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ABSTRACT

THE SALIENCE OF PARENT EDUCATION FOR ADOLESCENTS:
GENDER AND GRATIFICATION ORIENTATIONS

by

Katrina H. Miller, Master of Science
Utah State University, 1979

Major Professor:  Dr. Glen Jenson
Department:     Family & Human Development

The purpose of this study was to test the relevance of parent education for high school students in terms of interest, concerns, expectations and experiences of the adolescents regarding children. The ability to delay gratification and gender served as independent variables. Weaver's (1977) "Adolescent Interest Survey" was administered to 179 high school students enrolled in three different programs in semi-rural northern Utah. These programs were objectively classified to represent two levels of ability to defer gratification. Regular high school students, male (N=51) and female (N=52) were treated as "deferrers of gratification". Potential dropout students, Males (N=26) and females (N=23) and females enrolled in a young mothers program (N=27) were treated as "nondeffers".
Because regular high school students may be "deferrers" only because of family and other pressures, and because there may be governing situational differences which would otherwise render the student in potential dropout programs and young mothers programs, the sample was again divided subjectively on the basis of response to whether or not the subject planned on continuing his education beyond high school. A "future education" group, males (N=48) and females (N=55) and a "non-education" group, males (N=30) and females (N=46) was devised to compare differences of responses in terms of subjective ability to defer gratification.

Three constellations of null hypotheses dealt with significant differences in (1) expressed parenting interests; (2) expectations of child development; and (3) experiences with children.

Results yielded interesting paradoxes. (1) Although young mothers are the most interested and most experienced of all the groups, their expectations of child development were the most liberal and unrealistic. (2) Although females are more interested and experienced than males, males have the more reasonable expectations of child development. (3) Although "non-deferrers" of gratification expect to marry and have children at an earlier age than "deferrers", "deferrers" prefer spouses and children as an x
adult priority, while "non-deferrers" prefer the things that money can buy—a car and a house.

The survey indicated that adolescents have relatively little or no interest in "children", and only mild interest in marriage and parenting. More interesting and relevant are present and self-referenced topics: money, pursuing a vocation, physical development (weight, height, complexion), clothes (girls) and sports (boys). The future and other-referenced goals of education for parenthood programs are presented as inappropriate for the adolescent who is more concerned with pimples and the present.

(120 pages)
INTRODUCTION

The entire history of the human race teaches us that the family unit is the best way for men and women to live their lives, the best way to raise children, and the only solid foundation upon which to build a strong nation. (p. 35)

Jimmy Carter (1977)
President of the United States

Our task must be to do more than lead a government that tolerates family life or pretends to be neutral about it. We must help shape a society which nourishes families and helps them grow strong and flourish. And there is no more important task. (p. 1)

Walter Mondale (1978)
Vice President of the United States
Former Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth

Let us accept without reservation that trained parents are every child's birthright and a sine qua non of our society. (p. 272)

T. H. Bell (1975)
U. S. Commissioner of Education

Concern for the lack of programs to train parents coupled with alarm over statistics on teenage parenting, divorce among those married prior to age 20, and the abuse and neglect of young children prompted the current federal impetus in developing programs to disseminate training for parents. States are rallying to the support of such programs. Alarm for the rising statistics reflecting the need for parent education programs creates incentive for
such programs as is currently being developed by the State of Utah, "Responsible Parenthood".

Adolescents are the beneficiaries of the bulk of these programs. "Exploring Childhood", the major governmental agency developed curriculum, is used in 2,300 schools, 350 colleges and universities, and 400 community agencies throughout the country and in 38 sites in foreign countries (Morris, 1977). It reaches some 60,000 students around the United States and Canada alone (Felt, 1977).

Edward Zigler, former director of the Office of Child Development said, "I have long believed that the development of a child does not begin the day he is born--or at age three--but much earlier, during the formative years of his parents" (School & Society Programs, 1977, p. 6). In response to the rising statistics that federal and state authorities, professionals trained in family and human relations, and parents find so alarming, the philosophy of urgency of parent education seems to be that "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure."

Programs such as "Exploring Childhood" have been specifically developed for the adolescent who exists within a pre-parent developmental moratorium. Such a moratorium is an opportunity for the adolescent to open his or her door to the future, to discover who she or he is, and to move forward subsequently in the direction of intimacy, generativity, and integrity (Muus, 1968; Erikson, 1968, 1975). These are the very virtues required for effective
parenting (Malony, 1978).

Other adolescents have at least partially closed their doors to future success, curtailing the range of their life-choices by entering parenthood prematurely, or by dropping out of school. Out of 152,973 total secondary enrollment in the State of Utah for the 1976-77 school year, 3,248 students dropped out (Annual Statistical Report, 1976-77). Traditionally, adolescent parents have been banned from education. As late as 1960 in an NEA poll, close to 50% of all teachers polled felt that married boys and girls should be excluded from regular school (Atkyns, 1968).

Today, federal and state programs extend the range of life-choices for the drop out, the potential drop out, and the adolescent parent in the form of services such as employment, education, medical care, and counseling. In its National Directory of Services for School-Aged Parents, the National Alliance Concerned With School Aged Parents (1976) identifies some 12,000 agencies to assist the adolescent parent. Federal programs such as the Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA) and the Work Incentive Program (WIN) have been developed to assist the drop out in obtaining employment and vocational training. Drop out prevention programs administered by state boards of education attempt to identify and prevent possible premature exit from school.
The question has been posed by de Lissovoy (1978) and Weaver (1977), "Is parent education a white elephant in the classroom" Cohen (1973) and Malony (1978) would answer, "yes". The basis for their arguments rests in the interests and developmental tasks of adolescents.

Weaver (1977) investigated some of these concerns for the viability of parent education in her survey of adolescent interests, concerns, expectations, and experiences regarding parenting education and the skills involved in parenting. She found that adolescent interest in parenting education assumed a "back seat" to more current interests, such as sports, clothes, money, the opposite sex, and physical appearance. Interests expressed in parenting varies with the sex of the respondent (girls are more interested) and the perceived entry into the adult world, in terms of both expected age of marriage and parenting and the choice of vocation over education. The less the perceived distance from parenting, the more interest expressed. In addition, she found that experience with children does not guarantee the attainment of knowledge about children.

For some adolescents, the need for parent education is more immediate. Weaver's (1977) "employment oriented" sample, or those students who indicated they planned on working after high school, rather than pursuing further education, indicated that they planned on marrying and
becoming parents at much earlier ages than their "education oriented" counterparts. Young mothers and students in drop out prevention programs (non-educationally oriented), although they probably will be parents at earlier ages, even during adolescence, enjoy no major government sponsored program to educate them on parenting skills.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this study is to develop some implications for parent education from the bases of data measuring interest in parent education according to gender and ability to defer gratification. If Cohen's (1959) definition of "deferrment of gratification is correct, or "the subordination of present hedonistic satisfactions and immediate impulse to the pursuit of long-range goals", then persons in young mothers programs and drop out prevention programs will be labelled "non deferrers" and their interests in parenting education and knowledge of children will be compared with regular high school students.
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Need for Parent Education

Children are America's future. The quality of life for children in America leaves much to be desired. The 1970 White House Conference on Children provides statistical indicators of problems that could at least be partially alleviated with increased parenting skills (Kruger, 1972).

*Infant mortality rates in the United States are higher than the rates in 12 other major developed nations. (p. 1)

*Among pre-school children in the United States in 1968-69, the diets of 51% of boys and 56% of girls were substandard in Vitamin A. (p. 1)

*15,000 children under age 15 die from accidents each year in the U.S. (1966); another 19,000,000 children are injured severely enough to seek medical care or restrict their usual activity. Most accidents involving children occur at home. (p. 1)

*Among children aged 5-14 surveyed in 1963-65 in the U.S., one in four had never seen a dentist. (p. 1)

*The number of children under 18 years of age involved in (affected by) divorce and annulments in the U.S. in 1965 alone was estimated at 630,000. (p. 1)

*Although statistics are incomplete, child abuse has become a problem of critical concern, with more than one third of surveyed cases affecting children three years of age and younger. (p. 1)

The secondary school system, in striving to educate its students in those skills which will adequately prepare
them for adult life, frequently places more emphasis on
skills that are more socially rewarding than parenting
skills. Kruger (1972) observed,

There is more emphasis by State and local school
systems upon the satisfactory completion of a driver
education course by secondary-school students than
there is a similar emphasis upon the satisfactory
completion of a parenthood education course. As
important as good driving skills are to the pre-
vention of deaths, injury, and property damage on
the nation's highways; the maneuvering of a modern
automobile is nowhere near as significant, or com-
p lex, as the rearing of a child in modern society
(p. 3).

Certainly, if secondary school systems do not place
more emphasis on driver training than parent education,
more adolescents certainly do. Getting a driver's license
is probably the "rite of passage" in American society,
and the rewards inherent in having that plastic document
are more perceivable to the young person who has grown up
within the value structure of American Society.
Bronfenbrenner stated,

When families become as important to America as
footballs and firearms, the divorce rate will turn
downward, school achievement will rise, and juve-
nile delinquency and vandalism will cease to be
national problems (Cobe, 1977, p. 114).

In no other group of parents, is the need for increased
parenting skills more patent than in the case of the
adolescent parent. If the child is born to adolescent
parents, his problems are complicated. Teenage pregnancy
is "a Major Problem for Minors" (Green & Lowe, 1976).
"Minors" include the teenage parent and his or her off-
spring.
*Pregnant teenagers run a four to five times higher risk of pregnancy complications than a woman in her twenties (Menken, 1972). The main problems are toxemia, perinatal death, and prematurity (Jekel et al., 1975) which involve risks of mental retardation and physical defects for the infants (Honig, 1976).

*In 1974, the proportion of children born illegitimately to white teenagers was 21% and for non-white teenagers 73% (Baldwin, 1976). Two thirds of all teenage pregnancies are unintended, and one half of all births to teenagers are unintended (Alan Guttmacher Institute, 1976). This means that around half of all children born to adolescent mothers enter the world fatherless and unintended.

*If the child is not fatherless prior to birth, he most likely will be fatherless shortly after. Nye (1976) suggested that 80% of marriages in which the bride is under 16 will end in divorce (excluding those ending in separation or desertion). The Alan Guttmacher Institute (1976) reports that three in five pregnant teenage brides are divorced within six years.

*Osofsky (1973) found that compared to data for the population at large, children of adolescents face guarded social prognosis and poor educational attainment.

No only the child is affected, but the parents as well. Trussell (1976), McLaughlin (1977), and Inselberg (1961) review the social consequences of early childbearing and marriage in terms of less schooling, increased poverty and dependency, increased levels of childbearing, and less employment among the wives. Burchinal (1963) stated that the evaluation of early marriage both objectively (divorce and separation data) and subjectively (self-ratings) point to greater stresses in youthful marriages. This is because, he adds, not because of early marriage per se, but because of factors associated with young age such as low status backgrounds, limited education, meager
economic basis, and a need for continued parental support for most youthful married couples.

These problems afflict a high proportion of our society. In 1976, 124,354 babies were born to parents who were both adolescents (under age 19) (Monthly Vital Statistics Report Supplement, March 29, 1978). Twenty one percent of all live births in the country occurred to mothers in age range from 12-19 (Alan Guttmacher Institute, 1976). One girl in every 10 is a mother before her 18th birthday (Nye, 1976).

What is Being Done

Although education for parents has been traced back as far as the early 1800's (Brim, 1959), education for future parents is a relatively modern innovation. The first course in marriage and family was offered to college students in 1927 (Lazelere, 1975). By the late 1950's, marriage and family courses were offered in about 75% of all colleges and universities (Lazelere, 1975).

Dager and Harper (1959) provide a definition of the somewhat ambiguous scope of family life education in public high schools.

Family life education is the teaching of dating and courtship; implications of early marriage; love and romance; preparation for marriage; implications of being husband-father, wife-mother; sex education; and marital adjustment as related to the personal and social responsibilities of a family (p. 385).

A number of surveys examining the enrollment, topics,
teachers, and methods of family life courses have been carried out at the state level (Baker & Darcy 1970; Bayer & Nye, 1964; Dager, Harper & Whitehurst, 1962; Landis, 1965; Mason, 1974; Howells, 1968). Dating and courtship, personality development, family relationships, marriage, child development, and budgeting are the topics most frequently discussed (Weaver, 1977). The entire gamut of topics related to family life education are generally given less than a year of consideration. Howells (1968) found that 60% of family life teachers in Utah were teaching less than 6 weeks of family life a year. Generally, family life education is either an elective, or a course taught on a unit basis.

Courses and units dealing specifically with child development and parenthood are also offered. Kerckhoff (1976) and the Family Coordinator family life education panel defined "parent education" as educating future parents on childrearing or educating students on the physical and psychological development of children.

One such program is "Growing Children" developed by Charles Jones (1973). The development of the child—physically, mentally, socially and emotionally and parenting issues such as discipline, arguments, responsibilities for children, adjustment required by birth of a child, ways to answer children's questions and fears are the main foci of this program. Students are encouraged to visit
day care centers and nursery school, but direct involvement with children is not an integral part of the program.

A program at the Gaithersburg High School Child Development Laboratory emphasizes direct involvement with children. After six weeks of study and practical preparation, high school students assume immediately the teaching role in the nursery school class (Kruger, 1972). The teacher-supervisor serves as a resource-support person, and much of the advice on operations comes from peer conferences. The days of the week are divided into distinct learning periods for the adolescent as a teacher, as an observer, as a researcher in child development, and as a curriculum planner. On the fifth day of the week, when the school is not in session, the adolescent evaluates the week's experiences with the teacher and the other students.

High school students in other departments are involved also in parenting type of experiences. Industrial art students construct and maintain climbing equipment. Auto body students keep tricycles and wagon in good repair. Youth studying speech practice storytelling; drama students put on plays; music students demonstrate instruments and teach songs; and horticulture enthusiasts help the preschoolers plant a garden.

In 1977 the Board of Education, State of Utah adopted a new set of graduation requirements (Rowley, 1978), making Utah one out of five other states requiring that
education for parenthood be offered in all high schools in the state (Sullivan, 1978). Major funding was provided by the state legislature, and presently a new program, "Responsible Parenthood" is being piloted in several school districts in Utah.

