The purpose of this paper was to study the relationship of a high school family life course to post high school problems and marriage role expectations. The specific objective of the study was to determine whether or not there is a relationship between participation in a high school family life course and perceived problems and marriage role expectations.

The subjects were girls who had completed a high school family life course from two high schools, in a North-Central California coast community, and their matched control group. The matching of the control persons with the family life students was done with regard to age, ethnic group, marital status and high school grade point average. A follow-up study was conducted, approximately two years after graduation, by mailing the instruments to the subjects.
Forty-three of the experimental group and 35 of the control group responded. This represented forty-six percent of the total.

Null hypotheses were formulated regarding the personal problems and the marriage role expectations of the two groups.

The Mooney Problem Check List (MPCL) was used to determine the number and kinds of concerns of the subjects. The statements were related to nine areas: health, personality, self-improvement, economic security, home and family, religion, courtship, sex and occupation.

The Dunn Marriage Role Expectation Inventory (DMREI) was used to determine whether the former family life students had more modern (equalitarian) marriage role expectations when compared with the control group. This instrument consists of 71 statements regarding expectations in the marriage roles and are related to seven areas: authority, homemaking, child care, personal characteristics, social participation, education, employment and support.

The analysis of variance was used to test for a significant difference in the responses of the experimental and control groups for both the MPCL and DMREI.

An F value of .007 in a comparison of marriage role expectations of the two groups made it impossible to reject the null hypothesis that there is no difference in marriage role expectations of former family life students and non family life students.
An F value of .360 in a comparison of the total number of problems and F values below the level of significance in each of the nine areas in the comparison of the experimental and control groups made it impossible to reject the null hypothesis that there is no difference in the life adjustment problems of the two groups.

Factors which may have affected the results of the study, limitations of the study and suggestions for further research were discussed.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

In recent years there has been increasing interest in family life education. There are many indications of this interest but three of the more important ones are: the increase in frequency of articles on the subject appearing in popular magazines, the number of summer institutes carrying graduate credit in family life education (16 institutes in 1967 and over double that in 1968), and the rapid growth of the Sex Information Education Council of the United States (SEICUS), established in 1965.

Behind the sudden increase of interest in family life education is the awareness of a social problem and the need to find some solutions. The problem is: failing families. One of the more popular solutions appears to be through education.

An examination of the problem is a necessary step in evaluating the appropriateness of any proposed solution and this examination is particularly crucial when an educational program is involved. An examination of a social problem, such as failing families, which is both extensive in scope and complexity might have a number of
different foci. However, one basic consideration must focus on defining the functions of the family and exploring the ramifications of its failure, with regard to society and the individual.

It is an accepted fact that the family is a basic institution in our society. It seems that no other social unit or social organization is able to assume the most important function of the family, the nurture of the young. Since the home and the family is the first social organization into which a child is brought, its stability is important. The Landis (1965) paper states that:

All the studies of the growth and development of children and of the functioning of adults in society show a close relationship between the individual's functioning in society and the quality of the relationships within his family. Statistical studies of delinquency, crime, illegitimacy, suicide, alcoholism and mental illness show that all these indices of personal failure that create problems for society are closely associated with the damaging relationships in failing families. Similarly, studies of those who are able to develop competence in coping with their personal problems and to handle their own crises in life are more likely to come from families which have been able to develop a climate of good mental health.

Mussen (1963, p. 66) further supports the importance of the family with this observation:

A child's first social learning occurs at home, and his earliest experiences with his family, particularly with his mother, are critical in determining his attitude toward, and his expectations of, other individuals.

If success of the family as a basic institution is necessary to
lessen the incidence of crime, alcoholism, illegitimacy, suicide and mental illness; then the evidence of family failure cannot help but appear threatening to society.

One criterion of family success or failure is found in the divorce rate. According to the United Nations Demographic Yearbook (1962) the national picture is that one out of every four marriages ends in divorce. The Judiciary Committee on Domestic Relations for the Assembly of the State of California (1965, p. 3) has published a statement concerning divorce in California:

There are a minimal number of things which can be said about divorce in California, but one thing which can be said is that we have a high divorce rate. We don't know the rate exactly because divorce rate is a complicated matter.

The high rate of divorce in California may well reflect problems elsewhere in the nation in that many people migrate to California and then divorce.

Divorced families is not the only problem. Another recent study by Landis (1962) reported that children from unhappy homes, though not divorced families, had received about the same adverse conditioning as had those from divorced homes. In a later paper, Landis (1965) goes on to state:

It is parents who are unhappy in marriage, parents who have poor mental health, and parents who are in constant conflict, that create a home with an emotional climate
permanently damaging to children. Children from such a home are as damaged as though they had some physical disease or were suffering from malnutrition, but their damage is of an emotional nature. It is this damage which causes them to repeat the failure of their parents in marriage and parenthood.

Thus it appears that family success is important to society and a failing family becomes a matter of great concern. The need for solutions is urgent. It is this need which has prompted the California Assembly Interim Committee on Domestic Relations (1965, p. 30) to suggest:

As a positive approach to building better marriages, one of the greatest needs today is education which will delay youth in their rush to pseudomaturity, marriage, and parenthood before they are old enough to cope with either.

It is further suggested by this committee that the State of California launch a program to aid youth in making successful marriages and in becoming intelligent parents, because the greatest hope lies in prevention of marital difficulties through a program of education rather than in rehabilitation. It appears that the only effective method of meeting the problem is through the schools since they have a regular, structured relationship with youth over an extended period of time. On this foundation the committee recommended that a major step in coping with California's family failure problem is more adequate family life education for young
people and adults in our school system.

The question here is, can we justify increased emphasis of family life education as a partial solution to the problem of failing families? Consideration of this question leads naturally to a regard for the effectiveness of family life education.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to compare the responses of students who had taken a high school family life course with those who had not taken such a course. The comparison was made using the student's perceptions with regard to selected types of personal problems and their marriage role expectations.

The definition of family life education has been the subject of much debate. However, Lee (1963) in taking a consensus of opinion from the experts arrived at a definition, which will be used in this study. This definition is: family life education is that which involves any and all school experiences deliberately and consciously used by teachers in helping to develop the personalities of students to their fullest capacities which equip the individual to solve most constructively the problems unique to his family role. As difficult as this definition is to work with in the research setting, it is still acceptable. However, for purposes of this study, the definition will be narrowed to the family life course as offered in the school system
in which the study was done.

The general hypothesis under consideration was that a family life student will have different life adjustment problems and a more modern marriage role attitude than a student who has not taken the course in family life education.

The specific hypotheses tested were the following: 1) There is no difference between problem area scores of former family life students and those who have not taken a family life course. 2) There is no difference in marriage role expectations of former family life students and those who have not taken a family life course.

**Review of the Literature**

The evaluation of the effectiveness of a course such as family life education runs into complications not found in the evaluation of other courses. Some assumptions have to be made; these are: 1) that all family life courses have relatively the same content and the same goals (this assumption needs to be made as course content is seldom mentioned in the research literature), 2) that family life education can only add to the chances of success in family living and not in any way increase chances of failure, 3) that the short range goals of family life education are concerned with increasing the student's emotional and ideological maturity, 4) that the long range goals of such a course are that the student will experience a higher
level of happiness in family life than he would have otherwise. Accurate measurement of this means comparing the student with himself which is impossible. No one can tell what might have been his level of happiness if he had not taken a course in family life education. Therefore, the control person becomes in theory what the experimental person would have been without the advantage of the course. To assume that there is that much similarity between the control and the experimental persons is subject to debate. However, it is the best we can do. Taking all these things into consideration, the problem evolves to be that of measuring the success of both the short range goals and the long range goals. Evaluation of the success of the long range goals means establishing an acceptable criterion for a successful marriage and family life and measuring the success of the student in this endeavor; then determining the influence of the family life course in this success.

