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I. INTRODUCTION

In the past, love has largely been rejected as a topic of serious study and many people feel it should remain so. However, psychologists have become increasingly interested in the area and have begun to empirically examine and move towards a more scientific approach to studying romantic love.

Not unexpectedly, many studies have examined sex differences in the experience of romantic love. General sex role stereotypes suggest that women are more romantic, sentimental and emotional, while men are more rational, detached and unemotional. However, contrary to stereotypes, the research has consistently found that men are more romantic than women (Rubin, 1969; Knox & Sporakowski, 1968; Kephart, 1967; Rubin, Peplau & Hill, 1981).

The data indicates that men have been shown to be more romantic through a variety of methods and measures. For example, Knox and Sporakowski (1968) used the Knox-Sporakowski Attitudes Towards Love Scale, which measures an individual's perceived attitudes towards love on a continuum ranging from romantic love to conjugal love. Conjugal love is defined as a more calm, solid and comforting type of love than romantic love. The paper and pencil 85 item scale contains items representing materials written about love.
from a variety of fields. Included are statements such as, "When you are really in love, you just aren't interested in anyone else"; "You can't make yourself love someone, it just comes or it doesn't"; "Daydreaming usually comes along with being in love." Point values were assigned to a Likert scale, in order to derive total scores from the instrument.

Knox and Sporakowski's original findings suggested that females are less romantic in attitudes towards love than males. These findings are consistent with research that was done nearly a decade before by Hobart (1958). Hobart conducted research to study the incidence of romanticism during courtship. Using a condensed version of the Gross Romanticism Scale (Gross, 1944) Hobart surveyed respondents' attitudes regarding courtship and romanticism. Administered to the sample were statements such as, "The sweetly clinging vine girl cannot compare with the capable and sympathetic girl as sweetheart" and "A girl should expect her sweetheart to be chivalrous on all occasions." Scoring involved counting the number of romantic responses, whether in agreement or disagreement with the questionnaire statement. From this, a romanticism score was obtained. Although Hobart's various hypotheses were not sex specific, he found that males scored higher than females in romanticism. Thus, it would appear that scales measuring attitudes towards love as an abstraction reveal men to be the more romantic of the two sexes.
Additional paper and pencil scales have been devised to measure the amount of love felt in an actual relationship. Rubin's Love Scale (1969) was designed to measure aspects of one person's attitudes, thoughts and feelings towards a particular other person. Utilizing this scale, Rubin conducted a study of dating couples and their self-reported feelings towards one another. Rubin found that the love scale scores of men and women were approximately equal. However, for those couples who had been dating from zero to three months, the male's romanticism scores were significantly higher than those of females.

While the results of the various studies mentioned are consistent with one another, they have used a rather simple, unidimensional measurement of love. Others have assumed that love is not a unitary variable, but rather, is experienced differently by different people, resulting in various "styles of loving." For example, Lasswell and Lasswell (1976) tested the hypothesis that people do have different concepts of love by presenting a 95 item true-false questionnaire to respondents. The instrument was based on characteristics, thoughts, feelings and behaviors extracted from Lee's (1973) work. After conducting an item analysis in which 57 of the items were found to be discriminators, the scale was subsequently reduced to 50 conceptually distinct items. With this data, Lasswell and Lasswell constructed personal profiles to determine how subjects conceptualized
love according to six love types. The six love types included storgic, agapic, manic, pragmatic, ludic and erotic love styles.

Storgic lovers are basically good friends, characterized by interdependency and mutual need fulfillment. This love style is uneventful, lacks intensity or passion and might best be compared with sibling love. Storgic lovers commence an interpersonal relationship very slowly and such encounters are usually the result of sharing the same social activities. This love type may be difficult to distinguish from the reciprocal caring that is experienced in ordinary friendship.

An agapic lover is completely altruistic, deeply compassionate, regardless of the rewards or difficulties involved for the lover. Agapic lovers are always supportive and given the opportunity, would sacrifice or give up their relationship if they thought their lover might have a greater chance for happiness elsewhere.

Manic love types are obsessively devoted, possessive and intensely dependent on their partners. They are jealous, almost to the point of being irrational and cannot tolerate loss of contact with their lover. They may be unable to sleep, eat or think logically around their partner. Manic persons experience periods of intense excitement and deep depression. Typically, they have low self-esteem and a poor self-concept.
Pragmatic lovers are likely to look realistically at themselves, decide on their "marketability" and proceed to acquire the best possible deal for a suitable partner. Once the partner is found, more intense feelings may develop. These lovers are systematic in approach and tend to be keenly aware of alternatives that might be available.

Ludic lovers refuse to become dependent on their loved one and will not tolerate anyone becoming dependent on them. These persons avoid commitment and gravitate towards game playing to get the greatest gain for the least cost. They typically have many lovers "on a string" and are careful not to date the same person for any length of time in order to dispel the idea of a stable relationship. Ludic persons are self-centered and have high self-esteem. They convince themselves of their own assets; therefore, they do not "need" other people.

Finally, the erotic love type is equated with romanticism. These people depend on initial attraction and believe that love at first sight is practically mandatory. Erotic lovers must always be on their best behavior because they cannot afford losing their partner. They remember the exact date they met their partner, the first time they kissed and details such as hour, place and minute of first sexual contact with their partner. Erotic lovers are thoroughly
committed and monogamous. When they fall in love, it is hard, fast and total.

Lasswell and Lasswell were able to construct personal profiles for each of their respondents by using a Guttman-Lingoes Smallest Space Analysis statistical procedure. On the basis on that, they found that people responded to the six love types with varying degrees of each quality. They concluded that persons have different concepts of love; thus, they were able to support their hypothesis.

