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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not engaged couples taking part in a Family Life Education Program could become better prepared for marriage by learning to communicate with each other according to specific rules governing verbal messages.

Thirty couples took part in the experiment and were randomly selected for three groups. The experimental group was taught to communicate in a dyadic setting; two control groups functioned in a general group discussion setting. All participants were tested before and after on the Marital Preparedness Inventory (MPI) to determine any change.

Statistical analysis of the data revealed that the difference in change scores between the experimental group and the control groups did not achieve statistical significance. However, a clear trend of greater change on the MPI was manifest by both male and female participants in the experimental group.

It was concluded that all engaged couples showed some change; that engaged couples in the experimental setting who used specific rules of communicating exhibited change scores approaching significance.
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It is easy to tell the courting couple from the married one. The courting couple keep their faces taut while they listen to each other, and answer, "You . . ."

The married couple are relaxed, and answer, "I . . ." not from ego but from uneasiness or ease.

Eric Berne
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Chapter I

THE PROBLEM

General Statement of the Problem

The problem proposed by this study is whether or not the preparedness of engaged couples would be affected by using a certain model of communication. More specifically, whether couples taught to use feedback and listening skills in a dyad would change in their readiness for marriage after a brief experience of communicating in this way.

Background of the Problem

The decision to get married and the steps that follow to get ready for marriage are crucial events in the lives of the two individuals who come to this point in life. Being married and raising a family are important developments of this first decision and are the immediately resulting interactions of an engaged couple.

Many experts in the related fields studying human behavior and social development have pointed out that one key factor affecting intimate human relationships, especially marital and family relationships is the ability to communicate. In the developing field of family sociology, recognition is given to the basic importance of the
communication process. Karlsson (1963) in studies of mate selection in the Western culture, pointed out that communication of role-expectations and feelings are a necessary process in an open system of marriage.

In the field of preventive mental health, Caplan (1963) stressed the need for healthy communication networks within family systems. He says communication is a vital component in problem-solving and decision-making functions.

Theorists in the area of modern communication systems such as Reush and Bateson (1951), family therapists such as Satir (1964), Watzlawick, Beavin, and Jackson (1967) generally concluded that lack of effective communication lies at the root of many marital and family difficulties. Another clinician, Greene (1971) cited that lack of communication was the most common marital complaint among the research that he had done.

In a study of family strengths, Otto (1963) concluded that the ability to communicate effectively is one essential function among many family strength components. In the specific realm of pre-marital counseling, Rutledge (1966) stressed the need to assist engaged couples in developing this skill so that they might be better prepared for working through problems and difficulties.

This brief overview of many related fields seemed to indicate that communication is one essential factor affecting
marriage and family existence. This study is an attempt to discover if using a dyadic model of communication with engaged couples could affect their preparedness for marriage.

Significance of the Problem

Within recent years, professionals involved with the problems of marital and family life have begun to stress the need for providing for marital and family health in preventive programs. Vincent (1967) distinguished between marital and family health and urged specialization in studying the marital dyad and roles. Rutledge (1966) and Wilms (1966) both pointed out the need to work with engaged couples because this was an integral part of the newly forming relationship.

The period of engagement tends to be paradoxical. It seems to be a crucial stage or transition point that is often clouded by mirages and distortions that remain covered up until a later period in the relationship, as indicated by Lederer and Jackson (1969). Greene (1971) cited data that problems in the time of engagement carried over in fifth percent of the couples who acknowledged marital problems. Yet the common experience of those in contact with engaged couples indicates that most effort, time, and energy is spent on the incidental and passing tasks of preparation for the wedding day itself; clothes, ceremony, banquet, and guest lists.
It seems to be important to assist couples who have made their decision to marry in preparing more realistically and effectively than often seems to be the case. The engagement period seems to be a time in which couples could begin to develop important skills; skills that can lead to a fruitful and strong relationship in the future. It is the specific interest of this study to find more effective and useful ways of helping engaged couples prepare themselves for a future married and family life. It is also of interest to determine whether use of a specific communication model can affect preparedness in a relatively short period of time.

**Definition of Terms**

**Communication** - For the purposes of this study, the term refers to any verbal/non-verbal message conveyed from one person to another.

**Dyadic Model of Communication** - This describes a process of verbal communication involving one pair or set of individuals. While speaking together face to face, each alternates as a sender and receiver of messages in a feedback system. The main rule being that each message be clarified by the participants before another message is sent.

**Engaged Couple** - This term refers to those who are decided to marry and are actively preparing for married life together.
Preparedness - This term refers to a degree of readiness for specific marital and family tasks, as measured by the Marital Preparedness Schedule developed by Sporakowski (1968).
Chapter II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter will be divided into three sections. The first will deal with current conceptual frameworks of developing family theory. The second will deal with modern communication theory and research. The third will focus on recent practice of marital and family therapy that reflect the influence of these two areas of theory and research.

Frameworks of Family Theory

Questions regarding marriage and the family are as old as mankind and most of them still remain unanswered. However, within the last quarter of a century, systematic study of the family has produced several theoretical frameworks that have been the basis of study, research and therapeutic practice concerning the family. The theories taken up are: symbolic interaction theory, developmental theory, general systems theory.

Symbolic interactional framework is a system for viewing the personal relationships between husband and wife, between parents and children and other family members. In this framework the family is seen as a unity of interacting personalities. In a chapter summing up the basic characteristics of this framework, Schvanveldt (1966) states that the
stress is upon the family as a unity of interacting personalities. The family is seen as a vital, living, growing and changing reality. It is in interactions of the members that the family is studied. A unique differentiating characteristic of this approach is that it is based on the action of the family resulting from the communication process.