Several studies have been made to determine the problems inherent in attempting to evaluate the effectiveness of family life education. From these studies have come some warnings and also helpful guidelines. A cautious view towards this kind of research is taken by Cuber (1949) who feels that if marriage succeeds it is difficult to know whether it was the happy childhood of the parties, their mental health, their religion, their occupation and interest, or their three hour course in family life education.
The measurement of the success of the short range goals of a family life course is a different kind of problem. Bee (1952) feels that we can measure the change that has taken place in the student's basic orientation and pattern of action during the brief duration of the course. He stresses that if appropriate instruments are used, measurement of the student's emotional and ideological growth is possible. However, he offers no proof that this approach may be fruitful, but simply that it can be done.

Longworth (1953) and Kerckhoff (1960) have agreed that the problems found in evaluating the effectiveness of family life education are: determining the criterion for a successful marriage, determining when the measurement should be made, determining the appropriate kinds of instruments with which to measure the success of the marriage. Kerckhoff (1960) has found that students are poor estimators of change in themselves or of change in the class and that instructors' estimations are not reliable, in view of their vested interest. Longworth (1953) is optimistic in his view of this problem and finds it possible and desirable to evaluate family life education within the province of existing knowledge if proper attention and concern are given to methodological considerations.

Cuber (1949) has stated four methodological factors which enter into the evaluation of family life education. Those are: 1) A control group is necessary with which the family life students have
been matched in as many ways as possible. 2) There must be a careful operational definition of marital happiness, success, adjustment etc. 3) Evaluation should ideally be made over a period of years. 4) Mental health of the respondents should be a consideration.

An examination of the research literature shows that primarily an evaluation of the success of short term goals has been the object of the studies. Only two studies (Dyer, 1959; Moses, 1956) have attempted follow-up studies to determine the success of a course's long range goals.

The study by Moses (1956) adhered to two of the methodological considerations advised by Cuber (1949), which made her study more creditable than some of the others. She used a relatively large sample of 212 students, with a control of 50, and, in addition, included 60 married students in a follow-up. The instrument was devised by Moses to closely fit the course that had been taught. This study attempted to test the respondent's understanding of areas taught and, also, to measure insight which the students considered to be of personal value. In addition to this, an appraisal was made as to how the student applied these insights and understandings in efforts to solve personal problems. Using pre and posttest scores, change was measured in both the experimental and control groups. Comparison of these changes indicated that the family life students
showed gains in their understanding of areas of the course which the staff considered to be important. The students reported that they gained insights that they themselves considered to be of personal value; and that they applied these understandings and insights in their efforts to solve personal problems. In effect, the students reported that they applied in their everyday lives the learnings and insights derived from the course.

One of the few studies found in the literature which allows five years to elapse between the college course of family life and the study is Dyer's (1959), where she attempts to relate marital happiness to participation in a family life course. In this study, Dyer uses a large sample with 1032 family life students responding to the questionnaire. Of this group 593 were married. A control group of 466 was selected at random from the school directory, matched for age, college and sex. Of the 250 who responded from the control group, 111 were married. Comparisons were made between control group of married (111) and the experimental married group (593). The questionnaire was based on the Burgess and Locke Marital Adjustment Test. The responses indicated that the preparation for marriage course had been instrumental in developing a point of view, an attitude or insight that influenced the experimental group toward greater satisfaction in a marriage.

Wetzel (1965) administered the Group Rorschach and the
Personality section of Burgess-Wallin Marriage Prediction Schedule to marriage course and control students at Florida State University. She found no significant differences in the initial testing of the 54 students of the marriage course and the 54 matched controls from the Schools of Business and Education. The students who took the marriage course changed significantly in a positive direction as compared with the control group, leading to the conclusion that, "... participation in a marriage course aids in the modification of personality in the areas of neurotic traits, ability to identify and relate to others, psychological blocking and strong affective reactions."

A study which points out the student's feeling about the value of a family life class is the Finck (1956) study. Finck did a follow-up study of students who had taken a marriage and family living course and a control group. A questionnaire was used to elicit responses concerning the course. The course in family life was considered helpful by 87.6 percent of the family life students. The remaining 12.4 percent said the course had made no difference. No graduate felt that he or she had been hurt by the course. Finck found that most of the graduates who participated in the course believed that it helped them in their marriages and that many respondents from the control group wished they had taken such a course. This kind of response is typical of how family life students
feel about family life education. However, as pointed out earlier in this paper, (Kerkhoff, 1960) students are not good estimators of change in themselves.

Duvall (1965) in doing an overview of the research that has been done on the effectiveness of family life education found that the methodology fell into three categories: 1) Collecting student and alumni reaction to completed courses. 2) Pre-test and posttest assessments of student knowledge, attitudes and competence. 3) Administered standardized instruments to marriage course students and matched control groups. She found that in the 80 studies reviewed, the marriage and family life courses being evaluated were effective by all measures. This effectiveness was evident in changes in the student's understanding, attitudes, expectations and/or the abilities being tested. Duvall further states (1965, p. 183):

Students' attitudes toward love and sex, marriage and family life, as well as toward themselves and the significant people in their lives, shift as a result of their experiences in a marriage course. Their attitudes change in the direction of becoming more flexible, more realistic, and more responsible as they proceed through a course that deals with these areas. They become more able to talk about many of the aspects of personal and family living that previously they had found too embarrassing or difficult to discuss. This increased competence in openly facing interpersonal conflicts augurs well for their ability to better handle tensions that infuse intimate relationships over a period of time.
Duvall (1965) found, in the studies reviewed, that the use of standardized instruments was widely accepted and effective in the evaluation of the success of a course. For instance, fewer problems were checked on the Mooney Problem Check List at the close of the family life course than at its start. Students have been shown to do better in knowing what to expect of marriage as measured by the Dunn Marriage Role Expectation Inventory, both at the high school level and the college level. The family life students have been found to improve by such measures as the California Parent Attitude Survey and the Wiley Child Guidance Survey significantly more than do members of control groups who were not in courses designed to study parent-child relationships. Pre and posttests with the Group Rorschach and on the Burgess-Wallin Marriage Prediction Schedule show a change in the positive direction significantly more than the control group.

It appears that in the majority of courses tested, family life education can and does make some positive differences in attitudes of young people toward marriage, in personal adjustment and problem solving and in eventual marital satisfaction. However, whether or not these measured attitudinal changes significantly effect behavior is still in doubt.

In some recent investigations the subject of marriage role expectations has been a point to consider in marriage satisfaction.
There is evidence of change in marriage roles in our society. If family life education is to be meaningful, it must deal with an interpretation of this change in order to diminish the likelihood of marital role conflict. For this reason marriage role expectations are a consideration in this study.

Previous research of marriage roles starts with Lu's (1952) study where he investigated the relation between dominant-equalitarian-submissive roles in marriage and marital adjustment of young couples. One thousand couples (600 of these married) were asked to respond to an instrument, devised by Lu, to measure different roles in marriage. From the responses, a rating was obtained which categorized the couple as husband more dominant, or equalitarian; or wife more dominant. Lu's results indicated that the equalitarian relationship or democratic partnership was correlated with good marital adjustment and the dominance of either the husband or the wife was associated with poor adjustment in marriage. This was an indication that the patriarchal family was losing popularity.

