

2012

# Entry to Adulthood: College Women's Desire for Marriage

Shuguo Xu  
*Iowa State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Sociology Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Xu, Shuguo, "Entry to Adulthood: College Women's Desire for Marriage" (2012). *Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 12871.  
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd/12871>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact [digirep@iastate.edu](mailto:digirep@iastate.edu).

# **Entry to adulthood: college women's desire for marriage**

by

**Shuguo Xu**

A thesis submitted to the graduate faculty  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

**MASTER OF SCIENCE**

Major: Sociology

Program of Study Committee:  
Stephen Sapp, Co-major Professor  
Teresa Downing-Matibag, Co-major Professor  
Yalem Teshome

Iowa State University

Ames, Iowa

2012

Copyright © Shuguo Xu, 2012. All rights reserved.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	iii
LIST OF FIGURES.....	iv
ABSTRACT.....	v
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 2: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK .....	4
CHAPTER 3: DATA AND METHODS .....	9
DATA AND MATERIALS .....	9
MEASUREMENTS .....	12
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS.....	16
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS .....	16
FACTOR ANALYSIS .....	18
RELIABILITY .....	26
CORRELATIONS .....	27
LISREL TEST OF STRUCTURAL REGRESSION.....	31
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION.....	34
APPENDIX A. LISREL RESULTS OF STRUCTURAL MODEL.....	40
APPENDIX B. INVITATION LETTER .....	48
APPENDIX C. THE QUESTIONNAIRE OF DESIRE FOR MARRIAGE.....	49
REFERENCES.....	63
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	71

**LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1 Percentage of Women by race.....	16
Table 2 Percentage of Women by Education Level.....	18
Table 3 Percentage of Women by Sexuality.....	18
Table 4 Percentage of Women by Age.....	18
Table 5 Factor Analysis of Desire for Marriage.....	19
Table 6 Factor Analysis of Expectations for Marriage.....	20
Table 7 Factor Analysis of Expectations for Economic Status.....	21
Table 8 Factor Analysis of Expectations for Adulthood.....	21
Table 9 Factor Analysis of Expectations for Relationship with Others.....	22
Table 10 Factor Analysis of Social Acceptance.....	23
Table 11 Factor Analysis of Gender Role Perspectives.....	24
Table 12 Factor Analysis of Spouse Identity.....	25
Table 13 Factor Analysis of Career Choice.....	25
Table 14 Factor Analysis of Parental Perspectives.....	26
Table 15 Factor Analysis of Feminist View.....	26
Table 16 Cronach's Alpha of Variables.....	27
Table 17 Correlations.....	30

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 Conceptual Framework of Desire for Marriage .....	4
Figure 2 LISREL Estimates (Maximum Likelihood).....	31
Figure 3 Squared Multiple Correlations for Structural Equations.....	32
Figure 4 Chi-Square and P-ValueFigure 4. Chi-Square and p-value.....	32
Figure 5 Standardized Solution.....	33

## **ABSTRACT**

Recent literature has addressed the extent to which women's desire for marriage has been affected by factors like education, age, economic status, and gender role attitudes. This study undertook a comprehensive examination of college women's marital perception, their desire for marriage, and the extent to which these perceptions and desires are affected by level of formal education, age, expectations about marriage, and gender role perspectives. The conceptual model hypothesized that education would be negatively associated with desire for marriage, while age would have a positive correlation with marriage desire. Moreover, gender role perspectives as well as expectations for marriage were presumed as positively correlated with marriage desire. Survey data from 449 unmarried respondents enrolled at Iowa State University were used to explore educational, attitudes, and expectation differences in the expressed desire to marry. The results indicated that education and age have little influence on college women's desire for marriage. Among overall expectation for marriage, a strong expectation to enter adulthood was the most important factor affecting desire to marry. The study also indicates that those who hold a traditional view of gender role, especially concerning having kids and possessing traditional spouse identity, will have a relatively strong desire to marry.

## CHAPTER 1 . INTRODUCTION

Previous research indicates that age (Qian., & Preston, 1993; Rogers., & Thornton, 1985), regional differences (Scheuble, Johnson, & Johnson, 2012) , family influences (Larson, Benson, Wilson, & Medora, 1998), social class (Locksley, 1982), parental influences (Kerpelman, & Schvaneveldt, 1999), culture (Anderson, 1990), mate availability (Lichter., Anderson., & Hayward., 1995) and personal preferences (Mclanahan., & Casper., 1995; Etaugh., & Stern., 1984) affect desire for marriage. However, the extent to which each of these factors most affects desire for marriage remains unclear. Also, because the nature of marriage is undergoing constant redefinition in response to changing social conditions, wherein people are more inclined to choose cohabitation or remain single, the influences of socioeconomic factors on desire for marriage are becoming less significant and emphasized. Some researchers (Goldscheider & Whaite, 1986; Oppenheimer, 1988), for example, argue that women who have a strong orientation toward work or a relatively high income might delay their marriage timing, but their marriage desirability might be stronger because they can reduce some economic burden formerly shouldered primarily by their partner. Additionally, recent studies (Frazier et al. 1996) indicate that more educated and financially secure women exhibit less desire for marriage.

Recent literature has focused upon how women's marital perceptions have changed as the stereotypical assumptions about themselves have been changing since late 1990s. Research (e.g., Botkin, Weeks, & Morris, 2000; Lichter, Anderson,

& Hayward, 1995) has shown that college-age women's marriage role expectations are becoming more egalitarian because increasing education allows women to spend more time searching for their partners. This finding has been challenged to the extent that it cannot sufficiently demonstrate a clear correlation between education and women's marital choices (Gordon, 2003). For example, highly educated women's lower desire for marriage may occur because of a perceived lack of high quality mates. It is also possible that some women earning high salaries view less economic advantages to marriage. Additional research (Blakemore, Lawton, & Vartanian, 2005) indicates that gender ideology affect desire for marriage.

Three perspectives can be identified from the previous research. One perspective asserts that women care more about marriage more than do men. Women are hypothesized to have a higher drive to marry than men because they are more concerned about their future parental identity (Blakemore, Lawton, & Vartanian, 2005; Novack & Novack, 1996). Although younger women expressed stronger preference to equally treat career and marriage (Kerpelman & Schvaneveldt, 1999), younger women are more willing to make compromises for men and choose marriage than young do men (Novack & Novack, 1996). A second perspective hypothesizes that men express a stronger desire for marriage than do women because they are more likely to value marriage prior to other life goals (Hammersla & Frease- McMahan, 1990; South, 1993). The third perspective posits that any gap in the desire for marriage lasts only until about age 26 (South, 1993). Ercull et al. (2010), for example, report that men and women do not differ in their

reported desires for marriage and children; however, both women and men perceived women as having stronger desires.

In summary, people's marital attitudes might be correlated with several factors. Although previous literature suggests that gender role attitudes are the most important among them, the overall results remain unclear. This uncertainty justifies a comprehensive examination of women's desire for marriage as well as its association with their gender role perspectives. This paper is divided into 5 sections. Section 2 introduces conceptual model of the thesis. Section 3 includes research method and analysis. Section 4 introduces the results in detailed. Section 5 is discussion and assessment of the research.

## CHAPTER 2 . CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Our goals were to find out if factors such as age, education level, race, or attitudes towards women have relations to their eagerness to get married. The specific question would be: Are people's marriage desirability differentiate by race, age, or education level among college female students? On the one hand, we hoped to find relevance between different variables with women's drive for marriage, to find whether there are changes in women's perception of marital relationship and their gender roles; on the other hand, if variables like education, age and race have little correlation with women's desire of marriage, what will be the main factors that drive their longing for marriage?




Figure 1. Conceptual Model of desire for marriage

Figure 1 represents the conceptual framework of the model in this thesis. Desire for marriage is used as a central concept in this thesis since we tried to study how it varies with different variables which contain four parts---education, age, expectations for marriage, and gender role perspectives. Although researchers have found that women with college degree were more egalitarian and less desired for marriage than other women, it was insufficient to conclude that education is a factor that can affect women's desire for marriage (Gordon, 2003). It is possible that women who have higher education may also have good income and thus they don't value marriage. Or it is probable that some well-educated women didn't put marriage in their priority from the beginning, so to speak education may not relate to their marriage desire at all. Similar speculation has been applied to age also. Although it was said elder women are more likely to put marriage in the priority that younger women because they may suffer the aging problem without touch from partners or children (Lowenstein et al., 1981; Primakoff, 1983), no obvious results have proved that age is also an influential factor since they also enjoy free time and opportunities in dating as well as independence from raising children (Lewis, 1994). Moreover, studies on singlehood have shown that elder unmarried women may have a stronger desire for marriage than younger women since they are facing aging problems without touch from partners or children, while some other researchers have found that elder unmarried women also enjoy more freedom, less family responsibility and constant availability for dating. Thus whether age is a catalyst to women's marriage desire or a retardant needs to be clearly identified.

