

VALUE PREFERENCES AND IDEALIZATION PATTERNS IN
DATING RELATIONSHIPS OF COLLEGE STUDENTS:
AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

By

CAROL ANN JENSEN

Bachelor of Arts
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma
1963

Master of Arts
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma
1964

Submitted to the faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
May, 1968

OKLAHOMA
STATE UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
OCT 25 1968

VALUE PREFERENCES AND IDEALIZATION PATTERNS IN
DATING RELATIONSHIPS OF COLLEGE STUDENTS:
AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

Thesis Approved:

Gerald P. Leslie

Thesis Adviser

Sara Smith Suther

Sara Smith Suther

Benjamin L. Eon

Kenneth D. Sarboles

H. Durham

Dean of the Graduate College

688410

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. BACKGROUND FOR THE PROBLEM.	1
Introduction.	1
Waller's Analyses of the Rating and Dating Complex and Idealization in Courtship	2
Need for and Problem of the Present Study.	8
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.	12
Campus Values in Dating and Courtship	12
Idealization and Ideal Mate Images.	22
Love, Romanticism and the Romantic Complex.	28
Framework and Hypotheses of the Present Study.	32
III. DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY.	36
Introduction.	36
Selection of Primary Respondents for the Sample	37
Selection of Friends as Secondary Respondents.	40
Instrumentation and Procedure	41
The Idealization Instrument	41
Measuring the Relative Importance of Characteristics Desired in a Serious Dating Partner	46
The Romanticism Instrument.	47
Statistical Procedures.	49
IV. RESULTS	51
Description of the Sample	51
The Relative Importance of Twenty-Four Characteristics Related to the Selection of Potentially Serious Dating Partners	52
Idealization in Dating.	59
Summary of Results.	69

Chapter	Page
V. DISCUSSION.	71
Limitations	77
Recommendations	78
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	81
APPENDIX A	87
APPENDIX B	97

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Significant Differences Between Greek and Independent Students in Perceived Campus Norms and Personal Preferences in Casual Dating.	19
II. Number of Primary Respondents by Involvement Stage, by Greek--Non-Greek Affiliation, and by Sex	52
III. Number and Per Cent of Primary Respondents by Involvement Stage, by Class Standing, and by Sex	53
IV. Mean Importance Values and Ranks of Twenty-Four Characteristics Related to the Selection of Potentially Serious Dating Partners by Sex.	55
V. Mean Importance Values and Ranks of Twenty-Four Characteristics Related to the Selection of Potentially Serious Dating Partners by Sex and Greek--Non-Greek Affiliation.	57
VI. Differences on Item and Total Idealization Scores for Male and Female Primary Respondents in Three Involvement Stages.	61
VII. Differences on Item and Total Difference Scores of Friends' Ratings of the Dating Partners of Male and Female Primary Respondents in Three Involvement Stages.	64
VIII. Mean Total Idealization Scores and Corresponding Friends' Mean Difference Scores for Primary Respondents in Three Involvement Stages by Sex and Greek--Non-Greek Affiliation.	66
IX. Kruskal-Wallis Values and Sums of Ranks on Total Idealization Scores for Male and Female Primary Respondents in Six Categories of Length of Time Dating.	67

X. Kruskal-Wallis Values and Sums of Ranks on Total
Idealization Scores for Male and Female Primary
Respondents Representing Three Degrees of Roman-
ticism. 68

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND FOR THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The past two decades have seen a growing body of research on various aspects of dating relationships in American society. Some of the aspects of dating systematically studied include the age at which dating ordinarily begins,¹ traits desired in dates and mates,² and levels of sexual involvement.³ In several areas, enough data have been assembled to permit generalizations to be made with some confidence.

¹Robert R. Bell and Leonard Blumberg, "Courtship Intimacy and Religious Background," Marriage and Family Living XXI (1959), pp. 356-360; and Samuel H. Lowrie, "Early and Late Dating: Some Conditions Associated with Them," Marriage and Family Living, XXII (1961), pp. 284-291.

²Robert O. Blood, Jr., "A Retest of Waller's Dating Complex," Marriage and Family Living, XVII (1955), pp. 41-47; Harold T. Christensen, "Dating Behavior as Evaluated by High School Students," American Journal of Sociology, LVII (1952), pp. 580-586; Lester E. Hewitt, "Student Perceptions of Traits Desired in Themselves as Dating and Marriage Partners," Marriage and Family Living, XX (1958), pp. 344-349; Eleanor Smith and J. H. G. Monane, "Courtship Values in a Youth Sample," American Sociological Review, XVIII (1953), pp. 635-640.

³There is a rather extensive body of literature dealing with premarital sexual involvement. For representative examples see Dorothy D. Bromley and Florence H. Britten, Youth and Sex: A Study of 1300 College Students (New York, 1938); W. Ehrmann, Premarital Dating Behavior (New York, 1959); L. A. Kirkendall, Premarital Intercourse and Interpersonal Relationships (New York, 1961); and Ira L. Reiss, Premarital Sexual Standards in America (Glencoe, Illinois, 1960).

A great deal of this research on dating relationships has been stimulated, either directly or indirectly, by Willard Waller's early analyses of dating and courtship. Waller had the fortune--or misfortune--to write before much family research had developed and was not hampered by having to check his analyses against empirical data. Moreover, he wrote in a provocative style that encouraged others to take issue with him. Many have disputed his ideas. Others have sought to test, empirically, various aspects of his descriptions of the dynamics of dating and courtship. The present study is one such attempt.

Waller's Analyses of the Rating and Dating
Complex and Idealization in Courtship

In his classic paper on "The Dating and Rating Complex"⁴ and subsequently in his original text on the family,⁵ Waller gave theoretical substance to the notions of a rating complex, the hierarchy of values governing campus dating, and the emergence of courtship behavior based upon mutually reinforcing idealization of each partner by the other. These notions were based on observations made by Waller at Pennsylvania State University during the 1930's, and particularly on his observations of dating patterns within the context of the sorority-fraternity system there.

Although Waller viewed both dating and courtship as competitive processes, he saw them as being governed by quite different norms and

⁴Willard Waller, "The Rating and Dating Complex," American Sociological Review, II (1937), pp. 727-734.

⁵Willard Waller, The Family: A Dynamic Interpretation (New York, 1938).

values. Dating was referred to as a period of institutionalized dalliance and heterosexual experimentation and was described as aim-inhibited in that it was not supposed to eventuate in marriage. The emergence of aim-inhibited dating was attributed to decay of an older moral structure which governed the set of association processes governing mating. Motivations for engaging in such aim-inhibited relationships, said Waller, were largely dominated by thrill-seeking. What thrills were sought varied somewhat by sex with males being inclined to seek sexual thrills and females being interested in achieving prestige and status. Because of this difference in motivations, there emerged a tendency for each partner in a dating relationship to seek the best bargain he or she could get in terms of maximizing rewards and minimizing costs.

Waller maintained that these dating relations were highly competitive and were governed by a cultural complex identified as the "rating complex." Like every other process of competition, the rating complex determined a distributive order with the result that individuals in each sex group are differentially ranked in terms of their desirability as dates.⁶ An individual's rank in the distributive order was largely determined by a configuration of campus values which has been described as being composed of competitive-materialistic criteria.⁷

The most desirable male dates, those who ranked high on the scale

⁶Waller, "The Rating and Dating Complex," p. 731.

⁷Lee Burchinal, "The Premarital Dyad and Love Involvement," Handbook of Marriage and the Family, ed. Harold Christensen (Chicago, 1964), p. 632.

of values, were those who belonged to a high status fraternity, were prominent in activities, had plenty of spending money, were well-dressed and "smooth" in manners and appearance, had a "good line," danced well, and had access to a car. Similar traits were used in evaluating the desirability of females. Women who rated high were those who appeared to be much sought after, had good clothes, and danced well. Most importantly, the coed who wished to retain high desirability had consistently to date high ranking males. According to Waller, this class system or gradient of dating desirability on the campus, was clearly recognized and adjusted to by the students themselves.⁸ While recognized and adjusted to, it encouraged unstable relationships, bargaining, and exploitation rather than mutual love relationships and impeded the usual set of association processes leading to courtship.

While Waller drew a conceptual distinction between dating and courtship, he saw courtship as emerging from dating behavior with the advent of emotional involvement. Although forces work against it, then, dating often leads to true courtship "as one or both partners succumb to the temptation to become emotionally involved."⁹

When this happens, a pattern of interaction different from that characterizing dating ensues. The tendency toward exploitation by the partner who is least involved in maintaining the relationship eventually leads to the "lover's quarrel." During the "lover's

⁸Waller, "The Rating and Dating Complex," p. 731.

⁹Gerald R. Leslie, The Family in Social Context (New York, 1967), p. 358.

quarrel" open accusation of exploitation is made in an attempt to elicit statements of commitment from the less interested partner. Resolution of the crisis brings security and greater emotional involvement. The relation moves along at a fairly even keel until the next quarrel. True courtship emerges as the dating relationship goes through a number of these crises leading to successive redefinitions of the relationship in deeper terms. "The mores of dating break down, and the behavior of individuals is governed by the older mores of progressive commitment."¹⁰ Courtship behavior then proceeds in a directional trend based on the "interaction of idealizations" although the process may be arrested or broken off at any level.

A prominent component of courtship behavior, as viewed by Waller, is idealization. Idealization is an element essential to romantic love and is defined as "the process of building up a complete picture of another person in one's own imagination, a picture for which sensory data are absent or to which they are definitely contradictory."¹¹ One builds up an almost completely unreal picture of a person which he calls by the same name as a real person, and vainly imagines to be like that person, but in fact the only authentic thing in the picture is the emotion which one feels toward it."¹² Such an idealized conception, if it is extreme, can often only be created by the suppression or repression of much known truth which is replaced by "more ennobling"

¹⁰Waller, "The Rating and Dating Complex," p. 733.

¹¹Waller, The Family, p. 200.

¹²Ibid.

sensory elements. Thus, it is presumed that the individual who has fallen in love is somewhat incapable of making a rational and realistic assessment of the character and personality traits of the loved one.

Others, besides Waller, have argued this same thesis. For example, Folsom discussed as one of the seven characteristics of the romantic complex, "idealization, aesthetic appreciation, and worship. . . . of woman by man."¹³ Folsom went on to say that "love brings with it the tendency to idealize the object and to become blind to characteristics which otherwise would be annoying or disturbing."¹⁴ Hence, the saying that love is blind implies that love generates idealization.

In a penetrating analysis of the process of idealization, Waller maintained that idealization, engendered by being in love, is founded upon a temporary blocking or frustration of sexual impulses.

Love of a person is essentially a striving toward her, an urge to behave toward her in a certain way. When overt expression of this urge is wholly or partially frustrated, the tendency expresses itself in imagination; erotic phantasy substitutes for erotic behavior. Since phantasy is much less effective than the appropriate physical behavior as a means of relieving physical tensions there must be a great deal of this phantasy and it must occupy consciousness almost completely. Since the phantasies of most people have little real direction of their own, culture enters here to furnish the form and content of the phantasies which go to make up the preoccupation of the lover.¹⁵

A lover idealizes his beloved because he strives toward her in sexual as well as in other senses.

¹³ Joseph K. Folsom. "Steps in Love and Courtship," Family, Marriage and Parenthood, eds. Howard Becker and Reuben Hill (Boston, 1955), p. 223.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Willard Waller, The Family: A Dynamic Interpretation, rev. Reuben Hill (New York, 1951), p. 123.

It is not sufficient to say that he idealizes her because of the tendency to over-value the sex-object, although that is, in fact, an element in the situation. . . . He wants to possess her completely both physically and spiritually, which in our culture is not possible; balked in this striving, he fills his mind with her by imagining things about her. Given the cultural blockings of the sexual impulse, and its associated sentiments, idealization arises inevitably. A young man idealizes a woman because he has strong passions, because he does not know very much about women, particularly the woman whom he idealizes, and also because he has been trained to idealize.¹⁶

Waller recognized the part played in idealization by the image of an ideal mate an individual carries around with him even before he falls in love. Each person, he believed, creates an image of an ideal mate in answer to his own needs. Such an image is formed on the basis of personal experience as well as culturally prescribed ideals, and the picture is already present before the individual ever meets his future mate. As Reik more recently stated it, the ideal is there ahead of the person who will be idealized.¹⁷ The dream calls forth the reality with the result that the lover subsequently endows the loved one with all the qualities of his constructed imaginary ideal. At this juncture sentiment-formation has overcome objectivity.

It was further held that there exists a tendency toward increasing idealization once a relationship is beyond its early stages. This is characterized by the "interaction of idealizations" which carries the couple in love further and further from contact with reality. At the outset of a dating relationship

A and B see each other without the intervention of any screens of idealization other than those produced by

¹⁶Ibid., p. 120

¹⁷Theodor Reik, A Psychologist Looks at Love (New York, 1944), p. 64.

conventional attitudes toward the opposite sex, and by a certain irreducible overevaluation of the sex object; allowance must also be made for the petty frauds which young persons conventionally perpetrate upon one another.¹⁸

As a love relationship develops, each partner begins to display only a limited segment of himself in an effort to live up to the image he thinks the other has of him.

A idealizes B, replacing the actual B to a considerable extent with a creature of his own imagination. . . . Because of his idealization of B, he displays to her only a limited segment of himself; he puts his best foot forward and has his shoes shined beforehand; in her presence he tries to be the sort of person who would be a fit companion for the sort of person he thinks she is; all of this facilitates the idealization of A by B, and B in turn governs her behavior in such a way as to give A a false impression.¹⁹

It is this "interaction of idealizations," abetted by a mounting strain of sexual pressures, which leads to the "cumulative idealization of the courtship period." With the development of serious emotional involvement, the individual in love comes to be increasingly occupied, at least at the conscious level, with positive aspects of his relationship. At the same time, he increasingly loses his ability to evaluate objectively the object of his romantic involvement.

Need for and Problem of the Present Study

Despite the deep impressions which Waller's ideas have left on academicians interested in dating and courtship behavior, relatively few studies have been brought to bear directly on the validity of his theses. This may be due to the fact that not only were his

¹⁸Waller, The Family, 1951, p. 188.

¹⁹Ibid.

descriptions based heavily on observations made at a single university, but they were largely undocumented and often contained inconsistencies.²⁰

That aspect of his analyses which has perhaps received the most empirical attention is the rating and dating complex.²¹ Evidence from studies in this area indicates that the competitive-materialistic complex described by Waller does not provide a wholly accurate picture of dating on college campuses during the 1950's and presumably later. Empirical data on idealization are much more scanty. While many opinions have been brought to bear on Waller's analysis of idealization, most of them critical in tone, questions concerning the factual correctness of his description have gone begging.

When people fall in love, do they see each other as they really are or do they create an unrealistic picture of each other? Do they exaggerate and distort qualities which the loved one has or impute desirable qualities to him or her when in fact they are utterly lacking? Do they deny or repress knowledge of undesirable traits? If idealization does occur, what is its extent? Is it extreme, leading

²⁰One such inconsistency concerns the extent of idealization. Waller's discussion depicted a situation of extreme idealization of the loved one by the lover. On the other hand, he indicated that many persons appear to be aware of the imperfections of those whom they love. He recognized the possible extremeness of his interpretation and said that, "We must . . . concede that modern folkways probably are tending to minimize idealization," Willard Waller, The Family, 1938, p. 202. Burgess and Wallin conclude that, "Despite the significance he attaches to idealization in his discussion of modern courtship in America, Waller's opinion as to its prevalence is, in the end, very uncertain." Ernest W. Burgess and Paul Wallin, Engagement and Marriage (Chicago, 1953), p. 217.

²¹See Chapter II, pp. 17-20.

to possible harmful effects after marriage, or is it only moderate? What kinds of conditions facilitate the development of idealization? Does it increase with increasing emotional involvement, as Waller said it did, leading to progressive departures from reality? By and large, these questions have not been answered empirically.

"Since the choice of a mate depends primarily on the judgment of the individual man and woman, knowledge of the influence of idealization in the formation of the judgment is crucial for an understanding of modern marriage."²² In addition, knowledge of the process can provide valuable insights for those studying many aspects of love relationships. For example, many researches utilize evaluations of a dating or mating partner. Whether or not idealization is operative and the extent to which, if any, it is operative may obviously effect any kind of evaluative statement concerning a loved one. Efforts to control for such an effect could be made if reliable knowledge on idealization were available.

