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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Today's man lives in a constantly changing world. Moreover, as times and conditions change, man finds himself changing—and unfortunately, not always in the most profitable directions. Groups who are concerned about the effects of change are also involved in the process; thus, "... the world is now involved in a relatively new process--deliberate, planned change" (Arenberg & Niehoff, 1964, p. 66). Planned change is a process of "... change which derives from a purposeful decision to effect improvements in a personality system or a social system" (Lippitt, Watson & Westley, 1958, p. v).

"Human interventions designed to shape and modify the institutionalized behaviors of men are now familiar features of our social landscape" (Bennis, et al, 1961, p. 9). In all such intervention there are two agents: the intervening agent and the object of intervention. In Lippitt's (1958, p. 10-12) widely accepted terminology, these are known respectively as the "change agent" and the "client system." A client system can range in size and complexity from a single individual to a large organization or community (Lippitt, et al, 1958). Although "change agent" commonly refers to a professional consultant, the change agent function can be performed by organization or institution leaders (Bennis,
et al., 1961). In many such cases the organization is so closely identified with its leadership that the organization is thought of as the change agent. The present study concerns such an organization—a religious institution—and its purposeful efforts toward instituting an innovation among its membership through planned intervention.

In the fall of 1964, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints introduced the Family Home Evening Program, "... a new program designed to assist parents in teaching of the gospel in the home." Church leaders urged that each member family institute the practice of "family home evening" (Lee, 1964, p. 1080). This was to be a weekly meeting of the family under the direction of the parents for the purpose of discussing religious principles and participating in other joint activities. It was essentially an effort to establish a new pattern of ritual behavior among its member families.

Ritual in the family takes the form of a symbolic behavior pattern for the attainment of specific goals and normally arises out of family interaction (Sussman, 1955). The family home evening displays many of the features which typify what Bossard and Boll (1950) term "family ritual." However, the former has acquired special characteristics inasmuch as it was contrived and initiated by an external institution—the church. In fact, the Family Home Evening Program appears to be the first attempt by any large institution to initiate the universal imple-
mentation of the family night ritual among its constituents. Seen in theoretical context, the Church is clearly acting in the role of change agent in attempting to institute a ritual practice among its member families (client systems). These considerations provide a setting for the introduction of the research problem.

I. THE PROBLEM

The success of a program of planned intervention hinges on two basic variables—the effectiveness of the change agent in implementing his plan for change, and the readiness of the client to accept and adopt the innovation. Normally the change agent strives to foster the readiness of the client system by arousing its need to implement the desired change. In recent years especially, numerous innovators have learned ways of precipitating change in various client systems; yet the fact remains that the nature and extent of change is ultimately determined by the client system itself. A client system—even a single personality—is complex; a multitude of factors may influence its readiness to accept and adopt a given innovation. Therefore, in seeking to know what determines the effectiveness of a program of planned change, one logically looks first to the dynamic factors within the client system itself, and to the nature of its relationship with the change agent. Such is the approach of the present study.

From the view of behavioral science, the Family Home Evening
Program constitutes an intriguing and important social experiment. For, inasmuch as the program has not been accepted and adopted by all, it is clear that a family's readiness to accept and adopt family home evening is associated with certain factors within the family and is affected by the nature of the church-family relationship. With these underlying assumptions, the present investigation has two general objectives:

1. To explore patterns of acceptance and adoption of the family home evening—as prescribed by the L. D. S. Church—among member families.

2. To explore the nature of the relationships between these patterns of acceptance and adoption of family home evening and certain selected variables.

II. RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY

A rationale, or justification for undertaking a study, is essentially inherent in the nature of the problem studied. Three important reasons generally justify a particular investigation: (1) it asks an intrinsically interesting question (to the researcher at least); (2) it has relevance to a body of theory and research; and (3) it has practical value; i.e., it points to the possibility of learning how to "... do something better or more efficiently (Selltiz, Jahoda, Deutsch, & Cook, 1959, p.4). The present investigation meets each of these criteria to some degree.

In 1963, Allen reported an experimental study evaluating the effectiveness of "home night" as an aid to formal religious instruction.
However, a review of the literature reveals no further investigation of home evening in the family context; nor has any systematic and objective study of the Family Home Evening Program been reported. The present study moves toward filling these deficits.

Home evening is a family practice; traditionally, the family itself has the prerogative of determining if it will adopt such an innovation. The Family Home Evening Program is an attempt by an institution external to the family to convince the latter to initiate this rather complex pattern of behavior. A question arises: "What factors characterize both those who do and those who do not respond as the Church desires to this unique situation?"

The research problem is of interest to the family life educator, inasmuch as the Family Home Evening Program is an avowed effort toward strengthening the unity, solidarity and spirituality of the family. This effort is in close harmony with the position of "national professional organizations [who] see the successful family as closely knit unit, in which each member feels responsible for the conduct and development of all . . . ." (Council of National Organizations on Children and Youth, 1960, pp. 11-12). It is consistent with the findings of the Family Service Association of America that a strong family is aware of its ethical and moral values and imparts these to its children.

The present study is justified on the basis of its relevance to existing theory and research. Its direct relationship to family ritual
makes it one of the few studies to investigate this viable but little researched concept. Furthermore, its focus on an attempt to institute ritual practice through intervention places it in the mainstream of thought and investigation of planned social change. In the latter framework, the present study has conceptual antecedents in a number of areas, particularly attitude change and the adoption of innovations.

Finally, it is justified on the merit of its practical implications. Although the study does not attempt to analyze the Family Home Evening Program itself, it is anticipated that the research findings will be of value to many who are concerned with family home evening. It should be particularly helpful in (1) specifying some conditions under which family home evening is accepted and adopted; in (2) showing some of the characteristics of adopters and non-adopters; and (3) clarifying common patterns followed by those who adopt the family home evening innovation.

That the present investigation has intrinsic interest because of the uniqueness and importance of the research problem, and that it has both theoretical relevance and implications for practical application, gives justification and support to its pursual in the view of the researcher.

III. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Clear understanding of the following terms is essential to a meaningful interpretation of the present report:
1. **Family ritual**—"A prescribed formal procedure, arising out of a family interaction, involving a pattern of defined behavior, which is directed toward some specific end or purpose and which acquires a rigidity and sense of rightness as a result of its continuing history" (Sussman, 1955, p. 276).

2. **Planned change**—For the present study, a process of deliberate change initiated by a change-agent. Planned change is accomplished through an action program based upon an awareness of dynamic factors within a client-system and the potential long range effects of change efforts.

3. **Family home evening**—The official designation of the family night ritual as conceived and defined by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

4. **The Family Home Evening Program**—The official designation of the program of planned change undertaken by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, in order to initiate the "family home evening." While an interchangeable use of the terms Family Home Evening Program and family home evening is occasionally encountered in the literature, the present report makes a basic distinction. Whereas the former is a blueprint for planned change, the latter is the innovation which client systems attempt to initiate. Occasionally it is referred to below simply as the Program.

5. **Mormons, L. D. S., Latter-day Saints**—terms used inter-
changeably to designate the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints or its members.
CHAPTER II

THE FAMILY HOME EVENING PROGRAM

IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Much has been said in recent times about the "new morality." Its advocates see it as an awakening from outdated restraints to new freedom; many authoritative observers, however, view it simply as a new justification for a growing departure from traditional values. In the words of one religious leader, "The new morality is nothing more than the old immorality; . . . the new freedom is nothing more than disrespect for law and the rights of others . . ." (Tanner, 1966, p. 1096). To some, this departure is symptomatic of a general moral decline. For example, J. Edgar Hoover, chief of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, asserted that "the moral strength of our nation has decreased alarmingly . . . This breakdown in our moral standards can only render us impotent as a people and as a nation" (McKay, 1967, p. 7).

Others have raised similar warnings. The Christian Century (1963, p. 821), an eccumenical journal, declared that:

when a generation concludes--as many in this one have--that in regard to sexuality nothing is inviolably sacred, nothing absolutely forbidden, nothing degrading which sophistication cannot redeem, it is on its way to domestic ruin. The warning signs are up; we have already traveled a long way down the road which destroyed Rome.

Although not all commentators manifest such foreboding, many agree
that individuals with a courageous faith are better prepared to cope with the capricious values of the times. As Kagan (1960, p. 158) observed, religion is discovering that this much needed faith "... is best strengthened in the home."

An awareness of the vital importance of the home has long characterized the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, and the recent church-wide innovation, The Family Home Evening Program, is an active expression of this cognizance. The present chapter considers the developmental history of the Family Home Evening Program. Inasmuch as the ideology of a church institution is the crucible in which its programs are formulated, the theological setting for the Program is first explored. Next, the Family Home Evening Program is shown to be only new in format, not in concept. Finally, against this background, the program is described in terms of its central characteristics.

I. THEOLOGICAL CONTEXT OF THE FAMILY HOME EVENING PROGRAM

A church or religion is a cultural system, and policies and programs arising within the system bear the imprint of its cultural milieu. The Family Home Evening Program is rooted in basic theology; the present section reviews some of the most fundamental doctrines of the Church which provide a framework for this innovation.
Latter-day Saints view the home as a divine institution. Joseph F. Smith, a former Church leader, affirmed that "There is no substitute for the home. Its foundation is as ancient as the world and its mission has been ordained of God from the earliest times" (Richards, 1936, p. 16). The same concept has been echoed by many other leaders of the Church. David O. McKay, current president, declared that "the home is the basis of a righteous life and no other instrumentality can take its place or fulfill its essential functions" (Conference Report, April, 1963, p. 82). This philosophy was elaborated by Hugh B. Brown, a prominent Church official and theologian (1966, p. 1094):

Marriage, the family, and the home are among the most important subjects of our whole theological doctrine, and as the family is the basic fundamental unit of the Church and of society, its preservation and its righteous needs take precedence over all other interests.

The pre-eminent place of the home in L. D. S. philosophy is particularly sustained by two fundamental teachings of the Church:

(1) The home is the most important influence in the training of children, and (2) The family is a basic unit of eternal government. "The family teaches, regardless of what it teaches" (Melchizedek Priesthood Lessons, 1965, p. 9). Gilbert Highet (1950, p. 5), a noted educator, clarified this concept: "It is impossible to have children without teaching them. Beat them, coddle them, ignore them, force-feed them, shun them or worry about them, love them or hate them, you are still teaching them something, all the time."
Assuming that "the character of the child is largely formed during the first twelve years of life," (McKay, 1966, p. 423), parental influence becomes crucial. It has been estimated that during these years, the child spends sixteen times as many waking hours in the home as in the school, and more than a hundred times as many in the home as in the church. "Each child is to a degree what he is because of the ever constant influence of home environment and the careful or neglectful training of parents" (Ibid.).

It is also affirmed in Mormon theology that with the family lie the greatest of eternal opportunities. "When a man and a woman undertake to build a home--not merely a house--and rear a family, they lay the foundation of what may become an eternal and ever increasing kingdom, over which they preside as king and queen forever" (Brown, 1966, p. 191). With sufficient obedience to the faith--including marriage in an L. D. S. temple for "time and all eternity"--the Church teaches that believers will be blessed to return into the presence of God their creator, where they will rule and be ruled under a divine government established upon a patriarchal order. As Hugh B. Brown (1966, p. 1095) stated,

"The church itself exists to exalt the family... In fact [the] very concept of heaven itself is a projection of the home into the eternity. Salvation is essentially a family affair and full participation in the plan of salvation can be had only in family units.

When the family is seen as such a vital institution, both in life and in the afterlife, it follows consistently in L. D. S. theology that the
responsibility for the quality of home life is placed directly upon the parents. No scripture is more familiar to Latter-day Saints than that written in 1831 (Tuttle, 1967):

And again, inasmuch as parents have children in Zion, or in any of her stakes which are organized, that teach them not to understand the doctrine of repentance, faith in Christ the Son of the living God, and of baptism and the gift of the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands, when eight years old, the sin be upon the heads of the parents.

For this shall be a law unto the inhabitants of Zion, or in any of her stakes which are organized.

And their children shall be baptized for the remission of their sins when eight years old, and receive the laying on of hands.

And they shall also teach their children to pray and walk uprightly before the Lord (Doctrine and Covenants 68: 25-28).

To Mormons, "... this is not just a 'good idea' or a suggestion, or good advice but [is] 'a law unto the inhabitants of Zion' [i.e., members of the Church]" (Melchizedek Priesthood Lessons, 1965, p. 10). It has become a maxim in Mormondom that "no other success can compensate for failure in the home."

The greatest trust that can come to a man and a woman is the placing in their keeping of the life of a little child. ... If a person entrusted with a government secret discloses that secret and betrays his country, he is called a traitor. What must the Lord think, then, of parents who, through their own negligence or wilful desire to indulge their selfishness, fail properly to rear their children, and thereby prove untrue to the greatest trust that has been given to human beings? In reply he has said: "The sin be upon the head of the parents" (McKay, 1962, p. 2).

The doctrinal position of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints is unmistakably clear: All parents are responsible to God for bestowing
upon their children an heritage of faith and character. They cannot delegate their accountability to any other person or institution, even the Church.

The church, which assumes the function of strengthening the family and leading men to greater individual goodness, endeavors to assist parents in the fulfillment of their trust. It was this succorance which gave birth to the Family Home Evening Program.

II. PRECURSORS OF THE FAMILY HOME EVENING PROGRAM

Within the Mormon culture, the concept of home evening had its inception over fifty years ago. Objectively speaking, the current program was not metamorphosed, but evolved. Some of the more important highlights of this development are outlined below.

1. Beginnings. In the year 1909, a prominent local leader of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Salt Lake City was greatly concerned that many parents under his ecclesiastical jurisdiction had partially abrogated their parental responsibilities. Frank Y. Taylor, president of the Granite Stake*, lamented, "... many of us have depended largely upon our auxiliary organizations [Sunday School, etc.] to teach our boys and girls the gospel, when the real duty and the real responsibility belongs to the fathers and mothers, at home."

---

*A geographical and administrative unit of the L. D. S. Church which is intermediate between the Church General Authorities and local congregations.
Taylor observed that some years prior to 1909, families in Granite Stake had been admonished to try to "... devote at least one night a week to the gathering of their children around their own firesides to teach them the principles of the gospel, "but because of numerous meetings that the fathers were required to attend, many of the latter were unable to teach their families (Granite Stake, 1927, p. 28).

In his concern, Taylor reported that he "... went before the Lord and asked him what would be for the best good of the saints. I was impressed very strongly that we should try to adjust our meetings so that it would be possible that every man, woman and child could be free to spend at least one evening a week at home" (Granite Stake, 1927, p. 28). He presented his impressions to other stake leaders, and for several months the topic of home evening was discussed among this body. Then, in September of 1909, the local church leaders met, heard the plan which had been outlined and agreed unanimously upon it; at that time a committee was appointed from among them to formulate concrete suggestive exercises for "home evening," as it was then called. The committee's suggestions, later adopted by Granite Stake, were the first formal delineations of the home evening concept.

2. Meeting of parents. On Sunday, October 16, 1909, parents of Granite Stake were asked to gather in a special meeting to hear the idea of home evening presented. Joseph F. Smith, then President of the Church, was invited to be a featured speaker. "That the parents
were enthusiastic over the subject and favored the movement, [was evident from the great attendance. It was the second largest meeting ever held in the stake, exceeded in number only by the one held some years prior at the dedication of the Stake Tabernacle" (Granite Stake, 1927, p. 9).

During the course of the meeting, Taylor challenged his listeners to adopt a regular home evening. "If you will accept this advice," he promised, "... you will have more influence over your boys and girls than you have ever had before in your lives" (Granite Stake, 1927, p. 31). In the address delivered by Edward H. Anderson, counselor to Taylor, several aspects of the practice of "home evening" which are found in the current family home evening were outlined. Some of the prominent ones are as follows: (a) parents should urge all members to be present; (b) the mother should preside in the absence of the father; (c) formality and stiffness should be avoided; (d) every family member should participate; and (e) exercises should include prayer, singing of hymns, scripture reading, family discussion and consultation.

