

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Helen Grove entitled "Social-Psychological Predictors of Attitudes Toward Premarital Sexual Permissiveness Among College Women." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Home Economics.

Priscilla N. White

Priscilla N. White

Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Jocelyn Coughlin

Ruth Highberger

Roger W. Dewey

Accepted for the Council:

L. Evans Good

Vice Chancellor

Graduate Studies and Research

Thesis
806
.G769
cop. 2

SOCIAL-PSYCHOLOGICAL PREDICTORS OF ATTITUDES
TOWARD PREMARITAL SEXUAL PERMISSIVENESS
AMONG COLLEGE WOMEN

A Dissertation
Presented for the
Doctor of Philosophy
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Helen Grove

March 1980

1413834

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is not possible to acknowledge fully the efforts of the colleagues, teachers, friends, and family who have contributed in such meaningful ways to my professional and personal growth. I would like, however, to express my sincere appreciation to those individuals whose support and guidance have been especially meaningful.

To my parents, Robert and Mary Grove, I wish to express my love and continuing commitment. Their support, encouragement, and faith in my abilities have served to help me find direction in my life and work.

John Porter, my supervisor, colleague, and friend, has enthusiastically supported my professional development. I wish to express my warm thanks to him for his continuing interest.

Sincere appreciation is expressed to the members of my doctoral committee—Drs. Jo Lynn Cunningham, Ruth Highberger, Roger Swagler, and Priscilla White. Their knowledge, guidance, and warm support have greatly enhanced my graduate study and professional pursuits.

My profound gratitude is expressed to Dr. Priscilla White who has served for me as a model of both professional and personal excellence. The acceptance, encouragement, and direction she has provided have richly contributed to my experience.

ABSTRACT

This study was done in an attempt to identify social-psychological predictors of attitudes toward premarital sexual permissiveness among college women. An interactional framework was used as a conceptual basis for the study; variables of interest were from the general areas of sociodemographic characteristics, reference group characteristics and heterosexual socialization experiences.

An availability sample of 87 undergraduate women students from The University of Tennessee, Knoxville was used in this study. All participants were in school and tested during the summer quarter of 1976. Women who were or had been married, who were nonwhite, or who were not United States citizens at birth were excluded from this study. The mean age of participants was 20.5 years. The sample included 7 sophmores, 32 juniors, and 48 seniors.

A questionnaire approach was used to collect data. Five questionnaires were used in this study. Attitudes toward premarital sexual behavior were assessed by the Reiss Premarital Sexual Permissiveness Scale. Sex-role orientation was measured by the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. Attitudes toward love were assessed by the Knox-Sporakowski Attitudes Toward Love Scale. Sociodemographic information was collected through the use of a Background Data Sheet

developed by the researcher. Finally, a Personal History Inventory was constructed by the researcher to gather information relevant to the personal and family backgrounds of the participants.

Data were analyzed by means of a stepwise multiple regression procedure. Predictor variables were grouped conceptually into the categories of sociodemographic characteristics, reference group characteristics, and heterosexual socialization experiences. The criterion variable was the score on the Reiss Premarital Sexual Permissiveness Scale.

The model used in this study explained 73% of the variation in attitudes held toward premarital sexual permissiveness and was significant at a .001 level of confidence. It was concluded that the predictor variables were related to attitudes held toward premarital sexual permissiveness.

The regression coefficients for the variables religious affiliation, subject's direct assessment of her permissiveness, size of hometown, and mother's educational level were all significant. It can be concluded that these four variables were strong predictors of premarital sexual standards.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Rationale for this Study	3
Conceptual Framework	3
Nominal Definitions	5
Statement of the Problem	6
Assumptions	7
II. REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH	8
The Range of Research and Theory on Premarital Sexuality	10
Sociodemographic Variables	13
Reference Group Influences	15
Heterosexual Socialization	18
Summary	23
III. METHODS	26
Subjects	26
Instrumentation	31
Reiss Premarital Sexual Permissiveness Scale	31
Bem Sex Role Inventory	32
Knox-Sporakowski Attitudes Toward Love Scale	32
Background Data Sheet and Personal History Inventory	33
Data Collection	34
Operational Definitions	35
Null Hypothesis	35
Statistical Procedures	36
IV. RESULTS	38
Regression Analyses	38
Intercorrelations Among Selected Independent Variables	43
Summary of Results	43
V. DISCUSSION	47
The Regression Model	47
Implications for Theory, Research, and Practice	52

PAGE

Limitations of the Study	54
Conclusion	56
LIST OF REFERENCES	57
APPENDICES	62
Appendix A	63
Appendix B	66
Appendix C	81
Appendix D	83
VITA	93

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Permissiveness of Subjects, Parents, and Peers	30
2. Crosstabulation of the Bem Sex Role Inventory by the Reiss Premarital Sexual Permissiveness Scale	39
3. Relative Contribution of Predictor Variables to Attitudes toward Premarital Sexual Permissiveness In a Stepwise Regression Analysis	41
4. Analysis of Variance on Regression Equation . . .	42
5. Regression Coefficients and Beta Weights for Regression Equation	44
6. Correlations among Selected Predictor Variables	45
D-1. Correlations of Predictor Variables	84

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The scientific study of premarital sexuality has reflected popular concern with the incidence of premarital sexual behavior and increasing trends toward permissiveness. Strong concern has been raised in recent years over "the sexual revolution," which is accepted widely as having occurred and assumed to represent an overthrow of traditional norms and values regarding sexual expression. Yet an examination of available research evidence indicates that changes in sexual behavior, although significant for females, have not been as drastic as commonly believed. Instead, significant change has occurred in the attitudes people hold toward sexual behavior, both for themselves and for others. Questions must also be raised as to whether increases in premarital coital rates reflect "revolutionary" change from traditional norms and values. In a nationwide survey, Morton Hunt (1973) found that the vast majority of respondents in all age categories still believed sexual relations to be most meaningful when occurring in the context of love or strong affection. Thus, if the recent changes in premarital sexuality reflect greater attitudinal than behavioral shifts, it is important that these attitudes and the forces shaping them be more fully understood.

Attitudes represent only one dimension of premarital sexuality. Physiological functioning, behavioral expression, cultural influence, and interpersonal relationships are also important for a more complete understanding of sexuality in young adulthood. But attitudes influence each of these other dimensions and have important implications for individual growth and functioning. Given the significance of attitudes, it is noteworthy that they have received the least attention in the research literature.

It is appropriate that the study of sexual attitudes during late adolescence and young adulthood be undertaken apart from the study of attitudes during other phases of the life cycle. Some of the developmental issues of the years from 17 to 23 influence and are influenced by a attitudes toward sexuality. Erikson (1950) identified the stage-critical tasks for these years as the need to establish a sense of identity and the need to establish intimacy. Attitudes toward one's sexuality are inextricably bound to one's attitudes toward self and intimate others. Recent evidence on loneliness indicates that many contemporary adolescents and young adults are having trouble establishing satisfying intimate relations. This is a time when the individual struggles with attitudes about many issues of identity, and sexuality is often one of the most difficult of these issues. Information on attitude formation and

change during these years in relation to sexual issues is necessary for alleviating some of the confusion evidenced by many adolescents and young adults.

Rationale for this Study

The present study was focused on the attitudes held by college women toward premarital sexual permissiveness. An investigation of the attitudes of young women was deemed important because changing cultural expectations for women in recent years have had a significant impact on all aspects of the lives of women, including their sexuality. However, little empirical information was available to describe the nature of this impact. Previously identified correlates and predictors of the sexual attitudes held by women may be no longer applicable. Previous investigations have been limited by the relatively few influences on sexual attitudes examined. A need exists for careful investigation of the many socializing influences on the development of attitudes toward sexual expression.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework used in this study was that of symbolic interaction. Concepts central to this framework include social interaction as the basis for identity formation, significant others, reference groups, and socialization.

Sexual attitudes are assumed to develop and change in much the same way as other attitudes. Central to this process is the concept of socialization. Socialization is a process of social interaction through which the individual internalizes the dominant attitudes, beliefs, and values of his/her cultural groups. In this study of sexual attitudes, individuals were assumed to develop attitudes as a result of their interaction with significant others and reference groups, specifically peers, family members, and religious affiliations. The relationship between sexual attitudes held by significant others and the attitudes of the individual has been identified previously in the literature (e.g., Davis, 1969; Reiss, 1967; Teevan, 1972; Walsh, Ferrell, & Tolone, 1976). Dating experiences were viewed also as socializing experiences.

A developmental framework also had implications for the present study. College age women are assumed to be concerned with the stage critical tasks identified by Erikson (1950) (i.e., identity formation and establishment of intimate relations). Previous socialization for sexuality, or "sexualization" as discussed by Spanier (1979), is likely to influence present attitudes as well as the issues of identity and intimacy. Erikson (1950) pointed out that during these stages of development physical expressions of intimacy are particularly salient life experiences. They are related to

the resolution of critical social-psychological issues during the later stages of adulthood.

Nominal Definitions

The central concern of the present study was attitudes toward sexual permissiveness. Kerlinger (1973) defined an attitude as an organized predisposition to think, feel, perceive, and behave toward a referent or cognitive object. Reiss (1960) used the term sexual standard as a synonym for the attitude held toward the referent of sexual behavior. He defined sexual standard as the level of sexual behavior acceptable to an individual or group based on a balanced hierarchy of values. In this society there are four primary standards for premarital sexual behavior: abstinence, permissiveness with affection, permissiveness without affection, and the double standard.

Attitudes play an important part in the processes of identification and role formation. Of particular interest in this study was sex-role identification, which was defined as the degree to which the individual's behavior and attitudes coincide with cultural stereotypes of masculinity and femininity (Hillbrun, 1968).

Attitudes toward the referent of love have been discussed by Knox and Sporakowski (1968). They identified two primary attitudes toward love. Romantic attitudes are

characterized by idealization of the partner, exclusivity, and mysticism. Conjugal attitudes are more realistic and less idealistic in reference to interpersonal and sexual relationships. This type of love is perceived as long term and stable, yet periodically problematic, with mutual effort and support required for maintenance.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to identify the attitudes held by unmarried college women toward premarital sexual permissiveness and the relationship of selected factors to these attitudes. Of particular interest were the factors of sex-role identification, attitudes toward love, dating experience, religious affiliation, and selected personal and family background factors. In addition to the relationship between specified variables and premarital sexual permissiveness, attempts were made to identify those factors which were more predictive of attitudes. More specifically, the general objective of this study was to identify correlates of attitudes held by college women toward premarital sexual permissiveness. The specific objectives were to examine the relationships between the following: (a) heterosexual socialization experiences and attitudes toward premarital sexual permissiveness, (b) reference group influences and attitudes toward premarital sexual permissiveness, and (c)

selected sociodemographic characteristics and attitudes toward premarital sexual permissiveness.

Assumptions

The formulation of the research problem and the methodological approach used in the present study evolved from the premises of certain assumptions. These basic assumptions were: (a) attitudes are formed in part by interactions with significant others and reference groups, (b) human development and sexuality can be understood fully only by securing knowledge about both attitudes and behavior, (c) attitudes are affected by previous experiences and will affect future experiences of the individual, and (d) attitudes can be ascertained from self-report data.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

Permissiveness associated with premarital sexual attitudes and behavior has been an important focus in marriage and family literature during the past three decades. Much early research came from family sociology and represented an attempt to examine the implications of premarital sexually permissive behavior for the functioning and maintenance of the institutions of marriage and family. Of particular concern was whether nonvirginity at marriage, especially on the part of females, contributed to marital instability.

