Some Factors Affecting the Frequency and

Status of University Students' "Dating" Behavior

by

Neil William Macdonald


A Thesis submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Arts

in the Department of

Psychology


We accept this thesis as conforming to

the standard required from candidates

for the degree of Master of Arts.



Members of the Department of

Psychology


The University of British Columbia

April, 1960

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for an advanced degree at the University
of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make
it freely available for reference and study. I further
agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis
for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Head of my
Department or by his representatives. It is understood
that copying or publication of this thesis for financial
gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of _Psychology_

The University of British Columbia,
Vancouver 8, Canada.

Date _April 21, 1960_

# SOME FACTORS AFFECTING THE FREQUENCY AND STATUS OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' "DATING" BEHAVIOR

## Abstract

The object of this study was to investigate the relationship of various factors affecting the frequency and status of "dating" behavior. The techniques used were (a) a Subjective Survey, to obtain item possibilities for the Questionnaire and to define terms; (b) a specially constructed Questionnaire, to explore the relationship between a wide variety of personal characteristics of young people and their frequency and status of dating; (c) the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey and a separate section requiring each subject to report his "dating" behavior, to explore relationships between 10 personality traits and the frequency and status of dating.

The findings may be divided into three sections. The Subjective Survey defined the terms "date" and "go steady" and established popular conceptions of the infrequent, frequent and "go steady" types of "dater". The Questionnaire findings found 46 separate items to be significantly related to frequency of dating. Briefly summarized the items could be classified under the following headings: (a) physical factors; (b) clothes; (c) automobiles; (d) active and passive activities (athletics, dancing, listening to jazz); (e) moral factors (smoking, drinking) and (f) previous "dating" experience. The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey and the special section on "dating" behavior found three traits, A-Ascendance, F-Friendliness, S-Sociability, significantly related to the frequency of dating in females; and two traits, G-General Activity and S-Sociability, significantly related to the frequency of dating in males.

The writer's Theory of Normal-Neurotic Sexual Choice was formulated in an attempt to explain some unexplored areas in the field.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

CONTENTS

CONTENTS

TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM


Probably since the beginning of recorded time, man has puzzled over the mysteries of mating. Only recently has the social scientist explored this problem.

What makes mating the focal point of such interest? The answer possibly stems from the breadth and universality of the problem. The process of mating is related to such social problems as divorce, prostitution, sexual perversion and bachelorhood; to such institutions as the church, the family, the school system and the work situation; to such universal and everyday happenings as the birth and raising of children; to such academic problems as adolescent develop-ment and personality theory.

The understanding of mating is of prime concern to the marriage counsellor, the school teacher, the preacher, the parent and, of course, the unmarried and married.

The crux of the problem involves the question of sexual choice: what factors determine an individual's choice of mate?

In North America, the mate-choice question is further complicated by the peculiar, recent Western World phenomenon called "dating". To understand the mate-selection system, one must first understand the date-selection system.

It is the principal aim of this study to investigate the relationship of various factors affecting the frequency and

status of dating behavior.

A Subjective Survey was employed to define terms and obtain item possibilities for use in a questionnaire. A questionnaire was constructed and used to explore the relationship between a wide variety of personality and activity characteristics of young people and their frequency and status of dating. A personality test (the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey) was utilized to explore relationships between personality traits and dating behavior.

CHAPTER 11

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND RELEVANT STUDIES


Just when the scientific analysis of sexual behavior

commenced is difficult to ascertain. If one means science

in the narrowest of terms, that is, showing definite re-

produceable results, then the analysis has hardly

started. But, if one is more lax and takes science in

broad terms, sexual behavior was probably first studied

scientifically in the late 19th Century. Granted, an

interest in sex may be traced to the dawn of recorded

history (Lewinsohn, 1958, pp. 2-4). But, it was not

until the time of Charles Darwin, Sigmund Freud and

Havelock Ellis that sex came under scientific scrutiny.

It was not until 1904 that the study of adolescent be-

havior was put on empirical foundations with the work of

G. Stanley Hall (1904). 1929 marked the first theory of

dating (Waller, 1937); 1958, the first laboratory studies

of love (Harlow, 1958).

Since the field of study is so young, an attempt to

classify the various theories, studies, scraps and pieces

into a system for further research and analysis has been

made. The classification is based on (a) the theorist's

proposed mode of selection (eg. sexual stimulation) and

(b) the scientific approach used (biological, sociologi-

4

cal, anthropological, psychological). Table 1 is a condensation of the various theories.

-----------------------------------------------------

TABLE 1

-----------------------------------------------------

1. Pre-destination theory

This category is reserved for the non-scientific theories, held by laymen, that choice has a "mystical-magical" basis - the individual just meets the so-called "right one" and immediately "falls in love".

The Westerner's traditional theory of mating is embodied in this predestined, "one person" theory. The theme appears in varying forms — in novels, movies, songs, even everyday speech. The basic idea is that there is only one person meant for another.

2. "Promiscuity"

This category takes in theories postulating that choice is completely random — that no laws are operant in mate selection.

Many of the early scientific theories stem from attempted explanations of family evolution. Bachofen cited in Groves and Groves (1934, pp. 8-17), Morgan (1878) and McLennan (1886, 1896) each proposed somewhat similar explanations. Each saw man beginning in a promiscuous state and gradually moving from group to

TABLE 1

PRINCIPAL DATING-MATING THEORIES

| System of Selection | Description | Author(s) |
|---|---|---|
| 1. "Predestination" | 'only one' person meant for another | Folklore |
| 2. "Promiscuity" | Basically promiscuous, mate indiscriminately | Bachofen Morgan McLennan |
| 3. "Simple biological" | Aesthetic preference | Darwin |
| | Simple sensory stimulation | Ellis |
| | Mate to complete maleness, femaleness | Weininger |
| 4. "Socio-biological" | Discrepancy between biological-emotional maturation. Mate to relieve sex tensions. | Davis Groves Brooks |
| 5. "Social" | Assortative mating (homogamy, propinquity); likes attract, spatial proximity | Galton Schiller |
| | Dating is positive; learn how to get along. | Lowrie Burgess Locke Blood |
| | Dating is negative; functionless | Waller Herman |
| 6. "Empathy" | Role-playing; learn to interpret behavior of the other (emotional emphasis) | Vernon Stewart Groves Groves LeMasters |
| 7. "Personality" | Dominance drive; mate to dominate | Adler |
| | Parental image; unconsciously seek mate who resembles opposite sex parent | Freud |
| | Complementary needs; opposites attract | Winch |

(Continued)

TABLE 1

PRINCIPAL DATING-MATING THEORIES

(Continued)

| System of Selection | Description | Author(s) |
|---|---|---|
| | Preferential mating; pick person who has admired characteristics | Fleege Hollings-worth |
| 8. "Integrative" | Merging of several theories | Bossard Boll |

individual marriage. Their major assumption was that man is basically promiscuous and therefore will mate with any member of the opposite sex available. Man became monogamous when he switched from being a hunter to being a farmer.

Lewinsohn (1958, p. 14) discusses this 19th Century controversy:

> No one knows what the position was in prehistoric times, but analogies from among the surviving primitive peoples show monogamy to be the practice...in most primitive hordes, which possess only vestiges of tribal organization.

One value of Bachofen, Morgan and McLennan's theorizing is the suggestion that sexual choice may be purely random and not scientifically lawful.

3. "Simple biological"

This category includes theories having a biological basis to sexual choice as opposed to a sociological or psychological basis.

Charles Darwin, who revitalized evolutionary theory by proposing the ideas of "survival of the fittest" and "natural selection", also presented a unique system of mate selection. He (1859, p. 97) believed that man and animals selected mates on the

basis of aesthetic preferences. His postulates
raise the problem of beauty.

Havelock Ellis (1904) opposed Darwin's views,
arguing that both human and animal mate selection
rested on simple sensory stimulations (touch, smell,
hearing, vision) and that the one you "loved" was the
one who was most capable of stimulating these senses.

An interesting contribution to the biologically-
slanted interpretations was the physical, almost
"one person" theory proposed by Otto Weininger. He
believed that people were composed of degrees of
maleness and femaleness. His principal postulate
was that:

> For true sexual union it is
> necessary that there come
> together a complete male (M)
> and a complete female (F),
> even although in different
> cases the M and F are distri-
> buted between the two individ-
> uals in different proportions.
>
> (Weininger, 1932-5, p. 29)

For example, if a male were 3/4 male, 1/4 female;
then his proper mate would be 1/4 male, 3/4 female.
Extreme maleness would seek out extreme femaleness and
so on.

The important ramification of Weininger's theory
is that theoretically it accounts for relative beauty.

Interestingly enough, however, Weininger rejected
Darwin's aesthetic factor arguing that aesthetic
preferences involve judgments void of sexuality.
Weininger believed the attraction was physical-
sexual.

In an intriguing analysis using evolution theory,
he traced the complete maleness-femaleness theme through
the plant and animal kingdoms. He thought the law was
widespread — eg. the mating of bisexual plants, etc.

He postulated that sterility and divorce occured
when a wrong pair mated — a childless marriage was
a loveless one. As a final complication, Weininger
theorized that the selection system probably under-
went change with age. This was logical since the system
was biologically based.

4. "Socio-biological"

This category includes theories which incorporate
biological and sociological systems of sexual choice.

Probably as a reaction to the 19th Century's ex-
treme biological emphasis, 20th Century investigators
leaned toward the social aspects of the problem.
Some, however, retained certain physiological leanings.

Davis (1955) is a prime example of this socio-
biological approach. He reasoned that mating involves
(1) a marital choice brought about by personal attach-
ment coupled with a (11) frustration of sex leading to
repression, which forces one to marry to relieve sexual

tensions. Davis stated also that our society is under-
going continual change with the result that systems of
choice may be changing.

Williams (1959), another sociologist, agreed almost
completely with Davis and added that: (a) in American
Society no true ceremonies help the transition from
adolescence to adulthood; (b) the youth has a career-
marriage conflict; (c) it is difficult for the youth to
break from parental authority and security.

Davis' presentation parallels the 1934 hypothesis
of Groves and Brooks (1934, pp. 257-272), who applied a
physiological basis to a trial-and-error process of
learning in mating-dating. They stated that since the
sexual functions reach maturity early while the intellec-
tual functions mature late, the choice of mate is apt to
be determined by sex preferences unguided by intellect.

5. "Social"

This category includes theories which postulate
sociological determinants to be of primary importance to
sexual choice as compared to biological or psychological
determinants.

Malinowski (1927), Margaret Mead (1949), Blum (1953)
and others asserted that courtship was dependent on
culture. They stressed customs, goals, personal relation-
ships and beliefs. Their work led to the comparative
analysis of cultural sex behaviors.

In North America, the culture-oriented thinkers
attempted to define the limits of marital possibil-
ities. There are, of course, limitations; eg. (Woods,
1959, p. 343) Negroes can marry whites in only 18
American states. The group, however, were more in-
terested in the subtle determining forces. This led
to the theories of homogamy — tendency to marry
peoples like ourselves; and propinquity — tendency
to marry people in spatial proximity to ourselves.
Actually, the theories of homogamy and propinquity
could best be grouped under assortative mating
(Baber, 1939, p. 143), the "conscious or unconscious
tendency of an individual to select a mate having
certain characteristics similar to his own."

Up to now we have mingled mating and dating
selection together as if they were one. The question,
of course, was soon to arise: does one pick a date
by the same standard as he would pick a mate? Since
the answer still eludes us, both mate and date selection
enter our analysis.

Willard Waller shook the foundations of all prev-
ious theory in 1929 when he proposed that there was a
distinct difference between courtship and dating.
Waller's definitions were based on the individual's
attitudes.

Courtship was (Waller in Wilson & Kolb, 1949, p. 611):

> The set of processes of association
> among the unmarried from which, in
> time, permanent matings usually
> emerge...excludes those associations
> which cannot normally eventuate in
> marriage — as between Negro and
> white...

Dating, on the other hand, was a dalliance process (Waller in Wilson & Kolb, 1949, p. 612); a thrill-seeking, exploitative relationship. According to Waller, the criteria of date selection included such things as dancing ability, physical attractiveness, neat appearance, smooth manners, access to an automobile, popularity with the peer group, etc.

Mating came when the time and circumstances were appropriate. Cultural conditioning through suggestions and examples gave rise to the romantic ideal within the person. The individual was frustrated through the dalliance process of dating; the frustration heightened the impulse to be married; a person presented himself or herself and marriage followed.

Thus, to Waller, the individual dated for thrills and married when bored with the dalliance dating system.

Waller postulated also the dating-mating of socially rejected people. Those who didn't fit the dating criterion, who were not physically attractive, not well-dressed, etc., eventually flocked together

and mated.

An intriguing aside that Waller postulated was his theory of least interest (Waller in Wilson & Kolb, 1949, p. 617): "that person controls who is less interested in the continuation of the affair."

Waller's theories led to a host of studies. Pro and con opinions were advanced. Basically, he had set forth a "dating is negative" theory, which saw dating as having no useful function as a preparation for mating.

R. D. Herman (1956) supported the "dating is negative" approach, by emphasizing the "Go-Steady Complex". He reasoned that random dating gave one only a superficial knowledge of people, and was therefore not an adequate preparation for marriage. "Going steady", on the other hand, served several functions: (1) it allowed social security for a date (predictability); (2) it removed one from the discomfort of competing for dates; (3) it was less exploitive and gave the individual a real chance to interact with someone.