Four main aspects concerning gender role attitudes were studied in existing research about their impact on individual's marital perceptions. First, traditional titles (Miss and Mrs.) were thought a major part of gender ideology which can reflect women's perceptions of their spouse identity and attitudes toward marriage. Research has found that women perceived titles as an indication of one's marital status (Lakoff, 1973; Nilsen, 1977) and characters. Those using Ms. were perceived as more assertive, career-oriented, well-educated but less likable and warm than those using Mrs (Atkinson, 1987a; Dion & Schullaer, 1990; Dion & Cota, 1991). Married people were also perceived as more favorably than unmarried people (Blakemore, 2005). However, the perception of Ms. may have changed over the years in that women do not need to be identified by their marital status or show their feminism anymore (Blakemore, Lawton & Vartanian, 2003).

Second, desire of having children and pursue career are another two reflections of one's gender ideology on people's marriage desire. As forms of marriage have been changed more loosely, people may choose cohabitation and have children rather than necessarily getting married. Women supporting having children without getting married are perceived more feminist. At the same time, although it is argued that women who has a strong orientation toward work or has relatively high income may delay their marriage timing (Goldscheider & Whaite, 1986), their marriage desirability may be stronger because they can reduce some economic burden formerly shouldered primarily by their partner (Oppenheimer, 1988).

Feminism was a third major part that recent studies usually focus on. Women who are less feminist and focused on a future career have a stronger drive for marriage (Blakemore, 2004). Based on these results we suppose that gender role perspectives may affect individual's marriage desire in a way that traditional gender ideology leads to a stronger desire for marriage.

Last but not least, expectations for marriage were perceived as a linking part in this causal effect because traditional gender views not only leads directly to the extent of desire for marriage, but also should make individual expect benefits from marriage. South (1993) concluded the four possible benefits from marriage--- happiness, economic status, sex and social relations. We consider expectations for marriage as partially generated from one's gender view, but also affect marriage desirability. If individual emphasizes on the essence or real quality of marriage, for instance, having children or being truly happy, rather than concentrating on the form of getting marriage, then we can say this person has a less traditional gender view as well as a low expectation for marriage since the benefits are separated from the marriage and been considered important independently.

Three aspects were investigated in this study. First was whether there women's desire for marriage varies with age. We hypothesized that women's desire for marriage has a positive correlation with their ages, more specifically; women's drive to marry is relative higher with elder age than younger age. Second, we presumed that education level also plays a negative role in influencing people's desire for marriage. Higher education level associates with people's lower desire for marriage.

Third issue was how gender role perspectives and expectations influence people's marriage desirability. Blakemore (2005) found that women who have a stronger desire for marriage value more on parental and marital roles, are more concerned about other's comments, and value their occupational roles less. We hypothesized that women who have traditional gender attitudes and higher expectations for marriage are also positively correlated with women's desire for marriage. We also presumed that people who hold more feminist attitudes towards women will have less eagerness for marriage.

## CHAPTER 3 . DATA AND METHODS

### DATA AND MATERIALS

The research population was 11,439 women students enrolled in Iowa State University. The survey was designed as a questionnaire with 54 questions on *www.qualtrics.com* and administrated to the college students. The internet survey was sent to study population with an e-mail invitation letter and a link to the survey page. Identifying information was removed. We collected 449 responses. After filtering out responses with missing data on some items or sessions, participants whose age was under 18 and over 29 years old and married participants, 347 responses were left valid. All the respondents were women with college education level whose ages range from 18 to 29 years old. The sample was 80.5% undergraduates, 9.1% master students, and 10.4% PhD or higher. Race was 88.7% white, 6.6% Asian American, 5.5% African American, 3.6% Asian, and 4.2% other ethnicities. 42% of the participants were single, 50.5% were in a relationship, 0.3% divorced, and others engaged or cohabiting with partners. 94.5% of the respondents reported themselves as heterosexual, 1.4% homosexual, 3.3% bisexual, and others decline to answer.

The questionnaire was divided into several sections. First section is "Desire for Marriage". Participants were asked whether they ever want to get married and when they would like to marry. The first question was measured by simple yes/ no or undecided answers, while the second question was measured by 4-scale responses of different timing: "1= within next 10 or more years, 2= within next 8 to 10 years, 3=

within next 4 to 7 years, 4= within next 3 years.” We believe that using future time periods as a measurement for marriage desire is helpful because if individual has strong desire to get married, she ought to wish to get married as soon as possible. Although women were said to possibly delay their actual marriage timing due to various reasons, their desire for marriage should connect closely with their expecting marriage timing. Besides, respondents were asked about their motivation for marriage. The five motivation were “self-longing for marriage,” “partner’s request,” “family members or friends’ encouragement,” “the pressure of aging,” “economic pressure.” The higher scores the respondents get, the more desire they have for marriage. Those who chose they don’t want to marry will skip directly to the next section. Thus only those who said they want to get married will answer the questions in this section.

In the second section students were asked about their expectations regarding the possible benefits of marriage. We adopted the question that South (1993) has designed: “For each of the following areas, please choose how you think your life might be different if you were married.” The eight areas of expectation were “overall happiness,” “living standard,” “economic security,” “economic independence,” “sex life,” “friendship with others,” “relations with your parents,” “relations with your partner’s parents.” The five possible responses to each item ranged from “much worse” to “much better.” Participants were also asked how getting married will make them feel, with nine feelings of “proud,” “complete,” “more mature,” “more restricted/less free,” “less restricted/ more free,” “more accepted by others,” “isolated

by others,” “more attractive,” “less attractive.” Those who chose they don’t want to marry will participate in this section since they refused marriage for some reason, or they had low expectations for marriage. Higher scores represent respondents have higher expectations to gain benefits from marriage.

The third section related to women’s preferences for traditional marital relationships. The second section including the following items: a) whether respondents would like to adopt their partners’ last name, b) which title they would prefer to use after getting married, and c) their gender role perspectives concerning surname and title choice. Surname choice questions include “I plan to keep my maiden name if I get married.” Title questions include “I prefer to use Mrs. after I get married.” Gender role perspectives include “A woman who changes to her spouse’s name when she gets married is more committed to the marriage than those who do not.” The responses were 5-scale Likert answers ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. The higher scores there are, the more traditional respondents would be. Section 3 also involved items about women’s finding balance between work and family, as well as their expectations for being parent. This part included items such as “I prefer to quit my job and be homemaker after I get married,” “I prefer to have baby after I have achieved my career goal,” “Raising children will bring more satisfaction than pain.” Most of the responses use 5-scale range. Like section 2, high scores in these responses mean that the respondents are traditional.

Section 4 is about women’s attitudes toward feminism. Previous research showed that women who are less feminist would probably agree that men have the authority

on judging whether a woman is feminine or attractive. Men and women are also differentiated in acting social behaviors. Women's feminist view may have influence on their gender role perspectives, thus we use this section to ask more about their opinions on traditional view rather than their life choices. For example, respondents were asked "Men have more authority on whether a woman is attractive than women," "Women ought to devote more to their husbands and children than their own career."

## **MEASUREMENTS**

### **Desire for Marriage**

We measured desire for marriage by three aspects. First, having a desire for marriage means one wants to marry, and the desire comes from one's inner longing for marriage. In the questionnaire we put forward a question asking respondents: "Do you ever want to get married?" The answers range from 1=yes to 0=no. Thus those respondents who chose 0 to this question were filtered out because they don't want to get married. The source of motivation is another question based on this point. We presumed that self-longing for marriage would be a booster for stronger marriage desire. The answers are 5-Likert choices ranging from "1= none", "2= less", "3= average", "4= stronger" to "5= strongest". Second, we measured desire for marriage based on their ideal marriage timing. We presume that the stronger marriage desirability one has, the sooner one might hope to marry, and vice versa. The question relates to this point is: "When would you like to get married?" The answer ranges from "1= 10 years or later", "2= within next 8 to 10 years", "3= within

4 to 7 years” to “4= within next 3 years”, which corresponds to the presumption that we hold. Last but not least, we also use excitement for marriage and expectation for happiness as a criterion for measuring desire for marriage. We presume that the more excited one feels about wedding- related events, or the higher expectation one has for the happiness during marriage, the stronger desire for marriage one has. The answers to these questions range from “1= strongly disagree” to “5= strongly agree”. Last part is about the expectation for marriage happiness. The answers range from “1= much worse” to “5= much better.” The higher the sum scores are, we can infer the stronger desire for marriage that one has.

### **Expectation for Marriage**

As previously discussed, one’s desire to marry may be affected by her expectation for marriage life; that is, there ought to be something that people think is beneficial to their lives or their future and thus making marriage attractive to them. Similar perspective was expressed by South (1993) that those who supposes expecting more benefits from marriage would lead to greater desire to marry. In this study respondents were asked: “For each of the following areas, please choose how you think your life might be different if you were married?” The eight areas of benefit were “overall happiness,” “living standard,” “economic security,” “economic independence,” “sex life,” “friendship with others,” “relations with your parents,” and “relations with partner’s parents.” The five possible responses to each item ranged from “1= much worse” to “5= much better.” Respondents were also asked: “Getting married will make me feel \_\_\_\_\_.” The nine areas of feeling for marriage were

“proud,” “complete,” “more mature,” “more restricted,” “less restricted,” “more accepted by others,” “isolated by others,” “more attractive,” and “less attractive.”

