

72-15,307

SULLIVAN, Joyce Ann, 1931-
CHARACTERISTICS PERTAINING TO THE SELECTION
OF DATING AND MARITAL PARTNERS AS PERCEIVED BY
COLLEGE STUDENTS AND THEIR PARENTS.

The Ohio State University, Ph.D., 1971
Home Economics

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

© 1972

Joyce Ann Sullivan

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

CHARACTERISTICS PERTAINING TO THE SELECTION OF DATING AND
MARITAL PARTNERS AS PERCEIVED BY COLLEGE
STUDENTS AND THEIR PARENTS

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate
School of The Ohio State University

By

Joyce A. Sullivan, B.S., M.A.

The Ohio State University

1971

Approved by

D. Lois Gilmore
Adviser

Cecil M. Taylor
Co-Adviser
School of Home Economics

PLEASE NOTE:

**Some pages have indistinct
print. Filmed as received.**

University Microfilms, A Xerox Education Company

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express sincere appreciation to her major adviser, Dr. Claribel Taylor, Chairman, Division of Family and Child Development, for her continuous guidance and support through the designing and implementation of this study. Appreciation is also gratefully extended to other members of the committee, Dr. Alfred Clarke, Dr. Lois Gilmore and Dr. I. Keith Tyler for their generous time and insightful contributions to the manuscript.

The hundreds of students and parents affiliated with The University of Akron are also gratefully acknowledged for their willingness and cooperation in their participation in this study.

Special gratitude is also extended to Dr. Ralph Blackwood and Robert Seeman of The University of Akron for their time and assistance in computer programming and analysis of the research data.

And finally, a special word of thanks to the writer's husband, mother and children for their efforts and encouragement which helped to make the writer's doctoral study a possibility and a reality.

VITA

March 18, 1931 . . . Born, Cleveland, Ohio

1952 B.S. (Home Economics Education), Kent State University,
Kent, Ohio

1952-1962 Instructor, Junior High and High School Home Economics
Trenton, Michigan, Warren and Kent, Ohio

1954-1957 Instructor, Adult Education, Warren, Ohio

1962-1967 Instructor in Food and Nutrition and Family Life
Kent State University, Kent, Ohio

1963 M.A. (Home Economics), Kent State University,
Kent, Ohio

1967- Associate Professor and Head of Department of Home
Economics, The University of Akron, Akron, Ohio

PUBLICATIONS

"Using ITV for Food Instruction", Journal of Home Economics, March, 1966

"Televised Food Demonstrations", Journal of Home Economics, May, 1967

FIELDS OF STUDY

Major Field: Family and Child Development

Studies in Family and Child Development, Dr. Claribel M. Taylor

Studies in Home Economics Education, Dr. Marie Dirks

Studies in Multi-Media Communications, Dr. I. Keith Tyler

CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
VITA	iii
TABLES	vii
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	6
Statistical Design	8
Hypotheses	9
Limitations	10
Definition of Terms Used in Study	10
II REVIEW OF LITERATURE	12
The Rating and Dating Complex	13
Social Homogamy and Endogamy	18
Race	19
Religion	20
Ethnic Origin	21
Social Status and Propinquity	21
Theories of Complementary Needs and Value Consensus in Mate Selection	23
Parental Image and Parental Influence	28
The Ideal Mate Theory	33
Personality Characteristics and Physical Traits	37
Changing Life Styles	41
Drugs	44
Sexual Permissiveness	45
Alternatives to Pre-marital Pregnancy	47
Alternative Life Styles	48
III RESEARCH DESIGN	51
Hypotheses	55
Description of the Population	56
Student Population	56
Parental Population	59

CONTENTS (continued)

CHAPTER		Page
III	(continued)	
	Description of Sample	60
	Students	60
	Parents	63
	Instrument	64
	Pilot Study	66
	Reliability of the Instrument	66
	Statistical Analysis of Data	69
IV	PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	73
	Student Preferences for Dating and Marital Partners	74
	Students' and Parents' Preferences for Marital Partners	77
	Female and Male Preferences for Marital Partners	84
	Female and Male Preferences for Dating Partners	87
	Mothers' Preferences for Marital Partners for Daughters and Sons	93
	Fathers' Preferences for Marital Partners for Daughters and Sons	95
	Preferences for Marital Partners for Married and Non-married Students	98
	Preferences for Dating Partners for Married and Non-married Students	104
	Preferences for Marital Partners for Campus-Residents and Non-Residents	104
	Dating Preferences for Dating Partners for Campus-Residents and Non-Residents	107
	Preferences for Marital Partners as Viewed by Self-perceived Liberal, Conservative and Independent Students	107
	Preferences for Dating Partners as Viewed by Self-perceived Liberal, Conservative and Independent Students	115
	Summary	117
V	SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS	118
	General Findings	119
	Findings in Relation to the Null Hypotheses	120
	Null Hypothesis 1	120
	Null Hypothesis 2	120
	Null Hypothesis 3	121

CONTENTS (continued)

CHAPTER	Page
V (continued)	
Null hypothesis 4	122
Null hypothesis 5	122
Null hypothesis 6	122
Null hypothesis 7	123
Implications	125
Suggestions for Further Research	128
APPENDICES	130
A. Tables Presenting the Group With the Highest Percentage of Rejection, Chi Square, Degrees of Freedom and Probability Levels for Characteristics Influencing the Selection of Dating and/or Marital Partners as Perceived by Various Classifications of Students and Parents	131
B. Student Questionnaire	144
C. Parental Questionnaire	153
BIBLIOGRAPHY	159

TABLES

Table	Page
I. MALE PERCEPTIONS OF CAMPUS NORMS FOR FEMALE POPULARITY	17
II. TABLE AND RANK OF 18 PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS IN MATE SELECTION BASED ON MEAN VALUE, BY YEAR AND SEX	40
III. COMPARISON OF NORMS CONCERNING ESSENTIAL AND IMPORTANT OBJECTIVES IN LIFE FOR UNIVERSITY OF AKRON AND NATIONAL COLLEGE FRESHMEN, 1970	58
IV. COMPARISON OF NORMS REGARDING POLITICAL BELIEFS FOR UNIVERSITY OF AKRON AND NATIONAL COLLEGE FRESHMEN, 1970	58
V. DESCRIPTION OF STUDENTS INCLUDED IN SAMPLE N=465	62
VI. DESCRIPTION OF PARENTS INCLUDED IN SAMPLE N=318	65
VII. KENDALL'S RANK ORDER CORRELATION COEFFICIENT (TAU), STANDARD DEVIATIONS z SCORES AND PROBABILITY LEVELS FOR MARITAL AND DATING SCALES AS AN INDICATOR OF RELIABILITY	70
VIII. PERCENTAGES AND LEVELS OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF DATING AND MARITAL PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY COLLEGE STUDENTS (N=465)	75
IX. PERCENTAGES AND LEVELS OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY COLLEGE STUDENTS (N=465) AND THEIR PARENTS (N=318)	79
X. AVERAGE MEAN SCORES, t-VALUES AND PROBABILITY LEVELS FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS AS PERCEIVED BY COLLEGE STUDENTS (N=465) AND THEIR PARENTS (N=318)	81

TABLES (continued)

Table	Page
XI. PERCENTAGES AND LEVEL OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR THE "MOST DETRIMENTAL" CHARACTERISTICS FOR MARITAL PARTNERS AS PERCEIVED BY COLLEGE STUDENTS AND THEIR PARENTS	82
XII. ITEM CONSIDERED "MOST DETRIMENTAL", CHI SQUARE VALUE, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVEL INDICATING PREFERENCE FOR MARITAL PARTNERS AS PERCEIVED BY STUDENTS (N=465) AND PARENTS (N=318)	83
XIII. PERCENTAGES AND LEVELS OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY COLLEGE FEMALES (N=225) AND COLLEGE MALES (N=240)	85
XIV. AVERAGE MEAN SCORES, t-VALUES AND PROBABILITY LEVELS FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS AS PERCEIVED BY COLLEGE FEMALES (N=225) AND MALES (N=240)	88
XV. PERCENTAGES AND LEVEL OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR THE "MOST DETRIMENTAL" CHARACTERISTICS FOR MARITAL PARTNERS AS PERCEIVED BY COLLEGE FEMALES AND MALES	89
XVI. ITEM CONSIDERED "MOST DETRIMENTAL", CHI SQUARE VALUES, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVEL INDICATING PREFERENCES FOR MARITAL PARTNERS AS PERCEIVED BY COLLEGE FEMALES AND MALES	90
XVII. PERCENTAGES AND LEVELS OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF DATING PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY COLLEGE FEMALES (N=225) AND COLLEGE MALES (N=240)	92
XVIII. PERCENTAGES AND LEVELS OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS FOR DAUGHTERS AND SONS AS VIEWED BY MOTHERS (N=168)	94
XIX. PERCENTAGES AND LEVELS OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS FOR DAUGHTERS AND SONS AS VIEWED BY FATHERS (N=147).	96

TABLES (continued)

Table		Page
XX.	PERCENTAGES AND LEVEL OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR THE "MOST DETRIMENTAL" CHARACTERISTICS FOR MARITAL PARTNERS FOR DAUGHTERS AND SONS AS PERCEIVED BY MOTHERS	99
XXI.	ITEM CONSIDERED "MOST DETRIMENTAL", CHI SQUARE VALUES, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVEL INDICATING PREFERENCE FOR MARITAL PARTNERS FOR DAUGHTERS AND SONS AS PERCEIVED BY MOTHERS (N=168)	100
XXII.	PERCENTAGES AND LEVEL OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR THE "MOST DETRIMENTAL" CHARACTERISTICS FOR MARITAL PARTNERS FOR DAUGHTERS AND SONS AS PERCEIVED BY FATHERS	101
XXIII.	ITEM CONSIDERED "MOST DETRIMENTAL", CHI SQUARE VALUES, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVEL INDICATING PREFERENCE FOR MARITAL PARTNERS FOR DAUGHTERS AND SONS AS PERCEIVED BY FATHERS (N=147)	102
XXIV.	PERCENTAGES AND LEVELS OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY NON-MARRIED STUDENTS (N=397) AND MARRIED STUDENTS (N=68)	103
XXV.	PERCENTAGES AND LEVELS OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF DATING PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY NON-MARRIED STUDENTS (N=397) AND MARRIED STUDENTS (N=68)	105
XXVI.	PERCENTAGES AND LEVELS OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY CAMPUS-RESIDENT STUDENTS (N=110) AND STUDENTS RESIDING WITH PARENTS (N=260)	106
XXVII.	PERCENTAGES AND LEVELS OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF DATING PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY CAMPUS-RESIDENT STUDENTS (N=110) AND STUDENTS RESIDING WITH PARENTS (N=260)	108

TABLES (continued)

Table	Page
XXVIII. PERCENTAGES AND LEVELS OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY SELF-PERCEIVED LIBERAL (N=112), CONSERVATIVE (N=156) AND INDEPENDENT (N=192) STUDENTS	110
XXIX. AVERAGE MEAN SCORES, t-VALUES AND PROBABILITY LEVELS FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY SELF-PERCEIVED LIBERAL (N=112), CONSERVATIVE (N=156) AND INDEPENDENT (N=192) STUDENTS	112
XXX. PERCENTAGES AND LEVEL OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR THE "MOST DETRIMENTAL" CHARACTERISTICS FOR MARITAL PARTNERS AS PERCEIVED BY LIBERAL, CONSERVATIVE AND INDEPENDENT COLLEGE STUDENTS	113
XXXI. ITEM CONSIDERED "MOST DETRIMENTAL", CHI SQUARE VALUES, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVEL INDICATING PREFERENCE FOR MARITAL PARTNERS AS PERCEIVED BY LIBERAL, CONSERVATIVE AND INDEPENDENT STUDENTS	114
XXXII. PERCENTAGES AND LEVELS OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF DATING PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY SELF-PERCEIVED LIBERAL (N=112), CONSERVATIVE (N=156) AND INDEPENDENT (N=192) STUDENTS	116
XXXIII. CHI SQUARE, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVEL FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF DATING AND MARITAL PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY COLLEGE STUDENTS (N=465)	132
XXXIV. CHI SQUARE, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVEL FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY COLLEGE STUDENTS (N=465) AND THEIR PARENTS (N=318) .	133
XXXV. CHI SQUARE, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVELS FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS AS PERCEIVED BY COLLEGE FEMALES (N=225) AND COLLEGE MALES (N=240)	134

TABLES (continued)

Table	Page
XXXVI. CHI SQUARE, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVELS FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF DATING PARTNERS AS PERCEIVED BY COLLEGE FEMALES (N=225) AND COLLEGE MALES (N=240)	135
XXXVII. CHI SQUARE, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVELS FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS FOR DAUGHTERS AND SONS AS VIEWED BY MOTHERS (N=168)	136
XXXVIII. CHI SQUARE, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVELS FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS FOR DAUGHTERS AND SONS AS VIEWED BY FATHERS (N=147)	137
XXXIX. CHI SQUARE, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVELS FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY NON-MARRIED (N=397) AND MARRIED STUDENTS (N=68)	138
XL. CHI SQUARE, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVELS FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF DATING PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY NON-MARRIED (N=397) AND MARRIED STUDENTS (N=68)	139
XLI. CHI SQUARE, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVELS FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY CAMPUS-RESIDENT STUDENTS (N=110) AND STUDENTS RESIDING WITH PARENTS (N=260)	140
XLII. CHI SQUARE, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVELS FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF DATING PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY CAMPUS-RESIDENT STUDENTS (N=110) AND STUDENTS RESIDING WITH PARENTS (N=260)	141
XLIII. CHI SQUARE, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVEL FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY SELF-PERCEIVED LIBERAL (N=112), CONSERVATIVE (N=156) AND INDEPENDENT (N=192) STUDENTS	142

TABLES (continued)

Table		Page
XLIV.	CHI SQUARE, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVELS FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF DATING PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY SELF-PERCEIVED LIBERAL (N=112), CONSERVATIVE (N=156) AND INDEPENDENT (N=192) STUDENTS	143

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The campus confrontations experienced across the nation in the spring of 1970 focused attention on the current issues involved in giving rise to youthful dissent against, in the terms of the dissenters, "irrelevancy and hypocrisy." Bell and Chaskes claim that while there has always been rebellion by the younger generation toward their elders, it has probably never been as great in this country as it has been since the mid sixties. College students have been the primary group during recent years to instigate rebellions, but the real difference in this generation of college students is that they are not only alienated as others have been in the past, but they are actively alienated. Today's youthful rebellions are being given both implicit and explicit approval by many in the older generation.¹

Parallel to and interwoven with youthful rebellion, in both internal and external strife against the situation quo, are attempts to seek greater individualized freedom in practices relating to dating, marriage and family life. In this dimension, the criticism has been leveled against the youth during past generations. Nearly fifty years ago, Watson predicted:

¹Robert R. Bell and Jay B. Chaskes, "Premarital Sexual Experience Among Coeds, 1958 and 1968," Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXII (February, 1970), p. 81.

In fifty years, unless there is some change, the tribal custom of marriage will no longer exist. Family standards have broken down and parents contribute little to behavior of their children. The automobile and other things have taken the child out of control. The mystery and beauty of marriage and rearing of children has pretty well broken down.²

Thirty years ago, Waller claimed that the once acceptable codes of courtship progressing from casual dating to courting to formal engagement in a predictable fashion was giving way to thrill seeking and exploitative types of relationships which were not necessarily linked with marriage.³ In that same decade, Folsom predicted:

A part of the so-called 'sex freedom' of today is simply the devaluation of the marriage ceremony, together with ceremony and ritual in general . . . Once reproduction is widely understood as a natural process, it becomes difficult to maintain it as something sacredly immune to human interference. Hence, contraception becomes tolerable, abortion slightly less tolerable and 'voluntary parenthood' even becomes a positive value . . . Clearly we are moving toward assimilation of the sexes in their dress, their occupations, their sex behavior codes and their leisure time activities.⁴

In the late forties, Harvard sociologist Carle Zimmerman, declared:

The American family is doomed unless it returns to the domestic type of our grandparents. There is little left now within the family or the moral code to hold the family together.⁵

Recent articles pertaining to the obsolete or the shattered family appear to support Zimmerman's predictions. However, there has been little

²Ernest Burgess and Paul Wallin, Engagement and Marriage, (Chicago: Lippincott, 1953), p. 3.

³Ira L. Reiss, "Social Class and Campus Dating," Social Problems, XIII (Fall, 1965), p. 193.

⁴Joseph K. Folsom, "Changing Values in Sex and Family Relations," American Sociological Review, II (October, 1937), p. 717.

⁵Carle C. Zimmerman, The Family and Civilization, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947), p. 796.

evidence to indicate anything amounting to a revolution of change in the institution of marriage and family. Midway through the century, Burgess and Wallin attributed the major change to a shift of attitudes regarding the objectives for American marriage. A few generations ago it was common practice to marry for wealth, security, social status, religious reasons or political or social advancement. Parents were frequently instrumental in the selection of a marital partner for their siblings. Motivation for marriage, in the early 1950s, according to Burgess and Wallin, included fun, happiness or companionship with little or no intervention from parents.⁶

The morality of the 1970s brought about new predictions regarding youth summarized in Michael's claims for The Next Generation. The growth in social complexity, said Michael, will result in more intense and widespread priority conflicts in traditional community interest. Part of the issue will be to decide which traditional institutional positions are to be preserved and which shall be changed. In a sweeping conclusion, Michael predicted that "youth will turn intensively to self-emphasizing experiences with love, family, sex, religion, hallucinatory drugs, etc."⁷

If young adulthood could be considered a moratorium in life's maturation process, the concerns for the young by the older generation might be greatly reduced. However, frequently during the decade of decisions, ages fifteen to twenty-five, an individual makes decisions and

⁶Meyer Barash and Alice Scourby (Eds.), Marriage and the Family: A Comparative Analysis of Contemporary Problems, (New York: Random House, 1970), p. 342.

⁷Donald Michael, The Next Generation, (New York: Random House, 1963), p. 161.

accepts patterns of behavior which will direct and guide the course of much of the remainder of life. The active alienation of today's youth and the forms of "cop outs" chosen as means of coping or not coping with reality are indeed serious concerns to parents and society.

The issues which surround the growing-up process are many of the same issues which threaten to destroy the very fabric of the institution of marriage and family. Drug addiction, abortion, illegitimacy, unwed parenthood, communal living and other alternatives to traditional marriage, sexual permissiveness, population control and loss of religious practice have direct bearing on future families and future parental attitudes and life styles.

The realities of Michael's predictions are evidenced by current statistics regarding the prevalence of these related social issues among the younger generation. Researchers estimate that approximately 40 per cent of teenage brides are pregnant at the time of their marriage. Approximately two to three million illegal abortions are performed annually, many of which involve unmarried teenagers. Illegitimacy and unwed parenthood are increasing among the teenage population. Today nearly one in every 15 births in the United States is illegitimate in spite of scientific advancement in birth control.⁸

More recent issues concern the problems of drugs and youth. Estimates in large cities indicate that as many as 75 per cent of all high school students have experimented with drugs. A recent Harris poll

⁸Akron Beacon Journal, "Illegitimacy is Exploding," Sunday, October 8, 1967, p. F 20.

of youngsters ages 15 to 21 found that 62 per cent of persons questioned knew someone taking drugs.⁹ Conservative estimates indicate that approximately 10 per cent of high school youngsters might be considered drug users; the percentage would be much higher in most college populations. National estimates place the number of drug dependent persons between 600,000 and 700,000.¹⁰

Hippism, communal living patterns and other alternatives to traditional courtship and marital practices have attracted large numbers of youth. Interracial dating is becoming more frequent and is more widely accepted among young adults.¹¹ Divorces are more widely accepted and easier to obtain and are sometimes considered a status symbol among certain subcultures of young adults. Draft evasion and anti-war demonstrations have become commonplace among the youth. Churches of all denominations have taken various measures in an attempt to counteract the "God is Dead" philosophy prevalent among the rebellious generation.

In spite of youthful confrontation on all fronts, research indicates that the young and old have, basically, the same values. A Harris poll claims that on the national level, students have largely the same values as their parents.¹² In a comparison of studies of campus values

⁹"The New Youth Poll," Life, January 8, 1971, p. 26.

¹⁰American Social Health Association, The Price of Ignorance. A report prepared by the American Social Health Association, New York, 1970.

¹¹Akron Beacon Journal, "Fifty-six Percent Frown on Laws Banning Interracial Marriages," Thursday, September 10, 1970, p. B 1.

¹²"The New Youth Poll," op. cit., p. 23.

In mate selection from 1939 to 1967, Hudson and Henze concluded that in general the young people had not basically departed from traditional values.¹³

If the marriage rate remains as constant as it has been during the past 100 years, approximately 95 per cent of the United States population will marry at some time in their life. From the foregoing statistics, it is evident that many potential dating and marital partners will be or will have been personally involved with social issues of pre-marital sex, pregnancy, abortion, unwed parenthood, drug abuse or alienated patterns of behavior toward religious, social or political spheres of life. What influence, if any, will these exert on student preferences for dating or marital partners? Are there apparent value differences between parents and students in these dimensions? What future family patterns or life styles are indicated by attitudes of today's youth in these dimensions?

Statement of the Problem

This study was designed to determine whether or not students' values toward selection of dating and marital partners reflected issues apparent in today's youth culture. Value similarity or dissimilarity between parent-child generation regarding marital choices was incorporated into the design. An attempt was made to assess the influence of specified personal characteristics on the selection of dating and/or marital partners as viewed by students and parents. College students rated hypothetical personal characteristics for their partners; parents rated the

¹³John Hudson and Lura Henze, "Campus Values In Mate Selection: A Replication," Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXIX (November, 1969), p. 775.

personal characteristics for marital partners for their sons or daughters. The specific characteristics studied pertained to a dating and/or marital partner who:

1. had neurotic tendencies
2. had a slight physical handicap (limped, loss of fingers, speech impediment)
3. had a major physical handicap (loss of one limb, blind)
4. was in poor health
5. was not considered good looking
6. had been divorced
7. favored divorce as solution to conflict in marriage
8. had children by a previous marriage
9. was a habitual smoker
10. was a habitual drinker
11. was a drug user
12. was a drug addict
13. was currently living in a commune
14. was currently living as a hippy
15. was of another race
16. had a much lower educational attainment level
17. had a much higher educational attainment level
18. was of a lower socio-economic level
19. was of a higher socio-economic level
20. favored sexual relationships with other than marital partner
21. had no desire to bear or rear children
22. favored abortion
23. was considered sexually permissive

24. had totally denounced religious practice

25. had totally denounced religious faith

(Included on female questionnaire only.)

26. had refused induction into the armed services

27. had fathered an illegitimate child

28. held little sense of responsibility

(Included on male questionnaire only.)

26. had had at least one pre-marital abortion

27. had given up an illegitimate child

28. was rearing an illegitimate child

29. had little sense of responsibility

Statistical Design

These preceding characteristics were incorporated into several variables in the study including: (1) the dating and marital preferences of college students; (2) the marital preference of students as compared to the marital preferences of their parents for their siblings; (3) the marital preferences for daughters and sons as compared by mothers and fathers; and (4) marital preferences as perceived by the following groups: (a) male and female students; (b) married and non-married students; (c) campus residents and non-residential students, and (d) students who perceived themselves as liberal, conservative or independent.

A Likert type questionnaire was designed by the researcher to test the null hypotheses. The instrument was checked for validity and reliability. Kendall's tau-coefficient of correlation was used to determine reliability.

The questionnaires were administered to a sample of students attending The University of Akron and their parents. A total of 465 students and 318 parents comprised the final sample.

Chi square and average mean scores were used to determine significant differences between the variables incorporated in the study. The critical rejection level was established at the .01 level of probability. A detailed description of the design of the study is given in Chapter III.

Hypotheses

The null hypotheses tested in this study were as follows:

1. There will be no significant difference between the accepted and rejected personal characteristics which influence the selection of dating partners and those which influence the selection of marital partners as perceived by college students.
2. There will be no significant difference between the accepted and rejected personal characteristics which influence the selection of marital partners as viewed by college students and those which influence the selection of marital partners for siblings as viewed by parents of college students.
3. There will be no significant difference between the accepted and rejected personal characteristics which influence the selection of dating and marital partners as perceived by college males and those which influence the selection of dating and marital partners as perceived by college females.
4. There will be no significant difference in the hypothetical selection of marital partners for sons and marital partners for daughters as perceived by mothers and fathers.
5. There will be no significant difference between the accepted and rejected personal characteristics which influence the selection of dating and marital partners as perceived by married college students and non-married college students.
6. There will be no significant difference between the accepted and rejected personal characteristics which influence the selection of dating and marital partners as perceived by resident campus students and non-resident campus students.

7. There will be no significant difference between the accepted and rejected personal characteristics which influence the selection of dating and marital partners as viewed by college students who perceive themselves as liberal, conservative, or independent.

Limitations

The limitations of the study were primarily related to the sample and the method of testing. The findings of the study should not be generalized on a universal basis due to the limited sample studied. It should also be recognized that the element of social desirability may have influenced the choices of answers for some persons. Although an attempt was made to randomize the sample, the investigator recognized that the student sample represented a greater degree of randomization than the parental sample. All students selected for the study completed the questionnaire. Approximately 35 per cent of the parents who were asked to participate in the study returned usable replies. It might, therefore, be assumed that the parents who were interested in the study comprised the parental sample.

Definition of Terms Used in Study

1. Attitude "The sum total of a man's inclination and feelings, prejudice or bias, preconceived notions, ideas, fears, threats, and convictions about any specific topic."¹⁴
2. Communal living six to fifteen persons of both sexes determined to reconstruct their own lives and influence others to seek meaningful work, mutual love and spiritual re-birth. Communal living may or may not be extended to include sexual relationships among its members.

¹⁴L. L. Thurstone and E. J. Chaves, The Measurement of Attitude, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929), pp. 7-8.

3. Dating a relationship expressing freedom, lack of commitment or public obligation for any sort of future action.¹⁵
4. Drug addict applied to person who is dependent upon the addicting drugs such as opium and its derivatives, synthetic narcotics, barbiturates and solvents.¹⁶
5. Drug user applied to a person who has an habitation for cocaine, amphetamines, marijuana, LSD, or other hallucinogenic drugs.¹⁷
6. Hippy person who shuns conventional forms of dress code, habits of personal care and cleanliness and traditional values of materialism. A hippy is usually identified by symbols of dress and accessories currently termed as "hippy style." Drug use and communal living excluded from the definition of a hippy.
7. Value Individual idea of conditions and objects which gives meaning to life for him and of reality as he thinks it to be.¹⁸
"Complex but definitely patterned principles, resulting from the transactional interplay of three analytically distinguishable elements of the evaluative process—the cognitive, the affective, and the directive elements—which give order and direction to the ever-flowing stream of human acts and thoughts . . ."¹⁹

¹⁵Jack Delora, "Social Systems of Dating on a College Campus," Marriage and Family Living, XXV (February, 1963), p. 82.

¹⁶Kenneth L. Jones, Louis W. Shainberg and Curtis O. Byer, Drugs and Alcohol, (New York: Harper and Row, 1969), pp. 9-11.

¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁸Eleanore L. Kohlmann, "Personal Values—What are They?" Journal of Home Economics, LIV (December, 1962), p. 819.

¹⁹Florence R. Kluckhohn and Fred L. Strodtbeck, Variations in Value Orientations, (New York: Row, Peterson and Company, 1961), p. 341.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The phenomena of date selection and marital choice is complex. It has long been recognized that mate selection criteria and marital aspirations reflect the social codes of a given culture and vary most widely throughout the world. The "filtering"¹ or selective factors operative within any culture or subculture have neither been totally assessed nor understood.

The American dating and mate selection process is unique. American youth frequently receive more parental and formalized counseling on the subject of what occupation or what college they should select than on the subject of who they should or should not marry. The American dating system, according to Pope and Knudsen, is participant-run. Parents may attempt to teach children restraint, especially their daughters, however, as children enter adolescence, the peer group influences may compete with parental attitudes and controls. At this point, the youth takes control of the bargaining power within the courtship market.²

¹Allan C. Kerckhoff and Keith E. Davis, "Value Consensus and Need Complementarity in Mate Selection," American Sociological Review, LXII (June, 1962), p. 295.

²Hallowell Pope and Dean D. Knudsen, "Premarital Sexual Norms, The Family and Social Change," Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXVII (August, 1965), pp. 315-16.

In the review of literature an attempt will be made to survey various theories which may be related to the mate selection process. Research regarding the progressive and behavioral approaches to mate selection as well as the social and parental influence upon the dating process will be discussed.

Extensive literature has accumulated on the subject of who dates and who marries whom. Although the phenomenon of the dating process was mentioned in sociological literature prior to the 1930s, the observations of Waller regarding shifting campus dating patterns brought the subject to the attention of researchers and theorists. Little research on dating and courtship practices was attempted until the late 1940s.³ During the past few decades various theoretical frameworks of references for dating and marital selection have been proposed.

The Rating and Dating Complex

Early research regarding dating practices on college campuses was conducted by Waller at Pennsylvania State University. Although the study was published in 1937, data for the study was collected in the late 1920s and was, therefore, reflective of the decade of the Roaring Twenties. Waller noted a definite departure from the formal code of courtship, engagement and marriage in the emergence of thrill-seeking exploitative relationships and a competitive system of dating and rating which had little or no connection with marriage. The determinants of campus prestige for dating popularity according to the male preference for female

³Lee G. Burchinal, "The Premarital Dyad and Love Involvement," in Handbook of Marriage and the Family, ed. by Harold T. Christensen, (Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1964), p. 643.

dates included good clothes, a smooth line and the ability to dance well. In a pattern of circular causation, the most popular girls became the most frequently sought.

Campus females gave highest rating to men who belonged to better fraternities, were prominent in activities, had copious supply of spending money, were well dressed and had smooth manners and attractive appearance. A good line, ability to dance well and access to an automobile also attributed to higher ratings for male dates.

Waller recognized the fact that rating and dating varied from one school to another. He considered the competitive materialistic rating as dysfunctional to the process of marital selection. The researcher admitted that a true relationship might develop from rating and dating, but if a couple moved into a more sincere and lasting relationship, the original involvement was based on the pretention that each was in love with the other since the entire complex of rating and dating was greatly supported by pretending.⁴

Theoretical descriptions of dating and courtship were related to student responses by Lowrie in 1951. Contrary to the theorists who claimed that dating was for prestige or exploitation, Lowrie found that the majority of students claimed educational and socializational benefits from the dating process. One-third of the students studied claimed dating was a learning or educational process. Lowrie found that students did not distinguish between degree of involvement or commitment in dating and

⁴Willard Waller, "The Rating and Dating Complex," American Sociological Review, 11 (October, 1937), pp. 727-34.

courtship. The word "courtship", however, was not considered a part of the 1950 campus terminology.⁵

Smith re-tested Waller's theory on the same campus where the original data was collected. Changes in housing facilities and male-female ratios were evident over the 20-year span between studies. The male-female ratio was six to one in the 1930s and decreased to three to one by the 1950s. Nearly half of the male population of the campus resided in fraternity houses at the time of Waller's study; twenty years later only one-fourth of the Penn State males were residing in fraternity houses. The students were asked to express agreement or disagreement with the 28 characteristics which were included in Waller's original study. Over 90 per cent of the females stated that it was not necessary for males to have sex relations or be on football teams to be considered popular. Females in Smith's study differed with Waller's findings on such items as belonging to one of the better fraternities, having a copious supply of money and having access to an automobile. Of 344 men in the study, 80 per cent agreed that a girl must be smooth in manners and appearance. Smith found the college students still aware of a rating and dating complex, but they were not in agreement with Waller's priority of items. The rating-dating complex was found to be more operative during the pre-engagement period than afterwards.⁶

Following Waller's and Smith's studies, Blood attempted to check the closeness of fit of Waller's rating complex to the generation of the

⁵Samuel H. Lowrie, "Dating Theories and Student Responses," American Sociological Review, XVI (June 3, 1951), pp. 334-40.

⁶William M. Smith, Jr., "Rating and Dating: A Re-Study," Marriage and Family Living, XIV (November, 1952), pp. 312-17.