Another study that utilized the love style measure was conducted by Hatkoff and Lasswell in 1977. They hypothesized that there were normative sex differences and similarities in conceptualizing love based on the six SAMPLE (acronym for storge, agape, mania, pragma, ludus and eros) profiles. Under the assumption that there were socio-cultural norms regarding love, Hatkoff and Lasswell administered the Lasswell and Lasswell 50 item questionnaire, plus additional background questions to a variety of subjects. Questionnaires were scored as profiles with each person receiving a separate score for each of the six love styles. They proceeded to compare percentages of males and females who scored high, medium or low on each of the six dimensions.

They found that females scored higher than males in the storgic, pragmatic and manic love styles. The manic category includes characteristics of intense dependency,
congruent with social norms and media portrayal of women. Males were found to score higher than females in the ludic and erotic love styles. There were no significant differences in the agapic love style. Once again, the results confirm the previous research suggesting males to be more romantic than women.

These studies have shown that males are more likely to endorse love styles which are romantic, while females endorse more "practical" ones. Thus, these studies, (Lasswell & Lasswell, 1976; Hatkoff & Lasswell, 1977) though employing a more complicated method, are consistent with previous research reviewed above.

An interesting sidelight that supports male romanticism comes from the work of Kephart (1967). He conducted a statistical analysis of a questionnaire developed to assess correlates of romantic love, such as age, socioeconomic status, personality types and I.Q. Included in his study was a question, "If a boy (girl) had all the other qualities you desire, would you marry this person if you were not in love with him (her)?" Two-thirds, 65%, of his male respondents answered no, as opposed to only one-quarter, 24%, of the female respondents. This finding indicates that in addition to males being more romantic in general, they are more likely to insist that they be in love with the person that they marry.
Research also suggests that males seem to be more romantic by several behavioral measures, as well. In the Boston Couples Study (Rubin, Peplau & Hill, 1981), 231 dating couples were asked to complete questionnaires designed to assess their experiences, feelings and attitudes regarding their current love relationships. Almost all of the couples were dating one-another exclusively, with few having definite marital plans. The questionnaire was administered and followed-up by subsequent inquiries dealing with changes in the relationships over time. Response rates on the follow-up questionnaires were high with a return rate of 83% by females and 75% of males.

Rubin, Peplau and Hill proposed a two-part hypothesis regarding sex differences in entering into and giving up romantic relationships. They proposed that 1) men are inclined to fall in love more readily than women and 2) women are inclined to fall out of love more readily than men.

In the first hypothesis, it was found that consistent with previous research, men scored significantly higher on paper and pencil measures of romanticism $t_{(230)} = 4.10$, $p < .001$. The assessment instrument included items pertaining to the belief that love is possible at first sight and that love overcomes race, religion and social class. The findings indicate that men may be more ready than women to fall in love quickly, while women may tend to be more
selective about entering into a romantic relationship. Contrary to the popular stereotype of romantic women, the researchers also found that men rated the "desire to fall in love" as a significantly more important reason for entering into the relationship than did women.

The second hypothesis, that women tend to fall out of love more readily and more easily than men, focused on the termination of the romantic relationship. Rubin, Peplau and Hill found that by several different measures, females seem to be less romantic where termination of the romantic relationship was concerned; they were more likely to perceive a higher number of problems in the relationship, more likely to anticipate termination of the relationship and reacted less emotionally to the break up. The findings seem to indicate that females were more detached and rational throughout the relationship. Furthermore, males were found to suffer more emotionally after termination of the relationship, which suggests that females exhibit a more controlled, pragmatic and rational orientation towards romanticism. Thus, to sum up, males have been shown to be more romantic than females through a variety of methods and measures.

Few explanations have been offered to explain the sex differences found in this research. However, Rubin, Peplau and Hill offered three theoretical interpretations. They
include psychoanalytic, socioeconomic and socialization experiences.

The psychoanalytic theory proposes that men have a greater capacity for complete heterosexual commitment because of their strength in their initial love for their mothers. A woman's sexual interest is first shifted from father, to substitute objects of love. Under this assumption, the differences between men and women are accounted for in their capacity for heterosexual commitment.

Another explanation offered is that females are socialized to have better emotional control. Women are likely to be more sensitive and empathic to nonverbal communication (Hoffman, 1977; Hall, 1978) and are better able to distinguish between liking and loving (Rubin, 1973). It is assumed that this characteristic leads them to evaluate their relationships more carefully than men, as well as making their standards for falling in love higher than that of men (Rubin, Peplau & Hill, 1981). Men, on the other hand, are not as closely in touch with their feelings and consequently, are less active in regard to them. Women are also presumed to have greater control of their emotions as a result of their socialization experiences, whereas men do not exercise a great deal of control in that area. In conclusion, women learned to control their emotions more effectively than men, Hochschild's study (cited in Rubin, Peplau & Hill, 1981).
The third explanation offered by Rubin, Peplau and Hill is the socioeconomic one. It proposes that females must be pragmatic during mate selection for social and economic reasons. This theory was first introduced in the 1930s by Willard Waller (1938), who stated that,

"A man when he marries, chooses a companion and perhaps a helpmate, but a woman chooses a companion and at the same time a standard of living. It is necessary for a woman to be mercenary."

Although there has been movement towards equality in sex roles, men are still believed to be the primary economic provider in a heterosexual relationship. A woman must carefully evaluate her partner in terms of strengths and weaknesses to make sure she is getting the most suitable partner in the marriage market. She cannot afford to fall in love too quickly and end up marrying the wrong person. On the other hand, men can afford themselves the opportunity to fall in love and experience romance.