The present study was designed to explore some of the aforementioned questions concerning both the rating and dating complex and idealization in romantic love. First, the present investigation will attempt to validate results of previous researches on the hierarchy of campus values governing dating and will assess which of two broad kinds of characteristics, personality or competitive-materialistic, seem to be the most important criteria used by students at Oklahoma State University in selecting a potentially serious dating partner. Second, relationships between idealization, romanticism, and involvement stage

²²Burgess and Wallin, p. 214

will be examined to determine: (a) the degree to which idealization occurs in dating and whether the tendency to idealize varies with dating status; (b) if there is any interaction between romanticism and the tendency to idealize a dating partner; and (c) if there is differential idealization in relation to personality as opposed to competitive-materialistic characteristics.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter is devoted to a review of relevant literature, particularly appropriate empirical studies, to a critical analysis of the contributions of these studies, and to a statement of the framework and hypotheses of the present study. The review of literature will be divided into three areas: (1) studies which have sought to determine the saliency of different values or traits used in selecting a dating or marriage partner; (2) studies which have dealt with the influence of ideal mate images and idealization processes in mate selection; and (3) the descriptive literature and studies concerning romanticism and the romantic complex as this manifests itself in American society. On the basis of this review and the presentation of Waller's theses in the preceding chapter, the ground will be laid for the current study.

Campus Values in Dating and Courtship

A fair amount of research has been directed to the study of young peoples' values relative to the choosing of a date or mate. This literature, which began accumulating in the early 1940's, provides, by and large, considerable consensus on the relative importance of different characteristics sought in a date and mate, the kinds of changes which have occurred in differential emphasis on given values,

and variations in value emphasis with certain group membership characteristics. Of the total number of studies in this area, however, only a few can be construed as having provided a direct test of Waller's theses concerning the rating and dating complex. Data from the remainder must be interpreted in terms of indirect support for, or refutation of, Waller's rating complex. Attention will first be focused on this latter type of research.

In an early study by Hill¹ at the University of Wisconsin, that was later replicated by McGinnis² and Hurley,³ students were asked to rate the relative importance of eighteen factors and their desirability in a prospective marriage partner. Factors judged by both sex groups to be most important were dependable character, emotional stability and maturity, pleasing disposition, mutual attraction, good health, and desire for home life and children. McGinnis' replication of Hill's study again utilized University of Wisconsin students, while Hurley studied students at a college on the West coast. The results of these two later studies were highly similar to those obtained by Hill fifteen years earlier. In fact, the six most highly rated traits in Hill's study also appeared as the six most highly rated traits in the McGinnis research, although the order of ranking was slightly different. Only

¹Reuben Hill, "Campus Norms in Mate Selection," Journal of Home Economics, XXXVII (1945), pp. 554-558.

²Robert McGinnis, "Campus Values in Mate Selection: A Repeat Study," Social Forces, XXXVI (1958), pp. 368-377.

³As cited in J. Richard Udry, The Social Context of Marriage (New York, 1966), p. 248.

one different trait appeared in the top six in Hurley's study--refinement and neatness replaced good health.⁴ In sum, these studies revealed considerable stability over time in the relative desirability of values contained in Hill's original checklist.

Christensen⁵ did two studies, one of students at Brigham Young University and a later one of high school students and of college students at Purdue University. Although he used a checklist slightly different from that used by Hill, verbalized patterns of value preferences in choosing a mate were consistent with those found by Hill. When questioned about their preference patterns in choosing a date, it was found that patterns were similar to those stated in terms of choosing a mate except that more importance was attached to certain competitive kinds of traits. As Christensen interpreted these results,

Mate choice gives more stress to such things as family-mindedness, normal heredity, and homemaking ability, while date choice gives greater emphasis to physical attractiveness, sociability, and the like.⁶

Hewitt,⁷ using Christensen's checklist, asked students at Ball State Teacher's College about the importance of the twenty traits in (a) selecting a dating partner and (b) selecting a marriage partner. In addition, members of each sex group judged how important they

⁴Ibid.

⁵Harold T. Christensen, "Dating Behavior as Evaluated by High School Students," American Journal of Sociology, LVII (1952), pp. 580-586; Harold T. Christensen, Marriage Analysis (New York, 1950), pp. 239-243.

⁶Christensen, Marriage Analysis, p. 259.

⁷Lester E. Hewitt, "Student Perceptions of Traits Desired in Themselves as Dating and Marriage Partners," Marriage and Family Living, XX (1958), pp. 344-349.

believed most persons of the opposite sex regarded the traits in (a) selecting a dating partner and (b) selecting a marriage partner.

Hewitt's data confirmed patterns of value preference cited by Christensen. It was concluded that men and women appear to seek approximately the same traits in dates as in marriage partners even though they do express greater importance on many items in choosing someone whom they would marry. Himes⁸ and Sussman and Yeager⁹ also employed Christensen's checklist but utilized Negro subjects. Their findings were in essential agreement with those cited above.

Still another study reported by Williamson¹⁰ in Los Angeles used a similar approach but a quite different checklist. Students were asked to indicate the importance of fourteen traits in selecting a marital partner. Traits ranking highest, those that were stated as being of "considerable" or "greatest" importance, were making a good parent, similarity of interests, enjoyment of home life, and desire for children. However, many traits which had rated high in other studies, such as emotional stability, being considerate, being dependable, and mutual attraction, did not appear in Williamson's list of traits.

The methodology of the above studies all involved preconstructed checklists. One of the problems encountered in attempting to interpret

⁸Joseph S. Himes, Jr., "Value Consensus in Mate Selection Among Negroes," Marriage and Family Living, XIV (1952), pp. 317-321.

⁹Marvin B. Sussman and H. C. Yeager, Jr., "Mate Selection Among Negro and White College Students," Sociology and Social Research, XXXV (1950), pp. 46-49.

¹⁰Robert C. Williamson, Marriage and Family Relations (New York, 1966), pp. 269-270.

results of these studies, in light of the rating complex, stems from the fact that the checklists used contained very few items which Waller specified as being important in the rating complex. Smith and Monane¹¹ followed a different methodological tack than they asked students to state, in their own words, the trait or characteristic most desired in a date. Coding categories were established subsequent to data collection. The categories, ranked in order of percentages of students who mentioned the quality, were companionability, desirable physical appearance, social graces, intelligence and education, and miscellaneous. While general agreement was found concerning the above-mentioned values, significant differences in preferences were found to exist among students of different age, sex, year in college, grade average, and fraternity affiliation. Comparing Smith and Monane's results with studies employing preconstructed lists, it appears that when individuals are left to their own devices, more emphasis is placed on characteristics which could be considered as being of the competitive-materialistic type.

Burchinal, in a review of the results of many of these studies, states:

Three broad generalizations emerge from the studies of norms and values that influence students' attitudes toward dating and courtship: (a) The dominant values in campus dating and courtship are diffused widely and are generally accepted by both sexes, in all but the lowest socioeconomic levels, and among different racial, religious, or other groups. These values cluster around basic themes directing cross-sex interpersonal relations in the United States today. (b) The dominant themes are not the competitive-prestige or trivial norms, but seem to be based on norms that are functional for

¹¹Eleanor Smith and J. H. G. Monane, "Courtship Values in a Youth Sample," American Sociological Review, XVIII (1953), pp. 635-640.

current courtship and marriage. (c) Although there is general agreement on the values directing dating and courtship, some important differences emerge for some groups of youth.¹²

Three studies have attempted to test Waller's theory of the rating complex directly. In 1950, Smith¹³ obtained data from students at Pennsylvania State University, where Waller made his original observations, concerning the twenty-eight items mentioned by Waller in his 1937 article. Instructions asked students to express the responses "agree, disagree, or questionable" on each item in response to the question, "What must a fellow (or coed) have or do to be popular on campus?"¹⁴ Smith reported that while much of Waller's description of dating at Pennsylvania State still held true, times had changed and many factors which afforded prestige at an earlier date had lost their effectiveness. The rating and dating complex appeared to have a greater operative force during pre-courtship than during courtship and engagement. In part, the decline in influence of the prestige rating system on dating patterns was attributed to a changed sex ratio at Pennsylvania State University.

In 1953, Blood¹⁵ studied students at the University of Michigan in order to follow up on Smith's observations. Included in his trait list

¹²Lee Burchinal, "The Premarital Dyad and Love Involvement," Handbook of Marriage and the Family, ed. Harold T. Christensen (Chicago, 1964), p. 632.

¹³William M. Smith, Jr., "Rating and Dating: A Re-Study," Marriage and Family Living, XIV (1952), pp. 312-316.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 312.

¹⁵Robert O. Blood, Jr., "A Retest of Waller's Dating Complex," Marriage and Family Living, XVII (1955), pp. 41-47; Robert O. Blood, Jr., "Uniformities and Diversities in Campus Dating Preferences," Marriage and Family Living, XVIII (1956), pp. 37-45.

were eighteen Waller-Smith items as well as seventeen items of the personality type. Respondents were simply asked to check "yes" on those items which were important in terms of (a) perceived campus norms governing dating, (b) personal preferences on casual dates, and (c) personal preferences on dates who were viewed as prospective marriage partners. Blood failed to find support for the applicability of Waller's rating complex to Michigan students. Moreover, it was concluded that there was no sharp break in values governing dating and those governing courtship as Waller implied. Instead, popularity seemed to be based more upon personality characteristics, as indicated by the fact that highest rankings, among all groups in response to each of the three questions, were attached to being pleasant and cheerful, having a sense of humor, being a good sport, being natural, being considerate, and being neat in appearance.

Many diversities between groups did appear on reactions to the remaining traits. Most importantly, significant differences were found between Greeks and independents on several Waller items. Table I presents data from Blood on such differences. Blood interprets this table to mean

that the "free-floating Waller complex" is not simply a hang-over from the past but rather a reflection of the contemporary dating behavior of the most conspicuous organized groups on campus--the social fraternities and sororities. In this sense, the Waller complex is not floating in thin air but is reinforced by the actual dating patterns of the Greek members of the student body.¹⁶

Both the researches of Smith and Blood were based upon subjective responses of students toward the saliency of different norms in dating.

¹⁶Blood, "Uniformities and Diversities in Campus Dating Preferences," p. 41.

TABLE I

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GREEK AND INDEPENDENT STUDENTS
IN PERCEIVED CAMPUS NORMS AND PERSONAL
PREFERENCES IN CASUAL DATING

	Per Cent Of Respondents Choosing Item	
	Perceived campus norms	Personal preferences in casual dating
A. Female Roles		
1. "Is popular with opposite sex"		
Independent men	75.9*	55.2
Fraternity men	94.6*	54.1
Total men	83.2	54.7
2. "Is affectionate"		
Independent men	79.3*	75.9
Fraternity men	91.9*	83.8
Total men	84.2	78.9
3. "Is good looking, attractive"		
Independent men	91.4*	82.5
Fraternity men	100.0*	89.2
Total men	94.7	85.1
B. Male Roles		
4. "Belongs to a fraternity"		
Independent women	26.8*	6.2*
Sorority women	45.9*	27.0*
Total women	32.1	11.9
5. "Goes to popular places"		
Independent women	53.7	28.9*
Sorority women	70.3	64.9*
Total women	57.9	38.8
C. General Role (regardless of sex)		
6. "Is willing to drink socially"		
Independent students	ca.48	36.3*
Greeks	ca.53	57.7*
Total students	ca.50	43.7

*Vertically adjacent items with asterisks differ significantly from one another at the 0.05 level or better.

Source: Adapted from Robert O. Blood, Jr., "Uniformities and Diversities in Campus Dating Preferences," Marriage and Family Living, (February, 1956), p. 40.

Rogers and Havens,¹⁷ studying 725 students at Iowa State College in 1956, used behavioral data rather than attitudinal data to investigate the importance of prestige rating in mate selection patterns. Eleven undergraduate judges rated each of the major campus residences as to prestige. Prestige was defined by the criteria of dances, participation in campus activities and honor organizations, possession of automobiles and spending money, quality of grades, and pleasing personalities of members. These judges agreed that prestige differences between residences did exist and exhibited a remarkable amount of agreement in ranking sororities and fraternities as to prestige. Moreover, data indicated that students disproportionately date, pin, and become engaged to members of their own prestige group. Rogers and Havens concluded that:

Waller's hypothesis that prestige rating governs casual campus dating but not more serious mate selection is not substantiated to any great degree by the present findings. Instead, these findings indicate that students follow prestige lines at all stages in the mate selection process.¹⁸

Apparent discrepancies between the findings of Smith and Blood on the one hand those of Rogers and Havens on the other have been interpreted by Burchinal as follows.

Dating may be endogamous with regard to the prestige of residence units but still be characterized by the norms described by Blood. . . Dating appears to be based on the educational-personality-companionship norms. . . Yet, at the same time, dating generally is endogamous with regard to. . . status, and other sociological variables.¹⁹

¹⁷ Everett M. Rogers and A. Eugene Havens, "Prestige Rating and Mate Selection on a College Campus," Marriage and Family Living, XXII (1960), pp. 55-59.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 59, (italics mine).

¹⁹ Burchinal, p. 645.

Undoubtedly the Waller presentation had, and perhaps still has, a basis in fact, but the current tendency is to reject the operation of a rating complex as conceptualized by Waller in favor of an explanation of dating values as being more "level-headed" and preparatory for marriage. Existence of such a complex during the 1920's is attributed to the social whirl among the college set during that period of time and to the peculiarities of the sex ratio. The assertion that its applicability is now limited rests on studies conducted in the area, but generalizations which have emerged from these investigations may be limited because of the following factors.

1. Waller did not systematically collect data on the extent to which the rating complex governed campus dating at the time his observations were made. The first systematic data in the area were gathered by Hill in 1940 but were not designed to test hypotheses concerning the rating complex. This means that truly comparative data on the operation of a rating complex at different time periods do not exist.
2. The force with which the rating complex supposedly operated during the 1920's and 1930's is attributed to certain social conditions existing then. It is difficult to see how dating norms in the twilight of the raucous 1920's could be so much more trivial and status-oriented than those operating currently in an age of affluence and consumption. The implication of this is that the picture depicted by Waller may have been too extreme in that it was based on observations made at only one university.

3. It has been shown that individuals respond to surveys tapping attitudinal dimensions along normatively sanctioned lines. Dating competition in terms of competitive-materialistic characteristics may be viewed publicly in negative terms. Because responses are publicly oriented, they do not accurately reflect the extent to which a rating complex is operative. In other words, studies using preconstructed checklists may elicit responses which tap socially sanctioned norms rather than individual attitudes.

Idealization and Ideal Mate Images

Empirical studies pertaining to idealization have not been so numerous as those relating to the rating complex and campus norms governing date and mate selection. Moreover, most of these studies have generally been restricted to the influence of ideal mate images on the selection of a marital partner and perceptions of that partner.

Every culture and subculture imposes some sort of ideal mate images on its adherents in terms of qualities or characteristics important in mate selection. According to Udry,²⁰ this cultural definition of the ideal mate influences mate selection in two ways. First, it represents consensual validation about traits desirable in a mate. Second, it provides "a set of desirable characteristics to be attributed to the person with whom one has fallen in love, independent of whether or not he in fact has them."²¹ This raises the question of the extent to

²⁰J. Richard Udry, The Social Context of Marriage (New York, 1966), p. 243-244.

²¹Ibid., p. 243.

which ideal mate images actually affect selection of a mate.

The first of the investigations on ideal mate images was done by Mangus,²² who studied 200 upper-division college females. Subjects were queried concerning their personality perceptions of their fathers, of another male relative, of a current nonrelative male companion, and of their "ideal husbands." Mangus reported that ideal mate conceptions were closer to perceptions of male companions than to those of their fathers or other male relatives. This, however, could not be taken as evidence on the extent to which mate selection was influenced by ideal mate images, nor did Mangus make this interpretation. Udry offered two interpretations of these data:

(1) The ideal image is simply attributed to the present companion, whether or not he actually fits it; (2) the ideal mate image is changed by the relationship with a particular companion, so that the ideal comes to resemble him.²³

The second study, by Anselm Strauss,²⁴ appeared in 1946. Strauss gathered questionnaires from 373 engaged or recently married persons (200 women, 173 men) along with interview data from 50 engaged or recently married females concerning their ideal and actual mates. He found that 59.2 per cent of the interviewees considered their mates to have come very close to meeting their physical ideal while 73.7

²²A. R. Mangus, "Relationship Between the Young Woman's Conception of Her Intimate Male Associates and of Her Ideal Husband," Journal of Social Psychology, VII (1936), pp. 403-420.