1950s. Over 200 University of Michigan male and female students, selected at random, participated in the study by taking a refined version of Waller's rating scale. The scale was modified to include some factors which Smith found to be significant in selection of dates. Approximately half of Waller's items failed to receive majority support; therefore, they were not considered characteristic of the 1950 rating priorities. The pattern of responses to the modified items on Blood's scale suggested that personality aspects outranked the more materialistic items which dominated the Penn State study of the 1930s. Blood regarded the system of values referred to by Waller as more typical of the Greek campus population than the overall university population. Blood summarized:

Waller's scale of campus values was not generally subscribed to by contemporary students at the University of Michigan.⁷

The table⁸ on page 17 illustrates the results of the modified popularity scale administered to the Michigan University students in 1953.

One of the most striking results of Blood's study was that six of the 37 items in the modified questionnaire rated unanimous approval from all the students. These six items regarded persons who: (1) were pleasant and cheerful; (2) had a sense of humor; (3) were good sports; (4) were natural; (5) were considerate and (6) were neat in appearance. All six items were related to characteristics which enhance human interaction rather than characteristics which would indicate exploitation or

⁷Robert O. Blood, Jr., "A Retest of Waller's Rating Complex," Marriage and Family Living, XVII (February, 1955), pp. 41-47.

⁸Ibid., p. 43.

TABLE 1. MALE PERCEPTIONS OF CAMPUS NORMS FOR FEMALE POPULARITY

Item	Per Cent Yes	Rank	Source of Item
Is considerate	99.3	1	
Is pleasant and cheerful	97.8	3.5	
Is neat in appearance	97.8	3.5	Waller
Has a sense of humor	97.8	3.5	
Is a good sport	97.8	3.5	
Is willing to join in a group	97.0	6.5	
Has good sense, is intelligent	97.0	6.5	
Be natural	96.3	8	
Is appropriately dressed	95.5	9	Waller, modified
Is dependable	94.8	11	
Thinks of things to do	94.8	11	
Gets along well with his own sex	94.8	11	
Is a well-rounded person	94.0	13	
Is honest, straight-forward	90.3	14	
Is well-poised	88.8	15	
Is an intelligent conversationalist	86.6	16	
Is emotionally mature	85.8	17	
Is a good listener	84.8	18	
Is good-looking, attractive	82.7	19	Waller
Has polished manners	81.3	20	Waller, modified
Is popular with the opposite sex	79.9	21	(Waller, female only)
Doesn't have a reputation for petting	73.2	22	(Waller, female only)
Is affectionate	70.9	23	
Knows how to dance well	70.1	24	Waller
Doesn't have a reputation for necking	64.9	25	(Waller, female only)
Goes to popular places	57.9	26	(Waller, female only)
Is willing to drink socially	47.4	27	(Waller, female only)
Is willing to neck on occasion	45.5	28	(Smith, modified)
Is prominent in activities	34.3	29	Waller
Belongs to a fraternity	32.1	30.5	Waller
Has a car or access to one	32.1	30.5	Waller
Has plenty of money	14.9	32	Waller
Is willing to pet on occasion	13.4	33	(Smith, modified)
Has plenty of clothes	9.7	34	Waller, modified
Dates popular students only	9.0	35	(Waller, female only)

materialism. These ratings suggest a more functional objective to college dating than Waller's findings and analysis. The uniformities of Blood's re-test of Waller's study implied a pattern unlike either the traditional courtship phenomena or the rating and dating complex. Emphasis was toward the desirability of interpersonal relationships and equalitarian companionship.⁹

Rogers and Havens studied behavior patterns of dating, rather than dating preferences, at Iowa State University in 1956. Results were in agreement with Smith's findings and indicated established prestige ratings within definite endogamy patterns for dating, pinnings and engagements. Men from high prestige fraternities dated women from high prestige sororities; dormitory men dated dormitory women.¹⁰

Social Homogamy and Endogamy

The principles of homogamy, heterogamy, endogamy and exogamy are repeatedly referred to in mate selection literature. As early as 1949 Burgess and Locke reported that more than 100 studies illustrated evidence that "like marry like."¹¹ Homogamy refers to similarity of various characteristics, or briefly, "like attract like." Heterogamy suggests that "opposites attract." Endogamy refers to persons marrying within a

⁹Robert Blood, Jr., "Uniformities and Diversities in Campus Dating Preferences," Marriage and Family Living, XVIII (February, 1956), pp. 37-44.

¹⁰E. M. Rogers and A. E. Havens, "Prestige Rating and Mate Selection on a College Campus," Marriage and Family Living, XXII (February, 1960), pp. 55-59.

¹¹Ernest W. Burgess and Harvey J. Locke, The Family, (New York: American Book Co., 1945), p. 422.

given group; exogamy indicates marriage outside a group structure. Certain aspects of each of these theories or phenomena have been researched by psychologists and sociologists. Psychologists have confined their attention to individual physical and psychological characteristics. Sociologists have referred to external factors produced within social settings in an emphasis of ethnic origin, residential propinquity, race, religion, status and social characteristics.¹²

The physical and psychosocial characteristics which may operate in mate selection within the boundaries of homogamy and endogamy will be discussed later in this chapter as they relate to value consensus. The intent here will be to briefly outline a few of the more significant sociological factors which either through legal or social custom, have direct bearing upon mate selection.

One of the most extensive studies regarding cultural factors and mate selection was done by Hollingshead. A 54 per cent random sample of couples married in New Haven, Connecticut in 1948 and still residing in New Haven in 1949, drawn by Census Tracts, participated in structured interviews. The results of the Hollingshead study will be discussed and incorporated with other appropriate research findings in regard to the following factors: race, religion, ethnic origin and class.

Race

Race appears to have the strongest most explicit limitation in marital selection. Interracial marriages are the least prevalent for all

¹²August B. Hollingshead, "Cultural Factors in the Selection of Marriage Mates," American Sociological Review, XV (October, 1950), pp. 619-27.

forms of mixed marriages. The rate of interracial marriages varies by state, according to existing laws which may prohibit interracial marriages and according to population ratios, Negro-White combinations are generally the major type of interracial marriages. Although current data regarding interfaith marriage is incomplete, it is estimated that interracial marriages constitute less than one per cent of all marriages in the United States. There appears to be an increase in the incident of interfaith marriage; however, the trend may be limited to certain regions of the country.^{13,14}

Religion

Hollingshead found that next to race, religion is the most decisive cultural factor operating in mate selection. Ninety-one per cent of all marriages in the New Haven study were religiously endogamous. Hollingshead noted that the rate of interfaith marriage had remained stable in New Haven over two generations. No consistent tendency between interfaith marriages and sex of partners was observed.¹⁵

Burchinal found more favorable attitudes toward dating partners of other faiths than toward marrying persons of other faiths.¹⁶ Although much data can be produced to indicate that religious-endogamy norms do exist, the rates of interfaith marriages will vary within regions and

¹³Joseph Golden, "Characteristics of the Negro-White Intermarried in Philadelphia," American Sociological Review, XVIII (April, 1953), p. 19.

¹⁴David Herr, "Negro-White Marriage in the United States," Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXVIII (August, 1966), pp. 262-73.

¹⁵Hollingshead, op. cit., pp. 622-23.

¹⁶Lee G. Burchinal, op. cit., p. 652.

within denominations. Glick reported that approximately 93 per cent of the Jewish marriages; 91 per cent of the Protestant marriages, and 78 per cent of the Catholic marriages were religiously homogamous nationally.¹⁷

Ethnic Origin

Ethnicity has been closely related to religion and, in combination, they have been a powerful influence in the mate selection process. Hollingshead noted a tendency to cross ethnic lines within religious groups. In most cases, marriages across religious lines involved mixing of ethnic groups in the New Haven study.¹⁸

Social Status and Propinquity

Social status and spacial proximity are closely related. Many researchers^{19,20} have accepted propinquity as a significant criterion in the mate selection process. Although there is a positive correlation between residential area and marriage, it should be noted that many other "filtering" factors exert influence in the mate selection process. Hollingshead observed that 58.2 per cent of both partners in marriage came from the same residential area. If adjacent residential areas were included in this group, the percentage increased to 82.8. It was indicated in the New Haven study that when class lines were crossed, it was

¹⁷Paul C. Glick and E. Landau, "Age as a Factor in Marriage," American Sociological Review, XV (February, 1950), pp. 517-29.

¹⁸Hollingshead, op. cit., pp. 623-24.

¹⁹James Bossard, "Residential Propinquity as a Factor in Marriage," American Journal of Sociology, XXXVII (September, 1932), pp. 219-22.

²⁰Marvin R. Koller, "Residential and Occupational Propinquity," American Sociological Review, XIII (October, 1948), pp. 613-16.

more frequent for males to select wives from lower classes. There was also a strong association between education, religion and classes. That is, the levels of education and the similarity of religion operated within the given social strata and within residential proximity.²¹

Some researchers have disputed the concept of status endogamy. Leslie and Richards found in their study at Purdue University only minimal tendencies toward homogamy in a sample of students who dated prior to entering college and no homogamous patterns among those who dated and married after college entrance.²² Other researchers have indicated that homogamous tendencies were greatest among couples still dependent upon parental living relationships.

Waller did not accept the fact that social status operated in the dating selection patterns of the Penn State students in his study regarding the rating and dating complex. Prestigious factors were not considered in regard to differences between parental background and familial social class. Waller viewed the students at Penn State as a basic homogeneous group extracted from middle class origins.

In contrast to Waller's belief, Ira Reiss suggests:

Social classes on campus are not simple 'popularity' classes, but that they are stable class structures based on many campus values and that they reflect parental social class and affect serious as well as casual dating.²³

²¹ ibid.

²² G. R. Leslie and A. H. Richardson, "Family Versus Campus Influences in Relation to Mate Selection," Social Problems, IV (October, 1956), pp. 117-20.

²³ Ira L. Reiss, op. cit., p. 195.

In general, research has evidenced that the primary mechanism leading to choice of marital partner is similarity or homogamy in respect to race, religion, social class, residential propinquity and ethnic background. The normative patterns are well embodied by investigation and documentation. In addition to these homogamous factors, numerous researchers have suggested that homogamy also exists as a selective factor in regard to physical and psychological or social-psychological characteristics as well. The Burgess and Wallin study of engaged couples²⁴ and the longitudinal research compiled by Kelly²⁵ indicate that homogamous tendencies are operative in various dimensions including social endogamy, physical and psychological characteristics.

Theories of Complementary Needs and Value Consensus in Mate Selection

The theory of complementary needs in mate selection was developed by Winch, Ktsanes and Ktsanes in the mid fifties. It is based on the fact that homogamy operates with respect to various social characteristics including socio-economic, race, religion, status; however, a second principle of mate selection becomes operative within the heterosexual dyad. The complementary need theory suggests that individuals select within their field of eligibles the person who gives the greatest promise of providing maximum need gratification. Needs of spouses are complementary rather than similar. Some needs are different in kind; others are different in intensity. Needs may be gratified consciously or

²⁴Ernest Burgess and Paul Wallin, op. cit.

²⁵E. Lowell Kelly, "Consistency of the Adult Personality," American Psychologists, X (November, 1955), pp. 659.81.

or unconsciously; a person may or may not be aware of the motivation for behavior needed to fulfill his needs.²⁶

The preliminary report on complementary needs describing the complex design and testing procedures was published in 1953. It was hypothesized that high assertives would tend to marry high receptives.²⁷ The results of the study were based on 388 interspousal correlations. Interviews and projective tests were administered to 25 Northwestern University undergraduate students and their respective spouses. Distributions of correlation derived from the analyses of the need-interview and personal conferences supported the theory of complementary needs in mate selection. Distributions based on case-history and the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) were not supportive of the theory.²⁸ Ktsanes utilized the same data in a factor analysis design to study typology of personality. He hypothesized that persons who indicated high ratings on a given factor would tend to select a mate who had indicated either low or negative ratings on the same factor. Four types of personalities were extracted from 44 variables derived from the interview data. The results of the statistical analysis were consistent with the theory of complementary

²⁶Robert F. Winch, T. Ktsanes and V. Ktsanes, "The Theory of Complementary Needs in Mate-Selection; An Analytic and Descriptive Study," American Sociological Review, XIX (June, 1954), pp. 241-49.

²⁷Robert Winch, T. Ktsanes and V. Ktsanes, "Empirical Elaboration of the Theory of Complementary Needs in Mate Selection," Journal of Abnormal Psychology, LI (June, 1953), pp. 508-13.

²⁸Robert F. Winch, "The Theory of Complementary Needs in Mate-Selection: Final Results on the Test of General Hypothesis," American Sociological Review, XX (October, 1955), pp. 552-55.

needs. Married partners selected spouses who possessed personality factors different from their own.²⁹

The theory of need complementarity in mate selection has been disputed by several researchers. Most frequent criticisms revolve around the issues of the small sample size and the derivation of data from the same basic sample. In an attempt to retest the complementary needs theory, Bowerman and Day utilized scores from the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule for 60 Seattle, Washington college couples who were either formally engaged, pinned or had a mutual understanding regarding the future. Results of the study did not support the need complementary theory. The data indicated little evidence of either complementary or homogamous needs in paired combinations. The majority of the 225 correlations between needs of couples were small. In cases where analysis produced significant differences, there was no consistent support for either complimentariness or homogamy.³⁰

Schellenberg and Bee also administered the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule to re-check the findings of Winch and Bowerman and Day. Results from couples who were going steady, engaged or recently married indicated emotional homogamy rather than complementariness. Married couples exhibited higher mean convergence scores than non-married couples as further support for the homogamous-need hypothesis.³¹

²⁹T. Ktsanes, "Mate Selection on the Basis of Personality Type: A Study Utilizing an Empirical Typology of Personality," American Sociological Review, XX (October, 1955), pp. 547-51.

³⁰Charles E. Bowerman and Barbara R. Day, "A Test of the Theory of Complementary Needs as Applied to Couples During Courtship," American Sociological Review, XXI (October, 1956), pp. 602-05.

³¹J. A. Schellenberg and L. S. Bee, "A Re-examination of the

Kerckhoff and Davis utilized a longitudinal study to measure homogamy and complementariness in regard to progress in relationships. They hypothesized that value consensus and complementarity of needs were independently related to progress toward permanence. Questionnaires were completed by 103 Duke University students who were engaged, pinned or seriously attached. Seven months later, the 103 couples were asked to complete a second questionnaire; 94 of these replies were usable. The two independent variables were value consensus, as measured by The Farber Family Values Index, and need complementarity, as measured by the FIRO-B scale for inclusion, control and affection. Value consensus was significant toward long-term couples. There was a relationship, between complementariness and progress toward permanence, although not significant, in two out of the three measures.³²

Karp, Jackson and Lester attempted to demonstrate that homogamous-need and complementary-need operated together in the mate selection process. Personality traits rather than personality needs were appraised to research a modified hypothesis of the complementary-need theory. The design was based upon the assumption that mate selection originated on homogamous measures. The researchers hypothesized that couples would illustrate more homogamous than non-homagamous traits or select partners with traits which they would wish to possess. Fifty-four engaged Wellesley College girls were given a questionnaire to determine if a list of 54 adjectival phrases were descriptions of actual-self, ideal-self,

Theory of Complementary Needs in Mate Selection," Marriage and Family Living, XXII (February, 1960), pp. 227-32.

³²Alan C. Kerckhoff and Keith E. Davis, op. cit., pp. 295-303.

fiance's actual-self, or of the fiance's closest male friend. Results indicated a significant degree of homogamy between the traits of the subject and the traits of her fiance; as perceived by the subject. When the traits were not homologous, there was a significant tendency for the fiance to resemble the subject's ideal-self rather than the actual-self. The researchers claim that the ideal-self fulfillment process operates for traits in which the individual's actual-self and ideal-self differ.³³

In summary of the theories of need complementarity and value consensus, Kerckhoff and Davis suggest that various "filtering factors" operate during phases of the mate selection period. Social status variables (class, religion, etc.) operate in the early stages, consensus on values somewhat later, and need complementarity still later.³⁴

Several other researchers have suggested progressive stages in the mate selection process. Reiss interpreted a circularity of the phenomenon in a conceptualization referred to as the Wheel Theory of Love. According to Reiss, rapport is the essential ingredient in the development of rapport, one reveals himself and thereby moves into the self-revelation stage which creates an atmosphere for need. The revelation state is followed by a mutual dependent or interdependent stage which finally creates a personality need fulfillment.³⁵

³³Ellen S. Karp, Julie H. Jackson, and David Lester, "Ideal-Self Fulfillment in Mate Selection: A Corollary to the Complementary Need Theory in Mate Selection," Journal of Marriage and Family, XXXII (May, 1970), pp. 269-72.

³⁴Kerckhoff and Davis, op. cit., p. 303.

³⁵Ira L. Reiss, "Toward a Sociology of the Heterosexual Love Relationship," Marriage and Family Living, XXII (May, 1960), pp. 139-45.

Murstein suggests that role similarity and perception is an important aspect of the mate selection process. His theory incorporates stimulus, value and role. Partners who possess similar physical attractiveness and value similarity further analyze their relationships through real or imagined role-compatibility. Perceived similarity or complementarity is not considered as significant as self-acceptance of the perceived. High self-accepting individuals, in Murstein's study, were more apt to perceive their partner as similar than low self-accepting individuals.³⁶

Parental Image and Parental Influence

The wish for a parental substitute is an unconscious motive in mate selection according to psychoanalytical theory. In this theory, the assumption is made that people are inclined to select a marital partner with characteristics similar to those of his parent of the opposite sex, especially if the parent-child interrelationship was a happy one during his childhood. Although several studies^{37,38,39} have been attempted to confirm this theory, the data presented to date are far from conclusive.

³⁶Bernard I. Murstein, "Stimulus - Value - Role: A Theory of Marital Choice," Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXII (August, 1970) pp. 465-80.

³⁷Clifford Kirkpatrick, "A Statistical Investigation of the Psychanalytic Theory of Mate Selection," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXXII (October-December, 1937), pp. 427-30.

³⁸Robert F. Winch, "The Relation Between Courtship Behavior and Attitudes Toward Parents Among College Men," American Sociological Review, VIII (April, 1943), pp. 164-74.

³⁹Robert F. Winch, "Interrelations Between Certain Social Background and Parent-Son Factors in a Study of Courtship Among College Men," American Sociological Review, XI (June, 1946), pp. 333-41.

Strauss found evidence to support the generalization that there was a definite parental image influence although it may or may not be attributed to the parent of the opposite sex.⁴⁰

Various aspects of parental influence or parental images have been researched during the past several decades. In one of the earliest studies Barber, in 1936, attempted to investigate differences and similarities of views regarding essential criteria operative in the selection of a marital partner possessed by parents and their college age children. The study produced some rather significant findings:

1. Parents were willing for sons and daughters to marry persons of lower economic rank, although they were not as willing in this regard as were the young people themselves.
2. Sons insisted much more upon beauty in their mates than did parents and daughters.
3. Parents were only a little less intolerant of mates of unattractive dispositions and personality than were young people.
4. Parents and children were far apart on moral standards. Parents insisted strongly that their children should not marry persons of lower moral standards. On the average one-fourth of the young people were willing to do so if all other factors were satisfactory.
5. Young people rated disposition and personality characteristics, followed by health, intelligence, education and the same religion highest for desirous traits in marital partners.
6. Parents rated hypothetical marital partners for their children in the following hierarchy: health, same religious faith, moral standards, intelligence and education, disposition and personality.⁴¹

⁴⁰Anselm Strauss, "The Influence of Parental Images Upon Marital Choice," American Sociological Review, XI (October, 1946), pp. 554-59.

⁴¹Ray Baber, "Some Mate Selection Standards of College Students and Their Parents," Journal of Social Hygiene, XXII (March, 1936), pp. 115-25.

Bates found in the study that "virtually the entire body of data tended to support the hypothesis that parents still play roles in courtship which affect the behavior and decisions of the child." However, he found parental influence in the process most varied and concluded:

Whether or not a parent in our culture plays a dominating role in courtship seems to be less a function of stereotype cultural demands, than of the adequacy of the personal adjustment of the parent himself. Courtship presents certain difficulties of adjustment to nearly all parents, but most, being fairly well adjusted persons, make the necessary adaptations without too much difficulty just as they similarly face other crisis periods of life.⁴²

Winch made several observations concerning parental influence on choice of marital partners in a series of studies during the 1940s. The role of the mother was of greater significance to the son's dating progress than the role of the father. Consequent research did not clearly indicate whether this pattern was prevalent for daughters.^{43,44} Winch also found that progress in dating among males was directly correlated with success or favorability in early dating practices and the desire to be married. There was also some evidence to indicate that the son's progress in dating was correlated to parental happiness and the family economic and social status. Factor analysis of original data provided organization and speculation regarding matrices of family

⁴²Alan Bates, "Parental Roles in Courtship," Social Forces, XX (May, 1942), p. 486.

⁴³Robert F. Winch, "Interrelations Between Certain Social Background and Parent-Son Factors in a Study of Courtship Among College Men," op. cit.

⁴⁴Robert F. Winch, "Courtship in College Women," American Journal of Sociology, LV (November, 1949), pp. 269-78.

variables and their influence on the male courtship behavior patterns and progress as well as to possible reactions to ultimate spouses.⁴⁵

Bates and Kirkpatrick and Caplow found that mothers encouraged initial or early dating more frequently than fathers and that both parents played a more protective role for the daughters than for the sons. Fathers had a tendency to disapprove first dates for their daughters more frequently than for their sons.^{46, 47}

Sussman studied ways in which parents influenced their children regarding selection of dating and marital partners. He found that in the majority of cases, parents used pressure tactics such as proper milieu for dating, persuasion and/or threatening of withdrawal of economic support. Eighty-one per cent of the parents in his study admitted using some persuasive technique when children dated persons who were not approved. Parents also admitted to success in a majority of attempts.⁴⁸

In a University of Wisconsin study of 296 men and women, Prince found that 74 per cent of campus coeds had received some parental advice on the choice of a marital partner. In most cases, the advice was given by the mother to both daughters and sons. The parental advice

⁴⁵Robert F. Winch, "Primary Factors in a Study of Courtship," American Sociological Review, XII (December, 1947), pp. 658-66.

⁴⁶Alan Bates, op. cit.

⁴⁷Clifford Kirkpatrick and Theodore Caplow, "Courtship in a Group of Minnesota Students," American Journal of Sociology, LI (January, 1945), pp. 124-25.

⁴⁸Marvin Sussman, "Parental Participation in Mate Selection and Its Effects Upon Family Continuity," Social Forces, XXXII (November, 1953), pp. 32, 76-81.

most frequently received by the men referred to characteristics concerning the same religious faith, traits influencing homemaking ability, family background and disposition and personality. Parental advice, most frequently suggested to females, regarded the selection of partners who possessed good financial prospects, similar religious faith, disposition, personality and good family background.⁴⁹

In addition to findings regarding the prevalence of social homogamy, Coombs also found indication to support the view that forces in the parental home exerted influence for homogamy. Data from his study indicated that there was a positive correlation between home influence and homogamy in measuring church affiliation. Eighty-eight per cent of the couples living at home chose mates with similar religious backgrounds as compared to 64 per cent of couples not living at home.⁵⁰

In general, it might be summarized that there are definite dating and marital selection norms functioning within the marital system. These norms have remained relatively similar over the past two or three generations. How much influence the home or parental environment exert within these dimensions is difficult to ascertain. Reference made to various kinds of parental influence⁵¹ is definitive of the interplay of consensus factors operative in the selection process. Kirkpatrick summarizes much of the research in stating:

⁴⁹Alfred J. Prince, "Factors In Mate Selection," The Family Life Coordinator, X (July, 1961), pp. 55-58.

⁵⁰Robert H. Coombs, "Reinforcement of Values in the Parental Home as a Factor In Mate Selection," Marriage and Family Living, XIV (May, 1962), pp. 155-57.

⁵¹Anselm Strauss, op. cit.

Admitting that other factors may be operative in home environment, there is reason to believe that the parental influence is the dominant one. For even though courtship in the United States has for several generations been changing away from direct parental control toward 'self-arranged' marriages, studies show that parents continue to play a significant part in the courtships and marriages of their children.⁵²

The Ideal Mate Theory

Closely aligned with the influence of parental image and influence upon the mate selection process is the ideal mate theory. The theory presupposes that a person of marriageable age already possesses an image of the kind of person they would prefer to marry. Early research in this area was confined to determining which traits or which characteristics were desired within specified populations. Nimkoff stated:

There does not seem to be much doubt that most persons have a more or less conscious ideal at the time they meet and choose a mate and that the ideal has some bearing on the choice.⁵³

Rather than investigating which traits were most desirable in the ideal mate selection process, Strauss reversed the question in a 1946 study to determine if the actual mate choice was influenced by the ideal mate image. In a study of 373 engaged or recently married persons, Strauss found 91 per cent of the men and 93 per cent of the women said they held some conscious ideal of a mate. Approximately 80 per cent of the group believed that the concept of their ideal mate was uppermost in their minds although many said they did not consciously compare their

⁵²Clifford Kirkpatrick, op. cit., p. 125.

⁵³Meyer F. Nimkoff, Marriage and the Family, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.) 1947, p. 402.

ideal mate and their chosen mate in their decision to marry. Others felt that their conception of an ideal mate existed, but that they were only vaguely formulated in their minds. A large proportion of the group admitted that their image of the ideal mate was related to physical, temperamental and cultural characteristics. Temperamental traits were stressed less than other traits in the study. As indicated in patterns of homogamy, differences in race, faith, social, educational and economic status ranked high on eliminating characteristics. Approximately one half of the sample believed that their mates came close to their concept of an ideal mate in terms of physical and personal traits.⁵⁴

Prince studied coeds at the University of Wisconsin in an attempt to determine which traits were regarded most desirable or most undesirable in potential mates and if young people of marriageable age did, in fact, have an ideal mate. If so, questioned Prince, what were their sources of ideal-images? It was found that men and women sought similar qualities in marital partners. Both sexes tended to stress disposition and personality, intelligence, moral character and understanding. Men, more often than women, stressed physical attractiveness. Men also desired a mate who had homemaking abilities and was well-groomed. Women, in contrast, tended to select an ideal mate who was ambitious and industrious, had a sense of humor and who wanted a home and family. Being a good provider was also considered an essential in an ideal mate. Undesirable traits most frequently listed by the males in the study were: selfishness and inconsiderateness, lacking personal cleanliness, lacking homemaking ability, low moral standards and low intelligence. The

⁵⁴Anselm Strauss, op. cit.

undesirable traits most frequently mentioned by girls in the ideal mate choice were selfishness and inconsiderateness, lacking in ambition or lazy, conceitedness, self-centeredness, low moral standards, and lacking personal cleanliness.

Prince found that the conception of an ideal mate was derived for the most part from family orientations. Over half of the students studied reported that their ideal mate image was based upon either their observation of one or both partners.⁵⁵

Williams assessed 530 college students in regard to hypothetical characteristics desired in concepts of ideal mates. It was found that women, in theory at least, were more demanding and more critical of specified characteristics for mate selection than were males. Older and married students were also more rigid in their choice of mate. Preferred characteristics ranked by both single and married students were listed as capacity for parenthood, desire for children, satisfactory grooming and similarity of interest. Males rated physical attractiveness and similarity of age higher than females.

In general, Williamson's study indicated only minimal effects on mate selection in relation to class difference. Upper classes were somewhat more demanding of intellectual qualifications. Upper class students were also more rigid in their tendencies to reject persons due to certain "rejection characteristics."

Religious differences were also studied and for the most part it was found that religion exerted approximately the same influence as class positions although not always on the same items. Catholics placed less

⁵⁵Alfred Prince, op. cit.

emphasis on education; however, decidedly greater emphasis on desire for children and religion. Protestants ranked intermediately between Catholics and Jews in rejection characteristics.⁵⁶

Dating aspirations and partner satisfaction with ideal mate concepts were tested by Coombs and Kenkel in a study which involved selection of dating partners via computer. Marked sex-linked differences were discovered. Women had a tendency to be more rigid in the selection of computer arranged dates than were men. Seventy-three per cent of the women required their date to be of the same race as compared with 56 per cent of the males. One fourth of the women felt it was absolutely necessary to date someone of the same faith; approximately 50 per cent preferred partners of the same race while the remaining quarter said it made little difference. By comparison, only 14 per cent of the males felt it was absolutely necessary to date someone of the same faith. Differences in racial and religious preferences between males and females were significant at the .001 level.

Seventy-four per cent of the girls, compared to 64 per cent of the males said that they desired their partners to wear stylish clothes. Girls also had a tendency to rate dancing ability higher than men. The only quality which men rated higher than females was physical attractiveness.

A higher number of men, 41.0 per cent, compared to 32 per cent of the women were satisfied with their computer arranged dates on the

⁵⁶Robert C. Williamson, "Dating, Courtship and the 'Ideal Mate': Some Relevant Subcultural Variables," Family Life Coordinator, XI (July, 1965), pp. 137-44.

initial date. A follow-up study, six months later, indicated that both sexes were less enthusiastic about their dates, especially the women.⁵⁷

Personality Characteristics and Physical Traits

Although the relationship between personality characteristics, physical traits and the mate selection process have been established in various theories, several researchers have chosen to study personal attitudes and physical attributes apart from any theoretical framework. In one of the earliest studies, Bernard surveyed 500 students at the University of Colorado to discover their attitudes toward various aspects of marriage and family. Some of the more significant results of Bernard's survey included:

1. Eighty-eight per cent of the students felt that sex was not the most important factor in life.
2. Sixty-three per cent felt that some sex liberty should be permitted before engagement or marriage.
3. Sixty-five per cent wanted their partner to be of at least equal intelligence. In a comparison of males and females, however, it was found that 89 per cent of the males preferred partners of equal intelligence while 58 per cent of the females desired superior intelligence in their husbands. It was interesting to note that not one person in the sample favored inferior intelligence in his or her partner.
4. Eighty per cent of both sexes believed that one act of infidelity should be pardoned; the remaining 20 per cent thought that immediate separation should ensue as a result of infidelity.
5. The majority of respondents aspired for higher standards of living and fewer children in contrast to lower

⁵⁷Robert H. Coombs and William F. Kenkel, "Sex Differences in Dating Aspirations and Satisfaction with Computer Arranged Partners," Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXVIII (February, 1966), pp. 62-69.

standards of living and larger families. Adoption was accepted almost unanimously as an alternative to childlessness.

6. Over 80 per cent of the group approved of the use of contraceptives in marriage. Differences among the sexes indicated that 94 per cent of the male sample approved while 74 per cent of the females supported the use of contraceptives.
7. Nearly 88 per cent of the total group agreed that divorce was an expedient social device and registered no opposition to it on moral, ethical or religious grounds.⁵⁸

McCormick and Macrory asked 259 undergraduate women at the University of Wisconsin to rate various traits desired in a husband. The traits which were desired most in a prospective husband were character and intelligence, followed by popularity and physical characteristics. Religious affiliation, family and occupation were next in order. Nationality was of the least consequence. Ninety-two per cent of the students would not marry a Negro and 68 per cent would not marry a man with lower education than themselves.⁵⁹

Weller studied student attitudes, both Brethren and Non-Brethren, in Brethren institutions in the late 1940s. Two hundred and fifty students evaluated 42 characteristics of potential marriage partners. The traits were classified into seven categories: religions, education and intellect, ethics, the physical, domestic life economics and social virtues. The Brethren were slightly less insistent than the Non-Brethren

⁵⁸William Bernard, "Student Attitudes on Marriage and the Family," American Sociological Review, 111 (June, 1938), pp. 354-61.

⁵⁹Thomas C. McCormick and Boyd E. Macrory, "Group Values in Mate Selection, in a Sample of College Girls," Social Forces, XXII (October-May, 1943-44), pp. 315-17.

in their demands for marriage partners. Most frequently required characteristics regarded possession of personal cleanliness, desire for home and family, the ability to support a family and good health. Personal characteristics which were regarded as most undesirable were the use of intoxicating liquor, sex relations with others and the use of tobacco. Women were somewhat more insistent on good economic and family background than the men. Weller concluded that young people were still distinctly conventional.⁶⁰

Several researchers^{61,62} have utilized similar questionnaires on various campuses during the past thirty years to examine and compare campus values in regard to mate selection. For the most part, these studies have netted much the same results regardless of the year in which they were completed or on the campus on which they were studied.

