

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

---

All Graduate Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

---

5-1969

## Communication Patterns and Other Variables Within the LDS Family Which Influence the Development of the Family Home Evening Program

Arthur Don Crane

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Sociology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Crane, Arthur Don, "Communication Patterns and Other Variables Within the LDS Family Which Influence the Development of the Family Home Evening Program" (1969). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 6971.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/6971>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@usu.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@usu.edu).



COMMUNICATION PATTERNS AND OTHER VARIABLES WITHIN THE  
LDS FAMILY WHICH INFLUENCE THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE  
FAMILY HOME EVENING PROGRAM

by

Arthur Don Crane

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Sociology

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY  
Logan, Utah

1969

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. R. Welling Roskelley, my major professor, with whose assistance the completion of this thesis was possible. I would also like to thank the members of the committee, Dr. Jay Skidmore and Dr. Bruce Bylund, for their efforts and cooperation.

Others who assisted materially in this study were Mrs. Cleone Peterson, who punched the cards for tabulation; Mr. M. E. (Ted) Wilde, who helped with the editing; and Pamela, my daughter, and Miss Sherry Ball, who did the typing for me.

Much appreciation goes to my wife, Elva, who made it possible for me to devote long hours to this project; to my children Pamela, Cory, Wendy, and Linda, who have shown great patience and understanding to a father trying to produce a thesis and who often failed to perform all the duties of a father.

Many thanks go to the friends and co-workers who helped in many ways and willingly gave of their time and service to this study.

Arthur Don Crane

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	ii
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	v
ABSTRACT . . . . .	vi
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
II. HISTORICAL REVIEW . . . . .	4
Ancient Family Life . . . . .	4
The Middle Ages . . . . .	7
Modern Thinking . . . . .	7
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES . . . . .	14
Pilot Study . . . . .	15
Questionnaire . . . . .	16
Personal Interviews . . . . .	18
Sampling Procedures . . . . .	19
Oral Evaluation Training Course . . . . .	20
Main Study . . . . .	21
IV. ANALYSIS, SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS OF DATA . . . . .	29
Section I: Some Facts About the Respondents . . . . .	29
Brief Summary of Section I . . . . .	32
Section II: Some Specific Indices of Communication Patterns Between Parents and Children . . . . .	35
Brief Summary of Section II . . . . .	43
Section III: Composite Measures of Communication Patterns . . . . .	48
Chi-square . . . . .	49
Patterns of Association . . . . .	50
Analysis of Data for Likes and Patterns of Likes and Dislikes and Patterns of Dislikes . . . . .	57
Additional Data . . . . .	64



## TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	68
Major Findings of This Study . . . . .	68
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	71
Recommendations For Future Study . . . . .	72
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	74
APPENDIXES . . . . .	75
Appendix A. Definition of Terms . . . . .	76
Appendix B. Questionnaire Answered by 1,151 Seminary Students in the Brigham City, Utah Area . . . . .	78
VITA . . . . .	80

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. The extent to which the quality of communication patterns between students and parents is associated with frequency of holding the Family Home Evening Program--part 1. The questions were designed to gauge the student's opinion of how communication patterns related to his or her position in the family . . . . .	51
2. The extent to which the quality of communication patterns between students and parents is associated with frequency of holding Family Home Evening Program--part 2. The questions were designed to find with whom the student felt free to discuss his problems . . . . .	52
3. The extent to which the quality of communication patterns between students and parents is associated with frequency of holding the Family Home Evening--part 3. The questions were designed to determine how the student felt his family solved its problems . . . . .	53
4. Composite of communication patterns showing extent to which these patterns between parent and student are associated with frequency of holding Family Home Evening . . . . .	56
5. The relationship of family size to the holding of the Family Home Evening . . . . .	58
6. Relationship of the things the seminary students liked about the Family Home Evening to the frequency of holding the activity . . . . .	59
7. The relationship of the like patterns of seminary students to the frequency of holding the Family Home Evening . . . . .	60
8. The relationship between the dislikes of the seminary students about the Family Home Evening and the frequency of holding the activity . . . . .	62
9. The relationship of the seminary student's dislike patterns to the frequency of holding the Family Home Evening . . . . .	63

## ABSTRACT

Communication Patterns and Other Variables Within the  
LDS Family Which Influence the Development of the  
Family Home Evening Program

by

Arthur Don Crane, Master of Science

Utah State University, 1969

Major Professor: Dr. R. W. Roskelley  
Department: Sociology, Social Work, and Anthropology

During the 1965-66 school year a study was made of 250 ninth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grade students attending the West Seminary of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Brigham City. The object was to determine the extent to which the Latter-day Saint families in this area were holding the Family Home Evening Program and what variables influenced their participation.

Sixty per cent of those interviewed said they participated in the Family Home Evening Program when it was first introduced to the Church membership. Eight months later participation had dropped to 40 per cent. It was found that patterns of communication within the family affected the frequency of Family Home Evenings. Families with satisfactory patterns of communication held the program more frequently than those with unsatisfactory or no patterns of communication. Student attitudes also influenced the frequency of home evenings. In addition, the size of the family influenced the frequency of the home evening. Moderate (three to five children) and

large (six to eight children) families held the activity most frequently, very large (nine or more children) families ranked next, and small (one to two children) families held the activity least.

The study showed that efforts by the Church authorities to help families hold Family Home Evening Program, through training programs and manuals, were largely ineffective.

(87 pages)

CHAPTER I  
INTRODUCTION

The family has been the basic unit of society as far back as records of civilization exist. Studies by anthropologists and historians have described both patriarchal and matriarchal societies. These studies show somewhat the effect of these systems on individual families and on intra- and inter-family relationships and communication patterns.

Parents had problems with their children in ancient days and history is replete with examples of "the generation gap." Our "modern" age with all its technology, industrial growth, mass media, and mushrooming social institutions has focused attention on the problems of how a family affects a child's eventual place in society. In the last 10 years especially, the relationship and communication patterns between parents and children have come under scrutiny by professional researchers.

Our modern scholars have established fairly well these basic communication patterns, but more needs to be known on how these patterns influence the acceptance or rejection of ideas or organized programs of action which are thrust upon the family unit. I am professionally active in teaching religious discipline to young people. I felt that an excellent situation existed by which I could examine some of the conclusions reached by social scientists relative to family communication patterns.

It is well known that religions play a definite part in shaping, or at least coloring, an individual's attitudes and behavior.

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Mormons or LDS) is a very social-minded organization and deeply concerned with retaining the loyalty of its members and the solidarity of the family unit.

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints teaches a system of high ideals and a strict morality. It views the family unit as being eternal in nature. In other words, the entity survives death, will be resurrected, and will always experience the family relationship. Since the Church has no professional paid ministry, the positions of leadership are held by lay members. At the age of 12, worthy young men (most of them) are ordained to the priesthood and as they grow to adulthood (and remain worthy) they are given additional offices of priesthood or delegations of responsibility. Part of most faithful male members' experience is the duty of home teaching. This consists of visiting an assigned number of member families at least once a month. These visits may be social or more formal where a message or lesson on Church doctrine is delivered. The main purpose is to encourage Church activity, check for sickness or financial hardship, and promote fellowship.

Throughout its history, the Church has emphasized a patriarchal family order and a close relationship between parents and the children. There is ample evidence that this pattern has often failed to materialize. Authoritarian LDS homes seem to be especially vulnerable to the outside influences of today's busy, wide-open, and mobile societies.



The Church introduced the Family Home Evening Program in an effort to counteract the growing tendency of family members, especially the children, to grow apart or become estranged during their formative years. The program is designed to help parents plan activities in which all family members can participate. Lessons teaching basic LDS doctrine and ideals are presented. Children are encouraged to participate by singing, reciting, acting, or even conducting the activities. Families are encouraged to hold these "evenings" once a week. When the program was first introduced, I felt this would be an ideal opportunity to determine if there was any relationship to family communication patterns and the acceptance or rejection of this "outside" program.

CHAPTER II  
HISTORICAL REVIEW

Ancient Family Life

One of the earliest accurate records that provides insight into family relationships and patterns of communication was found on a piece of black dorite stone. Thereon was engraved the code of Hammurabi, a documentary statement made in Babylon about 1700 B.C. Part of this code defined duties and responsibilities of different individuals in Babylonian society. The role of woman and her responsibilities were clearly spelled out. The relationship of man and wife, father and children, and both parents to their children was spelled out with some degree of clarity. It is quite evident that the patterns of authority were definitely patriarchal, yet children and mothers still enjoyed a considerable number of privileges and undoubtedly exercised many rights within the family (4, p. 32-36).

Many records have been found in the tombs and catacombs of Egypt since the turn of the century. They clearly indicate that the position of the woman and children in Egyptian families was very high. Evidently, the Egyptian home had the most ideal communication patterns of any early culture for which we have records (4, p. 59-64).

Ancient as well as relatively modern Chinese records show that a great deal of attention was paid to the concepts of family structure



yet the wife and children had little to say and much to do. The mother and children were subjected to an authoritarian father.

Confucious offered this comment:

Women are as different from men as earth is from heaven; women are, indeed, human beings, but they are of lower state than men. It is the law of nature that women should be kept under the control of men and not allowed any will of their own. (1, p. 68)

This quotation from Confucious indicates that children were something to be seen but not heard, that mothers were doers, not thinkers. The patterns of communication were almost exclusively those in which the father instructed the child or the mother as to their specific responsibilities.

The family patterns in ancient India are well documented. Women and girls were subordinate and their role was difficult. Girl babies were not welcome, but a good father made the most of his misfortune and sought to marry off his daughters fittingly. There are many passages in the Indian epics that speak of her birth as a misfortune for she brought burdens, not only to her own family but to others including her mother's family, her father's family, and the family into which she married. This defined position of girls and women in the family indicates that they had little status. They were not given meaningful rights or responsibilities other than satisfying the sex interests of men, giving birth, caring of children, and taking care of the menial tasks around the household. Meaningful patterns of communication between members were conspicuously absent in the ancient Indian family (1, p. 74-84).

In the Old Testament one reads of the patriarchal order that

existed in ancient Israel. It is evident that some prestige was extended to women. Children were undoubtedly loved and cared for, but it is also very evident that children were to be seen and not heard. This suggests that "give and take" between parents and children was conspicuously absent. The communication pattern was one in which the father instructed the youngsters what their responsibilities were or the things that they were supposed to do. There was little opportunity for the children to discuss things as they saw them. Obedience by children was the great virtue that was emulated in the biblical family (4, p. 145-152).

Among the early Greeks, Plato's ideas of family life were given much favorable attention. His thought is embodied in his best known work Republic. Plato thought that government should be run by the intellectual men of the nation. He felt that such elite should breed only with intellectual women (not necessarily their wives) in order to produce a superior race of people. In addition, he suggested that the husbands, the fathers of these biological creations, should not assume the responsibilities of fatherhood in terms of family tasks. This, he felt, obligated them too much to take care of family responsibilities and prevented them from devoting full time to promoting the affairs of state.

The information about families in Rome indicates that at no time in her history were there meaningful communication patterns, as defined today, between husband, wife and children (4, p. 222-223).

This brief summary of family life and patterns of communication in some of the ancient societies clearly indicates the conspicuous

absence of meaningful communication patterns between parents and their children (4, p. 203-204).