²³J. Richard Udry, "The Influence of the Ideal Mate Image on Mate Selection and Perception," Marriage and Family Living, XXVII (1965), p. 477.

²⁴Anselm L. Strauss, "The Ideal and the Chosen Mate," American Journal of Sociology, LII (1946), pp. 204-208.

per cent stated their mates closely approximated their ideals in terms of personality traits. It was also reported that the selected mates were closer to the ideal in personality than were any persons whom the subject had loved next best. Most men and women denied, however, making conscious comparisons of the ideal and the actual mate.

As part of a larger research effort at Purdue, Christensen²⁵ had 259 engaged and married students, after rating the importance of twenty items in a mate, go back over the list and check those items that applied to the mate already chosen. A comparison of the two ratings was used to determine the extent to which the chosen mate compared to the ideal. For both males and females, items on which the greatest discrepancies appeared were emotional maturity, poise and confidence, considerateness, and intellectual stimulation. More interestingly, it was found that discrepancies between chosen mates and ideal mates were about twice as great for males as for females.

In a further study by Udry,²⁶ mate perceptions of ninety engaged persons were compared with ideal mate conceptions of a precision-matched sample of single, unengaged persons. As a result of his findings, Udry concluded that ideal mate images probably are of little importance as a salient feature in the perception of a selected mate. In line with the interpretation given to Mangus's results, he again suggested that the ideal is changed to resemble the real or the ideal is attributed to the real whether he exists or not. In part, this may help to explain the high percentage of respondents in the Strauss

²⁵Christensen, Marriage Analysis, pp. 239-243.

²⁶Udry, "The Influence of the Ideal Mate Image on Mate Selection and Perception," pp. 477-482.

sample for whom the real matched the ideal on personality traits.

The studies by Mangus, Strauss, Christensen, and Udry all assessed the influence of positive ideals in mate selection. In contrast, an investigation by Williamson²⁷ charted marriage ideals in terms of negative characteristics by asking the degree to which persons rejected others as marital choices when they possessed certain characteristics. On the whole, female respondents were more rejecting than males and seemed to be more conventionally oriented, but it was not estimated to what extent ideal mate images actually affected choice of mates.

Burgess and Wallin,²⁸ in their extensive research on engaged and married couples, took a somewhat different approach in gauging the importance of ideal images in mate selection. The question was asked: "If you could, what things would you change in your engagement partner (spouse)?" No more than 36 per cent of either males or females in any group said they had no desire to change any traits in their partners although the percentages are slightly higher for engaged men and women than for married ones. In light of their data, Burgess and Wallin concluded that:

Because being realistic is important to many persons for their self-esteem, we believe they are constrained to curb any tendency they may have to idealize the loved one. If there is idealization it is therefore likely to be moderate in extent.²⁹

²⁷Robert C. Williamson, "Dating, Courtship and the 'Ideal Mate': Some Relevant Subcultural Variables," Family Life Coordinator, XIV (1965), pp. 137-143.

²⁸Ernest W. Burgess and Paul Wallin, Engagement and Marriage (Philadelphia, 1953).

²⁹Ibid., 222-223.

A study of more relevance to the current one is one by Brim and Wood.³⁰ They employed fifty male-female pairs in different stages of courtship to test the hypothesis that the number of consensual³¹ conceptions stated by each pair member for the other would decrease as their stage of courtship advanced. For each pair member twenty responses were obtained to the question, "Who am I?" and "Who is He?" (or She) referring to the other member of the pair. The hypothesis was based on the expectation that, as intimacy increases, one learns more of the individual and unique attributes of the other person which should be reflected in a shift from consensual to subconsensual responses. Results failed to confirm the hypothesis. A tentative explanation offered for this was that external social pressures may have precluded appraisal of the marital partner in personal terms resulting in appraisal of that partner in consensual social terms.

The only study found concerning idealization directly was done by

³⁰Orville G. Brim, Jr. and Nancy Wood, "Self and Other Conceptions in Courtship and Marriage Pairs," Marriage and Family Living, XVIII (1956), pp. 243-248.

³¹Cf. Manford Kuhn and Thomas McPartland, "An Empirical Investigation of Self-Attitudes," American Sociological Review, XIX (1954), pp. 69-70: Consensual and subconsensual responses were defined by Kuhn and McPartland as follows. "The responses were dealt with by a form of content analysis. They were categorized dichotomously either as consensual references or as sub-consensual references. These content categories distinguish between statements which refer to groups and classes whose limits and conditions of membership are matters of common knowledge, i.e., consensual; and those which refer to groups, classes, attributes, traits or any other matters which would require interpretation by the respondent to be precise or to place him relative to other people, i.e., subconsensual."

Wallin³² in a secondary analysis of some original data collected by he and Burgess. Idealization was defined as the imputation of desirable qualities to a person lacking them, or as an exaggeration of their proportions and/or the denial or underestimation of unfavorable attributes. Within the framework of this definition, Wallin tried to determine whether and how the phenomenon of love affects perception of the beloved. He believed that Waller's account of the idealization process was too extreme and was wrong concerning the primary causative factors involved. He did not find that idealization is excessive in love relationships but argued nevertheless, that it is present to some degree. He also argued that, contrary to Waller's notion, idealization is not the result of sexual frustration but a consequence of the importance of maintaining self-esteem. In general, his hypotheses were supported and, on the basis of these results, Wallin suggested:

(a) There is no evidence of extreme idealization in middle-class American courtship behavior. (b) There is strong evidence of moderate idealization in courtship, and this can be accounted for adequately by the theory of self-esteem. (c) Waller's theory, if correct in part, is not generally applicable in current middle-class courtship.³³

Inadequacies of previous studies on, or related to, idealization have several implications for the present study. These are:

1. Although it appears that idealization generally is not extreme in serious romantic relationships, the evidence is not conclusive concerning how much idealization does take place.

³²Paul Wallin, "Two Conceptions of the Relationship Between Love and Idealization," Research Studies State College of Washington, XX (1952), pp. 21-35.

³³Burchinal, p. 662.

2. No evidence exists with respect to whether the tendency to idealize, if any, varies with dating status, even though it is presumed in the literature to be absent or minimal before the advent of love. In addition, the conclusion that idealization decreases with increasing involvement is largely unsupported.
3. There is no research on what kinds of characteristics are most susceptible to idealization tendencies. While several assumptions could be made along this line, all of which would appear to be tenable, the fact is that empirical leads in the area are lacking.

Love, Romanticism and the Romantic Complex

For obvious reasons, the descriptive literature on love and the romantic complex is expansive. Most of this literature is beyond the scope of the present study. Therefore, a discussion of the essays and studies on romanticism will be brief and cursory.

Numerous discussions of romantic love in American society, ranging from those of the poet and essayist to those of sociologists and psychologists, have emphasized the dysfunctional and nonrational, or even irrational, aspects of this phenomenon. A typical interpretation of this kind is one by Waller who viewed love as a habit, moreover, a bad habit.³⁴ He saw it as a very powerful tendency to act which carries the individual on to fulfill his striving. An inevitable outgrowth of this striving is idealization and intense emotion with the result that partners are carried along by a current of emotional unreality toward

³⁴Willard Waller, The Family: A Dynamic Interpretation, rev. Reuben Hill (New York, 1951), pp. 106-129.

marriage. Since the emotion of love impedes the ability of each partner to view and judge the other in a critical manner, it leads, said Waller, to difficulties in adjustment after marriage.

More recently, other views of romantic love, such as those offered by Kolb³⁵ and Biegel,³⁶ have challenged the notions that romanticism is irrational and dysfunctional. Kolb has argued that those who attack romantic love are also attacking fundamental values inherent in our society including personal freedom and the integrity of the individual. If romanticism were to be suppressed, personality growth and individual creativity in human relationships would be stifled. Biegel joined in this criticism of the criticism of romanticism and stated that romanticism is part of the process of modern marriage "that aims at the reconciliation of basic human needs with frustrating social conditions."³⁷

Foote³⁸ has taken an approach to love quite different from that taken by Waller on the one hand and Kolb and Biegel on the other. He argues against romantic love as depicted with intense idealization and surrounded by an aura of unreality. Instead, he couches his conception of love in terms of human development--as the commitment of one person to another, not on the basis of forced delusions but on the basis of

³⁵William H. L. Kolb, "Family Sociology, Marriage Education, and the Romantic Complex," Social Forces, XXIX (1950), pp. 65-72.

³⁶Hugo G. Biegel, "Romantic Love," American Sociological Review, XVI (1951), pp. 326-334.

³⁷Ibid., p. 326.

³⁸Nelson H. Foote, "Love," Psychiatry, XVI (1953), pp. 245-251.

expectations of real possibilities that can emerge in marriage. A similar position has been taken by Reiss³⁹ who maintains that there are four basic elemental processes in love. These are, and they follow upon one another, rapport, self-revelation, the development of mutual dependencies between persons, and fulfillment of personality needs. Reiss referred to his conceptualizations as a wheel theory of love in that one process does lead into another. The whole sequence tends in a positive direction as long as the people involved allow, although it may also reverse itself and be destroyed.

Goode,⁴⁰ who does not really discuss romantic love, has reconciled opposing views of love by conceptualizing love on a continuum. At one end is a strong love attachment which may elicit strong negative sanctions while at the other end is approved love as a basis for marriage.

Research on romantic love, and more specifically on the effects of romanticism in love relationships, is not extensive. In fact, the only studies directly relevant to the present one are those by Hobart⁴¹ and Dean.⁴² Hobart, in several studies, has sought to investigate

³⁹ Ira L. Reiss, "Toward a Sociology of the Heterosexual Love Relationship," Marriage and Family Living, XXII (1960), pp. 139-145.

⁴⁰ William J. Goode, "The Theoretical Importance of Love," American Sociological Review, XXIV (1959), pp. 38-47.

⁴¹ Charles W. Hobart, "Disillusionment in Marriage and Romanticism," Marriage and Family Living, XX (1958), pp. 156-162; Charles W. Hobart, "Some Effects of Romanticism During Courtship on Marriage Role Opinions," Sociology and Social Research, XXXXII (1958), pp. 336-343; Charles W. Hobart, "The Incidence of Romanticism During Courtship," Social Forces, XXXVI (1958), pp. 362-367.

⁴² Dwight G. Dean, "Romanticism and Emotional Maturity: A Preliminary Study," Marriage and Family Living, XXIII (1961), pp. 44-45; Dwight G. Dean, "Romanticism and Emotional Maturity: A Further Exploration," Social Forces, XXXXII (1964), pp. 298-303.

relationships between romanticism and disillusionment in marriage, some effects of romanticism during courtship on marital opinions, and the incidence of romanticism during courtship. In the study on the incidence of romanticism during courtship, questionnaires were obtained from several hundred students to test the hypothesis that romanticism of adolescents changes at different stages in courtship. Among others, Hobart also tested the hypothesis that there is a cyclic movement in romanticism during courtship with individuals at the beginning and end of courtship being least romantic and those going steady being most romantic. Interestingly enough, no significant differences in romanticism were found among women. Among men, romanticism scores of steadies were not significantly higher than those for married men; however, the casual dating group scored significantly lower than the steady dating group.

The relationship between tension and romanticism assumed by Waller and by Hobart was also included as an element in a study, by Dean, of the relationship between romanticism and adjustment. Correlations between romanticism scores and scores from four sub-scales of the Bell Adjustment Inventory were computed for data gathered from 194 female subjects at Capital University. All correlations were of low magnitude, ranging from .02 to .19. In further research, Dean developed fourteen sub-scales to test the hypothesis of a negative relationship between emotional maturity and romanticism. Again, low correlations were found, and Dean's hypothesis was not supported.

Framework and Hypotheses of the Present Study

In the preceding review of literature, a discussion has been made of the contributions and limitations of studies which have relevance to this investigation. On the basis of Waller's analyses of the rating and dating complex and idealization in courtship, as presented in Chapter I, and leads obtained from the review of literature, the framework within which the present study was conducted was developed and hypotheses to be tested were formulated. Given the tremendous impact which Waller's conceptualizations have had on scholars in the family area, the problem of the present investigation became one of exploring a number of hypotheses derived from his descriptions. In the absence of such testing it seems likely that Waller's notions will continue to occupy a central place in thinking on the family and will be surrounded by emotionally and non-empirically based arguments.

To recapitulate, the basic ideas stemming from Waller's theories which have relevance to the current study may be summed up as follows. Campus dating is governed by a rating complex which determines a distributive order in terms of the desirability of individuals as dates. The rating complex places emphasis on certain kinds of competitive-materialistic characteristics, the possession of which makes one relatively desirable or undesirable as a date, and contributes to the formation of brittle relationships which do not have the goal of leading to marriage. While the nature of dating as governed by a rating complex tends to obviate the development of serious emotional relationships, such relationships do emerge when individuals succumb to the temptation of becoming involved. When one or both partners in a

dating relationship become emotionally involved, the resulting interaction pattern produces idealization, which is defined as attributing qualities to a loved one which he or she does not possess. Furthermore, once idealization has been introduced into a relationship, there is a tendency toward increasing idealization as the dating partners move closer, psychologically, to marriage, and this leads to progressive departures from reality on the part of both partners.

Evidence from studies relating to these aspects of Waller's descriptions have produced the following generalizations.

1. The rating complex as described by Waller is not widely applicable to campus dating at present. While some elements in the complex do appear to be important criteria in selecting a dating partner, by and large they are overshadowed by the greater importance attributed to personality characteristics.
2. It does not appear that individuals undergo a sharp alteration in dating preferences and values when moving from casual to serious relationships, but it does appear that values deemed most important in selecting a date are, by and large, those deemed most important in selecting a mate.
3. Idealization in romantic love relationships appears to be moderate rather than extreme with individuals becoming more attuned to reality as they become more involved. Empirical supports for this conclusion are few, however, and in fact, indirect evidence, such as that presented by Brim and Wood, throws some doubt on the notion that persons become more reality oriented as they become more involved.

In light of the above statements, several assumptions were made which underlie the basic framework within which the present investigation was conducted and upon which hypotheses are based. First, any hierarchy of campus values in dating, as measured by preconstructed lists, does not necessarily reflect the real hierarchy in an operative sense, but may reflect only a publicly stated and normatively sanctioned one. Second, results of previous studies have made it possible to assume that personality characteristics are more important criteria in dating than are competitive-materialistic criteria and, therefore, that personality characteristics will be most subject to distortion and idealization if it is occurring and will be likely to elicit greatest ego-involvement on the part of judges who are asked to rate another person. Third, idealization can be measured by comparing ratings of different persons on another individual when the raters are of two types--one who is relating intimately in interpersonal heterosexual terms to the person rated and one who is not so relating.

Accordingly, the hypotheses stated below were tested in a design where primary respondents, those respondents whose dating relationships will be the focus of interest in the present study, were differentiated according to varying involvement stages, sex, Greek--non-Greek affiliation, romanticism, and other selected independent variables. The crucial dependent variable was the primary respondent idealization and was defined as occurring when one (1) imputes desirable qualities to a person lacking them, (2) exaggerates their proportion when they are present, and/or (3) denies the existence or extent or unfavorable qualities.

Hypotheses: The following hypotheses were formulated for testing in the present study.

Hypothesis 1: The importance values attached to personality characteristics will be greater than the importance values attached to competitive-materialistic characteristics for both males and females.

Hypothesis 2a: Males and females in three involvement stages will differ with respect to their total idealization scores.

Hypothesis 2b: Total idealization scores will be greatest for males and females in the serious involvement stage, less for those in the moderate involvement stage, and least for those in the casual involvement stage.

Hypothesis 3: Males and females who vary in the length of time they have dated a given individual will differ with respect to total idealization scores.

Hypothesis 4: Males and females exhibiting different degrees of romanticism will differ with respect to total idealization scores, with those scoring lowest on romanticism being less prone to idealization, those scoring medium being more prone to idealization, and those scoring high being most prone to idealization.