Christensen's study involved the administering of two surveys, five years apart, to the students at Brigham Young University during the 1940s. Both studies indicated two factors which were rated most important in mate selection: dependable character and emotional stability and maturity. Other factors rating higher were ambition, industriousness, pleasing disposition and desire for home and children. The least desirable characteristics pertained to individuals who were

⁶⁰Forrest L. Weller, "Student Attitudes on Marriage Partners," Sociology and Social Research, XXVI, (1946), pp. 512-24.

⁶¹Reuben Hill, "Campus Values in Mate Selection," Journal of Home Economics, XXXVII (November, 1945), pp. 554-58.

⁶²Robert McGinnis, "Campus Values in Mate Selection: A Repeat Study," Social Forces, XXXVI (May, 1959), pp. 368-73.

dishonest and unreliable; neurotic and unstable emotionally; hard to get along with; persons whom a partner didn't love and persons who used liquor and tobacco.⁶³

Hudson and Henze summarized various studies which had been replicated over a period of three decades (1939 to 1969). In a comparison of ranking of 18 characteristics over the years, Hudson and Henze found striking consistency in the students' evaluation of these traits. Chastity and good health evidenced the greatest decline in rank over the three decades. The table below illustrates the comparison of rankings by sex and years:⁶⁴

TABLE 11. TABLE AND RANK OF 18 PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS IN MATE SELECTION BASED ON MEAN VALUE, BY YEAR AND SEX

Characteristics	Male			Female		
	1939	1956	1967	1939	1956	1967
1. Dependable character	1	1	1	2	1	2
2. Emotional stability	2	2	3	1	2	1
3. Pleasing disposition	3	4	4	4	5	4
4. Mutual attraction	4	3	2	5	6	3
5. Good health	5	6	9	6	9	10
6. Desire for home-children	6	5	5	7	3	5
7. Refinement	7	8	7	8	7	8
8. Good cook-housekeeper	8	7	6	16	16	16
9. Ambition-industriousness	9	9	8	3	4	6
10. Chastity	10	13	15	10	15	15
11. Education-intelligence	11	11	10	9	14	7
12. Sociability	12	12	12	11	11	13
13. Similar religious background	13	10	14	14	10	11
14. Good looks	14	15	11	17	18	17
15. Similar educational background	15	14	13	12	8	9
16. Favorable social status	16	16	16	15	13	14
17. Good financial prospect	17	17	18	13	12	12
18. Similar political background	18	18	17	18	17	18

⁶³Harold T. Christensen, "Student Views on Mate Selection," Marriage and Family Living, IX (Autumn, 1947), pp. 85-88.

⁶⁴Hudson and Henze, p. 774.

In conclusion, Hudson and Henze wrote:

The charge that young people have departed from traditional values and are less serious about mate selection is not given support by the present study. Indeed, the findings suggest that youth's values regarding the importance of personal characteristics in mate selection are much the same today as they were a generation ago.

It might be said in conclusion that social change in the area of mate selection has not been as great as indicated by the press, feared by the parent, and perhaps hoped by the youth.⁶⁵

Changing Life Styles

The foregoing review of research indicates that there has been little departure from traditional values regarding the selection of dating and marital partners during the past few decades. There has been considerable similarity in the studies concerning mate selection criteria. In the majority of cases, researchers have studied optimum, socially desirable or idealistic characteristics. In many cases, these characteristics have been itemized in a structured questionnaire which required priority ratings or responses indicating acceptance or rejection. It is quite conceivable that most persons would possess many of the desirable characteristics. However, individuals are not seen by item analysis, but in a total perspective. Suppose a person would possess many of the plus characteristics desired in a mate (pleasing disposition, similar religion, education and dependability), but was rearing an illegitimate child. What influence would this latter fact have upon a person's selection of a marital partner? The concern of the impact of many facets of our emerging "youth culture" must be considered as significant factors in the mate selection process. Keniston states:

⁶⁵John Hudson and Lura F. Henze, op. cit.

Every society tends to ignore its most troublesome characteristics.⁶⁶ Usually these remain unfathomed precisely because they are taken for granted, because life would be inconceivable without these traits. And most often they are taken for granted because their recognition would be painful to those concerned or disruptive to the society. . . .

Thus though barraged with discussion of 'our rapidly changing world' and 'recent development,' we too easily can remain incognizant of the enormous significance, and in many ways the historical uniqueness, of social change in our society. Rapid changes in all aspects of life mean that little can be counted on to endure from generation to generation, that all technologies, all institutions, all values are open to revision and obsolescence.⁶⁷

Keniston continues to relate change to emerging characteristics of today's youth by observing that the most outstanding characteristic of youth today is their apparent lack of a deep commitment to adult values and roles. The younger generation, in increasing numbers, are alienated from their parents' conceptions of adulthood, dissatisfied with the historical institutions of society and disaffiliated from the main streams of traditional public life.⁶⁸

In describing the events which occurred at Kent State University in the spring of 1970, Michener wrote concerning the new life style subscribed to by some of the nation's youth:

The new life-style rejects most of these precepts, [those based upon the Puritanical Code] and is thus an assault on all that older people hold most sacred. Starting from a positive interpretation of life (indeed, a most optimistic one,) the new life-style preaches love, freedom, interdependence,

⁶⁶Kenneth Keniston, "Social Change and Youth in America," in Barash and Scourby, op. cit., p. 353, quoting Erik H. Erikson, Change and Challenge (New York: Basic Books, 1963).

⁶⁷Kenneth Keniston, "Social Change and Youth in America," in Barash and Scourby, op. cit., p. 353.

⁶⁸Ibid., p. 363.

personal responsibility and radically new interpretation of society. Specifically, it ridicules the Puritan ethic as archaic and destructive. . .

The new life-style, continued Michener, finds no place for patriotism and holds the military in contempt. Those who adhere to the new style have a deep respect for work if they initiate it and understand its function. Many of them, especially women, reject traditional marriage as a pattern of life. Love becomes the capacity to relate to other human beings. Chastity is not considered; if one is physically attracted to someone, the new life-style would subscribe to do something about it and get it out of the system.⁶⁹

Although the new life-style may not be totally subscribed to by the majority of today's youth, various aspects of this mode of life have filtered into the thinking of a large percentage of the younger generation. Issues of drugs, sexual permissiveness, unwed parenthood or bachelor parenthood, abortion, draft evasion, apathy toward religious institutions along with drastic changes in wearing apparel, obvious on campuses throughout the country, are perhaps symbolic of both concern and behavior of youth culture. Although the vast majority of the youth cannot be considered extremists or radicals, they are becoming increasingly involved in many of these patterns which will, without a doubt, alter their adult lives. If 95 per cent of the present generation marries, as has been true of the generations of the past 100 years, it is quite obvious that individuals will carry many of these social involvements into their marriages.

⁶⁹James Michener. Kent State—What Happened and Why. (New York: Random House, 1971), pp. 66-69.

Drugs

The drug issue of recent years has been viewed as a problem undermining social morality and destroying the fabric of the younger generation. Conservative estimates place the number of drug dependent persons between 600,000 and 750,000.⁷⁰ National estimates indicated that one out of every 3000 persons is currently addicted to drugs. In larger cities, however, that proportion may be closer to one out of every 130 persons.⁷¹

A recent Gallup poll found that the number of college students who have tried marijuana and LSD has grown at a remarkable rate over a period of less than four years. In a national survey of college students, completed in December, 1970, 42 per cent said they had tried marijuana. That figure almost doubles the 1969 figure of 22 per cent and is eight times as high as the 1967 figure of five per cent.⁷² Another recent national survey indicated that 62 per cent of the high school students knew someone using marijuana; 83 per cent of the college students surveyed knew someone taking marijuana.⁷³

The use of LSD is also on the increase. The latest survey of college students lists 14 per cent of the college students using some LSD or other hallucinogen, compared to four per cent in 1969 and one per

⁷⁰American Social Health Association, The Price of Ignorance, op. cit.

⁷¹Karl Kaufman, "Understanding and Meeting Problems of Drug Abuse," Paper presented for the Family Life Education Conference, Bloomington: Indiana University, April 20, 1971.

⁷²George Gallup, "Students' Drug Use is Rising," Akron Beacon Journal, January 17, 1971, p. A 21.

⁷³"The New Youth Poll," op. cit.

cent in 1967.⁷⁴ A recent national poll found that 62 per cent of the college students knew persons on amphetamines while 57 per cent knew persons on LSD. In the high school group, 41 per cent knew persons on amphetamines and 35 per cent knew persons taking LSD.⁷⁵

The use of barbiturates (depressants or "downs") has also increased from 10 per cent in 1969 to 14 per cent in 1970.⁷⁶ Approximately 35 per cent of the campus coeds claimed they knew persons on Heroin and 19 per cent of the high school students said they knew persons on Heroin.⁷⁷

Sexual Permissiveness

Studies regarding premarital sex are abundant in family life literature. While many researchers indicate that there is a greater tendency and acceptance of premarital sexual behavior among the younger generation, others still insist that the significant increase in sexual permissiveness occurred in the 1920s.⁷⁸

In an extensive study of premarital sexual permissiveness, Reiss gave evidence that values pertaining to sexual behavior are more conservative among the adult than among the college age population. In a study of adults, college students and high school students' attitudes

⁷⁴George Gallup, op. cit.

⁷⁵"The New Youth Poll," op. cit.

⁷⁶George Gallup, op. cit.

⁷⁷"The New Youth Poll," op. cit.

⁷⁸Robert Bell, "Parent-Child Conflict in Sexual Values," Journal of Social Issues, XXII (April, 1966), pp. 34-44.

toward permarital sex, Reiss found that a significant larger percentage of both high school and college students agreed upon the acceptability of both petting and intercourse during engagement than did the parental sample.⁷⁹

Bell and Buerkle compared attitudes of 217 coeds with their mothers regarding the questions of virginity. Eighty-eight per cent of the mothers said virginity was very important at marriage, 12 per cent said it was generally important. Approximately 55 per cent of the daughters felt it was very important; 34 per cent said it was generally important and 13 per cent said it was not important.⁸⁰

In a trend analysis, Christensen and Gregg studied several cultures over a period of ten years to determine whether or not attitudes concerning premarital coitus had liberalized during the decade of the sixties. They found a relatively greater liberalization of females over males, indicating an intersex convergence of both attitude and behavior. More than half of the coeds in a midwestern university said they wanted to marry a male who was virgin. Approximately half of their male classmates claimed virginity. A greater percentage of mountain state coeds insisted on marrying virgin males. Seventy-four per cent of the males in the midwestern college stated they want to marry virgins; however, only 61 per cent of the women in the same university claimed virginity.⁸¹

⁷⁹Ira L. Reiss, "The Scaling of Premarital Sexual Permissiveness," Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXVI (February, 1964), pp. 26, 188-98.

⁸⁰Robert Bell and Jack Buerkley, "Mother and Daughter Attitudes Toward Premarital Sexual Behavior," Marriage and Family Living, XXXIII (February, 1961), pp. 390-92.

⁸¹Harold T. Christensen and Christina F. Gregg, "Changing Sex

In a recent survey of sexual experience and attitudes among coeds, Bell and Chaskes found that there appeared to be less commitment of engagement as a necessary condition for premarital coitus. If, stated the researchers, the findings are accurate, the results could indicate the first significant change in premarital sexual behavior patterns since the 1920s.⁸²

Alternatives to Pre-marital Pregnancy

By the mid-sixties, illegitimacy, bachelor motherhood and abortion—like sex—were no longer subjects of taboo. Increased premarital sexual experiences and more liberalized attitudes regarding alternatives to premarital pregnancy have brought these subjects to the forefront. The number of illegitimate births has doubled in the past 15 years. The spiraling surge of illegitimate births may be illustrated in the following figures: In 1950, about one out of every 25 children born in the United States was illegitimate. By 1960, the figure was one out of every 19 births. By 1965, it was one out of every 15. If the trend continues at the present rate, sometime during the 1970s one out of every 10 American babies will be born out of wedlock. In some of the major cities of the United States, the figure has already been surpassed.⁸³

Norms in America and Scandinavia," Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXII (November, 1970), pp. 616-27.

⁸²Robert Bell and Jay Chaskes, op. cit., pp. 81-84.

⁸³Akron Beacon Journal, "Illegitimacy is Exploding," op. cit.

The trend toward single parenthood has been noted among the white middle class mothers. The National Council on Illegitimacy in New York City noted that one out of every three unwed mothers kept her baby in 1967. The largest rate of increase in bachelor motherhood was among the white middle class girls.⁸⁴

Abortions, both legal and illegal, are increasing at rapid rates. It has been estimated that there are approximately 200,000 to 1.2 million illegal abortions performed annually in the United States.⁸⁵ Of the several states where abortion laws have been liberalized, many have reported that legal abortions are up at least 25 per cent; however, illegal abortions are still prevalent in these states.⁸⁶

A recent survey of college students' attitudes toward abortion illustrated that the desirability of abortion was significantly related to sex, college level, church activity, family size, exposure to abortion and attitude toward premarital sex. The data indicated that there would be increasing acceptance of abortion in the near future.⁸⁷

Alternative Life Styles

Religious practices, military involvement, interracial dating, and cohabitation without the rights of traditional marriage are significant

⁸⁴Arlene Van Breems, "For Them, Motherhood Comes Before Marriage," Akron Beacon Journal, August 24, 1969, p. E 19.

⁸⁵Robert Bell, Social Defiance (New York: The Dorsey Press, 1971), p. 125.

⁸⁶Robert Hall, "The Abortion Revolution," in Arlene Skolnick and Jerome Skolnick, Family in Transition, Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971, p. 263.

⁸⁷Joseph Maxwell, "College Students' Attitudes Toward Abortion," The Family Coordinator, IXX (July, 1970), pp. 247-52.

topics of concern for both the young and their parental generation. Various patterns of non-conformity are symbolic of youthful discontent with the status quo or "the establishment". The more extreme have attempted to rediscover life for themselves in various forms of alternative life styles.

One such life style, originating in the early 1960s, is known as hippism. Constituting a small minority of youth, the hippy subculture is made up of better than average educated, mostly white sons and daughters of the middle or upper middle class. Although many hippies are imaginative, articulate and artistic, there are also some who are mentally ill or victims of heavy use of LSD or marijuana. Hippies rebel against "Vietnam, nuclear fusion, automation, bigness in industry, labor and government—in sum, against everything that diminishes the importance of the individual. Their slogan is "I am a human being: Do not fold, spindle or mutilate."⁸⁸

Another life style which has attracted perhaps thousands of young people is the pattern of communal living. Although this form of living has been engaged in by many groups, for a variety of reasons, the world over throughout history, it appears ironic that it should reappear among a highly educated affluent youth culture. Communal living is the sharing of resources in a closely knit community. Some communes have become a subculture of hippies; others have been formulated by those who do not consider themselves hippies. In general, intercommunal or

⁸⁸ June Bingham, "The Intelligent Square's Guide to Hippie Land," in Barash Scourby, op. cit., pp. 383-94.

tribal bartering, subsistence farming and small craft industries do not provide sufficient money for necessary expenses for the operation of communal living; therefore, the majority of communal members are forced to rely on welfare assistance or benefactors. This fact presents a dilemma for communards since it is the establishment which they wish to escape which must support them. Children also present a dilemma for communards. Although children are considered the responsibility of all communal members, most communes are currently facing a choice between training the next generation of communards and allowing their offspring the freedom of choice. The majority, it would seem, would opt for the latter choice.⁸⁹

The recent dilemmas of life styles faced by many of our younger generation may be an indication that the theory regarding the mate selection process is no longer in tune with the practice. On the other hand, it may be possible that young persons who do become involved with deviant life patterns from traditional norms do not consider the implication for future marital life. The proportion of young persons involved in issues of drugs and communal or progressive marital arrangements has not yet been determined. In addition, the general attitude of young people regarding these practices in relationship to traditional marital life has not been assessed.

⁸⁹Bennet Berger et al., "Child-Rearing Practices of the Communal Family," in Skolnick and Skolnick, op. cit., pp. 509-23.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

Less than ten years ago, Michael predicted in his book, The Next Generation, that the "youth would turn intensively to self-emphasizing experiences with love, family, sex, religion, hallucinatory drugs, etc."¹ The campus scene across the country today, in part, reflects the realism of Michael's prediction. The changing campus scene as well as the present social issues of drugs, communal living, increased illegitimacy, unwed parenthood, increased abortion, inter-racial dating and loss of religious practice are frequently considered indicative of changing values among our youth and perhaps a widening of the gap between generations.

Patterns of behavior may reflect a value or they may simply reflect a passing mood or fad. Allport states, "Even the best integrated of personalities do not always act consistently with their schemata of values."² It might well be that long range commitments in the decision making process are more reflective of an individual's values than his spontaneous, immediate or imitative behavior patterns. The selection of either a hypothetical or realistic marital partner

¹Donald Michael, op. cit., p. 161

²Eleanor Kohlman, op. cit., p. 820.

might indicate an extension of one's value system; that is, what personal characteristics one would be willing to accept or what personal characteristics one found necessary to reject in a marital partner.

Extensive literature collected over the past three decades pertaining to the mate selection process has produced limited indication of the influence of drugs, abortion, communal living and illegitimacy, in relation to the selection of dating or marital partners. Furthermore, literature is virtually non-existent in regard to the similarities or differences of opinion which might exist between generations pertaining to the influence of these factors on mate selection criterion.

Do personal characteristics involving issues of drug abuse, abortion, illegitimate children, unwed parenthood, communal living and hippism influence the choice of dating and marital partners? Do parents and youth view these characteristics similarly as they relate to the selection of marital partners? Are personal characteristics resulting from self-imposed types of behaviors considered differently from innate personal or physical characteristics? Are marital partners selected or rejected on the basis of similar criteria for dating partners in regard to involvement in these social issues?

The purpose of this study was to determine, by use of an attitude scale, whether specified personal characteristics, listed on the following pages, have differential influence upon: a) the selection of dating and the selection of marital partners; b) the preference for marital partners as viewed by college students and the selection for marital partners (for their children) as viewed by parents; c) the preferences for dating and marital partners as viewed by males and as viewed by females; d) the

selection of dating and marital partners as viewed by college students living on campus and college students residing at home; e) the dating and marital preferences as viewed by married students and as viewed by non-married students; and f) the dating and marital preferences as viewed by conservative students and as viewed by liberal students.

The specified personal characteristics incorporated into this study were: Consideration of the selection of dating or marital partners who

1. had neurotic tendencies
2. had a slight physical handicap (limped, loss of fingers, speech impediment)
3. had a major physical handicap (loss of one limb, blind)
4. was in poor health
5. was not considered good looking
6. had been divorced
7. favored divorce as solution to conflict in marriage
8. had children by a previous marriage
9. was a habitual smoker
10. was a habitual drinker
11. was a drug user (applied to a person who has a habituation for cocaine, amphetamines, marijuana, LSD, or other hallucinogenic drugs)
12. was a drug addict (applied to a person who is dependent upon the addicting drugs such as opium and its derivatives, synthetic narcotics, barbiturates and solvents)
13. was currently living in a commune (six to fifteen persons of both sexes determined to reconstruct their own lives and influence others to seek meaningful work, mutual love and spiritual re-birth. Communal living may or may not be extended to include sexual relationships among members)

14. was currently living as a hippy (person who shuns conventional forms of dress code, habits of personal care and cleanliness and traditional values of materialism and can be identified by symbols of dress and accessories denoting hippy subculture. DRUG USE AND COMMUNAL LIVING EXCLUDED FROM THIS DEFINITION.)
15. was of another race
16. had a much lower educational attainment level (at least four years)
17. had a much higher educational attainment level (at least four years)
18. was of a lower socio-economic level
19. was of a higher socio-economic level
20. favored infidelity in marriage
21. had no desire for children
22. favored abortion
23. was considered sexually permissive
24. had totally denounced religious practice
25. had totally denounced religious faith
26. held little sense of responsibility

Females only:

27. had refused induction into the armed services
28. had fathered an illegitimate child
29. desired a large family

Males only:

27. had had at least one pre-marital abortion
28. had given up an illegitimate child
29. was rearing an illegitimate child

In summary, several variables were incorporated in this study to examine the attitudes of college students and their parents toward

certain specific characteristics as influences on the choice of dating and/or marital partners:

1. The dating preferences and marital preferences of college students.
2. The marital preferences of students and the marital preferences of parents for their sons and daughters.
3. The dating and marital preferences as rated by
 - a) males and females
 - b) married and non-married students
 - c) resident and non-resident students
 - d) self-perceived liberal, conservative or independent students

Hypotheses

This study was designed to test the following null hypotheses:

1. There will be no significant difference between the accepted and rejected personal characteristics which influence the selection of dating partners and those which influence the selection of marital partners as perceived by college students.
2. There will be no significant difference between the accepted and rejected personal characteristics which influence the selection of marital partners as viewed by college students and those which influence the selection of marital partners for siblings as viewed by parents of college students.
3. There will be no significant difference between the accepted and rejected personal characteristics which influence the selection of dating and marital partners as perceived by college males and those which influence the selection of dating and marital partners as perceived by college females.
4. There will be no significant difference in the hypothetical selection of marital partners for sons and marital partners for daughters as perceived by mothers and fathers.
5. There will be no significant difference between the accepted and rejected personal characteristics which influence the selection of dating and marital partners as perceived by married college students and non-married college students.

6. There will be no significant difference between the accepted and rejected personal characteristics which influence the selection of dating and marital partners as perceived by resident campus students and non-resident campus students.
7. There will be no significant difference between the accepted and rejected personal characteristics which influence the selection of dating and marital partners as viewed by college students who perceive themselves as liberal, conservative, or independent.

Description of the Population

Students and parents currently affiliated with The University of Akron constituted the sample for this study. The University of Akron is one of Ohio's fastest growing state universities. The campus is comprised of 90 acres and 50 modern buildings and is located at the hub of an industrial urban area of 700,000 persons.³

The University enrolls approximately 13,000 day-time students and 6,000 evening students. The University offers the Associate, Baccalaureate, Master's and Doctoral Degrees in its various colleges and schools: Business Administration, Community and Technical, Education, Engineering, Fine and Applied Arts, Arts and Sciences, Law and Nursing.

Student Population

The American Council on Education, Office of Research Survey Studies of the past few years describe The University of Akron freshmen and the average national university freshmen in a multiplicity of dimensions. In the majority of descriptive categories, the 1970 freshmen, both nationally and locally, are similar to the freshmen classes of 1967,

³The University of Akron. General Bulletin, 1970-71, p. 4.

1968 and 1969. The 1970 study will be cited because it is a more extensive study than those completed in previous years.

In many dimensions, the average 1970 University of Akron freshman was very similar to his national counterpart. The significant comparisons are analyzed in the following dimensions.

The majority of Akron freshmen in 1970 were 18 and 19 years old; however, approximately two per cent of them were over 20 years of age. Fifty-seven per cent of the freshmen class was male; forty-three per cent was female. Ninety-seven per cent of the students were United States citizens. The majority of students came from middle class homes. Approximately 50 per cent of the Akron students combine their academic endeavors with either part-time or full-time employment.

Eighty-seven per cent of the freshmen at The University of Akron lived within a 50-mile radius of the University; approximately half of these lived within a 10-mile radius of the campus. In this category, the students from The University of Akron differed considerably from the national norm. Approximately 10 per cent of the Akron University enrollment is housed on campus. The majority of students commute. By contrast, 49 per cent of the nation's college students live 100 miles or more from their campuses.

In Tables III and IV the 1970 freshmen at The University of Akron are compared with national freshmen norms in issues regarding personal philosophies and social and political opinions.

In regard to political preference, 37 per cent of The University of Akron freshmen regarded themselves as politically liberal; forty-seven per cent considered themselves conservative. A slightly higher

TABLE III. COMPARISON OF NORMS CONCERNING ESSENTIAL AND IMPORTANT OBJECTIVES IN LIFE FOR UNIVERSITY OF AKRON AND NATIONAL COLLEGE FRESHMEN, 1970

Important Objectives	Akron Males	Akron Females	Akron Mean	National Mean
Develop a philosophy of life	70.0	78.6	73.7	79.7
Raise a family	64.0	74.0	68.3	65.4
Be authority in field	70.5	60.6	66.2	67.9
Help others in difficulty	55.6	74.5	63.7	63.9
Have friends different from me	57.3	68.6	62.2	63.1
Have active social life	56.6	53.6	55.3	54.6
Keep up with political affairs	51.2	49.1	50.3	59.3
Influence social values	29.8	32.5	30.9	34.8
Marry within next five years	20.0	40.0	28.6	23.9

TABLE IV. COMPARISON OF NORMS REGARDING POLITICAL BELIEFS FOR UNIVERSITY OF AKRON AND NATIONAL COLLEGE FRESHMEN, 1970

College Students Agree	Akron Males	Akron Females	Akron Mean	National Mean
Liberalize abortion laws	86.7	79.2	83.5	89.1
Incent to Control Birth Rate	38.1	34.5	36.6	50.9
Liberalize Divorce Laws	53.4	42.9	48.9	57.1
Legalize Marijuana	40.0	34.2	37.5	45.8
Army Should be voluntary	77.4	61.2	70.4	70.4
Military Involvement in Southeast Asia	12.8	12.5	12.7	13.4

percentage of Akron freshmen placed themselves in the liberal category in 1970 than in 1969. By comparison with the national norm for college freshmen, The University of Akron freshmen would be considered slightly more "middle of the road" than their college national counterparts with only a slight percentage of difference in both the liberal and conservative categories.

It may be concluded, therefore, that The University of Akron freshman in 1970 was comparable to his national counterpart in most aspects. The greatest difference would lie in the fact that the average Akron freshman is far more likely to commute to school than the average college freshman on the national scale. A large percentage of the Akron students combine college and employment. Lastly, it should be pointed out that the Akron University 1970 freshman was just slightly more "middle of the road" in terms of political and social attitudes than his national counterpart.

Parental Population

Data describing the parents of the students from The University of Akron were also obtained from the 1970 American Council on Education Research study.

Twenty-six per cent of the Akron University freshmen were from homes where the parental income was between \$10,000 and \$12,499. Twenty-eight per cent of the Akron freshmen families lived on parental incomes under \$10,000. By comparison, 17 per cent of the University freshmen, nationally, were from homes where the income was between \$10,000 and \$12,499. Twenty-five per cent of the freshmen were from homes where the parental income was less than \$10,000 annually according to the national norm.

Thirty-seven per cent of the Akron freshmen fathers had completed their education at the 12th grade level, compared to 25 per cent at the national level. However, more fathers had some college or held college degrees in the national sample than those represented in the Akron population. In 1970, 59 per cent

of the national college freshmen class had fathers who had either gone to college or held college degrees. This percentage was 42 per cent for fathers of the 1970 Akron freshmen class. The majority of fathers of Akron freshmen were employed in business, research, skilled work or education. A higher percentage, 18 per cent, of Akron fathers were employed in semi-skilled or unskilled work than the national norm of seven per cent in these two categories.

As a group, mothers of Akron freshmen also had a higher percentage of high school graduates than the national 1970 average of 54.6 per cent as compared to 40 per cent for the national norm. However, a higher percentage of mothers of freshmen had attended college or had college degrees nationally than did the local group. Forty-eight per cent of the national population of mothers of Akron freshmen had been to college or held college degrees compared to 31 per cent of the Akron freshmen.

In summary, the average parent of The University of Akron 1970 freshmen is more apt to have more high school education than the national parental average of university parents, but less likely to have as much college education as the national norm. On the average, the parents have slightly higher incomes than the national average of college parents; they are more likely to be employed in semi-skilled or unskilled work than the national average college parent.

Description of Sample

Students

Students from The University of Akron were systematically sampled for this study. Questionnaires were administered to classes selected

from the University Schedule of Classes on the basis of every fifth and/or every tenth section entered in the listings by various departments within each of the degree granting colleges or professional schools. The fifth section of evening offerings within various colleges was also sampled.

Students were asked to complete the questionnaires in class. The questionnaires and answer sheets were collected upon completion. The students were asked to take parental questionnaires home for completion by one or both parents. Male students, participating in the study, were provided with parental questionnaires for mothers and fathers regarding marital preferences for sons. Female students, participating in the study, were provided parental questionnaires for mothers and fathers regarding marital preferences for daughters.

More parents of female students than parents of male students participated in the study. The ratio of parents of female students to parents of male students was approximately four to one. This variance may be significant in the analysis of data regarding the hypothesis pertaining to the choice of hypothetical marital partners for sons and hypothetical marital partners for daughters as viewed by parents. However, it should also be noted that 94.6 per cent of the parental sample had two or more children, therefore, the likelihood of answering these questions from a reference point of having both a son and a daughter in the family was increased.

A proportional stratified representation of the University's enrollment in each of the degree granting colleges and schools (upper colleges) was used in the final analysis. "A proportional stratified sample is often used to assure a more representative sample than might

be expected under simple random or systematic sampling.⁴ Approximately seven per cent of each of the degree granting colleges or schools (upper colleges) was reflected in the final stratified student sample.

A total of 465 student questionnaires and 318 parental questionnaires comprised the final sample. The sample included 240, or 52 per cent male students; 225, or 48 per cent female students; 169, or 53 per cent mothers, and 149, or 47 per cent fathers.

Table V presents various dimensions of the students' background.

TABLE V. DESCRIPTION OF STUDENTS INCLUDED IN SAMPLE N = 465

Category	Number	Percentage
Sex		
Males	240	52
Females	225	48
Age		
Between 18-23	412	88.6
Between 24-29	38	8.2
Over 30	15	3.2
Marital Status		
Single	397	85.3
Married	59	12.7
Divorced	9	1.9
Employment		
Employed Full-time	39	8.4
Employed Part-time	239	51.4
Not Employed	154	33.1
Residence		
Living on campus	72	15.6
Living off-campus	38	8.2
Living at home with parent(s)	260	55.9
Living with spouse	38	8.2
Living alone	2	9.4
Political Tendencies		
Liberal	156	33.5
Conservative	112	24.1
Independent	192	41.3

⁴Hubert M. Blalock, Jr., Social Statistics (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960), p. 397.

A comparison of the background of this student sample with the University sample surveyed by the American Council on Education (see discussion, pp. 56-60) would indicate that the sample used in this study was highly representative of the University student body. Slight differences might be noted in that the sample of students had more residential students than the actual percentage of dormitory students at The University of Akron. The sample used for the study also had a slightly higher proportion of female students than was represented by the actual ratio of male and female students in attendance at the University.

In comparison with The University of Akron sample surveyed by the American Council on Education, the student sample used in the study perceived themselves slightly less liberal, considerably less conservative and more independent in terms of political tendencies.

Parents

The largest number of parents in the sample were between ages 40 and 50 although one-third of the parents were over 50. There was almost an even distribution of the number of parents who had two, three, four or five or more children. The parental sample used in this study represented a slightly higher level of education than the Akron sample utilized for the American Council on Education study. This might be a result of a tendency for the more highly educated parents to be more willing to be involved in this type of study. A higher percentage of post-baccalaureate level parents were included in this study than in the study by the American Council. Approximately 20 per cent of the parental sample in this study was employed in educational or professional work.

In general, the parental sample selected for this study was very comparable with the sample extracted for the American Council study in 1970. Areas with the greatest amount of variance between the national and local samples would pertain to higher educational and employment levels for the parental sample selected for this study.

The parental sample for this study perceived themselves almost twice as conservative as the student sample. Forty-three per cent of the parental group perceived themselves as conservative in contrast to 24 per cent of the student group. Forty-one per cent of the students compared to 32 per cent of the parents perceived themselves as independent in political tendencies. Table VI presents data concerning the parents participating in this study.

Instrument

To obtain data for the study a Likert type attitude scale (see Appendix) was developed and tested by the investigator. The instrument had five scaled, forced-choice answers. The questionnaire had four forms designed for male and female students and for fathers and mothers. They were color-coded for ease of distribution. The student questionnaires included questions regarding personal data such as age, marital status, major area of academic concentration, employment, residence and political tendencies. Students were asked questions relating to specified characteristics regarding dating and marital preferences as well as questions regarding which of several characteristics they considered "most detrimental" to marriage.

