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INTRODUCTION

The objective of this investigation is to discover whether certain selected personality characteristics, parent-child relationships and dating experiences are associated with marriage among high school girls.

One aspect of the declining age of first marriage in the United States has been the increasing number of girls who marry while in high school. This trend towards more high school brides may also be enhanced by the fact that education generally has been extended to include high school graduation, Glick and Carter (16).

Statistics elaborated by Baber (1, pp. 108-109) reveal that the median age of first marriage in the United States has been declining almost steadily from 1890 to the present date. In this period the median age at first marriage for women has dropped from 22.0 years in 1890 to 20.4 in 1951. For men during the same period, age at first marriage dropped from 26.1 years to 22.6. The decline in age at first marriage has accelerated since 1940, especially for males. In the decade between 1940 and 1950 the median age of first marriage for males declined from 24.3 to 22.8 or 1.5 years. The net decline in age of first marriage over the sixty year period was 3.3 years for males and 1.7 years for females.
More recent data for the state of Iowa indicate that the downward trend in marriage age is still continuing. In 1940 sixteen percent of all Iowa brides were eighteen years or younger, but by 1957 this percentage had increased to 28.7. When only first marriages are considered, the percentage was even higher, reaching 36.8 percent in 1957. In 1957 a total of 53.7 percent of all Iowa brides at first marriage were under twenty. In this year the median age for brides was 19.8 and the median age for grooms was 22.2. The mean ages were 20.5 and 23.2 for brides and grooms, respectively (27).

Whatever the general reasons for a declining age of marriage may be, it is clear that at present only a small fraction (less than five percent) of girls marry while in high school (33). It is this group of girls who marry while in high school that is the population of interest in this study. An attempt will be made to test whether or not certain personality characteristics, parent-child relationships and dating experiences will discriminate between the girls who marry while in high school and those who postpone marriage to a later age.

The need for research in this area is important and urgent. At present our society generally and our schools and
families in particular are not well prepared to deal with the phenomenon of married high school girls (33). The majority of studies in marital happiness and success have reported a positive relationship between age of marriage and marital success. This fact may be stated in another way by saying that there is a distinct pessimism among sociologists about early marriage, especially teen-age marriage, Burgess and Cottrell (5), Terman (56), Landis (34), Burgess and Wallin (6), Monahan (45) and Locke (41). In view of these facts a study of factors associated with high school marriage appears to be a worthwhile and socially relevant undertaking.

In pursuing the literature on the subject, the writer discovered a paucity of research in the area of high school marriages. Since this dissertation is a specific and limited treatment of the larger problem of early marriage, a general review of literature appears to be unnecessary. The reader will find literature pertinent to a given phase of the study reviewed in the chapter to which it is related. The writer believes that the review of literature will serve its purpose most effectively as an integrated part of the dissertation rather than a single chapter.
In the introduction it was noted that only a fraction of girls marry while in high school. In general, society expects high school girls to complete their education before entering marriage (36) (8). Therefore high school marriage may be considered a form of norm deviation. This deviation from the norm may be permitted by society even though it is not fully approved. Such deviation need not imply social pathology. It may simply imply that married high school girls were dissatisfied with their adolescent roles which society expected them to play. Instead they elected an adult role which appeared more satisfying to them even though society did not fully approve this change in roles.

The nature of this problem lends itself to treatment within the framework of general sociological theory using conceptual variable analysis. The general hypothesis to be tested is:

Role change varies with role deprivation.

These two concepts will now be defined and discussed.

1. Role change - a shift from one culturally defined pattern of behavior to another.

2. Role deprivation - the degree to which reward ex-
pectations of a given role exceed the net rewards actually available.

The concept, role change, is based on the sociological concepts of status and role. Linton (38, pp. 113, 114) discusses these concepts as follows:

The term status, like the term culture, has come to be used with a double significance. A status, in the abstract, is a position in a particular pattern. It is quite correct to speak of each individual as having many statuses, since each individual participates in the expression of a number of patterns. However, unless the term is qualified in some way, the status of any individual means the sum total of the statuses which he occupies. It represents his position with relation to the total society. ... A status, as distinct from an individual who may occupy it, is simply a collection of rights and duties ...

A role represents the dynamic aspect of status. The individual is socially assigned to a status and occupies it with relation to other statuses. When he puts rights and duties which constitute the status into effect, he is performing a role. Role and status are quite inseparable, and a distinction between them is of only academic interest. There are no roles without statuses and no statuses without roles. Just as in the case of status, the term role is used with a double significance. Every individual has a series of roles deriving from the various patterns in which he participates and at the same time a role, general, which represents the sum total of these roles and determines what he does for his society and what he can expect from it.

In a later work Linton (39, p. 264) speaks of status and role in this more general sense.
The term role is used to designate the sum total of the culture patterns associated with a particular status. It thus includes the attitudes, values and behavior ascribed by a society to any and all persons occupying that status. In so far as it represents overt behavior, a role is the dynamic aspect of status; what the individual has to do in order to validate his occupation of the status.

Kleinberg (31, p. 360) quotes a definition by S. S. Sargent in which a very similar emphasis is made.

A person's role is a pattern or type of behavior which seems situationally appropriate to him in terms of the demands and expectations of those in his group.

The term role as it is used in the definition of role change implies these culturally defined expectations of an individual in a particular social position.

The concept of relative deprivation was employed by Merton and Kitt (44) to account for variations in attitudes towards the army by individuals who were members of specific groups. According to Merton and Kitt the concept seemed to have a kinship to and, in part, include such well known sociological concepts as "social frame of reference," "patterns of expectation," or "definitions of the situation".

Merton and Kitt employed this concept as an interpretative intervening variable to explain differences in attitude between married and single men. The greater dissatisfaction with the army of the married men compared to single men became understandable when one took into account the fact that the mar-


ried man in comparing himself to his unmarried associates felt he was called upon to make a greater sacrifice than they. By comparing himself to his married acquaintances the married soldier felt he was making sacrifices which they escaped altogether. It was not merely the deprivational character of the army itself which generated the feelings of dissatisfaction but the reference groups of the particular soldier which influenced his definition of the situation.

The concept, role deprivation, is defined for this dissertation with respect to these two aspects of deprivation, namely, (1) feelings of deprivation are not a simple function of an objectively deprivational situation but rather they result from an individual's interpretation of that situation. (2) One's interpretation of a situation is influenced by one's reference groups. Both membership groups and non-membership groups may provide frames of reference for an individual (44, pp. 48-51). In the case of the problem investigated in this dissertation the high school girl who elects to marry may be influenced in her decision not merely by reference to her peers (membership group) but by married adults (non-membership group) as well.

The definition of the concept, role deprivation, as presented above is a modification of R. L. Hamblin's defi-
His definition of deprivation omits any reference to negative sanctions. To this writer unexpected negative sanctions appear to be just as depriving as a failure to receive rewards that one has expected. Hence the term "net rewards" is introduced.

Burchinal** has suggested restricting the concept deprivation to role deprivation for the purposes of this study since the focus of the study is on adolescent role dissatisfactions as a factor in high school marriage.

Operations

High school marriage will be regarded as an operation of role change. The girl who married while in high school is shifting from one culturally prescribed and approved role, that is, being a single dependent adolescent, to a role which has questionable social acceptance, that is, assuming the adult status of a married woman while still in high school.

If we can assume that individuals will act to optimize satisfactions, then it appears that girls who marry while in high school are experiencing role deprivation. They are


willing to risk some social censure (negative sanctions) in order to obtain the supposedly greater satisfactions of marriage. In the case of premaritally pregnant girls, getting married may reduce role deprivation in that high school marriage incurs less social censure than taking the role of an unwed mother in our society. Role deprivation will be operationalized by taking measures from three possible sources of deprivation, namely, unmet personality needs, unsatisfactory parent-child relationships, and certain aspects of dating experiences. These three areas will now be discussed.

Personality needs and high school marriage

According to Henry A. Murray's theory of personality, individuals have differing hierarchies of needs. A need has been defined by Murray (47, pp. 123-124) as follows:

A need is a construct (a convenient fiction or hypothetical concept) which stands for a force (the physio-chemical nature of which is unknown) in the brain region, a force which organizes perception, apperception, intellection, conation and action in such a way as to transform in a certain direction, an existing unsatisfying situation.

More simply he defined a need dynamically as a "disequilibrium which stresses toward equilibrium". (47, p. 67)

The needs of a person are affected by the individual's unique physiological make up, by his relationships to significant reference groups such as peers, immediate family and
organized groups, by crisis experiences, and by culture values generally.

Since it is considered that strong needs which cannot be met in a culturally defined role are sources of feeling of role deprivation, this part of the study is concerned with exploring the relationship of certain personality needs to high school marriage.

While at the Harvard Psychological Clinic, Murray developed an extensive classification of personality needs. Several of these needs appear to the writer to bear a relationship, either positive or inverse, to the phenomenon of marriage. Some personality needs are better met by entering marriage than by remaining single. When the tension of an unmet need is great enough to risk some social censure in order to relieve it, and when marriage is perceived as an answer to this need and when the opportunity for marriage is present, one would expect girls to marry. When marrying while in high school becomes a hindrance to the meeting of a need one would expect girls to reject the alternative of marriage. In each case the girls would so act as to optimize their satisfactions and to minimize deprivations. Therefore, in contrast to girls who remain single, one would predict that girls who marry while in high school would manifest stronger needs of the kind that are met in marriage and weak-
er needs of the kind that can best be met by remaining single while in high school.

Edwards (13) designed a Personality Preference Schedule to measure manifest needs.* Edwards' operational definitions varied somewhat from Murray's original list on which they were based. The definitions of manifest needs employed in this dissertation will be those given in the Edwards' Personality Preference Schedule since that was the instrument employed in this research.

In this dissertation manifest need will be abbreviated "n" as is customary in the literature.

Girls who marry while in high school will hereinafter be referred to simply as married girls. The single girls who were used as controls will be referred to as controls.

Hypothesis No. 1: Married girls have higher n Abasement scores than their controls.

n Abasement was defined by Edwards (13) as follows:

To feel guilty when one does something wrong, to accept blame when things do not go right, to feel that personal pain and misery suffered does more good than harm, to feel the need for punishment for wrong doing, to feel better when giving in and avoiding a fight than when having one's own way, to feel the need for confes-

*For a discussion of the Edwards' Personality Preference Schedule see the section on Methodology, Part: Measures. p. 52.
sion of errors, to feel depressed by the inability to handle situations, to feel timid in the presence of superiors, to feel inferior to others in most respects.

The items in this definition suggest a personality that has strong feelings of guilt, inferiority and inadequacy. These are often accompanied by anxiety. Horney (23) has stated that the quest for affection is frequently used in our culture for obtaining reassurance against anxiety. She speaks of the neurotic need for affection and the neurotic need for a partner to take over one's life (25). By forming an intimate personal relationship the individual can feel secure again.

There is evidence that there are a considerable number of premarital pregnancies among the girls who marry while in high school. Christensen (9) in his studies of record linkage found that approximately twenty percent of all marriages were "forced" by premarital pregnancies. Landis and Landis (35, p. 157) in a study of 1,425 high school marriages in seventy-five California high schools revealed that if both members of a couple were in high school at the time of the marriage, between forty-four and fifty-six percent of the marriages were forced by pregnancy.

Other couples perhaps marry lest a pregnancy occur or perhaps simply to legitimate sex relationships. Since our
society has the ethical norm of premarital chastity one would expect that most individuals in the above mentioned circumstances would have feelings of guilt.

Another reason for predicting higher n Abasement scores for the married girls related to personality adjustment. Kuhlen and Lee (32) found the following among the personality traits which are associated with social acceptability among adolescents: cheerful and happy, enthusiastic, friendly, enjoys jokes, initiates games and activities, enjoys jokes on himself. These items indicate a personality pattern in sharp contrast to the low self esteem pattern suggested by n Abasement. If social acceptability to one's peers is related to a personality adjustment one would expect adolescents with high n Abasement to be somewhat less well adjusted than their more extroverted peers.

Two studies dealing with personality adjustment in relation to marriage have found some evidence that proneness towards marriage is related to poor personality adjustment.

Martinson (42) and (43) used a sample of 528 males and 640 females who were graduates of rural high schools in Minnesota during the years 1945-1949. In this study the following factors were controlled by matching: age, position in family, nationality, father's occupation, high school attended, year of graduation, and intelligence. This reduced
the sample to fifty-nine matched pairs of girls and thirty-two matched pairs of boys. These matched pairs had taken the California Test of Personality and the Bell Adjustment Inventory. Both groups were single at the time the data were gathered. Martinson's findings indicated that persons who marry early demonstrated greater feelings of what he termed, "ego deficiency", than did persons who remained single to a more mature age. Mean differences on the California Test of Personality were significant on the two percent level of confidence. There were significant differences on three of the four sections of the Bell Adjustment Inventory. Although the girls were matched for intelligence, the mean high school grade average was significantly lower for the married girls. All mean scores measuring adjustment favored the single girls. Parallel but less conclusive results were found for the male sample. The differences failed to reach significance at the five percent level of confidence in the male sample but the tendencies were in the predicted direction. Martinson (42) concluded:

It may be that it is the immature or not so well adjusted person for whom marriage has its strongest appeal.

A second study by Moss and Gingles (46), now in progress includes a sample of 3,456 girls from home making classes in seventy-two Nebraska high schools. Each girl who had married by age nineteen was matched with a single girl whose name was
next to that of the married girl in the same class and in the same school. The Minnesota Test of Personality and the Mooney Problems Check List were used to test for differences between those who married by age nineteen and their single controls. Preliminary reports include data from 297 girls who had married by age nineteen. In addition 110 interview schedules from girls who married by age nineteen and 121 interview schedules from mothers whose daughters had married by age nineteen have been received.

The Mooney Problems Check List showed that the married girls checked a larger number of "troublesome problems" but the controls checked a greater number of "very troublesome" problems and a significantly greater total number of problems.

On the Minnesota Personality Scale, however, the married girls had lower scores on morale, family relations and emotionality, the latter two being significant at the one percent level of confidence.

Moss and Gingles conclude tentatively that the findings indicate that (1) girls who married early were less well adjusted than their school mates; (2) girls who married early had less satisfying relationships with their families.

The idea that poor adjustment, feelings of insecurity and emotional immaturity are related to marriage proneness,
i.e. the inclination to marry, is widespread (36, 35, 8, 28, 20). Paul Landis (36, p. 198) reflects this view when he lists as one symptom of emotional immaturity the following:

Is overly eager to form a binding relationship—may want to go steady, become engaged, or marry very early hoping to find security and thus escape the uncertainty of more casual social relationships.

Stated in null form the hypothesis relating to \( n \) Abasement reads: There is no difference in \( n \) Abasement scores between married girls and their controls.

Hypothesis No. 2: Married girls have higher \( n \) Heterosexuality scores than their controls.

The mores of our society approve full expression of heterosexual relationships within marriage only. There is a discrepancy in our culture between the age of biological readiness for sex relations and the age of marriage. It is therefore predicted that individuals with high \( n \) Heterosexuality will feel greater deprivation when unmarried than those who have lower \( n \) Heterosexuality. Edwards' (13) operational definition of \( n \) Heterosexuality was as follows:

To go out with members of the opposite sex, to engage in social activities with the opposite sex, to be in love with someone of the opposite sex, to kiss those of the opposite sex, to be regarded as physically attractive to those of the opposite sex, to participate in discussions about the opposite sex, to read books and plays involving sex, to listen to or tell jokes involving sex, to become sexually excited.
These items seem to reflect a strong heterosexual interest, suggest behavior patterns which lead to marriage or are best realized in the marriage relationship itself. For this reason one would logically expect the girls who marry while in high school to manifest stronger n Heterosexuality than those who postpone marriage to a later date. Stated in null form this hypothesis reads: There is no difference between married girls and their controls in n Heterosexuality scores.