Hypothesis 5: The magnitude of item idealization scores for both males and females will vary positively with the importance values assigned to those items.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

One of the primary aims of the present investigation was to design a technique for measuring idealization, since, to the knowledge of this author, no such technique has been devised. As stated earlier, most studies relating to idealization have been concerned with the impact of an individual's ideal mate images on selection of a mate, and this in itself does not provide a direct measure of idealization. Even Wallin, whose explicit objective was to test four hypotheses concerning idealization, used derived measures from the Burgess and Wallin data on ideal mate conceptions. A second methodological aim was to ascertain the relative importance of characteristics in date selection by utilizing a different scale than any used previously in this area. The general procedure used to realize these aims involved the construction of a three-part questionnaire administered to subjects defined as primary respondents and a shorter form of this questionnaire which was administered to subjects defined as secondary respondents. Before discussing the procedures utilized in constructing and administering questionnaires, however, it is necessary to specify how the sample of primary and secondary respondents was selected.

Selection of Primary Respondents for the Sample

The term primary respondents refers to those individuals whose dating relationships are to be the focus of study in the present investigation. The population from which primary respondents were selected consisted of all single students residing in university-operated dormitories and sorority and fraternity houses at Oklahoma State University during the spring semester of 1967. While the population did not include all single students at the university, it did include the vast majority. Restriction of the population to single students residing in the abovementioned residences was made in the interest of economy. This facilitated collection of data by making it easier to assemble respondents in a given location at a given time.

IBM cards on all students in the population were obtained from the Office of Student Affairs whose listing was up to date at the time the sample was selected. The cards were run through an accounting machine to get a print-out with fifty-four names listed per page. This listing constituted the sampling frame.¹

The sampling frame was then stratified with respect to two variables, sex and Greek-non-Greek affiliation. Individuals in the population were accordingly arranged into four strata, Greek male, non-Greek male, Greek female, and non-Greek female. Within each of these strata names were arranged alphabetically by residence units which were also arranged alphabetically.

Phase II in the sampling process, actual selection of the study

¹Matilda W. Riley, Sociological Research I: A Case Approach (New York, 1963), pp. 284-287.

sample, entailed two steps. First, using a table of random numbers to designate page and entry number, 100 individuals were drawn without replacement from each stratum.² More names were chosen than would be actually sampled in order to allow for the expected elimination of respondents who did not meet certain additional criteria necessary for inclusion in the sample. Second, a quota sampling procedure³ was utilized to achieve representativeness with respect to a third independent variable, involvement stage.

A slightly involved strategy was used to place primary respondents in one of three involvement stages (casual, moderate, or serious) representing different degrees of emotional involvement in a dating partner.⁴ The general information part of the schedule contained three questions, with preconstructed answers, pertaining to involvement status. These questions, along with code numbers attached to the

²W. Allen Wallis and Harry V. Roberts, Statistics: A New Approach (New York, 1956), p. 78.

³William J. Goode and Paul K. Hatt, Methods in Social Research (New York, 1952), pp. 230-231; and Frederick F. Stephan and Philip J. McCarthy, Sampling Opinions (New York, 1963), pp. 37-38.

⁴Although many studies found in the literature have used dating or courtship status as an independent variable, there is rarely a definitional statement made of how these different statuses are determined. It may be that labels attached to the statuses used were partially intended by the authors as defining criteria, although this is never made explicit in such studies. See, for example, Charles W. Hobart, "The Incidence of Romanticism During Courtship," Social Forces, XXXVI (1958), p. 364; Clifford Kirkpatrick and Charles Hobart, "Disagreement, Disagreement Estimate, and Non-Empathic Imputations for Intimacy Groups Varying From Favorite Date to Married." American Sociological Review, XIX (1954), p. 11; and Orville G. Brim, Jr. and Nancy Wood, "Self and Other Conceptions in Courtship and Marriage Pairs," Marriage and Family Living, XVIII (1956), p. 245.

different responses, were as follows.

Emotional involvement: No or slight emotional involvement (1); moderate emotional involvement (2); or serious emotional involvement (3).

Nature of dating relationship: Have not really considered marriage to current dating partner (1); have considered marriage to current dating partner, but no definite plans or decisions have been made (2); or have definite plans to marry current dating partner (3).

General dating status: Casually dating (1); dropped or what could be considered the equivalent of being dropped (2); or pinned, what could be considered the equivalent of being pinned, or engaged (3).

It was assumed that these questions were tapping related dimensions of involvement rather than isolated variables and that, in itself, no single question provided a sufficient measure of involvement. Therefore, coded responses to the three items were added to arrive at a composite score defined as involvement stage. Subjective judgments rather than objective measures were used to determine involvement because it was further assumed that the psychological perspective a person has on his own relationship would be a crucial determinant of idealization.

The possible range of scores on these three items was 3 to 9. Primary respondents receiving a score of 3 or 4 were arbitrarily assigned to the casual involvement stage, those receiving scores of 5, 6, or 7 were assigned to the moderate involvement stage, and those receiving scores of 8 or 9 were assigned to the serious involvement stage. This procedure admittedly does not allow for fine distinctions

concerning degree of involvement, and undoubtedly, there is great variation within a given involvement stage. In any further study, it would be desirable to use a more refined measure of this variable.

Respondents were contacted and participated in the order in which they were randomly drawn until the quota in a given sex and Greek affiliation stratum for a given involvement stage was achieved. Once the quota in any one stratum had been filled, the next respondent on the list was asked first to fill out only that portion of the instrument pertaining to involvement status. If his status was one for which a quota had already been completed, he did not participate further and the next name on the list was contacted. This was done until each of the twelve sample strata was filled with seventeen to twenty-four respondents.

Several other criteria, in addition to a quota being filled, resulted in elimination of some primary respondents from the original sample listing. First, to be included in the final sample, respondents had to have had at least two dates with the same individual in the preceding month. Second, they could not participate if they perceived themselves as "just having broken up" and not yet dating another individual. Third, they had to have two friends who knew their dating partner personally. Of necessity, this led to partial self-selection by primary respondents. Because of this self-selective principle, strictly speaking, rules of probability do not apply to the sample.

Selection of Friends as Secondary Respondents

Secondary respondents were selected by having each primary respondent name two best friends of his or her same sex who were also

asked to participate in the study. The only criterion used in having the primary respondent designate two friends was that the friends so chosen must have known the primary respondent's then current dating partner on a personal basis. That is, the friends must have met and interacted with the dating partner enough to be classified as having personal knowledge of him or her.

Because friends were selected in this manner, the sample may be biased by a sociometric chain relationship between primary respondents and friends. While effects of this bias upon research results cannot be determined, it can be said with some confidence that effects due to conformity to group norms that are evoked will work against the hypotheses. This results in some methodological control since group factors were held constant from one group to another; therefore, any effects noted are likely to be greater than those statistically indicated.

Instrumentation and Procedure

The study required the use of three different instruments: one to yield a measure of idealization; one to determine the relative importance of characteristics in selecting a serious dating partner; and another to give a measure of romanticism. Each of these instruments will be discussed separately.

The Idealization Instrument

The idealization instrument, devised to explore hypotheses 2,3,4, and 5, was composed of thirteen personality characteristics and four items relating to competitive-materialistic characteristics as

defined by Waller. These characteristics are shown in Appendix A. All were drawn from previous studies of traits desired in dating and marriage partners.⁵ Most of the characteristics chosen, moreover, were those which had received high rankings in previous studies. This made it possible to assume that the characteristics used were not simply trivial kinds of criteria and that responses to the items were likely to be given serious consideration.

Each characteristic was placed on a five point rating scale which measured frequency with which a dating partner displayed the quality rather than degree to which each quality was possessed.⁶ The scales were based upon frequency only in order to avoid forcing respondents to shift scales from item to item. The five scale points were: always, very often, often, occasionally, and rarely. In conformity with Guilford, "high" ends of the scales were placed in the same direction.

Only one term in the scale, rarely, can be considered as possibly being unfavorable, while the other four points are given to degrees of favorable report. This was done in anticipation of a positive leniency error and was intended to counteract it insofar as possible. As

⁵Robert O. Blood, Jr., "A Retest of Waller's Dating Complex," Marriage and Family Living, XVII (1955), p. 72; Harold T. Christensen, Marriage Analysis (New York, 1950), p. 259; Lester E. Hewitt, "Student Perceptions of Traits Desired in Themselves as Dating and Marriage Partners," Marriage and Family Living, XX (1958), p. 346; Reuben Hill, "Campus Norms in Mate Selection," Journal of Home Economics, XXXVII (1945), p. 557; Eleanor Smith and J. H. G. Monane, "Courtship Values in a Youth Sample," American Sociological Review, XVIII (1953), p. 637; and William M. Smith, Jr., "Rating and Dating: A Re-Study," Marriage and Family Living, XIV (1952), p. 314.

⁶For a discussion of the general approach which was used in scaling items see Goode and Hatt, pp. 255-260; and J. P. Guilford, Psychometric Methods (New York, 1954), pp. 263-299.

Guilford describes the leniency error, it "was named from the very obvious fact that raters tend to rate those whom they know well, or in whom they are ego-involved, higher than they should. This is presumably a constant tendency regardless of trait."⁷ It is not possible to estimate to what degree another anticipated error, the halo effect, was operative. According to Guilford,

One result of the halo effect is to force the rating of any trait in the direction of the general impression of the individuals rated and to that extent to make the ratings of some traits less valid.⁸

Points on the scales were assigned numerical values in the same manner as that used in scoring a Likert-type scale, with the provision that the positive end expressing greatest frequency always carried a weight of five and the negative end expressing least frequency a weight on one.

Discussion of the instrumentation procedure is a necessary prelude to showing how the total idealization score was derived. Contact was made with each primary respondent. Names of two best friends who knew his or her dating partner and would be willing to participate were obtained. A time and place was set up when all three members of a group could complete the schedule at the same time. Respondents were told only that they were asked to cooperate in a survey dealing with several aspects of dating behavior among college students at Oklahoma State University. They were assured that individual questionnaire responses would be kept confidential, that their names or the name of

⁷ Guilford, p. 278.

⁸ Guilford, p. 279.

the person they had been asked to judge would not be recorded in any manner, and that the name of the housing unit in which they resided would not be identified.

Each respondent was asked to sit in a different part of the room and not to talk or leave the room until all members of the group had completed the schedules. Primary respondents, whose schedules contained two instruments besides the idealization one, took approximately a half an hour to finish. Friends, who filled out the idealization schedule only, generally finished in five to ten minutes.

Instructions asked respondents to choose that one point on the scale for each item which would best describe the primary respondent's dating partner. Before they began, it was made explicit that all three individuals were to judge the primary respondent's dating partner on the seventeen traits contained in the instrument. From these three ratings of the same individual, a measure of the primary respondent's idealization was derived by computing the direction and numerical discrepancy between the primary respondent's ratings compared separately with those of each friend. Scoring was as follows.

Discrepancy scores were computed on the assumption that the individuals responding as best friends were giving the more objective of the two kinds of evaluations although it is not claimed that the best friends' ratings were necessarily objective. Their ratings were utilized merely as a standard with which to score the primary respondent's ratings. For example, if a primary respondent assigned a rating to an item which numerically exceeded that given by one of his best friends on the same item, a positive value in the amount of the numerical difference between the two was given to that item. This was

called overestimation of an item. Likewise, if the primary respondent assigned a rating which was numerically lower than that given by one of his best friends, a negative value in the amount of the numerical difference was assigned to that item. This was called underestimation. An agreement score of zero was assigned if an item was rated identically by primary respondent and best friend.

The two resulting discrepancy scores for each item were summed algebraically to yield an idealization score for that item. Individual item discrepancies were also totaled algebraically to arrive at a total idealization score for the primary respondent.

For each group, the absolute difference between friends' ratings by item was summed for all seventeen items to yield a total difference score for friends. This score was used to help assess the validity of the idealization measure--to determine whether what was being measured was the primary respondent's idealization of his or her dating partner or an "interaction of idealizations" between friends and the primary respondent. It is possible that as one becomes increasingly involved with a member of the opposite sex, his or her friends may share in the idealization process by also idealizing a quality which the dater attributes to the dating partner. A test for significant differences between the two friends ratings averaged by dating status of the primary respondent in that group was made. If idealization of a dating partner by the primary respondent is what is being measured, then no significant differences between friends of primary respondents in different stages of involvement should appear.

Measuring the Relative Importance of
Characteristics Desired in a
Serious Dating Partner

That portion of the questionnaire relating to characteristics desired in potentially serious dating partners involved scaled responses to a list of twenty-four qualities--the seventeen contained in the idealization instrument along with seven others adapted with some modifications from Waller. The traits used are shown in Appendix A.

A variety of kinds of response categories have been used in assessing importance and/or desirability of traits in selection of dating and marriage partners. Two researches by Blood⁹ and Himes,¹⁰ cited previously, simply required a "Yes" or "No" in response to each trait in terms of its importance. A similar method was used by Smith¹¹ who had subjects express "agree," "disagree," or "questionable" to the importance of traits. Another approach, used by Hill¹² and McGinnis,¹³ utilized the response categories "irrelevant," "desirable but not important," "important but not undesirable," and "undesirable." None of these procedures was deemed satisfactory and a slightly different scale was constructed for use in the present investigation.

⁹Blood, p. 42.

¹⁰Joseph S. Himes, Jr., "Value Consensus in Mate Selection Among Negroes," Marriage and Family Living, XIV (1952), p. 318.

¹¹Smith, p. 314.

¹²Hill, p. 556.

¹³Robert McGinnis, "Campus Values in Mate Selection: A Repeat Study," Social Forces, XXXVI (1958), p. 369.

Primary respondents were asked to indicate, on a five-point scale, how important they felt each characteristic was in terms of someone with whom they might become emotionally involved. The five scale points were: very important, important, mildly important, unimportant, and very unimportant. Instructions for this portion of the questionnaire emphasized the need for subjects to respond to the items without reference to any specific person. This was intended to create a response set so that traits would be evaluated independently of any dating partner and to decrease the possibility that traits might be rated on the basis of whether and to what extent a specific dating partner possessed them. In other words, an individual may consider looks to be fairly important in a dating partner, but because he thinks a current dating partner is not particularly good-looking, he may rate the importance of that trait lower than he really feels it is to avoid dissonance. Other than trying to control for this problem through an instructional set, it cannot be estimated to what extent this might have been occurring.

Responses to each item were averaged by sex group and Greek affiliation group and by involvement stage within sex groups, thus arriving at a mean importance value for each characteristic. Comparison of item means will make it possible to assess the relative importance not only of individual characteristics but also of the general importance of personality characteristics as opposed to competitive-materialistic traits. These means will be used in testing hypotheses 1 and 5.

The Romanticism Instrument

Intensive research into contemporary American culture would have

been required to chart, systematically and rigorously, current dimensions of the romantic complex. Since the aim of this study was to assign respondents to classes varying in romanticism, it was decided to use Hobart's revision of the Gross romanticism scale rather than constructing a new one.

In 1939, after extensive research of popular romanticism as revealed in movies, popular love stories, radio "soap operas," popular songs, and other materials, Gross constructed eighty items intended to distinguish the Romantic Culture Pattern from the Realist Culture Pattern.¹⁴ In 1958, Hobart¹⁵ employed a variety of techniques, including Guttman scaling analysis and judgment of item appropriateness by students and faculty, to both shorten and update the Gross schedule. The resulting twelve item romanticism scale devised by Hobart was used to measure romanticism in the present investigation. Inasmuch as over a decade has passed since Hobart revised the Gross scale, it was felt that the wording of Hobart's statements was a bit archaic in places, and wording was changed to better conform with current patterns of expression although such changes were kept to a minimum.

Following Hobart, each statement was listed with two response categories, "agree" and "disagree." The procedure for scoring items and deriving a measure of romanticism, defined as the number of responses conformable to the key, was the same as that employed by Hobart. This was done by counting the number of romantic responses

¹⁴Llewellyn Gross, "A Belief Pattern Scale for Measuring Attitudes Toward Romanticism," American Sociological Review, IX (1944), pp. 463-472.

¹⁵Hobart, pp. 362-367.

that a subject made. The romantic response to items 2,3,4,5,7, and 10 was "agree," while the romantic response to items 1,6,8,9,11, and 12 was "disagree." It was possible for romanticism scores to range from 0 to 12. In fact, the range for our sample was 0 to 9. In view of this, subjects were arbitrarily assigned to one of three classes of romanticism. Respondents scoring from 0 to 3 were classified as low in the romanticism scale, those scoring 4 to 6 were classified as medium, and those scoring 7 to 9 were classified as high.

Statistical Procedures

Four statistical procedures were employed in testing hypotheses: the t test of difference between means; the Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance by ranks; the Mann-Whitney test for two independent samples; and Spearman's rank correlation technique. Except for the t test, these are order statistics and are properly used where data do not meet the assumptions required for use of parametric techniques.