The five responses ranged from “1= strongly disagree” to “5= strongly agree.” The responses to “more restricted,” “isolated by others,” and “less attractive” were reversely coded to reduce variations. Higher scores mean higher marriage expectations.

### **Gender Role Perspectives**

Several focuses were included in studying students’ gender role perspectives. First, respondents were asked about whether they would adopt their partner’s surname after getting married. They were also asked about what title they would prefer to use after getting married. Previous research has revealed that women using “Mrs.” were perceived as fewer career- oriented, less competent, and less independent than those using “Ms.” or “Miss.” as their title (Blakemore & Vartanian, 2003). Thus we presume that individuals who are willing to adopt partner’s last name or use “Mrs.” after getting married are more traditional than those who are not willing to do so. Second, respondents were asked whether they would want to have children. We presume that desire to be a parent may lead to the desire for marriage if individuals hold relatively traditional gender role perspectives. Third, respondents were asked about how they planned to balance their career and marriage. Previous research shows individuals who emphasize career are more pro-feminist, more independent and thus less desirable for marriage (Owen Blakemore, 2006). Last but not least, we include some statements about attitudes toward women. The

hegemony of men has influence on their interaction with women in that men has the authority on deciding whether a woman is attractive by her appearance and her behaviors. Although this traditional perspective received much criticism by feminists, it is necessary to involve this view in our study and discover how women perceive themselves nowadays. These four aspects are scored separately. Higher scores represent more traditional gender role perspectives.

## CHAPTER 4 . RESULTS

Factor analyses were used to discover the factors that lead toward the desire for marriage, and Pearson correlation was used in finding the significance of factors in affecting students' desire for marriage.

### DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics on the race of respondents. 312 (89.9%) of the college students who participated in this study are white, and the percentages of Asian American and African American are 6.6% and 5.2%. According to US Census Bureau population data in 2011, the national proportion of white people was approximately 75%, which was much lower than the proportion of white in this study. We found it was possible to over-represent the population. We ran the analyzing process with race for the first time and found that race is hardly correlated with women's desire for marriage, while including non-white races will exaggerate the error. After taking all these reasons into account, we decided to filter out the non-white sample and keep white students as the only race for further study.

**Table 1. Percentage of Women by Race**

		White			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	.00	35	10.1	10.1	10.1
Valid	1.00	312	89.9	89.9	100.0
	Total	347	100.0	100.0	

**Asian American**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	.00	324	93.4	93.4	93.4
Valid	1.00	23	6.6	6.6	100.0
	Total	347	100.0	100.0	

#### African American

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	.00	329	94.8	94.8	94.8
Valid	1.00	18	5.2	5.2	100.0
	Total	347	100.0	100.0	

#### American Indian

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	.00	345	99.4	99.4	99.4
Valid	1.00	2	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	347	100.0	100.0	

#### Asian

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	.00	337	97.1	97.1	97.1
Valid	1.00	10	2.9	2.9	100.0
	Total	347	100.0	100.0	

As Table 2 to 4 have shown, among 312 white students, 258 (82.7%) are enrolled as undergraduate. The respondents are predominantly heterosexual and over 20 years old.

**Table 2. Percentage of Women by Education Level**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Undergraduate	258	82.7	82.7	82.7
Master graduate	26	8.3	8.3	91.0
PhD graduate or higher	28	9.0	9.0	100.0
Total	312	100.0	100.0	

**Table 3. Percentage of Women by Sexuality**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Heterosexual	297	95.2	95.2	95.2
Homosexual	3	1.0	1.0	96.2
Bisexual	10	3.2	3.2	99.4
Decline to answer	2	.6	.6	100.0
Total	312	100.0	100.0	

**Table 4. Percentage of Women by Age**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Age between 18 to 19	82	26.3	26.3	26.3
Age between 20 to 21	121	38.8	38.8	65.1
Age over 22	109	34.9	34.9	100.0
Total	312	100.0	100.0	

## FACTOR ANALYSIS

As Table 5 has shown, Q11 is the most statistically significant statement that illustrates desire for marriage, while Q14\_1 factor loading is slightly under 0.6, which

means expectation for happiness after marriage might not be as concerned with respondents' desire for marriage as other aspects. However, all the questions included are statistically significant with desire for marriage.

**Table 5. Factor Analysis of Desire for Marriage**

	Component
	1
Q14_1. How do you think your life might be different if you were married? --- Overall Happiness	.571
Q8. When would you like to get married?	.604
Q9_1. Where does your motivation for marriage come from? ---Self-longing for marriage	.662
Q10. Getting engaged would be one of the most exciting things that happened to me.	.658
Q12. Wearing a wedding dress will make me the happiest woman in the world.	.655
Q11. Getting married is NOT one of my priorities °.	.724

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 components extracted.

As table 6 has shown, when putting all these questions together in a factor analysis, five components were extracted. Difference in economic independence, pride, sense of completeness, and maturity were statistically significant in Component 1. These aspects are all about being a mature and independent grown-up, so we conclude this factor as “Expectations for Adulthood.” Component 2 contains difference in living standard, economic security, and a bit of economic independence. We conclude this component as “Expectation for Economic Status.” Acceptance by others and attractiveness are two items that are statistically significant in Component 3. Since both items are about social acceptance, we call this factor as “Expectations for Social Acceptance.” Moreover, difference in friendship and relations with parents become significant in Component 4, which is

thus called “Expectations for Relationship with others.” Last but not least, expectation about sex is the single one that is statistically significant in Component 5, thus we call this factor “Expectation for sex.”

What’s worth notice is that the item of economic independence is statistically significant in both Component 1 and 2, which means economic independence indicates both a sense of adulthood and economics at the same time. We will conduct a factor analysis to the 5 components separately and included this item in Component 1 and 2.

**Table 6. Factor Analysis of Expectations for Marriage**

	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
Q14_2. How life might be different if you were married? <sup>a</sup> --- Living standard	.082	<u>.879</u>	-.069	.129	.046
Q14_3. How life might be different if you were married? <sup>a</sup> --- Economic security	.055	.898	-.040	.060	-.060
Q14_4. How life might be different if you were married? <sup>a</sup> --- Economic Independence	<u>.410</u>	.381	.225	.030	-.439
Q14_6. How life might be different if you were married? <sup>a</sup> --- Friendship with others	.032	-.002	-.005	<u>.748</u>	-.353
Q14_7. How life might be different if you were married? <sup>a</sup> --- Relations with parents	.050	.127	-.074	<u>.807</u>	.036
Q14_8. How life might be different if you were married? <sup>a</sup> --- Relations with parents	.222	.109	-.225	<u>.475</u>	.261
Q14_5R. How life might be different if you were married? <sup>a</sup> --- Sex life	.010	.010	.163	-.061	<u>.845</u>
Q15_6R. Getting married will make me feel more accepted by others <sup>a</sup> .	-.091	-.028	<u>.822</u>	-.061	-.047
Q15_8R. Getting married will make me feel more attractive <sup>a</sup> .	-.124	-.042	<u>.832</u>	-.127	.178
Q15_1. Getting married will make me feel proud.	<u>.776</u>	-.009	-.049	.086	-.022
Q15_2. Getting married will make me feel complete.	<u>.771</u>	.099	-.021	.076	.031
Q15_3. Getting married will make me feel more mature.	.661	.084	-.351	.043	-.048

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 5 iterations.

Table 7 presents factor analysis of economic expectations. Although economic independence is less significant in statistics in economic expectations, all three aspects are all corresponding to each other.

**Table 7. Factor Analysis of Expectation for Economic Status**

	Component
	1
Q14_2. How life might be different if you were married?---Living standard	.859
Q14_3. How life might be different if you were married?--- Economic security	.881
Q14_4. How life might be different if you were married?--- Economic Independence	.561

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 component extracted.

**Table 8. Factor Analysis of Expectations for Adulthood**

	Component
	1
Q15_1. Getting married will make me feel proud.	.764
Q15_2. Getting married will make me feel complete.	.802
Q15_3. Getting married will make me feel more mature.	.740

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 component extracted.

**Table 9. Factor Analysis of Expectations for Relationship with Others**

	Component
	1
Q14_6. How life might be different if you were married?--- Friendship with others	.742
Q14_7. How life might be different if you were married?--- Relations with parents	.802
Q14_8. How life might be different if you were married?--- Relations with parents	.558

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 component extracted.

Table 8 presents a rotated component matrix of expectations for adulthood. All three statements are statistically significant. We also found that the factor loading of item of economic independence is 0.515 in analysis of adulthood, while the factor loading of economic independence is 0.561 in Table 7. Thus we put this item into the category of economic status due to the higher significance. According to Table 9 and Table 10, after separately analyze the factor loadings of each component and the statements that we presume to correspond to it, we found the factor loadings of the statements are all above 0.4, which means the results are statistically significant to support the validity of each category we concluded.

**Table 10. Factor Analysis of Social Acceptance**

	Component
	1
Q15_6. Getting married will make me feel more accepted by others <sup>a</sup> .	.874
Q15_8. Getting married will make me feel more attractive <sup>a</sup> .	.874

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 component extracted.