Hatkoff and Lasswell (1977) offered their own interpretation regarding the sex differences. In conducting their research on love styles, as previously mentioned, they found no significant differences in the agapic love style. Upon further examination, they conducted an analysis of ethnic subsamples and found that in the Hawaiian sample, females were significantly more agapic, while in the mainland United States, males were slightly (nonsignificantly) more agapic.
Hatkoff and Lasswell explained these differences by examining traditions and norms regarding sex differences in Oriental cultures. Traditional Oriental women were taught to put their husbands before themselves, whereas the American culture has regarded women as dependent, in need of protection, therefore, to be placed on pedestals by men. They conclude that love styles can have masculine and feminine implications, although these characteristics may not be necessary.

It was the purpose of this research to test some implications specific to the socioeconomic theory that may account for the sex differences. It was anticipated that while men may still be the primary breadwinners in a heterosexual relationship, the movement of women towards a more career oriented lifestyle would account for a shift in romantic orientation. It was presumed that a woman who has the opportunity to choose a career and her own standard of living will have the opportunity to be more romantically inclined than women of previous generations. Given that females are more likely to be planning on careers, females should move into a role in society that was once traditionally male. It was expected that in doing so, females would also adopt views of love that are common to traditional males.

Specifically, it was predicted that traditional males and nontraditional females would be 1) likely to score higher on the Knox-Sporakowski Attitudes Towards Love Scale
and the Gross Romanticism Scale, 2) likely to score higher on the ludic and erotic dimensions of Lee's love styles and 3) likely to score lower on the pragmatic and manic love styles than traditional females and nontraditional males.

While the use of different measures of love in previous research encourages confidence in the generalizability of the results, it also raised the question of their comparability. Thus, another aim of the present study was to examine the correlation between the various measures to determine their equivalence.

Toward this end, it was proposed that all of the paper and pencil scales (Knox-Sporakowski Attitudes Towards Love Scale, Gross Romanticism Scale) would positively correlate with each other and with scores on the erotic dimension of Lee's love styles. It was further anticipated that endorsement of romanticism on these scales would be positively associated with an insistence on love in response to Kephart's question concerning the importance of love in mate selection.

It was unclear what relationship would be anticipated between the paper and pencil unidimensional scales and the remaining five love style scales; thus, no prediction was made. However, the relationships were explored to determine if the love styles were substantially different than the unidimensional scales.
II. METHOD

The sample consisted of 96 males and 104 females at the University of Central Florida. Subjects were voluntarily recruited from two sororities, two fraternities and various psychology and business classes. Volunteers completed questionnaires in groups that ranged in number from 11 to 55. Available classrooms were used for this purpose. All subjects were single and none had ever been married. The average age for both males and females was 21.

Subjects were initially told that they were participating in research that dealt with love relationships. They were told that they did not have to be currently in love to participate, that each questionnaire was totally anonymous and that they were free to discontinue at any time that they wished to do so. After securing voluntary participation and in addition to verbal instruction, subjects were asked to sign a consent form (appendix A), as well as read the information form (appendix B) before beginning the questionnaire.

The instruments consisted of the Knox-Sporakowski Attitudes Towards Love Scale (appendix C), the Gross Romanticism Scale (appendix D), Lasswell and Lasswell's SAMPLE questionnaire (appendix E), a 15 item lifestyle questionnaire (appendix F), and a question taken from the work of
Kephart. The 29 item Knox-Sporakowski Attitudes Towards Love Scale is designed to measure an individual's perceived attitudes towards love. Scoring of the scale was based on a five point continuum ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Point values were assigned to responses with a value of five being assigned to the most romantic response and a value of one being assigned to the least romantic response. From this, a total score was obtained which could range from the most romantic, 145, to the least romantic, 29.

Knox and Sporakowski employed a test-retest procedure to measure reliability for their scale. The scale yielded a percentage agreement of 78.4 over a one-week time interval when administered to a representative sample from their population. In addition, Hinkle and Sporakowski (1975) factor analyzed a condensed version of the original Knox-Sporakowski scale and concluded the scale was unidimensional with several intercorrelated subscales.

The Gross Romanticism Scale was also used as a measure of romanticism among contemporary college students. On this scale, subjects were asked to agree or disagree with 12 statements concerning romantic love. A romanticism score was obtained by tallying the number of romantic responses a person made according to the following key. The romantic response to items 1, 2, 4, 9, 10 and 12 was "disagree", the
romantic response to items 3,5,6,7,8 and 11 was "agree." These scores could range from 0 to 12.

The Gross Romanticism Scale was tested for reliability and unidimensionality by Hobart. He used the Guttman Scale Analysis procedure and after several attempts, found that there was no group of items scalable according to the test. The original study, conducted by Gross, utilized two separate panels of judges, as well as a formula presented by Yule (1922) to test for internal consistency and validity. Based on this, Hobart eliminated several items which were poor discriminators, resulting in the condensed version of the original scale used in the present study. Hobart, in turn, used a panel of judges to determine those items likely to be endorsed by "romantic" students.

The third dependent variable in the present study was the Lasswell and Lasswell SAMPLE questionnaire. This is designed to measure the extent to which persons endorse six different "love styles", or views of love. The questionnaire consists of 50 statements to which subjects are to respond with either "true" or "false." Scattered throughout the questionnaire are seven to nine statements comprising each of the six "love styles": storgic, agapic, manic, pragmatic, ludic and erotic. For example, one "erotic" item deals with believing in love at first sight. Following Lasswell and Lasswell's work, each of the six subscales was scored separately, with one point given for a "true"
response and no points for a "false" response. The scores on the erotic scale were taken as a measure of romanticism.

