Udry, J. The Social Context of Marriage. Philadelphia: J. P. Lippincott Co., 1966.
- Waller, W. The Family: A Dynamic Interpretation. New York: Dryden Press, 1938.
- Winch, R. The Modern Family. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1963.
- Womble, D. Foundations for Marriage and Family Relations. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1966.

APPENDIX A

Your cooperation in this project is greatly appreciated. Your contribution in a research project of this type helps us to gain greater knowledge and insight into human relationships. Please check or fill in answers as appropriate to each question. Since your name is not required, please be as honest in your answers as possible. There are no right or wrong answers. This is not a test.

The blanks at the extreme left of the page are for purposes of coding. (Do not fill in.)

____ 1. - 3.

____ 4. Sex: ____ 1. male
 ____ 2. female

____ 5. Age: ____

____ 6. Race: ____ 1. White
 ____ 2. Black
 ____ 3. Indian
 ____ 4. Other

____ 7. Was your mother employed for the major part of your childhood?

____ 1. No
____ 2. Yes (part-time employment)
____ 3. Yes (full-time employment)

____ 8. If your mother was employed for the major part of your childhood, did she enjoy her work?

____ 1. Yes
____ 2. Undecided
____ 3. No

____ 9. Religious preference:

____ 1. Catholic	____ 4. Mormon
____ 2. Protestant	____ 5. None
____ 3. Jewish	____ 6. Other

Specify

____10. For the major part of your life have you lived:

- ____1. On farm or in country
- ____2. Small town under 25,000 population
- ____3. City of 25,000 to 50,000 population
- ____4. City of 50,000 to 100,000 population
- ____5. City of over 100,000 population

____11. What is your parents' marital status?

- ____1. Living together
- ____2. Separated or divorced (with no remarriage)
- ____3. One of parents deceased (with no remarriage)
- ____4. Divorced (with remarriage)
- ____5. One of parents deceased (with remarriage)

____12. What is the occupation of the head of your family (teacher, policeman, etc.)?

____13. What is the primary source of the income of your family?

- ____1. Inherited savings and investments
- ____2. Earned wealth, transferable investment
- ____3. Profits, royalties, fees
- ____4. Salary, Commissions (regular, monthly, or yearly)
- ____5. Hourly wages, weekly checks
- ____6. Odd jobs, seasonal work, private charity
- ____7. Public relief or charity

____14. What is the highest educational attainment of the principal earner of the income of your family?

- ____1. Completed graduate work for a profession
- ____2. Graduated from a 4-year college

- _____3. Attended college or university for two or more years
- _____4. Graduated from high school
- _____5. Attended high school, completed grade 9, but did not graduate
- _____6. Completed grade 8, but did not attend beyond grade 9.
- _____7. Less than grade 8.
- _____15. (Omit)
- _____16. Which one of the following most nearly describes the type of discipline you received as a child from your father?
- _____1. Very permissive
- _____2. Permissive
- _____3. Moderate degree of both permissiveness and strictness
- _____4. Strict
- _____5. Very strict
- _____17. Which one of the following most nearly describes the type of discipline you received as a child from your mother?
- _____1. Very permissive
- _____2. Permissive
- _____3. Moderate degree of both permissiveness and strictness
- _____4. Strict
- _____5. Very strict
- _____18. Which one of the following describes the degree of closeness of your relationship with your father during childhood?
- _____1. Above average
- _____2. Average
- _____3. Below average

____ 25. As a child did your mother find time to do things together with you?

- | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|
| ____ 1. Very rarely | ____ 4. Often |
| ____ 2. Rarely | ____ 5. Very often |
| ____ 3. Moderate | |

____ 26. As a child did your parents encourage you to respect the feelings of other children?

- | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|
| ____ 1. Very rarely | ____ 4. Often |
| ____ 2. Rarely | ____ 5. Very often |
| ____ 3. Moderate | |

As a child, how much were each of the following disciplinary methods used with you by your parents?