Joseph F. Smith, the concluding speaker, made clear his support for home evening. "The inspiration that has come to President Taylor, with reference to setting apart at least one evening in a week for the especial use and benefit of the families of the Saints," he asserted, "is one of the greatest importance to the Latter-day Saints" (Granite Stake, 1927, p. 43). After a discourse on parental influence, he con-
cluded with the admonition: "Look out then for your children;--and, oh! Thank the Lord, and thank Brother Frank Y. Taylor that he has insti-
tuted or is about to institute a practice that is, at least, calculated to bring the family together once a week" (Granite Stake, 1927, p. 56).

3. Home evening inaugurated church-wide. Perhaps prompted by the events of the parents' meeting, and by successes of the home evening program in Granite Stake, President Smith (1915, pp. 733-734) led the way in introducing the practice to the whole Church. In April, 1915, the home evening was inaugurated church-wide. The following letter was sent throughout the Church at that time:

To the Presidents of Stakes, Bishops and Parents in Zion:

DEAR BRETHREN AND SISTERS:

We counsel the Latter-day Saints to observe more closely the commandment of the Lord given in the 68th section of the Doctrine and Covenants:

"And again, inasmuch as parents have children in Zion, or in any of her Stakes which are organized, that teach them not . . . the sin be upon the heads of the parents;

"For this shall be a law unto the inhabitants of Zion, or in any of her Stakes which are organized; . . .

"And they shall also teach their children to pray and to walk up-
rightly before the Lord."

The children of Zion should also observe more fully the command-
ment of the Lord given to ancient Israel, and reiterated to the Latter-
day Saints: "Honor thy father and thy mother: that they (sic) days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee."

These revelations apply with great force to the Latter-day Saints,
and it is required of fathers and mothers in this Church that these commandments shall be taught and applied in their homes.

To this end we advise and urge the inauguration of a "Home Evening" throughout the Church, at which time fathers and mothers may gather their boys and girls about them in the home and teach them the word of the Lord. They may thus learn more fully the needs and requirements of their families; at the same time familiarizing themselves and their children more thoroughly with the principles of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The "Home Evening" should be devoted to prayer, singing hymns, songs, instrumental music, scripture-reading, family topics and specific instruction on the principles of the Gospel, and on the ethical problems of life, as well as the duties and obligations of children to parents, the home, the Church, society and the nation. For the smaller children, appropriate recitations, songs, stories and games may be introduced. Light refreshments of such a nature as may be largely prepared in the home might be served.

Formality and stiffness should be studiously avoided, and all the family should participate in the exercises.

These gatherings will furnish opportunities for mutual confidence between parents and children, between brothers and sisters, as well as give opportunity for words of warning, counsel and advice by parents to their boys and girls. They will provide opportunity for the boys and girls to honor father and mother, and to show their appreciation of the blessings of home so that the promise of the Lord to them may be literally fulfilled and their lives be prolonged and made happy.

We request that the presidents of stakes and bishops throughout the Church set aside at least one evening each month for this purpose; and that upon such evenings no other Church duties shall be required of the people.

We further request that all the officers of the auxiliary organizations throughout the Church support this movement and encourage the young people to remain at home that evening, and use their energies in making it instructive, profitable and interesting.

If the Saints obey this counsel, we promise that great blessings will result. Love at home and obedience to parents will increase. Faith will be developed in the hearts of the youth of Israel and they will gain power to combat the evil influences and temptations
which beset them.

Your brethren,

Joseph F. Smith
Anthon H. Lund
Charles W. Penrose
First Presidency

4. Endorsement of Heber J. Grant. On December 18, 1926, Heber J. Grant, presidential successor to Joseph F. Smith, gave his support to the home evening in a letter to Frank Y. Taylor. "You may be assured," he said, "of my complete endorsement of this movement. I am in sincere sympathy with the idea of having parents meet with their families in the home to teach them the word of the Lord" (Granite Stake, 1927, pp. 4-5). Again in 1936, Grant made known his assent to home evening in the Home Evening Handbook, a manual under the private editorship of Claude Richards. He said in part,

There has been established in a number of stakes a "Home Evening" at which time parents and children gather around the family hearth in social and religious communion. In this day when socials, parties, dinners, business interest, etc., all tend to lead away from home associations, adoption of a Home Evening is highly advisable (Richards, 1936, pp. 2-3).

5. George Albert Smith and the "Family Hour." George Albert Smith, the next president, even before his appointment to that office, advocated home evening. Speaking before a conference session in 1926, he observed:

President Joseph F. Smith was inspired to give unto us the wise counsel to be more with our children, not withstanding the many
things that occupy our time; . . . notwithstanding the pursuit of life whereby we gain a livelihood, that prophet of the Lord gave to us this advice: that we should so arrange our time that one evening each week would find the Latter-day Saints in their own homes, associated with their own children, and there teach them the things that the Lord has decreed they should know. . . . If the home evening could only be a fact among the Latter-day Saints, if during one evening a week, we would live with our own, under the influence of the spirit of the Lord, at our own firesides surrounded by those whom the Lord has given us, and told us particularly that we should instruct them, how many happy homes there would be where today there is sorrow and discord and distress (Conference Report, 1926, pp. 144-146).

In 1946, with the sanction of George Albert Smith, the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles--leading council of the Church--again commended to the membership the practice of home evening with the new designation of "family hour." The women's auxiliary--Relief Society--was given the charge to promote the program in the home. Accordingly, this organization issued a bulletin of suggestions for parents entitled, "The Family Hour." These suggestions were similar to those which had been presented in previous years, with one notable exception. A major theme was "flexibility," the lack of which appears to have become an obstacle to the preceding "home evening."

George Albert Smith made a final official appeal urging Church members to initiate the family hour practice in 1948. Yet in the years intervening between 1948, and the announcement of the Family Home Evening Program, the concept was not forgotten. Frequent positive mention was made of the practice in L. D. S. periodicals, sermons, etc. Then in 1964, David O. McKay said: "We have talked about this
thing for fifty years. Now is the time we are going to do something about it" (Lee, 1964, p. 1104).

III. THE FAMILY HOME EVENING PROGRAM

The Family Home Evening Program emerged as the central element of a larger innovative effort in the Church. The present section shows how family evening emerged in this context, elaborates the major objectives of the program, and elucidates some of the primary normative characteristics of family home evening as seen in the Church today.

Emergence of the Family Home Evening Program

In the L. D. S. Church, the work of the ministry is largely carried on by a body of lay priesthood assisted by "auxiliary" organizations, such as Sunday School. Prior to 1963, each priesthood group and auxiliary organization operated quite autonomously, each planning its own curriculum, supervising the writing of its own lesson manuals, etc. The foundation for the correlation of these divergent elements was laid some years before 1963, by the First Presidency* in a directive to a general church committee. Harold B. Lee (1964, p. 1078), chairman of that committee, reported the substance of the letter as follows:

... First, we must see that the whole effort of correlation is to strengthen the home and to give aid to the home in its problems,

*The president of the Church and his counselors
giving it special aid and succor as needed.

Second, the strength of the priesthood must be full employed within the total responsibility of priesthood quorums as clearly set forth in the revelations.

Third, we must survey the purposes lying behind the creation and purpose of each auxiliary organization.

And fourth, the prime and ultimate objective of all that is done is the building up of a knowledge of the gospel, a power to promulgate the same, a promotion of the faith, growth, and stronger testimony of the principles of the gospel among the members of the Church.

Members of the committee set to work to develop a program which would achieve these objectives. The result of their labors was called the Correlation Program, having a two-fold purpose: to coordinate religious instruction within the Church and to initiate formally among its membership, the home evening practice--officially designated "The Family Home Evening." Lee (1964, p. 1080), outlining these innovations to the priesthood declared,

The time has now come when the General Authorities have decided to correlate and co-ordinate all of these efforts of the auxiliaries under the direction of the Priesthood, and we announce, then, a new program to assist parents in the teaching of the gospel in the home. This program . . . is to be inaugurated throughout the Church in 1965.

The introduction of the innovation was followed by various efforts to interest and motivate the membership to apply the practice in the home. A lesson manual, which was the first systematic course of study for the use of parents in the home, was presented gratis to church members. Filmstrips, special presentations at church meetings, and church per-
iodicals acquainted members with the new program. Even those on the 
periphery of church activity were introduced to the program through 
"home teachers," official emissaries of the Bishop. In a short time, 
it appears, nearly all members of the Church were aware of the new 
program for families.

Objectives of the Family Home Evening Program

The basic nature of the Family Home Evening Program can best 
be seen against a background of its aims and objectives. Many of these 
objectives were stated several years ago, during the infancy of the home 
evening movement. For example, an early publication defined home 
evening as

a weekly gathering in the home designed to promote those things 
both spiritual and temporal, that are conducive to the well being 
and happiness of the family. It is designed, as we conceive it, 
not only to produce better conditions within each family, but 
also to extend its influence into the community . . . its most 
important function is to put religion into the home (Richards, 
1936, p. 4).

Basically, the underlying objectives of the home evening have changed 
little over the years, for it is essentially, "an old program in new dress" 
(Kimball, 1965, p. 513). These fundamental aims are reflected in the 
following excerpts:

Because the family is a primary social unit and because the Lord 
through revelation has given parents the responsibility of teaching 
the Gospel in the home, it is hoped that each family in the Church 
will give this program top priority (Improvement Era, 1965, Vol.
The objective of the program is to assist us to live better lives and to become more devout Latter-day Saints (Ibid.).

Those who consistently practice home evening,

... will find a beautiful spirit in the home—a spirit of kindness, patience, understanding, growth and love. This will be manifested in the sensitive and considerate ways in which each member of the family treats every other member (Family Home Evening Manual, 1967, p. xi).

Family Home Evening is a program prepared by the Church to help revive the unity of the family” (Melchizedek Priesthood Committee, 1965, p. 812).

In review of the L. D. S. literature, one finds the thread of four essential objectives running through the expressions of the Church and its leaders over the years. These aims, as illustrated by the above statements are (1) to assist and encourage parents to take the initiative in teaching their children; (2) to increase spirituality and conformity to Christian principles; (3) to improve the quality of interaction within the home; (4) to strengthen the solidarity of the family.

In order that the objectives might be accomplished in the family, the Church has prescribed the essential procedures of the family home evening. Through repeated exposition, these patterns have emerged as norms. Delineation of these norms will complete a basic prospectus of the Family Home Evening Program.

**Normative Characteristics of Family Home Evening**

What constitutes family home evening is made abundantly clear
in church literature. Evaluation of these sources reveals the following normative elements in the practice of home evening: (1) Home evening was clearly intended for all members of the Church, including adults without children. The current Family Home Evening Manual (1967, p. vi) makes a special appeal: "Do not be misled or discouraged because there is instruction for children. Much of the information applies to adults, as does also the application." (2) Families are encouraged to hold home evening on a regular basis. "Regularly holding such an evening is more effective than sporadically doing so" (Bradford, 1965, p. 29). (3) Consistent with the concept of patriarchy in the home is the norm that the father should preside over home evenings. (4) The Home Evening Program promotes total family involvement. Not only should all members be present at the family hour, but each member should be given the opportunity to participate actively in each home evening. (5) As in former times, family home evening should be a time of prayer, singing of hymns, participation with musical instruments and other uplifting activities. The principle is to engage the talents of all members of the family. (6) Home evenings should follow the lessons outlined in the manual, particularly the central truth or principle elaborated in each lesson. (7) Leaders urge families to adapt home evening to the ages and needs of the family. Material is included in the manual for all age ranges--parents are to choose through preparation, the segments that apply to their particular family situations. Flexibility is a major guideline.
IV. SUMMARY

The Family Home Evening Program is the forthright answer of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints to the challenge of the times. It is a unique product of the cultural system which produced it; it is rooted in basic Mormon theology. It is an "old program in new dress," having been conceived over fifty years ago, largely by one man in search of an answer to some of the same dilemmas which confront the present generation.

The Correlation Program--an effort to coordinate the instruction in the Church in the support of the home--was the setting for the introduction of the Home Evening Program. The latter has essentially the same objectives as earlier attempts to institute the home evening practice within the Church, but is more systematic and comprehensive. Where is the Family Home Evening Program located in theoretical context? Chapter III suggests some answers.
CHAPTER III

THE FAMILY HOME EVENING PROGRAM

IN THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

There is little question that the Family Home Evening Program is a deliberate effort by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints to initiate change within its member families, a function known to applied social scientists as "planned change." This chapter reviews the basic aspects of the relevant research in (1) planned change, (2) "family ritual," a related area, and (3) factors involved in the acceptance and adoption of new ideas and practices. The Family Home Evening Program is evaluated in the context of each of these frameworks.

I. THE FAMILY HOME EVENING AS PLANNED CHANGE

The planning of change is inherent in a broad field of social activities. The present section establishes this fact before going on to elaborate the nature of planned change. Having laid the latter foundation, the Family Home Evening Program is then shown to be a program of active intervention.

Planned Change: A Broad Concept

The importance of the study of planned change is underscored by many behavioral scientists who agree that it is a province with significant
theoretical and practical implications (e. g., Etzioni & Etzioni, 1964; Hertzler, 1956; Moore, 1960). This importance is also evidenced in the breadth of theorizing and research which has been conducted in recent years. At least five distinct areas emerge in which intervention is the basic premise: public opinion and attitude change (Asch, 1951; Brown, 1962; Cohen, 1964; Katz, 1957; Kelman, 1961; Hovland & Janis, 1959), community development (Arensberg & Niehoff, 1961; Barnett, 1952; Goodenough, 1963; Linton, 1936; Mead, 1961), adoption of innovations (Fliegel, 1956; Hoffer, 1958; Lionberger, 1960; Rogers, 1958; Wilkening, 1953), group dynamics (Festinger & Kelley, 1951; Jaques, 1952; Lewin, 1943; Lippitt, 1949; Moreno, 1946; Thalen, 1954), and therapeutic intervention (Ackerman, 1958; Bettelheim, 1950; Fromm-Reichmann, 1950; Glasser, 1965; Rogers, 1951). A considerable body of literature, both conceptual and empirical has flourished in each of these areas; however, a comprehensive review of this vast work is beyond the scope of the present study.

Brief mention should be made, however, of two seminal works which have been of great use to the researcher in the present investigation: Lippitt, Watson and Westley's *The Dynamics of Planned Change*, and *The Planning of Change* by Bennis, Benne and Chin. The former is a pioneer attempt to abstract out of specialist auspices and isolated institutional settings many of the fundamental principles of the planned change process. *The Planning of Change* is a book of readings which
elaborates several basic concepts. These volumes were invaluable to the present analysis.

The Nature of Planned Change

Karl Mannheim (1961) provides a setting for the delineation of planned change in a perceptive analysis of the evolution of thought. He observed that human thought, at the primitive level, was characterized by chance discovery, preceded by trial and error. As man progressed, he came to a second stage in thought development--inventing. At this level, man had to imagine a definite goal and then think out in advance how to achieve that goal; but, he did not have to think beyond the task at hand and the environmental factors immediately associated with it.

The third stage, into which society is emerging today, Mannheim called planning or planned thinking. In this phase man moved from the "... deliberate invention of single objects or institutions to the deliberate regulation and intelligent mastery of the relationships between these objects" (Mannheim, 1961, pp. 34-38). This planned approach views change as occurring in sequential, causal chains, influenced by numerous factors in the environment, and in which certain key links play vital roles.

Planning, he declared,

... not only changes individual links in the causal chain and adds new ones but also tries to grasp the whole complex of events from the key position [italics in the original] which exists in every situation. The mechanism of the cycle of events can be mastered and guided only if the appropriate key positions are found and dealt with by a new method (Mannheim, 1961, p. 37).
This illuminates three characteristics of planned change:

1. It is based upon an awareness of the total dynamic field of the situation in question, particularly the key factors;

2. It reflects a cognizance of the probable long range effects of manipulating various factors within the field;

3. Through an action program, attempts are made to alter the total field, usually by dealing with the key factors in a new way.