The six love styles, developed by Lee (1973) have been tested by numerous researchers for validity and reliability. The love style questionnaire used in the present study is a product of Lasswell and Lasswell's attempt to investigate this. They commenced their research with a 144 item scale and subsequently reduced it to 50 items after it was presented to a panel of judges and item-analyzed.

The lifestyle expectation variable was assessed by completion of a 15 item questionnaire. These items were chosen after consulting existing scales which tapped attitudes towards women and feminism (Spence and Holmreich, 1972). The selected items were thought to be the most appropriate measure of traditional and nontraditional attitudes towards lifestyle expectations. For example, the scale contained items such as the following: "Women with small children should not work outside the home." Response opportunities were assigned point values that ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 12 and 13 were scored on a continuum with a value of one being assigned to strongly disagree statements and a value of five assigned to strongly agree statements. Questions 5, 6, 8, 10, 11 and 14 were scored in the reverse order with strongly disagree given a value of five and strongly agree given a value of one. Question 15 dealt with the number of
children a person would like to have assuming that they marry. Point values from one to five were assigned to responses that ranged from no children to five or more, respectively.

The range of scores for this variable ranged from 14 to 70. The question dealing with the number of children was not included in the total score. For purposes of comparison, males and females were each divided into two groups, those holding traditional career views versus those having nontraditional career views. Individuals were sorted into two groups by splitting scores at the median for each sex. Males who scored 36 and below were considered nontraditional, those scoring 37 and above were considered traditional. Females who scored 32 and below were considered nontraditional, while those scoring 33 and above were considered traditional.

The final instrument was taken from Kephart's work (1968). This was used to assess the importance of whether an individual was likely to insist that they be in love with the person that they marry. A subject had the option of answering yes, maybe or no to the question. Point values of three, two and one were assigned, respectively.
III. RESULTS

Correlations Between Measures of Romanticism

Pearson product moment correlations were used to evaluate the hypothesis that positive correlations would exist between the paper and pencil romanticism scales (Knox-Sporakowski Attitudes Towards Love Scale, Gross Romanticism Scale), the eros dimension of Lee's SAMPLE profile and with the insistence on love in response to Kephart's question concerning the importance of love in mate selection. All of the various measurement devices were correlated with each other and results can be seen in Table 1. Even though half of the correlations are positive, they are of a very low magnitude. This is especially surprising since the variables are supposed to be equivalent measures of the romanticism construct.

Contrary to expectation, examination of Table 1 for all subjects combined revealed that only three of the six correlations were statistically significant. The Knox-Sporakowski measure was significantly correlated with both the Gross Romanticism Scale, $r = .30$, $p < .001$, and the eros love style, $r = .24$, $p < .001$. The correlations between the Kephart variable and the Gross Romanticism Scale were also
**TABLE 1**

**CORRELATIONS BETWEEN MEASURES OF ROMANTICISM FOR COMBINED SUBJECTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KSATLS</th>
<th>GRS</th>
<th>ELS</th>
<th>KEPHRT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KSATLS</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRS</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELS</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEPHRT</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** KSATLS = Knox-Sporakowski Attitudes Towards Love Scale; GRS = Gross Romanticism Scale; ELS = Eros Love Style; KEPHRT = Kephart.

*p < .001.  **p < .05.
statistically significant, $r = 0.14, p = 0.021$. The three remaining correlations were statistically nonsignificant.

In view of this unexpected pattern of results, the data for male and female subjects were separated and correlations were performed on both groups using the four romanticism measures. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 2.

For males, three of the six correlations were statistically significant and positive. Results indicate positive relationships between the Knox-Sporakowski and eros variable, $r = 0.18, p = 0.039$, and the Knox-Sporakowski variable and the Gross scale, $r = 0.21, p = 0.018$. Males were also found to be significantly positively correlated on the Kephart and Gross measures, $r = 0.26, p = 0.006$. The three remaining correlations were found to be nonsignificantly negatively correlated.

For females, only two of the six correlations were statistically significant. The Knox-Sporakowski scale was positively correlated with both the Gross, $r = 0.40, p < 0.001$, and the eros variable, $r = 0.27, p = 0.002$. Thus, there appears to be virtually the same pattern of correlations emerging for both males and females. In sum, clearly shown in the tables, there are no substantial differences between the sexes on the four romanticism measures.
### TABLE 2

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN MEASURES
OF ROMANTICISM FOR MALES AND FEMALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KSATLS</th>
<th>GRS</th>
<th>ELS</th>
<th>KEPHRT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KSATLS</td>
<td>---</td>
<td><strong>.21/.40</strong></td>
<td><strong>.18/.28</strong></td>
<td>-.05/.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRS</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.05/.11</td>
<td><strong>.26/.07</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELS</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>.26/.07</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEPHRT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** KSATLS = Knox-Sporakowski Attitudes Towards Love Scale; GRS = Gross Romanticism Scale; ELS = Eros Love Style; Kephrt = Kephart; Males/Females.

*p < .001. **p < .05.*
Correlations Between SAMPLE Subscales

Pearson product moment correlations were also conducted on each of the SAMPLE variables to determine to what extent they were interrelated. As seen in Table 3, the storgic (good friends) and agapic (altruistic) love styles were significantly positively correlated for the overall sample, $r = .39, p < .001$. To a lesser degree, the manic (intensely dependent) and agapic love styles were significantly positively correlated, $r = .20, p < .002$, as well as the manic and erotic (romantic) love styles, $r = .21, p < .001$.

Separate correlations were also performed for males and females on these data, as seen in Table 4. For males, the eros subscale was statistically and positively correlated with agape, $r = .19, p = .031$, mania, $r = .27, p = .003$, and pragma (logical), $r = .30, p < .001$. For females, the eros subscale correlated significantly with the ludus (game playing) love style, $r = .34, p < .001$.

