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AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION OF VARIATION IN STUDENTS' PREMARITAL SEX STANDARDS AND BEHAVIOR

Robert L. Horton, PhD.
Western Michigan University, 1973

Data from 800 undergraduate students in southwestern Michigan were examined in an exploratory analysis to determine the major characteristics of students who possessed differing sex standards and behavior patterns, and to specify the major determinants of variation in male and female sex standards and behavior. The data were collected in 1971-72 as part of a larger research effort, designed by Dr. Herbert Smith of the Department of Sociology, Western Michigan University. The questionnaire covered a wide range of topics (375 items) relating to students' sex attitudes and behavior patterns, information and attitudes toward human sexuality, sources of sex information, parent and peer relations, and students' attitudes toward the marriage and family institutions, as well as moral issues pertaining to human sexuality.

The research objectives were (1) to specify the major variables accounting for variation in premarital sex standards and behavior of college students; (2) to determine the distinguishing characteristics of respondents who held permissive and non-permissive sex standards and behavior patterns; and (3) to examine the nature of
Permissive students held a modern attitudinal orientation toward marriage and the family (a successful sexual relationship could be established outside the context of marriage, and a family is for those who want it, but not for everyone), had low religious participation (attend church rarely or never), and were equalitarian in their sex standards. Non-permissive students held traditional orientations toward marriage and the family (i.e., sex requires marriage, and the family is to have children), had high religious participation (attend church weekly), and were traditional in their sex standards (favoring the double standard for sexual relations).

The relationship between students' sex standards and sex behavior was highly reciprocal, with sex standards varying directly by stage of courtship and past sexual behavior.

The data also suggested that students' attitudes toward the marriage and family institutions and the equality of male-female relationships are more permissive than those commonly reported in prior decades, suggesting that earlier predictions of the emergence of a new morality may have been fulfilled. Behavioral change, in this case, appears to follow attitudinal change by about a decade.

The findings generally supported Reiss's theory of sexual permissiveness, in that the evidence strongly suggested that standards of sexual permissiveness vary by the social setting and are influenced by group and cultural norms.
the relationship between the sex standards of respondents and the corresponding behavioral patterns. For this, the "grounded theory" methodology with Automatic Interaction Detection analysis (AID) and factor analysis was used to explore the above objectives. The "grounded theory" methodology is an inductive mode of analysis that seeks to develop descriptive classifications of respondents that are "grounded" or directly represented in the data, thus are not biased by preconceived notions of relationships. AID analysis uses a complex analysis of variance approach to specify descriptive classifications of respondents that account for the greatest reduction in variation in the sex standards and behavioral patterns reported by students. Approximately 80 variables were explored for their ability to account for variation in both students' sex standards and sex behavior. Factor analysis was used to specify the unidimensionality of variables specified by the AID analytical technique above.

It was found that the three variables of past sexual experience, the extent of religious participation, and the attitudinal orientation (traditional vs. modern) toward the marriage and family institutions accounted for approximately 75 percent of the variation in students' premarital sex standards. The variables of the person's sex standards, religious participation, and attitudinal orientation toward marriage and the family accounted for approximately 67 percent of the variation in students' premarital sexual behavior.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

One of the major social concerns recently to receive national attention has to do with the changing attitudes and behavior related to human sexuality, and the appropriateness of educating our nation's youth for family living and human sexuality. Boards of Education in communities across the nation have become embattled and deadlocked over the issue of sex education in the public schools. Legislators heatedly debate the merits of abortion reform and the dissemination of birth control devices. Church officials find their clergy and parishioners openly defying ecclesiastical pronouncements over abortion, birth control, and the sanctity of life. Illegitimacy rips apart families who are caught between love for their errant children and their personal moral standards (and reputation). Venereal disease has reached epidemic proportions as the youth of our society experiment more openly and freely in their sexual endeavors.¹

A review of the literature pertaining to the formation of attitudes toward sexual standards clearly shows the paucity of

objective empirical studies in this area of human behavior. As recently as 1967, Reiss, a noted specialist in human sexual behavior, states that he could identify only 16 sociologists who have systematically pursued the search for knowledge in the area of human sexuality.¹

Without doubt, the academic interest in sex research has mushroomed in the past decade, and the fruits of these labors are beginning to trickle into the published literature. This trend is exemplified by the recent introduction of the magazine, Sexual Behavior, which asserts its respectability by stating at its masthead, "A serious magazine devoted to authoritative information about sex."²

A central core of questions relating to the study of human sexuality involves the specification of those factors and situations that influence sex standards and behavior patterns. Although much is thought to be true in the area of sex research, little is known to be true.

PURPOSE

Against this background and in light of the many unknowns as


²Masthead title of Sexual Behavior, II (January 1972).
to the factors associated with the different attitudes and behavior in this area of social life, this dissertation explores two general questions: (1) what are the most significant variables that account for variation in the different sex standards of college students; and (2) what are the most significant variables that influence variation in students' sex behavior. With these general questions in mind, let us review more specifically what is known, based on the past research on sex standards and behavior.

Research on Sex Attitudes

There are five major research efforts that have particular relevance for this present study of sex attitudes. The first significant research attempt was made by Bromley and Britten in 1930, in which they measured the current sex standards and behavior of college students.¹ They found that about one-half of the college women of the period approved of premarital or extra-marital coitus for others, and that one-fourth of the females and one-half of the males in their sample reported having experienced premarital coitus.

The second major study of sex attitudes was conducted by

Rockwood and Ford in 1945. These authors were the first to attempt to classify the sex attitudes held by college students by sex and engagement status. They developed the basic classifications of (1) no sexual relations for either sex, (2) sex relations for men only, (3) coitus for both sexes, and (4) coitus for engaged couples only. Through the use of these categories, Rockwood and Ford found for a sample of 173 students that nearly half of the males and three-fourths of the females held standards that did not condone premarital sexual relations for either sex; only 15 percent of males and 6 percent of females expressed standards that permitted both sexes to engage in premarital coitus. The above categories, which represent the first attempt to develop a classification scheme to represent the different attitudinal positions (sex standards) persons held for themselves and others, was later refined by Reiss (see below) and is in part incorporated into this research analysis.

A decade later, Landis (1958) refined and expanded the earlier study by Rockwood and Ford. Essentially the same

---


2 loc cit., p. 40.

response categories were used, but the sample was increased to include eleven colleges and 3,000 students. Landis' findings paralleled the earlier findings of Rockwood and Ford. He found that 52 percent of males and 65 percent of females did not approve of premarital coitus for either sex; only 20 percent of males and 5 percent of females approved of premarital coitus for both sexes. Thus Landis' study produced the most reliable data on students' sex standards to the early 1960's.

Winston Ehrman (1959) changed the focus of sex attitudes research from the simple descriptive to the interpretative. Ehrman focused upon the divergence in male-female response on sex attitudes, concluding that both sexes held "double-standards" for male-female behavior. The sex and love implications of these "double-standards," according to Ehrmann, can be translated into representations of male and female subcultures. Thus sexual behavior can be compartmentalized into stages of physical intimacy. He then developed a conservative-liberal typology for classifying student responses which is applicable to a later section of this analysis.

Up to this point in the development of sexual research, the

most significant study for this analysis is Reiss's *The Social Context of Premarital Sexual Permissiveness*. Reiss's research (1967) is both a synthesis and an elaboration upon past research efforts, and perhaps his greatest contribution lies in his effort to refine the classificatory schemes developed by Ehrmann. Reiss developed a Guttman scale to measure premarital sexual permissiveness, and concluded that students' premarital sex standards could be represented by the scale.

Reiss developed four major categories and ten subcategories for use in classifying premarital sex standards. The major categories consisted of: (1) abstinence, (2) double standard, (3) permissiveness with affection, and (4) permissiveness without affection (see complete listing of categories in appendix). Reiss found in his sample of 821 students that 28 percent of males and 15 percent of females expressed standards permitting premarital coitus if the couple were engaged or in love. Only 13 percent of males and 2 percent of females expressed acceptance of permissiveness without affection, indicating that as late as 1965, there had been no great shift in student standards toward unrestrained and free sexual expression.

Through the use of his scale, Reiss further concluded that

---

1 *op. cit.*
students tended to be more permissive than their parents, and that parental permissiveness declined as their children approached the age where they might begin to have some sexual experience. Reiss went ahead to develop seven propositions about sexual permissiveness, finally concluding by proposing the theory that sexual permissiveness is learned in a social context in the same fashion that other attitudes and behavior patterns are learned.\(^1\) This theory is based on his finding that standards of personal permissiveness tend to change to conform to the norms of permissiveness of the peer group, and that levels of permissiveness acceptable to the adolescent or college student tend to be related to the role and status of the person (i.e., as students later become parents, their standards of permissiveness for their children tend to become more conservative).\(^2\)

These basic categories described by Reiss provide the basis for the sex standards continuum used in Chapter IV of this analysis.

**Summary of research on sex standards**

The most significant research efforts to date have been an attempt to develop classificatory schemes to represent different

\(^1\)loc. cit., p. 164.

\(^2\)loc. cit., pp. 162-164.
standards for premarital sex relations. Little effort (with the exception of Reiss) has been made to step beyond classificatory schemes and to search for the determinants of variation in sex standards. Herein lies one of the contributions of this present dissertation; to attempt to move beyond simple classificatory schemes and determine the demographic, descriptive, and attitudinal variables that are most significantly associated with variation in college students' attitudes toward premarital sex relations.

Research on Sex Behavior

In the examination of the literature pertaining to premarital sexual behavior, we see somewhat the same state of development in research as was found for sex standards. A variety of descriptive studies have been made on premarital sexual behavior, from what would appear to be a greater variety of scholars. Studies of the sexual behavior of high school and college students date back to the early 1920's. While each of these studies have contributed to our knowledge of the incidence of premarital coitus for the samples involved, they were limited in size and the population indicated. A summary of these findings can be found in Packard.¹

The most famous and wide-ranging study of sexual behavior was done by Kinsey and Associates. Kinsey's findings invalidated more common perceptions about sex that previously were assumed to be true. In particular, Kinsey's research showed that the range and nature of sexual behavior experienced by the general population was much greater than previously believed.

Kinsey found, during the 1940's, that nearly 50 percent of females had experienced premarital coitus (without considering the age of marriage), and that 60 percent of college women reported premarital coitus (perhaps because college females tend to marry later).

Kinsey was the first researcher to make any strong effort to control different descriptive variables in his study of human sexual behavior. He noted a variety of social class and educational differences in sexual behavior (the lower the level of education and social class, the more frequent the rate of premarital coitus) and that the likelihood of experiencing premarital coitus increased by

---


the age of the respondent rather than being directly determined by their moral standards. Kinsey did more than any previous researcher to create a greater awareness among the academic community that sexual research could, in fact, be done and that the need for empirical data was more acute than had been realized. Kinsey's research presents the most reliable and comprehensive research to that time, and still remains unequalled in scope and method today.

Whereas Kinsey focused more upon the total sexual behavior of adults, Ehrmann, in a study of 1,000 college students, focused exclusively upon the premarital sexual behavior of students. Ehrmann attempted to describe the sex aspects of dating behavior and premarital love-making of students, and then to relate the behavior to sex attitudes held by students. Ehrmann noted that previous research efforts had produced a potpourri of findings on the frequency of premarital coitus experienced by college students, as depicted in Exhibits 1 and 2. From these exhibits, two conclusions appear evident: first, that consistently a greater proportion of males have experienced premarital coitus than females, and second, that approximately 40 to 60 percent of males and 10 to 30 percent of females have experienced premarital coitus.

---

1 op. cit.
## EXHIBIT 1

### INCIDENCE OF PREMARITAL SEXUAL INTERCOURSE OF MALES

**AS REPORTED BY VARIOUS INVESTIGATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigator</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Incidence %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exner</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>518 college students, S</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peck &amp; Wells</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>180 college level, S &amp; M</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peck &amp; Wells</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>230 college level, S &amp; M</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>100 college level, M</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromley &amp; Britten</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>470 college students, S</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromley &amp; Britten</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>122 college students, S</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>419 college students, S</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terman</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>760 college and high school, M</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porterfield &amp; Salley</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>285 college students, S</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finger</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>111 college students, S</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hohman &amp; Schaffner</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>1000 college students, S</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinsey, et al.</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>2308 college level, S</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinsey, et al.</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>761 college level, S &amp; M</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinsey, et al.</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>202 college level, S &amp; M</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>95 college students, S</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Youth Research</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>--- college students, S</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgess &amp; Wallin</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>580 college and high school, M</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landis &amp; Landis</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>600 college students, S &amp; M</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehrmann</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>274 college students, S</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehrmann</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>302 college students, S</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehrmann</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>50 college students, S</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packard</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>644 college students, S</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

- S = Single marital status
- M = Married

EXHIBIT 2

INCIDENCE OF PREMARITAL SEXUAL INTERCOURSE OF FEMALES AS REPORTED BY VARIOUS INVESTIGATORS¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigator</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Incidence %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>1000 college and high school, M</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>100 college level, M</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson &amp; Beam</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>500 college and high school, S</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromley &amp; Britten</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>618 college students, S</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromley &amp; Britten</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>154 college students, S</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terman</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>777 college and high school, M</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landis, et al.</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>109 high school and college, S</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landis, et al.</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>44 high school and college, M</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porterfield &amp; Salley</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>328 college students, S</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Youth Research</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>--- college students, S</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinsey, et al.</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>3303 college level, S &amp; M</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgess &amp; Wallin</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>604 college and high school, M</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landis &amp; Landis</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>1000 college students, S &amp; M</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reevy</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>139 college students, S</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehrmann</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>265 college students, S</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehrmann</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>50 college students, S</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packard</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>688 college students, S</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend

S = Single marital status
M = Married

On the other hand, it cannot be clearly deduced if there are any new trends in behavior, or, for that matter, what are the exact behavioral patterns for the different status groups. Thus, as Ehrmann concluded, it is of greater importance to study the relationships between attitudes and sex behavior than simply compiling descriptive statistics on premarital sex behavior; only in this fashion can we expect to unravel the discrepancies in findings of past research efforts.

Using this perspective, Ehrmann focused his analysis upon the nature of the inter-personal commitment and sexual behavior. He found that both the frequency and likelihood of premarital coitus decreased for males and increased for females as the affective commitment became stronger; males were less likely to expect coitus from their "steady" as the affective relationship grew, while females were more willing to engage in coitus as the love relationship developed. Thus Ehrmann clearly demonstrates the fact that attitudes and behavior are interrelated and are a product of the nature of the affective relationship.

Summary of research on sex behavior

The above research efforts on sexual behavior possess the same limitations as found in research on sex attitudes, in that few studies have extended beyond the descriptive realm. Here again, we conclude that it is now timely and appropriate that a step beyond
simple description and classification is made, to seek to identify the most significant variables that account for variation in premarital sex behavior.

Thus, a second purpose of this dissertation, growing out of the above descriptive studies, is to attempt to identify the major variables that influence the premarital sexual behavior of college students.

It is intended to accomplish these purposes through the research objectives described below, objectives that have not been clearly specified nor answered in the current literature referred to above.

**RESEARCH OBJECTIVES**

In light of the above discussion, it is important to specify the major research objectives guiding this analysis. Specifically, the paramount concern of this analysis is to explore a wide range of variables, many that are not included in the current literature, and examine their impact in accounting for variation in premarital sex attitudes and behavior patterns. From this, it is hoped that one may specify:

1. The major variables accounting for variation in premarital sex standards and behavior of college students. During the process of exploring this question and attempting to provide empirical answers, the interrelationships among the variables derived from the analysis
of the above are examined. Thus, a second objective for analysis is:

2. To determine the distinguishing characteristics of respondents who hold permissive vs. non-permissive sex standards and behavior patterns.

A further point of interest is the nature of the relationship between sex standards and behavior patterns, more specifically whether sex behavior is directly associated with sex standards, or are standards modified to conform with behavioral patterns. Thus, a third research objective is to examine:

3. The nature of the relationship between sex standards of respondents and the corresponding behavior patterns.

As stated above, most of the past research efforts, focusing upon premarital sex standards and behavior, have been an attempt to develop descriptive categories to represent the different sex standards and behavior patterns of college students, and to find out simply what proportion of males and females hold such attitudes or are engaged in such behavior. Although this will also be explored, the intent of this analysis is to move beyond the basic categories already developed in the literature, and explore the effects of a wide range of social demographic and attitudinal variables upon students' sex standards and behavior.

Methods of Analysis

To accomplish the above purposes and to answer the research
questions posed, the "grounded theory" methodology of inductive research is used.

The "grounded theory" methodology

The "grounded theory" method (which is described more fully in Chapter II) is an inductive method of analysis which seeks to discover basic classifications and relationships inherent in the raw data. In its purest sense, "grounded theory" begins with no pre-conceived theoretical conceptions and proceeds through the systematic and logical analysis of the data at hand. Thus, any conclusions or emerging theoretical conceptions are directly "grounded" in the research data collected for analysis. It is intended that such a method would produce the most representative classifications of data, and preclude the elements of error that might be present in deductive analysis.¹ This method seems justified for the following reasons:

1. It is presumed in this analysis that the state of development of sex knowledge is insufficiently supported (empirically) to warrant a general deductive analysis, except upon very specific hypotheses.

¹Inductivists have long argued that the deductivists can never know the true nature of the data they use, as their theoretical conceptions are formed through the logical processes of deduction, rather than explicitly representing the data under analysis. This debate is elaborated in Chapter II.
2. It is of greater importance at this time, given the current state of sexual research, to broaden the base of empirically supported knowledge through exploratory research than to attempt a detailed analysis of highly specific sub-areas of knowledge.

3. A consideration of lesser importance than above, although definitely of significance, is that an abundance of data encompassing a wide range of demographic, descriptive, and attitudinal variables relating to students’ premarital sex attitudes and behavior were made available for analysis. Although naturally there are limitations imposed upon the analysis by using pre-collected data, these limitations are noted and taken into consideration in the analysis. These limitations are acceptable if there is no alternative readily available in an exploratory analysis.

These above objectives are explored through the statistical techniques described below.

Statistical method

With the above research objectives in mind, Automatic Interaction Detection analysis (AID) and factor analysis are used to define and describe the variables most salient in accounting for variation in student sex standards and behavior.

The AID program used the analysis of variance method to select the variables (of those included in the analysis) that account
for the most variation in sex standards or behavior (whichever is being analyzed at the moment). Respondents possessing the specified characteristics are then classified into two dichotomized subgroups. The analytic process is then repeated for each subgroup in turn, creating a progression of different classifications, each one accounting for additional variation in the dependent variable of sex standards or behavior. (See Chapter II for an elaboration of this statistical technique.) Through this fashion, an elaborated series of classifications are developed to account (statistically) for the variation in responses to sex standards and behavior.

Through the use of the above statistical technique, a rather large number of variables can be evaluated for their ability to account for the variation in respondents' sex standards and behavior. In this analysis, about 80 variables are evaluated for both sex standards and sexual behavior.

Factor analysis is also used herein to define and identify the different "dimensions" that may be expressed within the data, thus providing (or subtracting) validity from the classifications developed through AID analysis. For example, factor analysis might tell us if a classification specified by AID analysis is clearly represented in the data, or is crossed with characteristics of another classification. Through this fashion one can ascertain the unidimensionality of categories specified in the analysis. (See Chapter II for a
description of factor analysis.)

With the above purposes and methods of analysis in mind, we may now proceed with (1) a detailed description of the methodology used in this study, Chapter II; (2) a description of the sample and characteristics of the data, Chapter III; (3) a presentation of the findings in the analysis of sex standards and behavior, Chapters IV, V, VI, and VII, and (4) the conclusions derived from this analysis, Chapter VIII.
CHAPTER II

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

There are a variety of methodological approaches available for the social scientist to utilize in the examination and explanation of data. Two prominent methodological approaches are the deductive and inductive (or the "grounded theory" approach).

To most of academia, these approaches are in direct competition and the utility of either is frequently viewed as being mutually exclusive. A smaller minority of scholars argue that while it may seem that the two approaches are antithetical, it may well be that as theoretical orientations, the two approaches are, in fact, complementary, each contributing to the understanding of the social phenomena being studied. Therefore, this author prefers to use the approaches eclectically, to maximize the relative advantage and contributions of each. It is important to discuss both methodologies in order to understand the qualities of each approach.

Deductive Analysis

From the period of early Greek civilization, deduction has been the basic model used in the development of science. Nagel observes that the most comprehensive and impressive systems of
explanation are "deductive."¹ For many of today's scholars -- Nagel and Popper in particular -- the deductive model is the only reliable method for achieving truth in science (a position sharply challenged by the inductivists). A brief description of deductive reasoning can lend clarification to the debate.

Two modern theorists, Sjoberg and Nett, define the basic elements of the deductive approach to include: (1) a system of postulates or axioms, based upon previous research or studied guesses, that enter logical systems as "hypotheses"; (2) the definitions of key terms in the axioms or postulates as well as a statement of undefined terms; and (3) the theorems (or hypotheses or propositions) are logically derived from the axioms or postulates which are then subjected to "testing" through empirical observation.²

In the basic deductive model, the explanation of propositions must follow (or be derived) from the premises; particular events must flow from the universal. Knowledge is accumulated through the discovery of general laws of science, then the elements of the laws or axioms are tested to determine both the validity of the initial premises upon which they are based and the propositions derived


from the postulates.

An earlier theorist, Popper, defines four different lines along which deductive theory is tested: (1) the logical comparison of the conclusions among themselves; (2) the investigation of the logical form of the theory (tautological vs. testable hypotheses); (3) a comparison for consistency and value with other theories; and (4) testing the theory through the empirical application of the conclusions derived.¹

The inductive method of analysis first evolved as an alternative and competing approach to the deductive method. The deductive method utilized the deduction of propositions from axioms or postulates assumed to be true. All deduction and knowledge would flow logically from the premises and thus would be consistent with all other knowledge and premises. However, scientists soon realized that deduction could not always be relied upon to coincide with the observed facts, and that primitive terms could not always be defined, thus creating discrepancies in the state of knowledge.

Inductive Analysis

A few early scholars came to recognize the virtue of inducing propositions from the bottom up, so to speak, from the ideographic —

specific, to the nomothetic -- general.\textsuperscript{1} Essentially this methodology involves the gathering of facts or observations, formulating an explanation or proposition to represent that which was observed, then forming a hypothesis in order to determine the validity and reliability of the proposition. The reasoning usually took the form of a statement presented in the "if and when -- then . . ." form. In other words, if A and B are evident in a situation of X, they Y may be expected to be manifest. Thus, induction proceeds from the singular to the universal, and the particular to the general.

The inductive method was refined through the combined efforts of Bacon, Spencer, and Mill, with Mill being the most frequently cited reference today. Mill contributed a paradigm for inductive proof consisting of five canons: (1) the method of agreement, (2) the method of negative agreement, (3) the method of difference, (4) the method of agreement and difference, and (5) the method of concomitant variation.\textsuperscript{2} When a set of observations satisfied (or survived) these canons of logic, the proposition was assumed to be verified and accepted as valid.

Although Mill's model of inductive proof served its purpose for


the period, the inductive approach has been further refined to serve
the needs of science today. With the work of Keynes, modern science
has added the mathematical properties of probability to the inductive
approach, thus making it more inferential than straight induction.¹
The use of probability statistics or theories enabled scientists to
support hypotheses, or infer conclusions based upon the likelihood
or relative extent of truth that could be assured, given the percentage
or proportion of occasions one may assume the statement is represen-
tative or correct.

The integration of statistical probability in inferential logic
has greatly expanded the utility of the inductive approach for testing
hypotheses, as well as circumventing many of the complaints of its
critics. The rules of probability were incorporated into statistical
analysis, providing a mathematical means for establishing a relative
level of support.

Barker notes that modern induction is usually accomplished
through three means -- eliminative, enumerative, and the method of
hypothesis.² The eliminative method proceeds through the elimina-
tion of rival generalizations. One could ideally accomplish a

¹Keynes, John Maynard, A Treatise on Probability. London

²Barker, S. F., Induction and Hypothesis. Ithaca: Cornell
reasonable level of proof through this manner, if it can be assumed that a finite number of possible generalizations or occasions representing the phenomena exists, and if one could reasonably be expected to examine all alternative generalizations. Keynes strengthened this approach by adding the mathematics of probability to the eliminative method, but the method still remains limited and something less than satisfactory as an answer for the development of proof. Critics proclaim that one can never refute all past, present, and future incompatible generalizations, thus at best eliminative logic would only constitute a marginal level of proof.

The enumerative approach, according to Barker, entails the gathering of observations or situations and creating propositions to account for their occurrence. Thus, if one observes that 10,000 different crows, without exception, are black, one may conclude that all crows are black. As with others, inductive logicians have attempted to attach the element of probability to this enumerative approach, but the critics remain unsatisfied. They argue that there always remains the possibility of the one exception of deviant case emerging to refute the final statement of truth.

Barker's third approach, the method of hypothesis, utilizes a quasi-inductive method. This methodology develops hypotheses felt to be consistent with the observations, then confirms them through cross-verification for negating occasions. If the consequents of the
hypotheses are verified (and no exceptions derived) the hypotheses are considered confirmed. Each hypothesis is strengthened by adding more verification (through replication) until one is satisfied a sufficient level of proof is achieved.

The hypothesis-method, which perhaps is the best the inductivists have to offer, is open to criticism by the formal deductivists. They charge that inductive logic never achieves truth, it only approaches a more correct state of knowledge through each confirmation.

Modern deductivists thus remain unsatisfied with the ability of inductive logic to achieve proof. However, as Barker would argue, inductive logic is by definition non-demonstrable, thus it is pointless to fault it for not being demonstrable. Barker also argues that the only relevant question concerns the ability of inductive logic to achieve reliable and empirically valid propositions.¹

The reason for even considering, albeit briefly, the debate over the relative merits and shortcomings of either deductive or inductive reasoning is because of the relevance of such arguments for the research methodology incorporated in this study of sex standards and behavior.

¹loc. cit., pp. 24-25.
Inductive Analysis and Sexual Research

With the exception of a few very prominent research efforts, much more information on sexual behavior is presumed than verified (for reference, see Chapter I). There are few reliable axioms or postulates in the research of sexual behavior that are sufficiently supported from which to proceed with deductive analysis. The few exceptions that exist are drawn from or rely heavily upon other substantive areas (Marriage and the Family, Family Living, etc.). Although other substantive areas may assist in understanding sexual behavior, they do not build a theory or integrated set of propositions of sexual behavior in itself.

Thus it is proposed in this dissertation that the inductive or "grounded theory" method is particularly well suited for substantive research on sexual behavior. In this manner propositions may be developed which are directly representative of the available empirical knowledge. This is felt to be preferable to a situation where the data collection is shaped to confirm unsupported or predetermined notions or reality.

Therefore, this dissertation incorporates the "grounded theory" reasoning to structure the central problem under consideration and to guide its research methodology. Analytic techniques using Automatic Interaction Detection analysis and factor analysis permits the development of propositions from the data being studied.
It is appropriate at this juncture to explain further what is meant by "grounded theory."

**Grounded theory methodology**

Perhaps the most integrated and comprehensive examination of grounded theory is contained in Glaser and Strauss's *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*. Grounded theory is therein described as a classificatory method for generating theory directly from the data at hand. Whereas the deductive theorist collects data to test an axiomatic or deductively developed hypothesis, the "grounded theorist" develops his hypotheses from the categories and relationships emerging from the data. Thus, while the deductive theorist is concerned more with verifying theory, the grounded theorist attempts to generate theory that directly represents the data under investigation.

**The method of grounded theory.** The method of grounded theory is to select populations for study which are expected to be most productive in developing useful classifications and theoretical relationships related to the general concerns being studied. As such, the study is basically exploratory in nature, yet with concern being given to anticipate relationships between selected variables. Thus

---
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such a study, while not guided by specific hypotheses to be tested, is not without empirical or theoretical underpinning. As such, sample populations are not specified by a given theory, but rather are directed by the theoretical orientation being considered.

With the grounded theory methodology, any conventional or unobtrusive method for collecting data may be utilized. The interpretation of the substantive content of the data is guided by the research questions and theoretical conceptions defined prior to the study. Ideally, data are collected in a series of stages, with each successive stage being altered and refined from previous stages in order to maximize the explication of theoretical relationships.