An illustration of the operation of these principles can be found in the Russian experiment to abolish the family (Timasheff, 1960). The revolutionists made the "logical" assumption that by weakening ties of the family, the bulwark of conservatism and the "old way," that the people would be more susceptible to the new culture. This anti-family policy was partially successful, but brought a number of detrimental effects unforeseen by its promoters. Widespread delinquency, dissolution of family and community ties, sexual exploitation, and an ominous decrease in birth rate followed in the wake of their legal and social innovations, endangering the very stability of the new society. In this case a program of change was undertaken without a realization of the family's role in stabilizing society. The lack of respect for parental authority in Russian youth fostered the same disrespect for all authority. Unrestrained marriage and divorce laws promoted hedonism and sexual anarchism. This illustrates that an effective program of planned change must be founded upon the bedrock of reality.

Any program of planned change involves two agents: the person or group who is to adopt the change (called the client-system), and the
person or group initiating and conducting the direction of change (called the change-agent). An important facet of planned change is the relationship between these agents. The change agent must take the initiative to foster the desired change in the client. Furthermore, as Bennis, et al (1961, p. 13) point out, the "relationship between a change-agent and a client cannot truly be 'permissive,' 'totally democratic,' and so on. A kind of coercion is present, a coercion hopefully in the service of liberation but nevertheless a coercion that the client, for good or bad reason, can always reject."

Thus planned change, just the opposite of fortuitous, short sighted and short term change, is methodical, far reaching and based upon an awareness of its potential effects, even in peripheral areas. The change-agent, in his efforts to initiate the desired change, uses the most effective methods of influence at his disposal. He must also play a dominant role in determining what these changes should be.

The Family Home Evening Program as Planned Change

If a religious institution is to maintain traditional moral values in a time when these values are being challenged on many fronts, it must possess adaptability. The ability to adapt seems to be a characteristic of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Modification in policies and programs—while still retaining the same doctrine and basic organization—has occurred continually since its inception. McBride
(1952) describes Mormon philosophy as being very similar to experimentalism, and suggests that the experimental approach to truth is consistent with Mormon values. Joseph Smith, founder of the Church, saw a divine consistency in the innovations and adaptations of the Church:

God said, "Thou shalt not kill," At another time he said, "Thou shalt utterly destroy." This is the principle on which the government of heaven is conducted—by revelation adapted to the circumstances [italics added] in which the children of the kingdom [of God] are placed. Whatever God requires is right, no matter what it is, although we may not see the reason thereof til long after the events transpire (Documentary History of the Church, vol. 5, p. 135).

In a large institution, truly adequate adaptation—the appropriate adjustment to changing circumstances—is an outgrowth of planned change; it is a program of action based upon an awareness of the system undergoing change, as well as an understanding of the probable short and long range effects of change efforts. The L. D. S. Family Home Evening Program is an example of a planned approach in adapting to the exigencies of the times—it fully meets the criteria of planned change. First, it is based upon an oft expressed recognition of the role of the home in fostering the faith and character needed to cope with the anomalies of modern society. Second, it considers the short term goals of increased understanding of religious principles and family fellowship as a long range effort to increase spirituality and family solidarity. Finally, the Family Home Evening Program is an attempt to institute these ends through a comprehensive plan of action. It is the comprehensiveness
of this program of planned change which seems to be the key to the recent success of the program.

As a blueprint for planned change, the Family Home Evening Program displays many of the characteristics common to other effective programs of intervention. The elements operative in this program may be classified into three main categories—sanction, education and follow-up. These central aspects of this format for planned change are discussed below.

Sanction is the approval or ratification given to a particular act, policy, program, etc. Sanctions vary in strength according to their origin, nature and the deference given to them by the group. All aspects of the Family Home Evening Program tend to lend positive sanction for adoption, but two factors are particularly effective. First are the conditions associated with its conception and initiation. Having been developed by General Authorities of the Church and approved by the Presidency, the Program, to most devout Latter-day Saints, is inspired. Thus, in addition to endorsement by respected leaders, family home evening takes on an element of divine sanction.

A second sanction, which tends to reinforce the first mentioned, is the status which home evening has been given as a functioning "program" of the Church. It may be easy to pass by a "policy" of the church (the original "Home Evening" seemed to be of this nature), but a member can hardly ignore a new program which is given equal ranking with old
established programs (e.g., "Home Teaching"). When a practice is elevated from a policy to a program, it takes on an institutionalized character which adds greatly to the psychological pressure it exerts for conformity.

Another aspect of the Family Home Evening Program which has apparently added to its success is education. Chapin (1957) found that the less certain a group is about the stand it should take, the less control it has over its membership. When a group or institution makes clear its stand and objectives, it can expect greater conformity to that particular innovation. The Family Home Evening Program was in large part an effort to clarify the nature of the home evening innovation and to give it concreteness. For the families who said, "We don't know what to talk about," a lesson manual was prepared to give a definite course of instruction. Filmstrips were prepared in order to demonstrate procedures, and church periodicals presented "how to do it" ideas concerning family night. These and other educational efforts by the Church have clarified the norms of home evening and tend to add further status to the Program.

Follow-up is a vital third element in the Family Home Evening Program. Festinger (1963, p. 413) has hypothesized that when opinions or attitudes are changed through persuasive behavior, that "... this change, all by itself is inherently unstable and will disappear or remain isolated unless an environmental or behavioral change can be brought about to support and maintain it." The Church by means of a lay priest-
hood has contact with each member family monthly and strives to encourage conformity to home evening practice and other norms. Periodic discourses by general authorities and local leaders, articles in church publications, sanction from practicing members, etc., all tend to reinforce and reemphasize the home evening.

As a blueprint for planned change, the Family Home Evening Program has operationalized many of the principles of social intervention which have been found through research; sanction, education and follow-up are among the most basic. From a theoretical point of view, these modes of influence become particularly important in light of the fact that family home evening is a type of ritual practice that the family itself would normally initiate. The next section looks at this phenomenon.

II. FAMILY HOME EVENING AS FAMILY RITUAL

Family night, a traditional—if limited—American practice, is a concrete example of what Bossard and Boll (1950) have termed "family ritual." The L. D. S. "Family Home Evening," a unique form of family night, has many characteristics of ritual behavior. This section defines family ritual and distinguishes it from other forms of ritual; it reviews pertinent research and elaborates some of the major aspects of family ritual; finally, family home evening is evaluated in terms of its qualifications as a family ritual.
Family Ritual Defined

In popular usage, the word ritual is synomous with worship and ceremony, the forms of which are usually prescribed by some authority other than the lay participant. This connotation is reflected in Webster's New International Dictionary, which defines ritual as "the form or forms of conducting worship, especially as established by tradition or sacerdotal prescription. . . . Hence, a code or form of ceremonies observed, as by an organization or upon any ceremonial occasion; as the ritual of the Freemasons." Even social scientists have proscribed the definition of ritual to the field of sacred activities. Yet when one delves into the meaning of the term, "... there is nothing awesome or mysterious or religious about it" (Bossard & Boll, 1950, p. 16).

Fundamentally, ritual is a system or procedure, a form or pattern of social interaction which is definitely prescribed, which attains an element of rigidity the longer the procedure continues, and with which is associated a sense of rightness emerging from the past history of the process. Ritual is distinguishable from mere habit in that deviation is not only non-utilitarian, it is "wrong." When ritual is understood as a process, it can be applied conceptually beyond the realm of religion and prescribed ceremony; it can be used as a tool for the analysis of family behavior. The fact that the ritual aspects of family life have been largely neglected "... may have been due to inadequate and confused conceptions of the true nature of ritual" (Bossard & Boll, 1950, p. 29).
The family, through intimate and constant interaction, provides fertile soil for the growth of many ritual practices. This development is exemplified in the case of the Lowe family. Mrs. Lowe (1963, pp. 361-366), related how she and her husband came to the realization that they were spending too much time in activities away from home and too little time at home in meaningful interaction with their children. Their solution was a family night, which they held every eighth day. Mrs. Lowe reported,

One week our family night is on a Sunday; the next, Monday, the next, Tuesday, and so forth. The calendar is marked accordingly and nothing, absolutely nothing is allowed to interfere. We've missed important meetings, annual banquets and a scout circus, but nobody will give up family night.

This case illustrates characteristics common to family ritual—a prescribed and rigid nature, and a sense of rightness acquired through repetition.

Development of the Family Ritual Concept

The concept of family ritual, for all practical purposes, had its genesis in the pioneering work of James H. S. Bossard and Eleanor S. Boll. Their monograph, *Ritual in Family Living*, remains the first and only major attempt to treat this aspect of family life. The aim of their research was to explore qualitatively the content of over four-hundred case accounts by college students, and interviews and reports obtained from other school and community sources. Responses were analyzed
in terms of social class, family life cycle, generational continuity, and other frames of reference.

One reason that Bossard and Boll's work has had few sequels perhaps lies in the comprehensiveness of their original contribution. Evaluating from various vantage points, they elucidated the concept on several fronts. Their broad conclusions were as follows:

1. The evaluation of published autobiographies showed that adults who seek to recapture the essence of earlier stages of their lives, do so in large measure in terms of recurrent forms of procedure; i.e., family patterns of behavior or family rituals.

2. Many personality traits are molded through family rituals; e.g., social habits of cooperation, regularity, punctuality, recognition of the rights of others, etc.

3. Rituals are an integral part of family culture, hence they vary from one cultural level to another, from one social class to another, and from one family to another.

4. Family rituals vary from one stage of family history or cycle to another, and for similar reasons.

5. There is a marked continuity about many rituals (Bossard & Boll, 1950).

Only one research report has been located subsequent to the work of Bossard and Boll which utilizes directly the concept of family ritual. In 1959 (p. 213) Orren E. Klapp reported an attempt to quantify the amount and kinds of family ritual and to determine the relationship between ritual and family solidarity. He learned that "most ritual seems to center about Christmas, Thanksgiving, Mothers' Day and birthdays, with relatively low frequency of such things as visits to cemeteries, family
prayers, and family reunions, however important these may be for other family systems." He also found support for his hypothesis that "a natural relationship exists between ritual and solidarity of families" (Klapp, 1959, p. 213).

Although family ritual research is limited to these two studies, it is interesting that the concept remains viable in family sociology. References to research by Bossard and Boll particularly, are encountered frequently in family literature, and their original publications occur in several books of readings (e.g., Sussman, 1955; Bell and Vogel, 1960). Many possibilities remain in the expansion of this important concept; it is hoped that the present investigation of the family home evening may take some useful steps in that direction.

Family Home Evening as Family Ritual

That family home evening is family ritual is a premise which needs substantiation. This may be accomplished by examining the former in terms of the origins and essential elements of family ritual. When home evening is initiated at the behest of the church, it acquires a special deliberateness of adoption, which distinguishes it from most ritual behavior. Research indicates that most family ritual has a traditional or spontaneous origin.

Traditional rituals are those which are handed down from generation to generation, such as church and holiday ceremonies. These
forms tend to be conserved precisely, often having many characteristics in common with other families in the neighborhood and nation. Spontaneous rituals arise out of immediate family interaction in specific situations, such as going to bed, eating meals, etc. Both are marked by an absence of predetermination.

The deliberate type of ritual results when a particular pattern of behavior is initiated consciously and purposefully in a family situation with certain objectives in mind. The fact that this form occurs less frequently than others does not diminish its importance; in fact, Popenoe (1966, pp. 1-3) pleads for more purposefully contrived rituals in the family. "Dinner table conversation," he illustrates, "represents one of the most important opportunities to increase intelligent family life, but it must be planned wisely, in advance for that purpose." Then he affirms, "... the establishment and management of patterns of family ritual is one of the significant keys to successful marriage and family living."

The essential elements of family ritual have been summarized in Bossard and Boll's definition, cited above. These can be condensed into three basic aspects: ritual is (1) prescribed procedure, which (2) arises out of family interaction, and (3) acquires a rigidity and sense of rightness because of its continuing history. To what extent does Family Home Evening meet these criteria? The question is explored below.
There is little uncertainty as to what procedures family home evening involves. It is to be a religiously oriented gathering at which all members of the family are present. It should be directed by the father when he is home and the mother in his absence. It should follow a specific format, including prayer and singing. It should be discussion-centered, planned for the participation of all members, and should follow the topics suggested in the Family Home Evening Manual. These and other normative procedures have been clearly defined through the manual, periodicals, orientation programs, addresses by church leaders, etc. Family home evening fully meets the first criterion.

The second aspect concerns the ritual's origin. Bossard and Boll see all family ritual arising out of family interaction, and have their roots in the needs of the family. While it may appear that home evening is imposed by the Church, this only partially is true, for the family need not contrive a ritual form in order to feel a need for it. The need is the crucial factor, a factor generated within the dynamic system of the family. Home evening is of such a nature that it cannot be initiated unless some motivating need is felt for its adoption—even if that need by for compliance to church norms. Family home evening, then, has a basic origin in family interaction.

In the category of deliberate family rituals, the home evening is unique. It was contrived by the Church—a function ordinarily perfor-
med by the family itself. Because of this external origin, its adoption does not tell the whole story—there still remains the question of why adoption occurs. H. C. Kelman (1958) suggested that when individuals respond to social influence in adopting certain behaviors, although overt actions may appear to be the same, the underlying process of adoption may differ. He identified three of these processes: (1) compliance—when an individual accepts influence because he wants to achieve a favorable reaction from another person or group; (2) identification—when an individual accepts influence because he wants to establish or maintain a satisfying, self-defining relationship with another person or group; (3) internalization—when an individual accepts influence because the content of the induced behavior is intrinsically rewarding.

Perhaps at this point it is meaningful to conjecture what processes may underlie the adoption of family home evening among Latter-day Saints. Several factors appear to justify the conclusion that "identification" may be the underlying process when adoption occurs in many families. First, because the practice of home evening is relatively inconspicuous to church members outside the family, group pressure would no doubt be insufficient to foster adoption out of "compliance" alone. Second, having been initiated by a highly respected leadership and reference group, it appears likely that many families would adopt home evening in an effort to "do what is right," or to conform to the norms. Such conformity would enable the individual to justify his self-image as a
"good member" of the church. However, it is evident that a definite element of intrinsic reward, or "internalization" is needed in order to continue the ritual for an extended time. That is, even though adoption is originally motivated by "compliance" or "identification," it is likely that as home evening is practiced, many--perhaps most--families will continue it because they see it as adding to the quality of their family life.

Ordinarily, family rituals attain a rigidity and sense of rightness through satisfactory repetition; yet to a large extent the family home evening is already endowed with these attributes by virtue of its origin within and sanction by the church institution; in fact, it is this explicitness and sense of rightness which prompts many families to adopt it in the beginning. Moreover, in terms of Kelman's (1958) model, when it is adopted out of "compliance" or "identification," a successful history will add to its sense of rightness through illumination of its intrinsic worth. Hence, a family becomes committed to it because of the satisfaction it brings to them.

Thus far it has been determined that the Family Home Evening Program is a planned attempt to initiate a unique family ritual, the "family home evening." Inasmuch as the family has the ultimate choice, attention is next turned to a consideration of factors within the family which may be associated with acceptance and adoption of this ritual.
III. FACTORS IN THE ACCEPTANCE AND ADOPTION OF FAMILY HOME EVENING

Because the family is a complex social system, it is likely that a number of factors are associated with its readiness to accept and adopt the family home evening innovation--factors anchored both within the dynamics of the family system and within its relationships with external institutions, particularly the church. A central objective of the present study is to explore certain of these variables and their relationship to the acceptance and adoption of home evening innovation. This section first considers some general characteristics of adoption, then elaborates on the nature of the acceptance and adoption processes. The vital role of family culture in determining the response to expectations of adoption is evaluated, and variables chosen for exploration in the present study are reviewed.

Some General Characteristics of Adoption

It has been pointed out above that adoption research (or "diffusion" as it is interchangeably termed by many sociologists) is a subdivision of the general area of planned change. Considerable attention has been given to adoption and diffusion in recent years. Over fourteen percent of all research reported in the journal Rural Sociology between 1956 and 1965 dealt with this area (Sewell, 1965). These studies have concentrated
on two basic areas: (1) the nature of the adoption process, and (2) factors associated with adoption. Among others, the following characteristics have been found to be common to the adoption process: All people do not adopt a new practice at the same time; initial adoption is not always permanent adoption; the source of information is an important factor in the adoption process; the adoption process tends to snowball, with the amount of energy necessary to initiate adoption diminishing with time.