A "dating is positive" theory was proposed by Lowrie (1951). He acknowledged Waller's exploitative side as a possibility, but considered dating to serve a positive learning function. (Obviously learning does occur. The real problem is to determine: what is

learned and how is it learned?) Waller believed dating
only teaches one to date. Herman followed the idea
that since we are a monogamous society; monogamy in
dating was the only true training for mating. Lowrie
(1951, p. 336) hypothesized that there was:

> a gradual, almost unconscious
> development from the customs
> of our courtship whereby young
> people obtain the training and
> experience needed for sensible
> selection of mates.

Burgess and Locke (1945, 1951) saw dating as an
end in itself, having many positive functions. They
maintained that personal values were replacing older
sacred and sociological values in dating; eg. getting
along with people, rating among the peer group, etc.
Davis (1955) opposed this view, maintaining that the
mores have changed, not the individual's personal
values.

Blood (1955, 1956) was another "dating is posi-
tive" theorist. Blood hypothesized that students
preferred an exploitative-free system which was
casual, friendly and easy-going. He believed dating
was dependent on maturity, intelligence, affectionate
behavior and other factors reflecting good human re-
lations. Thus, Blood refuted the early beliefs of
Margaret Mead, Geoffrey Gorer and Waller cited in

Wilson and Kolb (1949), that dating taught one only to date and didn't lead to good mate selection. Blood believed that the dating pattern was very complex due to heterogeneous groupings, but it was still very functional.

One should note that a moral trend crept into the Wallerian question. Since each investigator, from Margaret Mead onward, was subtly trying to throw light on why Americans divorce more often than anyone else, they focussed on the preliminaries to mating — some seeking the good; some, the bad aspects.

6. "Empathy"

This category includes theories which emphasize the importance of learning how to sympathically under-stand the role of the other.

Another set of theorists seemed more interested in the actual learning that took place in dating. Of these, Vernon and Stewart (1957) considered empathy a key factor. Empathy is the ability to play a role, that is, to understand the position, feelings and wants of the other.

Groves and Groves (1947, p. 362) earlier had out-lined the selection basis of dating as being dependent on personality needs — the individual coming to recognize, accept and partially meet the other's de-mands. E. H. Groves had earlier supported a socio-

biological approach. (See page *10*)

LeMasters (1957, pp. 100, 113-4), who supported
Lowrie's positive learning theory by stating that
dating teaches one the skills necessary in our urban,
mobile society, believed also that the ability to
interpret the other's behavior was essential to health-
ful marital adjustment.

7. "Personality"

This category includes theories which postulate
personality or psychological determinants as the primary
selective factors as compared to theories which empha-
size biological determinants.

Paralleling all the sociologically-emphasized
developments were certain psychologically-oriented
approaches. To outline their progress to the present,
one must go back again to the 19th Century.

Sigmund Freud, like Bachofen, Morgan and McLennan,
was interested in family evolution. Freud (in Brill,
1938) saw man arising from a primal horde in antiquity
to a position where patriarchal rule reigned. At
birth, the individual showed primal narcissism, sex-
uality was uncontrolled. Socialization was the
gradual limiting of this primary sex drive and its
channeling through a series of physical focal points —
oral, anal and, finally, genital. The individual
couldn't attain a satisfactory sex adjustment or
marriage unless the genital stage was reached.

Thus, to select normally the individual had to reach the genital stage. Secondly, however, the individual unconsciously would seek a mate resembling the parent of the opposite sex (Freud in Kirkpatrick, 1937).

Alfred Adler, another psychoanalyst, postulated a dominance drive, which had an organic basis. He (Adler, 1924) argued that the ultimate goal of everyone was to obtain complete masculinity. In relation to mating, he considered the yielding of self in a heterosexual relationship only an indirect way of attaining domination over another.

It should be noted that Freudian theory emphasizes the biological and the abnormal. A complete understanding of the Freudian and Neo-Freudian viewpoints on mating-dating would require considerable time and space. A thorough analysis of the psychoanalytic approach to sex would be a separate study in itself. Since this is only a general survey, only Freud and Adler's views were presented as examples of the psychoanalytic viewpoint.

A theory involving a synthesis of the sociological and psychological viewpoints was developed by Winch. His theory of complementary needs (1955, 1958) is summarized by LeMasters (1957, p. 248):

> While recognizing that mate-
> selection has been found to

> be homogamous with respect to
> numerous social characteristics
> (religion, socioeconomic status,
> etc.)...with respect to individ-
> ual motivation (or at the psychic
> level) mate-selection tends to be
> complementary rather than homogamous.

Winch asked the important question: why does one pick such-and-such an individual from within the limit- ed range of homogamous possibilities? Certainly one may marry within his religion, his race, his educa- tional group; but what are the factors that determine choice within these limits?

Another personality-oriented theory to oppose assortative mating analysis was the theory of prefer- ential mating (Baber, 1939, p. 145):

> the conscious or unconscious
> choice of a mate because of
> certain desirable characteristics,
> whether or not these are possessed
> to any marked degree by the one
> doing the choosing.

In relation to very early dating and "crushes", Hollingsworth (1928) and Fleege (1945) take the preferential mating approach. They see these attach- ments as a kind of affection involving jealousies and demands. Fleege believes that the "crush" is a projection of an ideal because the object just happens to possess a few admired traits.

8. "Integrative"

This category includes theories attempting to
merge all three aspects — biological, sociological
and psychological — into an integrated explanation
of sexual choice.

With so many opposing views, so many investigators
attempting to answer so many different sets of questions,
there was obviously room for synthesis. An example of
this is the presentation of a series of interesting
comments on American dating patterns by Bossard and
Boll (1958, pp. 54-68). They believed that dating
(dancing, parties) didn't have the same atmosphere as
marriage (sitting at home), thus agreeing with Waller
et al. Dating behavior is still changing from that of
a generation ago, agreeing with Blood et al. Sex is
forbidden resulting in loneliness and marriage may
result out of this desperation or loneliness, agree-
ing with Davis, Groves and Brooks. Bossard and Boll
state also that marriage is a status-achieving device,
agreeing with Waller again; and that women are taught
"the art of retreat that subtly beckons", agreeing
with Margaret Mead et al.

Relevant Studies

We now turn to a consideration of research rel-
evant to each of the eight foregoing approaches to

date-mate selection.

1. "<u>Pre-destination</u>"

The pre-destination theory postulated that only one person suited another. The basis of selection was both psychological and physiological; but tended to ignore sociological aspects. Most social scientists regard the traditional theory as myth. Hurlock (1955, p. 17) writes:

> few adolescents find the happiness
> from their romantic experiences
> that they have dreamed of since
> their fairy-tale days, when all
> romances ended happily and the
> couple 'lived happily ever after.'

The pre-destination theory stresses an important point — that, perhaps, there are only a few suitable partners for any one person. LeMasters hints this when he states (1957, p. 59):

> Of the millions of potential
> partners in the world, or in
> the United States, we will...
> get to know only a few. The
> real problem is to choose <u>the
> most compatible person avail-
> able to us</u>.

LeMasters quotes a study (1957, p. 60) where girls who had dated 70 or more boys considered only five as suitable marriage partners.

An important criticism of the pre-destination

theory is that apparently one can marry the "wrong"
one, especially in certain cultural settings. Bossard
and Boll state (1958, p. 12): "Approximately one-half
of all divorces reported in the world each year are
granted in the United States."

Other investigators have pointed out that the
selection based on predestination can be ineffective.
Burgess and Cottrell (1939) report that 21.5% of
their married sample admitted being unhappy; Lang
(1932) found 15.8% of his sample defining themselves
as unhappy; Popenoe's study cited in Bossard and Boll
(1958, p. 13) sampled 20,000 people married more than
five years, found between 20 and 40% unhappy. In
addition, LeMasters (1957, p. 55) writes: "many hus-
bands can enjoy their wives sexually and still not
enjoy being married to them."

2. "Promiscuity"

Bachofen (in Groves and Groves, 1934), Morgan
(1878) and McLennan (1886, 1896) argued that man start-
ed in a group marriage state and moved through polygamy
to monogamy. Their hypothesis seems to suggest that
the more primitive tribes even today should be shading
toward the earlier forms of marriage. LeMasters (1957,
p. 26) lists the number of societies presently practic-
ing the different forms: monogamy, 43; polygyny, 193;
polyandry, 2; group marriage, 0. He goes on to state
that the polygynic societies were all basically monogam-

ous, however, due to economic conditions.

Woods (1959, pp. 38-41) presents an important point when she states that both polyandry and polygyny probably arise out of an imbalanced sex ratio. In other words, multiple marriage probably may stem from a shortage of males or females; not necessarily because man is basically promiscuous.

In the 1920's, Katharine Davis (1929) reported only 7% of 2,000 women sampled admitted premarital relations. This does not seem to support promiscuity theory. People have argued, however, that Kinsey's findings (1948, 1953) support promiscuity theory. But his findings are difficult to interpret. For example: Kinsey reported that over 50% of the females sampled did not have premarital relations. This may be interpreted as being either for or against promiscuity theory.

Man may have been promiscuous in the beginning, but the evidence suggests that promiscuity is probably a resultant of several factors: unbalanced sex ratio, marital maladjustment, cultural patterning, rather than being some inborn drive.

It is probably unsound to ask whether man is basically promiscuous or not. It would be better to ask: what are the biological, sociological and

psychological factors leading to promiscuity?

3. "Simple Biological"

Very little research work is relevant to the simple biological approaches of Darwin, Ellis and Weininger. Many studies (Woods, 1959) reveal that both sexes rate physical attractiveness as an important factor influencing both date and mate selection.

The findings of comparative psychologists would reflect negatively on a biological-based theory. Young gives the general point-of-view by stating (Young in Stone, 1955, p. 119):

> as mammals have evolved, psychic
> and cultural factors have become
> more important, while the import-
> ance of purely hormonal factors
> have decreased...

Nissen (in Stone, 1955, pp. 446-7) found "The general rule (that) the stronger male (got) most of the females." This questions Weininger's theory, which would seem to favor a one-to-one selection basis, not one animal gaining extreme favorable status.

4. "Socio-biological"

Kingsley Davis (1955), Groves and Brooks (1934) proposed the theory of American social codes holding the biological urges in check too profoundly, re-sulting in a marriage to relieve sexual tension. Bossard and Boll (1958), who formulated an integrated

approach, agreed with the marriage-out-of-loneliness scheme. Davis added the theme of rapid cultural change.

That the age of sexual maturation and the age of marital possibility are not in conjunction in our society is an easily accepted fact. Any North American comparison of physiological findings regarding age at onset of puberty with statistical records of age at first marriage would reveal marked discrepancies.

That rapid social change has occured is also markedly evident (Woods, 1959): a rapid population increase, especially in Western States; a movement from rural to urban economy; a continual residential mobility (20% of U.S. citizens move within one year); three wars and two depressions; an increase in female population; a tremendous increase in percentage of adolescents in schools; a marked extension in the average length of life — the list could go on and on. No one would dispute these facts. One would also agree that the 20th Century American urban family is far less a functional unit than the 19th Century rural family.

The question posed by the socio-biological approach is: does one marry due to sex tensions and loneliness?

Ehrmann (1955, pp. 48-53) found sexual conquest a definite reason for the middle class male to date the lower class female. This tends to support socio-

biological thinking.

LeMasters' earlier cited finding (1957, p. 55) that: "many husbands can enjoy their wives sexually and still not enjoy being married to them" also supports the socio-biological approach.

5. "Social"

(a) Assortative Mating

Assortative mating is one area where considerable evidence has been gathered. The principles of homogamy and propinquity seem to operate. The following is a brief summary of the more significant studies:

Schiller (1932) found people mated homogamously regarding physical traits (age, height, weight, hair and eye color); and mental traits (association reactions, arithmetic reasoning, information and opinions). No evidence was found for order of birth, number of siblings, vocabulary, temperamental or emotional traits. Schiller's study may be criticized in that his group was already married — that is, he did not study those who were rejected.

Smith and Greenberg Monane (1953) found that for dates, the educated preferred the educated; the highly intelligent, the highly intelligent.

Burgess and Wallin (1944) found some correlation for height. Baber (1939, p. 81) reports that the deaf tend to marry the deaf. He also found general intelli-

gence to be a homogamic factor.

Winch (1955) found American wives resembled their husbands in race, religion, socioeconomic status and intelligence. Groves and Groves (1947, p. 336) cite Mitchell's study which demonstrated that Vassar graduates married childhood friends 26% of the time. They cite (1947, p. 337) Marvin's study also, which used a sample of 49,000 and found that there was a 2.8 times better than chance possibility that one would marry someone in the same occupation. He found also that 90% of Bryn Mawr graduates married college graduates and that 60% married professional people. Bossard (1940) showed that there is a marked trend to marry someone within six blocks of one's residence. Kennedy (1942-3) found marked ethnic endogamy. Percentages for her sample ran: Negroes, 100%; Jews, 100%; Italians, 80%; British Americans, 77%.

Partridge (1934) found propinquity to be a factor even in the selection of friends.

Evidence for the success of assortative mating is given by investigating what happens when homogamy isn't a factor in marriage. Regarding religion, Bossard and Boll (1958, pp. 87-88) state:

> Between two and three times as
> many marriages result in divorce
> and separation in Roman Catholic-
> Protestant unions than when the

couples are of the same faith.

In regard to color differences:

the out-married have a higher divorce
rate than the in-married.

(Baber, 1939, pp. 162-3)

The evidence establishes assortative mating as
a definite sociological fact.

(b) Dating is positive in function

Blood was the major theorist postulating that
dating had positive functions. In his 1955 study he
asked college subjects to check norms about date
selection they thought to be in existence. He found
that they tended to mark personality items as being
more important (93% support) than Wallerian items
(55% support). His data, however, may be interpreted
in either way. For example: 98% of his female sample
wanted their dates to be neat in appearance; 90%
wanted them to dress appropriately; 50% wanted them to
dance well. These are all Wallerian factors.