Additional statistically significant results for males and females are found in Table 4.

ANOVA on Measures of Romanticism

Given the low correlations between the various measures of romantic attitudes, it is clear that these measures share little variance in common. Thus, the original predictions that sex and traditionality would affect these variables in the same way was called into question. Nevertheless,
TABLE 3

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SAMPLE SUBSCALES FOR COMBINED SUBJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Storge</th>
<th>Agape</th>
<th>Mania</th>
<th>Pragma</th>
<th>Ludus</th>
<th>Eros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storge</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agape</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mania</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragma</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludus</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eros</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .001. **p < .05.
### TABLE 4

**CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SAMPLE SUBSCALES FOR MALES AND FEMALES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Storge</th>
<th>Agape</th>
<th>Mania</th>
<th>Pragma</th>
<th>Ludus</th>
<th>Eros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storge</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>* .46/.33*</td>
<td>** .22/.08**</td>
<td>** .22/.22**</td>
<td>-.03/.05</td>
<td>.00/-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agape</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>** .20/.21**</td>
<td>.12/.15</td>
<td>-.07/-.29*</td>
<td>** .19/-.08**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mania</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>** .23/.18**</td>
<td>.10/.15</td>
<td>** .27/.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragma</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03/.08</td>
<td>** .31/.08**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludus</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.07/.35*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eros</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Males/Females.

* _p < .001.* ** _p < .05.*
identical 2 x 2 analyses of variance were performed on the different patterns that emerged for each of the four dependent variables (Knox-Sporakowski Attitudes Towards Love Scale, Gross Romanticism Scale, Lee's eros scale, Kephart's question).

The Knox-Sporakowski analysis of variance revealed a significant interaction between sex and traditionality, $F(1,196) = 5.51, p = .020$. However, this pattern was not what was anticipated. Examination of the simple effects revealed that traditional females scored significantly higher ($M = 85.33$) than nontraditional females ($M = 79.36$), $F(1,102) = 8.622, p = .004$, while traditional and nontraditional males ($M = 83.59$), ($M = 84.46$) are not significantly different, $F(1,94) = .175, p = .676$. This would indicate that traditionality makes a difference for females but not for males.

The analysis of variance performed on the Gross Romanticism Scale indicated only a significant main effect for sex, $F(1,196) = 4.25, p = .041$, with females ($M = 5.33$) scoring higher than males ($M = 4.79$) on this measure.

An analysis of variance conducted on the eros dimension of Lee's SAMPLE profile indicated a nonsignificant tendency, $F(1,193) = 2.97, p = .086$, for males ($M = 4.05$) to score higher than females ($M = 3.69$).

Finally, an analysis of variance on the Kephart question revealed no significant main effects or
interactions. Thus, what becomes evident are contradictory results across all four measures of romanticism. While the Kephart variable revealed no significant effects, the Gross scale revealed a significant tendency for females to be more romantic than males. To confuse results even further, the eros love style indicated a nonsignificant tendency for males to be more romantic, while the Knox-Sporakowski variable revealed no main effects but an interaction was found. This interaction between sex and traditionality suggests that traditional females are much more romantic than nontraditional females, while nontraditional and traditional males are not significantly different. These results could not more strongly contradict the assumption that these are equivalent measures.

In view of these surprising results, an examination of the five remaining love styles was conducted using identical 2 x 2 designs. Only two of the five ANOVAs showed any significant effects. Males (M = 4.05) scored higher on the ludus scale than females (M = 3.34), F (1, 193) = 7.61, p = .02, while females (M = 4.63) scored higher than males (M = 3.89) on the pragma subscale, F (1, 193) = 5.52, p = .006. Both of these findings replicate previous research.
IV. DISCUSSION

Previous research on romantic love has demonstrated, with impressive consistency, a tendency for males to be more romantic than females. This sex difference has consistently appeared in studies which measured attitudes toward love in the abstract (Knox and Sporakowski, 1968; Hobart, 1958; Hatkoff and Lasswell, 1977; & Kephart, 1967), which measured attitudes of love toward a dating partner (Rubin, Peplau & Hill, 1981), and which employed behavioral measures of love (Rubin, Peplau & Hill, 1981). The major purpose of the present research was to test the socioeconomic explanation (Rubin, Peplau & Hill, 1981) of this consistent finding. It was decided to use paper and pencil measures of attitudes toward love as an abstraction as the measures of romanticism. This decision was made largely on practical grounds; this strategy does not require recruitment of a sample of dating couples. It was also decided to use four different measures of romantic attitudes to provide an empirical test to the implicit assumption that these measures are equivalent. Based on the assumption of equivalence between these measures, it was anticipated that results for these four measures would show the same pattern of relationships to subject sex and traditionality. Thus, the study has two major concerns. First, are the four
measures of romanticism positively and substantially correlated? Second, are these measures of romantic attitudes consistently related to subject sex and traditionality?

With regard to the first question, it was predicted that positive correlations would exist between the four romanticism variables. However, only three of the six correlations between these variables were statistically significant, and these were all of a very low magnitude. The results showed that the Knox-Sporakowski scale significantly correlated with the Gross Romanticism Scale and the eros love style. In addition, responses to Kephart's question correlated with the Gross measure. The three remaining variables were not significantly correlated.