Among the factors which have been shown to be associated with adoption of innovations are the following: the individual must perceive a need for the new practice; practices which are compatible with existing ideas and beliefs are most likely to be adopted quickly; an easily demonstrable practice may be more quickly adopted; social groups influence the rate of adoption; families vary in their adoption behavior; people's values may either speed or retard change; formal education is associated with adoption (Lionberger, 1960).

Since the present study is concerned with the adoption process, particularly the factors associated with adoption, adoption literature has been particularly helpful in the selection of variables to be explored. Those factors selected from rural sociology as well as other sources are reviewed below.

The Acceptance and Adoption Processes

"It has been recognized that for any individual, the adoption of a
complex new...home practice is not a single unit act. The adoption process is probably a specific application of the general pattern by which human beings learn to make changes of any kind" (Beal, Rogers & Bohlen, 1957, p. 166). Wilkening (1953) was one of the first to suggest that adoption is a process, and developed four stages to characterize it. A subcommittee of rural sociologists (1955) later suggested the addition of a fifth stage. The five were then referred to as awareness, interest, evaluation, trial, and adoption. Later substantial empirical evidence was gathered to confirm the assumption that adoption of new ideas and practices did occur frequently in stages (Beal, et al, 1957). Thus adoption can be defined as essentially a process by which an individual becomes aware of a particular idea or practice, makes a decision to attempt its application, is satisfied and continues the pattern. It is a process which tends to progress from one stage to another.

In the majority of studies of adoption that have been conducted to date, there is the tacit assumption that adoption is synonymous with acceptance of an innovation. However, Wilkening (1958, pp. 99-100) observes that "practices may be 'accepted' without being 'adopted' and visa versa." It appears that this may be particularly true of an innovation such as family home evening which requires the direction of complex forces within an interactive system. One could intellectually accept the principle of home evening without being sufficiently committed to put forth the necessary energy to adopt it. The element which
distinguishes acceptance from adoption is that of action or application. Acceptors have come to the point of evaluating the new concept favorably but have not translated their beliefs into behavior. The present study takes into consideration the difference between these two dimensions and provides for a look at each.

**Family Culture: Key to Acceptance and Adoption**

In a free society it cannot be expected that a program of planned change will be equally accepted or adopted by all clients, for the client himself must determine the extent of his conformity. In the case of family home evening, it is the Latter-day Saint parent, usually in consultation with his spouse, who will ultimately decide to what extent he and his family will respond to the intervening influences of the Church. This response is greatly conditioned by the culture of each particular family. A better understanding of this concept is gained through a brief look at the development of family culture.

Bossard was one of the first to propose a cultural approach to the family. In 1943, in his book *Family Situations*, he stated, "Since the concern of the present volume is that of family and family situations, this is a plea for the study of the cultural context [italics added] of family situations" (Bossard & Boll, 1943, p. 234). The idea of family culture gained greater status with the advent of two other important concepts: subculture and family system. Gillin (1948) was the first to observe
that groups smaller than societies possess distinct cultures or subcultures, while Chapple and Coon (1942) were instrumental in applying Linton's (1936) construct of "social system" to small groups. Through the fusion of these two notions, the family can be seen as a social system, structured by its own unique culture or subculture. Evidence for the existence of such family cultures is cited by Nye and McDougall (1960).

It is culture which underlies what may be called "family atmosphere," the emotional and intellectual temperament which characterizes family interaction. This unique way a family has of adapting to its environment was suggested by Farber (1964) who maintained that families use various "strategies" to solve the problems of living, strategies which are contingent upon a family's attitudes, values, customs, etc. (i.e., culture). According to Hess and Handel (1959) family atmosphere has underlying themes which evolve out of significant issues in the lives of its most influential members. Thus, out of its inner dynamics, a family comes to view the world in terms of its own unique experience.

It is therefore expected that each family in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints will respond to the prompting of the Church to adopt the family home evening in a manner consistent with its own internal culture. An understanding of the relationships between patterns of response to the home evening innovation and factors within the family system should reveal a number of insights into family dynamics, family rituals, and the process of adoption.
Variables of Home Evening Acceptance and Adoption

A review of the literature has shown that several factors may be associated with acceptance and adoption of family home evening (which constitute the dependent variables in the present study). From a list of several possible independent variables, six major factors have been selected as a basis of evaluation. These conceptual variables are defined and reviewed below, along with selected research pertinent to each.

1. Social status. This is defined as "the rank or position of an individual in the prestige hierarchy of a group or community" (Krech, Crutchfield & Ballachey, 1962). Status has consistently been found to be associated with the adoption of new practices. For example, Rogers (1958) found status achievement to be significantly associated with technological change (adoption of innovations); Lionberger (1959) found a close correlation between prestige and adoption of new practices; Copp and Brown (1958) found education, which has traditionally been considered to be a major index of social status, to be highly related to innovation adoption. Thus it appears that status may be an important correlate of home evening acceptance and adoption.

3. Use of time. Successful adoption of family home evening requires that the family be able to spend time together participating in
this activity. If parents, or children are away from the home because of other commitments, it may be difficult for the family to institute the practice. Rollins (1965) found that the amount of leisure time a family spends together is positively related to home evening adoption. Hardee (1965), in elaborating a concept known as "systemic linkage"--the amount of temporal contact between a client and a change agent--provided a rationale for the use of time spent in religious activity in the present study, inasmuch as time thus spent may be related to desire to conform. The study also considers the time spent by husband and wife in occupational pursuits as possible correlates to acceptance and adoption of home evening.

3. Family integration. Family integration has been defined as the degree to which a family member is oriented toward obtaining rewards and satisfactions for other family members (Rogers & Sebald, 1962, p. 27). Bossard and Boll (1950) state: "Perhaps the overall conclusion that emerges from the assemblage of our material is that ritual is a relatively reliable index of family integration." This conclusion was corroborated in an empirical study by Klapp (1959), who found a positive relationship between these two variables. These findings justify the use of this factor in the present investigation.

4. Marital authority. Decision making in a family is associated with leadership; i.e., the extent to which the husband or wife dominates
in making important decisions in the family is a major index of the influence exerted by him or her (Wolfe, 1953). Since the L. D. S. Church has specified that the husband should lead out in the holding of family home evening, the marital authority pattern may be an element in the adoption process.

5. Church orthodoxy. Concerning church orthodoxy, Vernon (1955, p. 324) said, "The degree to which a culturally established institution is effective in channeling the behavior of individuals is related to the extent of acceptance or rejection of the institutional norms. . . . With reference to religion, an individual is orthodox to the extent that the institutional norms find expression in his behavior." Thus conformity to the norm of family home evening is itself an indication of orthodoxy. The present study explores this relationship for both husband and wife.

6. Marital adjustment. It has been repeatedly shown that religiously active couples report higher marital adjustment, satisfaction or happiness scores than couples who are not religious. (Berelson & Steiner, 1964). It is therefore expected that the normative pattern of adoption of family home evening will be related to marital adjustment.

In addition to the above correlates, the study provides for a glimpse at acceptance and adoption of family home evening in terms of some descriptive variables. These are (1) family life cycle, (2) family size, and (3) priesthood of the father.
A major objective of the present investigation is that of specifying the adoption patterns of those who do and do not implement family home evening. This is accomplished by looking at the following factors in home evening adoption: (1) earliness of adoption, (2) regularity in use of the manual, (3) the extent to which the father leads out in holding home evening, (4) the degree of whole family participation, (5) the consistency with which home evening was held, (6) who is usually present during family home evening, and (7) whether the family held home evening prior to the introduction of the Family Home Evening Program.

IV. SUMMARY

It has been established that society is moving into a stage of planned thinking; that is, man has come from chance discovery to a recent awareness that he can regulate his life. Regulation suggests change, for when a man attempts to improve his thinking and circumstances, he must change himself.

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints is no stranger to change. Innovation and adaptation are inherent in the basic philosophy of the Church, the Family Home Evening Program being one of its most recent attempts at planned change. The present chapter discussed three elements common to programs of intervention that are operative in the Family Home Evening Program. These were sanction, education and follow-up.
The second section considered the idea that family night has many of the characteristics of ritual behavior. According to Bossard and Boll (1950) three essential properties of family ritual are (1) that it follows a prescribed procedure, (2) that it arises out of family integration, and (3) that it acquires a rigidity and sense of rightness because of its continuing history. Family home evening was shown to possess these elements in a substantial degree.

The family itself usually initiates changes in its behavior and will establish its own rituals for its own reasons. Because family home evening is deliberately initiated, it is unique among family rituals.

Adoption research is a subdivision of planned change. The third part of Chapter III reviewed the factors involved in the acceptance and adoption of new ideas and practices which are initiated by change agents.

Adoption and acceptance are not synonymous; one may exist without the other. The decision to accept and practice family home evening is greatly determined by the culture of each individual family; that is, the unique way a family has of perceiving and adapting to its environment. Some of the factors which may be associated with this pattern of acceptance and adoption are the social status of a particular family, its use of time, the marital adjustment of the parents, family integration, relative marital authority, and orthodoxy of the family regarding church norms. The following chapter discusses the format of the investigation conducted by the researcher to determine how these and other factors operate in the family home evening practice.
CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present investigation explores specific attributes of the L. D. S. family group and relationships of selected variables within it. Such aims are characteristic of a descriptive study (Selltiz, et al., 1951). The study then, is exploratory in its central purpose and descriptive in its design. This chapter reviews the methods and procedures employed in the development of the questionnaire, in the selection of the sample, and in collection and treatment of the data.

I. DEVELOPMENT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The first limitations imposed upon the questionnaire were considerations of format and content. While it appeared that the personal interview method might have been the most revealing, limitations of time and resources dictated the use of a "paper-pencil" instrument. It was determined that the questionnaire method would fully meet the demands of an exploratory study while at the same time making possible the acquisition of a larger sample of respondents. Furthermore, since the study was an attempt to seek out as many variables as possible which might be related to acceptance and adoption of family home evening, the questionnaire method provided for the maximum number of these variables within limits of the respondent's time.
Before the data were gathered, the questionnaire was pretested by the investigator. Responses from approximately 20 mothers prompted certain modifications and refinements.

Two general types of items--descriptive and scale--were employed in the questionnaire. In each of these categories some questions were contrived by the researcher while others were adopted or adapted from the work of other investigators. The dependent and independent variables considered are operationally defined below along with relevant indications of validity and reliability. See Appendix A for the complete questionnaire.

Dependent Variables

The present research considers the effects that various factors may have upon the acceptance and adoption of a family ritual. The latter variables, then, are assumed to be dependent or criterion variables--those which register the effects of the independent variables. Two attitude or "acceptance" variables, and the adoption variable are reviewed below.

1. Acceptance and the Family Home Evening Program. This variable attempts to ascertain in what light the respondent sees the origin and applicability of the Family Home Evening Program as reflected by his "verbal" report on the questionnaire. At one end of a rank order scale he may indicate "as an experiment," while at the other end
he may indicate, "as divinely inspired," with various steps intervening. Those who accept it as inspired are following the normative pattern.

2. Acceptance of family home evening norms. This variable specifies some of the central norms which deal with the principles and procedures of the home evening ritual, as defined by the Church. Respondents are asked to indicate degree of agreement or disagreement with these norms by means of a Likert scale; it can be seen that this may not reflect their actual behavior.

3. Adoption of family home evening. Number of times that a family has held family home evening within the preceding six months or 25 weeks is used as a measure of adoption. It was reasoned that this ratio would be the most appropriate index of adoption, because it covered a sufficiently short span of time to facilitate relatively accurate recall, at the same time indicating the family's basic commitment to the practice. No specific provision was made for those families who may have begun holding home evening during the previous six-month period, but it appeared that since they also had been introduced to the program, perhaps two years prior to that time, the same measure could appropriately apply to them.

Independent Variables

Independent variables are those which are typically assumed for
the sake of investigation to display a causal relationship with the criterion variables. In the present study, this classification is largely for methodological clarity as cause and effect cannot be determined by the methods employed. The investigation is concerned with the association of acceptance and adoption variables with six major independent variables. The latter are reviewed below.

1. **Social status.** Social status was operationalized by asking the respondent to indicate the level of the husband's occupation and education. These items were then coded according to Hollingshed's (1958) seven point scale.

2. **Use of time.** The respondent was asked to estimate the average time spent each week in the following activities: (1) husband's occupation, (2) wife's occupation, (3) joint family leisure, and (4) husband and wife's combined time in religious activity away from home. Questions were adapted from Rollins (1965).

3. **Family integration.** Rogers and Sebald (1962) found support for the view that Bardis' (1959) well-known "familism scale" actually involves two dimensions, "family integration" and "kinship orientation." On the basis of these findings, the present study employs the "family integration" concept. It is operationalized through the ten Likert scaled, family integration items in Bardis' instrument.
Bardis found concurrent validity in his original scale by comparing scores of familistic groups with more individualistic groups. In a test among college students, he reported a reliability coefficient of .904. The split half method gave corrected coefficient of .84.

4. Marital authority. Wolfe's (1959, p. 582-600) scale operationalizes relative marital authority by demonstrating whether family decision making is dominated by one spouse or is equalitarian. Wolfe reported no measures of validity or reliability but affirmed that the eight questions of his scale were "... thought to be pertinent to almost all urban families and sufficiently representative to give an indication of the relative authority of the husband and wife. ..." Support for this assumption was displayed in his data analysis which showed that the scale discriminated between the more affluent, husband dominant families and the less affluent, wife dominated families.

5. Husband and wife orthodoxy. Orthodoxy of husband and wife were indicated by means of four items adapted from Vernon's (1955) "Church Orthodoxy Scale," which determines the extent of conformity to L. D. S. norms. Vernon demonstrated the scalability of his original twelve items using a Guttman technique. His scale yielded a coefficient of reproducibility of .91. The four items adapted (concerning church attendance, participation in family prayer, observance of the health law and acceptance of church leaders as inspired) were determined to be the
most indicative of church orthodoxy on a priori grounds. A fifth item concerning attitude toward payment of financial contributions was added by the researcher.

6. Marital adjustment. The familiar Short Marital-Adjustment Test by Locke and Wallace (1959) was used to investigate this dimension of the husband-wife relationship. The authors demonstrated concurrent validity and reported a corrected reliability coefficient of .90.

7. Descriptive variables. In addition to the above scale type factors, three descriptive variables were investigated in relation to the dependent variables. These were: stage of family life cycle (as indicated by age-group of the oldest child), family size (number of children living at home), and father's office in the priesthood.

II. OBTAINING THE SAMPLE

Samples were chosen from two separate populations, one rural and one suburban. L. D. S. families living within the boundaries of South Sanpete Stake of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints constituted the rural population. All families in this stake live in or near three communities of Sanpete County, Utah: Ephraim, Manti, and Sterling. Sanpete County is an agriculturally based area with some small industry and business. A large majority of the residents of this county claim a membership in the Mormon Church, and represent a wide range
of occupational and income levels.

Sharon Stake in the Orem-Provo area of Utah County, Utah, constituted the suburban population. Provo and Orem, two adjacent communities, are economically based in business, industry and the Brigham Young University. Because of the proximity of the latter, the suburban population contained a disproportionately high number of educated professionals.

Within each population, the L. D. S. family constituted the sampling unit. The wife/mother of each family was chosen as the representative of the sampling unit, and hence the respondent, for the following reasons: (1) conceptual: It was felt that the mother would be better acquainted with patterns of family behavior, not only because she typically spends more time in the home than than the husband, but also because mothers tend to be more home oriented than fathers who have occupational and other outside involvements; (2) methodological: The mother would be more accessible to the investigator because of the greater likelihood of her being home. On the other hand, it must be recognized that the data are limited to the wife's perception of the family situation.

Data for the present study were obtained with the assistance of junior high school students and their instructors. The students were enrolled in the ninth grade seminaries of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Those assisting in obtaining the rural sample attended Ephraim-Manti-Sterling consolidated seminaries. The urban sample was obtained through ninth grade students at the seminary associated
with the Lincoln Junior High School in Orem, Utah.