As Table 11 has shown, Q 16 and Q19 were about women's surname choice and their title preference. The five responses ranged from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." Q28 and Q29 were two statements referring to women's balance between career and marriage. Q30, Q35 and Q36 are about desire to be a parent. The five responses to Q35 ranged from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree," while responses to Q30 and Q36 ranged from "1= no" to "3= yes." Q44 to Q46 are about how women think about themselves. The responses to Q44 were "1= little or none," "2= a little," "3= on average," "4= quite a bit," "5= very much," while the 5 responses to Q45 and Q46 ranged from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree."

Four components were extracted. First, Q30, Q35 and Q36 has the highest factor loading in column 1, which means the factor loadings of these questions are positive and significantly pointing to the same aspect. Since they are all about being a parent, we conclude Component 1 as "parental perspectives." Second, factor loadings of Q28 and Q29 being positive and statistically significant means both statements refer to a common aspect, which we conclude as "career choice." Third, Q16 and Q19, two statements about title and surname have positive and significant factor loading

in third column, we call this component “spouse identity” since both components are about recognition of one’s identity within marriage as a spouse. Last but not least, Q44, Q45, and Q46 have significantly positive statistics in column 4. The key words of these questions are “looks,” “appearances,” “feminine,” and “others,” and they are referring to respondents’ attitudes toward women and how feminist they are. As a result, we call this component “feminist view.

**Table 11. Factor Analysis of Gender Role Perspectives**

	Component			
	1	2	3	4
Q35. Raising children will bring me more happiness than pain.	<u>.789</u>	.013	.175	.022
Q30. Do you want to have children <sup>a</sup> ?	<u>.766</u>	.045	.187	.105
Q36. Do you like children <sup>a</sup> ?	<u>.777</u>	.003	.002	-.030
Q44. I care _____ about what others say about my looks <sup>a</sup> .	.084	.063	-.092	.796
Q45. It is more important to me that others like my appearances than I like it myself.	-.056	-.013	.104	<u>.792</u>
Q46. Women should make themselves look feminine, for example, they should keep long hair or wear skirt, etc.	.110	.352	.290	.464
Q28. I prefer to quit my job and be a homemaker after I get married.	.195	<u>.825</u>	.232	.105
Q29. I prefer to pursue my career and take care of my family at the same time after I get married.	-.139	<u>.889</u>	.010	.022
Q16. I plan to change my last name to that of my spouse if I get married.	.195	.167	<u>.820</u>	.079
Q19. I prefer to use "Mrs." after I get married.	.112	.047	<u>.853</u>	.017

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 5 iterations.

Table 12 to 15 represent factor analyses of each category that we have concluded by using principal component analysis. The significances of factor loadings in Table 12 and 14 are reinforced, while the significances of factor loadings in Table 13 and 15 are averaged compared to that in Table 11.

**Table 12. Factor Analysis of Spouse Identity**

	Component
	1
Q16. I plan to change my last name to that of my spouse if I get married.	.872
Q19. I prefer to use "Mrs." after I get married.	.872

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 component extracted.

**Table 13. Factor Analysis of Career Choice**

	Component
	1
Q28. I prefer to quit my job and be a homemaker after I get married.	.880
Q29. I prefer to pursue my career and take care of my family at the same time after I get married.	.880

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 component extracted.

**Table 14. Factor Analysis of Parental Perspective**

	Component
	1
Q35. Raising children will bring me more happiness than pain.	.821
Q30. Do you want to have children <sup>a</sup> ?	.808
Q36. Do you like children <sup>a</sup> ?	.762

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 component extracted.

**Table 15. Factor Analysis of Feminist View**

	Component
	1
Q44. I care _____ about what others say about my looks <sup>a</sup> .	.756
Q45. It is more important to me that others like my appearances than I like it myself.	.638
Q46. Women should make themselves look feminine, for example, they should keep long hair or wear skirt, etc.	.751

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 component extracted.

## RELIABILITY

Before conducting the correlation regression, we integrated the categories that we have concluded in factor analysis. Based on previous tables, we computed the variable “desire for marriage”, “expectation for adulthood”, “expectation for economic status”, “expectation for relations with others” (Relations), “expectation for social

acceptance” (SOCACCP), “expectation for kids” (WantKids), “gender role-spouse identity” (GRSI), “gender role---career”(GRC) and “gender role---feminist” (Feminine) as mean of each group of scores that we mentioned earlier in this article. Table 16 presents the Cronbach’s Alpha of variables after integration and numbers of items in each category. The reliability test results of the variables are significant, which means it’s reasonable to integrate questions into new variables in this way. We’ll be using these variables in further correlation analysis.

**Table16. Cronbach’s Alpha of Variables**

	Cronbach’s Alpha	N of Items
Desire for Marriage	.694	6
Expectation for Adulthood	.649	3
Expectation for Economic Status	.791	2
Expectation for Social Acceptance	.687	2
Expectation for Relations with Others	.480	3
Gender Role---Parental Choice	.633	3
Gender Role---Spouse Identity	.685	2
Gender Role---Career	.700	2
Gender Role---Feminist	.526	3

## **CORRELATIONS**

The Pearson regression was a two-tailed analysis in order to find the correlations among different variables and testify our theoretical frame.

From the Figure 1 we can see that the correlation between expectation of adulthood and desire for marriage is 0.563, highest in correlation between desire for marriage and other variables. This means for the respondents, starting a marriage also partially means starting to be an adult. The desire to be a grown-up will

positively affect people's desire for marriage. Apart from anticipation of adulthood, recognition as a spouse and parent also present a positive correlation with people's desire for marriage. The correlation between one's desire for marriage and career choice is less significant but still positive, which means women's gender role perspective on career has less positive influence on their desire for marriage than the expectation to be adult, spouse and parent do. Besides, we found expectation for a better economic status has little impact on women's marriage desirability.

There is also little correlation between women's expectation for social acceptance and their marriage desire. Whether a woman is pro-feminist seems affect her desire for marriage to a very little extent. Education, as well as age, has a negative correlation with women's desire to marry. Women with higher education level or elder age have lower desire for marriage than those with lower level education or younger age.

We can find more on the inter-influence of other variables. Among all the independent variables, desire to be a spouse and parent are most closely correlated to the expectation to be an adult. Moreover, there is some correlation between adulthood anticipation and social acceptance. Economic expectation, career, feminist view, and sex barely vary with anticipation of adulthood. Women with higher education and elder ages have lower anticipation for adulthood than those with lower education or younger ages. When one's education goes up, her expectation for sex life goes a little bit down, which also happens when she gets older. The hope of being socially accepted becomes less for elder and better- educated women than others. The results also shows that well-educated women and elder women have

significantly less traditional gender role perspective of being a spouse; that is, these women are more likely to maintain their own surname and less likely to use “Mrs.” as their title after getting married. Correspondingly, we find that these women have a more independent and career- oriented life goal. Their attitudes toward women are more pro-feminist than younger and less-educated women. Last but not least, although these women are at a relatively elder age and more accomplished education, they have a lower desire to have kids than other women.

We find that statistically sex and social acceptance correlates little with other variables, nor does women’s feminist view correlate with whether they want to have kids. Women’s gender view as a spouse has positive correlations with their gender view concerning career, their feminist view and their parental desire although the results are not much significant. This means women who are willing to adopt their partner’s last name or use “Mrs.” after getting married are more likely to be family-oriented, less feminist, and have kids after marriage.

Table 17. Correlations

		DESIRE	ADULT	ECONOMICS	Education	Age	SEXLIFE	SOCACCP	GRSI	GRC	FEMININE	WANTKIDS
DESIRE	Pearson Correlation	1	.563**	.133*	-.053	.153**	.198**	.104	.440**	.246**	.153**	.445**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.019	.352	.007	.000	.068	.000	.000	.007	.000
	N	312	311	311	312	312	312	311	312	312	312	312
ADULT	Pearson Correlation	.563**	1	.194**	-.104	.178**	.075	.218**	.369**	.166**	.185**	.298**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.001	.067	.002	.188	.000	.000	.003	.001	.000
	N	311	311	311	311	311	311	311	311	311	311	311
ECONOMICS	Pearson Correlation	.133*	.194**	1	-.033	-.016	.050	.066	.011	.005	-.018	.121*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.019	.001		.568	.785	.380	.246	.845	.936	.746	.034
	N	311	311	311	311	311	311	311	311	311	311	311
Education	Pearson Correlation	-.053	-.104	-.033	1	.499**	-.055	.027	.235**	-.142*	-.153**	.037
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.352	.067	.568		.000	.333	.634	.000	.012	.007	.514
	N	312	311	311	312	312	312	311	312	312	312	312
Age	Pearson Correlation	-.153**	-.178**	-.016	.499**	1	-.118*	.018	.237**	-.110	-.145*	-.091
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.007	.002	.785	.000		.037	.748	.000	.053	.010	.108
	N	312	311	311	312	312	312	311	312	312	312	312
SEXLIFE	Pearson Correlation	.198**	.075	.050	-.055	-.118*	1	.008	.163**	.170**	.023	.174**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.188	.380	.333	.037		.883	.004	.003	.691	.002
	N	312	311	311	312	312	312	311	312	312	312	312
SOCACCP	Pearson Correlation	.104	.218**	.066	.027	.018	.008	1	.058	.064	.151**	-.004
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.068	.000	.246	.634	.748	.883		.307	.259	.008	.950
	N	311	311	311	311	311	311	311	311	311	311	311
GRSI	Pearson Correlation	.440**	.369**	.011	-.235**	.237**	.163**	.058	1	.275**	.273**	.304**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.845	.000	.000	.004	.307		.000	.000	.000
	N	312	311	311	312	312	312	311	312	312	312	312
GRC	Pearson Correlation	.246**	.166**	.005	-.142*	-.110	.170**	.064	.275**	1	.295**	.094
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.003	.936	.012	.053	.003	.259	.000		.000	.096
	N	312	311	311	312	312	312	311	312	312	312	312
FEMININE	Pearson Correlation	.153**	.185**	-.018	-.153**	-.145*	.023	.151**	.273**	.295**	1	.085
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.007	.001	.746	.007	.010	.691	.008	.000	.000		.136
	N	312	311	311	312	312	312	311	312	312	312	312
WANTKIDS	Pearson Correlation	.445**	.298**	.121*	.037	-.091	.174**	-.004	.304**	.094	.085	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.034	.514	.108	.002	.950	.000	.096	.136	
	N	312	311	311	312	312	312	311	312	312	312	312