Two needs from the Edwards schedule seem to inversely relate to marriage while in high school. They are n Achievement and n Endurance.

Hypothesis No. 3: Married girls have lower n Achievement scores than their controls.

Edwards defines n Achievement as follows:

...To do one's best, to be successful, to accomplish tasks requiring skill and effort, to be a recognized authority, to accomplish something of great significance, to do a difficult job well, to solve difficult problems and puzzles, to be able to do things better than others, to write a great novel or play.

It appears to this writer that a high aspiration level is implied in the items of this definition. Many of these items could not be realized in our society without a high
school education or perhaps even a college education. Mar­riage during high school often involves dropping out of school and assuming roles in which achievement aspirations may not be realized, such as the roles of housewife, mother, or employment with little chance of career advancement.

Kirkpatrick (30, p. 380) in interpreting some data collected by Davis (11) on why women college graduates failed to marry, suggested that women with high personal and occup­pational aspirations may have high marital aspirations as well. Whether this holds for high school girls at the present time is not known. If high school marriage militates against the realization of high career achievement and high aspiration levels are correlated with high marital aspirations then one would hypothesize that high school marriage is inversely re­lated to \( n \) Achievement. Stated in null form this hypothesis reads: There is no difference in \( n \) Achievement scores be­tween married girls and their controls.

Hypothesis No. 4: Married girls have lower \( n \) Endurance scores than their controls.

There is reason to regard \( n \) Endurance to be related to marriage while in high school. The success theme is very strong in our culture. The British cultural anthropologist
Gorer (18) considered striving behavior as one of the basic aspects of the national character of Americans. Since success in our society is achieved most frequently at the cost of considerable effort and endurance and since early marriage might well inhibit the career achievement of girls, one would expect that girls who marry while in high school will have lower \( n \) Endurance scores than those who postpone marriage.

Edwards (13) defines \( n \) Endurance as:

To keep at a job until it is finished, to complete any job undertaken, to work hard at a task, to keep at a puzzle or a problem until it is solved, to work at a single job before taking on others, to stay up late working in order to get a job done, to put in long hours of work without distraction, to stick at a problem even though it may seem as if no progress is being made, to avoid being interrupted while at work.

Horney (24, pp. 65-72 and 22, pp. 17-39) has stated that one of the ways of obtaining reassurance against anxiety is the quest for power, prestige and possession. There is considerable research support for this view. Young (61) has reviewed it. In terms of the items of Edwards' definition it appears to this writer that \( n \) Endurance would be associated with the success striving form of relieving anxiety. In contrast to the married girls who relieve anxieties by forming an intimate relationship, those who remain single would tend to seek reassurance from anxiety through prestige, power and possession. They would therefore manifest the greater \( n \)
Endurance required to attain prestige, power and possession. Stated in null form this hypothesis reads: There is no difference in Endurance scores between married girls and their controls.

Because of the exploratory nature of the study and the lack of research evidence the writer refrained from predicting the direction of the differences in scores on the eleven remaining variables of the Edwards' Personality Preference Schedule. Therefore the hypotheses concerning the other variables will simply be stated in null form. Definitions of the variables are found in Appendix A.

Hypothesis No. 5: There is no difference in Deference between married girls and their controls.

Hypothesis No. 6: There is no difference in Order scores between married girls and their controls.

Hypothesis No. 7: There is no difference in Exhibition scores between married girls and their controls.

Hypothesis No. 8: There is no difference in Autonomy scores between married girls and their controls.

Hypothesis No. 9: There is no difference in Affiliation scores between married girls and their controls.

Hypothesis No. 10: There is no difference in Intra-ception scores between married girls and their controls.

Hypothesis No. 11: There is no difference in Succor-
Hypothesis No. 12: There is no difference in dominance scores between married girls and their controls.

Hypothesis No. 13: There is no difference in nurturance scores between married girls and their controls.

Hypothesis No. 14: There is no difference in change scores between married girls and their controls.

Hypothesis No. 15: There is no difference in aggression scores between married girls and their controls.

**Parent-child relations and high school marriage**

The psychoanalytic literature generally has emphasized that events and relationships taking place in infancy and childhood are crucial determinants of adult behavior. Parents are regarded as the most important agents of the early socialization process. Hurlock (26, pp. 554-559) in summarizing contemporary research in this area stated:

A pattern of home life in which parents and children are companionable, where cooperative and democratic relations exist, and where attempts are made to meet the child's needs, produces a well adjusted personality in the child. This type of home provides the affectional relationships every child needs with his parents and siblings. Homes characterized by family discord, lack of interest in the children, friction among parents, and breaks due to separation, death, or divorce lead to emotional instability and poor adjustment on the child's part....

...Parental attitudes that have been found favorable to the development of the child's personality are characterized by understanding, love and interest in the child as an individual. Parental attitudes that have been
found unfavorable to the child's personality development are characterized by a lack of emotional warmth, rejection in such subtle forms as criticism and hostility submerged under the cloak of insincere care and affection, favoritism toward a sibling, and a high degree of behavioral control. ...It is the parents' attitude toward the child and their personalities that are far more influential in the child's personality development than are the external factors of the home environment.

In terms of the items mentioned in this quotation "favorableness" seems to imply a feeling of trust and security whereas "unfavorableness" seems to imply a feeling of deprivation.

If certain kinds of parent-child relationships produce feelings of deprivation in children and adolescents it appears legitimate to measure these relationships and to use the scores as measures of deprivation. The reader may note that it is not assumed that disturbed parent-child relationships are the only source of feelings of deprivation which may be associated with high school marriage or early marriage. It is quite possible that peer group rejection, school or occupational failures may be similarly related. It will be the distinctive emphasis of this dissertation to test the relationship of deprivation engendered by parent-child interaction to the phenomenon of marriage while in high school.

Hypothesis No. 16: Married girls are less accepting of their parents than their controls.
Albert Ellis (14) using a sample of 200 girls from fifteen colleges found that girls who do not get along very well with their mothers have an ardent desire to find a lover who will make up for the love they have missed at home.

Nye (52) developed the concept of the rejected parent and tested the hypothesis that there is a positive relationship between delinquent behavior in adolescents and rejecting attitudes towards parents. A group of 320 youths in training schools were compared to a control group of high school students. The data supported his hypothesis and also the hypothesis that there is a positive relationship between parents' acceptance of a child and a child's acceptance of his parents.

Glueck and Glueck (17) found a high negative relationship between delinquency and: (1) affection of parents for the boy; (2) the acceptability of the father to the boy; (3) the types of discipline in the home. All of these appear to be deprivation producing types of interaction in which, lacking satisfying home relationships, young people consciously or otherwise seek to form a new relationship. Perhaps the deprivation experiences which motivate youth to change to the role of a delinquent may motivate girls into early marriage. In both cases there may be a violation of expected norms to relieve tensions generated by home atmosphere.
Since some clinical and research data support the hypothesis that deprivation of affection in parent-child relations is related to marriage proneness, it was decided to test the hypothesis that high school marriage is inversely related to the acceptability of the parents to the child. The parental acceptance scale developed by Nye (52) was employed as a measure of parental acceptance and hence as a negative measure of deprivation. Stated in null form the hypothesis reads: There is no difference in parental acceptance scores between married girls and their controls.

Hypothesis No. 17: Married girls have lower scores on the fairness in discipline scale than their controls.

Various writers (55, p. 121; 26, 35, 12 and 15) stress the importance of consistency and fairness in discipline. It is widely conceded that harsh, inconsistent, unclear or unfair discipline has disturbing effects on the child. Assuming that girls who report harshness, rigidity and unfairness in discipline are more likely to suffer from role deprivation than those who report favorable relations to their parents it was decided to test the hypothesis that marriage while in high school is inversely related to fairness in discipline. The Stone fairness in discipline scale* was used

*See Methodology section, part: Measures, p. 57.
as an operational measure of the conceptual variable, role deprivation. Stated in null form this hypothesis reads: There is no difference in fairness in discipline scores between married girls and their controls.

Hypothesis No. 18: Married girls have lower scores on the parent communication index than their controls.

It has been demonstrated that good communication is important to the morale of work groups and decision making groups (2, 7, 17). Since the family is often either a work group or a decision making group this principle may hold for the family as a group as well. In that event one would predict that poor communication between parents and children is a source of role deprivation for the children. It was decided to test the hypothesis that marriage while in high school is inversely related to good parent-child communication. An index of parent-child communication was constructed by the use of questions about communication in the areas of dating behavior and moral standards pertaining to sex. * The communication index was regarded as an operational measure of the conceptual variable role deprivation. Stated in null form this hypothesis reads: There is no difference in communication scores between married girls and their controls.

Hypothesis No. 19: Married girls rate their parental

*See Methodology section, part: Measures, p. 58.
control as more authoritarian than their controls.

There have been several research studies in the area of family and group authority and the reaction of children to various forms of authority. Lippitt (40) carefully matched two groups of five children chosen from a list of volunteers. The group objective was mask making. One group was submitted to authoritarian supervision, the other was given democratic supervision. It was observed that in the authoritarian group fifty-four percent of the remarks initiated by children toward adults were hostile or aggressive. The comparable figure for the democratic group was four percent. In the authoritarian group sixty-seven percent of conversation directed toward other children was hostile whereas only twenty-two percent of the conversation in the democratic group was so classified. For the authoritarian group there was a progressive increase in dominating hostile behavior as the meetings continued. The opposite trend was observed in the democratic group. "Scapegoating" was likewise greater in the authoritarian group. This behavior appears indicative of high deprivation in the authoritarian group. Watson (59) found permissive discipline positively correlated with socialization and cooperation, originality and creativity and negatively correlated with hostility.

Landis and Stone (37, pp. 1-28) tested the hypothesis
that teenagers reared in a democratic family suffer from fewer serious personal adjustments and enjoy all around happier homes than do young people reared in an atmosphere dominated by their parents' wishes or commands, with little or no chance to think for themselves. Questionnaire data from 4,310 high school seniors, nearly one-third of all high school seniors in the state of Washington, were employed. A carefully developed scale (to be described later in this study) was employed. It included a check list of 250 problems covering seven broad areas of concern encountered by teenagers today. In all seven areas covered, the teenagers from the most authoritarian families checked most problems. Children of authoritarian parents were least ready to talk over problems with their parents, least likely to entertain friends in their home and disagreed most frequently with their parents in nine areas of decision making. Landis and Stone concluded (p. 28):

A comparison of the democratic and authoritarian families on the basis of these data leave little doubt as to the superiority of the former in terms of harmonious parent-teenage relationships. Teenagers in democratic families have fewer problems by far than those in authoritarian families. They enjoy a closer relationship with parents and experience far fewer frictions. This is true of both sexes and of rural and urban young people alike.

Young people in authoritarian families not only have more problems that grow directly out of their relationships with parents, but also have more problems in fields entirely outside the family as such--
in community, in school, in personal relationships and in social participation generally.

It was therefore decided to test the hypothesis that high school marriage is directly related to authoritarian parental control. Stated in null form this hypothesis reads: There is no difference in family authority scores between married girls and their controls.

**Dating history and high school marriage**

Participation in the roles of dating and courtship usually leads the participants towards increasingly intimate physical and emotional involvement. Waller and Hill (57, p. 18) note this aspect of the courtship interaction process:

Each of the successive steps in the process of mating is more powerfully determined by social pressures and inner impulse than the one which preceded it. As the process unfolds, each person becomes increasingly committed in his own eyes and those of others to the completed act, and at the same time his impulses are increasingly stirred up. Once they have reached a level of a certain intensity, these relations have a movement of their own which is more or less beyond the control of individuals. The social process of mating tends to be irreversible after it has gathered a certain momentum.

As high school girls progress along the dating to marriage continuum the non-membership group of married adults probably becomes increasingly important as a reference group. The result is an increase in relative deprivation since the girls would then crave the perceived satisfactions of a marital role which are denied them in their role as an adolescent.
At this stage the protraction of courtship and postponement of marriage becomes emotionally frustrating. An earlier age of serious heterosexual involvement would tend to result in an earlier age marriage. Therefore, relative to girls their age, one would expect girls who marry while in high school to have begun dating earlier, to have dated more frequently, to have gone steady earlier, to have gone steady with a larger number of persons, and to have been emotionally involved with a greater number of dates or steadies. In short, they would have passed through the courtship transition at younger ages than their peers. This leads to the following empirical hypotheses.

Hypothesis No. 20: Married girls began dating at an earlier age than their controls. Stated in null form it reads: There is no difference in age of first date between married girls and their controls.

Hypothesis No. 21. Married girls began going steady at an earlier age than their controls. Stated in null form it reads: There is no difference in age at first steady between married girls and their controls.

Hypothesis No. 22. Married girls had gone steady with a greater number of persons than their controls. Stated in null form this hypothesis is: There is no difference between married girls and their controls concerning the number of persons with whom they had gone steady.
Hypothesis No. 23: Married girls had been in love with a larger number of persons than their controls. Stated in null form it reads: There is no difference between married girls and their controls with respect to the number of persons with whom they had been in love.

Hypothesis No. 24: Married girls dated more frequently than their controls at ages fourteen, fifteen and sixteen. Stated in null form this hypothesis is: There is no difference between married girls and their controls with respect to frequency in dating at ages fourteen, fifteen and sixteen.

Hypothesis No. 25: Married girls did more serious dating at ages fourteen, fifteen and sixteen than did their controls. Stated in null form this hypothesis is: There is no difference in dating seriousness between the married girls and their controls at ages fourteen, fifteen and sixteen.

Summary of Concepts and Hypotheses

The theoretical framework of this dissertation hypothesizes that people who have feelings of deprivation in one social role will change roles in order to have these dissatisfactions relieved. Marriage is perceived by some high school girls as a social role which would reduce their feelings of deprivation.

Role deprivation among high school girls may result
from certain personality needs, parent-child relationships, and their position on the dating to marriage continuum.

The general hypothesis to be tested is: Role change varies with role deprivation.

Role change is defined as a shift from one culturally defined pattern of behavior to another.

Role deprivation is defined as the degree to which reward expectations of a given role exceed the net rewards actually available.

The following needs are considered as motivating people into a marriage relationship rather than to the postponement of marriage: n Abasement and n Heterosexuality. Therefore they are considered as positive measures of role deprivation among high school girls.

The following needs are considered to be better met by remaining single while in high school: n Achievement and n Endurance. The marriage role would intensify feelings of deprivation due to having these needs unmet. On the other hand, remaining single while in high school would minimize deprivation due to these unmet needs, hence they are regarded as negative measures of deprivation.

This led to the following empirical hypotheses:
1. Married girls have higher $n$ Abasement scores than their controls.

2. Married girls have higher $n$ Heterosexuality scores than their controls.

3. Married girls have lower $n$ Achievement scores than their controls.

4. Married girls have lower $n$ Endurance scores than their controls.

As indicated earlier, the relation of the remaining variables of the Edwards' Personality Preference Schedule to high school marriage were not predicted so they were stated in null form only and are omitted in this summary.

The following areas of parent-child interaction were considered as potential sources of role deprivation; acceptance of the parents by the child, fairness in discipline as perceived by the child, parent-child communication and degree of authoritarian control by parents. This led to the following empirical hypotheses:

1. Married girls have lower scores on the acceptance of parents scale than their controls.

2. Married girls have lower scores on the fairness in discipline scale than their controls.

3. Married girls have lower scores on the parent-child communication index than their controls.
4. Married girls rate their parental control as more authoritarian than their controls.