Because this program is still in the developmental phases, specifics as to course content are unavailable. The basic scheme for development of learning experiences include budgeting skills, understandings of human growth and development, skills and understandings of leadership and followership, skills and understandings of freedom and responsibility, understanding and expressing love, skills and insights in interpersonal relationships and thinking and decision making skills (Rowley, 1978).

Programs in Mt. Desert Island, Maine; Los Angeles, California; Dallas, Texas; Battle Creek, Michigan; and Salt Lake City, Utah are discussed by Kruger (1972). He notes that while these programs do indeed contribute to parenthood education objectives, they are insufficient because (1) they reach only a small fraction of those who will eventually need parenthood education (2) the quality of content and methodology in many instances is lacking, particularly where the adolescent is not given experience with children (3) many programs are confined solely to one instructional area within the secondary school curriculum, rather than drawing upon the total resources of the entire school system. For example, the "Responsible Parenthood"
program in Utah is chiefly the domain of the home economics department (Rowley, 1978). Kruger (1972) realizing the urgent need for parent education in our society stated,

 Particularly given the complexities of modern life, can we as a society continue our "catch-as-catch-can" approaches to training for parental responsibilities; or has the time come for a more thoughtful, systematic, vigorous approach toward developing our individual and collective competencies and resources in strengthening this aspect of American Family life (p. 1).

 In response to the need for a more systematic and thorough parent education program, Kruger (1972), then Commissioner of Education, led the federal government into actively promoting parent education through a new program—"Education for Parenthood". Three major governmental agencies—the Office of Education, the Office of Child Development, and the National Institute of Mental Health formulated Education for Parenthood. The mission is to promote and persuade voluntary organizations and schools to establish parenthood education programs for all school youth, male and female, ages 12-18.

 Four target areas provide the foci in (1) curriculum development—in which the "Exploring Childhood" program has been developed; (2) technical assistance; (3) non-school based parent education; and (4) public and professional education.

 "Exploring Childhood", the curriculum in use at this time, combines the study of child development with work with young children on a regular basis. This curriculum
represents 6 years of development under the organizations of Boy Scouts of America, Girl Scouts of the U.S.A., Boys Clubs of America, National 4-H Foundation of America, National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, Salvation Army, and the Save the Children Federation (Morris, 1977). Many of these developing agencies represented a male population (though imbued most heavily with females), so that the programs and materials developed would be universal and relevant to all in-school youth.

"Exploring Childhood" has three purposes: (1) to prepare students for parenthood; (2) to prepare students for careers involving children; and (3) to prepare students for citizenship with the responsibility of making daily decisions that affect children (Felt, 1976). It is designed to promote learning and growth in four major areas: concept development, inquiry and observation skills, personal awareness, and interpersonal skills.

In contrast to the massive effort of federal and state governments to deliver parenting education to the regular high school student is the lack of concentrated effort to deliver parenting education to those whose need for it is more urgent. It is noteworthy that the "Education for Parenthood" program, with its focus on "non-school" based parent education, has the capacity to reach out to these individuals.
Weaver (1977) found that those students who planned on entering the job market immediately after graduating from high school planned on marrying a full two years earlier (X 20.5 years) than their counterparts who planned on furthering their education (X 22.5 years). Those seeking employment also planned on becoming parents at an earlier age (X 22.9 years) than those continuing their education (X 25.0 years).

Kruger (1972) points out the high school-aged parenting is often really a matter of early family formation, under high risk conditions resulting from or accentuated by, inadequate understanding of and preparation for parenthood responsibilities, as evidenced by the high divorce rate among teenagers when compared with other age groups in this country.

Lack of education, the result of early family formation or dropping out of high school, carries with it numerous other disadvantages such as lack of knowledge and experience, lack of maturity, low economic base, and a need for continued economic support by parents (de Lissovoy, 1973; Burchinal, 1963). The result is frequently severe frustration and stress, which can, as de Lissovoy (1973) puts it, "raise (the) level of irritability and lower (the) threshold of tolerance when children are involved. While collecting data on his sample, de Lissovoy (1973) noted that the young parents were, with few notable exceptions, "an
intolerant group--impatient, insensitive, irritable, and prone to use physical punishment with their children" (p. 23). Using an experimental design, Passman et al (1977) confirmed that stress does increase the punitiveness of mothers toward their children.

Young mothers programs and drop out prevention programs administered by local school districts, along with numerous programs administered by private charitable organizations, attempt to counter the adverse effects of premature exit from school. Educational and occupational opportunities, counseling and hotline services, health and family planning services, daycare, and other forms of supports are available to young people in need of help (Gallagher, 1973; Furstenberg, 1976; Nelson, 1973; & Christensen, 1977). These services, however, are inadequate. Furstenberg (1976) points out that as limited programs, they can produce only limited results, and that easier accesses to social resources must be provided. The Alan Guttmacher Institute in 1975 noted that only 350 programs for all of the pregnant school-aged girls in the United States were in existence. This few programs are available to assist the high-risk mothers of 21% of all live births in the country. In Utah, drop out prevention is available in less than half of all school districts (Carr, 1979).¹

¹Carr, Donna. Pupil Personnel Specialist, Utah State Board of Education. Telephone interview with author.
In the context of enhancing the quality of parenting for tomorrow's children, the delivery of services to adolescents can be summarized as follows. Because a need has been recognized, federal and state governments have combined resources with private organizations to offer regular high school students effective parent education and child development courses. In this case, "lack of knowledge", rather than maturity, is assumed to be the hallmark of poor parenting, and adolescents are offered elective courses on parenting and child development to stay future voids in parenting skills. In the case of the young parent or the potential drop out, "lack of adequate resources" is assumed to be the hallmark of poor parenting skills. Though existing programs have the capacity to do so, no cumulative effort on the part of the government exists to administer parent education to potential drop outs or young mothers. However, great strides in the delivery of other types of services to them have been made in recent years by private charitable societies and local school districts. These services attempt to restore health to young persons and young families whose meager resources evoke frustration, stress, and the inability to cope psychologically or temporally with the responsibilities of parenthood. Such services lack the breadth to adequately assist the great numbers of young people in need of help.
An Examination of Current Methods of Enhancing Quality of Parenting

Critics of present administration of parent education claim that there is a mismatch between adolescent interests and concerns and the goals of parent education, and that it is impossible to be able to retain the knowledge and experience gained in a one semester course on parenting. Adolescents, they claim, are not developmentally able to integrate parenting knowledge into their lives.

"The last role that most adolescents consciously wish to assume and the one that is among the least developmentally suitable for them, is the parenting role" (Cohen, 1973, p. 28). As evidence, he cites the disruptive effect that parenthood has upon the lives of adolescent parents. He emphasizes that adolescents "need opportunities that help them with the feelings, concerns, and impulses that dominate their lives at the moment" (p. 28).

Adolescent interests and concerns. Studies of adolescent interests and concerns show that adolescents are indeed primarily concerned with the here and now and the rewards of the present. The future is by no means irrelevant, but is "crucial as it is absorbed, integrated, and expressed in current activities and attitudes" (Douvan & Adelson, 1966, p. 341).

Symonds (1936) developed a fifteen item scale which asked students to rank the items in order of their interest.
The list of items included such terms as health, money, recreation, study habits, and sex adjustment. Each item was defined by a descriptive phrase that accompanied it. For example, sex adjustment was defined as love, petting, courtship, and marriage. Money was defined as earning, spending, and saving. The three primary areas of interest in his sample of adolescents in grades 7 through 12 were recreation, health, and personal attractiveness. The major areas of concern were money, health, personal attractiveness, study habits, and personal and moral qualities.

Three replications of this study yielded similar results. Harris (1959), Kaczkowski (1962) and Chabassal and Thomas (1969) utilized the Symonds scale in their surveys of adolescent interests and concerns. For males in these studies, money, study habits, and personal and moral qualities were consistently ranked among the top four areas of concern. Recreation, money, and health ranked as the highest areas of male interest. For females, money was the number one problem, and personal attractiveness was the number one interest. Daily planning of schedules was the least interesting topic for both males and female.

Schwartz (1970) and his team interviewed 152 high school juniors to ascertain what they most frequently talked about. If "most frequently talked about subject" is a good operational definition of "interest", than these adolescents' were primarily interested in people in this order: self, friends and acquaintances, and authority.
figures.

Few studies have investigated adolescent interest in parenting. More studies have investigated their interest in "love and marriage". Dusek and Monge (1977) asked students in grades 5, 7, 9, 11 and early college to list topics of interest to them. The 30 resulting categories were collapsed into 14 broad interest areas. It is interesting to note that "parenting" was not one of the interest areas. "Love and Marriage" was the topic most closely related to the family. When these topics were presented to students to rank in order of importance, eleventh grade students ranked "love and marriage" as fifth, and twelfth grade students ranked it as seventh, behind more important things like sports, arts and crafts. Weaver (1977) found that interest in parenting increased as the perceived distance from parenting decreased. Students who anticipated earlier parenting were more interested in parenting than students who planned on parenting at a later date. Regardless of their future plans, both boys and girls were generally more interested and concerned about such items as "physical appearance, the opposite sex, money, clothes, and sports". Girls showed more interest in family concerns in terms of their future role as wife and their relationship with their family. Douvan and Adelson (1972) postulated that females find their identity as a consequence of intimacy, and thus their focus of future orientation is
more upon the interpersonal aspects of future life than the real skills. Weaver's (1977) study exemplified this. Boys, according to Douvan and Adelson (1972) are more concerned with real skills and a vocational future. The interests of adolescent boys in Weaver's sample were generally of a vocational nature.

A few studies have investigated adolescent interest in "parent education". All of these studies, however, suffer from one major methodological weakness in that the results were obtained in the context of questionnaires which focused on parenting (Weaver, 1977).

Heron (1952) asked adolescents in England a series of 12 questions about their interest in parenthood training as well as their view of the need for parent education on the whole. A majority (81%) of them believed that instruction on parenting should prerequisite actual parenting. A smaller number (65%) saw it as appropriate to the curriculum of the secondary school. In relation to other school subjects, 58% agreed that education for parenthood would be more useful in life than many of their school subjects. When asked if they favored education for parenthood courses in school, 70% said they did. Sixty percent indicated they would gladly read a book on parenthood. In terms of their knowledge level, 70% expressed a need for more information.

Byles (1975) solicited socially acceptable "yeses"
from 65% of the girls and 36% of the boys when asked if they would take a parenting education course if it was offered in their high school. Essman and Deutsch (1975) asked 225 high school students (150 females, 75 males) if they would be interested in joining a group designed to teach them better ways of relating to younger siblings. A majority of the females (83%) expressed interest in joining such a group, while only 47% of the males expressed interest.

Weaver (1977) placed parenting education courses within a constellation of five other courses and asked subjects to rank the courses according to their preferences. Only 5% of the males chose "Parenting and Infant Care" as a first choice. "Parenting and Infant Care" was a first choice for 41% of girls who planned on continuing their education beyond high school, and 67% of the girls who did not plan on going on to school.

Many other studies have shown that girls are more interested in parenting and parent education classes than boys (Howells, 1968; Weaver, 1977; Kerckhoff, 1977). This however, does not mean that boys would not be receptive to such a class if such a class were offered and was removed from the social stigmata attached to males in "home ec". Kerckhoff (1977) reported that the majority of his sample of secondary teachers in 44 states (U.S.) and provinces (Canada) felt that boys who did take the courses in parent
education were as receptive as the girls. Three of the forty-four teachers polled felt that boys were more receptive. Jensen (1977) reported the results of a survey administered to a group of Boys' Staters at Utah State University. Out of his sample of 300, only 10% claimed that they were not interested in parent education.

The literature cited demonstrates that adolescents are more interested in the relevant present than in the unforeseeable future. Interests and concerns such as "health, recreation, money, and physical attractiveness" subordinate concerns about the future such as planning a schedule or parenting an infant. When asked if they would take a parenting education class, most adolescents replied "yes"; however, it is certain that it wouldn't be their first choice if more interesting courses were offered. Girls are more interested in parenting and parenting education classes than boys, and girls who do not plan on continuing their education beyond high school are the most interested. This does not mean, however, that boys are not interested, as objectively (self-report when asked if they would take a parent education course) and subjectively (teacher's opinions about the boys who have taken such courses) the literature demonstrates that they might respond if certain stigmata were removed.

Adolescent's knowledge and attitudes about children.

If parenting education courses are administered to high
school students in faith that improving their knowledge of parenting skills will make them more effective parents, then it is important to ascertain the initial state of that knowledge.

Research on adolescent's knowledge and attitudes about children generally indicates that adolescents overestimate the child's and the parent's ability to perform, even if the adolescent has had experience with children in the form of parenting.

English, Katz, Schefflen, Danzig, and Speiser (1959) investigated high school and college seniors' knowledge about children and attitudes toward parenting and concluded that this group had a strong tendency toward unrealistic expectations (overestimation of time parents spend with children) and idealized attitudes (unquestioning ideas about love and devotion). More than half of the sample who completed the questionnaire gave incorrect answers to 11 out of 15 questions asking for information about generally accepted facts and practices in the rearing of children.

A Purdue Opinion Panel poll done in 1959 (Belooort, Franklin, Maier, & Remmers, 1959) matched opinions about childrearing of adolescents with a panel of eleven child development experts. Only questions on which eight out of the eleven judges agreed on a specific answer were presented for response. Subjects were asked to rate each item concerning parent-child relationships for its
effectiveness in producing good mental health. Only 64% of the items were answered in agreement with the panel of expert judges.

Even being a parent while an adolescent does not seem to improve this level of knowledge. de Lissovoy (1973) studied childrearing attitudes and practices of forty-eight adolescent couples in central Pennsylvania. The average age of the mothers was 16.5, and the fathers' average age was just 17. Subjects were asked to respond to when a child could be expected to sit alone, smile, take first step alone, etc. The parents' expectations were unrealistically high. For example, mothers expected a baby to sit alone at 12 weeks of age, and fathers thought that a child should be able to sit alone at 6 weeks of age. Of course, their own children were not able to meet these expectations. Only in the parents' expectations of the first appearance of the social smile did three of the mothers and four fathers mention a realistic norm. For comparison purposes, these same questions were given to a group of unmarried seniors attending a rural high school, and the responses were almost identical. Weaver (1977) administered the same questions to her sample of adolescents. Because her results contradicted past research, she cautions that her results be viewed cautiously as they may be an artifact of the instrument. In addition to unrealistic attitudes about child development, research
indicates that adolescents have unrealistic attitudes about child management.