Just as the romanticism variables were not significantly correlated with each other, they showed no consistent relationships to the variables of subject sex and traditionality. While all previous studies employing these measures showed females to be less romantic than males, the present results reveal no consistent sex differences. Indeed, the only measure (Gross's Romanticism Scale) to show a significant main effect for sex contradicts the previous results by showing females to score higher in romanticism than males. Of the remaining measures, one (responses to Kephart's question about the importance of love in mate selection) shows no sex differences, another (Lee's eros
scale) shows a nonsignificant tendency for males to be more romantic, while the fourth (Knox-Sporakowski Attitudes Towards Love Scale) shows an interaction between sex and traditionality. These results clearly do not support the predictions made in this study. Nor do they, taken together, corroborate previous work in this area.

No simple explanation can handle all of the present results, since they are contradictory among themselves, and it is not clear what they measure. This suggests that some, or all of the measures are not measuring romanticism and may not be valid. However, the contradictions between the current results and previous studies using the same measures may be due to specific features of the present study and previous research.

For example, while Knox and Sporakowski did not evaluate traditionality, it is possible that the females within their sample were all nontraditional to begin with. Also, differences in student characteristics between the two samples (University of Central Florida versus Florida State University) may have played a part in the respondents' attitudes towards love. For example, the subjects in the current sample are much more likely to be living at home with their parents than those who attend Florida State. This may account for a higher incidence of traditionality within the current sample. The subjects in the present study are more likely to be from the Central Florida area
also, as the University is basically a "commuter" school. Knox and Sporakowski's sample are more likely to come from all over the United States, as Florida State is a larger university than the University of Central Florida.

A second explanation may be that females have developed more nontraditional attitudes with changes over time. It was proposed that a woman who had the opportunity to choose a career and her own standard of living would have more of an opportunity to be more romantically inclined than women of previous generations. However, the greater concern for a career may have caused a shift in priorities, with romanticism and mate selection taking second place to educational and occupational concerns.

An analysis of the Gross Romanticism Scale also revealed inconsistencies between the present study and previous research. In 1958, Hobart, using a condensed version of the Gross Romanticism Scale (Gross, 1944) surveyed respondents' attitudes regarding courtship and romanticism. Although Hobart's various hypotheses were not sex specific, he found that males scored higher than females in romanticism. This study clearly contradicts Hobart's findings. An analysis of variance revealed a significant main effect for females to be more romantic than males.

Regional differences may account for this shift. Hobart's sample was taken from the West Coast and included 923 undergraduate students and their partners. While
attitudes may be different between West and South, another important factor emerges. Hobart's respondents were in actual dating relationships, whereas the current sample may or may not have been. Perhaps attitudes are different when one is just thinking of a relationship versus actually being in one.

In addition, the Gross scale was devised in 1944. Forty years later, with changes over time the scale may no longer reflect romantic attitudes. For example, Gross uses the terms "sweetheart" and "sweetly clinging vine girl" as descriptive terms on his scale. While "sweetheart" may be used by couples today, "clinging vine girl" is not.

While both of these romanticism variables (Knox-Sporakowski and Gross) found contradictory results, an analysis of variance conducted on the eros measure revealed similar results between the current study and previous research of Hatkoff and Lasswell (1977). They found that males scored higher than females on the ludic (game playing) and erotic (romantic) love styles. Females were found to score higher on the storgic (good friends), manic (intensely dependent) and pragmatic (logical) love styles. The results of this study replicated some of the previously mentioned sex differences. The current results found men to score higher on the ludic love style, as did the Hatkoff and Lasswell study. In addition, males displayed a nonsignificant tendency to score higher on the eros scale. Although
the results were not statistically significant, they are similar to Hatkoff and Lasswell's findings that males scored higher on eros. In the present study, females were found to score significantly higher than males on the pragmatic dimension. No significant differences were found on the manic, storgic or agapic (altruistic) love styles, though the patterns of means on the storgic and manic variables were the same as Hatkoff and Lasswell's results. Thus, the present results are rather similar to Hatkoff and Lasswell, though some differences in the present study fell short of statistical significance.

One possible explanation may be that statistical significance may only turn up with extremely large samples. Hatkoff and Lasswell used 554 subjects, versus 200 for the current study. This explanation may be especially true of the eros scale. This may account for the reason that the eros results in the current study approach significance, but do not quite match the results of Hatkoff and Lasswell. Their sample also utilized a diversity of various ethnic groups, while respondents in the present study were mainly Caucasian. This suggests that perhaps ethnic or cultural differences influence a person's developing attitudes towards romantic love.

Responses to Kephart's question in the present study also failed to match those obtained by Kephart nearly two decades ago. Kephart's findings revealed that 65% of his
male respondents answered no, as opposed to only 24% of the female respondents. This suggested that in addition to men being more romantic in general, they were likely to insist that they be in love with the person that they marry. A large number of Kephart's female subjects were undecided, 72%, as opposed to 24% for males.

The original Kephart results may be misleading due to the large number of females who were undecided. This would indicate that rather than being nonromantic, his subjects were displaying a tendency towards indecisiveness.

In sum, each of the separate results for the four romanticism variables are inconsistent. No one explanation can possibly explain the various discrepancies because they are logically contradictory if one assumes that the four measures of romanticism are interchangable. Once again, it is abundantly clear that the dependent measures are not equivalent. If they were, they would reveal at least somewhat similar relationships with the variables of sex and traditionality and high correlations with each other. This is diametrically opposed to what was found.

An ancillary purpose of this study was to determine the interrelationships between each of the SAMPLE variables. Interestingly, the patterns of relationships are somewhat different for males and females. For males, the erotic subscale was positively correlated with agapic, manic and pragmatic love styles but correlated negatively with ludic.
For females, the erotic subscale negatively correlated with the storgic and agapic love styles, but positively correlated with ludic. Though weak, there seems to be an association between eros and a "gentle" style of love for males and not for females. Thus, a high score on the eros scale may have a somewhat different meaning for males than for female subjects.