The parental questionnaires were similar to the student questionnaires except the questions regarding dating preferences were not

TABLE VI. DESCRIPTION OF PARENTS INCLUDED IN SAMPLE N = 318

Category	Number	Percentage
Sex		
Male	149	46.7
Female	169	52.8
Age		
Between 35-40	31	6.6
Between 41-45	83	26.1
Between 46-50	108	34.0
Over 50	106	33.3
Marital Status		
Living with spouse	298	93.7
Divorced	11	3.5
Widowed	6	1.9
Highest Level of Education		
Below 12th grade	42	13.2
High school graduate	133	41.8
Some college	84	26.4
College graduate	26	8.2
Post-baccalaureate work	33	9.7
Employment		
Business/Management	89	28.0
Industry/Manufacturing	91	28.6
Sales/Promotion	40	12.6
Education	30	9.4
Professional	39	12.3
Number of Children		
One	17	5.3
Two	77	24.2
Three	99	31.1
Four	57	17.9
Five or more	68	21.4
Political Tendency		
Liberal	71	22.3
Conservative	138	43.4
Independent	101	31.8

included in the parental forms. The parents were asked personal questions regarding age, number of years married, number of children, employment, education and political tendencies. Questions concerning the "most detrimental" characteristics were also included on the parental forms. One major point of difference in the two forms, however, was

that the students were asked to consider the questions in regard to their choice of a dating or marital partner; the parents were asked to consider the questions on the basis of a hypothetical choice of a marital partner for their son or daughter.

The dating and marital scales for students and the marital scale for parents had a five, forced-choice set of answers for each item in the scales. These forced-choice answers were: a) I would insist that my partner possessed this characteristic; b) I would not mind if my partner possessed this characteristic; c) I would not consider this characteristic important in my choice of a mate; d) I would rather my partner did not possess this characteristic; and e) I could never accept this characteristic in a person. The last answer on the forced-choice continuum was considered a rejection of the characteristic and was used to determine which group had the highest percentage of rejection.

Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted prior to completing the final instrument. Sixty students and 25 of their parents were asked to complete the questionnaires and to comment on terminology or on portions which were not clearly understood. Twenty students were interviewed, regarding their responses, after completing the questionnaire. The pilot study served two purposes: to check and improve the content validity of the items and to gain insight into the interpretation of the findings.

Reliability of the Instrument

Test reliability was determined by administering identical questionnaires twice, two weeks apart, to 60 students and their parents.

The number of usable returns totaled 46 students and 33 parents. Students were given instructions in class; their questionnaires were collected upon completion. The students were requested to take the parental questionnaires home and ask their parents to complete them. The parental questionnaires and responses were returned to the investigator via the students.

Kendall's tau correlation coefficient was used to check the reliability of the instrument. Kendall's tau was chosen since it allows a more concise conceptualization of the measurement of relationships between variables than other correlations. If repeated pairs of persons are drawn at random from a population, the indication that they will have the same orders on two variables, X and Y, is represented by the value of tau.⁵ The degree of relation between the two sets of ranks is indicated by the ratio of the actual total of + 1's and - 1's to the possible maximum total. The formula used for Kendall's tau is⁶

$$\tau = \frac{S}{\sqrt{1/2N(N-1) - T_x} \sqrt{1/2N(N-1) - T_y}}$$

Where $T_x = 1/2 \sum t(t-1)$, t being the number of tied observations in each group of ties on the X variable

$T_y = 1/2 \sum t(t-1)$, t being the number of tied observations in each group of ties on the Y variable

Questions regarding marital preferences for students and parents (items 12-40) and questions regarding dating preferences for students

⁵Gene V. Glass and Julian C. Stanley, Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1970), pp. 176-78.

⁶Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956), pp. 217-18.

(Items 48-76) were analyzed in a total scale. Questions pertaining to the "most detrimental" characteristics considered for marital partners (test items 41 through 47) were analyzed individually. Test items which were not answered on both the test, re-test questions by students or parents were not considered in the reliability analysis. Therefore, not all questions are based on the responses of 46 students and 33 parents. Results of Kendall's tau computed on the test, re-test data indicated a highly reliable instrument. In the majority of correlations (7 out of 9), both the total scales and the separate items had z scores which were significant beyond the .01 level. Of the remaining two items, one was significant and one was not significant at the .05 level of probability.

Students' responses indicated high reliability of the dating and marital scales. The reliability was higher on the marital total scale than on the dating total scale with probabilities beyond the .01 and .05 levels respectively. Separate items on the "most detrimental" characteristic set of questions (items 41-47) had probabilities beyond the .01 level with the exception of one question which reached the .036 level of probability. This question dealt with a choice of characteristics regarding higher or lower socio-economic backgrounds and educational levels for marital partners. The lower level of significance on this question may have been an indication that: (1) students had a tendency to change their minds about which of these characteristics would be "most detrimental" to marriage; (2) students did not consider either choice as a detriment to marriage, or (3) students considered both choices equally detrimental to marriage.

The parental responses on the total marital scale also had a high reliability at less than the .01 level of probability. Five of the separate items in the "most detrimental" characteristic set of questions on the parental questionnaire were significant beyond the .01 level. In the following table (Table VII) the Kendall's rank order correlation coefficient (tau), standard deviation, z score and probability level for the dating and marital scales and for the individual items on the "most detrimental" set of questions is presented.

Statistical Analysis of Data

Chi square (χ^2) test for two independent variables appropriate for the number of samples compared was used to determine significant differences between groups for each item tested. The formula used for chi square is as follows:

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{(O_{ij} - E_{ij})^2}{E_{ij}}$$

The significance level was established as alpha = .01; therefore, the region of rejection consists of all values of χ^2 which are so large that the probability associated with their occurrence by chance is equal to or less than .01.⁷ The null hypotheses were not rejected unless the majority (more than half) of the items in any set of variables differed significantly at the .01 level or beyond. The percentage of persons answering the last choice in the forced-choice scale, "I could never accept this characteristic in a person," was used to determine

⁷Sidney Siegel, op. cit.

TABLE VII. KENDALL'S RANK ORDER CORRELATION COEFFICIENT (TAU), STANDARD DEVIATIONS z SCORES AND PROBABILITY LEVELS FOR MARITAL AND DATING SCALES AS AN INDICATOR OF RELIABILITY

TEST SCALE OR TEST ITEM	S T U D E N T S				P A R E N T S			
	Tau	Standard Deviation	z Score	P	Tau	Standard Deviation	z Score	P
Marital Scale (Items 12-40)	0.52	0.10	5.12	.000	0.57	0.12	4.70	.000
Item 41	0.27	0.10	2.63	.004	0.28	0.13	2.16	.014
Item 42	-0.28	0.10	-2.77	.003	0.27	0.13	2.08	.018
Item 43	0.13	0.12	1.11	.136	0.62	0.17	3.69	.000
Item 44	0.72	0.11	6.62	.000	0.73	0.14	5.25	.000
Item 45	0.38	0.10	3.73	.000	0.61	0.13	4.54	.000
Item 46	0.81	0.13	6.15	.000	0.59	0.10	5.67	.000
Item 47	0.41	0.13	3.17	.000	0.51	0.10	5.03	.000
Dating Scale (Items 48-76)	0.18	0.10	1.76	.044				

Significance Level = .01

which group had the highest percentage of rejection for each characteristic.

Average mean scores were calculated from the answer responses on the continuum by assigning a value of one to the first answer, "I would insist that my partner possessed this characteristic," values of two, three and four to successive points on the continuum, and a value of five to the last answer, "I could never accept this characteristic in a person." The average mean scores, calculated for various groups, therefore, gave an indication of where the total group stood on the answer continuum for the characteristics studied. The differences in the mean scores between various groups were calculated for each of the characteristics and the t-ratio was computed to determine significant differences between the means for students' and parents' preferences for partners. The basic computational formula for the t-test of a difference between two independent means, based on a pooled variance estimate, is:⁸

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\left[\frac{\sum X_1^2 - \frac{(\sum X_1)^2}{N_1}}{N_1} + \frac{\sum X_2^2 - \frac{(\sum X_2)^2}{N_2}}{N_2} \right] \cdot \left[\frac{1}{N_1} + \frac{1}{N_2} \right]}}$$

- where
- \bar{X}_1 = the mean of the first group of scores
 - \bar{X}_2 = the mean of the second group of scores
 - $\sum X_1^2$ = the sum of the squared score values of the first group
 - $\sum X_2^2$ = the sum of the squared score values of the second group
 - $(\sum X_1)^2$ = the square of the sum of the scores in the first group
 - $(\sum X_2)^2$ = the square of the sum of the scores in the second group
 - N_1 = the number of scores in the first group
 - N_2 = the number of scores in the second group

⁸James L. Bruning and B. L. Kintz. Computational Handbook of Statistics (Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1968), p. 10.

The analysis of data is discussed in the following chapter in relation to the percentage of persons rejecting the characteristic, the probability levels determined by chi square, the comparison of average mean scores and the differences in means for various classifications of students and parents.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The study was designed to examine attitudes of college students and parents toward the issues of drugs, communal living, hippism, illegitimacy, abortion and loss of religious faith as influences in selection of dating and marital partners. Approximately 500 students attending The University of Akron and 300 of their parents supplied data by means of a forced-choice attitude scale designed to compare differences in preferences for dating and/or marital partners between various groups of students and parents. The instrument was checked for reliability and validity. Chi square and average mean scores were used in the statistical analysis.

The null hypotheses tested included: There would be no significant difference between the accepted and the rejected personal characteristics which influenced the selection of (1) dating and marital partners as perceived by college students; (2) marital partners as perceived by college students and marital partners for siblings as perceived by the parents of the college students; (3) dating and marital partners as perceived by college males and by college females; (4) marital and dating partners for sons and daughters as viewed by mothers and fathers; (5) dating and marital partners as perceived by married and non-married college students; (6) dating and marital partners as viewed by

campus resident students and non-resident students; and (7) dating and marital partners as viewed by college students who perceived themselves as liberal, conservative or independent. The data are presented in the following chapters in relation to the stated null hypotheses. The results are discussed on the basis of the probabilities determined by chi square, average mean scores and percentages of responses to the last answer in the forced-choice continuum, "I could never accept this characteristic in a person."

Student Preferences for Dating and Marital Partners

A comparison was made between the characteristics which influenced the selection of dating partners and those which influenced the selection of marital partners as perceived by college students. An analysis of the percentages attributed to the last answer-response indicated that students had higher percentages of rejection for more of the characteristics pertaining to marital partners than for those pertaining to dating partners. The difference between students' preferences for dating partners and for marital partners was significant at the .01 level for 16 of the 26 items in the questionnaire. The rejection of 14 of these items was higher for marital than for dating partners; for two of the 16 items the rejection was higher for dating partners than for marital partners. Percentages and probability levels comparing students' preferences for dating and marital partners are presented in Table VIII.

An analysis of the student responses on preferences for dating partners would indicate high rejection for potential dates who were drug addicts, 75.1 per cent; drug users, 48.3 per cent for habitual drinkers,

TABLE VIII. PERCENTAGES AND LEVELS OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF DATING AND MARITAL PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY COLLEGE STUDENTS (N=465)

CHARACTERISTIC	PER CENT INDICATING PREFERENCES										PROBABILITY
	For Dating Partners					For Marital Partners					
	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E	
Neurotic Tendencies	1.1	8.3	14.4	57.0	19.2	9.6	5.8	6.0	61.1	26.3	.000
Slight Physical Handicap	0.4	22.7	42.8	32.0	2.2	0.2	24.5	37.7	35.9	1.7	.488
Major Physical Handicap	0.4	6.9	18.1	57.7	16.8	9.0	8.9	12.7	59.4	19.0	.084
Poor Health	0.2	9.5	25.9	57.2	7.1	0.2	8.8	13.6	69.6	7.8	.000
Not Good Looking	0.4	14.0	57.1	23.7	4.7	0.2	16.2	57.3	21.8	4.5	.834
Had Benn Divorced	0.9	15.3	37.5	30.8	15.5	0.9	18.3	27.5	37.2	16.1	.024
Favored Divorce	1.5	11.9	28.4	35.1	23.0	3.2	13.1	11.4	37.5	34.7	.000
Had Children	0.2	14.0	36.9	34.3	14.7	0.6	21.0	24.6	40.0	13.0	.000
Habitual Smoker	0.0	12.5	28.1	45.6	13.8	0.2	11.6	18.9	49.9	19.4	.005
Habitual Drinker	0.4	4.5	9.1	46.2	39.7	0.4	1.3	3.2	42.7	52.4	.000
Drug User	0.2	6.5	12.3	32.8	48.3	0.6	3.9	4.1	21.3	70.0	.000
Drug Addict	0.0	2.2	2.8	20.0	75.1	0.4	9.9	1.1	12.5	85.1	.000
Living in Commune	0.4	15.9	25.7	30.5	27.5	0.2	13.7	16.3	30.6	39.3	.000
Living as Hippie	0.7	16.0	26.5	30.0	26.9	1.7	15.9	19.1	30.5	32.7	.036
Another Race	0.0	9.8	31.6	30.9	27.7	0.0	8.8	26.7	36.6	27.8	.228
Lower Educational Level	0.4	15.3	43.4	32.7	8.3	0.2	13.6	34.7	39.9	11.6	.025
Higher Educational Level	1.3	36.4	51.1	9.9	1.3	1.9	42.9	36.9	17.5	0.9	.000
Lower Socio-economic Level	0.4	20.3	62.5	14.6	2.2	0.2	21.5	61.1	14.8	2.4	.958
Higher Socio-economic Level	1.3	31.6	58.0	7.0	2.2	2.2	34.4	55.9	6.2	1.3	.572
Favored Extra-marital Sex	1.1	8.7	21.6	29.8	38.8	0.2	1.3	4.9	21.9	71.6	.000
No Desire for Children	1.8	10.7	36.8	29.5	21.2	2.2	7.5	9.9	29.9	50.5	.000
Favored Abortion	4.4	21.0	36.9	20.5	17.2	4.7	23.0	29.7	23.4	19.1	.242
Sexually Permissive	4.6	16.8	26.9	34.4	17.3	1.1	9.5	19.2	40.2	30.0	.000
Denounced Religious Practice	9.4	15.5	42.7	28.2	13.1	1.5	12.9	31.8	34.2	19.6	.000
Denounced Religious Faith	0.2	11.4	32.6	33.7	22.1	0.6	9.2	22.4	32.5	35.3	.000
Little Sense of Responsibility	0.7	21.2	40.6	25.1	12.4	1.9	1.7	2.4	37.4	56.6	.000
SEX-ORIENTED CHARACTERISTICS											
Refused Service Induction*	0.9	18.6	36.7	30.3	13.6	1.8	18.3	31.7	32.6	15.6	.745
Fathered Illegitimate Child*	0.0	10.0	24.4	40.3	25.3	0.0	7.6	17.3	51.1	24.0	.094
Desired Large Family*	1.4	35.0	39.2	18.4	6.0	3.1	41.3	16.4	28.4	10.7	.000
Had Pre-marital Abortion**	0.0	8.0	42.0	31.4	18.6	0.4	6.7	30.4	37.9	24.6	.063
Given-up Illegitimate Child**	0.9	9.4	43.8	32.6	13.3	0.4	7.5	27.1	41.7	23.3	.000
Rearing Illegitimate Child**	0.9	8.6	36.9	36.9	16.7	0.4	10.8	27.9	35.4	25.4	.083

KEY: A-Would Prefer; B-Would Not Mind; C-Not Important; D-Would Rather Not; E-Never Accept

*Answered by females (N=225)

**Answered by males (N=240)

Significance Level = .01

39.7 per cent; and for persons who favored extra-marital sex, 38.8 per cent. Approximately one-fourth of the students rejected hypothetical dating partners who had lived in communes, were of another race, were hippies, favored divorce, and denounced their religious faith and had no desire for children. Dating partners who had children or who were of a higher educational level were rejected over and above marital partners with these characteristics.

High rejection percentages were given for marital partners who were drug addicts, 85.1 per cent; favored extra-marital sex, 71.6 per cent; were drug users, 70.0 per cent; were irresponsible, 56.6 per cent; were habitual drinkers, 52.4 per cent, and who had no desire for children, 50.5 per cent. Approximately one-fourth to one-half of the students rejected marital partners who had lived in communes, 39.3 per cent; who were sexually permissive, 30.3 per cent; who were of another race, 27.8 per cent, and persons who had neurotic tendencies, 26.3 per cent.

Persons who had slight physical handicaps and persons who had poor health received low rejection percentages for both dating and marital partners. Characteristics receiving highest rejection for both dating and marital partners included drug addicts, drug users and habitual drinkers. Students did not differentiate between dating partners and marrying partners of another race in percentages of rejection. Twenty-eight per cent of the students stated they would never date a person of another race. Nearly 10 per cent of the students gave accepting responses toward dating and marrying persons of another race; more than one-fourth of the students claimed that a person of another race would not be considered important in the selection of a dating or marital partner.

Sex-oriented test items pertaining to female or male characteristics had significant differences on two of the six items comparing dating and marital preferences of college students. These six items are included in the lower portion of Table VIII. The two characteristics which had significant differences between the selection of dating and marital partners included the desire for a large family and giving-up an illegitimate child. Females rejected dating and marital partners who had fathered an illegitimate child with almost equal percentages, 25.3 and 24.0 per cent, respectively. Approximately 15 per cent of the females considered refusal of induction into the service as a highly unfavorable characteristic for either dating or marital partners.

Males were more apt to reject female marital partners who had an abortion or who had an illegitimate child than dating partners with these characteristics. Females did not differentiate in percentage of rejection of dating or marital partners who had fathered an illegitimate child. A female marital partner who had had an abortion or who had given-up an illegitimate child or who was rearing an illegitimate child was rejected almost equally by the males, 24.6 and 25.4 per cent, respectively.

Students' and Parents' Preferences for Marital Partners

Students' preferences for marital partners and parents' preferences for hypothetical marital partners for their siblings were compared for all the specified characteristics in the study. The students' and parents' preferences differed significantly at the .01 level of probability on all test items except one on the marital preference test. The exception dealt with the characteristic concerning drug addiction. Both parents and students had high percentages of rejection for this item. Eighty per cent

of the parents said they could never accept this characteristic in a marital partner for their siblings; 85 per cent of the students claimed that they would never accept this characteristic in a marital partner. The percentages of responses for each answer and the levels of significance for students' and parents' preferences for marital partners are presented in Table IX.

Students had higher percentages of rejection than parents on 17 of the 26 items on the marital preference scale. A comparison of the last response on the answer continuum, "I could never accept this characteristic in a marital partner," indicated that students were more opposed than their parents to marital partners who had been divorced, who had children, who were habitual smokers or habitual drinkers and persons who favored extra-marital sex. The parents had higher percentages of rejection than students for marital partners who had communal living experience, who were living as hippies, who were of another race, who had had an abortion, who were sexually permissive, and who had denounced their religious practice and/or faith.

Average mean scores were computed for both parent and student responses on the marital preference scale. The total average mean score for all parent responses to all items on the marital scale was only slightly higher than the total average mean score for all student responses to all test items, 3.79 and 3.78, respectively. An average mean score of 3.0 would reflect the answer-response, "I do not consider this characteristic important in my choice of a mate." An average mean score of 4.0 would reflect the answer-response, "I would rather not marry a person with this characteristic."

TABLE IX. PERCENTAGES AND LEVELS OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY COLLEGE STUDENTS (N=465) AND THEIR PARENTS (N=318)

CHARACTERISTIC	PER CENT INDICATING PREFERENCES										PROBABILITY
	Students					Parents					
	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E	
Neurotic Tendencies	0.6	5.8	6.0	61.3	26.1	0.6	2.5	3.5	80.4	13.0	.000
Slight Physical Handicap	0.2	24.5	37.7	35.9	1.7	1.3	28.4	46.1	24.3	0.9	.009
Major Physical Handicap	0.0	8.9	13.0	59.4	18.8	0.0	7.9	11.4	73.8	6.9	.000
Poor Health	0.2	8.6	13.6	69.8	7.8	0.0	5.7	4.8	82.9	6.7	.000
Not Good Looking	0.2	15.9	57.3	22.2	4.3	1.3	26.3	67.7	4.1	0.6	.000
Had Been Divorced	0.9	18.1	27.7	37.2	16.1	0.6	10.1	14.2	65.1	10.1	.000
Favored Divorce	3.2	13.1	11.4	37.9	34.3	1.6	13.7	8.3	59.4	17.1	.000
Had Children	0.6	21.0	24.6	41.0	12.7	0.6	17.6	18.6	56.3	6.9	.000
Habitual Smoker	0.2	11.6	19.1	49.9	19.1	0.3	11.0	36.8	47.2	4.7	.000
Habitual Drinker	0.4	1.3	3.2	43.1	51.9	0.0	0.9	1.3	55.7	42.1	.005
Drug User	0.6	3.9	4.1	21.8	69.6	0.0	1.0	0.0	27.0	72.1	.000
Drug Addict	0.4	0.9	1.1	12.5	85.1	0.0	0.6	0.0	18.9	80.4	.032
Living In Commune	0.2	13.5	16.5	30.7	39.1	0.0	1.9	2.6	35.9	59.6	.000
Living as Hippie	1.7	15.9	19.4	30.5	32.5	0.0	1.9	1.9	38.3	57.9	.000
Another Race	0.0	8.8	26.7	36.6	27.8	0.0	4.7	7.9	47.3	40.1	.000
Lower Educational Level	0.2	13.4	34.5	40.1	11.9	0.3	13.6	39.9	42.1	4.1	.005
Higher Educational Level	1.9	43.1	36.6	17.5	9.9	19.8	35.5	37.1	7.5	0.0	.000
Lower Socio-economic Level	0.2	21.9	60.4	15.1	2.4	1.3	21.2	42.4	33.5	1.6	.000
Higher Socio-economic Level	2.2	34.8	55.3	6.2	1.5	8.9	39.0	41.5	9.9	0.6	.000
Favored Extra-marital Sex	0.2	1.3	4.9	22.2	71.4	0.3	1.0	1.3	32.4	65.1	.002
No Desire for Children	2.2	7.5	9.9	29.7	50.8	0.6	3.5	9.6	60.4	25.9	.000
Favored Abortion	4.7	23.0	30.1	23.2	18.9	0.0	11.3	20.4	37.4	30.8	.000
Sexually Permissive	1.1	9.5	19.4	40.2	29.8	0.3	1.9	4.1	47.1	46.5	.000
Denounced Religious Practice	1.5	12.7	31.6	34.2	20.0	0.0	5.1	12.4	48.9	33.7	.000
Denounced Religious Faith	0.6	9.0	22.4	32.7	35.3	0.0	3.2	6.7	45.4	44.8	.000
Little Sense of Responsibility	1.9	1.7	2.6	36.7	57.0	0.0	1.3	0.3	61.1	37.3	.000
SEX-ORIENTED CHARACTERISTICS											
Refused Service Induction*	1.8	18.4	31.4	33.2	15.2	0.4	7.2	18.6	41.5	32.2	.000
Fathered Illegitimate Child*	0.0	7.6	17.4	51.3	23.7	0.0	1.3	12.3	50.8	35.6	.000
Desired Large Family*	3.1	41.5	16.1	29.0	10.3	4.2	30.7	35.3	27.7	2.1	.000
Had Pre-Marital Abortion**	0.4	6.7	30.1	38.1	24.7	1.4	5.6	11.1	66.7	15.3	.000
Given-up Illegitimate Child**	0.4	7.9	26.8	41.8	23.0	1.4	5.6	12.5	65.3	15.3	.007
Rearing Illegitimate Child**	0.4	10.9	27.6	36.0	25.1	0.0	8.5	16.9	60.6	14.1	.007

KEY: A-Would Prefer; B-Would Not Mind; C-Not Important; D-Would Rather Not; E-Never Accept

*Answered by Females (N=225) or parents of female students (N=233)

**Answered by Males (N=240) or parents of male students (N=82)

Significance Level = .01

**Answered by Males (N=240) or parents of male students (N=82)

Significance Level = .01

Students had higher average mean scores than parents on 14 of the 26 items on the marital scale. There were significant differences at the .01 level or beyond on approximately half of the comparisons of average mean scores for parents and students for marital characteristics. Parents had significantly higher average mean scores for the following characteristics: drug user, living in commune, denounced religious faith, favored abortion, poor health and lower socio-economic level. The students had significantly higher average mean scores for the following characteristics: habitual drinker, neurotic tendencies, favored divorce, lower educational level, slight physical handicap, not good looking, higher socio-economic level and higher educational level. The average mean score for each characteristic for students and parents, the t-value, the levels of probability and the total average mean scores for parents and students for all characteristics are listed in Table X.

Students and parents were also asked to select the "most detrimental" characteristic in a set of seven test items. Each test item listed four or five characteristics; the majority of the items were unrelated. The characteristics, percentages for students' and parents' responses and the level of significance for each of these test items are listed in Table XI. The highest percentages for the responses given by students and parents are underlined. Results of the chi square analysis for this portion of the questionnaire are given in Table XII.

Parents and students agreed on which item was considered "most detrimental" in five of the seven cases. In the other two cases, parents regarded lower educational level and students regarded higher socio-economic level as "most detrimental" in marital partners. Parents also thought that the loss of religious faith was more detrimental, whereas,

TABLE X. AVERAGE MEAN SCORES, t-VALUES AND PROBABILITY LEVELS FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS AS PERCEIVED BY COLLEGE STUDENTS (N=465) AND THEIR PARENTS (N=318)

CHARACTERISTIC*	AVERAGE MEAN SCORES		t-Value	Probability
	Parents	Students		
Drug Addict	4.78	4.80	-0.86	0.39
Drug User	4.65	4.45	-2.72	0.01
Favored Extra-marital Sex	4.56	4.63	-1.35	0.18
Living as Hippie	4.49	3.77	2.15	0.03
Living in Commune	4.43	3.92	-7.68	0.00
Habitual Drinker	4.38	4.44	3.62	0.00
Sexually Permissive	4.31	3.87	-1.61	0.11
Little Sense of Responsibility	4.29	4.43	2.44	0.02
Denounced Religious Faith	4.28	3.92	1.22	0.00
Another Race	4.21	3.83	-5.05	0.30
Denounced Religious Practice	4.09	3.57	-1.04	0.50
No Desire for Children	4.01	4.19	1.93	0.56
Neurotic Tendencies	4.00	4.05	-0.58	0.00
Favored Abortion	3.87	3.29	7.14	0.00
Poor Health	3.87	3.75	10.27	0.00
Major Physical Handicap	3.78	3.87	5.93	0.02
Had Been Divorced	3.74	3.49	-6.43	0.02
Favored Divorce	3.73	3.86	2.48	0.00
Had Children	3.51	3.43	-3.56	0.19
Habitual Smoker	3.44	3.77	-1.31	0.10
Lower Educational Level	3.35	3.48	-2.59	0.00
Lower Socio-economic Level	3.11	2.98	7.49	0.00
Slight Physical Handicap	2.96	3.12	5.10	0.00
Not Good Looking	2.75	3.14	-2.43	0.00
Higher Socio-economic Level	2.50	2.70	6.64	0.00
Higher Educational Level	2.32	3.61		
Total Average Mean Score	3.79	3.78		

KEY: 1.0-Would Prefer; 2.0-Would Not Mind; 3.0-Not Important; 4.0-Would Rather Not; 5.0-Never Accept

*Items ranked from highest to lowest amount of parental objection of the characteristic

Significance Level = .01

TABLE XI. PERCENTAGES AND LEVEL OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR THE "MOST DETRIMENTAL" CHARACTERISTICS FOR MARITAL PARTNERS AS PERCEIVED BY COLLEGE STUDENTS AND THEIR PARENTS

CHARACTERISTIC	PERCENTAGE CONSIDERING "MOST DETRIMENTAL"		PROBABILITY
	Students	Parents	
Was Sexually Inexperienced	4.3	4.5	.802
Had Pre-marital Abortion	10.1	12.6	
Had Illegitimate Child	3.8	4.2	
Was Rearing Illegitimate Child	11.0	9.4	
Liberal Attitudes on Extra-marital Sex	<u>70.7</u>	<u>69.3</u>	
Was Drug User	5.7	7.1	.432
Was Drug Addict	<u>76.5</u>	<u>79.6</u>	
Drank Heavily (Alcohol)	7.8	5.5	
Had Neurotic Tendencies	6.3	4.2	
Had Major Physical Handicap	3.7	3.6	
Was a Higher Socio-economic Level	14.5	14.8	.000
Was a Lower Socio-economic Level	16.4	40.9	
Was a Higher Educational Level	13.0	7.2	
Was a Lower Educational Level	<u>55.6</u>	<u>46.6</u>	
Was of Another Race	<u>64.0</u>	<u>71.4</u>	.004
Same Race, Another Nationality	1.0	3.0	
Had Another Major Religion	8.7	4.3	
Had NO Religious Belief	24.7	21.3	
Was Apathetic Toward Religion	3.6	5.7	.000
Had Denounced Religious Faith	32.1	<u>49.0</u>	
Was Politically Extreme	7.2	7.1	
Was Politically Conservative	3.6	2.4	
Was Extremely Prejudiced	53.5	35.8	
Was Irresponsible	<u>69.4</u>	<u>58.9</u>	.000
Had Communal Living Experience	11.3	17.4	
Was a Hippie	8.0	16.4	
Was Advocate of Woman's Lib	11.3	6.6	
Insisted on Large Family	16.6	9.0	.000
Insisted on NO Children	<u>54.0</u>	<u>50.3</u>	
Unwilling to use Birth Control	20.0	23.1	
Wanted to Adopt rather than Have Children	8.7	17.2	

Significance Level = .01

TABLE XII. ITEM CONSIDERED "MOST DETRIMENTAL", CHI SQUARE VALUE, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVEL INDICATING PREFERENCE FOR MARITAL PARTNERS AS PERCEIVED BY STUDENTS (N=465) AND PARENTS (N=318)

Item Considered "Most Detrimental"	PERCENTAGE REJECTING		χ^2	df	PROBABILITY
	Students	Parents			
Liberal Attitude Toward Extra-marital Sex	70.7	69.3	1.63650	4	.802
Drug Addict	76.5	79.6	3.81166	4	.432
Higher Socio-economic Level Lower Educational Level	59.3	46.9	19.19380	4	.000
Another Race	64.0	7.14	15.16311	4	.004
Extremely Prejudiced Denounced Religious Faith	53.5	49.0	27.65747	4	.000
Irresponsible	69.4	58.9	26.74121	4	.000
No Desire for Children	54.0	50.3	19.78868	4	.000

Significance Level = .01

students regarded partners who were extremely prejudiced as "most detrimental." Although parents and students agreed on which item was most detrimental in five of the seven cases, unequal distribution of percentages attributed to the various answer-responses resulted in significant differences at the .01 level on five of the seven items.

Female and Male Preferences for Marital Partners

Males and females differed significantly in their preferences for marital partners on the majority of items in the marital preference scale. Three items on the scale did not have significant differences between males and females preferences beyond the .05 level. These characteristics regarded marital partners who had neurotic tendencies, major physical handicaps and communal living experience. Twenty of the 26 items in the marital test were significantly different between males and females at the .01 level of probability.

Females had a tendency to be more selective in choice of marital partners than males. A higher percentage of females than males rejected more of the marital characteristics. Males had a higher percentage of rejection than females for marital partners on seven of the items including slight physical handicap, not good looking, major physical handicap, poor health, habitual smoker, habitual drinker, higher socioeconomic and higher educational levels. Percentages for answer responses and the probability levels for female and male students for their preferences for marital partners are listed in Table XIII.