#### The Middle Ages

Thomas Aquinas was a great intellectual of the Middle Ages--a good writer, capable, and resourceful in many ways. He did not marry, but his writings point out very clearly that women should be subjected to men (4, p. 279).

Descriptions of family life during the latter part of the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, and Reformation yield little evidence that meaningful, in the modern sense, patterns of communication existed between parents and children.

These periods were characterized by patterns of dictation and domination by the male. The women and children were expected to follow patterns of obedience and show respect for authority (4, p. 336-340).

#### Modern Thinking

In the western world it was not until the beginning of the 20th century that much change in this patriarchal pattern occurred. Only in the last 70 years have parents begun to extend to children the right to play a role in decision making and communicating their feelings on vital issues affecting the welfare of family members. With the extending to children of the right to be meaningful members in the household and take part in decision making, the criteria of a "good" family has changed to include the happiness and a close

affectional relationship of the child with his parents. A "good family relationship" as used hereafter denotes the absence of serious conflict between the parent and child and their ability to share confidences with each other. This type of relationship can only be built if meaningful give and take patterns of communication exist in the home (8, p. 631). Modern scholars are now becoming aware of the factors that must prevail in a home environment to make it possible for two-way communication patterns to develop between family members.

Generally, the thinking of American sociology scholars and cultural anthropologists working in American and foreign cultures tend toward the viewpoint that an infant is born solely as a biological unit. As the infant develops, his personality is formed through the interaction of his inherited biological capabilities and the environment into which he is born. Thus, the type of family he is born into becomes very important to his eventual adjustment to society. The major function of the family is to socialize the children. It is here that the child is taught how to behave in order to fit into his culture (2, p. 149). There is considerable agreement among scholars that a child develops most favorably in a warm family atmosphere that also tends to be democratic in nature without extremes of over- or under-indulgence (2, p. 184).

The extent to which a child develops into a social being is dependent upon the environment, the type of parents, and the interaction patterns of the family unit he is born to. If the family patterns of interaction include a spirit of warmth and the freedom to speak one's ideas and thoughts, then this person usually develops

into an individual with a sense of worth and a constructive social attitude. The ability of a family unit to develop a child into the most desirable type of social adult is based on the patterns of interactions in the family unit and these, in turn, depend on the ability of the family unit to communicate these patterns to the individual child. The most successful families are those who set up a favorable environment for the necessary patterns of interaction and communication. Thus a child reflects the pattern of family interaction.

Of the few studies made which reveal patterns of interaction and communication in the family, one of the earliest was by Mildred Thurow, working at Cornell University. In her research she used the autobiographies of 200 college students. On the basis of their stories she concluded that the following characteristics were associated with the most successful families: (a) little tension in the home; (b) much family affection; (c) much entertaining of friends and relatives in the home; (d) much entertaining of children's friends in the home; (e) much joint attendance of husband and wife at social functions; (f) high-school education or more for parents; (g) consensus of parents on discipline; (h) little dominance of the father in the home; (i) moderate to much family counseling, preferably much; (j) little to moderate discipline in the home, preferably little; (k) moderate supervision of children's activities by both parents; and (l) moderate to much confidence of the children in the parents, preferably much (12, p. 48-49). In her study she recognized that satisfying two-way patterns of communication are necessary for a



successful family.

In another study Howard Beers, also at Cornell University, interviewed 85 families. On the basis of his interview data, Beers gave each family a rating on the degree of family integration which existed. He also constructed an index of shared activities. These shared activities consisted of such items as: (a) demonstration of affection, (b) husband and children help in the home, (c) the family members attend church with equal frequency, (d) reading aloud, and (e) family picnics. Each family was assigned an index of shared activities. This index was positively correlated with his integration rating, with the proportion of those with other children home visiting, sex instruction at home, wife's leadership record and show of affection. It was negatively correlated with families where the husband alone decides about crops or insurance, the wife alone supervises school work, and with the age of the oldest child (3). Where the old pattern of male dominance or the authoritative family pattern existed it was found there also was the least amount of integration. His study clearly indicated that the better the pattern of communication, the better the integration of the family.

Leland H. Stott conducted a study of child adjustment in farm families in Nebraska, and concluded that some of the more important characteristics of the successful farm family from the standpoint of the personal development of the boy and the girl are roughly as follows:

Boy

1. An attitude of welcome on the part of the parents toward the child's friends in the home.
2. Frequently to have enjoyable times in the home as a group.
3. Infrequent punishment.
4. An affectionate relationship between the boy and his mother (expressed by frequently kissing mother).
5. A minimum of nervousness manifested in the mother.
6. A minimum of nervousness in father.
7. Nothing in the behavior of the mother which he particularly dislikes.
8. Nothing in the behavior of the father which he particularly dislikes.

Girl

1. An attitude of welcome on the part of the parents toward the child's friends in the home.
2. Infrequent punishment.
3. Nothing in the behavior of the mother which she particularly dislikes.
4. A minimum of participation of mother in the work outside the home.
5. A confidential relationship between girl and her father.
6. An affectionate relationship between the girl and her mother (frequently kisses mother).
7. A confidential relationship between the girl and her mother.
8. Frequent family excursions (picnics, visits, church, etc.) in which she participates.

(10, p. 46)

Again, satisfying patterns of two-way communication as a basis for the successful social adjustment of the child were evident in this study.

In the three studies it is very evident that two-way communication patterns were essential to happy families. This fact is borne out by the importance that the children involved in the study attached to the ability to confide in and feel at ease with their parents and feel comfortable within the family unit.

The ability of a family to communicate is usually determined when the man and wife meet and begin their courtship. As they become better acquainted with each other and as feelings of empathy develop,

the patterns of communication broaden. This process continues on into marriage and the same patterns may be transferred to the children which follow. The extent to which these patterns of empathy, confidence, and idea exchange are developed affects, to a large degree, the success of the particular family unit (7, p. 603).

Atlee L. Stroup (11, p. 233), in his book Marriage and the Family, has this to say: "A third major requirement for satisfactory marital life involves the establishment of satisfying patterns of communication." He lists the following as factors which recent studies have revealed to be most important to a successful family relationship: (a) finances, (b) work, (c) playing with children, (d) talking about children, (e) frequent kissing, (f) engaging in outside interests together, and (g) talking things over together. He ends by saying that interpersonal competency, especially empathy, is involved in intra-family communication and the couples who can communicate are fortunate for they shall achieve understanding (11, p. 240).

Another study by John Gabler and Herbert A. Otto (6) at the University of Utah as late as May 1964 was based on works contained in professional journals of social work, psychiatry, psychology, and sociology, plus 36 books in the field of family life covering a period of 20 years (1942-1962). These men found that factors defining family strengths fall into the 15 following categories: (a) family as a strength within itself, (b) strong marriage, (c) strength of parents, (d) parents help children to develop, (e) relationship within the family, (f) family does things together, (g) social and



economic status satisfactory, (h) religious beliefs, (i) home environment, (j) activities in community affairs, (k) education, (l) capacity to change, (m) attitudes toward sex, (n) relationships with in-laws, and (o) recognizing need for help and accepting help. It is interesting to note that 68 per cent of the factors fell into the categories of family strength (6).

These recent studies demonstrate, as did the older ones, that the success of the family parallels the ability of that family to communicate. In all of the studies, one of the yardsticks used to measure family success is the family's ability to generate an atmosphere in which its members feel free to express themselves and in which there are satisfying basic patterns of communication.

CHAPTER III  
METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This study is concerned with problems of communication and other variables as factors influencing the holding of the Family Home Evening by families belonging to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in the Brigham City area.

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints recognized the home as the basic institution of learning and the family as an eternal unit. With this in mind, Church programs have been directed towards strengthening the family unit.

In 1877 Church leaders admonished parents to take time--if not each day, then not let too much time elapse--to gather their families together for association and instructions (5, p. 288).

In April of 1915 the Church leaders introduced a program called "Home Evening" and each family was asked to observe this evening once a week. This program had as its purpose association of the family through prayer, singing, scriptures, ethical problems, obligations of children to parents and parents to children, and duty to nation. Light refreshments after the lessons and discussions were encouraged (9, p. 733).

The leaders of the LDS Church, in January 1965, under the direction of the Priesthood Correlation Committee and with the help of the Home Teachers, introduced a new program, "The Family Home Evening." The stated purpose of this new program was to develop the

various skills of the family members through prayer, singing, scriptures, lessons, and association. The intended results would be love, consideration, and cooperation of the family members within the family unit.

This program differed from the older Home Evening concept in that books were provided which contained instructions for the families to follow. In addition, each Ward Bishopric was asked to set aside a specific night when the families within the ward would not be given any other Church duties and would be free to hold a Family Home Evening.

That a problem in this area existed was evident from a series of dialogues I experienced with a number of different groups. The first dialogue developed in September 1965, eight months after the Church Family Home Evening Program had been formally initiated and all families were vigorously encouraged to develop weekly Family Home Evenings. Informal discussion between Seminary teachers at Box Elder High School, based upon discussions with students enrolled, revealed quite clearly that only a fraction of families were observing the recommended practices of Family Home Evening activities.

#### Pilot Study

To define the relationship of family communication patterns to family participation in the Family Home Evening Program, the teachers in the Brigham City West Seminary mutually agreed to develop and administer a very simple questionnaire based upon three questions:

(a) Did you hold Family Home Evening when it first started? (b) Do

you hold it now? (c) How often do you hold it: once a week, twice a month, once a month, two or three times a year, never?

The results of this questionnaire indicated that six out of ten families (60 per cent) followed the recommendation of the Church and held Family Home Evening when it was first initiated. Of these, however, nearly 20 per cent discontinued the practice within eight months.

At this time I was looking for a thesis problem and, in consultation with my major professor, it was decided that a very meaningful study could be developed by attempting to answer the question: What were some of the factors that caused 40 per cent of the LDS families to never start holding Family Home Evening, and why did 20 per cent of those who started cease to hold the activity within eight months after the program was started?

In consultation with my major professor, it was hypothesized that one of the major factors influencing holding or not holding of Family Home Evening was that of communication. It was tentatively assumed that if there were abundant and satisfying patterns of communications within a family, it would be holding Family Home Evening. It also was assumed that in those families where there were few or no effective patterns of communication between parents and children, Family Home Evenings would not be held.

#### Questionnaire

Several methods were used to test the feasibility of this study. A small group of people (heads of families) was invited to a meeting

where the hypothesis was presented and discussed. This group included my major professor, a fellow seminary teacher who was working on his doctorate, and two co-workers on a previous research project. It was the general consensus that the hypothesis was logical and well formulated.

I then researched in the area of communication to obtain a wide variety of ideas and to formulate a number of questions which would, when answered by the students, reveal patterns of communication. The same group of people mentioned above was invited to a second meeting where the suggested questions were reviewed. Those which the group felt would most effectively measure the patterns and the levels of communication within the family were chosen. Additional questions which would reveal the students' attitudes about Family Home Evenings--the things they liked or disliked--were formulated. Other questions relative to family size, place of residence, and influences of the Home Teachers in the home, also were selected for the questionnaire. It was agreed by the group members that there would be a relationship between these independent variables.

After the questionnaire had been administered it was found that some questions did not really contribute to the meaningfulness of the study. These were deleted and were not included in the tabulation of data.

The questionnaire was then printed and administered to the 1,151 students at the Brigham City West Seminary in September 1965. The respective teachers who helped distribute and collect the questionnaires were instructed on the purpose and method of administration.