____ 27. Physical punishment

- | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|
| ____ 1. Very rarely | ____ 4. Often |
| ____ 2. Rarely | ____ 5. Very often |
| ____ 3. Moderate | |

____ 28. Deprivation of privileges

- | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|
| ____ 1. Very rarely | ____ 4. Often |
| ____ 2. Rarely | ____ 5. Very often |
| ____ 3. Moderate | |

____ 29. Being isolated (forced to stay in room, etc.)

- | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|
| ____ 1. Very rarely | ____ 4. Often |
| ____ 2. Rarely | ____ 5. Very often |
| ____ 3. Moderate | |

____ 30. Withdrawal of love

- | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|
| ____ 1. Very rarely | ____ 4. Often |
| ____ 2. Rarely | ____ 5. Very often |
| ____ 3. Moderate | |

____31. Use of reasoning

- | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|
| ____1. Very rarely | ____4. Often |
| ____2. Rarely | ____5. Very often |
| ____3. Moderate | |

____32. Use of tangible rewards

- | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|
| ____1. Very rarely | ____4. Often |
| ____2. Rarely | ____5. Very often |
| ____3. Moderate | |

____33. Do you feel that you can talk with your parents freely about your problems and things that concern you?

- | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|
| ____1. Very rarely | ____4. Often |
| ____2. Rarely | ____5. Very often |
| ____3. Average | |

____34. Which parent do you feel has had the greatest influence in determining the kind of person you are?

- | |
|---|
| ____1. Mother |
| ____2. Father |
| ____3. Both mother and father about equally |

____35. Which one of the following do you feel has had the greatest influence in determining the kind of person you are?

- | | |
|------------------------------|--|
| ____1. One or both parents | ____4. A public figure such as a president or movie star |
| ____2. A brother or sister | |
| ____3. Friends of my own age | |
| | ____5. Other |

(Specify)

How much emphasis did your parents place on your learning each of the following values?

____36. Determination and Perserverance

- | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|
| ____ 1. Very rarely | ____ 4. Often |
| ____ 2. Rarely | ____ 5. Very often |
| ____ 3. Moderate | |

____ 37. Seeing each person as having dignity and worth

- | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|
| ____ 1. Very rarely | ____ 4. Often |
| ____ 2. Rarely | ____ 5. Very often |
| ____ 3. Moderate | |

____ 38. Cooperation

- | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|
| ____ 1. Very rarely | ____ 4. Often |
| ____ 2. Rarely | ____ 5. Very often |
| ____ 3. Moderate | |

____ 39. Self discipline

- | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|
| ____ 1. Very rarely | ____ 4. Often |
| ____ 2. Rarely | ____ 5. Very often |
| ____ 3. Moderate | |

____ 40. Spiritual development

- | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|
| ____ 1. Very rarely | ____ 4. Often |
| ____ 2. Rarely | ____ 5. Very often |
| ____ 3. Moderate | |

____ 41. Loyalty

- | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|
| ____ 1. Very rarely | ____ 4. Often |
| ____ 2. Rarely | ____ 5. Very often |
| ____ 3. Moderate | |

____ 42. Feeling genuine concern and responsibility toward others

- | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|
| ____ 1. Very rarely | ____ 4. Often |
| ____ 2. Rarely | ____ 5. Very often |
| ____ 3. Moderate | |

____ 43. Expressing sincere appreciation for others

- | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|
| ____ 1. Very rarely | ____ 4. Often |
| ____ 2. Rarely | ____ 5. Very often |
| ____ 3. Moderate | |

____ 44. Taking responsibility for the consequences of your own actions

- | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|
| ____ 1. Very rarely | ____ 4. Often |
| ____ 2. Rarely | ____ 5. Very often |
| ____ 3. Moderate | |

____ 45. Did your parents express affection toward you openly as a child?

- | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|
| ____ 1. Very rarely | ____ 4. Often |
| ____ 2. Rarely | ____ 5. Very often |
| ____ 3. Moderate | |

____ 46. Which one of the following do you feel has influenced you most in the formation of your attitudes toward marriage?