It is the writer's opinion that Blood's data reveals
that: (1) people do not wish to define themselves as
mercenary regarding dating because only 6% checked that
their date should have plenty of money; 17% that their
date needed a car. (2) Blood's data support rather
than refute Waller's theory because males wanted females:

neat in appearance (100%), appropriately dressed (94.7%), having polished manners (70.5%) and dancing skills (57.6%). (3) It particularly hints that Waller's dalliance process operates since the Wallerian choice items were rated higher for casual than serious dates: dancing ability was rated important by 54.7% for a casual date and 33.7% for a serious date. Waller would say the change in emphasis was due to the attitude change from thrill-oriented to courtship-oriented.

In his 1956 study, Blood used a questionnaire technique and claimed further support for his theories. He found the following to be important in date selection: (1) is pleasant and cheerful; (2) has a sense of humor; (3) is a good sport; (4) is natural; (5) is considerate; (6) is neat in appearance.

The different interpretations of Blood's work stem from the following: in his 1955 study, he asked subjects to check: (1) the norm they thought to be in existence; (2) the way they dated in regard to the norm; (3) the way they would date for a marriage mate. His findings showed a tendency for the answers from the third group (marriage-oriented) to follow his theorizing: eg. for the item "dance well", the perceived norm was 70.1%; the casual date, 49.3%; and the serious date, 29.1%. Statistically significant changes were shown for dancing, manners, socially prominent and fraternity

items.

Blood interpreted these changes in favor of his casual, well-rounded personality approach. On the other hand, his findings could be interpreted to demonstrate that American College youth believe other's dates are chosen on trivial criteria, but their own dates are not, especially when marriage is a serious possibility.

Lowrie (1951) put forth perhaps the most comprehensive comparison of dating theories. His findings may be summerized as follows: 41% of boys and 39% of girls supported "affection" and "selection of mate" as the reason they dated; 28% of boys and 39% of girls gave "learning to adjust" and "gaining poise and ease" as the reasons they dated; 30% of boys and 20% of girls gave Wallerian reasons for their dating. Lowrie's data revealed definite support for the learning approach and moderate support for Waller's exploitative element.

In a later study, Lowrie (1956) found four factors affected dating frequency: (1) sex: females date more than males; (2) age: older people date more than younger; (3) age at which dating begins: earlier "dater" dated more; (4) dating status: "going steady" group dated more than random "daters".

(c) Dating is negative in function

Much of what was discussed under positive dating theory obviously dealt with negative dating theory.

The dating is positive theorists would have difficulty explaining the American divorce rate (Lewinsohn, 1958, p. 397) which has rapidly accelerated in the past 60 years: eg. 1890, one divorce to every 18 marriages; 1945, one divorce to every four marriages. Kinsey's finding (1948) that 40% of the males sampled were unfaithful to their wives supports negative dating theory and questions positive dating theory. The studies, cited on page 21, concerning marital unhappiness, also cast doubt on dating is positive theory.

Crist (1953) used a personal, structured interview technique to investigate high school dating. He divided his sample into lower levels (grade 9) and upper levels (grades 10-12). His major findings were that (a) dating was not marriage-oriented (85.2% of students rarely, or never considered dates as possible mates); (b) the lower level group commenced dating because it was socially expected; (c) 50% of the subjects reported that their first date was not enjoyable because of shyness, etc.; (d) "going steady" was a matter of social convenience offering security, increased status and relief from competition problems. Crist supports Waller in that early dating is definitely not courtship. He also supports positive learning theory in that early dating is a socialization process.

Smith (1952, pp. 312-7) replicated Waller's

initial research. Although Smith found that rapid
social change in the economic and moral spheres had
made some of Waller's original items obsolete, he did
find general support for the "Rating-Dating" Complex.
Norms rated highest by both sexes were: (a) manners,
appearance; (b) dance well; (c) physical attractiveness;
(d) good clothes. Smith's study is one of the most
important for Wallerian students.

Le Masters (1957, pp. 60-112) criticized Blood's
method of asking questions: eg. "What qualities do
you look for in a good date?" LeMasters contended
that this elicits the answer to the question: "What
should you look for?" not "What do you actually look
for?" LeMasters believed that observation, used by
Waller, or interview techniques produced more reason-
able results. Using the latter technique, he inter-
viewed hundreds of students and found (1957, p. 105)
an extremely superficial criteria for dating selection:
(a) clothes; (b) physical shape; (c) smile; (d) hair
style, etc.

In the final summary of his findings (1957, p. 113),
LeMasters agreed with Waller's exploitative theory,
stating: "Some persons do not have this ability to con-
trol emotion (they therefore can) often be exploited
and hurt". He agreed also with "empathy" theory, postu-
lating that the ability to interpret the other's behavior

correctly was essential otherwise one could be easily hurt or led astray.

Pressey and Robinson (1944) found support for Waller's theory when they sampled an adolescent group. The girls valued (a) appearance, (b) grooming, (c) good manners and (d) good dancers; the boys valued (a) good manners, (b) good talkers, (c) good dancers, etc.

Waller's exploitative element gained more support from Kirkpatrick and Kanin's study (1957) on male sex aggression. Their study revealed that 55.7% of 291 girls reported they were offended during one college year at some level of erotic intimacy. The following percentages of offence were given: very early date, 48.5%; regular or steady date, 43.3%; pinned, engaged, 8.2%. Kirkpatrick and Kanin concluded (1957, p. 58):

> There is evidence on one campus
> suggesting that in courtship
> relationships there is a progressive
> pattern of exploitation, involvement,
> ambivalent resistance, awareness of
> shared stigma and reduced reliance
> upon institutional controls with
> corresponding stress on control
> within the dyadic relationship.

Kirkpatrick and Caplow (1945), using a question-naire technique, found (p. 119):

> some evidence men undergo increas-
> ing relative maladjustment because
> of their double burden of mate-
> finding and mate-supporting.

They concluded, however, that there was no
evidence the men protected themselves by having the
casual attitude to dating suggested by Waller. There
was no real trend when subjects were asked: "Did you
worry about becoming too involved?" Kirkpatrick and
Caplow reported also that about 50% claimed no adjust-
ment problems after the affair ended. Waller had
postulated that there would be progressive fear of
involvement after each breakup, that breakup would
have fierce emotional hurt. How Kirkpatrick and
Caplow's findings reflect on this is debatable.

Ausubel refutes Waller's position that fear of
involvement and emotional hurt from old affairs less-
ened a person's ability to love. He stated that
there was an (1954, p. 427) "increasing degree of
affectional success in successive love affairs."
This supports "dating is positive" learning theory.
But, Byrd's evidence (1956, pp. 26, 41) that second
marriages are less enduring than first marriages
questions Ausubel's conclusion.

Herman (1955) presented the other "dating is
negative" theory when he supported the "Going Steady
Complex". Herman used a questionnaire and term
essay technique with college students. He found
that (pp. 36-40) "going steady" was the preferred
norm (45% "went steady"). He concluded that there

were two types of "going steady": (a) marriage-oriented, usually non-university bound students, and (b) dalliance-oriented, usually university bound students. Some support was found for this two-type hypothesis: only 24% of the university bound students ever considered marrying their "steady". Herman concluded that "going steady" was usually less exploitive than the dalliance, random dating phenomenon.

6. "Empathy"

Vernon and Stewart (1957, pp. 48-52) made a very important contribution to the literature when they studied the role of empathy in dating. They asked college students the following questions about a recent date: (1) their satisfaction in each of 14 areas; (2) their guess of their partner's satisfaction. The 14 areas included the following: money, sex, manners, etc. They found that the more dates with a person, the higher the degree of empathy. In other words, the "go steady" group were able to interpret their partner's feelings far better than the casual dating group. Vernon and Stewart put one limitation on their findings: the result may be due to degree of involvement rather than empathy itself.

This study reflects on the views of both Waller and Herman. Casual, random dating may perhaps be functionless. "Going steady" may be one way of

learning to interact, to understand a member of the opposite sex.

7. "Personality"

(a) Adler's dominance drive

Very little work has been done on Adler's postulate that people marry to dominate. Martinson (1955) demonstrated that with other things being equal such as age, sex, intelligence, position in family, nationality, father's occupation and amount of education, persons who marry demonstrate greater feelings of ego deficiency than do those who remain single. Byrd (1956, pp. 28-9) comments on this, believing the findings may apply only to early marriage: that is, to persons who marry right after high school graduation.

(b) Freud's parental image

Several studies have investigated Freud's theory that a person married an individual resembling the parent of the opposite sex.

Kent (1951) asked college students to write mental images of their mothers. Six weeks later, they were asked to list traits they wanted in their wives. Kent found the findings correlated significantly.

Strauss (1946) found similar evidence for engaged girls. The prospective grooms bore physical resemblances to the girls' fathers. Their opinions and

beliefs were not significantly similar. The girls
themselves resembled the men's mothers in personality
and temperament.

Woods (1959, p. 341) reported that there is a
tendency to select mates like the parent image with
respect to physique, opinions, personality likes and
dislikes.

Schiller (1932) suggested that homogamic factors
are operant in marriage selection: the husband resembled
the wife and the wife's father; the wife also resembled
the husband's mother. This supports Freud as well as
homogamy theory and suggests that the two approaches
may be two ways of looking at the same marital selection
process.

Hamilton and McGowan (1930) found that 17% of their
male cases married women physically like their mother
and that 94% of this group were happily married. Only
33% of a control group were happily married.

(c) Winch's complementary needs

Winch (1958) believed that complementary needs
were operant in mate-selection at the psychic level.
He granted that at the social level homogamic factors
probably operated in mate-selection.

Winch (1958, p. 109-114) used three techniques —
(1) a "need" interview, which was content-analyzed by
two independent researchers, (2) a case-history inter-
view, (3) the Thematic Apperception Test — to develop

personality pictures of 25 couples. He found general support for his theory, especially regarding traits like deference-dominance, abasement-dominance and abasement-hostility.

Ktsanes (1955) and Roos (1956) independently factor-analyzed the ratings of these 50 subjects on 44 sub-variables. Roos emerged with four factors; Ktsanes, six. Commenting on their work, Winch (1958. p. 130) stated that their findings suggest "that complementariness may be stated in part at least in terms of achievement and passivity, of nurturance and dependence, of dominance and deference."

The rigorous scientific controls used in Winch's research is commendable, but a larger sample than 50 is needed before any definite conclusions may be drawn.

(d) Hollingsworth, Fleege — preferential mating

This theory rests between assortative mating and Winch's theory. Some support for the theory that one picks a person who has admired characteristics was supplied by McCormick and MacRory's study (1944). The traits checked by 93 "steadies" as desirable in an opposite sex partner tended to correlate with traits possessed by their "steady". These traits also correlated highly with traits desired by those who were not "going steady" as well.

## 8. "Integrative"

Some evidence suggests that the inter-relation-
ship between the biological, the sociological and
the psychological should be studied very carefully
when one is considering the analysis of dating
behavior.

For example: numerous studies have investigated
the relationship between physical characteristics,
on the one hand, and personality and social develop-
ment on the other. Terman (1926) and Reals (1938)
found that good health led to better psychological
development; that leaders had good health and above
average strength. Frazier and Lisonbee (in Seidman,
1955) showed that young adolescents have a marked
concern for bodily development, each sex wishing to
fit the socially-desired image for their respective
sex more accurately; girls wanted to be shorter, boys
wanted better body proportions, more weight, etc.
Jones and Bayley (in Seidman, 1953) revealed that
early maturing boys tended to be attractive; well-
built, muscular, athletic and very attentsive to
personal grooming while late-maturers were more express-
ive, fiery, uninhibited. Cruce (1953, p. 427) provides
a comprehensive list of physical traits that affect
personality; the better physical specimen tending to
have the better personality.

The foregoing survey of empirical findings probably gives most support to Wallerian, assortative mating and learning theories of date-mate selection.

The present study was not intended as a test of any of these theories. Rather it was an attempt to find empirical relationships between the frequency and status of dating behavior on the one hand, and personality characteristics and activities on the other. The intention then was to relate the findings to existing theories.

CHAPTER 111

PROCEDURE

In order to investigate the relationship of various factors affecting the frequency and status of dating behavior, three separate techniques were employed. Each used a different group of subjects, who remained anonymous throughout.

The first, a Subjective Survey asking for essay-style answers, was used to define terms and obtain item possibilities.

The second, a Questionnaire constructed mainly on the basis of the Subjective Survey findings, was used to explore the relationships between a wide variety of personal characteristics of young people and the frequency and status of dating.

The third, the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey, administered together with a questionnaire regarding dating behavior was used to explore relationships between the 10 personality traits of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey on the one hand, and frequency and status of dating on the other.

1. Construction and Administration of the Subjective Survey

In order to define terms and to obtain relevant items for the Questionnaire, a Subjective Survey was employed.

Three questions were derived on the bases of:
(a) nine informal interviews with friends; (b) a
listing of pertinent material from novels, plays,
movies and (c) a reading of the psychological lit-
erature.

The Subjective Survey consisted of three
questions: (1) a definition of a "date", (2) a
definition of "going steady", (3) the subject's
opinion regarding the differences between people with
varying dating patterns. Three forms of question three
were employed. The one (Form A) found to give the
most useful answers was used most frequently. See
Appendix A.

Forty-eight volunteer subjects were used. Aside
from a deliberate effort to get people from various
walks of life, no attempt at randomization was made.