This framework attempts to understand family phenomena in terms of internal processes that become manifest in communication processes, decision making, and reactions to interpersonal stress (Schvanveldt 1966). Research pursuing this has dealt with the dynamics of family relationships: marital harmony and discord, family harmony and discord.

The developmental framework attempts to deal with the dimension of time in the study of the family. Rodgers (1964) held that this was a unique contribution of this approach. A family grows through stages and there are moments of transition from stage to stage. During these stages relationships of husband-wife and parent-child change. The developmental aspect of this theory is reflected in the fact that the family is seen as a living organic structure with specific tasks that need to be accomplished at certain moments or stages of the family cycle.

Some aspects of the developmental framework and the interactional approach appeared in the work of Pollack (1956, 1965). He systematically used concepts like interaction, social system of the family, life cycle of the family,
transition states as part of a framework of family treatment. He attempted to relate the sociological concepts with psychoanalytical principles as a basis for treatment procedures in marital and child psychotherapy.

The concepts of crisis points or developmental tasks have been used in the field of community mental health. With this framework, Caplan (1963) set out strategies for assisting those involved in or going through these transitions. He has welded the parts of this framework into a program of community mental health prevention and has suggested that key moments such as beginning school, going to college, engagement, marriage, and pregnancy are crisis moments that need special attention. One research project concerned with the critical transition points in the normal, expectable development of the family life cycle such as, birth of the first child, children going to school, death of a spouse specifically focused on the transition of getting married. Rapoport reported on her efforts with couples during the engaged period (1963), the honeymoon period (1964) a period of time that included the action of getting married and changing jobs (1965). The main significance of Rapoport's systematic investigation was that it developed ideas and methods into a more integrated formula and framework to test specific hypotheses pinpointing this one phase of the family life cycle.
In a similar attempt to develop these theories into a mental health program, Bolman (1968) described a plan of family oriented prevention. This plan was based on the systems approach and the developmental model of the family including critical transition points.

Recently, several other theories have begun to have some impact on the conceptual framework for family analysis. One that promises increased usefulness and integrative force is the General Systems Theory. The modern systems approach has developed in many fields over the last two decades and has recently made its appearance in family sociology. Buckley (1967, 1968) has written a brief but cogent account of how general systems theory can benefit sociological theories, such as the ones mentioned. The work of von Bertalanffy (1968) has been pioneering and influential in this area.

The systems approach has also been introduced into the theoretical framework of family therapy. Jackson (1959, 1965) and others have modeled their approach on this perspective. Conceptually it considers the family as a system that requires constant feedback and operates within a set of implicit or explicit rules that regulate family behavior. This approach is mainly concerned with the process of transactions within the family system itself. Reviewers such as Olson (1970) and Broderick (1971) regard
the systems theory as a possibly valuable enriching development of family theory and functioning.

Despite the increasing usefulness of family theories, gaps still appear in applying these frameworks to the marriage relationship itself. The symbolic interactional approach and the family life cycle approach seem to help to come to grips with the complex realities and functions of total family systems, yet the dynamics of the marital dyad are not yet fully understood. Vincent (1967) concluded that specially developed methods and concepts are needed to study marital health, marital roles, and marital dynamics. The research activities of Goodrich and Ryder (1968) pointed to some increased attention in the specific study of the marital dyad, but gaps in applied theory still exist in understanding the interaction of engaged and married couples per se.

Modern Communication Theory

During the last two decades, the major theoretical work on inter-familial communication has been done by those clinically involved with the process and dynamics of family life. Communication within a family is seen as a process of a system. Broderick (1971) described the whole movement as one stemming from the concepts and constructs of general systems theory. The systems approach was introduced into family therapy primarily by Jackson (1959, 1965), Haley
(1963), Watzlawick, et al. (1967). The theory and clinical practice of this movement is based on this assumption; that human communication is a pattern of sequential messages, occurring between persons-communicating-with-other-persons. In order to understand and work with a whole family or a specific member of a family, it is necessary to view family communication as a process with properties and elements with complex structures, involving all those within that specific system.

One of the chief concepts of communication theory was developed by Reusch and Bateson (1951). The concept is that of meta-communication, or communication about the very process of communication. Meta-communication involves,

"... all exchanged cues and propositions about (a) codification and (b) relationship between the communicators. ... The qualities and characteristics of meta-communication between persons will depend upon the qualities and degree of their mutual awareness of each other's perception."

(Reush and Bateson 1951, pg. 209)

Watzlawick et al. (1967) also stated that the one important aspect of communication is not content per se but the relationship aspect defined by the very process and pattern of the ones communicating.

Another aspect of communicating theory centers around the family as a rule-governed system. Jackson (1965) reasoned that many aspects of interpersonal relationships are governed by a few family rules. Haley (1963) held that many
family conflicts center around family rules and who determines these rules. In attempting to assess patterns of family interacting and family rules many recent studies directly observed families interacting. Watzlawick (1966) reported an interview technique attempting to observe and code such rules.

Another way of describing and classifying the communication process is discussed by Jackson (1965) and Lederer and Jackson (1969). They use the terms report and command. The report part of the message relates to the content being communicated. The command part defines the nature of the relationship of the parties communicating. These authors felt that many communication problems occur because the command component is not clearly worked out.

Based on the dimensions and properties of this communication theory, it would seem that effective or ineffective communication skills would affect the function of marital and family systems. A research effort by Cardillo (1971) involved teaching couples specific communication rules and procedures. The results indicated positive change associated with the treatment. Ard (1969) commented that most workers in helping professions would probably agree on the basic points of this theory. He then pointed out that there might be disagreement among these same professionals as how best to apply this theory in clinical practice.
Further research seemed to bear out the importance of communication as one factor affecting marital and family relationships. Navran (1967) indicated that his results might show that marital adjustment is positively related with the capacity to communicate effectively. And conversely, his data indicated that couples who made poor marital adjustment had developed significantly different communication styles which made for poor problem solving. In studying the relationship of family problems and husband-wife communications, Petersen (1969) concluded that it would appear that husband-wife communication was related to problem solving in the family. Low incident of problems in the family was related to effective communication between husband and wife.