As illustrated in the writings of Kirkendall (1961) and Kirkendall and Libby (1966), the focus was shifted in the 1960s to an examination of premarital sexuality in the context of interpersonal relationships. The previous trend toward moralizing declined and was replaced by a growing interest in the affective consequences of premarital sexual permissiveness.

Research in the area of human sexuality, including premarital sexuality, has been focused more on behavior than on attitudes. Numerous attempts have been made in recent years to identify rates and trends of premarital coitus. Claims made in the media and especially in popular literature of a "sexual revolution" among unmarried adolescents and

young adults are questionable in light of findings that changes in premarital coital rates have not been revolutionary (Gagnon, 1966; Hunt, 1970; King, Balswick, & Robinson, 1977; Robinson, King, Dudley, & Clune, 1968). Although an increase in premarital sexual intercourse has occurred among females, the most revealing finding in these studies is that attitudes toward premarital sex have changed far more than actual behavior. Given these changes in attitude, it is noteworthy that the focus in the literature has been and continues to be largely on behavior.

Many recent attempts to examine attitudes toward premarital sexual permissiveness have been of peripheral interest in some behavioral studies and have been designed only to examine changing trends. There remains a need for careful and ongoing investigation of the correlates and determinants of attitudes toward premarital sexual permissiveness. A major limitation of the work of researchers who have attempted such examination has been seen in a focus on only a few independent variables and analyses that do not involve multivariate models. Given the multitude of correlates tentatively identified over the years, research efforts are needed to identify the complex of influences which shape attitudes toward premarital sexuality.

The Range of Research and Theory
on Premarital Sexuality

The major contributor to the research literature on premarital sexual attitudes has been Ira Reiss. His work has provided an empirical data base, theoretical foundation, and methodological refinement of the study of premarital sexual attitudes. In his initial work, Reiss (1960) identified four sexual standards (or categories of attitude) which have served as an important conceptual model for subsequent research by Reiss and others. These standards as defined by Reiss are:

- (a) Abstinence—Premarital intercourse is wrong for both men and women, regardless of the circumstance.
- (b) Permissiveness with Affection—Premarital intercourse is right for both men and women under certain conditions when a stable relationship with engagement, love or strong affection is present.
- (c) Permissiveness without Affection—Premarital intercourse is right for both men and women regardless of the amount of affection or stability present, providing there is physical attraction.
- (d) Double standard—Premarital intercourse is acceptable for men, but is wrong and unacceptable for women. (pp. 83-84)

In 1967, Reiss published the first study of premarital sexual standards using a national probability sample. For this study Reiss developed a Guttman-type scale for the measurement of permissiveness which gives the individual an opportunity to indicate the level of permissiveness

deemed appropriate for the degree of emotional intimacy in the relationship. High school, college, and adult populations were surveyed in an attempt to identify standards held and variables predictive of these standards. Sex research until that point had been focused on behavior to the exclusion of attitudes. As Reiss pointed out, attitudes play a significant role in the understanding of sexuality and are important to the individual when attitudes and behavior are discrepant.

Based on the empirical findings of this study, Reiss formulated seven tentative propositions from which he developed the following theory:

The degree of acceptable premarital sexual permissiveness in a courtship group varies directly with the degree of autonomy of the courtship group and with the degree of acceptable premarital sexual permissiveness in the social and cultural setting outside the group (p. 167).

Harold Christensen has also contributed to the status of theory in the investigation of premarital sexual standards. Based on a group of studies (Christensen, 1958, 1960, 1963, 1966; Christensen & Carpenter 1962a, 1962b; Christensen & Cannon, 1964) focused on differences in sexual permissiveness and behavior among three cultural groups (Danish, Midwestern, and Mormon), Christensen developed a series of generalizations and propositions and subsequently a "Theory of Relative Consequence" in which he stated the following:

Both the behavior itself and the resulting effects of premarital sexual intimacy are in part dependent upon differing cultural norms, plus the conversion of these norms into individual values; and the negative consequences are greatest in restrictive societies where behavior is most deviant from existing standards (both cultural and personal). (p. 220)

An important contribution to the field of theory has been the work of Burr (1973) in which he has focused on theory building in reference to the family. In his theoretical model which focused on premarital sexual attitudes and behavior, he presented twenty propositions based on the work of Reiss (1967) and Christensen (1969). Burr sought to refine and clarify earlier theoretical propositions in order that they could be tested and expanded more readily. He also integrated his propositions with one another and with other areas of family theory. Examples of the propositions he developed include the following:

Proposition 2: The proscriptiveness of norms about premarital sexual behavior positively influences the amount of deviation from the norms. (p. 5)

Proposition 15: The extent to which significant reference relationships exist with family members is inversely related to the sensitivity of premarital sexual norms to social forces. (p. 29)

Proposition 19: Liberality inversely influences permissiveness. (p. 32)

Since the publication of Reiss' original propositions and general theoretical statement, a number of studies have

been conducted which contribute to further formulation and refinement of theoretical relationships. Reiss and Miller (1979) reviewed current evidence for the original seven propositions and reformulated and expanded them into 26 propositional statements. Additionally, the propositions put forth by Christensen (1960) were reformulated and integrated with the Reiss-Miller propositions. Given the relatively comprehensive theory of premarital sexual permissiveness presented by Reiss and Miller, attention is currently being focused on formulating a theory of heterosexual permissiveness which can be generalized to marital and extramarital sexuality.

Sociodemographic Variables

An assumption frequently reported in sociological literature is that persons of higher socioeconomic status are relatively conservative in their standards for premarital sexual permissiveness, although persons of lower socioeconomic status tend toward more liberal levels of permissiveness. This belief was supported in the findings of Alfred Kinsey's first report (1948). Despite serious sampling limitations, the Kinsey findings served as the basis for most of the discussion of social class influences on premarital sexual permissiveness until the mid 1960s. Using a national probability sample of students, Reiss (1967)

failed to find the expected negative relationship between social class and premarital sexual permissiveness. Subsequent examination of this relationship has been limited and findings have been contradictory. Bayer (1977), in a national cross-sample of college males and females, found positive correlations between parents' income and the students' level of premarital sexual permissiveness and between fathers' educational level and students' level of premarital sexual permissiveness.

Despite the absence of differences between social class groups in terms of sexual permissiveness, Reiss indicated that there were sharp differences within each social class. He then grouped respondents according to whether they were from liberal or conservative settings. In this study, a liberal setting involved such characteristics as living in a town of 100,000 or more, living in New England or Mid-Atlantic regions, being divorced, being Jewish, and having low church attendance. A conservative setting involved living in a town of 10,000 or less, being Protestant, living in the South Atlantic region, and low church attendance. Reiss found that for those individuals from a conservative setting, a negative relationship existed between social class and premarital sexual permissiveness, whereas for those persons from a liberal setting, a positive relationship existed. Reiss thus concluded that a liberal

or conservative lifestyle is a more important factor in determining attitude toward premarital sexual permissiveness than is social class.

This liberal-conservative dimension was examined further in four subsequent studies (Bayer, 1977; Koomen, 1970; Libby & Nass, 1971; Maranell, Dodder, & Mitchell, 1970). In each of these studies, direct self-report measures of the liberal-conservative dimensions for individuals were used in preference to Reiss' indirect assessment of the liberal-conservative settings in which subjects lived. None of these four studies provided support for Reiss' findings.

The relationship between social class and premarital sexual permissiveness has not been examined adequately. It is possible that the liberal/conservative factor suggested by Reiss is significant, but other factors may also intervene. As pointed out by Otto (1975), the differential effects of components of socioeconomic status should be examined carefully. Available empirical evidence suggests that the assumption of a negative relationship between social class and level of premarital sexual permissiveness is questionable.

Reference Group Influences

Reference group theory frequently has been used in attempts to explain variations in attitudes toward premarital sexual permissiveness. Teevan (1972) defined a reference

group as "an audience consisting of real or imaginary personifications to whom certain values are imputed. It is an audience before whom a person tries to maintain or enhance his standings" (p. 283). In the study of premarital sexual permissiveness, the reference groups most frequently examined have been the family, peer groups, and religion.

The conclusion that the attitudes of parents toward premarital sexual permissiveness positively relate to the attitudes of daughters has been supported empirically. Reiss (1967) found that those females who perceived their sexual standards as being similar to standards held by both mother and father showed a much lower level of permissiveness than those who perceived their standards as being dissimilar to parents' standards. Teevan (1972), Walsh, Ferrell, and Tolone (1976) and Libby, Gray, and White (1978) also reported a negative relationship between identification with parental standards and the permissiveness of personal sexual standards. The affective dimensions of the parent-daughter relationship and their possible impact on the daughter's sexual permissiveness largely have been ignored in previous studies. Reiss (1967) asked respondents to rate their happiness/unhappiness with family relationships and found that those daughters who were unhappy with their family relationships tended to hold more permissive attitudes. Further examination of the emotional quality of father-daughter and mother-daughter relationships is needed.

One of the most significant predictors of attitudes toward premarital sexual permissiveness is attitudes held by close friends and the general peer group. Studies by Reiss (1967), Davis (1969), Teevan (1972), Davis (1974), and Walsh, Ferrell, and Tolone (1976) all revealed a positive relationship between the permissiveness of female respondents' attitudes and those of their peers. Only a study by Libby, Gray, and White (1978) failed to find peer influence a significant factor in relationship to females' attitudes.

A question in need of further examination is the relative influence of parents versus peers in determining the permissiveness of college-age females. A general conclusion often cited is that peer group influence has a short-term impact on individual attitudes and family influence is overriding and longer term. A number of researchers have suggested that peer influences are stronger than parental influences in their impact on attitudes toward premarital sexual permissiveness (Davis, 1969; Reiss, 1967; Teevan, 1972; Walsh, Ferrell & Tolone, 1976). Davis (1974) indicated that parental and peer influences were of equal importance. One consideration in interpreting these findings is that data for each study generally were collected at one point in time, thus revealing little about the long-term or ongoing impact of parent versus peer influences. Only Walsh, Ferrell, and Tolone (1976) used both longitudinal

and cross-sectional designs. Findings indicated that peer orientation and identification increased over the course of the students' college career.

Another reference group influence frequently cited as predictive of premarital sexual permissiveness is religious affiliation. Numerous studies have examined the relationship between these two variables (Bayer, 1977; Burgess & Wallin, 1953; Croake & James, 1973; Ehrman, 1964; Hatch, 1968; Heltsley & Broderick, 1969; Jackson & Potkay, 1973; Kelly, 1978; Kinsey, 1953; Libby, Gray & White, 1978; Prince, 1958; Thomas, 1973). In general, they found a negative relationship between religiosity and level of permissiveness which is stronger for females than males. Religious affiliation (Protestant, Catholic, or Jewish) was not as important a predictor as was religiosity (as measured by church attendance or self-report data). Results of a 1978 study by King et al. suggested that the relationship between religiosity and premarital sexual attitudes is most clearly understood if religiosity is measured by attitudinal criteria rather than criteria such as church attendance.

Heterosexual Socialization

An assumption often reported in the literature is that early and frequent dating experiences lead to sexually permissive attitudes and behavior. Several researchers have

verified a positive relationship between dating experience and premarital coital behavior (Curran, Neff, & Lippold, 1973; Ehrman, 1959; and Lewis, 1973). However, the impact of dating experience on attitudes is delineated less clearly. In an effort to examine this relationship, Reiss (1967) compared attitudes toward premarital sexual permissiveness with the age at which individuals began dating, the exclusiveness of their dating relationships, and the number of times individuals had gone steady. He found some support for exclusiveness of dating relationships and number of times of having gone steady as being related positively to permissiveness. Age at which subjects began dating was not a predictor. In an attempt by Libby, Gray, and White (1978) to retest Reiss' findings, dating experiences were not found to be predictive of premarital sexual permissiveness. A study by Hatch (1968) of Mormon students found no difference in permissiveness levels of those who were or had been pinned, engaged, or married. This study is of limited usefulness in clarifying the relationship between dating experience and permissiveness because of the homogeneous nature of the sample.