The sampling included different: (a) religious
groups (Protestants, Roman Catholics, Jews); (b) age
levels (14-60); (c) sexes (fairly evenly distributed);
(d) educational levels (grammar school to college
graduates); (e) heterosexual status groups (those not
dating; those dating, "going steady," engaged, married).
There was a shortage of both married men and older
men; and married adolescents.

From this material: (a) the most commonly accepted
definitions of a "date" were established; (b) the

group's popular conceptions of the infrequent and
frequent "dater" and the person "going steady" were
derived; (c) a list of relevant factors for inclusion
in the Questionnaire were selected.

2. Construction, Administration, Statistical
   Treatment of the Questionnaire

The Questionnaire was constructed mainly on the
basis of the factors derived from the Subjective
Survey. See Appendix B.

This phase of the study had three aspects: (a)
to obtain information about the subject's personal
characteristics, activities and dating behavior;
(b) to divide the subjects into categories on the basis
of their frequency and status of dating; (c) to test
for significant relationships between these dating
categories and each personal characteristic and activ-
ity item.

Questionnaire Construction

In obtaining information about the subject's
personal characteristics and activities, there were
four inter-related considerations: the need for
brevity and objectivity; the ease of administration and
statistical analysis.

In order to permit subjects to answer a relatively
large number of questions in the least possible time,
each item could be answered by placing a check in one
of several alternative spaces. This method also
allowed rapid tabulation and calculation of results.

To gain a certain degree of objectivity, items pertaining to behavioral facts were stressed. For example: How many hours do you study per week? 0-10 __ 11-20 __ Over 20 __ rather than: Do you study much? Yes __ No __

Through application of these criteria — brevity, objectivity, ease of administration and analysis — 57 items were constructed to form the Questionnaire. Fifty-one required check-space answers: six required two or three word answers.

To obtain information regarding the subject's dating behavior, a separate section of seven questions was added to the Questionnaire. See Appendix B. The first five of these questions were concerned with the determination of the subject's dating status ("steady" or "non-steady"). He was asked: (1) whether he "went steady" or not; (2) if so, how long; (3) if he had ever "gone steady" previously; (4) if so, when; and (5) what "going steady" meant to him. The last question was used to see if his definition of "going steady" agreed with the popular definition obtained in the Subjective Survey.

The last two questions were concerned with the frequency of the Subject's dating. He was asked: (6) how many dates he had in the past year; (7) to fill in a detailed account of his past month's dating (when,

where, who with?). The subject's dating partner was kept anonymous: Fl, F2, F3, etc. being used to indicate different individuals. A calendar for the past month was provided to aid the subject in recalling specific dates.

## Questionnaire Subjects

The Questionnaire subjects were taken from four of a possible seven sections of the Introductory Psychology course. This would appear to be a fairly representative sample of first year Arts and Science since approximately three-fifths of the students in this Faculty take Introductory Psychology. The sex ratio for the sampled groups was approximately the same as for the Faculty of Arts and Science and for the entire university (male: female: 3:1). See Appendix B.

The Questionnaire was administered during the last week of February and the first week of March, 1959.

The Questionnaire was completed by 569 subjects. Discards, including Negro, Chinese and married students, numbered 136. Three papers were discarded due to obvious vulgarity and excessive humor not conducive to reliable answers. The eligible subjects numbered 430 white, unmarried students — 162 females and 268 males.

Before administration of the Questionnaire, the subjects were requested to be as truthful as possible in spite of the fact that many of the items were highly personal. See Appendix D (b) for complete instructions.

## Determination of dating categories

(a) <u>males</u>

Two principal criteria were used to sort the 268
male subjects into four categories on the basis of
frequency and status of dating: (a) whether the
subject defined himself as "going steady" (in terms
of the definition derived from the Subjective Survey)
or being engaged: (b) the number of dates reported
in the past month and/or year. The detailed reports
of dating for the past month were considered more
accurate than the estimate of the past year's dating.
Wherever possible the former was used instead of the
latter.

A total of 79 males, defining themselves as
"going steady" or being engaged, were assigned to
Group 1V. The dating averages for the remaining
189 were determined as 3.17 dates in the past month
and 2.95 dates per month for the past year. These
norms were used to split the 189 into three groups:
(1) very infrequent, (11) average, (111) very frequent
"daters". See Table 2 for detailed description of
these four groups.

--------------------------------------------------------

TABLE 2

--------------------------------------------------------

(b) <u>females</u>

Two criteria were used to sort the 162 female

Table 2

Description of, and Criteria for,

the Dating Categories (Groups) employed in

analysis of Questionnaire, and

Frequency of Cases in each Category.

MALES

| Group | Description | Criterion | | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Monthly Dates | Past 12 Months | |
| 1 | very infrequent | 0-1/month | 0-12/month | 73 |
| 11 | average | 2-4/month | 13-59/month | 76 |
| 111 | very frequent | 3+/month | ---------- | 40 |
| 1V | "steadies" | define selves as "going steady" | | 79 |
| | | | Total N | 268 |

FEMALES

| Group | Description | Criterion | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Monthly Dates | |
| A | infrequent | 0-3/month | 44 |
| B | frequent | 4+/month | 64 |
| C | "steadies" | define selves as "going steady" | 54 |
| | | Total N | 162 |

subjects into three categories on the basis of frequency and status of dating: (a) whether the subject defined herself as "going steady" or being engaged; (b) the number of dates reported in the past month. The responses on the past year estimate were very scattered, making the determination of cut-off points impossible.

A total of 54 females, defining themselves as "going steady" or being engaged, were assigned to Group C. The dating averages for the remaining 108 subjects were determined as 4.98 dates in the past month and 4.91 dates per month for the past year. The past month norm was used to split the 108 into two "non-steady" groups: (A) infrequent and (B) frequent "daters". Three dates per month was the cut-off point. See Table 2 for detailed description of these three groups.

Statistical Treatment of the Questionnaire

The responses of male groups 1, 11, 111 and 1V were compared on each item of the Questionnaire using Chi-square analysis (McNemar, 1949; Edwards, 1954). Relationships were regarded as significant if they reached the .05 level of confidence.

The responses of female groups A, B and C were similarily compared on each item of the Questionnaire using Chi-square analysis. Again, relationships were regarded as significant if they reached the .05 level

of confidence.

The other six Questionnaire items were summarized in the form of averages (eg. mean number of times per month Group 1 washed car).

## 3. Administration and Statistical Treatment of the Personality Test

In order to explore the relationships between personality variables and the frequency and status of dating the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey was administered to a separate group of 99 subjects. At the same time, these subjects were asked to complete the separate section of the Questionnaire regarding dating behavior. See page 43.

The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey is designed to measure 10 personality traits: G-General Activity, R-Restraint, A-Ascendance, S-Sociability, E-Emotional Stability, O-Objectivity, F-Friendliness, T-Thoughtfulness, P-Personal Relations and M-Masculinity (Guilford and Zimmerman, 1949, pp. 5-8).

## Administration of Personality Test

A total of 99 white, unmarried subjects, 52 male and 47 female, were tested in small groups under supervision. The subjects were all volunteers. The majority were from first and second year Psychology courses. Mean ages were 20.45 years for the males; 19.34 years for the females.

The testing was given during the middle two weeks

of March, approximately three weeks before final
examinations and a week after the Questionnaire was
administered.

Subjects were instructed to fill in the Guilford-
Zimmerman Temperament Survey first, then proceed to the
attached questions regarding their dating behavior.
They were requested to be as truthful as possible.
See Appendix C (a) for complete instructions.

Determination of dating categories

(a) males

The 52 males were split into two groups — M-
Alphas or frequent "daters"; M-Betas or infrequent
"daters".

The males' dating averages were determined to
develop cut-off points: the "non-steadies" averaged
2.35 dates for the past month and 1.89 dates per
month for the past year.

Three dates in the past month and/or 20 dates
in the past year were set as the cut-off points. See
Table 3.

-------------------------------------------------------------

TABLE 3

-------------------------------------------------------------

(b) females

The 47 females were split into two groups — F-
Alphas or frequent "daters"; F-Betas or infrequent "daters".

The females' dating averages were determined to

TABLE 3

DATING CATEGORIES FOR USE WITH THE
GUILFORD-ZIMMERMAN TEMPERAMENT SURVEY


<u>A</u>

<u>Males</u>

| <u>Group</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Criterion</u> | <u>N</u> |
|---|---|---|---|
| M-Alpha | frequent | (a) defined selves as going steady | 27 |
| | | (b) 3 or more dates during past month | |
| M-Beta | infrequent | 0-2 dates during past month; 20 or less dates during past year | 25 |
| | | n | 52 |


<u>B</u>

<u>Females</u>

| <u>Group</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Criterion</u> | <u>N</u> |
|---|---|---|---|
| F-Alpha | frequent | (a) defined selves as going steady | 25 |
| | | (b) 7 or more dates during past month | |
| F-Beta | infrequent | 6 or less dates during past month | 22 |
| | | n | 47 |

develop a cut-off point: "steadies" averaged 8.88 dates during the past month and seven dates per month for the past year; "non-steadies" averaged 6.08 dates for the past month and 4.31 dates per month for the past year. Seven dates during the past month was set as the cut-off point. See Table 3.

Statistical Treatment

The responses of the two male groups M-Alphas and M-Betas were compared on each trait of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey using t-score analysis (McNemar, 1949; Guilford, 1942). Relationships were regarded as significant if they reached the .05 level of confidence.

The responses of the two female groups F-Alphas and F-Betas were compared on each trait of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey using t-score analysis. Relationships were regarded as significant if they reached the .05 level of confidence.

CHAPTER lV

THE RESULTS

As will be recalled, the procedure involved the
use of three techniques: (a) Subjective Survey; (b)
Questionnaire; (c) Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament
Survey and a section regarding dating behavior.

1. Results of Subjective Survey

The Subjective Survey was employed to define
terms and to obtain item possibilities. The analysis
of the Subjective Survey established popular def-
initions for the terms: "a date" and "going steady".
They were:

"A date": a definite pre-arrangement and mutual
agreement between members of the opposite sex to do
something together.

: not a chance or casual meeting,
such as a boy meeting a girl at a dance and taking
her home.

"Going Steady": the mutual agreement of a couple
to date one another exclusively.

The definition of a "date" was incorporated in
the section regarding dating behavior for use in the
Questionnaire and with the Guilford-Zimmerman
Temperament Survey. The definitions of both a "date"
and "going steady" aided in the assignment of subjects

to the various dating categories.

To obtain item possibilities, the group's popular conceptions of persons having different frequency and status of dating were derived.

In brief, the infrequent "dater" was seen as (a) the shy, sensitive, insecure person or (b) the aggressive, independent, negativistic individual. The infrequent "dater" lacked social skills and personal possessions conducive to dating (appropriate clothes, a car, etc.).

The frequent "dater" was either (a) the mature, confident, flexible, friendly person or (b) the insecure, aggressive type. The frequent "dater" was athletic, attractive, graceful and skillful socially. They possessed such things as a convertible, fine clothes, etc.

The "going steady" person was subdivided into four personality types: (a) the misfit seeking security; (b) the possessive, self-centered, demanding individual; (c) the docile, non-aggressive person; and (d) the mature, confident, friendly person, who had found his/her "true love". The person "going steady" was considered to fall between the infrequent and frequent "daters" regarding personal possessions and social skills.

## 2. Results of the Questionnaire

The Questionnaire was employed to test for significant relationships between the various dating categories and each personal characteristic and activity item.

For a more detailed analysis of Questionnaire results, see Appendix E.

Of the 51 check-type items the following significantly differentiated between the four male dating categories — (1) infrequent, (11) average, (111) frequent, (1V) "steadies" — at the .01 level of confidence: physical health (item 11), wearing desert boots (item 39), playing on athletic team (item 48), water skiing (item 46), playing billiards (item 46), skiing (item 46), jive (item 44), tango (item 44), listening to jazz (item 45), preferring musicals (item 54), money spent on entertainment (item 29), time spent on entertainment (item 24), regular access to automobile (item 30), drinking (item 41), having "gone steady" previously (item 60).

Of the 51 check-type items the following significantly differentiated between the three female dating categories — (A) infrequent, (B) frequent, (C) "steadies" — at the .01 level of confidence: listening to jazz (item 45), jive (item 44), smoking (item 40), having "gone steady" previously (item 60).

Items that significantly differentiated between the four male dating categories at the .02 level of confidence were: physical attractiveness (item 15), wearing a suit (item 39), wearing a white shirt and tie (item 39), swimming (item 46).

The item that significantly differentiated between the three female dating categories at the .02 level of confidence was: number of years intend to spend at university (item 16).

Items that significantly differentiated between the four male dating categories at the .05 level of confidence were: physique (item 12), wearing an athletic crest (item 39), wearing suede shoes (item 39), waltz (item 44), rhumba (item 44), preferring westerns (item 54), smoking (item 40).

Items that significantly differentiated between the three female dating categories at the .05 level of confidence were: ice-skating (item 46), rhumba (item 44), tango (item 44), going to movies (item 52), money spent on entertainment (item 29), whitewalls (item 34), drinking (item 41), first year at UBC or not (item 20).

Items that tended toward significance (.10 level of confidence) were: (a) for males: age (item 2), duckbill haircut (item 38), wearing Ivy League clothes (item 39), wearing semi-drapes (item 39),

grade 12 grade (item 17), number of subjects taking at
UBC (item 19), first year at UBC or not (item 20);
(b) for females: height (item 4), foxtrot (item 44),
samba (item 44), time spent on entertainment (item 24),
soft-top or hard-top convertible (item 34).