In this manner, evaluation of the data is a continuous process throughout the successive stages. At each level, the grounded theorist attempts to classify and reclassify data in order to establish empirical relationships. It also permits one to move from the specific -- ideographic situation to the general -- nomothetic realm. As such it holds the promise of not only establishing what is, but also statements of "why" and predictive statements of the "if and when -- then" variety, which, upon further analysis with new samples, help to establish the validity of such propositions across populations.

As meaningful relationships emerge from the classifications, the research instrument is revised and administered again to test
the emergent relationships. Thus the collection and analysis of data are continually intermeshed into one longitudinal process, until the researcher is satisfied with the reliability and validity of the emergent relationships. Through the above process substantive theory is developed which can later be formalized and tested in a deductive manner.

In summary, therefore, the "grounded theory" methodology calls for the following procedures:

1. Collect data representative of the population being examined.
2. Develop descriptive categories which represent the nature and characteristics of the data derived.
3. Maximize the descriptive differences between categories or groups so as to clearly define the nature of the phenomena being examined.
4. Formulate a theoretical explanation or proposition which represents the descriptive differences.
5. Collect additional data to test the reliability of the proposed explanation.

In this dissertation, the spirit of the grounded theory approach is incorporated, but not the total procedures. Certain adaptations were necessary to utilize the data available for this analysis. The

\[1\text{loc. cit., p. 45.}\]
adaptations are as follows:

1. The study is largely exploratory and descriptive, and contains a rather large sample size (N=800) and number of variables (375 variables). The infinite number of possible combinations of relationships with this number of variables precludes any complete and exhaustive analysis of all the data within a one-year time frame.

2. However, this limitation does not preclude the derivation of meaningful relationships. On the contrary, the spirit of the grounded theory approach is to examine a limited number of variables in depth, then expand the analysis as resources permit to increase understanding of the larger substantive context. Thus, only about one-fourth of the variables were selected for intensive examination in this analysis.

3. This analysis is intended to specify meaningful classifications to be developed for more intensive investigation and to identify non-productive relationships. Therefore, this study represents one stage in the grounded theory method and is not considered to be conclusive.

4. The purpose of this investigation is to describe characteristics of the student population and to work toward the development of substantive propositions for formal
investigation.

Given the above background, attention is now directed to the application of statistical techniques to the research problem as proposed herein.

The Application of Statistical Techniques

The questionnaire used in this analysis was designed to collect a wide range of information on students' sex knowledge, sex standards, and premarital sexual behavior. It included over 375 variables, many of which would be expected to be interrelated and intercorrelated in representing a number of common dimensions.

Since the sample was not random, or designed to be statistically representative of the universe, the data in this analysis are best suited to exploratory and descriptive statistical analysis.

With the above characteristics of the data in mind, there are two statistical techniques that are particularly well suited to the "grounded theory" method of analysis -- AID analysis, and factor analysis. These techniques are designed to specify and describe the basic classifications and dimensions represented in the data. Below, these techniques are described in greater detail.

The application of AID to grounded theory

The capacity for handling a large number of variables (45) and its "model building" ability makes Automatic Interaction Detection
analysis (AID) a particularly suitable statistical tool for application to grounded theory. AID's multi-classification method allows each of a series of independent variables to be considered at each juncture of analysis to produce the particular combination of variables that explain the greatest variation in the dependent variable.

With such information at hand, the researcher can then add or withdraw independent variables (at any stage of the analysis) to better ascertain the precise interrelationships among the variables. As an example of this quality, assume a dependent variable of "personal income" and the independent variables of "education, profession, sex, and race." The order of relationships may resemble the following: "profession" may account for the greatest variation in income, then type of profession is further split by education, which is further subdivided by sex and then race.

Having done this and found the relationship of variables to "profession" the researcher may then raise questions as to the form the model may assume if "profession" were deleted. Conceivably, and quite likely, education may then account for the greatest variation, followed by race and then sex, creating a different order or relationships and permitting one to ascertain the interrelationships

---

among variables in a model.

It is possible for the AID analysis to allow the development of several different classification orders; this is so because all later selections of classifications are based on the preceding order of categories.

Through examination of the different classification schemes, the researcher is able to develop an understanding of the interrelationships among the different sets of independent variables. This understanding (based upon empirical data) can then be utilized in preparing revised research instruments, to build substantive theory, and to predict the recurrence of similar findings if and when the conditions under analysis are found to exist or may be judged as occurring again. This technique, in essence, is also the method of grounded theory.

A more thorough and yet brief description of the AID analytic technique is presented on the following pages.

The Methodology of Automatic Interaction Detection Analysis

As mentioned above, a common problem in sociological research, and particularly in this analysis, is to determine the effect of a relatively large combination of independent variables upon any single dependent variable. Several techniques are available for handling small sets of variables -- regression analysis, dummy
variable analysis, and other techniques for holding one variable constant while allowing others to vary.

**Description of AID analysis**

Automatic Interaction Detection analysis (AID) is a recent statistical innovation (1964) which allows large amounts of survey data to be handled in one analysis. Its method uses an elaborated analysis of variance approach to measure the ability of any one of a combination of independent variables (X₁, X₂, X₃ . . . Xₙ) to explain or account for variation in the dependent variable Y. The independent (X₁) and dependent (Y) variables may be any mixture of nominal, ordinal, or equal-interval scales, and thus may also be dichotomous or continuous. No assumptions of linearity or additivity are required, thus allowing a considerable range in the selection of independent variables and the scale of analysis.¹

AID analysis proceeds by computing a mean score and total-sum-of-squares for the dependent variable and then evaluating the ability of each independent variable (predictor variable) to reduce the ratio of explained/unexplained variance (plus error) for the dependent variable.² The mean score for each response category on the

¹ loc. cit., pp. 2-10.

² The phrase "ability to explain variation" is used as a statistical explanation and is not necessarily extendable to the obdurate world. In the AID program, variation is explained when a classification is
predictor variables is computed, divided (split) and then regrouped to provide the maximum reduction of between-sum-of-squares/total-sum-of-squares (bss/tss) for that predictor. Each predictor is evaluated in sequence and finally split with the combination of response codes that allows the greatest reduction in unexplained variance.

Respondents in the original or parent group (dependent variable group) are classified into the high-low groups according to their response on the specified question. Each high-low group is then re-evaluated (subjected again to the statistical method described above) and split further by the predictors, finally producing a tree structure of subgroups. This process is continued until all respondents are classified or the predictors included in the analysis cannot explain any further statistical variation.

To illustrate the above description, assume a continuous dependent variable of sex standards with responses ranging from "no premarital sex relations permitted" to "sex relations permitted for both parties." A maximum of 45 predictors may be selected which are expected to have some impact in explaining variation of responses for the question and the dependent variable. ¹ In the analysis, each capable of reducing the ratio of between-sum-of-squares to total-sum-of-squares, plus error.

¹The program capacity is determined by the core storage capacity.
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predictor variable competes with all others to determine which of them accounts for the greatest reduction in unexplained variation.

Let us assume that sex of respondent is found to achieve the greatest reduction in variance. The parent group is then split by respondent's sex into two subgroups. The final result is a tree structure as diagrammed in Figure 1. The mean values of each subgroup (a group created by splitting a parent group) give an indication of the effect of the predictor upon the dependent variable. The higher mean score for males indicates they are more liberal in their sex standards than females ($\bar{X} = 3.3$ vs. 2.0 respectively). Thus the researcher would conclude that males and females hold quite different sex standards, that males show greater latitude in the acceptable sex behavior permitted before marriage than females, and that males who attend church weekly have more stringent sex standards than those who attend less frequently. The evaluation process is repeated for each subgroup until:

1. All respondents are classified into some final subgroup.

of the computer facilities being utilized. In this case, only 45 variables could be utilized on the PDP-10 at Western Michigan University in 1972.

1 A parent group is any group being considered for subclassification. Parent group 1 is composed of all valid respondents in the analysis, then parent group 1 is split into groups 2 and 3. Groups 2 and 3 then become parent groups when they are the subject of analysis.
FIGURE 1
A HYPOTHETICAL AID ANALYSIS

Parent
Group 1
Sex Standards

N = 400

Group 2
Respondents
Sex-Female

X = 2.0
N = 75

Group 3
Respondents
Sex-Male

X = 3.3
N = 325

Group 4
Religious Participation
Weekly

X = 2.5
N = 75

Group 5
Religious Participation
Monthly

X = 3.1
N = 125
2. Minimum levels of significance are achieved.

3. The predictors in the analysis cannot achieve any additional reduction in the unexplained variation.

A careful and systematic analysis of the tree structure, the change in mean values, and the competition of predictor variables can give an indication of the function of the independent variables, as well as to specify the conditions and patterns of interaction of variables.

It can be seen that this analytic technique has considerable utility in model building, in that the researcher is able to incorporate a rather large number of variables into a single analysis. Yet there are also limitations inherent in the analytic technique.

Limitations of the AID program

As stated by Sonquist,\(^1\) the most proper application of AID is as an evaluative tool and screening device for exploratory analysis. Its strength lies in its ability to screen out irrelevant or ineffective variables and identify significant variables. After the narrowing and refining process, more rigorous analysis using other statistical techniques can be applied to the smaller set of significant variables with greater efficiency.

However, the rather arbitrary nature of the decision logic built into the program severely limits its application to testing

\(^1\)op. cit., p. 1.
hypotheses. As such, it is not an appropriate tool for examining causal relationships. On the other hand, with cautious application, AID can be used to substantiate or refute expected structures of relationships among variables. As one example, an examination of the tree structure of the AID analysis can help determine if theoretically derived classifications are represented in the data.

As stated above, the particular advantage of AID for this study is its ability to define a small set of significant variables for further analysis using other statistical techniques. In this analysis, the next appropriate step would be the application of factor analysis to determine the durability of the classifications defined by AID analysis.

In this analysis, as well as in any statistical analysis, any conclusions are qualified and limited by the nature of the population examined, as well as the selection of predictors for analysis. It is expected that the findings of the AID analytical technique are valid and applicable to other populations that possess equivalent demographic and descriptive characteristics.

The Application of Factor Analysis

Factor analysis is a statistical technique for handling a large number of operational indices and reducing them to a smaller number of conceptual variables. It assumes that if several variables are
intercorrelated, there is an underlying common factor which can represent the larger number of variables.¹

The method of factor analysis is to select the variables that are most highly intercorrelated so that they may be integrated into a common factor. Thus, factor analysis attempts to define clusters of intercorrelated variables which contain a common dimension. A basic assumption is that all factors are linear and all uncorrelated factors are independent.

The approximate amount of variation accounted for by a factor can be estimated through the communalities specified for the factor, thus giving an indication of the relative explanatory strength of any particular cluster or dimension defined.

Factor analysis is most properly used as a descriptive technique rather than for a statistical test of hypotheses, and is thus used in this dissertation. It can, however, give an indication of the specification of dimensions contained in the data. Thus factor analysis is used as an additional descriptive and exploratory statistical tool in this analysis to support and clarify the classifications developed through AID analysis.

In this analysis, factor analysis will be used to describe the different dimensions within the data on college students. As such

it will serve to (1) add verification to the major classifications derived from AID analysis, (2) identify dimensions not defined or suggested by AID analysis, and (3) give some estimation of the interrelatedness (intercorrelation) among variables in a general substantive area.

In serving the above purposes, factor analysis will not directly "test" the models derived through AID analysis, but will empirically examine different elements and classifications described in the AID models, providing additional support (or refutation) for the conclusions. It accomplishes this by specifying the unidimensionality of variables in the data. For example, factor analysis may help the researcher to ascertain if there is a modern and/or traditional conception of the marriage and family institution represented in the data. If an intercorrelated cluster of questions expressing a liberal or modern conception of marriage is defined by the factor analysis, it may be presumed that this dimension is explicit in the data.

It is expected that the major classification derived through AID analysis will also be represented in the factor analysis. If they should not be represented, their reliability and validity would be open to question and a careful examination of the analytical interpretation would be warranted.

Limitations of factor analysis

Perhaps the greatest difficulty in the use of factor analysis
in research is the interpretation of the factors specified by the analysis. As stated above, the technique specifies sets of intercorrelated variables which represent a common dimension in the data. It is the problem of the researcher intuitively to attach meaning to the factors or dimensions. The process of labeling a factor is frequently open to some question.

Further, there is no absolute meaning associated with a cluster of intercorrelated variables. The utility of any factor analysis is to be found in the interpretation derived, and if the clusters do not yield to meaningful interpretation, the analysis has limited or no utility.

Thus, factor analysis is used only as a means to an end in this analysis, and is not considered to be conclusive in itself.

Having described the methodology and major statistical techniques used in this analysis, we will now turn to a description of the population.
CHAPTER III

DESCRIPTION OF THE POPULATION

The population for this study consists of 800 undergraduate college students who were enrolled in Sociology and Home Economics classes at Western Michigan University (650 students), Kalamazoo, Michigan, and at Calvin College (75 students), and Mercy School of Nursing (75 students), Grand Rapids, Michigan. Students enrolled in the courses of Introductory Sociology, Marriage and Family Relations, Modern Social Problems, and Introduction to Sex Education, were given the opportunity to assist in an exploratory study which focused upon general student attitudes about teaching Human Sexuality and Family Living in high school. The larger project, of which this present research study is a part and from which it was drawn, included among its objectives:

1. To determine the students' major source of information about sexuality, dating, male-female differences, etc.
2. To determine the approximate age at which the student acquired the information.
3. To determine the extent that parents had discussed or informed students about the physical aspects of sex and family life matters.
4. To determine the students' perceptions of the proper setting (school, home, church) for teaching sex and family life education.

5. To determine the sexual and family life information desired by students.

6. To examine students' perceptions of the school's role in teaching family life and sex education.

7. To examine students' attitudes toward marriage, the family, abortion, sex education for children, and family planning.

8. To determine the students' own sexual standards and behavioral patterns.

The questionnaire used in this study was designed, constructed and administered by Dr. Herbert L. Smith of the Department of Sociology at Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan. Dr. Smith is directing the larger project (described above) of which this questionnaire is a part.

Since a rather large amount of carefully collected data were available for analysis, this author chose to make use of the opportunity provided and thus incorporated the data into this analysis.

Given the exploratory nature of the study, and in order to maximize the possibilities of a large return, the students involved in the study were drawn from basic courses with large enrollments. In this fashion, the difficulties and disruption of gaining entrance...
to other smaller classes could be minimized. Questionnaires were given to all students present during regular classroom periods. The purpose of the study was explained and their assistance was requested, yet all students were given the option of not completing the schedules. From all indications it was estimated that as many as 40 percent of the total enrollment in the classes did not complete the questionnaire. It is felt that most of those students who did not assist in the study were males, as well as a sizeable proportion of the black male student enrollment.

A small male proportion in this study is probably due to a combination of factors: (1) a major portion of the courses sampled had very high female enrollments (especially the Home Economics and Nursing courses); (2) the majority of black males chose not (of their own accord) to complete the questionnaire; and (3) a greater proportion of females were represented in the freshman and sophomore enrollments at the time of this study. The combination of these factors produced the disproportionate low representation of male subjects for analysis. (See Tables I and II)

Since this study was intended to be exploratory, descriptive, and to generate propositions (in the absence of empirical studies from which to compare), no attempt was made to obtain a purely random sample. Consequently, no suggestion is made to generalize the findings beyond this group, except where (1) the data are in line
### Table I

**Age Classification of College Students by Sex and Percent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Classification</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 or less</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 24</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25+</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>224</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table II

**Academic Classification of College Students by Sex and Percent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Classification</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>224</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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with other research finds that have been reported, (2) where it can reasonably be assumed that the findings herein are not obviously biased, and (3) they are applicable to the white college student population. With the exception of sampling, however, the normal methodology of survey research was followed to eliminate any obvious forms of bias. The data were collected over a two semester time period in Fall, 1970 and Winter, 1971.

Demographic Characteristics

Students' sex and age distribution

The complete population which forms the basis of this study consisted of 224 male (28 percent) and 576 female (72 percent) subjects. Part of this sex imbalance is due to the fact that all students in the school of nursing were female. (See Table I)

Over three-fourths (77 percent) of the students were almost equally divided in the 18, 19, and 20 year category (27 percent, 25 percent, and 25 percent respectively), with an additional 15 percent falling in the age 21-23 category. Only 40 students (5 percent) were 25 years of age or older.

The academic standing of students showed little variation among the freshman, sophomore, and junior year categories (30 percent, 27 percent, and 29 percent respectively). The proportion of senior year students was considerably smaller (14 percent),
reflecting the small enrollment of seniors in early undergraduate courses. (See Table II)

**Place of residence**

The majority of the students (82 percent) lived in urban or suburban areas; only 17 percent came from rural farms or hamlets. At least 21 percent were born and lived in major metropolitan areas.

**Racial composition**

Although it was not intended or expected, the respondents were primarily white (94 percent). Other racial groups composed only slightly more than 6 percent of the population, a proportion which is somewhat equivalent to the enrollment of minority group students in the university. However, it is expected that the minority groups were slightly under-represented, particularly the black male population. This under-representation may be attributed to two possible and plausible explanations: (1) the enrollment of non-white students is typically small at universities in which a major portion of the student body are upper classmen and graduate students (at Western Michigan University over 50 percent of the student body are enrolled in upper-level curriculums), and (2) the sample was collected during a period when black sensitivity was very acute. One professor noted that in his large Introductory Sociology class in which more than 40 black students were enrolled, less than one-fourth of the blacks completed the questionnaire.
Family Characteristics

Students' college residence patterns

The majority of single students in this study live on campus and away from their parents' residence. In this study, only 10 percent of the students were continuing to live with their parents, while 60 percent were residing in college dormitories. Twenty percent of the students were sharing private apartments with other students. The remaining 10 percent were living with a private family, in a sorority or fraternity house, or were of undetermined residence. A greater proportion of males lived in apartments than females (31 percent as compared to 17 percent) while more females lived in college dormitories (67 percent vs. 38 percent for males).

Students' family structure

Students in this study reported a high degree of family stability. Almost 90 percent of the students lived with their original parents before matriculation into college. Of the 10 percent who came from broken homes, less than half of the cases were due to divorce (40 cases out of 800), with "death of one parent" being the most frequently reported reason. This proportion corresponds quite closely with U.S. Census data on families for 1968 in which the Bureau of Census reported that 87 percent of white adolescents aged 14-17 were living with both parents (although the Census data does not differentiate
between original parents and legal parents).  

The students were about equally divided in their relative sibling position. Thirty-four percent of the students were the eldest child, 22 percent were the youngest child, and 33 percent were "in-between" children. Only 5 percent were the "only child" in the family.

Parents' Socio-Economic Status

Parents' occupational status

The students' fathers' occupational level is reported in Table III below. When students' fathers' occupational level is compared with national census data, it is clearly apparent that students in this sample come from families of higher occupational status than for the nation generally. (See Table III)

While no attempt was made to determine the students' mothers' occupational level, it was ascertained that a sizeable proportion of mothers were employed. Actually, 46 percent of the student respondents reported that their mothers were employed in some

---


---
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### TABLE III

**STUDENTS' FATHERS' OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL COMPARED WITH NATIONAL CENSUS DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>College Student Sample</th>
<th>National Census Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Service work</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsman, Foreman, or Farm Manager</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical, Sales</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Official</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>800</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

capacity outside of the home at the time of the data collection.

**Parents' educational level**

Students' parents' educational level is reported in Table IV. Almost 70 percent of fathers completed high school and over 40 percent had attended college or received an advanced degree. Over 80 percent of the mothers completed high school and 38 percent attended college.

When these distributions are compared to national census data for parents' educational achievement, it is clearly apparent that these parents' education exceeded national norms.
### TABLE IV

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF STUDENTS' MOTHER AND FATHER COMPARED WITH NATIONAL CENSUS DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Level of Achievement</th>
<th>College Students' Sample</th>
<th>National Census Data (both sexes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade school</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed high school</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college or technical school</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced degree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

800 100% 800 100% 100%

Religious Affiliation and Participation

**Students' religious affiliation and participation**

The responses of students to the questions focusing on religious affiliation indicated that 53 percent of the respondents identified themselves as Protestant, and 31 percent as Catholic. Less than one percent identified themselves as Jewish. Twelve percent did check the "other" religious category and/or replied in terms of "no preference" of religion.
One third of the sample (33 percent) reported that they attended church regularly at least once a week, while an additional 25 percent indicated they attended once a month or more. Thirty-five percent of students attended church infrequently. Only 7 percent of respondents reported never attending church or religious services.

The females were more diligent in church attendance than males (which is consistent with other findings which consider the differences between religiosity and sex). (See Table V)

### TABLE V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Church Attendance</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardly ever</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a year</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 times a month</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week or more</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>224</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Church Attendance</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardly ever</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a year</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 times a month</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week or more</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When students were queried about the importance of their religion, their response distribution was largely similar to their attendance patterns. Thirty-seven percent indicated that their religion was quite important in their lives; 31 percent felt religion was fairly important to their lives. (See Table VI)

**TABLE VI**

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF IMPORTANCE OF RELIGION TO STUDENT BY SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of Religion</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N %</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly unimportant</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not too important</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly important</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite important</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely important</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parents' religious participation

The parents of students in the study appeared largely to either attend church regularly or not at all. Not surprisingly, students reported that their mothers were more consistent in attendance than the fathers; sixty-four percent of mothers attended regularly,
12 percent attended monthly or several times a year, and 23 percent hardly ever attended church. Of the fathers, 54 percent attended regularly, 10 percent attended occasionally, and 32 percent never attended church or religious services.

Summary

As is noted by a comparison of sample parameters with population parameters of the larger society, the parents of students in this sample were significantly higher in both occupational and educational achievement than the larger general population.

Over half of the students in this analysis reported that religion was "important" to them, with over a third of the students feeling religion was "very important" in their lives.

The nuclear family structure is also much more stable among the sample than the national data might lead one to expect. Not only is this stability evidenced by the high proportion of intact family units, but is further evidenced by the responses of the student group to questions of (1) how well they got along with parents, (2) how well they like their parents, (3) their description of the happiness in their parents' marriage, and (4) what they would change about their parents if they had the chance. (See below)

In total, the students in this sample, as represented by these few indices, appear to come from families which provide a favorable
and positive conception of family life. This high degree of family stability and harmonious parent-child relationships might, of course, be expected to bear significantly upon understanding the findings of this study as reported by the student population.

With these basic demographic characteristics in mind, we may now analyze the other descriptive characteristics of this student population.
CHAPTER IV

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF THE STUDENT POPULATION: FAMILY, DATING, SEXUAL BEHAVIOR AND ATTITUDES

The preceding chapter described the basic demographic characteristics of the student population in this analysis. In this chapter we examine other attitudinal and behavioral indices more fully.

Students' Perception of Relationship with Parents

In order to gather insight into the students' affective relationship with their parents, several questions pertaining to this dimension were incorporated into the research instrument. Specifically, these questions were directed toward (1) the students' affection for the mother and father, (2) students' perceptions of the extent of change in parents that is required to make them "ideal" parents, (3) the students' satisfaction with their relationship with their parents, and (4) the students' perception of their parents' satisfaction in marriage.

Students' affection for parents

As is shown in Table VII, students in general expressed very strong affection for their parents; over 70 percent stated they loved their father very much, and even more (80 percent) held this affection for their mother. Only four percent of respondents held
definite dislike for the father and less than 1 percent disliked their mother.

### TABLE VII

**STUDENTS' AFFECTIVE RELATIONSHIP WITH PARENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affection</th>
<th>Parent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despise them</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike them</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent is O.K.</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like them very much</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love them very much</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Students' relationship with parents**

In general, the students in this analysis felt that they had a strong positive relationship with their parents. Over 75 percent indicated that they got along "well" or "very well" with both parents; in contrast, only 4 percent of the students stated that they had a poor relationship with their parents. (See Table VIII)

**Students' satisfaction with parents**

In order to get an additional measure of the extent that students were satisfied with their parents, they were asked, "If it were possible to change real parents into ideal parents, how much
would you change?" Examination of Table IX indicates that in
general (about 70 percent), students were quite satisfied with the
current personality of their parents and would make either "no"
change of any nature or only "one or two" changes in their parents.
Only about 5 percent of the respondents stated they would change
considerably the nature of their parents.

TABLE VIII
STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF RELATIONSHIP WITH
PARENTS BY SEX AND PERCENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Relationship</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very well</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly well</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very well</td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>224</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students' perception of parents' satisfaction with marriage

Considerably more students felt their parents were happy in
their marriage than were unhappy (64 percent vs. 14 percent).
Approximately 19 percent felt that their parents were only "average"
in their marital satisfaction. (See Table X) This is interpreted to
mean that students in this sample felt that their parents' marriage
presented a positive example of married and family life, a point of importance when students' attitudes toward marriage and the family are discussed later.

TABLE IX

STUDENTS' SATISFACTION WITH PARENTS' NATURE BY SEX AND PERCENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Change Desired</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th></th>
<th>Father</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male %</td>
<td>Female %</td>
<td>Male %</td>
<td>Female %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 Things</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several Things</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everything</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of students' perceptions of parents

Examination of Tables VII, VIII, IX, and X clearly shows that the majority of the students stated that they were very satisfied with the relationship they have with their parents, and perceive their parents as happy in their marriage. The proportion of cases where students were dissatisfied with the relationship with their parents ranges from a very small 5 percent to a maximum of 10 percent.

Thus, there is considerable evidence for concluding that in general, most students in this study felt that their home life was a
TABLE X

STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF PARENTS' MARITAL SATISFACTION BY SEX AND PERCENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents' Marital Satisfaction</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unhappy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhappy</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average happiness</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above average</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very happy</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely happy</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>224</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

positive experience and would not be expected to contribute to the development of attitudes counter to those conventional marriage and family patterns manifest in society today. These data may have added relevance for the examination of students' attitudes toward marriage and the family, to be discussed later.

Students' Dating Behavior

In order better to understand the premarital behavioral patterns of the respondents, several questions on dating behavior were incorporated into the questionnaire. Of the sample, 97 percent of the students reported they had dated; only 3 percent reported...
negatively.

The age of first date tended to cluster into the 14-16 age category for both sexes, with almost 90 percent having dated by their sixteenth year of age, and 97 percent by their eighteenth year of age. (See Table XI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have not dated</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Present dating behavior of students

The respondents' present dating behavior appeared to follow quite similar patterns for both male and female students. The greatest divergency of responses were found in categories representing a formal relationship and interpersonal commitment (i.e., going...
steady, pre-engaged, and engaged). Although a greater proportion of males were married than females (16 percent compared to 6 percent of females) the females were more likely to be engaged or going steady. (See Table XII)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present Dating Behavior</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Dating</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating Quite Often</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going Steady</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-engagement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It cannot be ascertained from this data whether the divergence in male-female perceptions of dating commitment represent a difference in the females perception of their dates intentions, or is an actual characteristic of the student population. It is quite possible that females may be more likely to define the dating
relationship as being more formalized than understood or intended by their male partners. On the other hand, it is not unheard of for males to indirectly encourage the females to develop a perception of formal commitment on their behalf, with the possible anticipation of their date's favor. A last possibility can be found in the nature of the female sample; the nursing and home economics students have an "applied emphasis" rather than academic, and students in these courses may be dating non-college males. Whichever interpretation is most correct cannot be determined from the data available.

**Dating behavioral norms**

A series of questions were incorporated into the research instrument to gather information about the expected and actual behavior of students on dates. A chance procedural error in the questionnaire resulted in a relatively large proportion of "no responses" to this question for the male sample. This significantly limits interpretation of the structure of behavioral norms.

Since there were almost 20 questions pertaining to students' dating behavior, the data are more simply presented in descriptive form. Thus, the responses to these questions are presented as follows:

1. Sixty-seven percent of the boys expected a "good night kiss", but only 26 percent expected to "neck" and 9 percent to "pet" on a casual date.
2. Only 3 percent of the girls felt they had to neck to be popular, but 61 percent stated that they usually "petted" or "made out" on a date. This represents a considerable difference between the perceived norm and the behavioral norm.

3. Sixty-six percent of the girls indicated that they "drank" on dates and the most frequent setting was either at their home (44 percent) or at friends (65 percent).

4. A greater proportion of the males had used "grass" or drugs (31 percent vs. 25 percent for females), but both sexes felt that their friends were much more involved in drugs than themselves. This suggests that perceptions of drug use are more prominent than actual usage in the general student population, but adequate data to explain this discrepancy were not available.