Of more specific interest to this study has been research describing results using dyadic models of communication. Cardillo (1971) reported that his data supported the conclusion that the treatment procedure, using a sender-receiver model of communication enhanced the self-concepts and mutual understanding of the participating couples. In a related study dealing with dyadic interaction as a function of the amount of feedback, Willis and Hale (1965) found that the absence of feedback drastically reduced performance of their subjects, and, in their opinion highlighted the importance of communication for the coordination of interpersonal behavior. They also reported that their data indicated that some relationships would have to take into
account not only the quantity, but also the quality of information transmitted and the type of situation in which this communication took place.

A further study that attempted and tested the use of dyadic interaction is reported by Perregaux (1971). The experimenter was interested in the resolution of disagreements of marital couples. Her results indicated that some resolution to conflicts was affected by means of this type of interaction.

In the review of this section of the literature, it would seem that communication is an important factor in marital and family systems. It also seemed that studying communication in dyadic interaction might be profitable.

Family and Marital Therapy

The field of marital therapy is both old and new. There has always been interest and concern about the intimate relationship of husband and wife. It is only recently, however, that a need has been seen for separate professional status and emphasis. It is the specific attempt of this section of the review of literature to focus on the recent development of marital and family therapy that reflected the influence of the theories and research findings of the two preceding sections.
Olson (1970) stated that this new development has made a significant contribution in that it has placed renewed emphasis on the marital relationship per se. As a result of this interest in focusing on the marital relationship and the problems manifest between the couple, the technique of conjoint marital therapy has developed. Satir (1965) advanced a description of this approach and pointed out its roots in communication theory.

In a perspective and qualifying statement about marital therapy, Ard (1969) stated that communication difficulties often seem to lie at the heart of the marital and family problems. He pointed out that communication often gets off to a bad start during the dating period; and as one moves through dating into the engagement period, and then into marriage, expectations, roles, and values often changed without being explicitly discussed or modified.

When a marriage counselor or therapist offers service to a marital pair conjointly, there seems to be a need for a framework within which to fit therapeutic interventions. One therapist, Bolte (1970), proposed that communication theory provided such a framework. Bolte's paper discussed the communications approach as one vehicle for studying the marital relationship and for therapeutic practice. He presented the theory and its applicability to the treatment of pairs. He also gave an evaluation of its
strengths and weaknesses and its advantages and disadvantages.

In another study of marital behavior, Goodman and Ofshe (1968) used the structure of symbolic interaction theory and its pivotal concepts of communication and understanding to describe their results. The study concluded that viewing a family or marital relationship as a social system was a most useful means in understanding the special worlds of gestures, language, and communication that arise in interpersonal interactions such as courtship and marriage.

The popularly written work of Lederer and Jackson (1969) dealt with marriage and marital difficulties. This therapeutic approach was based on the key ideas and framework of communication theory. It was a less formal presentation that spelled out in detail the implications of this theory as applied to the marital dyad. The work of Cardillo (1971) with disturbed marriages had its roots in two interrelated theories. His data seemed to support the symbolic interaction formulation, and, at the same time, his data supported the possibility of the effectiveness of teaching specific communication rules to those involved in human relationships where conflict is likely.

In two recent volumes, Greene (1965, 1971) gave clear indications that the theoretical frameworks of systems theory, of the family life cycle, and of communication theory could play important parts in the growing field of marital psychotherapy.
In the related but distinct area of family therapy it is equally possible to see the influence of the above-mentioned theories. Communication theory is most prominent in the works of Satir (1968), Jackson (1959), and Watzlawick, et al. (1967). Many family therapists focus their therapeutic efforts to understanding and changing the process and rules of communication that exist within the family system. The underlying frameworks of symbolic interaction and developmental states is clearly seen in the work of Ackerman (1956, 1963), Minuchin, Montalvo, et al. (1967), who work with the whole family system and all of its members. Although there seems to be no one theory unifying family therapy or family therapists, the general systems approach seems to be underlying much that has developed. Olson (1971) held that:

"... by far the most significant contribution to the fields of family psychopathology is the systems theory which has been developed and espoused by many family therapists. (pg. 518)"

A review of literature seems to show an increasing interest in using these basic frameworks in the practice of marital and family therapy. It also seems that little attention has been given to preventive approach to family and marriage difficulties. This lack has been noted by Vincent (1967) in regard to emphasis on marital health concepts. This lack has also been noted by Wilms (1966) in regard to working with engaged couples as they prepare for marriage. Some therapists have been doing pre-marital
counseling and have strongly emphasized its value and significance. Rutledge (1966) clearly stated that the nature of family interaction is dependent to a great extent on the quality and quantity of communication skills learned in engagement. Efforts to positively effect a forthcoming marriage lean primarily upon this basic process of human interaction. A review of literature on pre-marital counseling revealed two significant descriptions of the use of groups for premarital counseling. Levine (1947) and Freeman (1965) both reported the existence of continuous programs of premarital counseling in groups that included working on communication and problem-solving skills. Another noted therapist, Ellis (1961) reported on a rational therapeutic approach to premarital counseling.

In a brief article on the history of premarital counseling, however, Rutledge (1968) revealed that much of the work with engaged couples was handled in an educational setting such as colleges and high school courses or in a pastoral counseling setting within church groups. There was little indication that the dimension of communication between engaged couples had been a major interest among therapists until the present time. However, two particularly relevant studies involving engaged couples has been reported. Miller (1971) and Nunnally (1971) set up programs to train engaged couples in various communication skills. Their program consisted of four weekly three-hour meetings in
which a group of engaged couples were trained in communication techniques which they practiced in the group. The results of their studies indicate the possibility of using this approach in other settings with engaged couples. These researchers also indicated that the theoretical basis of their attempt included the symbolic interaction theory, communication theory and the systems theory.