An analysis of the students' responses to the sex-oriented characteristics (listed on the lower portion of Table XIII) indicated that approximately one-fourth of both males and females elected to reject

TABLE XIII. PERCENTAGES AND LEVELS OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY COLLEGE FEMALES (N=225) AND COLLEGE MALES (N=240)

CHARACTERISTIC	PER CENT INDICATING PREFERENCES										PROBABILITY
	Female Students					Male Students					
	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E	
Neurotic Tendencies	0.9	5.8	4.5	58.7	30.0	0.4	5.8	7.5	63.3	22.9	.311
Slight Physical Handicap	0.0	31.5	38.3	28.4	1.8	0.4	17.9	37.1	42.9	1.7	.002
Major Physical Handicap	0.0	9.4	13.9	59.6	17.0	0.0	8.3	11.7	59.2	20.8	.685
Poor Health	0.4	9.4	8.9	74.6	6.7	0.0	8.3	17.9	65.0	8.8	.036
Not Good Looking	0.0	18.8	67.0	12.5	1.8	0.4	13.8	48.3	30.4	7.1	.000
Had Been Divorced	0.4	16.9	17.3	44.9	20.4	1.3	19.6	37.1	30.0	12.1	.000
Favored Divorce	2.7	14.7	7.1	37.1	38.4	3.8	11.7	15.4	37.9	31.3	.042
Had Children	0.9	24.1	18.8	43.8	12.5	0.4	18.0	30.1	38.1	13.4	.049
Habitual Smoker	0.0	16.4	13.8	53.8	16.0	0.4	7.1	23.8	46.3	22.5	.000
Habitual Drinker	0.0	0.9	0.9	40.6	57.6	0.8	1.7	5.4	44.6	47.5	.014
Drug User	0.0	1.3	1.8	18.8	78.1	1.3	6.3	6.3	23.8	62.5	.000
Drug Addict	0.0	0.4	0.0	7.1	92.4	0.8	1.3	2.1	17.5	78.3	.000
Living In Commune	0.0	14.7	13.4	29.5	42.4	0.4	12.7	19.0	31.6	36.3	.308
Living as Hippie	0.4	15.6	11.1	31.1	41.8	2.9	16.3	26.7	30.0	24.2	.000
Another Race	0.0	5.8	20.5	38.4	35.3	0.0	11.7	32.5	35.0	20.8	.000
Lower Educational Level	0.0	11.6	16.5	50.9	21.0	0.4	15.4	51.7	29.6	2.9	.000
Higher Educational Level	3.1	60.7	25.9	10.3	0.0	0.8	26.3	47.1	24.2	1.7	.000
Lower Socio-economic Level	0.0	21.8	49.8	24.4	4.0	0.4	21.3	71.7	5.8	0.8	.000
Higher Socio-economic Level	1.8	43.6	46.2	7.6	0.9	2.5	25.8	65.0	5.0	1.7	.000
Favored Extra-marital Sex	0.4	0.4	0.9	16.0	82.2	0.0	2.1	8.8	27.5	61.7	.000
No Desire for Children	1.8	7.1	1.8	27.1	62.2	2.5	7.9	17.5	32.5	39.6	.000
Favored Abortion	5.8	24.0	20.9	26.2	23.1	3.8	22.1	37.9	20.8	15.4	.001
Sexually Permissive	0.9	6.7	14.7	38.8	38.8	1.3	12.1	23.4	41.4	21.8	.000
Denounced Religious Practice	1.3	13.8	20.4	40.9	23.6	1.7	12.1	42.5	27.9	15.8	.000
Denounced Religious Faith	0.9	7.1	12.4	34.2	45.3	0.4	11.3	31.7	30.8	25.8	.000
Little Sense of Responsibility	1.3	1.3	0.4	30.7	66.2	2.5	1.1	4.2	43.7	47.5	.000
SEX-ORIENTED CHARACTERISTICS											
Refused Service Induction*	1.8	18.3	31.7	32.6	15.6						
Fathered Illegitimate Child*	0.0	7.6	17.3	51.1	24.0						
Desired Large Family*	3.1	41.3	16.4	28.4	10.7						
Had Pre-marital Abortion**						0.4	6.7	30.4	37.9	24.6	
Given-up Illegitimate Child**						0.4	7.5	27.1	41.7	23.3	
Rearing Illegitimate Child**						0.4	10.8	27.9	35.4	25.4	

KEY: A-Would Prefer; B-Would Not Mind; C-Not Important; D-Would Rather Not; E-Could Never Accept

*Answered by Females (N=225)

**Answered by Males (N=240)

Significance Level = .01

a marital partner who had parented a child out-of-wedlock. This percentage held true for the males regardless of how the hypothetical marital partner resolved the pregnancy. Nearly one-fourth of the males rejected marital partners who were rearing a child out-of-wedlock, who had had an abortion or who had given-up a child born out-of-wedlock. The same proportion of females, 24 per cent, said they would never accept a marital partner who had fathered an illegitimate child.

An analysis of the average mean scores for females and males further illustrated the fact that females tended to be more conservative in their choice of marital partners than males. The total average mean score for all females for all characteristics on the marital scale was 3.80 as compared to 3.68 for the males. An average mean score of 3.0 would reflect the answer-response, "I do not consider this characteristic important to my choice of a mate." An average mean score of 4.0 would indicate the response, "I would rather my partner did not possess this characteristic."

Significant differences between average mean scores for males and females were noted on approximately half of the characteristics. Males had significantly higher average mean scores for the following characteristics: higher educational level, favored abortion and slight physical handicap. Females had higher average mean scores for 13 of the 26 characteristics including drug addict, favored extra-marital sex, drug user, little sense of responsibility, no desire for children, denounced religious faith, sexually permissive, another race, living as hippy, denounced religious practice, had been divorced, lower educational level, and lower socio-economic level. The average mean scores, ranked

according to average responses for student preferences for marital partners, are listed in Table XIV.

Data analyzed and presented in Table XV for the "most detrimental" characteristics, perceived by females and males, indicated that the sexes completely agreed as to which item was considered "most detrimental" to marriage on each of the seven questions in this portion of the test.

The "most detrimental" items selected by females and males were: liberal attitude toward sex; drug addict; lower educational attainment; another race; extremely prejudiced; irresponsibility; and insistence upon no children. The "most detrimental" items, chi square values, degrees of freedom and the probability levels for this portion of the questionnaire are presented in Table XVI.

Distribution of percentages between the females and males, however, resulted in significant differences at the .01 level in five of the seven categories in spite of the fact that there was complete agreement as to which item was considered "most detrimental." Males had higher percentages of rejection than females for two of the seven "most detrimental" characteristics, another race and extremely prejudiced. Males were considerably more opposed to the characteristic, higher socio-economic level, than females, with rejection percentages of 27.5 and 4.4, respectively.

Female and Male Preferences for Dating Partners

Females and males differed significantly on the majority of their preferences regarding the characteristics influencing choice of dating

TABLE XIV. AVERAGE MEAN SCORES, t-VALUES AND PROBABILITY LEVELS FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE
ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS AS PERCEIVED BY COLLEGE
FEMALES (N=225) AND MALES (N=240)

CHARACTERISTIC*	AVERAGE MEAN SCORES			t-Value	Probability
	All Students	Females	Males		
Drug Addict	4.80	4.89	4.71	-3.44	0.00
Favored Extra-marital Sex	4.63	4.79	4.49	-5.09	0.00
Drug User	4.45	4.72	4.40	-4.19	0.00
Habitual Drinker	4.44	4.53	4.36	-2.59	0.01
Little Sense of Responsibility	4.43	4.59	4.28	-4.04	0.00
No Desire for Children	4.19	4.41	3.99	-4.49	0.00
Neurotic Tendencies	4.05	4.08	4.02	-0.66	0.51
Denounced Religious Faith	3.92	4.16	3.70	-5.04	0.00
Living in Commune	3.92	3.98	3.86	-1.15	0.25
Major Physical Handicap	3.87	3.81	3.92	1.47	0.14
Sexually Permissive	3.87	4.06	3.69	-4.70	0.00
Favored Divorce	3.86	3.92	3.81	-1.02	0.13
Another Race	3.83	4.01	3.65	-4.19	0.00
Habitual Smoker	3.77	3.69	3.83	1.68	0.09
Living as Hippie	3.77	3.98	3.56	-4.10	0.00
Poor Health	3.75	3.76	3.74	-0.26	0.79
Higher Educational Level	3.61	2.42	3.00	8.16	0.00
Denounced Religious Practice	3.57	3.72	3.44	-3.00	0.00
Had Been Divorced	3.49	3.68	3.32	-3.95	0.00
Lower Educational Level	3.48	3.11	2.85	-7.76	0.00
Had Children	3.43	3.41	3.45	0.35	0.73
Favored Abortion	3.29	3.37	3.22	-1.38	0.17
Not Good Looking	3.14	2.96	3.30	4.98	0.00
Slight Physical Handicap	3.12	2.96	3.27	4.00	0.00
Lower Socio-economic Level	2.98	3.11	2.85	-4.05	0.00
Higher Socio-economic Level	2.70	2.62	2.77	2.45	0.02
Total Average Mean Score	3.78	3.80	3.68		

KEY: 1.0-Would Prefer; 2.0-Would Not Mind; 3.0-Not Important; 4.0-Would Rather Not; 5.0-Never Accept

*items ranked from highest to lowest amount of student objection to the characteristics

Significance Level = .01

TABLE XV. PERCENTAGES AND LEVEL OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR THE "MOST DETRIMENTAL" CHARACTERISTICS FOR MARITAL PARTNERS AS PERCEIVED BY COLLEGE FEMALES AND MALES

CHARACTERISTIC	PERCENTAGE CONSIDERING "MOST DETRIMENTAL"		PROBABILITY
	Females	Males	
Was Sexually Inexperienced	2.3	6.2	.032
Had Pre-marital Abortion	8.6	11.5	
Had illegitimate Child	3.3	5.3	
Was Rearing illegitimate Child	10.0	12.4	
Liberal Attitudes on Extra-marital Sex	<u>76.8</u>	<u>64.6</u>	
Was Drug User	4.9	6.4	.008
Was Drug Addict	<u>82.1</u>	<u>70.9</u>	
Drank Heavily (Alcohol)	<u>4.5</u>	<u>11.4</u>	
Had Neurotic Tendencies	6.7	5.9	
Had Major Physical Handicap	1.8	5.5	
Was a Higher Socio-economic Level	4.4	27.5	.000
Was a Lower Socio-economic Level	21.1	11.1	
Was a Higher Educational Level	3.8	24.8	
Was a Lower Educational Level	<u>71.1</u>	<u>35.9</u>	
Was of Another Race	<u>62.5</u>	<u>64.9</u>	.755
Same Race, Another Nationality	0.5	1.6	
Had Another Major Religion	10.1	8.6	
Had NO Religious Belief	25.5	23.8	
Was Apathetic Toward Religion	4.1	3.5	.002
Had Denounced Religious Faith	38.8	25.4	
Was Politically Extreme	4.6	9.6	
Was Politically Conservative	1.4	5.7	
Was Extremely Prejudiced	<u>51.1</u>	<u>55.7</u>	
Was Irresponsible	<u>80.2</u>	<u>58.3</u>	.000
Had Communal Living Experience	<u>4.5</u>	<u>18.3</u>	
Was a Hippie	7.7	8.7	
Was Advocate of Woman's Lib	7.7	14.8	
Insisted on Large Family	10.5	22.7	.002
Insisted on NO Children	<u>62.7</u>	<u>45.9</u>	
Unwilling to Use Birth Control	19.1	20.9	
Wanted to Adopt Rather than Have Children	7.3	10.0	

Significance Level = .01

TABLE XVI. ITEM CONSIDERED "MOST DETRIMENTAL", CHI SQUARE VALUES, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVEL INDICATING PREFERENCES FOR MARITAL PARTNERS AS PERCEIVED BY COLLEGE FEMALES AND MALES

Item Considered "Most Detrimental"	PERCENTAGE REJECTING		χ^2	df	PROBABILITY
	Females	Males			
Liberal Attitude Toward Extra-marital Sex	76.8	64.6	10.55494	4	.032
Drug Addict	82.1	70.9	13.59688	4	.008
Lower Educational Attainment	71.1	35.9	83.94662	4	.000
Another Race	62.5	64.9	1.89549	4	.755
Extremely Prejudiced	51.1	55.7	16.67368	4	.002
Was Irresponsible	80.2	58.3	31.67560	4	.000
Insisted on No Children	62.7	45.9	11.37571	4	.002

Significance Level = .01

partners. Twenty of the 26 test items in the dating scale had significant differences at the .01 level or beyond. Neurotic tendencies, major physical handicap, had children, poor health, habitual smoker and living in a commune were characteristics which were more closely agreed upon by females and males. Percentages for preferences for dating partners and probability levels for females and males are presented in Table XVII.

As was true in the selection of marital partners, females indicated more conservative preferences for dating partners than males. Females rejected 20 of the 26 test items with higher percentages than males. The males had higher percentages of rejection than females for dating partners with the following characteristics: slight physical handicap, major physical handicap, poor health, not good looking, habitual smoker and higher educational level. Males rejected four characteristics with slightly higher percentages than females on both the marital and dating scales. These characteristics were: poor health, major physical handicap, not considered good looking and higher educational level.

The percentages for responses to the sex-oriented characteristics pertaining to dating partners are listed in the lower portion of Table XVII. Approximately one-fourth of the females claimed they would never accept a date from a person who had fathered an illegitimate child. Female dates who had had an abortion, who had given-up an illegitimate child or who were rearing an illegitimate child were rejected by males with 13.3, 16.7, and 18.6 per cent, respectively. Approximately one-sixth of the females claimed that they would never accept a date from a person who had refused induction into the armed service.

TABLE XVII. PERCENTAGES AND LEVELS OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF DATING PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY COLLEGE FEMALES (N=225) AND COLLEGE MALES (N=240)

CHARACTERISTIC	PER CENT INDICATING PREFERENCES										PROBABILITY
	Female Students					Male Students					
	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E	
Neurotic Tendencies	0.5	6.3	10.4	63.3	19.5	1.7	10.1	18.1	51.1	19.0	.022
Slight Physical Handicap	0.0	27.2	46.0	25.0	1.8	0.8	18.4	39.7	38.5	2.5	.008
Major Physical Handicap	0.9	6.7	22.3	54.0	16.1	0.0	7.1	14.2	61.1	17.6	.111
Poor Health	0.4	10.3	24.6	58.9	5.8	0.0	8.8	27.2	55.6	8.4	.569
Not Good Looking	0.0	16.9	70.7	11.1	1.3	0.8	11.3	44.4	35.6	7.9	.000
Had Been Divorced	0.0	16.0	25.8	37.3	20.9	1.7	14.6	48.5	24.7	10.5	.000
Favored Divorce	1.4	14.4	19.8	36.0	28.4	1.7	9.6	36.4	34.3	18.0	.000
Had Children	0.0	14.2	33.3	37.3	15.1	0.4	13.8	40.2	31.4	14.2	.450
Habitual Smoker	0.0	13.8	26.8	50.0	9.4	0.0	11.3	29.3	41.4	18.0	.030
Habitual Drinker	0.0	3.1	4.5	47.3	45.1	0.8	5.9	13.4	45.2	34.7	.001
Drug User	0.0	2.2	9.8	33.9	54.7	0.4	10.5	14.6	32.2	42.3	.000
Drug Addict	0.0	0.9	0.9	12.9	85.3	0.0	3.4	4.7	26.7	65.3	.000
Living in Commune	0.0	14.3	21.5	30.5	33.6	0.8	17.4	29.7	30.5	21.6	.021
Living as Hippie	0.0	13.5	16.7	37.8	32.0	1.3	18.3	35.7	22.6	22.1	.000
Another Race	0.0	7.2	23.8	35.9	33.2	0.0	12.3	39.0	26.3	22.5	.000
Lower Educational Level	0.0	12.6	26.0	48.0	13.5	0.8	17.8	59.7	18.2	3.5	.000
Higher Educational Level	1.8	51.4	40.5	5.9	0.5	0.9	22.2	61.1	13.7	2.1	.000
Lower Socio-economic Level	0.0	22.0	50.7	24.2	3.1	0.8	18.6	73.7	5.5	1.3	.000
Higher Socio-economic Level	1.8	40.8	49.8	6.3	1.3	0.8	22.9	65.7	7.6	3.0	.000
Favored Extra-marital Sex	0.0	4.5	12.1	33.2	50.2	2.1	12.7	30.5	26.7	28.0	.000
No Desire for Children	0.5	10.9	27.6	33.9	27.1	3.0	10.6	45.3	25.4	15.7	.000
Favored Abortion	4.1	20.3	27.9	25.2	22.5	4.7	21.6	45.3	16.1	12.3	.000
Sexually Permissive	0.5	9.5	18.9	47.7	23.4	8.5	23.8	34.5	21.7	11.5	.000
Denounced Religious Practice	0.0	15.4	33.9	36.7	14.0	0.8	15.7	50.8	20.3	12.3	.000
Denounced Religious Faith	0.0	8.6	22.1	41.0	28.4	0.4	14.0	42.6	26.8	16.2	.000
Little Sense of Responsibility	0.5	2.7	5.4	57.2	34.2	0.9	6.8	23.5	48.7	20.1	.000
SEX-ORIENTED CHARACTERISTICS											
Refused Service Induction*	0.9	18.6	36.7	39.3	13.6						
Fathered Illegitimate Child*	0.0	10.0	24.4	40.3	25.3						
Desired Large Family*	1.4	35.0	39.2	18.4	6.0						
Had Pre-marital Abortion**						0.9	9.4	43.8	32.6	13.3	
Given-up Illegitimate Child**						0.9	8.6	36.9	36.9	16.7	
Rearing Illegitimate Child**						0.0	8.0	42.0	31.4	18.6	

KEY: A-Would Prefer; B-Would Not Mind; C-Not Important; D-Would Rather Not; E-Could Never Accept

*Answered by females (N=225)

**Answered by males (N=240)

Significance Level = .01

Mothers' Preferences for Marital Partners
for Daughters and Sons

Significant differences at the .01 level between mothers' preferences for marital partners for their daughters and their sons were found in six of the 26 characteristics listed in the marital scale. These six characteristics included: had children by a previous marriage; lower educational attainment level; higher educational attainment level; higher socio-economic background; no desire to bear or rear children and another race.

In the majority of cases, mothers indicated higher percentages of rejection for characteristics pertaining to marital partners for daughters than for sons for the same characteristics. This was true on all except seven items; however, the difference was significant in only a few cases.

Mothers rejected the characteristic regarding a marital partner of another race for their daughters with a much higher percentage, 43.2 per cent, than they did for a marital partner of another race for their sons, 22.2 per cent. This was also true on the item, no desire for children. Mothers' percentage of rejection on this item for daughters was 31.5 as compared to 13.9 per cent for sons.

Characteristics which received higher percentages of rejection by mothers for marital partners for sons over daughters were: had been divorced; drug user; drug addict; and higher educational level. Table XVIII presents the percentages for mothers' responses, the chi square values and the probability levels for daughters and sons.

TABLE XVIII. PERCENTAGES AND LEVELS OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS FOR DAUGHTERS AND SONS AS VIEWED BY MOTHERS (N=168)

CHARACTERISTIC	PER CENT INDICATING PREFERENCES										PROBABILITY
	For Daughters					For Sons					
	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E	
Neurotic Tendencies	0.0	2.4	4.0	82.5	11.1	2.8	2.8	2.8	88.9	2.8	.209
Slight Physical Handicap	0.0	31.7	50.0	17.5	10.8	0.0	19.4	69.4	11.1	0.0	.221
Major Physical Handicap	0.0	4.8	12.7	76.2	6.3	0.0	11.1	19.4	69.4	0.0	.158
Poor Health	0.0	4.0	4.0	85.7	6.3	0.0	8.3	11.1	75.0	5.6	.254
Not Good Looking	1.6	23.8	71.4	3.2	0.0	2.8	16.7	77.8	2.8	0.0	.794
Had Been Divorced	0.0	10.3	11.1	69.0	9.5	2.8	2.8	22.2	58.3	13.9	.064
Favored Divorce	1.6	14.6	4.1	62.6	17.1	0.0	11.1	13.9	58.3	16.7	.268
Had Children	0.0	18.3	9.5	68.3	4.0	0.0	27.8	33.3	30.6	8.3	.000
Habitual Smoker	0.0	11.1	37.3	46.8	4.8	0.0	8.3	22.2	69.4	0.0	.087
Habitual Drinker	0.0	0.0	0.0	54.8	45.2	0.0	2.8	2.8	47.2	47.2	.062
Drug User	0.0	0.8	0.0	33.1	66.1	0.0	2.8	0.0	22.2	75.0	.322
Drug Addict	0.0	0.0	0.0	23.2	76.8	0.0	2.8	0.0	13.9	83.3	.092
Living in Commune	0.0	1.6	2.4	36.6	59.3	0.0	5.7	0.0	40.0	54.3	.414
Living as Hippie	0.0	0.0	3.2	40.0	56.8	0.0	2.9	2.9	48.6	45.7	.196
Another Race	0.0	4.0	4.8	48.0	43.2	0.0	5.6	19.4	52.8	22.2	.012
Lower Educational Level	0.0	13.6	26.4	55.2	4.8	0.0	8.3	72.2	19.4	0.0	.000
Higher Educational Level	83.3	35.7	26.2	4.8	0.0	2.8	25.0	55.6	16.7	0.0	.000
Lower Socio-economic Level	0.8	22.2	35.7	39.7	1.6	0.0	16.7	61.1	22.2	0.0	.090
Higher Socio-economic Level	10.4	48.0	32.8	7.2	1.6	0.0	22.2	58.3	19.4	0.0	.001
Favored Extra-marital Sex	0.0	0.0	0.8	33.1	66.1	2.8	2.8	0.0	30.6	63.9	.123
No Desire for Children	0.8	0.8	8.1	58.9	31.5	0.0	11.1	11.1	63.9	13.9	.009
Favored Abortion	0.0	11.9	20.6	33.3	34.1	0.0	19.4	13.9	47.2	19.4	.152
Sexually Permissive	0.0	2.4	2.4	47.6	47.6	0.0	2.8	5.6	38.9	52.8	.680
Denounced Religious Practice	0.0	3.2	8.0	50.4	38.4	0.0	11.1	8.3	58.3	22.2	.113
Denounced Religious Faith	0.0	1.6	4.0	46.0	48.4	0.0	2.8	2.8	58.3	36.1	.548
Little Sense of Responsibility	0.0	0.8	0.0	58.4	40.8	0.0	5.6	2.8	61.1	30.6	.053
SEX-ORIENTED CHARACTERISTICS											
Refused Service Induction	0.8	7.3	19.4	46.8	25.8						
Fathered Illegitimate Child	0.0	2.4	8.1	59.7	29.8						
Desired Large Family	4.8	34.9	30.2	27.8	2.4						
Had Pre-marital Abortion						0.0	2.8	11.1	72.2	13.9	
Given-Up Illegitimate Child						0.0	2.8	13.9	75.0	8.3	
Rearing Illegitimate Child						0.0	8.3	22.2	58.3	11.1	

KEY: A-Would Prefer; B-Would Not Mind; C-Not Important; D-Would Rather Not; E-Could Never Accept

Significance Level = .01

Fathers' Preferences for Marital Partners
for Daughters and Sons

Fathers' preferences for marital partners for their sons and daughters differed significantly at the .01 level on only two of the 26 items included on the marital scale. Fathers rejected these two characteristics, poor health and living as a hippy, with higher percentages for marital partners for daughters than for sons. Table XIX illustrates the fathers' preferences for marital partners for sons and daughters in a comparison of percentages of answer-responses and the resulting probabilities as determined by chi square.

Fathers, like mothers, had higher percentages of rejection on more of the items in the marital scale for daughters than for sons. This was true in all cases except three, where fathers indicated higher percentages of rejection for sons over daughters. These characteristics included higher educational level, lower socio-economic level and higher socio-economic level. Fathers and mothers were both more apt to reject the characteristic of higher educational attainment level for marital partners for their sons than for their daughters.

A comparison of Tables XVIII and XIX illustrates that more than one-third of all the fathers and mothers participating in the study rejected the following characteristics for marital partners for their daughters and sons: habitual drinker, drug user, drug addict, living in commune, living as hippy, favored extra-marital sex, and sexually permissive.

An analysis of sex-oriented items produced some interesting comparisons. Mothers and fathers had higher percentages of rejection for marital partners for daughters than for sons for the majority of

TABLE XIX. PERCENTAGES AND LEVELS OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS FOR DAUGHTERS AND SONS AS VIEWED BY FATHERS (N=147)

CHARACTERISTIC	PER CENT INDICATING PREFERENCES										PROBABILITY
	For Daughters					For Sons					
	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E	
Neurotic Tendencies	0.0	2.8	1.8	76.1	19.3	3.0	0.0	3.0	87.9	6.1	.109
Slight Physical Handicap	0.0	28.4	36.7	33.0	1.8	2.9	23.5	41.2	32.4	0.0	.379
Major Physical Handicap	0.0	7.3	6.4	76.1	10.1	0.0	20.6	14.7	61.8	2.9	.032
Poor Health	0.0	2.8	1.9	86.9	8.4	0.0	17.6	8.8	67.6	5.9	.003
Not Good Looking	0.9	30.6	64.8	2.8	0.9	0.0	23.5	64.7	11.8	0.0	.257
Had Been Divorced	0.0	8.3	12.8	67.0	11.9	2.9	17.6	20.6	52.9	5.9	.086
Favored Divorce	2.8	10.1	11.0	56.9	19.3	0.0	26.5	5.9	55.9	11.8	.114
Had Children	0.9	11.9	23.9	53.2	10.1	2.9	20.6	26.5	44.1	5.9	.533
Habitual Smoker	0.0	13.8	42.2	37.6	6.4	2.9	2.9	35.3	55.9	2.9	.065
Habitual Drinker	0.0	0.9	2.8	58.7	37.6	0.0	2.9	0.0	61.8	35.3	.620
Drug User	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.2	79.8	0.0	2.9	0.0	26.5	70.6	.137
Drug Addict	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.7	85.3	0.0	2.9	0.0	20.6	76.5	.134
Living in Commune	0.0	0.0	2.8	26.9	70.4	0.0	3.0	6.1	42.4	48.5	.048
Living as Hippie	0.0	0.9	0.0	30.3	68.8	0.0	5.9	5.9	38.2	50.0	.009
Another Race	0.0	2.8	6.4	45.0	45.9	0.0	8.8	11.8	41.2	38.2	.299
Lower Educational Level	0.0	11.8	42.2	39.4	6.4	2.9	20.6	44.1	32.4	0.0	.128
Higher Educational Level	15.6	40.4	39.4	4.6	0.0	8.8	26.5	47.1	17.6	0.0	.040
Lower Socio-Economic Level	1.9	20.4	42.6	33.3	1.9	2.9	29.4	35.3	29.4	2.9	.792
Higher Socio-Economic Level	12.1	40.2	42.1	5.6	0.0	6.1	27.3	48.5	15.2	30.1	.077
Favored Extra-marital Sex	0.0	0.0	0.9	32.1	67.0	0.0	5.9	2.9	35.3	55.9	.051
No Desire for Children	0.0	2.8	11.2	57.9	28.0	2.9	8.8	8.8	67.6	11.8	.068
Favored Abortion	0.0	6.4	21.1	37.6	34.9	0.0	14.7	23.5	41.2	20.6	.266
Sexually Permissive	0.0	0.9	3.7	48.6	46.8	3.0	3.0	6.1	45.5	42.4	.330
Denounced Religious Practice	0.0	3.7	17.6	41.7	37.0	0.0	8.8	5.9	61.8	23.5	.059
Denounced Religious Faith	0.0	1.8	10.1	40.4	47.7	0.0	8.8	5.9	55.9	29.4	.056
Little Sense of Responsibility	0.0	0.0	0.0	58.4	41.6	0.0	3.0	3.0	72.8	21.1	.061
SEX-ORIENTED CHARACTERISTICS											
Refused Service Induction	0.0	7.3	17.4	36.7	38.5						
Fathered Illegitimate Child	0.0	0.0	17.4	41.3	41.3						
Desired Large Family	3.7	26.6	39.4	29.4	0.9						
Had Pre-marital Abortion						2.9	8.8	8.8	61.8	17.6	
Given-up Illegitimate Child						2.9	11.8	8.8	55.9	20.6	
Rearing Illegitimate Child						0.0	9.1	9.1	66.7	15.2	

KEY: A-Would Prefer; B-Would Not Mind; C-Not Important; D-Would Rather Not; E-Could Never Accept

Significance Level = .01

sex-oriented characteristics. For example, 8.3 per cent of the mothers and 20.6 per cent of the fathers rejected a marital partner for their sons who had given-up an illegitimate child. However, 29.8 per cent of the mothers and 41.3 per cent of the fathers rejected a marital partner for their daughters who had fathered an illegitimate child. It was also interesting to note the relatively low percentage of rejection by both mothers and fathers for a marital partner who had given-up an illegitimate child. The characteristic of rearing an illegitimate child also received low percentages of rejection by parents, 11.1 per cent of the mothers and 15.2 per cent of the fathers. Percentages for parental answer responses for the sex-oriented characteristics appear on the lower portion of Tables XVIII and XIX.

Mothers selected the same item as the "most detrimental" characteristic for both their daughters and sons in five of the seven questions in the "most detrimental" segment of the questionnaire. Agreement for daughters and sons by mothers occurred on the following items: liberal attitude toward extra-marital sex; drug addict; another race; irresponsibility; and insistence on no children. In the other two cases, mothers selected lower educational level as more detrimental for a marital partner for their daughters as opposed to a marital partner from a higher socio-economic level for their son. This was the only item out of seven which had a significant difference at the .01 level of probability. In the second case where a difference of opinion occurred for daughters and sons, mothers selected the characteristic of being extremely prejudiced as "most detrimental" for marital partners for their daughters. The characteristics of being extremely prejudiced and

denouncing religious faith for marital partners for sons were rejected equally with 45.5 per cent. Tables XX and XXI present the statistical data regarding the "most detrimental" characteristics for marital partners for daughters and sons as perceived by mothers.

Fathers selected identical "most detrimental" characteristics for their daughters as for their sons. There were no significant differences between fathers' preferences for their daughters and for their sons on this part of the questionnaire. Percentages and probability levels for fathers' perception of the "most detrimental" characteristics are listed in Tables XXII and XXIII.

Fathers and mothers selected the same characteristic as the "most detrimental" item in all seven cases, with the exception of the two additional items where disagreement occurred by mothers for marital partners for their sons and for their daughters.

Preferences for Marital Partners for Married and Non-married Students

Married and non-married students had significant differences in their rating of marital characteristics on two of the 26 items on the marital scale. These items included the characteristics of having been divorced and favoring divorce. In both cases, the non-married students indicated higher percentages of rejection for these characteristics. Married students had higher percentages of rejection on 16 of the 26 characteristics studied. Table XXIV shows a comparison of percentages and levels of probability for preferences for the marital characteristics for married and non-married students.