Remmers and Drucker (1951) were the first to investigate adolescents' attitudes toward child management. Surveying 15,000 high school students across the U.S., Remmers and Drucker (1951) concluded that adolescent responses toward questions dealing with the training or disciplining of children were typically authoritarian and insensitive. Byles (1975) found this tendency toward authoritarian discipline in his sample also. In contrast to the attitudes expressed by the students in Remmers and Drucker's (1951) study, 70% of the students in the Byles (1975) study disagreed that spanking was the only way to teach right from wrong in young children.

The effect of parent education upon adolescents' knowledge and attitudes. Studies on the facilitation that parent education has upon skills generally indicate that parent education does improve the level of knowledge in both the parent and the future parent. Croake and Glover (1977) review early studies on knowledge facilitation of parent education upon parents, and report significant improvement of knowledge. Using more refined techniques with greater reliability and validity, current research affirms that parent education and family life education can increase knowledge and skills (Angrist, 1975; Croake & Glover, 1977; Morris, 1977).
Some question exists as to whether attitudes are facilitated by parent education. Angrist (1975) found that even though knowledge was increased, there was no significant change in attitude in the family life curriculum she evaluated. Evaluation of the "Exploring Childhood" curriculum indicates that positive changes in attitude as well as knowledge were attained (Morris, 1977). The difference in findings may be a result of the curricula involved. "Exploring Childhood" combines academic education and working experience with children to provide a learning experience. Exploring Childhood, National Field Test, Summary of Evaluation Findings Year Two (1976) reports that students who engaged in active participatory roles tended to have higher ratings in their skills in working with children. Those students who had previous child development courses tended to take more active roles with children. Weaver (1977) found that students who said that they had shared six or more out of ten listed activities with children were more interested in topics related to parenting. They discussed parenting more and were more interested in reading books or taking courses on the subject matter. Yahraes (1977) tested the effects of an education/intervention program on young mothers and their children living in a deprived environment and found that education is very effective in increasing skills and attitudes. She concluded that maternal attitudes and expectations
hold the key to full development of cognitive skills for children living in deprived environments. Perhaps good experiences with children, such as in the constructive cases of "Exploring Childhood" and the education/intervention program described, hold the key to good attitudes.

Parent Education: To Enhance the Quality of Life for Children

Parent education, whether or not it actually increases the knowledge, skills, and positive attitudes of adolescents or parents toward children is meaningless unless it can enhance the quality of life for children.

The Education for Parenthood Program, with its "Exploring Childhood" curriculum, is targeted to high school students, with the primary purpose of providing them with the knowledge and skills which will enable them to become effective parents. The literature indicates that it is meeting this goal. Adolescents can gain an academic knowledge of parenting skills.

The literature also clearly demonstrates that parenting is not a major concern of adolescence. It is, in essence, lacking in perceived relevance. More relevant are topics such as money, personal appearance, sports, arts, crafts, and the opposite sex. Perceived relevance of subject matter is a motivating factor in the facilitation of learning (McCandless, 1970).
This lack of relevance of parent education for the adolescent may be not only perceived, but actual. Adams and Looft (1977) summarize the developmental tasks of adolescence as: (1) the acquisition of sex-appropriate role behavior, (2) achievement of a sense of identity, and (3) a personal commitment to some ideology, set of values, occupation, or life style. "Learning to Parent" is not a developmental task of adolescence.

The evidence presented in the literature makes a strong case for maturity, rather than knowledge and skills, being the singular most important element in the ability to effectively parent. Enhancing the quality of life for the future children of today's high school students would therefore be not so much a matter of imbuing students with "knowledge and skills", but assisting these students in working through the developmental tasks of adolescence. Such a program, described as a "pre-parent education", is discussed by de Lissovoy (1978). Such a program would "facilitate the adolescents' resolution of the identity crisis; assist the adolescent in his move towards the identification of occupational choices and an ideological commitment."

Adolescents seeking freedom from parental control are not the prime prospects for the assimilation of tasks of parenthood. The goals of a pre-parent program oriented to adolescent development should center around issues of self, and values within a democratic milieu. (p. 331)

Cohen (1973) believes that in order to provide education
for adolescents that will have some impact upon their
future, it is important to respect what is on their minds
and not to intrude with what others, especially those with
the perspective of the adult generation, believe they ought
to be thinking or planning.

Malony (1978) points out the ineptitude and incompati-
bility of parent education with adolescents, and stresses
the importance of generative models in teaching parenting
values.

Can parenting be taught to youth? Probably not, if
one means thereby a didactic course with classroom
assignments. Youth are asking different questions
and they do not primarily learn values through text-
books or lectures. Most certainly yes, however, if
one means thereby a style of life grounded in the
importance of service and sharing. Youth will catch
these examples and emulate these persons, be they
natural parents or not. (p. 126)

Malony (1978) emphatically stresses that "to parent"
is not just a verb or an action following biological
father-or-motherhood, but is is a value. "The essence of
parenting", claims Malony, "is service". (p. 124).

Summary

What the literature seems to be saying is this:
Adolescents have enough problems and concerns and develop-
mental tasks of their own to worry about someone else's
problems, concerns, and development. Their interests,
therefore are justifiably self-referenced and present-
oriented. Parenting, with its requisite qualities of
generativity, service, and "other-ness" is incongruous with their needs and wants. Parenting does involve skills, which can be taught in a classroom and retained to a limited extent. The biggest favor that educational systems and society can do for adolescents and their future children is to prepare them with maturity and the ability to serve others. In layman's terms, this involves "keeping them in school" and "helping them grow up".

There are within our high schools today thousands of students who will not utilize their high school experience as an opportunity to work through the developmental tasks essential to effective parenting. In the high schools of Utah, there were 3,248 such students out of a total of 152,973 who dropped out of high school for pregnancy and other reasons (Annual Statistical Report, 1976-77). The literature is not so bountiful in its exploration of the needs of these adolescents regarding education for parenthood. The stance of this study is that all adolescents need preparation for parenthood, and the interests, expectations, and experiences of all future parents regarding children should be explored.

For students who will not avail themselves of the developmental moratorium provided by society and prepare themselves with maturity prior to childbearing and rearing, different strategies must be invoked to facilitate
effective parenting. The literature has demonstrated that their problems are complicated and involve a resource deficit, as well as a knowledge deficit. Cook and Blau (1978) stated,

The rising incidence of teenage parenthood in the American population suggests that they first and foremost should be the targets of parent education programs and also of other direct forms of support services (p. 237).

Present administration of services to adolescent parents are given after the fact of parenting. Conolly (1978) points out some of the weaknesses in our present system of delivering services to young parents.

It is difficult to believe that moral outrage and Band-Aid social services are preferred over preventing pregnancy. But the Child Welfare League of America, for example, held a regional conference in March, 1977 sponsoring 74 workshops discussing child welfare and not one program focused on how to prevent adolescent pregnancies. Not one workshop solicited recognition for the young father of kept babies. Vituperation and services after the fact are demonstrably inadequate and vengeful (p. 43).

The most topical solution to preventing pregnancy and subsequent early family formation is disseminating information about birth control and abortion. This is, in many respects, an insufficient method of dealing with a vital problem. First, cultural norms in many areas of the country, including Mormon Utah, proscribe both the teaching of sex education or birth control information in high school and abortion as a "solution" to a problem pregnancy. Secondly, having and keeping a baby during adolescence is frequently a matter of choice. "Teaching" adolescents about
birth control, or persuading them, frequently against the mores of their parents, that abortion is an acceptable alternative to having a baby would be a frugal attempt to treat symptoms that do not even exist. Thirdly, as Furstenberg (1977) points out, in the case of the "super-motivated" adolescent and the adolescent who receives adequate social and educational services, having a baby can have a "happy ending". Though adolescence pregnancy is a problem in most cases, it can be dealt with efficiently and effectively by methods other than termination.

A solution that would treat the causes of early family formation (rather than symptoms that may or may not exist) in addition to providing support services for those in need is needed. Such a solution would require the identification of those most vulnerable to early family formation, that "treatment" or services might be rendered that would help them become good parents.

Who are the vulnerable to early family formation? The Alan Buttmacher Institute (1976) reports that 6 out of 10 adolescents today are sexually active. But only 1 out of 10 adolescent girls become mothers prior to their 18th birthday (Nye, 1977).

What is it that makes the difference between adolescents who do become parents at an early age and adolescents who do not. Bruce (1978) suggested that "futurity" was a key hypothesis to be tested in answering this question.
Those for whom futurity is low will generate a high rate of childbearing during adolescence; similarly, among adolescents who have a well developed sense of the future and who trust their ability to make plans toward it, childbearing will be less likely (p. 78).

Deferrment of Gratification

"An individual's cognitions concerning the content, placement, and unfolding of relevant events in his past, present or future" (p. 317), the definition given the term "time perspective" by Lamm, Schmidt, and Trommsdorff (1976) may describe a salient difference between the adolescent who does form an early family and he who does not. Weaver (1977) demonstrated that the future cognitions and plans of students who did not plan on furthering their education were more present-oriented than those who did, and that these same students planned on marrying and becoming parents at a much earlier age than their educationally oriented counterparts. Mischel (1973) suggested that future time perspective is a cause or correlate of the tendency or capacity to delay rewards. Frequently, delay of reward is referred to in the literature as "deferrment of gratification."

Cohen (1959) defined the deferred gratification construct as "the subordination of present hedonistic satisfactions and immediate impulse to the pursuit of long-range goals" (p. 28). Young mothers and those who have been judged to be potential drop outs indicate a tendency to not "subordinate present hedonistic satisfactions and
immediate impulses". Empirically, it has been demonstrated that "delinquents" (part of the population with drop out prevention programs) have less ability to defer gratification than normal adolescents and that their time perspective is more "present oriented" (Davids, Kidder & Reich, 1962; Barndt & Johnson, 1955).

If knowing the interests, concerns, experience, and expectations of normal adolescents pertaining to parent education and parenting interests can improve the effectiveness of the adolescent as a future parent, then knowing these same things about the adolescent who is at high risk for early parenting might enable social and curriculum planners to meet the special needs of this population.
METHODOLOGY

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to test the relevance of parent education for high school students in terms of interests, concerns, expectations, and experiences of adolescents regarding children. Implications from the data were developed for parent education. The ability to defer gratification and gender served as independent variables. Ability to defer gratification was defined primarily on the objective basis of assignment to one of three programs indicating "defer" status (remaining in school) or "nondefer" status (potential dropouts or young mothers). Secondarily, deferrment of gratification was defined subjectively by response of the subject indicating "defer" status (desire to continue education) or "nondefer" status (desire to not continue education beyond high school).

The Sample

The sample consists of students in two school districts in semi-rural areas of Northern Utah. The criteria in selecting these districts were (1) districts were large enough to produce a useable sample within the potential dropout and young mothers programs and (2) districts were
accessible to researcher. Comparison of the data gathered from the different school districts by the F test yield no significant differences, and demonstrated that the two populations were homogenous. An objective sample of deferrers/nondeferrers of gratification was devised from the following groups:

1. Regular high school students, males (N=51) and females (N=52). Because these students are still in school they will be dealt with initially as "deferrers of gratification".

2. Potential dropout students, males (N=26) and females (N=23). These students have been judged by school administrators and themselves to lack the interest and/or the ability to succeed in regular high school and are considered high risk for premature exit from high school. On the basis of behaviors from which such a determination is made, these students will be initially considered as "non-deferrers of gratification."

3. Students enrolled in a young mothers program, females (N=27). Early childbearing is a manifestation of some lack of interest or ability to defer gratification, and will be considered as "non-deferrment".

Because assignment to a program in school may be the result of family and other pressures rather than behaviors, the students were again divided subjectively to determine ability to defer gratification.
1. "Future education", males (N=48) and females (N=55) indicated that they planned on "deferring" the monetary rewards of a full time job in favor of obtaining an education after high school.

2. "Non-education", males (N=30) and females (N=46) indicated a preference for that monetary reward of full time employment after high school graduation, rather than delaying gratification for a possibly greater future reward.

This subjective sample is not synonymous with the objective sample. Included within the "future education" group are 78 regular high school students (41 males, 37 females); 14 potential dropouts (7 males, 7 females); and 11 of the young mothers. Thirty-five percent of the "future education" group were not regular high school students. The "non-education" group consisted of 25 regular high school students (10 males, 15 females); 35 potential dropouts (19 males, 16 females); and 16 young mothers. Fifty percent of the non-education group consists of regular high school students.

Further biographical data on the samples is found in Table 1 which indicates that the only significant difference found between the subsamples was in religiosity. Regular students are depicted as the most religious, and potential dropouts as the least religious.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Regular Males N=51</th>
<th>Regular Females N=52</th>
<th>Potential Males N=26</th>
<th>Potential Females N=23</th>
<th>Young Mothers Males N=27</th>
<th>Young Mothers Females N=27</th>
<th>Young Future Males N=48</th>
<th>Young Future Females N=46</th>
<th>Young Education Males N=30</th>
<th>Young Education Females N=46</th>
<th>Young Non-education Males N=30</th>
<th>Young Non-education Females N=46</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity¹</td>
<td>2.3*</td>
<td>1.9***</td>
<td>3.9**</td>
<td>3.3**</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.2**</td>
<td>3.5***</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Mean is derived from the following key: (1) very religious; (2) moderately religious; (3) slightly religious; (4) not religious

* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001
The Instrument

The instrument consisted of a revised edition of Weaver's (1977) "Adolescent Interest Survey." The revision, accomplished by the researcher, graphically abridged the survey from eight pages into one page (legal size paper, both sides). This purpose of this abridgement was to make the survey more appealing and less arduous to the subject. The survey is referenced in appendix A.

 Seven sections of the survey measured the interests, concerns, expectations, experiences, and attitudes of adolescents regarding children and parent education.

Section 1 solicits information on biographical data. Age, grade, sex, religiosity, and basic orientation toward gratification deferral/non-deferral were ascertained from this section. Objective orientation toward gratification was recorded by the researcher. Subjective orientation toward gratification was ascertained on the basis of response to the question where the subject indicated whether or not he planned to "graduate from business or vocational school or college". Response to the question of whether or not the subject planned to "get a full time job" could have also differentiated between deferrers/nondeferrers; however, many students, particularly females, have no plans to get a full time job or continue their education. Therefore, rather than divide the groups into those continuing their education and those who plan on working, the division
was accomplished by differentiating between those who plan on continuing with school, and those who do not.