5. Girls indicated little reluctance to date a boy who drank, (70 percent were willing), but only 32 percent would date someone who used drugs. The males' responses for dating women followed the same pattern.

6. The high school and college dating patterns of both sexes were remarkably similar. (There was less than 3 percent variation between males and females in the distribution of dating frequencies and the number of different persons
dated at both the high school and college level.) About 10 percent of both sexes had not dated or had dated only one person in high school, while 27 percent had not dated or had dated only one person in college. (See Table XIII)

**TABLE XIII**

PERCENTAGE OF DIFFERENT PERSONS DATED IN JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL, HIGH SCHOOL, AND COLLEGE BY SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Persons Dated</th>
<th>Academic Classification</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior High School Male</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High School Male</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Male</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Over 70 percent of the students have never been formally engaged to be married. Of the remaining students, 22 percent of males have been engaged and 15 percent of the females reported they have been engaged at some time.
The discrepancy between males and females may possibly reflect the greater proportion of married males in the sample.

9. Both male and female students were quite similar in the number of times they reported they had been "in love." About 11 percent stated they had "never been in love," 80 percent reported 1 - 3 times, and 9 percent reported they had been "in love" at least four or more times.

Students' Pre-Marital Sexual Behavior

In order to measure the form and nature of students' pre-marital sexual behavior, students were asked to select the "most serious love relationship" they had experienced, and describe (1) the extent of physical intimacy for that stage, and (2) who limited the extent of intimacy. The proportion of student responses are presented in Table XIV.

The extent of physical intimacy for the respective stages was measured by a Guttman type scale with the following response categories: (1) casual hand holding, (2) casual kissing and hugging, (3) petting above the waist, (4) petting below the waist, (5) sexual intercourse a few times, and (6) sexual intercourse regularly.

Casual dating experience

The frequency distribution of extent of intimacy experienced
during casual dating is reported in Table XV.

### TABLE XIV

**MOST SERIOUS LOVE RELATIONSHIP, BY SEX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Courtship</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual Dating</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steady Dating</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of Engagement</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Engagement</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE XV

**EXTENT OF PHYSICAL INTIMACY EXPERIENCED BY STUDENTS REPORTING CASUAL DATING EXPERIENCES BY PERCENT AND SEX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Intimacy</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual hand holding</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual kissing</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petting above waist</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petting below waist</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coitus occasionally</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coitus regularly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The percentages in this table are not cumulative. The form of the question permitted the students to specify either the most advanced...
Examination of Table XV indicates that male students were somewhat more likely to participate in more advanced levels of physical intimacy in the casual dating stage than females. Neither sex engaged in coitus at this stage to any great degree, as evidenced by the fact that only 6 percent of the males and 2 percent of the females reported having experienced coitus on casual dates.

Steady dating experience

Data presented in Table XVI are somewhat similar to the previous pattern of Table XV in that males reported a higher level of physical intimacy than females. Although the differences were relatively small, there was a tendency (at the advanced levels of intimacy) for the female sample to be more conservative in their behavior and the male to be slightly more liberal in the extent of sexual intimacy experienced during steady dating.

The greatest difference found between casual and steady dating behavior is in the frequency of sexual intercourse. The proportion of males reporting sexual relations increased almost sixfold (from 6 percent in casual dating to 34 percent for steady dating), and females increased tenfold (from 2 percent to 20 percent).

stage of courtship, or all stages experienced. Thus, the categories contain some multiple responses for each respondent. Although this table is not an exact representation of the students' behavior, it still has some value and is included in this analysis with the above limitations in mind.
### TABLE XVI

**EXTENT OF PHYSICAL INTIMACY EXPERIENCED BY STUDENTS REPORTING STEADY DATING EXPERIENCE BY PERCENT AND SEX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Intimacy</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual hand holding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual kissing</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petting above waist</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petting below waist</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coitus occasionally</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coitus regularly</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In reference to the above, we find that an increase in sexual intimacy by stage of dating experience is to be expected, given the current literature. Ehrmann found for females that sexual intimacy is directly related to the perception of the interpersonal commitment; i.e., if females feel that the relationship represents a "love" involvement, they are willing to engage in more intimate sexual behavior. This tendency is also reported by Reiss, and Packard.

---


3 Packard, Vance, *The Sexual Wilderness: the Contemporary*
Pre-engagement experience

In examining Table XVII, we see that the extent of intimacy reported by both sexes has significantly increased from the steady-dating to pre-engagement phase of courtship, suggesting that pre-engagement represents a distinctive stage of behavior as well as perhaps representing a distinctive status. The proportion of males and females reporting regular coitus during pre-engagement has almost doubled over the steady dating stage.

TABLE XVII

EXTENT OF PHYSICAL INTIMACY REPORTED BY STUDENTS WITH INFORMAL OR PRE-ENGAGEMENT EXPERIENCE BY PERCENT AND SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Intimacy</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual hand holding</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual kissing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petting above waist</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petting below waist</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coitus occasionally</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coitus regularly</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Formal engagement experience**

Due to the rather small proportion of students in this analysis who were formally engaged, the responses for this stage are too few to permit meaningful analysis. Thus they are deleted from this analysis.

However, it is apparent that there is considerable basis for concluding that the extent of sexual intimacy increases with the advancement of stages of courtship, and the extent of physical intimacy reported by males is greater than that reported by females at all stages of courtship.

**Effect of Physical Intimacy upon the Dyad**

Moralists frequently proclaim that pre-marital sexual intimacy has an adverse effect upon the affective relationship between a couple. In an attempt to lend clarification to the issue, two questions were asked of the respondents who reported they had experienced a "serious love relationship" and had been physically intimate. The questions sought to ascertain first, how the respondent felt the intimacy affected the interpersonal relationship, and second, how they felt such intimacy affected them personally.

The majority of students in this study did engage in petting or some greater degree of sexual intimacy. However, the data below does not suggest that there were any strong adverse effects upon the affective relationship. On the contrary, almost 65 percent of both
males and females indicated that the intimacy they experienced actually improved their relationship with the other person concerned; another 15 percent of both sexes felt that the extent of intimacy had no impact upon their relationship. Only 20 percent of the respondents reported that the intimacy had been deleterious to their interpersonal commitment. (See Table XVIII)

TABLE XVIII

EFFECT OF PHYSICAL INTIMACY UPON AFFECTIVE RELATIONSHIP OF THE DYAD, BY PERCENT AND SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect of Intimacy</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brought us closer together</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>187</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brought us somewhat closer</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had no effect</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was disruptive</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was very disruptive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data on personal effects of physical intimacy reported by students showed patterns similar to those reported for the effects upon the interpersonal relationship. Almost one-half of males stated that they felt physical intimacy was "all right," but some
13 percent reported having some doubts about their activities. Another 15 percent of the males replied that their physical intimacy "did not affect me one way or the other." Only 15 percent of males reported that they felt guilty about their activities (13 percent of this group felt "slightly guilty," and 2 percent felt "extremely guilty.") (See Table XIX)

Table XIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feelings about Intimacy Experienced</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male N %</td>
<td>Female N %</td>
<td>Total N %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt it was all right</td>
<td>69 49</td>
<td>121 36</td>
<td>190 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had some doubts</td>
<td>30 21</td>
<td>101 30</td>
<td>131 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had no effect</td>
<td>21 15</td>
<td>35 11</td>
<td>56 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt slightly guilty</td>
<td>18 13</td>
<td>42 13</td>
<td>60 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt extremely guilty</td>
<td>3 2</td>
<td>32 10</td>
<td>35 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>141 100%</td>
<td>331 100%</td>
<td>472 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The female respondents, given their tendency to experience less physical intimacy than the males in the study, were also more concerned in their evaluation of the effects of the intimacy upon them personally. Thirty-six percent of females felt their sexual involvement was "all right," while nearly as many (30 percent) reported
having some doubts about the desirability of the intimacy experienced. Eleven percent of the females indicated that their sexual involvement did not affect them personally "one way or the other."

Both the males and females responses to this item are somewhat interesting in the fact that the sexual involvement of about 15 percent of the population is defined neither as desirable or undesirable, but in a neutral fashion. This suggests that some persons are able to enter into sexual liaisons of varying levels of intimacy and remain affectively neutral to the experience. Or, if they relate affectively to the experience at the time of their involvement, they soon re-evaluate the experience in a neutral manner. Such groups of respondents should be studied further to determine their familial, personal, and attitudinal components.

In contrast to the above, a significant portion of the population reported negative consequences from the physical intimacy they experienced. Twenty-three percent of the females reported negative effects of their sexual behavior. Of this group, 13 percent of the females (the same as for the males) felt "slightly guilty" about their physical intimacy, and 10 percent stated they felt "extremely guilty" from their sexual involvement with males. This proportion is over five times that of the males who reported feeling guilty about their sexual intimacy. (See Table XIX)

Overall, and in accordance with the traditional conception of
the behavior of males in our society, the males expressed slightly less negative effects from their sexual experience than females, but the difference is less than 10 percent for most categories. The differences between male and female perceptions, although statistically significant, is small, suggesting a definite overall similarity by both sexes in the interpretation of the affects of physical intimacy upon the person. The different proportion of responses to the "extremely guilty" category is a clear exception and one that should be given attention in further research.

Summary of Students' Dating Behavior and Experience

The most significant conclusion emerging from the prior section is that, in general, both male and female students follow quite similar patterns in their premarital dating experiences. That is, the patterns are similar in respect to the number of different persons dated in college, the proportion of students reporting a love relationship, and the petting behavior for "steady dating" students, which usually varied no more than 5 percent. Overall, however, as has been reported above, there is some tendency for males to have experienced a greater extent of physical intimacy at all stages of courtship, with the difference by sex usually ranging within 10 to 15 percent. It is well recognized in the literature that males tend to be somewhat more permissive than females in their sexual behavior, and that both sexes
tend to vary in the same direction on each of the criteria examined above.

The data suggest that the extent of physical intimacy increases for both sexes as the dating relationship progresses from casual to steady dating, but the extent of intimacy then tends to decrease for males during the informal engagement stages of the affective relationship. The data herein described thus appear to support the findings in the literature that a different normative standard is employed for the dating than the engagement experience, and that the effects upon males and females are perceptually, if not factually, different.¹

About 20 percent of the population reported that the physical intimacy they experienced was undesirable. In contrast, between 30 and 40 percent of the students felt that physical intimacy had a general positive influence. The remaining portion of respondents did not feel affected one way or another.

Since a major proportion of the population (see above) felt that physical intimacy was desirable in courtship, this finding may be interpreted to suggest that physical intimacy performs an important function in establishing an affective relationship, although the exact nature of the function is uncertain. Or, it may be as Reiss has suggested, that for youth whose behavior is unlike their values, and

as a result experienced guilt, do not stop their guilt-producing behavior, but rather continue their behavior until the feelings of guilt subside.¹

Students' Sources of Sex Information

There is much conjecture as to the effect of different sources of sex information and its latent impact upon the adolescents' morality and behavioral patterns. While there is an abundance of public opinion, there has been little research conducted upon this relationship. Further, the issue of sex education for the public school youth is violently condemned by opponents because of the assumed negative contribution which such instruction would produce and because it is seen as the right and responsibility of the home and the church to provide such instruction. Part of the reasoning used by the opponents of sex education and family living courses in the public schools is that:

1. Such information may be introduced too early into the school curriculum and would thereby not take into account the differing "readiness levels" of the student body.

2. That only facts would be taught, avoiding the moral injunctions and imperatives felt to be necessary components

of any such teaching.

3. That the church and home are in fact doing an adequate job of instructing their children in the basics of human sexuality and family living along with the proper value system, moral codes, and religious beliefs that should accompany such sensitive instruction.

4. That youth are not in fact obtaining sex information about themselves from other sources, which are in no way monitored for adequacy, objectivity, nor the harmful effects of pooled ignorance.

Therefore, in light of the heated and prolonged controversy over this issue, the college students in this analysis were questioned as to the source of "most of the information" they received about the physical and social aspects of sex behavior. These data are reported in Tables XX and XXI. The following conclusions are drawn from these data:

1. Approximately half of the females received their information on menstruation and pregnancy in the home context. The other major source of such information was the peer group context (about 15 percent) and the school context (almost 25 percent). It is also noteworthy that the home context was not reported as the major source of information (less than 25 percent) on coitus, use of contraceptives, abortion,
TABLE XX

SOURCES OF SEX INFORMATION ON SPECIFIC TOPICS - MALES - BY PERCENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic of Information</th>
<th>Family Context</th>
<th>School Context</th>
<th>School Books</th>
<th>Church</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>No Data</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother Father</td>
<td>Brothers</td>
<td>Peers-Friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menstruation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nocturnal Emission</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coitus</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contraceptives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abortion</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orgasm</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venereal Disease</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masturbation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necking/Petting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immorality of sex</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church's view of sex</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic of Information</th>
<th>Family Context</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>School Context</th>
<th>Church</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>No Data</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Brothers</td>
<td>Sisters</td>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menstruation</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nocturnal Emission</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coitus</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contraceptives</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abortion</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orgasm</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venereal Disease</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masturbation</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necking/Petting</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immorality of sex</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church's view of sex</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
orgasm, venereal disease, or masturbation. For these subjects, the peer group and school context are the major sources of information for over half of these college females.

2. The home or family context had even less impact for the males than females. Aside from the subjects of pregnancy and menstruation, an average of only 15 percent of males reported their family as being a basic course of sex information. In contrast, the peer context was generally the most frequently reported source of sex information (for slightly over 30 percent of males), followed by the school (almost 30 percent).

3. The church was a rather impotent source of sex information on all sex matters except for the subjects of the immorality of sex, and the church's view of sex. Still, only about a third of the students, both male and female, reported that they were influenced by their church in these matters.

Summary

It is apparent from Tables XX and XXI that the home context is a significant source of sex information for females, but still the majority of sex information is obtained outside the home, mainly from the school setting and the peer group. This tendency is even more pronounced for the males. Thus we are led to the conclusion that the church appears to have little impact as a source of sex information.
information for adolescents, as reported by the students in this study.

Thus, in response to the criticisms of opponents of sex education, the data show that the home is not serving as the major source of sex information, and that for most topics relating to human sexuality, the peer group is a more prominent source of information than the family or church.

STUDENTS' SEXUAL ATTITUDES, SEX STANDARDS, AND SEXUAL BEHAVIOR PATTERNS

It is almost axiomatic that attitudes influence behavior. However, the exact nature of the relationship has never been completely established; behavior may follow as a manifestation of the attitudes, or, attitudes may be reformulated to conform with patterns of behavior through a reciprocal pattern.

The following section describes students' sexual attitudes, and sex standards, with reference to the corresponding patterns of sexual behavior. First, we examine what students have come to conclude about sex in marriage, based upon information provided by their parents.

Students' perception of sex in marriage

Most of the students held positive attitudes toward sex in marriage. Over sixty percent (63 percent) of the females and
nearly sixty percent of the males (57 percent) reported that on the basis of the information and experiences provided them by their parents, they concluded that sex was not only for having children, but also for the mutual enjoyment of husband and wife (13 percent for each sex).

At this point, students were about equally divided in their opinions; some concluded that sex was a beautiful experience, but that it was not to be discussed (about 20 percent of males and females), and others concluded that sex was beautiful, and could also be discussed (just over 25 percent of males and females). (See Table XXII)

Less than one in ten students held native attitudes about sex in marriage. Ten percent of the males and eight percent of the females had concluded that sex was dirty, vulgar and shameful, or it certainly wasn't for children to know about.

Twice as many males as females (10 percent compared to 5 percent) stated their parents gave them the idea that sex in marriage was strictly for procreational purposes. Females held slightly greater positive conceptions of sex in marriage than males, although the response patterns for both sexes were quite similar. (See Table XXII)

The above discussion was concerned with the attitudes that students had come to develop about sex, based upon what they had
learned from their parents, and the perceptions of their parents' feelings and attitudes toward sex relations. Below attention is directed to the students' own attitudes with reference to their norms for premarital behavior.

**TABLE XXII**

**STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF SEX IN MARRIAGE BY PERCENT AND SEX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex was viewed as:</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirty, vulgar and shameful</td>
<td>7 3</td>
<td>6 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasn't for children to know</td>
<td>16 7</td>
<td>40 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something women had to tolerate in marriage</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex is for having children</td>
<td>22 10</td>
<td>29 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of husband-wife relationship</td>
<td>31 14</td>
<td>86 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex is for mutual enjoyment</td>
<td>29 13</td>
<td>75 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex is beautiful, but not to be discussed</td>
<td>43 19</td>
<td>115 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex is beautiful, can be discussed</td>
<td>56 25</td>
<td>179 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something else not listed</td>
<td>11 5</td>
<td>29 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>9 4</td>
<td>17 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N o %</td>
<td>224 100%</td>
<td>576 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Students' sex standards**

Students were asked to indicate their opinions on sex standards
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for men and women before marriage. The distribution of responses is presented in Table XXIII.

TABLE XXIII

SEX STANDARDS EXPRESSED BY STUDENTS BY PERCENT AND SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex Standard</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No coitus for either sex</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coitus for males only</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coitus for engaged couples only</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coitus for both sexes</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An examination of students' responses indicates that 59 percent of males and 37 percent of females expressed sex standards which permit premarital sexual relations for both sexes. In contrast, approximately 15 percent of males and 30 percent of females would permit no sexual relations for either party.

1The continuum of categories representing students' sex standards is an adaptation from Reiss, Ira L., The Social Context of Premarital Sexual Permissiveness, 1967, p. 19. Reiss used the Guttman scaling technique to define basic categories of sex standards. Although Reiss presents considerable theoretical and empirical basis for this continuum, it still cannot be assumed to be equal-interval or expressly linear. In other words, although the categories are thought to represent standards of somewhat equal unidimensionality, they are subject to the above limitations.
Not surprisingly, in view of the traditional double standard of sexual codes for women in the American society, more females held standards which permitted "sexual relations for males only" than males did for themselves (8 percent and 3 percent respectively). However, it should be noted that women were much more equalitarian than traditional in the standards they expressed. The fact that nearly 40 percent of the women held standards that would permit both males and females to engage in premarital coitus, and that this is not even limited to engaged couples, is of no small importance.

The above findings are in significant contrast to previous research efforts! (See Table XXIV) It would appear that the structure of standards has been directly reversed during the past decade. We see, in comparing the three studies reported in Table XXIV, that less than 20 percent of males approved of coitus for both sexes before 1960. In this analysis, almost 60 percent of males approve of premarital coitus for both sexes, a three-fold increase. For females before 1960, about 5 percent approved of premarital sex for both males and females, but in this analysis, 37 percent approve -- a seven-fold increase.

Further examination of the table also indicates that the above increase was at the expense of the "no sex relations" and "sex for men only" categories, with no great change in standards expressed for engaged couples.
### TABLE XXIV

**STUDENTS' SEX STANDARDS IN THREE STUDIES AND TIME PERIODS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Rockwood &amp; Ford, 1945</th>
<th>Landis 1958</th>
<th>This Analysis 1971</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex for both</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstinence</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex for men only</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex for engaged</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 173</td>
<td>N = 3000</td>
<td>N = 800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, the data in this analysis show that there has been a revolution in sex standards, toward permitting a much greater freedom in sexual experience for both sexes and a greater equality for women in their sexual activities.

It is important at this point to turn to the data on sex behavior to ascertain the extent that the shift in standards has been translated into behavior.

---

1. Categories and samples are not directly comparable and are presented for illustrative purposes only.


Students' sexual behavior

Since the focus of the larger project from which this study was drawn was not on premarital sexual behavior per se, it was necessary to use an indirect measure of students' sexual behavior. Thus students' sexual behavior was ascertained by their response to the question on the use of contraceptives during coitus (see Question 80 in questionnaire in appendix). Although the question on contraceptive use is in many respects a poor measurement of students' sexual behavior, it was the most representative question that could be used from the data already collected. Thus all interpretations are subject to this limitation in the analysis.

The question pertaining to the use of contraceptives, in essence, measures two dimensions: (1) if the student has experienced premarital coitus, and (2) if so, the type of contraceptive they used. The responses are described in Table XXV.

Examination of Table XXV reveals that only 24 percent of males and 37 percent of females indicated that they had not experienced premarital coitus. This would lead one to conclude that possibly as many as 76 percent of the males and 63 percent of the females may have experienced premarital sexual relations. These proportions are higher than reported in most other college student samples. (See Exhibit 1 above) The proportions are possibly inflated by the "other" replies (males 17 percent and 26 percent for females), which,
if deleted from the data considered, would suggest that a conservative 30 percent of females and 59 percent of males have experienced premarital coitus. This proportion corresponds closely to the sex standards permitted for both males and females, as presented in Table XXIII. A further possibility is that the proportion who indicated premarital intercourse in this study may be inflated due to the inclusion of married and formally engaged students in the sample.

TABLE XXV

STUDENTS' PREMARITAL SEXUAL BEHAVIOR AND CONTRACEPTIVE USE BY PERCENT AND SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contraceptive Method</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Female N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never had coitus</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pill</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jelly or Foam</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheath</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm Method</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>224</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, in reference to the above discussion on sex standards, it cannot be deduced from the above data whether the proportion of
students experiencing premarital coitus has changed greatly through
the years. This conclusion is stated with reference to the following
points: (1) other data on the extent of physical intimacy experienced
show considerable variation by stage of courtship (see above), (2)
Exhibit 1 in Chapter I shows a considerable range in findings on the
proportion of college students who have experienced premarital
coitus, and (3) all questions in this analysis focusing upon the
students' premarital sexual experience were stated indirectly and
do not yield precise data that are held to be valid measures of coital
experience.

To examine properly the rate of premarital sexual coitus we
would need to control for the variables of age, sex, race, stage of
courtship, and frequency of coitus. Limitations in the data available
do not permit this examination at this time.

**Contraceptive use**

For those students who reported having sexual relations, a full
one-third of the females (35 percent) and nearly three out of ten of
the males (29 percent) reported that they did not use a contraceptive
during their coital experiences.

Twenty-six percent of the females and 17 percent of the males
reported using some "other" contraceptive technique than the com-
mercial contraceptives or the rhythm method reported above. What
the "other" category really represents is unknown from the form of
the question used or the data examined. Overall, the greatest proportion of students (17 percent) utilized only the rhythm method or "just took their chances" as precautions in preventing pregnancy. According to the males, the use of the "pill" by the female was the second most frequently reported method of contraception, but surprisingly, a much greater proportion of males stated that their date used the pill than females who reported using it.

Relatively few students reported using "over-the-counter" contraceptives. Fifteen percent of the males reported using condoms and 10 percent of the females replied that their partner used a condom when they engaged in coitus. Fewer than 3 percent of both sexes utilized "commercially-packaged" (jellies, foam) contraceptives. Fewer than 1 percent of both sexes reported the use of intrauterine devices.

An interesting difference in the data is that more males reported the use of contraceptives than did females. It is unclear from the data whether this practice is associated with repeated sexual relations with one date or single associations with a variety of dates. But, on the basis of other research, it is known that females are most likely to enter into sexual liaisons when they are able to feel comfortable with and trust the male.\footnote{Ehrmann, Winston, \textit{Premarital Dating Behavior}. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1959. P. 180.} They (females) who engage in coital
experiences also are known to expect their male sexual partner to look out for them and to be protected by them. Therefore, the greater reported use of specific contraceptives by the males is probably understood by the fact that a larger proportion of males have experienced coitus, and by the fact that the males indicated that it was their women who used the "pill" rather than themselves taking the responsibility.

Below we turn to the attitudes of students with reference to whom birth control information should be available.

Students' attitudes toward birth control

Over three-fourths of all students felt birth control information should be available to "all who ask for such information regardless of whether the person was married or not." Women were slightly more emphatic in this view than men, but the difference was less than 3 percent. Only 3 percent of students would limit such information to married persons. (See Table XXVI)

Several other questions pertaining to students' attitudes toward the use of birth control were incorporated into the students' questionnaire. Since the data would require several tables to be presented, it is summarized in the description below. The specific questions centered upon how students felt couples should determine the size of their families. The specific responses were as follows:

1. Ninety-three percent of students "disagreed" with the idea
that parents should do nothing and have as many children as they get.

2. Over 75 percent of students felt that parents should stop having children as soon as they have produced the desired number. One out of ten students disagreed with this notion and/or were undecided.

3. Students in general did not favor the use of sterilization as a means of birth control (61 percent were against its use); only 10 percent of students favored sterilization of one
partner after the desired number of children was attained. A full one-fourth of the students were uncertain at the time of the study as to the use of sterilization as a means to limit family size.

4. Over 90 percent of the students rejected sexual abstinence as a likely means of birth control.

5. Nearly four-fifths of the students agreed that couples should use some type of birth control device after they have as many children as they want.

6. Eighty-six percent of students felt some means of birth control should be used in family planning and child spacing.

In summary, a strong majority of all students (80 percent) felt that birth control information should be available to all persons regardless of marital status, and that it should be utilized as a means for family planning and child spacing. This trend does not appear to be reduced when considering the respondents religious values.

The above attitudes referred to avoiding conception, given that intercourse is taking place between a couple. In the section below, the concern is directed to whereby a couple failed to prevent conception. Here attitudes toward abortion (termination of a pregnancy) are explored.
Students' attitudes toward abortion

Attitudes toward abortion touch the inner moral neurons of society, thus they are sensitive gauges of moral and value change. Less sensitive moral concerns such as dating behavior, family planning, and birth control do not document change as clearly, largely because of the greater diversity of responses and the situational determinants of morality.

In the United States attitudes toward abortion have been very strict and the laws are in general very repressive, permitting induced abortion only when the mother's life is clearly in danger (and in some states, not even then). In most states, an abortion could be obtained only after extensive legal and medical maneuvering.

Recently there has been a clear change in the national conscience of the American public. While many factors have contributed to the new attitudes of acceptance of abortion by request (under competent medical supervision), certainly important to this change has been the Thalidomide controversy, women's liberation, Zero Population Growth awareness, etc. Such concerns have led to a "liberalization" of the abortion laws in a number of states and concerted efforts in many others to see that the restrictive laws are repealed or at least modified. Research data to date leads one to expect that while this issue is not settled by any means, the college student favors a more liberal setting within which there is greater choice by the persons
most directly involved.

Thus student subcultural values which condone abortion assume added significance in a society which has traditionally condemned such behavior on moral - religious grounds. Both male and female students in this sample were in direct agreement upon the moral direction of abortion "reform" and in general agreement on the extent of reform they feel is appropriate in today's society.

Again, these attitudes are presented in descriptive form because of the large number of tables which would be necessary to present the data.

Student attitudes on abortion are as follows:

1. Over half the respondents (52 percent of females and 64 percent of males) did not accept the notion that abortion was "equivalent to murder." Only 14 percent of females and 8 percent of males stated that they felt abortion was murder. The remainder, a significant 25 percent of males and 31 percent of females, were undecided as to how they felt.

2. Fifty-seven percent of males and 47 percent of females viewed abortion as a therapeutic health measure. Rather interestingly, only 11 percent of both sexes disagreed that abortion be used as a health measure. Twenty-six percent of the males, 37 percent of the females remained undecided on the issue.
3. While there was considerable uncertainty as to the acceptance of abortion as a therapeutic health measure, over three-fifths of the students would not agree that abortion was clearly unnecessary from the perspective of maternal health (61 percent disagreed). This is interpreted to indicate that students in general feel that abortion should be used when necessary for the mother's health. Nevertheless, a full one-fourth of the students (27 percent female, 26 percent male) were undecided as to their feelings on this issue. Only 17 percent of females and 12 percent of males agreed abortion is morally wrong in spite of any other benefits. In contrast, 53 percent of the females and 58 percent of males replied that they disagreed with this statement. Again one-fourth of the students were "uncertain" whether they felt abortion was morally wrong.

4. Seventy-eight percent of males and 85 percent of females agreed with the statement that abortion had both advantages and disadvantages.

5. However, students in general do not feel abortion should be used indiscriminately as a form of birth control or as a solution to social problems. The females are somewhat more decisive in their attitudes from this perspective than are the males. In this sample 41 percent of males and 31
percent of females agreed that abortion was a form of birth control, with 39 percent of males and 32 percent of females agreeing that abortion was a solution to many of our social problems.