Two major findings emerge from the current data. Previous research indicates the appearance of consistency between the studies. Knox and Sporakowski (1968), Hobart (1958), Hatkoff and Lasswell (1977) and Kephart (1967) all found men to be more romantic, though they used different measures of romanticism. The present study shows clearly that these variables are not even equivalent; thus, it challenges the comparability of these previous results. At a minimum, this indicates that it is time for researchers to agree on a common measure of romantic love. Any comparison of sex differences from one study to another is meaningless when the researchers' measurement devices are unequivalent and inconsistent.

Perhaps one reason for this inconsistent and puzzling pattern of results is the measurement of attitudes toward love as an abstraction. A more appropriate strategy may be to study people who are actually in love relationships rather than subjects who simply fill out paper and pencil scales on attitudes. In the Boston Couples Study (Rubin,
Peplau & Hill, 1981) 231 dating couples were asked to complete questionnaires designed to assess their experiences, feelings and attitudes regarding their current love relationships. The researchers proposed a two-part hypothesis regarding sex differences in entering into and giving up romantic relationships. They proposed that 1) men are inclined to fall in love more readily than women and 2) women are inclined to fall out of love more readily than men. They were able to support both of their hypotheses by examining subjects in actual relationships.

At a more theoretical level, the whole concept of romantic love may be viewed as a sexual script (Gagnon, 1977) which unfolds when a person is in a love relationship. Perhaps when people find themselves in a love relationship, their behavior is much more responsive to the demands of the situation than to any prior beliefs about love which they may have had. Their attitudes may not necessarily be reflected in their actual behavior.

Previous research has addressed the issues of content validity and internal consistency to some degree. However, this study examined criterion validity by testing the interrelationships between different romanticism variables, and to some extent, construct validity by testing predictions from a theoretical perspective. The results of the present study indicate that the measures used here were unable to substantiate either type of test.
Given the pattern of results, the sample used in the current study may not have taken the research seriously, although this was not the atmosphere observed during testing. Future research may need to protect against this, as well as focus on a careful examination of reliability and validity of the measures of attitudes towards love. In addition, future investigations of romantic love may need to focus on the actual feelings and behaviors of persons already in a love relationship, rather than investigating individuals who may only be thinking of a romantic relationship.
APPENDIX A

CONSENT FORM
CONSENT FORM

I am aware that participation in this research will involve my answering a questionnaire involving my opinions regarding love relationships. I understand that all of the questionnaires will be anonymous and that all of my responses will be confidential. I also understand that I may cease participation in this research project at any point and that I may decline to answer any particular question. With full knowledge of the above, I voluntarily agree to participate in this research project.

If you would like a copy of the results, please include your address below your signature. It is anticipated that the data will be analyzed and ready for distribution by the end of the term.

Signature: ___________________________   Date: ________________
APPENDIX B

INFORMATION FORM
INFORMATION

This questionnaire is designed to measure your feelings, experiences and attitudes regarding love relationships. It contains several scales that have been used in previous research, as well as items concerning career expectations. Your answers will be completely anonymous. Your answers will not be identifiable in any way. Since your answers will be anonymous, I hope that you will have no difficulty in answering the questions with complete candor and truthfulness.

You are under no obligation to participate in this research and may discontinue at any time if you wish to do so. I hope that you will find this questionnaire interesting. Your support and aid in this endeavor are greatly appreciated. Thank you for participating.

Loretta L. Givens

Age:____________________
Sex:___________________
Marital Status:______________
APPENDIX C

KNOX-SPORAKOWSKI ATTITUDES TOWARDS LOVE SCALE

(Taken from Hinkle and Sporakowski, 1975, with permission from Journal of Marriage and the Family)
Circle the appropriate answer which best reflects your feelings.

A = Strongly Disagree  
B = Disagree  
C = Undecided  
D = Agree  
E = Strongly Agree

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

13. Usually there are only one or two people in the world whom you could really love and could really be happy with.

14. Regardless of other factors, if you truly love another person, that is enough to marry that person.

15. It is necessary to be in love with the one you marry to be happy.

16. When you are separated from the love partner, the rest of the world seems dull and unsatisfying.

17. Parents should not advise their children whom to date; they have forgotten what it is like to be in love.

18. Love is regarded as a primary motive for marriage, which is good.

19. When you love a person, you think of marrying that person.

20. Somewhere there is an ideal mate for most people. The problem is just finding that one.

21. Jealousy usually varies directly with love; that the more in love you are, the greater the tendency for you to become jealous.

22. Love is best described as an exciting thing rather than a calm thing.

23. There are probably only a few people that any one person can fall in love with.
24. When you are in love, your judgment is usually not too clear.

25. Love often comes but once in a lifetime.

26. You can't make yourself love someone; it just comes or it doesn't.

27. Differences in social class and religion are of small importance in selecting a marriage partner as compared with love.