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

### LISREL TEST OF STRUCTURAL REGRESSION

Structural Model of Regression was conducted so as to test whether the model fits the data and how applicable the model is. Beta refers to the parameter matrix

that specifies the linear relations among dependent variables, while Gamma refers to the parameter matrix that specifies the linear relations between dependent and independent variables.

**Figure 2. LISREL Estimates (Maximum Likelihood)**

<b>BETA</b>							
	DESIRE	A DULT	ECONOMIC	SEXLIFE			
	-----	-----	-----	-----			
DESIRE	--	0.339	0.018	0.055			
		(0.040)	(0.037)	(0.031)			
		8.534	0.496	1.763			
ADULT	--	--	--	--			
ECONOMIC	--	--	--	--			
SEXLIFE	--	--	--	--			
<b>GAMMA</b>							
	GRSI	GRC	FEMININE	WANTKIDS	EDU	NEWAGE	
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	
DESIRE	0.129	0.074	-0.014	0.151	0.054	-0.019	
	(0.034)	(0.033)	(0.031)	(0.029)	(0.050)	(0.039)	
	3.830	2.227	-0.441	5.162	1.071	-0.490	
ADULT	0.215	0.043	0.063	0.152	--	--	
	(0.045)	(0.047)	(0.045)	(0.040)			
	4.745	0.916	1.411	3.777			
ECONOMIC	-0.018	0.005	-0.020	0.095	--	--	
	(0.049)	(0.051)	(0.048)	(0.044)			
	-0.361	0.107	-0.412	2.166			
SEXLIFE	0.092	0.150	-0.057	0.121	--	--	
	(0.058)	(0.060)	(0.057)	(0.052)			
	1.586	2.489	-0.996	2.342			

The Lisrel estimates figure above shows that the unstandardized coefficients, standard error and t-ratio at freedom degree of 1. The t-ratio value above 1.96 means the result is significant at the probability less than .05. We find that in the

Beta form the t-ratio of adulthood, economics, and sex life equal 8.534, .496 and 1.763 respectively. This means only the result of adulthood is statistically significant to desire for marriage. Similarly, in the Gamma form the t-ratio of desire for kids keeps significant in each row, while some other results are not significant.

**Figure 3. Squared Multiple Correlations for Structural Equations**

DESIRE	ADULT	ECONOMIC	SEXLIFE
-----	-----	-----	-----
0.456	0.185	0.016	0.063

Squared Multiple Correlations for Reduced Form

DESIRE	ADULT	ECONOMIC	SEXLIFE
-----	-----	-----	-----
0.320	0.185	0.016	0.063

**Figure 4. Chi-Square and p-value**

Degrees of Freedom = 15

Full Information ML Chi-Square = 17.004 (P = 0.319)

Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = 0.0209

90 Percent Confidence Interval for RMSEA = (0.0 ; 0.0598)

P-Value for Test of Close Fit (RMSEA < 0.05) = 0.870

The statistics in Figure 3 represents R-Square under each variable in squared multiple correlations for structural equations meaning how much variance has been explained. 45.6% of the variance of desire for marriage can be explained by the regression, 18.5% of the variance of expectation for adulthood, 6.3% variance of anticipation for sex as well as 1.6% variance of expectation for economic status can be explained. The model was built at a 15 degree of freedom. The Chi-square at degree of freedom of 15 equals 17.004, at P- value of .870. Since the Chi-square is

significant at an estimate of error of .0209, we can conclude that the model fits the data very well.

**Figure 5. Standardized Solution**

<b>BETA</b>				
	DESIRE	ADULT	ECONOMIC	SEXLIFE
	-----	-----	-----	-----
DESIRE	--	0.399	0.021	0.077
ADULT	--	--	--	--
ECONOMIC	--	--	--	--
SEXLIFE	--	--	--	--

<b>GAMMA</b>						
	GRSI	GRC	FEMININE	WANTKIDS	EDU	NEWAGE
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
DESIRE	0.192	0.102	-0.020	0.240	0.053	-0.024
ADULT	0.272	0.051	0.078	0.205	--	--
ECONOMIC	-0.023	0.007	-0.025	0.129	--	--
SEXLIFE	0.097	0.148	-0.059	0.136	--	--

The standardized solution figure presents how much the statistics exceeds unity in absolute value. Higher values of standardized coefficients mean a high degree of multi-collinearity in the data. Both Beta and Gamma coefficients are under 0.4 after standardization, which again proves that the model fits the data better, thus the solution is admissible.

## CHAPTER 5 . DISCUSSION

Considerable research documents differences in marriage propensities among people of various social groups, but the results have gone contradictory and the relations among some factors still remained unclear. Although marriage represents an important and normative role for both men and women, getting married is perceived especially significant for women (Owen Blakemore, 2005). To understand more about how female college students' desire for marriage varies with different factors, an internet survey was distributed to 11,439 female students enrolled in Iowa State University. 449 responses were collected, 347 of which were valid for research. 89% of these students were white. Due to inadequate sample size of non-white races for further study and the risk of overrepresentation of the population, 312 white students were filtered as the only study group. 82.7% of them were undergraduate, 95.2% white students were heterosexual. 38.8% were from 20 to 21 years old, 34.9% were older than 22, and 26.3% were from 18 to 19 years old. It is worth note that very few of the students in the sample are non-heterosexual. Sexuality should become a center of future research. However, due to the limited numbers of respondents in the study, it should be better to conduct a qualitative research of non-heterosexual peoples' marital perception.

The dependent variable is the desire for marriage which contains a) whether one wants to get married; b) ideal marriage timing; c) motivation for getting married; d) changes that might happen after getting married. Higher scores mean stronger

desire for marriage. The independent variables were age, education, expectations for marriage, and gender role perspectives.

Factor analyses were conducted to find out more possible aspects regarding expectations and gender role perspectives. Then reliability and correlation were processed. Last we did a structural model using Lisrel tool. We find that expectations for marriage include five parts: adulthood, economic status, sex life, social acceptance, and relations with others. Gender role perspectives contain four aspects: spouse identity, career choice, feminist view, parental choice.

On the basis of previous research between age, education and marriage propensities, we predicted that age is positively correlated with desire for marriage. We assumed women with elder ages have a stronger desire for marriage. However, our results show that there exists little significant correlation between age and marriage desirability. One reason would be probably that mate availability is various by person, and the personal preferences are different. This finding refutes previous statement that elder unmarried women may desire more for marriage than younger women because they have aging problem. We can see from this finding that college women care little about aging problem. It could be because they would rather to keep single than marry to someone they are not satisfied with.

We also hypothesized that education is negatively correlated with women's desire for marriage, that is, women with higher education are less likely to long for marriage. Little correlation has been found between education and marriage desire. Within college women group, individual's desire for marriage doesn't vary with their

education level. Such finding corresponds to previous statements that although women with different education levels have different propensities to marriage, education does not serve as a factor to affect their desire. We have found that women with higher education expressed more pro-feminist attitudes toward their spousal identities, their career choice, and their feminism. One explanation might be because elder respondents have spent much time finishing educational goals and they need to start a career prior to getting married. Receiving education may have little direct impact on women's desire for marriage, but it allows women to have more feminist gender role attitudes which may directly affect their marriage desire.