The differences of opinion among students were nowhere as pronounced as they were on these last two notions. Nearly half the females (49 percent) and one-third (34 percent) of the males did not agree that abortion was a form of birth control and one-third (33 percent) of the females along with one-fourth (27 percent) of the males did not accept abortion as a solution to many of our social problems.

In summary, almost two-thirds of the students held values and attitudes which permitted abortion and/or favored its judicious use as a therapeutic health measure. However, students clearly did not feel it should be used as a form of birth control or as a cure for social problems.

The above tends to indicate rather clear cut differences in attitudes toward the practice of birth control to prevent conception, and the use of abortion as a general means of terminating pregnancies. This suggests that students have the general feeling that abortion has a different, more restricted function in marriage and family relations than the use of birth control devices. This latter conclusion is further supported by the considerable proportion of both sexes who
replied they were "uncertain" as to the statements pertaining to the use of abortion as included in the research instrument.

In the following section we conclude the description of the population being studied by centering attention on student replies as to how they felt about marriage, and the place of the family in modern society.

Marriage and family life attitudes

Reiss reports (based upon a nationwide research project on premarital sexual permissiveness) that unmarried students' attitudes toward the marriage and the family institutions tend to be more liberal than those of their parents.¹ A more recent article by Walsh argued that the differences between parents' and their children's standards of sexual permissiveness may not be as definite as was previously thought, or more specifically Walsh suggests that there is no direct association between parents' and their children's attitudes in that parental attitudes may change as a function of their role and status as parents rather than representing permanent moral standards.²

Although this divergence of opinion cannot be resolved in this analysis, it does provide a reference for consideration in the


examination of students' marriage and family life attitudes.

**Students' attitudes toward marriage**

Students were asked to indicate whether they agreed, disagreed, or were uncertain in their attitudes toward five separate statements of the function of marriage in today's society. The content of the separate questions ranged from a very conservative, traditional viewpoint of marriage to a modern, somewhat revolutionary view.

Examination of Table XXVII indicates that invariably both male and female students responded in the same direction to each question. While males were somewhat more liberal in their attitudes than females, the difference in their responses for any given item was not more than 5 to 10 percent.

There is some difficulty in interpreting the exact meaning of students' expressions of attitudes toward marriage from these questions. On one hand, students were traditional in viewing marriage as the "foundation of a family" (84 percent of females and 71 percent of males agreed with this statement). Moreover, only 73 percent of females and 66 percent of males disagreed with the notion that marriage was an obsolescent tradition. Thus, students appeared to accept the traditional notions of marriage in society, particularly as a basis for establishing a family.

On the other hand, many students did not feel marriage was the only context for sexual relationships, or that marriage was for
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Data</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage is an obsolescent tradition</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage is for those who believe in it, but not for everyone</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage is a legal technicality but not necessary for a successful relationship between a man and woman</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage is the foundation of a family</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage is the only access for sexual relationships and thus provides for order and control in society</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
everybody. A definite majority of students agreed with the statement that "marriage is for those who believed in it, but is not for everybody" (73 percent of females and 68 percent of males agreed with the statement). Further, a major proportion did not accept the idea that "marriage was the only access for sexual relationships and thereby provided for order and control in society" (54 percent of females and 62 percent of males "disagreed" with the statement).

It is also noteworthy that nearly half the female respondents (47 percent) and over half (56 percent) of the males accepted the notion that "marriage is a legal technicality but is not necessary for a successful relationship between a man and woman." Yet 30 percent of the males and 25 percent of the females disagreed with this idea. Also a sizeable proportion were unable to decide how they felt about this particular notion. The data above suggest that more than half of the students feel that meaningful sexual relationships can be developed outside of the marital context.1 However, up to 20 percent of both sexes remained "undecided" about the purpose of marriage in today's society.

Although it is recognized that the questions pertaining to attitudes toward marriage and the family were "double-barreled" in

---

1 This interpretation is derived from combining the response and interpretive meaning patterns of statements 2, 3 and 5. (See Table XXVIII) There is no direct test of this interpretation.
containing two dimensions (and all interpretations are somewhat limited by this fact), the responses above do indicate that students are making clearly defined distinctions in attitudes toward marriage and the family, and are offering ideas as to the role and function of marriage in today's society. An additional portion of students (10 to 20 percent) are still working through their feelings about marriage and the family.

**Students' attitudes toward the family**

Students were also asked to indicate whether they agreed or disagreed with a series of statements about the purpose of the family in modern society. These statements also ranged from what may be viewed as traditional-conservative statements to modern views. Both male and female students were in direct agreement as to both the direction and strength of consensus in their attitudes toward the family. (See Table XXVIII)

There was remarkable consistency in students' responses over all of the ideas presented and thus they would be considered as traditional or conservative in their attitudes toward the purpose of the family in today's modern society. The males in this sample showed slightly less consensus than females, but students in general felt that the family is a basic and necessary unit in society and is unlikely to change significantly in the future (note statements 1 and 4 on Table XXVIII).
TABLE XXVIII
STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD THE FAMILY IN MODERN SOCIETY BY SEX AND PERCENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>No Data</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The family is the most necessary and the basic unit of society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A family is a way of grouping individuals for living and learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A family is for the protection of the young and the weak</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A family is an unnecessary aspect of today's society and will eventually die out as a part of modern society</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, a significant degree of uncertainty in the above attitudes should be noted for both sexes. An average of 15 to 20 percent of students were unsure in their conception of the purpose of the family. Again, it is unclear if their uncertainty is a product of the nature of the questions asked (dual-dimensions were contained within these questions also), or indicative of student indecision.

Summary

To this point in the analysis we have (1) stated the research objectives, (2) described the research methodology, (3) described the characteristics of the sample used for analysis, and (4) drawn some conclusions from the data thus examined. Specifically these conclusions are as follows:

1. Students in this sample come from parents of slightly higher occupational and educational status than the general population.

2. Students in general reported very positive relationships with their parents, felt their parents were happy in their marriage, and felt that their home life presented a favorable image of the marriage and family institution.

3. The extent of physical intimacy experienced by students in their dating behavior increased as they advanced through the stages of courtship. Although even at the "pre-engage-
ment" stage, less than 15 percent of students reported experiencing premarital coitus regularly.

4. Students in general did not feel that their premarital sexual behavior (petting and necking) had an adverse effect upon themselves or upon the dating relationship (only about 20 percent were adversely affected). A larger proportion felt that the intimacy had helped the relationship (almost 40 percent).

5. The peer group serves as the major source of sex information for students for most topics on human sexuality, followed by the school and home in importance.

6. It appears that students hold a different structure of sex standards than those reported in the literature a decade ago. Todays students are much more liberal and equalitarian in permitting both males and females to engage in premarital coitus if they so choose.

7. Although the sex standards of students may have changed, there is no evidence in this analysis to suggest a corresponding change in premarital sex behavior, although a slight upward trend may be evidenced in the literature. Thus, students appear to only hold different standards, not behave differently.

8. The majority of students today favor the free use of
contraceptives and birth control for family planning. They also favor the freedom for abortion by request, but did not favor the inappropriate use of the practice.

9. Students in general held positive attitudes toward the marriage and family institutions as they presently exist, but did not feel that marriage was the only context for an affective-sexual relationship between a man and woman.

With the above descriptions and conclusions in mind, we will proceed in the analysis to identify the variables that account for variation in sex standards and behavior patterns.
CHAPTER V

FINDINGS ON ANALYSIS OF SEX STANDARDS

As stated above, it is the purpose of this dissertation to explore empirically the factors accounting for variation in students sex standards and behavior patterns. It is intended through this analysis to identify specific variables important in the determination of sex standards and behavior patterns, and to explore the interrelationships among these variables. With the background provided in the previous chapters we are ready to proceed with a description and analysis of the findings.

First, it may be useful to view briefly the "grounded theory" method of analysis and the "AID" statistical technique. The basic purpose of grounded theory analysis is to develop "classificatory schemes" that represent characteristics of the data under analysis. The different "data classifications" are examined to derive the most meaningful and useful theoretical schemes that account for variations within the data. A final model is then selected for testing through deductive analysis. ¹

AID analysis assists the researcher in testing the utility of the "classificatory process" by statistically deriving a model that, in terms of the research problem and the analyst's purpose, best "explains" (reduces the greatest unexplained variation) a selected phenomenon. As stated in Chapter II, the form of the model is specified by the response patterns for the predictor (independent) variables selected for analysis. Thus, it should be recognized that any different set of variables or composition of the sample could produce a different model, given the technique of AID analysis.

In the present study, the analytic models defined were specified by the combination of predictors that would account for the greatest total variation in the dependent variable. However, this is not to suggest that the structure finally derived is the only possible or correct model. A model that explains 60 percent of the variation of the attitudes or behavior being studied may be quite different in structure from one which explains 70 percent of the variation. There are no set standards for defining the "most correct" model, but rather, the value of the model is to be found in its application. Any particular AID model specified is correct only for the predictor variables included and the data collected from that sample. The final model used, however, is the most significant "statistically," given the efficacy of the variables used and the data collected.

In light of the above, however, one may make cautious general-
izations from the model being used to the larger population, but only insofar as the parameters of the research population are in line with known parameters of the larger population. However, the possibility remains that additional predictors or a different sample may produce a different structure of relationships in future analyses.

Further, the order of the predictors specified in the AID model has no absolute meaning in itself, but should only be used to derive understanding of larger, more general relationships that may exist between the variables selected for study. It is important for the researcher to note the various patterns of action and interaction among the variables, as different "predictors" are added and/or deleted during the analysis. In this manner the researcher can enlarge his understanding of the nature of the relationships between the variables in the data under investigation.

The various categories or related predictors may be grouped and evaluated by the ratio of between-sum-of-squares/total-sum-of-squares (Bss/Tss) developed. Thus, for example, if a grouping of questions pertaining to attitudes toward birth control all have low Bss/Tss ratios, one may conclude that the general context of the variables is of little significance in "explaining" the variation in the dependent variable being examined.

In light of the above, the following methodology is used in this analysis:
1. First, derive theoretically and empirically useful models to explain the variation in the data under analysis, and

2. Make generalizations from the data in terms of their representation in the sample being analyzed.

With this brief review, we are ready to turn our attention to what was found among this population of college youth.

**AID analysis**

The research instrument used in this study gathered information covering a number of concerns which were known or expected to have a bearing upon a person's behavior and attitudes. Altogether some 400 pieces of information were collected from each respondent. (See Chapter III and questionnaire in appendix for reference.)

In line with the research questions proposed in Chapter I, two variables were selected as dependent variables for analysis: (1) the respondents' sex standards, and (2) the respondents' premarital sex behavior in the steady dating stage of courtship. (See Chapter III for reference) From the 375 variables included in this survey, a total of 81 were selected for AID analysis on the dependent variable of sex standards. The initial (81) variables were selected on the basis of the following criteria:

1. The variables were considered to be basic demographic or descriptive variables.

2. The previous literature indicated or suggested the variables...
may have an impact upon the formation of and/or holding of certain sex standards.

3. Prior statistical analysis suggested that the variables may have some significance in accounting for variation in sex standards.

4. The variable was presumed to have some bearing upon a person's attitudes about premarital sex behavior.

The number of variables selected for analysis in this study exceeded the capacity of the PDP-10 computer facilities that were employed at Western Michigan University. A maximum of 45 variables could be evaluated on any single computer run. Thus it was necessary to develop a "step-wise" evaluation procedure to incorporate the total of 81 variables in the initial analysis. This "step-wise" method enabled the researcher to screen out impotent variables and include only salient variables in the final analysis. Those variables which, when analyzed, did not attain a $B_{ss}/T_{ss} > 0.01$ were deleted and replaced with new variables. This process was repeated until all 81 variables had been incorporated into the analysis and evaluated.

As with most complex statistical programs and methods of

---

$B_{ss}/T_{ss} = 0.01$ level means that the variable could be expected to "explain statistically" only 1 percent of the variation in the dependent variable. The purpose of the analysis is to identify the predictors that will cause the greatest reduction in the total-sum-of-squares for the dependent variable.
analysis, it was necessary to define certain maximum and minimum limits for AID (for use in establishing cut-off levels in the analysis) whereby selected variables not meeting the established limits would be deleted from further study. The methodology followed herein provided a maximum of 20 groups that could be defined through the computer analysis. It was felt that this number would be more than ample for the data at hand. This upper limit, however, was never achieved.

A minimum of 20 respondents for each sub-group was specified as a requirement for a parent group to be split. Any lower level of NMIN=20 would tend to increase the possibility of error through generalizing from an insufficient number of cases.

The "t" level of significance was set at TLEV=0.00 so that all possible classifications in the data might be defined. Higher levels of significance would produce groups of greater assuredness, but would also limit the number of classifications. Since the purpose of this research was to develop, rather than test, classifications, this level of significance seems justified.

Description and Analysis for Sex Standards

The question and response categories for the dependent variable -- premarital sex standards -- were as follows:

---

1 The rationale for these categories is presented in Chapter III. Although some may question whether Reiss has satisfactorily
Q-74. Which of the following most nearly represents your opinion on sex standards for men and women before marriage?

1 = No sexual relations for either

2 = Sexual relations for men only

3 = Sexual relations between engaged couples only

4 = Sexual relations for both

As will be noted in Diagram 1 (see below) there were 746 valid responses for the dependent variable of premarital sex standards. Forty-three percent of the respondents held the attitude that sexual relations for both men and women were acceptable regardless of the nature of their interpersonal commitment. Another 18 percent held standards permitting premarital sexual relations only for people who were engaged to each other. For these respondents the physical intimacy is tied to the nature of their interpersonal commitment.

The mean of all responses (male-female combined) for the dependent variable is $\bar{X}=2.84$; the standard deviation is $s=1.26$.

The proportion of variation ($B_{ss}/T_{ss}$) explained by each of the predictors in the initial analysis is reported in Table XXIX.

For the final analysis, the requirements specified by the computer program for splitting or subclassifying a group were as follows:

established the unidimensionality of the categories, or that the categories represent a continuum (and the data in this analysis do not suggest that they are), they will be assumed to be so for this analysis, and that they represent a continuum of attitudinal positions.
total-sum-of squares must be more than $T_{ss} > 11.93$ and the between-sum-of-squares must be more than $B_{ss} > 23.86$. The total weight for the dependent variable -- group 1, was 746.000, and the $T_{ss} = 1193.000$.\textsuperscript{1}

**Discussion of the findings on sex standards**

The final model produced by the AID analysis on sex standards possesses the following characteristics.

Parent Group 1: The single predictor that reduced the greatest amount of unexplained variation in the dependent variable was the reported use of contraceptives (question 80). Parent group 1 was split into two categories, groups 2 and 3. Group 2 was composed of 249 respondents who had "never had sexual relations" and therefore had no need to use contraceptives ($\bar{X} = 2.2$) and 165 respondents who reported having premarital sexual relations and who did not use any of the contraceptives specified ($\bar{X} = 2.5$). The mean response for this category was $\bar{X} = 2.3$ (vs. $\bar{X} = 3.5$ for Group 3) which indicated a definite difference in sex standards for these groups. (See Diagram 1)

The second group, Group 3 respondents ($N=329$), reported having experienced premarital coitus and used both commercial contraceptives and the so-called rhythm method of fertility control. The mean response for this group was $\bar{X} = 3.5$, suggesting that these

\textsuperscript{1}These limits are established within the computer program after computing the parameters of the data presented for analysis. They are not established by the researcher.
respondents were "more permissive" than the respondents of Group 2. Group 3 respondents held standards which "permitted premarital coitus for both sexes," but to some extent also felt that "sexual intercourse should be reserved for those couples who were engaged." The above classification alone accounts for a 21.4 percent reduction in the unexplained variation in the dependent variable.

Interpretation: The fact that the contraceptive predictor emerged first in the competition among the 45 variables suggests that some important factor is contained within the substantive context covered by the question on contraceptive use. Most likely it centered on the behavioral component of whether the respondent had experienced coitus. The immediate emergence of this predictor creates a basis for the conclusion that a respondent's attitudes toward premarital sex may be influenced by his behavioral patterns. In other words, the relationship between sex standards and behavior may well be reciprocal. This point is discussed more fully in Chapter VIII.

The response codes for the respective groups also suggest a difference in the patterns of behavior related to the use of contraceptives. The attitudes of the students in Group 3 (permitting premarital

---

1 Although Reiss devotes a whole book to the subject of premarital sexual permissiveness, he fails to explicitly define the term. Thus for purposes of explication in this analysis, permissiveness is implicitly described as those attitudes that permit or allow the person to engage in the premarital sexual experience.
 TABLE XXIX

THE PROPORTION OF VARIATION EXPLAINED BY PREDICTORS
FOR SEX STANDARDS (Bss/Tss<sub>1</sub> presented in rank order)<sup>1</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Bss/Tss&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Contraceptives used in premarital coitus</td>
<td>0.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-3</td>
<td>Marriage is a legal technicality and not necessary for a successful relationship</td>
<td>0.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>Marriage is the only access for sexual relationship and provides order and control in society</td>
<td>0.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b</td>
<td>Frequency respondent attends church</td>
<td>0.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a</td>
<td>Importance of religion to respondent</td>
<td>0.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-5</td>
<td>Females encountering males suggesting intercourse</td>
<td>0.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-6</td>
<td>Dating behavior - have to drink to be popular</td>
<td>0.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-3</td>
<td>Abortion is morally wrong in spite of any benefits</td>
<td>0.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-1</td>
<td>Abortion is equivalent to murder</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Respondents present residence</td>
<td>0.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-7</td>
<td>Abortion is a solution to social problems</td>
<td>0.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41b</td>
<td>Effect of physical intimacy upon respondent personally</td>
<td>0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41a</td>
<td>Effect of extent of physical intimacy upon the affective relationship</td>
<td>0.061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup>The reader is referred to the questionnaire in the appendix for the complete description of the questions or statements listed above. In the interests of brevity, only a brief paraphrase of each question is made for this table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Bss/Tss$_i$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71-2</td>
<td>Marriage is fine for some but not for everyone</td>
<td>0.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-2</td>
<td>Encountering a homosexual in a sexual relationship</td>
<td>0.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-3</td>
<td>Respondent's source of information on coitus</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-1</td>
<td>The family is a necessary and basic unit in society</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-5</td>
<td>The family is unnecessary today and will soon die out</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-6</td>
<td>The female met an over-aggressive male and had to resist by force</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-7</td>
<td>Male forced intercourse upon female</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-2c</td>
<td>Respondent's sexual behavior during steady dating</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Respondent's sex -- male-female</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-6</td>
<td>Abortion is a form of birth control</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Respondent's perception of difficulty of making friends</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31a</td>
<td>Extent respondent dated in junior high school</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-3</td>
<td>Respondent encountered a person making obscene gestures</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-1</td>
<td>Respondent encountered an exhibitionist</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Respondent's age of first date</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Respondent's present dating behavior</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31c</td>
<td>Extent respondent dated in college</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Predictor</td>
<td>$B_{ss}/T_{ss}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-8</td>
<td>Male forced sex act upon female as a child</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-3</td>
<td>Older woman enticed young boy into the sex act</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Frequency father attends church</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-2</td>
<td>Abortion is unnecessary for maternal health</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-9</td>
<td>An older female enticed sex act upon female child</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29a</td>
<td>Respondent's frequency of dating</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Student's religious preference</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31b</td>
<td>Extent respondent dated in high school</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-12</td>
<td>Respondent's source of information on the pleasure of sexual relations</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-4</td>
<td>Marriage is the foundation for a family</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Frequency mother attends church</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-4</td>
<td>Dating behavior - necking to be popular</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-5</td>
<td>Should use birth control</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Student's perception of relationship with parents</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Respondent's confidence on date</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-6</td>
<td>A couple should use birth control for family planning</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-5</td>
<td>Abortion is a therapeutic health measure</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Respondent's age</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Extent that respondent &quot;likes&quot; father</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Predictor</td>
<td>Bss/Tss&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Times respondent has been &quot;in love&quot;</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-3c</td>
<td>Respondent's sexual behavior during engagement</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-1</td>
<td>Marriage is an obsolescent tradition</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Extent that respondent &quot;likes&quot; mother</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Respondent's self-concept of physical appearance</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Respondent's perception of happiness in parents' marriage</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46b</td>
<td>Respondent's self-concept of academic ability</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-16</td>
<td>Respondent's source of information on the immorality of sexual behavior</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Respondent's expectation of having a successful marriage</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Father/mother authority relations</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-1</td>
<td>Couples should not use contraceptives and have lots of children</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-3</td>
<td>One partner should be sterilized when a couple have enough children</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-4</td>
<td>A male encountered a prostitute</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44a</td>
<td>Respondent's evaluation of academic ability</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-1</td>
<td>A male encountered a homosexual</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11b</td>
<td>Mother's educational achievement</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a</td>
<td>Father's educational achievement</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Predictor</td>
<td>Bss/Tss&lt;sub&gt;i&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Academic achievement expected by parents</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Respondent's year in college</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Respondent's community of origin</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-2</td>
<td>Male encountered an over-aggressive female who suggested coitus</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Father's occupational status</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-4</td>
<td>Use sexual abstinence as a means of birth control</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-4</td>
<td>Abortion has advantages and disadvantages</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-3</td>
<td>The purpose of the family is for the protection of the young and weak</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Respondent's perception of propriety of administration of birth control</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Student lived with original parents</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Respondent's race</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Respondent's mother employed outside home</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13a</td>
<td>Mother's occupational status</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-2</td>
<td>Couples should stop procreating when have the desired number of children</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-5</td>
<td>Male encountered a pick up</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

coitus) suggests also the likelihood of a conscious effort on their part to purchase and/or prepare contraceptives before engaging in sexual relations. Their attitudes and standards of acceptable behavior.
thereby carries with it another behavioral dimensional, that of not only engaging in coitus, but also the incorporation of contraceptive techniques into the pattern of behavior.

Group 2 respondents held more traditional standards of acceptable behavior.\textsuperscript{1} For the respondents who reported premarital coitus, but had not used any birth control techniques or device, one may surmise that their involvement may have been unanticipated, spontaneous and/or situational, or that their conservative "character" did not condone the use of contraceptives in sexual intercourse.

It is also important to note the alternative predictors which would be selected if this predictor were deleted from the analysis. (See Parent Group I on Table XXX\textsuperscript{2}) For example, the attitudes toward marriage that view marriage as being "only a legal technicality and not necessary for a successful relationship between a man

\textsuperscript{1}Again for purposes of explication in this analysis, "traditional" marriage attitudes and sex standards are described as those standards or attitudes toward behavior which favor the unity and sanctity of marriage and the family, sexual restraint before marriage, and non-permissive sexual behavior.

\textsuperscript{2}Table XXX is read and interpreted in the following fashion: Parent Group 1 is examined to identify the predictor that causes the greatest reduction in unexplained variation in the dependent variable (the predictor that has the largest $B_{ss}^i$ value). In Table XXX this predictor is $Q-80$ -- contraceptive use. Then all respondents are dichotomized according to their responses as to the use of contraceptives into Groups 2 and 3. The focus of the analysis then centers upon Group 2 to again identify the most significant predictor, which is $Q-71-3$ -- attitudes toward marriage. This process is repeated until each subgroup is examined in turn.
### TABLE XXX

**Bss/Tss\textsubscript{i} FOR PREDICTORS ON SEX STANDARDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Parent Group 1</th>
<th>Parent Group 2</th>
<th>Parent Group 4</th>
<th>Parent Group 5</th>
<th>Parent Group 7</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q-1  Sex</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>-.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-2  Age</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-4  Present residence</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-9  Religious preference</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-9a Importance of religion</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-9b Freq. attend church</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>-.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-14 Mother attends church</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>-.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-15 Father attends church</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>-.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-17 Likes father</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-18 Likes mother</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-19 Gets along with parents</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-24 Age of first date</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>-.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictor</td>
<td>Parent Group 1</td>
<td>Parent Group 2</td>
<td>Parent Group 4</td>
<td>Parent Group 5</td>
<td>Parent Group 7</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-25 Difficulty in making friends</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-28 Present dating behavior</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-29a Frequency of dating</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-30d Necking to be popular</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-30f Drink on date</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-31c Times dated in college</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-39-2c Sex behavior</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>-.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-41a Physical intimacy</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>-.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-41b Physical intimacy</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>-.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-55c Inform. coitus</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-55-1 Inform. pleasure coitus</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-70-1 Abortion attitudes</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-70-3 Abortion attitudes</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictor</td>
<td>Parent Group 1</td>
<td>Parent Group 2</td>
<td>Parent Group 4</td>
<td>Parent Group 5</td>
<td>Parent Group 7</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-70-6 Abortion attitudes</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-70-7 Abortion attitudes</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-71-1 Marriage attitudes</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-71-2 Marriage attitudes</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-71-3 Marriage attitudes</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-71-4 Marriage attitudes</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-71-5 Marriage attitudes</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-72-1 Family attitudes</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-72-5 Family attitudes</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-76-5 Birth control attitudes</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-76-6 Birth control attitudes</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-77-48 Sex situations encountered</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-77-49 Sex situations encountered</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XXX (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Parent Group 1</th>
<th>Parent Group 2</th>
<th>Parent Group 4</th>
<th>Parent Group 5</th>
<th>Parent Group 7</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q-77-52 Sex situations encountered</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-77-53 Sex situations encountered</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-77-54 Sex situations encountered</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-77-55 Sex situations encountered</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-80 Contraceptive use</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DIAGRAM 1

SPECIFICATION OF VARIABLES FOR PARENT GROUP 1

Group 2 1, 9
No coitus, or did not use contraceptives
$X = 2.3$
$N = 417$

Group 1
Students' sex standards

$X = 2.84$
$N = 746$

21.4% variation explained

Group 3 7, 8, 5, 6, 2
Experienced coitus and used contraceptives
$X = 3.5$
$N = 325$

Sex standards:
1 = abstinence
2 = sex for men only
3 = sex for engaged couples only
4 = coitus permitted for both sexes
and woman, "and "marriage is the only access for sexual relationships and thus provides for order and control in society; " each would account for more than a 16 percent reduction in unexplained variation of sex standards. This is interpreted to suggest that a factor represented by the marriage attitudes of the respondents has a direct impact in accounting for their sex standards. However, the "double-barreled" nature of the question pertaining to attitudes toward marriage and family does not permit the exact specification of the meaning (or which meaning in the question) the respondent is expressing. One would, therefore, wish to define and identify this factor more precisely (perhaps through factor analysis), and include it in any later revised model representing the determinants of sex standards.

Parent Group 3: The further evaluation of predictors for Parent Group 3 did not produce any further explanation or classifications, thus an asymmetrical tree structure is created for this analytic model. The program did attempt to sub-classify Group 3 according to the importance of religion, but this split did not attain a sufficient reduction in the between-sum-of-squares to develop a valid classification. (See Diagram 2)

Interpretation: For those respondents who have repeatedly experienced premarital sexual relations, no other predictor in this analysis accounts for a sufficient reduction in unexplained variation to develop any further classifications. The attempt to develop
Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

DIAGRAM 2
PREDICTORS SPECIFIED FOR GROUPS 2 AND 3

Group 1
Students sex standards
X=2.84
N=746

Group 2
No coitus, or did not use contraceptives
X=2.3
N=417

Group 3
Experienced coitus and used contraceptives
X=3.5
N=329

Group 4
1, 2
Marriage attitudes: marriage is important, Q-71-3
X=1.92
N=261

Group 5
3
Marriage attitudes: marriage is unnecessary, Q-71-3
X=3.00
N=156

... Final Group - attempted split on "importance of religion"
categories on the importance of religion suggests a slight, but statistically insignificant relationship for this category of respondents. Clearly, the predictor for premarital sexual behavior is predominant in this model.

Parent Group 2: Respondents reporting no premarital sexual relations or who did not use contraceptives, can be further classified according to their attitudinal orientation toward the "purpose of marriage," thereby creating Groups 4 and 5 (although the exact "purpose" they were accepting is unclear). These respondents who agreed with the statement "marriage is a legal technicality and not necessary for a successful relationship between a man and woman" had a mean score of $\bar{X}=3.00$, as opposed to those who disagreed with the statement or were unsure ($\bar{X}=1.92$). This further classification accounted for an additional 16.4 percent of unexplained variation in the dependent variable of sex standards.

A greater proportion (62 percent) of respondents in this sample are traditional in their marriage attitudes (Group 4, N=261 vs. Group 5, N=156) than those who held more permissive attitudes. However, a significant proportion of respondents (38 percent) held the attitude that a "successful relationship can be developed outside of the marriage context." These respondents (Group 5) clearly held more permissive sex standards ($\bar{X}=3.00$) than the "traditional" respondents.