The Kruskal-Wallis test, in effect, is comparable to an overall analysis of variance in a general test of significance, and Mann-Whitney tests are comparable to a series of t tests where ranking of k independent samples at a given level of significance has already been established. The Kruskal-Wallis test is a generalized version of the Mann-Whitney test in a manner analogous to the relationship of F and t , and the basic operation involved in both is to rank order all scores and to then obtain a sum of ranks for each sample. The two tests, taken together, are efficient and powerful non-parametric techniques. Referring to the Mann-Whitney test, Hays states:

This test is one of the best of the nonparametric techniques with respect to power and power-efficiency. It seems to be very superior to the median test in this respect, and compares quite well with t when assumptions for both tests are met. For some special situations, it is even superior to t . This makes it an extremely useful device for the comparison of two independent groups.¹

Spearman's rank correlation technique is analogous to the parametric correlation coefficient, Pearson's r , and is used where score values can only be ranked rather than subjected to precise arithmetic manipulations. While this test cannot be properly used to assess the linearity of two variables, it can be used to assess agreement among subjects on the proper rank ordering of two parameters.²

¹William L. Hays, Statistics for Psychologists (New York, 1963), p. 635. Also see Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (New York, 1956), for a good discussion of the Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney tests.

²Hays, *Ibid.*, p. 642.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Findings of the present investigation are reported below under two headings which represent the major subdivisions of the study: the relative importance of various characteristics in the selection of potentially serious dating partners; and idealization in dating. Before the findings are presented, a brief description of the sample of primary respondents is given. The implications of the findings along with recommendations concerning further research will be presented in Chapter V.

Description of the Sample

The final sample consisted of 110 male primary respondents with 220 male secondary respondents and 121 female primary respondents with 242 female secondary respondents. All were undergraduate students at Oklahoma State University and lived in residence units operated by the university. Information gathered on personal characteristics of respondents showed that they were largely from the middle socioeconomic levels and came predominately from Oklahoma cities of 25,000 and over. The distribution of the sample by Greek--non-Greek affiliation and class standing is presented in Tables II and III.

Table II shows the number of primary respondents who fell into each of the twelve sample strata. As can be seen, the number of cases

TABLE II

NUMBER OF PRIMARY RESPONDENTS BY INVOLVEMENT STAGE,
BY GREEK--NON-GREEK AFFILIATION, AND BY SEX

Greek--Non-Greek Affiliation	Involvement Stage			Total
	Casual	Moderate	Serious	
<u>Greek</u>				
Males	18	19	19	56
Females	18	22	24	64
<u>Non-Greek</u>				
Males	17	19	18	54
Females	19	19	19	57

from stratum to stratum does not differ greatly. Table III shows the distribution of the sample by class standing. Among both males and females, the sample contained individuals at all undergraduate levels. The only category which appears to be underrepresented is females in the senior year.

The Relative Importance of Twenty-four Characteristics
Related to the Selection of Potentially
Serious Dating Partners

That first hypothesis states that both males and females will attach greater importance to personality characteristics than to competitive-materialistic characteristics. Data used to test this hypothesis were derived from having primary respondents rate the importance of twenty-four characteristics related to the selection of a potentially serious dating partner. From these ratings, mean importance values and ranks were computed by sex, and t tests were run to

TABLE III

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF PRIMARY RESPONDENTS BY INVOLVEMENT
STAGE, BY CLASS STANDING, AND BY SEX

Class Standing	Involvement Stage							
	Casual		Moderate		Serious		Total	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent*
<u>Males</u>	35	31.8	38	34.5	37	33.6	110	100.0
Freshmen	8	7.3	16	24.5	5	4.5	29	26.4
Sophomore	13	11.8	7	6.4	12	10.9	32	29.1
Junior	7	6.4	8	7.3	15	13.6	30	27.3
Senior	7	6.4	7	6.4	5	4.5	19	17.3
<u>Females</u>	37	30.6	41	33.8	43	35.5	121	100.0
Freshmen	13	10.7	13	10.7	13	10.7	39	32.2
Sophomore	12	9.9	16	13.2	12	9.9	40	33.1
Junior	10	8.3	9	7.4	15	12.4	34	28.1
Senior	2	1.6	3	2.5	3	2.5	8	6.6

*Percentages do not sum to row or column totals because of rounding error.

determine whether values attached to personality characteristics were greater than those given to competitive-materialistic qualities. Means and ranks of these data by sex are presented in Table IV. For both males and females, t tests on differences between personality characteristics and competitive-materialistic ones are statistically significant beyond the .0005 level ($t=3.79$ for males and $t=4.95$ for females). The null hypothesis of no difference between the two kinds of items is rejected in favor of the alternative that personality characteristics are considered to be more important than competitive-materialistic ones. The magnitude of the t values indicates that the difference in importance attached to the two kinds of characteristics is slightly less for males than for females.

Since most of the characteristics received mean values of 3.00 or above, all but a few are considered to be at least mildly important in selecting dating partners with whom one might become involved. The few which were not rated as at least mildly important are all competitive-materialistic items. Differences between males and females on the values and ranks are few, and generally where there are differences, they are not large. One trend which emerges is that females consistently rate most characteristics higher, as shown by the means, than males do. While male exceptions to this trend are noted on five characteristics--being neat in appearance, having plenty of clothes, being sexually attractive, dressing appropriately, and being good-looking--it is interesting to observe that all five items cluster around a central theme relating to physical appearance. In general, this indicates that males appear to be more interested in appearance while females place more emphasis on personality characteristics.

TABLE IV
 MEAN IMPORTANCE VALUES* AND RANKS OF TWENTY-FOUR
 CHARACTERISTICS RELATED TO THE SELECTION OF
 POTENTIALLY SERIOUS DATING PARTNERS BY SEX

Characteristics	Males (N=110)		Females (N=121)	
	Means	Ranks	Means	Ranks
+Neat in Appearance	4.26	5	4.16	13.5
Self-Confident	3.95	13	4.33	11
+Dances Well	2.73	20	2.80	20
+Has a Good Reputation	3.94	14	4.16	13.5
Intellectually Stimulating	3.59	17	3.96	15
+Belongs to Greek Organization	1.68	24	1.88	24
Sensitive	4.09	10.5	4.54	5
Understanding	4.36	2.5	4.77	1
+Dresses Appropriately	4.06	12	3.93	16
+Plenty of Money	2.05	23	2.45	21
Good Sense of Humor	4.09	10.5	4.20	12
Good Disposition	4.19	7.5	4.35	10
+Drinks Socially	2.25	22	2.26	23
Considerate	4.19	7.5	4.55	4
Dependable	4.24	6	4.75	2
+Popular	2.93	19	2.99	19
+Good-Looking	3.58	18	3.02	18
Ambitious	3.82	15	4.42	8
Friendly	4.36	2.5	4.40	9
Emotionally Mature	4.28	4	4.46	7
Honest	4.60	1	4.63	3
+Plenty of Clothes	2.39	21	2.28	22
Sexually Attractive	3.73	16	3.35	17
Respectful	4.18	9	4.52	6

*Importance scale values are: very important (5.00), important (4.00), mildly important (3.00), unimportant (2.00), and very unimportant (1.00).

+Competitive-materialistic characteristics adapted from Waller.

Comparison of ranks within male and female groups reveals several characteristics on which the sexes differ. In addition to being neat in appearance and dressing appropriately, the items friendly and emotionally mature rank higher among males than females, while females achieve higher rankings on the qualities pertaining to being sensitive, considerate, dependable, ambitious, and respectful.

The data were analyzed further to determine what effects the variable of Greek--non-Greek affiliation has on importance values and ranks. Results of this breakdown are shown in Table V. Again, t tests were run. Differences between personality characteristics and competitive-materialistic characteristics are statistically significant for Greek males ($t=3.24$, $p < .005$), non-Greek males ($t=4.16$, $p < .0005$), Greek females ($t=4.79$, $p < .0005$), and non-Greek females ($t=5.00$, $p < .0005$).

It is interesting to see how the four groups compare in terms of means and ranks. Although all groups regard selection of dating partners similarly, there are some differences among them. In addition, where there are differences, they appear more often between male groups than between female groups. Among males, Greeks place more importance on a dating partner's being neat, dressing appropriately, and displaying a good disposition than non-Greeks do. In contrast, non-Greek males feel that being dependable, emotionally mature, and respectful are relatively more important than Greek males do. While both male groups generally attach low importance to competitive qualities, the mean values associated with such characteristics are consistently higher for Greeks than for non-Greeks. This is reflected in differences in the magnitude of the t values.

TABLE V
 MEAN IMPORTANCE VALUES* AND RANKS OF TWENTY-FOUR CHARACTERISTICS
 RELATED TO THE SELECTION OF POTENTIALLY SERIOUS DATING
 PARTNERS BY SEX AND GREEK--NON-GREEK AFFILIATION

Characteristics	Greek Males (N=56)		Non-Greek Males (N=54)		Greek Females (N=64)		Non-Greek Females (N=57)	
	Means	Ranks	Means	Ranks	Means	Ranks	Means	Ranks
+Neat in Appearance	4.38	4	4.14	8.5	4.21	13.5	4.12	13
Self-Confident	3.85	14	4.05	12	4.44	10.5	4.22	11
+Dances Well	3.15	19	2.32	21	2.87	20	2.73	20
+Has a Good Reputation	4.15	11.5	3.73	16	4.33	12	4.00	14
Intellectually Stimulating	3.60	15.5	3.59	18	3.98	15	3.95	15
+Belongs to Greek Organization	2.04	24	1.32	24	2.18	24	1.58	24
Sensitive	4.18	8	4.00	13	4.56	4	4.53	5.5
Understanding	4.45	2	4.27	5	4.75	1	4.80	1
+Dresses Appropriately	4.18	8	3.95	14	3.93	16	3.93	16
+Plenty of Money	2.16	23	1.95	23	2.46	21	2.44	21
Good Sense of Humor	4.04	13	4.14	8.5	4.21	13.5	4.19	12
Good Disposition	4.24	6	4.14	8.5	4.47	8	4.24	10
+Drinks Socially	2.45	21	2.05	22	2.31	22	2.22	23
Considerate	4.25	5	4.14	8.5	4.52	5.5	4.59	4
Dependable	4.16	10	4.32	3.5	4.72	2	4.78	2
+Popular	3.05	20	2.82	19	3.07	18.5	2.92	19
+Good-Looking	3.53	18	3.64	17	3.07	18.5	2.97	18
Ambitious	3.56	17	4.09	11	4.51	7	4.34	9
Friendly	4.40	3	4.32	3.5	4.44	10.5	4.37	8
Emotionally Mature	4.15	11.5	4.41	2	4.46	9	4.46	7

TABLE V (CONTINUED)

Characteristics	Greek Males (N=56)		Non-Greek Males (N=54)		Greek Females (N=64)		Non-Greek Females (N=57)	
	Means	Ranks	Means	Ranks	Means	Ranks	Means	Ranks
Honest	4.56	1	4.64	1	4.66	3	4.61	3
+Plenty of Clothes	2.42	22	2.36	20	2.25	23	2.32	22
Sexually Attractive	3.60	15.5	3.86	15	3.28	17	3.42	17
Respectful	4.18	8	4.18	6	4.52	5.5	4.53	5.5

*Importance scale values are: very important (5.00), important (4.00), mildly important (3.00), unimportant (2.00), and very unimportant (1.00).

+Competitive-materialistic characteristics adapted from Waller.

There are no large differences between ratings of any characteristic by female response groups and, in fact, Greek and non-Greek females designate the same first six preferences. These six characteristics relate to being understanding, dependable, honest, considerate, sensitive, and respectful. Greek females tend to rate materialistic items slightly higher than non-Greek females although both groups place little importance on most of the competitive-materialistic characteristics. Again, this is illustrated by the differing magnitudes of t .

Examination of Table V when sex distinctions are ignored shows that Greeks consider a good reputation and a good disposition to be more important than non-Greeks do, while non-Greeks receive a higher ranking on the item of emotional maturity. Greeks also give higher mean ratings than non-Greeks on most characteristics. This could be due to factors such as different verbal patterns among Greeks or different social pressures which they feel.

In conclusion, these findings indicate that: (1) there is a great deal of consensus among all response groups on the importance of the various items; (2) there is more variation in the importance attached to different items between male groups than between female groups; and (3) personality characteristics are rated higher than competitive-materialistic characteristics.

Idealization in Dating

Hypothesis 2a predicts that total idealization scores among both sexes will differ with involvement stage. Hypothesis 2b predicts that the direction of differences will be increasing idealization with increasing emotional involvement. The hypotheses were tested by the

application of Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney tests. These statistical procedures were applied to total idealization score differences of male and female primary respondents and to idealization score differences for each of the seventeen items which, taken collectively, comprise the total idealization score.

Results of these tests are presented in Table VI. Column one of this Table shows the H values for each item and the total score and their associated probabilities on two-tailed tests. Where an H value has a probability equal to or less than .05, results of Mann-Whitney tests are indicated to show the direction of significant differences. Since hypothesis 2b predicts the direction of the differences, the region of rejection for Mann-Whitney U values is one-tailed.

Among the males at three involvement levels, significant differences appear on four item scores and on total scores. Since only total scores were utilized in testing hypothesis 2a, the decision is to reject the null hypothesis of no differences inasmuch as the probability associated with a value as large as $H=10.879$, $df=2$, is $p < .01$. The alternate hypothesis that total idealization scores differ with stage of involvement is accepted for males.

The null hypothesis under 2b is also rejected since males in the casual involvement stage exhibit total scores which are significantly higher than those of males in both the moderate and serious stages. The observed order of scores by involvement stage, as indicated by the sums of ranks, is completely reversed from that stated in the alternate hypothesis. The order found, with corresponding ranks, is: casual involvement (69.44) > moderate involvement (52.74) > serious involvement (45.15). While the null hypothesis is rejected, the alternate cannot

TABLE VI

DIFFERENCES ON ITEM AND TOTAL IDEALIZATION SCORES FOR MALE AND FEMALE PRIMARY RESPONDENTS IN THREE INVOLVEMENT STAGES

Items	Males		Females	
	Kruskal-Wallis H ^a	Direction of Differences by Mann-Whitney U ^b	Kruskal-Wallis H ^a	Direction of Differences by Mann-Whitney U ^b
Considerate	6.406	C > M*, C > S**	3.657	
Dependable	0.697		0.569	
Self-Confident	2.769		1.160	
Ambitious	0.492		2.320	
Good Sense of Humor	0.733		5.083	
Good-Looking	2.520		0.222	
Honest	0.957		6.278	C > M*, C > S**
Respectful	2.788		7.073	C > M*, C > S*
Dresses Appropriately	4.108		2.333	
Sensitive	0.154		12.858	C > M**, C > S***
Emotionally Mature	4.833		0.256	
Intellectually Stimulating	6.957	C > M*, C > S**	1.098	
Sexually Attractive	4.054		0.937	
Good Disposition	14.554	C > M*, M > S*, C > S***	4.253	
Understanding	3.012		1.900	
Neat in Appearance	6.534	C > M*, C > S*	1.175	
Friendly	4.988		4.232	
Total Idealization Score	10.879	C > M*, C > S**	4.352	

^aTwo-tailed tests, df=2.

^bOne-tailed tests.

*p < .05 ***p < .001

**p < .01

Statistics were calculated on the basis of N's of male and female primary respondents in three involvement stages. The N's for males and females respectively are: C = casual involvement (35) (37), M = moderate involvement (38) (41), and S = serious involvement (37) (43).

be accepted either since the direction of differences reveals a trend toward decreasing idealization with increasing involvement.

The null hypotheses under both 2a and 2b are accepted for female involvement groups. In the case of hypothesis 2a, the probability associated with a value as large as $H=4.352$, $df=2$, is $p < .20$. Since the value of H is not significant, there were no U values which proved to be significant. Even so, significant differences did appear on the items pertaining to being honest, respectful, and sensitive. As among males, the sums of ranks on the total idealization scores indicate a tendency, although not significant, toward decreasing idealization with increasing involvement. The observed order of scores for females, as shown by the sums of ranks, is: casual involvement (69.78) > moderate involvement (61.06) > serious involvement (53.38).