Of the factors which differentiated significantly
amongst the various dating categories, inspection of
the chi-square table revealed the following trends:
(a) frequency of dating in males tended to be positively
related to endorsement of the items: health (10);
muscularature (11); physical attractiveness (15); going
out for entertainment (24); regular access to an auto-
mobile (30); wearing desert boots (39), suede shoes
(39), white shirt and tie (39); drinking (41); skiing
(46); playing billiards (46); water-skiing (46); playing
on athletic team (48); and preferring musicals (54).
(b) frequency of dating in both males and females tended
to be positively related to: spending money on entertain-
ment (29); dancing ability, jive (44), tango (44),
foxtrot (44), samba (44); and previous experience of
"going steady" (60).
(c) frequency of dating in females tended to be positive-
ly related to going to the movies (52); smoking (40)
tended to increase with frequency of dating in females
for the infrequent and frequent dating groups; but the
female "steadies" tended to smoke far less.
(d) both male and female average and frequent dating
groups tended to listen to jazz (45) while both male

and female "steadies" did not endorse this item.

As regards to the six other questions that were
treated separately, the following differences were
found by inspection of the frequencies. The data were
not amendable to treatment by chi-square:

(a) washing and vacuuming of car increases with
frequency of dating;

(b) frequent "daters" commence dating at a younger age;

(c) infrequent "daters" tend not to go to drive-ins;

(d) the dating pattern of a same-sex sibling tends to
be followed;

(e) female "only" children tend to "go steady";

(f) only 48% of male "go steadies" had previously
"gone steady"; but 78% of female "go steadies" had
previously "gone steady".

For detailed analysis and statistical support for
these findings, see Appendix E.

3. Results of the Personality Test

Of the 10 Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey
traits, the following significantly differentiated
between the two male dating categories (frequent and
infrequent "daters"): G-General Activity at the .05
level of confidence and S-Sociability at the .01 level
of confidence. Male frequent "daters" were higher
than male infrequent "daters" on both G-General Activity
and S-Sociability.

--------------------------------------------------------

Table 4

--------------------------------------------------------

Table 4

Comparison of Frequent (M-Alpha) with

Infrequent (M-Beta) Male Dating Groups on the 10 traits

of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey

Males

| Trait | Description | M-Alpha Mean Score | M-Beta Mean Score | $t$ | sign. |
|-------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----|-------|
| G | General Activity | 16.67 | 13.32 | 2.14 | .05 |
| R | Restraint | 15.15 | 16.36 | .89 | n.s. |
| A | Ascendance | 15.11 | 12.96 | 1.58 | n.s. |
| S | Sociability | 20.33 | 14.84 | 3.06 | .01 |
| E | Emotional Stability | 16.88 | 14.72 | 1.43 | n.s. |
| O | Objectivity | 18.67 | 17.20 | 1.08 | n.s. |
| F | Friendliness | 15.30 | 14.48 | .56 | n.s. |
| T | Thoughtfulness | 18.44 | 19.32 | .64 | n.s. |
| P | Personal Relations | 16.81 | 18.08 | .84 | n.s. |
| M | Masculinity | 20.52 | 18.24 | 1.94 | n.s. |

Of the 10 Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey
traits, the following differences were significant at the
.01 level of confidence: female frequent "daters" were
higher than female infrequent "daters" on S-Sociability
and A-Ascendance. At the .05 level of confidence, the
female frequent "daters" were significantly lower than
the female infrequent "daters" on F-Friendliness.

----------------------------------------------------
Table 5
----------------------------------------------------

Thus, according to the definitions of these traits
offered by Guilford-Zimmerman, the frequent male "dater"
as compared to the infrequent male "dater" was seen as:
setting a rapid pace of activities, energetic, busy,
productive, efficient, hurrying, quick in action, en-
thusiastic, lively, liking speed, having many friends and
acquaintances, entering into conversations, liking social
activities, seeking social contacts and limelight.

According to the definitions of these traits offered
by Guilford-Zimmerman, the frequent female "dater" as
compared to the infrequent was seen as: having many friends
and acquaintances, entering into conversations, liking
social activities, seeking social contacts and limelight,
self defensive, exhibiting leadership habits, no hesitation
to speaking with individuals or in public, persuading others,
being conspicuous, bluffing, hostile, belligerent, resent-
ful, resistant to domination, desiring to dominate, having
contempt for others and ready to fight.

For more detailed analysis, see Tables 4 and 5.

Table 5

Comparison of Frequent (F-Alpha) with

Infrequent (F-Beta) Female Dating Groups on the 10 traits

of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey

Females

| Trait | Description | F-Alpha Mean Score | F-Beta Mean Score | t | sign. |
|-------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|------|-------|
| G | General Activity | 16.24 | 13.82 | 1.38 | n.s. |
| R | Restraint | 16.20 | 17.50 | .74 | n.s. |
| A | Ascendance | 16.04 | 8.86 | 4.15 | .01 |
| S | Sociability | 19.92 | 14.00 | 3.38 | .01 |
| E | Emotional Stability | 15.60 | 12.41 | 1.88 | n.s. |
| O | Objectivity | 15.64 | 15.32 | .23 | n.s. |
| F | Friendliness | 15.08 | 18.18 | 2.30 | .05 |
| T | Thoughtfulness | 20.80 | 19.82 | .77 | n.s. |
| P | Personal Relations | 16.24 | 17.68 | .97 | n.s. |
| M | Masculinity | 11.68 | 11.23 | .35 | n.s. |

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

1. Discussion of the Subjective Survey Results

Analysis of the Subjective Survey reveals that
the popular conception regarding individuals who have
different dating patterns consists of two main aspects:
(a) materialistic factors (possession of automobile,
appropriate clothes, etc.; (b) personality factors
(maturity and getting along well with people).

The emphasis on materialistic aspects lends
support to Waller's theory, while the emphasis of
maturity and social skills supports the various
learning approaches to dating behavior (Lowrie,
Blood, Burgess, Locke, Vernon and Stewart).

2. Discussion of the Questionnaire Results

Support for (a) the biological-based; (b)
Wallerian and (c) learning theories of dating was
provided by the Questionnaire data.

(a) The biological-based theories were supported
to some extent by the finding that frequency of dating
was positively related to such physical factors as
health (item 11), attractiveness (item 15) and physique
(item 12) for males.

(b) Waller's dalliance dating theory was upheld
by the findings that frequency of dating was positively
related to clothes (item 39), sports activities

(item 46, item 48), dancing (item 44), automobiles
(item 30) for males: and dancing (item 44) and automo-
biles (item 34) for females. The car cleanliness
(item 33) and car ownership indices (item 30) also
support Wallerian theory: (a) the frequent "dater"
tending to wash and vacuum his car more often and
(b) the frequent "dating" group tending to own more
cars.

(c) Using a learning approach, Lowrie (1956)
found that the frequent "dater" tended to start dating
younger than the infrequent "dater". This was support-
ed by the data concerning age of first date (item 47).
For details see Appendix D (c).

The learning theories were also supported by the
tendency for the frequency of dating behavior to be
positively related to previous experience of "going
steady". An apparent exception to this general rule
is found in the male "steadies" (Group 1V) who had an
incidence of previous "steady" experience considerably
below that of the frequent "daters" (Group 111). See
Appendix D (c).

Recently the question of whether dating behavior
is related to academic performance has been raised by
many educators. The findings indicate that there is
no significant relationship between frequency of dat-
ing and academic performance either at the Grade 12 or

first year university level.

It would seem valuable to list, at this point, findings from the Questionnaire which have not previously been reported in the literature on dating behavior.

It is true that some of these findings have been reported in rather general fashion, but not in the specific detail given here.

(a) that physical attributes (physical health, attractiveness, physique) are positively related to frequency of dating;

(b) that specific items of clothes (wearing desert boots, a suit, suede shoes, white shirt and tie and an athletic crest) are all related to frequency of dating;

(c) that specific dances (jive, tango, waltz, rhumba) are positively related to frequency of dating;

(d) that certain likes-dislikes (listening to jazz, preferring musical and western movies) are related to frequency of dating;

(e) that smoking and drinking are positively related to frequency of dating;

(f) that specific athletic activities (swimming, skiing, ice-skating, playing billiards and water-skiing) are positively related to frequency of dating;

(g) that vacumming and washing of a car increases with frequency of dating;

(h) that the dating pattern of a same-sex sibling tends to be followed;

(i) that female "only" children tend to "go steady". See Appendix E (f).

## 3. Discussion of Personality Test Results

The Personality test findings question the popular opinion that personality variables are the most important factors related to the frequency and status of dating. Out of a possible 10 Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey traits, only two were significant for men; three for women. Three of these traits (S-Sociability, A-Ascendance, G-General Activity) are uncomfortably intercorrelated. Guilford and Zimmerman (1949, p. 6) report the following inter-correlations: S-Sociability and A-Ascendance, +61; S-Sociability and G-General Activity, +35; G-General Activity and A-Ascendance, +34. It might well be that one basic factor, underlying S-Sociability, A-Ascendance, G-General Activity, is related to the frequency and status of dating.

The Personality test findings support learning and Adlerian approaches to the study of dating behavior.

A learning approach was supported by the finding

that frequency of dating was positively related to S-Sociability. The frequent "dater" was sociable, had many friends, entered into conversations easily, like social activities and sought social contacts.

The Adlerian approach was supported by (a) the negative relationship between frequency of dating in females and F-Friendliness (the frequent female "dater" being more domineering and hostile); and (b) the positive relationship between frequency of dating and A-Ascendance in both males and females.

# CHAPTER Vl

## A PROPOSED THEORY OF SEXUAL CHOICE

In Chapter ll various approaches and theories
to the dating-mating problem were discussed. Each of
these have received some support from research. The
Wallerian and learning approaches particularly were
reinforced by the present study.

However, since none of these seem yet to offer
a final solution to this problem, it was felt that
it might be valuable to develop one further theoretical
formulation.

## The Theory of Normal-Neurotic Sexual Choice

With reference to Table 1 in which various
theories and approaches were classified, the Theory
of Normal-Neurotic Sexual Choice would be placed
in the sub-section on personality in the psychological
category (7).

The following is a brief outline of the major
aspects of this theory.

The normal sexual choice occurs when the person
can: manipulate the subtle social barriers adequately
to mate with the opposite sex member who is most
physiologically and psychologically compatible. He
is then fully capable of realizing his sexual potential
with this most-compatible mate.

A "neurotic" sexual choice occurs when the person

seriously fails to attain this pattern of normal adjustment.

It may be concluded then that very few people ever attain completely normal mating adjustment and, therefore that there are degrees of normal-neurotic dating and mating.

The scientific determination of whether a choice was normal or "neurotic" depends on a careful study of the personality of the individuals involved, which includes analysis of the total motivational pattern of the man and the woman, plus analysis of the nature of their interaction.

The main points of the theory are:

(a) The extension of emotional affection involves the danger of rejection and consequent ego damage.

(b) The amount and extent of possible ego damage is proportional to the amount and extent of desire (the more the desire, the more the possible ego damage);

(c) The theme of possible rejection is learned very early in life during the child-parent, child-sibling adjustment phase and is reinforced in American culture by the dating system which stresses intermittent rejection.

(d) Added to this basic theme are the forces that negatively influence normal choice. These may be either social (eg. romantic myth) or biological

(eg. insufficient sex hormone).

(e) A second theme is the problem of social and personal perception. Firstly, the individual making a normal sexual choice must adequately perceive the implicit and explicit social meanings involved in dating a person who would not be defined as a "proper mate" (eg. a Negro person dating a white person). Secondly, he must adequately understand his own motives.

(f) The same overt form of action may be a normal or "neurotic" choice — the normal choice is rational and mature, balancing emotion and intellect; the "neurotic" choice is frustration-instigated, fear-driven and anxiety-laden, often using defense mechanisms to hide conflicting motivations from self.

(g) A normal appearing marriage relationship may be the result of a normal or "neurotic" sexual choice. If normal, the couple have actually chosen their preferred mates. If "neurotic", either one or both have not, but they may get along superficially adequately since they no longer fear ego damage in competition for a preferred choice.

(h) It is the opinion of the writer that the mechanism of sexual choice in contemporary American society tends to be more "neurotic" than normal.

(i) A normal person may divorce. An individual may marry "neurotically"; realize this "neurotic" choice; find the preferred choice; divorce and marry the

preferred one. Or a person may marry normally; gradually build a fear of hurt; divorce; and marry a lesser choice "neurotically".

Thus, the "neurotic" choice may be found in any of our earlier defined dating groups:

(1) infrequent dating group: the "neurotic" choice protects the person from ego damage because he simply does not date. This form of adjustment involves two repressions — of the sex urge itself and of sex desire for any particular person.

(2) average dating group: if the individual uses a "neurotic" choice, he never allows the relationship to go beyond a trivial, light phase; no deep attachment is ever formed.

(3) frequent dating group: if the person uses a "neurotic" choice in this group, he always has more than one person available to date. If one rejects him, there is always a second possibility.

(4) the "go steady" group: the "neurotic" choice here involves "going steady" in the Wallerian pattern of the dating of rejected types. (See page *12*)

The central theme throughout is that the person taking the "neurotic" choice does so because he has learned that the price of competition is rejection. Therefore, he defends himself against possible rejection. The "neurotic" reaction usually contains some form of denial of desire for the preferred person.

An example may make the theory's basic assumptions clearer:

N has a choice between two members of the opposite sex: A, the most desired one; B, the less desired one. If N makes a "neurotic" choice, he may come to date or mate with B since B cannot hurt N's self esteem as much as A. The usual rationalizations, repressions, etc., occur during the process.