Those aspects of dating history which led to early serious physical and psychological involvement were regarded as producing deprivations in the adolescent role which could best be fulfilled in a marital role. This led to the following empirical hypotheses:

1. Married girls began dating earlier than their controls.

2. Married girls dated more frequently at ages fourteen, fifteen and sixteen than did their controls.

3. Married girls went steady at an earlier age than their controls.

4. Married girls went steady with more persons than their controls.

5. Married girls fell in love with more persons than their controls.

6. Married girls did more serious dating at ages fourteen, fifteen and sixteen than did their controls.
METHODOLOGY

Design

As indicated in the theory section, the objective of this dissertation is to test the relationships of several factors to high school age marriage. The most appropriate design for this undertaking appeared to be ex post facto experiment since the focus of the study is on an event which has already occurred. Jessen and Thompson (29, p. 6) have stated that the essence of an experiment is the ability of the experimenter to control the variables. Greenwood (19, pp. 12-14, 43-47) discusses the nature of the ex post facto method. He points out that in the case of the ex post facto method the control of the factors in the situation is indirect. It involves the manipulation of symbols of objects and persons not present to the senses, i.e., data on IBM cards. Instead of controlling physically by creating what he wants, the experimenter controls mentally by selecting from the environment what he needs.

The ex post facto design falls into Mill's classification of the natural experiment. It is not created by the experimenter but offered by nature. The effects need not have been achieved purposively by man. The important point is that control is exercised over the variables believed to be related to the effect. What the experimenter does is to select a con-
trol group and an experimental group who are similarly distributed on selected characteristics as measured by various scales or measuring instruments. The two groups differ in one important effect, in this case, high school marriage. When the experimental and control groups have been equated, attempts are made to trace back to possible causes or correlates of that observed event which differentiates the experimental and control groups.

In an ex post facto design of the effect-to-cause type the differences in the causal situation should be a matter of record by the time those events occur. The writer is keenly aware that such data are not available concerning the variables tested in the experimental and control groups employed in this study. The supposed causal events or correlates are reported by the subjects at the present time, after the event (high school marriage) has occurred for the experimental group. Therefore the experience of the event may affect the reporting and introduce bias into the results. For instance, family discipline may be perceived differently in retrospect once the child is married and out of the home.

To guard against the well known tendency to bias self reports in such a way as to put one's self in the most favorable light socially, certain precautions were taken. There was particular concern that the married girls might engage in
biased self reporting to justify their taking the socially dubious step of marrying while still in high school. To reduce such distortions to the minimum the field workers presented anonymous questionnaires to the classes which contained one or more married girls. It was emphasized that the researchers were interested in getting some facts and honest opinions of high school students on various subjects such as dating history, occupational plans, home life, et cetera. The questionnaires themselves carried such innocuous titles as High School Survey and Family Relations. (See Appendices B and C.)

The married girls who were out of school were told that their opinions were as important to the study of high school students as those who did not drop out of school. At no point was attention called to the fact that the study sought to test for differences between married and single girls. Not until the married girls were given the questionnaire entitled Wife Schedule (see Appendix D) did it become explicit that the study bore any relation to their marital status. How successfully this procedure removed a conscious distortion of self reports due to the respondents marital status is not known. Nor is it known what, if any, unconscious bias entered the reporting as a result of experiencing or failing to experience the event of marriage while in high school.
The data therefore are limited by a factor which often sets limitations upon pertinent social and psychological data, namely, candor in reporting. But in view of the total situation this appeared to be the most fruitful approach available for securing the desired information.

An immediate field objective was to gather needed data from married high school girls who were matched with single high school girls who served as a control group.

Matching of the experimental and control groups was done on certain factors known to be related to age at marriage. The following factors were matched: sex, community, school attended, age, grade, father's occupation and education, religion, and family structure. A brief consideration of each factor will follow to explain why it was considered important to control it via matching.

Factors related to age at marriage

Sex It is generally recognized in our culture that marriage is perceived as meeting somewhat different functions for women than it does for men. The differences in role prescription for men and women in our society might easily confound the results of a study of factors related to marriage at high school age if sex were ignored in matching. It was therefore decided to use no married or single males in this study but to restrict it entirely to a female population.
Also the relative frequency of marriage among high school males is such that gathering data on an adequate number of cases would be beyond the scope of this project.

**Community**

It is well known that differing communities and ethnic groups differ in their folkways and mores, including those which relate to marriage patterns. Iowa communities represent a wide variation in ethnic backgrounds. Therefore it seemed important to control on this variable by matching each married girl with a single control girl from the same community.

**School attended**

Since peer group patterns vary from community to community and to some extent from school to school in the same community it was considered essential to control on this variable. Peer sub-culture patterns are frequently in conflict with the adult values and practices of the community.

**Age**

Most classic studies in marriage prediction and success, including studies by Burgess and Cottrell (5), Terman (56), Locke (41), Burgess and Wallin (6) have shown age at marriage to be highly related to marital success. It is also known that adolescents during high school years are in the process of deciding upon a set of values to live by as well as upon an adult role. The sixteen year old girl may hold views of dating, courtship, marriage and a marital role that are quite different from those of an eighteen or nineteen
year old. Hence it seemed wise to control on age.

**Grade in school** For the school age child and adolescent, grade in school along with age serves to indicate where he stands in his progression towards adulthood. It is therefore possible that the adolescents' progress in choosing an occupation, in learning adult roles and his position on the dating to marriage continuum are related to his grade in school. It was decided to control on this variable.

**Father's occupation and education** A common indicator of social class is the father's occupation. Father's education is likewise related to social class. Many aspects of family life are associated with social class. Among them are age of marriage, family size, courtship and sex mores, child rearing patterns, family authority, and form of discipline. Hence if one wishes to test the individual effect of some of these parent child interaction variables it is important to control on social class as indicated by occupation and education of the father of the family.

**Religion** Unlike most Protestant groups, the Catholic Church regards marriage as a sacrament and does not permit divorce. These differences in emphasis may affect high school girls' attitudes toward marriage. One would expect Catholic youth to look upon marriage with greater seriousness and caution than Protestant and unaffiliated youth. Therefore it
was decided to control on this variable.

**Family structure**

Family structure seems to be related to the happiness and adjustment of children. The term family structure as used in this study refers only to the presence or absence of one or both parents. Other aspects of family structure were ignored for purposes of matching. Bowerman (3) in studying a sample of 4,500 students with step parents found that they rated their parents' marriage considerably less happy than children in homes in which both original parents were present. Nye (51) found children from broken homes to be better adjusted than children from unhappy unbroken homes. Winch (60) found some evidence, though not statistically significant, that loss of a mother tends to accelerate the courtship process for girls. His sample included 566 coeds from sixteen midwest colleges. In view of such evidence it seemed wise to control on this variable.

**Procedure**

Contact was made with the married girls and their single controls by soliciting the cooperation of the high school principals or superintendents. A letter was sent to the principal of each school expressing our desire to make the study and inquiring if there were any married girls attending school. In this letter a request for an appointment was also made.
During the appointment the nature of the research and its purposes were explained and cooperation was solicited. In order to maximize the use of time and support funds most of the contacts were made with larger school systems. Generally more cases could be secured per trip from the larger schools. Two of the schools contacted refused cooperation. In each of these two schools there were two married girls. Twelve schools cooperated with the study. The number of cases in each of the cooperating schools was as follows:

Table 1. Married girls interviewed by school attended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Total cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The usual procedure in selecting a control girl was to give a questionnaire to a class which the married girl attended or a class selected by the principal. These were usually American problems or family relations courses. This
questionnaire, which was given the innocuous title, High School Survey, included the data for matching as well as several questions relating to dating history, attitudes toward marriage, and some parent-child relations items. Students were not informed of the purpose of the survey at this point to help prevent biasing answers in relation to their marital status. Married girls were identified from the response to a question near the end of the questionnaire. Control girls were selected on the basis of the data on pages one and two in the High School Survey questionnaire. These matched pairs were asked to fill out another questionnaire entitled Family Relations. It contained various parent-child relations scales. Both married and control girls were also given an Edwards Personality Preference Schedule. Additional information was obtained from the married girls with a questionnaire entitled, Wife Schedule, and a structured personal interview. These instruments will be discussed later in this dissertation. Girls who were in school filled out these forms under the supervision of the writer or another field worker who was in charge of the total project. Occasionally the Edwards' Personality Preference Schedule was filled out under the supervision of the school psychologist when students' class schedules necessitated this.

The married girls who had dropped out of school were contacted by calling at the girls' former addresses to get
the girls' married addresses. Then the girls were contacted at their own home. The forms were left to be filled out and picked up later. When the field worker returned to pick up the forms he interviewed the girl.

Generally speaking, excellent cooperation was received from the girls, both married and controls. When it was learned how motivated they were to cooperate by filling out the forms it was decided to include the Edward's Schedule for married girls out of school as well. This accounts for the smaller N on Edwards' Schedules than was obtained for the other instruments. Of all contacts made, one married girl declined to cooperate; one agreed to cooperate but failed to fill out the forms; two were willing to cooperate but declined because of their husbands' objections and two turned in only partially completed data. This constitutes a refusal rate of five percent and a combined refusal and failure to complete rate of ten percent. The writer considers this to be a very gratifying response on the part of the married girls. There were no refusals from the control girls.

Certain limitations should be noted in this study. Circumstances made it impossible to be present to supervise the filling out of the forms for the married girls who had dropped out of school. They filled out these forms at their homes.

The married girls who were out of school were matched
with control girls who were still in school. In these cases an attempt was made to hold grade level and socio-economic status constant. To do this age differences were regarded as secondary and in several such cases age differences of a year were accepted.

The sixty pairs of girls from whom data were gathered include girls from Iowa communities only. Those who married and moved from the community were by this fact eliminated from this study. The selection of controls was sometimes limited by the policy of school administrators, available time, and the attitude of teachers. When no suitable controls could be identified in a class which filled out the questionnaire, the control case was selected on the basis of information obtained from permanent school records.

The data were gathered during April and May, 1958. The sixty married girls included married girls who were in school, girls who had married and dropped out during the year and some girls who had married the previous summer and failed to return to finish their high school education.

**Matching on selected variables**

Following is a series of tables which indicates the degree of success in matching on the selected variables.
Exact matching was achieved on three variables: sex, community and school attended.

**Age** In the case of age it was decided to match pairs within one year. Table 2 reveals how well the pairs were matched with respect to this variable.

### Table 2. Differences in ages of matched pairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Months difference</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 months or less</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 12 months</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 16 months</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 months or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximately eighty-eight percent of the pairs meet the one year criterion. An additional ten percent fell within four months of the proposed limit and a final pair was in the seventeen or more months category. These discrepancies were accepted in order to match for grade in school and socio-economic status. In 9 cases of the 23 pairs that had age differences greater than 6 months, the control girl was the older and in 14 pairs the married girl was older.

**Grade in school** An attempt was made to match the pairs within one grade level. Of the sixty pairs, fifty-nine
were matched within the same grade level. In one pair the control girl was one grade higher. This was done because of the limited number of controls in this school and because the case matched well on the other factors. Of the fifty-nine pairs, five pairs were tenth graders, twelve pairs were eleventh graders and forty-two pairs were twelfth graders.

Father's occupation and education To classify occupations into groups, the ranks assigned by the Hatt-North scale (48, pp. 412-414) were employed. Occupational categories with a range of ten points on the Hatt-North scale were defined. For example, occupational ratings below fifty were tabulated as Class I; fifty to fifty-nine, Class II; sixty to sixty-nine, Class III, and so on.

Educational matching is tabulated on the basis of years difference in education between parents of the matched pairs.

Table 3. Difference in occupation of fathers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class differences</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 class differences</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 class differences</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 class differences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm/non-farm</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Difference in education of fathers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years difference</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Difference in education of mothers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years difference</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Occupationally fifty-five percent were in the same class and eighty-three percent were within one occupational class of each other. Of the 19 pairs with one or two occupational class differences, 11 of the differences favored the married girls' fathers. When farm girls were matched with non-farm girls it was difficult to assign varying ranks to farmers. Two cases of farm background were paired with Class I occupationally, two cases were paired with Class II and one case with Class III. Cases giving no occupational information were paired as follows: one case with a farm girl, one case with a Class II occupational background and one case with a Class III. These choices were conditional upon good matching on the other factors.

Father's education matched to the extent that eighty-two percent of the pairs were within two years of each other. For the 28 pairs in which there was a difference of at least one year the differences were evenly split. No attempt was made to control on mother's education but the table reflects that it closely parallels the father's education. In seventy-eight percent of the pairs the mother's education was matched within two years. For the 35 pairs where there were differences of more than one year, 19 of the differences favored the control girls' mothers.
Religion  On Catholic-Protestant differences perfect matching was accomplished. In the case of unaffiliated individuals they were matched with Protestants. Within Protestantism itself fifteen pairs were matched within the same denomination. Actually the matching within Protestantism was more precise than is indicated by this figure. An attempt was made to evaluate denominations for similarity. Whenever possible sectarian background was matched with sectarian background, liturgical background with liturgical background and so on.

Table 6. Religious affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of matched pairs</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic / Catholic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant / Protestant</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant / Unaffiliated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Family structure  Family structure was classified into six types: both parents, mother only, father only, step parents, foster parents, other (parent surrogates).

According to Table 7, fifty-two pairs or eighty-six percent of the girls are matched on the issue of family structure. Included in this figure are two pairs involving one step parent
Table 7. Family structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matched pairs according to family type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both parents with both parents</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother only with mother only</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One step parent with one step parent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster parents with both parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One step parent with both parents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One parent with both parents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other with both parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(sex of the parent was ignored) and one case of foster parents matched with a case of both parents.

Number of siblings  Data were also gathered in regard to number of siblings and ordinal position among them. In fifteen pairs the married and control girls came from families of equal size. For nineteen pairs there was a difference of one; for twelve pairs a difference of two; in eight pairs a difference of three; in four pairs there was a difference of four and in two pairs there was a difference of five children in the family. In these forty-five pairs where there is a difference of one or more siblings in the size of families of married and control girls, twenty-three of the married girls
came from smaller families than their controls and in twenty-two of the pairs the control girls came from smaller families. Among the sixty married girls fifteen were the oldest children in the family; thirteen were youngest children; thirty were middle children; two were only children. Two girls had twin sisters. Since preference in matching was given to other factors, matching with respect to this variable was rather unsuccessful. The writer feels that the two groups cannot be considered as equated with respect to number of siblings and ordinal position.

In general the writer feels that the matching has been exact or complete enough to be considered successful. It should reduce experimental error and so it should greatly increase the reliability of the results obtained.

Measures

The instruments chosen to measure the concepts are a basic consideration in any social science research. The validity of the results are contingent upon the reliability and validity of the measures employed. Since the focus of this study was on the substantive findings rather than the development of new measures it was decided to select the most valid and reliable measures available from a number of possible choices. A description of the measures selected follows.
Edwards' Personality Preference Schedule

The instrument chosen to measure differences in personality needs which might discriminate between married and single high school girls was the Edwards' Personality Preference Schedule, herein after abbreviated as the P.P.S. There are several reasons for choosing this particular instrument.

1. In the first place the instrument was designed to measure a number of relatively independent normal personality variables. The variables which this schedule purports to measure have their origin in the classification of needs presented by H. A. Murray (47, pp. 142-242) and others. Since the hypothesis to be tested is framed within Murray's theory of differing hierarchies of needs of different persons, the P.P.S. appeared to be the most appropriate instrument of the paper and pencil type. If the writer were a trained clinical psychologist he might have chosen the Thematic Appreception Test based on the same general theory of needs.

2. The P.P.S. instrument employs the forced choice technique which is generally recognized as a method of controlling response sets and increasing candor in responses of self report tests (Cronbach, 10, p. 336). Research by Edwards revealed a high correlation between "yes" responses and social desirability of items (13). The pairing technique used for questions permits few obviously socially desirable responses to be apparent to the respondents.
3. The P.P.S. differs from other inventories in that the variables measured purport to be those of normal personalities and therefore high or low scores tend not to have pathological connotations attached to them.

The P.P.S. was standardized on a group of high school graduates with some college training. The samples used to standardize the test consisted of 749 college women and 760 college men.