Each cooperating student was instructed in the method of selecting the respondents, which was essentially as follows: (1) the student was to distribute three questionnaires with accompanying envelopes; one to his mother and the other two to neighboring mothers; (2) the neighbor families selected were to be those who met the following criteria: (a) parents were to be living together, (b) both were to be L. D. S., (c) having at least one child living at home, (d) with the mother expressing willingness to complete the questionnaire. The student was also requested to follow a specific procedure in selecting the neighbor; i.e., he was to go to the first family on either side of his residence that met the above criteria; (3) he was to ask the mother to read the letter of introduction before she agreed to complete the questionnaire. If she refused, he was to continue to the next appropriate house; (4) he was to return in a short time to pick up the questionnaire which was to be sealed in the envelope provided; (5) questionnaires were to be returned to the seminary the next day, where they were gathered by the researcher. It would have been desirable to ascertain the extent to which each student carried out the above procedures, but because the sampling method was an expedient alternative to another approach (the researcher had originally intended to draw a random sample within each population), there was not sufficient time to prepare for this aspect of sampling. Therefore, it was not known how closely desired sampling methods were observed.
Of the total of 200 questionnaires handed to students in each sample, 125 were returned by students in Sanpete County, while 116 were returned in Utah County. After a number of the questionnaires were deleted (deletions are reported in the next section), usable questionnaires totaled 117 and 108 for Sanpete and Utah Counties respectively.

The strength of this sampling method was that it allowed the researcher to obtain a comparatively large sample of responses in a short time. Furthermore, this procedure provided for a degree of randomness by having the student obtain responses from certain designated neighbors. Were the students to carry out their instructions carefully, at least two-thirds of the sample would be largely random.

A primary weakness of the method lay in the undefinable nature of the completed sample. Inasmuch as students gave no indication of how well they had carried out the prescribed procedural instructions for obtaining the data, the characteristics of the obtained sample cannot be specified except in general terms. Furthermore, it is not known to what extent the sample was biased by the unwillingness of the student to carry out indicated procedures, or by the respondent's lack of confidence in the anonymity of the questionnaire. However, a sample with a wide range of attitudes and behavior was obtained which was felt to be adequate for the exploratory nature of the present study. In fact, the sampling technique (having students take questionnaires to parents and neighbors) seems to
show considerable promise as an empirical method for obtaining certain kinds of data.

III. TREATMENT OF THE DATA

Questionnaires were first evaluated in terms of completeness and conformity to research criteria (i.e., both parents were to be living together, both were to be L. D. S., and at least one child was to be living at home). Those responses not meeting the requirements were deleted from the sample. It was found that twelve had to be eliminated because of incompleteness, two because parent was widowed or divorced, one because no children were living at home, and one because one parent was non-L. D. S. Next, responses were numerically coded and recorded on IBM data sheets. Two separate sets of sheets were made independently for each questionnaire. The data were then transformed to data cards by means of the optical scanner; thereafter the two sets of data were compared and discrepancies checked against the original questionnaire. This method of verification fostered considerable confidence in the accuracy of the data.

Data analysis was begun by computation of a frequency distribution of the raw data entered into the key punched data deck. The next step involved collapsing the data into appropriate summated scale scores—\this was accomplished through a computer program written for that purpose. The Pearsonian product moment correlation coefficients were
then calculated for each dependent-independent variable, along with the
coefficient of determination. The relative usefulness of these measures
in determining the quality of association is discussed by Hirsch (1957,
p. 285):

While the correlation coefficient tells us something about the closeness
of association, in case it assumes extreme values such as 0.0
and 1.0, it does not lend itself to an easy interpretation for the major-
ity of cases when it lies between these extremes. However, it is
safe to say that the closer the correlation coefficient is to ±1.0 or
-1.0, the closer the association of the variates.

Squaring the coefficient of correlation gives us the coefficient
do\text{etermination}, which is very useful in interpreting the closeness
of the association.

Essentially, the coefficient of determination indicates the amount of
variation in the dependent variable which is accounted for by the indepen-
dent variable. "Clearly, the larger the percentage of the explained
variance, the closer the association between the two variates and the
better the quality of prediction" (Hirsch, 1957, p. 261).

In addition to these measures, the Chi-square test for indepen-
dent samples was performed with reference to selected variables to
explore the differences between Sanpete and Utah subsamples.

There may arise some question as to the appropriateness of
employing the Pearsonian correlation coefficient to treat ordinal data.
Although there is some dissent, many authorities justify this approach.
"As a matter of fact," declares S. S. Stevens (1951, p. 26), editor of
\textit{Handbook of Experimental Psychology}, "most of the scales used widely
IV. SUMMARY

The present chapter has outlined the research methods and procedures employed in the investigation. It was first noted that the study is exploratory in purpose and descriptive in design. The sample was constituted by 225 L. D. S. mothers who completed a questionnaire designed to fulfill the major objectives of the study, namely (1) to ascertain the patterns of acceptance and adoption of family home evening among Latter-day Saint families, and (2) to explore the relationship between these patterns and several selected variables. Data were then computed and subject to analysis which consisted largely of preparing a frequency distribution and calculation of the product moment correlation coefficients between each variable. Certain variables were also employed in a Chi-square test for the independence of samples. Results of these analyses are presented in the following chapter.
CHAPTER V

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The present chapter presents highlights of the research findings. Inasmuch as data in the current study were obtained from two separate residential areas, consideration is first given to the question, are these subsamples actually independent? The second section focuses on certain descriptive characteristics of the sample, comparing home evening adopters with non-adopters as well as making cross-county comparisons. With this background, the two final sections present results central to the primary objectives of the study, namely, to determine what factors may be associated with acceptance and adoption of home evening, and to explore the nature of adoption patterns.

In all instances which involve a measure of significance, the .05 level is accepted as the lower confidence limit. This is the criterion commonly accepted in behavioral science research, particularly when the sample size is fairly large as in the present study.

I. INDEPENDENCE OF SAMPLES

It was not the aim of the present investigation to make extensive comparisons between rural and suburban subsamples--such an approach could well be the thesis of other research. However, in evaluating the present data, it is necessary to keep in mind that information was
gathered from two separate residential and ecological areas which appear to be distinctly dissimilar in several ways. In order to investigate the extent of real difference, the present section compares the Sanpete and Utah County subsamples along certain dimensions to ascertain the degree of their statistical independence. Inasmuch as the Chi-square test for independent samples was employed in making this comparison, a precaution must be noted. The Chi-square method assumes random sampling. In the present study, the extent of randomness is largely undetermined, a consideration which must be kept in mind throughout the current section.

The subsamples were first compared in terms of two demographic characteristics: occupation and educational status ranking. In terms of occupation, the two subsamples differed significantly from chance. (Table V, Appendix B). The $X^2$ value of 19.96 was substantially above 12.59 (with 6 degrees of freedom), the figure needed for statistical significance at the required level. Confidence in the statistical significance is further increased when it is noted that in coding, the occupations of "teacher" and "instructor" (of which there were a number) were assigned to the second level of Hollingshead's hierarchy. In the case of the Utah County subsample, there is a probability that several of these persons were full-time faculty at the University--positions which are usually assigned to the first level. A significant difference ($X^2 = 15.56$, df = 5) was also found between subsamples in terms of educational status
rankings (Table VI, Appendix B). The Utah County subsample reported a substantially greater number of college graduates than did the Sanpete subsample. However, it was somewhat surprising to note in the latter subsample, the comparatively large number of husbands who had "some college." Perhaps this may be accounted for by the location of a two year junior college in Sanpete County.

Next, in order to consider an attitude dimension, subsamples were compared as to attitude toward the Family Home Evening Program (Table VII, Appendix B). The most notable difference between the attitudes of mothers reporting was registered in the first two categories: while 77.8 percent of the respondents in Utah County agreed that the Home Evening Program was "inspired," only 57.3 percent of those in Sanpete County did so, making a discrepancy of over 20 percent. The difference is significant ($X^2 = 16.78, df = 4$) above the criterion level.

A final comparison of subsamples was performed (see Figure 1) regarding a behavioral variable, the adoption of family home evening (Table VIII, Appendix B). Differences along this dimension were striking; over half, 52.1 percent of the Sanpete respondents, were classified as "non-adopters," while only 22.2 percent of the Utah County mothers reported that home evening had not been held in their families during the last six months (the criterion for non-adoption). Furthermore, a detailed breakdown indicated that Utah County adopters tend to hold family
home evening substantially more often than Sanpete County adopters. For example, while 14.3 percent of the Sanpete adopters had held home evenings from 16 to 25 times in the previous 25 weeks, 29.8 percent of the adopting Utah respondents reported the same range. The X^2 value of 24.96 (df = 5) is well beyond the acceptable level of significance.

When compared along demographic, attitudinal and behavioral dimensions, the two county subsamples exhibit a consistent statistical differential. The question then becomes, does this represent an actual
difference? Inasmuch as sampling procedure leaves an indefiniteness about the real characteristics of the population studied, it cannot be asserted that the populations from which the subsamples are drawn actually differ. There is, however, definite tendency for the samples drawn to differ from one another in terms of the variables mentioned. The nature of these differences should be implicit in the interpretation of the data which are to follow.

II. DESCRIPTIVE CHARACTERISTICS

 Certain variables of a descriptive nature were important in helping to indicate who had adopted family home evening and when it was adopted. The present section considers three of these descriptive characteristics and compares them by the categories of adoption/non-adoption and county.

 A frequency distribution (Table IX, Appendix B) shows the number of families which were categorized into five stages of the family life cycle (beginning to preschool, school, early adolescent, late adolescent, early adult). A comparison of the Sanpete and Utah subsamples shows that they are roughly equivalent all along the cycle. A more important observation, however, concerns the adoption/non-adoption ratio (the number of adopters for each non-adopter). At the beginning-pre-school stage, the ratio is nearly three to two, then at the school age stage, nearly two to one. At the early adolescent stage, however, it approaches
equivalency, then returns to an approximately two to one ratio through the final two stages. This trend leads to the observation that families with older children in their early teens may be less adoption prone than families in other stages, and that the early stage of the family cycle may also reflect diminished adoptiveness. The data give no indication of the causes for these relationships and must be interpreted cautiously, especially in that the sample size is relatively small.

In comparing family size (Table X, Appendix B) one particular trend is meaningful to the present study—the adoption ratio tends to vary directly with family size. While about half of the families with one or two children are adopters, roughly two-thirds of the families with seven or eight children are adopters. This observation is somewhat corroborated by the correlation coefficient between the variables of family size and adoption. The coefficient of .17 was significant at the criterion level. A small coefficient of determination (.02), plus a small sample size, diminishes confidence in this statistic as representative of population parameters.

Another observation of interest, though peripheral to the central aims of the study, is the difference in family size between the Utah and Sanpete County subsamples. While the mean family size reported by Sanpete mothers is 3.51, the mean size in the Utah sample is 4.34. In the Utah subsample there is a greater clustering at the mode (3-4 children) while the Sanpete subsample shows a greater concentration in the
first stage. An investigation into the factors which account for this difference in family size would make an interesting inquiry.

When the priesthood office held by the father is compared by adoption/non-adoption and county, two observations stand out (Table XI, Appendix B): First, Utah County reveals a substantially greater number of high priests. This might be accounted for in the fact that L. D. S. men are often called from among the lay priesthood in that area to provide leadership for the Brigham Young University student population--positions which necessitate ordination to the high priesthood. The second observation again deals with the adoption ratio. Only one-third of the fathers in the lower three priesthood offices [when an adult male holds one of these, it usually indicates that he is not fully active in the Church] were adopters, while half of those who were Elders were reported adopters. Seventies and high priests, positions which require considerable normative behavior, reflect ratios of over four to one. Supporting evidence for the tendency of home evening adoption to vary directly with rank in the priesthood is expressed in the correlation coefficient for these two factors. The Pearsonian correlation of .38 had a coefficient of determination of 14.8 and was well beyond the required level for significance.

With the above and the preceding sections as background, attention is turned to one of the central concerns of the present study--that of ascertaining what factors may be associated with acceptance and adoption of family home evening.
III. CORRELATES OF FAMILY HOME EVENING ACCEPTANCE AND ADOPTION

In the present section, consideration is given to the relationships which exist between the dependent variables as well as between the dependent and independent variables. In the latter case, only those associations which show statistical significance above the criterion level of .05 are discussed. Since the nature of the relationships between the variable has not been quantitatively hypothesized, there appears to be no need to account for the lack of significant correlation.

Certain precautions are in order before proceeding with an evaluation of the correlates of family home evening acceptance and adoption. First, the present study has identified both "dependent" and "independent" variables. With certain research designs there is justification in referring to the latter as the "causal" variable while the dependent variable is expected to reflect the effects of these causes. However, such an assumption cannot be made in the current study where designation of the variables as "dependent" and "independent" is largely for methodological clarity. Even substantial correlation coefficients (designated "r") reflect only an association between the variables in question; it does not define cause and effect. Furthermore, in interpreting the correlation it is important to observe the percent of variation in the dependent variable which is accounted for by the operation of the indepen-
TABLE I
CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN DEPENDENT AND INDEPENDENT VARIABLES AS REPORTED BY THE WIFE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
<th>Acceptance of F.H. Evening Program</th>
<th>Acceptance of F.H. Evening Norms</th>
<th>Extent of F.H.E. Adoption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>sig/lv</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>sig/lv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>-.09 *</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.05 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: husband/employment</td>
<td>.02 *</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: wife/employment</td>
<td>-.06 *</td>
<td></td>
<td>.09 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: Family leisure</td>
<td>-.08 *</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.09 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: H/W Church activity</td>
<td>.00 *</td>
<td></td>
<td>.08 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband Orthodoxy</td>
<td>.48 .001</td>
<td></td>
<td>.50 .001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife Orthodoxy</td>
<td>.54 .001</td>
<td></td>
<td>.50 .001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Authority</td>
<td>.11 *</td>
<td></td>
<td>.10 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Adjustment</td>
<td>.20 .01</td>
<td></td>
<td>.13 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Integration</td>
<td>.13 *</td>
<td></td>
<td>.22 .01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not significant above the .05 level with 200 degrees of freedom

**Hollingshead's scale is in reverse order; i.e., a low number indicates high status. Thus the negative correlation indicates a positive relationship.
dent variable. This percentage is simply the square of the correlation coefficient, the product of which is known as the coefficient of determination and is designated "r²."

The relatedness between the three dependent variables is immediately apparent (Table I, text). The two attitudinal measures, "acceptance of the Family Home Evening Program" and "acceptance of family home evening norms," show an intercorrelation of .47 (r² = .22). However, the correlations between these acceptance variates and the behavioral factor of "family home evening adoption" are substantially lower, being .39 and .34 respectively (r² = .15 and .12). All three correlations are within the moderate range, reflecting a certain unidimensionality between attitudes of acceptance and the actual adoption of the practice. Yet from the literature there appeared an indication that acceptance and adoption were not entirely the same processes. Some support for this assumption can be found in examining the correlation between the attitude variables (.47) and those between attitudes and actual adoption (.39 and .34). This comparison indicates a tendency for those who accept the Family Home Evening Program as "divinely inspired" also to accept the Church's definition of how home evening should be conducted; but apparently a number of those who accept the family home evening on these levels do not actually practice it. It could be said that there appears to be a certain "discontinuity" between attitudes and actions.
Attention is now turned to the relationships between the dependent and independent variables. The most striking characteristic of the data in Table I is the pattern of correlations between the three dependent variables and orthodoxy of husband and wife, as reported by the wife. Wife orthodoxy is correlated .54 with her attitude toward the Family Home Evening Program \( r^2 = .29 \) with acceptance of home evening norms, .50 \( r^2 = .25 \), and with adoption of home evening, .59 \( r^2 = .35 \). Although the relationship between the wife's acceptance scores and the husband's orthodoxy appears to have relatively little meaning, the correlation between the husband's orthodoxy and adoption is very pertinent. The correlation coefficient is .60 which accounts for 36 percent of the variance. This configuration shows a consistent correlation between the three dependent variables and orthodoxy ratings.