For descriptive purposes and as further evidence of the validity of the statistical tests, mean total idealization scores for male and female primary respondents were computed. The order of mean scores for males was found to be 12.94 for casual involvement, 4.81 for moderate involvement, and 1.90 for serious involvement, while that for females was 13.85, 9.34, and 6.83 respectively. These means indicate that if interval scale assumptions had been met by the data, the increase in available information might have more powerfully and significantly supported the trends already noted.

In order to help assess the validity of the idealization measure, Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney tests were run on item and total

friends' difference scores¹ to see whether there were any differences between these ratings by involvement status of primary respondents. These tests were based upon the assumption that if primary respondent idealization of the dating partner is being measured, then no significant differences between the difference scores should appear from one involvement stage to another. That no differences are found can be seen in Table VII. H values among male and female involvement groups do not approach significance, indicating that the total difference scores for friends of primary respondents do not differ with the involvement status of primary respondents.

After the initial tests were run on hypotheses 2a and 2b, the data were analyzed to determine what effects fraternity or sorority membership has on the tendency to idealize. Accordingly, Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney tests were applied to the data classified by Greek--non-Greek affiliation and sex. When this was done, significant differences in total idealization scores by involvement stage were found for males and females in fraternities and sororities. Differences among male and female non-Greeks by involvement stage are not significant. Values indicating whether there were differences are as follows: Greek males ($H=6.597$, $df=2$, $p < .05$) where men at the casual level scored significantly higher than those at the serious level; non-Greek males ($H=4.699$, $df=2$, ns); Greek females ($H=7.323$, $df=2$, $p < .05$) where women at the casual level scored significantly higher than those

¹Friends' difference scores were computed by taking the absolute numerical difference between two friends' ratings of a primary respondent's dating partner on every item. Item differences were then summed to yield the total friends' difference score

TABLE VII

DIFFERENCES ON ITEM AND TOTAL DIFFERENCE SCORES OF FRIENDS' RATINGS OF THE DATING PARTNERS OF MALE AND FEMALE PRIMARY RESPONDENTS IN THREE INVOLVEMENT STAGES

Items	Friends of Males		Friends of Females	
	Kruskal-Wallis H ^a	Direction of Differences by Mann-Whitney U ^b	Kruskal-Wallis H ^a	Direction of Differences by Mann-Whitney U ^b
Considerate	2.117		4.859	
Dependable	1.297		1.667	
Self-Confident	0.967		0.225	
Ambitious	5.882		0.020	
Good Sense of Humor	4.458		0.626	
Good-Looking	2.491		1.069	
Honest	3.754		7.080	C > M*, M < S*
Respectful	2.438		3.317	
Dresses Appropriately	0.337		4.215	
Sensitive	2.045		0.168	
Emotionally Mature	2.369		2.130	
Intellectually Stimulating	0.923		1.768	
Sexually Attractive	5.793		2.616	
Good Disposition	0.928		3.465	
Understanding	2.013		0.894	
Neat in Appearance	0.799		2.923	
Friendly	8.904	C > S**	1.102	
Total Difference Score	0.877		1.122	

^aTwo-tailed tests, df=2.

^bOne-tailed tests.

*p < .05

**p < .01

Statistics were calculated on the basis of N's of male and female primary respondents in three involvement stages. The N's for males and females respectively are: C = casual involvement (35) (37), M = moderate involvement (38) (41), and S = serious involvement (37) (43).

at the serious level; and non-Greek females ($H=0.500$), $df=2$, ns).²

Further evidence is presented in Table VIII concerning directional trends which emerged when this breakdown was made. Table VIII gives mean total idealization scores achieved by each of the four response groups along with the corresponding mean friends' difference scores. It must be kept in mind that these two means are based on different scoring procedures and are not comparable.³ Among males and females, idealization decreases with greater emotional involvement. In fact, respondents who fall in the serious involvement group show a tendency to underestimate their dating partners rather than to overestimate them--underestimation meaning that primary respondents' ratings are numerically smaller than those of their friends.

A quite different picture is revealed for non-Greek males and females in that they appear to maintain higher levels of idealization through the stage of serious involvement. Although scores for non-Greek males show a decrease in moving from the casual to the moderate stage, a similar decrease does not occur in moving from the moderate to the serious stage. Non-Greek females, on the other hand, seem to maintain a fairly constant level of idealization across all involvement levels.

² Again, these findings cannot be attributed to significant differences in friends' difference scores. Results of Kruskal-Wallis tests run on total difference scores of friends of primary respondents in the three involvement stages were as follows: Greek males ($H=0.586$, $df=2$, ns); Greek females ($H=2.321$, $df=2$, ns); non-Greek males ($H=1.340$, $df=2$, ns); and non-Greek females ($H=2.316$, $df=2$, ns). Kruskal-Wallis tests were two-tailed.

³ See pp. 44-45 for information on procedures used in arriving at total idealization scores and total friends' difference scores.

TABLE VIII

MEAN TOTAL IDEALIZATION SCORES AND CORRESPONDING FRIENDS' MEAN DIFFERENCE
SCORES FOR PRIMARY RESPONDENTS IN THREE INVOLVEMENT STAGES
BY SEX AND GREEK--NON-GREEK AFFILIATION

Involvement Stage	Males		Females	
	Greek	Non-Greek	Greek	Non-Greek
<u>Casual</u>	(N=18)	(N=17)	(N=18)	(N=19)
Idealization Score \bar{X}	11.94	13.94	14.50	13.21
Difference Score \bar{X}	13.67	14.05	11.78	15.37
<u>Moderate</u>	(N=19)	(N=19)	(N=22)	(N=19)
Idealization Score \bar{X}	3.79	5.84	8.27	10.42
Difference Score \bar{X}	13.79	11.79	16.36	12.32
<u>Serious</u>	(N=19)	(N=18)	(N=24)	(N=19)
Idealization Score \bar{X}	-1.63	5.44	-0.29	13.95
Difference Score \bar{X}	12.68	12.72	11.88	13.37

Hypothesis 3, which predicts that idealization will vary with the length of time in the specific dating relationship (as differentiated from degree of involvement), was tested by again employing Kruskal-Wallis tests to the data broken down by sex groups. H values were not significant, and the null hypothesis of no difference for males and females in six categories of length of time dating is accepted. However, it is of interest to note that the sums of ranks of idealization total scores consistently decrease as length of time dating increases (see Table IX). This trend suggests that people tend to become more objective in evaluating someone they are involved with simply as a function of available interaction time and independently of degree of emotional involvement.

TABLE IX

KRUSKAL-WALLIS VALUES* AND SUMS OF RANKS ON TOTAL IDEALIZATION
SCORES FOR MALE AND FEMALE PRIMARY RESPONDENTS IN
SIX CATEGORIES OF LENGTH OF TIME DATING

Length of Time Dating	Sums of Ranks on Total Idealization Scores				
	Males		Females		
0 to 3 months	(N=28)	65.30	(N=30)	70.33	
3+ to 6 months	(N=27)	59.56	(N=22)	64.70	
6+ to 9 months	(N=16)	56.47	(N=26)	65.06	
9+ months to 1 year	(N=8)	47.06	(N=5)	61.00	
1+ year to 2 years	(N=13)	44.35	(N=14)	48.50	
2 years and over	(N=18)	45.11	(N=24)	48.83	
*Two-tailed tests, df=5.		H=7.161	ns	H=7.390	ns

Hypothesis 4, which states that the tendency for both males and females to idealize will increase with increases in romanticism scores, again was tested by using the Kruskal-Wallis statistic. Possible romanticism scores ranged from 0 to 9. Primary respondents were divided into three groups varying by degree of romanticism: low romanticism (0 to 3); medium romanticism (4 to 6); and high romanticism (7 to 9). Results of this analysis are shown in Table X. As can be seen, the hypothesis is rejected for both males and females, and the null hypothesis that there is no difference in idealization scores of individuals exhibiting different degrees of romanticism is accepted. Even though H values do not approach significance and the sums of ranks do not reveal a definitive trend, the order of ranks suggests that males and females who score high on the romanticism scale may idealize slightly more than those scoring low.

TABLE X

KRUSKAL-WALLIS VALUES* AND SUMS OF RANKS ON TOTAL IDEALIZATION SCORES FOR MALE AND FEMALE PRIMARY RESPONDENTS REPRESENTING THREE DEGREES OF ROMANTICISM

Romanticism Score	Sums of Ranks on Total Idealization Scores				
	Males		Females		
Low	(N=28)	54.34	(N=50)	57.37	
Medium	(N=55)	52.27	(N=52)	64.24	
High	(N=27)	63.28	(N=19)	61.68	
*Two-tailed tests, df=2.		H=7.161	ns	H=7.390	ns

Hypothesis 5, which predicts that item idealization scores will vary positively with the importance values attached to those items, was evaluated by means of Spearman r_s correlations. Items ranked by

primary respondents on the basis of total importance scores and total idealization scores were correlated. Correlations for males and females respectively were found to be .27 and .38. The low correlations are in the predicted direction but are not statistically significant. Hypothesis 5 is rejected.

Summary of Results

Statistical tests have been made of five main hypotheses stated at the outset of this study and for an additional two which were included to facilitate interpretation of other findings. The data used in testing these hypotheses were based on questionnaires gathered from several hundred respondents, all college students at Oklahoma State University. A brief summary of the results obtained is presented below.

It was found that males and females--both Greek and non-Greek--attach importance ratings to personality characteristics in selecting a date which are significantly higher than those which they attach to competitive-materialistic characteristics. In addition, descriptive data showed that Greeks rate competitive-materialistic items higher than non-Greeks, and that there is some variation in emphasis of certain values by sex as well as Greek-non-Greek affiliation.

Second, it was determined that idealization among males varies significantly with degree of involvement in a negative manner leading to decreasing idealization with increasing involvement. Significant differences between idealization and degree of involvement were not found among females, although the data indicated a trend toward decreasing idealization with increasing involvement. It was also found that the relationship between idealization and involvement varies with

introduction of the variable of Greek-non-Greek affiliation. Greek males and females showed significant differences, again indicating decreasing idealization with increasing involvement, while no significant differences were found among non-Greek males and females.

Tests run to ascertain the effects of two other variables--length of time dating and romanticism score--on idealization did not approach the level of significance determined earlier. In spite of the lack of statistical significance, the data suggested that a negative relationship exists between length of time dating and idealization. They did not, however, indicate any systematic relationship between idealization and romanticism as measured by Hobart's romanticism scale.

The hypothesis that the magnitude of idealization on various characteristics will vary positively with the importance attached to them was also rejected. Correlations, although in the predicted direction, were low and not significant.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Five main hypotheses were tested in this study, the results of which were presented in the previous chapter. It remains now to relate these findings to the existing literature and to consider their implications for family theory and further research.

According to Willard Waller, college dating is governed by a rating complex which determines a distributive order in terms of the desirability of individuals as dates. The rating complex places importance on certain kinds of competitive-materialistic characteristics as the criteria by which dates are selected. Although Waller did not buttress this thesis with empirical supports, other sociologists have sought to test it. The resulting studies have yielded considerable consensus on characteristics deemed important in selecting dates. The general conclusion is that the influence of competitive-materialistic values is small, that the applicability of the rating complex is limited, and that the dominant themes in date selection are not competitive-materialistic ones but ones that revolve around personality dimensions and companionship norms.

Data reported in the present study reaffirm that personality characteristics and orientations toward others are deemed more important and override materialistic considerations in selecting dates. Also indicated is the emergence of certain themes or value clusters in

dating such that traits within any cluster tend to be rated similarly, resulting in differential importance of themes. This can be interpreted to mean that selection of dating partners probably revolves around larger themes rather than around specific traits and that, on the whole, themes composed of materialistic traits are relatively unimportant.

It appears, moreover, that most competitive-materialistic criteria receive even less support from students at Oklahoma State University than they have in studies such as those by Smith¹ and Blood.² It is difficult to make direct comparisons, however, since different stimulus questions were employed. Smith, it will be remembered, queried students about what it takes to be popular on campus. This is quite different from asking students to rate the importance of traits in selecting dates.

To the extent that it is possible to make comparisons, our data are consistent with those of Blood on the differential emphasis attached to competitive-materialistic norms by Greeks and non-Greeks, in that Greeks attach more importance to these criteria than non-Greeks do. This at least partially reflects the operation of certain normative orientations within the organized groups, in terms of which members are socialized. Additionally, since Blood produced evidence which supports the notion that there is no sharp break between norms governing dating and those governing mating, it appears that the ranking

¹William M. Smith, Jr., "Rating and Dating: A Re-Study," Marriage and Family Living, XIV (1952), pp. 312-216.

²Robert O. Blood, Jr., "A Retest of Waller's Dating Complex," Marriage and Family Living, XVII (1955), pp. 42-47.

of characteristics related to date selection is similar to that operating in mate selection.

It is very difficult to assess the validity of preconstructed checklists in measuring actual campus dating values since the hierarchy determined by such a method may not reflect the operations of the true hierarchy. Enough data have been gathered using preconstructed checklist to assure consistency of results obtained by this methodology, and findings of the present study come as no surprise. As was made explicit in Chapter II, it is possible that such checklists may only evoke responses which are socially approved along normatively sanctioned lines. Therefore, a direct test of Waller's hypothesis concerning the rating complex has not been made. It can be said that the evidence questions the force with which it operates.

A second general problem investigated relates to Waller's analysis of idealization as an element essential in romantic love. Waller believed that when one or both partners in a dating relationship become emotionally involved, the ensuing interaction produces idealization--defined as attributing to a loved one qualities which he or she does not possess, in kind and/or in degree. Once the process of idealization has begun, there is a tendency toward increasing idealization with increasing involvement. In other words, increasing involvement leads to progressive departures from reality on the part of both partners. No research has been done to test the validity of these specific notions. The little related research which can be found has produced the tentative conclusion that idealization in love relationships is moderate rather than extreme and has led many theorists to question the applicability of Waller's ideas concerning idealization to middle-class

courtship.

Our data do not support Waller's contention that idealization is an essential outgrowth of romantic love nor his thesis that the relationship between idealization and involvement is one of increasing idealization with increasing involvement. They do support the position of Burgess and Wallin,³ that idealization is curbed in serious romantic involvement and engagement, but do not allow inferences to be made concerning these authors' argument regarding the cause of idealization. If idealization is a result of the importance of maintaining self-esteem, as Burgess and Wallin contend, the importance placed on doing so must vary with certain group membership characteristics.

It has been shown that the tendency to idealize is highest when emotional involvement with dating partners is minimal. After an initial high in idealization, the tendency is to become more realistic and less prone to idealization as emotional involvement increases. No evidence was found to indicate that an "interaction of idealizations" carries couples in love further and further from reality. While both sexes exhibit a comparable degree of idealization at the casual involvement level, its development with increasing involvement is affected by the introduction of several independent variables. With respect to sex, males exhibit a much greater decrease in idealization with increasing involvement than females do. This trend additionally is affected by whether or not one is a fraternity or sorority member, with members--males and females--showing greater decreases than non-members.

³Ernest W. Burgess and Paul Wallin, Engagement and Marriage (Philadelphia, 1953), pp. 222-223.

One explanation of the differences found between males and females stems from the fact that males have career orientations which females generally do not have. It may be that the process of their becoming occupied with such orientations leads to decreasing idealization even before marriage. The finding concerning differences between Greeks and non-Greeks--where Greeks at the serious involvement level give ratings of their dates which are numerically smaller than those of their friends--was not expected, and no adequate explanation can be offered to account for this.

Although not independent of involvement level, idealization also appears to vary with length of time dating in a negative manner. With respect to this relationship, it is probable that involvement level and length of time dating operate interactively to affect idealization. Because intimacy tends to increase over time, the individual learns more of the peculiar attributes of a dating partner, resulting in more objective assessments of his or her characteristics.

No evidence of the hypothesized relationship between idealization and romanticism was found. The lack of any systematic relationship between the two casts doubt on Waller's contention that idealization is an inevitable outgrowth of romantic love and Folsom's assertion that idealization is a necessary component of the romantic complex. These conclusions, however, are limited to a definition of romanticism as that which is measured by Hobart's romanticism scale. It may be that some relationship would be found if a different scale were used.

The best explanation of the results of this study can be made in

terms of a framework offered by Merrill⁴ and Winch⁵ on the role played by ideal mate images in romantic involvement. According to Merrill, during the early stages of a relationship each individual may assume that the other is actually the personification of his or her ideal image. When love first appears, the loved one is endowed with all the attributes of the ideal mate image. As the individuals involved come to know each other better and as the period of euphoria comes to subside a little, many of the constructed ideal attributes fall into more realistic perspective.