TABLE XX. PERCENTAGES AND LEVEL OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR THE "MOST DETRIMENTAL" CHARACTERISTICS FOR MARITAL PARTNERS FOR DAUGHTERS AND SONS AS PERCEIVED BY MOTHERS

CHARACTERISTIC	PERCENTAGE CONSIDERING "MOST DETRIMENTAL"		PROBABILITY
	For Daughters	For Sons	
Was Sexually Inexperienced	5.7	0.0	.466
Had Pre-marital Abortion	12.3	8.8	
Had Illegitimate Child	9.0	8.8	
Was Rearing Illegitimate Child	9.0	8.8	
Liberal Attitudes on Extra-marital Sex	<u>70.5</u>	<u>82.4</u>	
Was Drug User	5.7	5.9	
Was Drug Addict	<u>82.9</u>	<u>85.3</u>	
Drank Heavily (Alcohol)	<u>4.9</u>	<u>5.9</u>	
Had Neurotic Tendencies	1.6	2.9	
Had Major Physical Handicap	4.9	0.0	
Was a Higher Socio-economic Level	7.6	<u>41.7</u>	.000
Was a Lower Socio-economic Level	31.5	<u>12.3</u>	
Was a Higher Educational Level	4.3	<u>16.7</u>	
Was a Lower Educational Level	55.4	<u>29.2</u>	
Was of Another Race	<u>71.2</u>	<u>57.6</u>	.419
Same Race, Another Nationality	<u>3.4</u>	<u>3.0</u>	
Had Another Major Religion	<u>3.4</u>	<u>3.0</u>	
Had No Religious Belief	22.0	36.4	
Was Apathetic Toward Religion	4.2	3.0	.680
Had Denounced Religious Faith	<u>52.5</u>	<u>45.5</u>	
Was Politically Extreme	<u>7.6</u>	<u>3.0</u>	
Was Politically Conservative	2.5	3.0	
Was Extremely Prejudiced	<u>33.1</u>	<u>45.5</u>	
Was Irresponsible	<u>66.7</u>	<u>54.5</u>	.065
Had Communal Living Experience	<u>16.7</u>	<u>15.2</u>	
Was a Hippy	13.3	18.2	
Was Advocate of Women's Lib	3.3	6.1	
Insisted on Large Family	6.1	12.5	.449
Insisted on NO Children	<u>55.7</u>	<u>53.1</u>	
Unwilling to Use Birth Control	<u>24.3</u>	<u>15.6</u>	
Wanted to Adopt Rather than Have Children	13.9	18.8	

Significance Level = .01

TABLE XXI. ITEM CONSIDERED "MOST DETRIMENTAL", CHI SQUARE VALUES, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVEL INDICATING PREFERENCE FOR MARITAL PARTNERS FOR DAUGHTERS AND SONS AS PERCEIVED BY MOTHERS (N=168)

Item Considered "Most Detrimental"	PERCENTAGE OF MOTHERS REJECTING		χ^2	df	PROBABILITY
	For Daughters	For Sons			
Liberal Attitude Toward Extra-marital Sex	70.5	82.4	3.57761	4	.466
Drug Addict	82.9	85.3	1.97196	4	.740
Lower Educational Level Higher Socio-economic Level	55.4	41.7	24.63832	4	.000
Another Race	71.2	57.6	2.82470	3	.419
Extremely Prejudiced Denounced Religious Faith	33.1	45.5 45.5	2.3045	4	.680
Was Irresponsible	66.7	54.5	8.81683	4	.065
Insisted on No Children	55.7	53.1	2.64475	3	.449

Significance Level = .01

TABLE XXII. PERCENTAGES AND LEVEL OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR THE "MOST DETRIMENTAL" CHARACTERISTICS FOR MARITAL PARTNERS FOR DAUGHTERS AND SONS AS PERCEIVED BY FATHERS

CHARACTERISTIC	PERCENTAGE CONSIDERING "MOST DETRIMENTAL"		PROBABILITY
	For Daughters	For Sons	
Was Sexually Inexperienced	5.6	3.0	.367
Had Pre-marital Abortion	16.8	6.1	
Had Illegitimate Child	7.5	3.0	
Was Rearing Illegitimate Child	8.4	12.1	
Liberal Attitudes on Extra-marital Sex	<u>61.7</u>	<u>75.8</u>	
Was Drug User	9.4	6.1	.355
Was Drug Addict	76.4	<u>75.8</u>	
Drank Heavily (Alcohol)	3.8	12.1	
Had Neurotic Tendencies	7.5	6.1	
Had Major Physical Handicap	2.8	0.0	
Was Higher Socio-economic Level	10.3	20.0	.033
Was a Lower Socio-economic Level	37.2	20.0	
Was a Higher Educational Level	3.8	20.0	
Was a Lower Educational Level	<u>48.7</u>	<u>40.0</u>	
Was of Another Race	<u>76.6</u>	<u>78.1</u>	.618
Same Race, Another Nationality	2.8	0.0	
Had Another Major Religion	2.8	6.3	
Had NO Religious Belief	17.8	16.6	
Was Apathetic Toward Religion	6.9	3.1	.495
Had Denounced Religious Faith	<u>47.1</u>	<u>53.1</u>	
Was Politically Extreme	9.8	3.1	
Was Politically Conservative	2.9	0.0	
Was Extremely Prejudiced	33.3	40.6	
Was Irresponsible	<u>55.7</u>	<u>48.5</u>	.809
Had Communal Living Experience	17.0	24.2	
Was a Hippie	18.9	18.2	
Was Advocate of Woman's Lib	8.5	9.1	
Insisted on Large Family	9.1	18.8	.217
Insisted on NO Children	<u>49.5</u>	31.3	
Unwilling to Use Birth Control	22.2	18.8	
Wanted to Adopt Rather than Have Children	18.2	28.1	

Significance Level = .01

TABLE XXIII. ITEM CONSIDERED "MOST DETRIMENTAL", CHI SQUARE VALUES, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVEL INDICATING PREFERENCE FOR MARITAL PARTNERS FOR DAUGHTERS AND SONS AS PERCEIVED BY FATHERS (N=147)

Item Considered "Most Detrimental"	PERCENTAGE OF FATHERS REJECTING		χ^2	df	PROBABILITY
	For Daughters	For Sons			
Liberal Attitude Toward Extra-marital Sex	61.7	75.8	4.29800	4	.367
Drug Addict	76.4	75.8	3.39128	4	.355
Lower Educational Level	48.7	40.0	8.70250	3	.033
Another Race	76.6	78.1	1.78246	3	.618
Denounced Religious Faith	47.1	53.1	3.38884	4	.495
Was Irresponsible	55.7	48.5	0.96635	3	.809
Insisted on No Children	49.5	31.3	5.76277	4	.217

Significance Level = .01

TABLE XXIV. PERCENTAGES AND LEVELS OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY NON-MARRIED STUDENTS (N=397) AND MARRIED STUDENTS (N=68)

CHARACTERISTIC	PER CENT INDICATING PREFERENCES										PROBABILITY
	Non-Married Students					Married Students					
	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E	
Neurotic Tendencies	0.5	6.3	6.3	61.8	25.1	1.5	2.9	4.4	57.4	33.8	.379
Slight Physical Handicap	0.0	24.6	37.2	36.5	1.8	1.5	23.9	40.3	32.8	1.5	.178
Major Physical Handicap	0.0	8.9	11.9	60.3	19.0	0.0	8.8	17.6	54.4	19.1	.606
Poor Health	0.3	8.8	14.4	69.2	7.3	0.0	8.8	8.8	72.1	10.3	.694
Not Good Looking	0.3	16.7	58.3	20.5	4.3	0.0	13.2	51.5	29.4	5.9	.472
Had Been Divorced	1.0	17.6	25.7	37.3	18.4	0.0	22.1	38.2	36.8	2.9	.010
Favored Divorce	3.0	12.9	9.8	36.6	37.6	4.4	14.7	20.6	42.6	17.6	.008
Had Children	0.8	21.2	23.7	40.2	14.1	0.0	19.4	29.9	44.8	6.0	.317
Habitual Smoker	0.0	11.1	19.4	48.6	20.9	1.5	14.7	16.2	57.4	10.3	.025
Habitual Drinker	0.5	1.0	3.3	44.4	50.8	0.0	2.9	2.9	32.4	61.8	.251
Drug User	0.8	4.0	4.3	23.0	67.9	0.0	2.9	2.9	11.8	82.4	.191
Drug Addict	0.5	1.0	1.0	13.9	83.6	0.0	0.0	1.5	4.4	94.1	.193
Living in Commune	0.3	14.9	15.9	31.6	37.2	0.0	6.1	18.2	24.2	51.5	.109
Living as Hippie	2.0	16.4	19.4	32.2	30.0	0.0	13.2	17.6	20.6	48.5	.032
Another Race	0.0	8.1	26.0	38.1	27.8	0.0	13.2	30.9	27.9	27.9	.271
Lower Educational Level	0.3	14.4	34.8	39.6	10.9	0.0	8.8	33.8	41.2	16.2	.564
Higher Educational Level	2.0	43.1	36.8	17.4	0.0	1.5	41.8	37.3	17.9	1.5	.975
Lower Socio-economic Level	0.0	22.2	61.2	14.1	2.5	1.5	17.6	60.3	19.1	1.5	.105
Higher Socio-economic Level	2.5	35.3	54.7	6.5	1.0	0.0	29.4	63.2	4.4	2.9	.271
Favored Extra-marital Sex	0.0	0.8	5.0	21.9	72.3	1.5	4.4	4.4	22.1	67.6	.016
No Desire for Children	2.0	7.3	10.1	30.5	50.1	2.9	8.8	8.8	26.5	52.9	.923
Favored Abortion	4.5	21.4	29.2	24.7	20.2	5.9	32.4	32.4	16.2	13.2	.153
Sexually Permissive	1.0	9.1	19.5	40.5	29.9	1.5	11.8	17.6	38.2	30.9	.946
Denounced Religious Practice	1.5	12.6	31.5	34.8	19.6	1.5	14.7	33.8	30.9	19.1	.966
Denounced Religious Faith	0.8	8.6	21.9	32.7	36.0	0.0	13.2	25.0	30.9	30.9	.622
Little Sense of Responsibility	2.0	1.5	2.5	38.9	55.1	1.5	3.0	1.5	28.4	65.7	.419

KEY: A-Would Prefer; B-Would Not Mind; C-Not Important; D-Would Rather Not; E-Could Never Accept

Significance Level = .01

Preferences for Dating Partners for
Married and Non-married Students

Married and non-married students rated only one item on the dating scale significantly different. The characteristic of being a habitual smoker had a higher percentage of rejection by non-married students and a significant difference between the groups beyond the .01 level. As was true with marital preferences, the married students had higher percentages of rejection on more items than the non-married students. Married students had higher percentages of rejection for both dating and marital partners who were sexually permissive than non-married students. Single students, however, rejected the characteristic of favoring extra-marital sex with a higher percentage of rejection than the married students. The dating preferences for married and non-married students are summarized in Table XXV.

Preferences for Marital Partners for
Campus-Residents and Non-Residents

There were no significant differences in preferences for marital partners between students residing on campus and students residing at home. However, students residing with parents tended to be more conservative than students residing on campus. The students residing at home had higher rejection percentages of rejection for nearly two-thirds of the characteristics. Table XXVI compares the percentages of student responses regarding the selection of marital partners and gives the resulting probability level for campus-resident students and students residing with parents.

TABLE XXV. PERCENTAGES AND LEVELS OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF DATING PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY NON-MARRIED STUDENTS (N=397) AND MARRIED STUDENTS (N=68)

CHARACTERISTIC	PER CENT INDICATING PREFERENCES										PROBABILITY
	Non-Married Students					Married Students					
	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E	
Neurotic Tendencies	1.0	8.7	14.8	56.5	18.9	1.5	6.0	11.9	59.7	20.9	.881
Slight Physical Handicap	0.5	23.3	41.5	32.4	2.3	0.0	19.1	50.0	29.4	1.5	.716
Major Physical Handicap	0.3	7.3	17.5	57.7	17.2	1.5	4.4	22.1	57.4	14.7	.462
Poor Health	0.0	9.9	26.8	55.9	7.3	1.5	7.4	20.6	64.7	5.9	.090
Not Good Looking	0.5	15.2	56.3	24.0	4.0	0.0	7.4	61.8	22.1	8.8	.195
Had Been Divorced	0.8	15.9	35.9	30.1	17.4	1.5	11.8	47.1	35.3	4.4	.044
Favored Divorce	1.5	12.0	29.3	33.1	24.2	1.5	11.8	23.5	47.1	16.2	.238
Had Children	0.3	15.2	34.3	34.1	16.2	0.0	7.4	51.5	35.3	5.9	.021
Habitual Smoker	0.0	13.9	26.8	43.8	15.4	0.0	4.4	35.3	55.9	4.4	.005
Habitual Drinker	0.5	4.8	9.4	47.6	37.7	0.0	2.9	7.4	38.2	51.5	.296
Drug User	0.3	6.8	12.6	34.1	46.2	0.0	4.4	10.3	25.0	60.3	.308
Drug Addict	0.0	2.3	2.8	21.5	73.4	0.0	1.5	3.0	10.6	84.8	.210
Living in Commune	0.3	17.3	25.4	30.0	27.0	1.5	7.6	27.3	33.3	30.3	.204
Living as Hippie	0.8	17.1	25.8	31.5	24.8	0.0	9.1	30.3	21.2	39.4	.046
Another Race	0.0	9.9	31.3	31.3	27.5	0.0	9.1	33.3	28.8	28.8	.966
Lower Educational Level	0.5	16.3	43.5	31.6	8.1	0.0	9.1	42.4	39.4	9.1	.494
Higher Educational Level	1.5	37.0	50.1	10.2	1.0	0.0	32.8	56.3	7.8	3.1	.433
Lower Socio-economic Level	0.5	21.9	61.3	14.0	2.3	0.0	10.6	69.7	18.2	1.5	.253
Higher Socio-economic Level	1.5	32.8	56.5	6.9	2.3	0.0	24.2	66.7	7.6	1.5	.473
Favored Extra-marital Sex	1.0	8.7	21.6	30.3	38.4	1.5	9.1	21.2	27.3	40.9	.981
No Desire for Children	1.8	11.0	37.9	28.9	20.5	1.5	9.1	30.3	33.3	25.8	.696
Favored Abortion	3.8	21.1	36.9	21.1	17.0	7.7	20.0	36.9	16.9	18.5	.645
Sexually Permissive	4.6	16.4	27.9	34.5	16.6	4.5	19.7	21.2	33.3	21.2	.733
Denounced Religious Practice	0.3	15.3	43.6	28.6	12.2	1.5	16.9	36.9	26.2	18.5	.338
Denounced Religious Faith	0.0	10.7	31.9	35.5	21.9	1.5	15.4	36.9	23.1	23.1	.038
Little Sense of Responsibility	0.8	5.4	15.3	52.3	26.3	0.0	1.6	10.9	56.3	31.3	.475

KEY: A-Would Prefer; B-Would Not Mind; C-Not Important; D-Would Rather Not; E-Could Never Accept

Significance Level = .01

TABLE XXVI. PERCENTAGES AND LEVELS OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY CAMPUS-RESIDENT STUDENTS (N=110) AND STUDENTS RESIDING WITH PARENTS (N=260)

CHARACTERISTIC	PER CENT INDICATING PREFERENCES										PROBABILITY
	Campus-Residents					Students Residing Home					
	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E	
Neurotic Tendencies	0.0	7.3	9.2	56.0	27.5	0.8	5.4	5.0	63.7	25.1	.358
Slight Physical Handicap	0.0	25.5	36.4	36.4	1.8	0.4	22.1	41.5	34.5	1.6	.841
Major Physical Handicap	0.0	11.8	10.9	60.9	16.4	0.0	7.8	12.0	61.2	19.0	.615
Poor Health	0.9	10.0	17.3	63.6	8.2	0.0	8.1	13.5	71.8	6.6	.348
Not Good Looking	0.0	15.5	68.2	15.5	0.9	0.4	15.8	57.1	21.2	5.4	.128
Had Been Divorced	0.9	17.3	26.4	40.9	14.5	1.2	16.5	26.2	35.4	20.8	.682
Favored Divorce	2.8	9.2	11.9	42.2	33.9	3.5	13.1	8.8	35.4	39.2	.497
Had Children	0.9	20.2	26.6	40.4	11.9	0.8	18.5	24.2	40.8	15.8	.895
Habitual Smoker	0.0	12.7	21.8	45.5	20.0	0.4	9.2	16.5	51.9	21.9	.506
Habitual Drinker	0.0	0.0	3.6	51.8	44.5	0.8	1.9	1.5	41.3	54.4	.094
Drug User	0.0	4.6	4.6	21.1	69.7	0.8	2.7	31.	23.5	70.0	.667
Drug Addict	0.0	2.8	0.0	15.6	81.9	0.8	0.0	1.2	12.3	85.8	.039
Living in Commune	0.0	12.7	18.2	28.2	40.9	0.4	13.6	14.7	32.6	38.8	.806
Living as Hippie	1.8	14.5	19.2	31.7	32.7	1.5	15.8	17.3	34.2	31.2	.978
Another Race	0.0	9.1	27.3	40.0	23.6	0.0	6.6	26.3	35.9	31.3	.456
Lower Educational Level	0.0	12.7	33.6	45.5	8.2	0.4	13.9	35.1	37.8	12.7	.544
Higher Educational Level	0.9	42.7	41.8	14.5	0.0	2.7	41.5	34.6	19.6	1.5	.282
Lower Socio-Economic Level	0.0	23.6	65.5	7.3	3.6	0.4	19.6	61.5	16.5	1.9	.138
Higher Socio-Economic Level	0.9	35.5	58.2	5.5	0.0	3.5	33.5	54.2	6.9	1.9	.337
Favored Extra-marital Sex	0.0	0.0	5.5	25.5	69.1	0.0	0.8	3.8	20.4	75.0	.460
No Desire for Children	3.6	5.5	11.8	34.5	44.5	1.5	6.9	9.6	30.8	51.2	.520
Favored Abortion	3.6	21.8	28.2	27.3	19.1	5.8	20.0	28.8	23.8	21.5	.842
Sexually Permissive	0.9	7.3	22.7	43.6	25.5	0.4	8.5	18.9	39.0	33.2	.557
Denounced Religious Practice	2.7	11.8	29.1	40.0	16.4	1.5	11.2	33.1	32.7	21.5	.523
Denounced Religious Faith	0.9	7.3	24.5	35.5	31.8	0.8	7.7	20.8	33.1	37.7	.842
Little Sense of Responsibility	2.7	0.9	3.6	43.6	49.1	1.9	1.5	1.5	36.3	58.7	.358

KEY: A-Would Prefer; B-Would Not Mind; C-Not Important; D-Would Rather Not; E-Could Never Accept

Significance Level = .01

Dating Preferences for Dating Partners for
Campus-Residents and Non-Residents

As was true in the case of selection of marital partners, there was no significant difference between campus-resident students and non-resident students in their preferences for dating partners. The non-residents were more conservative in selection of dating partners than the campus-residents. The non-resident students had higher percentages of rejection for 22 of the 26 characteristics. These figures are compared in Table XXVII.

Preferences for Marital Partners as Viewed
by Self-perceived Liberal, Conser-
vative and Independent Students

Students identified themselves as liberal, conservative or independent in their political and social attitudes. One hundred and twelve of the students described themselves as liberal; 156 perceived themselves as conservative and 192 listed themselves as independents. The percentages of students in each of the above categories responding to each response on the answer continuum was compared with the other two groups of self-perceived students. The self-perceived conservative students were, in fact, the most conservative.

The conservative students had higher percentages of rejection than the other two self-perceived groups for 22 of the 26 items on the marital scale. The self-perceived independent students had highest percentages of rejection for four of the characteristics and the self-perceived liberal group had one percentage tie with the conservatives.

Eight of the 26 items on the marital scale were significantly different between the three groups at the .01 level or beyond. The

TABLE XXVII. PERCENTAGES AND LEVELS OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF DATING PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY CAMPUS-RESIDENT STUDENTS (N=110) AND STUDENTS RESIDING WITH PARENTS (N=260)

CHARACTERISTIC	PER CENT INDICATING PREFERENCES										PROBABILITY
	Campus-Residents					Students Residing at Home					
	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E	
Neurotic Tendencies	0.9	6.5	24.3	50.5	17.8	0.8	9.7	12.5	58.4	18.7	.077
Slight Physical Handicap	0.0	27.5	40.4	30.3	1.8	0.8	21.6	44.4	30.9	2.3	.669
Major Physical Handicap	0.9	7.3	18.3	56.0	17.4	0.0	7.3	16.6	60.2	15.8	.580
Poor Health	0.0	9.2	33.9	49.5	7.3	0.0	10.0	24.3	58.7	6.9	.280
Not Good Looking	0.0	14.5	60.9	20.9	3.6	0.8	14.3	57.5	23.2	4.2	.870
Had Been Divorced	0.0	11.8	42.7	30.9	14.5	1.5	15.1	32.8	30.5	20.1	.224
Favored Divorce	0.0	11.1	33.3	35.2	20.4	0.9	12.7	27.0	31.7	26.6	.309
Had Children	0.0	15.5	39.1	32.7	12.7	0.4	13.5	32.0	35.5	18.5	.482
Habitual Smoker	0.0	13.6	20.0	43.6	12.7	0.0	12.7	24.7	45.6	17.0	.610
Habitual Drinker	1.8	2.7	10.9	58.2	27.3	0.0	5.4	7.4	43.0	44.2	.007
Drug User	0.0	6.4	12.7	34.5	46.4	0.0	5.4	10.0	34.7	49.8	.843
Drug Addict	0.0	1.8	2.8	23.9	71.6	0.0	1.6	2.3	18.6	77.5	.682
Living in Commune	0.0	15.6	25.7	30.3	28.4	0.8	17.2	23.0	30.5	28.5	.880
Living as Hippie	0.0	15.7	27.8	29.6	26.9	0.8	16.1	22.7	34.5	25.9	.696
Another Race	0.0	6.4	36.7	33.0	23.9	0.0	10.9	28.5	29.7	30.9	.182
Lower Educational Level	0.9	14.7	46.8	30.3	7.3	0.4	17.2	40.6	34.0	7.8	.790
Higher Educational Level	0.9	38.5	49.5	10.1	0.9	2.0	35.9	48.8	11.3	2.0	.870
Lower Socio-economic Level	0.9	20.2	66.1	11.9	0.9	0.4	22.3	59.4	15.6	2.3	.622
Higher Socio-economic Level	0.9	36.7	49.5	11.0	1.8	1.6	31.6	58.6	5.5	2.7	.241
Favored Extra-marital Sex	1.9	5.5	22.0	34.9	35.8	0.8	9.0	20.3	28.5	41.4	.453
No Desire for Children	5.5	7.5	43.0	32.7	15.0	2.0	11.7	35.2	27.3	23.8	.193
Favored Abortion	4.7	17.4	42.2	22.9	11.9	4.7	18.8	25.2	22.3	19.1	.470
Sexually Permissive	0.0	14.0	29.0	43.9	8.4	4.3	15.6	27.3	31.6	21.1	.034
Denounced Religious Practice	0.0	14.8	42.6	30.6	12.0	0.4	13.3	43.4	30.5	12.5	.966
Denounced Religious Faith	1.8	9.2	33.9	39.4	17.4	0.0	10.2	29.4	36.9	23.5	.565
Little Sense of Responsibility	1.8	3.7	11.9	57.8	24.8	0.4	5.5	14.5	51.0	28.6	.421

KEY: A-Would Prefer; B-Would Not Mind; C-Not Important; D-Would Rather Not; E-Could Never Accept

Significance Level = .01

differences occurred on characteristics which related to drug use, had been divorced, living in a commune, living as a hippy, lower educational level, lower socio-economic level, denouncing religious faith and practice. The percentages for the last three answer-responses and the probability levels are given for the marital preferences for each of the self-perceived student groups in Table XVIII.

An analysis of average mean scores and differences between the means for marital preferences were computed for the three groups of self-perceived students. Total average means scores for all characteristics were 3.61 for self-perceived liberal students, 3.86 for self-perceived conservative students and 3.75 for self-perceived independent students. An average mean score of 3.0 would indicate a point on the response continuum meaning, "I do not consider this characteristic important to my choice of a mate." An average mean score of 4.0 would indicate the response, "I would rather my partner did not possess this characteristic."

Significant differences were observed between the self-perceived liberal students and the self-perceived conservative students on less than one-half of the characteristics in the marital scale including had been divorced, had children, habitual smoker, drug user, living in commune, living as hippy, another race, favored extra-marital sex, favored abortion, sexually permissive and denouncing religious practice and faith.

An analysis of the comparison of the average mean scores for the self-perceived liberal and self-perceived independent students resulted in significant differences between the two groups on four of the

TABLE XXVIII. PERCENTAGES AND LEVELS OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY SELF-PERCEIVED LIBERAL (N=112), CONSERVATIVE (N=156) AND INDEPENDENT (N=192) STUDENTS

CHARACTERISTIC	PER CENT INDICATING PREFERENCES									PROBABILITY
	Liberals			Conservatives			Independents			
	C	D	E	C	D	E	C	D	E	
Neurotic Tendencies	6.4	60.9	25.6	8.2	58.2	28.2	4.7	62.5	26.0	.589
Slight Physical Handicap	38.1	43.2	1.3	28.8	36.0	1.8	42.9	29.3	2.1	.032
Major Physical Handicap	17.4	57.4	15.5	10.8	52.3	27.9	10.4	65.1	16.7	.053
Poor Health	16.0	69.9	5.8	9.9	71.2	7.2	13.5	69.3	9.7	.482
Not Good Looking	54.5	26.9	4.5	55.9	20.7	4.5	60.4	18.8	4.2	.685
Had Been Divorced	30.8	28.2	12.8	18.8	43.8	22.3	29.2	41.1	15.1	.000
Favored Divorce	13.5	35.3	34.0	8.9	39.3	38.4	11.0	38.2	33.5	.681
Had Children	27.7	37.4	9.7	23.2	42.9	17.0	22.5	42.9	13.1	.204
Habitual Smoker	23.1	50.6	14.1	17.9	42.0	27.7	16.7	53.6	18.2	.154
Habitual Drinker	7.1	41.7	49.4	2.7	40.5	56.8	0.5	45.8	51.0	.025
Drug User	7.1	25.6	59.6	0.9	17.9	78.6	3.7	20.4	72.4	.014
Drug Addict	2.6	16.1	74.4	0.9	8.0	90.2	0.0	12.0	87.0	.038
Living in Commune	20.1	23.4	31.8	10.0	36.4	49.1	17.2	33.3	39.1	.000
Living as Hippie	24.4	29.5	20.5	10.7	31.3	50.0	19.3	31.3	22.8	.000
Another Race	31.0	34.2	21.3	15.2	39.3	40.2	29.7	37.0	26.6	.000
Lower Educational Level	39.7	33.3	10.9	27.0	42.3	16.2	34.9	43.8	9.4	.122
Higher Educational Level	39.1	18.6	0.6	34.8	17.0	0.0	36.6	17.3	1.6	.720
Lower Socio-economic Level	66.7	10.3	1.9	49.1	25.9	4.5	34.1	12.5	1.6	.011
Higher Socio-economic Level	60.9	33.8	1.3	49.1	11.6	0.0	56.8	5.2	1.6	.073
Favored Extra-marital Sex	7.7	26.9	63.5	3.6	18.8	77.7	36.6	19.8	74.5	.124
No Desire for Children	10.9	32.1	44.9	8.0	29.5	57.1	10.4	29.3	51.6	.576
Favored Abortion	31.4	21.2	16.7	29.5	20.5	27.7	28.6	27.1	16.1	.108
Sexually Permissive	23.7	36.5	26.9	10.4	41.4	41.4	19.9	42.9	26.2	.031
Denounced Religious Practice	35.9	27.6	14.6	27.7	38.4	29.5	30.7	38.0	16.7	.000
Denounced Religious Faith	29.5	28.2	25.7	15.1	28.6	50.9	20.3	38.5	33.9	.000
Little Sense of Responsibility	3.2	36.1	56.1	3.6	36.6	56.3	1.0	39.3	56.5	.823

KEY: C-Not Important; D-Would Rather Not; E-Could Never Accept

Significance Level = .01

characteristics and included had been divorced, living in commune, living as hippy and denouncing religious faith.

Computation of the average mean scores between the self-perceived conservative and self-perceived independent students illustrated differences which were significant at the .01 level for six of the characteristics including living in commune, living as hippy, another race, lower socio-economic level, sexually permissive and denouncing religious faith and practice. The average mean scores, t-values and probability levels for characteristics influencing the selection of marital partners as perceived by self-perceived liberal, conservative and independent students are reported in Table XXIX.

The responses of the self-perceived liberal, conservative and independent students were also compared for the "most detrimental" characteristic set of questions. There was complete agreement among the three groups as to which items were considered "most detrimental" for marital partners. The "most detrimental" characteristics selected by the three groups on seven questions included liberal attitude toward extra-marital sex, drug addict, lower educational level, another race, extremely prejudiced, irresponsibility, and insistence upon no children. Although there was agreement as to which item was considered "most detrimental," uneven distribution of percentages of responses resulted in significant differences between the three groups at the .01 level for two of the seven items. Tables XXX and XXI summarize the findings for the "most detrimental" characteristic for marital partners as viewed by self-perceived liberal, conservative and independent students.

TABLE XXIX. AVERAGE MEAN SCORES, t-VALUES AND PROBABILITY LEVELS FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY SELF-PERCEIVED LIBERAL (N=112), CONSERVATIVE (N=156) AND INDEPENDENT (N=192) STUDENTS

CHARACTERISTICS	AVERAGE MEAN SCORE			t-Value	P	t-Value	P	t-Value	P
	Lib.	Con.	Indep.	Lib.	Con.	Lib.	Indep.	Con.	Indep.
Neurotic Tendencies	4.05	4.00	4.07	-0.48	0.63	0.26	0.80	0.72	0.47
Slight Physical Handicap	3.26	3.04	3.06	-2.15	0.03	-2.33	0.02	0.21	0.83
Major Physical Handicap	3.76	3.96	3.91	1.72	0.09	1.64	0.10	-0.50	0.62
Poor Health	3.72	3.71	3.82	-0.20	0.84	1.22	0.22	1.25	0.21
Not Good Looking	3.22	3.08	3.10	-1.45	0.15	-1.51	0.13	0.21	0.84
Had Been Divorced	3.26	3.72	3.44	3.75	0.00	2.80	0.00	-1.48	0.14
Favored Divorce	3.84	3.98	3.83	1.03	0.30	-0.09	0.93	-1.13	0.26
Had Children	3.29	3.60	3.44	2.50	0.01	1.35	0.18	-1.30	0.20
Habitual Smoker	3.67	3.85	3.78	1.61	0.01	1.21	0.23	-0.61	0.54
Habitual Drinker	4.38	4.50	4.44	1.33	0.19	0.77	0.44	-0.69	0.49
Drug User	4.37	5.72	4.59	3.53	0.00	2.42	0.02	-1.45	0.15
Drug Addict	4.70	4.88	4.84	2.33	0.02	2.13	0.03	-0.64	0.53
Living in Commune	3.57	4.22	4.01	4.58	0.00	3.67	0.00	-1.80	0.07
Living as Hippie	3.42	4.23	3.79	6.20	0.00	3.06	0.00	-3.57	0.00
Another Race	3.61	4.14	3.83	4.53	0.00	2.19	0.03	-2.93	0.00
Lower Educational Level	3.39	3.56	3.51	1.48	0.14	1.24	0.22	-0.54	0.59
Higher Educational Level	2.76	2.65	2.73	-1.12	0.26	-0.32	0.75	0.85	0.40
Lower Socio-economic Level	2.93	3.14	2.93	2.46	0.14	0.04	0.97	-2.51	0.01
Higher Socio-economic Level	2.71	2.68	2.71	-0.32	0.75	0.05	0.96	0.36	0.17
Favored Extra-marital Sex	4.51	4.74	4.67	2.79	0.01	2.05	0.04	-1.04	0.30
No Desire for Children	4.07	4.37	4.22	2.35	0.02	1.32	0.19	-1.28	0.20
Favored Abortion	3.16	3.51	3.27	2.47	0.01	0.89	0.37	-1.83	0.07
Sexually Permissive	3.77	4.13	3.81	2.97	0.00	0.35	0.73	-2.75	0.01
Denounced Religious Practice	3.34	3.90	3.56	4.64	0.00	2.06	0.04	-3.05	0.00
Denounced Religious Faith	3.60	4.25	3.99	5.23	0.00	3.70	0.00	-2.39	0.02
Little Sense of Responsibility	3.39	3.74	3.99	0.35	0.73	0.67	0.50	0.25	0.80
Total Average Mean Score	3.61	3.86	3.74						

KEY: 1.0-Would Prefer; 2.0-Would Not Mind; 3.0-Not Important; 4.0-Would Rather Not; 5.0-Could Never Accept

Significance Level = .01

TABLE XXX. PERCENTAGES AND LEVEL OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR THE "MOST DETRIMENTAL" CHARACTERISTICS FOR MARITAL PARTNERS AS PERCEIVED BY LIBERAL, CONSERVATIVE AND INDEPENDENT COLLEGE STUDENTS

CHARACTERISTICS	PERCENTAGE CONSIDERING "MOST DETRIMENTAL"			PROBABILITY
	Liberals	Conservatives	Independents	
Was Sexually Inexperienced	5.6	0.0	5.9	.046
Had Pre-marital Abortion	4.9	13.4	11.3	
Had Illegitimate Child	2.1	5.4	3.8	
Was Rearing Illegitimate Child	14.0	8.9	10.2	
Liberal Attitudes on Extra-marital Sex	<u>73.4</u>	<u>72.3</u>	<u>68.8</u>	
Was Drug User	3.3	6.3	7.3	.352
Was Drug Addict	<u>73.2</u>	<u>81.3</u>	<u>75.4</u>	
Drank Heavily (Alcohol)	9.8	6.3	7.9	
Had Neurotic Tendencies	9.2	2.7	6.3	
Had Major Physical Handicap	4.6	3.6	3.1	
Was a Higher Socio-economic Level	16.2	13.6	15.3	.460
Was a Lower Socio-economic Level	10.5	19.3	19.7	
Was a Higher Educational Level	12.4	9.1	15.3	
Was a Lower Educational Level	<u>60.0</u>	<u>58.0</u>	<u>48.9</u>	
Was of Another Race	<u>65.9</u>	<u>61.2</u>	<u>64.1</u>	
Same Race, Another Nationality	0.0	3.9	0.6	.414
Had Another Major Religion	10.0	5.8	10.8	
Had NO Religious Belief	22.5	28.2	23.4	
Was Apathetic Toward Religion	4.0	3.6	3.8	
Had Denounced Religious Faith	23.5	<u>46.4</u>	29.3	
Was Politically Extreme	7.4	8.2	6.5	.006
Was Politically Conservative	6.0	1.8	2.2	
Was Extremely Prejudiced	<u>59.1</u>	40.0	<u>58.2</u>	
Was Irresponsible	<u>75.8</u>	<u>61.3</u>	<u>68.1</u>	
Had Communal Living Experience	14.8	13.5	8.0	
Was a Hippie	2.7	14.4	8.5	.001
Was Advocate of Woman's Lib	6.7	10.8	15.4	
Insisted on Large Family	18.0	12.6	16.7	
Insisted on NO Children	<u>46.7</u>	<u>59.5</u>	<u>58.6</u>	
Unwilling to Use Birth Control	27.3	18.0	15.5	
Wanted to Adopt Rather than Have Children	8.0	9.0	9.2	.197

Significance Level - .01

TABLE XXXI. ITEM CONSIDERED "MOST DETRIMENTAL", CHI SQUARE VALUES, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVEL INDICATING PREFERENCE FOR MARITAL PARTNERS AS PERCEIVED BY LIBERAL, CONSERVATIVE AND INDEPENDENT STUDENTS

Item Considered "Most Detrimental"	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS REJECTING			χ^2	df	PROBABILITY
	Liberals	Conservatives	Independents			
Liberal Attitude Toward Extra-marital Sex	73.4	72.3	68.8	15.72199	8	.046
Drug Addict	73.2	81.3	75.4	8.88216	8	.352
Lower Educational Level	60.0	58.0	48.9	7.73027	8	.460
Another Race	65.8	61.2	64.1	8.19596	8	.414
Extremely Prejudiced	59.1	46.4	58.2	21.26802	8	.006
Was Irresponsible	75.1	61.3	68.1	22.32681	6	.001
Insisted on No Children	46.7	59.5	58.0	11.07621	8	.197

Significance Level = .01

Preferences for Dating Partners as Viewed by
Self-perceived Liberal, Conservative
and Independent Students

A comparison of the dating preferences for the self-perceived liberal, conservative and independent students yielded much the same results as the comparison of marital preferences for these three student groups. The self-perceived conservative students were the more conservative group and had higher rejection percentages for 16 of the 26 items on the dating scale. The self-perceived liberal students had higher percentages of rejection for two of the characteristics and included major physical handicap and higher educational level. The self-perceived independent students indicated higher percentages of rejection for neurotic tendencies, slight physical handicap, poor health, not good looking, drug addict, lower educational level, higher socio-economic level and denounced religious faith. The percentage of responses for the last three answers on the forced-choice continuum and the resulting probability level determined by the chi square analysis are presented in Table XXXII.