Each teacher was told only to hand out the questionnaires in the order they came. Marked questionnaires were scattered at random through each stack given each teacher. Each teacher was told the color combination of the marked questionnaires so he could observe who answered it. He was to note the name without the student's knowledge. He was told not to answer questions or offer any guidance other than to have each student mark the answer on the questionnaire which he, the student, felt best suited his situation. The teacher was to then gather the questionnaires, put the name of the students on the marked questionnaires, and bring them directly to my office. A total of 50 marked copies was distributed and collected. These instructions were given to insure as much as possible that each student would receive the same information about answering the questionnaire. These questionnaires were completed but not signed, which enabled the students to freely express themselves.

#### Personal Interviews

To further check reliability and validity of this study the 50 unsigned but marked and identified questionnaires were used.

These students were called in by the writer for personal interviews and were asked the same questions that were on the questionnaire. I then talked to the student's teacher to find out if the teacher felt the student was the type of individual who would answer the questionnaire sincerely.

It was the opinion of all the teachers concerned that the students called from their classroom for a personal interview were

sincere individuals. Some of the students came from my classes and I felt this was a true consensus of opinion.

After the 50 students were interviewed, we hand-tabulated the results of their questionnaires and a comparison was made with the same questions asked in the personal interview. I found the difference in the answers to the questionnaire and the personal interview to be almost nil. These findings are very significant to this study. Thus, three checks of the validity and reliability of the questionnaire were made: (a) questions were chosen by group consensus, (b) the respective teachers felt the personal interviews would be answered fairly by the students, and (c) differences in the comparison of the tabulated results of the marked questionnaires and the answers in the personal interviews were so minor that they could be accounted for by chance. It was, therefore, concluded that the questionnaire was a valid and reliable instrument for testing the hypothesis of this study.

#### Sampling Procedures

To obtain a random sample for use in this study, and because each stake (an LDS Church administrative division similar to a Catholic diocese) has approximately the same number of students, all questionnaires were sorted into the four stakes involved, and 50 (every fifth one) questionnaires were taken from each stake. These 200 questionnaires and the 50 marked questionnaires were used as the random sample on which this study was based.

Oral Evaluation Training Course

When the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints initiated the Family Home Evening Program it undertook to promote it in several ways: (a) a special handbook distributed to each family, (b) newspaper articles, (c) general priesthood meetings, (d) the church-owned periodicals, and (e) training sessions. Of all these promotion efforts, the Oral Evaluation Training Course was chosen to determine what effects it might have had on the Home Teachers and, second, the effect it might have had on the families they visited. Each stake held its own training course which consisted of ten separate meetings and make-up meetings when needed. These courses were conducted for priesthood quorum (those holding offices in the priesthood are organized into quorums) leaders. Their purpose was to train these leaders to help the Home Teachers become more effective in their jobs of strengthening the family unit and encouraging the family to hold Family Home Evening. I felt that if the Oral Evaluation Training Course was effective the leaders would receive training in how to better communicate the objectives and methods of the program to the Home Teachers who would then encourage their respective families to participate. This could be measured in two ways: (a) in frequency of Home Teacher visits and (b) families holding the Family Home Evening.

With this in mind, I attended some of the classes taught in the four stakes and observed the content of the course, and the attitude and general reaction of the men. Of the 10 classes or sessions in the course in each stake, I attended one-half (20 sessions). At the



close of each session I interviewed several of the men attending these meetings to find if they felt that the course would help them in their Oral Evaluation Meetings with their Home Teachers. A total of 15 participants was interviewed and asked the following questions: (a) Did you enjoy the training course? (b) Will you use what you have learned? (c) Do you feel this training program will help your Home Teachers? Six weeks later they were again interviewed to determine whether the training course had helped them in the meetings with their Home Teachers. This is discussed in greater detail under Additional Data.

### Main Study

#### Measure of communications

It was realized that no one question would fit all families nor would all questions fit all families. Thus, the questionnaire was divided into three parts consisting of three series of questions concerning three general areas. After they were filled out a score for each family was summed and put into tables. I assumed that the highest scores represented the patterns of the more satisfactory communication and the lowest scores represented the less satisfactory patterns of communication.

The first set of questions was designed to determine the student's opinion of what the patterns of communication were in relation to his position in the family unit. The second set of questions was designed to find with whom the student felt free to discuss his problems. The third set of questions was designed to find how the student

felt his family worked out its problems.

The first set of questions--numbers 3 through 15--was designed to find how the student felt patterns of communication were in relation to his position in the family. The students were directed to answer: always, usually, occasionally, seldom, or never. These values were assigned to give the student an opportunity to choose an answer most appropriate to the way he felt the situation actually existed in his family.

The 13 questions used in part 1 of the questionnaire were: (a) Our family attends sacrament meetings together. (b) Do your parents understand teen-age fads? (c) I confide my problems to my parents. (d) Our family takes vacations together. (e) Our family plans and does things together. (f) Are you willing to share your things with other members of your family if necessary? (g) Do your parents treat you as a young adult? (h) Do your parents willingly change their minds if you present a logical idea to something they disagree with? (i) Do you willingly change your mind if your parents present a logical idea to something you disagree with? (j) Do you feel free to express your ideas without recrimination when your family is discussing something? (k) Are you willing to listen to your parents and follow their advice even though you do not like their decision? (l) Do you feel your parents are overly critical of you? (m) Do your parents talk down to you?

These questions were given the following point values: always, 5; usually, 4; occasionally, 3; seldom, 2; and never, 1. The point values were assigned to these answers to provide a total score at

the end of part 1 and thus have a graphic tool to demonstrate the difference in communication patterns of the individual students. Of the 13 questions, two were asked worded in such a way that good patterns received low scores. Therefore, the tabulation had to be changed to give a true and accurate score. The two questions treated in this manner were: number 14 (l), do you feel your parents are overly critical of you; and number 15 (m), do your parents talk down to you? These questions were given a value of always, 1; usually, 2; occasionally, 3; seldom, 4; and never, 5 to reflect their true values. These scores were summed, an aggregate score made for each family and entered in Table 1.

Part 2 of the questionnaire was constructed to show patterns of communication by asking questions which would show in whom the student confided. The three questions in this part--17 through 19--were: (a) I usually confide in \_\_\_\_\_. (b) I usually discuss my problems with \_\_\_\_\_. (c) Who gives the lesson for your Family Home Evening? The possible answers to these questions were: father, mother, brother, sister, or other. The students were asked to check one or as many of the choices as applied to them. The following point values were assigned: brother or sister, 1; brother and sister, 2; mother or father, 2; father and brother or father and sister or mother and brother or mother and sister, 3; father and mother or father and brother and sister or mother and brother and sister, 4; father and mother and brother or father and mother and sister, 5; father and mother and brother and sister, 6; and other or no answer, 0. The resulting scores were summed and an aggregate score was made

for each family and entered in Table 2. I again determined that the highest score represented the highest pattern of communication and the lowest score the lowest pattern of communication.

Part 3 of the questionnaire was designed as yet another way to point up the patterns of communication that existed in the student's family. This would be reflected by how the student felt his family worked out its problems as a family unit. The first three questions in this part of the questionnaire--numbering 20 through 22--are: (a) Does your family work out their problems without much trouble? (b) Do you feel the members of your family are treated equally in decision making? (c) Do your parents go to ball games, plays, or meetings when you have a part on the program? Although part 3 of the questionnaire contained four questions which were answerable by yes or no, only answers to the first three were given values: yes, 4 points; no, 0 points. Scores were summed for each family and the aggregate incorporated into Table 3. The fourth question--number 23--was: Do the Home Teachers tell you how or help you to hold Family Home Evenings? It was put in to evaluate the effectiveness of the Oral Evaluation Training Course.

With the completion of Tables 1, 2 and 3, a composite table of the three questionnaire parts was constructed. The summed score for each of the families in each of the three parts was then totaled into one score for each family and a table was constructed with these totals. This table was numbered 4 and, along with the first three tables, is presented in the analysis chapter of this study.

### Other variables measured

The final part of the questionnaire was made up of three questions. These questions asked for specific answers but each student could answer the questions differently, depending on the situation in his or her particular family. Number 24 read: How many children in your family and what are their ages? The families were grouped according to the number of children in the family unit and a category assigned. A family with one or two children was categorized as small, three to five children as moderate, six to eight children as large, and nine and over as very large. The families were then arranged by categories listed in Table 5, which shows a relationship between family size and the frequency of the Family Home Evening activity.

Question 25 read: The things that I like most about the Family Home Evening Program are\_\_\_\_. It was designed to find those things about the Family Home Evening Program which the family enjoyed the most. Each student could respond as he desired. The answers were then listed under seven general headings: (a) refreshments and games, (b) family getting together and visiting, (c) lessons, (d) scriptures and stories, (e) music, (f) everything, and (g) no answer. Table 6 was constructed to show the results of this question.

The answers to question 25 were further consolidated under four headings: (a) refreshments and games grouped with family getting together and visiting, (b) lessons grouped with scriptures and stories, (c) music and everything grouped, and (d) no answer. The results were put into Table 7.



Question 26 was: The things I dislike most about the Family Home Evening are \_\_\_\_\_. It was designed to point out those things the family did not like about the program. The answers were grouped under seven headings: (a) time it takes, (b) interruptions, (c) singing, (d) scriptures, (e) lessons, (f) everything, and (g) no answer. The results of this question were tabulated and used in Table 8.

The general headings of dislike were also further consolidated and were grouped into patterns of dislikes with the headings: (a) time it takes and interruptions, (b) singing and scriptures, (c) lessons and everything, and (d) no answer. The results of this grouping were tabulated and form Table 9.

#### Preparation of the data

After processing the questionnaire and constructing the tables, the questions were programmed for an IBM computer.

At the beginning of the questionnaire two questions were asked-- first, which stake the student lived in, and second, how often the family held the Family Home Evening: (a) once a week, (b) every two weeks, (c) once a month, (d) two or three times a year, and (e) never. The answers to the first question were put on the code sheet as 1, Box Elder; 2, South Box Elder; 3, Brigham City; 4, North Box Elder; and 5, no answer. The answer checked by the student for the second question was put on the code sheet as 1, once a week; 2, every two weeks; 3, once a month; 4, two or three times a year; 5, never; and 6, no answer.

In part 1 answers to each question were given a value ranging

from 1 to 5. These values were then summed for each family. The values possible ranged from 0 to 52. These were then divided into five categories: (a) no answer; (b) 1 to 13, poor; (c) 14 to 26, fair; (d) 27 to 39, good; and (e) 40 to 52, very good. In part 2 the value given to each question ranged from 0 through 6. These scores were summed for each family with a possible range of 0 through 18. These were divided into five categories of (a) 0, no answer; (b) 1 to 5, poor; (c) 6 to 9, fair; (d) 10 to 14, good; and (e) 15 to 18, very good.

In part 3 the answers were either no or yes and had a value of 0 for no or no answer and 4 for yes. The possible summed scores in part 3 ranged from 0 through 12. These scores were then categorized into: 0, no answer; 0 to 3, poor; 5 to 6, fair; 7 to 9, good; 10 to 12, very good. Table 4, a composite of parts 1, 2, and 3, had a possible range of 0 through 92. These summed scores were divided into 0, no answer; 1 to 23, poor; 24 to 46, fair; 47 to 69, good; and 70 to 92, very good.