Marie Dunn (1960) devised a marriage role expectation inventory which she then used with 436 high school seniors. The responses from this age group reflected a definite trend toward the companionship-equalitarian type of family. This statement should be qualified in that there were some roles, such as the wife as a "homemaker" and the husband as the "breadwinner" which are still
held to in a traditional sense by this age group.

Dunn's summary observation was that an awareness of changing roles and diversity in interpretation serve to emphasize the importance of functional family life education particularly at the high school level. Evidence indicates that youth need to become aware of the significance of role expectation in determining the quality of the relationship two people are able to build in the marriage. The Marriage Role Expectation Inventory developed in this study may have value as a teaching aid toward this goal. Since the items are applicable to all who look forward to marriage, it appears that the instrument could be used to advantage with post-high school groups.

Dunn goes on to state that rather than defining "correct" patterns of behavior, it seems important that emphasis be placed upon development of understanding and interpersonal skills that will make it possible for each couple to build a pattern of relationships that will serve its own needs.

In another study Beasely (1967) used the Dunn Marriage Role Expectation Inventory. This study was designed to measure student achievement in a functional college marriage course. She found that men in a pre-test and posttest situation showed a significant change at the .02 level from traditional to equalitarian marriage role expectations. In contrast, women in this situation showed no change under the same conditions. Their marriage role expectations were
essentially equalitarian throughout.

Moser (1961) used the Dunn Marriage Role Expectation Inventory with 354 twelfth grade students. This study investigated six relevant variables to determine whether or not these factors contribute significantly to the formulation of roles in marriage. The variables were: sex, social status, religious affiliation, mental maturity, number of siblings, and sex of siblings. One of the most significant conclusions of this study showed that marriage role expectations were significantly related to sex of respondent in three of the seven sub-scales. This finding suggests that young men and women may disagree frequently on marriage role behavior. Thus, one infers that persons anticipating marriage would do well to discuss their attitudes and role expectations within specific areas of a marriage relationship and not merely in general terms of likes and dislikes.

Broderick (1964) sums up the objective of this study very well in pointing out that research is needed to provide useful and accurate information into the needs, feelings and behavior of young people.

In the studies reviewed here, research has been focused, for the most part, on the college age student. Since more American girls (Landis, 1965) are married at age 18 than any other age, it would seem pertinent to ascertain what is being done or can be done on the high school level to meet the felt needs of individuals as they
enter adult living. Therefore, information is needed about the nature of the problems experienced by the age group 19-20 years and their marriage role expectations, in order to better prepare young people to enter the marriage relationship.
II. DESIGN

Subjects

The subjects were 169 girls from the graduating class of the two high schools located in North Central California in a community of 50,000 population. Their ages ranged from 19-20 years.

The experimental group consisted of 85 of the girls who had completed a course in family life education at one of the two high schools, and whose addresses were known by the research department of the school district. The control group were girls who matched the experimental group with respect to age, ethnic group, high school grade point average, and marital status. Each control person was individually selected for each experimental person, in order to assure as much similarity as possible.

Forty-six percent of the 169 subjects responded (43 of the experimental group and 35 of the control group). Since grade point average was a prime consideration in the matching, standard deviation for the grade point average of the experimental group was 63.4 and 59.2 for the control group. The mean grade point average for both groups fell into the C+ category. This indicated that the groups were still closely matched in this respect among the respondents.

There were ten married respondents in the experimental group and eight married in the control group.
There were two ethnic groups, Negroid and Oriental. The experimental group had six Negroid respondents and the control group three. The experimental group had four Oriental respondents and the control group three.

The high school population from which the students came was very diverse, both in respect to nationalities and socio-economic status. Sixty-five percent of one high school come from military families associated with the Army. The remaining thirty-five percent of this school's population are members of lower-socio-economic groups, the bulk of which are Negroes. The other high school serves an area of the community populated by professional people as well as representatives of service occupations.

**Instruments**

**Mooney Problem Check List**

Two instruments were selected to test the hypotheses. One, the Mooney Problem Check List (MPCL), Adult Form A was used to measure the kinds of problems the respondent perceives to be of concern to her. The other instrument, the Dunn Marriage Role Expectation Inventory (DMREI) was used to measure to what extent and in what areas the respondent holds traditional or equalitarian views concerning marriage roles.
The Adult form of the Problem Check List is printed on a six-page folder in a way that provides for ease of marking by the individual and ease of summarization by the researcher.

The Problem Check List is self-administering. All the directions needed are on the cover page. The language is simple and can be readily understood by individuals of varying educational backgrounds. Usually, the check list will be completed in from 20 to 30 minutes, although some individuals may take as long as 50 minutes.

The check list is constructed so that the problem areas run horizontally across the page, in groupings of six items. The areas, with the number of items in each, are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Security</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Improvement</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home and Family</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtship</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>288</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The individual goes through the items in the check list, underlining the problems that are of concern to him. Most people, in answering the check list, do not discover the horizontal grouping of items by area. This is important to avoid the possibility that the individual would skip entire areas that appear to be inappropriate without bothering to read the items, and to avoid marking items in
areas that they feel have lower social acceptability -- such as personality and sex. The format of the Problem Check List overcomes these difficulties and still presents a grouping of problems that is convenient for the researcher.

The Adult Form of the MPCL was developed for use with late adolescents and adults.

The Mooney Problem Check List taps the major areas of the family life course as offered in that particular school district. The areas of health and religion are not of real concern within the structure of the family life course, so results in these two areas do not reflect instruction in this course. The other areas that are stressed in the course and are tapped by this instrument are: occupational goals, self-understanding; self-identity; understanding emotions; understanding money management.

Special effort was made to control the fact that other high school courses might cover some of the same areas as the family life course. A course called Senior Problems was the only course that touched these areas. Since senior problems is required of all seniors it was not considered a variable.

Reliability and validity of the Mooney Problem Check List cannot be assessed with regard to the usual concepts. Chief attention is directed to the individual items as the significant data. The author, Mooney (1950) states:
The check list is designed to reflect the problems which an individual senses and is willing to express at a given time. Since the problem world of any individual is a dynamic interrelation of changing situations and experiences, one would expect the number of items, and the specific items checked to be somewhat different at each administration of the check list if the instrument does what it is designed to do. The problems of reliability of an instrument like the Problem Check List are not quite the same as those of a test from which scores are obtained.

The manual for the MPCL further states, concerning validity:

If the Problem Check Lists were personality tests designed to predict definite patterns of behavior, the process of validation would be simply that of determining the extent to which the predicted behavior patterns correspond with actual behavior as judged by other criteria. The check lists are not built as tests, however. They are used for a variety of purposes and are so constructed that the obtained data must be considered in light of many factors. A single over-all index of the validity of the check lists would therefore be quite meaningless.

**Dunn Marriage Role Expectation Inventory**

The Dunn Marriage Role Expectation Inventory (DMREI) is designed to reflect role expectations of youth and at the same time lend itself to statistical treatment. The DMREI does not determine readiness for marriage. It is not a device for predicting marriage success. The Inventory is an exploratory pencil and paper test to help students and counselees prepare for marriage and family living by recording, evaluating, and comparing what is expected of the self.
and of a marriage partner in seven areas of behavior. These areas are Authority, Homemaking, Care of Children, Personal Characteristics, Social Participation, Education and Employment and Support. The Inventory consists of 71 items. In 34 of these the subject responds in terms of agreement, uncertainty, or disagreement with statements indicating a companionship-equalitarian relationship to a marriage partner. In the remaining 37 items, response is in terms of agreement, uncertainty, or disagreement with statements indicating a traditional-patriarchal marriage relationship.