28. Daydreaming usually comes along with being in love.

29. When you are in love, you don't have to ask yourself a bunch of questions about love; you will just know that you are in love.
APPENDIX D

GROSS ROMANTICISM SCALE

(Taken from Hobart, 1958, with permission from Social Forces)
Please respond to the following statements by checking the appropriate answer which best reflects your feelings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lovers ought to expect a certain amount of disillusionment after marriage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. True love should be suppressed in cases where its existence conflicts with the prevailing standards of morality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To be truly in love is to be in love forever.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The sweetly feminine &quot;clinging vine&quot; girl cannot compare with the capable and sympathetic girl as sweetheart.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. As long as they at least love each other, two people should have no trouble getting along together in marriage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A girl should expect her sweetheart to be chivalrous on all occasions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A person should marry whomever he loves regardless of social position.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lovers should freely confess everything of personal significance to each other.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Economic security should be carefully considered before selecting a marriage partner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Most of us could sincerely love any one of several people equally well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. A lover without jealousy is hardly to be desired.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. One should not marry against serious advice of one's parents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

LASSWELL AND LASSWELL SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE
(Taken from Lasswell and Lasswell, 1976)
In responding to the following items, when it is appropriate, think of your most significant peer love relationships. If you cannot decide which has been your most significant, think of your most recent significant love relationship. If you wish, you may think of your ideal love relationship whether you have actually experienced it or not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>TRUE</th>
<th>FALSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I believe that &quot;love at first sight&quot; is possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I did not realize that I was in love until I actually had been for some time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. When things aren't going right with us, my stomach gets upset.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. From a practical point of view, I must consider what a person is going to become in life before I commit myself to loving him/her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. You cannot have love unless you have first had caring for a while.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It's always a good idea to keep your lover a little uncertain about how committed you are to him/her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The first time we kissed or rubbed cheeks, I felt a definite genital response (lubrication, erection).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I still have good friendships with almost everyone with whom I have ever been involved in a love relationship.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It makes good sense to plan your life carefully before you choose a lover.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. When my love affairs break up, I get so depressed that I have even thought of suicide.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sometimes I get so excited about being in love that I can't sleep.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I try to use my own strength to help my lover through difficult times, even when he/she is behaving foolishly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I would rather suffer myself than let my lover suffer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Part of the fun of being in love is testing one's skill at keeping it going and getting what one wants from it at the same time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>As far as my lovers go, what they don't know about me doesn't hurt them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>It is best to love someone with a similar background.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>We kissed each other soon after we met because we both wanted to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>When my lover doesn't pay attention to me, I feel sick all over.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I cannot be happy unless I place my lover's happiness before my own.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Usually the first thing that attracts my attention to a person is his/her pleasing physical appearance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>The best kind of love grows out of a long friendship.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>When I am in love, I have trouble concentrating on anything else.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>At the first touch of his/her hand, I knew that love was a real possibility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>When I break up with someone, I go out of my way to see that he/she is okay.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I cannot relax if I suspect that he/she is with someone else.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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26. I have at least once had to plan carefully to keep two of my lovers from finding out about each other.  
27. I can get over love affairs pretty easily and quickly.  
28. A main consideration in choosing a lover is how he/she reflects on my family.  
29. The best part of love is living together, building a home together, and rearing children together.  
30. I am usually willing to sacrifice my own wishes to let my lover achieve his/hers.  
31. A main consideration in choosing a partner is whether or not he/she will be a good parent.  
32. Kissing, cuddling and sex shouldn't be rushed into; they will happen naturally when one's intimacy has grown enough.  
33. I enjoy flirting with attractive people.  
34. My lover would get upset if he/she knew some of the things I have done with other people.  
35. Before I ever fell in love, I had a pretty clear physical picture of what my true love would be like.  
36. If my lover had a baby by someone else, I would raise it, love it, and care for it as if it were my own.  
37. It is hard to say exactly when we fell in love.  
38. I couldn't truly love anyone I would not be willing to marry.  

TRUE FALSE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>39. Even though I don't want to be jealous, I can't help it when he/she pays attention to someone else.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40. I would rather break up with my lover than to stand in his/her way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41. I like the idea of me and my lover having the same kinds of clothes, hats, plants, bicycles, cars, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42. I wouldn't date anyone that I wouldn't want to fall in love with.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43. At least once when I thought a love affair was all over, I saw him/her again and knew I couldn't realistically see him/her without loving him/her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44. Whatever I own is my lover's to use as he/she chooses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45. If my lover ignores me for a while, I sometimes do really stupid things to try to get his/her attention back.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46. It's fun to see whether I can get someone to go out with me even if I don't want to get involved with that person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47. A main consideration in choosing a mate is how he/she will reflect on one's career.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48. When my lover doesn't see me or call me for a while, I assume he/she has a good reason.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49. Before getting involved with anyone, I try to figure out how compatible his/her hereditary background is with mine in case we ever have children.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50. The best love relationships are the ones that last the longest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX F

LIFESTYLE QUESTIONNAIRE
Circle the appropriate answer that best reflects your feelings.

A = Strongly Disagree  
B = Disagree  
C = Undecided  
D = Agree  
E = Strongly Agree

1. As head of the household, a husband should have more responsibility for the family's financial plans than a wife.
   A B C D E  

2. Men have more leadership abilities than women.
   A B C D E  

3. It should be the duty of the husband to support his wife and family.
   A B C D E  

4. If a woman with an infant works outside the home, she is neglecting her maternal duty.
   A B C D E  

5. It is natural if a woman's career is as important to her as her husband and children.
   A B C D E  

6. A major goal in life is to be able to support yourself financially through your own income.
   A B C D E  

7. A woman should be willing to move in order to further her husband's career.
   A B C D E  

8. A husband and wife should be equal in planning the family budget.
   A B C D E  

9. Childrearing should be the responsibility of the mother.
   A B C D E  

10. Women workers have abilities equal to those of men workers for most jobs.
    A B C D E  

11. A major goal in life is the pursuit of a career or profession.
    A B C D E
12. Men are more ambitious than women.

13. Women with small children should not work outside the home.

14. Women should feel free to compete with men in every sphere of economic society.

15. Assuming that you marry, how many children would you like to have:
   A. None
   B. 1
   C. 2
   D. 3-4
   E. 5 or more

16. If a man/woman had all the other qualities you desired, would you marry this person if you were not in love with him/her?
   A. No
   B. Maybe
   C. Yes
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