Significant differences in the selection of dating partners between the three groups were noted on eight of the 26 items and included drug user, drug addict, living in commune, living as a hippy, another race, sexually permissive, denounced religious practice and faith. Five of these same characteristics were also significantly different for the marital preferences for self-perceived liberal, conservative and independent students.

TABLE XXXII. PERCENTAGES AND LEVELS OF PROBABILITY FOR CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF DATING PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY SELF-PERCEIVED LIBERAL (N=112), CONSERVATIVE (N=156) AND INDEPENDENT (N=192) STUDENTS

CHARACTERISTIC	PER CENT INDICATING PREFERENCES									PROBABILITY
	Liberals			Conservatives			Independents			
	C	D	E	C	D	E	C	D	E	
Neurotic Tendencies	18.1	53.5	18.7	10.9	64.5	18.2	13.8	55.0	20.1	.476
Slight Physical Handicap	42.3	33.3	2.6	34.8	37.5	0.0	48.4	27.4	3.2	.045
Major Physical Handicap	33.3	33.8	33.3	19.6	52.7	20.5	17.9	60.5	15.3	.919
Poor Health	26.9	53.8	7.7	28.6	57.1	4.5	22.6	61.1	8.4	.584
Not Good Looking	50.0	28.2	3.8	60.7	19.6	3.6	61.8	22.5	5.2	.291
Had Been Divorced	40.4	23.7	12.2	34.8	37.5	19.6	35.6	33.5	15.7	.015
Favored Divorce	32.7	34.6	17.9	22.3	33.9	33.0	29.3	35.6	20.7	.037
Had Children	37.8	28.8	11.5	38.4	34.8	17.9	35.6	39.3	14.1	.047
Habitual Smoker	26.3	43.6	10.9	28.8	39.6	18.0	28.8	50.8	13.6	.018
Habitual Drinker	9.6	44.9	35.9	10.8	40.5	45.0	7.3	51.8	38.7	.041
Drug User	17.3	30.1	39.7	5.4	33.9	56.3	12.6	35.1	49.2	.001
Drug Addict	5.8	27.6	63.5	10.0	17.1	80.2	2.1	15.8	81.1	.001
Living In Commune	30.1	24.4	21.8	20.5	35.7	36.6	25.7	32.1	26.7	.005
Living as Hippie	31.0	27.7	15.5	21.4	31.3	40.2	25.8	31.2	28.5	.000
Another Race	37.8	24.4	23.1	22.3	36.6	33.9	31.6	32.6	28.3	.009
Lower Educational Level	48.1	26.9	7.1	31.3	42.9	8.0	46.0	31.6	9.6	.091
Higher Educational Level	53.8	7.7	1.9	50.0	11.6	0.0	49.5	10.9	1.6	.725
Lower Socio-economic Level	66.7	8.3	2.6	55.4	22.3	2.7	63.1	15.5	1.6	.130
Higher Socio-economic Level	57.7	5.1	1.9	55.4	8.0	1.8	59.4	8.0	2.7	.879
Favored Extra-marital Sex	25.0	29.5	30.8	16.0	25.9	50.0	21.4	32.1	39.6	.036
No Desire for Children	40.6	28.4	14.2	36.6	29.5	26.8	33.3	31.2	23.7	.141
Favored Abortion	41.0	14.1	13.5	33.9	23.2	25.0	34.9	24.2	16.1	.039
Sexually Permissive	33.5	25.2	14.8	17.0	37.5	27.7	26.9	40.3	13.4	.000
Denounced Religious Practice	43.6	25.0	7.7	38.4	31.3	21.4	44.3	29.7	11.9	.002
Denounced Religious Faith	37.8	28.2	14.7	26.1	32.4	23.2	32.3	39.2	38.4	.000
Little Sense of Responsibility	18.8	48.7	26.6	15.3	45.0	33.3	10.7	60.4	24.1	.138

KEY: C-Not Important; D-Would Rather Not; E-Could Never Accept

Significance Level = .01

Summary

The findings which have been analyzed and discussed in this chapter indicated that there were significant differences in preferences for marital partners between students and their parents. Results further indicated that students had significant differences in their preferences for dating partners and for marital partners. Males and females also showed significant differences for preferences for both dating and marital partners. Mothers and fathers indicated more rigid preferences for marital partners for their daughters than for their sons in the majority of cases, although the differences were not significant. No convincing significant differences were found in preferences for dating and marital partners among student groups which were classified into the following variables: married and non-married students; resident and non-resident students; and self-perceived liberal, conservative and independent students.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

This study was proposed and conducted to examine attitudes of college students and parents toward the issues of drugs, communal living, hippism, illegitimacy, abortion and loss of religious faith as influences in the selection of dating and marital partners. Several variables were incorporated into the study including: 1) the dating and marital preferences of college students; 2) the marital preferences of college students and the marital preferences of their parents for siblings; 3) the marital preferences for daughters and sons as perceived by mothers and fathers; and 4) dating and marital preferences as compared by the following groups: (a) male and female students; (b) married and non-married students; (c) campus resident and non-resident students; and (d) students who perceived themselves as liberal, conservative or independent.

Students attending The University of Akron during Spring 1971 and their parents participated in the study. The sample included 465 students and 318 parents. Data were compiled from responses to an attitude questionnaire administered to the participants. The instrument was tested for validity by soliciting comments and questions from students and parents in a pilot study. Kendall's tau was used to check test

reliability. Chi square, average mean scores, and t-ratios were computed to determine significant differences between variables.

General Findings

Students differed significantly in their preferences for dating and marital partners. Students' preferences for marital partners differed significantly from parents' preferences for hypothetical marital partners for their siblings. Mothers and fathers indicated more rigid preferences for marital partners for their daughters than for their sons, but not significantly so, in the majority of cases. Males and females differed significantly in their selection of characteristics for dating and marital partners. Females indicated more conservative preferences for the majority of characteristics.

Other variables compared in the study including married and non-married students; resident and non-resident students; and liberal, conservative and independent student groups did not show significant differences in preferences for dating and marital partners.

More than half of the students and parents rejected marital partners who were habitual drinkers, drug users, drug addicts, living in a commune, living as a hippy and partners who favored extra-marital sex. Parents more than students were opposed to partners who were of another race, were sexually permissive and had lost their religious practice and faith. The students objected to a greater extent than parents to marital partners who favored divorce, favored extra-marital sex and who had no desire for children. In general, the students indicated higher rejection percentages for marital partners than their parents.

Findings in Relation to the Null Hypotheses

Null Hypothesis 1. There will be no significant difference between accepted and rejected personal characteristics which influence the selection of dating partners and those which influence the selection of marital partners as perceived by college students.

A comparison of the frequencies of answer responses and the probability levels computed for chi square indicated that, in general, students selected dating and marital partners by different criteria. Therefore, the null hypothesis may be rejected.

Significant differences at the .01 level or beyond were observed between student preferences for dating and marital partners on 16 of the 26 characteristics. Students registered the highest percentages of rejection for marital and dating partners who were drug addicts, drug users and who favored extra-marital sex.

Null Hypothesis 2. There will be no significant difference between the accepted and rejected personal characteristics which influence the selection of marital partners as viewed by college students and those which influence the selection of marital partners for siblings as viewed by the parents of college students.

An analysis of the data presented evidence that students and parents differed significantly in their preferences for marital partners. Null hypothesis 2 may, therefore, be rejected.

In the majority of cases, students had higher percentages of rejection than their parents for the specified characteristics. Parents and students differed significantly at the .01 level or beyond on their selection of marital partners on all test items except one. This item pertained to drug addiction. Eighty per cent of the parents rejected a

marital partner for their siblings who was a drug addict; eighty-five per cent of the students rejected a marital partner on this basis.

Although there were significant differences between parents and students, both groups indicated high percentages of rejection for marital partners with characteristics pertaining to habitual drinking, drug use, communal living, hippism and loss of religious faith.

Null hypothesis 3. There will be no significant difference between the accepted and rejected personal characteristics which influence the selection of dating and marital partners as perceived by college males and those which influence the selection of dating and marital partners as perceived by college females.

Males and females differed significantly on their responses to the majority of items on both the dating and the marital scale. Therefore, null hypothesis 3 may be rejected.

Twenty of the 26 items in the marital test were significantly different between males and females at the .01 level of probability in the chi square analysis. Twenty of the 26 items on the dating scale were also significantly different at the critical level of rejection in the chi square analysis. Computation of average mean scores and t-ratios between males and female preferences for marital partners also indicated significant differences for the majority of characteristics studied. Females indicated more rigid requirements than males on the majority of items on the dating and marital scales. Males indicated higher rejection tendencies on both the dating and marital questions than females for characteristics pertaining to partners who had physical handicaps, who were not considered good looking and who were of higher educational levels.

Null hypothesis 4. There will be no significant difference in the hypothetical selection of marital partners for sons and daughters as perceived by mothers and fathers.

Mothers and fathers indicated significant differences in their preferences for marital partners for daughters and sons on only a few items in the marital scale. Data gathered in the study, therefore, would fail to reject the null hypothesis.

Null hypothesis 5. There will be no significant difference between the accepted and rejected personal characteristics which influence the selection of dating and marital partners as perceived by married college students and non-married college students.

Married and non-married students did not disagree significantly on their acceptance or rejection of marital partners on the basis of the characteristics tested. Evidence presented in the study, therefore, would fail to reject the hypothesis. Although differences in responses were not significant, married students indicated higher percentages of rejection for the majority of characteristics in the dating and marital scales than non-married students.

Null hypothesis 6. There will be no significant difference between the accepted and rejected personal characteristics which influence the selection of dating and marital partners as perceived by resident campus students and non-resident students.

There were no significant differences for any of the characteristics studied for dating and marital partners between the students who resided on campus and the students who resided at home. Null hypothesis 6 may not, therefore, be rejected.

Although the differences between the groups were not significant, it was observed that, in general, students who resided at home tended to be slightly more conservative regarding their choices for dating and marital partners than students who resided away from home.

Null hypothesis 7. There will be no significant difference between the accepted and rejected personal characteristics which influence the selection of dating and marital partners as viewed by college students who perceived themselves as liberal, conservative or independent.

Fewer than half of the characteristics on the dating and marital scales had significant differences in responses among the three groups tested; therefore, the null hypothesis of no significant differences between the groups was not rejected.

It was noted that the self-perceived conservative students did, in fact, have the most conservative replies to the majority of items on both the dating and the marital scales. All three groups indicated high rejection for dating and marital partners who were drug addicts or users, who were living in communes, who were living as a hippy and who had denounced religious faith.

Observable differences in frequencies of responses among the groups were noted in several of the variables incorporated into the study. These differences were consistent throughout various aspects of the study and included: 1) students indicated more moderate preferences for marital partners than they did for dating partners; 2) students had higher percentages of rejection than their parents on attitudes toward the majority of the characteristics studied; 3) females were less tolerant of the

majority of characteristics for choice of marital partner than were the males; 4) mothers, like the female college students, had higher percentages of rejection for marital partners for their children than fathers; 5) fathers and mothers were more protective in their attitudes toward marital partners for their daughters than for their sons; 6) married students indicated higher percentages of rejection than non-married students although not significantly higher; 7) non-campus residents had more rigid requirements for dating and marital partners than campus resident students and 8) self-perceived conservative students had more conservative attitudes toward the selection of dating and marital partners than either the self-perceived liberal or independent students.

A large proportion of both students and parents represented in the study rejected marital partners with the following characteristics: habitual drinker, drug user, drug addict, living in a commune, living as a hippy, favoring extra-marital sex and denouncing religious faith. The characteristic with the highest percentages of rejection for both students and parents was drug addiction, rejected by 85.1 per cent of the students and 80.4 per cent of the parents. Drug users received the second highest percentage of rejection by both students and parents, 69.6 and 72.1 per cent, respectively.

Students were more inclined than parents to reject characteristics pertaining to divorce, habitual smoking, no desire for children. Parents were more conservative than their children in their attitudes toward marital partners who were living in communes, living as hippies, of another race and who were sexually permissive.

Mothers and female college students indicated higher percentages of rejection for the majority of items included in the attitude preference scale. Fathers and male college students, however, had slightly higher percentages of rejection for marital partners who were not good looking and who were from a higher educational level.

Parents and students selected the following characteristics as "most detrimental" in a marital partner from a list of 31 items included in seven multiple choice questions: liberal attitude toward extra-marital sex, drug addict, another race, extremely prejudiced, loss of religious faith, irresponsibility, no desire for children, higher socio-economic level and lower educational level.

Sex-oriented items pertaining to six male or female characteristics were tabulated for percentages of responses. Approximately 15 per cent of the females rejected marital partners who had refused induction into the service. Approximately one-fourth of both the male and female students rejected marital partners who had parented an illegitimate child regardless of how an individual chose to resolve the matter. Parents objected more to daughters marrying a person who had parented an illegitimate child than they did to sons marrying an individual with this characteristic.

Implications

The findings from this research study suggest several implications for possible implementation and further study:

1. Although significant differences occurred between students' and parents' preferences for marital partners regarding the specified characteristics, both students and parents tended toward conservative replies

for the majority of items on the questionnaire. A greater proportion of college students had higher percentages of rejection for more of the characteristics than their parents. There was no convincing significant difference noted between the preferences of self-perceived conservative, liberal and independent students. These findings may imply that the generation gap regarding interpersonal value systems might be more symbolic than realistic.

2. College students indicated more leniency toward marrying a person of another race than did their parents. Nearly three times more students than parents said that a partner of another race would not be considered important in their choice of marital partner. This might imply a trend toward increases of interracial marriages for future generations.

3. Sexual permissiveness prior to marriage was accepted to a greater extent by the college-age generation than by the parental generation. The findings also indicated, however, that students were slightly more opposed to marital partners who favored extra-marital sex than their parents. Additional research is needed to determine what correlation exists between attitudes toward pre-marital and extra-marital sexual permissiveness for males and females.

4. Female students were more opposed than male students to marital partners who favored pre-marital or extra-marital sexual relations. This may present a dilemma in a society which allows the existence of a double standard. Previous research has continually indicated that males are more apt to be involved in pre-marital and extra-marital sex and yet females hold the most conservative preferences for marital partners with these characteristics. These conflicting attitudes should be incorporated in the study of human sexuality and sex education.

5. Female students rejected male marital partners who had fathered an illegitimate child to a greater extent than males rejected marital partners who had mothered an illegitimate child. Greater emphasis in family life education needs to be placed upon the implications of fathering a child out-of-wedlock. Further research is needed to study attitudes of males and females toward parenting illegitimate children.

6. The study indicated that religious practice and faith still appear to be relatively important criteria for selection of marital partners. This indication is contrary to the criticisms leveled against "The God Is Dead" generation.

7. Married students and students residing away from home did not differ significantly from the non-married and students residing at home with their parents in their preferences for dating and marital partners. This may imply that individual value systems regarding mate selection criteria are formulated prior to college-age. The finding might serve as evidence for need to incorporate family life education programs in various levels of secondary education.

8. Research findings in the study pertaining to the use of alcohol and drugs might be incorporated into drug education literature and educational programs. It was interesting to note that both students and parents were far more tolerant of marital partners with innate physical handicaps than they were of persons with self-afflicted handicaps. Personnel in high schools with high rates of drug utilization might find the statistics in this study beneficial. More than 90 per cent of the students stated that they would rather not accept or would never accept drug users or drug addicts as marital partners.

9. Family life education textbooks should incorporate discussions on the influence of deviant social characteristics on the mate selection process. Many of the current textbooks base their discussion of the dating and marital selection on criteria determined in the research of the 1950s. As long as drug utilization, sexual permissiveness, illegitimacy and alternative life styles are prevalent among the younger generation, their impact on long range life commitments must be considered. Pros and cons of various life styles need to be identified and discussed.

Suggestions for Further Research

The findings and implications presented in this study generate need for additional research:

1. Extended research is needed to compare the sample with other samples of students including high school, non-college and college students who are considered more liberal than the students represented in this sample.

2. Research is needed to probe reasons why mothers and female college students are more conservative in their preferences for marital partners than male college students and fathers. Are these differences perpetuated by social mores or through parent-child relationships? Are females cultivated for marriage while males are conditioned to it?

3. Differences in interpersonal attitudes pertaining to mate selection between males and females need to be identified, analyzed and interpreted if human sexuality is to really be understood.

4. Additional research is needed to gain insight into the attitudes and reactions of males and females regarding parenting children out-of-wedlock. How does the resolution of this situation by means of abortion, giving-up the child or rearing the child as a single parent affect the attitude of a potential marital partner?

5. Additional research is needed to determine what relationship exists between attitudes and behavior affecting pre-marital and extra-marital sexual involvement.

6. Further research is needed to gain insight into the relationships which may exist between political tendencies and social rejection or acceptance of varying life styles. The line of distinction between political and social dimensions of life appears to be increasingly finer.

7. There is urgent need for longitudinal studies in the area of intergenerational attitudes. Although conservative attitudes were exemplified in this study by both parents and students, there was a tendency for the student generation to be more acceptant of issues concerning interracial marriage, abortion, hippism and communal living. If this trend is continued, it may be that future generations will be more acceptant of various life styles.

8. Research is needed to compare changes in attitudes as one generation moves from the period of adolescence to the period of middlecence. If attitudes undergo basic transitions, what factors are attributed to change? Do parents become more conservative in their attitudes during middlecence than non-parents?

A P P E N D I C E S

APPENDIX A

**TABLES PRESENTING THE GROUP WITH THE HIGHEST PERCENTAGE OF
REJECTION, CHI SQUARE, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVELS FOR
CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE SELECTION OF DATING AND/OR MARITAL PARTNERS
AS PERCEIVED BY VARIOUS CLASSIFICATIONS OF STUDENTS AND PARENTS**

TABLE XXXIII. CHI SQUARE, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVEL FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF DATING AND MARITAL PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY COLLEGE STUDENTS (N=465)

CHARACTERISTIC	Status with Highest Percentage of Rejection	χ^2	df	Probability
Neurotic Tendencies	Marital	24.09123	4	.000
Slight Physical Handicap	Dating	3.42828	4	.488
Major Physical Handicap	Marital	8.20071	4	.084
Poor Health	Marital	23.71037	4	.000
Not Good Looking	Dating	1.45664	4	.834
Had Been Divorced	Marital	11.17129	4	.024
Favored Divorce	Marital	48.03352	4	.000
Had Children	Dating	21.80612	4	.000
Habitual Smoker	Marital	14.61545	4	.005
Habitual Drinker	Marital	29.89531	4	.000
Drug User	Marital	52.77228	4	.000
Drug Addict	Marital	19.06433	4	.000
Living in Commune	Marital	20.50165	4	.000
Living as Hippy	Marital	10.23486	4	.036
Another Race	Marital	4.32693	3	.228
Lower Educational Level	Marital	11.12542	4	.025
Higher Educational Level	Dating	23.71632	4	.000
Lower Socio-economic Level	Marital	0.64108	4	.958
Higher Socio-economic Level	Dating	2.91485	4	.572
Favored Extra-marital Sex	Marital	127.24859	4	.000
No Desire for Children	Marital	129.46703	4	.000
Favored Abortion	Marital	5.47242	4	.242
Sexually Permissive	Marital	43.22731	4	.000
Denounced Religious Practice	Marital	19.56296	4	.000
Denounced Religious Faith	Marital	24.79587	4	.000
Little Sense of Responsibility	Marital	373.48950	4	.000
SEX-ORIENTED CHARACTERISTICS				
Refused Service Induction	Marital	1.94618	4	.745
Fathered Illegitimate Child	Dating	6.37511	3	.094
Desired Large Family	Marital	30.86932	4	.000
Given-up Illegitimate Child	Marital	19.28818	4	.000
Rearing Illegitimate Child	Marital	8.21947	4	.083
Had Pre-marital Abortion	Marital	8.91656	4	.063

Significance Level = .01

TABLE XXXIV. CHI SQUARE, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVEL FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY COLLEGE STUDENTS (N=465) AND THEIR PARENTS (N=318)

CHARACTERISTIC	Group with Highest Percentage of Rejection	χ^2	df	Probability
Neurotic Tendencies	Students	32.52223	4	.000
Slight Physical Handicap	Students	13.39987	4	.009
Major Physical Handicap	Students	25.50827	3	.000
Poor Health	Students	31.91772	4	.000
Not Good Looking	Students	66.82794	4	.000
Had Been Divorced	Students	59.34511	4	.000
Favored Divorce	Students	42.49228	4	.000
Had Children	Students	19.65862	4	.000
Habitual Smoker	Students	52.36588	4	.000
Habitual Drinker	Students	14.55116	4	.005
Drug User	Parents	23.19623	4	.000
Drug Addict	Students	10.56015	4	.032
Living in Commune	Parents	80.16075	4	.000
Living as Hippie	Parents	110.98326	4	.000
Another Race	Parents	53.33669	3	.000
Lower Educational Level	Students	14.67308	4	.005
Higher Educational Level	Students	84.70818	4	.000
Lower Socio-economic Level	Students	43.90356	4	.000
Higher Socio-economic Level	Students	30.13515	4	.000
Favored Extra-marital Sex	Students	16.16220	4	.002
No Desire for Children	Students	78.25667	4	.000
Favored Abortion	Parents	60.28862	4	.000
Sexually Permissive	Parents	67.57050	4	.000
Denounced Religious Practice	Parents	68.99759	4	.000
Denounced Religious Faith	Parents	52.92436	4	.000
Little Sense of Responsibility	Students	50.99713	4	.000
SEX-ORIENTED CHARACTERISTICS				
Refused Service Induction	Parents	36.70728	4	.000
Fathered Illegitimate Child	Parents	18.09084	3	.000
Desired Large Family	Students	33.32442	4	.000
Had Pre-marital Abortion	Students	20.99498	4	.000
Given-up Illegitimate Child	Students	14.03474	4	.007
Rearing Illegitimate Child	Students	13.99829	4	.007

Significance Level = .01

TABLE XXXV. CHI SQUARE, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVELS FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS AS PERCEIVED BY COLLEGE FEMALES (N=225) AND COLLEGE MALES (N=240)

CHARACTERISTIC	Group with Highest Percentage of Rejection	χ^2	df	Probability
Neurotic Tendencies	Females	4.77696	4	.311
Slight Physical Handicap	Females	16.50557	4	.002
Major Physical Handicap	Males	1.48565	3	.685
Poor Health	Males	10.25630	4	.026
Not Good Looking	Males	34.01164	4	.000
Had Been Divorced	Females	29.74585	4	.000
Favored Divorce	Females	9.91001	4	.042
Had Children	Males	9.52545	4	.049
Habitual Smoker	Males	19.65683	4	.000
Habitual Drinker	Females	12.41523	4	.014
Drug User	Females	21.03748	4	.000
Drug Addict	Females	20.04118	4	.000
Living in Commune	Females	3.80205	4	.308
Living as Hippy	Females	29.90778	4	.000
Another Race	Females	19.76053	3	.000
Lower Educational Level	Females	89.11148	4	.000
Higher Educational Level	Males	65.89673	4	.000
Lower Socio-economic Level	Females	42.09280	4	.000
Higher Socio-economic Level	Males	19.96561	4	.000
Favored Extra-marital Sex	Females	31.84618	4	.000
No Desire for Children	Females	42.30469	4	.000
Favored Abortion	Females	17.57121	4	.001
Sexually Permissive	Females	19.72023	4	.000
Denounced Religious Practice	Females	27.34662	4	.000
Denounced Religious Faith	Females	34.66898	4	.000
Little Sense of Responsibility	Females	20.54228	4	.000

Significance Level = .01

TABLE XXXVI. CHI SQUARE, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVELS FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF DATING PARTNERS AS PERCEIVED BY COLLEGE FEMALES (N=225) AND COLLEGE MALES (N=240)

CHARACTERISTICS	Group with Highest Percentage of Rejection	χ^2	df	Probability
Neurotic Tendencies	Females	11.37571	4	.022
Slight Physical Handicap	Males	13.76085	4	.008
Major Physical Handicap	Males	7.49689	4	.111
Poor Health	Males	2.92998	4	.569
Not Good Looking	Males	58.45593	4	.000
Had Been Divorced	Females	34.04881	4	.000
Favored Divorce	Females	18.92717	4	.000
Had Children	Females	3.68470	4	.450
Habitual Smoker	Males	8.93195	3	.030
Habitual Drinker	Females	17.16875	4	.001
Drug User	Females	19.08020	4	.000
Drug Addict	Females	26.32188	3	.000
Living in Commune	Females	11.53805	4	.021
Living as Hippy	Females	33.17784	4	.000
Another Race	Females	19.64468	3	.000
Lower Educational Level	Females	79.15685	4	.000
Higher Educational Level	Males	46.28418	4	.000
Lower Socio-economic Level	Females	41.58865	4	.000
Higher Socio-economic Level	Females	19.13338	4	.000
Favored Extra-marital Sex	Females	47.89555	4	.000
No Desire for Children	Females	23.76917	4	.000
Favored Abortion	Females	21.17816	4	.000
Sexually Permissive	Females	72.33298	4	.000
Denounced Religious Practice	Females	20.54968	4	.000
Denounced Religious Faith	Females	33.16164	4	.000
Little Sense of Responsibility	Females	39.72609	4	.000

Significance Level = .01

TABLE XXXVII. CHI SQUARE, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVELS FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS FOR DAUGHTERS AND SONS AS VIEWED BY MOTHERS (N=168)

CHARACTERISTIC	Group with Highest Percentage of Rejection	χ^2	df	Probability
Neurotic Tendencies	Daughters	5.85945	4	.209
Slight Physical Handicap	Daughters	4.39837	3	.221
Major Physical Handicap	Daughters	5.18240	3	.158
Poor Health	Daughters	4.06607	3	.254
Not Good Looking	Daughters	1.02639	3	.794
Had Been Divorced	Sons	8.87783	4	.064
Favored Divorce	Daughters	5.19358	4	.268
Had Children	Sons	19.68716	3	.000
Habitual Smoker	Daughters	6.55825	3	.087
Habitual Drinker	Sons	7.32396	3	.062
Drug User	Sons	2.26062	2	.322
Drug Addict	Sons	4.77213	2	.092
Living in Commune	Daughters	2.85756	3	.414
Living as Hippy	Daughters	4.67945	3	.196
Another Race	Daughters	10.90322	3	.012
Lower Educational Level	Daughters	25.93639	3	.000
Higher Educational Level	Sons	23.55029	3	.000
Lower Socio-economic Level	Daughters	8.01987	4	.090
Higher Socio-economic Level	Daughters	17.66595	4	.001
Favored Extra-marital Sex	Daughters	7.25458	4	.123
No Desire for Children	Daughters	13.31301	4	.009
Favored Abortion	Daughters	5.27674	3	.152
Sexually Permissive	Sons	1.50903	3	.680
Denounced Religious Practice	Daughters	5.96457	3	.113
Denounced Religious Faith	Daughters	2.11564	3	.548
Little Sense of Responsibility	Daughters	7.66105	3	.053

Significance Level = .01

TABLE XXXVIII. CHI SQUARE, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVELS FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS FOR DAUGHTERS AND SONS AS VIEWED BY FATHERS (N=147)

CHARACTERISTIC	Group with Highest Percentage of Rejection	χ^2	df	Probability
Neurotic Tendencies	Daughters	7.55189	4	.109
Slight Physical Handicap	Daughters	4.20019	4	.379
Major Physical Handicap	Daughters	8.77222	3	.032
Poor Health	Daughters	13.80840	3	.003
Not Good Looking	Daughters	5.30850	4	.257
Had Been Divorced	Daughters	8.14717	4	.086
Favored Divorce	Daughters	7.44125	4	.114
Had Children	Daughters	3.15654	4	.533
Habitual Smoker	Daughters	8.84509	4	.065
Habitual Drinker	Daughters	1.77287	3	.620
Drug User	Daughters	3.96276	2	.137
Drug Addict	Daughters	4.01250	2	.134
Living in Commune	Daughters	7.90634	3	.048
Living as Hippy	Daughters	11.39225	3	.009
Another Race	Daughters	3.66537	3	.299
Lower Educational Level	Daughters	7.14749	4	.128
Higher Educational Level	Sons	8.31035	3	.040
Lower Socio-economic Level	Sons	1.68853	4	.792
Higher Socio-economic Level	Sons	8.41082	4	.077
Favored Extra-marital Sex	Daughters	7.74604	3	.051
No Desire for Children	Daughters	8.71931	4	.068
Favored Abortion	Daughters	3.95328	3	.266
Sexually Permissive	Daughters	4.60717	4	.330
Denounced Religious Practice	Daughters	7.41596	3	.059
Denounced Religious Faith	Daughters	7.54195	3	.056
Little Sense of Responsibility	Daughters	10.26178	3	.016

Significance Level = .01

TABLE XXXIX. CHI SQUARE, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVELS FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY NON-MARRIED (N=397) AND MARRIED STUDENTS (N=68)