Our second hypothesis was more traditional gender role perspectives will be leading to both a stronger desire for marriage and higher expectations for marriage. Our results partially corresponded with the hypothesis that young women who hold more traditional gender role attitudes are more incline to desire marriage. The spouse role and parental role are most positively connected with respondents' desire for marriage. Career and their feminist view also correlates with desire for marriage positively, but less significant. Clearly young women concerns about their spouse and parental identity when it comes to marriage. One possible reason may be that although public support for feminist gender perspectives has been increasing, feminism is yet considered as not warm nor nice but very competent (Huddy, Neely, & LaFay, 2000; Fiske et al.,2002). It is highly valued to be warm and nice of women and thus only very few women would love to choose feminist spouse and parental role (Lawton, Blakemore, & Vartanian, 2003). However, it doesn't mean that only a

minority of women have feminist attitudes toward career and themselves. We can see from the results that young women students separate their career and personal behaviors apart from their family lives very clearly. They would probably choose to work as hard as men in their career and try to keep independent and competent, but they would prefer to be as traditional as possible within marriage and family. We also found that women with traditional spousal and parental identity attitudes are more likely to have higher expectation for adulthood and being socially accepted. This finding partially proved our hypothesis since during the analysis we divided both gender role perspectives and expectations into several subcategories, so we cannot say that these two variables have connections overall. What we have found was that spousal and parental role perspectives play a significant role in strengthening women's expectations for marriage while other parts of gender role perspectives, such as career and feminism, do not have significant impact on their expectations. Reversely, among the different types of marital expectations, adulthood and social acceptance become two aspects that associate with parental and spousal role attitudes more closely.

We also found that high expectations for marriage life will lead to strong desire to marry. Our results showed that young women perceive marriage as an essential part of being a grown-up, thus their desire to be an adult positively affects their desire for marriage. College women are less likely to take economic factors into account than other factors speaking of drive to marry. The expectations of improving economic status, of sex and social acceptance are less significant than the anticipation of

being an adult. Moreover, we found that as women receive more education, their gender role attitudes about being a spouse become more feminist, which means they are less likely to adopt partner's name or use traditional titles.

Our study has found little correlation between economic factors with college women's desire for marriage. However, it doesn't mean that socioeconomic situation is not important. Of course, socioeconomic situation should not be overlooked. The results presented here suggest that most college women hope to have a good career that can show their capabilities, but the prevalence of feminism does not change much in these college women's attitudes concerning marriage compared to research that has been done decades ago. Although most women reported that they would prefer to equally treat their family and their career, they still prefer a traditional path in their future marriage. One explanation of less significance of economic factors may be that since the majority of respondents in the study are less than age 22 and mostly undergraduate, they might probably in their second year in college, so dating would be just a matter for fun rather than a long-term plan. In this sense economic factors will become less important since women students may just want to get married but they are not planning to marry to current dating partners. Thus economic situation may serve as a potentially important but currently non-prior factor among college women group.

One limitation of this study could be the inadequacy of non-white sample. South (1993) used a national survey sample to study racial differences in the desire to marry. We hoped to further our study onto Asian or African American groups in the

college. However, due to less than thirty participants in any of both groups and time limitation for interview, we had to filter the groups out, leaving only white college students. Similarly, most of the participants in our sample were under 30 years old and sample over age 30 were scattered, thus unmarried women over age 30 were eliminated from the study also. Another limitation would be that most of Cronbach's Alphas in reliability analysis were lower than the desired number (0.7). This may be due to the limited sample size and limited content of questionnaire. Since we tried to focus on desire for marriage and its relationship with gender role perspectives, we could only ask several questions in each aspect of their attitudes. Although these questions reflect well in their attitudes, they need to reflect more exactly and comprehensive how the participants feel. Third limitation should be that we didn't include non-college women whose age was about 20 or more years old and compare their desire for marriage to college women's, which I suppose should reflect more on whether education is an essential factor for the difference of marriage desirability.

Future research would be more comprehensive in explaining people's attitudes and life choices if researchers include more participants with different ethnic groups and sexualities. Since religious belief and culture were not taken into account as independent variables, researchers should pay attention to how the beliefs and culture involved and influence people's gender attitudes and their desire. Previous research has provided some thoughts on how cultural differences affect people's mate selection. For example, western people and Asians vary significantly toward

whether getting married because of love (Levine, Sato, Hashimoto & Verma, 1995), what marriage means to them (Jow-Ching & Li, 1999) as well as whether the families approve marriage outside of one's culture (Dugsin, 2001). Further research should give more cultural explanation to people's drive to marry based on existing statements that marriage means not only a love outcome, but also means stable and secured family alliances.

## APPENDIX A. LISREL RESULTS OF STRUCTURAL MODEL

DATE: 8/30/2012

TIME: 13:22

LISREL 8.71

BY

Karl G. Jöreskog & Dag Sörbom

This program is published exclusively by  
 Scientific Software International, Inc.  
 7383 N. Lincoln Avenue, Suite 100  
 Lincolnwood, IL 60712, U.S.A.  
 Phone: (800)247-6113, (847)675-0720, Fax: (847)675-2140  
 Copyright by Scientific Software International, Inc., 1981-2004  
 Use of this program is subject to the terms specified in the  
 Universal Copyright Convention.  
 Website: www.ssicentral.com

The following lines were read from file C:\Users\ssapp\Desktop\XuSapp\Model2.LS8:

Model of Desire for Marriage  
 DA NI=11 No=314  
 RA FI=PRELIS.PSF

-----  
 EM Algorithm for missing Data:  
 -----

Number of different missing-value patterns= 2  
 Convergence of EM-algorithm in 3 iterations  
 -2 Ln(L) = 6854.54199  
 Percentage missing values= 0.06

Note:

The Covariances and/or Means to be analyzed are estimated  
 by the EM procedure and are only used to obtain starting  
 values for the FIML procedure

SE  
 3 4 5 6 8 9 10 11 1 2 /  
 MO NY=4 NX=6 BE=FU,FI GA=FU,FI PH=ST PS=DI  
 FR BE 1 2 BE 1 3 BE 1 4  
 FR GA 2 1 GA 2 2 GA 2 3 GA 2 4  
 FR GA 3 1 GA 3 2 GA 3 3 GA 3 4  
 FR GA 4 1 GA 4 2 GA 4 3 GA 4 4  
 FR GA 1 1 GA 1 2 GA 1 3 GA 1 4 GA 1 5 GA 1 6  
 OU SC ND=3

## Model of Desire for Marriage

Number of Input Variables 11  
 Number of Y - Variables 4  
 Number of X - Variables 6  
 Number of ETA - Variables 4  
 Number of KSI - Variables 6  
 Number of Observations 312

## Model of Desire for Marriage

## Covariance Matrix

	DESIRE	ADULT	ECONOMIC	SEXLIFE	GRSI	GRC
DESIRE	0.385					
ADULT	0.255	0.532				
ECONOMIC	0.059	0.102	0.519			
SEXLIFE	0.107	0.049	0.032	0.764		
GRSI	0.252	0.249	0.008	0.132	0.852	
GRC	0.131	0.105	0.003	0.127	0.217	0.732
FEMININE	0.086	0.121	-0.012	0.018	0.228	0.228
WANTKIDS	0.271	0.214	0.085	0.150	0.276	0.079
EDU	-0.020	-0.047	-0.014	-0.029	-0.133	-0.074
NEWAGE	-0.074	-0.101	-0.009	-0.081	-0.170	-0.073

## Covariance Matrix

	FEMININE	WANTKIDS	EDU	NEWAGE
FEMININE	0.815			
WANTKIDS	0.075	0.966		
EDU	-0.085	0.022	0.374	
NEWAGE	-0.102	-0.070	0.238	0.607

## Means

	DESIRE	ADULT	ECONOMIC	SEXLIFE	GRSI	GRC
	3.535	3.746	3.841	4.038	4.090	1.880

## Means

	FEMININE	WANTKIDS	EDU	NEWAGE
	1.955	3.952	1.263	2.087

## Model of Desire for Marriage

## Parameter Specifications

BETA

	DESIRE	ADULT	ECONOMIC	SEXLIFE
	-----	-----	-----	-----
DESIRE	0	1	2	3
ADULT	0	0	0	0
ECONOMIC	0	0	0	0
SEXLIFE	0	0	0	0

## GAMMA

	GRSI	GRC	FEMININE	WANTKIDS	EDU	NEWAGE
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
DESIRE	4	5	6	7	8	9
ADULT	10	11	12	13	0	0
ECONOMIC	14	15	16	17	0	0
SEXLIFE	18	19	20	21	0	0

## PHI

	GRSI	GRC	FEMININE	WANTKIDS	EDU	NEWAGE
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
GRSI	0					
GRC	22	0				
FEMININE	23	24	0			
WANTKIDS	25	26	27	0		
EDU	28	29	30	31	0	
NEWAGE	32	33	34	35	36	0

## PSI

	DESIRE	ADULT	ECONOMIC	SEXLIFE
	-----	-----	-----	-----
	37	38	39	40

## ALPHA

	DESIRE	ADULT	ECONOMIC	SEXLIFE
	-----	-----	-----	-----
	41	42	43	44

Model of Desire for Marriage

Number of Iterations = 0

LISREL Estimates (Maximum Likelihood)

## BETA

	DESIRE	ADULT	ECONOMIC	SEXLIFE
	-----	-----	-----	-----
DESIRE	--	0.339	0.018	0.055
	(0.040)	(0.037)	(0.031)	
	8.534	0.496	1.763	