**Summary**

A review of literature has revealed that research and theory dealing with teaching dyadic communication skills to engaged couples is quite limited and recent but perhaps well based. For the literature dealing with related areas of developing family theories and modern communication theories has given evidence of positive direction and results.
Chapter III
DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

Specific Statement of the Problem

The problem considered in this study is whether engaged couples who are taught specific feedback techniques in dyadic communication for use in a relatively short period of time (one hour) will manifest a change in their preparedness for marriage as measured by MPI scores; and whether this change will be significantly greater than change in MPI scores of the two control groups of engaged couples participating in general group discussion procedures.

Hypotheses

Ho 1 Engaged couples in the experimental group will not have a significantly different change in MPI scores when compared with the change in MPI scores of couples in control groups.

Ho 2 Engaged males in the experimental group will not have a significantly different change in MPI scores when compared with the change in MPI scores of engaged males in the control groups.

Ho 3 Engaged females in the experimental group will not have a significantly different change in MPI scores when
compared with the change in MPI scores of engaged females in the control groups.

Ho 4 Engaged males in the experimental group will not have a significantly different change in MPI scores when compared with the change in MPI scores of engaged females in the control groups.

Ho 5 Engaged females in the experimental group will not have a significantly different change in MPI scores when compared with the change in MPI scores of engaged males in the control groups.

Ho 6 Engaged males in the experimental group will not have a significantly different change in MPI scores when compared with the changes in MPI scores of engaged females in the experimental group.

Ho 7 Engaged couples in the experimental group will not have significantly different change in the eight sub-categories of MPI scores when compared with the changes in sub-categories of MPI scores of engaged couples in the control groups.

General Methodology

Design of Study. The basic design of this study was that of a field experiment, as defined by Kerlinger (1965):

A field experiment is a research study in a realistic situation in which one or more independent variables are manipulated by the experimenter under as carefully controlled conditions as the situation will permit, (pg. 382)
It followed the Pretest-Postest Group Design, which requires that the subjects be randomly assigned to the experimental and control groups. Because of the specific need to include all the couples who might attend this Family Life Education Program, it was decided to have a second control group with its own leaders. This was felt to be a slight advantage to this study in that it would offer some additional data for comparison and analysis. In part the design has the characteristics of a laboratory experiment: communications training is provided in a specially contrived situation. This investigated the effects of training in dyadic communications as measured by the Marital Preparedness Inventory (MPI).

**Setting for Study.** The setting for this experimental study was a Family Life Education Program sponsored by the Catholic Diocese of Oakland. This program is specifically designed to reach couples who are engaged to be married. Its major goal is to help engaged couples in their preparation for married and family life. The structure or format used to achieve this goal is basically educational or informational. It is scheduled for a four-hour period on a Sunday afternoon. It regularly consists of several talks given by professional people including a medical doctor, a priest, and a married couple. It includes some opportunity for informal discussion and a period of question and answer. It is
conducted competently and warmly; and most of the participating couples expressed their appreciation and have offered helpful suggestions and evaluations at the end of the program, indicating their interest and involvement.

**Experimental Procedure.** For this experiment it was decided to divide the couples into smaller groups and to spend one hour in some form of learning experience along with the talks. As the couples entered the conference room, each couple was given a colored name tag, i.e., red, yellow or blue. After a brief orientation to the day, couples were requested to fill out a biographical questionnaire (see Appendix) containing demographic information. Couples were then instructed to go through a Q sort of thirty-one items and to rate themselves on each item as to how prepared they felt themselves to be at that moment. They were asked to rate themselves on a five point continuum. Five representing "very well prepared," one representing "least well prepared." After going through the Q sort and rating each item, they were instructed to return the score sheets, the Q sort items, and the demographic information.

Immediately following this testing procedure was the first planned talk which lasted approximately forty-five minutes. During this period the score sheets of the Blue (experimental) group were tabulated so as to determine which category of items scored lowest. At this point the couples
were asked to go into three separate groups according to the color of their name tags, without indicating any difference in group procedures or purposes. Each group gathered in separate areas and spent the next hour in following specified group procedures.

Each group used the same general topics or items for discussion with the method of communication the main variable. The time spent in discussion or group communication was equal, one hour. The topics for discussion were specifically related to married or family life, although each control group was free to handle the choice of topics and subsequent discussion in its own fashion. The leaders for each control group were different, although pre-trained in general group procedures.

Randomization Procedures

In all, thirty-four couples attended the program. The couples were assigned to the three groups in the following manner. As the paired couples entered the conference room they were randomly given different colored name tags (Blue, Yellow, Red). Of the total number of couples, twelve couples were given Blue name tags; eleven were given Yellow name tags; eleven were given Red name tags. In the Blue group, it resulted that one couple was above the predetermined age and was not included in the results, leaving eleven couples. In the Yellow group it resulted that one
subject had been married previously, therefore the test results of that couple were not included in the results, leaving ten couples. In the Red group it resulted that three people had come separately and they were not included in the results, leaving nine couples. The total number of couples whose scores were reported and analyzed was thirty, evenly divided into thirty male and thirty female subjects. It was determined prior to the experiment that the Blue group would be the experimental group, and that the other two would function as control groups.

**Test Administration**

The experimental group and two control groups were tested at the beginning and at the end using the MPI. The differences in terms of absolute change of pretest-posttest scores were analyzed to assess the degree and character of the movement taking place.