A basic orientation towards acquiring a spouse and children was also ascertained in this section. This was not used as an independent variable, but might have provided some interesting insight had it been used as such. The subjects were asked to rank order spouse and children within a constellation of other adult priorities, car/pickup, home ownership, and recreational equipment. The advantage of this arrangement is to eliminate contamination of data measuring interest in a particular subject by soliciting merely socially acceptable "yes" from unacceptable "no" responses.

Section 2 measured interest, via "rank order", in three groups of five hypothetical conversation preferences. Within each group, a topic relating to children or parenting was placed. "Younger brothers, sisters, or neighbors; future roles as parents; and concerns such as what kind of parent I will be" were measured against other more self and present-referenced conversational topics such as the "opposite sex, money, clothes, and sports".

Section 3 also used the rank-order method to compare interests in book preferences. "How to Be a Good Parent" and "Making the Most of Marriage" was placed in juxta-position with other book titles such as "Hobbies for Fun and Profit", "How to Win Friends and Influence People",
and "How to Get and Keep the Job You Want". "Backpacking On the Appalachian Trail", this title on Weaver's (1977) sample was changed to a local title of similar nature, "Cache Trails".

Section 4 compared ranks given by students to two groups of five possible course preferences. "Parenting and Infant Care" and "Courtship and Marriage" were compared with courses such as "Red Cross First Aid", "Drafting," and "Tennis".

Section 5 contained a list of sixty concerns of which the student was instructed to circle all of the concerns bothering him. The concerns represented 12 categories. Each category included five specific problems. The categories are: Physical development, money, dating, sex, courtship, marriage, parenting, friends, family, vocation, school, and personal. A key to section five which lists the problems in each category is found in Appendix B.

Section 6 solicited information concerning the adolescent's experiences with young children, and his attitudes about those experiences. Heron (1952) originally used these 10 activities for young children with students in England as a method of measuring adolescents' experiences. This section also included two questions about the frequency of babysitting.

Section 7 was used to evaluate the adolescent's expectations of the growth and development of children.
Eight developmental events were described and the students were asked to indicate the age at which the events occurred. The last question of this section related to an expectation of infant behavior. Section seven was a revision of a measure developed by de Lissovoy (1973) in his study of adolescent parents.

**The Procedure**

The questionnaires were administered to regular high school students in sociology classes. For students in young mothers programs and potential drop out programs, the questionnaire was administered during regular class hours in a group assembly for the purpose of completing the survey.

Prior to the administration of the questionnaire, students were given a letter requesting permissions from their parents to have the student participate in the study. As the study was not sponsored by the school districts, this procedure was required by law. The letter is referenced in Appendix C.

After being introduced by the teacher, the investigator gave careful instructions on the procedures to follow in completing the questionnaire. During the fifteen to thirty minutes it took to complete the questionnaire, the investigator was present to answer questions and to monitor the successful completion of the questionnaire. The
students handed their completed questionnaire to the investigator.

**Analysis of the Data**

All responses, including biographical data, were subjected to the "F" test for significance, which tests samples of unequal sizes.

All sections requiring the student to rank order preferences were subjected to a "rank-significance" test, which utilized the chi-square statistic to ascertain the nature of the ranks. In addition, the F test was applied to each of the responses listed on the table, to determine if the particular ranking given to the particular question was significantly different from rankings given the other alternatives within the group. Hence, a ranking of "3", the median response, is seldom if ever significant by F test, but those responses most different from the median response are significant. If the rank order test determined that the order of the ranks was significant, a response that is significant by F test is outstandingly different from the other responses within the group.

For all of the data, the mean response for each sub-sample was ascertained and tested for significance. Thus data were generated and tabled according to mean biographical data; mean predicted age of life events; mean response to each rank-order question on preferences; mean frequency
of babysitting, number of experiences, and the enjoyment of those experiences according to a specified code. The mean age estimated by students in each of the subsamples at which a specified developmental milestone occurs in children and was also listed.

The percentages of concerns checked by each subsample within each of the twelve categories, and the percentage of unrealistic responses to estimated age of appearance of developmental milestone (according to a specified code) was also ascertained and tested for significance. The significance of concerns was checked vertically (intragroup differences) and horizontally (inter-group differences). The Student "t" was used to determine the significance of unrealistic responses, as the mean in this case was fixed.

**The Null Hypotheses**

Three constellations of null hypotheses were tested.

**Constellation 1: Differences in Expressed Parenting Interest**

H1: There is no significant difference in expressed interest in acquiring children or spouses in relationship to other possible priorities on the basis of gender.

H2: There is no significant difference in expressed interest in acquiring children or spouses in relationship to other possible priorities on the basis of ability to
defer gratification, defined objectively and subjectively.

H3: There is no significant difference in expressed parenting interests when solicited in the contexts of a course preference, a conversational topic, a book, or a concern on the basis of gender.

H4: There is no significant difference in expressed parenting interests when solicited in the contexts of a course preference, a conversational topic, a book, or a concern on the basis of ability to defer gratification, defined subjectively and objectively.

Constellation 2: Differences in Expectations of Child Development

H1: There is no significant difference in expectations of child development on the basis of gender.

H2: There is no significant difference in expectations of child development on the basis of ability to defer gratification, defined objectively and subjectively as described.

Constellation 3: Differences in Experience with Children

H1: There is no significant difference in experience with children on the basis of gender.

H2: There is no significant difference in experience with children on the basis of ability to defer gratification, both objectively and subjectively.
H₃: There is no significant difference in attitudes about the experiences had with children on the basis of gender.

H₄: There is no significant difference in attitudes about the experiences had with children on the basis of ability to defer gratification, both objectively and subjectively.
RESULTS

Time Perspective

If an individual's cognitions concerning the relevant events in the future is actually a cause or a correlate of the tendency to delay rewards as Mischel (1973) suggested, then this study should demonstrate that there are differences between the expectations of "nondeferrers" and "deferrers" of gratification concerning ages at which they will acquire adult rewards such as full time job, education, spouse, and children. It is expected that this difference will be that "nondeferrers" expect to acquire these things at an earlier age than "deferrers". On the basis of Weaver's (1977) study, it was also expected that females expect to acquire a spouse and children at an earlier age than males.

The data in Tables 2 and 3 indicates that all of the above expectations were found to be significant.

"Nondeferrers", both males and females, both from a subjective and an objective reference, plan on getting a full time job sooner than "delayers". Because 50% of the non-education group consists of regular high school students, these data suggest that regular high school students who are themselves "nondelayers" on the basis of
Table 2  
F-test Analysis of Mean Predicted Age for Life Events of Subsamples Compared by Gender and the Ability to Defer Gratification Defined Objectively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Regular Students</th>
<th>Potential Dropouts</th>
<th>Young Mothers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get a full time job</td>
<td>20.1***</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>17.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate from business or vocational school or college</td>
<td>24.4***</td>
<td>21.5***</td>
<td>20.0***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get married</td>
<td>22.7***</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have first child</td>
<td>25.0***</td>
<td>23.5*</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  
** p < .01 (according to ability to defer gratification)  
*** p < .001  
____ p < .05  
_____ p < .01 (according to gender)  
______ p > .001
Table 3
F-test Analysis of Mean Predicted Age for Life Events of Subsamples Compared by Gender and the Ability to Defer Gratification Defined Subjectively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Future Education</th>
<th>Non-education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get a full time job</td>
<td>20.1**</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate from business or vocational school or college</td>
<td>23.8**</td>
<td>21.2***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get married</td>
<td>23.1***</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have first child</td>
<td>25.0***</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05  
**p<.01 (according to ability to defer gratification) 
***p<.001

---p<.05  
==p<.01 (according to gender) 
==p<.001
educational orientation plan on getting a job at an earlier age than those who plan on furthering their education. While future education females plan on getting a job sooner ($\bar{X} \text{ age} = 19.2$) than males ($\bar{X} \text{ age} = 20.1$), non-education oriented females expect to get a job later ($\bar{X} \text{ age} = 18.6$) than males ($\bar{X} = 17.7$).

Even "nondefer" males from an objective reference who indicated that they planned on furthering their education beyond high school demonstrated this directional difference in expected age at which they planned on graduating from college or vocational school ($\bar{X} \text{ age} = 20.0$) than "delay" males ($\bar{X} \text{ age} = 24.4$) (see Table 2). This would indicate that their education will probably consist of vocational, rather than academic training, and that they will be eligible for the full-time job market sooner. There were no such significant differences found between the females of the two samples. However, between males and females, significant differences exist in that females plan on completing their education earlier than males. Among regular high school students, there is a difference of about three years in expected age at which males and females expect to graduate from business or vocational school. This difference may be more pronounced in this geographical location than it would be in others, because of expectations for future L.D.S. (Mormon) proselyting missions for males.
"Nondefer" non-education males and females plan on marrying much earlier than their future education oriented counterparts (see Table 3), and consequently also expect to have their first child earlier. What is interesting is that females in every case plan on having children sooner after marriage than males, and that potential dropout males plan on having their first child sooner after marriage ($\bar{X} = 1.1$ years) than males attending regular high school ($\bar{X} = 2.3$ years) (see Table 2).

It is significant that potential dropout females plan on marrying earlier ($\bar{X}$ age = 21.8), having children earlier ($\bar{X}$ age = 23.1) and having children sooner after marriage ($\bar{X} = 1.3$ years) than females attending regular high school who plan on marrying on the average at age 22.0, having their first child at 23.5 years, and waiting 1.5 years before having a child. These differences are more pronounced as illustrated in Table three, where many of the young mothers are included within the subjective "non-education" group.

"Time perspective" is not presented as a null hypothesis, but as a basis for interpreting the null hypotheses. The important points to keep in mind are that females are more vulnerable to early family formation than males, and that "nondeferrers", both males and females, are more vulnerable to early family formation than "deferrers". The method in which the deferrment of gratification construct is utilized in this study does provide a
differentiating basis on which to interpret findings.

**Differences in Expressed Parenting Interests**

If adolescents who do not defer the rewards of adulthood are higher risk for earlier parenting, then it is expected that their interest in parenting would be higher. The literature predicts that females will be more interested in parenting than males. These differences are examined in this study in the contexts of adult priorities, conversational preferences, book preferences, course preferences, and concerns. One parenting topic is imbedded within a constellation of five other topics to ascertain the relative interest adolescents have in that topic as compared with other topics as an adult priority, a conversational topic, a book preference, and a course preference. Five parenting topics are imbedded within a constellation of sixty other topics (divided evenly into 12 categories) to ascertain the relative concern adolescents have for parenting and family matters in relationship to other concerns.

**Adult Priorities**

With "1" representing the priority most desirable and "5" representing the priority least desirable, the mean rank order given by males to the parenting topic in this section, "Children" was "5", regardless of ability to defer
gratification. Females generally ranked it as "4", but potential dropouts found it least desirable ("5") and young mothers, probably because it is something that most of them have already achieved, ranked it as "2". All of these differences are significant.

"Husband/wife", was rated as the primary ("1") by males and females in every "defer" category, while "non-deferrers" males and females rated it as "3". Young mothers, by virtue of the fact that many of them already have spouses, also rated it as "1". These differences are significant, as indicated by Table 4.

Equally important to the consistency and significance of rank orders ascribed to "husband/wife" and "children" is the consistency and significance ascribed to non-familial topics. Potential dropouts, both male and female gave "car/pickup" and "own a home" mean ranks of "1" and "2" respectively, while all other students rated them lower. Recreational equipment in all cases was about as undesirable as "children" and was consistently ranked as "4" and "5".

Conversational Preferences

Three groups of five conversational topics contained one topic each that in some way dealt with parenting.

The parenting topic in group A (Table 5) read, "younger brothers, sisters, or neighbors" and is abbreviated on the table as "children". As in the case of adult priorities, "children" was ranked as "5" consistently by
Table 4
F-test Analysis of Rankings of Adult Priorities and Rank-significance of rank order given by subsamples divided According to Gender and Ability to Defer Gratification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Females &amp; Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank Significance</td>
<td>Rank Order</td>
<td>Rank Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular students</td>
<td>113.33***</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential dropouts</td>
<td>81.72***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future education</td>
<td>103.64***</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-education</td>
<td>91.98***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>2***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular students</td>
<td>62.93***</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential dropouts</td>
<td>34.77***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young mothers</td>
<td>61.40***</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future education</td>
<td>67.83***</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-education</td>
<td>54.31***</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total females</td>
<td>121.72***</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>1***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
**p<.01
***p<.001
Table 5
F-test Analysis of Rankings of Conversational Preferences (Group A) and Rank-significance Given by Subsamples According to Gender and the Ability to Defer Gratification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Personal Appearance</th>
<th>Younger Children</th>
<th>Special Hobby</th>
<th>Opposite Sex</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females &amp; Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular students</td>
<td>159.14***</td>
<td>4***</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential dropouts</td>
<td>65.27***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4***</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future education</td>
<td>151.40***</td>
<td>4***</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-education</td>
<td>88.59***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular students</td>
<td>77.78***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential dropouts</td>
<td>37.97***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4***</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young mothers</td>
<td>39.08***</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future education</td>
<td>73.49***</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-education</td>
<td>68.29***</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular students</td>
<td>96.29***</td>
<td>4***</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential dropouts</td>
<td>29.57***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2**</td>
<td>1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future education</td>
<td>87.34***</td>
<td>4***</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-education</td>
<td>30.80***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>2**</td>
<td>1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total males</td>
<td>106.89***</td>
<td>4***</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>1***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05
**p < 0.01
***p < 0.001
males and also females. Potential dropouts present a notable exception in that both males and females ranked it as "4". The difference is more significant in the case of the female dropout. It is interesting that young mothers also believed that talking about younger children was the least desirable topic.

"Future parental role", the topic in Table 6, seemed a more desirable conversational topic than younger children. Future education females ranked it as "1", while all other females ranked it as "2". All males ranked "future parental role" as "3" in the specified list of conversational preferences. In all cases, the position of rank given "future parental role" is significant, but in most cases, the rank given "future parental role" was not much different from the rank given to "reading interests" and "t.v. shows". The exceptions were in the case of the young mother, the future education female, and females in general.