The DMREI can be administered to a single subject, to couples, or to groups. In this study, the respondents were given the Inventory as individuals.

The Teacher's and Counselor's Guide accompanying the Inventory (Dunn, 1963) states:

> Each person must respond in terms of what he expects of his own marriage, rather than in terms of what he or she believe is expected by a desired marriage partner.

In the absence of someone to administer the test, the respondent would be aware of the importance of the responses reflecting his own feelings by the directions at the bottom of the instruction page on the inventory. These are in capital letters: **DO NOT CONSULT WITH YOUR COURTSHIP PARTNER, FIANCE(E) OR MARRIAGE PARTNER WHILE COMPLETING THIS INVENTORY.**
The responses can yield an equalitarian or a traditional rating. The scoring involves a +1 for agreement with equalitarian items and a -1 for agreement with traditional items. Zero is given for uncertain or disagree or strongly disagree to any items. By subtracting the smaller total from the larger, a rating can be established as to the nature of the marriage role expectation.

Dunn (1960) reports that for checks on the reliability of the inventory, a split-half correlation coefficient was computed on scores of fifty respondents. The resulting coefficient was .953 corrected to .975. She feels that this is of sufficient magnitude to permit the interpretation of a substantial degree of reliability in the final form of the instrument.

Intrinsic validity is claimed on the basis of the way in which the items were selected (which included a consensus of qualified judges) and on the fact that the final 71 items met the criteria of differentiating between "high" and "low" groups of adolescent testees at the .05 level of significance, according to Challman (Buros, p. 685).

**Procedure**

The MPCL and the DMREI were mailed out together with an accompanying letter. The letter explained that the purpose of the study was to obtain a description of the kinds of concerns young
people are faced with in order to improve the educational offerings in the high school. There was no mention of the family life course so as not to bias the responses. The respondents were asked not to sign either instrument but were asked to sign and return an enclosed post card so that receipt of their response could be recorded. The post card was returned to one address and the instruments to another to further insure the respondent's anonymity.

The instruments were marked in colored ink to identify the high school and the two groups.

Two weeks following the first mail out a follow-up letter was sent to those who had not responded to the first letter.
III. RESULTS

The major concern of the study was to investigate the post high school responses of an experimental group, who had been exposed to a high school course in family life education, and their matched control group.

The experimental group of 43 was closely matched with the control group of 35 with regard to high school grade point average, marital status and ethnic group. This matching is described in detail in Chapter 2.

The analysis of variance was used to compare the responses of the experimental and control groups in both the area of marriage role expectations, as determined by the Dunn Marriage Role Expectation Inventory and perceived problems reflected in responses to the Mooney Problem Check List. This analysis allowed a comparison of the high schools, as well as an indication of the interaction of the high schools with participation in the family life course.

Hypothesis I. There is no difference in the marriage role expectations of former family life students and those who have not taken the course.

The data from the DMREI was scored in the traditional system of counting agreements only. Each respondent received a total of agreements to statements designated as equalitarian and a total of
agreements to statements designated as traditional. The statements were designed by Dunn to be either equalitarian or traditional. For the purposes of this study, it was necessary to arrive at one score indicating the respondent's degree of traditionalism or equalitarianism. Every respondent, but one, had scores reflecting equalitarian viewpoints. To establish the degree of equalitarianism for each respondent the number of traditional agreements was subtracted from the equalitarian agreements arriving at a range of scores from +30 to 0, the +30 being the most equalitarian and the 0 reflecting as many equalitarian as traditional responses. It was this score that was used in the analysis of variance.

The results of the analysis of variance with regard to marriage role expectations are given in Table I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE I. SUMMARY OF F VALUES FROM ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF DUNN MARRIAGE ROLE EXPECTATION INVENTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p > 3.95 equals significance at the .05 level.

The F test reported in the "Treatment" column refers to the comparison between the control and experimental groups. This indicates that if the family life students respond in a significantly different manner than the non family life students, the F value will
be 3.95 or greater. The F value of .007 (shown in this Table) in the comparison of the experimental and the control groups was not significant and therefore the null hypothesis was accepted. This indicates that in the comparison of the two groups it could not be established that there were significant differences in their marriage role expectations. More specifically it could not be established that equalitarian or traditional views were significantly different for these groups.

The F test reported in the "High School" column refers to the degree of difference in total responses with the experimental and control groups combined for each school. When there is an F value of 3.95 or greater, there is evidence that the individual schools hold significantly different viewpoints in regard to marriage role expectations. The F value of 1.63 indicates that there is no significant difference in the marriage role expectations of the groups in the two schools.

The F test reported in the "Interaction" column refers to a comparison of the effect of the treatment on the schools. When there is an F value of 3.95 or greater, there is evidence that the effect of the treatment in each school as compared was found to be significantly different. The F value of 3.05 in the "Interaction" column was not significant. This indicates that in comparing the amount of change between the experimental and control groups within each school, the
schools were found to be not significantly different. More specifically, the effect of the treatment within the schools was similar.

With an F value of .007, it seemed unnecessary to investigate the sub areas of the DMREI. However, because previous studies have presented graphically the results in the sub areas, a comparison in terms of percentages is presented in figure 1. Figure 1 shows that both the experimental and control groups have essentially the same pattern of responses to the individual sub areas in this instrument. It was not the purpose of this investigation to analyze the sub area scores but merely to present them in order to allow some comparison with previous studies.

Hypothesis II. There is no difference between problem area scores of former family life students and those who have not taken a family life course.

The data from the MPCL provides information regarding nine problem areas: health, economic-security, self-improvement, personality, home and family, courtship, sex, religion, and occupation.

An analysis of variance was used to test for a significant difference in responses between the experimental and control groups with regard to the nine areas and the total number of problems checked. The results of this test are found in Table II.
Fig. 1. Percentage of Subjects, By Group, Who Agreed With Equalitarian and Traditional Statements Concerning Seven Areas of Behavior
TABLE II. SUMMARY OF F VALUES FROM ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MOONEY PROBLEM CHECK LIST BY PROBLEM AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Areas</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>5.47*</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Security</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Improvement</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home &amp; Family</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtship</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>5.70*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p > 3.95 equals significance at the .05 level.

The column heading "Treatment" refers to the comparison of the experimental and control group scores. The F values in this column for each of the nine areas and the total score are not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted. This indicates that in comparing the experimental and control group it could not be established that there were significant differences in problems of students who had experienced a high school family life course and those who had not.

Although the null hypothesis was accepted in the test of Hypothesis II, two significant F values were established in the analysis dealing with specific problem areas.
One of these significant F values is associated with the Health area and it is involved in the comparison of the high schools. The F value of 5.47 indicates that when responses in the health area are compared for the combined experimental and control groups in each high school significant differences are observable. This significant difference is very difficult to relate to the family life course since it is not a part of the course content.

There is also significance in the column headed "Interaction" with regard to Occupation. The F value of 5.70, as shown in Table II, indicates that the difference between the schools in their response to the treatment is significant. An inspection of Table IV, showing the means and standard deviations for the groups, indicates that the mean of problems checked under Occupation by the experimental group in A school was .76. The control group of that school checked a mean of 1.56 problems in this area. The interaction of the treatment with the school is in a positive direction. While B school has a mean of 1.59 problems checked from the experimental group and a mean of .84 in the control group. The interaction of the course or treatment with this school is in a negative direction. This difference between the schools is significant.
IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship of a high school family life course to post high school problems and marriage role expectations.