In the fourth part of the questionnaire there were no scores or summing of scores. The first question in part 4 asked for family size and ages. Only family size was deemed important to the study and it was categorized as follows: one to two children, small; three to five children, moderate; six to eight children, large; and nine children and over, very large. These were coded: 1, small; 2, moderate; 3, large; and 4, very large. The next two questions asked what the student liked or disliked, respectively, about the Family Home Evening Program. The answers to these questions were grouped

under the headings: Likes--refreshments and games, family getting together, lessons, scriptures and stories, music, everything, and no answer. Dislikes--time it takes, interruptions, singing, scriptures, lessons, everything, and no answer. These were put on the coding sheet as 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, respectively. These answers were then further grouped into patterns of: Like--refreshments and games and family getting together and visiting; lessons, scriptures, and stories; music and everything; and no answer. Dislike--time it takes and interruptions; singing and scriptures; lessons and everything; and no answer. These like and dislike categories were put on the coding sheet as 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively.

After coding sheets were prepared, they were taken to the computer section at Utah State University, where IBM cards were punched. A table of cross tabulation was then compiled and these were run through the computer to check or show a relationship of number, percentages, and similarity through the use of chi-square.

Two other questions were used in the study but were hand-tabulated for numbers and percentages. The first question was number 16. This question was located in part 1 of the questionnaire and was answerable by always, usually, occasionally, seldom, and never. The answers to this question were tabulated with the number who answered each of the possible choices. The second question--number 23--was found in the third part of the questionnaire: Do the Home Teachers tell you how or help you to hold your Family Home Evening? The answers to this question were totaled as either yes or no.

The significance of these questions to the study will be found in the next chapter.



## CHAPTER IV

## ANALYSIS, SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS OF DATA

Section I: Some Facts About  
the RespondentsResidence

Data compiled from the 250 questionnaires showed that 66 (26.4 per cent) students resided in Box Elder Stake, 63 (25.2 per cent) students lived in South Box Elder Stake, 60 (24.0 per cent) listed their residence in Brigham City Stake, and 61 (24.4 per cent) lived in the North Box Elder Stake.

Family size

Thirty (12.0 per cent) of the families were small (one or two children); 153 (61.2 per cent) were moderate (three to five children); 55 (22.0 per cent) were large (six to eight children); and 8 (3.2 per cent) families were very large (nine or more children). Four students (1.6 per cent) did not answer this question.

Frequency of holding Family Home  
Evening

Fifty-one (20.4 per cent) of the families held the Family Home Evening once a week, 24 (9.6 per cent) held the program every two weeks, 30 (12.0 per cent) families held it once a month, 40 (16.0 per cent) held the activity only two or three times a year, and 150 (42.0 per cent) of the families never held the program. Only 75 (30.0 per cent) or three out of ten families were reported as holding

the Family Home Evening often enough to be considered meaningful.

Students likes about the Family Home Evening Program

The students were given an open-ended question which asked them to write down the one feature of the Family Home Evening Program that was most appealing to them. Their responses were as follows: 44 (17.6 per cent) of the students liked refreshments and games best; 46 (18.4 per cent) enjoyed the family getting together and visiting; 29 (11.6 per cent) chose the lessons; 5 (2.0 per cent) preferred the scriptures and the stories; 1 (0.4 per cent) enjoyed the music most; and 8 (3.2 per cent) said they enjoyed everything. One hundred sixteen (46.4 per cent) did not answer this question. This 46.4 per cent represents almost half of all the 250 students. This does not mean that these young people do not want to hold Family Home Evening. This only indicates that those families do not hold the activity regularly enough to be meaningful in the lives of these young people. These statistics also reveal very clearly that the social aspects of the Family Home Evening have the greatest appeal to the largest number of persons. The challenge to the Church, then, is to make the other aspects of the Family Home Evening Program more attractive and meaningful to a larger number of children in the family. Because of the very low number of persons who liked music and scriptures, one is forced to ponder whether or not such activities should be continued as a regular part of the Family Home Evening Program, or at least discontinued until such time as they can be made to be more attractive and meaningful to the young people.

Student dislikes about the Family Home Evening Program

The students were invited to identify the one thing they disliked most about the Family Home Evening Program. Thirty-seven (14.8 per cent) disliked the lessons most; 28 (11.2 per cent) disliked the time it took to hold the meeting; 25 (10.0 per cent) said that interruptions during the meeting bothered them most; 8 (3.2 per cent) disliked everything; 4 (1.6 per cent) resented singing most; 2 (0.8 per cent) disliked scriptures; and 144 (57.6 per cent) did not answer the question. It can be presumed that most of those who did not answer this question belonged to the families not holding the activity.

Frequency of visits by Home Teachers

One hundred twenty-four (49.6 per cent) reported that the Home Teachers always visited their home; 72 (28.8 per cent) answered that they usually visited their home; 23 (9.2 per cent) were visited occasionally; 12 (4.8 per cent) students said the Home Teachers seldom visited; and 16 (6.4 per cent) indicated that the Home Teachers never come to visit in their homes. Three (1.2 per cent) students did not answer this question. A total of 196 (78.4 per cent) students reported regular visits by the Home Teachers.

Contributions of the Home Teachers to the development and holding of Home Evenings

Sixty-two (24.8 per cent) students answered that the Home Teachers did not tell or help their family to hold Home Evenings. Only four (1.6 per cent) answered yes to the question and 184 (73.8

per cent) did not respond. This suggests that Home Teachers do little to help their assigned families to develop meaningful Family Home Evening Program activities, at least from the viewpoint of the students.

#### Student communication with the Bishopric

Just over half (127, or 50.8 per cent) of the students felt free to confide in at least one or more individuals in the Bishopric of their ward. One hundred fourteen gave a negative answer to this question and gave various reasons as to why they felt so. Nine (3.9 per cent) of the students did not respond to this question. From these answers one can conclude that Bishoprics do not have the trust and confidence of about half of the young people in their wards. Under such conditions it is obvious that many Bishoprics do not develop enough empathy with the young people of high school age in their wards to play a helpful, guiding, and counseling role with them.

#### Brief Summary of Section I

##### Residence

Twenty-six per cent resided in Box Elder Stake.

Twenty-five per cent resided in South Box Elder Stake.

Twenty-four per cent resided in Brigham City Stake.

Twenty-five per cent resided in North Box Elder Stake.

##### Family size

Twelve per cent were small in size.

Sixty-one per cent were moderate in size.

Twenty-two per cent were large in size.

Three per cent were very large in size.

Two per cent did not answer the question.

Frequency of holding Family Home  
Evening

Twenty per cent held once a week.

Ten per cent held every two weeks.

Twelve per cent held once a month.

Sixteen per cent held two or three times a year.

Forty-two per cent never held the Family Home Evening.

Students' likes about the Family  
Home Evening

Eighteen per cent liked refreshments and games.

Eighteen per cent liked getting together and visiting.

Twelve per cent liked the lessons.

Two per cent liked scriptures and stories.

One per cent liked music.

Three per cent liked everything.

Forty-six per cent did not answer this question.

Students' dislikes about the Family  
Home Evening

Fifteen per cent disliked lessons.

Eleven per cent disliked time it took.

Ten per cent disliked interruptions.

Three per cent disliked everything.

Two per cent disliked singing.



One per cent disliked scriptures.

Fifty-eight per cent did not answer the question.

Frequency of visits by Home Teachers

Fifty per cent reported Home Teachers always visited.

Thirty per cent reported Home Teachers usually visited.

Eight per cent reported Home Teachers occasionally visited.

Five per cent reported Home Teachers seldom visited.

Six per cent reported Home Teachers never visited.

One per cent did not answer this question.

Contributions of the Home Teachers to  
development and holding of Home Evening

Twenty-five per cent of the families reported no help.

Two per cent reported some help.

Seventy-three per cent did not answer this question.

Student communication with the  
Bishopric

Fifty-one per cent felt free to confide in members of the  
Bishopric.

Forty-five per cent did not confide in any member of the  
Bishopric.

Four per cent did not answer this question.

Section II: Some Specific Indices of  
Communication Patterns Between  
Parents and Children

Section II contains questions designed to measure the degree to which personally satisfying patterns of communication exist in the families of the students. These questions were designed to find the degree of freedom which the student felt he had in expressing himself, the person or persons in whom he felt free to confide, and the position he felt he held in relation to other members of his family.

Sacrament Meeting attendance

Eighty (32 per cent) of the students said that their family always attended Sacrament Meetings together. Forty-three (17.2 per cent) reported their families usually attend Sacrament Meetings together. Occasionally, 43 (17.2 per cent) of the students attended with their families. Twenty (8 per cent) said they seldom attended together, and 64 (25.6 per cent) reported that they never attended Sacrament Meeting as a family. These statistics show that one out of four of the families never attend Sacrament Meetings as a family unit, which indicates that one-fourth of the Latter-day Saint families do not display a pattern of closeness or demonstrate the desire to communicate and do things together.

Teen-age fads

Thirty-three (13.2 per cent) of the students said their parents always understood teenage fads; 127 (50 per cent) reported that their parents usually understood teen-age fads; 46 (18.4 per cent) answered that their parents occasionally understood; 19 (7.6 per

cent) answered seldom to this question; and 25 (10.0 per cent) said their parents never understood. In the case of 77 students, they and their parents evidently had developed little or no patterns of communication and understanding about teen-age fads.

#### Confidence in parents

Only 29 (11.6 per cent) students reported that they always confided in their parents, while 90 (36.0 per cent) answered that they usually confided in their parents. Sixty-nine (27.6 per cent) answered occasionally; 24 (9.6 per cent) said they seldom did so; and 38 (15.2 per cent) said they never confided in their parents. These statistics show that only 119 (47.6 per cent) of the students have a confiding relationship with their parents. Thus 131 (52.6 per cent) of the young people did not feel free to confide in their parents, and this situation very definitely indicates a lack of satisfying communication patterns in the respective homes.

#### Family vacations

Taking vacations together was a regular practice for 144 (45.6 per cent) of the students. Another 55 (22 per cent) answered that their families usually took their vacations together. Thirty-seven (14.8 per cent) answered occasionally, and 17 (6.8 per cent) reported that they seldom vacationed as a family unit. Twenty-six (10.4 per cent) answered never to this question.

#### Family plans and does things together

Seventy-one (28.4 per cent) of the students said their family always planned and did things together; 86 (34.4 per cent) answered

usually; 44 (17.6 per cent) occasionally; 28 (11.2 per cent) answered seldom; and 21 (8.4 per cent) students gave never as their answer to this question. The figures show that one out of three families only occasionally, if ever, plan and participate in activities as a unit. The ability to plan and do things as a family is another measure of satisfying communication patterns in a family.

#### Sharing things with others

In answering this question, 80 (32.0 per cent) of the students marked always; 134 (53.6 per cent) answered usually; 14 (5.6 per cent) said occasionally; 16 (6.4 per cent) said they seldom were willing to share; and 6 (2.4 per cent) answered never. Although only 26 (14.4 per cent) students expressed reservation or unwillingness to share their things with other members of their families, it is indicative of an inability of persons within the family to communicate with each other.

#### How your parents treat you

Sixty (24 per cent) students said their parents always treated them as young adults; 137 (54.8 per cent) answered usually to this question; 21 (8.4 per cent) reported that their parents only occasionally treated them as young adults; 23 (9.2 per cent) answered seldom to the question; and 9 (3.6 per cent) answered never. Approximately one out of five (21.2 per cent) of these students thus experience some difficulty in communicating with their parents on an adult level.