Under this thesis, it would be expected that some idealization would occur with moderate involvement since love (or at least infatuation) is emerging. This would be followed by decreasing idealization at the serious level when forces set in to produce more realistic appraisals of the loved one. This explanation, however, does not account for the idealization shown at the casual level when emotional attachment is slight. It could be that high idealization at the casual involvement level is a result of anxieties and inadequacies which are experienced in trying to anticipate and meet expectations of dating partners. Lacking the perspective and support of expectations that emerge with prolonged interaction, casual daters may have a tendency to initially over-value many of their dating partners.

⁴Frances E. Merrill, Courtship and Marriage (New York, 1959), pp. 147-150.

⁵Robert F. Winch, The Modern Family (New York, 1963), pp. 646-648.

Limitations

In interpreting the findings of this investigation, it should be pointed out that there are several limitations. A brief discussion of such limitations will be presented below, followed by recommendations for further research.

One limitation stems from the population on which the research was based and the nature of the sample. The population was made up of single students at only one university in the southwestern portion of the United States. This population is distinguished by characteristics of the university including the specific normative orientations associated with its students, the peculiarities of its Greek system, and the general socioeconomic level of its students. The sample drawn from this population was relatively small and was selected to provide strata of approximately equal size representing different involvement levels. In addition, the sample is not subject to rules of probability. In light of the above, a conservative interpretation of findings would appear to be in order.

A second possible limitation concerns the relative lack of control exerted over criteria used in selecting secondary respondents. Ideally, the degree of the intimacy of their friendship to primary respondents should have been controlled. An attempt should have been made to equate the two friends in terms of how well they knew the primary respondents' dating partners. Since it cannot be said what kinds of factors were contributing to differences in friends' ratings, problems arise in interpreting the effects of such on idealization scores. Relative comparisons can be made in terms of the numerical

differences in idealization scores. Inferences cannot be drawn, however, as to the general magnitude of idealization. In other words, this writer believes that it would be untenable to hazard guesses about the general extent of idealization--interpreting the scores in terms of their indicating extreme, moderate, or slight idealization.

A third problem pertains to the determination of involvement stage. Only three involvement levels were used and there undoubtedly is a great deal of variation within each level. It is possible that a more precise statement of the relationship between involvement and idealization could be made if more involvement levels were employed. One advantage which accrues from the method used in determining involvement levels stems from the use of pre-established criteria. Placing of a primary respondent in one stage or another on the basis of such criteria increases the ease with which replication can be made.

Lastly, no effort was made to check the current validity of Hobart's romanticism scale. It is not known to what extent this scale effectively discriminates between individuals representing different degrees of romanticism. The scale was constructed over two decades ago, and conceptions relating to love and courtship have probably changed since the time when it was first used. To the extent that they have changed, if they have, the discriminatory power of the scale becomes subject to question.

Recommendations

Further investigations of hypotheses derived from Waller's analyses of the dynamics of dating and courtship are needed in order to assess the validity of conclusions reached on the basis of this

research. Several leads concerning the direction of future research and theorizing in the area of college dating relationships, the rating complex, and idealization in courtship, however, have emerged.

Data analyzed in this study have pointed out possible relationships between idealization and several independent variables. Future research is needed to determine what additional kinds of factors may affect idealization. Included in a list of factors that might be explored are age, socioeconomic level, and differences between high school and college students. In addition, it would be fruitful to examine, systematically, interaction effects of variables on idealization. Further study into the relationship between romanticism and idealization would profit by either developing a new romanticism scale or determining the discriminatory value of Hobart's scale before using it again.

Only one test was made to help assess the validity of the technique developed for measuring idealization. While it is believed that this technique has much potential as a measure of idealization, several other tests of its validity are needed. Empirical inquiry should be made into several assumptions underlying its construction and interpretation, as indicated by the fact that the meaning of minus scores--representing the phenomenon of underestimation--must be interpreted with great caution at the theoretical level.

Finally, in subsequent research on the process of idealization, another test of the hypotheses could be made by taking individuals at the beginning of a dating relationship, that is, at the casual involvement level, and periodically administering the idealization instrument to them at different points in their relationship. This kind of

longitudinal research should yield more definitive results on the operation of idealization in dating and romantic relationships.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Beigel, Hugo G. "Romantic Love." American Sociological Review. XVI (June, 1951), 326-334.
- Bialock, Hubert M. Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960.
- Blood, Robert O., Jr. "A Retest of Waller's Rating Complex." Marriage and Family Living, XVII (February, 1955), pp. 41-47.
- Blood, Robert O., Jr. "Uniformities and Diversities in Campus Dating Preferences." Marriage and Family Living, XVIII (February, 1956), 37-45.
- Brim, Orville C., Jr., and Nancy Wood. "Self and Other Conceptions in Courtship and Marriage Pairs." Marriage and Family Living, XVIII (August, 1956), 243-248.
- Burchinal, Lee. "The Premarital Dyad and Love Involvement." Handbook of Marriage and the Family. Ed. Harold Christensen. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964.
- Burgess, Ernest W. "The Romantic Impulse and Family Disorganization." Survey, LVII (December, 1926),
- Burgess, Ernest W., and Paul Wallin. Engagement and Marriage. Chicago: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1953.
- Christensen, Harold T. "Courtship Conduct as Viewed by Youth." Journal of Home Economics, XXXX (April, 1948), 187-188.
- Christensen, Harold T. "Dating Behavior as Evaluated by High School Students." American Journal of Sociology, LVII (May, 1952), 580-586.
- Christensen, Harold T. Marriage Analysis. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1950.
- Christensen, Harold T. "Student Views on Mate Selection." Marriage and Family Living, IX (Fall, 1947), 85-88.
- Cupps, Rayanne D., and Norman S. Hayner. "Dating at the University of Washington." Marriage and Family Living, IX (May, 1947), 30-31.

- Dean, Dwight G. "Romanticism and Emotional Maturity: A Further Exploration." Social Forces, XXXXII (May, 1964), 298-303.
- Dean, Dwight G. "Romanticism and Emotional Maturity: A Preliminary Study." Marriage and Family Living, XXIII (February, 1961), 44-45.
- Edwards, Allen L. Statistical Methods. 2nd Ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967.
- Folsom, Joseph K. "Steps in Love and Courtship." Family, Marriage and Parenthood. Eds. Howard Becker and Reuben Hill. Boston: D.C. Heath Company, 1955.
- Foote, Nelson H. "Love." Psychiatry, XVI (August, 1953), 245-251.
- Goode, William J., and Paul K. Hatt. Methods in Social Research. New York: Mc-Graw Hill Book Company, 1952.
- Goode, William J. "The Theoretical Importance of Love." American Sociological Review, XXIV (February, 1959), 38-47.
- Gross, Llewellyn, "A Belief Pattern Scale for Measuring Attitudes Toward Romanticism." American Sociological Review, IX (August, 1944), 463-472.
- Guilford, J. P. Psychometric Methods. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1954.
- Hays, William L. Statistics for Psychologists. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Incorporated, 1963.
- Herman, Robert D. "The Going Steady Complex: A Re-Examination." Marriage and Family Living, XVII (February, 1955), 36-40.
- Hewitt, Lester E. "Student Perceptions of Traits Desired in Themselves as Dating and Marriage Partners." Marriage and Family Living, XX (November, 1958), 344-349.
- Hill, Reuben. "Campus Norms in Mate Selection." Journal of Home Economics, XXXVII (November, 1945), 554-558.
- Himes, Joseph S., Jr. "Mate Selection Among Negro College Students." Sociology and Social Research, XXXIII (January-February, 1949), 204-211.
- Himes, Joseph S., Jr. "Value Consensus in Mate Selection Among Negroes." Marriage and Family Living, XIV (November, 1952), 317-321.
- Hobart, Charles W. "Attitude Changes During Courtship and Marriage." Marriage and Family Living, XXII (November, 1960), 352-359.

- Hobart, Charles W. "Disagreement and Nonempathy During Courtship." Marriage and Family Living, XVIII (November, 1956), 317-322.
- Hobart, Charles W. "Disillusionment in Marriage, and Romanticism." Marriage and Family Living, XX (May, 1958), 156-162.
- Hobart, Charles W. "Some Effects of Romanticism During Courtship on Marriage Role Opinions." Sociology and Social Research, XXXIII (May-June, 1958), 336-343.
- Hobart, Charles W. "The Incidence of Romanticism During Courtship." Social Forces, XXXVI (May, 1958), 362-367.
- Jensen, Carol A., and Kenneth J. Kiser. "Idealization in Dating: An Empirical Study." Paper delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Southwestern Social Science Association, March, 1967.
- Kirkpatrick, Clifford, and T. Caplow. "Emotional Trends in the Courtship Experience of College Students as Expressed by Graphs With Some Observations on Methodological Implications." American Sociological Review, X (October, 1945), 619-626.
- Kirkpatrick, Clifford, and Charles Hobart. "Disagreement Estimate and Nonempathic Imputations for Intimacy Groups Varying From Favorite Date to Married." American Sociological Review, XIX (February, 1954), 10-20.
- Kolb, William L. "Family Sociology, Marriage Education and the Romantic Complex." Social Forces, XXIX (October, 1959), 65-72.
- Kuhn, Manford H., and Thomas S. McPartland. "An Empirical Investigation of Self-Attitudes." American Sociological Review, XIX (February, 1954), 68-76.
- Kuhn, Manford H. "How Mates Are Sorted." Family, Marriage and Parenthood. Eds. Howard Becker and Reuben Hill. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1955.
- Leslie, Gerald R. The Family in Social Context. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- Lovejoy, Arthur O. "On the Discrimination of Romanticisms." Essays in the History of Ideas. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1948.
- Lowrie, Samuel H. "Dating Theories and Student Responses." American Sociological Review, XVI (June, 1951), 334-340.
- McGinnis, Robert. "Campus Values in Mate Selection: A Repeat Study." Social Forces, XXXVI (May, 1958), 368-373.
- Mangus, A. R. "Relationship Between the Young Woman's Conception of Her Intimate Male Associates and of Her Ideal Husband." Journal of Social Psychology, VII (November, 1936), 403-420.

- Mather, William G. "Courtship Ideals of High-School Youth." Sociology and Social Research, XIX (November, 1934), 167-171.
- Merrill, Frances E. Courtship and Marriage. 2nd Ed. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1959.
- Reik, Theodor. A Psychologist Looks at Love. New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1944.
- Reiss, Ira. L. "Toward a Sociology of the Heterosexual Love Relationship." Marriage and Family Living, XXII (May, 1960), 139-145.
- Riley, Matilda W. Sociological Research I: A Case Approach. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1963.
- Rogers, Everett M., and Eugene A. Havens. "Prestige Rating and Mate Selection on a College Campus." Marriage and Family Living, XXII (February, 1960), 55-59.
- Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.
- Smith, Eleanor, and J.H.G. Monahan. "Courtship Values in a Youth Sample." American Sociological Review, XVIII (December, 1953), 635-640.
- Smith, William M., Jr. "Rating and Dating: A Restudy." Marriage and Family Living, XIV (November, 1952), 312-317.
- Stephen, Frederick F., and Philip J. McCarthy. Sampling Opinions. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Incorporated, 1963.
- Strauss, Anselm. "The Ideal and the Chosen Mate." American Journal of Sociology, LII (November, 1946), 204-208.
- Sussman, Marvin B., and H.C. Yeager, Jr. "Mate Selection Among Negro and White College Students." Sociology and Social Research, XXXV (September-October, 1950), 46-49.
- Udry, J. Richard. "The Influence of the Ideal Mate Image on Mate Selection and Perception." Marriage and Family Living, XXVII (November, 1965), 477-482.
- Udry, J. Richard. The Social Context of Marriage. New York: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1966.
- Vail, James P., and Virginia M. Staudt. "Attitudes of College Students Toward Marriage and Related Problems: I. Dating and Mate Selection." Journal of Psychology, XXX (1950), 174-176.
- Waller, Willard. The Family: A Dynamic Interpretation. New York: The Cordon Company, 1938.

- Waller, Willard. The Family: A Dynamic Interpretation: Rev. Reuben Hill. New York: Dryden Press, 1951.
- Waller, Willard. "The Rating and Dating Complex." American Sociological Review, II (October, 1937), 727-734.
- Wallin, Paul. "Two Conceptions of the Relationship Between Love and Idealization." Research Studies State College of Washington, XX (1952), 21-35.
- Wallis, Allen and Harry V. Roberts. Statistics: A New Approach. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1956.
- Walster, Elaine, Vera Aronson, Darcy Abrahams, and Leon Rottman. "Importance of Physical Attractiveness in Dating Behavior." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, IV (November, 1966), 508-516.
- Williamson, Robert C. "Dating, Courtship and the 'Ideal Mate:' Some Relevant Subcultural Variables." Family Life Coordinator, XIV (October, 1965), 137-143.
- Williamson, Robert C. Marriage and Family Relations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Incorporated, 1966.
- Winch, Robert F. Mate Selection. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.
- Winch, Robert F. "Primary Factors in A Study of Courtship." American Sociological Review, XII (December, 1947), 658-666.
- Winch, Robert F. The Modern Family. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Incorporated, 1963.

APPENDIXES

Appendix A

SCHEDULE COMPLETED BY PRIMARY RESPONDENTS

1. Age: 17____ 18____ 19____ 20____ 21____ 22____ 23____

2. Sex: Male____ Female____

3. Class standing in college:

Freshman

Sophomore

Junior

Senior

Other (Specify) _____

4. Approximately how large is the community your parents or guardian currently live in:

Under 2,500

2,500-24,999

25,000-49,999

50,000-100,000

Over 100,000

5. What is the title of the occupation of your father or the head of your family:

What does your father or the head of your family do on the job:

6. Are you a pledge or member of a sorority or fraternity:

Yes

No

Was a pledge or member but no longer am

7. How long have you known the person you have been asked to judge:

0 to 3 months

3+ to 6 months

6+ to 9 months

9+ months to 1 year

1+ year to 2 years

Over 2 years

8. How long have you been dating the person you have been asked to judge:

0 to 3 months

3+ to 6 months

6+ to 9 months

9+ months to 1 year

1+ year to 2 years

Over 2 years

9. How emotionally involved are you with the person you have been asked to judge:
- No emotional involvement or slight emotional involvement
 - Moderate emotional involvement
 - Serious emotional involvement
10. Check one of the following in terms of the nature of your relationship with the person you have been asked to judge:
- Have not really considered marriage to this person
 - Have considered marriage to this person, but no definite plans or decision has been made
 - Have definite plans to marry this person
11. In relation to this person, would you consider yourself to be:
- Casually dating
 - Dropped or what you would consider the equivalent of being dropped
 - Pinned or what you would consider the equivalent of being pinned
 - Engaged

PART I. Evaluations of Dating Partner

Directions: Listed below are some qualities or characteristics which are often used by people to describe other individuals whom they know or with whom they are involved. We would like you to rate the individual you have been asked to judge on the extent to which you think he or she exhibits each of these characteristics.

You may indicate the extent to which you think the individual you are judging possesses each characteristic by circling one of the responses under each item. Choose that response which most nearly represents your judgment concerning this individual, and please try to be as objective as possible in making your judgments.

1. Is considerate of other individuals?

Always Very Often Often Occasionally Rarely

2. Is dependable?

Always Very Often Often Occasionally Rarely

3. Is self-confident?

Always Very Often Often Occasionally Rarely

4. Is ambitious?

Always Very Often Often Occasionally Rarely

5. Exhibits a good sense of humor?
 Always Very Often Often Occasionally Rarely
6. Is considered by other people to be good-looking?
 Always Very Often Often Occasionally Rarely
7. Is honest?
 Always Very Often Often Occasionally Rarely
8. Is respectful of others?
 Always Very Often Often Occasionally Rarely
9. Dresses appropriately?
 Always Very Often Often Occasionally Rarely
10. Is sensitive to other people's feelings?
 Always Very Often Often Occasionally Rarely
11. Acts emotionally mature?
 Always Very Often Often Occasionally Rarely
12. Is intellectually stimulating?
 Always Very Often Often Occasionally Rarely
13. Is considered by other people to be sexually attractive?
 Always Very Often Often Occasionally Rarely
14. Displays a good disposition?
 Always Very Often Often Occasionally Rarely
15. Is understanding?
 Always Very Often Often Occasionally Rarely
16. Is neat in appearance?
 Always Very Often Often Occasionally Rarely
17. Is friendly?
 Always Very Often Often Occasionally Rarely

PART II. Importance of Characteristics in Dates

Directions: We would now like to know how important you feel each of the following characteristics is in terms of someone with whom you might become emotionally involved. In other words, how important do you feel it is that a person, with whom you might become involved, possess each of these characteristics? Indicate how important you feel each characteristic is by circling one of the responses under each item. Try to respond to the items without reference to any specific person. It is also crucial that you respond to the items in terms of your own feelings about how important they are rather than how important others may think they are, etc.