The subjects were girls who had graduated from one of the two high schools in a North-Central Coast California community. Both high schools were used in this study. Forty-three of the subjects had completed a high school course in family life. Thirty-five of the subjects made up the control group. The controls were matched with regard to age, ethnic group, marital status and high school grade point average.

The study was a follow-up conducted approximately two years after the subjects had graduated from high school.

The Mooney Problem Check List, Adult Form A (MPCL) and the Dunn Marriage Role Expectation Inventory (DMREI) were used to collect data relating to marriage role expectation and the incidence of personal problems.

The analysis of variance was selected as a statistical method to test the specific hypotheses, regarding no difference in marital role expectations or personal problems. Using the analysis of variance not only gave the information needed in regard to the hypothesis,
but, in addition, would establish whether there was any difference between the two schools. Combining students from two schools into one experimental and one control group meant assuming great similarity between the groups. This needed to be checked statistically. The two schools were not significantly different in regard to the areas of concern in this investigation.

The results of the analysis of variance in regard to marriage role expectations, as measured by the DMREI, established no significant difference between the experimental and control groups at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no difference in marriage role expectations between the former family life students and non-family life education students was accepted.

Another point to consider in this discussion is when analysis of the sub scales of the DMREI is appropriate. Since the analysis of variance test indicated no significant differences between the groups using the respondent's total score, it was thought unnecessary to apply the same analysis to the sub scales. This decision takes into consideration Dunn's philosophy of the purpose of the inventory. Dunn, in devising the scoring system, has made evaluation of an individual's degree of equalitarianism or traditionalism within an area especially difficult. The rationale behind this is that rather than declare an individual traditional or equalitarian in one area, e.g. authority, it is more important to look at specific responses
within an area when the inventory is used for purposes of counselling. It is the specific items of the test on which disagreement between a husband and wife is likely, not areas. Therefore, specific items within the sub scales are used for discussion purposes with the respondents (when the test is taken for that purpose), and an entire groups' responses to a sub scale can be used and given a statistical analysis when significance is indicated. If there had been significance with the analysis of variance on the total scores, it would have been necessary to investigate the sub scales to determine where the difference was between the groups.

The analysis of variance was also used to test for a significant difference between the experimental and control groups in regard to the kinds of problems and total number of problems, perceived by the respondents, as measured by the MPCL. The F values for each of the nine areas and the total score were not significant at the .05 level, in the comparison of the experimental and control groups.

The F value of 5.47 from Table II in the column headed "High School" is significant for the area of health. This means that the health concerns of the combined experimental and control groups differed significantly between the schools. Therefore, this significance does not apply to testing the hypothesis.

The F value of 5.70 from Table II in the column headed "Interaction" is significant. However, this F value is not an indication of
the difference between the control and experimental groups, but rather a difference in the interaction of the course with each school. Therefore, this is not pertinent to a test of the hypothesis.

Finding significance in these two areas is important in regard to the task of making high school curriculum more meaningful. These findings also point to possibilities for further research.

Conclusions

Although acceptance of the major hypotheses was not possible, inspection of the descriptive statistics did reveal some interesting trends.

An inspection of Table III of the means and standard deviations from the DMREI, for example, provides some information to consider.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimental</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A High School</td>
<td>18.05</td>
<td>6.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B High School</td>
<td>17.36</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A High School</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>7.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B High School</td>
<td>19.79</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table shows a tendency toward equalitarian responses from the experimental group of high school A, as compared with their controls, and a reversal in high school B in that the control group showed a tendency toward equalitarian responses, as compared with their experimental group. This trend toward equalitarianism is evident with an increase of means. This suggests to the investigator that the teacher's interpretation of marriage roles is the influential factor here. It would seem that the teacher's concept of marriage roles might somehow influence the viewpoint of the class. However, anything conclusive is difficult for several reasons. For instance, it is difficult to assess the teacher's emphasis on marriage roles or the impact of this emphasis on the students.

Other difficulties arise from the fact that the author of the inventory does not provide a means of clearly defining an individual's marriage role expectation category when using the scoring method of counting agreements only. One can only say that an individual appears to be more equalitarian than another. The inventory is, perhaps, more beneficial when used as a means to identify differences in marriage role expectations on specific items of individuals about to be married.

It is not surprising that the respondents, being girls, tended toward equalitarian marriage role expectations. Other studies have had the same results. Beasley (1967) found that the women held
equalitarian marriage role expectations in pre and posttests, while the men made a significant change in the pre and posttest results from traditional to equalitarian marriage role expectation. This change came about through the experience of a family life course at the college level. On this basis, acceptance of the null hypothesis is consistent with previous research.

An examination of the responses within the sub areas was thought unnecessary for the purposes of this study, and on the basis of the results received with the total scores.

While there was no significant difference in the number and kind of problems checked on the MPCL between the experimental and control groups, there is an interesting trend. This trend is evident at one school where the mean of problems checked by the experimental group was less in six out of seven areas covered by the family life course. Table IV is a summary of means and standard deviation for the MPCL by problem areas. This table offers evidence of this trend. The areas referred to are: economic security, self-improvement, home and family, courtship, sex and occupation. Two areas not covered by the course are health and religion. The experimental groups checked fewer problems in these areas also. The fact that students who had a family life education course in one high school had fewer concerns than the control group in six out of seven areas, whether significant or not, is a trend to acknowledge. Since a trend
### TABLE IV. SUMMARY OF MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR MOONEY PROBLEM CHECK LIST BY PROBLEM AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EXPERIMENTAL GROUP</th>
<th></th>
<th>CONTROL GROUP</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A School</td>
<td>B School</td>
<td>A School</td>
<td>B School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S. D.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S. D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28.38</td>
<td>13.46</td>
<td>34.27</td>
<td>22.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Security</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Improvement</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>10.38</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td>8.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtship</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
can be seen it should inspire high school family life teachers to work for greater effectiveness.

Another interesting result was in the area of occupation where there was significant difference in interaction of the course with the school. An inspection of Table IV of the means and standard deviation from the MPCL indicates that the experimental group from high school B had more problems with occupation than the control group of the same school; while in high school A, the experimental group had fewer problems with regard to occupation, as compared with their control group. It would appear that the course interacts with the students of each school in a different way. The explanation that seems logical here is that offering the same course of study to two schools representing different socio-economic groups means that the course may not meet the needs of both groups. It appears that where the course seemed to help solve some occupational problems at one school, it tended to increase awareness of such problems at the other school. This discussion centers around the possibility that the curriculum is interacting with the students when in actuality it could be that the emphasis and approach to that particular unit by the teacher is causing the interaction between the course and the school. Further research into the needs of different socioeconomic groups for occupational preparation might be necessary before finding a reason for the difference.
Another significant F value is associated with the health area and it is involved in the comparison of the high schools. This significance indicates that when responses in the health area were compared for the combined experimental and control groups in each high school, differences were observable. Close inspection of the data revealed that the students in high school A had reported more concern in this area. The inspection of the means and standard deviations reported in Table IV will substantiate the direction of the difference. One plausible explanation might be the socio-economic differences of the two schools. Health problems are often associated with the lower socio-economic groups, as is shown in this study. This concern in this school indicates a need to augment the existing curriculum offered in order to emphasize prevention of health problems. Another indication is a need for further research with regard to health problems in different socio-economic groups.

The total problems checked on the MPCL by the experimental groups from both schools approached significance in interaction of the course with the school. Once again it would appear that the course and/or the influence of the teacher is more beneficial at one school than the other in terms of over-all perception of problems.