4. The test has a built-in consistency check. A series of forced choice questions are repeated and it is possible to check the frequency of consistent answers. One can then calculate if variations occur by chance or if the respondent is inconsistent in giving his preferences. A score of nine has a probability of .30 that the respondent is answering by chance. A score of eleven has a probability of .06 that the respondent's variations in consistency are due to chance. Cases with consistency scores below nine were omitted from the sample.

5. Reliability and validity checks. Split half reliability coefficients or coefficients of internal consistency have been calculated. The r's for the fifteen variables range from .60 for n Deference to .87 for n Heterosexuality. Test-retest reliability or stability coefficients were calculated for the different variables. The rs ranged from .74 for n Achievement to .88 for n Abasement. Intercorrelation of va-
riables was quite low. The largest coefficient is between n Affiliation and n Nurturance and amounts to .46. The low values of intercorrelations indicate that the variables being measured by the P.P.S. are relatively independent. An attempt was made to establish validity of the test by self ratings and peer ratings. Some subjects showed perfect agreement while others showed very low agreement between self ratings and P.P.S. scores. A similar situation obtained in the case of peer ratings of subjects. Some showed very high agreement, others very little agreement.

Correlations between the P.P.S. variables and variables on several other personality inventories were calculated. Some correlations that were significant on the five percent level of confidence were found, namely:

n Succorance with Taylor Manifest Anxiety score.

n Endurance negatively with Taylor Manifest Anxiety score.

The following significant correlations were found with P.P.S. variables and items on the Guilford Martin Personality Inventory:

n Deference with cooperativeness, agreeableness

n Order with agreeableness

n Autonomy negatively with cooperativeness and agreeableness
Affiliation with agreeableness
Succorance negatively with agreeableness and objectivity
Dominance negatively with agreeableness
Abasement with agreeableness
Nurturance with agreeableness
Endurance with cooperativeness, agreeableness, objectivity
Heterosexuality with agreeableness
Aggression negatively with agreeableness and cooperativeness.

These correlations suggest that the P.P.S. may be a more discriminating instrument than the Guilford Martin Personality Inventory.

Since there is a tendency to answer items "yes" in favor of social desirability an attempt was made to validate the items by controlling on this factor. An intra-class correlation of .85 between pairs of items on degree of social desirability was achieved. An additional check made on a sub-sample of 160 from the normative group indicated that coefficient of determination was only .16, that is, only sixteen percent of the total variance in choosing yes answers can be accounted for by differences in social desirability of the paired items. (See Appendix A for examples of the items).
In summary, the reasons for selection of the P.P.S. are as follows: it is designed to measure personality needs based on Murray's classification, it employs the forced choice technique, it attempts control on the social desirability bias in responses, its reliability has been tested, it was recommended by those believed to be competent, and finally, it was feasible under the circumstances in which these data were gathered.

Parent-child relations measures

Four of the instruments employed to measure various areas of parent-child interaction will be considered in this dissertation. The child's acceptance of parents was considered by this writer to be a more sensitive measure of deprivation than were measures of parental acceptance of the child. Nye (50, 52) has developed a scale to measure the child's rejection of his parents. (See Appendix C, questions 27-48.

Nye standardized this scale on 1,543 high school youth and 320 delinquents from a state training school. Usable data were received from ninety-nine percent of the "normal" youths and eighty-six percent of the training school population. Items were scaled by the Cornell technique and a coefficient of reproducibility of .80 was achieved. When the
item responses were reweighted employing the Israel Gamma Technique, the coefficient or reproducibility was .92 for the mother's and .94 for the father's acceptance-rejection score. The validity claims made for this instrument are unidimensionality, face validity of the items and the ability to discriminate between groups known to be different. The data Nye gathered with this measure did support his hypothesis that training school youth are more rejecting of their parents than youth in a home situation.

The fairness in discipline scale employed in this study was developed by Landis and Stone*. Items were scaled according to the Guttman technique. Coefficients of reproducibility were based on data gathered from four different communities in the state of Washington. Since the sample was not random the scale was actually tested four times. Boys and girls were scaled separately. There were approximately 3,800 usable questionnaires from 2,164 high school boys and 1,805 high school girls. Coefficients of reproducibility for the female samples ranged from .896 to .937. For the boys it ranged from .885 to .918.

No validity checks have yet been published for this scale. By examining the items the writer felt that the scale has high face validity. (See Appendix C, questions 1 and 2.)

Parent-child communication index consisted of a set of six questions. The same questions were asked in relation to the father and the mother. Three of the questions dealt with dating and three dealt with standards of sex morality. (See Appendix C, questions 3-14.) No claim is made that these questions form a scale. There are no reliability or validity checks for these questions. They seem to the writer to have face validity. It has often been suggested that in traditional families there is poor communication between parents and teenagers, particularly in matters relating to sex. If this popular assumption is true then one might hypothesize that good communication on this subject may be a predictor of good communication in other areas.

The Landis and Stone (37, pp. 29, 30) scale for measuring parental authority patterns was employed in this study. The scale was developed by having eight members of the sociology staff at the State College of Washington check the six questions from a long questionnaire which they believed would best differentiate between authoritarian and democratic
families. The questions were of the Likert type. The twelve questions checked most frequently were then subjected to the Guttman technique of scaling.

A random sample of one hundred cases was used to determine the scale score, applying the scalogram board technique with the trials done on paper rather than with a board. The twelve questions were dichotomized into democratic and authoritarian answers. After several successive trials, six questions were discarded as containing too many errors. The final scale containing six questions appears in Appendix C, questions 15-26. The same six questions were asked about both father and mother. In applying this scale to 4,310 cases the authors found that a nine percent error existed among the sample of 1,900 boys and a six percent error among the sample of 2,410 girls. The scale purports to measure the teenagers perceptions of parental authority patterns rather than to be an objective measure of authority. For the purposes of this study this may be a more sensitive measure of deprivation than some objective measure of authority.

The authors sought to validate the scale by checking scale scores with scores on several questions closely associated with parental authority but which are not used in the scale. If the scale has validity more youth from the democratic homes would respond favorably to the five Likert
type questions than would youth of intermediate or authoritarian homes.

The questions were:

1. My parents and I agree on things concerning the whole family: all of the time, most of the time, sometimes, or never.

2. In general I feel that my parents approve of my conduct: always, almost always, sometimes, or never.

3. When my parents punish me they are: always fair, usually fair, sometimes fair, always unfair.

4. With regard to money I earn myself my parents allow me to: spend all as I wish, keep most for myself, spend as they wish, or take most of it.

5. As far as my social activities are concerned, my parents: heartily approve, usually approve, sometimes approve, seldom approve or never approve.

The democratic group consistently checked these questions more favorably than the intermediate and authoritarian groups. It was therefore concluded by the authors that the scale has validity.

To the writer both the scale and the questions used to validate it appear to have face validity. No validity beyond face validity is claimed for the scale.
The t test is often employed in analyzing mean differences in scores from an ex post facto matched pairs design when the assumptions of this parametric test can be met. These assumptions are:

1. Independence of observations
2. Observations must be drawn from normally distributed populations
3. Homogeneity of variance
4. The variables involved must be measured by at least an interval scale.

When these assumptions cannot be met, the researcher has the alternative to use the test and violate the assumptions stating how they are being violated, or he can resort to a nonparametric test whose power efficiency approaches that of a parametric test. Many of the measures employed in the behavioral sciences yield data which do not meet the assumptions required by parametric tests and therefore nonparametric tests are appropriate.

In this dissertation one measure, the Edwards' P.P.S. was assumed to approach an interval scale and the t test was employed to test the significance of the differences between scores of the matched pairs.
Some of the scales in this dissertation yield data which indicate both the direction and the magnitude of the differences between matched pairs but do not meet the assumptions of an interval scale. The Wilcoxon matched pairs signed-ranks test is an appropriate nonparametric test for analyzing this kind of data. With this test the researcher can make judgments as to which member of a pair is greater than the other and he can also rank the differences in order of absolute size. When the assumptions of the t test are in fact met the asymptotic efficiency of the Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test compared to the t test is 95.5 percent. This means that $\frac{3}{3.1416}$ is the limiting ratio of sample sizes necessary for the Wilcoxon test and the t test to achieve the same power. For small samples the efficiency is near ninety-five percent (Siegel 54, pp. 75-83).

This test will be employed to analyze the measurements of the following variables:

1. Fairness in discipline scale
2. Parents' communication index
3. Parental authority scale
4. Parental acceptance scale
5. Number of steadies
6. Number of steadies or dating partners with whom they had been in love.
For some data it is possible to make a judgment only about the direction of the difference but no statement can be made about the magnitude of the difference. In such cases the Wilcoxon test is inappropriate. Measures which give us only the direction of a difference can be tested for significance by the sign test. The only assumption underlying this test is that the variable has a continuous distribution. It does not make any assumptions about the form of the differences nor that the subjects are all drawn from the same population. The power efficiency of this test for small samples, \( N \) equals six, is about ninety-five percent (Siegel 54, pp. 68-75).

Data were obtained for some variables by using measures which yield only the direction of the differences and do not reveal anything about the magnitude of the differences. They were therefore analyzed by the use of the sign test. These variables are:

1. Dating frequency at ages 14, 15, 16
2. Dating status at ages 14, 15, 16.
ANALYSIS OF DATA

The empirical hypotheses used to test the general hypothesis, "Role change varies with role deprivation," will now be presented with the results of the analysis. The results of the analysis will be presented in a series of tables. Each table will precede the hypotheses to which its data are pertinent.

The term "pregnant group" will refer to those matched pairs in which the married girls were pregnant at the time of their marriage. The term "non-pregnant group" will refer to those matched pairs in which the married girls were allegedly not pregnant at the time of their marriage.

The term, "significant difference" will refer to differences which are significant on the .05 level of confidence. The term "highly significant difference" will refer to differences which are significant on the .01 level of confidence.

Analysis of Personality Needs Data

Results of the analysis of the data concerning the Edwards' P.P.S. variables and high school marriage are presented in Table 8.

Hypothesis 1. Married girls have higher Abasement scores than their controls. Stated in null form this hy-
Table 8. Means, direction of differences and tests of significance for married girls and their controls on the variables of the Edwards Personality Preference Schedule.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Total N = 37</th>
<th>Pregnant only N = 11</th>
<th>Non-pregnant only N = 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abasement</td>
<td>19.47</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>21.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexuality</td>
<td>10.21</td>
<td>13.36</td>
<td>13.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>9.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>15.34</td>
<td>13.20</td>
<td>13.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deference</td>
<td>12.96</td>
<td>12.61</td>
<td>12.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>10.66</td>
<td>12.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>12.79</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>12.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>10.91</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>12.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>17.79</td>
<td>18.12</td>
<td>17.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intraception</td>
<td>17.06</td>
<td>16.23</td>
<td>15.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succorance</td>
<td>12.34</td>
<td>12.74</td>
<td>12.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>10.02</td>
<td>11.18</td>
<td>9.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurturance</td>
<td>17.66</td>
<td>16.77</td>
<td>17.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>17.28</td>
<td>17.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>11.29</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>11.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aThese need scores were considered as relevant to adolescent role deprivation and high school age marriage. All scores have an expected range from 0 to 28.
Table 8. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean differences</th>
<th>&quot;t&quot;</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Pregnant</td>
<td>Non-pregnant</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \bar{d} )</td>
<td>( \bar{d} )</td>
<td>( \bar{d} )</td>
<td>( t )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abasement</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexuality</td>
<td>-3.16</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>-5.23</td>
<td>2.59*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deference</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-1.82</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.94**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>-1.54</td>
<td>-1.82</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.73</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intraception</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succorance</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-.73</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>-1.72</td>
<td>-.92</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurturance</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-.62</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.77</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically significant difference.

**Statistically highly significant difference; probabilities are based on the two-tailed test.
Hypothesis is: There are no differences in n Abasement scores between married girls and their controls.

The calculated t values are 1.26, 1.92, .47 for the total, pregnant and non-pregnant groups respectively. None of these differences are significant and the null hypothesis is not refuted. The direction of the difference is towards greater n Abasement scores for the married girls and falls just short of significance in the case of the pregnant group.

Hypothesis 2: Married girls have higher n Heterosexuality scores than their controls. Stated in null form the hypothesis is: There are no differences in n Heterosexuality scores between married girls and their controls.

The calculated t values are 2.59, .80 and 4.15 for the total, the pregnant and the non-pregnant groups respectively. There is a significant difference between the married and control groups for the total group and a highly significant difference for the non-pregnant group and their controls. The null hypothesis is refuted but the original hypothesis is not supported since the difference in scores is opposite the direction predicted. In the case of the pregnant group the difference is in the predicted direction but it fails to reach statistical significance.
Hypothesis 3: Married girls have lower \( n \) Achievement scores than their controls. Stated in null form this hypothesis is: There are no differences in \( n \) Achievement scores between married girls and their controls.

The calculated \( t \) values are \(.40, .86 \) and \(.91 \) for the total, pregnant and non-pregnant groups respectively. None of the differences are significant and the null hypothesis is not refuted. The original hypothesis remains unsupported.

Hypothesis 4: Married girls have lower \( n \) Endurance scores than their controls. Stated in null form this hypothesis is: There are no differences in \( n \) Endurance scores for married girls and their controls. The calculated \( t \) values are \(2.11, .24 \) and \(2.12 \) for the total, pregnant and non-pregnant groups respectively. The differences for the total group and the non-pregnant group are significant on the \( .05 \) level of confidence. The difference for the pregnant group fails to reach significance. The null hypothesis is refuted but the original hypothesis is not supported since the differences are opposite the direction predicted.

For eleven variables of the P.P.S. there was no prediction made of the direction of differences in scores between the married girls and their controls. Hypotheses were simply stated in null form. Inspection of Table 8 reveals that sig-
significant differences were found among the matched pairs for two of these variables. They are as follows:

Hypothesis 6: There are no differences in Order scores between married girls and their controls. The calculated t values are 2.94, 1.09 and 2.79 for the total, pregnant and non-pregnant groups respectively. The differences are highly significant for the total and non-pregnant groups but falls short of significance in the case of the pregnant group. The null hypothesis is refuted for the total and non-pregnant groups.

Hypothesis 8: There are no differences in Autonomy scores between married girls and their controls. The calculated t values are 1.40, .31 and 2.33 for the total, pregnant and non-pregnant groups. The differences are significant for the non-pregnant group. The direction of the difference being towards higher Autonomy scores for control girls. The differences for the total group fall just short of significance. The differences are in the opposite direction for the pregnant group.

Analysis of Parent-Child Relations Data

The results of the analysis of the parent-child relations data are presented in Table 9. The Wilcoxin matched pairs signed ranks test was employed in the analysis.
Table 9. Means, direction of differences and tests of significance for married girls and their controls on parent-child relationships measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Total(^{a})</th>
<th>Pregnant</th>
<th>Non-pregnant</th>
<th>Total Married</th>
<th>Cont. Married</th>
<th>Pregnant Cont.</th>
<th>Non-pregnant Cont.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of mother by child</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of father by child</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness in discipline</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with Mother</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16.91</td>
<td>15.03</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with Father</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>8.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority of mother</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority of father</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\)The number of cases (N) refers to the number of pairs for which a difference occurred. For the Wilcoxin signed-ranks test, comparisons in which no difference occurred (tied scores) are deleted from the original number of pairs. The calculation of Z is based on the N shown.

\(^{b}\)The total group contains two cases not included in either subgroup. Questionnaire data were obtained from two girls from whom interviews were not obtained and for whom pregnancy or nonpregnancy at marriage could not be established.
Table 9. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean differences</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Pregnant</td>
<td>Non-pregnant</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Pregnant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of mother by child</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of father by child</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>2.15*</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness in discipline</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with mother</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with father</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority of mother</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority of father</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The symbol $z$ refers to the Wilcoxon matched pairs signed-ranks test statistic in the case of continuous data.

*Statistically significant at $P < .05$.