"Concerns about what kind of parent I will be", abbreviated as "parenting concerns" on Table 7, received higher rankings by females than did "younger children". All females rated "parenting concerns" as "3" except for young mothers who rated it as "2", and the ordinal position of all of these rankings are significance. Except for the singular case of "non-education" females, the rankings given to "parenting concerns" were not much different than
Table 6
F-test Analysis of Rankings of Conversational Preferences (Group B) and Rank-significance Given by Subsamples According to Gender and the Ability to Defer Gratification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Future Parental Rank Significance</th>
<th>Money Rank Order</th>
<th>Interests Rank Order</th>
<th>Roles Rank Order</th>
<th>Teachers Rank Order</th>
<th>TV Shows Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females &amp; Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular students</td>
<td>43.91***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4***</td>
<td>2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential dropouts</td>
<td>34.91***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future education</td>
<td>41.07***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>4***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-education</td>
<td>65.66***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>4***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular students</td>
<td>9.57*</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential dropouts</td>
<td>17.11**</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young mothers</td>
<td>33.59***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>4***</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future education</td>
<td>10.36*</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-education</td>
<td>42.89***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>5**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4***</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total females</td>
<td>44.51***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>4**</td>
<td>2**</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular students</td>
<td>51.40***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>4***</td>
<td>2***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential dropouts</td>
<td>22.12***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future education</td>
<td>44.83***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>4***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4***</td>
<td>2***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-education</td>
<td>26.21***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>4**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total males</td>
<td>70.31***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>4***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>2***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
**p < .01
***p < .001
## Table 7
F-test Analysis of Rankings of Conversational Preferences (Group C) and Rank-significance given by subsamples According to Gender and the Ability to Defer Gratification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>Vocational</th>
<th>Parenting</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Motion</th>
<th>Sports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clothes</td>
<td>Hopes</td>
<td>Concerns</td>
<td>Pictures</td>
<td>Sports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females &amp; Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular students</td>
<td>25.44***</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1**</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential dropouts</td>
<td>43.02***</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future education</td>
<td>17.85**</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-education</td>
<td>31.47***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>5**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular students</td>
<td>22.75***</td>
<td>1**</td>
<td>1**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential dropouts</td>
<td>26.00***</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young mothers</td>
<td>17.95**</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future education</td>
<td>23.32***</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>1**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-education</td>
<td>34.89***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>2**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>5***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total females</td>
<td>54.79***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4**</td>
<td>5***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular students</td>
<td>73.07***</td>
<td>4***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>2**</td>
<td>1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential dropouts</td>
<td>21.03***</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>4**</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future education</td>
<td>63.15***</td>
<td>4***</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-education</td>
<td>10.57*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1**</td>
<td>5**</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total males</td>
<td>56.96***</td>
<td>4**</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05  
**p<.01  
***p<.001
the ranking given to "new motion pictures", and so the higher ratings given "parenting concerns" over "younger children" are probably inconsequential. Males rated "parenting concerns" as "5", except for potential dropouts, who rated it higher ("4"). These rankings are all significant.

More interesting than parenting conversational topics was the "opposite sex" (see Table 5) and "money" (see Table 6) which was rated an overwhelming "1" by every category of student. Table 7 demonstrates some diversity in adolescent conversational preferences on the basis of gender and the ability to defer gratification. Females in general felt that "clothes" was the best conversational topic and "sports" was the least desirable conversational topic; while males reversed the order, ranking "sports" as "1" and "clothes" as "4" ("parenting concerns" was the least desirable conversational topic for males). Regular high school females and males are very concerned about "future vocational hopes", and females ranked it relatively higher than males. Potential dropouts, male and female, listed "future vocational hopes" as their number "1" conversational preference.

In summary, "parenting" is not what adolescents are talking about. More important are subjects such as "the opposite sex", "money", "clothes", (for females) and "sports" (for males). This is consistent with Weaver's
(1977) findings. Males talk about parenting less than females, and potential dropouts, especially males, talk about parenting more frequently than regular students. No significant differences in the discussion of parenting existed between regular high school student females and young mothers.

**Book Preferences**

Two groups of book titles each contained a book about a future-family related topic. In group A, that book was *How to Be a Good Parent*. In group B, that book was *Making the Most of Marriage*.

"Nondeferrers" of gratification, both male and female, ranked *How to Be a Good Parent* consistently higher than the "deferrers" group. This difference is significant between and within groups for females, and is significant within the group of "nondefer" males. *Making the Most of Marriage* was also ranked consistently higher by "nondeferrers" both male and female.

Only in the cases of the young mother and "non-education" females were *How to Be a Good Parent* and *Making the Most of Marriage* the most desirable book titles. Regular high school females and "future education" females both indicated a preference for *How to Win Friends and Influence People* and *Hobbies for Fun and Profit* (see Table 8). Table 9 indicates that the preference of "future education" females and regular high school females was *How to Get
Table 8
F-test Analysis of Rankings of Book Preferences (Group A) and Rank-significance Given by Subsamples According to Gender and the Ability to Defer Gratification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>How to Win</th>
<th>Hobbies for fun</th>
<th>How to Be A Good Parent</th>
<th>Cache Trails</th>
<th>Backyard Cooking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank Order</td>
<td>Rank Order</td>
<td>Rank Order</td>
<td>Rank Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females &amp; Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular students</td>
<td>106.50***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential dropouts</td>
<td>30.45***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>4**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future education</td>
<td>64.21***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>4***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-education</td>
<td>45.54***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>5***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular students</td>
<td>52.09***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential dropouts</td>
<td>23.22**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>5***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young mothers</td>
<td>57.63***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>5***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future education</td>
<td>54.21***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>4***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-education</td>
<td>53.36***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>5***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total females</td>
<td>100.95***</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>3***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>5***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular students</td>
<td>61.65***</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential dropouts</td>
<td>13.00*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future education</td>
<td>69.91***</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-education</td>
<td>10.05**</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total males</td>
<td>64.84***</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
**p<.01
***p<.001
Table 9
F-test Analysis of Rankings of Book Preferences (Group B) and Rank-Significance Given by Subsamples According to Gender and the Ability to Defer Gratification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rank Significance</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females &amp; Males</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular students</td>
<td>80.19***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>4***</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential dropouts</td>
<td>38.12***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future education</td>
<td>66.20***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>4***</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>2***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-education</td>
<td>74.28***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>4***</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>2**</td>
<td>3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular students</td>
<td>62.97***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>4***</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>3**</td>
<td>2***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential dropouts</td>
<td>25.64***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>2***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young mothers</td>
<td>48.34***</td>
<td>2**</td>
<td>4***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future education</td>
<td>66.20***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>4***</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>2***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-education</td>
<td>59.37***</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>3**</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total females</strong></td>
<td>99.49***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>4***</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular students</td>
<td>29.77**</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>2**</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential dropouts</td>
<td>21.17***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future education</td>
<td>23.82***</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4***</td>
<td>5***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-education</td>
<td>11.40*</td>
<td>1**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5**</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total males</strong></td>
<td>24.67***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
**p < .01
***p < .001
and Keep the Job You Want, and Making the Most of Marriage was ranked as "2".

Males were not as favorable toward the book titles dealing with future family, but ranked How to Be a Good Parent as "2" or "3" and Making the Most of Marriage as "4" or "5". The ordinal position of the ranking is in all cases, significant, but in cases where it was ranked as "2" (potential dropouts and non-education males), it was not much different than the rank of "3" given to Cache Trails. This is consistent with the finding in this study that "future education" males generally are less interested in parenting topics and plan on delaying parenting more than any other group. Even though "future education" males are planning on continuing their education, they preferred a "fun" book, Guinness Book of Records to a vocational book, How to Get and Keep the Job You Want, ranked as "2". The vocational book was also ranked as more important than an educational book, How to Get Admitted to the College of Your Choice, ranked as "3".

Similarities between male and female responses, as well as differences, were significant. Particularly, both "defer" and "nondefer" males and females were the most interested in the topic dealing with future vocation, How to Get and Keep the Job You Want. This similarity reinforces the salience of money as a desirable reward, one that is as powerful and meaningful to the "deferrer" as
it is for the "nondeferrer", for the male as well as the female.

It must be remembered that "money" as a topic of conversation was also rated as number "1" among all groups for both genders.

In summary, females were very interested in the book titles dealing with future family as compared with the other titles, and generally ranked both books as "1" or "2". Nondeferrers of gratification, both male and female, consistently ranked the future family books higher than the deferrers of gratification. All groups were very interested in How to Get and Keep the Job You Want, ranking it as "1" or "2". Only young mothers and "non-education" females ranked this title as "2". "Future education" males were most interested in a fun book, Guinness Book of Records.

Course Preferences

Two groups of courses which the adolescent was asked to rank order each contained a course dealing with future families. In group A (Table 10) that course was "Parenting and Infant Care". In group B (Table 11), "Courtship and Marriage" was the topic dealing with future family.

The consistencies in Table 10 are noteworthy. Females in every category ranked "Parenting and Infant Care" as "1", "Gourmet Cooking" as "2", and "Red Cross First Aid" as "3". Males consistently ranked "Drafting" as "1" and Hunter's Safety" as "2". The consistency of these ratings
Table 10
F-test Analysis of Rankings of Course Preferences (Group A) and Rank-Significance Given by Subsamples According to Gender and the Ability to Defer Gratification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Parenting</th>
<th>Red Cross First Aid</th>
<th>Gourmet &amp; Infant Care</th>
<th>Hunter's Safety</th>
<th>Drafting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank Significance</td>
<td>Rank Order</td>
<td>Rank Order</td>
<td>Rank Order</td>
<td>Rank Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females &amp; Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular students</td>
<td>16.18***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>5**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential dropouts</td>
<td>9.95*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1**</td>
<td>5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future education</td>
<td>21.02***</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>5***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-education</td>
<td>45.30***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>4***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular students</td>
<td>57.28***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>5***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential dropouts</td>
<td>43.58***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>5***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young mothers</td>
<td>65.90***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2**</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>4***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future education</td>
<td>59.96***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>5***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-education</td>
<td>105.29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>4***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total females</td>
<td>156.89***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>5***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular students</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential dropouts</td>
<td>11.42*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future education</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-education</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total males</td>
<td>14.04**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5**</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05  
**p<.01  
***p<.001
Table 11
F-test Analysis of Rankings of Course Preferences (Group B) and Rank-Significance Given by Subsamples According to Gender and the Ability to Defer Gratification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Psychol-Courtship &amp; Marriage</th>
<th>Tennis</th>
<th>Woodworking</th>
<th>Pottery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank Significance</td>
<td>Rank Order</td>
<td>Rank Order</td>
<td>Rank Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females &amp; Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular students</td>
<td>126.40***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential dropouts</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future education</td>
<td>104.54***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-education</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular students</td>
<td>98.49***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential dropouts</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young mothers</td>
<td>10.32***</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1**</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future education</td>
<td>63.99***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-education</td>
<td>24.49***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>2**</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total females</td>
<td>84.99***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular students</td>
<td>58.82***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential dropouts</td>
<td>20.05**</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future education</td>
<td>66.93***</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-education</td>
<td>21.68***</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total males</td>
<td>42.38***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.01
**p<.001
***p<.001
indicate the (1) rank-order techniques impose limitations upon the expression of the subject—which is all right as this study seeks to understand only the relative interests of adolescents and (2) adolescents perceive their traditional roles as men and women in society as relevant. The rank given by males to "Parenting and Infant Care" was "4" but was in most cases insignificant, both within and between the groups.

In Table 11, "Courtship and Marriage" is ranked "2" by both groups of regular high school students, and "future education" and "non-education" females. Young mothers were most interested in the course and ranked it as "1". Potential dropouts, male and female and non-education males ranked the course lower than the "defer" students. In the case of the potential dropout female, this difference is not significant. It is significant, however, in the case of the "nondefer" male who ranked it as "5"—the least desirable course.

All groups of regular high school students and non-education and future education females ranked "Psychology" as "1". When administering the questionnaire to high school students, the researcher was told by the instructor that the psychology teacher at the particular high school was outstanding and that the course was the most popular in the school. Because this biases the results on this Table slightly away from the other preferences, "Courtship
and Marriage" might have received the primary, rather than the secondary rating in other circumstances.

In summary, young mothers and regular high school females are most interested in parenting and marriage courses, and consistently ranked them as "1" or "2" among other courses. Males within the dropout prevention program are not interested in parenting or marriage courses, and consistently ranked them among the least desirable. Although female potential dropouts were more interested in the parenting and marriage courses than the males, they were less interested in the courses than regular high school females.

Adolescent Concerns

Sixty concerns were divided into 12 categories to which 5 concerns each were assigned. These concerns were spread randomly throughout the list in which the adolescent was asked to circle all of the concerns currently bothering him or her. Because certain groups of the subjects were more responsive to concerns in general than other groups, the data on concerns was analyzed in terms of "percentage of concerns checked in each category" rather than "number of concerns checked in each category" as Weaver's (1977) data were analyzed. This, in effect, corrected for responsiveness.

Statistical significance was determined by "F" test,
and each response was tested for significance both between groups and within the group.

The greatest concern of all of the adolescents in this study was "money," as indicated in the "average" columns of Tables 12 and 13. Female potential dropouts (not "non-education" females) were especially concerned about money, checking 20.4% of the concerns within this category, and this is significant both within the group and between the groups. Potential dropout males were the next most concerned, and checked 17.2% of the monetary concerns.

"Nondeferrers" in both Tables 12 and 13 checked a greater percentage of monetary concerns than "deferrers", and this is true for both genders. This is particularly significant for females within the dropout prevention program, and males in dropout prevention and young mothers demonstrate this same preference very strongly. Males in regular high school indicate that money is their number one concern, but vocation and school and physical development (in that order) are close behind. Regular high school females ranked "money" as "3", behind more important concerns such as physical development and vocation. Note that the ranking given money is significant only between (not within) groups, but the rankings given to physical development and vocation were significant within (not between) the group.