Pre-test administration of the MPI was by means of the Q sort method, scoring each item on a five point continuum. Test time was approximately five to seven minutes for the entire group. To lessen the bias in test administration, the experimenter noted that information would be confidential and that the testing was no indicating of any right or wrong results or answers. Rather it was aimed at gathering data for research and their honest self-appraisal would be helpful.
Post-test administration of the MPI, which came at the end of the program, was by means of a one page fill-in with the same thirty-one items on a five point continuum. It was recognized that the subjects would be sensitized to the test, but it was hoped that the different manner of administering the test would help to modify the biasing factor.

**Treatment**

When the experimental group came together, the steps of the treatment procedure were explained and modeled. A copy of the eight categories of items were returned to each couple with each category marked for discussion for that specific couple. The group as a whole was then instructed in a sender-receiver model of communication. First, one person expressing his ideas or feelings on the first indicated category would speak. The partner would listen and then send back his understanding of what the first person had said, until accurately expressing what that person thought or felt. Then the receiving person would become the sender on the same topic expressing his feelings or ideas to the other. That receiver would then feed back as accurately as possible his understanding of the other persons thought or feeling.

The couple was then instructed to continue this procedure on the same topic for ten minutes. At the end of the ten minutes, the experimenter would stop the process and
ask the couples to go on to the second topic or category marked on their paper and follow the same process of communicating.

After the verbal instruction, the experimenter modeled this procedure with a co-worker for two minutes. He then asked each subject to attempt to use this procedure with a partner other than the engaged partner for three minutes. He then asked each subject to attempt to use this procedure with a partner other than the engaged partner for three minutes. After determining that each subject felt comfortable enough with the rules and process, the couples were asked to separate themselves into different parts of the room and to begin as directed. At the end of the allotted period of time, four topics had been discussed in the manner described.

During this same period of time, each control group went to a designated area. The group discussion leaders in both cases were married couples pretrained in general methods of group discussion. The group discussions followed a different process than the treatment group. They mainly followed a question and answer format with the leader couples stimulating discussion by asking their opinions, experiences and expectations on the various categories. Although each leader couple was different in personality, both control groups followed a similar approach, but focusing on a different sequence of topics.
Analytical Design. A 3 x 2 x 8 factorial analysis of variance, as described by Bruning and Kintz (1968) was performed on the change in MPI scores. The three factor mixed design is basically a combination of the factorial design and the treatments by subjects design. Not only does this design permit examination of the effects of two factors in combination with each other, it also permits examination of performance variations shown by the subjects during the experimental sessions.

This factorial analysis tested for significant differences due to treatment, sex, subcategory and to their interactions. The level of confidence was set at .05 for the hypotheses and for the non-hypothesized findings.

Population and Sample

The population consisted of pairs of engaged couples who were taking part in a scheduled program of Family Life Education sponsored by the Catholic Diocese of Oakland in the Spring of 1972. Most of the couples attending this program did so at the recommendation of a local pastor. Some of the couples came on their own initiative. Generally, at the beginning the couples seemed to be moderately interested in the program and its possible productive outcome. A few did appear to be unresponsive. The sample for this investigation consisted of engaged couples entering into their first marriage, between the ages of eighteen and
The age of the participants is as follows: for the experimental group, the mean age was 21.7 (male) and 20.5 (female). For the Control Group II it was 22.3 (male) and 20.4 (female); for Control Group III it was 23.1 (male) and 21.8 (female). Members of the training group were slightly younger than members of the control groups.

The formal educational achievements of the participants are in terms of years of education. For the experimental group it was 13.2 (males) and 12.9 (females). For the Control Group II it was 13.9 (males) and 13.6 (females). For the Control Group III it was 14.2 (males) and 13.4 (females). Comparing couples in the groups around the length of engagement, it was found that the length of engagement varied from one month to thirty-six months, with the mean of 10.06 months. The mean length of engagement of participants measured in months was 13.09 for the experimental group, 10.1 for Control Group II, and 6.11 for Control Group III.

The participants were then living within the counties of Alameda and Contra Costa. Most would be married within six months time in some religious ceremony.

**Instrument Used**

For the purpose of this study, the instrument used was the Marital Preparedness Inventory (MPI) which was developed by Sporakowski, (1968). The instrument was
designed and tested for several purposes; namely, for predictive research and for use in both preventive and remedial pre-marital education and counseling. It is an instrument for assessing an individual's self-perception of his own preparedness or readiness for marriage. The study for which this instrument was developed had as its main population the single, unengaged person who was about to enter into the marriage market. Its use involved a direct self-assessment of preparedness. The assessment was in the form of responses to variations on thirty-one items which previously had been determined to be useful in marital predictive studies, or which had been hypothesized to be functional attributes of the married state, as found in the review of literature. The MPI as used in the present study kept the same thirty-one items and offered the same five point continuum. In the study the only change was in the designation "very well-prepared-least well-prepared." This was used instead of "very well prepared-very poorly prepared." The original author of the MPI administered test-retest procedures. The overall results yielded a Spearman Rank Order correlation of +0.83. The results seemed to be within an acceptable range of discrimination.

Although the MPI was developed primarily for use with the marriageable more than for engaged couples, the experimenter felt that the instrument showed promise as a useful tool of measurement with engaged couples in this
setting. One possible limitation of this instrument was considered. The general tendency expected was that couples would rate themselves highly (a score toward "very well prepared") from the very beginning. This tendency was noted by Sporakowski (1968) when he stated:

The trend noted was that as the subjects status moved from single to engaged there was a significant increase in the number of persons scoring in the upper two quartiles. Interestingly, 79% of the married groups fell in the two lower quartiles. The findings based on the single group appear to be in concordance with Kelly (1941) who stated that non-reality exaggeration increases up to marriage. (pg. 195)

It was also expected that because of their sensitivity to the first testing on this instrument, the couples might recall their initial responses and respond in the very same way or might tend to rate themselves a bit higher.