**Statistically highly significant at $P < .01$; probabilities are based on the two-tailed test.
Hypothesis 16: Married girls are less accepting of their parents than their controls. Stated in null form this hypothesis is: There is no difference in parental acceptance scores between married girls and their controls.

The calculated $Z$ scores on acceptance of the mother are 1.26, .32 and 2.54 for the total, pregnant and non-pregnant groups respectively. The differences are significant for the non-pregnant group and approach significance for the total group. The null hypothesis is refuted in the case of non-pregnant group but the original hypothesis is not supported since the direction of the differences is opposite that which was predicted.

The calculated $Z$ scores on acceptance of the father are 2.15, .34 and 1.46 for the total, pregnant and non-pregnant groups respectively. The differences are significant for the total group and the null hypothesis is refuted in the case of the total group. The original hypothesis is not supported since the direction of the differences is opposite that which was predicted.

Hypothesis 17: Married girls have lower scores on the fairness in discipline scale than their controls. Stated in null form this hypothesis is: There is no difference in fairness in discipline scores between married girls and their controls.
The calculated $z$ scores are .18, .11 and .68 for the total, pregnant and non-pregnant groups respectively. The null hypothesis is not refuted and the original hypothesis remains unsupported.

Hypothesis 18: Married girls have lower scores on the parent communication index than their controls. Stated in null form this hypothesis is: There is no difference in parent communication scores between married girls and their controls.

The calculated $z$ scores for mother communication are 1.93, .36, 1.65 for the total, pregnant and non-pregnant groups respectively. The difference falls just short of significance in the case of the total group. The null hypothesis is not rejected and the original hypothesis is not supported. The differences were opposite of the predicted direction.

The calculated $z$ scores for father communication are .13, .78 and .97 for the total, pregnant and non-pregnant groups respectively. The differences are not significant. The null hypothesis is not refuted and the original hypothesis remains unsupported.

Hypothesis 19: Married girls rate their parental control as more authoritarian than their controls. Stated in null form this hypothesis is: There is no difference in
family authority scores between married girls and their controls.

The calculated $Z$ scores for mother authority scores are .10, 1.07 and .20 for the total, pregnant and non-pregnant groups respectively. The differences are not significant. The null hypothesis is not refuted and the original hypothesis remains unsupported.

The calculated $Z$ scores for father authority are .62, .46, .40 for the total, pregnant and non-pregnant groups respectively. The differences are not significant. The null hypothesis is not refuted and the original hypothesis is unsupported.

Analysis of Dating History Data

Results of the analysis of dating history and high school marriage data are presented in Table 10.

Hypothesis 20: Married girls began dating at an earlier age than their controls. Stated in null form this hypothesis is: There is no difference in age of first date between married girls and their controls.

The calculated $Z$ scores are 1.52, .33, 2.14 for the total pregnant and non-pregnant groups. The difference is significant for the non-pregnant group and approaches significance.
Table 10. Means, directions of differences and tests of significance for married girls and their controls on variables in dating experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age of 1st date</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.98</td>
<td>14.38</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of 1st steady</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.90</td>
<td>15.47</td>
<td>14.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of steadies</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of steadies in love with</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. friends married</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers age at marriage</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19.11</td>
<td>19.96</td>
<td>19.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at 14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at 15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at 16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The total group contains two cases not included in either subgroup. Questionnaire data were obtained from two girls from whom interviews were not obtained and for whom pregnancy or nonpregnancy at marriage could not be established.

bThe frequencies under M > C are those corresponding to comparisons in which married girls choose a response of greater dating frequency or seriousness than the control girls. M < C indicates the frequency of pairs where the control girls' responses exceeded the married girls' responses.

cIn dating frequency and seriousness comparisons, the frequencies under M > C and M < C equals N. N plus ties equals the original number of cases. However, N plus ties for the two subgroups will not equal a similar number for the total group for reasons given in footnote a. Also only 59 cases are included for the 15-year-old level since one girl was married by this age level. The 16-year-old level comparison is reduced to 50 pairs because ten girls were married by this age.
Table 10. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Total Pregnant</th>
<th>Non-pregnant</th>
<th>Total Pregnant</th>
<th>Non-pregnant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dating seriousness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at 14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at 15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at 16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[Na^b\]
Table 10. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean differences</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Pregnant</td>
<td>Nonpregnant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of 1st date</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of 1st steady</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of steadies</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. steadies in love with</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. friends married</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers age at marriage</td>
<td>-.85</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at 14</td>
<td>2.85**</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2.34*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at 15</td>
<td>2.06*</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>2.18*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at 16</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating seriousness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at 14</td>
<td>2.74*</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>2.94**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at 15</td>
<td>2.88**</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>2.08*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at 16</td>
<td>4.32**</td>
<td>2.71**</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{The symbol } \# \text{ refers to the Wilcoxon matched pairs signed-ranks test statistic in the case of continuous data or to the statistic used in the sign test in the case of greater or less than comparisons.} \]

*Statistically significant at \( P < .05 \).

**Statistically highly significant at \( P < .05 \); probabilities are based on the two-tailed test.
for the total group. The null hypothesis is refuted and the original hypothesis is supported.

Hypothesis 21: Married girls began to go steady at an earlier age than their controls. Stated in null form this hypothesis is: There is no difference in age at first steady between married girls and their controls.

The calculated z scores are 2.40, 1.37, and 2.95 for the total, pregnant and non-pregnant groups respectively. The difference is significant in the case of the total and non-pregnant groups. It approaches significance for the pregnant group. The null hypothesis is refuted and the original hypothesis is supported.

Hypothesis 22: Married girls had gone steady with a greater number of persons than their controls. Stated in null form this hypothesis is: There is no difference between married girls and their controls concerning the number of persons with whom they had gone steady.

The calculated z scores are 3.06, 1.83 and 2.45 for the total, the pregnant and the non-pregnant groups respectively. The difference is highly significant for the total group, significant for the non-pregnant group and falls just short of significance \( P < .06 \) for the pregnant group. The null hypothesis is refuted in the cases of the total and non-pregnant
groups and the original hypothesis is supported.

Hypothesis 24: Married girls dated more frequently than their controls. Stated in null form this hypothesis is: There is no difference between married girls and their controls with respect to frequency in dating.

Data on dating frequency were secured from girls for ages fourteen, fifteen and sixteen. The calculated Z scores for differences in dating frequency for the total group at ages fourteen, fifteen and sixteen were 2.85, 2.06 and .61 respectively. The difference is highly significant at age fourteen, significant at fifteen and not significant at age sixteen, although the difference is still in the predicted direction. The null hypothesis is refuted in the case of the total group for ages fourteen and fifteen and the original hypothesis is supported.

The calculated Z scores for dating frequency among the pregnant group for ages fourteen, fifteen and sixteen are 1.03, .47 and .71 respectively. The differences fail to reach significance. The null hypothesis is not refuted and the original hypothesis is unsupported. The differences are in the predicted direction.

The calculated Z scores for dating frequency among the non-pregnant group for ages fourteen, fifteen and sixteen are
2.34, 2.18 and 1.02 respectively. The differences are significant for ages fourteen and fifteen. The differences fall short of significance for age sixteen but the difference is in the predicted direction.

Hypothesis 25: Married girls did more serious dating at ages fourteen, fifteen and sixteen than did their controls. Stated in null form this hypothesis is: There is no difference in dating seriousness between the married girls and their controls at ages fourteen, fifteen and sixteen.

The calculated $Z$ scores for dating seriousness for the total group are 2.74, 2.88 and 4.32 for ages fourteen, fifteen and sixteen respectively. The differences are highly significant for ages fourteen, fifteen and sixteen. The null hypothesis is refuted and the original hypothesis is supported.

The calculated $Z$ scores for dating seriousness for the pregnant group are .26, 1.29, and 2.71 for ages fourteen, fifteen and sixteen respectively. The difference is not significant for ages fourteen and fifteen but is highly significant for age sixteen. Therefore the null hypothesis is refuted for the pregnant group in the case of age sixteen and the original hypothesis is supported.

The calculated $Z$ scores for dating seriousness for the non-pregnant group are 2.94, 2.08, 1.56 for ages fourteen, fif-
teen and sixteen respectively. The difference is highly significant for age fourteen and significant for age fifteen. Therefore the null hypothesis is refuted in the case of ages fourteen and fifteen and the original hypothesis is supported.

Some Additional Data

The major part of this dissertation has dealt with the relationship of adolescent role deprivation to high school marriage. However the degree of role deprivation need not be the only factor affecting the high school marriage rate. The strength of cultural deterrents to marriage while in high school may also be an important factor in determining the frequency of high school marriage. If cultural deterrents to high school marriage are weak or nonexistent one would predict a higher high school marriage rate than if there are strong negative sanctions to high school marriage. If we assume that parents, older sisters and peers serve as models for adolescents, and if these married early, one of the important social deterrents to early marriage would have been removed.

Data were obtained for both married and control girls with regard to their mothers' ages at marriage, number of friends who married while in high school and number of older sisters who married under twenty. This led to the following hypotheses:
Hypothesis 26: Married girls' mothers married at an earlier age than mothers of the controls. Stated in null form this hypothesis is: There is no difference between married girls and their controls with respect to their mothers' marriage ages.

Hypothesis 27: Married girls had a greater number of friends who married while in high school than did their controls. Stated in null form this hypothesis is: There is no difference between married girls and their controls with respect to the number of their friends who married in high school.

Hypothesis 28: Married girls had more older sisters who married under twenty than did their controls. Stated in null form this hypothesis is: There is no difference between married girls and their controls with respect to the number of their older sisters who married under age twenty.

The results for hypothesis 26 and 27 are reported in Table 10. The calculated Z scores for differences in mothers' age at marriage are 2.01, 2.53 and .60 for the total, pregnant and non-pregnant groups respectively. The differences are significant for the total and pregnant groups. The null hypothesis is refuted and the original hypothesis is supported in the case of the total and pregnant groups. The difference is in the predicted direction but fails to reach significance for the non-pregnant group.
The calculated Z scores for differences in number of friends who married while in high school are 2.53, 2.48 and .65 for the total, pregnant and non-pregnant groups respectively. The differences are highly significant for the total group and significant for the pregnant group. The null hypothesis is refuted for the total and pregnant groups and the original hypothesis is supported. The difference was in the predicted direction for the non-pregnant group but was not significant.

In both cases, mothers' age of marriage and number of friends who married while in high school, the pregnant group proved to have the significant differences.

It was not feasible to make a test of statistical significance of the hypothesis concerning number of older sisters who married under twenty on a matched pairs design basis. There were so few cases where both the married girl and her control had an equal number of older sisters. However, by treating them as two groups a trend is indicated. The married girls N = 59 reported twenty-one older sisters who married under age twenty, whereas the control girls reported four older sisters who married under age twenty.

Another cultural deterrent to marriage while in high school is the social class expectation to finish high school before marriage. The strength of this deterrent may vary
significantly between various strata in society. It is generally recognized that persons of lower socio-economic class positions marry at an earlier age than middle and upper class persons (Hollingshead 21, pp. 106), Warner and Lunt (58, p. 225). If early marriage is a pattern of the lower class subculture one would expect lower class girls to be over represented among those who marry while in high school.

Since data on parents' occupational and educational levels were obtained for a large group of girls it was possible to make a group comparison between the sixty married girls in the study and all others who completed the first questionnaire. This larger group (N = 357) is not an unbiased sample of high school girls in the communities included in the study. They were not randomly chosen nor were their numbers from any one community directly proportional to the number of married girls included from that community. These limitations need to be recognized in interpreting the results of test of this hypothesis.

Hypothesis 29: The frequency of marriage among high school girls is inversely related to their socio-economic background. Stated in null form this hypothesis is: There is no relationship between frequency of marriage among high school girls and their socio-economic background.
Of the married girls, 8.6 percent were from farm homes whereas a similar proportion, 9.7 percent of the unmarried girls who had completed the questionnaire had farm backgrounds. Results shown in Table 11* indicate that on the basis of the fathers' non-farm occupations, the lower socio-economic levels are over represented. The probability falls just short of statistical significance, \( P = .069 \).

Table 11. Percentage of non-farm married and unmarried girls' fathers by levels of occupational prestige scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North-Hatt score levels</th>
<th>Married N = 60</th>
<th>Unmarried N = 315</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 60</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 69</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 and over</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>-12.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marshall's \( C = 1.48 \) \( P = .069 \)

Added support is given to the hypothesis when educational levels of the girls' parents are analyzed. The data are presented in Tables 12 and 13. The calculated \( t \) value for mean differences in fathers' education is 2.68 and for mothers' education the corresponding \( t \) value is 3.75. Both are highly

significant with the difference being in the direction of less education for the married girls' parents.

The amount of difference in education is illustrated more dramatically when analyzed on the basis of differences in percentage of parents of married and unmarried girls to be found on various educational levels.

Table 12. Mean differences in educational levels for married and unmarried girls' parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Mean years of education</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married N = 60</td>
<td>Unmarried N = 357</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statistically highly significant at P < .05.

Table 13. Percentages of married and unmarried girls' parents by years of education

| Years of education | Fathers | | | |
|--------------------|---------|---|---|
|                    | Married | Unmarried | |
| 8 years or less    | 43.8    | 25.2       | |
| 9 - 12 years       | 49.0    | 51.8       | |
| Above 12 years     | 7.2     | 23.0       | |

|                    | Mothers | | | |
|--------------------|---------|---|---|
|                    | Married | Unmarried | |
| 8 years or less    | 32.1    | 15.7       | |
| 9 - 12 years       | 57.5    | 65.7       | |
| Above 12 years     | 10.4    | 19.1       | |
According to these data 15.8 percent more fathers of unmarried girls acquired education beyond high school than did the fathers of married girls. Of the married girls' fathers, 43.8 were restricted to eight years of education or less but only 25.2 of the unmarried girls' fathers had eight or less years of education.

A similar pattern obtains for mothers' education. There were 9.7 percent more mothers of unmarried girls than mothers of married girls in the educational category of above twelve years. At the other extreme there were sixteen percent more mothers of married girls than mothers of unmarried girls restricted to eight years of education or less.

These data lend support to the hypothesis that high school marriages occur with greater frequency among girls with lower socio-economic backgrounds.
DISCUSSION AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This dissertation reports an attempt to test empirically certain hypotheses derived from general theory. In one area of the study, namely dating history, the hypotheses were generally supported, but in two areas of the study, namely, personality needs and parent-child relations, the hypothesized relationships did not obtain. When hypotheses fail to test out several alternative explanations are possible.

In the first place the theoretical formulation may fail to fit the facts. It may be that role deprivation is not related to role change. It may be that differential personality needs are not related to the decision to marry while in high school or that parent-child relations are not related to the decision to marry while in high school. However, to declare that a theory is untenable because it is not supported by the data of part of one small study would be presumptuous indeed! Since the writer has no alternative theory to offer, it is his opinion that the failure to find more support for the theory must be attributed to other limitations of the study.

The writer believes that the major limitation of the study is that it departs from the ex post facto design in that the data were gathered after the fact of marriage had occurred. Therefore the married girls must report their
parent-child relationships on the basis of recall which is usually subject to inaccuracies. The change of status from a dependent adolescent to a married adult may have caused the girls to assess their relationships with their parents from a different perspective. The fact of marriage probably also affected the actual nature of the relationship since the parents began to deal with their married daughters as adults instead of children. Shifting to married status no doubt also affected the situational needs of the individual by relieving some of the needs and probably creating others. This may have affected the need scores reported on the P.P.S.

A second major limitation of the study was the measures employed to operationalize the conceptual variables. While the scales employed were thought to be the best available they seem not to have been sensitive enough to discriminate between married girls and their controls in the area of parent-child relationships and have produced somewhat ambiguous results in the area of personality needs. Although there was some degree of validation for these scales*, it is possible that they lacked validity when employed in the circumstances of this study. This limitation is no doubt related to the first one of post factum gathering of data.