Do your parents change their minds?

Twenty-two (8.8 per cent) students said their parents would always change their minds if a counter idea was logically presented and 114 (45.6 per cent) reported that their parents were usually willing to change their minds. Fifty-eight (23.2 per cent) answered occasionally; 38 (15.2 per cent) said seldom; and 18 (7.2 per cent) said their parents never changed their minds. In reviewing these statistics it appears that, in the opinion of the students, only 54.4 per cent of the parents always or usually are willing to change their minds to a logically presented idea with which they originally disagreed. This leaves 45.6 per cent or almost one out of two young people who feel they have little or no ability to communicate their ideas to their parents.

Do you change your mind?

Twelve (4 per cent) students said they were always willing to change their minds if an idea was logically presented; 129 (51.6 per cent) reported they usually changed their minds; 52 (20.8 per cent) said they occasionally changed; 43 (17.2 per cent) answered seldom to this question; and 14 (5.6 per cent) students gave never for an answer. Approximately three out of five students (141, or 56.4 per cent) said they were willing to change their minds to a logically presented idea with which they originally disagreed. These statistics indicate that the student feels he is more willing to change his mind than his parents are when confronted with the same type of problem.



Freedom to express ideas

Seventy-two (28.8 per cent) students said they always felt free to express ideas within the family. Ninety (36 per cent) answered usually; 40 (16 per cent) felt they only occasionally were free to express ideas; 18 (7 per cent) said seldom; and 30 (12 per cent) said they were never free to express themselves without fear of recrimination. Thus, 88 (35.2 per cent) of the students only occasionally, if ever, felt free to communicate openly and frankly in family discussions.

Willingness to listen to and follow parents' advice

Forty-five (18 per cent) students answered that they were always willing to listen to and follow their parents' advice, and 138 (55.2 per cent) reported they usually were willing. Thirty-four (13.6 per cent) answered occasionally, while 27 (10.8 per cent) seldom were willing, and 6 (2.4 per cent) listed never as the answer to this question. Although 183 (73.2 per cent) were willing to change their minds most of the time, one out of four expressed reluctance to participate in this crucial area of family understanding. Evidently the parents are not able to communicate in such a manner as to gain their cooperation.

Parents overly critical of their children

Fifteen (6 per cent) of the students felt their parents were always too critical of them, and 20 (8 per cent) answered usually to this question; while 82 (32.8 per cent) students felt their parents

occasionally were too critical. Forty-six (18.4 per cent) students gave seldom as their answer, and 87 (34.8 per cent) said their parents were never overly critical. Approximately one out of five (57, or 22.8 per cent) students felt their parents were too critical of them. Note that with this and the next question, a pattern of communication is indicated by answering the question just opposite from the preceding 11 questions.

Do your parents talk down to you?

Twenty-eight (11.6 per cent) students gave always as their answer to this question, and 28 (11.2 per cent) of the students said their parents usually talked down to them. Fifty-eight (23.2 per cent) students answered occasionally; 47 (18.8 per cent) replied seldom; and 88 (35.2 per cent) answered never. Tabulation shows that 112 (46.0 per cent) students felt their parents always, usually, or occasionally talked down to them. It is assumed that in families where this feeling exists, satisfying patterns of communication are lacking.

With whom in the family do children confide?

Fifty (20 per cent) students listed their brother or their sister as their confidants; 43 (17.2 per cent) said a brother and a sister or either their father or mother; 86 (34.4 per cent) listed father and brother, father and sister, mother and brother, or mother and sister. Twenty-nine (11.6 per cent) of the students said that they confided in their father and mother, father or brother and sister, or mother or brother and sister; and 27 (10.8 per cent)

answered father or mother and brother, or father or mother and sister. Ten (4 per cent) students listed father or mother or brother and sister, and 5 (2 per cent) did not answer the question. It is clearly indicated that patterns of communication exist in most of the families, but a large percentage (245, or 96.0 per cent) of the students indicated that they do not communicate with all members of the family.

With whom does the student discuss his problems?

Fifty (20 per cent) students said they usually discussed problems with just a brother or just a sister; 31 (12.4 per cent) marked brother and sister, only mother, or only father on their questionnaires; 103 (41.2 per cent) reported they discussed problems with father and brothers, mother and brothers, father and sisters, or mother and sisters. Twenty-one (8.4 per cent) preferred to talk to father and mother, father or brothers and sisters, or mother or brothers and sisters. Thirty-six (14.4 per cent) listed father or mother and brothers, or father or mother and sisters as the combination with whom they would discuss their problems, and 6 (2.4 per cent) said they would discuss their problems with father or mother or brothers and sisters. This last group would discuss problems with all members of the family unit. Three (1.2 per cent) students did not answer this question.

Who presents the Family Home Evening lesson?

Of the students, 108 (43.2 per cent) answered a brother or a

sister; 2 (0.8 per cent) answered brother and sister or mother or father; 66 (26.4 per cent) students answered that father and brothers, mother and brother, father and sister or mother and sister gave the lesson. Five (2 per cent) said father and mother, father or brother and sister, mother or brother and sister; 32 (12.8 per cent) listed father or mother and brother and father or mother and sister; and 8 (3.2 per cent) students gave the combination of father or mother or brother and sister. Twenty-eight (11.2 per cent) students did not answer this question. It appears that in approximately two out of five homes the lessons are given only by a brother or a sister. The reason for this is unknown, but it seems safe to assume that in those families where only a brother or a sister presents the lesson, all the family members are not participating on an equal basis. This would indicate that unequal or unsatisfactory communication patterns exist in those families.

#### Working out family problems

Sixty-three (25.2 per cent) students answered no to this question while 187 (75.8 per cent) answered yes. In the opinion of the students, three out of four of their families solve their problems without difficulty, but one out of four families does not achieve complete success in this area.

#### Equality of family members in decision making

Eighty-two (32.8 per cent) students did not believe all members of the family were treated equally, while 168 (67.2 per cent) of the students said they believe that all members of their families were

treated equally in decision making. Every student replied to this question.

Support parents give to activities  
in which student is involved

Forty-six (18.4 per cent) students replied in the negative to this question. The rest (204, or 81.6 per cent) of the students answered that their parents did support them by attending games, plays, and meetings that they (the student) were involved in.

Brief Summary of Section II

Sacrament Meeting attendance

Thirty-two per cent always attended Sacrament Meeting together.  
Seventeen per cent usually attended Sacrament Meeting together.  
Seventeen per cent occasionally attended Sacrament Meeting together.

Eight per cent seldom attended Sacrament Meeting together.

Twenty-six per cent never attended Sacrament Meeting together.

Teen-age fads

Thirteen per cent always understood.

Fifty per cent usually understood.

Nineteen per cent occasionally understood.

Eight per cent seldom understood.

Ten per cent never understood.

Confidence in parents

Twelve per cent answered they always confided in parents.



Thirty-six per cent answered they usually confided in parents.

Twenty-eight per cent answered they occasionally confided in parents.

Nine per cent answered they seldom confided in parents.

Fifteen per cent answered they never confided in parents.

#### Family vacation

Forty-six per cent always vacationed together.

Twenty-two per cent usually vacationed together.

Fifteen per cent occasionally vacationed together.

Seven per cent seldom vacationed together.

Ten per cent never vacationed together.

#### Family plans and does things together

Twenty-eight per cent always planned and did things together.

Thirty-four per cent usually planned and did things together.

Eighteen per cent seldom planned and did things together.

Nine per cent never planned and did things together.

#### Sharing things with others

Thirty-two per cent always shared.

Fifty-four per cent usually shared.

Six per cent occasionally shared.

Six per cent seldom shared.

Two per cent never shared.

#### How your parents treat you

Twenty-four per cent felt always treated them as young adults.

Fifty-five per cent felt usually treated them as young adults.

Eight per cent felt occasionally treated them as young adults.

Nine per cent felt seldom treated them as young adults.

Four per cent felt never treated them as young adults.

Do your parents change their minds?

Nine per cent always changed their minds.

Forty-six per cent usually changed their minds.

Twenty-three occasionally changed their minds.

Fifteen per cent seldom changed their minds.

Seven per cent never changed their minds.

Do you change your mind?

Four per cent always changed their mind.

Fifty per cent usually changed their mind.

Twenty-one per cent occasionally changed their mind.

Seventeen per cent seldom changed their mind.

Six per cent never changed their mind.

Freedom to express ideas

Twenty-nine per cent always felt free to express ideas.

Thirty-six per cent usually felt free to express ideas.

Sixteen per cent occasionally felt free to express ideas.

Seven per cent seldom felt free to express ideas.

Twelve per cent never felt free to express ideas.

Willingness to listen to and follow  
parents' advice

Eighteen per cent always listened to parents' advice.

Fifty-five per cent usually listened to parents' advice.

Fourteen per cent occasionally listened to parents' advice.

Eleven per cent seldom listened to parents' advice.

Two per cent never listened to parents' advice.

Parents overly critical of their children

Seven per cent felt parents were always too critical.

Eight per cent felt parents were usually too critical.

Thirty-three per cent felt parents were usually too critical.

Eighteen per cent felt parents were seldom too critical.

Thirty-four per cent felt parents were never too critical.

Do your parents talk down to you?

Twelve per cent answered always.

Eleven per cent answered usually.

Twenty-three per cent answered occasionally.

Nineteen per cent answered seldom.

Thirty-five and two per cent answered never.

With whom in the family do children confide?

Twenty per cent answered with a brother or a sister.

Seventeen per cent answered with a brother and a sister.

Fifty-seven per cent answered with a brother or a sister and parents.

Four per cent answered with all members of the family.

Two per cent did not answer the question.

With whom does the student discuss  
his problems?

Twenty per cent answered just a brother or just a sister.

Twelve per cent answered brother and sister or one parent.

Sixty-four per cent answered brother and sister and one parent.

Two per cent answered all members of the family.

Two per cent did not answer.

Who presents the Family Home  
Evening lesson?

Forty-three per cent answered a brother or a sister.

One per cent answered a brother and a sister or a parent.

Forty-two per cent answered brother and sister and one parent.

Three per cent answered all members of the family.

Eleven per cent did not answer.

Working out family problems

Twenty-five per cent answered no.

Seventy-five per cent answered yes.

Equality of family members in  
decision making

Thirty-three per cent answered no.

Sixty-seven per cent answered yes.

Support parents give to activities in  
which student is involved

Eighteen per cent answered no.

Eighty-two per cent answered yes.

Section III: Composite Measures of  
Communication Patterns

In the material presented above I was interested in presenting responses of students to questions chosen to reflect family communication patterns. This section presents the tabulation of scores for each part of the three parts of the questionnaire. Each part measures a different facet of the communication patterns. A combination of the three composite measures also is presented.

Part 1--questions answerable by always,  
usually, occasionally, seldom and never

Answers of 59 (23.6 per cent) students were categorized under very good; 149 (59.6 per cent) were good; 38 (15.2 per cent) were fair; and 4 (1.6 per cent) were listed under poor. All 250 students answered all of the questions in part 1 of the questions.

Part 2--person or persons student feels  
free to confide in

Two (0.8 per cent) students were listed under the very good category; 52 (20.8 per cent) under good; 74 (29.6 per cent) were fair; and 122 (48.8 per cent) were classified poor. All students marked at least one question in part 2.