On the average, all students considered physical development as concern "2", and vocation as concern "3". All
Table 12
F-test Analysis of Inter-group and Intra-group Differences in Percentage of Concerns Checked in Each Category According to Gender and Ability to Defer Gratification Objectively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Regular Students</th>
<th>Potential Dropouts</th>
<th>Young Mothers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical development</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>13.4***</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>14.0***</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>17.2***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.1*</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtship</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.7*</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocation</td>
<td>11.9**</td>
<td>12.2**</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>4.8**</td>
<td>4.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>4.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
**p<.01 (intragroup significance)
***p<.001

____p<.05
_____p<.01 (intergroup significance)
Table 13
F-test Analysis of Inter-group and Intra-group Differences in Percentage of Concerns Checked in Each Category According to Gender and Ability to Defer Gratification Subjectively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Future Education</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-education</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical development</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>12.9***</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>14.4***</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>14.6***</td>
<td>12.5***</td>
<td>15.8***</td>
<td>15.3***</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>4.4*</td>
<td>3.7***</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4.2***</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtship</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.7*</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocation</td>
<td>11.9*</td>
<td>11.6*</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>5.1*</td>
<td>5.1*</td>
<td>2.4***</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>4.6*</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
**p<.01 (intra-group significance)
***p<.001

---
p<.05

---
(p<.01 (inter-group significance)
females show higher percentages of concerns with the physical development category than males, but these differences are only significant within the particular group of females. Young mothers are more concerned for physical development than any other group, and this is significant between the groups.

None of the percentages of concerns checked by regular high school males were significantly low, and deserve no special consideration as such. Females in regular high school, however, and young mothers indicated that they were the least interested in sex. This lack of concern for sex, though not significant within most groups, was on the average and in nearly every group the least concern. The singular exception was the "nondefer" male (subjectively and objectively defined). Subjectively defined, the difference was significant between the groups. Still, this concern was lower than money, vocation, family, physical development, courtship, friends, and dating in that order. It was still below the average of the total percentage of concerns checked by "non-education" males (see Table 13).

"Dating" also was below the average of the total percentage of concerns checked by all of the groups except the "defer" male (see Tables 13 and 14). This difference, in the case of the regular high school male, is significant between the groups, where these males checked 9.5% of the dating concerns and students in general checked
Table 14
F-test Analysis of Adolescent's Knowledge of Child Development on the Basis of Gender and the Ability to Defer Gratification Objectively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Normative Age</th>
<th>Regular Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Potential Dropouts Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Young Mothers Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Peek-a-boo&quot;</td>
<td>10 mos.</td>
<td>7.7 mos.</td>
<td>7.2 mos.</td>
<td>11.7 mos.**</td>
<td>7.9 mos.</td>
<td>9.0 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First step</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.2*</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet training</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowel control</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoon feeding</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.8*</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>11.6***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First word</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.5**</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>11.6**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedience training</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.7**</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>8.2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tying shoelaces</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001
only 7.1% of the dating concerns.

All "nondefer" groups, and also females, indicated that school was among the least of their concerns. Only "defer" males indicated that it was important, and this difference is significant. Personal concerns were the lowest among potential dropout males, and highest among young mothers, and these differences are significant between the groups. Vocation is significantly lower among young mothers than any of the other groups.

"Parenting" as a concern is right on the average when the entire aggregate of students is considered. Exception to the rule is the young mother, for whom "parenting" concerns are the greatest. Family generally was lower than the average when considered aggregately also. Female potential dropouts, however, were very concerned about family. Young mothers were not concerned about family, and checked only 3.6% of all family concerns. Courtship was also a lower concern of the aggregate of students.

In summary, adolescents are not relatively concerned about matters relating to the procedures involved in formation of their future families of procreation such as dating, courtship, marriage and parenting. They are also not greatly concerned about their own family of orientation. They are, however, concerned about things that sustain that family (and themselves) as indicated by their concerns for "money" and "vocation". The "future
education" male who plans on supporting his family on the basis of skills acquired through his education, school is very important.

Status of Null Hypotheses in Constellation 1: Differences in Expressed Parenting Interest

H₁: There is no significant difference in expressed interest in acquiring children or spouses in relationship to other possible priorities on the basis of gender.

H₁ is rejected. Males consistently gave "children" the least desirable rank, while females ranked it higher.

H₂: There is no significant difference in expressed interest in acquiring children or spouses in relationship to other possible priorities on the basis of ability to defer gratification, defined objectively and subjectively.

H₂ is rejected. Among females, significant differences exist in response to desire for children. Young mothers ranked "children" as "2", potential dropouts ranked it as "5" (least desirable), and all other categories of females, regardless of ability to defer gratification, ranked it as "4".

"Husband/wife" was rated as "1" by both genders in every "defer" category, while "nondeferrers" in both genders rated it as "3". Young mothers rated it as "1".

H₃: There is no significant difference in expressed parenting interests when solicited in the contexts of a
course preference, a conversational topic, a book, or a concern on the basis of gender.

$H_3$ is rejected. Males are less concerned than females about parenting no matter how "interest in parenting" is solicited.

$H_4$: There is no significant difference in expressed parenting interests when solicited in the contexts of a course preference, a conversational topic, a book, or a concern on the basis of ability to defer gratification, defined subjectively and objectively.

$H_4$ is rejected. "Nondeferrers" whether subjectively or objectively defined, consistently ranked "parenting" higher as a conversational topic and a book. Every category of "nondeferrers" however, except the young mother, ranked "parenting" and "marriage" courses lower than "deferrers".

Adolescent Expectations of Child Development

Eight developmental tasks of infants and children were presented to adolescents with the instruction to indicate on the line provided the age at which they expected the child or infant to demonstrate that task. The average responses of the various groups of adolescents are compared to the normative age in Tables 14 and 15. The percentages of unrealistic expectations, ascertained from a "lower age
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Normative Age</th>
<th>Future Education Males</th>
<th>Future Education Females</th>
<th>Non-education Males</th>
<th>Non-education Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Peek-a-boo&quot;</td>
<td>10 mos.</td>
<td>8.1 mos.</td>
<td>7.2 mos.</td>
<td>10.0 mos.</td>
<td>8.5 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Step</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.8***</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>10.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet training</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowel control</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoon feeding</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.3**</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First word</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.3***</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>13.1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedience Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.5**</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>10.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tying shoelaces</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>40.4*</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
**p<.01
***p<.001
boundary" are reported for each of the groups in Tables 16 and 17. The normative ages and the lower age boundary are similar to the ones used by Weaver's (1977) study with two exceptions. On the basis of literature reviewed, expecting a child to begin toilet training is unrealistic at 12 months (Weaver's (1977) lower boundary), and to expect one's own child to respond as effectively to toilet training initiated at 15 months (Weaver's (1977) normative age) compared with initiating it a few months later is also unrealistic. Sear, Maccoby, and Levin (1957) compared children's responses to toilet training at various ages of initiation and found that the age of initiation of bladder training made no difference in the age at which children gained bladder control, and that children whose training was initiated at a later time were trained faster and with less frustration (to parent as well as the child). McCandless (1961) encourages mothers, on the basis of the Sears Maccoby and Levin (1957) data to postpone bowel training until the second year. Davis and Havighurst (1946) and Bowley (1948) indicated that a child is generally not trained completely until the second year. Azrin and Foxx (1976) encourage mothers to begin bladder training no earlier than 18 months and preferrably at 20 months, stating that bowel control will follow bladder control almost immediately in most cases. As the normative age and the lower age boundary serve only as reference points, perhaps
Table 16  
T-test Analysis of Percentage of Unrealistic Expectations of Child Development on the Basis of Gender and the Ability to Defer Gratification Objectively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Lower Age Boundary</th>
<th>Regular Students</th>
<th>Potential Dropouts</th>
<th>Young Mothers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Peek-a-boo&quot;</td>
<td>7 mos.</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>13%***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First step</td>
<td>10 mos.</td>
<td>22***</td>
<td>26***</td>
<td>30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet training</td>
<td>18 mos.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowel control</td>
<td>18 mos.</td>
<td>39*</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoon feeding</td>
<td>12 mos.</td>
<td>27***</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First word</td>
<td>8 mos.</td>
<td>10***</td>
<td>13***</td>
<td>11***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tying shoelaces</td>
<td>54 mos.</td>
<td>73**</td>
<td>87***</td>
<td>63*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*\(p<.05\)  
**\(p<.01\)  
***\(p<.001\)

1Predictions at this age or below were classified as unrealistic.
Table 17  
T-test Analysis of Percentage of Unrealistic Expectations of Child Development on the Basis of Gender and the Ability to Defer Gratification Subjectively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Lower Age Boundary</th>
<th>Future Education Males</th>
<th>Future Education Females</th>
<th>Non-education Males</th>
<th>Non-education Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Peek-a-boo&quot;</td>
<td>7 mos.</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First step</td>
<td>10 mos.</td>
<td>21***</td>
<td>26**</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet training</td>
<td>18 mos.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowel control</td>
<td>18 mos.</td>
<td>40**</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoon feeding</td>
<td>12 mos.</td>
<td>30***</td>
<td>55*</td>
<td>36**</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First word</td>
<td>8 mos.</td>
<td>9***</td>
<td>12***</td>
<td>17***</td>
<td>16***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tying shoelaces</td>
<td>54 mos.</td>
<td>74***</td>
<td>86***</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>82***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05  
**p<.01  
***p<.001

1Predictions at this age or below were classified as unrealistic.
numerical differences between this study and Weaver's (1977) study are only semantics. The normative age for bladder and bowel training is herein presented as 20 months, and the lower age boundary is presented at 18 months.

Significant differences were found between the genders in regular high school and within the future education group for four of the eight questions. In each case, the males mean estimation was more conservative than the female estimation. Weaver (1977) noted the same difference in the same questions.

While the mean estimated ages by males and females at which an infant should take his first step was above the normative age slightly, the male response was significantly more conservative than the female response. This was true in Weaver's (1977) study also. The same directional difference between males and females is found within the potential dropout group, but the difference is not significant at the .05 level.

The differences between the genders of regular high school students and future education group (Tables 14 and 15) were significant for the question of "spoon feeding". While the male estimation was above the normative age, the female estimation was below the normative age. Weaver (1977) found that while males were more conservative, both male and female were conservative in their estimation
of "spoon feeding". Although not significant, this same
directional difference between the genders is apparent
for the potential dropouts. The most significant dif­
ference in response to "spoon feeding" occurred in young
mothers, who were the most liberal in their estimation.

Regular high school and future education males were
also more conservative in their estimations of the time at
which an infant should say his first word. Females were
also conservative in response to this question, but not as
conservative as males. Weaver (1977) also found these
differences. Young mothers were the only group that were
not conservative in their estimation of when a child
should say their first word, and this difference was
significant at the .01 level.

No normative age was given for "obedience training"
in this study or Weaver's (1977) or de Lissovoy's (1973)
study. However, the same directional difference between
males and females is found for the regular high school
and future education groups, in that males gave the most
conservative estimation. Young mothers were by far the
most liberal in response to "obedience training".

All of the mean estimations of the normative age for
children to begin tying shoelaces were liberal. Males in
regular high school and within the future education group
were again, significantly more conservative in their esti­
mation than females. Weaver's (1977) study indicated the
same directional difference, but it was not significant.
While Weaver's (1977) sample were also liberal in their responses to this question, they were less liberal than the responses of the sample in this study. This difference may not be significant, but probably would be if all of the data were available and could be analyzed simultaneously with the data in this study. While males (regular high school) estimated children should tie shoelaces at 48 months, and females estimated at 40.9 months, Weaver's males estimated 52.1 months and her females estimated at 51.5 months.

One significant difference existed in comparing potential dropouts to the rest of the sample, and that difference was found in male response to "peek-a-boo", which response was the only mean response to be above the normative age. Again, this difference significantly demonstrates the greater conservative responses of males.

More than half of all students gave unrealistic responses to the age at which a child should be able to tie shoelaces, and this is consistent with Weaver's (1977) study. More females gave unrealistic responses in all of the categories, and all of these differences were significant. Young mothers were the most unrealistic in their response to tying shoelaces, with 92% of the young mothers expecting children to tie shoelaces before the specified lower age boundary. Regular high school females were nearly as unrealistic (87%). Potential dropouts,
males and females were significantly more conservative in that they gave less unrealistic responses to this question, 63% for the males, and 70% for the females. This difference is enough that when comparing the sample subjectively, non-education females gave significantly less unrealistic responses (82%) when compared with the rest of the group than future education females (86%).

"Toilet training" was the other question to which more than half of the responses were unrealistic. This was not the case in Weaver's (1977) study, as extremely low normative ages and lower age boundaries were used. The only significant differences between the mean estimations given by the respondents was in female potential dropouts, who gave the most unrealistic responses. Divided subjectively, this difference is not significant.

"Peek-a-boo" and "bowel control" also elicited a relatively high percentage of unrealistic responses, but most of the students in these cases were realistic.

Potential dropout males (13%) and females (22%) were more realistic than regular high school males (39%) and females (43%) and young mothers (38%) in their response to "peek-a-boo", and this difference was significant. Regular students were more realistic for "bowel control" than potential dropouts, but the difference is only significant at a lower level (.05) for the males.

Most of the students were realistic in their responses
to "first step", "spoon feeding", and "first word". The directional difference where males were more conservative than females is demonstrated for both regular high school students and potential dropouts in response to "first step"; and for regular high school students in response to "spoon feeding" and "first word". Potential dropout females, however were significantly more conservative in terms of unrealistic expectations than potential dropout males in these cases. The directional difference showing young mothers being more liberal in their expectations of child development is significant in terms of unrealistic expectations for "spoon feeding" and "first word".

It is questionable whether or not eight questions about child development can really sift out the differences between groups of responses. However, Weaver (1977) found this same directional difference between males and females on the same questions. Exploring the ramifications of this difference would be an interesting study. If males are more conservative than females, it is only for a relatively few number of questions about child development if a much more comprehensive set of questions were used?

The picture emerging from this study is that the young mother is the most liberal in her expectations of child development, and males, particularly regular high school and future education males, are the most conservative.
The analysis of data on Tables 16 and 17 indicate that adolescents possess a low level of knowledge about child development. Although most of their expectations are reasonable, a substantial number of them are not. The percentages of unrealistic responses in this study were generally higher than the percentages of unrealistic responses in Weaver's (1977) study. This greater number of unrealistic expectations occurs not only on the questions of "toilet training" and "bowel control" where this study used a higher criteria than Weaver's (1977) study, but other questions as well. However, the adolescents in this study were not totally unknowledgeable about child development as de Lissovoy's (1973) study suggested.

**Status of Null Hypotheses in Constellation II: Differences in Expectations About Children**

H₁: There is no significant difference in expectations of child development on the basis of gender.