*See section on Measures.
The inability to achieve candor in self reporting is a common problem in social science research. Distortion may have occurred even though the following precautions were taken: anonymity, innocuous titles, and the selection of the P.P.S. which supposedly controls this problem through its item selection. However, to report even on an anonymous questionnaire that one has strained relations with one's parents, or that one prefers jokes and literature involving sex, or that one prefers to become sexually excited, may be threatening to the ego. As a result there was an undefinable amount of distortion.

The writer believes that the hypotheses which failed to receive support did so because of these general limitations of the study, namely, post factum gathering of data, insensitivity of measures of the paper and pencil type, and lack of candor in reporting.

Following these general comments it seems appropriate to discuss the results of specific scales and items and their implications for future research. The results will be discussed in the following order: P.P.S. scores, parent-child relations scores, and dating history data.
The P. P. S. Scores

Of the thirty-seven usable replies of the P.P.S. there were only eleven cases of premaritally pregnant girls. This fact immediately circumscribes the generality value of these results from the pregnant subgroup.

No statistically significant differences were found with respect to \( n \) Abasement although they approached significance for the pregnant subgroup \( .05 < P < .10 \). It seems entirely logical that girls who bear the disgrace of a forced marriage would express a personality pattern of guilt, need for punishment and low self esteem. Since most of the marriages were still in their first year (median 5.7 months) the social humiliation may still be strongly felt and the event of marriage is perhaps less likely to have altered their self reporting with respect to \( n \) Abasement than may be the case for some other needs. The writer was surprised to note that the mean \( n \) Abasement scores for all categories of girls, married and controls, were well above the norm for women as given by Edwards. The Edwards' norm is 15.11 compared to 18.33, 18.56 and 21.72 for the controls, non-pregnant and pregnant groups, respectively. These high \( n \) Abasement scores may reflect highly legalistic and moralistic community backgrounds of the girls in the study.
The mean scores for $n$ Heterosexuality proved to be significantly lower for the non-pregnant group than their controls $P < .001$. The direction of this difference is the opposite of what had been predicted. Although not significant, the pregnant group had higher $n$ Heterosexuality scores than their controls. With the clearer light of hindsight the writer can now see some possible reasons why the predicted direction of differences failed to materialize. A re-examination of the items reveals that many of the proposed choices are alternatives no longer open or useful to the married girls. They appear at least in part to be the single person's substitutes for the heterosexual experience of marriage. Note these examples: "To go out with members of the opposite sex," "to be regarded as physically attractive to the opposite sex," "to read books and plays involving sex," "to listen to or tell jokes involving sex".

Since the data for this study were gathered, the writer has been informed of some empirical support for expecting lower $n$ Heterosexuality scores for married subjects. In the clinical use of the P.P.S. Charles* found that the $n$ Heterosexuality score declined with age, marriage and children in the home. Most of his respondents were married male job ap-

---

pliants. Charles suggests that the $n$ Heterosexuality score reflects the respondent's interest in heterosexually oriented social activities of single adolescents rather than the strength of the sex drive.

The higher $n$ Heterosexuality mean scores for the pregnant group, 13.64 as compared to 8.78 for the non-pregnant group, may indicate a less satisfying sex-social adjustment on the part of the pregnant group. Their marriages were, for the most part, forced on them by their pregnancies and they may feel deprived of the heterosexual social activities still being enjoyed by their peers. The non-pregnant on the other hand, entered marriage voluntarily. They may feel that they have accomplished these developmental tasks of adolescence and are ready to surrender such social activities for marital roles.

The differences in scores on a third selected variable, $n$ Endurance, proved to be statistically significant for the total and non-pregnant groups but the direction was the opposite of what was predicted. Of the unselected variables the scores on $n$ Order were significantly greater for the married group. In the case of $n$ Autonomy the scores were significantly higher for the non-pregnant group only.

The writer is unable to propose an alternative hypothesis which might satisfactorily account for these results. The
most reasonable explanation appears to be that the Edwards' P.P.S. does not measure stable personality need patterns but rather it tends to reflect the immediate situational needs of the respondent. If this were the case it would seem reasonable that the unmarried group would report greater n Heterosexuality. On this basis it would also appear logical to expect the married group who were experiencing for the first time the unromantic, demanding routines of housekeeping and living within budgets to report greater n Order and n Endurance. This hypothesis, that the P.P.S. measures immediate situational needs, would not explain the higher n Autonomy of the non-pregnant married girls.

With respect to personality needs in general the P.P.S. scores indicate greater personality differences between the non-pregnant group and their controls than the pregnant group and their controls. Perhaps it is to be expected that girls who elect marriage voluntarily would show greater differences from the single girls than the girls who had marriage forced on them by pregnancy.

In view of these results several suggestions for future research in the area of personality needs and marriage proneness emerge.

1. Employ a true ex post facto design using a more sensitive instrument than the paper and pencil test. Perhaps a
projective test such as the Thematic Appreception Test which is based on the same theory of needs might be used.

2. Further research is needed on the high school girls' perceptions of marriage. What needs do they perceive to be answered in marriage? Is there any consensus of what these needs are? Are there community and ethnic differences in the perception of the functions of marriage? To what extent do high school girls regard marriage in high school as a violation of the norms? A little evidence appeared in this study to show that the girls do regard high school marriage as a form of norm deviation. Married girls seemed under some compulsion to justify their marriage during interviews. Several cases expressed great relief that time had vindicated them from the public suspicion that their marriage had been forced by pregnancy.

When the married girls were asked what they would do different if they could go back to the time before they were married, twenty-six said they would finish high school first, four additional ones said they would wait until they were older or had economic security. Of the twenty-two who said they would do the same thing, eighteen said they planned to finish high school and four said that they had no intentions of finishing high school.

The expectation to finish high school seems to be strong,
but we have no clear indication of the extent to which the high school girls feel that both marriage and high school can be combined.

To what extent is marriage perceived as a means for satisfying the need for personal acceptance? If possible one might test the relationship of early marriage to the degree of acceptance by the peer group through the use of sociograms. This would be one more test of the role deprivation hypothesis. If the girls with low peer acceptance should enter high school marriage with greater frequency than girls with high peer acceptance there would be some evidence in support of the deprivation hypothesis.

Parent-Child Relations

The failure to find support for the hypotheses in the area of parent-child relations requires elaboration. The possibility that unsatisfactory parent-child relations have no measurable effect on the decision to marry while in high school cannot be completely ignored. In this study only three girls mentioned home tension as one of the reasons for marrying when they did. However, the Moss and Gingles study (46) found that early married girls scored significantly lower on the Minnesota family relationship scale. Although their study used less rigorous controls than the present one, their
data had the advantage of being obtained before the girls had married. It appears to this writer that the post factum gathering of data is a more tenable explanation of the failure of these hypotheses to be supported than to conclude that early marriage is unrelated to unsatisfactory family situations. As indicated earlier the marriage experience may cause girls to make a different assessment of their parent-child relationship and parents may deal with their children on a more adult level once they are married. Support for this contention may be obtained from the interview data taken from the married girls in this study. A number of girls reported that their parents, "opposed the marriage at first", but after a while they "accepted it", or "came around to our point of view". Such changes, real or perceived, may account for the significantly greater acceptance of the parents reported by the non-pregnant group and also for the better communication with mother for the total married group.

Due to the failure to get any significant differences in the area of parent-child relations two suggestions for further research are given:

1. Use a true ex post facto design employing the same scales to see if they discriminate between girls who will marry in high school and those who postpone marriage until after graduation.
2. Should this method prove fruitless, perhaps a different approach to the problem might be used. The motivations to escape from strained family relations via marriage may be largely unconscious. The admission of strained family relations may be threatening to the ego. Thus the respondents may be both unable and unwilling to verbalize their feelings concerning their parent-child interaction. Instruments used to probe such reactions would require the services of a trained psychologist.

3. To what extent would unsatisfactory relationships in social systems other than the family induce girls to marry early? Data were not available in this study on grade point averages, I.Q.s, participation in extra curricular activities and community organization, prestige ratings and acceptance by peers.

Dating History Data

Analysis of the data in this area showed consistent support for the hypotheses that marriage in high school is directly related to the length and seriousness of heterosexual involvement. The married girls began dating and going steady at an earlier age. They had a greater number of steadies and were in love with a greater number of their dates or steadies than the control girls.
The data as presented for age of first steady are an understatement of the difference between married girls and their controls. There were 16 cases of control girls who had never gone steady so it was manifestly impossible to make comparisons for these pairs. However, it is clear that these 16 pairs represent the maximum individual difference possible for each pair as of the date of the survey. This would lend added support to the hypothesis that married girls began going steady earlier.

On questions relating to frequency of dating the married group reported themselves as dating significantly more frequently at ages fourteen and fifteen than the controls. The differences are in the same direction for both the pregnant and non-pregnant subgroups but they fail to reach significance for the pregnant group. At age sixteen there are no significant differences between married and control girls. This would suggest that by age sixteen most adolescents who participate in dating have begun to do so.

With respect to dating seriousness the married group reported a significantly greater degree of dating seriousness than the controls at ages fourteen, fifteen and sixteen. For the non-pregnant group the significance of the difference declined from $P < .001$ at age fourteen to $P < .05$ at age six-
teen. The opposite trend was observed for the pregnant group. For the pregnant group the difference did not reach significance until age sixteen. These data suggest that with respect to dating seriousness the pregnant girls seem to resemble the controls more than the non-pregnant girls resemble the controls up to age sixteen when possibly a fairly rapid courtship and a pregnancy precipitates their marriage.

A few suggestions for further research emerged from the dating history data.

1. The data indicated that those who began dating at younger ages, dated more frequently and experienced more serious involvements were more likely to marry earlier. That is, they passed through the courtship transition at an earlier age. Little light has been shed on factors associated with early initiation of the dating process. In our society's dating and courtship system the initiative is a male prerogative. Further research might explore the social, psychological and physical factors in girls which lead to the early, frequent and steady selection as a dating partner.

2. The married girls reported more love affairs. They averaged approximately .5 love affair more than the controls. An analysis of social and psychological factors associated with proneness towards heterosexual involvement might be made.
Other Research Suggestions

1. This study concerned itself with the relation of role deprivation to high school marriage. Some of the additional data indicated that cultural deterrents also affect the frequency of high school marriage. The writer is not aware of any systematic study of the cultural inducements and impediments to early marriage. What effect has the movie and magazine presentation of marriage on a teenager's decision to marry? What is the effect of current economic prosperity?

2. This study focused on the married girls. Who are their husbands? Why do they select high school girls, generally several years their junior, as their brides?

3. Perhaps high school marriage could be analyzed as a form of crisis behavior. Of the sixty married girls in the study, twenty-one were premaritally pregnant (crises of accession), thirteen were related to draft separations (crises of separation) and three reported family tension (crises of demoralization). This involved sixty-three percent of all married cases included in this study.
SUMMARY

The objective of this investigation was to discover whether certain selected personality characteristics, parent-child relationships and dating experiences are associated with marriage among high school girls.

The conceptual variable involved in high school marriage was called role change. Role change was defined as a shift from one culturally defined pattern of behavior to another.

It was hypothesized that role change would vary directly with role deprivation. Role deprivation was defined as the degree to which reward expectations of a given role exceed the net rewards actually available.

To test this hypothesis a modified ex post facto design was employed. Data were gathered from sixty married girls who were individually matched with sixty single girls who served as controls. Individual matching was achieved with varying degrees of success on the following eight characteristics; sex, community, school attended, age, grade in school, father's occupation and education, religion, and family structure.

Marriage while in high school was used as an index of role change. Three groups of measures were used to operationalize role deprivation: personality needs, parent-child relationships and dating experience.
Selected need scores from the Edwards' Personality Preference Schedule were used as measures of role deprivation in the area of personality needs.

The Stone fairness in discipline scale, the Nye parental acceptance scale, the Landis-Stone parent authority scale, and a communications index constructed for this study were used as negative measures of role deprivation stemming from unsatisfactory parent-child relations.

In the area of dating experience, data concerning the length, frequency and seriousness of dating were used as measures of role deprivation. Appropriate parametric and nonparametric statistical techniques were used to test the hypothesized relationships.

None of the hypothesized relationships in the area of personality needs were supported. The hypothesized relationship with respect to one variable, greater Abasement for the pregnant sub-group, approached significance .05 < P < .10.

None of the hypothesized relationships in the area of parent-child relationships were supported by the data. The hypothesized relationships in the area of dating experience were generally supported. Girls who married prior to high school graduation on the average began dating and going steady at an earlier age, dated more frequently, had more steadies
and had fallen in love with a greater number of their boy friends than did the control girls. Additional data indicated that married girls experienced less social and cultural deterrents to early marriage than their controls.

Failure of hypothesized relationships to be supported was attributed to post factum gathering of data and inadequacy of the measures employed. Implications for further research in this area were suggested.
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APPENDIX A: EDWARDS P.P.S. DEFINITIONS OF PERSONALITY NEEDS

1. Achievement: To do one's best, to be successful, to accomplish tasks requiring skill and effort, to be a recognized authority, to accomplish something of great significance, to do a difficult job well, to solve difficult problems and puzzles, to be able to do things better than others, to write a great novel or play.

2. Deference: To get suggestions from others, to find out what others think, to follow instructions and do what is expected, to praise others, to tell others that they have done a good job, to accept the leadership of others, to read about great men, to conform to custom and avoid the unconventional, to let others make decisions.

3. Order: To have written work neat and organized, to make plans before starting on a difficult task, to have things organized, to keep things neat and orderly, to make advance plans when taking a trip, to organize details of work, to keep letters and files according to some system, to have meals organized and a definite time for eating, to have things arranged so that they run smoothly without change.

4. Exhibition: To say witty and clever things, to tell amusing jokes and stories, to talk about personal adventures and experiences, to have others notice and comment upon one's appearance, to say things just to see what effect it will have on others, to talk about personal achievements, to be the center of attention, to use words that others do not know the meaning of, to ask questions others cannot answer.

5. Autonomy: To be able to come and go as desired, to say what one thinks about things, to be independent of others in making decisions, to feel free to do what one wants, to do things that are unconventional, to avoid situations where one is expected to conform, to do things without regard to what others may think, to criticize those in positions of authority, to avoid responsibilities and obligations.

6. Affiliation: To be loyal to friends, to participate in friendly groups, to do things for friends, to form new friendships, to make as many friends as possible, to share things with friends, to do things with friends rather than alone, to form strong attachments, to write letters to friends.

7. Intraception: To analyze one's motives and feelings, to observe others, to understand how others feel about prob-
lems, to put one's self in another's place, to judge people by why they do things rather than by what they do, to analyze the behavior of others, to analyze the motives of others, to predict how others will act.

8. Succorance: To have others provide help when in trouble, to seek encouragement from others, to have others be kindly, to have others be sympathetic and understanding about personal problems, to receive a great deal of affection from others, to have others do favors cheerfully, to be helped by others when depressed, to have others feel sorry when one is sick, to have a fuss made over one when hurt.

9. Dominance: To argue for one's point of view, to be a leader in groups to which one belongs, to be regarded by others as a leader, to be elected or appointed chairman of committees, to make group decisions, to settle arguments and disputes between others, to persuade and influence others to do what one wants, to supervise and direct the actions of others, to tell others how to do their jobs.

10. Abasement: To feel guilty when one does something wrong, to accept blame when things do not go right, to feel that personal pain and misery suffered does more good than harm, to feel the need for punishment for wrong doing, to feel better when giving in and avoiding a fight than when having one's own way, to feel the need for confession of errors, to feel depressed by inability to handle situations, to feel timid in the presence of superiors, to feel inferior to others in most respects.

11. Nurturance: To help friends when they are in trouble, to assist others less fortunate, to treat others with kindness and sympathy, to forgive others, to do small favors for others, to be generous with others, to sympathize with others who are hurt or sick, to show a great deal of affection toward others, to have others confide in one about personal problems.