CHARACTERISTIC	Group with Highest Percentage of Rejection	χ^2	df	Probability
Neurotic Tendencies	Married	4.20193	4	.379
Slight Physical Handicap	Single	6.28560	4	.178
Major Physical Handicap	Married	1.83819	3	.606
Poor Health	Married	2.22674	4	.694
Not Good Looking	Married	3.53427	4	.472
Had Been Divorced	Single	13.21789	4	.010
Favored Divorce	Single	13.58938	4	.008
Had Children	Single	4.71970	4	.317
Habitual Smoker	Single	11.07912	4	.025
Habitual Drinker	Married	5.36896	4	.251
Drug User	Married	6.09978	4	.191
Drug Addict	Married	6.07059	4	.193
Living in Commune	Married	7.55919	4	.109
Living as Hippie	Married	10.51843	4	.032
Another Race	Married	3.90586	3	.271
Lower Educational Level	Married	2.95987	4	.564
Higher Educational Level	Married	0.47747	4	.975
Lower Socio-economic Level	Single	7.64999	4	.105
Higher Socio-economic Level	Married	5.16184	4	.271
Favored Extra-marital Sex	Single	12.07399	4	.016
No Desire for Children	Married	0.90446	4	.923
Favored Abortion	Single	6.67995	4	.153
Sexually Permissive	Married	0.73866	4	.946
Denounced Religious Practice	Single	0.56459	4	.966
Denounced Religious Faith	Single	2.62740	4	.622
Little Sense of Responsibility	Married	3.89902	4	.419

Significance Level = .01

TABLE XL. CHI SQUARE, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVELS FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF DATING PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY NON-MARRIED (N=397) AND MARRIED STUDENTS (N=68)

CHARACTERISTIC	Group with Highest Percentage of Rejection	χ^2	df	Probability
Neurotic Tendencies	Married	1.17690	4	.881
Slight Physical Handicap	Single	2.10354	4	.716
Major Physical Handicap	Single	3.60310	4	.462
Poor Health	Single	8.02074	4	.090
Not Good Looking	Married	6.05655	4	.195
Had Been Divorced	Single	9.78554	4	.044
Favored Divorce	Single	5.50961	4	.238
Had Children	Single	11.51937	4	.021
Habitual Smoker	Single	12.63491	3	.005
Habitual Drinker	Married	4.90957	4	.296
Drug User	Married	4.79644	4	.308
Drug Addict	Married	4.52319	3	.210
Living in Commune	Married	5.92761	4	.204
Living as Hippie	Married	9.66147	4	.046
Another Race	Married	0.26405	3	.966
Lower Educational Level	Married	3.39376	4	.494
Higher Educational Level	Married	3.80119	4	.433
Lower Socio-economic Level	Single	5.35078	4	.253
Higher Socio-economic Level	Single	3.53139	4	.433
Favored Extra-marital Sex	Married	0.40670	4	.981
No Desire for Children	Married	2.21332	4	.696
Favored Abortion	Married	2.49490	4	.645
Sexually Permissive	Married	2.01483	4	.733
Denounced Religious Practice	Married	4.53521	4	.338
Denounced Religious Faith	Married	10.10257	4	.038
Little Sense of Responsibility	Married	3.51396	4	.475

Significance Level = .01

TABLE XLI. CHI SQUARE, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVELS FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY CAMPUS-RESIDENT STUDENTS (N=110) AND STUDENTS RESIDING WITH PARENTS (N=260)

CHARACTERISTIC	Group with Highest Percentage of Rejection	χ^2	df	Probability
Neurotic Tendencies	Resident	4.36467	4	.358
Slight Physical Handicap	Resident	1.41826	4	.841
Major Physical Handicap	Non-Resident	1.79680	3	.615
Poor Health	Resident	4.45004	4	.348
Not Good Looking	Non-Resident	7.15072	4	.128
Had Been Divorced	Non-Resident	2.28874	4	.682
Favored Divorce	Non-Resident	3.37084	4	.497
Had Children	Non-Resident	1.09250	4	.895
Habitual Smoker	Non-Resident	3.31385	4	.506
Habitual Drinker	Non-Resident	7.91678	4	.094
Drug User	Non-Resident	2.37245	4	.667
Drug Addict	Non-Resident	10.03164	4	.039
Living in Commune	Resident	1.61362	4	.806
Living as Hippie	Resident	0.44500	4	.978
Another Race	Non-Resident	2.60562	3	.456
Lower Educational Level	Non-Resident	3.07998	4	.544
Higher Educational Level	Non-Resident	5.04342	4	.282
Lower Socio-economic Level	Resident	6.96000	4	.138
Higher Socio-economic Level	Non-Resident	4.54361	4	.337
Favored Extra-marital Sex	Non-Resident	2.58465	3	.460
No Desire for Children	Non-Resident	3.22749	4	.520
Favored Abortion	Non-Resident	1.40858	4	.842
Sexually Permissive	Non-Resident	3.00247	4	.557
Denounced Religious Practice	Non-Resident	3.21148	4	.523
Denounced Religious Faith	Non-Resident	1.41146	4	.842
Little Sense of Responsibility	Non-Resident	4.36998	4	.358

Significance Level = .01

TABLE XLII. CHI SQUARE, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVELS FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF DATING PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY CAMPUS-RESIDENT STUDENTS (N=110) AND STUDENTS RESIDING WITH PARENTS (N=260)

CHARACTERISTIC	Group with Highest Percentage of Rejection	χ^2	df	Probability
Neurotic Tendencies	Non-Resident	8.42531	4	.077
Slight Physical Handicap	Non-Resident	2.36520	4	.668
Major Physical Handicap	Resident	2.87043	4	.579
Poor Health	Resident	3.83438	3	.279
Not Good Looking	Non-Resident	1.24943	4	.869
Had Been Divorced	Non-Resident	5.67926	4	.224
Favored Divorce	Non-Resident	4.79786	4	.308
Had Children	Non-Resident	3.47574	4	.481
Habitual Smoker	Non-Resident	1.82574	3	.609
Habitual Drinker	Non-Resident	14.07614	4	.007
Drug User	Non-Resident	0.82803	3	.842
Drug Addict	Non-Resident	1.50100	3	.682
Living in Commune	Non-Resident	1.19221	4	.879
Living as Hippie	Resident	2.21895	4	.695
Another Race	Non-Resident	4.86097	3	.182
Lower Educational Level	Non-Resident	1.70609	4	.789
Higher Educational Level	Non-Resident	1.25147	4	.869
Lower Socio-economic Level	Non-Resident	2.62731	4	.622
Higher Socio-economic Level	Non-Resident	5.48808	4	.240
Favored Extra-marital Sex	Non-Resident	3.66820	4	.452
No Desire for Children	Non-Resident	6.08940	4	.192
Favored Abortion	Non-Resident	3.55194	4	.470
Sexually Permissive	Non-Resident	10.44762	4	.033
Denounced Religious Practice	Non-Resident	0.57563	4	.965
Denounced Religious Faith	Non-Resident	2.03476	3	.565
Little Sense of Responsibility	Non-Resident	3.89398	4	.420

Significance Level = .01

TABLE XLIII. CHI SQUARE, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVEL FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF MARITAL PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY SELF-PERCEIVED LIBERAL (N=112), CONSERVATIVE (N=156) AND INDEPENDENT (N=192) STUDENTS

CHARACTERISTIC	Group with Highest Percentage of Rejection	χ^2	df	Probability
Neurotic Tendencies	Conservative	6.51375	8	.589
Slight Physical Handicap	Independent	16.78268	8	.032
Major Physical Handicap	Conservative	12.43289	6	.053
Poor Health	Independent	7.51627	8	.482
Not Good Looking	*Liberal/Conservative	5.65522	8	.685
Had Been Divorced	Conservative	27.82399	8	.000
Favored Divorce	Conservative	5.69240	8	.681
Had Children	Conservative	10.94772	8	.204
Habitual Smoker	Conservative	11.95093	8	.153
Habitual Drinker	Conservative	17.45721	8	.025
Drug User	Conservative	19.13101	8	.014
Drug Addict	Conservative	16.26408	8	.038
Living in Commune	Conservative	35.62799	8	.000
Living as Hippie	Conservative	36.36342	8	.000
Another Race	Conservative	22.74124	6	.000
Lower Educational Level	Conservative	12.70469	8	.122
Higher Educational Level	Independent	5.33862	8	.720
Lower Socio-economic Level	Conservative	19.81366	8	.011
Higher Socio-economic Level	Independent	14.33686	8	.073
Favored Extra-marital Sex	Conservative	12.65853	8	.124
No Desire for Children	Conservative	6.63734	8	.576
Favored Abortion	Conservative	13.11439	8	.108
Sexually Permissive	Conservative	16.87109	8	.031
Denounced Religious Practice	Conservative	32.20033	8	.000
Denounced Religious Faith	Conservative	36.65692	8	.000
Little Sense of Responsibility	Independent	4.34865	8	.823

*Tie

Significance Level = .01

TABLE XLIV. CHI SQUARE, DEGREES OF FREEDOM AND PROBABILITY LEVELS FOR CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING THE ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF DATING PARTNERS AS VIEWED BY SELF-PERCEIVED LIBERAL (N=112), CONSERVATIVE (N=156) AND INDEPENDENT (N=192) STUDENTS

CHARACTERISTIC	Group with Highest Percentage of Rejection	χ^2	df	Probability
Neurotic Tendencies	Independent	7.56790	8	.476
Slight Physical Handicap	Independent	15.82207	8	.045
Major Physical Handicap	Liberal	3.22941	8	.919
Poor Health	Independent	6.56277	8	.584
Not Good Looking	Independent	9.63796	8	.291
Had Been Divorced	Conservative	18.88187	8	.015
Favored Divorce	Conservative	16.36086	8	.037
Had Children	Conservative	15.68919	8	.047
Habitual Smoker	Conservative	15.30838	6	.018
Habitual Drinker	Conservative	16.03241	8	.041
Drug User	Conservative	25.69289	8	.001
Drug Addict	Independent	20.86752	6	.001
Living in Commune	Conservative	21.96541	8	.005
Living as Hippie	Conservative	32.49037	8	.000
Another Race	Conservative	16.95073	6	.009
Lower Educational Level	Independent	13.63325	8	.091
Higher Educational Level	Liberal	5.29275	8	.725
Lower Socio-economic Level	Conservative	12.48552	8	.130
Higher Socio-economic Level	Independent	3.74453	8	.879
Favored Extra-marital Sex	Conservative	16.47624	8	.036
No Desire for Children	Conservative	12.23552	8	.141
Favored Abortion	Conservative	16.23539	8	.039
Sexually Permissive	Conservative	26.42749	8	.000
Denounced Religious Practice	Conservative	23.91447	8	.002
Denounced Religious Faith	Independent	31.33582	8	.000
Little Sense of Responsibility	Conservative	12.3037	8	.138

Significance Level = .01

APPENDIX B

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

DIRECTIONS: Please answer the following questions by marking the letter which corresponds to your answer in the appropriate blank.

1. You are taking this test as a

- a) College student
- b) Parent of college student

2. You are

- a) Female
- b) Male

3. What is your approximate age

- a) Between 18 and 23
- b) Between 24 and 29
- c) Between 30 and 35
- d) Between 36 and 45
- e) Fifty or older

4. Marital Status

- a) Single
- b) Married
- c) Divorced—currently single
- d) Remarried
- e) Widow

5. Number of years married

- a) None
- b) Between 1 and 4
- c) Between 5 and 9
- d) Between 10 and 19
- e) Twenty or more

6. Major area of academic concentration

- 2) Education (Elementary, Physical Education or Graduate Education)
- b) Natural Sciences (Chemistry, Biology, Physics, etc.)
- c) Social Sciences (Sociology, Psychology, Home Economics)
- d) Fine Arts (Music, Art, Speech)
- e) Professional (Nursing, Law)
Business

7. Employment (MARK TWO ANSWERS)

- a) Not employed
- b) Employed part-time
- c) Employed full-time
- d) Part-time student
- e) Full-time student

8. Residence

- a) Living on campus
- b) Living in off-campus housing
- c) Living at home with parent or parents
- d) Living with husband or wife
- e) Living alone or sharing residence with another person

9. Approximate age of parents

- a) In their thirties
- b) In their forties
- c) In their fifties
- d) In their sixties
- e) Seventy or older

10. Political tendencies

- a) Liberal
- b) Conservative
- c) Independent

11. Highest level of parents' education (Use parent with highest level)

- a) Below 12th grade
- b) High school graduate
- c) Some college
- d) College graduate
- e) Post Baccalaureate work or advanced degree(s)

MARITAL SCHEDULE

DIRECTIONS: Judge each of the following items as to their importance to you in the choice of a MARITAL PARTNER. Consider all other things as equal or satisfactory. Definitions are included in some statements. Please read entire statement and judge according to the definitions given.

IF ALL OTHER THINGS MET MY APPROVAL, MY REACTION TO MARRYING A PERSON WITH THE FOLLOWING CHARACTERISTICS WOULD BE:

- a) I would insist that my partner possessed this characteristic
- b) I would not mind if my partner possessed this characteristic
- c) I do not consider this characteristic important to my choice of mate
- d) I would rather my partner did not possess this characteristic
- e) I could never accept this characteristic in a partner

A PROSPECTIVE MARITAL PARTNER

- 12. had neurotic tendencies
- 13. had a slight physical handicap (limped, loss of fingers, speech impediment)
- 14. had a major physical handicap (loss of one limb, deaf, blind)
- 15. was in poor health
- 16. was not considered good looking
- 17. had been divorced
- 18. favored divorce as solution to conflict in marriage
- 19. had children by a previous marriage
- 20. was a habitual smoker
- 21. was a habitual drinker
- 22. was a drug user (applied to a person who has a habitation for cocaine, amphetamines, marijuana, LSD, or other hallucinogenic drugs)
- 23. was a drug addict (applied to a person who is dependent upon the addicting drugs such as opium and its derivatives, synthetic narcotics, barbiturates and solvents)

MARITAL SCHEDULE (continued)

- 24. was currently living in a commune (six to fifteen persons of both sexes determined to reconstruct their ~~own~~ lives and influence others to seek meaningful work, mutual love and spiritual re-birth. Communal living may or may not be extended to include sexual relationships among members)
- 25. was currently living as a hippy (person who ~~shuns~~ conventional forms of dress code, habits of personal care and cleanliness and tradition values of materialism and can be identified by symbols of dress and accessories denoting hippy subculture. DRUG USE AND COMMUNAL LIVING EXCLUDED FROM THIS DEFINITION)
- 26. was of another race
- 27. had a much lower educational attainment level (at least four years)
- 28. had a much higher educational attainment level (at least four years)
- 29. was of a lower socio-economic level
- 30. was of a higher socio-economic level
- 31. favored sexual relationships with other than marital partner
- 32. had no desire to bear or rear children
- 33. favored abortion
- 34. was considered sexually permissive
- 35. had totally denounced religious practice
- 36. had totally denounced religious faith

The following items were used on questionnaires for female students:

- 37. had refused induction into the armed services
- 38. had fathered an illegitimate child
- 39. desired a large family
- 40. had little sense of responsibility

The following items were used on questionnaires for male students:

- 37. had had at least one pre-marital abortion
- 38. had given-up an illegitimate child

MARITAL SCHEDULE (continued)

39. was rearing an illegitimate child

40. had little sense of responsibility

Which one of the following characteristics in each set, if possessed by a prospective marital partner, do you believe would be most detrimental to your marriage? If you do not believe any of the characteristics within the group would be detrimental, leave that number column blank.

41. a) was sexually inexperienced
b) was considered sexually permissive
c) had fathered an illegitimate child
d) was supporting an illegitimate child
e) had rather liberal attitudes toward extra-marital sex
42. a) was a drug user
b) was a drug addict
c) drank heavily (alcoholic beverages)
d) had neurotic tendencies
e) had a major physical handicap
43. a) was from a higher socio-economic background
b) was from a lower socio-economic background
c) was of a higher educational attainment level
d) was of a lower educational attainment level
44. a) was of another race
b) was of the same race, but another nationality
c) was of another major religious faith
d) had no religious belief
45. a) was apathetic toward religion
b) had denounced religious faith
c) was politically extreme
d) was extremely conservative (politically)
e) was extremely prejudiced
46. a) was irresponsible
b) had communal living experience
c) was a hippy
d) had resisted induction into the armed services
47. a) insisted on a large family
b) insisted on no children, either by birth or adoption
c) was unwilling to practice birth control
d) insisted on adopting children rather than having own children

DATING SCHEDULE

DIRECTIONS: Judge each of the following items as to their importance to you in the choice of DATING PARTNERS. Consider all other things as equal or satisfactory. Definitions are included in some statements. Please read entire statement and judge according to the definitions given.

IF ALL OTHER THINGS MET MY APPROVAL, MY REACTION TO DATING A PERSON WITH THE FOLLOWING CHARACTERISTICS WOULD BE:

- a) I would insist that my partner possessed this characteristic
- b) I would not mind if my partner possessed this characteristic
- c) I do not consider this characteristic important to my choice of partner
- d) I would rather my partner did not possess this characteristic
- e) I could never accept this characteristic in a partner

A PROSPECTIVE DATING PARTNER

- 48. had neurotic tendencies
- 49. had a slight physical handicap (limped, loss of fingers, speech impediment)
- 50. had a major physical handicap (loss of one limb, deaf, blind)
- 51. was in poor health
- 52. was not considered good looking
- 53. had been divorced
- 54. favored divorce as solution to conflict in marriage
- 55. had children by a previous marriage
- 56. was a habitual smoker
- 57. was a habitual drinker
- 58. was a drug user (applied to a person who has a habituation for cocaine, amphetamines, marijuana, LSD, or other hallucinogenic drugs)
- 59. was a drug addict (applied to a person who is dependent upon the addicting drugs such as opium and its derivatives, synthetic narcotics, barbiturates and solvents)

DATING SCHEDULE (continued)

60. was currently living in a commune (six to fifteen persons of both sexes determined to reconstruct their own lives and influence others to seek meaningful work, mutual love and spiritual re-birth. Communal living may or may not be extended to include sexual relationships among members)
61. was currently living as a hippy (person who shuns conventional forms of dress code, habits of personal care and cleanliness and tradition values of materialism and can be identified by symbols of dress and accessories denoting hippy subcultures. DRUG USE AND COMMUNAL LIVING EXCLUDED FROM THIS DEFINITION)
62. was of another race
63. had a much lower educational attainment level (at least four years)
64. had a much higher educational attainment level (at least four years)
65. was of a lower socio-economic level
66. was of a higher socio-economic level
67. favored sexual relationships with other than marital partner
68. had no desire to bear or rear children
69. favored abortion inside or outside of marriage
70. was considered sexually permissive
71. had totally denounced religious practice
72. had totally denounced religious faith

The following items were used on questionnaires for female students:

73. had little sense of responsibility
74. had refused induction into the armed services
75. had fathered an illegitimate child
76. desired a large family

The following items were used on questionnaires for male students:

73. had little sense of responsibility
74. had had at least one pre-marital abortion

DATING SCHEDULE (continued)

75. had given-up an illegitimate child

76. was rearing an illegitimate child

APPENDIX C
PARENTAL QUESTIONNAIRE

DIRECTIONS: Please answer the following questions by marking the letter which corresponds to your answer in the appropriate blank.

1. You are taking this test as a
 - a) College student
 - b) Parent of a college student
2. You are
 - a) Female
 - b) Male
3. What is your approximate age
 - a) Between 35 and 40
 - b) Between 40 and 45
 - c) Between 45 and 50
 - d) Between 51 and 55
 - e) Fifty-six or older
4. Marital Status
 - a) Living with spouse (first marriage)
 - b) Divorced
 - c) Remarried
 - d) Widowed
5. Number of years married
 - a) Approximately twenty years
 - b) Between 21 and 29 years
 - c) Between 30 and 39 years
 - d) Between 40 and 49 years
 - e) Over fifty years
6. Highest level of education (Approximately)
 - a) Below 12th grade
 - b) High school graduate
 - c) Some college
 - d) College graduate
 - e) Post Baccalaureate work or advanced degree
7. Employment
 - a) Full-time
 - b) Part-time
 - c) Unemployed
 - d) Retired

8. Employed in (or past affiliation)

- a) Business or Management
- b) Industry-Manufacturing
- c) Sales and Promotion
- d) Education
- e) Professional

9. Number of children

- a) One
- b) Two
- c) Three
- d) Four
- e) Five or more

10. Political tendency

- a) Liberal
- b) Conservative
- c) Independent

11. This form was given to you by your

- a) Daughter
- b) Son

DIRECTIONS: Judge each of the following items as to their importance in the choice of a MARITAL PARTNER for your son. Consider all other things as equal or satisfactory. Definitions are included in some statements. Read the entire statement and judge according to the definitions given. You may wish to compare notes after you have completed the form, but it is important that these questions be answered independently.

IF ALL OTHER THINGS MET MY APPROVAL, MY REACTION TO MY SON ANNOUNCING MARRIAGE TO A PERSON WITH THE FOLLOWING CHARACTERISTICS WOULD BE:

- a) I would be very pleased if my son selected a partner with this characteristic
- b) I would not mind if my son selected a partner with this characteristic
- c) I do not consider this characteristic important in the selection of a partner
- d) I would rather my son did not select a person with this characteristic
- e) I could never accept this characteristic in my daughter-in-law

IF A PROSPECTIVE MARITAL PARTNER FOR MY CHILD

- 12. had neurotic tendencies
- 13. had a slight physical handicap (limped, loss of fingers, speech impediment)
- 14. had a major physical handicap (loss of one limb, deaf, blind)
- 15. was in poor health
- 16. was not considered good looking
- 17. had been divorced
- 18. favored divorce as a solution to conflict in marriage
- 19. had children by a previous marriage
- 20. was a habitual smoker
- 21. was a habitual drinker
- 22. was a drug user (applied to a person who has a habitation for cocaine, amphetamines, marijuana, LSD, or other hallucinogenic drugs)
- 23. was a drug addict (applied to a person who is dependent upon the addicting drugs such as opium and its derivatives, synthetic narcotics, barbituates and solvents)

- 24. was currently living in a commune (six to fifteen persons of both sexes determined to reconstruct their own lives and influence others to seek meaningful work, mutual love and spiritual re-birth. Communal living may or may not be extended to include sexual relationships among members)
- 25. was currently living as a hippy (person who shuns conventional forms of dress code, habits of personal care and cleanliness and tradition values of materialism and can be identified by symbols of dress and accessories denoting hippy subculture. DRUG USE AND COMMUNAL LIVING EXCLUDED FROM THIS DEFINITION)
- 26. was of another race
- 27. had a much lower education attainment level (at least four years)
- 28. had a much higher educational attainment level (at least four years)
- 29. was of a lower socio-economic level
- 30. was of a higher socio-economic level
- 31. favored sexual relationships with other than marital partner
- 32. had no desire to bear or rear children
- 33. favored abortion
- 34. was considered sexually permissive
- 35. had totally denounced religious practice
- 36. had totally denounced religious faith

The following items were used on questionnaires for parents of a college son:

- 37. had had at least one pre-marital abortion
- 38. had given up an illegitimate child
- 39. was rearing an illegitimate child
- 40. had little sense of responsibility

The following items were used on questionnaires for parents of a college daughter:

- 37. had refused induction into the armed services
- 38. had fathered an illegitimate child

- 39. desired a large family
- 40. had little sense of responsibility

Which of the following characteristics in each set, if possessed by a prospective marital partner for your son, do you believe would be most detrimental to his marriage? If you do not believe any of the characteristics within the group would be detrimental, leave that number column blank.

- 41.
 - a) was sexually inexperienced
 - b) had had at least one pre-marital abortion
 - c) had mothered an illegitimate child
 - d) was rearing an illegitimate child
 - e) had rather liberal attitudes toward extra-marital sex
- 42.
 - a) was a drug user
 - b) was a drug addict
 - c) drank heavily (alcoholic beverages)
 - d) had neurotic tendencies
 - e) had a major physical handicap
- 43.
 - a) was from a higher socio-economic background
 - b) was from a lower socio-economic background
 - c) was from a higher educational attainment level
 - d) was from a lower educational attainment level
- 44.
 - a) was of another race
 - b) was of same race but another nationality
 - c) was of another major religious faith
 - d) had no religious belief
- 45.
 - a) was apathetic toward religion
 - b) had denounced religious faith
 - c) was politically extreme
 - d) was extremely conservative (politically)
 - e) was extremely prejudiced
- 46.
 - a) was irresponsible
 - b) had communal living experience
 - c) was a hippy
 - d) was an extreme advocate of the womans' liberation movement
- 47.
 - a) insisted on a large family
 - b) insisted on no children, either by birth or adoption
 - c) was unwilling to practice birth control
 - d) insisted on adopting children rather than having own children

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Barash, Meyer, and Scourby, Alice, eds. Marriage. New York: Random House, 1970.
- Bell, Robert. Social Deviance. New York: The Dorsey Press, 1971.
- Bialock, Hubert M., Jr. Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960.
- Bruning, James L. and Kintz, B. L. Computational Handbook of Statistics. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1968.
- Burchinal, Lee G. "The Premarital Dyad and Love Involvement," in Handbook of Marriage and the Family, ed. by Harold T. Christensen. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1964.
- Burgess, Ernest W., and Locke, Harvey J. The Family. New York: American Book Co., 1945.
- _____, and Wallin, Paul. Engagement and Marriage. Chicago: Lippincott, 1953.
- Glass, Gene V., and Stanley, Julian C. Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1970.
- Jones, Kenneth L.; Shainberg, Louis W.; and Byer, Curtis O. Drugs and Alcohol. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.
- Kluckhohn, Florence R., and Strodtbeck, Fred L. Variations in Value Orientations. New York: Row, Peterson and Company, 1961.
- Michener, James. Kent State—What Happened and Why. New York: Random House, 1971.
- Michael, Donald. The Next Generation. New York: Random House, 1963.
- Nimkoff, Meyer F. Marriage and the Family. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1947.
- Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.

Skolnick, Arlene, and Skolnick, Jerome. Family in Transition. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971

Thurstone, L. L., and Chaves, E. J. The Measurement of Attitude. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929.

Zimmerman, Carle C. The Family and Civilization. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947.

Articles and Periodicals

Akron Beacon Journal, "Fifty-six Pct. Frown on Laws Banning Interracial Marriages," Thursday, September 10, 1970.

Akron Beacon Journal, "Illegitimacy Is Exploding," Sunday, October 8, 1967.

Baber, Ray. "Some Mate Selection Standards of College Students and Their Parents." Journal of Social Hygiene, XXII (March, 1936), 115-25.

Bates, Alan. "Parental Roles in Courtship." Social Forces, XX (May, 1942), 483-486.

Bell, Robert. "Parent-Child Conflict in Sexual Values." Journal of Social Issues, XXII (April, 1966), 34-44.

_____, and Buerkley. "Mother and Daughter Attitudes Toward Premarital Sexual Behavior." Marriage and Family Living, 1961, XXXIII (February, 1961), 390-92.

_____, and Chaskes, Jay. "Premarital Sexual Experience Among Coeds, 1958 and 1968." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXII (February, 1970), 81-84.

Bernard, William. "Student Attitudes on Marriage and the Family." American Sociological Review, III (June, 1938), 354-61.

Blood, Robert, Jr. "Uniformities and Diversities in Campus Dating Preferences." Marriage and Family Living, XVIII (February, 1956), 37-44.

_____. "A Retest of Waller's Rating Complex." Marriage and Family Living, XVII (February, 1955), 41-47.

Bossard, James. "Residential Propinquity as a Factor in Marriage." American Journal of Sociology, XXXVIII (September, 1932), 219-22.

Bowerman, C. E. and Day, Barbara R. "A Test of the Theory of Complementary Needs as Applied to Couples During Courtship." American Sociological Review, XXI (October, 1956), 602-05.

- Christensen, Harold T. "Student Views on Mate Selection." Marriage and Family Living, IX (Autumn, 1947), 85-88.
- _____, and Gregg, Christina F. "Shifting Sex Norms in America and Scandinavia." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXII (November, 1970), 616-27.
- Coombs, Robert H. "Reinforcement of Values in the Parental Home as a Factor in Mate Selection." Marriage and Family Living, XIV (May, 1962), 155-57.
- _____, and Kenkel, William F. "Sex Differences in Dating Aspirations and Satisfaction with Computer Arranged Partners." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXVIII (February, 1966), 62-69.
- Delora, Jack. "Social Systems of Dating on a College Campus." Marriage and Family Living, XXV (February, 1963), 81-83.
- Gallup, George. "Students' Drug Use is Rising." Akron Beacon Journal, January 17, 1971.
- Glick, Paul C. and Landau, E. "Age as a Factor in Marriage." American Sociological Review, XV (February, 1950), 517-29.
- Golden, Joseph. "Characteristics of the Negro-white Intermarried in Philadelphia." American Sociological Review, XVIII (April, 1953), 18, 177-83.
- Folsom, Joseph K. "Changing Values in Sex and Family Relations." American Sociological Review, II (October, 1937), 717-25.
- Herr, David. "Negro-White Marriage in the United States." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXVIII (August, 1966), 262-73.
- Hill, Reuben. "Campus Values in Mate Selection." Journal of Home Economics, XXXVII (November, 1945), 554-58.
- Hollingshead, August B. "Cultural Factors in the Selection of Marriage Mates." American Sociological Review, XV (October, 1950), 619-27.
- Hudson, John and Henze, Lura F. "Campus Values in Mate Selection: A Replication." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXI (November, 1969), 772-75.
- Karp, Ellen S.; Jackson, Julie H.; and Lester, David. "Ideal-Self Fulfillment in Mate Selection: A Corollary to the Complementary Need Theory in Mate Selection." Journal of Marriage and Family, XXXII (May, 1970), 269-72.

- Kelly, E. Lowell. "Consistency of the Adult Personality." American Psychologists, X (November, 1955), 659-81.
- Kerckhoff, Allan C. and Davis, Keith E. "Value Consensus and Need Complementarity in Mate Selection." American Sociological Review, LXII (June, 1962), 295-303.
- Kirkpatrick, Clifford and Caplow, Theodore. "Courtship in a Group of Minnesota Students." American Journal of Sociology, LI (January, 1945), 51, 114-25.
- Kohlmann, Eleanore L. "Personal Values—What are They?" Journal of Home Economics, LIV (December, 1962), 819-22.
- Koller, Marvin R. "Residential and Occupational Propinquity." American Sociological Review, XIII (October, 1948), 613-16.
- Ktsanes, T. "Mate Selection on the Basis of Personality Type: A Study Utilizing an Empirical Typology of Personality." American Sociological Review, XX (October, 1955), 20, 547-551.
- Leslie, G. R. and Richardson, A. H. "Family Versus Campus Influences in Relation to Mate Selection." Social Problems, IV (October, 1956), 117-20.
- Lowrie, Samuel H. "Dating Theories and Student Responses." American Sociological Review, XVI (June 3, 1951), 334-40.
- McGinnis, Robert. "Campus Values in Mate Selection: A Repeat Study." Social Forces, XXXVI (May, 1959), 368-73.
- McCormick, Thomas C. and Macrory, Boyd E. "Group Values in Mate Selection, in a Sample of College Girls." Social Forces, XXII (October-May, 1943-44), 315-17.
- Maxwell, Joseph. "College Students' Attitudes Toward Abortion." The Family Coordinator, IXX (July, 1970), 247-52.
- Murstein, Bernard I. "Stimulus - Value - Role: A Theory of Marital Choice." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXII (August, 1970), 465-480.
- "The New Youth Poll." Life, January 8, 1971, 26.
- Pope, Hallowell and Knudsen, Dean D. "Premarital Sexual Norms, The Family and Social Change." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXVII (August, 1965), 314-323.

- Winch, Robert F. "Interrelations between Certain Social Background and Parent-Son Factors in a Study of Courtship Among College Men." American Sociological Review, XI (June, 1946), 333-41.
- _____. "The Relation Between Courtship Behavior and Attitudes Toward Parents Among College Men." American Sociological Review, VIII (April, 1943), 164-74.
- _____. "Primary Factors in a Study of Courtship." American Sociological Review, XII (December, 1947), 658-66.
- _____. "The Theory of Complementary Needs in Mate-Selection: Final Results on the Test of General Hypothesis." American Sociological Review, XX (October, 1955), 552-55.
- _____; Ktsanes, T.; and Ktsanes, V. "Empirical Elaboration of the Theory of Complementary Needs in Mate Selection." Journal of Abnormal Psychology, LI (June, 1953), 508-13.
- _____; Ktsanes, T.; and Ktsanes, V. "The Theory of Complementary Needs in Mate-Selection; An Analytic and Descriptive Study." American Sociological Review, XIX, (June, 1954), 241-49.

Unpublished Material

- American Social Health Association. The Price of Ignorance. A Report Prepared by the American Social Health Association, New York, 1970.
- Kaufman, Karl. "Understanding and Meeting Problems of Drug Abuse." Paper Presented for the Family Life Education Conference, Bloomington: Indiana University, April 20, 1971.