Parent Group 4: Following through on these two new parent
groups, we find that Group 4 is composed of respondents who had no premarital sexual relations, or those who had limited sexual experience, and were traditional in their attitudes toward marriage. Group 4 was capable of further classification by the frequency of church attendance, thus creating Groups 6 and 7. Group 6 is composed of respondents who attended church once a week or even more frequently (\(\bar{X}=1.57, N=142\)). Respondents with these characteristics were the least permissive of all groups in not permitting premarital coitus for either sex. (See Diagram 3)

The respondents in Group 7 were somewhat less diligent in their church attendance, ranging from monthly attendance to those who almost never attended church (\(\bar{X}=2.3, N=119\)). This classification accounts for an additional 10.6 percent of the unexplained variation in sex standards.

Interpretation: The frequency that students attend church appears to account for some variation in sex standards and its impact is most significant for specific sub-categories of students. Students with low religious participation are more permissive in their sex standards than those who attend church more frequently.

Parent Group 6: Returning now to Parent Group 6, which consists of respondents who reported no coitus or use of contraceptives, who were traditional in their attitudes toward marriage, and attended church regularly, was not capable of further subclassification of the
DIAGRAM 3

SPECIFICATION OF PREDICTORS FOR GROUPS 4, 5 AND 7

Group 4 1, 2
Marriage attitudes:
marrige is important Q-71-3
X=1.92
N=261

1.06

Group 6 6
Church attendance:
weekly
X=1.57
N=142

Group 10 5, 4, 2
Mother attends
church - rarely
X=1.8
N=59

Group 7 4, 5, 3, 2
Church attendance:
rarely, occasionally
X=2.3
N=119

Group 11 1, 6
Mother attends church
regularly or never
X=2.8
N=60

Group 5 3
Marriage attitudes:
marrige is unnecesar y Q-71-3
X=3.00
N=156

12.9

Group 8 3, 2
Marriage provides
order in society -
agree, uncertain
X=2.39
N=53

... Attempted split on frequency
respondent attends church

Group 9 1
Marriage provides
order in society-
disagree
X=3.32
N=103

... Attempted split on religious
preference of respondent
analytical program. The computer program attempted to subclassify students by their present dating behavior, but there was an insufficient reduction in the between-sum-of-squares for the group to permit the classification (maximum $B_{SS}$ for Group 6 is $B_{SS}=16.107$; minimum $B_{SS}$ required for a significant classification is $B_{SS}=23.865$.

Parent Group 7: Directing our attention to Parent Group 7, which consists of students reporting no premarital coitus or use of contraceptives, who were traditional in their attitudes toward marriage, and who rarely attended church. Group 7 was split into Groups 10 and 11, according to the frequency that the mother attended church. Group 10 was composed of students whose mothers "rarely attended church" ($\bar{X}=1.86$), while Group 11's mothers attended church either "very regularly or never" ($\bar{X}=2.8$).

Interpretation: The subclassification of Parent Group 7 does not yield to clear or concise interpretation at this point. Two possible interpretations are available: Group 11 mothers are extreme in their religious participation (either very high or low) and are of a different character (personality) than the "moderate" church attending mothers. The second possibility is that the classification is spurious and thus of no utility.

Although the above question cannot be clearly resolved at present, the weight of cautious evaluation would lend credence to the first interpretation. The basic subclassification of Group 7 reduces
the unexplained variation some 13.6 percent, suggesting thereby that
the division does have definite (although unclear) statistical signifi­
cance. It may mean simply that those youth whose mother rarely
attends religious services also rarely considers the moral alternatives,
and when experiencing coitus they simply forget all about the use of
contraceptives or feel that they have little or no responsibility for
their use. Since religion bears little relevance to the life styles of this
group, even continuous coital experience need not require use of a
contraceptive. Those youth whose mothers attend religious services
regularly and who themselves reflect such a pattern of attendance may
be those who also clearly hold traditional attitudes toward marriage
or who are somewhat uncertain of their stand on contraceptive use.
Since there is no indication from the data, it may have been for some
of this group that coitus was a "once" occurrence not to have been
repeated or if so, to simply allow the factor of risk to punish them
for their violation of behavioral codes. A final alternative, and per­
haps more reasonable, is for these students to simply not have
considered the use of contraceptives or not use them as a matter of
preference. Having followed Parent Group 4 through to its analytic
conclusions, we return to analyze further Parent Group 5.

Parent Group 5: Parent Group 5 consists of respondents who
had not experienced coitus, or if so, did not use contraceptives, and
who were liberal in their attitudes toward marriage (they held the
predominant view that "marriage was a legal technicality and not necessary for a successful relationship between a man and woman"). Respondents in this group were further classified according to a second attitude toward marriage -- the respondents' conception of the role of sex in marriage. This classification resulted in the formation of two other subgroups, Groups 8 and 9. Group 8 respondents held traditional attitudes toward sex and marriage, in agreeing that "sex relations should be contained within the context of marriage" ($\bar{X}=2.39, N=53$). Conversely Group 9 respondents were more permissive in their attitudes and rejected the traditional notion that sex should be limited to marriage ($\bar{X}=3.32, N=103$). This division accounts for an additional 12.9 percent of the unexplained variation in sex standards.

Interpretation: This classification represents a small step toward a clearer understanding of the interrelation of variables within a common substantive area -- the attitudes toward marriage. Group 5 (to some extent) refers more to the marital dyad (marriage is necessary for a successful relationship between a man and woman). Subgroups 8 and 9 refer to Question 71-5 on the questionnaire which carries more of a societal reference to marriage (marriage is the only access for sexual relationships and thus provides for order and control in society). Almost twice as many Group 9 respondents ($N=103$) disagreed with this notion as agreed (Group 8, $N=53$).
Parent Group 8: Parent Group 8 (N=53) consisted of respondents who reported no coitus or use of contraceptives, who agreed that an affective sexual relationship could be created outside of the context of marriage, but who also felt that "sex requires marriage" and "marital institutions provide order and control in society." This group was not capable of further subclassification. The AID program attempted to classify respondents according to the frequency that the student attended church, but the between-sum-of-squares was insufficient to effect a valid categorization (minimum Bss required for splitting, Bss=23.86; Group 8 Bss=7.10). Thus Group 8 is considered a "final group" and is not subjected to further analysis in this study.

Parent Group 9: Parent Group 9 (N=103) was composed of respondents who reported no coitus or use of contraceptives, who felt that affective sexual relationships could be created outside of the context of marriage, and who expressed the attitude that "sex relations do not require a marital context" or do not believe that "marriage provides order and control in society." Group 9 was not subjected to further analysis, as it was not capable of further subclassification. While an attempt was made by the AID program to classify respondents by their religious preference, the maximum between-sum-of-squares only attained Bss=11.12, which was insufficient to subclassify the groups. Therefore, Group 9 is considered to be a final group that does not warrant further examination in this analysis.
To recapitulate the analytic development up to this point, a total of 81 variables were evaluated in the initial analysis, and the impotent variables were deleted. The $B_{ss}/T_{ss_i}$ scores for each variable is reported in Table XXIX. Through the "step-wise" evaluation process, a total of 45 variables were defined for the final analysis. These variables produced 11 classifications by which to explain the variation in the sexual standards held by this sample of college students. The impact of each predictor variable for each classification is reported in Table XXX.

The summary of findings of the final model is presented below.

**Summary**

The final AID model explaining variation in sex standards for the college youth in this study can be described as having the following characteristics:

1. The most significant predictor in accounting for variation in sex standards is a behavioral variable (whether or not premarital coitus was experienced). No predictors in this analysis were capable of accounting for greater variation in this first classification.

2. The respondents who reported "no coitus or that they did not use contraceptives" could be subclassified further. Two predominant variable categories appeared to be important in accounting for variation within this classifica-
tion: (a) the attitudes toward the purpose and function of the marriage institution in society, and (b) the extent of the student's religious participation. Since the questions pertaining to marriage and the family were somewhat "double-barreled" in nature, the attitudes toward marriage are later explored through factor analysis to determine their unidimensionality. The impact of religious participation upon traditionally-minded persons appears to be reasonably well defined and established, but again its major impact appears to be effected most significantly upon subgroups of respondents. (See Bss/Tss: scores on Table XXX)

3. The family background variables (father's occupation, mother working, relationship with parents, etc.) does not appear to have any significant influence in accounting for variation in sex standards for this population of college students. (See Table XXX) It is, however, possible and plausible that the influence of family background may have been neutralized by the maturity, homogeneity, or perhaps the past experiences of the college student population, thus the influence of these variables may be superseded by other social influences. This analysis does not include pre-college students, therefore prior family influence can-
not be examined directly.

4. Other descriptive and demographic variables (age, variations among males and among females, year in college, community of origin, etc.) do not appear to be effective (statistically) in accounting for variation in sex standards of college youth, although any influence evidenced may be superseded by more prominent attitudinal or behavioral variables.¹ (See Table XXXIX)

Having explored the variables accounting for variation in the sex standards of college youth, we will turn to the analysis of variation in premarital sex behavior.

¹It is recognized that the literature reports considerable differences in sex standards expressed by students according to sex, age, race, and other demographic variables, but the point of this analysis is not to study differences between male and female students, or differences by age or race classifications, but rather it focuses upon variations among males and among females who may possess the different demographic characteristics. Thus, the variables that account for variation in male's behavior and attitudes may also account for variation in female's attitudes and behavior. Even though there is a difference between the sexes, the sex predictor may not necessarily be selected by the AID analysis.
CHAPTER VI

ANALYSIS OF PREMARITAL SEX BEHAVIOR

Given the strong and enduring academic interest in the impact of attitudes upon behavior, the sex behavioral patterns of college youth were examined. The same method and technique of analysis utilized in the examination of sex standards was applied to the data on sex behavior.

Students' sex behavior was measured by asking respondents to indicate the greatest degree of physical intimacy they experienced for the different stages of courtship. Physical intimacy was measured on a continuum with the response categories ranging from "casual hand holding" to "coitus regularly." Respondents were asked to note the most advanced form of intimacy they experienced for the following stages of courtship:

1. Casual dating
2. Steady dating
3. An "understanding" (pre-engagement)
4. Formal engagement

The "steady dating" stage of courtship was selected for examination in this analysis. This selection seems warranted for the following reasons:
1. Respondents in the "steady dating stage" reported the greatest frequency and variety of sexual behavior (see Chapter IV above).

2. The pre-engagement and formal engagement phases of courtship present different attitudinal structures and behavioral patterns (attributable to the different status associated with engagement) than exists for the steady dating stage.

3. The majority of respondents reported a "steady dating" relationship, thus presenting the largest number of respondents for analysis.

As will be noted on Diagram 4, there are 426 valid responses for the dependent variable of sex behavior, thus slightly more than one-half of the initial 800 respondents are represented in the "steady dating" category. The remaining 374 respondents are distributed among the other stages of courtship (either the students were not dating, dating casually, or were engaged or married).

In total, 79 predictor variables were included in the initial analysis. This number was gradually reduced to 45 final variables through the "step-wise" procedure described in the previous chapter. The 45 predictors that attained the largest $B_{ss}/T_{ss}$ value of the original group of 79 variables were selected for the final analysis. The proportion of variation in the dependent variable of sex behavior
(Bss/Tss_i) explained by each predictor in the initial analysis is reported in Table XXXI.

For the final analysis, the requirements established within the computer analysis for splitting or subclassifying a parent group were as follows: (1) the total-sum-of-squares must be greater than $Tss > 6.465$ and (2) the between-sum-of-squares for any parent group must be greater than $Bss > 12.931$. A maximum of 20 groups may be specified with a minimum of 20 respondents per group. The t-level of significance was set at $TLEV = 0.00$ in order to get the maximum possible number of valid classifications.

The response codes representing the extent of physical intimacy experienced by stage of courtship are as follows:

Q-39-2c. Most advanced stage in physical intimacy experienced for steady dating.

1 = Casual hand holding
2 = Casual kissing and hugging
3 = Petting above waist
4 = Petting below waist
5 = Occasional coitus
6 = Regular coitus

Of the responses for the steady dating courtship stage, 23 percent of students reported that their most advanced experience was "casual kissing," 27 percent petted "above the waist," 27 percent petted "below the waist," 15 percent experienced "occasional coitus," and
TABLE XXXI

THE PROPORTION OF VARIATION EXPLAINED BY PREDICTORS FOR SEX BEHAVIOR. (Bss/Tss₁ Presented in Rank Order)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Bss/Tss₁</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Respondent's sex standards</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-7</td>
<td>Male forced intercourse upon female</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-3</td>
<td>Marriage is legal technicality and not necessary for a successful relationship between a man and woman</td>
<td>0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Type of birth control used in premarital coitus</td>
<td>0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-5</td>
<td>Male was aggressive in suggesting coitus to female</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Respondent's present residence</td>
<td>0.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-6</td>
<td>Dating behavior - drinking on date</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-8</td>
<td>Male forced sex act upon female child</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-3</td>
<td>Abortion is morally wrong in spite of benefits</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Respondent's present dating behavior</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-9</td>
<td>Female enticed sex act upon female child</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b</td>
<td>Frequency respondent attends church</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-1</td>
<td>Abortion is equivalent to murder</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Respondent's sex</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Respondent's age</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a</td>
<td>Importance of religion to respondent</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-3</td>
<td>Older woman entices male into sex act</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Predictor</td>
<td>Bss/Tss _</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-6</td>
<td>Encountered an over-aggressive male, that female resisted by force</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31a</td>
<td>Extent respondent dated in junior high school</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41b</td>
<td>Effect of physical intimacy upon respondent personally</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-5</td>
<td>Marriage is the only access for sexual relationships and provides order in society</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-2</td>
<td>Female encountered a homosexual</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31c</td>
<td>Extent respondent dated in college</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-1</td>
<td>Female encountered an exhibitionan</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Extent that respondent &quot;likes&quot; father</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Respondent's perception of happiness in parent's marriage</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Respondent's perception of difficulty in making friends</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Respondent lived with both original parents</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41a</td>
<td>Effect of physical intimacy upon the dyadic relationship</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-12</td>
<td>Respondent's source of information on the pleasure of sexual relations</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-6</td>
<td>Abortion is a form of birth control</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Respondent's religious preference</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Respondent's age of first date</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Frequency mother attends church</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Predictor</td>
<td>Bss/Tss₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29a Respondent's frequency of dating</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-4 Dating behavior - necking to be</td>
<td>Respondent's attitudes toward sex in marriage</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>popular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Respondent's attitudes toward sex</td>
<td>Marriage is fine for some but not for all</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in marriage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-2 Marriage is fine for some but not</td>
<td>Respondent's year in college</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Respondent's year in college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37a Respondent's emotional state upon</td>
<td>Respondent's emotional state upon breaking an engagement</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>breaking an engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11b Mother's educational achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-4 Marriage is the foundation of a</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-1 The family is the most necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and basic unit of society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a Father's educational achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Frequency father attends church</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Father's occupational status</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-1 Marriage is an absolescent</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tradition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Student's perception of relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-7 Abortion is a solution to social</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Respondent's self-concept of</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical appearance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31b Extent respondent dated in high</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-2 Abortion is unnecessary for</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maternal health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-4 Abortion has advantages and</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disadvantages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-4 Male encountered a prostitute</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Predictor</td>
<td>Bss/Tss₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Parent's educational expectations for respondent</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Times respondent has been &quot;in love&quot;</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Extent that respondent &quot;likes&quot; mother</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-3</td>
<td>Female encountered a person making obscene gestures</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-1</td>
<td>Male encountered a homosexual</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-16</td>
<td>Respondent's source of information on the immorality of sexual behavior</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Respondent's evaluation of academic ability</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-5</td>
<td>The family is unnecessary today and will soon die out</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Respondent's confidence on dates</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-3</td>
<td>The family is for protection of young and weak</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-2</td>
<td>Male encountered an over-aggressive female</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Respondent's community of origin</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-2</td>
<td>The family is a way of grouping individuals</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-5</td>
<td>Male encountered a pick-up</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Father/mother authority relations</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-5</td>
<td>Abortion is a therapeutic health measure</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mother employed outside of home</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Respondent's perception of adequacy of first information about sex</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Respondent's race</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>(Six questions relating to attitudes toward birth control</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Six questions relating to attitudes toward birth control were included in the AID analysis but were too insignificant to enter the analysis and explain any behavior pattern.)
8 percent experienced "regular coitus." Since this question is of the "Guttman form," the response codes are assumed to represent a continuum and thus are considered to be cumulative for all lower levels of experience.\(^1\)

The total weight for Parent Group 1—the students' sex behavior—was \(T_{ss} = 426,000\), the mean behavior is \(\bar{X} = 3.59\), and the standard deviation is \(s = 1.23\). The \(B_{ss}/T_{ss_i}\) ratio for each predictor in the final analysis is reported in Table XXXII. A total of 67 percent of the variation in sexual behavior is explained statistically by the final model.\(^2\)

Having described the characteristics of the dependent variable, we will now turn to a description of the findings from AID analysis of the sex behavior of college youth.

**Findings on Sex Behavior**

**Parent Group I:** In the analysis on sex behavior of college youth, the single predictor that reduced the greatest proportion of

\(^1\) It is recognized that the above categories are not of equal interval, and in fact there appears to be (based upon data in this analysis) a considerable qualitative difference between the categories. However, the qualitative differences between the categories are left to future analyses and are assumed to represent a linear continuum for this analysis.

\(^2\) The total variation explained by the model is equal to the sum of \(B_{ss}/T_{ss_i}\) ratios for each parent group split or subclassified by the program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Parent Group 1</th>
<th>Parent Group 2</th>
<th>Parent Group 3</th>
<th>Parent Group 5</th>
<th>Parent Group 8</th>
<th>Parent Group 11</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q-1</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-2</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-3</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-4</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-8</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-9</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-9a</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-9b</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-11a</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-11b</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-12</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-14</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictor</td>
<td>Parent Group 1</td>
<td>Parent Group 2</td>
<td>Parent Group 3</td>
<td>Parent Group 5</td>
<td>Parent Group 8</td>
<td>Parent Group 11</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-17 Extent like father</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-18 Extent like mother</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-22 Happiness of parent's marriage</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-24 Age first date</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-25 Difficulty making friends</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-28 Present dating behavior</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>-.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-29a Frequency dating</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-30-4 Neck to be popular</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-30-6 Drink on date</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-31a Date in junior high</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>-.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-31c Dated in college</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-37 Emotional state</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictor</td>
<td>Parent Group 1</td>
<td>Parent Group 2</td>
<td>Parent Group 3</td>
<td>Parent Group 5</td>
<td>Parent Group 8</td>
<td>Parent Group 11</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-41a Physical intimacy</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-41b Physical intimacy</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-55-L Pleasure of sex</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-68 Sex in marriage</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-70-1 Abortion</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-70-3 Abortion</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-70-6 Abortion</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-71-2 Marriage</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-71-3 Marriage</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-71-4 Marriage</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-71-5 Marriage</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-72-1 Family</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-74 Sex standards</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictor</td>
<td>Parent Group 1</td>
<td>Parent Group 2</td>
<td>Parent Group 3</td>
<td>Parent Group 5</td>
<td>Parent Group 8</td>
<td>Parent Group 11</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEMALES ONLY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-77-A Exhibitionist</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-77-B Homosexual</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-77-E Aggressive male</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-77-F Forceful male</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-77-G Raped</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-77-H Molested as child</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MALES ONLY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-78-C Molested as child</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>-.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-80 Contraceptive used</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
unexplained variation in sex behavior was the respondents' sex standards. Students are classified into a conservative-traditional group, Group 2 (those whose standards permitted sex for males or engaged couples, or abstinence - $\bar{X}=3.12$, $N=244$). (See Diagram 4)

Interpretation: The selection of the sex standards variable as accounting for the greatest variation in sex behavior, is of particular interest. First, the early emergence and direct linking of an attitudinal structure (sex standards) to sex behavior suggests that variation in behavior can be explained in terms of the respondents' sex standards. This classification accounts for an 11.1 percent reduction in variation of sex behavior. Second, this finding reinforces a conclusion in the prior chapter on sex standards, linking the respondent's standards to their behavioral patterns. This classification thus provides additional support for concluding that the relationship between sex standards and behavior is reciprocal.

However, it is also important to examine the structure the model may have assumed if the sex standards predictor were deleted. The alternative variable that would have been selected for Parent Group 1 would again be a behavioral variable --whether the student had experienced coitus and used contraceptives. (See Parent Group 1 on Table XXXII) The AID program would have classified respondents on essentially the same criteria used in the previous analysis for sex standards; those who reported no premarital coitus and thus used no
**DIAGRAM 4**

**SEX BEHAVIOR, PARENT GROUP 1**

**VARIABLE 39-2-c**

**Sex behavior**

1 = casual hand holding
2 = casual kissing and hugging
3 = petting above waist
4 = petting below waist
5 = occasional coitus
6 = regular coitus

**Extent of sexual intimacy:**

- **1** = casual hand holding
- **2** = casual kissing and hugging
- **3** = petting above waist
- **4** = petting below waist
- **5** = occasional coitus
- **6** = regular coitus

**DIAGRAM:**

- **1** (Sex behavior) with
  - **2** (Sex standards - abstinence)
  - **3** (Sex standards - equalitarian)

**Values:**

- N = 426
- N = 182
- N = 244

**Scores:**

- X = 3.59
- X = 3.12
- X = 3.95

**Notes:**

- **11.1%**
contraceptives (Group 1), and respondents who had experienced pre-marital coitus and regularly used contraceptives (Group 2). This split would have accounted for 10 percent of the variation in sex behavior, had it been used in the analysis. This specification for the alternative predictor (contraceptive use) lends credence to the conclusion that the response patterns on the contraceptive variable represents quite significant behavioral patterns and thus are worthy of further examination in future analyses.

Parent Group 2: Going ahead on the upper "tree" branch, Parent Group 2, consisting of non-permissive-traditional respondents (either permitting no coitus or coitus only for males or engaged couples) was capable of further subclassification into Groups 6 and 7, according to the definitions of guilt associated with the respondent's sexual experiences. (See Diagram 5) This subclassification produced a 9.7 percent reduction in the variation in responses for sex behavior. Group 6 (N=81) consisted of respondents who felt no guilt from their sexual experiences, but also had experienced little from which to feel guilty. The mean for Group 6 was $\bar{X}=2.75$, indicating that the majority of these respondents had indulged in only casual necking and occasional petting above the waist.

Group 7 respondents expressed feelings of greater guilt, but also were more intimate in their sexual experiences. The mean level of behavior was $\bar{X}=3.42$, suggesting that most respondents had engaged
DIAGRAM 5
SEX BEHAVIOR PARENT GROUPS 1, 2, 3

VARIABLE 39-2-c

1. Sex behavior
   - X = 3.59
   - N = 426

   2. Sex standards - abstinence
      sex for males or engaged couples
      - X = 3.12
      - N = 182
      - 9.7%

   3. Sex standards - equalitarian
      - X = 3.95
      - N = 244
      - 5.6%

   4. Sex behavior - no coitus or use of contraceptives
      - X = 3.66
      - N = 125

   5. Sexual behavior - coitus, and used contraceptives
      - X = 4.25
      - N = 119

   - Attempted split on father's occupation
   - Attempted split on father's education
in petting of a rather intimate nature (N=101).

Interpretation: Groups 6 and 7 represent the most non-permissive or "traditional" classification of respondents in the steady dating stage of courtship. These respondents' behavior was limited to casual necking and petting, and seldom extended to coitus. The remaining groups of respondents are sufficiently large for further subclassification, however, no predictor included in the analysis accounted for sufficient variation to effect a split in categories. Thus, one may only conclude that additional predictors need to be included in future analyses to further account for the non-permissive - traditional category of respondents.

Parent Group 3: We return now to the lower tree branch composed of the more permissive students. Parent Group 3, composed of respondents who held more liberal sex standards than Group 2 students, was subclassified into Groups 4 and 5, according to the students' premarital sex behavior and whether they used contraceptives. This classification accounted for an additional 5.6 percent variation in sex behavior. (See Diagram 5)

Group 4 consisted of the less permissive segment of the larger category of respondents who were permissive in their sex standards (X̄=3.66, N=125). Within this category, respondents reported either no coitus (N=38) or not using contraceptives in coitus (N=87).

Group 5 respondents were more permissive in their sex
standards than those in Group 4. These respondents reported that they participated in very intimate petting (normally genital) and occasional coitus, with a mean behavior of X=4.25.

Interpretation: Respondents in the "lower branch structure of the tree" are more permissive in their sex behavior than the "upper branch" respondents. These students reported very intimate petting and occasional coitus. The relatively large number of respondents in the lower branch and the larger proportion of unexplained variation in these groups permits further analysis and classification.

Parent Group 5: Going ahead on the "lower branch of the tree" we find that Parent Group 5, composed of respondents who reported permissive sex standards and used contraceptives, was capable of subclassification according to the respondents' perception of the "role of sex in marriage." This classification created Groups 8 and 9, and accounts for an additional 11.1 percent of the variation in students' sex behavior. (See Diagram 6)

Group 8 respondents, as contrasted with those in Group 9, held a traditional "moralistic-functional" perception of sex in marriage. Respondents expressed the views that "sex was for procreation, part of the husband-wife relationship, was a desirable and pleasant experience, but generally was a very private matter and not to be discussed with others." The mean behavior for Group 8 respondents was X=4.0 (N=89), suggesting that they were quite
**DIAGRAM 6**

**SEX BEHAVIOR PARENT GROUPS 5, 8, 11**

5 3, 7, 6, 2
Sexual behavior - coitus, and used contraceptives

\[
\bar{X} = 4.25 \\
N = 119
\]

8 0, 9, 7, 5, 4
Marriage attitude: sex is for marriage

\[
\bar{X} = 4.0 \\
N = 89
\]

10 2, 4
Importance of religion - moderate

\[
\bar{X} = 3.52 \\
N = 42
\]

12 0, 5, 6, 2
Dated junior high - very little or a lot

\[
\bar{X} = 3.96 \\
N = 27
\]

9 6, 2
Marriage attitude: sex is for having children and to enjoy

\[
\bar{X} = 5.0 \\
N = 30
\]

11 3, 1
Importance of religion - very religious or not religious

\[
\bar{X} = 4.43 \\
N = 27
\]

13 1
Dated junior high, 2-10 different persons

\[
\bar{X} = 5.05 \\
N = 20
\]
intimate in their petting, and occasionally experiencing coitus.

Group 9 respondents, while accepting the functional view that sex was for procreation, differed from Group 8 respondents in feeling that the major purpose of sex was to enjoy the experience. The mean behavior for Group 9 was $X = 5.0$, suggesting that these respondents experienced regular coitus in the "steady dating" phase of courtship ($N=30$).

Interpretation: Parent Group 5 represents a classification of respondents which were quite permissive in their sexual behavior, and were experiencing a behavioral pattern of quite intimate petting and occasional coitus. These respondents also made a conscious and planned use of contraceptives in their sexual relations.

However, this group (Group 5) can be subclassified further according to the respondents' perception of the role of sex in marriage. The most permissive group (Group 9) places major emphasis upon the pleasure of sex and generally disregards the other functions and moralistic elements of sex and marriage. Group 8 respondents held the more traditional and functional views that sex is for procreation and important in preserving the marital union.

The small number of respondents in Group 9, ($N=30$), prevents any further subclassification and the variation in responses is almost totally explained (statistically). However, these respondents represent fewer than 10 percent of the sample being examined, indicating
that regular coitus is not a regular pattern for the "steady dating" stage of courtship and is practiced by only 10 percent of the student population.

Parent Group 8: Of the remaining groups in this analysis, only Group 8 qualifies for further analysis. Parent Group 8 is composed of respondents who were permissive in their sex standards, who used contraceptives, but held a "moralistic-functional" perception of marriage. Group 8 students were subclassified into Groups 10 and 11 according to the "importance of religion" to the students. This classification accounts for an additional 12.2 percent of the variation in students' sexual behavior. (See Diagram 6)

To Group 10 respondents, religion was moderately important, but not extremely so. These respondents were also less permissive in their sexual behavior, as contrasted with Group 11 respondents, ($\bar{X}=3.52$, $N=42$).