12. Change: To do new and different things, to travel, to meet new people, to experience novelty and change in daily routine, to experiment and try new things, to eat in new and different places, to try new and different jobs, to move about the country and live in different places, to participate in new fads and fashions.

13. Endurance: To keep at a job until it is finished, to complete any job undertaken, to work hard at a task, to keep at a puzzle or problem until it is solved, to work at a
single job before taking on others, to stay up late working in order to get a job done, to put in long hours of work without distraction, to stick at a problem even though it may seem as if no progress is being made, to avoid being interrupted while at work.

14. Heterosexuality: To go out with members of the opposite sex, to engage in social activities with the opposite sex, to be in love with someone of the opposite sex, to kiss those of the opposite sex, to be regarded as physically attractive by those of the opposite sex, to participate in discussions about sex, to read books and plays involving sex, to listen to or to tell jokes involving sex, to become sexually excited.

15. Aggression: To attack contrary points of view, to tell others what one thinks about them, to criticize others publicly, to make fun of others, to tell others off when disagreeing with them, to get revenge for insults, to become angry, to blame others when things go wrong, to read newspaper accounts of violence.
APPENDIX B: HIGH SCHOOL SURVEY

This is a scientific survey of high school students' dating experience, family relations, plans and opinions. Try to give accurate answers; when in doubt, use your best judgment.

There is a great deal written and said about your age group, but much of it is not based on facts. This study is intended to supply many important facts about what young people of your age feel, think and do.

Directions:

1. Read each question carefully once, read all the answers and then answer to the best of your ability.
2. Place an X squarely in the blank by your answer.
3. If you wish to comment on any item, write in the margin next to the item.
4. Some questions refer to parents. Answer these for whomever you usually live with. For example, if you usually live with your stepfather or uncle, answer the father questions for them.
5. Remember, this is not a test. What you think and do are the basis of this research.

Remember, you will not be identified personally. We are interested in learning about what is true of your age group.

A. Some Descriptive Facts

1. Sex: (1) female; (2) male. Your birthday: Year____ Month____
2. Circle your grade in school: 8, 9, 10, 11, 12.
3. Your school __________________________
4. What is the name of the work your father does; his specific occupational title? (or former one if he is not living or retired) __________________________
5. Circle the highest grade that each of your parents finished in school: School College Post
   Father 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 1 2 3 4 1 2 3 4
   Mother 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 1 2 3 4 1 2 3 4
6. What adults have you lived with most of your life? 
   (1) original father and mother_; (2) mother and step-
   father_; (3) father and stepmother_; (4) father
   only_; (5) mother only ___; (6) foster parents (adop-
   ted)___; if none of these, who?________________________

7. Number of brothers and sisters: (1) older brother:___;
   (2) younger brothers_; (3) older sisters_; (4)
   younger sisters __.

8. Where have you lived most of your life? (1) on a farm___;
   (2) in the country, but not on a farm___; (3) in a town
   or city___.
   If in towns or cities, name them
   City________________________ State___________________________

9. What church or Sunday school did you generally attend
   up to age 14 or 15? (Like Methodist, Catholic, Lutheran,
   etc.) If none, write none.____________

10. Are you a member of this church? (1) yes__, (2) no__.

11. If no, are you a member of some other denomination
    (1) no_; (2) yes, its name is____________________

12. How often did you attend Sunday school between the ages
    of 6 and 14? (1) never_; (2) occasionally ___; (3)
    about half the time___; (4) most of the time___; (5)
    regularly___.

13. How often do you attend Sunday morning church services?
    (1) never_; (2) several times a year___; (3) once a
    month ___; (4) two or three times a month ___; (5) prac-
    tically every Sunday ___.

B. Dating Information

For clarity, a DATE is defined as a BOY CALLING FOR OR MEETING
A GIRL BY PREARRANGEMENT AND THE TWO BEING LEFT ALONE OR GOING
OUT ALONE, or with others of their ages. It includes double
dating.
1. On the average, how often have you dated during the past month? (1) three or more times a week; (2) twice a week; (3) once a week; (4) once a month; (5) no date during the month.

2. In comparison with you, what was the age of the last person you dated? (1) same age, less than a year difference; (2) one or two years younger; (3) one year older; (4) two years older; (5) three or more years older; (6) I don't know; (7) I have never dated.

3. Was the person whom you last dated attending high school? (1) yes; (2) no, he had dropped out; (3) no, he had graduated.

4. At what age did you start to date? (1) never dated; (2) 12 or younger; (3) thirteen; (4) fourteen; (5) fifteen; (6) sixteen; (7) seventeen; (8) eighteen or older.

5. In comparison with you at the time was the first person you ever dated (1) same age, less than a year difference; (2) one or two years younger; (3) one year older; (4) two years older; (5) three or more years older; (6) I don't know; (7) I have never dated.

6. How old were you when you first began to go steady—exclusively with one person by agreement? (1) never have; (2) thirteen or younger; (3) fourteen; (4) fifteen; (5) sixteen; (6) seventeen or older.

7. In comparison with you at the time, was the first person you went steady with (1) same age, less than a year difference; (2) one or two years younger; (3) one year older; (4) two years older; (5) three or more years older; (6) I don't know; (7) I have never gone steady.

8. Have most of your dates been with persons (1) still in school; (2) persons who dropped out of high school; (3) persons who had already graduated from high school.

9. Place a check on a line below to show how frequently you have dated in relation to persons of your sex and age group when you were each of these ages.
117

Your relative dating frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your age at the time</th>
<th>less than most</th>
<th>about the same as most</th>
<th>more than most</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Place a check on a line below to show what your dating arrangements were or are for each of the ages given below. (Dated around means you dated different persons or one person repeatedly but with no agreement not to date others; went steady means agreement not to date any other person)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your age at the time</th>
<th>Didn't date</th>
<th>Dated around</th>
<th>Went steady</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How many persons have you "gone steady" with since you began dating? (Give the exact number or the closest estimate you can make to it) ____________________

12. How many different persons whom you have dated or gone steady with have you felt you were in love with? (Give the exact number or the closest estimate you can make to it) ____________________

13. How soon after first becoming interested in a person whom you are dating or would like to date, do you feel a strong physical attraction to him (her)? (1) at first acquaintance ___; (2) after our first date ___; (3) after several dates ___; (4) after about a month ___; (5) after two months ___; (6) after three months ___; (7) after four or more months ___.
14. How serious are you with the person you are now dating?
   (1) doesn't apply, I'm not dating.
   (2) I'm married
   (3) am dating several persons
   (4) am dating just one person, just for companionship
   (5) am dating just one person and we are pretty serious
       about each other
   (6) am dating just one person and we have discussed the
       possibility of getting married someday
   (7) am dating just one person and we have definitely
       agreed we will get married someday though we haven't
       become officially engaged
   (8) I am engaged—that is, we have definitely announced
       that we will be married.

C. Your Plans and Opinions

1. Do you plan to finish high school (1) yes___; (2) ___.

2. What plans do you have for education beyond high school?
   (1) no further plans___; (2) business school___; (3) nurses
       training___; (4) college___; (5) other____________

3. How sure are you of these plans? (1) very certain___; (2)
       fairly certain___; (3) not at all certain__.

3. When do you expect to get married? (1) I am married___;
   (2) perhaps before high school graduation___; (3) probably
       right after high school graduation___; (4) I will probably
       work for several years after high school graduation___;
       (5) I will probably go to college and graduate first___;
       (6) I will finish college and probably work for several
           years before I marry___.

4. How many of your school mates do you like? (1) none___;
   (2) a few___; (3) some of them___; (4) most of them___;
   (5) practically all of them___.

5. In comparison with other persons in your school how well
   do you think you are liked by your school mates? (1) much
   less than most___; (2) some less than most___; (3) about
   the same as most___; (4) more than most___; (5) much more
   than most___.

6. If you marry to what extent will you miss the life you have
   had as a single person? (1) not at all___; (2) very little
   ___; (3) to some extent___; (4) very much____.
7. In your opinion, to what extent will it trouble you to give up your personal freedom when you marry? (1) Not at all__; (2) very little__; (3) to some extent__; (4) very much__.

8. In your opinion, will adjustment to married life be difficult for you? (1) not at all__; (2) very little__; (3) to some extent__; (4) very much__.

9. Do you ever have doubts as to whether you will enjoy living exclusively in marriage with one member of the opposite sex? (1) never__; (2) hardly__; (3) occasionally__; (4) frequently__.

10. In your opinion, to what extent will the responsibilities of married life be enjoyable to you? (1) very much so__; (2) fairly enjoyable__; (3) not too much__; (4) not at all__.

11. How happy do you think you will be if you marry? (1) very happy__; (2) happy__; (3) unhappy__; (4) very unhappy__.

12. Do you ever have doubts about your chance of having a successful marriage? (1) never__; (2) rarely__; (3) occasionally__; (4) frequently__.

13. Do you think you will find (or have found) a person who is a suitable marriage partner for you? (1) yes__; (2) no__.

14. Do you think it would be advisable for you always to remain single? (1) yes__; (2) no__.

15. My father says and does things that makes me feel that I am not trusted by him. (1) very often__; (2) often__; (3) sometimes__; (4) seldom__; (5) never__.

16. My mother says and does things that makes me feel that I am not trusted by her. (1) very often__; (2) often__; (3) sometimes__; (4) seldom__; (5) never__.

17. I believe my father feels that I have the ability to make my own decisions. (1) none of them__; (2) few of them__; (3) some of them__; (4) most of them__; (5) all of them__.

18. I believe my mother feels I have the ability to make my own decisions. (1) none of them__; (2) few of them__; (3) some of them__; (4) most of them__; (5) all of them__.
19. I believe my father has tried to make me the kind of person who can make his (or her) own decisions. (1) very much; (2) much; (3) some; (4) a little; (5) not at all.

20. I believe my mother has tried to make me the kind of person who can make his (or her) own decisions. (1) very much; (2) much; (3) some; (4) a little; (5) not at all.

21. My parents quarrel-get mad at each other: (1) very often; (2) often; (3) sometimes; (4) seldom; (5) never.

22. My parents disagree, but don't necessarily get mad at each other: (1) very often; (2) often; (3) sometimes; (4) seldom; (5) never.

23. From what you have observed, would you say your mother is: (1) completely happy in her marriage; (2) generally happy and satisfied; (3) happy about some things, unhappy about others; (4) more unhappy than happy; (5) very unhappy and dissatisfied.

24. From what you have observed, would you say that your father is: (1) completely happy in his marriage; (2) generally happy and satisfied; (3) happy about some things, unhappy about others; (4) more unhappy than happy; (5) very unhappy and dissatisfied.

25. As long as they really love each other, two people should have no real trouble getting along with each other in marriage. (1) strongly agree; (2) agree; (3) disagree; (4) strongly disagree.

26. There are many things more important in love than physical attraction for each other. (1) strongly agree; (2) agree; (3) disagree; (4) strongly disagree.

27. It is not necessary for two people who love each other to consider differences in their religion or education before they marry. (1) strongly agree; (2) agree; (3) disagree; (4) strongly disagree.

28. Love is no more mysterious than many things usually taken for granted. (1) strongly agree; (2) agree; (3) disagree; (4) strongly disagree.
29. To some extent, fate plays a part in the way two people find they love each other. (1) strongly agree; (2) agree; (3) disagree; (4) strongly disagree.

30. Most of us could love anyone of several people equally well. (1) strongly agree; (2) agree; (3) disagree; (4) strongly disagree.

31. There is no love which will not decrease with the passage of time. (1) strongly agree; (2) agree; (3) disagree; (4) strongly disagree.

32. Love is more precious to persons who have had to overcome obstacles for it. (1) strongly agree; (2) agree; (3) disagree; (4) strongly disagree.

33. A person who is really in love always has some feeling of jealousy as well. (1) strongly agree; (2) agree; (3) disagree; (4) strongly disagree.

34. Real love is usually based on the immediate reaction to a person when you first meet him or her. (1) strongly agree; (2) agree; (3) disagree; (4) strongly disagree.

35. When one is truly in love one feels a sense of excitement all over. (1) strongly agree; (2) agree; (3) disagree; (4) strongly disagree.

36. Along with periods of great excitement, love is also characterized by periods of despair. (1) strongly agree; (2) agree; (3) disagree; (4) strongly disagree.

37. If necessary, lovers owe it to each other to marry against their parents' objections. (1) strongly agree; (2) agree; (3) disagree; (4) strongly disagree.

38. When two persons are in love they can ignore what other people think about them and what they do. (1) strongly agree; (2) agree; (3) disagree; (4) strongly disagree.
APPENDIX C: FAMILY RELATIONS

1. Is your family like this? For each statement:
   If the answer is yes, mark X under yes.
   If the answer is no, mark X under no.
   If the answer is partly yes and partly no, mark X under partly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>children are punished more severely than children in other families.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children are disciplined when they don't need it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some children in the family are punished more severely than others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parents get all the facts before punishing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enforcement of rules is not consistent; sometimes punishment is harsh, sometimes not.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Rating your own family on discipline would you say discipline is (1) very unfair; (2) rather unfair; (3) somewhat fair and somewhat unfair; (4) quite fair; (5) very fair.

3. Have you ever had serious discussions with your father about dates and dating in general? (1) never; (2) seldom; (3) sometimes; (4) often; (5) very often.

4. Have you ever had serious discussions with your mother about dates and dating in general? (1) never; (2) seldom; (3) sometimes; (4) often; (5) very often.

5. When you have wanted to talk with your father about your dates, did he seem interested? (1) very much; (2) much; (3) some; (4) a little; (5) not at all.

6. When you have wanted to talk with your mother about your dates, did she seem interested? (1) very much; (2) much; (3) some; (4) a little; (5) not at all.

7. Has your father helped you to understand boys (or girls) and to learn how to act around boys (girls) you date? (1) very much; (2) much; (3) some; (4) a little; (5) not at all.

8. Has your mother helped you to understand boys (or girls) and to learn how to act around boys (girls) you date? (1) very much; (2) much; (3) some; (4) a little; (5) not at all.
9. Have you ever had serious discussions with your father about questions of sexual morality? (1) never; (2) seldom; (3) sometimes; (4) often; (5) very often.

10. Have you ever had serious discussions with your mother about questions of sexual morality? (1) never; (2) seldom; (3) sometimes; (4) often; (5) very often.

11. When you have wanted to talk about questions of sexual morality with your father has he seemed interested? (1) very much; (2) much; (3) some; (4) a little; (5) not at all.

12. When you have wanted to talk about questions of sexual morality with your mother has she seemed interested? (1) very much; (2) much; (3) some; (4) a little; (5) not at all.

13. Has your father helped you to arrive at a set of standards you use to guide your sexual behavior? (1) very much; (2) much; (3) some; (4) a little; (5) not at all.

14. Has your mother helped you to arrive at a set of standards you use to guide your sexual behavior? (1) very much; (2) much; (3) some; (4) a little; (5) not at all.

15. With regard to "evenings out," my mother allows me: (1) every evening out if I wish; (2) some school nights; (3) only week-end evenings; (4) just an occasional evening out; (5) almost no evening out.

16. With regard to "evenings out," my father allows me: (1) every evening out if I wish; (2) some school nights; (3) only week-end evenings; (4) just an occasional evening out; (5) almost no evening out.

17. With regard to where I go on dates, my mother criticizes: (1) never; (2) seldom; (3) as often as not; (4) usually; (5) always.

18. With regard to where I go on dates, my father criticizes: (1) never; (2) seldom; (3) as often as not; (4) usually; (5) always.

19. Considering the family income, when I need money my mother is: (1) very generous; (2) fairly generous; (3) about average; (4) stingy; (5) very stingy.