- | | |
|----------------------------|---|
| ____ 1. Parents | ____ 4. Church |
| ____ 2. Friends my own age | ____ 5. Mass media (books, magazines, movies, etc.) |
| ____ 3. School | |

____ 47. How prepared do you feel for marriage at the present time?

- | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| ____ 1. Very prepared | ____ 4. Unprepared |
| ____ 2. Prepared | ____ 5. Very unprepared |
| ____ 3. Uncertain | |

____ 48. Which of the following do you believe to be most important in achieving marital success (select one)?

- | |
|--|
| ____ 1. Being in love |
| ____ 2. Determination to make the marriage succeed |
| ____ 3. Having common interests |

____4. Compatibility of personalities

____5. Mutual respect and consideration

____49. What is your present dating situation?

____1. Seldom date

____4. Going steady

____2. Moderately

____5. Engaged

____3. Date often

PREPAREDNESS SCALE

(Male Form)

Directions: This instrument is an attempt to determine how well prepared individuals feel they are in performing their future marriage roles. We are not concerned with how well prepared you think you "ought" to be, but with how prepared you feel you actually are. Please be as frank as possible in your answers. Remember, your name is not required on this questionnaire.

For each item below you are to indicate the degree to which you feel you are prepared or unprepared by circling the number in the appropriate box at the left of each item.

Response code: Very Prepared = VP (circle 1); Moderately Prepared = MP (circle 2); Undecided = UD (circle 3); Moderately Unprepared = MUP (circle 4); Very Unprepared = VUP (circle 5).

	VP	MP	UD	MUP	VUP	Concerning my marriage relationship with my future wife, I feel I am prepared in the following:
____1.	1	2	3	4	5	Promoting a feeling of security in her.
____2.	1	2	3	4	5	Expressing my affection for her.
____3.	1	2	3	4	5	Showing my admiration for her.
____4.	1	2	3	4	5	Satisfying her desire for affection.
____5.	1	2	3	4	5	Showing her that I evaluate her highly.
____6.	1	2	3	4	5	Helping her to feel that she is an attractive person.
____7.	1	2	3	4	5	Showing my confidence in her.
____8.	1	2	3	4	5	Letting her know that I feel emotionally close to her.
____9.	1	2	3	4	5	Letting her know that I believe we have a common purpose in life.
____10.-11.						(omit)

	VP	MP	UD	MUP	VUP	
____12.	1	2	3	4	5	Helping her to achieve her potentials (to become what she is capable of becoming).
____13.	1	2	3	4	5	Bringing out the "best" qualities in her.
____14.	1	2	3	4	5	Helping her to become a more interesting person.
____15.	1	2	3	4	5	Helping her to see herself more positively.
____16.	1	2	3	4	5	Helping her to increase her circle of friends.
____17.	1	2	3	4	5	Helping her to improve the quality of her interpersonal relationships outside marriage.
____18.	1	2	3	4	5	Helping her to improve her personality.
____19.	1	2	3	4	5	Helping her to act according to her own beliefs rather than simply "following the crowd."
____20.	1	2	3	4	5	Helping her to have confidence in herself.
____21.-22.	(omit)					
____23.	1	2	3	4	5	Being a good listener when she talks to me.
____24.	1	2	3	4	5	Encouraging her when she is discouraged.
____25.	1	2	3	4	5	Seeing things from her point of view.
____26.	1	2	3	4	5	Being considerate of her feelings.
____27.	1	2	3	4	5	Showing her that I understand what she wants to achieve in life.

	VP	MP	UD	MUP	VUP	
____28.	1	2	3	4	5	Respecting her wishes when making important decisions.
____29.	1	2	3	4	5	Accepting disagreement from her.
____30.	1	2	3	4	5	Accepting her differentness.
____31.	1	2	3	4	5	Avoiding habits which annoy her.
____32.-33.	(omit)					
____34.	1	2	3	4	5	Expressing my disagreement with her honestly and openly.
____35.	1	2	3	4	5	Letting her know how I really feel about something.
____36.	1	2	3	4	5	Helping her to express her feelings to me.
____37.	1	2	3	4	5	Letting her know about my expectations in life.
____38.	1	2	3	4	5	Seeing beyond what she says and being aware of her true feelings when her feelings are different from her words.
____39.	1	2	3	4	5	Being aware that what she says may not always indicate how she really feels about something.
____40.	1	2	3	4	5	When she is angry at me trying to understand why she is angry.
____41.	1	2	3	4	5	Being observant as to whether she has understood correctly the meaning of the message I have communicated to her.
____42.	1	2	3	4	5	When I am troubled, letting her know what is bothering me.
____43.-44.	(omit)					

PREPAREDNESS SCALE

(Female Form)

Directions: This instrument is an attempt to determine how well prepared individuals feel they are in performing their future marriage roles. We are not concerned with how well prepared you think you "ought" to be, but how prepared you feel you actually are. Please be as frank as possible in your answers. Remember, your name is not required on this questionnaire.