1. Is neat in appearance?

Very Important	Important	Mildly Important	Unimportant	Very Unimportant
-------------------	-----------	---------------------	-------------	---------------------

2. Is self-confident?

Very Important	Important	Mildly Important	Unimportant	Very Unimportant
-------------------	-----------	---------------------	-------------	---------------------

3. Dances well?

Very Important	Important	Mildly Important	Unimportant	Very Unimportant
-------------------	-----------	---------------------	-------------	---------------------

4. Has a good reputation?

Very Important	Important	Mildly Important	Unimportant	Very Unimportant
-------------------	-----------	---------------------	-------------	---------------------

5. Is intellectually stimulating?

Very Important	Important	Mildly Important	Unimportant	Very Unimportant
-------------------	-----------	---------------------	-------------	---------------------

6. Belongs to a Greek organization?

Very Important	Important	Mildly Important	Unimportant	Very Unimportant
-------------------	-----------	---------------------	-------------	---------------------

7. Is sensitive to other's feelings?

Very Important	Important	Mildly Important	Unimportant	Very Unimportant
-------------------	-----------	---------------------	-------------	---------------------

8. Is understanding?

Very Important	Important	Mildly Important	Unimportant	Very Unimportant
-------------------	-----------	---------------------	-------------	---------------------

9. Dresses Appropriately?
- | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|
| Very
Important | Important | Mildly
Important | Unimportant | Very
Unimportant |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|
10. Has plenty of money?
- | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|
| Very
Important | Important | Mildly
Important | Unimportant | Very
Unimportant |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|
11. Exhibits a good sense of humor?
- | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|
| Very
Important | Important | Mildly
Important | Unimportant | Very
Unimportant |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|
12. Displays a good disposition?
- | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|
| Very
Important | Important | Mildly
Important | Unimportant | Very
Unimportant |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|
13. Is willing to drink socially?
- | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|
| Very
Important | Important | Mildly
Important | Unimportant | Very
Unimportant |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|
14. Is considerate of other individuals?
- | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|
| Very
Important | Important | Mildly
Important | Unimportant | Very
Unimportant |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|
15. Is dependable?
- | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|
| Very
Important | Important | Mildly
Important | Unimportant | Very
Unimportant |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|
16. Is popular?
- | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|
| Very
Important | Important | Mildly
Important | Unimportant | Very
Unimportant |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|
17. Is good-looking?
- | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|
| Very
Important | Important | Mildly
Important | Unimportant | Very
Unimportant |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|
18. Is ambitious?
- | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|
| Very
Important | Important | Mildly
Important | Unimportant | Very
Unimportant |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|
19. Is friendly?
- | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|
| Very
Important | Important | Mildly
Important | Unimportant | Very
Unimportant |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|

20. Acts emotionally mature?

Very Important	Important	Mildly Important	Unimportant	Very Unimportant
-------------------	-----------	---------------------	-------------	---------------------

21. Is honest?

Very Important	Important	Mildly Important	Unimportant	Very Unimportant
-------------------	-----------	---------------------	-------------	---------------------

22. Has plenty of clothes?

Very Important	Important	Mildly Important	Unimportant	Very Unimportant
-------------------	-----------	---------------------	-------------	---------------------

23. Is sexually attractive?

Very Important	Important	Mildly Important	Unimportant	Very Unimportant
-------------------	-----------	---------------------	-------------	---------------------

24. Is respectful of others?

Very Important	Important	Mildly Important	Unimportant	Very Unimportant
-------------------	-----------	---------------------	-------------	---------------------

PART III. Opinions About Love Relationships

Directions: Listed below are twelve statements which relate to love, love relationships, and marriage. We would like to know how you feel about each statement--whether you agree or disagree with the content of each statement. It is very important that you evaluate the statements in terms of how you really feel about them. Indicate your opinion about each item by circling "Agree" if you agree with the statement and "Disagree" if you do not agree with the statement.

1. Lovers ought to expect a certain amount of disillusionment with each other and their relationship after marriage.

Agree	Disagree
-------	----------

2. To be truly in love is to be in love forever.

Agree	Disagree
-------	----------

3. As long as they at least love each other, two people should have no trouble getting along together in marriage.

Agree	Disagree
-------	----------

4. A girl should expect her boyfriend to be chivalrous on all occasions.

Agree	Disagree
-------	----------

5. A person should marry whomever he loves regardless of the social position of the one he loves.
- Agree Disagree
6. One should not marry against the serious advice of one's parents.
- Agree Disagree
7. Lovers should freely confess everything of personal significance to each other.
- Agree Disagree
8. Economic security should be carefully considered before selecting a marriage partner.
- Agree Disagree
9. Most of us could sincerely love any one of several people equally well.
- Agree Disagree
10. A lover who is not jealous is hardly to be desired.
- Agree Disagree
11. The sweetly feminine "clinging vine" girl cannot compare with the capable and sympathetic girl as a girlfriend.
- Agree Disagree
12. True love should be suppressed in cases where its existence conflicts with the prevailing standards of morality.
- Agree Disagree

SCHEDULE COMPLETED BY SECONDARY RESPONDENTS

1. Age: 17____ 18____ 19____ 20____ 21____ 22____ 23____
2. Sex: Male____ Female____
3. Class standing in college:
 - Freshman
 - Sophomore
 - Junior
 - Senior
 - Other (Specify)_____
4. Approximately how large is the community your parents or guardian currently live in:
 - Under 2,500
 - 2,500-24,999
 - 25,000-49,999
 - 50,000-100,000
 - Over 100,000
5. What is the title of the occupation of your father or the head of your family:

What does your father or the head of your family do on the job:

6. Are you a pledge or member of a sorority or fraternity:
 - Yes
 - No
 - Was a pledge or member but no longer am
7. How long have you known the person you have been asked to judge:
 - 0 to 3 months
 - 3+ to 6 months
 - 6+ to 9 months
 - 9+ months to 1 year
 - 1+ year to 2 years
 - Over 2 years

PART 1. Evaluations of Friend's Dating Partner

Directions: Listed below are some qualities or characteristics which are often used by people to describe other individuals whom they know or with whom they are involved. We would like you to rate the individual you have been asked to judge on the extent to which you think he or she exhibits each of these characteristics. Remember that the person you have been asked to judge is your friend's dating partner.

You may indicate the extent to which you think your friend's dating partner possesses each characteristic by circling one of the responses under each item. Choose that response which most nearly represents your judgment concerning this individual, and please try to be as objective as possible in making your judgments.

1. Is considerate of other individuals?

Always	Very Often	Often	Occasionally	Rarely
--------	------------	-------	--------------	--------

2. Is dependable?

Always	Very Often	Often	Occasionally	Rarely
--------	------------	-------	--------------	--------

3. Is self-confident?

Always	Very Often	Often	Occasionally	Rarely
--------	------------	-------	--------------	--------

4. Is ambitious?

Always	Very Often	Often	Occasionally	Rarely
--------	------------	-------	--------------	--------

5. Exhibits a good sense of humor?

Always	Very Often	Often	Occasionally	Rarely
--------	------------	-------	--------------	--------

6. Is considered by other people to be good-looking?

Always	Very Often	Often	Occasionally	Rarely
--------	------------	-------	--------------	--------

7. Is honest?

Always	Very Often	Often	Occasionally	Rarely
--------	------------	-------	--------------	--------

8. Is respectful of others?

Always	Very Often	Often	Occasionally	Rarely
--------	------------	-------	--------------	--------

9. Dresses appropriately?

Always	Very Often	Often	Occasionally	Rarely
--------	------------	-------	--------------	--------

10. Is sensitive to other people's feelings?

Always	Very Often	Often	Occasionally	Rarely
--------	------------	-------	--------------	--------

11. Acts emotionally mature?

Always	Very Often	Often	Occasionally	Rarely
--------	------------	-------	--------------	--------

12. Is intellectually stimulating?

Always	Very Often	Often	Occasionally	Rarely
--------	------------	-------	--------------	--------

13. Is considered by other people to be sexually attractive?
Always Very Often Often Occasionally Rarely
14. Displays a good disposition?
Always Very Often Often Occasionally Rarely
15. Is understanding?
Always Very Often Often Occasionally Rarely
16. Is neat in appearance?
Always Very Often Often Occasionally Rarely
17. Is friendly?
Always Very Often Often Occasionally Rarely

Appendix B

TOTAL IDEALIZATION SCORES, FRIENDS' DIFFERENCE SCORES, AND
ROMANTICISM SCORES OF MALE PRIMARY RESPONDENTS IN THE
CASUAL INVOLVEMENT STAGE

Respondent Number	Total Idealization Score	Friends' Difference Score	Romanticism Score
176	37	19	6
178	19	19	6
100	27	5	5
173	45	13	8
146	-6	16	8
078	-1	13	6
147	-14	16	6
151	17	5	6
075	-1	19	9
098	-7	23	7
102	9	17	8
095	4	6	6
152	9	19	8
131	18	7	4
166	-2	16	7
093	18	12	6
160	21	9	3
070	20	10	6
193	21	11	7
032	22	12	3
031	-1	11	3
135	-8	8	2
145	16	12	4
144	18	16	2
067	24	22	8
030	14	12	4
065	-4	26	1
028	1	17	1
029	29	17	8
066	31	11	2
033	-10	6	4
214	31	11	9
156	19	23	7
074	22	16	7
092	14	10	7

TOTAL IDEALIZATION SCORES, FRIENDS' DIFFERENCE SCORES, AND
ROMANTICISM SCORES OF MALE PRIMARY RESPONDENTS IN THE
MODERATE INVOLVEMENT STAGE

Respondent Number	Total Idealiza- tion Score	Friends' Dif- ference Score	Romanticism Score
208	16	12	4
155	13	13	6
054	17	19	3
187	-1	9	1
025	-15	9	4
068	22	10	6
186	15	13	5
192	4	6	3
191	19	9	6
073	-4	4	2
064	33	13	1
136	17	15	6
035	7	15	7
027	-5	11	2
149	-23	19	8
204	-18	16	2
014	12	12	5
050	-4	9	2
072	6	10	3
171	-7	15	5
097	-7	11	8
236	-20	12	5
172	12	8	7
175	-13	13	5
177	22	26	1
076	20	16	3
079	4	12	7
234	-12	12	4
157	12	14	4
168	31	11	5
164	-17	15	5
158	6	10	7
169	20	10	6
148	-8	14	4
165	25	13	6
170	-5	13	6
134	-5	17	4
132	14	20	5

TOTAL IDEALIZATION SCORES, FRIENDS' DIFFERENCE SCORES, AND
ROMANTICISM SCORES OF MALE PRIMARY RESPONDENTS IN THE
SERIOUS INVOLVEMENT STAGE

Respondent Number	Total Idealiza- tion Score	Friends' Dif- ference Score	Romanticism Score
071	9	13	7
154	15	15	9
195	5	9	2
232	9	13	4
040	-1	17	2
024	5	11	5
130	2	12	4
188	-9	7	3
023	22	16	2
069	10	18	7
194	4	14	4
150	-7	7	6
202	-7	13	3
026	15	11	6
203	15	13	5
051	-8	9	4
190	25	15	8
034	-3	11	6
238	1	19	6
133	-19	7	6
174	-13	15	5
233	3	9	7
101	9	9	6
104	-13	11	4
103	6	20	3
189	-12	12	3
077	5	9	4
159	-14	14	5
096	14	12	6
153	10	12	3
179	-20	14	4
099	-8	18	4
094	-4	4	3
153	1	11	7
235	4	18	7
167	15	15	5
161	1	17	4

TOTAL IDEALIZATION SCORES, FRIENDS' DIFFERENCE SCORES, AND
ROMANTICISM SCORES OF FEMALE PRIMARY RESPONDENTS IN THE
CASUAL INVOLVEMENT STAGE

Respondent Number	Total Idealiza- tion Score	Friends' Dif- ference Score	Romanticism Score
213	10	12	2
142	22	10	4
242	18	22	4
143	15	17	4
118	18	18	1
057	12	8	3
080	6	17	3
092	9	13	5
207	8	6	1
018	2	8	7
218	10	15	3
197	9	31	7
241	-4	8	2
049	-4	10	2
062	-24	10	3
211	19	15	3
088	17	15	7
183	25	13	3
109	-8	8	2
105	32	22	3
039	31	9	2
212	32	10	3
009	47	11	1
128	41	9	8
058	5	11	4
022	29	17	3
061	-15	13	7
044	-1	13	5
107	-3	11	2
038	20	16	2
047	10	10	7
081	7	25	5
090	24	12	6
205	27	15	7
013	33	17	4
221	8	18	4
017	12	9	4

TOTAL IDEALIZATION SCORES, FRIENDS' DIFFERENCE SCORES, AND
ROMANTICISM SCORES OF FEMALE PRIMARY RESPONDENTS IN THE
MODERATE INVOLVEMENT STAGE

Respondent Number	Total Idealiza- tion Score	Friends' Dif- ference Score	Romanticism Score
045	-1	9	3
053	-2	12	2
036	5	11	7
035	16	12	3
003	5	29	2
063	35	15	6
222	17	17	6
006	19	11	3
129	18	24	4
056	-23	13	3
196	6	6	3
046	-19	15	6
037	-4	4	5
087	47	7	3
182	-12	10	2
206	-9	7	7
201	39	15	7
121	-1	17	4
113	-2	18	9
215	14	12	7
200	-3	13	3
052	27	17	3
053	26	16	2
111	4	8	4
185	17	9	4
060	20	8	5
227	20	16	4
127	-12	16	2
119	14	12	2
184	-39	9	3
228	32	0	6
229	25	27	0
106	29	9	2
086	-1	3	5
181	-5	19	4
198	31	31	8
084	1	17	3
180	21	19	2
105	15	35	5
083	-5	13	6
126	9	13	7

TOTAL IDEALIZATION SCORES, FRIENDS' DIFFERENCE SCORES, AND
ROMANTICISM SCORES OF FEMALE PRIMARY RESPONDENTS IN THE
SERIOUS INVOLVEMENT STAGE

Respondent Number	Total Idealiza- tion Score	Friends' Dif- ference Score	Romanticism Score
122	-3	15	7
048	-4	22	2
219	41	9	5
116	-35	17	2
041	-13	7	7
043	-12	8	0
123	-9	9	5
059	15	12	4
230	11	15	4
245	7	7	5
082	64	14	9
008	-3	15	4
042	9	13	5
114	20	18	5
220	7	15	8
111	25	19	6
217	14	12	5
231	1	13	1
085	-9	13	3
117	2	20	5
020	10	12	0
108	-26	16	4
007	19	17	4
210	15	9	1
004	18	8	4
115	5	11	3
209	-1	9	3
110	4	4	4
213	24	14	5
216	5	13	6
089	15	15	3
163	-20	10	4
120	15	15	5
122	23	9	4
124	-31	19	2
008	30	20	5
001	0	12	7
091	-8	8	4
162	17	7	5
112	-9	5	3
125	9	7	5
199	20	14	6
019	-4	12	1

VITA

Carol Ann Jensen

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: VALUE PREFERENCES AND IDEALIZATION PATTERNS IN DATING
RELATIONSHIPS OF COLLEGE STUDENTS: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

Major Field: Sociology

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Willmar, Minnesota, April 4, 1941, the daughter of Robert J. and Lillian F. Jensen.

Education: Received the Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma, with a major in English in May, 1963; received the Master of Arts degree from the University of Oklahoma, with a major in Sociology in August, 1964; and completed requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, with a major in Sociology in May, 1968.

Professional Experience: Employed as a graduate teaching assistant at the University of Oklahoma from 1963 to 1964; as a graduate research and teaching assistant at Oklahoma State University from 1964-1967; and as an instructor at Oklahoma State University in 1967. Held a National Science Foundation traineeship during the summer of 1967.

Professional Organizations: Alpha Kappa Delta and American Sociological Association.