Part 3--family participation and  
problem solving

Answers of 130 (52.0 per cent) students fell into the very good category; 66 (26.4 per cent) were good; 34 (13.6 per cent) were fair; and 20 (8.0 per cent) were classified under poor. All students answered all questions in part 3.



A composite picture of all patterns  
of communication

Five (2 per cent) of the students' answers were rated very good; 145 (58.0 per cent) were good; 91 (36.4 per cent) were fair; and 9 (3.6 per cent) were rated poor. From the final tabulation it appears that of the 250 randomly selected students only 2.0 per cent feel their homes have very good patterns of communication. Only 3.6 per cent of the students indicated their homes have poor patterns of communication. However, 40 per cent reported fair or poor patterns of communication. Apparently, then, two out of five homes do not have satisfying communication patterns within the family unit.

Chi-square

In the first and subsequent chi-square tables, data presented include (a) the number of persons within each category who actually responded to the question (no.), (b) the percentage of those responding within each category in relationship to the total number of respondents (%), and (c) the calculated expected number of respondents within each category who should have responded to the question in contrast to those who actually did respond if there was no association between the variables cross-tabulated (Exp. No.). The magnitude of chi-square is determined by the extent to which the expected number varies from the actual number found in the cell.

When using the chi-square method of testing each cell should have an expected number of not less than five. In this study several cells do not have this expected number. Three alternatives presented themselves: first, delete from the study those columns containing

cells with less than the expected responses. Second, combine one column with another to get the expected number. Or third, do the first two steps and, if it was found no significant change occurred, leave the tables as they were. Alternative number three was followed.

#### Patterns of Association

The chi-square method of analysis was used to find if there was any meaningful correlation between communication patterns and other variables within the family and the observance of the Family Home Evening Program by Latter-day Saint families. The data in this study reveal that Family Home Evening was usually held in those cases where meaningful patterns of communication prevailed.

After the questionnaires were scored, and cross tabulated tables were constructed, the chi-square method of testing was used to evaluate any relationship among variables which might exist. The relationship was not significant in several of the tables and they will not be presented in this study. Several tables did show a relationship at the .05 level of significance or greater.

#### Analysis of data between frequency of holding Family Home Evening and patterns of communication

Tables 1, 2, and 3 show the degree of correlation which exists between the patterns of communication and the frequency of holding the Family Home Evening for each of the three sections in the questionnaire.

Table 1. The extent to which the quality of communication patterns between students and parents is associated with frequency of holding the Family Home Evening Program--part 1.<sup>a</sup> The questions were designed to gauge the student's opinion of how communication patterns related to his or her position in the family

Frequency of holding Family Home Evening	Very good			Good			Fair			Poor			Total		
	No.	%	Exp. No.	No.	%	Exp. No.	No.	%	Exp. No.	No.	%	Exp. No.	No.	%	Exp. No.
Once a week	23	45.1	12.0	25	49.1	30.4	3	5.8	7.8	0	0.0	0.8	51	100.0	--
Every two weeks	7	29.1	5.7	17	70.9	14.3	0	0.0	3.6	0	0.0	0.4	24	100.0	--
Once a month	8	26.6	7.1	18	60.1	17.8	4	13.3	4.6	0	0.0	0.5	30	100.0	--
Two or three times a year	12	30.0	9.4	22	55.0	23.8	4	10.0	6.1	2	5.0	0.7	40	100.0	--
Never	9	8.5	24.7	67	63.9	62.6	27	25.7	16.0	2	1.9	1.7	105	100.0	--
Total	59	23.6	--	149	59.6	--	38	15.2	--	4	1.6	--	250	100.0	--

$$X^2 = 42.69 \text{ at } 12df > .001$$

$$C = \sqrt{\frac{X^2}{N + X^2}} = C = \sqrt{\frac{42.69}{250 + 42.69}} = C = .12$$

<sup>a</sup>See page 22 for explanation.

Table 2. The extent to which the quality of communication patterns between students and parents is associated with frequency of holding Family Home Evening Program--part 2.<sup>a</sup> The questions were designed to find with whom the student felt free to discuss his problems

Frequency of holding Family Home Evening	Very good			Good			Fair			Poor			Total		
	No.	%	Exp. No.	No.	%	Exp. No.	No.	%	Exp. No.	No.	%	Exp. No.	No.	%	Exp. No.
Once a week	0	0.0	.04	18	35.2	10.6	23	45.0	15.1	10	19.6	24.7	51	100.0	--
Every two weeks	0	0.0	0.2	11	45.8	5.0	10	41.6	7.1	3	12.5	11.6	24	100.0	--
Once a month	2	6.6	0.2	5	16.6	6.2	12	40.0	8.9	11	36.6	14.5	30	100.0	--
Two or three times a year	0	0.0	0.3	13	32.5	8.3	16	40.0	11.8	12	27.5	19.4	41	100.0	--
Never	0	0.0	0.8	5	4.7	21.8	13	12.3	31.1	86	50.8	81.8	104	100.0	--
Total	2	0.8	--	52	20.8	--	74	29.6	--	122	48.8	--	250	100.0	--

$$\chi^2 = 106.99 \text{ at } 16df < .001$$

$$C = \sqrt{\frac{\chi^2}{N + \chi^2}} = C \sqrt{\frac{106.99}{250 + 106.99}} = C = .17$$

<sup>a</sup>See page 23 for explanation.

Table 3. The extent to which the quality of communication patterns between students and parents is associated with frequency of holding the Family Home Evening--part 3.<sup>a</sup> The questions were designed to determine how the student felt his family solved its problems

Frequency of holding Family Home Evening	Very good			Good			Fair			Poor			Total		
	No.	%	Exp. No.	No.	%	Exp. No.	No.	%	Exp. No.	No.	%	Exp. No.	No.	%	Exp. No.
Once a week	27	50.9	26.5	16	31.3	13.5	4	7.8	6.9	5	9.8	3.5	52	100.0	--
Every two weeks	16	66.6	12.5	8	33.3	6.3	0	0.0	3.3	0	0.0	1.6	24	100.0	--
Once a month	21	70.0	15.6	6	20.0	7.9	2	6.6	4.1	1	3.3	2.0	30	100.0	--
Two or three times a year	20	50.0	20.8	9	22.5	10.6	7	17.5	5.4	3	7.5	2.8	39	100.0	--
Never	49	44.7	54.6	27	25.7	27.7	21	20.0	14.3	8	7.6	17.1	105	100.0	--
Total	133	53.2	--	66	26.4	--	34	13.6	--	17	6.8	--	250	100.0	--

$$\chi^2 = 29.05 \text{ at } 16df > .02$$

$$C = \sqrt{\frac{\chi^2}{N + \chi^2}} = C = \sqrt{\frac{29.05}{250 + 29.05}} = C = .10$$

<sup>a</sup>See page 24 for explanation.



Table 1 is based on the answers to the 13 questions found in part 1 of the questionnaire and which were designed to find how the student felt the patterns of communication to be as judged by closeness, togetherness, and attitudes of family members toward each other. This table shows that in the families where the patterns of communication are very good or good, these are also the families which hold the Family Home Evening most frequently. This table also shows that in families where patterns of communication are only fair or poor, these families are the ones which hold Family Home Evening the least or not at all. This association, although not large as measured by the C (coefficient of contingency), is definitely significant as it could not have happened even once in 100 times. Coefficient of contingency is a device which measures the relationship between two variables and shows perfect association when the value approaches .90.

Table 2 demonstrates the degree to which patterns of communication exist within the family unit. It is based on part 2 of the questionnaire. Part 2 was designed to find which members of the family the students confided in and with whom they discussed their problems. Here, as in Table 1, those families which have good and fair patterns of communication hold the Family Home Evening most frequently. In addition, we find a significant increase in families with poor communication patterns with very few families falling into the very good category. The data in Table 2 reveal that the better the patterns of communication, the higher the frequency of Family Home Evenings. Chi-square indicates that the probabilities are less

than one out of a thousand that the degree of relationship which exists could occur by chance. When C (coefficient of contingency) is calculated to express statistically the degree of association which prevails, it is significant even though it is low--.17.

Table 3 is based on part 3 of the questionnaire which was designed to determine what the student felt his relationship with the family members to be. According to this table the better the students rated their families, the higher the frequency with which those families hold Family Home Evening. This table shows a significance level of .02 which means that this association could only occur twice in 100 times, which is far above the possibility of chance. The coefficient of contingency is .10.

Table 4 is a summed composite of the three preceding tables and was constructed as a further check on communication patterns and their relationship to the frequency of holding Family Home Evening Program. Chi-square tests on this table show a relationship at the .001 level of significance. Table 4 demonstrates again that patterns of communication are definitely related to the frequency with which families adhere to the Family Home Evening Program. The coefficient of contingency for Table 4 is .12. Those families which have very good or good patterns of communication hold the Family Home Evening more frequently than do those who have fair or poor patterns of communication.

#### Family size and its relationship to the frequency of holding Family Home Evening

This question was asked to find if the size of the family was a

Table 4. Composite of communication patterns showing extent to which these patterns between parent and student are associated with frequency of holding Family Home Evening

Frequency of holding Family Home Evening	Very good			Good			Fair			Poor			Total		
	No.	%	Exp. No.	No.	%	Exp. No.	No.	%	Exp. No.	No.	%	Exp. No.	No.	%	Exp. No.
Once a week	1	1.9	1.0	40	78.4	29.6	10	19.6	18.6	0	0.0	1.8	51	100.0	--
Every two weeks	1	4.1	0.5	20	83.3	13.9	3	12.5	8.7	0	0.0	0.9	24	100.0	--
Once a month	2	6.6	0.6	20	63.3	17.4	9	30.0	10.8	0	0.0	1.1	31	100.0	--
Two or three times a year	1	2.5	0.8	25	62.5	23.2	13	32.5	14.6	1	2.5	1.4	39	100.0	--
Never	0	0.0	2.1	41	39.0	60.9	56	53.3	38.2	8	7.6	3.8	105	100.0	--
Total	5	2.0	--	145	58.0	--	91	36.4	--	9	3.6	--	250	100.0	--

$$X^2 = 44.21 \text{ at } 12df > .001$$

$$C \sqrt{\frac{X^2}{N + X^2}} = C \sqrt{\frac{44.21}{250 + 44.21}} = C .12$$

variable which applied to the holding of Family Home Evening.

Table 5 shows a relationship at the .01 level of significance between the number of children in the family and the frequency of holding the Family Home Evening. The coefficient of contingency is .10. Note that the small family holds Family Home Evening less frequently than do the other three family sizes. The moderate and very large families hold the Family Home Evening more frequently than does the small family. The large families hold the activity most frequently. This table does not account for the reasons that affect these frequency rate differences. It only shows that they exist.

Analysis of Data for Likes and Patterns  
of Likes and Dislikes and Patterns  
of Dislikes

Those things the students like and  
the frequency of holding Family  
Home Evening

Table 6 shows a significance at the .001 level between frequency of holding Family Home Evening and the things which the students liked about the activity. As can be seen, those things which the students liked were closely related to the frequency of holding Family Home Evening. This relationship could only happen by chance once in 1000 times. It is interesting to note that those things the students cared for most were the things which require the greatest degree of socialization. The coefficient of contingency for this table is .23.