Often, N will start out with a normal choice and pick A; but because N is over-anxious or over-desiring, he will tend to force A away from him. In the next similar situation N is less likely to choose his preferred choice.

How does this theory fit with other theories cited in Chapter 11?

It questions pre-destination theory because dating is seen as selective on either a conscious or unconscious level. There may be one person that is more compatible than another; but whether there is just one compatible person is highly debatable. It is more likely that certain people are compatible in one way, while other people are compatible in other ways.

It agrees somewhat with Darwin's aesthetic preference, Ellis' simple sensory stimulation and Weininger's maleness-femaleness theories; in that, these theories may describe some of the criteria for

normal choice. It queries any biological basis for
promiscuity, believing promiscuity to be rather a
result of a "neurotic" rather than a normal sexual dat-
ing pattern. It agrees with Davis' socio-biological
approach, in that the customs of our society tend to
contribute to the development of "neurotic" sexual
choice.

It agrees with assortative mating theories, in
that occupational, residential propinquity, etc. are
some of the social limits in which normal or "neurotic"
choices operate.

It agrees with process learning theory in that
empathy is one of the interactive processes that bring
the couple together whether the choice is normal or
"neurotic".

It is apparent that much investigation is required
to test the Theory of Normal-Neurotic Sexual Choice.
The following section is an attempt to outline some
suggestions for further research, growing out of this
theory and the others cited in Chapter 11.

CHAPTER V11

POSSIBLE RESEARCH

All the research possibilities could not be out-
lined in the space available. The following is only
a sample of what seem to be some of the best possib-
ilities.

1. Determination of Actual Behavior

The principal need is the development of more
adequate measuring devices. Since every correlation
will eventually be made against frequency and status
of dating, every available technique should be used to
determine the person's actual behavior. This survey
used a questionnaire technique; it could be repeated
with an improved questionnaire using more refine
measurements on a larger sample. A carefully developed
interview technique would seem to offer even better
possibilities.

Another approach would involve investigating real
life situations either through watching various kinds of
mixed-sex gatherings through a one-way screen, or through
participant observation.

2. Retest of Waller's Dalliance Hypothesis

(a) Through a longitudinal study of the dating behavior
or several individuals it could be ascertained whether
or not there is a tendency to select successive partners
in terms of higher social status, better automobiles,

more appropriate clothes, etc. In addition, those that
are rejected as partners should have a lower rating of
all such Wallerian variables than those accepted.

(b) A preliminary separate study to develop more
precise Wallerian variable measurement would probably
be needed. This would require the development of
rating scales to be used on a larger sample to determine
the prestige the group actually gave different Wallerian
variables: for example, 1959 Mercury Montclair vs.
1957 Buick Century hard-top; what criteria are used to
determine the "best dancer"?

(c) To match individuals on relevant Wallerian
variables (automobile, ability to dance, etc.) and
then investigate the non-Wallerian factors (eg.
personality traits, propinquity, etc.) which operate
to produce sexual choice.

3. The Physical-Psychological Factors

This and numerous other studies have supported
the conclusion that physical characteristics are im-
portant in the frequency and status of dating. The
material cited on pages 31,38 suggested the interaction
of three variables: (a) onset of pubertal characteris-
tics; (b) degree of maleness-femaleness of these
characteristics and (c) the effect this pubertal reaction
has on the individual's personality. It emphasizes also
the role of health and the interaction of physical and

psychological factors. This would, of course, open up many interesting studies.

For example: Factors contributing to physical attractiveness could be studied by having subjects respond favorably or unfavorably to varying silhouettes of male and female figures. Hair color, eye color, relative heights could be similarly studied as independent variables. The long range goal is to develop the culture's images of male and female beauty.

Another approach would be to develop a scale elaborating in considerable detail the activity items on the Questionnaire. Still another would be to correlate various aspects of the individual's medical history and health status with frequency and status of dating.

4. Developmental Factors

Developmental studies, analogous to those done by Gesell on children (1957), need to be carried out with adolescents and young adults. We now have no exact knowledge of the rate and nature of the development of social skills and motor coordination and skills. Presumably the stage of development of an individual may have an important bearing on his dating behavior.

5. The Sociological Factor

(a) Propinquity theory probably needs re-examination since the automobile may have caused residential

proximity to be of less importance now than it was when the original studies were completed.

(b) It might be profitable to hold certain homogamous factors constant in order to see if psychological variables operated. For example: Is choice made on the basis of parental image, preferential mating or complementary needs, etc. when one chooses between possible dates in the same profession, locale, religion, etc.? Hollingshead (1949) found social class a distinquishing factor. What selective factors operate within a social class?

(c) Sub-cultural studies — analogous to Hollingshead's Elmtown (1949) and Whyte's Street Corner Society (1955) are needed in order to investigate the possibility that differences in dating patterns exist in various sub-cultures.

(c) The problem of sub-cultures brings in the influence of cross-cultural dating. A careful study of the type of person who dates out of his group (eg. white with Negro) and what happens to this person socially, etc., would probably bring profitable information.

(d) Wood (1959) and Waller (1938) maintain that sex ratios affect the dating pattern. The hypothesis might be forwarded: that different patterns would arise in university faculties with different sex ratios.

For example: at the University of British Columbia
(See Appendix B) engineering, medical and commerce
students might date differently than the Arts students
studied in this investigation.

6. The Factors of Social Influence

(a) From the Questionnaire data on sibling's ages
and activity, there is a suggestion that child-sibling
and parent-child relations are important. The two
significant variables seem to be the dating activity
of the sibling and the attitudes of parent and child.

(b) From the discrepancies on the entertainment
questions (item 24), (item 29), there is a hint that
two important variables may operate: the attitudes
and activities of same-sex friends; the extent the
subject actually searches for a dating partner. Does
he or she go to places where he/she can meet the oppo-
site sex?

Riesman's (1955) hypothesis that the character
of American people is formed chiefly by the example
of their peers and contemporaries suggests that same-
sex friends may exert important influences here.

It is hoped that in the near future all these
areas might be subjected to intensive investigation.
In terms of priorities, the writer's preference would
be to study the influence of physical factors
(attractiveness, coordination, musculature) in relation
to frequency and status of dating.

REFERENCES

Adler, A. Practice and theory of individual psychology.
    New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1924.

Ausubel, D.P. Theory and problems of adolescent develop-
    ment. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1954.

Baber, R. E. Marriage and the family. New York: McGraw-
    Hill, 1939, 154-200.

Blood, R.O. A retest of Waller's rating complex. Marriage
    Fam. Living, 1955, 17, 41-47.

Blood, R.O. Uniformities and diversities in campus dating
    preferences. Marriage Fam. Living, 1956, 16, 37-45.

Blum, G.S. Psychoanalytic theories of personality.
    New York: McGraw-Hill, 1953.

Bossard, J.H.S. Marriage and the child. Philadelphia:
    Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1940, 80-82.

Bossard, J.H.S. & Boll, E.S. Why marriages go wrong.
    New York: Ronald Press, 1958.

Brill, A. (Ed.) The basic writings of Sigmund Freud.
    New York: Random House, 1938.

Burgess, E.W. & Cottrell, L. S. Predicting success or
    failure in marriage. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1939.

Burgess, E.W. & Locke, H.J. The family. New York:
    American Book, 1945.

Burgess, E.W. & Locke, H.J. Comment on Lowrie's
    "dating theories and student responses". Amer.
    sociol. Rev., 1951, 16, 843-844.

Burgess, E.W. & Wallin, P. Homogamy in personality
    characteristics. J. abnorm. soc. psychol., 1944,
    39, 475-481.

Byrd, O.E. Family life sourcebook. Stanford, Calif.:
    Stanford Univ. Press, 1956.

Crist, J.R. High school dating as a behavior system.
    Marriage Fam. Living, 1953, 15, 23-28.

Cruze, W.W. Adolescent psychology and development.
    New York: Ronald Press, 1953.

Darwin, C. The origin of species. Akron, Ohio: Werner, 1872 (copyright 1859).

Davis, Katharine. Factors in the sex life of twenty-two hundred women. New York: Harper, 1929.

Davis, K. Human society. New York: Macmillan, 1955, 392-429.

Edwards, A.L. Statistical methods for the behavioral sciences. New York: Rinehart, 1954.

Ehrmann, W.W. Influence of comparative social class of companion upon premarital heterosexual behavior. Marriage Fam. Living, 1955, 48-53.

Ehrmann, W. W. Student cooperation in a study of dating behavior. Marriage Fam. Living, 1952, 14, 322-6.

Ellis, H. Studies in the psychology of sex: sexual selection in man. Philadelphia: F.A. Davis Co., 1925 (copyright 1905).

Fleege, U.H. Self-revelation of the adolescent boy. Milwaukee, Wis.: Bruce, 1945.

Gesell, A. Child behavior. New York: Dell, 1957.

Groves, E.R. & Brooks, L.M. Readings in the family. Chicago: Lippincott, 1934.

Groves, E.R. & Groves, G.H. The contemporary American family. New York: Lippincott, 1947.

Guilford, J.P. Fundamental statistics in psychology and education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1942.

Guilford, J.P. & Zimmerman, W.S. The Guilford-Zimmerman temperament survey: Manual. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sheridan Supply Co., 1949.

Hall, G.S. Adolescence: its psychology and its relations to physiology, anthropology, sociology, sex, crime, religion, and education. New York: Appleton, 1904.

Hamilton, G.V. & McGowan, K. What is wrong with marriage. New York: Albert and Coni, 1930.

Harlow, H.F. The Nature of Love. Amer. Psychologist, 1958, 13, 673-685.

Herman, R.D. The "Going Steady" complex: a re-examination, Marriage Fam. Living, 1955, 17, 36-40.

Hollingshead, A. B. Elmtown's youth. New York: Wiley, 1949.

Hollingworth, L.S. The psychology of the adolescent. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1928.

Hurlock, E.B. Adolescent development. (2d ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill, 1955.

Kennedy, R. Premarital residential propinquity and ethnic endogamy. Amer. J. Sociol., 1942-43, 48, 580.

Kent, D.P. Subjective factors in mate selection — an exploratory study. Sociol. soc. Res., 1951, 35, 391-398.

Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., & Martin, C.E. Sexual behavior in the human male. Philadelphia: Saunders, 1948.

Kinsey, A.C., Pomeroy, W.B., & Martin, C.E. Sexual behavior in the human female. Philadelphia: Saunders, 1953.

Kirkpatrick, C. A statistical investigation of the psychoanalytic theory of mate selection. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1937, 32, 427-430.

Kirkpatrick, C. & Caplow, T. Courtship in a group of Minnesota students. Amer. J. Sociol., 1945, 51, 114-25.

Kirkpatrick, C. & Kanin, E. Male sex aggression on a university campus. Amer. sociol. Rev., 1957, 22, 52-58.

Ktsanes, T. Mate selection on the basis of personality type: a study utilizing an empirical typology of personality. Amer. sociol. Rev., 1955, 20, 547-551.

Lang, R.O. A study of the degree of happiness or unhappiness in marriage as rated by acquaintances of the married couples. Unpublished M.A. Thesis,

Chicago: University of Chicago Libraries, 1932. Cited by R.F. Winch. Mate-Selection: a study of complementary needs. New York: Harper, 1958.

LeMasters, E.E. Modern courtship and marriage. New York: Macmillan, 1957.

Lewinsohn, R. (trans. by A. Mayce) A history of sexual customs. New York: Harper, 1958 (copyright 1956).

Lowrie, S.H. Dating theories and student responses. Amer. sociol. Rev., 1951, 16, 334-340.

Lowrie, S.H. Factors involved in the frequency of dating. Marriage Fam. Living, 1956, 18, 46-51.

Malinowski, B. Sex and repression in savage society. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1927.

Martinson, F.M. Ego deficiency as a factor in marriage. Amer. sociol. Rev., 1955, 20, 161-64.

Mead, M. Male and female. New York: Morrow, 1949.

Morgan, L.H. Ancient Society. New York: Holt, 1878.

McCormick, T.C. & MacRory, B.E. Group values in mate selection in a sample of college girls. Soc. Forces, 1944, 22, 315-7.

McLennan, J.F. Studies in ancient history. London: Macmillan, 1886.

McLennan, J.F. Studies in ancient history: the second series. London: Macmillan, 1896.

McNemar, Q. Psychological statistics. New York: Wiley, 1949.

Partridge, E.D. Leadership among adolescent boys. Teach. Coll. Contr. Educ., 1934, 608, 15.

Pressey, S.L. & Robinson, F.P. Psychology and the new education. New York: Harper, 1944.

Reals, W.H. Leadership in the high school. Sch. Rev., 1938, 46, 523-31.

Riesman, D., Glazer, N. & Denney, R. The lonely crowd. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1955 (copyright 1950).

Roos, D.E. Complementary needs in mate-selection: a study based on R-Type factor analysis. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1956. Cited by R.F. Winch. Mate-Selection: a study of complementary needs. New York: Harper, 1958.

Schiller, B. A quantitative analysis of marriage selection in a small group. J. soc. Psychol., 1932, 3, 297-319.

Seidman, J.M. (Ed.) The adolescent: a book of readings. New York: Dryden Press, 1953.

Smith, E. & Greenberg Monane, J.H. Courtship values in a youth sample. Amer. sociol. Rev., 1953, 18, 635-640.

Smith, W.M. Rating and dating: a re-study. Marriage Fam. Living, 1952, 14, 312-317.

Stone, C.P. Comparative psychology. (3d ed.) Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1955 (copyright 1934).

Strauss, A. The influence of parent-images upon marital choice. Amer. sociol. Rev., 1945, 11, 554-9.