For Group 11 students, religion was either very important or else they rejected religion completely, creating a U-shaped relationship. These respondents reported very intimate petting and occasional coitus ($\bar{X}=4.43$, $N=47$). (See Diagram 6)

Interpretation: The incorporation of the variable for the "importance of religion" into this analysis indicates that religiosity does have importance in accounting for variation in sexual behavior, but the importance is in part superseded by more potent variables.
The composition of respondents in Group 11 (either very religious or not religious) is unique and unclear in meaning. The selection of extreme types in this group may suggest that these students hold a unique combination of character traits, as some of the "very religious" students also report frequent coitus. This represents a considerable discrepancy between moralistic and behavioral norms for these students. Intensive analysis of this subgroup is needed to clarify the meaning of the classification for Group 11.

Parent Group 11: Going onward from Group 8, we find that Group 11 is composed of respondents who held permissive sex standards, used contraceptives, held a moralistic-functional perception of marriage, and were either very religious or not religious. Group 11 was capable of further subclassification according to the "adolescent dating behavior" of respondents, creating Groups 12 and 13. Group 12 respondents were classified according to whether they had dated a large number of different persons in junior high school, or had not dated any at all ($\bar{X}=5.05$, N=20). This classification accounts for an additional 17.1 percent of the variation in sexual behavior.

Group 13 respondents reported dating 2-10 different persons in junior high school, thus were more balanced in their dating behavior than Group 12 respondents.

Interpretation: Groups 12 and 13 again represent a "moderate
vs. extreme" pattern of responses. Again, the explanation for the classification in Group 12 is not clearly apparent. It is possible that these classifications are a spurious product of the AID analytic program, but more likely this classification represents some particular characteristic of these respondents in accounting for their extreme (or lack of) dating behavior. The repeated emergence of the extreme vs. balanced form of the last two parent groups suggests that the AID analysis is most likely identifying some latent character trait of the very permissive students. However, the nature of this trait is not apparent. The small number of respondents of these groups prevents any further analysis, and additional data on these particular subgroups is needed to clarify these questions.

Summary

To this point in the analysis of the sexual behavior of college students, 79 predictor variables were subjected to AID analysis. Predictors not achieving at least a 2 percent reduction in the dependent variable were deleted and others substituted in order to reduce the initial 79 to 45 variables for the final analysis. The variance scores for these predictors are reported in Table XXXII. The model, as completed in Diagram 6, accounts for approximately 67 percent of the variation in students' sex behavior.

The final AID model explaining variation in the sex behavior of
college youth in this sample can be described as possessing the following characteristics.

1. The most significant predictor explaining variation in students' sex behavior is the students' sex standards, differentiating between respondents who held standards favoring abstinence or coitus for males or engaged couples only (almost 40 percent of respondents), while the second group of respondents permitted coitus for both sexes (almost 60 percent).

2. The traditional group of respondents (permitting no sex relations, or coitus for males and engaged couples only) was capable of further classification according to the feelings of guilt associated with their sexual experience. Eighty-one of the 182 respondents felt no guilt, but also had not engaged in highly intimate sexual behavior. A slightly larger group (101 respondents) had engaged in more intimacy and felt some guilt about their experiences. However, at this point, no other predictor variables in the analysis were capable of reducing any additional unexplained variation in sex behavior, suggesting that additional variables are needed to account for these categories of respondents.

3. The variation in sex behavior for permissive students was
explained more fully than the non-permissive "traditional" students. The permissive students were further classified into 8 subgroups.

The first of these eight classifications was again a behavioral variable, differentiating between students who engaged in coitus and who used contraceptives, and those who reported no coitus or use of contraceptives. Those students who reported premarital coitus were capable of much further classification. The traditional segment of the permissive students (Group 4) was not fully accounted for in this analysis, as the predictors included did not account for any additional statistical variation. Additional predictors are needed to further "explain" this category of respondents (N=125).

4. As was also found in the analysis of sex standards, the substantive areas represented by the perceptions of the "role of sex in marriage" and the "function of the marriage institution" are prominent dimensions in the explanation of variation in sex behavior. Although all classifications in the traditional-non-permissive -- modern-permissive typology are not significant, the distinction definitely overshadows the impact of other less significant predictors.

(See Table XXXII)
The exact substantive meaning of the above findings is unclear, however, the importance of these perceptions is sufficiently demonstrated to warrant their inclusion in any future analysis of sex behavior.

5. The importance of religion appears to have a greater impact in accounting for variation in sex standards than for sex behavior, but for both variables, religiosity has a definite impact, particularly upon subclassifications of students.

However, some features of the religious dimension are somewhat unclear; both very religious and non-religious students reported very intimate sexual involvement. The dichotomy in this classification encourages us to seek to identify the discriminating elements of this special group of religious and non-religious students. Quite possibly, the discriminatory element may involve a status position of "group marginality" or alienation. Whatever the explanation, these students (N=47) reported regular coitus in their premarital behavior, and are rather atypical of the larger student population. This group of students definitely should be examined further.

6. The category of very religious or non-religious respondents described above can be subclassified according to their dating behavior as adolescents. Again we see an extreme
vs. moderate pattern of classification; those who never
dated and those who dated frequently experienced regular
coitus, but again these are a very atypical group of
respondents (N=20). The dating, sexual behavior, and
religious patterns of these respondents have very unique
behavior patterns and thus deserve examination as a
separate unique sample in themselves.

7. Other descriptive and demographic variables (age, year in
college, community of origin, parents' occupation and
education, relationship with parents, etc.) do not appear to
have any significant impact in reducing unexplained varia-
tion in sex behavior. Any impact they might have is over-
shadowed or superseded by more prominent attitudinal or
behavioral variables.
CHAPTER VII

FACTOR ANALYSIS

In the previous chapters, the data on 800 college students were examined in both a descriptive and analytic analysis. In Chapter IV it was noted that, in general, the students in this study had a positive home life experience and a favorable relationship with their parents.

However, in Chapters V and VI we note that a major proportion of students held rather revolutionary perceptions of the marriage and family institutions in that although the students appeared to have experienced a favorable home life, they also expressed rather non-traditional attitudes toward these institutions. A significant proportion of these students agreed with statements suggesting that "sex does not require marriage," and that "marriage is an obsolescent tradition."

Upon first examination it would appear that the data in this analysis were suggesting the existence of a new morality or attitudinal structure for this sample of college students. The "new morality" concept has recently been touted in the popular literature (particularly by a well known magazine called Playboy), and more recently it has been considered seriously in the more academic publication Sexual Behavior. In most analyses the "new morality" represents a shift
from institutional values toward more individualistic values in regard to the person's sex standards and behavior.

Although the existence of these non-institutional individualistically oriented norms is suggested in the description and analysis above, we do not have adequate basis at this point to form any conclusions in this reference.

It is of interest, however, to examine further the questions pertaining to marriage and family attitudes. A pervading problem in this analysis, particularly in interpreting the AID statistical analysis, is determining the dimensionality of the marriage and family questions and their impact in accounting for variation in sex standards and behavior. This problem is particularly acute with the "double barred" questions, which often contain two dimensions. Since the marriage and family attitudes were found to account for a major portion of variation in sex standards and behavior patterns, it is desirable to attempt to define the dimensions in the data through factor analysis. It was intended that factor analysis would accomplish the following objectives:

1. Provide basis for confirmation or rejection of the classifications derived through AID analysis.
2. Identify other dimensions not specified through AID analysis.
3. Provide confirmation for (or rejection of) the AID models derived.
4. Provide insight into relationships within the data not
discovered at this point in the analysis.

In this analysis, all variables with the following substantive
references were selected for factor analysis: (1) attitudes toward
marriage, (2) attitudes toward the family, (3) attitudes toward birth
control, (4) attitudes toward sex education, (5) attitudes toward
abortion, and (6) sex standards.

For this analysis, the orthogonal rotation of variables was used
in preference to the oblique rotation in order to increase assuredness
that any factors defined would truly represent separate dimensions.

In total, 36 variables were selected and analyzed by the Bio­
med factor analysis program BMDX72,¹ which was adapted to the
PDP-10 computer facilities of Western Michigan University. Seven
factors defined by the analysis are described below.

Description of Factors

Factor 1: The first factor represents a specification of functions
the family institution serves in society. This provides a basis for
concluding that the family variables are indeed salient and represent
a definite dimension in the attitudes of the youth in this study. In
addition to the family variables, there are also two variables repre-

¹Biomedical Computer Programs, X-Series Supplement, W. J.
102.
senting traditional functions of the marriage institution in society; "marriage provides order and control in society," and "marriage is the foundation of a family." Thus, on the basis of this analysis, the traditional functions of marriage and the family are joined in a common dimension. (See Table XXXIII)

**TABLE XXXIII**

**FACTOR 1: MARRIAGE AND FAMILY FUNCTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Weight</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Predominant Response Pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-.78</td>
<td>The family is for protection of the young and weak</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.77</td>
<td>The family is a way of grouping individuals</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.66</td>
<td>The family is unnecessary and will soon die out</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.62</td>
<td>The family is very necessary and the basic unit of society</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>Marriage is the only access to sex, order, and control in society</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>Marriage is the foundation of a family</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 2: Factor 2 is composed of variables relating to respondents' attitudes toward the dissemination of sex education to children. Students in general felt that children should be given sex information whenever they were "ready" for it or expressed an
interest. (See Table XXXIV)

**TABLE XXXIV**

**FACTOR 2: DISSEMINATION OF SEX KNOWLEDGE TO CHILDREN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Weight</th>
<th>Attitudes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.89</td>
<td>Sex information to children should be limited to flowers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.89</td>
<td>Children should be discouraged from asking questions about sex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.86</td>
<td>Any sex information given must be truthful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.86</td>
<td>Knowing about sex will encourage children to experiment with sex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.86</td>
<td>Sex education is an important duty of parenthood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.82</td>
<td>No sex information should be given to children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.81</td>
<td>Sex information is unnecessary for children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.81</td>
<td>Parents should give information only as the child asks questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.78</td>
<td>Sex information is important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.74</td>
<td>Parents should give sex information, as children will find out anyway.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 3: Factor 3 clearly represents attitudes toward the use of birth control techniques. Students in general did not favor the restriction of birth control practices and preferred the use of family planning in marriage.

There is a high consistency in the factor loadings on these
variables, suggesting they are equally salient variables. (See Table XXXV)

TABLE XXXV

FACTOR 3: USE OF BIRTH CONTROL TECHNIQUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Weight</th>
<th>Attitudes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-.76</td>
<td>Couples should use birth control methods in family planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.76</td>
<td>Couples should abstain from sex unless they want children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.75</td>
<td>A couple should use birth control measures after they have all the children they want.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.75</td>
<td>One partner should be sterilized after the desired number of children is achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.75</td>
<td>Couples should stop when they get the number of children they want.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.72</td>
<td>Couples should do nothing and have as many children as they want.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 4: Factor 4 represents a complex of negative attitudes toward the moral issue of abortion. This dimension contains the view that abortion is morally wrong, constitutes murder, and is undesirable. (See Table XXXVI)

Factor 4 is later contrasted with Factor 6 below which contains a more positive conception of abortion.
TABLE XXXVI

FACTOR 4: NEGATIVE CONCEPTION OF ABORTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Weight</th>
<th>Attitudes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>Abortion is equivalent to murder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.66</td>
<td>Abortion is morally wrong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>Abortion is unnecessary for maternal health.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 5: Factor 5 refers to the use of contraceptives and represents a single variable dimension which is complete within itself. The unusually high factor loading on this variable (-0.98) indicates that it is strongly represented in the data. The emergence of this factor, and the strength of the loading definitely reinforces the selection of the contraceptive variable in the AID models presented above as a specific dimension in the data. (See Table XXXVII)

TABLE XXXVII

FACTOR 5: CONTRACEPTIVE USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Weight</th>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-.98</td>
<td>Premarital contraceptive used.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 6: Returning now to the abortion variables we see that Factor 6 is composed of variables expressing a positive view of abortion. These attitudes support abortion as a solution to social
problems, a form of birth control, and as a therapeutic health measure. (See Table XXXVIII)

TABLE XXXVIII

FACTOR 6: POSITIVE CONCEPTION OF ABORTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Weight</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Predominant Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-.74</td>
<td>is a solution to social problems</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.72</td>
<td>is a form of birth control</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>is a therapeutic health measure</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.63</td>
<td>has advantages and disadvantages</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This factor is in distinct contrast to Factor 4 which represented a negative conception of abortion. (See above) The separation of these two attitudinal references suggests that there is a distinct difference in the perceived implications of each respective view.

Factor 7: The emergence of Factor 7 (sex standards) is of particular significance. The relatively high factors loading (0.89) indicates that this variable is strongly established as a separate dimension in the data. Thus, this factor analysis indirectly supports the AID analysis on sex behavior, in which the students' sex standards are the major variable accounting for variation in sex behavior. (See Table XXXIX)
TABLE XXXIX

FACTOR 7: SEX STANDARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Weight</th>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>Sex standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 8: The final dimension to be defined represents another set of attitudes toward the marriage institution. In general, these questions express attitudes which suggest that the marriage institution is dated and is of questionable utility in today's society. Approximately one-third of respondents expressed this view. (See Table XL)

TABLE XL

FACTOR 8: ATTITUDES TOWARD THE MARRIAGE INSTITUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Weight</th>
<th>Attitudes</th>
<th>Predominant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.72</td>
<td>Marriage is an obsolescent tradition</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.43</td>
<td>Marriage is only a legal technicality</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.41</td>
<td>Marriage is fine for those who believe in it</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the emergence of this factor reinforces the above conclusion that attitudes toward the marriage institution are quite salient variables and definitely should be included in any comprehensive analysis of sex standards and behavior patterns.
Summary of Factor Analysis

It was reported above in Chapters V and VI that variables representing attitudinal positions toward the marriage and family institutions accounted for significant portions of variation in students' sex standards and sex behavior. It logically follows (given the logic of AID analysis) that the particular variables (attitudes specified in the final models) would not necessarily be expected to explicitly represent an attitudinal orientation, but only represent a single factor dimension.

Thus, in order to attempt to enlarge the scope of the findings, it was desirable to specify the dimensions within the data through factor analysis. Through this fashion, the conclusions may be extended from specific attitudes to the larger attitudinal orientations implicit in models accounting for variation in students' sex standards and behavior patterns. In interpreting the implications of the dimensions defined above through factor analysis we develop the following conclusions:

1. The variables pertaining to attitudes toward the family are definitely intercorrelated and constitute a concise dimension within the data. Any further analysis of this data, or of data comparable to this population should incorporate the family dimension.

2. The marriage context, while also representing a definite
dimension in this data (see Factors 1 and 8) is dichotomized into two conceptions: the traditional attitudes, and the modern attitudes. The modern conception is in distinct contrast with the traditional conception of the structure and function of marriage. Thus, empirical evidence exists for the conclusion that a significant proportion of students hold non-traditional or modern conceptions of the marriage institution, and that these students are more permissive in their sex standards and behavior than the traditionally-oriented students. This finding supports and clarifies the classification defined through the AID analyses above.

3. Additional dimensions defined through factor analysis and not explicitly represented in the AID analysis are (1) the dissemination of sexual knowledge, (2) attitudes relating to birth control, and (3) attitudes toward abortion. (See Factors 2, 3, and 4) These general substantive areas did receive relatively high Bss/Tss₁ scores in the AID analysis (see Tables XXIX, XXX, XXI, and XXXII), but their effect was superseded by more potent variables in the specification of the final AID models.

The emergence of the above substantive areas in both methods of analysis (AID and factor analysis) suggests that these groups of variables are indeed salient, and deserve
attention in any further analysis.

4. The specification of the dimension of sex standards indicates that the respondents' sex standards represent a separate dimension in itself, and thus can validly be used as a dependent variable in a model representing sex standards.

At this point in the analysis of the sex standards and behavioral patterns of college students, it is now appropriate to integrate the findings of the four different analyses into a body of conclusions. Since this effort would constitute a chapter in itself, further discussion will be deferred to the conclusions chapter, which follows.
CHAPTER VIII

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

In line with the purpose of this study as specified in Chapter I, we have examined data obtained from 800 college students who attended Western Michigan University of Kalamazoo, Michigan, and Calvin College and Mercy School of Nursing of Grand Rapids, Michigan. The data were collected during the winter and spring of 1971 and covered a wide range of questions relating to students' sex attitudes, behavior, and knowledge of human sexuality and family living. Overall, information on 375 different items was collected, the majority of which is included in this analysis. (See Chapter III and IV and questionnaire in appendix.)

A smaller number of demographic, descriptive, and attitudinal items (approximately 80) were selected from among the larger number for more intensive analysis through Automatic Interaction Detection analysis and factor analysis. (See Chapter V, VI, and VII above.) It was decided to examine these variables in depth in order to ascertain their utility in accounting for variation in sex standards held by respondents and their sex behavior patterns. It was intended that through this analysis, some insight could be gained for the development of conceptual models to represent variation in students' sex
standards and behavior.

The method of this analysis was inductive, in that it did not set out to test hypotheses derived deductively from the previous literature, but rather sought to derive classifications that represent and reflect variation in attitudes toward sex standards, and behavioral patterns. This method is popularly known as the "Grounded Theory" Methodology. (See Chapter II)

Up to this point we have (1) provided a descriptive analysis of the data obtained from college students, (2) conducted an AID analysis of about 80 variables to ascertain their ability to account for variation in students' sex standards and behavior patterns, and (3) conducted a factor analysis to ascertain the different dimensions contained within the data. It is now feasible to integrate the findings of the above methods of analysis into a more systematic and conclusive summary.

First, perhaps, it is important to restate the demographic and descriptive characteristics of the student population. These characteristics must be kept in mind when making any generalizations from the conclusions contained herein. From the analysis of this student group it was found that:

1. The students are about equally distributed among the freshman, sophomore, and junior years of college (just fewer than 30 percent respectively). For the higher academic levels, the proportion of senior or graduate
level respondents was less than 14 percent.

2. Three-fourths of the students are grouped into the 18-20 age category; only 5 percent were of age 25 or more.

3. Over 70 percent of the respondents are female students. This disproportion is in part due to the inclusion of students in Nursing and Home Economics curriculums in the original population. (See Chapter III for elaboration.)

4. Most students (82 percent) were of urban or suburban origin; only 17 percent are of rural or small town origin.

5. The respondents are primarily white (94 percent), thus the conclusions cannot be extended to populations with a different racial mix.

6. The family unity of students was quite high, as approximately 90 percent of the students lived with their original parents before enrolling in college; only 5 percent reported that their parents were divorced.

7. The parents of these students were somewhat higher in both educational and occupational status than the national population. (See Chapter III) This is not surprising as only a college student population was sampled which would be expected to be somewhat higher in educational and occupational status than the general population.

8. The religious distribution of students approximated national
norms, as approximately 53 percent of respondents reported they were Protestant, 31 percent Catholic and less than one percent Jewish.

9. Approximately one-third of the respondents reported that they attended church regularly (weekly), while an additional 25 percent attended church occasionally (monthly or less). Only 7 percent of students rarely attended church or religious services (once a year or less).

With these characteristics of the student population in mind, we now turn our attention to the conclusions of this analysis.

Conclusions Relating to Sex Standards

For the past 20 years it has been predicted that there has been a revolution in students' sexual attitudes and behavioral patterns. Until very recently, support for this revolution has been based more upon supposition than fact. That tremendous change in adolescent and student attitudes has occurred seems highly probable. The point, however, is to attempt to document the expected change and describe the nature of its source and ramifications.

What is first apparent from this analysis is that these students' attitudes toward the basic American institutions of marriage, the family, courtship, moral issues, and sex standards and behavior
differ greatly from those commonly reported in prior decades. As would also be expected, it is apparent from the AID analysis that the difference is not total and absolute, but rather is represented mainly by a progressive portion of students while the more conservative students follow the paths cleared by the modern youth. Other than a tendency for being from the upper socioeconomic strata of the population, these students (in general) represent a cross section of the American college youth population and thus can be expected to reflect (to a limited extent) the youth attitudes of the larger college student population. To this extent, the findings of this analysis can be extrapolated to the larger student population.

It was also found (as expected), and empirically represented through the AID and factor analysis (see Chapters V and VII), that the nature of the students' attitudes toward marriage, family, and premarital sex relations can be dichotomized into traditional vs. modern (as well as permissive vs. nonpermissive) attitudes toward moral issues and institutions.¹ (See Table XXX) These delineations provide a basic fundamental classification from which to describe students' sex standards and behavior patterns, as well as account for variation in student opinions on moral issues.

¹ This dichotomy has been proposed in the literature, but its use has found only limited application.
**Conclusions on sex standards**

Empirical evidence is finally being compiled to indicate that students' sex standards have changed from those levels of prior decades. Bell\(^1\) has proposed that past change in sex attitudes and behavior can be represented by three plateaus: the first major change appeared in the 1920's (which represented the flapper generation), the second occurred during the 1940's which was influenced by the economic and social forces of World War II, and possibly the third major change occurred during the 1960's. It is still too early for retrospective interpretation to evaluate the forces influencing the latter change of sex standards.

It is clear, however, that as of 1970, students' attitudes toward premarital sex are different from those generally expressed in the early 1950's. (See Table XXIV) Data from 1945 and 1958 clearly show that abstinence was the predominant sex standard for the period, or if sexual intimacies were to be experienced, they were generally considered to be for the pleasure of males. The "double standard" is repeatedly demonstrated in almost any data of the period.

During the late 1960's data began to emerge to support the earlier predictions of a revolution in sex standards, a revolution which threw down the traditional male-female double standard and

---

substituted an equalitarian-permissive standard for sexual behavior. Abstinence in sexual relations was depreciated and replaced with values that permitted both males and females to engage in sexual intimacies, and the restrictions were not based upon the nature of the commitment to marriage (i.e., pre-engaged or engaged to be married).

Table XXIV shows that before 1960, an average of 60 percent of students favored abstinence as the proper sex standard, and only about 10 percent of students permitted both sexes to experience sexual intimacy. Data in this analysis (1971) show a distinct contrast from earlier data; less than one-fourth of students today favor abstinence while almost one-half of students express standards that permit both males and females to participate in sexual intimacies.

It cannot be concluded that changes as are observed in sex attitudes are related to an unsatisfactory home environment and/or parental estrangement. Table VII shows that over 80 percent of students in this study held quite strong affection for their parents, and fewer than 5 percent of students had poor relationships with their parents. (See Table VIII) Further, over 80 percent of students felt their parents were happy in their marriage and thus presented a favorable image of married and family life. One can only conclude that in general the students' home life was positive and cannot be expected to have encouraged a shift in students' perception of the
sex relationships in marriage.¹

This is not to suggest, however, that students' perceptions of the marriage and family institutions have not changed. These attitudes too have changed, and are most appropriately represented by the "traditional-modern" dichotomy referred to above. While it is apparent that there is perhaps a new attitudinal orientation emerging among today's students which does not limit sexual intimacy to the marriage context, students do not appear to be rejecting the institutions themselves, but are mainly viewing them in a new light. This is to say that students today do not reject marriage or the conventional family form, but are only changing some of their attitudes toward the institutions. For example, over 70 percent of students rejected statements suggesting that "marriage was an obsolescent tradition" or that "the family is an unnecessary aspect of today's society." Further, over 70 percent of students agreed that marriage is "the foundation of a family" and that "the family is the most necessary and basic unit of society." These students are clearly not rejecting the marriage and family institutions, but do tend to view them in a revised fashion.

What appears to be occurring is that students are accepting the conventional marriage and family forms, but are adding a new liberal

(or permissive) meaning to the sexual relationship, both before and perhaps after marriage. Almost 60 percent of students disagreed with the attitude that "marriage is the only access for sexual relationships," and almost 70 percent agreed that "marriage is for those who agree with it, but not for everyone." This finding is interpreted to mean that today's students accept the conventional form of marriage and family, if marriage and children are desired by the couple, but that marriage is not the only context for a sexual relationship. This finding is supported by a statement by Broderick, that "although young people (today) are experimenting with sex before marriage, they are not abandoning marriage."¹

It would appear, although it cannot be confirmed, that students today may be viewing marriage in a more serious light, entering marriage as an affective commitment based upon companionship, rather than the physical elements of sexuality. If this is true, students may be seeking a higher level of marital satisfaction that is not "body centered" but "person centered" and based upon the affective commitment.² From this perspective, sexual expression serves to complement, rather than constitute the marriage.


Other attitudes expressed by students in regard to issues of morality tend to support the conception of the permissive morality described above. Students clearly favor the dissemination of birth control information (over 75 percent of all students favored this practice) regardless of whether the person is or is not married. Moreover, students favored the idea that couples should limit their family size through family planning and the use of contraceptives.

However, these values did not overwhelmingly include the use of sterilization or abortion as a means of birth control. The predominant attitude appeared to support the use of abortion to preserve the mother's health or well being, and that the decision should be left to the persons involved rather than being controlled by laws of society. In other words, students appeared to favor the judicious use of sterilization, contraceptives, and abortion, but not the abuse of the practices.

Parent-peer influences upon sex standards

Although data on the parent-peer influences upon sex standards were not collected per se for this analysis, some insight into their impact may be garnered from data on the sources of sex information reported by students. Table XX and XXI show that students acquired most of their sex information within their family, from their peers, and in the school setting. Although the major source of information varied slightly by the topic specified, each of the three sources had
approximately the same impact upon students. In general, females were slightly more likely to get their physical information and moral attitudes from their parents than males, but the differences by sex were considered to be of limited significance.

It is more important perhaps, to note the impact of the peer group and school context as sources of physiological information and moral attitudes. Over two-thirds of students reported non-parent sources of information, indicating that the parental influence is definitely limited at the high school and college levels. In view of this finding, opponents of sex education in the public schools might take note of the significant impact of alternative, non-parent sources of information actually reported by students, and might wish to orient their activities toward these alternative sources instead of attempting to center sex education strictly within the parent-home context.

In summary, it would appear that students' sex standards, attitudes toward marriage and the family, and issues of morality are gradually and continually shifting toward more liberal or permissive interpretations, with the most significant references coming from outside of the family-home setting.

However, there is no evidence to suggest that students have overwhelmingly rejected conventional marriage and family life norms, but mainly student attitudes may be shifting from a strictly "body centered" to "person centered" relationship, even outside of marriage.
The often predicted element of parental estrangement of students does not appear to exist in fact, as students report quite favorable relationships with their parents.

**Sources of variation in students' sex standards**

In accounting for variation in students' sex standards the most prominent variable (of the many examined in this analysis, and selected by the AID statistical technique) in accounting for variation in students' sex standards is whether or not the respondent has experienced premarital sexual intercourse. The occurrence of premarital coitus was determined by the response to the question on "type of contraceptive used" in premarital sexual behavior. (See Question 80 in questionnaire in appendix.) Although this question is an indirect measure of premarital sexual behavior, it is felt that the sexual patterns are dichotomized and are specified in the responses to the question.

It cannot be determined explicitly from this statistical technique whether the respondents' sex behavior "determines" their standards, or whether the behavioral pattern encourages the respondents to redefine their structure of sex standards. This possibility will be examined in more detail below. It is apparent, however, that respondents who engage in "heavy" petting and premarital coitus are more permissive in their sex standards than students who do not engage in such behavior. In either event, we see that students' sex
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standards are directly related to their sex behavior.

It appears obvious that the above description represents an element of circularity in findings relating to students' sex standards and behavior; variation in students' sex standards appears to account for variation in students' sex behavior, and variation in sex behavior accounts for variation in students' sex standards. The problem appears to be magnified by the AID statistical technique, in which highly interrelated independent and dependent variables account for the major portion of variation in each other. This problem could be avoided if, upon recognition of the circularity, the variables creating the circularity were deleted, allowing other predictors to assume their place. This method would also give added significance to predictors of lessor importance in the earlier analysis. The AID technique only recognizes variations within the data, and cannot interject an intuitive evaluation of the variables to produce findings of theoretical merit. For this, the researcher must turn to other evaluative techniques. Thus, it is recognized that the above relationships are circular in nature, and with this in mind, we turn to other findings produced by the analysis.