ADULT -- -- -- --  
 ECONOMIC -- -- -- --  
 SEXLIFE -- -- -- --

## GAMMA

	GRSI	GRC	FEMININE	WANTKIDS	EDU	NEWAGE
DESIRE	0.129 (0.034) 3.830	0.074 (0.033) 2.227	-0.014 (0.031) -0.441	0.151 (0.029) 5.162	0.054 (0.050) 1.071	-0.019 (0.039) -0.490
ADULT	0.215 (0.045) 4.745	0.043 (0.047) 0.916	0.063 (0.045) 1.411	0.152 (0.040) 3.777	--	--
ECONOMIC	-0.018 (0.049) -0.361	0.005 (0.051) 0.107	-0.020 (0.048) -0.412	0.095 (0.044) 2.166	--	--
SEXLIFE	0.092 (0.058) 1.586	0.150 (0.060) 2.489	-0.057 (0.057) -0.996	0.121 (0.052) 2.342	--	--

## Covariance Matrix of Y and X

	DESIRE	ADULT	ECONOMIC	SEXLIFE	GRSI	GRC
DESIRE	0.384					
ADULT	0.253	0.531				
ECONOMIC	0.029	0.014	0.517			
SEXLIFE	0.110	0.058	0.012	0.762		
GRSI	0.252	0.249	0.008	0.132	0.852	
GRC	0.131	0.105	0.003	0.127	0.218	0.732
FEMININE	0.086	0.122	-0.012	0.018	0.228	0.228
WANTKIDS	0.272	0.214	0.085	0.150	0.277	0.080
EDU	-0.015	-0.034	0.006	-0.016	-0.133	-0.075
NEWAGE	-0.056	-0.057	-0.002	-0.029	-0.171	-0.074

## Covariance Matrix of Y and X

	FEMININE	WANTKIDS	EDU	NEWAGE
FEMININE	0.815			
WANTKIDS	0.075	0.966		
EDU	-0.085	0.022	0.374	
NEWAGE	-0.103	-0.070	0.238	0.607

## Mean Vector of Eta-Variables

DESIRE	ADULT	ECONOMIC	SEXLIFE
-----	-----	-----	-----
4.464	3.746	3.841	4.038

## PHI

GRSI	GRC	FEMININE	WANTKIDS	EDU	NEWAGE
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
GRSI	0.852				

GRC	0.218	0.732			
	(0.040)				
	5.438				

FEMININE	0.228	0.228	0.815		
	(0.042)	(0.039)			
	5.387	5.921			

WANTKIDS	0.277	0.080	0.075	0.966	
	(0.045)	(0.047)	(0.050)		
	6.158	1.692	1.512		

EDU	-0.133	-0.075	-0.085	0.022	0.374
	(0.030)	(0.029)	(0.030)	(0.034)	
	-4.521	-2.584	-2.802	0.652	

NEWAGE	-0.171	-0.074	-0.103	-0.070	0.238	0.607
	(0.038)	(0.037)	(0.039)	(0.043)	(0.018)	
	-4.543	-1.978	-2.650	-1.631	13.024	

## PSI

Note: This matrix is diagonal.

DESIRE	ADULT	ECONOMIC	SEXLIFE
-----	-----	-----	-----
0.209	0.433	0.509	0.713
(0.017)	(0.035)	(0.041)	(0.058)
12.362	12.350	12.349	12.369

## Squared Multiple Correlations for Structural Equations

DESIRE	ADULT	ECONOMIC	SEXLIFE
-----	-----	-----	-----
0.456	0.185	0.016	0.063

## Squared Multiple Correlations for Reduced Form

DESIRE	ADULT	ECONOMIC	SEXLIFE
-----	-----	-----	-----

0.320 0.185 0.016 0.063

Reduced Form

	GRSI	GRC	FEMININE	WANTKIDS	EDU	NEWAGE
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
DESIRE	0.206	0.097	0.004	0.211	0.054	-0.019
	(0.036)	(0.037)	(0.035)	(0.031)	(0.050)	(0.039)
	5.739	2.644	0.118	6.710	1.071	-0.490
ADULT	0.215	0.043	0.063	0.152	--	--
	(0.045)	(0.047)	(0.045)	(0.040)		
	4.745	0.916	1.411	3.777		
ECONOMIC	-0.018	0.005	-0.020	0.095	--	--
	(0.049)	(0.051)	(0.048)	(0.044)		
	-0.361	0.107	-0.412	2.166		
SEXLIFE	0.092	0.150	-0.057	0.121	--	--
	(0.058)	(0.060)	(0.057)	(0.052)		
	1.586	2.489	-0.996	2.342		

ALPHA

DESIRE	ADULT	ECONOMIC	SEXLIFE
-----	-----	-----	-----
1.640	2.062	3.569	3.013
(0.256)	(0.206)	(0.224)	(0.265)
6.417	9.988	15.934	11.384

Global Goodness of Fit Statistics, Missing Data Case

-2ln(L) for the saturated model = 6854.542  
 -2ln(L) for the fitted model = 6871.546

Degrees of Freedom = 15

Full Information ML Chi-Square = 17.004 (P = 0.319)

Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = 0.0209

90 Percent Confidence Interval for RMSEA = (0.0 ; 0.0598)

P-Value for Test of Close Fit (RMSEA < 0.05) = 0.870

Model of Desire for Marriage

Standardized Solution

BETA

DESIRE	ADULT	ECONOMIC	SEXLIFE
--------	-------	----------	---------

	-----	-----	-----	-----
DESIRE	--	0.399	0.021	0.077
ADULT	--	--	--	--
ECONOMIC	--	--	--	--
SEXLIFE	--	--	--	--

## GAMMA

	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
	GRSI	GRC	FEMININE	WANTKIDS	EDU	NEWAGE
DESIRE	0.192	0.102	-0.020	0.240	0.053	-0.024
ADULT	0.272	0.051	0.078	0.205	--	--
ECONOMIC	-0.023	0.007	-0.025	0.129	--	--
SEXLIFE	0.097	0.148	-0.059	0.136	--	--

## Correlation Matrix of Y and X

	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
	DESIRE	ADULT	ECONOMIC	SEXLIFE	GRSI	GRC	
DESIRE	1.000						
ADULT	0.561	1.000					
ECONOMIC	0.066	0.027	1.000				
SEXLIFE	0.203	0.091	0.019	1.000			
GRSI	0.441	0.370	0.012	0.164	1.000		
GRC	0.247	0.168	0.005	0.170	0.276	1.000	
FEMININE	0.154	0.185	-0.018	0.023	0.274	0.296	
WANTKIDS	0.446	0.299	0.121	0.175	0.305	0.095	
EDU	-0.039	-0.076	0.013	-0.030	-0.236	-0.143	
NEWAGE	-0.117	-0.100	-0.003	-0.043	-0.238	-0.110	

## Correlation Matrix of Y and X

	-----	-----	-----	-----
	FEMININE	WANTKIDS	EDU	NEWAGE
FEMININE	1.000			
WANTKIDS	0.085	1.000		
EDU	-0.154	0.037	1.000	
NEWAGE	-0.146	-0.092	0.500	1.000

## PSI

Note: This matrix is diagonal.

	-----	-----	-----	-----
	DESIRE	ADULT	ECONOMIC	SEXLIFE
	0.544	0.815	0.984	0.937

## Regression Matrix Y on X (Standardized)

	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
	GRSI	GRC	FEMININE	WANTKIDS	EDU	NEWAGE
DESIRE	0.307	0.134	0.006	0.335	0.053	-0.024
ADULT	0.272	0.051	0.078	0.205	--	--
ECONOMIC	-0.023	0.007	-0.025	0.129	--	--
SEXLIFE	0.097	0.148	-0.059	0.136	--	--

## APPENDIX B. INVITATION LETTER

IRB #: 12-101

Dear ISU students,

What factors influence college students' desire to marry? How do female students perceive their gender roles and marriage-career balance? Are feminist attitudes affecting students' gender perceptions? Your email address is one of only a small number that have been randomly selected to help answer these questions, so your answers are of great importance to learning about college students' desire for marriage. Please complete the questionnaire through the following link on Qualtrics survey websites by August 31th, 2012. You will receive one or two reminder email of the survey during the time. If you have not returned the questionnaire to us by the time, we will not contact you again.

Please note that this survey is only applicable to **female students that are not in a marital relationship**. The questions should take less than 15 minutes to complete and will not take long in your busy final-preparing time. Your responses are voluntary and will be kept confidential. Since your name is not on our mailing lists and your answers will never be associated with your address, your answers will also be anonymous. If you have any questions about the survey or choice of research methodology, please contact Shuguo Xu, the principle study researcher at 515-203-9883 or [shuguox@iastate.edu](mailto:shuguox@iastate.edu). If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this study, please contact IRB administrator of Iowa State University at 515-294-45666 or [IRB@iastate.edu](mailto:IRB@iastate.edu).

By taking a few minutes to share your thoughts and opinions about female students' marriage desirability, you will be helping us out a great deal. Your answers will be used as data to analyze the questions we put forward.

We hope you'll enjoy the questionnaire and look forward to receiving your responses.