Table 7 was constructed to further condense the likes into three patterns. The relationship demonstrated by this table when

Table 5. The relationship of family size to the holding of the Family Home Evening

Frequency of holding Family Home Evening	Small			Moderate			Large			Very large			Total		
	No.	%	Exp. No.	No.	%	Exp. No.	No.	%	Exp. No.	No.	%	Exp. No.	No.	%	Exp. No.
Once a week	2	3.9	6.1	34	66.6	31.2	12	23.5	11.2	3	5.7	2.4	51	100.0	--
Every two weeks	1	4.1	2.9	12	50.0	14.7	10	41.6	5.3	1	4.1	1.2	24	100.0	--
Once a month	3	10.0	3.6	15	50.0	18.4	9	30.0	6.6	3	9.9	1.5	30	100.0	--
Two or three times a year	2	5.0	4.8	28	70.0	24.5	7	17.5	8.8	3	7.5	1.9	40	100.0	--
Never	22	20.9	12.6	64	60.9	64.3	17	16.1	23.1	2	1.9	5.1	105	100.0	--
Total	30	12.0	--	153	61.2	--	55	22.0	--	12	4.8	--	250	100.0	--

  

$$\chi^2 = 34.14 \text{ at } 16df > .01$$

$$C = \sqrt{\frac{\chi^2}{N + \chi^2}} = C = \sqrt{\frac{34.14}{250 + 34.14}} = C = .11$$



Table 6. Relationship of the things the seminary students liked about the Family Home Evening to the frequency of holding the activity

Frequency of holding Family Home Evening	Refreshments & games			Family getting together			Lessons			Scriptures, stories, & music			Everything			Total		
	No.	%	Exp. No.	No.	%	Exp. No.	No.	%	Exp. No.	No.	%	Exp. No.	No.	%	Exp. No.	No.	%	Exp. No.
Once a week	14	27.4	9.0	15	28.4	9.1	11	21.5	5.9	2	3.9	3.0	1	1.9	1.6	43	100.0	--
Every two weeks	9	37.5	4.2	7	29.1	4.4	4	16.6	2.8	1	4.1	0.6	2	8.3	0.8	23	100.0	--
Once a month	10	33.3	5.3	7	23.3	5.5	5	16.6	3.5	1	3.3	0.7	2	6.6	1.0	25	100.0	--
Two or three times a year	8	20.0	7.0	12	30.0	7.4	4	10.0	4.6	1	2.5	1.0	3	7.5	1.3	28	100.0	--
Never	3	2.8	18.5	5	4.7	19.3	5	4.7	12.2	1	0.9	2.5	0	0.0	3.4	14	100.0	--
Total	44	33.3	--	46	34.6	--	29	21.8	--	6	4.5	--	8	5.8	--	133	100.0	--

$$\chi^2 = 135.43 \text{ at } 20df > .001$$

$$C \sqrt{\frac{\chi^2}{N + \chi^2}} = C \sqrt{\frac{135.43}{133 + 135.43}} = C .23$$

Table 7. The relationship of the like patterns of seminary students to the frequency of holding the Family Home Evening

Frequency of holding Family Home Evening	Refreshments & games, family getting together			Lessons, stories & scriptures			Music and everything			Total		
	No.	%	Exp. No.	No.	%	Exp. No.	No.	%	Exp. No.	No.	%	Exp. No.
Once a week	39	76.4	23.7	2	3.9	1.4	1	1.9	1.8	42	100.0	--
Every two weeks	19	79.1	11.1	2	8.3	0.7	2	8.3	0.9	23	100.0	--
Once a month	21	70.0	13.9	2	6.6	0.8	2	6.6	1.1	25	100.0	--
Two or three times a year	24	60.0	18.6	1	2.5	1.1	4	10.0	1.4	29	100.0	--
Never	13	12.3	48.7	0	0.0	2.9	0	0.0	3.8	13	100.0	--
Total	116	87.8	--	7	5.3	--	9	6.9	--	132	100.0	--

$$\chi^2 = 135.62 \text{ at } 12df > .001$$

$$C \sqrt{\frac{\chi^2}{N + \chi^2}} = C \sqrt{\frac{135.62}{132 + 135.62}} = C .23$$

tested shows significance at the .001 level. This confirms the testing in Table 6 and is way beyond the possibility of chance. The more things the student liked about the Family Home Evening Program, the more likely was his family to hold the activity and the more frequently they did hold it. The coefficient of contingency is .29.

Those things the students disliked and  
the frequency of holding Family Home  
Evening

Table 8 shows the relationship between the students' dislikes about the Family Home Evening and the frequency with which they said their family held the activity. Chi-square analysis, when applied to this table, showed a relationship at the .001 level of significance. This level is much too great to attribute to chance and thus there is a close relationship between the things students disliked and the frequency of holding the Family Home Evening. The relationship as measured by coefficient of contingency is .23.

Table 9 demonstrates a relationship at the .001 level of significance by chi-square testing and shows a grouped pattern of the students' dislikes of Family Home Evening activities. The coefficient of contingency was calculated to be .22. This table also tests at a level of significance not accountable for by mere chance. This demonstrates that the frequency of holding Family Home Evening is directly influenced by the things the students dislike about the Family Home Evening.

Table 8. The relationship between the dislikes of the seminary students about the Family Home Evening and the frequency of holding the activity

Frequency of holding Family Home Evening	Time it takes		Interruptions			Singing			Scriptures			Lessons			Everything			Total			
	No.	Exp.	No.	%	Exp.	No.	%	Exp.	No.	%	Exp.	No.	%	Exp.	No.	%	Exp.	No.	%	Exp.	
Once a week	8	15.6	5.7	8	15.6	5.1	2	3.9	0.8	1	1.9	0.4	11	21.5	7.5	3	5.8	1.6	33	100.0	--
Every two weeks	5	20.8	2.7	4	16.6	2.4	0	0.0	0.4	0	0.0	0.2	11	45.8	3.6	1	4.1	0.8	21	100.0	--
Once a month	4	13.3	3.4	4	13.3	3.0	1	3.3	0.5	0	0.0	0.2	4	13.3	4.4	2	6.6	1.0	15	100.0	--
Two or three times a year	8	20.0	4.5	9	22.5	4.0	0	0.0	0.6	1	2.5	0.3	5	12.5	5.9	2	5.0	1.3	25	100.0	--
Never	3	2.8	11.8	0	0.0	10.5	1	0.9	1.7	0	0.0	0.8	6	5.7	15.5	0	0.0	3.4	10	100.0	--
Total	28	28.0	--	25	25.3	--	4	0.3	--	2	0.1	--	37	35.7	--	8	0.6	--	104	100.0	--

$$X^2 = 106.24 \text{ at } 32df > .001$$

$$C \sqrt{\frac{X^2}{N + X^2}} = C \sqrt{\frac{106.24}{104 + 106.24}} = C .23$$

Table 9. The relationship of the seminary student's dislike patterns to the frequency of holding the Family Home Evening

Frequency of holding Family Home Evening	Time it takes and interruptions			Singing and scriptures			Lessons and everything			Total		
	No.	%	Exp. No.	No.	%	Exp. No.	No.	%	Exp. No.	No.	%	Exp. No.
Once a week	29	56.8	19.2	0	0.0	0.2	4	7.8	2.9	33	100.0	--
Every two weeks	18	75.0	9.0	0	0.0	0.1	3	12.5	1.3	21	100.0	--
Once a month	15	50.0	11.3	0	0.0	0.1	2	6.6	1.7	17	100.0	--
Two or three times a year	23	57.5	15.0	1	2.5	0.2	3	7.5	2.2	27	100.0	--
Never	9	8.5	39.5	0	0.0	0.4	2	1.9	5.9	11	100.0	--
Total	94	86.3	--	1	0.9	--	14	11.8	--	119	100.0	--

$$\chi^2 = 100.85 \text{ at } 20df > .001$$

$$C \sqrt{\frac{\chi^2}{N + \chi^2}} = C \sqrt{\frac{100.85}{119 + 100.85}} = C = .22$$



Additional DataOral evaluation

As mentioned in the introduction, I am closely identified with many of the Latter-day Saint Church programs. I raised the following question at a very early period of the study: "Is the Church aware of the meaningful association between family communication patterns and participation in the Family Home Evening Program?" To see if the Church gives meaningful consideration to the improvement of communication patterns through leadership training programs, I attended some leadership sessions. In December 1965 and January 1966 the Church sponsored Oral Evaluation Training Courses in the four Brigham City area Latter-day Saint stakes involved in this study. The training course consisted of ten sessions, one each week. The total number of class sessions in the four stakes was 40. Priesthood quorum leaders were invited and instructed how to involve, enthuse, and improve the effectiveness of the Home Teachers who were charged to introduce the program to those families to which they were assigned.

I attended approximately one-half (twenty) of all of these meetings and made observations as to interest, content of lesson, and participation of those in attendance. At the end of each meeting I interviewed several of the participants. Six weeks after the Oral Evaluation Training Courses had been completed, the same men were interviewed again.

It is my observation that there were certain values received from the training courses, but the one I was interested in--personal

communications within the family--was completely lacking.

I made no attempt to evaluate all of the positive values of the Oral Evaluation Training Course, but the attitude of those men interviewed showed decidedly negative. Following are some of the comments most frequently made to the writer: "This program is inspired but will take a long time to take hold." "It will work if they give follow-up courses." "It is too idealistic." "It is utopian in nature." "It sounds good but I doubt if it will work."

Three specific questions were asked of 15 of the Oral Evaluation Training Course participants, answerable by either yes or no. Their responses indicated that: first, they all enjoyed the training courses; second, most felt that they would use what they had learned in attempting to teach their home teachers; and third, most felt the training could help, but that it would be a slow process and take a long time to be effective.

Six weeks later I interviewed the same 15 men and asked: first, "Were they continuing the training with their home teachers?" In most cases the answer was no. Second, "Did the training you got help you in your work with your home teachers?" In most cases the answer was no. Third, "Did the training course help your home teachers to be more effective with their families?" The answer once again was no.

Nothing in the training course nor in the actions of the men who took the training course was found that would demonstrate the training course to be of value to the Home Teacher in aiding him to help his families participate in the Family Home Evening Program.

It becomes evident, then, that to make the Family Home Evening become a regular and important function of the family, a new program must be set in motion which will deal with the vital issues missing in the present Family Home Evening Program. At least part of this program should deal with teaching the families how to obtain more positive and satisfying patterns of personal communication within the home.

Frequency of holding Family Home Evening--1967

A follow-up survey taken in 1967 to check the frequency with which the same families were holding the Family Home Evening yielded the following results: one hundred eighty-five (23.6 per cent) students reported the activity was held once a week; 85 (11.3 per cent) students said every 2 weeks; 32 (4.5 per cent) answered once a month; 184 (24.2 per cent) gave two or three times a year as their answer; and 279 (36.4 per cent) students said they never held Family Home Evening. In comparing the year 1967 with 1966, I find the change in the number of families holding the Family Home Evening Program often enough for it to be meaningful in the lives of the students to be so minimal that it is of little significance.

Frequency of holding Family Home Evening--1968

A survey was again taken in 1968. It revealed that 237 (23.0 per cent) students were participating in Family Home Evening once a week; 87 (8.2 per cent) said their families held Family Home Evening every 2 weeks; 91 (8.5 per cent) students answered once a month; and 458 (60.3 per cent) students gave never as their answer. The

statistics, as gathered from the students in 1968, do not, in my opinion, show any significant change in the patterns of Family Home Evening activity.