Terman, L.M. Genetic studies of genius. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford Univ. Press, Vol. 2, 1926.

Terman, L.M. Psychological factors in marital happiness. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1938.

University of British Columbia calendar, 45th session, 1959-60, pp. 513-15.

Vernon, G.M. & Stewart, R.L. Empathy as a process in the dating situation. Amer. sociol. Rev., 1957, 22, 48-52.

Waller, W. The family: a dynamic interpretation. New York: Cordon, 1938.

Weininger, O. (trans.) Sex and character. New York: Putnam, 1932-5.

Williams, R.M. American society: a sociological interpretation. New York: Knopf, 1959, 36-77.

Wilson, L. & Kolb, W.L. Sociological analysis. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1949.

Winch, R.F. The theory of complementary needs in mate-selection: a test of one kind of complementariness. Amer. sociol. Rev., 1955, 20, 52-56.

Winch, R.F. Mate-Selection: a study of complementary needs. New York: Harper, 1958.

Whyte, W.F. Street corner society. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1955 (copyright 1943).

Woods, F.J. The American family system. New York: Harper, 1959.

# APPENDIX A

# SUBJECTIVE SURVEY

Psychological Survey (Boy-Girl Courtship Relations)

1. How would you define a date?  Give an example of
   what is not a date (in your opinion).

2. What does the teen-age term "going steady" mean?

3. (A) What are the important differences (economic,
      social, likes - dislikes, possessions, person-
      ality, etc.) between the following four groups
      for males and for females:

<br>

either
one of

          17-19 year-olds who: (a) don't date
                               (b) date occasionally
                                  (about once a month)
                              (c) date frequently (4
                                  to 8 times per month)
                              (d) "go steady"

   (B) Compare your friends    (a) who "go steady"
              with those         (b) who date frequently
              with those         (c) who don't date

   (C) Compare your friends    (a) who date, but don't
                                 "go steady"
                              (b) who "go steady"
                              (c) who don't date

What differences do you see between these groups?

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

Confidential

DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME ON THIS BOOKLET. The following material will remain
strictly confidential. Every precaution will be taken to protect your
identity and privacy. Check appropriate space for the following items:

1. Sex: Male ___ Female ___

2. Age: 16 & under ___ 17-18 ___ 19-20 ___ Over 20 ___

3. Race: White ___ Other ___

4. Height: Under 5'7" ___ 5'7"-5'10" ___ 5'11"-6'2" ___ 6'3" & Over ___

5. Weight: Under 140 ___ 141-160 lbs. ___ 161-179 lbs. ___ 180 & Over ___

6. Eye Color: Blue ___ Brown ___ Other ___

7. Hair Color: Blonde ___ Brown ___ Brunette ___ Red ___

8. Is your hair naturally: Straight ___ Curly ___ Inbetween ___

9. Complexion: Dark ___ Medium ___ Fair ___

10. Marital status: Single ___ Engaged ___ Married ___ Other ___

11. Physical health: Excellent ___ Average ___ Poor ___

12. Physique: Muscular ___ Slightly Muscular ___ Average ___ Non-muscular___

13. Do you wear glasses? Don't ___ Part-time ___ Full-time ___

14. Do you suffer from any physical defect? Yes ___ No ___

15. Where would you rank yourself on physical attractiveness?
    High ___ Above average ___ Average ___ Below Average ___ Low ___

16. Providing you pass, how many years do you intend spending in
    university? One __ Two __ Three __ Four __ Five __ More than five __

17. Final average grade obtained, Grade 12: A __ B __ C+ __ C __ C- ___

18. Average UBC grade this Christmas: Failure ___ Pass ___ Second __ First___

19. Number subjects taking: Five ___ Six ___ Other ___

20. Is this your first year at UBC? Yes ___ No ___

21. Not counting lectures, how many hours per week do you spend doing UBC
    homework? Less than 10 ___ 10-20 ___ 21-30 ___ 31-40 ___ Over 40 ___

22. Including labs, how many hours per week do you actually spend in
    lectures? Less than 10 ___ 11-15 ___ 16-21 ___ Over 22 ___

23. Where do you spend the majority of your hours studying? At home ___
    UBC library ___ In company of friends, but not in library ___ Other ___

24. How many days of the week do you go out for entertainment?
    None ___ One ___ Two ___ Three ___ Four ___ Five ___ Six ___ Seven ___

25. Do you presently have: a part-time job ___ an allowance ___
    a scholarship ___ other means of remuneration ___

26. How many summer vacations have you worked? None ___ One __ Two ___
    More than Two ___

-2-

27. Do you presently live: at home ___ on campus ___ other? ___

28. Do you pay board and/or room? Yes ___ No ___

29. How much do you spend per month on entertainment?

Under $5 ___ $5-10 ___ $11-20 ___ $21-30 ___ Over $30 ___

30. Do you have regular access to an automobile? Yes ___ No ___

31. Year of automobile: 1942 & older ___ 1946-49 ___ 1950-52 ___ 1953-54 ___

1955-56 ___ 1957-58 ___ 1959 ___

32. Indicate make and style: _____

_____

33. How many times in the past year was the automobile:

washed ___ cut-polished ___ simonized ___ vacuumed ___

34. Check spaces appropriate to automobile:

soft-top convertible ___ hard-top convertible ___ customized ___

whitewalls ___ power equipment ___ radio ___ heater ___ sun-visor ___

automatic ___ continental kit ___ V-3 engine ___ 6-cylinder engine ___

35. Condition of automobile: Good ___ Average ___ Poor ___

36. Have you ever owned a motorcycle? Yes ___ No ___

37. How do you get to UBC? Car ___ Bus ___ Bicycle ___ Walk ___ Other ___

38. Check, if in the past four years you have had: pompadour ___ a beard ___

moustache ___ side-burns ___ crewcut ___ duckbill cut ___

39. Check, if in the past four years you have ever frequently worn any of

the following to school classes, social functions, work, etc.:

Ivy league clothes ___ Windbreaker/sweater with athletic team crest ___

White cloth jacket ___ Leather windbreaker ___ Cap/hat ___ Golf hat ___

Hawaiian shirt ___ Suit ___ White shirt and tie ___ sport-jacket ___

Cowboy hat ___ loafers ___ oxfords ___ cowboy boots ___ jet boots ___

white bucks ___ suede shoes ___ jeans ___ drapes ___ semi-drapes ___

desert boots ___

40. Smoking habits: Don't ___ Smoke occasionally ___ Smoke frequently ___

Cigarettes ___ Cigars ___ Pipe ___

41. Drinking habits (alcoholic consumption): Don't ___ Very Occasionally ___

Occasionally ___ Frequently ___

42. Do you swear, Don't ___ Very Occasionally ___ Occasionally ___

Frequently ___

43. Are you able to dance? Yes ___ No ___

44. If yes, can you: jive ___ waltz ___ square dance ___ folk dance ___

-3-

foxtrot ___ rhumba ___ tango ___ samba ___ Indicate other(s) _____

45. Type of music you listen to: None ___ Classical ___ Semi+classical ___
    Western ___ Popular ___ Rock'n'roll ___ Jazz ___Other _____

46. Which of the following do you participate in: swimming ___ bowling ___
    skiing ___ ice-skating ___ roller-skating ___ billiards ___ tennis ___
    golf ___ water-skiing ___ hunting ___ fishing ___ drawing ___
    painting ___ writing ___ singing ___ playing musical instrument ___
    photography ___ Other(s) _____

47. How old were you when you went out on your first date? _____

48. Have you played on an athletic team in the past year? Yes ___ No ___

49. Have you been on the executive of any club, organization in the past
    year? Yes ___ No ___

50. Do you attend religious services? Don't ___ Occasionally ___ FrequenTly___

51. Aside from school reading, how many novels did you read in the past
    year? None ___ 1-5 ___ 6-10 ___ 11-20 ___ Over 20 ___

52. Approximately how many movies did you attend in the past year?
    None ___ 1-10 ___ 11-20 ___ 21-40 ___ Over 40 ___

53. Approximately what percentage of these movies attended were at
    drive-ins? _____%

54. In regard to movies, check preferences: Musicals ___ Drama ___ Comedy ___
    Westerns ___ War pictures ___ Mystery-crime ___ Other _____

55. Are you parents: living together ___ divorced ___ separated ___
    remarried ___ one dead ___ both dead ___

56. Indicate what occupational group your gainfully-employed parent would
    fit: business executive ___ professional ___ small business ___
    white collar ___ skilled manual ___ semi_-skilled ___ unskilled ___

57. Indicate number of siblings who fit appropriate columns below:

| | Number | Age(s) | Number married engaged | Number going steady | Number dating randomly | Number not dating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| sister(s) | | | | | | |
| brother(s) | | | | | | |

-4-

58. Do you presently "go steady"? Yes ___ No ___
59. If so, how long have you been "going steady"? _____
60. Have you ever gone steady? Yes ___ No ___
61. If so, indicate age(s) went steady? _____
62. What does the term "go steady" mean to you? _____

_____

_____

63. Approximately how many dates have you had in the past 12 months?

_____

The following chart is to be used to summarize your dating behavior as well as you can for the past four weeks. A calendar for the past four weeks is on the board for your convenience. A date is defined as a pre-arranged agreement between members of the opposite sex to attend some function or take part in some activity (dance, show, sitting at home).

Instructions:

Column One: For males, indicate females you went out with, by F1, f2, etc.

For females, indicate males you went out with, by M1, M2, etc.

ie - if you are a male and you went out with Alice, mark F1, then Joan, mark F2, then Alice, mark F1 again.

Column Two: Indicate day of week you went out. Sat. Feb. 7

Column Three: Indicate exactly where you went, what activity took part in.

ie + dance at brock hall; movie, capitol, "Auntie Mame"

| 1) who went with | 2) day | 3) where went, what activity took part in |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

(if you need more space, use the back of this page)

APPENDIX C


SEX RATIOS:  MALES TO FEMALES; UNIVERSITY
OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, 1958-59

| Classification | Male | | Female | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | n | % | n | % |
| University total | 7,134 | 71.7 | 2,816 | 28.3 |
| Arts and Science total | 3,292 | 73.1 | 1,213 | 26.9 |
| first year | 1,559 | 72.9 | 580 | 27.1 |
| second year | 882 | 76.1 | 277 | 23.9 |
| third year | 513 | 71.1 | 208 | 28.9 |
| fourth year | 338 | 69.5 | 148 | 30.5 |
| Nursing | --- | 00.0 | 224 | 100.0 |
| Home Economics | --- | 00.0 | 198 | 100.0 |
| Education | 563 | 38.9 | 882 | 61.1 |
| Social Work | 32 | 40.0 | 48 | 60.0 |
| Pharmacy | 90 | 72.0 | 35 | 28.0 |
| Physical Education | 100 | 76.9 | 30 | 23.1 |
| Graduate Studies | 471 | 82.5 | 100 | 17.5 |
| Agriculture | 136 | 87.2 | 20 | 12.8 |
| Medicine | 195 | 91.5 | 18 | 8.5 |
| Law | 239 | 94.8 | 13 | 5.2 |
| Architecture | 112 | 95.7 | 5 | 4.3 |
| Commerce | 576 | 96.5 | 21 | 3.5 |
| Engineering | 1,064 | 99.6 | 4 | .4 |
| Forestry | 140 | 100.0 | --- | 00.0 |

(UBC Calendar, 1959-60, pp. 513-15)

APPENDIX D


INSTRUCTIONS: (A) FOR SPECIAL SECTION ON DATING
BEHAVIOR FOR USE WITH THE GUILFORD-ZIMMERMAN
TEMPERAMENT SURVEY; (B) FOR USE WITH QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions for the
special section on dating behavior for
use with the Guilford-Zimmerman
Temperament Survey.

Subjects were instructed to fill in the Guilford-
Zimmerman Temperament Survey first, then proceed to
the special section on dating behavior:

We are asking you to fill in this questionnaire —
it's part of a research project being done by the
department. You will notice there are two pages and
a booklet. Would you please turn to the mimeographed
second page, which is marked page four. You will see
it is about dating. Do the first sheet first then
fill in this page as truthfully as you can.

"Now, turn back to the first page. (Hold up
booklet) Before marking this first page, which is
an answer page, please read the instructions on the
cover of this question booklet. (See that subjects
read Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey instruc-
tions)."

Instructions for use with Questionnaire

"We are asking you all to fill in this questionnaire — it's part of a research project being done by the department. We know that some of the questions will seem very personal to you — but please bear with us and do the best you can. You're not required to put your name on the questionnaire.

"As you can see, it's about dating — something that concerns almost all of you — so I hope you'll treat this seriously and realize we need all types of people to answer this — those who go out ten times a month and those who don't go out — all we ask is that you answer it as truthfully as you can.

"I don't think you'll find the hour a total loss — being a subject in a psychological study can be a rewarding experience — it may help you understand some of the problems involved — and you'll have the full knowledge you have made a real contribution to science.

"If you make an error while checking the items, just circle in your mistake and put the check in the right place and continue on.

"This questionnaire was designed for males — so we hope the girls won't be offended by male-oriented questions. Please make sure you have four

pages. If you meet any problems while answering it, just raise your hand and Mr. M---, who is supervising this research, or one of his assistants will help you.

"If Mr. M--- is fortunate enough to get the data analyzed in time, he will probably come back and tell you about it in April."

"Thank you."