The fact that the null hypothesis was accepted with this instrument is surprising, in view of the trend that did appear in one school. However, research with this age group using this instrument does not
appear in the literature, so the result could not be anticipated.

It is interesting to look at the areas of concern in regard to ascertaining what kinds of problems post high school individuals have. Information about the nature of these problems might be useful in structuring courses of study to meet their needs. In rank order, the experimental group was concerned with these areas:

1. Personality
2. Self-Improvement
3. Economic-Security
4. Health
5. Occupation
6. Home and Family
7. Religion
8. Courtship
9. Sex

The control groups had similar concerns; these are in rank order:

1. Self-Improvement
2. Personality
3. Religion
4. Home and Family
5. Health
6. Occupation
7. Economic-Security
8. Courtship
9. Sex

A logical conclusion here is that young people are most concerned about personality and self-improvement and least concerned with courtship and sex. The lack of concern about courtship and sex reported by respondents, who are 19 to 20 years of age, would lead the investigator to believe that educators have a different perception of problems of young people than young people themselves have.
Further investigation of this is needed, in view of the fact that family life courses have been emphasizing courtship and sex under the assumption that these are the needs of young people. It is still possible that these are needs, in terms of education, for persons still in high school. However, this finding does lead one to question the emphasis on courtship and sex in the school curriculum.

Further investigation into the specific statements checked by both groups yields some information about concerns in the area of personality. The leading five were:

1. Confused as to what I really want
2. Taking things too seriously
3. Feeling blue and moody
4. Sometimes acting childish and immature
5. Feelings easily hurt

The five most checked statements in the area of self-improvement by both groups were:

1. Wanting to improve my mind
2. Wanting very much to travel
3. Wanting to improve my appearance
4. Not being as efficient as I would like
5. Wanting to improve myself culturally

A course designed to enable individuals to understand and accept themselves should meet many of these felt needs. In addition, within the same course structure, emphasis could be put on how to take advantage of opportunities for self-improvement available in the community.
Values and Limitations of the Study

This study indicates that the experience of a family life education course at the high school level has not made a significant difference in the respondents' perceived problems and marriage role expectations. However, as more is learned about the needs of students steps can be taken to meet those needs within the school curriculum. Thus, in some small measure the effects of failing families may be counteracted with the hope that this will in turn raise the level of happiness in future families.

Research, such as this, can provide a more accurate appraisal of the value and limitations of family life education. The public should be fully informed of the limitations of such an educational program before their expectations place an unnecessary burden on it.

This study has two limitations. One, the subjects were all girls and this gives a biased picture of problems and marriage role expectations of this age group. Any future study should include boys as well. Also, the subjects had been out of high school less than two years. When it is possible to locate graduates who have been out longer it might be wise to sample their responses. One reason is that a small percentage of these respondents were married. Perhaps in a follow-up study of family life education, the viewpoint of
the recently married is more revealing in terms of whether the
course has been pertinent to the students' felt needs.

Several research directions seem justified on the basis of this
study:

1) repetition of this study with both boys and girls.
2) repetition of this study with a larger sample of
   married persons.
3) testing an hypothesis concerning problems of different
   socio-economic groups with regard to health.
4) testing an hypothesis concerning problems of different
   socio-economic groups with regard to occupations.
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APPENDICES
FORM F
MARRIAGE ROLE EXPECTATION INVENTORY
by
Marie S. Dunn

Please supply the information requested below:

Age ........... Sex (check one) ☐ Male ☐ Female

Marital Status (check one) ☐ Single ☐ Married ☐ Separated ☐ Divorced

Education (circle highest grade completed) High School ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 College ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4

How many brothers and/or sisters do you have? ...........................................

Type of community in which childhood was spent
☐ Country ☐ Small town ☐ Small city ☐ Suburban ☐ Large city

Childhood religious training
☐ Catholic ☐ Protestant ☐ Jewish ☐ None ☐ Other .......................................

INSTRUCTIONS

To help you prepare for marriage and family life your counselor or teacher needs to know what you expect of marriage. And, for a better understanding of yourself and your present or future courtship partner you should know what to expect of each other in marriage.

If you are planning to be married this MARRIAGE ROLE EXPECTATION INVENTORY will help you and your fiance(e) reveal yourselves to each other against a background of marriage expectations that are important to your happiness and success as man and wife.

If you are married the inventory will help you achieve a better understanding of yourself and your marriage partner.

On the pages that follow you will find brief statements of marriage expectations for husbands and wives. As you read these statements think about what you expect from your own marriage and indicate your opinion of each statement in one of the following ways:

1. If you strongly agree with a statement draw a circle around the letters SA.
2. If you agree with a statement draw a circle around the letter A.
3. When you are undecided as to your opinion of a statement put a circle around U.
4. If you disagree with a statement draw a circle around the letter D.
5. If you strongly disagree with the statement draw a circle around the letters SD.

As you read begin each statement with the phrase, "In my marriage I expect . . . ."

The Marriage Role Expectation Inventory is not a test. The only right and helpful answers will be those in which you truly show what you expect of your own marriage.

DO NOT CONSULT WITH YOUR COURTSHIP PARTNER, FINANCE(E) OR MARRIAGE PARTNER WHILE COMPLETING THIS INVENTORY.

Please Answer Every Question

Published by Family Life Publications, Inc., Box 6725, College Station Post Office, Durham, N. C.
Copyright 1963 Family Life Publications, Inc. All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America
Originally published in Marriage and Family Living May 1960
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Key for marking items below. SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; U = Undecided; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree

IN MY MARRIAGE I EXPECT:

SA A U D SD 1. that if there is a difference of opinion, my husband will decide where to live.
SA A U D SD 2. that my opinion will carry as much weight as my husband's in money matters.
SA A U D SD 3. my husband to help with the housework.
SA A U D SD 4. that it would be undesirable for me to be better educated than my husband.
SA A U D SD 5. that if we marry before going to college, my husband and I will do our best to go on to earn college degrees.
SA A U D SD 6. to combine motherhood and a career if that proves possible.
SA A U D SD 7. my husband to be the 'boss' who says what is to be done and what is not to be done.
SA A U D SD 8. that I will be as well informed as my husband concerning the family's financial status, and business affairs.
SA A U D SD 9. my husband to leave the care of the children entirely up to me when they are babies.
SA A U D SD 10. my husband to be as interested in spending time with the girls as with the boys in our family.
SA A U D SD 11. that if I prefer a career to having children, we will have the right to make that choice.
SA A U D SD 12. that for the most successful family living my husband and I will need more than a high school education.
SA A U D SD 13. it will be more important for me to be a good cook and housekeeper than for me to be an attractive, interesting companion.
SA A U D SD 14. that being married will not keep my husband from going to college.
SA A U D SD 15. that the family 'schedule' such as when meals are served and when the television can be turned on will be determined by my husband's wishes and working hours.
SA A U D SD 16. that my husband and I will share responsibility for work if both of us work outside the home.
SA A U D SD 17. that keeping the yard, making repairs, and doing outside chores will be the responsibility of whoever has the time and wishes to do them.
SA A U D SD 18. if my husband is a good worker, respectable and faithful to his family, other personal characteristics are of considerably less importance.
SA A U D SD 19. it will be more important that as a wife I have a good family background than that I have a compatible personality and get along well with people.
SA A U D SD 20. that almost all money matters will be decided by my husband.
SA A U D SD 21. that my husband and I shall have equal privileges in such things as going out at night.
SA A U D SD 22. that my husband's major responsibility to our children will be to make a good living, provide a home and make them mind.
SA A U D SD 23. that since doing things like laundry, cleaning, and child care are 'woman's work,' my husband will feel no responsibility for them.
SA A U D SD 24. week-ends to be a period of rest for my husband, so he will not be expected to assist with cooking and housekeeping.
SA A U D SD 25. that if my husband helps with the housework, I will help with outside chores such as keeping the yard, painting or repairing the house.
SA A U D SD 26. that my husband and I will have equal voice in decisions affecting the family as a whole.
SA A U D SD 27. that after marriage I will forget an education and make a home for my husband.
SA A U D SD 28. that I will love and respect my husband regardless of the kind of work he does.
29. to work outside the home if I enjoy working more than staying at home.
30. that both my husband and I will concern ourselves with the social and emotional development of our children.
31. it will be just as important for my husband to be congenial, love and enjoy his family as to earn a good living.
32. that it will be equally as important that as a wife I am affectionate and understanding as that I am thrifty and skillful in housekeeping.
33. that it will be my husband's responsibility and privilege to choose where we will go and what we will do when we go out.
34. that both my husband and I will concern ourselves with the social and emotional development of our children.
35. that it will be just as important for my husband to be congenial, love and enjoy his family as to earn a good living.
36. that both my husband and I will concern ourselves with the social and emotional development of our children.
37. that it will be equally as important that as a wife I am affectionate and understanding as that I am thrifty and skillful in housekeeping.
38. that it will be my husband's responsibility and privilege to choose where we will go and what we will do when we go out.
39. that it will be just as important for my husband to be congenial, love and enjoy his family as to earn a good living.
SA A U D SD  56. my husband to help wash or dry dishes.
SA A U D SD  57. my husband to be entirely responsible for earning the living for our family.
SA A U D SD  58. that staying at home with the children will be my duty rather than my husband's.
SA A U D SD  59. that an education for my husband will be as important in making him a more cultured person as in helping him to earn a living.
SA A U D SD  60. my husband to feel equally as responsible for the children after work and on holidays as I do.
SA A U D SD  61. my husband to make most of the decisions concerning the children such as where they will go and what they may do.
SA A U D SD  62. that it will be exclusively my duty to do the cooking and keeping the house in order.
SA A U D SD  63. that my husband will forget about an education after he is married and support his wife.
SA A U D SD  64. that my husband and I will share household tasks according to individual interests and abilities rather than according to "woman's work" and "man's work."
SA A U D SD  65. as far as education is concerned, that it is unimportant for either my husband or me if both of us are ambitious and hard working.
SA A U D SD  66. my husband to earn a good living if he expects love and respect from his family.
SA A U D SD  67. whether or not I work will depend on what we as a couple think is best for our own happiness.
SA A U D SD  68. that if I am not going to work outside the home, there is no reason for my getting a college education.
SA A U D SD  69. as our children grow up the boys will be more my husband's responsibility while the girls will be mine.
SA A U D SD  70. that my husband and I will feel equally responsible for looking after the welfare of our children.
SA A U D SD  71. that I will take full responsibility for care and training of our children so that my husband can devote his time to his work.

---

**SUMMATION OF SCORES**

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{a} & \ldots & (11) \\
\text{b} & \ldots & (11) \\
\text{c} & \ldots & (1) \\
\text{d} & \ldots & (7) \\
\text{e} & \ldots & (12) \\
\text{f} & \ldots & (8) \\
\text{g} & \ldots & (11) \\
\end{array}
\]

**SCORE**

\[
U-(\text{total}) \\
S-(\text{total}) \\
\text{SA or SD} \\
O-OR
\]
MOONEY PROBLEM CHECK LIST
LEONARD V. GORDON and ROSS L. MOONEY
Bureau of Educational Research
Ohio State University

Name........................................................................................................Date..................................................

Occupation.....................................................................................................Age...............Sex.............

Marital Status...................................................................................................No. of Children.............
(Single, Married, Divorced, etc.)

DIRECTIONS
Following you will find a list of problems with which people are often faced — problems relating to health, work, family, temperament, and so on. You are to read through the list and to select those statements that represent your problems. Mark the list honestly and sincerely and you will obtain a representative inventory of your problems. Remember, this is not a test. There are no right or wrong answers. The statements that you are to underline are those that refer to you. You are assured that what you mark in the inventory will be treated in the strictest of confidence. There are three steps for you to take.

First Step: Read slowly through the list and underline each problem that suggests something that is troubling you, thus "1. Feeling tired much of the time."

Second Step: After you have gone through the entire list, look back over the problems that you have underlined and circle the numbers in front of those problems that are of most concern to you, thus "1. Feeling tired much of the time."

Third Step: Reply to the summarizing statements on page 5.
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First Step: Read the list slowly, and as you come to a problem which troubles you, underline it.