For these reasons the experimenter chose to score the MPI in such a way as to give a more reliable indication of the experimental effect. It was decided to note any activity on the five point scale, both increase and decrease for each item, in an absolute fashion. Each change of score would be counted. It was hoped that scoring absolute change rather than simply the numerical increase in post-test scores would add to reliability of the instrument and would be a more sensitive and realistic indication of change toward preparedness in the couples.
Chapter IV

RESULTS

Following the conclusion of the experiment with the engaged couples, the resulting change in scores was analyzed to determine whether there was any indication of performance variation between the groups and within the groups. The factorial analysis used in this study tested for significant differences due to the communication treatment and sex as independent variables. Their interactions were also studied for similar differences. Sub-scores on eight categories were also analyzed for indication of significant differences within the groups. At the same time the interactions of Categories X Communication, Categories X Sex, and Categories X Communication X Sex were also studied.

It would appear that the data in the factorial analysis of Table 1 support the null hypotheses in all cases. Examination of mean change scores for MPI on Table 2 for group and sex differences support these data. Also the examination of mean change scores for categories in Table 3 is consistent with the hypotheses.

On closer look at the F ratio for the Communication variable there seems to be a trend toward significance. This does bear directly upon the main focus of this study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>m.s.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>479</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication X Sex</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error_b</td>
<td>341.66</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories</td>
<td>221.65</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31.66</td>
<td>20.96</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories X Communication</td>
<td>14.35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories X Sex</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories X Communication X Sex</td>
<td>14.66</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error_w</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Mean Change Scores on the MPI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17.27</td>
<td>13.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 2.53 p .05

T Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Im IIIm</th>
<th>Im IIIm</th>
<th>If IIIf</th>
<th>If IIIIf</th>
<th>Im If</th>
<th>Im IIIf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.76*</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( t = 1.72 \) p .05 20 df

Im = group I males   If = group I females
IIIm = group II males IIIf = group II females
IIIIm = group III males IIIIf = group III females
Table 3
Mean Change Score on Sub-Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group I</th>
<th>Group II</th>
<th>Group III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although the trend does not reach a statistical level of significance decided upon (.05), it seems to lend support to the theoretical and practical interpretations and conclusions.

**Significance of the Results**

H<sub>0</sub>1. Engaged couples in the experimental group will not have a significantly different change in MPI scores when compared with the change in MPI scores of couples in control groups.

Table 1 indicates an F ratio (2.53) which is not significant at the .05 level decided upon. Null hypothesis 1 was therefore accepted. Examination of the mean change scores of the experimental and control groups in Table 2 reveals a difference of 4.22 between Groups I and II; and a difference of 4.33 between Group I and III. The t-tests indicate that this was not significant, although approaching significance.

H<sub>0</sub>2. Engaged males in the experimental group will not have a significantly different change in MPI scores when compared with the change in MPI scores of males in both control groups.

Table 1 indicates an F ratio (2.53) which is not significant at the .05 level decided upon. Null hypothesis 2 was therefore accepted. Examination of the mean change score of the experimental and the control groups in Table 2
reveals a difference of 4.4 between Groups I and II (male); and a difference of 5.0 between Groups I and III (male). The t-tests indicate that this difference was not significant, although approaching significance.

H₀3. Engaged females in the experimental group will not have a significantly different change in MPI scores when compared with the change in MPI scores of females in control groups. Table 1 indicates an F ratio (2.53) which is not significant at the .05 level decided upon. Null hypothesis 3 was therefore accepted. Examination of the mean change score of the experimental and control groups in Table 2 reveals a difference of 4.0 between Groups I and II (female); and a difference of 3.7 between Groups I and III (female). The t-tests indicate that this difference was significant between Groups I and II.

H₀4. Engaged males in the experimental group will not have a significant change in MPI scores when compared with the change in MPI scores of females in control groups. Table 1 indicates an F ratio (2.53) which is not significant at the .05 level decided upon. Null hypothesis 4 is therefore accepted. Examination of the mean change scores of the experimental and control groups in Table 2 reveals a difference of 3.1 between Groups I (male) and II (female); and a difference of 2.8 between Group I (male) and III (female). The t-tests indicate that these differences
were not significant.

H₀₅. Engaged females in the experimental group will not have a significantly different change in MPI scores when compared with the change in MPI scores of males in the control groups. Table 1 indicates an F ratio (2.53) which is not significant at the .05 level decided upon. Null Hypothesis 5 was therefore accepted. Examination of the mean change scores of the experimental and control groups in Table 2 reveals a difference of 5.3 between Group I and Group II (male); and a difference of 6.1 between Group I (female) and Group III (male). The t-tests indicate that this difference was not significant, although approaching significance.

H₀₆. Engaged males in the experimental group will not have a significantly different change in MPI scores when compared with the change in MPI scores of females in the experimental group.

By examining the mean change scores of male and female in Group I the difference is obviously insignificant. Therefore, Null Hypothesis 6 is accepted.

H₀₇. Engaged couples in the experimental group will not have significantly different change in the eight sub-categories of the MPI scores when compared with the changes in sub-categories of MPI scores of couples in control groups.
Table 1 indicates an F ratio (.67) which is not significant at the .05 level decided upon. Null hypothesis 7 is also accepted. Examination of mean change scores of the experimental group and control groups in terms of sub-scores on eight categories reveals only slight differences from category to category.

Other significant results. Examination of Table 1 indicates an F ratio of (20.96) which is highly significant at the .01 level. It seems to indicate that sub-scores highly differentiate among all groups, among all subjects across all eight categories.