It appeared to the researcher that the consistency of this pattern may indicate that family home evening adoption is another index of orthodoxy. In order to test this possibility, values in the correlation table were rotated in order to ascertain the relationships between orthodoxy and all other variables in the matrix (Table XII, Appendix B). It was discovered that the factors which show significant relationships with orthodoxy (both husband and wife) are the same variables which are related significantly to adoption of home evening. The similarity in the two configurations provides a priori evidence that adoption is an aspect of orthodoxy.
The next noticeable finding is the relationship between adoption and social status, which is substantially above the required level of significance. This positive association is consistent with coefficients in Table X which show similar associations between orthodoxy and social status. Perhaps there is an interdependence between social status, orthodoxy and adoption of home evening. It seems likely that the relationship is dichotomous between social status and orthodoxy—adoption being another measure of orthodoxy.

A significant positive relationship is also encountered in the data (r = .21, \( r^2 = .04 \)) between the time which husband and wife spend in church activities outside the home (their combined hours) and extent of adoption of home evening. This association is consistent with the fact that time spent in church activity is often associated with leadership positions and high conformity. It is anticipated that this correlation would have been higher had time spent in church activity been individually recorded for both husband and wife.

When the four time variables are correlated with the three independent variables, the only relationship which shows statistical significance at the required level besides the above is that of wife's employment, which indicates a negative association. The correlation coefficient is \(-.15\), but the coefficient of determination (.03) is small and shows that actual relatedness is slight.
Marital adjustment is positively related above the criterion level with both attitude toward the Family Home Evening Program and with adoption of home evening. The former relationship is evidenced by a correlation coefficient of .20 ($r^2 = .04$) and the latter by a coefficient of .17 ($r^2 = .03$). Though slight, these relationships are consistent with the findings of other studies which have demonstrated a positive association between marital happiness or adjustment and religious activity.

In view of the inconsistency of the correlation patterns between the wife's response to the family integration scale and the three dependent variables, no justification can be seen for the .22 correlation ($r^2 = .05$) between this scale and one dependent variable: acceptance of home evening norms.

No other correlation coefficients reported in Table I are sufficiently large to meet the criterion level of .05. It is interesting to note that of the correlates which have shown significance, most of them are behavioral rather than attitudinal. This may be an indication of greater stability (i.e., lack of susceptibility to biasing factors) of behavioral variables as compared with attitudinal variables.

In concluding the discussion of the correlates of home evening acceptance and adoption, one cautionary note needs to be reemphasized--the data reflect a single point of view, that of the wife/mother. Evidence for the operation of this factor is found in the correlation between the wife's report of her husband's orthodoxy as compared with her report of
her own orthodoxy. This correlation ($r = .82$, $r^2 = .67$) is high for a behavioral variable. Further evidence is found in a comparison of all correlations with husband and wife orthodoxy. The latter two variables show a pronounced tendency toward parallel variation.

IV. PATTERNS OF FAMILY HOME EVENING ADOPTION

The present concluding section is concerned primarily with those families that are adopters—that is, who held family home evening at least once during the six months preceding the completion of the questionnaire. After reported frequencies of adoption are considered, data are examined which reveal the patterns which families have exhibited in instituting the home evening ritual. For this examination, the data from both samples are combined.

Of the total of 225 respondents, 85 or 37.8 percent reported that home evening had not been held in their homes during the preceding six months. Twenty (8.9 percent) reported having held it from one to five times, while 33 (14.7 percent) had held it from six to ten times (Table XIII, Appendix B). These latter two categories represent an average of a little over once a month. Twenty-seven or twelve percent of those responding indicated that home evenings had been held in their homes from eleven to fifteen times, an average of about twice a month. Another 33 (14.7 percent) reported family home evenings were held from sixteen to twenty times. Twenty-seven or twelve percent of the total num-
ber of respondents reported an average approaching once a week. The most notable characteristic of this distribution is its lack of prominent modalities. This pattern perhaps reflects the influence of a number of factors in the family situation which tend to determine how frequently home evening is held.

When asked to indicate how soon the home evening practice was initiated in the home after the introduction of the innovation in 1965, approximately one-half of the adopters reported beginning with the first three months (Table XIV, Appendix B). Others distributed intermittently over the ensuing two year period. A substantial number of respondents failed to answer the question--perhaps because it was too difficult to remember a certain beginning date, or perhaps for some other deliberate reason.

The consistency with which family home evening was held since its initiation shows a bi-modal distribution (Table XV, Appendix B) with the greatest number (33.5 percent) indicating that they had held it sporadically, while the second modal group (28.6 percent) reported to have held it "regularly, both in winter and summer." In a comparison of this estimate with the report of actual number of home evenings held (Table XIII, Appendix B), this bi-modality was not evident, indicating perhaps a lack of sensitivity in the consistency scale.

Although it is clearly the norm that the father should take the leadership in family home evening, indications are (Table II, text)
### TABLE II

**EXTENT TO WHICH FATHER LEADS OUT IN HOLDING FAMILY HOME EVENING**

**QUESTION:** To what extent does your husband lead out in encouraging the family to hold family home evenings?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He always leads out when he is home</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He usually takes the lead when he is home</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We share this responsibility about equally</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually take the lead, even when he is home</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I always take the lead but he supports me</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He does not participate—I carry the full load</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that it is more of a shared responsibility. These results are consistent with those of Christopherson (1966), who found in a study of authority in the Mormon family that, while Latter-day Saints retained a patriarchal concept of the family, in actual behavior they closely resembled the equalitarian patterns of the culture at large. The fact that in less than 20 percent of the cases the wife reported that she took more responsibility for home evening than her husband may be an indication that the husband is not abrogating his leadership in the majority of cases, at least in the wife's opinion.

Another pattern of family behavior is revealed which does not fully meet the norm (Table III, text). It has been made explicit to most members that the participation of each family member in home evening is important; yet, 42.7 percent of the respondents reported that no regular assignments are given. In only 24.3 percent of families sampled is each member given some specific part each time, while in 25.7 percent of the homes the responsibilities are rotated. However, less than eight percent reported a "lecture method" of presentation.

When asked to indicate the extent to which the Family Home Evening Manual was used in home evening preparation, over half (55 percent) of the respondents reported that they almost always followed the lessons as outlined in the manual, while over 30 percent of the remainder depended on the manual for aid in preparing the lessons (Table XVI, Appendix B) making a total of over three-fourths of the respondents who use the
### TABLE III

**EXTENT TO WHICH ALL MEMBERS OF THE FAMILY PARTICIPATE IN FAMILY HOME EVENING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION: To what extent do all members of the family participate in family home evenings?</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each member has a specific part each time</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members take turns on various nights</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No regular assignments are given</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certain members often don't participate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family usually listens to lesson presentation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>140</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
manual consistently. This is perhaps indicative of the significant role the preparation of a course of study for families has played in the relative success of the home evening program.

Another question examined the family's basic resolve to hold home evening in the face of absences of one or more members (Table XVII, Appendix B). Almost half (49.3 percent) held family home evening only when all members of the family were present, while 16.4 percent reported that they would hold home evening even if a parent and a child were absent. The determination to hold family home evening when some members are absent may play a crucial role in view of the many activities which tend to compete for attention of family members.

When respondents whose families were categorized as "non-adopters" were asked to indicate the experience their families had had with home evening, only 17.7 percent of them reported no attempts at initiating the practice. The majority (55.3 percent) reported a few (presumably unsatisfactory) trials at beginning the practice. Home evening had attained a certain regularity prior to the previous six months for 27.1 percent of the respondents.

Non-adopters were also asked their intentions toward holding family home evening in the future (Table IV, text). Over 16 percent of the respondents reported frankly that they doubted they would ever hold home evening. Only 3.6 percent of the non-adopters expressed a positive commitment to begin home evening within a definite period of time.
### TABLE IV

**INTENTIONS TOWARD FAMILY HOME EVENING OF FAMILIES THAT HAD NOT HELD IT DURING THE PRECEDING SIX MONTHS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION: What intentions do you and your husband have in regard to family home evening?</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I doubt that we will ever hold it</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to hold it sometime in the future</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have planned to begin holding it soon</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have made plans to hold it within a month</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have made plans to hold it within a week or so</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The remaining 30 percent expressed only a general intention of holding it in the unspecified future.

In order to appraise the respondent's reaction more fully than could be accomplished through questions with response categories, three open-end questions were posed in the questionnaire concerning obstacles in holding family home evening, factors influential in convincing the family to begin home evenings, and perceived effects of home evenings on the quality of home life. The most typical responses of those reporting were categorized and are analyzed below. (See Tables XIX and XX, Appendix B for complete summary.)

When asked to specify the greatest obstacle encountered in holding family home evening, one third of the respondents spoke of their inability to get the family together or to "find time" for this activity. The second most prevalent obstacle (17.5 percent) was the employment of the husband which took him away from the home during the evenings, etc. Nearly nine percent of the wives indicated that the greatest obstacle in their homes was their husband's lack of responsibility for home evening. To 8.3 percent of the families reporting, other activities were more interesting than home evening. Over seven percent of the respondents reported that the family was either indifferent toward home evening, or dissatisfied with it in some manner. To 6.3 percent of the respondents, conflicting church activities presented an obstacle to holding family home evenings. Other obstacles reported were: lack of the family preparing for
home evening, children who were too young, too great a diversity in age
range of children, and wife's employment.

Respondents were also asked to specify what had convinced them
to initiate family home evening in the beginning. Over a third (36.1 per-
cent reported that a need or desire felt within the family was the motiva-
ting force. Another one-third (33.2 percent) reported a desire to conform
to the appeals of the church and its leaders. Nearly fourteen percent indi-
cated that impetus came from the conviction that the program was inspir-
ed, while 9.3 percent cited the concreteness of the program and the manual
as giving the needed incentive. Testimonial from friend or relative
convinced 7.4 percent of the respondents that home evening was a practice
that they themselves should initiate.

Finally, the participating L. D. S. mothers were asked to
evaluate the effects of home evening in their family situations. The over-
whelming majority, 90.7 percent reported positive effects. Fewer than
ten percent of the respondents indicated that they could see a little or no
effects on the quality of their family life.

The current chapter has reported the findings of the present
investigation and has highlighted the major results. Section one com-
pared the two county subsamples and indicated that they differed statis-
tically. Section two gives a profile on certain descriptive characteris-
tics of the subsamples, and, along with the preceding section, provides
a background for the ensuing analysis of the factors correlated with
family home evening acceptance and adoption. Section four concludes the chapter with an examination of patterns of adoption and non-adoption of home evening and other relevant data.
CHAPTER VI
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In 1964, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints launched the Family Home Evening Program--a deliberate effort to convince its membership to adopt a new family practice, the "family home evening." It has been shown that although this program was evolved through intermittent attempts to establish the home evening practice over a fifty year period, the current Program is the most comprehensive and systematic attempt to date. Perhaps these latter characteristics, more than any others, place this endeavor in a theoretical context of interest to social science.

In the foregoing chapters, the Family Home Evening Program was shown to be an effort toward what is known in applied social science as "planned change," a deliberate, predetermined and far-reaching attempt at improving a particular "client system." In this context, the L. D. S. Church was shown to be acting in the role of "change agent" in endeavoring to institute the family home evening innovation. Furthermore, this innovation has many features of a special form of family action known as "family ritual"--a prescribed pattern of family behavior which normally arises out of the interaction of the family, and which achieves a sense of rightness as a result of the continuing process.

Notwithstanding the influence of the Church in persuading its
member families to adopt this ritual practice, the ultimate decision as to whether it would be implemented was the prerogative of the family itself. Thus it was felt that an investigation of the adoption process should logically begin by looking at the factors in the home setting which might be associated with the process of adoption. In light of these considerations, the present study had two objectives:

1. To explore the patterns of acceptance and adoption of the family home evening (as defined by the Church) among L. D. S. families.

2. To explore the nature of the relationships between these patterns of acceptance and adoption of family home evening, and certain selected variables.

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

Data were collected by means of a questionnaire administered to a total of 225 L. D. S. mothers. A questionnaire was developed which hopefully would ascertain the extent to which the families had accepted the Family Home Evening Program and prescribed norms for family home evening as well as the extent to which they had adopted the practice. It also explored selected factors which were thought to have some association with the acceptance and adoption process, as well as certain background data. The study aimed toward determining which of these factors were associated with acceptance and adoption of family home evening.

The Latter-day Saint family constituted the sampling unit with
the wife/mother functioning as the respondent. It was felt that the wife/mother would be closer to the family situation and would also be more accessible for cooperation in the study. Respondents were chosen from only those families which met the following criteria: (1) parents were living together; (2) both parents were L. D. S.; (3) they had at least one child living at home. Sampling was conducted in two residential areas. The samples differed substantially when compared in terms of demographic, attitudinal and behavioral dimensions by means of the Chi-square test for independent samples. Of the total sample of 225 responses, 117 were drawn from Sanpete County, Utah, and 108 were drawn from Utah County, Utah; the former largely rural, the latter largely suburban.

Ninth grade students in the L. D. S. seminary located in the two sampling areas assisted in the collection of the data. Nearly sixty participating students in each area were handed three questionnaires with envelopes. The student was to give one questionnaire to his mother and one to each of two neighbors. If the students carried out the directions for the collection of the data, at least two-thirds of the sample showed random selection. Under the circumstances, the researcher was unable to ascertain to what extent the students assisting had carried out the sampling procedures. Fortunately, examination of the data revealed that an adequate cross-section of respondents had been obtained which was deemed sufficient for the purposes of an exploratory study.
II. FINDINGS

The findings most central to the aims of the study were those which gave certain descriptive profiles of the data, which demonstrated the correlates of acceptance and adoption, which elaborated the patterns of adoption practice and which reflected the respondents' perceptions of obstacles, rewards and motivational factors in adopting home evening. These findings are outlined below.

Descriptive profiles

1. Respondents in the Utah County subsample reported greater acceptance and adoption of the family home evening ritual than those in the Sanpete County subsample. The Chi-square test for independent samples showed a significant difference between subsamples along this and other dimensions.

2. A comparison of adoption ratios (number of adopters per non-adopter) revealed a tendency for the adoption of family home evening to be comparatively lower during the early adolescent stage.

3. There was a tendency for larger families in the samples studied to report higher adoption scores.

4. The data revealed that fathers who hold higher offices in the priesthood (especially Seventy and High Priest) tend to accept and adopt family home evening more readily than those holding lesser
priesthood offices.

**Correlates of Acceptance and Adoption**

The results of correlating the dependent variables of acceptance (which included two factors: [a] acceptance of Family Home Evening Program and [b] acceptance of family home evening norms) and adoption of home evening with the independent variables (selected factors) by means of Pearsonian correlation are highlighted below. Those associations which surpassed the criterion level of significance (.05) are reported with the following precautions: (a) correlation coefficients demonstrate only association, not causal relationship; (b) most of the correlations accounted for a small portion of the variance, hence demonstrating limited relatedness.

1. There were three dependent variables: attitude toward the Family Home Evening Program, acceptance of church prescribed norms for home evening, and adoption of the family home evening. These were significantly interrelated statistically \( r = .47, .34, .39 \).

2. Adoption of family home evening was related to social status \( r = .25 \), showing a tendency for higher adoption rates among the higher echelons of status rankings.

3. The data showed a negative relationship between hours spent by mothers in employment and the rate of adoption of home evening. This relationship \( r = -.15 \) was slight and accounted for little of the
4. A trend toward higher adoption rates for families whose fathers and mothers spent more time in religious activity outside the home was evidenced ($r = .21$).

5. The data showed a general tendency for positive relationships ($r = .17$) between home evening acceptance and adoption and marital adjustment ($r = .20$). These associations accounted for only a small percentage of the variance.

6. Moderate correlations were exhibited between dependent variables of acceptance and adoption and wife orthodoxy ($r = .54$ and $.50$ for acceptance factors; $.59$ for adoption). The correlation between husband orthodoxy as reported by the wife and adoption of family home evening was also in the moderate range ($r = .60$).