The relationship between love and premarital sexual permissiveness has received little attention in the research literature. Much of the published literature on romanticism is historical or speculative in nature, partly because of an

assumption that love cannot be understood by empirical means. Morton Hunt (1970) and others have examined the origins of romantic love in contemporary western culture. Romanticism appears to have originated during the 12th century, when love as an emotion reached an exalted status in European countries. Central to this notion of romanticism was the belief that love was possible only where sexual relations were prohibited. Wilkinson (1978) has discussed a similar relationship between love and sex occurring in a variety of cultural settings and hypothesized that romantic love is most prevalent in those societies in which restrictions are placed on premarital sexual activity.

Reiss (1967) and Knox and Sporakowski (1968) attempted to examine love empirically by developing scales designed to reflect romantic or conjugal orientations toward love. Reiss used his scale in his study of attitudes toward premarital sexual permissiveness. He found that romantic attitudes toward love were related positively to premarital sexual permissiveness, as was the number of times respondents reported having been in love. Ludwig (1973-74) revealed a negative relationship between romantic love and permissive attitudes toward premarital sex. Given serious sampling and methodological limitations in the Ludwig study, Reiss' findings might be considered the more valid although not definitive. Further examination of this relationship is

needed. Researchers who have studied premarital sexual behavior report that unmarried females are more likely to engage in coitus if they are in love with or engaged to their partner (Ehrman, 1959; Eysenck, 1971; Hunt, 1970; Kinsey, 1953) thus suggesting that love is an important variable. Its relationship to attitudes rather than behavior has not been defined clearly.

A relationship between sex-role identity and sexual attitudes frequently is inferred but has not been given empirical support in the research literature. Davis (1974) cited the lack of attention to the sexual socialization process and the possible implications of changing sex roles for changes in sexual attitudes. Much of the available information regarding the relationship between sex role identification and sexual attitudes is speculative and theoretical in nature, frequently found in popular literature. Nancy Friday in My Mother, My Self (1977) argued that the daughter's attitudes toward sexual relationships are tied closely to notions of sex-role appropriate behavior conveyed by the mother. Despite the popularity of Friday's work and its possible conceptual merit, empirical validation is lacking for the ideas presented. The persistence of the double standard also raises question about a relationship between sex-role identification and attitudes toward permissiveness.

Reiss (1960) identified two subtypes of the double standard, orthodox and transitional. According to Reiss, the orthodox double standard dictates that sexual experience before marriage is accepted and valued for the male but prohibited for the female. The transitional double standard permits sexual experience for males before marriage regardless of the emotional involvement in the relationship, whereas premarital sexual experience for females is acceptable only when they are in love with or engaged to their partner. Reiss (1967) and other researchers have indicated that the double standard, although declining in popularity, still is advocated by many people, at least overtly. The double standard has traditionally been the dominant standard in western cultures. Women who identify closely with traditional sex-roles are likely to have relatively nonpermissive attitudes about premarital sexual involvement if the concept of the double standard is accurate.

Physical attractiveness has been reported to have a positive impact on interpersonal relations in general (Freedman, Carlsmith, & Sears, 1970) and dating relationships in particular (Curran, 1972). Studies of dating preferences among adolescents and college students frequently have specified physical attractiveness as an important characteristic for a dating partner. Little attention has been devoted to the relationship between attractiveness and

premarital sexual behavior, and no one has examined attractiveness in relation to sexual attitudes. In a study of the incidence of premarital coitus among college women, Kaats and Davis (1970) found that those females who were more attractive were more likely than less attractive women to date often and to have engaged in coitus. Physical attractiveness in their study was rated by the investigators. Another dimension of attractiveness that may be related more strongly to a woman's sexual attitudes is her perception of her attractiveness and how satisfied she is with her attractiveness, (i.e., her attitude toward her attractiveness). This dimension has received little attention in the research literature.

Summary

Several conclusions can be drawn from reviewing research related to the attitudes of females toward premarital sexual permissiveness. Limitations of research on human sexuality in general are exemplified in this specific area of sex research. Data primarily have been measured indirectly. Researchers have tended to focus either on sexual attitudes or sexual behaviors and little attempt has been made to integrate these findings in a meaningful way.

Although a variety of factors related to sociodemographic characteristics, the process of heterosexual socialization,

and the role of reference groups have been examined in studies, few studies have been done in which a complex of variables was used. This narrow perspective has resulted in findings that are often contradictory or limited in the extent to which they may be used to foster a wholistic conceptualization of the influences on sexual standards. Therefore, implications of these findings for practitioners have been minimal.

Research in this area appears to come primarily from a sociological perspective exemplified by the work of Kinsey (1953) and Reiss (1967) or to a lesser extent from a psychological perspective exemplified by the work of Kirkendall (1961). When one looks at the theoretical developments in this area, it is obvious that a blending of these approaches would enhance the understanding of attitudes toward premarital sexual permissiveness. Reiss and Miller (1979) discussed the concept of autonomy as it relates to permissiveness. This most current attempt at theoretical formulation provides support for a social-psychological perspective which would broaden the conceptual basis for research in the area.

The present study is an initial attempt to use a multivariate, social-psychological perspective as the basis for research in this area. Certainly further efforts will need to be made to provide a more complete understanding of

attitudes toward premarital sexual permissiveness. However, early attempts at identifying and using different perspectives to problems can help in the process of identifying new research imperatives.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

Subjects

An availability sample of 87 undergraduate women students was used in this study. All participants were enrolled for the summer quarter, 1976, at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Respondents who were married or had been married, who were non-white, or who were not United States citizens at birth were excluded from this study.

The mean age of the participants was 20.5 years. The sample included 7 sophomores, 32 juniors, and 48 seniors. The absence of freshmen in this sample resulted from the lack of accessibility for research purposes to basic freshman level courses.

Size of high school senior class was used to indicate the size of high school as well as the size of the available peer reference group. Students were assumed to be able to estimate more accurately the size of their graduating class than the size of the total high school population. The distribution of subjects in this study according to size of high school senior class was as follows: 2% were from classes of 50 students or less, 25% from classes of 50-200 students, 55% from classes of 200-500, 8% from classes of

500-1000, and 6% from classes of 1000-2000. The most frequently reported estimation of class size was 50-200 students.

Size of home town was assumed also to reflect size of available peer reference groups of the women in the sample. Of the group of participants, 40% of the subjects were from towns with 100,000 population or greater, 2% from towns of 50,000-100,000, 12% from towns of 25,000-50,000, 31% from towns of 5,000-25,000, 9% from towns of 1,000-5,000, and 6% from towns with populations under 1,000. The most frequently reported home town size was in the 25,000-50,000 range. The women in this study were almost exclusively from the southeast region of the United States.

Parents' levels of income and education were used to reflect the socioeconomic background of the students. The most frequently reported family income range was \$16,000-20,000. This income range is slightly higher than the national figures for 1976. The United States Bureau of the Census (1977) reported that 32% of families were in the income range of \$15,000-24,999 in 1976. The mean number of years of education for fathers was 14.3, and mothers had completed an average of 13.8 years of school.

The sample was also atypical in terms of religious affiliation and church attendance, variables frequently reported to be related to sexual attitudes. All of the

group of participants reported that they attended church, with 69% attending often (one or more times a week), 18% attending occasionally (two to five times within a 6 month period), and 13% attending rarely (two to four times a year). Most of the women (90%) were Protestant, 5% were Catholic, and 5% were Jewish.

An important family background factor was place in the family constellation. Ordinal position of subjects within the family of origin was distributed as follows: 7 were only children, 31 were eldest born, and 49 were later born.

Subjects were asked to rate on a four point continuum the closeness of their relationships with their father and with their mother. Participants reported somewhat closer relationships with their mothers than fathers, 42% reported they were very close to their mothers, but only 25% reported very close relationships with fathers. Overall relationships with mothers and fathers were perceived as more positive or closer than negative or distant. Participants estimated the degree of happiness in their parents' marriage; 51.7% reported their parents' marriage as very happy, 36.8% as somewhat happy, 6.9% as somewhat unhappy, and 4.6% as very unhappy.

The dating experiences of participants were examined in terms of how long they had been dating, the number of dating partners, previous and current involvement in exclusive

dating relationships, involvement in love relationships, and satisfaction of parents with their daughter's dating experience. The mean age at which subjects in this sample began dating was 15.24 years, with a range of 8 to 19 years of age and a standard deviation of 1.49. The mean number of dating partners since participants began dating was 24.74. The range for number of partners was from 2 to 100 or more. For the purposes of this study, exclusive or "steady" dating relationships were defined as dating only one person for 6 months or longer. Almost all of the women (94%) had been involved in an exclusive, long-term dating relationship at least once, with the average number of such relationships being 2.53. The greatest number of "steady" relationships was six, reported by 4.6% of the subjects. At the time of data collection, 61% of the participants were involved in an exclusive and long-term dating relationship. Only 4.6% of the respondents reported never having been involved in a dating relationship they would characterize as a love relationship. The mean number of such relationships was 1.84, with a range of 0 to 6. The great majority of participants reported that their parents were satisfied (55.2%) or very satisfied (33.3%) with their dating experience.

Subjects were asked to report their perception of permissiveness in premarital sexual attitudes for their

parents, for peers, and for themselves. The results are summarized in Table 1.

TABLE 1
Permissiveness of Subjects, Parents, and Peers

	Very conservative	Somewhat conservative	Somewhat liberal	Very liberal
Permissiveness of subjects	18.4%	24.1%	35.6%	21.8%
Permissiveness of peers	11.5%	31.0%	37.9%	19.5%
Permissiveness of parents	66.7%	23.0%	9.2%	1.1%

When participants were asked to rate their physical attractiveness and their satisfaction with their physical attractiveness, 8.1% of the subjects described themselves as very attractive, 79.3% as somewhat attractive, 12.6% as somewhat unattractive, and no subjects categorized themselves as very unattractive. The majority of subjects indicated they were somewhat or very satisfied with their physical attractiveness.

Participants were questioned about attitudes toward marrying, having children, and cohabiting. Only one subject reported that she did not plan to marry in the future, 92% anticipated having children at some point in their lives,

and 40.2% reported that they would not consider living with someone of the opposite sex without being married.

Instrumentation

A questionnaire approach was chosen as the most practical and efficient means for obtaining the desired information. Five instruments were used in this study, each chosen with a concern for its brevity and interest, as well as for its reliability and validity. In addition to these inventories, each subject completed three questionnaires. All five instruments are appended (see Appendix B).

Reiss Premarital Sexual Permissiveness Scale (RPSPS)

Attitudes toward premarital sexual behavior were assessed in terms of the individual female's level of sexual permissiveness as measured by Guttman scales developed by Ira Reiss (1967). The women were asked to rate their degree of agreement or disagreement with a listing of twelve attitudinal statements regarding premarital sexual behavior for females. On the basis of these responses, participants were assigned to one of six scale types. In the regression analysis, scores were used rather than scale types.

Reiss validated the permissiveness scales using both student and adult samples. All the samples showed a coefficient of reproducibility of about .95, a coefficient

of scalability of about .85, a minimal marginal reproducibility of about .75, and a percent pure scale type of about .55. These results compare favorably to scales used by Guttman and others. The original 12 questions selected for the scales formed a Guttman scale without any combination or dropping of questions, thus lending support for the validity of this instrument.

Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI)

The BSRI developed by Bem (1974) was chosen to measure sex-role orientation. The inventory, composed of nonorthogonal measures of masculinity and femininity, was used to control for endorsement of socially desirable traits. Participants were asked to indicate on a 7-point scale how well each of 60 personality characteristics described them. Responses to items designated by Bem as "masculine" and "feminine" were analyzed to determine differences in sex-role orientation. The BSRI was selected for its conceptual merit and reliability. High test-retest reliability figures have been established (.90) for both sex-role categories. The most recently revised scoring system (Bem & Watson, 1976) was used.

Knox-Sporakowski Attitudes Toward Love Scale

A 29-item questionnaire developed by Knox and Sporakowski (1972) was used to measure attitudes toward love.

Each respondent was asked to indicate the degree of agreement or disagreement on a 1 to 5-point scale, thus providing an indication of orientation toward love. In order to establish validity, ten professionals in the field of marriage and family living were asked to accept, reject, or modify 200 items for inclusion in the scale. Based on a 70% or greater agreement as to the items' romantic or conjugal nature, 85 of the original 200 items were retained. These 85 items were scored by a student population on a 5-point scale indicating degree of romantic or conjugal response to the item. A chi-square analysis differentiated between high-scoring and low-scoring students. Significance at the .01 level in this analysis was the basis for the inclusion of each of the 29 items of the scale. A test-retest procedure over a 1-week interval yielded a reliability coefficient of .78.

Background Data Sheet and Personal History Inventory

A background data sheet and a personal history inventory were developed by the author to assess additional relevant variables. These instruments were used to collect information on: (1) sociodemographic information, (2) personal and family background, and (3) dating experience. Both the background data sheet and the personal history inventory were subjected to review by independent judges to insure the clarity of the questions.

Data Collection

The participants in the study were solicited in the summer of 1976 through undergraduate courses in the Colleges of Liberal Arts and Home Economics and the School of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. With the prior consent of instructors, class meetings were used to request participation of subjects and administer the questionnaire. A brief description of the nature of the study preceded distribution of an "Explanation of Procedure and Informed Consent Form" (See Appendix A) and the instruments. All prospective participants were asked to read the "Explanation of Procedure and Informed Consent Form" and, if choosing to participate in the study, to sign this form before completing any of the inventories. Written instructions for completing the questionnaires accompanied each inventory, and the investigator was present to answer questions related to procedures or individual items. Most subjects required no more than 30 minutes for completion of the instruments. No potential students refused to participate in this study. Inventories with incomplete responses were discarded from the sample.

In the interest of maintaining a low level of anxiety, the instrument related to a potentially sensitive area (i.e., sexual attitudes) was placed last among the

questionnaires. The order in which the instruments were presented was as follows: (a) the background data sheet, (b) the personal history inventory, (c) the Bem Sex Role Inventory, (d) the Knox Sporakowski Attitudes Toward Love Inventory, and (e) the Reiss Premarital Sexual Permissiveness Scales.

Operational Definitions

For the purposes of this study, sex-role orientation was operationally defined as the masculinity and femininity scores earned on the BSRI. Attitudes toward premarital sexual permissiveness were defined operationally as the subjects' scale types (one of six) on the Reiss Premarital Sexual Permissiveness Scales (Reiss, 1967). The operational definition for attitude toward love was the sum total of points earned on the Knox-Sporakowski Attitudes Toward Love Inventory. The remaining variables pertaining to personal and family history, dating experience, and sociodemographic data are defined operationally as the appropriate items on the Background Data Sheet and the Personal History Inventory (see Appendix C).

Null Hypothesis

The null form of the hypothesis tested in the present study is stated as follows:

There is no relationship between selected sociodemographic characteristics, reference group characteristics, heterosexual socialization experiences, and attitudes toward premarital sexual permissiveness. In addition, it was hypothesized that there would be no relationships between the following predictor variables: (a) attitude toward love and sex-role identification, (b) closeness to mother and sex-role identification, (c) closeness to father and sex-role identification, (d) closeness to mother and attitude toward love, (e) closeness to father and attitude toward love, (f) age at which subject began dating and attitude toward love, (g) number of dating partners and attitudes toward love, (h) number of long term dating relationships and attitudes toward love, (i) current involvement in a long term dating relationship and attitude toward love, (j) number of love relationships and attitude toward love, (k) physical attractiveness and satisfaction with physical attractiveness, (l) ordinal position in family of origin and sex role identification, and (m) happiness of parents' marriage and participant's attitude toward love.

Statistical Procedures

Three statistical procedures were used in this study. A regression equation was computed to determine the relationship between the predictor variables with the

criterion variable of premarital sexual attitudes. The criterion variable in the regression equation was the score on the Reiss Premarital Sexual Permissiveness Scale. Predictor variables were entered into the regression equation in a step-wise fashion using a predetermined order of entry. Beta weights were computed for each independent variable. An alpha of .05 was selected as a criterion for significance.

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were computed between predictor variables. Relationships between nominal variables were examined by chi-square tests. Cross tabulations of selected independent variables by subscales on the Reiss Premarital Sexual Permissiveness Scale were computed.

The computer package used in this study was the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. The type of computer used was an International Business Machine 360/65.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The Reiss Premarital Sexual Permissiveness Scale (RSPSPS) was used to identify the sexual standards held by subjects. The score from this measure served as the criterion variable for the regression analysis. For descriptive purposes the distribution of participants according to subtype was: 10.3% in scale type 0, 9.2% in scale type 1, 11.5% in scale type 2, 18.4% in scale type 3, 26.4% in scale type 4, and 24.1% in scale type 5.

Responses on the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) were used to categorize participants into one of four sex-role orientations for descriptive purposes, although masculinity and femininity scores were entered in the regression equation. In this study, respondents were relatively evenly distributed across categories.

A crosstabulation of sex role orientation by scale type on the RSPSPS was calculated. Results of this cross-tabulation are presented in Table 2.

Regression Analyses

A regression equation was computed with the following independent variables: score on the Knox-Sporakowski Attitudes Toward Love Scale, masculinity and femininity

TABLE 2
Crosstabulation of the Bem Sex Role Inventory
by the Reiss Premarital Sexual
Permissiveness Scale

BSRI Score	RSPSP Score ^a		Row totals
	0-3	4-5	
Masculine			
Row percentage	44.4	55.5	0.9
total percentage	13.7	17.2	31.0
Feminine			
Row percentage	65.0	35.0	2.8
total percentage	14.8	8.0	23.0
Androgynous			
Row percentage	36.9	63.1	
total percentage	7.9	13.7	21.8
Undifferentiated			
Row percentage	52.4	47.6	
total percentage	12.5	11.4	24.1
Column totals	49.4	50.5	100

^aThe six scale types of the RSPSP were combined into two groups to more clearly show the distribution of subjects.

^b $\underline{n} = 87$.

scores on the Bem Sex Role Inventory, age at which dating began, number of dating partners, number of exclusive dating relationships, current involvement in an exclusive dating relationship, number of times in love, frequency of church attendance, religious affiliation, permissiveness of peers, permissiveness of parents, permissiveness of subject, parents' satisfaction with subject's dating experience, closeness of relationship with mother, closeness of relationship with father, happiness of parents' marriage, ordinal position in family, physical attractiveness of subject, satisfaction with physical attractiveness, size of hometown, size of high school, classification, father's educational level, mother's educational level, parents' income level, unwillingness to marry, unwillingness to cohabit, and unwillingness to have children. The predictor variables were entered into the equation using a step-wise procedure. The score on the Reiss Premarital Sexual Permissiveness Scale was used as the criterion variable. Table 3 is a summary of the relative predictive value of the predictor variables toward premarital sexual permissiveness.

As each variable was entered into the equation, an analysis of variance was calculated to determine the relative goodness of fit of the model. The overall model was significant, $F(1, 85) = 5.188, p. < .001$ (see Table 4).

TABLE 3

Relative Contribution of Predictor Variables to
Attitudes Toward Premarital Sexual
Permissiveness in A Stepwise
Regression Analysis

Variable ^a	Multiple r	r Square	r-square Change	Simple r
score on the K-S Attitude Toward Love Scale	.08	.01	.01	-.08
Unwillingness to cohabit	.63	.40	.39	-.63
Masculinity score on BSRI	.65	.42	.02	.18
Femininity score on BSRI	.65	.42	.00	-.16
Age at which subject began dating	.65	.43	.01	.01
Number of dating partners	.66	.43	.00	.04
Number of exclusive dating relationships	.60	.43	.00	.17
Current involvement in exclusive dating relationship	.70	.45	.01	-.16
Number of times in love	.68	.46	.01	.10
Frequency of church attendance	.69	.47	.02	.31
Religious affiliation	.70	.48	.01	.15
Permissiveness of peers	.76	.58	.09	.61
Permissiveness of parents	.76	.58	.00	.16
Permissiveness of subject	.82	.67	.09	.76
Parents' satisfaction with subject's dating experience	.82	.67	.00	.08
Closeness of relationship with mother	.82	.67	.00	.03
Closeness of relationship with father	.82	.67	.00	-.01
Happiness of parents' marriage	.82	.67	.00	.03
Ordinal position in family	.82	.67	.00	-.14
Physical attractiveness of subject	.82	.67	.00	.04
Satisfaction with attractiveness	.82	.67	.00	.06
Size of hometown	.82	.68	.00	-.16
Size of high school	.84	.71	.03	.23
Classification	.84	.71	.00	-.04
Father's educational level	.84	.71	.00	.06
Mother's educational level	.85	.72	.01	.01
Parent's income level	.85	.72	.01	.25
Unwillingness to marry	.85	.72	.00	-.01
Unwillingness to have children	.85	.73	.00	.16

^a_n = 87.

TABLE 4
Analysis of Variance on Regression Equation

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean square	F
Regression	29	165.60056	5.71036	5.188*
Residual	57	62.74427	1.10078	

$a_n = 87.$

* $p < .001$

Regression coefficients and standardized regression coefficients were computed. Table 5 is a summary of these coefficients for the sample. F values were computed to test the strengths of the B 's on the criterion variable. For the total sample, religious affiliation and size of high school were predictive at a .001 level of confidence and mother's educational level was significant at a .01 level of confidence.

Intercorrelations Among Selected Independent Variables

Relationships between selected independent variables were examined using correlation coefficients. The results are presented in Table 6. A positive relationship at a .001 level of confidence was found between the participants' physical attractiveness and satisfaction with that attractiveness. The masculinity score on the BSRI was related positively to the subjects' ordinal position at a .05 level of confidence and to closeness of relationship to father at a .05 level of confidence. Other independent variables were not intercorrelated. All intercorrelations are presented in Appendix D.