H₁ rejected. Males in this study in all "defer" and "nondefer" categories were more conservative in their expectations than females. Weaver's (1977) data demonstrated this same directional difference on the same questions.

H₂: There is no significant difference in expectations of child development on the basis of the ability to defer gratification, defined objectively and subjectively as
H₂ is rejected. Potential dropout females have more liberal (below the normative age) responses than regular high school females, and young mothers (who are actually parents) generally gave liberal responses that were below the normative age.

**Differences in Experience With Children**

Tables 18 and 19 compare the experiences and the attitudes regarding those experiences that adolescents have had with children. "Experience" is measured as "frequency of babysitting" (for siblings or others) and "number of experiences shared with children" out of a possible list of 10 activities. "Attitude" is reported as "enjoyment of experiences shared with children" and was ascertained by requesting the adolescent's reaction to the activities that he indicated he had shared with children. F-test analysis reveals that all of the differences are significant, except for the ones reported by potential dropout females of "frequency of babysitting", the young mother's report of "frequency of babysitting" is also not significant. Non-significance is eliminated when the samples are divided according to "future education" and "non-education", except for the "frequency" report of future education males, which is significant when compared only with the males.
Table 18
F-test Analysis of Adolescents' Experience and Attitude Regarding Experience with Children on the Basis of Gender and the Ability to Defer Gratification Objectively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Potential</th>
<th>Dropouts</th>
<th>Young Mothers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Frequency of Babysitting&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Average</td>
<td>1.8*</td>
<td>2.4*</td>
<td>1.6*</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Inter-group rank</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Number of Experiences&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared With Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Average</td>
<td>6.7**</td>
<td>8.3**</td>
<td>5.4***</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Inter-group rank</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Enjoyment of Experiences&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared With Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Average</td>
<td>2.0***</td>
<td>1.4*</td>
<td>1.9**</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Inter-group rank</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup>Average represents $\bar{X}$ frequency of babysitting (for siblings or "others") reported by subjects according to the following key: (1) never; (2) once a month or less; (3) two times a month; (4) once a week or more

<sup>2</sup>Average represents $\bar{X}$ number of experiences subjects reported they had shared with children out of a list of ten activities.

<sup>3</sup>Average represents $\bar{X}$ response to enjoyment of the shared activities with children according to the following key: (1) enjoyed; (2) didn't mind; (3) didn't enjoy.
Table 19
F-test Analysis of Adolescents’ Experience and Attitude Regarding Experience with Children on the Basis of Gender and the Ability to Defer Gratification Subjectively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Non-education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Frequency of Babysitting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Average</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.3**</td>
<td>1.4**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Inter-group rank</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Number of Experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared with Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Average</td>
<td>6.5*</td>
<td>8.3**</td>
<td>5.3***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Inter-group rank</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Enjoyment of Experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared with Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Average</td>
<td>1.9***</td>
<td>1.4***</td>
<td>2.1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Inter-group rank</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05  **p<.01  ***p<.0001

1 Average represents X frequency of babysitting (for siblings or "others") reported by subjects according to the following key: (1) never; (2) once a month or less; (3) two times a month; (4) once a week or more.

2 Average represents X number of experiences subjects reported they had shared with children out of a list of ten activities.

3 Average represents X response to enjoyment of the shared activities with children according to the following key: (1) enjoyed; (2) didn't mind; (3) didn't enjoy.
The most experienced with children was a tie between regular high school females and young mothers. Regular high school females babysat more than young mothers, but young mothers shared more experiences with children. When the deferralment of gratification construct is looked at subjectively, however, "future education" females are more experienced both in "frequency of babysitting" and "number of experiences shared with children". The difference, though significant when compared with males, probably exists because most young mothers no longer tend siblings or other children.

The least experienced were the males, and regular high school males and "future education" males were more experienced than potential dropouts and "non-education" males.

Females also enjoyed their experiences with children more than males. The difference reported by young mothers is slightly greater than the difference reported by females in regular high school, and is significant when compared with males and with female potential dropouts. When the data are analyzed according to "future education" and "non-education", females enjoy their experiences with children equally.

Status of Null Hypotheses in Constellation 3: Differences in Experience with Children
H₁: There is no significant difference in experience with children on the basis of gender.

H₁ is rejected. Females have more experience than males, both in terms of "frequency of babysitting" and "number of experiences shared with children."

H₂: There is no significant difference in experience with children on the basis of ability to defer gratification, both objectively and subjectively.

H₂ is rejected. Young mothers and regular high school females had significantly greater experience with children than potential dropout females. Defined subjectively, however, this difference is probably not significant.

H₃: There is no significant difference in attitudes about the experiences had with children on the basis of gender.

H₃ is rejected. Females significantly enjoyed the experiences they had with children more than males. However, males didn't mind sharing activities with children.

H₄: There is no significant difference in attitudes about the experiences had with children on the basis of ability to defer gratification, both objectively and subjectively.

H₄ is rejected. Young mothers and females in regular high school enjoy their experiences with children more than potential dropout females, and "future education" males enjoy their experiences with children more than
"non-education" males. However, males in both categories didn't mind sharing activities with children.
DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The Null Hypotheses

The purpose of this study was to test the relevance of parent education for high school students in terms of interests, concerns, expectations, and experiences of the adolescents regarding children. This was accomplished using three constellations of null hypotheses.

Null Hypotheses in Constellation I: Differences in Expressed Parenting Interest

H₁: There is no significant difference in expressed interest in acquiring children or spouses in relationship to other possible priorities on the basis of gender.

H₁ is rejected. Males consistently gave "children" the least desirable rank, while females ranked it higher.

H₂: There is no significant difference in expressed interest in acquiring children or spouses in relationship to other possible priorities on the basis of ability to defer gratification, defined objectively and subjectively.

H₂ is rejected. Among females, significant differences existed in response to desire for children.
Young mothers ranked "children" as "2", potential dropouts ranked it as "5" (least desirable) and all other categories of females, regardless of ability to defer gratification, ranked it as "4".

"Husband/wife" was rated as "1" by both genders in every "defer" category, while "non-deferrers" in both genders rated it as "3". Young mothers rated it as "1".

H₃: There is no significant difference in expressed parenting interests when solicited in the contexts of a course preference, a conversational topic, a book, or a concern on the basis of gender.

H₃ is rejected. Males are less concerned than females about parenting no matter how "interest in parenting" is solicited.

H₄: There is no significant difference in expressed parenting interests when solicited in the contexts of a course preference, a conversational topic, a book, or a concern on the basis to defer gratification, defined objectively and subjectively.

H₄ is rejected. "Nondeferrers" whether objectively or subjectively defined, consistently ranked "parenting" higher as a conversational topic and a book. Every category of "nondeferrer" except for the young mother, ranked "parenting" and "marriage" courses lower than "deferrers".
Null Hypotheses in Constellation

II: Differences in Expectations of Child Development

$H_1$: There is no significant difference in expectations of child development on the basis of gender.

$H_1$ is rejected. Males in all categories were more conservative and reasonable in their expectations of child development. Weaver's (1977) data demonstrated this same difference on the same questions, and the result may be due to the questions themselves.

$H_2$: There is no significant difference in expectations of child development on the basis of ability to defer gratification, defined objectively and subjectively.

$H_2$ is rejected. Young mothers were the most liberal and unrealistic in their expectations of child development of all of the groups.

Null Hypotheses in Constellation

III: Differences in Experience With Children

$H_1$: There is no significant difference in experience with children on the basis of gender.

$H_1$ is rejected. Females have more experience than males, both in terms of "frequency of babysitting" and "number of experiences shared with children".

$H_2$: There is no significant difference in experience with children on the basis of ability to defer gratification,
both objectively and subjectively defined.

H2 is rejected. Young mothers and regular high school females had significantly greater experience with children than potential dropout females. Define subjectively however, this difference is probably not significant.

H3: There is no significant difference in attitudes about the experiences had with children on the basis of gender.

H3 is rejected. Females significantly enjoyed the experiences they had with children more than males. However, males did not mind sharing activities with children.

H4: There is no significant difference in attitudes about the experiences had with children on the basis of ability to defer gratification, both objectively and subjectively.

H4 is rejected. Young mothers and females in regular high school enjoy their experiences with children more than potential dropout females, and "future education" males enjoy their experiences with children more than "non-education" males. However, males in both categories did not mind sharing activities with children.

Implications for Parent Education:

A Synthesis of Literature & Results

A need for parent education for regular high school students has been recognized by federal and state governments, local school districts, and private charitable
organizations. The literature has substantiated that a skill deficit exists in the case of the young parent, and such a deficit contributes to "intolerance and insensitivity" (de Lissovoy, 1973) of the young parent toward their young children. This study has compared the interests, concerns, expectations, and experiences that regular high school students have regarding children with those of the young mother and the potential dropout to develop implications for parent education. Each group will be examined in the contexts of what the literature has said about their need and response to parent education and what this study has determined.

Regular High School Students

Although not particularly interested in parenting matters (de Lissovoy, 1978; Weaver, 1977) and not developmentally ready to integrate parenting responsibility into their lives (Cohen, 1973), the adolescent in regular high school is offered a panacea for poor parenting by federal and state governments and local school districts. Parent education, in this case, is prescribed to prevent poor parenting in much the same manner that aspirin might be prescribed to prevent the onset of a cold or flu. de Lissovoy (1978) suggested that the latent dysfunction of inadvertantly encouraging young marriage and childbearing may occur as a consequence of this treatment. Parent education for the regular high school student has been
criticized as being a "white elephant" in the classroom (de Lissovoy, 1978), and the literature suggests that there are better ways of preparing young people for parenthood than utilizing an academic setting to disperse parenting information (de Lissovoy, 1978; Malony, 1978; King, 1975). The literature reviewed the negative effects characterizing young marriage and early childbearing, suggesting that maturity, rather than knowledge and skills, may be more important in effective parenting. This maturity comes by effectively meeting the developmental tasks of adolescence, which include resolving the identity crisis, acquiring sex-appropriate role behavior, and committing oneself to an occupation and/or a lifestyle or set of values (Adams & Looft, 1977). de Lissovoy (1978) suggested that helping the adolescent achieve those goals be the function of a "pre-parent" education program.

If interest is the criteria of relevance in parent education, and if perceived relevance is a motivating factor in learning (McCandless, 197), then adolescents in regular high school are not very motivated to learn about parenting, when compared with subjects they perceive to be far more relevant.

As a conversation topic, regular adolescents would rather discuss subjects such as "money", the "opposite sex", "clothes" (females) and "sports" (males). As a book topic, they would rather read about How to Get and
Keep the Job You Want, How to Win Friends and Influence People, Hobbies for Fun and Profit, and Guiness Book of Records (males). The topics of such books are fairly consistent with interests in conversational topics, "money", "friends", and "fun". Females are interested in reading about marriage. As a course preference, parenting is number "1" within the specified list of course alternatives for females, but males were not interested in it. Learning about marriage through coursework, however, was ranked favorably ("2") by both male and female. They are not concerned about parenting or marriage. They are concerned about money, physical development, vocation. Males are concerned about school.

King (1975) stated that clothing, feeding and housing (money and vocational matters) and maintaining the health of children (physical development matters) are essential to effective parenting. The goals in producing effective parents out of regular high school students could, by virtue of adolescent interests, focus on such matters.

If the criteria of relevance of parent education is a lack of knowledge about child development, then it is interesting that although adolescents need to improve their knowledge of child development, they still know as much or more than young mothers. Indeed, they do not impose such stringent demands and expectations upon children as young mothers do. The lack of knowledge about
development was not dramatic, and the adolescents in this study were generally reasonable in their expectations of child development. However, Weaver's (1977) sample were more realistic in their responses.

If experience with children produced a positive effect on the adolescents' enjoyment of children, it is interesting that adolescents already generally enjoy sharing experiences with children. If their level of enjoyment is any prophecy of their level of enjoyment of children during actual parenting, then the future looks bright—if they become parents when ready to do so.

High school can help these adolescents become ready for parenting. By maintaining the interest, motivation, and attendance of the student throughout the moratorium of adolescence, many of the problems of early childbearing and rearing are circumvented.

There is a mismatch between adolescent interests and developmental needs and the goals of parent education. These goals must focus not on the child that will be the responsibility of the adolescent someday, but on the adolescent who must prepare himself to be responsible for that child.

de Lissovoy (1977) describes such a course as a "preparent education program", facilitating the adolescent's resolution of the identity crisis, and assisting the adolescent in moving forward toward the identification
of occupational choices and an ideological commitment. "Adult Living", "Patterns for Successful Living", or other sellable titles can remove stigmata attached to homemaking courses for males and encourage adolescents to avail themselves of the opportunity provided.

Young Mothers

Young mothers are the most interested in parenting, but still not developmentally ready to assume the responsibility for parenting (Cohen, 1973). Typically, if they are not already assuming the sole responsibility for parenting, they soon shall be, as the divorce and separation for young marriages is high (Nye, 1976; Alan Guttmacher Institute, 1976). The demands on young mothers to perform as a parent is therefore greater than older mothers.

Although young mothers do not talk about parenting any more than regular high school females, they are more interested in reading about it (and marriage) and taking courses about it (and marriage). They have understandably more parenting concerns. Of greater concern to young mothers than parenting, is money and their own complexion, weight and height. Young mothers indicated that they have a significantly greater amount of personal concerns, than other students.

Young mothers definitely are more liberal in their expectation of child development than regular high school
students, and they tend to have more unrealistic expectations of their children. It is an interesting parallel that not only might demands on the young mother be greatest, but demands upon their children as imposed by young mothers might also be the greatest. Lack of education on the part of the parents, increased poverty and dependency on the parents, substantially increased risk of birth defects, and abnormality, coupled with these high demands can be contributing factors to Osofsky's (1973) finding that compared to date for the population as a whole, children of adolescents face guarded social prognosis and poor educational attainment.