Patterns of Family Home Evening Adoption

In order to discover how family home evening was being conducted among those who had adopted the practice, a number of quantitative and qualitative questions were asked. Responses to these are outlined below.

1. The majority of the adopters reported having first begun family home evening within three months after the announcement of the Family Home Evening Program.

2. Nearly 80 percent of the respondents reported that the husband
took as much or more responsibility than the wife for initiating family home evening.

3. In over three-fourths of the cases, the respondents indicated that the *Family Home Evening Manual* was utilized in preparing the home evening.

4. Nearly half of the respondents reported that home evening was held in their home only when all of the family was present.

5. Concerning the extent of family participation in family home evening, 42.7 percent of the adopting respondents reported that no regular assignments were given to various family members. Nearly half reported that assignments were given in preparing for home evening. Less than eight percent of the respondents reported a "lecture method" of lesson presentation.

6. Of the 85 respondents who were classified as "non-adopters" only 17.7 percent reported that they had never held home evening. The majority reported a few attempts at beginning the practice, while over a fourth had practiced it regularly for a period of time.

7. When asked to specify their intentions regarding holding home evening in the future, less than four percent of the respondents indicated a commitment to begin family home evenings within a specified period of time, while nearly 95 percent expressed no intentions or only a general intention to begin sometime in the future.

Certain other aspects of family home evening practice
were ascertained by means of three open-ended questions. Asked what was the greatest single obstacle to holding family home evening, a majority indicated the "inability of the family to get together" and "husband's employment." Other obstacles were husband's lack of responsibility, resistance of older children, etc.

Factors most commonly reported as motivation for the family to begin holding family home evening were: a need felt in the family, a desire to conform to church expectations, the divinely inspired nature of the Program, concreteness of the Program, and testimonial of friend or relative.

Finally, over 90 percent of the respondents reported that they had noted positive effects in their family life because of family home evening.

THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

A number of inferences are possible from the results of the present investigation. Those which the researcher sees as having substantial relevance to the body of theory considered are outlined below:

1. When a religious institution undertakes to establish an innovation among its member families, the nature of the family's commitment to the institution will be a major determinant in its adoption of the innovation. The substantial correlations between adoption and orthodoxy in the present study support this view.
2. The use of sanction by an institution to implement a complicated pattern of behavior such as the family home evening, may be effective only with those who are most susceptible to sanction. Other forms of influence may be needed to initiate the innovation among more peripheral members.

3. Deliberate family rituals can be successfully initiated through the influence of an external institution. Prior to the present study, there seemed to be no empirical evidence to indicate that this is so.

4. When a family ritual is initiated by a sanctioning institution, its initial implementation in the family tends to occur in terms of "identification," the need to establish or maintain a satisfactory self-defining relationship. Support for this conclusion is found in the number of respondents who reported that they had been persuaded to begin home evening by the Church and its leaders.

5. Regardless of the source of the ritual, the crucial element in its maintenance is priority of commitment. In the absence of an external sanction to maintain this priority of commitment, it must arise out of successful experience with the ritual itself.

6. Acceptance of an innovation does not mean that it will be adopted. Initial adoption does not mean permanent adoption. The present research shows a disparity between attitudes and actions.

7. An innovation which involves specific procedures and can be clearly demonstrated is more likely to be adopted than one which is not.
PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

The adoption of family home evening is not like deciding which rug to buy for the living room floor. The practice is a complex pattern of interaction, usually requiring substantial commitments in time, thought and energy for its successful implementation. Parents and children are called upon to grapple with these intricate dynamics and to master them. Theoretical and empirical facets of the present research suggest to the investigator some possible ways families might be assisted in accomplishing this arduous task. These are outlined with the full awareness that they represent only this researcher's point of view.

The home evening was originally conceived as a means by which the family could be brought together to learn and to share meaningful interaction; however, many members of the Church still express an inability to get the family all together at the same time to participate in this practice. Is this inability inherent in the family's activity schedule or in its basic motivation? One respondent in the study, when asked to list the greatest obstacle her family had encountered in holding family home evening, replied: "I can't think of an obstacle. I feel that if you feel the need, you can always find a way to hold home evening." She illustrates the common observation that people usually find a way to do what they really want to do.

Every family makes commitments as to what activities it will
pursue. It is the priority given to these commitments which determines to a great extent what kind of experiences the family has, and for that matter, what kind of a family it becomes. If the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints is to meet its objectives as a change agent leading its member families to greater unity and spirituality through family home evening, it must somehow motivate more families to grant to this practice sufficient priority to implement it. How can this be done? The answer appears to lie in the nature of the processes by which family rituals become established.

The present research indicates that those who have most readily adopted the home evening practice have been those who show the greatest orthodoxy in other ways. These are the families that are the most susceptible to the sanction of the church, and many of them seem to have originally adopted home evening ritual because of their commitment to that institution. This is one way of establishing a family ritual. To those more on the periphery of orthodoxy, the commitment to the church is not enough; they must have other reasons if they are to adopt a ritual practice. Most of these families will be convinced only when they see the intrinsic worth of the practice—a realization which usually comes through successful experience with the innovation.

It appears that many members of the church have not had the successful experiences with home evening that they have expected. Thus
it is evident that if the church, as a change agent, is to be effective in implementing its plan for strengthening the family, it must help families to have successful experiences—experiences which illuminate the intrinsic worth of the practice.

In order to accomplish this, it appears to the investigator, that now the emphasis in the home evening program could effectively be placed on the process, not only on sanction. That is, parents need to become engaged in an evaluation of the home evening itself rather than in a reaction to church directive to adopt it. The researcher feels that the practice of home evening would stand such evaluation. Once a family is convinced that the home evening is worthwhile, it is ready to give it the priority necessary to make it successful.

Perhaps there are a number of ways the emphasis could be shifted to the process of home evening; one particular approach occurs to the researcher. Parents need help with home evening. For example, what is the solution for those mothers who would like to hold it but the father will not take the initiative? How do parents cope with a teenager who resists family night? How can a family "make time" for home evening with so many interfering activities? The present study indicates that most families sampled had attempted holding family home evening, and that many of those who held it did so less than weekly. One way to help families to solve these problems may be found in a two pronged approach.
First, in order to solve the above and similar dilemmas, the family needs help with its own unique problems. Perhaps "home evening consultants" might be called from the ward or stake to counsel with those families who need help. Such an assignment would logically go to a couple who had been successful in holding home evening, and could be effective in helping others solve their problems regarding it. Second, through "workshops" or "seminars," whole families might be invited to participate. This is envisioned as more of an informal meeting where families could discuss their problems together—perhaps in small groups. The "home evening consultants" would be the natural choice to lead such a workshop.

It seems that such an approach would place the emphasis on the problems involved in home evening, would help families come to an awareness of what home evening could do for them, and thus bring a commitment which would make the practice successful. Few social scientists would question such efforts to strengthen the moral commitment and solidarity of the family.

LIMITATIONS

The following are seen as the limitations of the present study and should be considered in evaluation of the research.

1. The most obvious limitation is the undetermined nature of the sample due to the peculiarities of sampling procedure. Because the
method used was an expedient alternative to a more random (but probably less comprehensive) sampling method originally planned, no provision could be made to evaluate the performance of the student assistants in gathering the data. Although the data themselves exhibit an excellent cross-section, they cannot be specified beyond this observation.

2. That the data reflect only a single point of view, that of the wife/mother, can be seen as a limitation; however, it was felt that for the purposes of an exploratory study this did not impose a serious restriction upon the quality of the information received.

3. The questionnaire had some limitations. First, results have shown that behavioral scales as opposed to attitude scales may have offered more fruitful and consistent correlations. Second, the scales contrived by the researcher could have been subject to validation measures beyond a priori methods. Time limits prevented this, but it may have improved results.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Within the conceptual content of the present investigation there exist a number of intriguing possibilities for further research. Those listed below are some of the more straightforward.

1. There is need for a study of family home evening based upon a random sample. The qualitative content may vary, but randomness is needed to present a truer picture of home evening practice in the Church.
2. The present research encountered several differences between rural and suburban subsamples, such as disparity in church orthodoxy and home evening adoption. An evaluation of these differences and their possible determinants would be pertinent.

3. There is need for a well designed experimental study which could ascertain the effects of home evening on family life. For instance, is successful adoption of home evening associated with greater family integration, cohesiveness or rapport?

4. A look into the dynamics of family ritual practice would have theoretical and practical importance. For example, what family themes are most prevalent in families who readily adopt home evening? What personality characteristics?

5. Festinger suggested that attitudes and practices are more successfully initiated when the innovation has behavioral follow-up. This assumption could be explored in terms of the reinforcement given to adopters of family home evening by home teachers, group members, and important reference persons.

6. There is need to look at family home evening from the viewpoint of children in the family, particularly those in their early adolescence. Meaningful questions are: why do some children resist the home evening while others participate eagerly? What kinds of family activity contribute most to the growth of children?

These are some of the avenues of research illuminated by the present study of the family home evening.
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APPENDIX A

LETTER TO PARTICIPANT

Department of Child Development
and Family Relationships
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah

Dear Homemaker:

This letter is to introduce Robert E. Larson and his student assistant, Mr. Larson is currently completing graduate studies in the Department of Child Development and Family Relationships at Brigham Young University. His thesis research explores home evening and the L. D. S. family. We invite your participation.

Would you please complete the questionnaire provided. It concerns your experience with family home evening, your attitudes toward the church, toward marriage, and other aspects of family life. Your answers will not be identified with your name.

Thank you very much for your cooperation with all items within 15 to 20 minutes.

[Signature]

Ph.D., Professor, Chairman
Department of Child Development
and Family Relationships

P. S. Please do not put your name on this questionnaire. After you have completed all items and put it in the envelope provided and return it to the student.
QUESTIONNAIRE

GENERAL DIRECTIONS:

Below are 76 various questions concerning you and your family. As you proceed to answer them, please keep the following points in mind:

(1) Read all questions very carefully and respond to all of them (EXCEPT WHERE DIRECTED TO SKIP AHEAD). Answer on the basis of your own evaluation without consulting other persons.

(2) Pay particular attention to special directions (marked *) in several sections.

(3) For research purposes you must consider all questions as they are without modifying any of them. In some cases you will have to select the response which most closely approximates your attitudes or experience.

SECTION A

1. Name your husband’s job or occupation

2. Schooling completed by husband (CHECK ONE):
   ____ Grade school  ____ Junior high  ____ Some high school  ____ High school
   ____ Some college  ____ College (B. S. or B. A.)  ____ College (graduate degree)

3. How many years have you been married? _______

4. How many children do you have? _____ Are they all living at home? _____ Yes  _____ No

5. How many children living at home are in each of the following age ranges?
   ____ 0 to 5  ____ 6 to 11  ____ 12 to 15  ____ 16 to 19  ____ 20 or over

6. What priesthood does your husband hold?
   ____ None  ____ Deacon  ____ Teacher  ____ Priest  ____ Elder  ____ Seventy
   ____ High Priest
7. What is your husband's main position in the Church? ________________

What is your main position in the Church? ________________

8. Were you married in the temple?

___ Yes ___ No ___ Civil marriage, later sealed in temple

SECTION B

*Directions: The following items ask you to estimate yours and your family's use of time during a typical week. The best way to estimate is to determine the actual number of hours spent in this activity last week, then decide if this figure is typical—if not adjust accordingly.

9. On the average, how many hours each week does your husband spend on the job?

___ Less than 15, ___ 16 to 35, ___ 36 to 45,

___ 46 to 55, ___ 56 to 65, ___ More than 65

10. On the average, how many hours each week do you spend in employment outside the home?

___ Less than 15, ___ 16 to 35, ___ 36 to 45,

___ 46 to 55, ___ 56 to 65, ___ More than 65

___ I have no paid employment outside the home

11. On the average, how many hours each week does your whole family spend together in leisure activities?

___ Less than 5, ___ 6 to 10, ___ 11 to 15, ___ 16 to 20, ___ 21 to 25,

___ More than 25

12. On the average, how many combined hours do you and your husband spend each week in church activities away from home? (i.e., husband's plus wife's time)

___ None, ___ 1 to 2, ___ 3 to 5, ___ 6 to 9, ___ 10 to 12, ___ More than 12 hours
SECTION C

*Directions*: Below is a list of statements pertaining to some aspect of family home evening. Indicate your agreement with each statement by writing, in the space at the left, only one of the following numbers: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4. The meaning of each of these figures is:

0: Strongly disagree
1: Disagree
2: Undecided
3: Agree
4: Strongly agree

__13. Family home evening applies to all members and should be practiced by every family in the Church.__

__14. Family home evening should be held regularly each week in Latter-day Saint homes.__

__15. It is the father's responsibility to see that home evening is held in his family.__

__16. Family home evenings should be conducted as outlined in the Family Home Evening manual.__

__17. Except for outings and activities, family home evenings should be opened and closed with prayer and should center around the discussion of gospel principles.__

__18. Every member of the family (except very small children) should participate in family home evening.__

*Directions*: Check the one statement below which is most true for your family.

19. **We see the Family Home Evening Program as . . .**

__ . . . a program divinely revealed for the good of all L.D.S. families

__ . . . a program developed by the General Authorities and worthwhile for all L.D.S. families

__ . . . a program more worthwhile for certain families that lack unity

__ . . . largely an effort by the Church to indoctrinate its members

__ . . . just another church experiment which will probably be outdated
SECTION D

*Directions: Below is a list of issues concerning the family in general, not your own. Read all statements very carefully and respond to all of them on the basis of your own true beliefs. Do this by writing one of the following numbers in the space at the left. As with the above section, the meaning of each of these figures is:

0: Strongly disagree
1: Disagree
2: Undecided
3: Agree
4: Strongly agree

20. Children below 18 should give almost all their earnings to their parents.

21. Children below 18 should almost always obey their elder brothers and sisters.

22. A person should always consider the needs of his family as a whole more important than his own.

23. A person should always be expected to defend his family against outsiders even at the expense of his own personal safety.

24. The family should have the right to control the behavior of each of its members completely.

25. A person should always avoid every action of which his family disapproves.

26. A person should always be completely loyal to his family.

27. The members of a family should be expected to hold the same political, ethical, and religious beliefs.

28. Children below 18 should always obey their parents.

29. A person should always help his parents with the support of his younger brothers and sisters if necessary.
SECTION E

*Directions: If you HAVE held family home evening or family night within the last six months (since Nov. 1), SKIP AHEAD TO SECTION F. If you have NOT held family home evening during the last six months, answer the following questions (30 and 31).