Summary of Results

The regression model used in this study explained 73% of the variation in attitudes held toward premarital sexual

TABLE 5
Regression Coefficients and Beta Weights
for Regression Equation

Variable	B	Beta	Standard B	df	F
Score on K-S Attitudes					
Toward Love Scale	-.0145	-.129	.009	1,85	2.687
Unwillingness to cohabit	-.4180	-.127	.356	2,84	1.380
Masculinity score on BSRI	.2980	.126	.218	3,83	1.871
Femininity score on BSRI	-.2777	-.083	.301	4,82	.853
Age at which subject					
began dating	.0184	.010	.092	5,81	.014
Number of dating partners	.0075	.103	.007	6,80	1.063
Number of exclusive					
dating relationships	-.0426	-.039	.127	7,79	.112
Current involvement in an					
exclusive dating					
relationship	-.0860	-.026	.316	8 78	.074
Number of love					
relationships	.1033	.067	.138	9,77	.558
Church attendance	.1414	.062	.216	10,76	.429
Religious affiliation	.4280	.161	.220	11,75	3.774**
Permissiveness of peers	.1276	.072	.208	12,74	.378
Permissiveness of parents	-.0329	-.014	.204	13,73	.026
Permissiveness of subject	.8592	.542	.203	14,72	17.894**
Parents' satisfaction with					
subject's dating					
experience	.1331	.054	.216	15,71	.378
Closeness of relationship					
with mother	-.2177	-.089	.215	16,70	1.023
Closeness of relationship					
with father	.0703	.031	.215	17,69	.108
Happiness of parents'					
marriage	.2024	.100	.172	18,68	1.389
Ordinal position in family	-.2557	-.101	.233	19,67	1.207
Physical attractiveness					
of subject	-.0063	-.002	.367	20,66	.000
Satisfaction with physical					
attractiveness	-.1170	-.050	.236	21,65	.246
Size of hometown	-.0733	-.076	.083	22,64	.782
Size of high school	.3640	.184	.159	23,63	5.222**
Classification	-.0432	-.017	.209	24,62	.043
Father's educational level	.0123	.021	.060	25,61	.042
Mother's educational level	-.0968	-.156	.062	26,60	2.455*
Parents' income level	.1189	.099	.101	27,59	1.234
Unwillingness to marry	.2199	.014	1.302	28,58	.029
Unwillingness to have					
children	.4015	.067	.553	29,57	.527

^an = 87

*p < .01

**p < .001.

TABLE 6
Correlations among Selected Predictor Variables

	Score on K-S Attitudes Toward Love Scale	Satisfaction With Physical Attractiveness	Masculinity Score on BSRI	Femininity Score on BSRI
Closeness to mother	-.10	.38	-.03	.06
Closeness to father	-.11	.01	.17*	.04
Age at which subject began dating	.01	-.07	-.12	.37
Number of dating partners	.13	-.03	.10	.11
Number of exclusive dating relationships	.07	.34***	.27	.17*
Current involvement in exclusive dating relationship	-.08	.06	-.03	.05
Number of love relationships	.15	.12	.10	.20
Happiness of parents' marriage	.04	.07	.10	.30
Physical attractiveness	.18	.52***	.35***	.12
Ordinal position	.38	.03	.28*	.12
Score on K-S Attitudes Toward Love Scale	-	.03	.08	-.14

$a_n = 87.$ * $\underline{p} < .05$ ** $\underline{p} < .01$ *** $\underline{p} < .001$.

permissiveness. It can be concluded that the independent variables were related to attitudes held toward premarital sexual permissiveness.

The regression coefficients for the variables religious affiliation, participant's direct assessment of her permissiveness, size of hometown, and mother's educational level were all significant in the model. It can be concluded that these four variables were strong predictors of premarital sexual standards.

Significant intercorrelations were found between the following variables: the participants' physical attractiveness and satisfaction with their attractiveness; the masculinity score on the BSRI and ordinal position; the masculinity score on the BSRI and closeness of relationship with father. Other significant intercorrelations were found between predictor variables, but these relationships were not included in the research questions of interest in the present study.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The Regression Model

The power of the regression model used in the statistical analysis indicates that various sociodemographic characteristics, heterosexual socialization experiences, and reference group characteristics are related to the attitudes held by college women toward premarital sexual permissiveness. Thus, the null hypothesis of the study was rejected. Although the predictive strength of predictor variables differed considerably, the overall combination of variables was successful in explaining the variations in measured attitudes.

The relationship of sociodemographic variables to attitudes toward sexual permissiveness has been previously investigated but findings have been inconsistent. Kinsey (1948) reported an inverse relationship between social class and permissiveness; Bayer (1977) found a positive relationship between socioeconomic status and permissiveness. Reiss, in his 1967 study, found no relationship between social class and permissiveness of attitudes. The findings of the present study more closely approximate those of Bayer (1977) than those of Kinsey (1948) or Reiss (1967). The indicators of socioeconomic status used in this study (parents'

educational and income levels) were the same criteria utilized by Bayer. The father's educational level was a significant factor in Bayer's research, but mother's educational level was far more predictive of permissiveness in the present study. Parents' level of income was a predictor of permissiveness in the Bayer study but was not significant in this study.

Reference group theory frequently has been used in the research literature to explain attitudes held by young adults toward premarital sexual permissiveness. The influence of family members, religion, close friends and peers on sexual attitudes frequently has been mentioned in the research literature (Bayer, 1977; Burgess & Wallin, 1953; Davis, 1969; Davis, 1974; Heltsley & Broderick, 1969; Libby, Gray, & White, 1978; Reiss, 1967; Teevan, 1972; Walsh, Ferrell, & Tolone, 1976). Thus, variables indicative of characteristics of these reference groups were included in the present study. The strength of the regression model indicates that reference group characteristics are related to the permissiveness of attitudes toward premarital sex, particularly the variables that indicated the female's perception of the permissiveness of parents and peers.

Heterosexual socialization experiences (dating, sex-role identification, and love) were considered important to include in the present study because of incomplete and

inconsistent information in the literature. Dating experience in terms of frequency, duration, and emotional intensity has been examined by several investigators (Curran et al., 1973; Ehrman, 1959; Lewis, 1973; Reiss, 1967). Although generally predictive of premarital sexual behavior, the relationship between dating and sexual attitude has been less understood. The influence of love, sex-role identification, and physical attractiveness has received little investigation even though these variables generally are assumed to be strongly related to the sexual attitudes of young women. The strength of the regression model in this study indicates that heterosexual socialization experiences are related to the sexual attitudes of college women.

Size of high school was a strong predictor of premarital sexual attitudes in this study. Although little attention has been given to this variable in the research literature, a strong positive relationship between permissiveness and size of the subject's high school was revealed in the regression analysis.

Conger (1977) cited the high school experience as an important socialization experience for adolescents. Within any high school, a variety of role models and reference groups are available to the student. The size of a high school setting can be assumed to be related positively to the diversity of norms, values, and behaviors evident in

that setting. With increasing diversity, there is a greater chance the adolescent will adopt attitudes and values which represent a departure from traditional and more conservative belief systems. Adolescents are likely to select peer groups which support and reinforce their beliefs and attitudes.

Size of high school is also assumed to be related to the size of the community. As with larger high schools, larger communities are characterized by greater diversity in norms and attitudes and lessening of strength for traditional social controls that are community based.

A strong positive relationship was identified between religious affiliation and permissiveness. Seventy-nine of the 87 subjects were Protestant, four were Catholic and four were other. In this region of the country, which is predominantly Protestant, other affiliations may represent very different reference groups and norms.

A strong positive correlation also was found between the female's direct assessment of her level of permissiveness and the permissiveness of her attitudes as measured on the RPSPS. This strong correlation serves to validate the scores obtained on the RPSPS as accurate reflections of subjects' attitudes. Because many criticisms have been made of indirect assessments like the RPSPS, it is important to examine the relationship between the female's perceived level of permissiveness and the score on the RPSPS.

Mother's educational level also was identified as a strong predictor of the sexual attitudes of daughters. Mothers with higher educational levels had daughters with more permissive attitudes toward premarital sex. This finding is somewhat different than the findings of previous studies. Reiss (1967) was unable to identify a relationship between parents' educational levels and the permissiveness of the attitudes held by daughters. One reason for Reiss' findings may be his combined use of education and income as indicators of social class. A comparison of the differential effects of the components of social class (education, income) as in the present study may provide a more accurate picture of the contribution of socioeconomic status to premarital sexual attitudes.

Bayer (1977) found that the father's educational level was a predictor of students' permissiveness in sexual attitudes. The mother's educational level was not predictive. It is noteworthy that in the present study, the reverse was evidenced (i.e., the mother's educational level was found to be a predictor and the father's was not). This finding may reflect the greater participation of women in educational and economic arenas and the resultant increase in their influence within the family. It may also reflect the fact that only daughters were included in the sample and they might be influenced more directly by the models presented by mothers.

Implications for Theory, Research,
and Practice

The results of this study indicated that attitudes toward premarital sexual permissiveness were related to several factors. Earlier attempts to examine predictors of such attitudes have been limited by the small number of variables included in the foci of these studies. An imperative for future research on sexual attitudes is the use of multivariate models and analyses capable of identifying that combination of variables most predictive of attitudes.

Multivariate research methods have implications for other foci in the study of human sexuality. Just as sexual attitudes appear to be related to a number of factors, so is sexual behavior related to a complex of variables. Thus, multivariate approaches could be useful in the study of predictors of sexual behavior and practices. To understand the factors which relate to the sexual attitudes held by young adult women was an important objective of the present study, but equally worthwhile would be a broader conceptualization of the attitudes of males and influences on both genders throughout the life cycle. Increasing permissiveness in sexual behavior over the life span has been noted (Reiss, 1973), yet little attention has been given to identifying concomitant changes in attitudes.

With the work of Reiss (1967), Christensen (1969), Burl (1973), and Reiss and Miller (1979), a theory of premarital sexual permissiveness has been identified which is relatively comprehensive. Major theoretical propositions have been identified, but there remains a need for continuing testing of hypotheses to enable expansion and refinement of the theory. The present study has provided a degree of empirical validation for some of the propositions identified by Reiss and Miller (1969).

This study has not been based on the assumption that examination of attitudes alone is enough in order to understand fully sexuality during young adulthood. Further research efforts need to be directed toward understanding the relationship between sexual attitude and behavior. Attitudes toward sexual permissiveness have important implications for the affective consequences of premarital sexual experiences. Available research information confirms that premarital coitus is increasingly the norm for older adolescents and young adults. Yet sex education programs are often ill-equipped to deal with the emotional and interpersonal dimensions of sexual relationships. Understanding how the socialization process affects sexual identity is of fundamental importance to educational efforts directed toward sexual and interpersonal relations. For young adults who hold one sexual standard but behave in ways inconsistent

with their attitudes, the disparity between attitudes and behavior can lead to feelings of guilt and anxiety which are dysfunctional for the individual and the relationship. A more comprehensive understanding of sexual attitudes and their relationship to behavior could be useful to counselors, teachers, and others working with young adults. In order for young adults to make responsible decisions regarding sexuality, clarification of attitudes and values is an important prerequisite.

Limitations of the Study

The sample employed was not a representative one. Findings from this study may not be applicable to noncollege or male-female groups, and caution should be exercised in generalizing the results to populations representative of other geographic regions of the country. Because individuals who were or had been previously married, who were not citizens of the United States at birth, or who were non-white were excluded from the sample, the findings of this study may not be applicable to individuals with these characteristics. The use of multiple regression analysis with the limited sample size used in this study may also serve to limit the extent to which the results may be generalized.

Self-report measures were used exclusively in the collection of data. A number of investigators (Gurin,

Verloff, & Feld, 1960; Kolb & Strauss, 1974) have reported that intentional and unintentional distortion, response set, and conventionalization are common sources of contamination in self-report instruments.

The reliability and validity of the Knox-Sporakowski Attitudes Toward Love Scale and the Personal History Inventory (developed by the author) have not been firmly established. Only limited instrumentation exists for the assessment of attitudes toward love. Of those instruments available, the one selected for this study has the greatest validity and reliability.

The use of a summer school population perhaps limits the findings of this study. Although no available empirical information suggests that summer school populations differ from students attending during the regular academic term, the possibility exists that some important yet unobtrusive differences may exist and therefore limit the generalizability of this study.