For each item below you are to indicate the degree to which you feel you are prepared or unprepared by circling the number in the appropriate box at the left of each item.

Response code: Very Prepared = VP (circle 1); Moderately Prepared = MP (circle 2); Undecided = UD (circle 3); Moderately Unprepared = MUP (circle 4); Very Unprepared = VUP (circle 5).

	VP	MP	UD	MUP	VUP	Concerning my marriage relationship with my future husband, I feel I am prepared in the following:
____1.	1	2	3	4	5	Promoting a feeling of security in him.
____2.	1	2	3	4	5	Expressing my affection for him.
____3.	1	2	3	4	5	Showing my admiration for him.
____4.	1	2	3	4	5	Satisfying his desire for affection.
____5.	1	2	3	4	5	Showing him that I evaluate him highly.
____6.	1	2	3	4	5	Helping him to feel that he is an attractive person.
____7.	1	2	3	4	5	Showing my confidence in him.
____8.	1	2	3	4	5	Letting him know that I feel emotionally close to him.
____9.	1	2	3	4	5	Letting him know that I believe we have a common purpose in life.

	VP	MP	UD	MUD	VUP	
____10.-11.	(omit)					
____12.	1	2	3	4	5	Helping him to achieve his potential (to become what he is capable of becoming).
____13.	1	2	3	4	5	Bringing out the "best" qualities in him.
____14.	1	2	3	4	5	Helping him to become a more interesting person.
____15.	1	2	3	4	5	Helping him to see himself more positively.
____16.	1	2	3	4	5	Helping him to increase his circle of friends.
____17.	1	2	3	4	5	Helping him to improve the quality of his interpersonal relationships outside marriage.
____18.	1	2	3	4	5	Helping him to improve his personality.
____19.	1	2	3	4	5	Helping him to act according to his own beliefs rather than simply "following the crowd."
____20.	1	2	3	4	5	Helping him to have confidence in himself.
____21.-22.	(omit)					
____23.	1	2	3	4	5	Being a good listener when he talks to me.
____24.	1	2	3	4	5	Encouraging him when he is discouraged.
____25.	1	2	3	4	5	Seeing things from his point of view.
____26.	1	2	3	4	5	Being considerate of his feelings.
____27.	1	2	3	4	5	Showing him that I understand what he wants to achieve in life.

	VP	MP	UD	MUD	VUP	
____28.	1	2	3	4	5	Respecting his wishes when making important decisions.
____29.	1	2	3	4	5	Accepting disagreement from him.
____30.	1	2	3	4	5	Accepting his differentness.
____31.	1	2	3	4	5	Avoiding habits which annoy him.
____32.-33.	(omit)					
____34.	1	2	3	4	5	Expressing my disagreement with him honestly and openly.
____35.	1	2	3	4	5	Letting him know how I really feel about something.
____36.	1	2	3	4	5	Helping him to express his feelings to me.
____37.	1	2	3	4	5	Letting him know about my expectations in life.
____38.	1	2	3	4	5	Seeing beyond what he says and being aware of his true feelings when his feelings are different from his words.
____39.	1	2	3	4	5	Being aware that what he says may not always indicate how he really feels about something.
____40.	1	2	3	4	5	When he is angry at me trying to understand why he is angry.
____41.	1	2	3	4	5	Being observant as to whether he has understood correctly the meaning of the message I have communicated to him.
____42.	1	2	3	4	5	When I am troubled, letting him know what is bothering me.
____43.-44.	(omit)					

APPENDIX B

TABLE VIII

F SCORES REFLECTING DIFFERENCE IN
RMC INDEX SCORES ACCORDING TO SEX

Description	No.	\bar{X}	F	Level of Sig.
<u>Sex</u>				
Male	141	69.60	2.25	N.S.
Female	358	65.82		

TABLE IX

F SCORES REFLECTING DIFFERENCE IN
RMC INDEX SCORES ACCORDING TO
RACE

Description	No.	\bar{X}	F	Level of Sig.
<u>Race</u>				
White	279	67.96		
Black	181	65.49	1.13	N.S.
Indian	32	68.53		
Other	7	52.57		