A second classification of relevance in accounting for variation in sex standards is the respondents' attitudes toward the role and function of the marriage institution in today's society. At two points in Diagram 2 (see Chapter V), the marriage context is represented
Since the exact meaning of these classifications cannot be ascertained from the AID analysis, it was useful to turn to factor analysis for clarification. (See Chapter VII) Factors 1 and 8 suggest that two separate dimensions to the meanings of the marriage variables may be defined: Factor 1 -- a traditional perception of the marriage institution (marriage is good, necessary, and desirable), and Factor 8 -- a modern perception (marriage may not be necessary today, not always to be desired). (See Chapter VII)

Thus, it may be concluded that the "traditional-modern" attitudinal framework is inherent within the students' responses toward the marriage institution. Therefore, going back to the findings of the AID analysis, we can conclude that students' sex standards vary according to a modern-traditional attitudinal association that is reflected by their perception of the marriage institution, i.e., the more modern the students' conception of marriage, the more permissive their sex standards. It cannot be determined from the data available whether the respondents' sex standards reflect a change or causes a change in marriage attitudes, but whatever the source, the association in attitudes is noted.

A third classification of importance in accounting for variation in sex standards is the religious dimension of religious participation or frequency of church attendance (see Diagram 3; Groups 6, 7 and 10, 11 in Chapter V). Here we find that students who attend church
weekly are less permissive in their sex standards than those who infrequently attend church. This relationship appears to hold even for the "very permissive" students or those who hold standards which permit both sexes to experience premarital coitus. Thus, although some students may hold very permissive sex standards they still appear to be influenced by the extent of their religious participation.

Thus, on the basis of this analysis, we could predict that the three contextual variables of (1) past sexual experience, (2) the traditional vs. modern attitudinal orientation, as represented by the attitudes toward the institutions of marriage and the family, and (3) the religious participation of the respondent, would account for approximately 75 percent of the variation in sex standards of this college student sample. These variables can be represented by the schematic diagram below. (See Diagram 7)

All of the other demographic, descriptive, and attitudinal variables in this analysis combined (within the limits of this statistical analysis) could be expected thereby to account for the other 25 percent of unexplained variation in sex standards. (See Table XXX)

Thus, taking the relationships described in Diagram 7 below, one might take the first step toward constructing a model to represent students' premarital sexual behavior, and propose the tentative proposition that "If a college student (a) holds permissive sex standards, (b) is at the steady dating stage of courtship, (c) has low
religious participation, and (d) has a modern attitudinal orientation toward marriage and the family (approves of sexual intimacies in a non-marital context), then he is likely to have experienced intimate sexual relations (petting and occasional coitus)."

Also, taking the inverse elements of each of the variables above, one might develop the converse proposition that "If a college student (a) holds non-permissive sex standards at the steady dating stage of courtship, (b) has high religious participation, and (c) has a traditional orientation toward marriage and the family, then he is not likely to have experienced intimate sexual relations.

The propositions above are tentative at best, but they do repre-
sent the method by which further propositions might be developed from this methodological approach. Additional data and analysis are needed to establish the reliability and validity of these propositions, as well as to develop new propositions.

Conclusions Relating To Sex Behavior

As stated above, for the past 20 years, it has been predicted in both the popular and academic literature that students' premarital sexual behavior was rapidly becoming more permissive. However, until very recently (since 1970) these predictions have found little support in fact or data. Thus the revolution in sexual behavior that was predicted for the late 1950's and early 1960's did not appear until almost a decade later; in other words, the change appears to be manifest only in this decade.

Part of the discrepancy in the above predictions may well exist as a result of the frequent (but non-academic) assumption that changes in sex attitudes are directly and immediately manifested in corresponding changes in sexual behavior. Although there is some element of truth in the above assumption, there appears to be a considerable time lag, (in this case, almost a decade) between the period in which attitudinal change begins and the occurrence of any corresponding behavioral change.

It may be appropriate to examine the above "time lag" between
attitudinal and behavioral change in terms of dissonance theory. From this perspective, dissonance theory would suggest that the "double standard" for male-female sexual behavior that existed during the first half of this century was legitimized and reinforced through the values of the economic, political, and social institutions. During this period, males were permitted a greater freedom in permissive sex standards and behavior. However, during the 1950's, changes in these institutions gradually eroded the foundations which supported the traditional double standard, permitting a greater legal and social equality for females, yet the attitudinal discrepancy in male-female sex standards remained. This created dissonance between the perceptions of social conditions and the appropriateness of traditional attitudes toward sex standards and behavior. This dissonance may be exemplified by the social controversy over the propitiousness of the "Playboy" philosophy that emerged in the early 1960's. Thus, in light of this condition, Festinger might suggest that premarital sex standards would be reformulated toward a state of consonance, permitting a more equalitarian conception of male-female sex standards.¹

likewise be reduced, without the traditional institutional basis for support. The time required for such change to occur and be represented in data would easily require the decade reported above.

The above is exemplified by Bell and Chaskes (1970), in which they provided the first reliable proof of any longitudinal change in students' sexual behavior. They noted a 10 percent average increase in the proportion of females experiencing premarital coitus for the casual dating, steady dating, and engaged stages of courtship between 1958 and 1968. Bell and Chaskes’s findings are reported in Table XLI below.

### TABLE XLI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Courtship</th>
<th>1958</th>
<th>1968</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casual dating</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steady dating</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the data in this analysis are compared to those reported by Bell and Chaskes, the levels of sexual experience reported by

---
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students in this sample show both a change in female sexual experience from that reported in 1958, and approximates the levels of sexual experience reported in 1968. (See Tables XVI and XVII) Thus, it would appear from data in this analysis that the premarital sexual experience of females has become more permissive during the last decade for each stage of courtship.

Although comparable data (longitudinal data) are not readily available for males, it is generally assumed in the literature that the males' sexual behavior has not undergone any great change during the last decade (probably less than 10 percent). The significant change in females' sexual behavior is generally presumed to be a product of changing male and female attitudes toward the "double standard," where in the past females were not expected to have or be permitted the freedom of sexual expression possessed by males. Recent shifts in adolescent subcultural values toward greater equalitarianism in sexual expression has eroded traditional conceptions of female behavior.¹

Sexual behavior and the dyad

Although the change in sexual behavior of females is noted, it is also important to examine the impact of the change upon the

courtship relationship. Moralists have long proclaimed (as an argument against premarital sexual intimacy) that premarital sexual involvement weakens or destroys the affective commitment and the sanctity of the marital union. Such presuppositions do not appear to have empirical basis. In fact, data in this analysis suggest that premarital sexual intimacy may well assist the development of an affective commitment, thus encouraging the progression toward a formal commitment in marriage.

Although the extent of physical intimacy tends to vary according to the stage of courtship, 65 percent of both males and females reported that the physical intimacy they had experienced brought both members of the dyad closer together; another 15 percent of students were undecided if the level of intimacy had any impact. (See Table XVIII) Only 15 percent of males and females felt that their premarital sexual experience (whatever the level) was disruptive to the dating relationship.

Further, the premarital sexual intimacy did not appear to be perceived as undesirable or destructive to the persons involved. Only 10 percent of females and 2 percent of males felt "extreme guilt" from their sexual behavior. (See Table XIX)

It cannot be known at this point whether some students had psychologically negated the moralist's presuppositions before the sexual involvement occurred, or if other students simply redefined
the nature of the sexual experience to neutralize any negative stigma (reinstating a stage of consonance). More likely (as suggested by Reiss), the latter is more correct.¹ However, in either event, data in this analysis suggest that sexual intimacy may well perform an integral role or purpose in the dating relationship, and that it does not appear to have any enduring deleterious effect upon the relationship of the persons involved.

Determinants of variation in premarital sexual behavior

The most significant variable selected by the AID analysis in accounting for variation in sex behavior is the respondents' sex standards, differentiating between students who expressed non-permissive sex standards and those who were permissive (allowing premarital coitus for both sexes). The students who held non-permissive sex standards favored abstinence as their sex standard, or coitus for males and engaged couples only (which represents a "traditional orientation" of the "double standard"). The permissive students permitted premarital coitus for both sexes.

For the non-permissive students, the perception of guilt from their sexual experience appears to be the most important factor affecting their sexual behavior. Of the 426 students in this analysis,

approximately 81 felt no guilt from their sexual behavior, but this
group had hardly gone beyond the "kissing" stage of intimacy. The
other 101 students who held non-permissive sex standards had experienced a greater degree of physical intimacy and expressed more
feelings of guilt from their experience. Thus, any perceptions of
guilt appear to be a product of the students' behavior, particularly
when it is out of line with their non-permissive value orientation.
The more permissive students appear to have effectively eliminated
any concern with "guilt" from their attitudinal structure. (See
Table XXXII)

This perhaps would suggest that perceptions of guilt should
also be examined in terms of cognitive dissonance theory. From
this perspective, the discrepancy between the person's sex standards
and the behavior they experience would be manifested in perceptions
of guilt (dissonance being represented). Since the student cannot
change the occurrence of past behavior, consonance may be achieved
by reformulating the structure of sex standards to permit the more
permissive behavior, and eliminating the dissonance which produced
the guilt feelings. Almost one-fourth of students appear to be con­
cerned or involved in this process of reformulation of sex standards,
thus cognitive dissonance theory would have direct application in
understanding the nature and forces of change in students' sex
standards and behavior patterns.
For the larger student population, Table XIX (Chapter IV), shows that 50 percent of all respondents felt no guilt from the sexual intimacy they experienced, but 20 percent were adversely affected by guilt feelings and 30 percent remained unsure of their perceptions. Thus it appears that the guilt experienced by a non-permissive respondent as a result of their sexual intimacy does have an impact upon their standards and behavior patterns as it does statistically account for variation in sex behavior, but that for the permissive student, the sexual experience may have been redefined (the structure of standard reformed) to eliminate the negative consequences of their perceptions. Although this interpretation cannot be completely confirmed from the data in this study, Reiss does provide supportive data to show that the emotional acceptance tends to follow the behavior.  

The analytic model defined by the AID analysis has particular utility in accounting for variation in behavior for those students who hold modern sex standards (see the lower branch structure for Diagram 6, Chapter VI). The major variables for this classification of respondents are the (1) traditional vs. modern conception of the marriage institution, (2) the importance of religion to the respondent,

---

and (3) the respondent's early dating behavior (in junior high school).

Marriage attitudes: It appears in this analysis that although the mean score of these respondents suggests that this group of students were in fact very permissive in their sexual behavior (experiencing occasional coitus), there still is a difference between respondents who were traditional (who felt sex is for marriage), and those expressing modern attitudes (sex is to enjoy). Thus students at all levels of permissiveness appear to be influenced by the traditional (non-permissive) / modern (permissive) dichotomy, regardless of the degree of intimacy of their sexual behavior.

Religion: A third variable, religion, appears to perform an important role in accounting for variation in premarital sex behavior, even for the very permissive students. The AID analysis dichotomized respondents according to: (1) whether they are moderate in their religious faith, or (2) whether they were highly devoted to their faith and/or reject religion completely.

The composition of the highly religious-non-religious category does not yield to clear understanding; it includes students who are strongly religious but who are also experiencing regular coitus. Obviously there is a considerable discrepancy between attitudinal (church norms) and behavioral norms for this group. A second possibility is that religion has a greater impact upon the formation of sex standards (attitudes) than upon behavior. On the other hand,
the proportion of respondents representing this characteristic is less than 10 percent of the total sample, making the group too small for additional analysis in this study, but certainly creating an interest in searching for a larger sample of persons with these characteristics for future research.

Dating behavior: The early dating behavior of students appeared to have a significant impact upon their sex behavior, although the exact nature of the influence is not clear. Students in the moderate category -- dating 2-10 different persons but no extremes of either (no dating at all, or dating more than 12 persons in junior high school) were the most permissive of all groups in their sex behavior.

This writer prefers to not make any generalizations from the above finding as the classification is only slightly significant in this analysis. Less than 5 percent of respondents possess this characteristic, and a very slight change in the statistical limits of the AID analysis (changing the minimum number of persons required for a group to be defined by one person) would have deleted this group completely. Thus, it is simply noted that the impact of the dating relationship upon premarital sexual behavior is curvilinear, and it is suggested that more respondents sharing these characteristics be analyzed before more specific conclusions are stated.¹

¹This finding was also reported by Reiss, along with a more complete description of the effects of dating behavior upon premarital
In light of the above presentation, variation in students' premarital sexual behavior can be represented by the following schematic diagram. (See Diagram 8)

**Diagram 8**

**Schematic Representation of Variables Accounting for Variation in Students' Premarital Sex Behavior**

Again, one might take the relationships established in Diagram 8 above and propose the tentative proposition that "If a college student (a) expresses permissive sex standards (equalitarian sex standards), (b) has low religious participation, (c) expresses a modern orientation toward marriage and the family (accepts non-marital sexual intimacies), then he is likely to be permissive in his sexual behavior."

Taking the inverse elements of the proposition above allows one to construct the converse proposition that "If a college student (a) expresses non-permissive sex standards (the double standard for sexual intimacies), (b) has high religious participation, (c) expresses a traditional orientation toward marriage and the family (believes that sex is for marriage), then he is not likely to be permissive in his sexual behavior."

These propositions, as those in the preceding section, are tentative and await additional data and analysis before acceptance. With these conclusions in mind, we now return to the analysis of the relationship between sex standards and sex behavior.

Situational ethics, sex standards and behavior

It was noted in the preceding analysis that two attitudinal dichotomies are represented in the data for both sex standards and behavior; the permissive-non-permissive attitudes of sex standards, and the traditional-modern attitudes toward the marriage and family institutions.

A brief examination of these typologies suggests that neither stage of the above dichotomies exists in the pure form in the human mind, but that both dichotomies are perhaps best represented as ideal types in a state of tension or balance. It is apparent that the permissive-non-permissive and traditional-modern dichotomies appear to exist for all levels of sex standards and behavior patterns. For
example, it is noted in the AID analysis that some of the strongly non-permissively oriented students engage in quite permissive behavior, while some of the very permissive students remain very non-permissive in their behavior. Thus one is led to conclude that each individual must achieve a balance in the states of tension of these dichotomies, which may be determined in part by the elements of the dating situation.

Further, the situational ethics of behavior suggest that the states of attitudinal balance may be influenced by factors which influence behavior but which do not result in immediate attitudinal change (the girl yields to her date's sexual demands rather than lose him as a dating partner), or be influenced by the group norms (shifting to peer groups with a more permissive value orientation).

For this, cognitive dissonance and reference group theory may appropriately be used to account for changes in personal sex standards over time (age and sexual experience), as well as account for the increasing influence of peer groups as the person matures. For example, a positive valence between behavior and the peer group (i.e., the experience of petting being reinforced by the general norms of the peer group) may be expected to lead to attitudinal change away from parental norms toward peer group norms.

From these perspectives the person's own sex standards are less a representation of morality than a product of the social milieu.
and experience. These above considerations should not be ignored in any analysis of premarital sex standards and behavior. It is therefore suggested that it may be of more value for future research on sex attitudes and determinants of behavior to focus upon the mechanisms of balance of these attitudinal states, and further, how these states of attitudinal balance may be influenced by peer group references, "situational" ethics, or the behavioral situations encountered.

Theoretical Implications

The ultimate purpose of any research is to select and derive findings that will have broader theoretical implications. This analysis, as with most others, is directed toward this end.

Reiss, in his book *The Social Context of Premarital Sexual Permissiveness* describes a decade of research on sexual permissiveness, and concludes with a theory accounting for variation in levels of sexual permissiveness. Essentially, Reiss suggests that standards of sexual permissiveness are learned in a social setting in much the same formal and informal ways that any other attitudes are learned. Reiss proposes that "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

---

1 ibid.
premarital sexual permissiveness in the social and cultural setting outside the group. ¹

Although this research did not include specific references to the autonomy of the courtship group,² it does have findings that have implications for the second element of Reiss's theory, the factors affecting variation in levels of sexual permissiveness. More significantly, this research indicates that variation in premarital sex standards and sex behavior are influenced by social factors and not any absolute standard of morality. Specifically, a person's standards of premarital sexual permissiveness appear to be a product of his religious participation, past sexual experience, and his attitudinal orientation toward the marital and family institutions (traditional vs. modern).

Since the attitudinal orientations toward marriage and the family are influenced by a variety of social factors (social class, the childhood family experience, and the degree of family functionality), they may be viewed as socially derived and/or influenced by group and societal norms.

¹loc. cit., p. 167.

²The autonomy of the courtship group was indirectly measured through variables specifying "place of current residence." Students in this sample were considered to have high autonomy; 90 percent of students lived separately from their parents, 60 percent lived in college dormitories and 20 percent shared a private apartment. Thus, students would be expected to have very low parental surveillance, allowing high autonomy in their courtship behavior.
Thus, this finding lends one element of credence to Reiss's theory of premarital sexual permissiveness.

The second finding, that definitions of sexual permissiveness are influenced by past sexual experience, also shows that no absolute standard of morality determines one's sex standards. It is well recognized that the definition of acceptable sexual behavior varies by stage of courtship, perception of peer group and cultural norms, and the situational determinants of morality (see above). Thus, this finding lends credence also to Reiss's conclusion that the degree of acceptable premarital sexual permissiveness is a function of the level of sexual permissiveness of the social and cultural setting, rather than solely being determined individually.

The third finding, that sexual permissiveness varies directly as a function of religious participation, again confirms the influence of social factors upon the specification of acceptable levels of sexual permissiveness. Primarily and/or initially, the family and peer group influences the likelihood of religious contact and church attendance. In numerous ways, religion is a group experience and the individual takes his personal norms from the complex of religious norms held by the group. Thus again, the social and cultural setting influences the person's exposure to standards of sexual permissiveness.

Therefore, it appears that the findings of this analysis do
support the basic elements of Reiss's theory of sexual permissiveness and that standards of sexual permissiveness are learned in a social setting and influenced by social determinants, rather than being absolutely or individually determined. This is true, naturally, to the extent that the findings in this analysis are valid.

Limitations of This Analysis

Inevitably, there are problems and limitations inherent within any attempt to use a questionnaire designed and data collected before the specifications of the analytical problem. Equally important are the problems of acquiring the financial resources for a research effort and acquiring access to populations for the collection of data. It was intended in this analysis that the above problems could be satisfactorily resolved and neutralized by using data collected as a part of a larger research effort. To a reasonable extent these problems have been resolved, within the limitations of the concerns described below:

1. Although the spirit of the "grounded theory" methodology was employed in this analysis, it was not feasible to employ all the stages of the methodology (see Chapter II above). The "grounded theory" method calls for a continuous process of collection of data, formulation of classifications to represent the characteristics of the data, the collection of
new data to test the classifications derived, the reformulation of the classifications to account for variations in the new data, etc., until a set of propositions are derived to represent characteristics of the population that are "grounded" in data. This dissertation represents one stage of data collection and analysis; it is now appropriate to revise the questionnaire to test classifications defined in this analysis on new populations.

However, in line with the "grounded theory" method, (1) data were collected from a population of college students, (2) the characteristics of the data are presented, (3) basic classifications are defined, and (4) the classifications are evaluated for their ability to account for (statistically) variation in students' premarital sex standards and behavior. The above represents the logical end for this first stage of analysis.

2. Two statistical modes of analysis were selected for application to the data in this research project (AID and factor analysis). As such, they served as tools to be used in building a structure for ordering the findings.

However, the AID analytic technique seemed to introduce a problem that is probably of its own design, that is, the specification of circularity in findings of these
data. In this, the program accomplished the purpose for which it was designed (as a statistical analysis), but this method failed to serve completely the purposes of this research problem as posed above. This requires caution in selecting the AID mode of analysis for research questions which contain two (or more) independent and dependent variables that are highly interrelated.

In conclusion, it appears, based upon the above description, that AID analysis is generally effective in performing its function and purpose as a statistical technique. However, it may be of limited utility when one relies solely upon this technique for the development of theoretical considerations. For the latter, other modes of statistical analysis may be more appropriate.

More specific limitations of this analysis are:

3. The proportion of males in the total sample is disproportionately small, partly due to the sampling process of administering the questionnaire to classes with predominantly female enrollments (Nursing and Home Economics), and partly because of the reluctance of black males to complete the questionnaire.

4. The proportion of non-white respondents is too small to allow their separation for control groups. Thus any
statement of findings is somewhat limited to the white population.

5. For the most part, only undergraduate college students were included in the sample, which were of slightly higher socioeconomic status than the national population. Thus, the findings are not to be generalized to populations that do not share the demographic characteristics of this sample.

6. An analytical problem emerging as a result of the analysis was the dual-dimensionality of some of the marriage and family variables, which were identified by the AID analysis as accounting for a major portion of the variation in sex standards and behavior patterns. This problem could not have been averted before the specification of the research question, as it arose as a product of the research findings. As much as possible, this problem was minimized through the use of factor analysis.

7. A final limitation inherent within this analysis involves the use of the AID and factor analytic techniques. Because of the nature and characteristics of these statistical techniques, questions arise as to the extent one may conclude the AID models are valid and can be extended to other student populations. These questions are epistemological in nature and complex, perhaps deserving a separate
dissertation for their examination.

Since it is not the purpose of this dissertation to examine the epistemology of sexual research, the above questions will not be explored. However, a few points might be stated for reference.

1. Within reasonable limits, all dimensions within the data were explored through AID and factor analysis, and models derived to represent variation in students' sex standards and behavior patterns. However, this is not to suggest that other models might not be defined to account for more variation. More powerful models might be developed through the addition of new predictor variables and increasing the sample size to allow the specification of additional subgroups.

2. The methodological techniques (Automatic Interaction Detection, and factor analysis) employed in this analysis are designed to be exploratory tools, and in no fashion should they be viewed as substitutes for theoretical reasoning. It is a legitimate question to ask if the statistics have any useful application at all in this analysis. In response, we might state that the models defined support (in general) similar findings proposed in the literature, thus adding validity to the accumulated knowledge of sexual research. But, because of the nature and characteristics of the statistical techniques, one should use them sparingly as a
means to an end, and not to constitute an end in inductive reasoning itself.

3. The original objectives, as stated in Chapter I, are fulfilled as follows: (A) Eighty-one variables were examined for their ability to account for variation in students' premarital sex standards, and 79 variables were evaluated for their ability to account for variation in students' premarital sexual behavior. The most significant of these variables were identified through statistical analyses and are presented in schematic diagrams. (See Diagrams 6 and 7 in Chapter VIII).

(B) The data from students were examined to determine the distinguishing characteristics of those who held permissive and non-permissive sex standards and behavior patterns. In regards to premarital sex standards, the level of permissiveness was found to be directly associated with the student's attitudinal orientation (traditional vs. modern), the degree of past sexual experience, and the extent of religious participation by the student. Permissive sexual behavior was found to be directly associated with the student's premarital sex standards, the nature of the attitudinal orientation (traditional vs. modern), and the extent of religious participation.
(C) the nature of the close relationship between students' sex standards and behavior patterns was explored and evidence compiled to suggest that a person's sex standards may vary more as a function of behavior (standards tend to be reformulated to conform with past behavior), than sexual behavior being directed by the premarital sex standards (which does not account for situational elements of behavior, the influence of peer group norms, or sexual intimacies encouraged by the affective relationship). In this, the influence of external variables is noted (peer group norms, situational ethics, and stage of courtship), which may well have a greater impact upon the formation of sex standards than elements of morality. Finally, a conceptual framework is suggested (cognitive dissonance) to account for the change in sex standards over time.

Suggestions for Future Research

Research in any area of knowledge has at least two basic purposes: (1) to clarify the existing state of knowledge; and (2) to ever advance the present stage of developing relevant questions for further exploration.

In line with the second purpose above, several questions derived from this analysis call for additional exploration:
1. It is known that premarital sex standards and behavior vary by stage of courtship. We must now define how sex standards and behavior vary as a function of each courtship phase.

2. It is known that students' premarital sex standards are associated with students' attitudes toward the marriage and family institutions (traditional vs. modern). Now we should explore the nature of the reciprocal effect of these attitudes.

3. It is established that sexual experience increases as a function of age and past experience. We should now inquire into the nature of the relationship, particularly as influenced by other descriptive characteristics and attitudinal orientations.

4. It is recognized that the students' reference group is gradually transferred from parents to the peer group as the adolescent matures. We should now inquire into the nature of the change and the latent impact of change in reference groups.

5. It is noted that change in sex attitudes and behavior can be accounted for in terms of cognitive dissonance theory. It is now appropriate to design research to further explore the implication of dissonance theory for sexual research.

6. With very few notable exceptions, all sexual research is
cross-sectional and descriptive in nature. It is not reason-
able to expect that even a large number of cross-sectional
snapshots can provide the insights of well developed longi-
tudinal research with representative groups. It is almost
impossible to meaningfully understand the subtle changes
occurring in the relations between sex standards and behav-
ior, the interaction of multiple variables, and the impact
these changes have upon other institutions without an exten-
sive and well designed longitudinal effort.

7. Almost all current research on premarital sex standards
and behavior is concentrated upon the captive audience of the
college student. As a result, over one-half of the youth
population is unexplored. Inevitably, this deficiency res-
tricts the development of theoretical interpretation.