Indications of behavioral congruence with attitudes reported in this study were not obtained. Assumptions regarding the extent to which sexual behavior can be assumed to be congruent with sexual attitudes cannot be made based on the findings of this study.

Conclusion

The attitudes held by young women toward premarital sexual expression are related to several variables. Sociodemographic variables, reference group characteristics, and heterosexual socialization experiences all appear to have a significant impact on attitudes toward permissiveness.

Overall, the women in this study endorsed a permissive sexual standard but one of permissiveness in the context of affectional relationships. This reflects not a "revolutionary" change from traditional norms, but a gradual redefinition. A pairing of sexuality and affection has long been a traditional norm, and the present evidence does not indicate a departure from that norm. The most significant change in premarital sexuality appears to be that attitudes are coming closer to behavior. The state of change in premarital sexuality was summarized by Reiss:

In short, there has been a gradually increasing acceptance of and overtness about sexuality. The basic change is toward greater egalitarianism, greater female acceptance of permissiveness, and more open discussion. In the next decade we can expect a step-up in the pace of this change. (p. 111).

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Bayer, A. E. Sexual permissiveness and correlates as determined through interaction analyses. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1977, 39, 29-40.
- Bell, R. D., & Buerkee, J. W. Mother and daughter attitudes related to premarital sexual behavior. Marriage and Family Living, 1961, 23, 390-392.
- Bell, R., & Chaskes, J. Premarital sexual experience among coeds, 1958 and 1968. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1971, 32, 81-84.
- Bem, S. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 155-162.
- Bem, S., and Watson, C. Scoring packet: Bem Sex Role Inventory, Unpublished manuscript, Stanford University, 1976.
- Burr, W. R. Theory construction and the sociology of the family. New York: Wiley, 1973.
- Christensen, H. T. Value variables in pregnancy timing: Some intercultural comparisons. In N. Anderson (ed.), Studies of the family (Vol. 3). Gottingen: Vanderhock and Ruprecht, 1958.
- Christensen, H. T. Cultural relativism and premarital sex norms. American Sociological Review, 1960, 25, 31-39.
- Christensen, H. T. Timing of first pregnancy as a factor in divorce: a cross-cultural analysis. Eugenics Quarterly, 1963, 10, 119-130.
- Christensen, H. T. Scandinavian and American sex norms: some comparisons, with sociological implications. Journal of Social Issues, 1966, 22, 60-75.
- Christensen, H. T. & Carpenter, G. R. Value-behavior discrepancies regarding premarital coitus in three western cultures. American Sociological Review, 1962, 27, 66-74. (a)
- Christensen, H. T., & Carpenter, G. R. Timing patterns in the development of sexual intimacy. Marriage and Family Living, 1962, 24, 30-35. (b)

- Christensen, H. T., & Cannon, K. L. Temple versus non-temple marriage in Utah: Some demographic considerations. Social Science, 1964, 39, 26-33.
- Conger, J. J. Adolescence and youth: psychological development in a changing world. New York: Harper and Row, 1977.
- Croake, J. W., & James, B. E. A four year comparison of premarital sexual attitudes. Journal of Sex Research, 1973, 9(2), 91-96.
- Davis, K. E. Sex on campus: Is there a revolution. Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality, 1970.
- Ehrman, W. Marital and nonmarital sexual behavior. In H. T. Christensen (Ed.), Handbook of marriage and the family. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964.
- Ehrman, W. Premarital dating behavior. New York: Henry Holt, 1959.
- Erikson, E. Identity: youth and crisis. New York: Norton, 1968.
- Freedman, J. L., Carlsmith, J. M., & Sears, D. O. Social Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
- Friday, N. My mother, my self. New York: Dell, 1977.
- Heilbrun, A. Sex identity in adolescent females: A theoretical paradox. Adolescence, 1968, 3, 79-88.
- Heltsley, M. E., & Broderick, C. B. Religiosity and premarital sexual permissiveness: a re-examination of Reiss' traditionalism proposition. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1969, 31, 441-443.
- Hunt, M. M. The natural history of love. New York: Minerva Press, 1959.
- Hunt, M. Sexual behavior in the 1970's. Chicago: Playboy Press, 1973.
- Jackson, E. D., & Potkay, C. R. Precollege influences on sexual experiences of coeds. Journal of Sex Research, 1973, 9(2), 143-49.

- Kaats, G., & Davis, K. The dynamics of sexual behavior of college students. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1970, 32, 390-399.
- Kelley, J. Sexual permissiveness: evidence for a theory. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1978, 455-567.
- Kephart, W. Some correlates of romantic love. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1967, 29, 470-482.
- Kerlinger, F. Foundations of behavioral research (2nd ed.). New York: Holt Rinehart, and Winston, 1973.
- King, K., Balswick, J., & Robinson, J. E. The Premarital Sexual Revolution Among College Females. Family Coordinator, 1972, 21(2), 189-194.
- King, M., & Sobel, D. Sex on the College campus: Current attitudes and behavior. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1975, 205-209.
- Kinsey, A., Pomeroy, W., & Martin, C. Sexual behavior in the human male. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1948.
- Kinsey, A. Sexual behavior in the human female. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1953.
- Kirkendall, L. A., & Libby, R. Interpersonal relationships-crx of the sexual renaissance. The Journal of Social Issues, 1967, 29, 45-60.
- Knox, D. H., & Sporakowski, M. J. Attitudes of college students toward love. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1968, 30, 638-642.
- Libby, R. W., Gray, L., & White, M. A test and reformulation of reference group and role correlates of premarital sexual permissiveness theory. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1978, 80-91.
- Libby, R. W., & Nass, C. C. Parental views of teenage sexual behavior. Journal of Sex Research, 1971, 7, 226-36.
- Lopiciolv, J. Mothers and daughters: Perceived and real differences in sexual values. Journal of Sex Research, 1973, 9(2), 171-77.
- Maranell, G. M., Dodder, R. A., & Mitchell, D. F. Social class and premarital sexual permissiveness: a subsequent test. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1970, 32, 85-88.

- Nutt, R. L., & Sedlaceh, W. E. Freshmen sexual attitudes and behavior. The Journal of College Student Personnel, 1974, 15(5), 346-351.
- Prince, A. J. Attitudes of college students toward premarital sex experience. The Family Coordinator, 1958, 6, 57-60.
- Reiss, I. L. Premarital sexual standards in America. New York: Free Press, 1960.
- Reiss, I. L. The scaling of premarital sexual permissiveness. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1964, 26, 188-98.
- Reiss, I. L. The social context of premarital sexual permissiveness. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Reiss, I. L. Response to the Heltsley and Broderick re-test of Reiss' proposition one. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1969, 32.
- Reiss, I. L. Comments on Middendorp's determinants of premarital sexual permissiveness. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1970, 32, 379-80.
- Reiss, I. L., & Miller, B. C. Heterosexual permissiveness: A theoretical analysis. In W. R. Burr, R. Hill, F. I. Nye, & I. L. Reiss (Eds.), contemporary theories about the family (Vol. 1). New York: The Free Press, 1979.
- Spanier, G. B. (Ed.). Human sexuality in a changing society. Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing, 1979.
- Teevan, J. J. Reference groups and premarital sexual behavior. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1973, 34, 283-291.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. Statistical abstract of the United States, 1977. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977.
- Walsh, R. H., Ferrell, M. Z., & Tolone, W. Selection of reference group, perceived reference group permissiveness, and personal permissiveness attitudes and behavior: A study of two consecutive panels (1967-71; 1970-74). Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1976, 36, 495-507.
- Wilkinson, M. L. Romantic love and sexual expression. The Family Coordinator, 1978, 141-147.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

EXPLANATION OF PROCEDURES AND INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Project: An Analysis of Standards for Premarital Sexual Permissiveness Among College Women

I am conducting a study concerned with the attitudes of undergraduate women concerning premarital sexual permissiveness. I am particularly concerned with how closely women identify with traditional feminine sex-roles, their attitudes toward love, their dating experience and family background, and how these factors appear to influence their attitudes toward premarital sexual permissiveness.

I would like to request your participation in my study. This would involve completing five questionnaires during this class meeting. The five questionnaires include: (1) a background data sheet; (2) a personal history inventory; (3) the Bem Sex-Role Inventory; (4) the Knox-Sporakowski Attitudes Toward Love Scale; and (5) the Reiss Male and Female Premarital Sexual Permissiveness Scale. I think you will find the questionnaires interesting and easy to answer. Although I will be unable to provide each participant with individual feedback, I will distribute a brief summary of my findings to you upon request.

Should you agree to participate in this study, I would like you to understand my commitment to the following safeguards in your interest:

(1) Your confidentiality as a participant will be protected by the use of number codes (instead of names) on all materials in the study. The information will be used as part of a large group of responses, and no reference will be made to individual responses.

(2) Confidentiality will be maintained in that individual data and participant identities will not be shared except with the written consent of individual participants.

(3) You are free to withdraw your consent and to discontinue participation in this study at any time.

(4) Answers to any questions you have about my procedures are available at any time. My office phone number is 974-5316, and my home phone number is 584-6305.

This research project and this "informed consent" form have been approved by the Human Subjects Committee of the Department of Child and Family Studies whose function is to

promote the ethical conduct of research involving human subjects. I have subscribed closely to their guidelines.

Thank you for your time.

Helen Grove, Doctoral Student
Child and Family Studies

I have read this form and, on the basis of "informed consent," agree to participate in this study.

Your signature

APPENDIX B

BACKGROUND DATA SHEET

Directions: Please complete the following form to the best of your ability. All information is confidential. Please do not put your name on this sheet.

Sex_____

Age_____

Classification (check one): Senior___ Junior___ Sophomore___
Freshman___ Other (please specify)_____

Are you or have you ever been married? yes___ no___

Race:_____

Were you a citizen of the U.S. at birth? yes___ no___

Name of your home town:_____

Approximately how many graduates were in your high school senior class? (check one):

under 50___ 50-200___ 200-500___ 500-1000___ 1000-2000___
over 2000___

What is your religious affiliation? (check one):

Protestant___ Catholic___ Jewish___ Other___ None___

Do you attend church? yes___ no___ If no, how often?_____

What is the highest grade in school completed by your father?_____

What is the highest grade in school completed by your mother?_____

Please check the income range most applicable to your parents:

below \$7,000___ \$7,000-\$12,000___ \$12,000-\$16,000___

\$16,000-\$20,000___ \$20,000-\$25,000___ Over \$25,000___

Why are you attending school this summer?_____

PERSONAL HISTORY INVENTORY

This questionnaire is designed to collect information about you, your family background, and your dating experiences. Recognizing the personal nature of these items, I wish to emphasize my commitment to preserving your confidentiality in this study. Your responses will be used with no reference to you personally.

1. What was your ordinal position (order of birth) in your family?

 1. only child
 2. eldest born
 3. later born

2. Overall, how would you rate the closeness of your relationship with your mother? (Please circle the appropriate response.)

1	2	3	4
very			very
distant			close

3. Overall, how would you rate the closeness of your relationship with your father?

1	2	3	4
very			very
distant			close

4. How would you rate the happiness of your parents' marriage?

1	2	3	4
very			very
unhappy			happy

5. At what age did you begin dating (couple dating)? _____

6. Estimate how many dating partners you have had since you began to date. _____

7. How many dating relationships have you experienced where you dated only one person for six months or longer? _____

8. Are you currently involved in a dating relationship where you have dated only one person for six months or longer? yes _____ no _____

9. How many dating relationships have you had which you would characterize as love relationships? _____

10. How satisfied do you think your parents have been with your dating experience (age at which you began dating, number of dating partners you have had, etc.)?