TABLE X
F SCORES REFLECTING DIFFERENCE IN
RMC INDEX SCORES ACCORDING
TO MATERNAL EMPLOYMENT

Description	No.	\bar{X}	F	Level of Sig.
<u>Maternal Employment</u>				
No	240	69.07		
Yes (Part Time)	132	64.50	1.78	N.S.
Yes (Full Time)	136	65.08		

TABLE XI
F SCORES REFLECTING DIFFERENCE IN
RMC INDEX SCORES ACCORDING
TO RESIDENCE FOR MAJOR
PART OF LIFE

Description	No.	\bar{X}	F	Level of Sig.
<u>Residence</u>				
Farm or Country	125	71.82		
Town Under 25,000	232	65.45	1.92	N.S.
City, 25,000-50,000	90	64.85		
City, 50,000-1000,000	31	62.06		
City, Over 1000,000	16	71.37		

TABLE XII
F SCORES REFLECTING DIFFERENCE IN
RMC INDEX SCORES ACCORDING
TO PARENTS MARITAL
STATUS

Description	No.	\bar{X}	F	Level of Sig.
<u>Marital Status</u>				
Living Together	318	67.58		
Separated or Divorced (No Remarriage)	81	63.21		
One Parent Deceased (No Remarriage)	50	69.08	1.25	N.S.
Divorced (With Remarriage)	28	70.86		
One Parent Deceased (With Remarriage)	17	58.18		

TABLE XIII
F SCORES REFLECTING DIFFERENCE IN
RMC INDEX SCORES ACCORDING
TO SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS

Description	No.	\bar{X}	F	Level of Sig.
<u>Socio Economic Status</u>				
Upper	0			
Upper Middle	43	62.56		
Lower Middle	135	66.71	1.13	N.S.
Upper Lower	216	66.39		
Lower Lower	100	70.54		

TABLE XIV
F SCORES REFLECTING DIFFERENCE IN
RMC INDEX SCORES ACCORDING
TO TYPE OF DISCIPLINE
RECEIVED FROM FATHER

Description	No.	\bar{X}	F	Level of Sig.
<u>Discipline</u>				
Very Permissive	30	68.27		
Permissive	67	71.81		
Moderate	288	64.85	1.99	N.S.
Strict	77	71.08		
Very Strict	21	60.62		

TABLE XV

F SCORES REFLECTING DIFFERENCE IN
RMC INDEX SCORES ACCORDING TO
THE DEGREE OF CLOSENESS
OF RELATIONSHIP WITH
FATHER DURING
CHILDHOOD

Description	No.	\bar{X}	F	Level of Sig.
<u>Relationship (Father)</u>				
Above Average	132	63.67		
Average	266	69.07	2.12	N.S.
Below Average	85	65.55		

TABLE XVI

F SCORES REFLECTING DIFFERENCE IN
RMC INDEX SCORES ACCORDING TO
THE DEGREE OF CLOSENESS
OF RELATIONSHIP WITH
MOTHER DURING
CHILDHOOD

Description	No.	\bar{X}	F	Level of Sig.
<u>Relationship (Mother)</u>				
Above Average	230	65.44		
Average	244	67.52	1.78	N.S.
Below Average	21	75.81		

TABLE XVII
F SCORES REFLECTING DIFFERENCE IN
RMC INDEX SCORES ACCORDING TO
DEGREE OF PRAISE

Description	No.	\bar{X}	F	Level of Sig.
<u>Praise</u>				
Very Rarely	27	70.96		
Rarely	68	70.60	.24	N.S.
Moderate	232	68.62		
Often	0	00.00		
Very Often	0	00.00		

TABLE XVIII
F SCORES REFLECTING DIFFERENCE IN
RMC INDEX SCORES ACCORDING TO
THE DEGREE TO WHICH FAMILY
PARTICIPATE IN RECREATION
TOGETHER IN CHILDHOOD

Description	No.	\bar{X}	F	Level of Sig.
<u>Recreation</u>				
Very Rarely	73	73.42		
Rarely	139	68.98		
Moderate	123	64.59	2.07	N.S.
Often	106	64.88		
Very Often	50	63.64		

TABLE XIX
F SCORES REFLECTING DIFFERENCE IN RMC
INDEX SCORES ACCORDING TO THE DEGREE
TO WHICH FATHER FOUND TIME TO
DO THINGS WITH RESPONDENT
DURING CHILDHOOD