# APPENDIX E

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS:  (A) CHI-SQUARES OBTAINED
(B) AUTOMOBILE ANALYSIS; (C) AGE, FIRST DATE; (D)
DRIVE-IN ATTENDANCE; (E) PREVIOUS "STEADY" EXPERIENCE;
(F) FAMILY INFORMATION

## Chi-squares obtained on Questionnaire

| Item | Description | Males Chi-square | Males Level of Sign. | Females Chi-square | Females Level of Sign. |
|------|-------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| 2 | Age | 11.61 | .10 | 3.26 | .20 |
| 4 | height | .76 | ns | 4.60 | .10 |
| 5 | weight | 5.75 | ns | 1.81 | ns |
| 6 | eye color | 6.81 | ns | 3.31 | ns |
| 7 | hair color | 2.21 | ns | 4.21 | ns |
| 8 | hair texture | 3.34 | ns | 3.67 | ns |
| 9 | complexion | 3.32 | .20 | ---- | --- |
| 10 | health | 18.56 | .01 | 1.80 | ns |
| 11 | physique | 9.17 | .05 | 3.06 | ns |
| 13 | glasses | 5.74 | ns | 2.52 | ns |
| 14 | physical defect | 1.91 | .20 | ---- | --- |
| 15 | attractiveness | 10.42 | .02 | 3.04 | ns |
| 16 | years intend to spend at univ. | 9.02 | .20 | 11.77 | .02 |
| 17 | grade 12 mark | 11.32 | .10 | .78 | ns |
| 18 | UBC mark | .77 | ns | .55 | ns |
| 19 | subjects | 5.92 | .10 | 4.13 | .20 |
| 20 | first year | 6.53 | .10 | 6.89 | .05 |
| 21 | hours study | 4.26 | ns | 4.81 | ns |
| 22 | lectures attend | 5.21 | ns | 3.83 | .20 |
| 23 | where study | 5.29 | ns | 1.77 | ns |

| Item | Description | Males Chi-square | Level of Sign. | Females Chi-square | Level of sign. |
|------|-------------|------------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------|
| 24 | entertainment time spent on | 26.95 | .01 | 9.26 | .10 |
| 25 | employment | 11.10 | ns | 3.07 | ns |
| 26 | vacations worked | 3.07 | ns | 1.42 | ns |
| 27 | where live | 3.36 | ns | 3.57 | ns |
| 28 | pay room/board | 1.59 | ns | .45 | ns |
| 29 | money spent on entertainment | 44.03 | .01 | 5.99 | .05 |
| 30 | automobile access | 26.23 | .01 | .57 | ns |
| 31 | year of automobile | 4.06 | ns | 1.91 | ns |
| 32 | see page 102 | | | | |
| 33 | see page 102 | | | | |
| 34 | convertible | .70 | ns | 4.94 | .10 |
| | whitewalls | 5.52 | .20 | 6.85 | .05 |
| | radio | 5.52 | .20 | 2.78 | ns |
| | sun-visor | 1.15 | ns | 2.36 | ns |
| | power equipment | 1.99 | ns | --- | --- |
| | heater | .75 | ns | --- | --- |
| | automatic | .51 | ns | 2.85 | ns |
| | V-8 engine | 2.92 | ns | --- | --- |
| | 6-Cylinder engine | 3.22 | ns | 1.50 | ns |
| 35 | condition of auto. | 2.05 | ns | .07 | ns |
| 36 | motorcycle | .20 | ns | --- | --- |

| Item | Description | Males Chi-square | Level of Sign. | Females Chi-square | Level of Sign. |
|------|-------------|------------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------|
| 37 | transport to UBC | 2.49 | ns | 2.58 | ns |
| 38 | beard | 2.43 | ns | ---- | --- |
|  | crewcut | 2.04 | ns | ---- | --- |
|  | duckbill cut | 7.11 | .10 | ---- | --- |
| 39 | Ivy League clothes | 6.87 | .10 | 1.00 | ns |
|  | athletic crest | 9.39 | .05 | ---- | --- |
|  | leather windbreaker | 1.03 | ns | ---- | --- |
|  | Hawaiian shirt | 5.29 | ns | ---- | --- |
|  | suit | 10.74 | .20 | ---- | --- |
|  | white shirt/tie | 11.27 | .02 | ---- | --- |
|  | sport jacket | 5.40 | .20 | ---- | --- |
|  | loafers | 4.96 | .20 | ---- | --- |
|  | oxfords | 4.86 | .20 | ---- | --- |
|  | white bucks | 4.77 | .20 | 2.97 | ns |
|  | suede shoes | 9.80 | .05 | 2.15 | ns |
|  | jeans | .12 | ns | ---- | --- |
|  | semi-drapes | 6.75 | .10 | ---- | --- |
|  | desert boots | 12.40 | .01 | ---- | --- |
| 40 | smoking | 11.16 | .05 | 17.26 | .01 |
| 41 | drinking | 22.57 | .01 | 9.19 | .05 |
| 42 | swearing | 6.15 | ns | 5.45 | ns |
| 43 | dancing | .85 | ns | ---- | --- |
| 44 | jive | 22.42 | .01 | 14.03 | .01 |

| Item | Description | Males | | Females | |
|------|-------------|-------|---|---------|---|
| | | Chi-square | Level of Sign. | Chi-square | Level of Sign. |
| 44 | waltz | 9.25 | .05 | ---- | --- |
| | square dance | 4.78 | .20 | 1.29 | ns |
| | folk dance | 7.71 | .10 | 1.01 | ns |
| | foxtrot | 21.55 | .01 | 5.96 | .10 |
| | rhumba | 8.42 | .05 | 6.67 | .05 |
| | tango | 11.77 | .01 | 6.12 | .05 |
| | samba | 5.94 | .20 | 5.82 | .10 |
| 45 | prefer classical music | .25 | ns | .44 | ns |
| | semi-classical | 1.42 | ns | .82 | ns |
| | western | 5.15 | .20 | ---- | --- |
| | popular | 3.16 | ns | .76 | ns |
| | rock'n'roll | 2.58 | ns | 1.20 | ns |
| | jazz | 12.83 | .01 | 9.27 | .01 |
| 46 | swimming | 11.00 | .02 | .53 | ns |
| | bowling | 4.09 | ns | .90 | ns |
| | skiing | 15.36 | .01 | .62 | ns |
| | ice-skating | 9.05 | .05 | .09 | ns |
| | roller-skate | 1.72 | ns | 2.10 | ns |
| | billiards | 14.11 | .01 | ---- | --- |
| | tennis | 6.22 | .20 | 2.41 | ns |
| | golf | 2.10 | ns | 1.46 | ns |
| | water-skiing | 18.58 | .01 | 3.17 | ns |
| | hunting | 1.19 | ns | ---- | --- |

| | | Males | | Females | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Item | Description | Chi-square | Level of Sign. | Chi-square | Level of Sign. |
| 46 | fishing | .83 | ns | .37 | ns |
| | drawing | ----- | --- | 2.09 | ns |
| | painting | 4.13 | .20 | ---- | --- |
| | singing | 1.65 | ns | .15 | ns |
| | writing | .40 | ns | ---- | --- |
| | play musical instrument | 4.61 | ns | 2.42 | ns |
| | photography | 5.21 | .20 | 2.26 | ns |
| 47 | see appendix *E(c), page 103* | | | | |
| 48 | athletics | 15.75 | .01 | 1.14 | ns |
| 49 | club executive | 5.96 | .20 | .48 | ns |
| 50 | religious service attendance | 8.49 | ns | 6.30 | .20 |
| 51 | number novels read | 7.61 | ns | 3.07 | ns |
| 52 | number movies attend | 6.82 | ns | 11.45 | .05 |
| 53 | see appendix *E(d), page 103* | | | | |
| 54 | prefer musicals | 12.97 | .01 | 1.61 | ns |
| | drama | .67 | ns | 2.37 | ns |
| | westerns | 8.61 | .05 | ----- | --- |
| | war movies | 4.81 | .20 | 1.14 | ns |
| | mystery-crime | 1.15 | ns | 2.37 | ns |
| 55 | parental marital status | 2.82 | ns | 2.77 | ns |
| 56 | parental occupational status | 14.50 | ns | 13.18 | ns |
| 57 | see page *103* | | | | |
| 60 | previous steady experience | 26.71 | .01 | 20.15 | .01 |

Items 32-33: ANALYSIS OF AUTOMOBILE QUESTIONS

---

Make, style, type of automobile were not significant (item 32). The Car Cleanliness Index is determined by dividing the total number of times washed (cut-polished, etc.) by the number of subjects answering each question (item 33). The Car Ownership Index is determined by dividing the number of cars by the number of subjects (item 32).

---

| Males | Car Cleanliness Index | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Group & Description | Washed | Cut-Polish | Simonized | Vacuumed |
| 1 - very infrequent | 12.83 | 1.67 | 3.63 | 8.76 |
| 11 - average | 20.72 | 2.59 | 3.35 | 15.14 |
| 111 - frequent | 22.70 | 1.67 | 3.68 | 19.91 |
| 1V - "steadies" | 21.58 | 2.17 | 3.05 | 18.50 |
| Females | | | | |
| A - infrequent | 13.58 | 2.50 | 3.37 | 6.62 |
| B - frequent | 14.55 | 2.40 | 3.86 | 8.50 |
| C - "steadies" | 13.61 | 3.67 | 1.62 | 15.10 |

| Males | Car Ownership Index | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Group & Description | N of cars | N of subj. | Index | Subj. with 2 or more cars |
| 1 - very infrequent | 36 | 73 | .49 | 0 |
| 11 - average | 60 | 76 | .79 | 5 |
| 111 - frequent | 38 | 40 | .95 | 5 |
| 1V - "steadies" | 72 | 79 | .91 | 5 |
| Females | | | | |
| A - infrequent | 23 | 44 | .52 | 2 |
| B - frequent | 36 | 64 | .56 | 5 |
| C - "steadies" | 24 | 54 | .44 | 3 |

### Item 47:  Age, First Date

| Males | X̄ Age |
|---|---|
| 1 - very infrequent | 15.01 |
| 11 - average | 14.33 |
| 111 - very frequent | 13.13 |
| 1V - steadies | 13.97 |

| Females | X̄ Age |
|---|---|
| A - infrequent | 14.68 |
| B - frequent | 13.22 |
| C - steadies | 13.44 |

### Item 53:  Drive-in Attendance

The drive-in attendance index was determined by: (a) multiplying the percentages by 100; (b) totalling each group's responses; (c) dividing by the number of subjects answering.

| Males | Attendance Index | Females | Attendance Index |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 - infrequent | 3.9 | A - infrequent | 5.9 |
| 11 - average | 14.3 | B - frequent | 8.8 |
| 111 - frequent | 14.6 | C - steadies | 8.2 |
| 1V - steadies | 12.5 | | |

### Item 60:  Previous "Steady" Experience

| Males | | Females | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Group - description | % reporting Previous "steady" | Group - description | % reporting Previous "steady" |
| 1-very in- frequent | 42% | A-infrequent | 35% |
| 11-average | 69% | B-frequent | 67% |
| 111-very frequent | 85% | C-steadies | 78% |
| 1V-steadies | 48% | | |
| total: | 55% | total: | 62% |

TABLE 11

Item 57 - FAMILY INFORMATION

## Males

|  | Family Structure | | | Family Order | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Group Description | % having: S | B | % "Only" Children | X̄ Age: S | B |
| 1 - very infrequent | 54.8 | 61.6 | 16.4 | 19.81 | 19.96 |
| 11 - average | 57.9 | 59.2 | 18.4 | 17.49 | 18.83 |
| 111- very frequent | 50.0 | 62.5 | 12.5 | 17.35 | 20.76 |
| 1V - steadies | 55.7 | 65.8 | 12.6 | 18.23 | 19.69 |

## HETEROSEXUAL ACTIVITY AND STATUS

| Group Description | Percentage: Married Engaged | Going Steady | Dating Randomly | Not Dating |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sisters | | |
| 1 - very infrequent | 37.7 | 7.2 | 26.1 | 28.9 |
| 11 - average | 29.7 | 6.2 | 31.2 | 32.8 |
| 111- very frequent | 32.4 | 5.4 | 16.2 | 45.9 |
| 1V - steadies | 38.5 | 8.9 | 12.8 | 41.0 |
| | | Brothers | | |
| 1 - very infrequent | 28.7 | 3.7 | 31.2 | 32.5 |
| 11 - average | 30.5 | 6.1 | 28.0 | 26.8 |
| 111- very frequent | 34.1 | 15.9 | 36.4 | 11.4 |
| 1V - steadies | 24.7 | 13.4 | 32.9 | 31.9 |

# - percentages do not necessarily
add to 100% due to not answering
groups.

TABLE 11

FAMILY INFORMATION

(continued)

### Females

| Group Description | % having: S | B | % "Only" Children | X̄ Age: S | B |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Family Structure | Family Order | |
| A- infrequent | 55.8 | 65.1 | 6.9 | 19.28 | 20.25 |
| B- frequent | 57.8 | 64.1 | 11.0 | 17.45 | 16.65 |
| C- steadies | 42.5 | 50.0 | 29.6 | 14.38 | 16.00 |

### Heterosexual Activity and Status

| Group Description | Percentage: Married Engaged | Going Steady | Dating Randomly | Not Dating |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sisters | | |
| A- infrequent | 27.7 | 8.3 | 27.7 | 36.1 |
| B- frequent | 18.2 | 12.7 | 30.9 | 34.5 |
| C- steadies | 9.7 | 9.7 | 38.7 | 41.9 |
| | | Brothers | | |
| A- infrequent | 40.0 | 10.0 | 30.0 | 20.0 |
| B- frequent | 10.9 | 9.0 | 36.4 | 43.6 |
| C- steadies | 18.6 | 6.9 | 20.9 | 53.5 |

S= Sister
B= Brother