1	2	3	4
very			very
dissatisfied			satisfied

11. Estimate where the majority of your friends would fall in terms of their attitudes toward premarital sexual permissiveness.

1	2	3	4
conservative			liberal

12. Estimate where you would fall in terms of your attitude toward premarital sexual permissiveness.

1	2	3	4
conservative			liberal

13. Estimate where your parents would fall in terms of their attitudes toward premarital sexual permissiveness.

1	2	3	4
conservative			liberal

14. In comparing your physical appearance to the physical appearance of others your age, rate how physically attractive you are.

1	2	3	4
very			very
unattractive			attractive

15. How satisfied are you with what you perceive to be your physical attractiveness?

1	2	3	4
very			very
dissatisfied			satisfied

16. Do you think, at this point in your life, that you will someday marry? yes _____ no _____

17. Do you think, at this point in your life, that you will at sometime have children? yes____ no____
18. Do you think, at this point in your life, that you could ever live with a person of the opposite sex without being legally married? yes____ no____

On the attached sheet, you will find a large number of personality characteristics. I would like you to use those characteristics in order to describe yourself. That is, I would like you to indicate, on a scale from 1 to 7, how true of you these various characteristics are. Please do not leave any characteristics unmarked.

Example: sly

Mark a 1 if it is NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 2 if it is USUALLY NOT TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 3 if it is SOMETIMES BUT INFREQUENTLY TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 4 if it is OCCASIONALLY TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 5 if it is OFTEN TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 6 if it is USUALLY TRUE that you are sly.

Mark a 7 if it is ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE that you are sly.

Thus, if you feel it is sometimes but infrequently true that you are "sly," Never or almost never true that you are "malicious," always or almost always true that you are "irresponsible," and often true that you are "carefree," then you would rate these characteristics as follows:

Sly	3
Malicious	1

Irresponsible	7
Carefree	5

DESCRIBE YOURSELF

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE	USUALLY NOT TRUE	SOMETIMES BUT INFREQUENTLY TRUE	OCCASIONALLY TRUE	OFTEN TRUE	USUALLY TRUE	ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE

Self Reliant	
Yielding	
Helpful	
Defends own beliefs	
Cheerful	
Moody	
Independent	
Shy	
Conscientious	
Athletic	
Affectionate	
Theatrical	

Reliable	
Analytical	
Sympathetic	
Jealous	
Has leadership abilities	
Sensitive to the needs of others	
Truthful	
Willing to take risks	
Understanding	
Secretive	
Makes decisions easily	

Warm	
Solemn	
Willing to take a stand	
Tender	
Friendly	
Aggressive	
Gullible	
Inefficient	
Acts as a leader	
Childlike	
Adaptable	
Individualistic	

Assertive	
Flatterable	
Happy	
Strong personality	
Loyal	
Unpredictable	
Forceful	
Feminine	

Compassionate	
Sincere	
Self-sufficient	
Eager to soothe hurt feelings	
Conceited	
Dominant	
Soft-spoken	
Likeable	
Masculine	

Does not use harsh language	
Unsystematic	
Competitive	
Loves children	
Tactful	
Ambitious	
Gentle	
Conventional	

ATTITUDES TOWARD LOVE

Please read each statement carefully and circle the number which you believe most adequately represents your opinion.

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| 1. Strongly agree
(definitely yes) | 4. Mildly disagree
(probably not) |
| 2. Mildly agree
(I believe so) | 5. Strongly disagree
(definitely not) |
| 3. Undecided (not sure) | |

	SA	MA	U	MD	SD
1. When you are really in love, you just aren't interested in anyone else.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Love doesn't make sense. It just is.	1	2	3	4	5
3. When you fall head-over-heels-in-love, it's sure to be the real thing.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Love isn't anything you can really study; it is too highly emotional to be subject to scientific observation.	1	2	3	4	5
5. To be in love with someone without marriage is a tragedy.	1	2	3	4	5
6. When love hits, you know it.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Common interests are really unimportant; as long as each of you is truly in love, you will adjust.	1	2	3	4	5
8. It doesn't matter if you marry after you have known your partner for only a short time as long as you know you are in love.	1	2	3	4	5
9. As long as two people love each other, the religious differences they have really do not matter.	1	2	3	4	5
10. You can love someone even though you do not like any of that person's friends.	1	2	3	4	5
11. When you are in love, you are usually in a daze.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Love at first sight is often the deepest and most enduring type of love.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Usually there are only one or two people in the world whom you could really love and could really be happy with.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Regardless of other factors, if you truly love another person, that is enough to marry that person.	1	2	3	4	5

	SA	MA	U	MD	SD
15. It is necessary to be in love with the one you marry to be happy.	1	2	3	4	5
16. When you are separated from the love partner, the rest of the world seems dull and unsatisfying.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Parents should not advise their children whom to date; they have forgotten what it is like to be in love.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Love is regarded as a primary motive for marriage, which is good.	1	2	3	4	5
19. When you love a person, you think of marrying that person.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Somewhere there is an ideal mate for most people. The problem is just finding that one.	1	2	3	4	5
21. Jealousy usually varies directly with love; that is, the more in love you are, the greater the tendency for you to become jealous.	1	2	3	4	5
22. Love is best described as an exciting thing rather than a calm thing.	1	2	3	4	5
23. There are probably only a few people that any one person can fall in love with.	1	2	3	4	5
24. When you are in love, your judgment is usually not too clear.	1	2	3	4	5
25. Love often comes but once in a lifetime.	1	2	3	4	5
26. You can't make yourself love someone; it just comes or it doesn't.	1	2	3	4	5
27. Differences in social class and religion are of small importance in selecting a marriage partner as compared with love.	1	2	3	4	5
28. Day dreaming usually comes along with being in love.	1	2	3	4	5
29. When you are in love, you don't have to ask yourself a bunch of questions about love; you will just know that you are in love.	1	2	3	4	5

The following questions concern some attitudes of yours regarding courtship behavior. I realize that you may be tolerant of what others do and think, but I am not interested now in that. I am interested in your own views about the questions to be asked. These questions do not concern what you do—they concern what you believe about courtship. On this sheet I would like you to circle the degree of agreement or disagreement you have with each statement. Just answer these statements on the basis of how you feel toward the view expressed. It is important that you respond to all items. Your name will never be connected with these answers, so please be as honest as you can. I use the words to mean just what they do to most people, but some may need definition:

Love means the emotional state which is more intense than strong affection and which you would define as love.

Strong affection means affection which is stronger than physical attraction, average fondness, or "liking," but less strong than love.

Petting means sexually stimulating behavior more intimate than kissing and simple hugging, but not including full sexual relations.

MALE STANDARDS (Both Men and Women Answer this Section)

Circle the appropriate response:

1. I believe that kissing is acceptable for the male before marriage when he is engaged to be married.
Agree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
Disagree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
2. I believe that kissing is acceptable for the male before marriage when he is in love.
Agree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
Disagree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
3. I believe that kissing is acceptable for the male before marriage when he feels strong affection toward his partner.
Agree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
Disagree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
4. I believe that kissing is acceptable for the male before marriage even if he does not feel particularly affectionate toward his partner.
Agree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
Disagree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight

5. I believe that petting is acceptable for the male before marriage when he is engaged to be married.
 Agree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
 Disagree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
6. I believe that petting is acceptable for the male before marriage when he is in love.
 Agree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
 Disagree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
7. I believe that petting is acceptable for the male before marriage when he feels strong affection for his partner.
 Agree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
 Disagree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
8. I believe that petting is acceptable for the male before marriage even if he doesn't feel particularly affectionate toward his partner.
 Agree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
 Disagree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
9. I believe that full sexual relations are acceptable for the male before marriage when he is engaged to be married.
 Agree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
 Disagree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
10. I believe that full sexual relations are acceptable for the male before marriage when he is in love.
 Agree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
 Disagree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
11. I believe that full sexual relations are acceptable for the male before marriage when he feels strong affection for his partner.
 Agree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
 Disagree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
12. I believe that full sexual relations are acceptable for the male before marriage even if he does not feel particularly affectionate toward his partner.
 Agree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
 Disagree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight

FEMALE STANDARDS (Both Men and Women Check this Section)

1. I believe that kissing is acceptable for the female before marriage when she is engaged to be married.
 Agree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
 Disagree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight

2. I believe that kissing is acceptable for the female before marriage when she is in love.
 Agree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
 Disagree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
3. I believe that kissing is acceptable for the female before marriage when she feels strong affection for her partner.
 Agree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
 Disagree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
4. I believe that kissing is acceptable for the female before marriage even if she does not feel particularly affectionate toward her partner.
 Agree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
 Disagree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
5. I believe that petting is acceptable for the female before marriage when she is engaged to be married.
 Agree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
 Disagree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
6. I believe that petting is acceptable for the female before marriage when she is in love.
 Agree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
 Disagree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
7. I believe that petting is acceptable for the female before marriage when she feels strong affection for her partner.
 Agree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
 Disagree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
8. I believe that petting is acceptable for the female before marriage even if she does not feel particularly affectionate toward her partner.
 Agree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
 Disagree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
9. I believe that full sexual relations are acceptable for the female before marriage when she is engaged to be married.
 Agree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
 Disagree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
10. I believe that full sexual relations are acceptable for the female before marriage when she is in love.
 Agree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight
 Disagree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight

11. I believe that full sexual relations are acceptable for the female before marriage when she feels strong affection for her partner.

Agree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight

Disagree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight

12. I believe that full sexual relations are acceptable for the female before marriage even if she does not feel particularly affectionate toward her partner.

Agree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight

Disagree: (1) Strong (2) Medium (3) Slight

APPENDIX C

OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS FOR PERSONAL AND
FAMILY HISTORY, SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC DATA,
AND DATING EXPERIENCE

ordinal position in family	Item No. 1	PHI
closeness to mother	Item No. 2	PHI
closeness to father	Item No. 3	PHI
happiness of parents' marriage	Item No. 4	PHI
age when subject began dating	Item No. 5	PHI
number of dating partners	Item No. 6	PHI
number of long term relationships	Item No. 7	PHI
current involvement in long term relationship	Item No. 8	PHI
number of love relationships	Item No. 9	PHI
parental satisfaction with subject's dating experience	Item No. 10	PHI
permissiveness of peers	Item No. 11	PHI
permissiveness of subject	Item No. 12	PHI
permissiveness of parents	Item No. 13	PHI
physical attractiveness	Item No. 14	PHI
satisfaction with physical attractiveness	Item No. 15	PHI
intention to marry	Item No. 16	PHI
intention to have children	Item No. 17	PHI
likely to cohabit	Item No. 18	PHI
classification	Item No. 19	BDS
size of hometown	Item No. 20	BDS
size of iigh school graduating class	Item No. 21	BDS
religious affiliation	Item No. 22	BDS
church attendance	Item No. 23	BDS
mother's educational level	Item No. 24	BDS
father's educational level	Item No. 25	BDS
parents' income	Item No. 26	BDS

APPENDIX D

TABLE D-1
Correlations of Predictor Variables

	Size of hometown	Size of high school	Religious affiliation	Church attendance	Father's educational level	Mother's educational level	Parents' income level	Ordinal position	Closeness to mother	Closeness to father
Size of hometown	-									
Size of high school	.13	-								
Religious affiliation	-.06	-.16	-							
Church attendance	.20*	.16	-.04	-						
Father's educational level	.08	.04	-.04	.09	-					
Mother's educational level	.21*	-.01	-.02	.28*	.59***	-				
Parents' income level	.17*	.15	.02	.21*	.33***	.34***	-			
Ordinal position	-.08	.13	.05	-.14	-.23*	-.18*	-.16	-		
Closeness to mother	-.15	.05	-.09	-.01	.04	.02	.09	-.16	-	
Closeness to father	-.08	-.10	-.00	-.03	-.26*	.01	.43	.45	.36***	-