Had regular high school, family, or society been effective in helping the young mother avoid her present situation, her prognosis as well as the prognosis of the child would have been more favorable. The young mothers in this sample were all in school. Education, according to McLaughlin (1977) is one of the more, if not one of the most, potentially powerful "reversers" of this poor prognosis. Other young mothers are not so fortunate. Campbell (1968) said,

The girl who has an illegitimate child at the age of 16 suddenly has 90% of her life's script written for her. She will probably drop out of school, even if someone else in her family helps to take care of the baby; she will probably not be able to find a steady job that pays enough to provide for herself and her child; she may feel impelled to marry someone she might not have otherwise chosen. Her life choices are few and most of them are bad. (p. 202).
Young girls who become pregnant simply stop attending school; as does the young father who must face the responsibility of providing for his family. Identification of these young people by school staff members is important, so that counseling can be given both the young mother and the putative father concerning educational and social services available them. At the very least, both parents should be encouraged to stay in school. If the young father must work, high school correspondence opportunities should be made available and incentives should be offered to encourage the young father to complete his education.

Because the need for increased parenting skills is so obvious, and because interests, concerns, and enjoyment of children is greater in this group than any other, young mothers should be given education for parenthood within their high school program.

Research should also substantiate the interests and needs of young fathers in parent education, and the interests and needs of young parents who are not involved in high school. These adolescents must also need parent education, as their problem involves not only a resource deficit, but a knowledge deficit as well. Incentives should be given adolescents in such a case to involve themselves in parent education, and this study indicates that such an incentive could be money—as all adolescents are so interested and concerned about money. Tax breaks
or monetary payment could be given adolescent parents who enroll in parent education courses. The cost to society might be minimal compared to the monetary outlay involved in the welfare services given as a result of poor parenting procedures.

**Potential Dropouts**

Potential dropouts, by virtue of their non-educational aspirations, indicated in this study a propensity toward earlier marriage and childbearing than regular high school students. Potential dropouts are also potential parents, and they have the same needs for knowledge and skills regarding parenting as other students. Their interests and concerns, knowledge and expectations regarding children were also examined. This study suggests that they may be more vulnerable to early parenting than regular high school students because of their tendency toward "non-deferrment of gratification". The deferrment of gratification construct yielded significant results in comparing most of the aspects of this study.

If more vulnerable to early parenting, adolescents in potential drop out programs are more interested in parenting matters than adolescents in regular high school. This difference was demonstrated in terms of a conversational topic and a book topic (although differences by gender were more salient than differences by ability to defer gratification, these differences were still significant).
They are not more interested in parenting as a course preference or an adult priority, and they are not more nor less concerned about parenting than adolescents in regular high school. Potential dropouts are most interested in money and future vocation, the opposite sex, and hobbies. They were significantly more concerned about money than regular high school students, and as a priority, they ranked the things that money could buy (car/pickup and a home) higher than regular high school students.

Potential dropouts did not know significantly more nor less about child development. They had less experience with children, and enjoyed the experiences less that they did have with children than regular high school students and young mothers. However, they still indicated that they either enjoyed or didn't mind the experiences they shared with children.

Like regular high school students, "pre-parenting" education seems to fit more into the schema of the interests and needs of the future parent currently enrolled in a potential dropout program. Their strong interests in money, the opposite sex, vocation, and hobbies are all pertinent to parenting, as parents should have an effective marital dyad, be able to support their children, and have fun for themselves as well as with their children. As more vulnerable to early parenting, it is fortunate that an attempt has been made to keep these students in school.
so that they can gain the knowledge, skills, and maturity essential in effective parenting.

Suggestions for Improvement in Further Studies of Adolescents and Parent Education

One of the major goals of good research is to be able to explain as comprehensively as possible the mechanisms that control behavior. Expanding upon prior research in a "building block" fashion enables social scientists to understand more fully the laws that govern behaviors.

The major strength of this study was that it used this "building block" approach to expanding research. This study is instrumental in validifying Weaver's (1977) "Adolescent Interest Survey". The strength of this survey is that it assesses the relative interests of adolescents within a constellation of interests, rather than soliciting socially acceptable "yeses" to any one interest.

The use of additional independent variables in this study explained more of the mechanisms that control the behaviors (interests, expectations, and experiences regarding children) of adolescents. Preparation for parenthood is considered by this study to be essential to all adolescents. Young mothers, potential dropouts and regular high school students represent various orientations towards their future role of parent. This study examined only
two of those orientations: gender and gratification.

Other independent variables, if examined, would explain more of the variance within the dependent variables of interests, expectations, and experiences of adolescents regarding parenting and parent education. Intelligence Quotient, age, experience with children, the enjoyment of experiences with children, religiosity, club membership and many other independent variables could be used. Interpreting the explanation of the variance through multivariate analysis would yield valuable insight into more of the many mechanisms that control the dependent variables measured here.

The use of other dependent variables also would be useful. The most important question in this study posed to adolescents was, "How interested are you in parenting and parent education." The response, in essence was "not very". Perhaps the response would not be so different if this same question was posed the adolescent's parents. If the question was posed, "How meaningful is your (future) role of parenting to you?" the response may have been more positive.

The dependent variables of expectations of child development and experiences with children were also examined. Eight questions are probably not sufficient to explore the differences of adolescents regarding expectations of child development. The findings of this study
suggest that amplifying research in the area of adolescent's expectations and knowledge of child development would yield some interesting and effective solutions to the problems of adolescent parenting. Experiences with children could have served not only as a dependent variable, but also as an independent variable. The literature suggests that experiences with children might be a basic issue in the retention of parenting knowledge dispersed through education for parenthood programs.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

"Adolescent Interest Survey"
I. Biographical Data

Age___ Grade___ Sex_____ Do you consider yourself (please circle correct one) very religious, moderately religious, slightly religious, or not religious?

Please put down the age that you think you will be when (and if) you do some of the following things. DO NOT respond to any item that DOES NOT apply to you.

Age Get your drivers license (if you have one put age when you got it)
1. Graduate from high school
2. Get a full time job (not a summer job)
3. Graduate from business or vocational school or college (including secretarial or beauty school or nurses training)
4. Get married (if you do not plan on marrying, DO NOT RESPOND)
5. Have my first child (if you do not plan on having children, DO NOT RESPOND)

INSTRUCTIONS

We are interested in knowing what YOUR interests are. For each section below, please RANK ORDER the groups of five topics according to (1) the topic you are MOST interested in (2) the NEXT most interesting topic and so on down to (5) the LEAST interesting.

EXAMPLE: Most people have certain dreams or hopes of what they want in the future. Assuming that you do not own or have any of the following things at the present time, please rank order them according to the above instructions.

1. new clothes
2. steady boyfriend or girlfriend
3. good job
4. airplane
5. engagement ring

This individual wanted a steady date more than any of the other choices, so she put (1) before "steady boyfriend or girlfriend". She wanted new clothes more than any of the remaining choices, so she put (2) before "new clothes" and so on. A good job was less important than new clothes, and an engagement ring was less important than a good job. An airplane was least important.

Now rank order these dreams according to the instructions. Here we are assuming that anything is possible:

1. car/pickup
2. husband/wife
3. own a home
4. children
5. recreational equipment (boat, camper, recreational vehicle, snowmobile, rifle, etc.)

II. What do you like to talk about with your friends? Please rank order these conversation topics according to the instructions. Remember to complete group A before going on to group B and then group C.

Group A
1. your own or friends personal appearance
2. younger brothers, sisters, or neighbors
3. special hobby or interest such as music
4. the opposite sex
5. school work or activities

Group B
1. money (in general like the cost of things)
2. reading interests (books or magazines)
3. future roles as parents (your future family)
4. teachers (personality or fairness)
5. TV shows

Group C
1. clothes
2. future hopes in terms of job or profession
3. concerns such as what kind of parent I will be
4. new action pictures
5. sports

III. Here are some titles of books that have been popular. Please rank order these titles according to the instructions.

Group A
1. How to Win Friends and Influence People
2. Hobbies for Fun and Profit
3. How to Be a Good Parent
4. Cache Trails
5. Backyard Cooking

Group B
1. How to Get and Keep the Job You Want
2. Guinness Book of Records
3. Getting the Most of Your Car Insurance Dollar
4. How to Get Admitted to the College of Your Choice
5. Making the Most of Marriage

IV. Let's assume you have scheduled all the courses you need for graduation and you have room in your schedule to take one more course. Below are five possible electives. Please rank order these courses according to the instructions.

Group A
1. Red Cross First Aid
2. Gourmet Cooking
3. Parenting and Infant Care
4. Hunter's Safety
5. Drafting

Group B
1. Psychology
2. Courtship and Marriage
3. Tennis
4. Woodworking
5. Pottery

V. Below is a list of problems which often bother students of your age. Some of these problems may be bothering you and some may not. As you read the list, pick out the problems which seem to bother you and circle them.

1. complexion
2. breaking up with boy or girlfriend
3. money for future education
4. need more information on sex
5. what to do after high school
6. not being attractive to opposite sex
7. concerned about being a parent someday
8. not enough clothes
9. teachers are unfair
10. concern about how much affection to show on a date
VI. Young people today have a variety of experiences. We would like to know about your experiences (if any) with young children. Describe below are a number of different experiences. Please circle the number of each one which you have done more than once.

After you have done that please underline whichever word describes best how you felt about doing that particular thing.

EXAMPLE: 1. Rocked a baby to sleep

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Didn't mind/enjoyed/did not enjoy</th>
<th>This individual enjoyed rocking a baby to sleep. If this person had rocked a baby to sleep only once or never, this question would be left alone.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Made a toy for a child</td>
<td>6. Fed a baby with a bottle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn't mind/enjoyed/did not enjoy</td>
<td>7. Bathed a baby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looked after younger brothers or sisters</td>
<td>8. Prepared a cooked meal at home for two or more people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn't mind/enjoyed/did not enjoy</td>
<td>9. Taken a baby or young child for a walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read from books to younger children</td>
<td>10. Put a baby or young child to bed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn't mind/enjoyed/did not enjoy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dressed a child aged five years or less</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn't mind/enjoyed/did not enjoy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed a baby with a spoon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn't mind/enjoyed/did not enjoy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please circle the answer that applies to you.

How often do you babysit your brothers & sisters?

- never
- once a month or less
- two times a month
- once a week or more

How often do you babysit someone other than your brothers & sisters?

- never
- once a month or less
- two times a month
- once a week or more

VII. Children grow up very fast. Here are some questions about growing babies and young children. Please fill in the blank with the age at which you think the event will happen.

EXAMPLE: At what age can you expect a smile from a baby? (please answer in terms of months) 1 1/2

1. At what age do you think children begin to respond to a game of "peek-a-boo"? (in months)

2. How old is a baby when he takes his first step without the aid of another person? (in months)

3. When is a good time to start toilet training to help baby to stay dry? (in months)

4. When do you think a baby will be trained to have bowel movements on the toilet or potty? Of course, we know that accidents will happen! (answer in terms of months)

5. At what age do most children begin to use a spoon to feed themselves? (in months)

6. How old do you think most babies are when they say their first real word—something other than "dada"? (in months)

7. When is a good time to start teaching a child to mind? About how old will he be? (in months)

8. At what age can you expect children to be able to tie shoe laces? (answer in terms of years)

9. Please circle the letter beside the answer which you believe is correct.

   Let's say the baby is fed and dry. How much crying can you expect from baby for no apparent reason?

   a. Should not cry at all.
   b. Very little but then only when they want something.
   c. They cry only if they're spoiled.
   d. You can expect a lot of crying.
APPENDIX B

Section V Key
The problems listed in section five represent 12 categories. The problems are listed below in their respective categories.

**Physical Development**
- weight (underweight or overweight)
- health problems
- height (too tall; too short)
- concerned about my physical fitness
- complexion

**Money**
- not enough spending money
- don't know how to spend money wisely
- not enough clothes
- money for future education
- need a job after school

**Dating**
- not having dates
- awkward in making or accepting dates
- not mixing well with opposite sex
- not being attractive to opposite sex
- not knowing what to do on a date

**Sex**
- concern about how much affection to show on dates
- need more information about sex
- concerned about proper sex behavior
- worried about venereal disease
- think too much about sex

**Courtship**
- deciding whether to get engaged
- deciding whether to go steady
- being in love
- afraid of losing the one I love
- breaking up with a boy or girlfriend

**Marriage**
- wondering if I'll ever get married
- needing advice about marriage
- wondering if I'll find a suitable mate
- wondering if I'll be a successful wife/husband
- worried about parental approval of mate choice
Parenting
wondering if I'll ever be able to support a family
not sure about how I will make my children behave
not sure if I want children
concerned about being a parent someday
worried I will mistreat my children

Friends
lack a best friend
slow in getting to know people
trouble in keeping conversation going
awkward in meeting people
nothing to talk about

Family
parents not understanding me
being criticized by parents
not getting along with family
parents make too many decisions for me
parents not trusting me

Vocation
need advice on what to do after high school
need to decide on an occupation
deciding whether or not to go to college
need to know more about college
afraid I won't be able to find a job after high school

School
school work is too hard
school work is uninteresting
teachers are unfair
school is too strict
not getting personal help from teachers

Personal
lack self-confidence
concerned because I am moody
trouble controlling my emotions
trouble being nervous
trouble making decisions
APPENDIX C

INFORMED CONSENT FORM
Dear Parent:

We at the Department of Family and Human Development at Utah State University feel that a consideration of the interests that adolescents have is essential in effective curriculum planning. To find out what those interests are, we are conducting research in your teenage youth's classroom on the first week in October. We are asking your permission to consult your "expert" on the interests that young people have.

The research will consist solely of a questionnaire that asks questions about the types of courses adolescents enjoy, what adolescents like to talk about with their friends, what types of books adolescents like to read, etc. This questionnaire will take thirty minutes or less of class time to complete. Those who have helped us in this study have found the questions interesting and enjoyable.

No one will know what answers your student gives, as no names are recorded on the questionnaire. A copy of the results will be presented the Logan School District in appreciation for their cooperation. We really need your help and will appreciate it very much if you would sign the statement below, which will allow your student to participate in our research. PLEASE help us out.

If you have ANY QUESTIONS or concerns whatsoever, please contact either Katrina Miller or Dr. Glen Jenson at the numbers listed below. Please send this sheet with your signed permission with your student to class as soon as possible. We will be conducting this research next week, and need all of the permission slips by this Friday, September 29, 1978.

Thank you very much for your help.

Katrina H. Miller
Principal Investigator
753-3121

Glen Jenson, Ph.D.
Project Supervisor
752-4100 ext. 7608 or 752-9019 (home phone)

STATEMENT

I am willing to have ____________________________ (student's name) help in the research by filling out a questionnaire. ____________________________ (parents signature)
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