With the descriptions and statistical analyses presented above,
the discussion and evaluation of findings, and in consideration of its
original objective, this research has reached its logical conclusion.
APPENDIX A

EXHIBIT 3

Reiss's Classification of Premarital Sexual Standards

1. Abstinence (premarital intercourse is considered wrong for both sexes)
   a. Petting without affection (petting is acceptable even when affection is negligible)
   b. Petting with affection (petting is acceptable only in a stable, affectional relationship)
   c. Kissing without affection (only kissing is acceptable, but no affection is required)
   d. Kissing with affection (only kissing is acceptable, and only in a stable, affectionate relationship)

2. Double standard (males are considered to have greater rights to premarital intercourse)
   a. Orthodox (males may have intercourse, but females who do so are condemned)
   b. Transitional (males have greater access to coitus, but females who are in love or engaged are allowed to have intercourse)

3. Permissiveness without affection (premarital intercourse is right for both sexes regardless of the amount of affection present)
   a. Orgiastic (pleasure is of such importance that precautions are not stressed)
   b. Sophisticated (pleasure is stressed, but precautions to avoid VD and pregnancy are of first importance)

4. Permissiveness with affection (premarital intercourse is acceptable for both sexes if part of a stable, affectionate relationship)
   a. Love (love or engagement is a prerequisite for coitus)
   b. Strong affection (strong affection is a sufficient prerequisite for coitus)

APPENDIX B

STUDENT SURVEY

Name of your school__________________________________________ School Code____(1, 2)
Questionnaire No.____(3, 4, 5)

1. What is your sex? (6)
   Check one: 1_____ male
   2_____ female

2. What is your present age: (7)
   Check one: 0_____ 16 or under
   1____ 17
   2____ 18
   3____ 19
   4____ 20
   5____ 21
   6____ 22
   7____ 23
   8____ 24
   9____ 25 or over (specify)

3. What is your year in college: (8)
   Check one:
   1____ Freshman
   2____ Sophomore
   3____ Junior
   4____ Senior
   5____ Graduate
   6____ Specialist
   0____ Other (specify)

4. Where are you living now? Check one:
   0_____ At home (parents)
   1_____ Dormitory (school)
   2_____ Apartment (alone)
   3_____ Apartment (share)
   4_____ Sorority or fraternity
   5_____ Private family
   6_____ Rooming house
   7_____ Other (specify)

5. How many brothers and sisters do you have? (10, 11, 12)
   ______ number brothers
   ______ number sisters
   ______ total
6. Are you: Check one. (13)
   1 _____ an oldest child
   2 _____ a youngest child
   3 _____ an only child
   4 _____ an in-between child
   5 _____ a twin

7. In what size community did you live most of the time you were growing up? (14)
   Check one:
   1 _____ Rural Farm
   2 _____ Rural Area (open country non-farm)
   3 _____ Town (under 20,000 population)
   4 _____ City (20,000 - 100,000)
   5 _____ Large City (more than 100,000)

8. As a teenager did you live in a home with both your original mother and father? (15)
   1 _____ no
   2 _____ yes

8a. If you are not living with both parents, which parent(s) is (are) not living in your home? Write in your age at the time when you were separated from the parent.
   1 _____ Mother was absent when I was ___ years old. (16, 17)
   2 _____ Father was absent when I was ___ years old. (18, 19)

8b. How did the separation come about? (20)
   1 _____ Father's death
   2 _____ Mother's death
   3 _____ They were divorced
   4 _____ Other (specify)

IF PARENTS ARE DIVORCED OR SEPARATED: (if not go to question 9)

8c. How old were you when your parents divorced or separated? ___ (21)

8d. Which parent did you live with most of the time after the divorce or separation? (22)
   1 _____ Mother
   2 _____ Father
   3 _____ Foster parents
   4 _____ Other relative (specify)

8e. If the parent with whom you lived remarried, how old were you when the parent remarried? (23)
   ___ years
9. What is your religious preference? (24)
   1____ Catholic
   2____ Jewish
   3____ Protestant: What denomination: ____________________________
   4____ Other (specify): _________________________________________

9a. All in all, how important would you say your church and religion is to you? Check one. (25)
   1____ Fairly unimportant
   2____ Not too important
   3____ Fairly important
   4____ Quite important
   5____ Extremely important

9b. How often do you attend church services? Check one. (26)
   1____ Never
   2____ Hardly ever
   3____ Several times a year
   4____ About once a month
   5____ Two or three times a month
   6____ Once a week or more

10. Are you: Check one. (27)
    1____ American Indian
    2____ Afro-American (Black-Negro)
    3____ White
    4____ Oriental
    5____ Other (what) ___________________

11. How many years of schooling did your father complete? Your mother? (The highest educational level completed) (28, 29)
    Father ( one)    Mother ( one)
    _______ _________ 1. Some grade school
    _______ _________ 2. Completed grade school
    _______ _________ 3. Some high school
    _______ _________ 4. Completed high school
    _______ _________ 5. Special school, but not college
    _______ _________ 6. Some college
    _______ _________ 7. Completed college
    _______ _________ 8. Advanced college degree
    _______ _________ 9. Other (please explain) __

12. What kind of work does your father do? (30) ___________________
12a. Where is your father employed? (31) ______________________

13. Does your mother work outside the home for money? (32)
   1_____ No
   2_____ Yes

13a. Where does your mother work? (33) ______________________

13b. What kind of work does your mother do? (34) _______________

14. About how often does your mother attend church services? (35)
   1_____ Never
   2_____ Hardly ever
   3_____ Several times a year
   4_____ About once a month
   5_____ Two or three times a month
   6_____ Once a week or more

15. About how often does your father attend church services? (36)
   1_____ Never
   2_____ Hardly ever
   3_____ Several times a year
   4_____ About once a month
   5_____ Two or three times a month
   6_____ Once a week or more

16. In your family would you say that your father bosses your mother, that your mother bosses your father, or that they don't boss one another? Check one. (37)
   1_____ Father is definitely the boss in our family
   2_____ Father tends to be boss, but not always
   3_____ Mom and Dad do not boss each other
   4_____ Mother tends to be boss, but not always
   5_____ Mother is definitely the boss in our family

17. How much do you like your father? (38)
   0_____ I despise him
   1_____ I dislike him very much
   2_____ I don't like him at all
   3_____ He's alright, I guess
   4_____ I like him okay
   5_____ I like him very much
   6_____ I love him very much
   7_____ He's really great
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17a. Answer only if you have a stepfather, or foster parent. How much do you like your stepfather or foster parent? (39)
   0  I despise him
   1  I dislike him very much
   2  I don't like him at all
   3  He's alright, I guess
   4  I like him okay
   5  I like him very much
   6  I love him very much
   7  He's really great

18. How much do you like your mother? (40)
   0  I despise her
   1  I dislike her very much
   2  She's alright, I guess
   3  I like her okay
   4  I like her very much
   5  I love her very much
   6  She's the greatest mom in the world

18a. Answer only if you have a stepmother, or foster parent. How much do you like your stepmother or foster parent? (41)
   0  I despise her
   1  I dislike her very much
   2  She's alright, I guess
   3  I like her okay
   4  I like her very much
   5  I love her very much
   6  She's the greatest

19. All in all, how well do you get along with both of your parents? (42)
   1  Poorly
   2  Not very well
   3  Fairly well
   4  Well
   5  Very well

20. If it were possible to change real parents into ideal parents, how much would you change in your MOTHER? (43)
   1  nothing at all
   2  one or two things -- what? ____________________________
   3  a few things -- what? _________________________________
   4  a fair number of things -- what? ________________________
   5  a large number of things -- what? ______________________
   6  just about everything -- what? _________________________
21. If it were possible to change real parents into ideal parents, how much would you change in your FATHER? (44)
   1____ nothing at all
   2____ one or two things -- what? ____________________________
   3____ a few things -- what? _________________________________
   4____ a fair number of things -- what? ________________________
   5____ a large number of things -- what? _____________________
   6____ just about everything -- what? _________________________

22. How would you describe your parents' marriage? (45)
   1____ very unhappy
   2____ unhappy
   3____ not too happy
   4____ just about average
   5____ a little happier than average
   6____ very happy
   7____ extremely happy

23. Have you ever been on a date? (46)
   1____ No
   2____ Yes

24. How old were you when you had your first date? Check one. (47)
   1____ under 13
   2____ 13
   3____ 14
   4____ 15
   5____ 16
   6____ 17
   7____ 18
   8____ have not dated

25. How much difficulty do you have in making friends with members of the other sex? Check one. (48)
   1____ very much
   2____ a good deal
   3____ not much
   4____ a little
   5____ very little

26. Compared with the other boys or girls of your sex, how would you describe your physical appearance? Check one. (49)
   1____ ugly
   2____ somewhat homely
   3____ about average
   4____ good looking
   5____ very good looking (handsome, pretty)
27. When you are on a date, how confident are you that things will work out okay and that it will be enjoyable or fun for both you and your date? Check one. (50)
   1______not confident at all
   2______a little confident
   3______I'm confident
   4______very confident

28. Which of the following best describes your present dating behavior or marital status? Check one. (51, 52, 53)
   0______not dating
   1______dating once in a while
   2______date quite often
   3______going steady with one person
   4______have an understanding for engagement
   5______am engaged
   6______am married
   7______have been married before but not now

Check one: 1______Separated (age when_____)
2______Divorced (age when______)
3______Widowed (age when______)

28a. If you are now or have been married, how old were you when you married? (54)
   0______16-17
   1______18-19
   2______20-21
   3______22-23
   4______24-25
   5______27-28
   6______29-30
   7______30-35
   8______35 +
   9______Never have been married

29. If dating, when do you date? (55)
   0______do not date
   1______mostly school nights
   2______mostly weekends
   3______both

29a. How often do you date? (56)
   0______seldom
   1______big occasions only
   2______once a month
29b. Which do you enjoy the most? (57)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not dating</td>
<td>going with a crowd</td>
<td>double dating</td>
<td>single dating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29c. What do you prefer to do on a date? (58)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dances</td>
<td>movies</td>
<td>sports</td>
<td>parties at home</td>
<td>parties at school - college</td>
<td>other activities (name)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Would you please read the following statements about dating and check yes or no. (59 through 77)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Don't</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>know</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Boys:** On a casual date do you expect a goodnight kiss?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>necking</td>
<td>petting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Girls: Do you think you have to neck to be popular?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>know</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you pet (make-out) on a date?

Girls: Do you ever drink on a date?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>know</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you drink do you do your drinking in your home?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>know</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When you have parties at home, are your parents usually around?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>know</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you respect a girl more if she refuses to drink?

Girls: Do you respect your date more if he refuses to drink?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>know</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would you go out with a boy or girl who drinks on a date?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>know</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have you ever tried "pot or grass?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>know</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have you ever tried "LSD or acids?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>know</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have you ever tried "goofballs or nimbies?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>know</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have you ever tried "pep pills, bennies or dexies?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>know</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
Have any of your friends or acquaintances tried "pot, acids, goofballs, or pep pills?"
Would you go out with a boy or girl who used drugs or narcotics?

31. How many different people have you dated? (78, 79, 80)

In Junior High School  In High School  In College Up to Now
0  none  0  none  0  none
1  one  1  one  1  one
2  two or three  2  two or three  2  two or three
3  four or five  3  four or five  3  four or five
4  six to nine  4  six to nine  4  six to nine
5  ten to fifteen  5  ten to fifteen  5  ten to fifteen
6  fifteen or more  6  fifteen or more  6  fifteen or more

32. How many times have you gone steady? (1 through 8)

In Junior High School  In High School  In College Up To Now
0  none  0  none  0  none
1  one  1  one  1  one
2  two or three  2  two or three  2  two or three
3  four or five  3  four or five  3  four or five
4  more than five  4  more than five  4  more than five

33. How many times have you been engaged? (9, 10)

"A Private Understanding"  "Formally Announced"
1  none
2  one
3  two or more

34. To the best of your remembrance, how many times would you say you have been in love with a member of the opposite sex? (11)

0  none
1  once
2  two or three times
3  four or five times
4  six or seven
5  eight or nine
6  10 - 12
7  13 - 15
8  15 or more

Following are several questions which have to do with adjustments to broken love relationships. If you have ever had such a relationship that ended, we would like for you to report on it. If you are now engaged or married, please report on the most serious love relationship before the present one. IF YOU HAVE NEVER HADA SERIOUS
LOVE RELATIONSHIP OR YOUR ONLY SERIOUS LOVE RELATIONSHIP HAS NOT ENDED, GO TO QUESTION 43.

35. Who or what was responsible for breaking your most serious love relationship? (12)
   1. Parents
   2. Mutual loss of interest
   3. Partner lost interest
   4. I lost interest
   5. Separation
   6. Contrasts in background
   7. Incompatibility
   8. I was not ready for marriage
   9. Partner was not ready for marriage
   0. Other (what?) ___________________

36. If there were conflicts in your most serious love relationship which of the following seemed to be causes of conflict? (13)
   0. Jealousy
   1. Possessiveness
   2. Criticism
   3. Irritability
   4. Dislike of friends
   5. Quarreling about many things
   6. Disagreement about future
   7. How far to go in sex
   8. Dominance
   9. Conflict of personalities
   O. Other (what?) ___________________

37. What was your emotional state when your most serious love relationship ended? (14)
   1. Very upset
   2. Mildly upset
   3. Indifferent
   4. Somewhat relieved
   5. Very relieved
   6. Mixed feelings, upset and relief
   7. Other (what?) ___________________

38. About how long did it take you to get over the emotional involvement when you most serious love relationship (or engagement) was ended? (15)
   1. Over by time of last date
   2. 1-2 weeks
   3. 3-4 weeks
**Stages in Courtship**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages in Courtship</th>
<th>Put an X after each stage you went through</th>
<th>Weeks and months covered by each stage</th>
<th>Most advanced stage in physical intimacy (see * below)</th>
<th>Who limited physical intimacy?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Casual Dating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Steady Dating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Understanding of engagement, or engaged-to-be engaged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Formal engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For answering column on physical intimacy use code letter (A) casual hand holding, (B) casual kissing and hugging, (C) petting above the waist, (D) petting below the waist, (E) sexual intercourse a few times, (F) sexual intercourse regularly.*

**39.** COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING CHART ON YOUR MOST SERIOUS LOVE RELATIONSHIP FROM FIRST DATE TO THE LAST DATE (16 through 31)

4_____1-2 months  
5_____3-5 months  
6_____6-12 months  
7_____13-23 months  
8_____2 years or more  
9_____Other (what?)

**40.** Total length of time from the first date to the end of your most serious love relationship? (32)  
_________months  
_________years

**40a.** Your age at the beginning of the relationship? (33) ____________

**40b.** Age of the partner at the beginning of the relationship? (34) ____________

**41.** How do you feel about going as far as you did go in physical intimacy? (35, 36)  
How did it affect your relationship:  
1____Brought us closer together  
2____Brought us somewhat closer  
3____Did not affect relationship  
4____Tended to be disruptive  
5____Was very disruptive
How did it affect you personally?
1. I felt this was all right
2. I had some doubts about it
3. It did not affect me one way or another
4. I felt slightly guilty
5. I felt extremely guilty

42. What adjustment reactions did you have after your most serious love affair? Check any that apply. (37 through 50)
0. Frequented places with common association
1. Avoided places with common association
2. Avoided meetings with him (her)
3. Attempted to meet him (her)
4. Remembered pleasant associations
5. Remembered unpleasant associations
6. Daydreamed about partner
7. Daydreamed
8. Thought of suicide
9. Got dates with others
10. Read over old letters
11. Liked or disliked people because of resemblance
12. Preserved keepsakes
13. Resolved to get even with him (her)

43. Are you a member of any of the following kinds of organizations? Check for each one that you are a member. (51 through 55)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>church groups</td>
<td>school clubs - how many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighborhood clubs - how many</td>
<td>social fraternity or sorority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional organizations - how many</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44. Compared with your close friends, how do you rate yourself in school ability? Check one. (56)
1. I am the poorest
2. I am below average
3. I am average
4. I am above average
5. I am the best

44a. How do you rate yourself in school ability compared with those in your class? Check one. (57)
1. I am the poorest
2. I am below average
3. I am average
45. Do you think you have the ability to complete college? Check one. (58)
1______ no
2______ probably not
3______ not sure either way
4______ yes, probably
5______ yes, definitely

46. What kind of grades do you usually get in your classes? Check one. (59)
1_____ mostly E's
2_____ mostly D's
3_____ mostly C's
4_____ mostly B's
5_____ mostly A's

46a. Forget for the moment how instructors grade your work. In your own opinion, how good do you think your work is? (60)
Check one.
1______ my work is much below average
2______ my work is below average
3______ my work is average
4______ my work is good
5______ my work is excellent

46b. What kind of grades do you think you are capable of getting? (61)
Check one.
1_____ mostly E's
2_____ mostly D's
3_____ mostly C's
4_____ mostly B's
5_____ mostly A's

47. What grades in school would you have to get to make your mother and father happy? Check one. (62)
1______ my parents don't care what marks I get in school
2_____ mostly E's
3_____ mostly D's
4_____ mostly C's
5_____ mostly B's
6_____ mostly A's
7_____ just as long as I do my best, they are happy
47a. Do your parents know how you are doing in college? Check one. (63)
1. they know nothing about my school work
2. they only know a little bit about my school work
3. they know something about my school work
4. they know almost everything about my school work
5. they know everything I do in school

48. Does your best friend know how you are doing in college? Check one. (64)
1. he (she) knows nothing about my school work
2. he (she) knows only a little bit about my school work
3. he (she) knows something about my school work
4. he (she) knows almost everything about my school work
5. he (she) knows everything I do in school

49. How far do your mother and father think you will go in college? Check one. (65)
0. before obtaining a degree
1. go to school to be a secretary or learn a trade
2. go to college for a little while
3. graduate from college
4. more than 4 years of college
5. complete requirements for a Master's Degree
6. complete requirements for a Doctor's Degree
7. other (specify) ____________________________

50a. How far in college does your best friend think you will go? Check one. (66)
0. before obtaining a degree
1. go to school to be a secretary or learn a trade
2. go to college for a little while
3. graduate from college
4. more than 4 years of college
5. complete requirements for a Master's Degree
6. complete requirements for a Doctor's Degree
7. other (specify) ____________________________

50. Sometimes what you expect to do isn't the same as what you'd like to do. How far in college will you really go? Check one. (67)
0. before obtaining a degree
1. go to school to be a secretary or learn a trade
2. go to college for a little while
3. graduate from college
4. more than 4 years of college
51. If you could have any job, which one would you like to have after you finish school? (68) 

52. Sometimes the job you get is not the job you wish for. What kind of job do you think you will get after you finish school? (69) 

53. Have either your parents (or guardians) talked with you about any of the following subjects? Check yes if they have, no if they haven't. (1 through 25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>menstruation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nocturnal emissions (wet dreams)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coitus (sexual intercourse)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pregnancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contraceptives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abortion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orgasm (climax)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>venereal disease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masturbation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex perversions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex deviants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleasure of sexual relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difficulty of controlling emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>differences between girls and boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>necking and petting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>premarital sex behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where to go on dates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how to act when on dates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immortality of sexual behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your church's view of sexual behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

54. Where did you get most of your information about the following subjects.

55. How old were you when you first learned about them? Check source. (26 through 61)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Mom</th>
<th>Dad</th>
<th>Bros.</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Sis</th>
<th>kids</th>
<th>school</th>
<th>Read</th>
<th>books</th>
<th>friend</th>
<th>church</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>menstruation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nocturnal emission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(wet dreams)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coitus (sexual intercourse)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pregnancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contraceptives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abortion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orgasm (climax)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>venereal disease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masturbation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex perversions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex deviants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleasure of sexual relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difficulty of controlling emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>differences between girls and boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>necking/petting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>premarital sex behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immorality of sexual behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your church's view of sexual behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

56. How adequate would you say that your first information about sex was? (62)

1. poor
2. adequate
3. very adequate
57. Where did you get your first information about menstruation?
Check one. (63)

0 ______ never received any information
1 ______ church
2 ______ school
3 ______ reading books
4 ______ girl friends
5 ______ older sister
6 ______ mother
7 ______ others (whom) ____________

FOR GIRLS ONLY: boys go to Q. 59.

58. If your mother provided you with information about menstruation, how well did she prepare you for your first period? (64)

1 ______ poorly
2 ______ adequately
3 ______ very adequately

58a. What was your first reaction upon finding out that you were menstruating? Check one. (65)

0 ______ have never menstruated
1 ______ very scared
2 ______ shocked or frightened Why? __________
3 ______ indifferent
4 ______ simply accepted it as part of growing up
5 ______ gratified Why? __________
6 ______ elated or thrilled

58b. At what age did you first experience menstruation? Check one. (66)

1 ______ under ten
2 ______ ten
3 ______ eleven
4 ______ twelve
5 ______ thirteen
6 ______ fourteen
7 ______ fifteen
8 ______ sixteen
9 ______ over sixteen
0 ______ never have menstruated

58c. Do you think it is primarily the responsibility of your mother to provide you with the information to prepare you for your first menstrual period? Check one. (67)

1. ______ No, she would probably be too embarrassed and uncomfortable about it.
2. ______ No, we could be better taught in school.
3. I'm not sure, it depends!
4. Yes, if she feels at ease about it.
5. Yes, definitely. It's her duty to her daughter.

59. Where did you get your first information about "wet dreams" or nocturnal emissions? Check one. (68)
0. never received any information
1. church
2. school
3. reading books
4. boy friends
5. older brother
6. mother
7. father
8. others (whom) ___________

FOR BOYS ONLY: girls go to Q. 61

60. How well were you prepared for your first wet dream? (69)
1. poorly
2. adequately
3. very adequately

60a. At what age did you experience your first wet dream or nocturnal emission? Check one. (70)
1. under ten
2. ten
3. eleven
4. twelve
5. thirteen
6. fourteen
7. fifteen
8. sixteen
9. never

60b. What was your reaction to the first experience of a wet dream, nocturnal emission? Check one. (71)
1. never had one
2. very scared
3. shocked, frightened
4. frustrated
5. indifferent
6. guilty
7. pleasantly surprised
8. thrilled
9. simply accepted it as a part of growing up
60c. Do you feel that it is the responsibility of your father to prepare you for your first wet dream? Check one. (72)

1______ No, he probably would be too embarrassed and uncomfortable.
2______ No, we could be better prepared by the schools.
3______ I'm not sure, it would depend.
4______ Yes, if he feels at ease about it.
5______ Yes, definitely. It's his duty as a father.

FOR BOTH BOYS AND GIRLS:
61. If you wanted to know something about your body, do you feel you could talk with your parents about it? Check one. (73)

1______ No, I have tried and they always avoid the subject.
2______ No, we just don't talk about things like this in our family.
3______ I'm not sure. I have never tried.
4______ Yes, if it was the right time and place.
5______ Yes, they always answer my questions about things like this.

61a. If you cannot talk about sex with your parents, why do you suppose this is so? (74)

62. When you were a Junior and Senior high school student and if you could have had your choice, would you have liked to learn more about the following subjects? Check those which you would have liked to learn about while in Jr. - Sr. high, while in college? As many as you prefer. (1 through 25)

1______ menstruation
2______ nocturnal emissions (wet dreams)
3______ coitus (sexual intercourse)
4______ pregnancy
5______ contraceptives
6______ abortion
7______ orgasm (climax)
8______ venereal disease
9______ masturbation
10______ sex perversions
11______ sex deviants
12______ pleasure of sexual relations
13______ difficulty of controlling emotions
14______ differences between girls and boys
15______ necking and petting
16______ premarital sex behavior
17______ appropriate dating behavior
18______ morality of sexual behavior
19______ your church's view on sexual behavior
20______ embryo development
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63. As Junior and Senior high school students and if you had your choice, would you prefer that your parents or your teachers provide this information for you? Check for each topic. (26 through 45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. menstruation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. nocturnal emissions (wet dreams)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. coitus (sexual intercourse)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. pregnancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. contraceptives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. abortion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. orgasm (climax)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. venereal disease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. masturbation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. sex perversions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. sex deviants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. pleasure of sexual relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. difficulty of controlling emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. differences between girls and boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. necking and petting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. premarital sex behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. appropriate dating behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. morality of sexual behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. your church's view on sexual behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. embryo development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. physical growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. children and child development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. personality development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. dating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. courtship and engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. marriage preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. family living</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. sex education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. marriage and family problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. divorce and broken homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. sex in society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

64. While in Junior and Senior high school if you had the opportunity for learning about any of the following subjects in your school, would you check those topics about which you would have liked to learn more than you then knew? (46 through 55)

Yes, I would like to know more about:

1. physical growth
2. children and child development
3. personality development
4. dating
5. courtship and engagement
6. marriage preparation
7. family living
8. sex education
9. marriage and family problems
10. divorce and broken homes
11. sex in society
65. If your Junior-Senior high school were to teach about the following areas of information, would you prefer that the material be taught as a unit within the regular courses being taught, or would you prefer that there be special courses which could be taken for credit, or would you prefer that the material be integrated through the entire school experiences from kindergarten to senior high? (57 through 65)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Special Courses K - 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. physical growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. children and child development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. personality development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. dating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. courtship and engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. marriage preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. family living</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. sex education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. marriage and family problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. divorce and broken homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. sex in society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

66. If this kind of information were taught by your Junior-Senior high school, do you think that it ought to be taught for boys only, girls only, or both boys and girls? (68 through 78)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. physical growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. children and child development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. personality development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. dating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. courtship and engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. marriage preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. family living</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. sex education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. marriage and family problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. divorce and broken homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. sex in society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

67. Why do you feel you would like to learn more about any of the kinds of information listed above? (1 through 6)
68. From the way your parents informed you, or failed to inform you about sex, what did you conclude about sex in marriage? Check all that apply. (7)

1. sex was dirty, vulgar or shameful
2. sex wasn't for children to know about
3. sex was something women had to tolerate in marriage
4. sex was for having children
5. sex was an acceptable part of husband-wife relationship
6. sex was for having children and for mutual husband-wife relationship
7. sex was not to be talked about but was beautiful
8. sex was a beautiful experience in marriage and could be talked about
9. other (what?) ____________________________

69. How do you personally feel about the giving of sex information to children? Check for each statement whether you agree or disagree. (8 through 17)

1. Under no consideration should children be given sex information
2. Only if the child asks questions
3. Might as well give information as they will find out anyway
4. Information should be limited to the study of plants and flowers
5. Children should be discouraged from asking intimate questions
6. Knowing about sex will encourage children to experiment with it
7. Sex information is unnecessary if the right moral principles are taught
8. Any sex information given out must be truthful
9. Sex education is an important duty of parenthood
10. Sex information is important to healthy living and maturity

70. How do you feel about abortion? For each statement check whether you agree or disagree with it. (18 through 24)

1. Equivalent to murder
2. Unnecessary from the standpoint of maternal health

3. Morally wrong in spite of its possible benefits

4. Has both advantages and disadvantages

5. A therapeutic health measure

6. A form of birth control

7. The solution to many of our social problems

71. **What are your attitudes toward marriage?** For each of these statements please check the response that best reflects your own attitude about it. (25 through 29)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Marriage is an obsolescent tradition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Marriage is for those who believe in it, but not for everyone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Marriage is a legal technicality, but not necessary for a successful relationship between a man and woman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Marriage is the foundation of a family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Marriage is the only access for sexual relationships and thus provides for order and control in society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

72. **How do you feel the family fits into the patterns of modern society?** Check those statements that apply to your view of modern society. (30 through 33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The family is the most necessary and the basic unit of society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A family is a way of grouping individuals for living and learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A family is for the protection of the weak and the young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A family is one way of grouping people, but there are other ways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. A family is an unnecessary aspect of today's society and will eventually die out as a part of modern society.

73. Do you ever have any doubts about your fair chances of having a successful marriage? (34)
1. I don't intend to ever marry
2. Frequently
3. Occasionally
4. Rarely
5. Never

74. Which of the following most nearly represents your opinion on sex standards for men and women before marriage? (35)
1. No sexual relations for either
2. Sexual relations for men only
3. Sexual relations between engaged couples only
4. Sexual relations for both

75. What do you think is the ideal number of children in a family? (36-38)
boys
girls
total

75a. How many children do you plan to have in your family if everything goes well? (39-41)
boys
girls
total

76. How do you think a couple should determine the size of their family? Please check whether you agree or not with each of the following statements. (42-47)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. They should do nothing and have as many children as they get.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. They should stop having children when they get as many as they want.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. One partner should be sterilized after they get the number they want.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. They should abstain from sexual relations unless they want a child.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. They should use some type of birth control device after they have as many children as they want.

6. They should use birth control methods in planning, having and spacing their children.

77. FOR GIRLS ONLY: Please check each of the following types of situations you have encountered with boys or men. (48-56)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- an exhibitionist
- a homosexual (another female)
- male making obscene gesture or remarks
- male who said obscene remarks or gesture
- male over-aggressive in suggesting intercourse
- male whose sexual aggressiveness you resisted by force
- male who forced you to have intercourse
- older male who enticed or forced you into a sex act when you were a child
- older female who enticed you into a sex act when you were a child.

77a. For each of the situations above that you checked, would you indicate what was your reaction? (57-64)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>anxiety</td>
<td>terror</td>
<td>fright</td>
<td>disgust</td>
<td>surprised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- an exhibitionist
- a homosexual (another female)
- male making obscene gesture or remarks
- male who said obscene things to you over the phone
- male over-aggressive in suggesting intercourse
- male whose sexual aggressive you resisted by force
- male who forced you to have intercourse
- older male who enticed or forced you into a sex act when you were a child
77b. After you had been faced with the experience you checked above, whom did you tell? (65)

1 ______ mother
2 ______ father
3 ______ my favorite teacher
4 ______ my counselor
5 ______ my minister
6 ______ the police
7 ______ my best friend
8 ______ didn't tell anyone, just kept it to myself. Why?

9 ______ other (who) _______________________

78. FOR BOYS ONLY: Have you encountered any of the following types of situations? Please check each that applies. (66-70)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>___</td>
<td></td>
<td>a homosexual (another male)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___</td>
<td></td>
<td>an over-aggressive female who suggested intercourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___</td>
<td></td>
<td>older woman who enticed you into a sex act when you were a child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___</td>
<td></td>
<td>a prostitute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___</td>
<td></td>
<td>a pick-up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

78a. What was your reaction to this? (71-75)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fright</td>
<td>Disgust</td>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Delight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosexual (another male)</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-aggressive female who suggested intercourse</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older woman who enticed you into a sex act when you were a child</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitute</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pick-up</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

78b. Did you tell anyone about your experience? (76)

1 ______ No
2 ______ Yes -- Whom? 2 ______ mother
3 ______ father
4 ______ minister
5 ______ roommate
6 ______ fiance
7 ______ police
8 ______ best friend
79. Do you believe that birth control information should be made available to -- (Check those whom you feel should be given this information) Check one. (77)
   1_____ should not be available to anyone!
   2_____ married women only
   3_____ married men and women only
   4_____ single girls/women who have had children out of wedlock
   5_____ all who ask for birth control information (married or single)
   6_____ other (specify) ________________________________

80. If you have had premarital sexual relations what contraceptive was used? (78)
   1_____ never had premarital sex relations
   2_____ the "pill"
   3_____ an intrauterine device
   4_____ diaphragm
   5_____ jelly or foam
   6_____ sheath or condom
   7_____ the safe period (rhythm method)
   8_____ nothing
   9_____ other (what?) ________________________________

81. In answering the questions in this study do you believe that you were: (79)
   1_____ dishonest in most instances
   2_____ dishonest in some instances
   3_____ truthful in most instances, but not all
   4_____ as honest and truthful as possible

We want to THANK YOU so very much for your participating in this important study. Remember that no one but you knows how you knows how you answered these questions.
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