Interpretation of Results

Treatment Variable. It would appear from analyzing the data on Table 2 that the mean change scores of the group using a specific communication process in a dyad did not differ significantly from the mean change scores of the control groups. However, it seems to indicate a non-significant trend approaching significance at the .05 level. Individual t-tests between the cells show that one reached significance and others approached significance but did not reach it. From this it can tentatively be suggested that the treatment variable of communication approached significance.
Sex Variable. The female mean change score (15.1) across all groups did not differ significantly from the male mean change score (13.6). Within each group, female scores were slightly higher, but were not significantly different. The t-tests indicate this also. This leads to the tentative interpretation that the Sex variable was not a significant factor of change. Males and females scored relatively the same on MPI scores. There were non-significant trends for experimental group females to score more change than males in control group and for males in experimental group to score more change than females in control groups.

Treatment X sex interaction. Table 2 indicates that females in experimental group were 1.1 higher in score than males in same group. Similarly, females in control group II were 1.3 higher in score than males of their respective groups. The difference was uniform, but it was not significant.

This suggests that the interaction of the Treatment X Sex variables were not significantly different. The treatments in each group had similar effects on both male and female subjects.

Interpretation of Results Within Groups

In examining the data on Table 1 for significance within groups, the F ratio (20.96) indicates a high degree of differentiation among the eight categories across all the
subjects of all three groups, and this regardless of sex. It would seem from this that each category measured individual differences at a high level of significance. In order to account for this significant variation, several factors will be highlighted.

First, in regard to the test itself, the eight categories seem to actually measure distinct areas of content relating to marital and family life. The thirty-one items of the MPI seem to reflect qualitatively different considerations. Also the eight categories themselves had varied number of items (ranging from two up to six). This may have added to the differentiation. On examination of mean change scores for each category across sex and group, it seems that no clear pattern exists.

Secondly, the engaged couples themselves may be a heterogeneous group. The demographic material indicated similarities in age, race, socio-economic status, educational advantages. However, the feelings and attitudes specifically reflected by these eight categories may well be a highly significant difference.

Thirdly, the ways in which each group handled the content reflected by these categories may be a factor. In the experimental group, each couple was asked to focus on only four of the eight categories in the one hour period. Those four items were selected by determining four lower scores as measured by the pre-test MPI for each couple
individually. The control groups were not limited to what topics to focus on. It seems possible that these factors may have influenced this diversity of scores across all eight categories.

**Categories X treatment interaction.** Table 1 indicates an F ratio (.67) which is not significant. People within the different communication groups did not change in a significantly different way in regard to the eight categories. On examination of the data on Table 3 by category, there seems to be a slight trend for the experimental group to show more change over most of the categories when comparing the total mean change. However, this trend does not seem to be statistically significant.

**Category X sex interaction.** In Table 1 it is indicated by the F ratio (0) there was no significant difference in the changes of score between the male and female score among the eight categories. Again looking at the data on Table 2 and 3 verifies this. It would seem that both male and female subjects made similar change throughout all categories. No one area seemed to manifest significant differences.

**Category X treatment X sex interaction.** It would appear from the F ratio (.68) that this interaction made no significant difference on the change scores of the MPI.
People of different sex within the different groups did not manifest significant change as measured by the different category scores. This suggests that no significant difference occurred in the scores through the interaction of sex and group. Considering the data on Table 3 would verify this tentative interpretation.
Chapter V

SUMMARY

This study examined the effects of using a sender-receiver model of communication with engaged couples. The effects were measured in terms of absolute change in scores on the Marital Preparedness Inventory pre-test and post-test scores. This change was then compared with the change of scores of two control groups of engaged couples. The results were analyzed in a factorial design to determine significant differences.

The study followed the Pre-test-post-test Control Group design. It used randomization procedures by assigning thirty engaged couples to three groups. The experiment took place as part of a Family Life Education Program sponsored by the Catholic Diocese of Oakland.

All couples were pre-tested and post-tested within a four-hour session. During this period of time, one hour was used for the experimental procedures. The experimental group was taught to use a feedback process of communication in a dyad, while the control groups followed general group discussion with married couples as leaders. The areas of discussion for all couples generally focused on topics of married and family life. At the end of the program all
couples were tested once more on the MPI.

The change scores were then analyzed in a factorial design according to communication treatment, sex, and various interactions, as measured on the MPI. All seven null hypotheses were accepted, although one main trend was evident. It seemed as if the variable of communication tended toward significance but did not quite reach the .05 level of significance.

Conclusions

First, engaged couples who participated in the experimental group using feedback system of communication did manifest greater change in score on the MPI following this experience than engaged couples in two control groups. This change did not reach an acceptable level of significant statistical difference. However, it seems that this specific method of communication had greater impact on the scoring of these couples. It is interesting that although changes were not statistically significant, there is a trend toward significance in a pattern related to other studies mentioned in the review in literature. Changes seemed to be greater for those engaged couples who took part in the experimental procedure. Second, it seems that the changes that became evident throughout the three groups were equally manifest in both male and female. It seems that both males and females were affected by total program, as measured by the MPI, with
the engaged couples, male and female of the experimental group, being more affected.

Thirdly, despite apparent similarities in age, education, length of engagement, socio-economic status, each individual may have differed significantly in views, attitudes, values, relating to the various areas of married and family life, as touched upon by the eight categories of the MPI. It would seem that the individual differences were of great significance.

Recommendations

It is recommended that this study might be replicated in a similar type of program with engaged couples, especially increasing the length of time spent in learning and using similar or varied types of communication techniques.

It seems warranted in terms of this study to recommend a longitudinal study be done to determine whether rules or procedures of communicating learned in a relatively short time would be maintained and effective in the remainder of their engagement, or once the couple was married.

Considering the lack of study dealing with engaged couples up to the present time, more data needs to be gathered with regard to the effect of length of engagement, the effect of the closeness of the date of marriage upon the couple's inter-personal communication. It is recommended that this
type of study could be used to determine the effect of these and other variables.