1. Feeling tired much of the time
2. Sleeping poorly
3. Too much underweight or overweight
4. Gradually losing weight
5. Frequently bothered by a sore throat
6. Catching a good many colds
7. Living in an undesirable location
8. Transportation or commuting problem
9. Lacking modern conveniences in my home
10. Lacking privacy in my living quarters
11. Unfair landlord or landlady
12. Poor living conditions
13. Wanting to develop a hobby
14. Wanting to improve myself culturally
15. Wanting worthwhile discussions with people
16. Wanting to learn how to dance
17. Lacking skill in sports or games
18. Not knowing how to entertain
19. Lacking leadership ability
20. Lacking self-confidence
21. Not really being smart enough
22. Being timid or shy
23. Lacking courage
24. Taking things too seriously
25. Wanting a more pleasing personality
26. Awkward in meeting people
27. Daydreaming
28. Being too tall or too short
29. Being physically unattractive
30. Wanting I were the other sex
31. Being away from home too much
32. Member of my family in poor health
33. Death in my family
34. Member of my family working too hard
35. Worried about a member of my family
36. Drinking by a member of my family
37. Having too few dates
38. Not finding a suitable life partner
39. Deciding whether I’m really in love
40. Having to wait too long to get married
41. Being financially unable to get married
42. In love with someone my family won’t accept
43. Needing a philosophy of life
44. Confused in my religious beliefs
45. Losing my earlier religious faith
46. Having beliefs that differ from my church
47. Failing to see the relation of religion to life
48. Differing from my family in religious beliefs
49. Poor appetite
50. Stomach trouble (indigestion, ulcers, etc.)
51. Intestinal trouble
52. Poor complexion or skin trouble
53. Poor posture
54. Feet hurt or tire easily
55. Needing a job
56. Needing part-time work
57. Disliking financial dependence on others
58. Having too many financial dependents
59. Getting into debt
60. Fearing future unemployment
61. Having a poor memory
62. Not being as efficient as I would like
63. Not using my leisure time well
64. Too few opportunities for meeting people
65. Trouble keeping up a conversation
66. Not mixing well with the opposite sex
67. Being lazy
68. Lacking ambition
69. Being influenced too easily by others
70. Being untidy
71. Being too careless
72. Not doing anything well
73. Feeling ill at ease with other people
74. Avoiding someone I don’t like
75. Finding it hard to talk before a group
76. Worrying how I impress people
77. Not getting along well with people
78. Not really having any friends
79. Having to live with relatives
80. Irritated by habits of a member of my family
81. Home untidy and ill kept
82. Too much quarreling at home
83. Too much nagging and complaining at home
84. Not really having a home
85. Wondering whether to go steady
86. Deciding whether to become engaged
87. Deciding whether to get married
88. Needing advice about getting married
89. Wondering if I really know my prospective mate
90. Afraid of the responsibilities of marriage
91. In love with someone of a different religion
92. Finding church services of no interest to me
93. Doubting the value of prayer
94. Doubting the existence of God
95. Science conflicting with my religion
96. Not getting satisfactory answers from religion
97. Having a permanent illness or disability
98. Frequent nose or sinus trouble
99. Having trouble with my ears or hearing
100. Allergies (asthma, hayfever, hives, etc.)
101. Having trouble with my eyes
102. Having a serious illness or disease
103. Needing financial assistance
104. Can't seem to make ends meet
105. Not getting a satisfactory diet
106. Not having enough money for necessities
107. Never being able to own a home of my own
108. Having too many financial problems
109. Wanting to improve my mind
110. Wanting to improve my appearance
111. Wanting to improve my manners or etiquette
112. Having trouble with my speech
113. Forgetting the things I learned in school
114. Having trouble understanding what I read
115. Speaking or acting without thinking
116. Being rude or tactless
117. Being stubborn or obstinate
118. Sometimes acting childish or immature
119. Being curious or jealous
120. Tending to exaggerate too much
121. Being disliked by someone
122. Being left out of things
123. Being made fun of or teased
124. Being treated unfairly by others
125. Suffering from racial or religious prejudice
126. Having feelings of extreme loneliness
127. Not being understood by my family
128. Not being trusted by my family
129. Feeling rejected by my family
130. Having an unhappy home life
131. Wanting love and affection
132. Being an only child
133. Disappointed in a love affair
134. Too deeply involved in a love affair
135. Having to break up a love affair
136. In love with someone I can't marry
137. Caring for more than one person
138. Afraid of losing the one I love
139. Not going to church often enough
140. Wondering if there is life after death
141. Worried by lack of religious faith in others
142. Upset by arguments about religion
143. Having trouble with my husband or wife over religion
144. Troubled by headaches
145. Glandular disorders (thyroid, lymph, etc.)
146. Menstrual or female disorders
147. Kidney or bladder trouble
148. Muscular aches and pains
149. High blood pressure
150. Not enough money for medical expenses
151. Too little money for recreation
152. Needing money for education or training
153. Unsure of future financial support
154. No steady income
155. Work too irregular or unsteady
156. Wanting more exercise
157. Needing more outdoor air and sunshine
158. Wanting more personal freedom
159. Wondering if further education is worth while
160. Wishing I had a better educational background
161. Wanting to read worthwhile books more
162. Wanting to read worthwhile books more
163. Too self-centered
164. Getting into arguments or fights
165. Disliking certain persons
166. Sometimes lying without meaning to
167. Feeling blue and moody
168. Trying to forget an unpleasant experience
169. Not knowing the kind of person I want to be
170. Confused as to what I really want
171. Feeling I am too different
172. People finding fault with me
173. Feeling no one cares for me
174. Sometimes feeling life is hardly worth while
175. Too much interference by relatives
176. Having too many decisions made for me
177. Unable to discuss certain problems at home
178. Not getting along with a member of my family
179. Educational level different from my family's
180. Wishing I had a different family background
181. Petting and seeking
182. Thinking too much about the opposite sex
183. Wondering how far to go with the opposite sex
184. Finding it hard to control sex urges
185. Repelled by thoughts of sexual relations
186. Needing information about sex
187. Lacking necessary experience for a job
188. Not knowing how to look for a job
189. Needing to know my vocational abilities
190. Unable to enter my chosen vocation
191. Doubting the wisdom of my vocational choice
192. Combining marriage and a career
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Cir.</th>
<th>Tot.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>193. Having considerable trouble with my teeth</td>
<td>241. Bothered by shortness of breath</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194. Occasionally feeling faint or dizzy</td>
<td>242. Having heart trouble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195. Troubled by swelling of the ankles</td>
<td>243. Having a persistent cough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196. Trouble with my scalp</td>
<td>244. Needing an operation or medical treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197. Occasional pressure or pain in my head</td>
<td>245. Needing another climate for my health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198. Not getting enough rest or sleep</td>
<td>246. &quot;Change of life&quot; (menopause)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199. Not budgeting my money</td>
<td>247. Needing legal advice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200. Not having a systematic savings plan</td>
<td>248. Needing to make a will</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201. Buying too much on the installment plan</td>
<td>249. Needing an insurance program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202. Being too extravagant and wasteful</td>
<td>250. Needing advice about investments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203. Living far beyond my means</td>
<td>251. Wanting to have a business of my own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204. Having to spend all my savings</td>
<td>252. Worried about security in old age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205. Wanting more chance for self-expression</td>
<td>253. Not having enough social life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206. Little chance to enjoy art or music</td>
<td>254. Being alone too much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207. Little opportunity to enjoy nature</td>
<td>255. Missing my former social life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208. Not having enough time for recreation</td>
<td>256. Not entertaining often enough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209. Wanting very much to travel</td>
<td>257. Spending too many evenings at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210. Needing a vacation</td>
<td>258. Not living a well-rounded life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211. Mind constantly wandering</td>
<td>259. Unhappy too much of the time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212. Constantly worrying</td>
<td>260. Sometimes feeling things are not real</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213. Too easily moved to tears</td>
<td>261. Bothered by thoughts running through my head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214. Too nervous or high strung</td>
<td>262. Sometimes afraid of going insane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215. Having a bad temper</td>
<td>263. Bothered by thoughts of suicide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216. Feelings too easily hurt</td>
<td>264. Sometimes feeling forced to perform certain acts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. Unable to express myself well in words</td>
<td>265. Having a troubled or guilty conscience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218. Feeling inferior</td>
<td>266. Afraid of being found out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219. Not reaching the goal I've set for myself</td>
<td>267. Sometimes being dishonest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220. Having difficulty in making decisions</td>
<td>268. Having a certain bad habit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221. Feeling I am a failure</td>
<td>269. Wanting to break a bad habit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222. Wanting to be more popular</td>
<td>270. Giving in to temptation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223. Mother or father not living</td>
<td>271. Worrying whether my marriage will succeed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224. Parents separated or divorced</td>
<td>272. Having different interests from husband or wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225. Having clashes of opinion with my parents</td>
<td>273. Marriage breaking apart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226. Parents sacrificing too much for me</td>
<td>274. Needing advice about a marriage problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227. Parents having a hard time of it</td>
<td>275. Needing advice about raising children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228. Not seeing parents often enough</td>
<td>276. Wanting to have a child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229. Being too inhibited in sex matters</td>
<td>277. Having unusual sex desires</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230. Being underdeveloped sexually</td>
<td>278. Bothered by sexual thoughts or dreams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231. Too easily aroused sexually</td>
<td>279. Worried about the effects of masturbation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232. Thinking too much about sex matters</td>
<td>280. Sexual needs unsatisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233. Fear of having a child</td>
<td>281. Sexually attracted to someone of my own sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234. Lacking sex appeal</td>
<td>282. Sexual desires differ from husband's or wife's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235. Working too hard</td>
<td>283. Being bothered or interfered with in my work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236. Getting no appreciation for the work I do</td>
<td>284. Not liking some of the people I work with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237. Finding my work too routine or monotonous</td>
<td>285. Family disapproves of my present job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238. Wanting more freedom in my work</td>
<td>286. Dissatisfied with my present job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239. Would rather be doing other kind of work</td>
<td>287. Poor prospects of advancement in my present job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240. Unsatisfactory working conditions</td>
<td>288. Afraid of losing my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second Step: Look back over the items you have underlined and circle the numbers in front of the problems which are troubling you most.
Third Step: Reply to the following.

SUMMARY

1. Use the space below to indicate any additional problems that you may have.

2. Write a brief summary of what you consider to be your chief problems.