TABLE D-1 (continued)

	Size of hometown	Size of high school	Religious affiliation	Church attendance	Father's educational level	Mother's educational level	Parents' income level	Ordinal position	Closeness to mother	Closeness to father
Happiness of parents' marriage	-.12	-.19*	.02	-.03	-.00	.16	.01	-.22	.11	.26**
Age at which subject began dating	.07	.02	.22*	.20*	.05	.00	.06	.09	-.12	-.16
Number of dating partners	.01	.11	.01	-.07	.18*	.05	.23**	.05	.21*	.04
Number of exclusive dating relation- ships	.08	.22*	-.11	.02	.02	-.03	.04	-.06	.08	.08
Current involvement in an exclusive dating relation- ship	.11	-.04	.08	-.10	.12	.13	.04	.13	.03	.26**
Number of love relationships	.10	.21*	.20*	.12	.02	.01	-.03	-.08	.03	.04
Parents' satisfaction with subject's dating experience	.03	.03	-.23**	-.07	-.10	-.06	-.06	.06	.28**	.12
Permissiveness of peers	-.16	.15	-.06	.32***	-.04	.08	.30**	-.09	.09	.02
Permissiveness of subject	-.12	.14	-.02	.38***	.07	.08	.17	-.13	.05	-.01
Permissiveness of parents	-.08	.02	.09	-.09	.14	.09	.09	-.15	.15	.17*

TABLE D-1 (continued)

	Size of hometown	Size of high school	Religious affiliation	Church attendance	Father's educational level	Mother's educational level	Parents' income level	Ordinal position	Closeness to mother	Closeness to father
Physical attractiveness	.01	.20*	-.10	.03	.06	.06	.08	.24**	-.10	.00
Satisfaction with physical attractiveness	-.08	.02	-.04	-.13	.09	.01	-.02	.03	.03	.24
Unwillingness to marry	.12	.02	-.03	-.07	.14	.17*	.12	.09	-.06	-.00
Unwillingness to have children	.12	-.06	.19*	-.12	-.05	.02	.11	-.09	.03	-.00
Unwillingness to cohabit	.02	.09	-.08	-.29	-.06	-.10	-.22*	.25**	.02	-.09
Score on the RSPS	-.16	.23*	.15	.31**	.06	.01	.25**	-.14	.03	-.00
Score on the K-S Attitudes Toward Love Scale	.10	.06	.09	.02	-.05	-.08	.08	.03	-.10	-.12
Masculinity score on the BSRI	-.14	.08	.19*	-.18*	.02	-.01	-.09	.28**	-.03	.17
Femininity score on the BSRI	-.01	.18	-.14	-.11	-.16	-.12	-.13	.12	.06	.04

TABLE D-1 (continued)

	Happiness of parents' marriage	Age at which subject began dating	Number of dating partners	Number of exclusive dating relationships	Current involvement in an exclusive dating relationship	Number of love relationships	Parents' satisfaction with subject's dating experience	Permissiveness of peers	Permissiveness of subject	Permissiveness of parents
Size of hometown	-.12	.07	.01	.08	.11	.10	.03	-.16	-.12	-.08
Size of high school	-.19*	.02	.11	.22	-.04	.21*	.03	.15	.14	.03
Religious affiliation	.02	.22*	.00	-.11	.08	-.20*	-.28***	-.06	-.02	.09
Church attendance	-.03	.20*	-.07	.02	-.10	.12	-.07	.32***	.38***	-.09
Father's educational level	-.00	.05	.18*	.02	.12	.02	-.10	-.04	.07	.14
Mother's educational level	.16	.00	.05	-.03	.13	.01	-.06	.08	.07	.09
Parents' income level	.01	.06	.23**	.04	.04	-.03	-.06	.30**	.17	.09
Ordinal position	-.02	.09	.05	-.06	.13	-.08	.06	-.09	-.13	-.15
Closeness to mother	.11	-.12	.21*	.08	.03	.03	.28**	.09	.05	.15
Closeness to father	.26***	-.16	.04	.08	.26**	.04	.12	.02	-.01	.17*

TABLE D-1 (continued)

	Happiness of parents' marriage	Age at which subject began dating	Number of dating partners	Number of exclusive dating relationships	Current involvement in an exclusive dating relationship	Number of love relationships	Parents' satisfaction with subject's dating experience	Permissiveness of subject peers	Permissiveness of parents
Happiness of parents' marriage	-								
Age at which subject began dating	-.09	-							
Number of dating partners	-.00	-.13	-						
Number of exclusive dating relation- ships	-.04	-.17	.43***	-					
Current involvement in an exclusive dating relation- ship	-.12	-.02	-.05	-.35	-				
Number of love relationships	-.05	-.21*	.05	.42***	-.10	-			
Parents' satisfac- tion with subject's dating experience	.06	-.26**	.20*	.25**	-.07	.15	-		
Permissiveness of peers	.04	-.03	-.01	.25**	-.06	.22	-.05	-	

TABLE D-1 (continued)

	Happiness of parents' marriage	Age at which subject began dating	Number of dating partners	Number of exclusive dating relationships	Current involvement in an exclusive dating relationship	Parents' satisfaction with subject's dating experience	Permissiveness of peers	Permissiveness of subject	Permissiveness of parents
Permissiveness of subject	-.05	.03	-.11	.11	-.13	-.14	.70***	-	
Permissiveness of parents	-.16	-.04	-.08	.03	.16	-.10	-.13	.26*	-
Physical attractiveness	.11	-.12	.17	.26**	.08	-.01	.10	.04	-.04
Satisfaction with physical attractiveness	.07	-.07	-.03	.34***	.06	.13	.16	.08	.06
Unwillingness to marry	-.05	.13	-.11	-.11	.13	-.03	.04	.04	.08
Unwillingness to have children	-.03	-.02	-.03	-.05	.02	.04	.11	.11	.28**
Unwillingness to cohabit	-.02	.10	-.01	-.14	.03	.19*	-.51***	-.66***	-.18*

TABLE D-1 (continued)

	Happiness of parents' marriage	Age at which subject began dating	Number of dating partners	Number of exclusive dating relationships	Current involvement in an exclusive dating relationship	Number of love relationships	Parents' satisfaction with subject's dating experience	Permissiveness of peers	Permissiveness of subject	Permissiveness of parents
Score on the RSPS	.08	.01	.04	.17	-.16	.10	-.08	.61***	.76***	.16
Score on the K-S Attitudes Toward Love Scale	.04	.01	.13	.07	-.08	.15	-.20	-.01	-.06	.01
Masculinity score on the BSRI	.14	-.12	.10	.27**	-.03	.10	.07	.09	.07	.15
Femininity score on the BSRI	.06	.04	.11	.17*	.05	.20*	.27**	-.07	-.12	.08

TABLE D-1 (continued)

	Physical attractiveness	Satisfaction with physical attractiveness		Unwillingness to marry	Unwillingness to have children	Unwillingness to cohabit	Score on RPSFS	Score on K-S Attitudes Toward Love Scale	Masculinity score on BSRI	Femininity score on BSRI
		Physical attractiveness	Satisfaction with physical attractiveness							
Size of hometown	.01		-.08	.12	.12	.09	-.16	.10	-.14	-.01
Size of high school	.20*		.12	.02	-.05	-.08	.23**	.06	.08	.18*
Religious affiliation	-.10		-.04	-.03	.19*	-.08	.15	.09	.19*	-.14
Church attendance	.03		-.13	-.07	-.12	-.29	.30	.02	-.18*	-.11
Father's educational level	.06		.09	.14	-.05	-.06	.06	-.05	.02	-.16
Mother's educational level	.06		.01	.17*	.02	-.10	.01	-.08	-.01	-.12
Parents' income level	.08		-.02	.12	.11	-.22*	.25**	.08	-.08	-.13
Ordinal position	.24		.03	.09	-.09	.25**	-.14	.03	.28**	.12
Closeness to mother	-.10		.03	-.06	.03	.02	.03	-.10	-.03	.06
Closeness to father	.00		.24**	-.00	-.00	-.09	-.00	-.11	.17	.04

TABLE D-1 (continued)

	Physical attractiveness	Satisfaction with physical attractiveness	Unwillingness to marry	Unwillingness to have children	Unwillingness to cohabit	Score on RSPS	Score on K-S Attitudes Toward Love Scale	Masculinity score on BSRI	Femininity score on BSRI
Happiness of parents' marriage	.11	.07	-.05	-.03	-.02	.03	.04	.14	.06
Age at which subject began dating	-.12	-.07	.13	-.02	.10	.01	.01	-.12	.04
Number of dating partners	.17	-.03	-.11	-.03	-.01	.04	.13	.10	.11
Number of exclusive dating relationships	.26**	.34***	-.11	-.05	-.14	.17	.07	.27**	.17*
Current involvement in an exclusive dating relationship	.08	.06	.13	.02	.03	-.16	-.08	-.03	.05
Number of love relationships	.24**	.12	-.07	-.04	-.04	.10	.15	.10	.20*
Parents' satisfaction with subject's dating experience	-.01	.13	-.03	.04	.19*	-.08	-.20*	.07	.27**
Permissiveness of peers	.10	.16	.04	.11	-.51***	.61***	-.01	.09	-.07
Permissiveness of subject	.04	.08	.04	.11	-.66***	.75***	-.06	.07	-.12
Permissiveness of parents	-.04	.06	.08	.29**	-.18*	.16	.01	.15	.08

TABLE D-1 (continued)

	Physical attractiveness	Satisfaction with physical attractiveness	Unwillingness to marry	Unwillingness to have children	Unwillingness to cohabit	Score on RSPS	Score on K-S Attitudes Toward Love Scale	Masculinity Score on BSRI	Femininity Score on BSRI
Physical attractiveness	-								
Satisfaction with physical attractiveness	.52***	-							
Unwillingness to marry	-.28*	-.13	-						
Unwillingness to have children	-.16	-.05	.36***	-					
Unwillingness to cohabit	-.08	-.10	.09	-.10	-				
Score on the RSPS	.04	.06	-.01	.16	-.62***	-			
Score on the K-S Attitudes Toward Love Scale	.17*	.02	-.01	.04	.00	-.08	-		
Masculinity score on the BSRI	.29	.35	-.18	-.13	-.05	.18	.08	-	
Femininity score on the BSRI	.12	.14	-.07	-.22*	.25**	-.16	-.14	.03	-

^an = 87
 *p < .05
 **p < .01
 ***p < .001

VITA

Helen Grove was born on July 7, 1951 in Holden, West Virginia. She was graduated from Logan Senior High School in 1969 and in 1973 received a Bachelor of Science degree from West Virginia Wesleyan College. She was admitted to graduate study at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville in 1973 and was awarded a Master of Science degree in Child and Family Studies in 1974. She entered the interdisciplinary doctoral program in Home Economics at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville in 1974 and was awarded her Doctor of Philosophy degree in 1980. During her graduate career, she taught at James Madison University in Virginia and at Walters State Community College in Morristown, Tennessee. Areas of teaching competence include child development, family relations, human development over the life cycle, general psychology, and social problems. She has been most recently employed as assistant director of admissions for Child and Youth Services at Lakeshore Mental Health Institute, Knoxville, Tennessee.