20. Considering the family income, when I need money my father is: (1) very generous; (2) fairly generous; (3) about average; (4) stingy; (5) very stingy.
21. When requiring me to do something my mother explains the reason: (1) always____; (2) usually____; (3) sometimes____; (4) seldom____; (5) never____.

22. When requiring me to do something my father explains the reason: (1) always____; (2) usually____; (3) sometimes____; (4) seldom____; (5) never____.

23. Family problems are discussed with me by my mother: (1) always____; (2) usually____; (3) sometimes____; (4) seldom____; (5) never____.

24. Family problems are discussed with me by my father: (1) always____; (2) usually____; (3) sometimes____; (4) seldom____; (5) never____.

25. My mother respects my opinions and judgment: (1) never____; (2) seldom____; (3) sometimes____; (4) usually____; (5) always____.

26. My father respects my opinions and judgment: (1) never____; (2) seldom____; (3) sometimes____; (4) usually____; (5) always____.

27. Do you enjoy letting your mother in on your "Big" moments? (1) very much____; (2) somewhat____; (3) hardly at all____; (4) not at all____.

28. Do you enjoy letting your father in on your "Big" moments? (1) very much____; (2) somewhat____; (3) hardly at all____; (4) not at all____.

29. Do you enjoy talking over your plans with your mother? (1) always____; (2) usually____; (3) sometimes____; (4) seldom____; (5) never____.

30. Do you enjoy talking over your plans with your father? (1) always____; (2) usually____; (3) sometimes____; (4) seldom____; (5) never____.

31. Where you are concerned do you think "what mother doesn't know won't hurt her?" (1) always____; (2) often____; (3) sometimes____; (4) seldom____; (5) never____.

32. Where you are concerned do you think "what father doesn't know won't hurt him?" (1) always____; (2) often____; (3) sometimes____; (4) seldom____; (5) never____.

33. Have you ever felt ashamed of your mother? (1) often____; (2) sometimes____; (3) once in awhile____; (4) seldom____; (5) never____.
34. Have you ever felt ashamed of your father? (1) often; (2) sometimes; (3) once in awhile; (4) seldom; (5) never.

35. Do you enjoy doing extra things to please your mother that you are not required to do? (1) often; (2) sometimes; (3) seldom; (4) never.

36. Do you enjoy doing extra things to please your mother that you are not required to do? (1) often; (2) sometimes; (3) seldom; (4) never.

37. If it were possible to change real parents into ideal parents, what would you change about your mother? (1) just about everything; (2) a large number of things; (3) a few things; (4) one or two things; (5) nothing.

38. If it were possible to change real parents into ideal parents, what would you change about your father? (1) just about everything; (2) a large number of things; (3) a few things; (4) one or two things; (5) nothing.

39. Do you confide in your mother when you get into some kind of trouble? (1) all problems; (2) most; (3) some; (4) few; (5) none.

40. Do you confide in your father when you get into some kind of trouble? (1) all problems; (2) most; (3) some; (4) few; (5) none.

41. Do you feel rebellious around your mother? (1) always; (2) often; (3) sometimes; (4) seldom; (5) never.

42. Do you feel rebellious around your father? (1) always; (2) often; (3) sometimes; (4) seldom; (5) never.

43. In general, do you feel that you get a "square deal" from your mother? (1) always; (2) usually; (3) sometimes; (4) seldom; (5) never.

44. In general, do you feel that you get a "square deal" from your father? (1) always; (2) usually; (3) sometimes; (4) seldom; (5) never.

45. Do you think "Oh, what's the use!" after you have tried to explain your conduct to your mother? (1) often; (2) sometimes; (3) seldom; (4) never.
46. Do you think "Oh, what's the use!" after you have tried to explain your conduct to your father? (1) often; (2) sometimes; (3) seldom; (4) never.

47. Are you interested in what your mother thinks of you? (1) very much; (2) somewhat; (3) hardly at all; (4) not at all.

48. Are you interested in what your father thinks of you? (1) very much; (2) somewhat; (3) hardly at all; (4) not at all.

E. Some Additional Information

1. What was your mother's age when she was married____.

2. What was your father's age when he was married____.

3. If any of your older brothers or sisters are married, what are their ages and educational level of the time of their marriages?

   brothers
   (1) age____ highest grade____
   (2) ______
   (3) ______

   sisters
   (1) age____ highest grade____
   (2) ______
   (3) ______

4. How many persons whom you have had as close friends have gotten married while they were still in high school? (1) none; (2) one; (3) two; (4) three; (5) if more than three, the exact number is ____.

Numbers 5, 6 and 7 for girls only!

5. For girls: at what age did you first menstruate?____

6. For girls: where did you get your first information about menstruation? (1) from girl friends; (2) from a sister; (3) from my mother; (4) from my father; (5) from a teacher; (6) from reading a book recommended by my parents or another adult; (7) from reading things other children gave me; (8) other(s)____________________

7. For girls: in terms of what you know now, would you say that your first information about menstruation was (1) very badly misleading; (2) pretty much misleading; (3) not too misleading; (4) not at all misleading.
Now for all students:

8. Where did you get your first information about sex in general? (1) from friends; (2) from a brother or sister; (3) from my mother; (4) from my father; (5) from a teacher; (6) from reading a book recommended by my parents or an adult; (7) from reading things over children gave me; (8) other(s)

9. In terms of what you know now, would you say your first information about sex was: (1) very badly misleading; (2) pretty much misleading; (3) not too misleading; (4) not at all misleading.

10. Where have you received most of present knowledge about sex? (1) from friends; (2) from a brother or sister; (3) from my mother; (4) from my father; (5) from a teacher; (6) from reading a book recommended by my parents or an adult; (7) from reading things other children gave me; (8) Other(s)

11. Do (or did) you feel your present knowledge about sex is (or was) adequate for marriage? (1) yes; (2) no; (3) only partly.

12. What was your father's attitude toward your early questions about the origin of babies and sex in general? (1) told me I was naughty to ask about such things and punished me; (2) told me I would be told when I was older; (3) just ignored me; (4) lied to me about these things; (5) gave me a very brief, not too complete answer; (6) gave me a frank answer and encouraged my questions about these things; (7) I never indicated my curiosity to him.

13. What was your mother's attitude toward your early questions about the origin of babies and sex in general? (1) told me I was naughty to ask about such things and punished me; (2) told me I would be told when I was older; (3) just ignored me; (4) lied to me about these things; (5) gave me a very brief, not too complete answer; (6) gave me a frank answer and encouraged my questions about these things; (7) I never indicated my curiosity to her.

Thank You Again

Your cooperation and sincerity in filling out these questionnaires is greatly appreciated. From this knowledge, we hope to be able to make recommendations to parents and teachers which should help young people meet important issues in their lives in a wholesome manner.
APPENDIX D: WIFE'S SCHEDULE

1. Where did you meet your husband? (1) at school; (2) home of a friend; (3) home of a relative; (4) where I work; (5) at church; (6) "pick-up"; (7) in a neighborhood group; (8) at a dance place, skating rink, etc.; (9) other.

2. How long had you known him before you were engaged? (1) we weren't formally engaged; (2) less than one month; (3) one to three months; (4) three to six months; (5) six to nine months; (6) nine months to one year; (7) one to two years; (8) two to three years; (9) most of my life.

3. What was the length of time between your engagement (formal or agreement just between you and your husband that you were going to get married) and your marriage? (1) less than one month; (2) one to three months; (3) three to six months; (4) six to nine months; (5) nine months to one year; (6) one to two years; (7) over two years.

4. Was your marriage in (1) the same town as you lived in; (2) as your husband lived in if his was different from yours; (3) in an Iowa town different from both of yours; (4) out of the state.

5. When were you married? Year Month Day

6. Who was present at your marriage? (Check as many as apply)
   ____ my mother  ____ my mother-in-law
   ____ my father  ____ my father-in-law
   ____ other relatives of mine  ____ other relatives of my
   ____ some of my friends  ____ husband
   ____ just the witnesses  ____ some of my husbands friends

7. Was your marriage performed by a (1) justice of peace; (2) a judge; (3) a clergyman.

8. How old is your husband?

9. What was your husband's highest grade in school?

10. What was your husband's occupation at the time of your marriage? (1) was a student; (2) was not going to school, but not employed; (3) his job title (describe his work) was.
11. What was the attitude of your father toward your marriage at the time of marriage? (1) strongly disapproved; (2) in general disapproved, but not completely; (3) in general approved but not too greatly; (4) strongly approved; (5) didn't seem to care too much.

12. What was the attitude of your mother toward your marriage at the time of marriage? (1) strongly disapproved; (2) in general disapproved, but not completely; (3) in general approved but not too greatly; (4) strongly approved; (5) didn't seem to care too much.

13. What was the attitude of your father-in-law toward your marriage at the time of marriage? (1) strongly disapproved; (2) in general disapproved, but not completely; (3) in general approved, but not too greatly; (4) strongly approved; (5) didn't seem to care too much.

14. What was the attitude of your mother-in-law toward your marriage at the time of marriage? (1) strongly disapproved; (2) in general disapproved, but not completely; (3) in general approved, but not too greatly; (4) strongly approved; (5) didn't seem to care too much.

15. What is the present attitude of your father toward your marriage? (1) strongly disapproves; (2) in general disapproves, but not completely; (3) in general approves, but not too greatly; (4) strongly approves; (5) doesn't seem to care too much.

16. What is the present attitude of your mother toward your marriage? (1) strongly disapproves; (2) in general disapproves, but not completely; (3) in general approves, but not too greatly; (4) strongly approves; (5) doesn't seem to care too much.

17. What is the present attitude of your father-in-law toward your marriage? (1) strongly disapproves; (2) in general disapproves, but not completely; (3) in general approves, but not too greatly; (4) strongly approves; (5) doesn't seem to care too much.

18. What is the present attitude of your mother-in-law toward your marriage? (1) strongly disapproves; (2) in general disapproves, but not completely; (3) in general approves, but not too greatly; (4) strongly approves; (5) doesn't seem to care too much.
19. What is your present attitude toward your father-in-law? 
   (1) like him very much_; (2) like him somewhat_; (3) dislike her somewhat_; (4) dislike her very much_.

20. What is your present attitude toward your mother-in-law? 
   (1) like her very much_; (2) like her somewhat_; (3) dislike her somewhat_; (4) dislike her very much_.

21. For the time since you were married, list in order and with the length of time where you lived; use own place if you and your husband lived by yourselves, wife's parents, husband's parents, or describe other arrangements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>place</th>
<th>from (date of marriage)</th>
<th>to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>from</td>
<td></td>
<td>to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from</td>
<td></td>
<td>to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from</td>
<td></td>
<td>to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. How often do you see or visit your parents? (1) every day practically_; (2) two or three times a week_; (3) about once a week_; (4) two or three times a month_; (5) about once a month_; (6) if less often, how frequently._

23. How often do you see your husband's parents? (1) every day practically_; (2) two or three times a week_; (3) about once a week_; (4) two or three times a month_; (5) about once a month_; (6) if less often, how frequently._

24. Just prior to your marriage, how active were you in school organizations? 
   very active fairly active not very didn't participate
   hold office on committees active participate
   band-orchestra
   choral groups
   dramatics
   debate-oratory
   school paper-annual
   student government
   hobby clubs
   others

25. Just prior to your marriage, how often did you attend Sunday school? (1) practically never_; (2) several times a year_; (3) once a month_; (4) two or three times a month_; (5) practically every Sunday_.
26. Just prior to your marriage, how often did you attend Sunday morning church services: (1) practically never_; (2) several times a year_; (3) once a month_; (4) two or three times a month_; (5) practically every Sunday_.

27. What church did your husband attend prior to your marriage? (1) none_; (2) its name is_____________________

   Was he a member of this church? (1) yes_; (2) no__

   If no, was he a member of some other church? (1) no_; (2) yes, its name is_____________________

28. What church do you attend now?

   (1) none_; (2) or its name_____________________

29. What church does he attend now?

   (1) none_; (2) or its name_____________________

30. How often do you and your husband attend church together?

   (1) almost every Sunday_; (2) about two or three times a month_; (3) about once a month_; (4) several times a year_; (5) practically never_.

You are doing fine; that makes it two down and one to go.
APPENDIX E: OUTLINE SHEET FOR INTERVIEW

Husband father occupation__________________________________________

We are going to ask some questions now in which we would like to have answers in your own words. Just try to describe your reactions as best you can.

The first area we would like to ask about is that of money matters.

I. Money Matters

1. What is your husband's present job?____________
or high school_____ college student______

2. Is he satisfied with this work:
   ______ present income, too low
   ______ present income, adequate
   ______ future income, advancement unsatisfactory
   ______ future income, advancement satisfactory

3. Are you satisfied with this work?
   ______ present income, too low
   ______ present income, adequate
   ______ future income, advancement unsatisfactory
   ______ future income, advancement satisfactory

4. Did your marriage change your husband's educational plans?
   ______ yes, he won't be able to finish high school
   ______ yes, he won't be able to go to college or vocational school
   ______ no, he wasn't going on to take further training
   ______ no, he will still go on for further training
   If last answer, how will this be done?

5. Did your marriage change your husband's occupational plans?
   ______ he had to get a job immediately even tho it wasn't the kind he wanted
   ______ he had to give up plans for a job he wanted because he couldn't get the required training
   ______ didn't matter much since he would have taken some job anyway
since he had more responsibility, he looked around and got a better job than he would otherwise have gotten

6. Are you working now? (1) yes ; (2) no .
   If yes, what is your job title?
   How many hours per week?

7. Do you have any children? (1) yes ; (2) no .
   If you are working, who cares for them?

8. What is the total weekly income for you and your husband?
   Husband's earnings
   Your earnings
   Other sources
     Your family
     His family
     Other(s)

9. Has this income been adequate for your family?
   ___ not at all, extremely limited
   ___ not too bad, it has been hard tho
   ___ pretty satisfactory
   ___ entirely adequate

   (Probe: how adequate, how limiting; how much of a husband-wife relationship problem is this)

II Social Activities: first, some questions about friendships.

1. What has happened to the friendships you had with girls you knew before marriage?
   ___ just as strong, still see them, etc.
   ___ not quite as strong
   ___ considerably weaker
   ___ almost gone, hardly ever see them
2. Have you developed new friendships since your marriage? (1) yes ; (2) no .

If yes, are these
___ older married couples
___ married couples about your age
___ single persons your age
___ older single persons

And were they picked from persons whom
___ you first knew
___ your husband first knew
___ both of you got to know them together

3. How do you feel about your friendships with your friends from before marriage? (Probes, how badly feel left out; degree to which feel deprived of a value)

4. How do you feel about the friendships you have made since marriage? (Probes, how much how these replaced or surpassed old friendships, degree deprivation)

III Relations with your families

1. How far do you live from your family?

2. How close do you live to your husband's family?

3. How much do you talk over your problems with your mother or parents?
   ___ most of them, do it quite a bit
   ___ some of them
   ___ only a few of them
   ___ not at all

4. How much do you talk over your problems with your husband's parents or mother.
   ___ most of them, do it quite a bit
   ___ some of them
   ___ only a few of them
   ___ not at all
5. To what extent do you feel your parents interfere with your marriage? prevent
   ___ quite a bit, try to run it
   ___ some
   ___ a little
   ___ not at all

6. To what extent do you feel his parents interfere with your marriage? prevent
   ___ quite a bit, try to run it
   ___ some
   ___ a little
   ___ not at all

IV Your children

1. How many children do you have? ______

2. Their birth dates are

   __________________________
   __________________________
   __________________________

3. Do you feel you were ready for the job of parenthood?
   In what ways yes:

   __________________________

   In what ways no:

4. Do you feel your husband was ready for the job of parenthood?
   In what ways yes:

   __________________________

   In what ways no:

   In general:

   1. What has been most satisfying about your marriage?

   2. What has been least satisfying about your marriage?
3. If you would go back to before you married, what would you do the same?

4. What would you do different?

5. Reasons for getting married.