## CHAPTER V

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Major Findings of This Study

Analysis of the data collected from the administration of the structured questionnaire to 1,151 students of the Brigham City West Seminary and a random sample of 250 of those questionnaires leads to several conclusions.

1. A relationship exists between the frequency of holding the Family Home Evening and family communication patterns. In other words, among those students whose scores indicated satisfying patterns of communication were also the ones who indicated that their families held Family Home Evening the most frequently. Those students who scored low in the questionnaire demonstrated poor or unsatisfying patterns of communication. These same ones also indicated that their families held Family Home Evening the least frequently.

2. Family size is one of the variables which proved to be related to the frequency of holding of Family Home Evening. Families in the categories of small and very large held the program less frequently than did the moderate or large families. This study did not discern what factors caused this relationship, but chi-square testing showed it existed.

3. The study revealed that in those cases where a number of things were done which the children liked, the holding of Family Home Evening continued. The students who answered that they liked



all or parts of the Family Home Evening activities also answered that the families held Family Home Evening most frequently. Their answers also showed that those parts of the Family Home Evening Program which were highly social, and thus conducive to the interaction of family members, were the parts they liked most.

4. The frequency of Family Home Evening is related to students' dislikes. The study revealed that where an effort was made to carry out a number of activities which the students did not like, the Family Home Evening was discontinued. The students who indicated several dislikes for Family Home Evenings also indicated that the activity was seldom, if ever, held in their homes. It is noteworthy that those things the students disliked were also the parts of the Family Home Evening that were least conducive to social interaction. This is evidence that these families do not have satisfactory patterns of communication and thus are unable to hold meaningful and enjoyable Family Home Evening activities.

In summarizing numbers 3 and 4, the evidence indicates beyond question that if parents held the Family Home Evening and did things which the children liked, little difficulty was encountered. On the other hand, the holding of Family Home Evening became very improbable if parents persisted in carrying out activities children did not like.

5. Leadership training courses designed to help quorum leaders assist Home Teachers to encourage families' participation in Family Home Evening activities failed to accomplish their purpose. Personal observations and interviews by the writer with priesthood quorum

leaders revealed that they held negative opinions about the results of the training program. They reported they were not given any real insights into things that they could do which would help the Home Teachers to in turn assist their families.

In their answers, students also indicated that the Home Teachers did not help nor advise their families in a way that would enhance the frequency or enjoyability of Family Home Evenings.

Two months after the completion of the Oral Evaluation Training Program I also conducted interviews with the students who should have been recipients of an improved Home Teacher program and I could find no change.

The Oral Evaluation Training Course carried out in the area in which the students lived did not show any apparent effect on the frequency of Family Home Evening activities.

The findings of this study reveal rather clearly that until family members learn to develop meaningful patterns of communication within the family, effective and satisfying Family Home Evening Programs are not possible.

If this evidence is correct, the immediate challenge of those responsible for giving leadership to the development of an effective Family Home Evening Program is to develop a great deal of instructional material and techniques which could be used to help family members learn how to communicate and satisfactorily relate to each other.

### Limitations of the Study

All possible measures were taken throughout this study to insure validity and reliability. It is realized, however, that certain defects do exist. Some of these defects were oversights on the part of the writer, while others were recognized but for various reasons were not corrected.

The more noticeable of these defects are:

1. This study is limited by its size. It was carried out in only one Seminary of 1,151 students with random sample of 250 students as the basis of the study. Thus, the study cannot be considered a true representation of all Seminaries.

2. Only the ninth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grade age groups were used and thus all families in this area were not included. One cannot, therefore, conclude that the study reflects the conditions in all Latter-day Saint families in the Brigham City area.

3. No provision was made for duplications that might result from the brothers and sisters who were attending the Seminary and the reflection this might have on the study.

4. It is recognized that the geographical and sociological setting of the Seminary may not represent a true cross section of all the Seminaries of the LDS Church.

5. The composition and number of questions used in the study and the answer choices were of necessity limited in comparison to the field which they were designed to cover.

6. Communication is only one of several independent variables that might have been studied as a factor influencing the Family Home

Evening Program. Patterns of Church orthodoxy prevailing in a home and the exercise of authority by parents are examples of other factors that might have been considered. The experience of the writer confirms earlier assumptions to the effect that on the average communication is the single most important variable.

#### Recommendations For Future Study

This study could not realistically handle all the variables affecting family communication patterns and frequency of Family Home Evenings. This thesis has been an attempt to look objectively at several of the variables which do affect the frequency of Family Home Evenings.

To more fully understand the variables involved, further research in the following areas is recommended:

1. That the same study be made at other Seminaries throughout the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saint Seminary system which are both larger and smaller and have different geographic and social settings.
2. Determine what influences any one age level might have on a study of this nature.
3. Test the effect of a strictly rural or urban setting on this type of study.
4. Undertake a study which would include those people who do not have young people or whose children are not of Seminary age.
5. Answer the question: "Why does family size affect the frequency of holding Family Home Evenings?"

6. Initiate a follow-up study to find if the variables change with age of students and, if so, what affect does this have on frequency of holding Family Home Evenings.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Baber, Ray E. Marriage and family. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York. 1939. 656 p.
2. Baughman, E. Earl, and George Schlage Welsh. Personality, a behavioral science. Prentice Hall, Inc., New Jersey. 1962. 566 p.
3. Beers, H. W. Measurements of family relationships in farm families of Central New York. Cornell University AES Memoir 183:27-28. December 1935.
4. Chambliss, Rollin. Social thought from Hammurabi to Comte. Dryden Press, Inc., New York. 1954. 457 p.
5. Clark, James R. (Ed.). Messages of the first presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints 1833-1964. Vol. II. Bookcraft, Inc., Salt Lake City, Utah 1965. 406 p.
6. Gabler, John, and Herbert A. Otto. Conceptualization of family strengths in family life and other professional literature. Journal of Marriage and the Family 26(2):221-222. May 1964.
7. Goodman, Norman, and Richard Ofecche. Empathy, communications efficiency, and marital status. Journal of Marriage and the Family 30(4):603. November 1968.
8. Ogburn, William Fielding, and Meyer Nimkoff. Sociology. 4th ed. Houghton Mifflin Co., New York. 1964. 780 p.
9. Smith, Joseph F., and Edward H. Anderson (Ed.). First presidency home evening. Improvement Era 18:1118. April 1915.
10. Stott, Leland H. The relation of certain factors in family life to personality development in adolescence. University of Nebraska AES Research Bulletin 106:46. October 1938.
11. Stroup, Atlee L. Marriage and the family, a developmental approach. Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York. 1966. 616 p.
12. Thurow, Mildred B. A study of selected factors in family life as described in autobiographies. Cornell University AES Memoir 171:48-49. February 1935.

APPENDIXES

## Appendix A

### Definition of Terms

Man, of all the animal forms, has developed means of communication far beyond what any other species has been able to accomplish. Yet, among men, there still exists the problem of being able to express an idea and be sure that other individuals comprehend its full meaning.

It is with this in mind that the writer feels there is a need to define several key expressions used throughout this study.

Communication. Communication is that process which takes place between people when a message is transmitted from one and received by the other by means of sight, sound, or touch. Satisfying communication results when feelings of empathy between the parties assure a mutually satisfactory response.

Family Home Evening. A regular scheduled night when LDS families meet together, usually in the home. In addition, they are, through gospel lessons and programs, to emphasize participation of all family members to develop their various skills and abilities.

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. A religious organization which, for the purpose of this study, is also referred to as the Church or LDS Church.

Home Teachers. Two men whose assignment is to visit a number of designated homes at least once a month, their purpose being to carry a message from their Bishop to the family and any messages from the family back to the Bishop. They are to further help the families or get them help in solving any problems they might have.

Priesthood. Males in good standing can hold offices in the Aaronic (deacon, teacher, priest) and Melchizedek (elder, seventy, high priest) priesthoods. They start as youths of 12 and are usually in their late 30s or 40s when ordained high priests.

Quorum. A designated number of male members in the LDS Church who have a specific priesthood office group of assignments in the functioning of a ward or stake.

Sacrament Meeting. A specific LDS meeting usually on Sunday evenings, where invited speakers, sometimes visiting Church authorities, address the audience on matters of doctrine and Christian

behavior. The sacrament (Lord's Supper) is administered to members present.

Ward. A specific geographic area with its designated number of people who are presided over by a Bishop with two counselors.

Stake. An administrative division composed of several wards in a specific geographic area and presided over by a President and two counselors.

Bishop. A man appointed by the leaders of the Church to officiate as the temporal and spiritual leader of a ward. He serves with two counselors and, together, they form the Bishopric.

## Appendix B

Questionnaire Answered by 1,151 Seminary Students  
in the Brigham City, Utah Area

1. I live in the \_\_\_\_\_ Stake.

2. Our family holds Family Home Evenings (check one below)

\_\_once a week    \_\_every two weeks  
\_\_once a month    \_\_two or three times a year  
\_\_never

PART I	Always	Usually	Seldom	Occasionally	Never
3. Our family attends sacrament meeting together.					
4. Do your parents understand teen-age fads?					
5. I confide my problems to my parents.					
6. Our family takes vacations together.					
7. Our family plans and does things together.					
8. Are you willing to share your things with other members of your family if necessary?					
9. Do your parents treat you as a young adult?					
10. Do your parents willingly change their minds if you present a logical idea to something they disagree with?					
11. Do you willingly change your mind if your parents present a logical idea to something you disagree with?					
12. Do you feel free to express your ideas without recrimination when your family is discussing something?					
13. Are you willing to listen to your parents and follow their advice even though you do not like their decisions?					
14. Do you feel your parents are overly critical of you?					
15. Do your parents talk down to you?					
16. Our Home Teachers visit us.					



PART II	Father	Mother	Sister	Brother	Other
17. I usually confide in my					
18. I usually discuss my problems with					
19. Who gives the lessons for your Family Home Evening?					

PART III	Yes	No
20. Does your family work out their problems without much trouble?		
21. Do you feel that the members of your family are treated equally in decision making?		
22. Do your parents go to ballgames, plays, or meetings when you have a part on the program?		
23. Do the Home Teachers tell you how or help you to hold Family Home Evenings?		

#### PART IV

24. How many children in your family and what are their ages?
25. The things I like most about the Family Home Evening.
26. The things I dislike most about the Family Home Evening.

## VITA

Arthur Don Crane

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: Communication Patterns and Other Variables Within the LDS Family Which Influence the Development of the Family Home Evening Program

Major Field: Sociology

Biographical Information:

Personal Data: Born at Herriman, Utah, January 31, 1924, son of Arthur W. and Elizabeth Emma Crane Crane; married Elva Annie Jones May 5, 1948, in the Salt Lake Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah; four children--Pamela Ann, Cory Don, Wendy Donnett, and Linda Elva.

Education: Attended elementary school at Herriman, Utah; Junior High School at Riverton, Utah; graduated from Jordan High School, Sandy, Utah, in 1942; received the Bachelor of Science degree from University of Utah, with major in sociology and minor in military science and tactics, in 1950; did graduate work at Brigham Young University summers of 1964, 1966, and 1968; and completed requirements for Master of Science degree from Utah State University in 1969.

Professional Experience: 1956-1964, District Scout Executive; 1964-1968, seminary teacher, Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, LDS Church School System--at Farmington, New Mexico, Fall of 1963, and Brigham City, Utah from 1964 to 1968.