Description	No.	\bar{X}	F	Level of Sig.
<u>Do Things (Father)</u>				
Very Rarely	84	66.46		
Rarely	105	69.41		
Moderate	134	68.25		
Often	100	66.33	0.68	N.S.
Very Often	59	63.08		

TABLE XX
F SCORES REFLECTING DIFFERENCE IN RMC
INDEX SCORES ACCORDING TO DEGREE TO
WHICH MOTHER FOUND TIME TO DO
THINGS WITH RESPONDENT
DURING CHILDHOOD

Description	No.	\bar{X}	F	Level of Sig.
<u>Do Things (Mother)</u>				
Very Rarely	34	74.68		
Rarely	78	68.86		
Moderate	137	66.89		
Often	150	64.53	1.24	N.S.
Very Often	94	67.21		

TABLE XXI
F SCORES REFLECTING DIFFERENCE IN RMC
INDEX SCORES ACCORDING TO DEGREE
TO WHICH PARENTS ENCOURAGED
RESPONDENT TO RESPECT
FEELINGS OF OTHER
CHILDREN DURING
CHILDHOOD

Description	No.	\bar{X}	F	Level of Sig.
<u>Respect Feelings</u>				
Very Rarely	20	71.60		
Rarely	26	79.50		
Moderate	99	67.81	2.23	N.S.
Often	168	66.16		
Very Often	179	64.51		

TABLE XXII

F SCORES REFLECTING DIFFERENCE IN RMC
 INDEX SCORES ACCORDING TO PERCEPTION
 OF SOURCE OF GREATEST PARENTAL
 INFLUENCE IN DETERMINING THE
 KIND OF PERSON THE
 RESPONDENT IS

Description	No.	\bar{X}	F	Level of Sig.
<u>Parental Influence</u>				
Mother	259	66.11		
Father	72	71.23	1.23	N.S.
Both—About Equal	157	66.79		

TABLE XXIII
F SCORES REFLECTING DIFFERENCE IN RMC
INDEX SCORES ACCORDING TO PERCEPTION
OF SOURCE OF GREATEST GENERAL
INFLUENCE IN DETERMINING THE
KIND OF PERSON THE
RESPONDENT IS

Description	No.	\bar{X}	F	Level of Sig.
<u>General Influence</u>				
One or Both Parents	293	66.27		
Brother or Sister	63	69.84		
Friends	89	68.43	0.99	N.S.
Public Figure	0			
Other	35	61.65		

TABLE XXIV
F SCORES REFLECTING DIFFERENCE IN RMC
INDEX SCORES ACCORDING TO PERCEPTION
OF SOURCE OF THE GREATEST INFLUENCE
IN THE FORMATION OF THE
RESPONDENTS ATTITUDE
TOWARD MARRIAGE

Description	No.	\bar{X}	F	Level of Sig.
<u>Influence (Marriage)</u>				
Parents	250	63.62		
Friends	124	69.11		
School	18	67.56		
Church	48	72.42	2.27	N.S.
Mass Media	35	70.94		

2
VITA

Mary Carr Allen Pyles

Candidate for the Degree of
Masters of Science

Thesis: MARITAL PREPAREDNESS AMONG HIGH SCHOOL YOUTH

Major Field: Family Relations and Child Development

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Poteau, Oklahoma, July 15, 1943, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Leo Carr Allen. Married May 25, 1965 to Mr. Gerald Pyles.

Education: Graduated from Wister High School, Wister, Oklahoma, in May, 1960; received an Associate of Arts degree from Poteau Community College, Poteau, Oklahoma in May, 1962; received a Bachelor of Science degree in Home Economics from Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in May, 1965; completed requirements for the Master of Science degree at Oklahoma State University in July, 1971.

Professional Experience: Vocational Home Economics teacher, Lakeview High School, Lakeview, Texas, September, 1965-July 1966; Vocational Home Economics teacher, Cushing High School, Cushing, Oklahoma, August, 1966-June, 1969; leave of absence for one year; returned to Cushing as Vocational Home Economics teacher at present date.

Professional Organizations: American Home Economics Association; Oklahoma Home Economics Association; Oklahoma Education Association; American Vocational Association; Oklahoma Vocational Association.