30. Check the item below which most closely approximates the experience of your family with family home evening since the Home Evening Program was introduced (Jan. 1965):

___ We have never held it

___ We tried a few times but that was all

___ We held it 6 to 15 times but not in the last six months

___ We held it regularly for over six months but not within the last half year

___ We held it regularly for over a year but not within the last six months

31. What intentions do you and your husband have in regard to family home evening? (CHECK ONE):

___ I doubt that we will ever hold it

___ We would like to hold it sometime in the future

___ We have generally planned to begin holding it soon

___ We have already made definite plans to begin holding it within the next month

___ We have already made definite plans to begin holding it in a week or so

IF YOU HAVE ANSWERED THE ABOVE TWO QUESTIONS, SKIP AHEAD TO SECTION G (PAGE 8).
SECTION F

32. In the past six months or 25 weeks, how many family home evenings have you held? (CHECK ONE):

___ 1 to 5, ___ 6 to 10, ___ 11 to 15, ___ 16 to 20, ___ 21 to 25

33. How accurate do you feel the above estimate is?

___ Almost completely accurate, ___ Quite accurate, ___ A reasonable estimate

34. Below is a scale indicating the months which have elapsed since the Family Home Evening Program was first introduced (Jan., 1965). Please indicate when your family first began to hold home evening on a regular and consistent basis (CIRCLE THE MONTH):

1965 Jan Feb Mar Apr May June July Aug Sep Oct Nov Dec
1966 Jan Feb Mar Apr May June July Aug Sep Oct Nov Dec
1967 Jan Feb Mar Apr

35. How closely do you follow the home evening manual in preparing your family home evenings? (CHECK ONE):

___ Almost always follow the lessons as outlined

___ Almost always discuss the topic suggested by the manual

___ Usually discuss lesson in the manual, occasionally substituting a topic of our own

___ Discuss our own topic about as often as manual topic

___ Discuss mostly our own topics with an occasional lesson from the manual

___ We never refer to the manual in preparing our family home evenings
36. To what extent does your husband lead out in encouraging the family to hold family home evenings? (CHECK ONE):

___ He always leads out when he is home
___ He usually takes the lead when he is home
___ We share this responsibility about equally
___ I usually take the lead, even when he is home
___ I always take the lead but he supports me
___ He does not participate—I carry the full responsibility myself

37. To what extent do all members of the family (except very small children) participate in family home evenings? (CHECK ONE):

___ Each member has a specific part at each home evening
___ Members take turns in taking part on various nights
___ No regular assignments are given but the topics are freely discussed
___ Although present, certain members often don't participate
___ The family usually just listens to the one giving the lesson

38. How consistently have you been able to hold family home evening since you first began holding it?

___ Regularly, both in winter and summer
___ Regularly in winter but not in summer
___ Quite regularly (it went in spurts, etc.)
___ More irregularly than regularly (when we could, no set times, etc.)
___ Just on certain occasions during the year

39. Check the statement below which is most true for your family:

We hold family home evening

___ ... only when all members of the family (living at home) are present
___ ... even when one or more children are not present
___ ... even when one parent is not present
___ ... even when one parent and one or more children are not present
40. Were you holding a regular family night before the Family Home Evening Program was introduced?  ____Yes  ____No

SECTION G

*Directions: In every family somebody has to decide such things as where the family will live and so on. Many couples talk such things over first, but the final decision often has to be made by the husband or wife. For each of the issues below, please indicate who usually makes the final decision in your home. Do this by reading each statement and then writing in the space at the left, only one of the following numbers. The meaning of these figures is:

1: husband always
2: husband more than wife
3: husband and wife exactly the same
4: wife more than husband
5: wife always

Who usually makes the decision—

____41. . . . about what car to get?
____42. . . . about whether or not to buy some life insurance?
____43. . . . about what house or apartment to take?
____44. . . . about what job your husband should take?
____45. . . . about whether or not you should go to work or quit work?
____46. . . . about how much money your family can afford to spend per week on food?
____47. . . . about what doctor to have when someone is sick?
____48. . . . about where to go on a vacation?

SECTION H

*Directions: Please rate your HUSBAND on the following items:

49. Does he usually attend Sacrament Meeting?
   ____Weekly,  ____Every 2 weeks,  ____Monthly,  ____On special occasions
   ____Never
50. Does he participate in family prayer? (Do not confuse with a blessing on the food) ___Daily, ___2 or 3 times a week, ___Weekly, ___Monthly, ___Never

51. Does he use tobacco, coffee or tea, beer or stronger alcoholic beverages? ___Never, ___Rarely, ___Occasionally, ___Regularly

52. Does he agree that the financial contributions asked by the Church are too high? ___Strongly disagrees, ___Disagrees, ___Undecided, ___Agrees, ___Strongly agrees

53. Does he agree that the present General Authorities are inspired in their decisions with reference to church matters?
   ___Strongly agrees, ___Agrees, ___Undecided, ___Disagrees, ___Strongly disagrees

*Directions: Please rate YOURSELF on the following items:

54. Do you usually attend Sacrament Meeting?
   ___Weekly, ___Every 2 weeks, ___Monthly, ___On special occasions, ___Never

55. Do you participate in family prayer?
   ___Daily, ___2 or 3 times a week, ___Weekly, ___Monthly, ___Never

56. Do you use tobacco, tea, coffee, beer or stronger alcoholic beverages?
   ___Never, ___Rarely, ___Occasionally, ___Regularly

57. Do you agree that the financial contributions asked by the Church are too high?
   ___Strongly disagree, ___Disagree, ___Undecided, ___Agree ___Strongly agree

58. Do you agree that the present General Authorities are inspired in their decisions with reference to church matters?
   ___Strongly agree, ___Agree, ___Undecided, ___Disagree, ___Strongly disagree

SECTION I

*Directions: Please read the following instructions CAREFULLY.

59. Check the dot on the scale line below which best describes the degree of happiness, everything considered, of your present marriage. The middle point, "happy," represents the degree of happiness which
most people get from marriage, and the scale gradually ranges on one side to those few who are very unhappy in marriage, and on the other, to those few who experience extreme joy or felicity in marriage.

State the approximate extent of agreement or disagreement between you and your mate on the following items. Please check only one on each line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

60. Handling family finances
61. Matters of recreation
62. Demonstrations of affection
63. Friends
64. Sex relations
65. Conventionality (right, good, proper conduct)
66. Philosophy of life
67. Ways of dealing with in-laws

68. When disagreements arise, they usually result in: husband giving in ___, wife giving in ___, agreement by mutual give and take ___.

69. Do you and your mate engage in outside interests together? All of them ___, some of them ___, none of them ___.
70. In leisure time do you generally prefer: to be "on the go"__, to stay at home___? Does your mate generally prefer to be "on the go"__, to stay at home___?

71. Do you ever wish you had not married? Frequently___, Occasionally___, rarely___, never__.

72. If you had your life to live over, do you think you would: marry the same person___, marry a different person___, not marry at all___?

73. Do you confide in your mate: almost never___, rarely___, in most things___, in everything___?

SECTION J

74. All things considered, what is the greatest single obstacle to your holding (or continuing to hold) family home evening?__________________________

__________________________

75. If you are now holding family home evening regularly, who or what finally convinced you to do so?__________________________

__________________________

76. If you are now holding family home evening regularly, what effects do you think it has had on the quality of your family life?__________________________

__________________________
APPENDIX B

TABLE V
CROSS-COUNTY COMPARISONS OF OCCUPATIONAL STATUS LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPATIONAL STATUS LEVELS</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sanpete</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Major professionals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lesser professionals</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Semi-professionals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Clerical, technicians, etc.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Skilled workers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Semi-skilled workers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Unskilled workers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df = 6  \quad x^2 = 19.06  \quad p < .01
### TABLE VI

**CROSS-COUNTY COMPARISONS OF EDUCATIONAL STATUS LEVELS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATIONAL STATUS LEVELS</th>
<th>Sanpete</th>
<th>Utah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Graduate Degree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. College Graduate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Some College</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. High School</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Some High School</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Junior High School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Grade School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ df = 5 \quad x^2 = 15.56 \quad p < .01 \]
TABLE VII
CROSS-COUNTY COMPARISON OF ACCEPTANCE OF FAMILY HOME EVENING PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTITUDE TOWARD ORIGIN OF FAMILY HOME EVENING</th>
<th>SAMPLE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sanpete</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divinely inspired</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed by General Authority</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For families lacking unity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An indoctrination effort</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term experiment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{df} = 4 \]

\[ \chi^2 = 16.78 \]

\[ p < .01 \]
TABLE VIII

CROSS-COUNTY COMPARISONS OF ADOPTION OF FAMILY HOME EVENING PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES FAMILY HOME EVENING HELD IN LAST SIX MONTHS</th>
<th>SAMPLE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sanpete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (non-adopters)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From one to five times</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From six to ten times</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From eleven to fifteen times</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From sixteen to twenty times</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From twenty-one to twenty-five times</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{df} = 5 \]
\[ \chi^2 = 24.96 \]
\[ p < .001 \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE OF FAMILY LIFE CYCLE</th>
<th>SAMPLES (N = 225)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adopters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beg. to preschool</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Adolescent</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Adolescent</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Adult</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE X
FAMILY SIZE COMPARED AS TO FAMILY HOME EVENING ADOPTION AND COUNTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF CHILD, LIVING AT HOME</th>
<th>Samples (N = 225)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adopters</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 or more</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table XI

**Father's Priesthood Compared by Family Home Evening Adoption and County**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father's Office in Priesthood</th>
<th>Samples (N = 225)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adopters</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deacon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventy</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Priest</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Totals</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XII
CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN SELECTED VARIABLES 
AND HUSBAND AND WIFE ORTHODOXY 
AS REPORTED BY THE WIFE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
<th>HUSBAND ORTHODOXY</th>
<th>WIFE ORTHODOXY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>sig / lv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: Husband/employment</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: Wife/employment</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: Family Leisure</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: H/W Ch. Act.</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Toward Family Home Eve.</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of the Norms</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of Family Home Evening</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Authority</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Adjustment</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Integration</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 225  *Not significant above .05 level  df = 200
### TABLE XIII

**FAMILY HOME EVENING ADOPTION RATES FOR TOTAL SAMPLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of times family home evening was held during the preceding six month period</th>
<th>FREQUENCIES FOR TOTAL SAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to five times</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six to ten times</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleven to fifteen times</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixteen to twenty times</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twenty-one to twenty-five times</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XIV

PERIODS DURING WHICH FAMILY HOME EVENING WAS FIRST INITIATED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION: How soon after the Family Home Evening Program was introduced did you first begin holding family home evening regularly?</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the first triennium, 1965 (Jan to Apr)</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the second triennium, 1965 (May to Aug)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the third triennium, 1965 (Sep to Dec)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the first triennium, 1966 (Jan to Apr)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the second triennium, 1966 (May to Aug)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the third triennium, 1966 (Sep to Dec)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the first triennium, 1967 (Jan to Apr)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XV

CONSISTENCY WITH WHICH FAMILY HOME EVENING WAS HELD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION: How consistently have you been able to hold family home evening since you first began holding it?</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regularly, both in winter and summer</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly in winter but not in summer</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite regularly (it went in spurts etc.)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More regularly than irregularly</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just on certain occasions during the year</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>140</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XVI

**EXTENT TO WHICH FAMILY HOME EVENING MANUAL WAS USED IN PREPARING FOR FAMILY HOME EVENINGS**

**QUESTION:** How closely do you follow the home evening manual in preparing your family home evenings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always follow the lessons as outlined</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always discuss manual topic</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually discuss lesson topic with some substitution</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss own topic about as often as lesson</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss mostly own lessons, refer sometimes</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use manual in preparing home evenings</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS** | **140** | **100.0** |
TABLE XVII

DEGREE OF THE FAMILY'S RESOLVE TO HOLD
FAMILY HOME EVENING WHEN A FAMILY
MEMBER IS ABSENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION: Check the statement below which is most true for your family:</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We hold family home evening . . .</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only when all members of the family are present</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even when one or more children are not present</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even when one parent is not present</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even when a child and parent are not present</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE XVIII**

PRIOR PATTERNS OF FAMILY HOME EVENING PRACTICE
FOR THOSE WHO HAD NOT HELD HOME EVENING
WITHIN PRECEDING SIX MONTHS

**QUESTION:** Check the item below which most closely approximates the experience of your family with family home evening.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have never held family home evening</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tried a few times but that was all</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held it 5 to 15 times</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held it regularly for over six months</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held it regularly for over a year</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XIX

MAJOR OBSTACLES TO HOLDING FAMILY HOME EVENING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>SAMPLE STATEMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Inability to get family together</td>
<td>&quot;A time when all the family can be together--outside pressures and demands on time do not coincide with family home evening schedules.&quot;</td>
<td>80 33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Husband's employment</td>
<td>&quot;My husband always works late or has other things to do. When he is home someone else is gone.&quot;</td>
<td>38 16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Husband's lack of responsibility</td>
<td>&quot;Husband just needs to take more of a lead. He holds the Priesthood--and I believe he should be the example for me and our children.&quot;</td>
<td>21 8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Family indifference or dissatisfaction with home evening</td>
<td>&quot;We are together as a family as much already in different activities that we are tired of each other by the time we get to a 'set' religious activity.&quot;</td>
<td>17 7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Conflicting church activities</td>
<td>&quot;Husband belongs to BYU stake ward and family belongs to local stake and ward</td>
<td>15 6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Children too young</td>
<td>&quot;Our children are too young for the things outlined in the manual. Would rather just be together.</td>
<td>13 5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Other activities are more interesting</td>
<td>&quot;The desire and determination is lacking to properly plan the time to do so. Our time together as a family is limited and we enjoy many outside activities.&quot;</td>
<td>12 5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Lack of initiative in preparing</td>
<td>&quot;Lack of preparation.&quot;</td>
<td>10 4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>44 13.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS** 237 100.0%
TABLE XX
MOTIVATING FACTORS IN THE INITIATION OF FAMILY HOME EVENING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Desire or need felt within the family</td>
<td>&quot;Seeing the need to get better acquainted with our children and seeing the need for spiritual development for all of us.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| B. Concreteness of the program and manual gave incentive | "This year's lessons are geared so well to realistic family situations."
"We always felt the need but until we had a lesson plan to follow we only had them when we had a topic to discuss." | 10 | 9.3 |
| C. Desire to conform to appeals of church and leaders | "The message given by Harold B. Lee at General Priesthood Conference, and the promise that we would not have one wayward child if we done (sic) this to the best of our ability." | 36 | 33.2 |
| D. Perceived as divinely inspired | "We know it came from our Heavenly Father and we want to obey." | 15 | 13.9 |
| E. Testimonial of friend or relative | "My husband's family have held home evenings 25 years monthly--12 children--12 temple marriages and complete family unity." | 8 | 7.4 |
| TOTALS | 108 | 100.0 |
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ABSTRACT

In an effort to cope with forces which would remove the home from its place of influence, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints recently inaugurated the Family Home Evening Program. Emerging out of a fifty year history of efforts to institute the home evening practice, it is one of the most systematic and comprehensive efforts to date to implement change within the structure of its member families.

Such a deliberate and predetermined effort toward improving the family system constitutes what applied social scientists call "planned change." Home evening, when adopted, has many of the elements of a behavior known as "family ritual." Inasmuch as the church has attempted to institute a ritual practice which the family itself would normally initiate, the Family Home Evening Program becomes, to the social scientists, an interesting social experiment.

The family itself must ultimately make the decision as to what extent it will adopt any advocated innovation. Factors within the culture of individual families will play a prominent role in determining to what extent they will be susceptible to the influence of a change agent. This then, becomes a starting place for the investigation of the family home evening. Within this context, the present investigation had two objectives: (1) to explore patterns of family home evening acceptance and adoption, and (2) to explore the relationships between acceptance and adoption of family home evening and certain selected variables.
In order to accomplish these aims, questionnaires were administered to a sample of 225 L. D. S. mothers living in two residential areas, one rural (Sanpete County) and one suburban (Utah County), with the assistance of ninth-grade students in the L. D. S. seminaries. By means of these questionnaires, it was ascertained to what extent families in each subsample area had accepted and adopted home evening, and other factors of their acceptance or non-acceptance.

When compared along selected dimensions, Sanpete and Utah County subsamples differed significantly above the criterion level of .05. For example, Utah County respondents reported a substantially higher rate of adoption than Sanpete County respondents. Both subsamples revealed a lower adoption ratio in the early adolescent stage of the life cycle and tendencies for the rate of adoption to vary directly with the size of the family and father's rank in the priesthood.

After testing the association between several independent variables and the dependent variables (acceptance and adoption of home evening), certain relationships proved to be statistically significant above the required level. Although family social status, time spent by parents in religious activities, and marital adjustment were all positively correlated with family home evening adoption, the relatedness of these factors was limited. Each of the dependent variables was substantially correlated with orthodoxy of husband and wife, suggesting that home evening acceptance and adoption were facets of the same dimension—orthodoxy.
The questionnaire revealed several patterns emerging in home evening practice. For example, it was found that fathers tend to lead as much or more than mothers in initiating home evenings; the manual is used extensively in preparing home evening; a majority of families do not hold home evening unless the entire family is together; most of the non-adopters in the sample had no definite intentions for beginning home evening within a specified time in the future.

The inability of the family to get together was the greatest obstacle to holding home evening. A majority of families reported that they began home evenings because they felt a need or they desired to conform to church expectations. Over 90 percent of those who had attempted home evening reported that they felt it had added to the quality of their family life. To the reader, appeals were made to exercise caution in the interpretation of results.

From the findings, the researcher derived a number of theoretical implications and made some suggestions for practical application.
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