It seems two areas that overlap in this study are both available for further valuable testing and analysis. One area is that of content, or what is communicated between couples. A second area is how the couple communicates. It is recommended that other types of tests and instruments be developed to more sensitively measure these two areas. It seems to be especially important to the area of how the couple communicates to develop instruments more directly relating to determining communication patterns and processes. One possible example of this is the Premarital Communication Inventory (PCI) developed by M. J. Bienvenu, Ph.D. (1969).

It seems that the theoretical positions mentioned in the review of literature regarding family life development and communication theory might be profitably and valuably applied to the area of Premarital counseling and programs of Family Life Education, such as the one in the Oakland Diocese.

Limitations

One limitation is in regard to the test instrument itself. It seems as if this study is the first time it has been used in measuring significant change among groups of engaged couples involved in a program of preparation for marriage. From the results of this one study, it seems to
have potentially useful characteristics. However, it would have been advantageous to have had another instrument for measurement; rather than having to use the same instrument twice in a relatively short period of time. Interaction of testing and the dependent variable could be related.

Secondly, it was not possible to control entirely for the effect of the different personalities of group leaders. This may have accounted for some of the results. Although the results of the two control groups were quite similar despite this fact, more control of the content area might be advisable.

Thirdly, not being able to control the heterogeneity of the engaged couples in vital factors affecting personal views on married and family life could be considered in some future study. Another factor that remained undetermined was the main motivating force behind their being present at the Program. As was indicated, some seemed to be there not because they wanted it; but rather because it was requested or demanded. This could certainly have a serious effect on effective results.

Fourthly, in the review of literature, there were no studies indicating contrary conclusions to the trend in this study, but there have been no other such specific studies with which to compare it or to contrast it. Therefore, it seems that much of what is hinted at in this study needs to be tested in different ways and over longer periods of time.
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MARITAL PREPAREDNESS INSTRUMENT

(Instructions: for each of the following items place a mark (x) in the space which most nearly approximates how well prepared you feel regarding these items as of today)

1. Food preparation
2. Making new friendships
3. Sexual intercourse: physical aspects
4. Adaptability to new people
5. Illness, disease, handicaps
6. Reproduction or child bearing
7. Planning long range goals
8. Breaking or reducing parental ties
9. Geographic mobility: moving to and living in an area or region with which you have had little experience
10. Adjustment to a lower income
11. Living with a person of the opposite sex
12. Adjustment to a higher income
13. Buying clothes, food, household goods
14. A philosophy of life
15. Vocational readiness, job preparedness
16. Ability to accept another's conventionality (manners, personal habits, etc.)
17. Maintaining friendships
18. Budgeting family income
19. Sexual intercourse: mental attitudes
20. Resolving interpersonal conflicts
21. Giving and receiving affection
22. Religious beliefs regarding marriage
23. Maintaining a lasting marital relationship
24. Courting practices, dating, necking, etc.
25. Recreation and leisure time pursuits
26. Home care: e.g., Domestic chores such as minor carpentry for males; ironing for females
27. Child care (feeding, clothing, discipline, etc.)
28. Living with another person
29. Being able to provide an adequate income
30. Marriage as a whole
31. Intellectual pursuits
APPENDIX B

ITEMS FORMING THE SUB-CATEGORIES FROM THE MPI

I 511 Home care: e.g. Domestic chores such as minor carpentry for males, ironing for females.
   621 Budgeting family income
   131 Buying clothes, food, household goods
   241 Food preparation

II 812 Sexual intercourse: mental attitudes
   222 Sexual intercourse: physical aspects
   932 Giving and receiving attention
   142 Courting practices, dating, necking, etc.

III 913 Child care (feeding, clothing, discipline, etc.)
   123 Reproduction or child bearing

IV 914 Ability to accept another conventionality (manners, personal habits, etc.)
   224 Living with a person of the opposite sex
   134 Illness, disease, handicaps
   744 Resolving interpersonal conflicts
   654 Living with another person
   564 Maintaining a lasting marital relationship

V 215 Breaking or reducing parental ties
   325 Making new friendships
   935 Maintaining friendships

56
APPENDIX B (continued)

645 Adaptability to new people

155 Geographic mobility: moving to and living in an area or region with which you have had little experience

VI 116 Recreation and leisure time pursuits

626 Intellectual pursuits

VII 117 Adjustment to a lower income

527 Being able to provide an adequate income

837 Adjustment to a higher income

747 Vocational readiness, job preparedness

VIII 318 A philosophy of life

628 Planning long range goals

938 Religious beliefs regarding marriage

548 Marriage as a whole
APPENDIX C

INFORMATION FOR PROJECT
(This information will be strictly confidential)

1. Your age _____
2. Sex: M _ F (circle)
3. Religious Preference (if any) ____________
4. Length of present engagement _____ (in months)
5. Have you ever been married before? yes--no (circle)
6. Have you ever been engaged before? yes--no (circle)
7. Years of education: 1.2.3.4.5.6.7.8.9.10.11.12 (High School)
   1.2.3.4. (college)
   Post Graduate: 1.2.3.4. (circle years completed)
8. Present occupation ________________
9. How would you describe yourself? (circle)
   a. American Indian/ Native American
   b. Black/Afro American/Negro
   c. Caucasion/White
   d. Chicano/Mexican American
   e. Filipino
   f. Oriental/Asian American
   g. other Spanish-speaking American
   h. other
10. Main source of income at this time is:
    a. own earnings
    b. parent/family
    c. other......(specify) ________________
APPENDIX C (continued)

11. Approximate income in 1971: (circle)

a. Less than $3000 a year
b. between $3000 and 5,999
c. between $6,000 and 8,999
d. between $9,000 and 11,999
e. between $12,000 and 14,999
f. $15,000 and above