**Follow this link to the Survey:**

[https://dc-viawest.qualtrics.com/ControlPanel/?ClientAction=EditSurvey&Section=SV\\_0kqgriZ4EDdc6SU&SubSection=&SubSubSection=&PageActionOptions=&TransactionID=3&Repeatable=0&T=1Dnz4q](https://dc-viawest.qualtrics.com/ControlPanel/?ClientAction=EditSurvey&Section=SV_0kqgriZ4EDdc6SU&SubSection=&SubSubSection=&PageActionOptions=&TransactionID=3&Repeatable=0&T=1Dnz4q)

Many Thanks,

Shuguo Xu  
Sociology Graduate, Iowa State University

## APPENDIX C. THE QUESTIONNAIRE OF DESIRE FOR MARRIAGE

1. How old are you (at last birthday)? \_\_\_\_\_

2. What is your current student status?

- Undergraduate (1)
- Master graduate (2)
- PhD graduate or higher (3)

3. What is your race/ ethnicity? (Check all that apply)

- White (1)
- Asian American (2)
- African American (3)
- American Indian (4)
- Asian (5)
- African/ Black (6)
- Native American/ American Indian (7)
- Hispanic (8)
- Pacific Islander (9)
- Arabian (10)
- Other (11)

4. What is your nationality? \_\_\_\_\_

5. What is your sexuality?

- Heterosexual/ interested in male (1)
- Homosexual/ interested in female (2)
- Bisexual/ interested in both male and female (3)
- Other (4)
- Decline to answer (5)

6. What is your current relationship status? (Check all that apply)

- Single (1)
- In a relationship (2)
- Engaged (3)
- Cohabiting (living with partner together) (4)
- Married (5)
- Separated within marriage but not divorced yet (6)
- Divorced (7)
- Widowed (8)

6. Do you ever want to get married?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

If No Is Selected, Then Skip To 5. Getting married will make me feel ...

Answer If 6. Do you ever want to get married? Yes Is Selected

7. When would you like to get married?

- Within next 3 years (1)
- Within next 4-7 years (2)
- Within next 8-10 years (3)
- 10 or more years later (4)

Answer If 6. Do you ever want to get married? Yes Is Selected

8. Where does your motivation for marriage come from? Please evaluate the extent of each motivation that influences on your marriage desirability.

	Strongest (1)	Stronger (2)	Average (3)	Less (4)	None (5)
Self-longing for marriage (1)					
Partner's request (2)					
Family members or Friends' encouragement (3)					
The pressure of aging (4)					
Economic pressure (5)					

Answer If 6. Do you ever want to get married? Yes Is Selected

9. Getting engaged would be one of the most exciting things that have happened to me.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

Answer If 6. Do you ever want to get married? Yes Is Selected

10. Getting married is not one of my top priorities.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

Answer If 6. Do you ever want to get married? Yes Is Selected

11. Wearing a wedding dress will make me the happiest woman in the world.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

Answer If 6. Do you ever want to get married? Yes Is Selected

12. I want a big wedding.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

Answer If 6. Do you ever want to get married? Yes Is Selected

13. For each of the following areas, please choose how you think your life might be different if you were married (South, 1993)

	Much worse	Somewhat	No change	Somewhat	Much better
--	------------	----------	-----------	----------	-------------

	(1)	Worse (2)	(3)	better (4)	(5)
Overall Happiness (1)					
Living Standard (2)					
Economic security (3)					
Economic independence (4)					
Sex life (5)					
Friendship with others (6)					
Relations with your parents (7)					
Relations with your partner's parents (8)					

14. Getting married will make me feel \_\_\_\_\_.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Undecided (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Proud (1)					
Complete (2)					
More mature (3)					
More restricted or less free (4)					
Less restricted or more free (5)					
More accepted by others (6)					
Isolated by others (7)					
More attractive (8)					
Less attractive (9)					

Answer If 6. Do you ever want to get married? Yes Is Selected

15. I plan to change my last name to that of my spouse if I get married.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

Answer If 6. Do you ever want to get married? Yes Is Selected

16. I prefer to keep my maiden name if I get married.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

Answer If 6. Do you ever want to get married? Yes Is Selected

17. If I get married, I prefer to wear my wedding ring in the public.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

Answer If 6. Do you ever want to get married? Yes Is Selected

18. I prefer to use "Mrs. " after I get married.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

Answer If 6. Do you ever want to get married? Yes Is Selected

19. I prefer to use "Ms." after I get married.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

Answer If 6. Do you ever want to get married? Yes Is Selected

20. I prefer to focus on pursuing my career after I get married.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

21. I think it's acceptable if a woman wants to keep her maiden name when she gets married.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

22. A woman who changes to her spouse's name when she gets married is more committed to the marriage than a woman who does not change her name.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

23. Women using "Miss" appears younger than those using "Ms. " or "Mrs."

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

24. Titles like "Ms.", "Miss" and "Mrs." are indicative of women's marital status.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

25. Women using "Ms." after getting married are more INDEPENDENT than those using "Mrs."

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

26. Women using "Ms." after getting married are more CAREER-ORIENTED than those using "Mrs."

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

Answer If 6. Do you ever want to get married? Yes Is Selected

27. I prefer to quit my job and be a homemaker after I get married.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

Answer If 6. Do you ever want to get married? Yes Is Selected

28. I prefer to pursue my career and take care of my family at the same time after I get married.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

29. Do you want to have children?

- Yes (1)
- Undecided (2)
- No (3)

If No Is Selected, Then Skip To 34. Raising children will bring me mo...

Answer If 6. Do you ever want to get married? Yes Is Selected

30. I prefer to have children right after getting married.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

31. I prefer to have children after I have achieved my career goals.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

Answer If 6. Do you ever want to get married? Yes Is Selected

32. It is acceptable to me to have children before getting married.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

33. It is acceptable to me to have children without getting married.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

34. Raising children will bring me more happiness than pain.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

35. Do you like children?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)
- Not sure (3)

36. Working will bring more satisfaction to me than my family will do.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

37. Economic independence of women matters a lot to them in maintaining equality with partners in the household.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

38. In your opinion, will there be any conflict between your family/ marriage and your jobs?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)
- Not sure (3)

If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To Will the conflict affect your career&...

Answer If 38. In your opinion, will there be any conflict between y... Yes Is Selected

38-1. Will the conflict affect your work negatively in your mind?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

39. Will you give up your jobs if your family request you to do so?

- Yes (1)
- Undecided (2)
- No (3)

40. Women should not go to exactly the same places as men.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

41. I care \_\_\_\_\_ about my appearances/ looks.

- very much (1)
- quite a bit (2)
- on average (3)
- a little (4)
- little or none (5)

42. I care \_\_\_\_\_ about what others say about my looks.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

43. It is more important to me that others like my appearances/ look than I like it myself.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

44. Women should make themselves look feminine, for example, they should keep long hair or wear skirts often.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

45. Men have more authority on whether a woman is attractive than other women do.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

46. Those whose appearances are appealing to men find it easier to get married than those whose are not.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

47. There are some behaviors that men can freely do but women cannot do, for example, sitting with legs open.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

48. Smoking will lower a woman's attractiveness to men.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

49. Women ought to devote more to their families than their own jobs.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Undecided (3)
- Agree (4)
- Strongly Agree (5)

50. Good wives WITH CHILDREN should \_\_\_\_\_.

- take care of their families and work equally (1)
- focus more on their families even if they have jobs (2)
- quit their jobs and devote themselves to the families (3)
- focus on their work (4)

51. Good wives WITHOUT CHILDREN should \_\_\_\_\_.

- take care of their families and work equally (1)
- focus more on their families even if they have jobs (2)
- quit their jobs and devote themselves to the families (3)
- focus on their work (4)

52. The following are some common jobs that people do. Please group these jobs into a category that you think is appropriate by dragging and dropping the items into the boxes. Are these jobs particularly suitable for women workers, for men workers, or gender-neutral (both women and men can do) in your opinion?

	Jobs that are particularly suitable for women	Gender-neutral	Jobs that are particularly suitable for men
_____ manager (1)			
_____ school teacher (2)			
_____ engineer (3)			
_____ firefighter (4)			
_____ spokesperson (5)			
_____ government official (6)			
_____ clerical worker (7)			
_____ doctor (8)			
_____ nurse (9)			
_____ detective (10)			
_____ professor (11)			
_____ pilot (12)			
_____ designer			

(13) _____ flight attendant (14) _____ factory director/ leader of the factory (15) _____ department secretary (16) _____ lawyer (17) _____ housekeeper (18) _____ babysitter (19) _____ CEO (20)			
--	--	--	--

53. Do you set standards for selecting your partner?

- Yes (1)  
 No (2)

If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To What factors do you consider in choos...

Answer If 53. Do you set standards for selecting your partner? Yes Is Selected

53-1. What factors will you consider in choosing your mate, for example. race, education level, job, personality, weight, height, habit, fondness of children, religious belief, etc. ? (Optional)

53-2. Which standard(s) above matter(s) to you most? (Optional)\_\_\_\_\_

## REFERENCES

- Alvarez, D., & Bean, F. D. (1976). The Mexican-American family. In C. H. Mindel & R. W. Habenstein (Eds.), *Ethnic families in American* (pp. 271-292) New York: Elsevier.
- Amatea, E. S., Cross, E. G., Clark, J. E., & Bobby, C. L. (1986). Assessing the work and family role expectations of career-oriented men and women: The Life Role Salience Scales. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *48*, 831–838.
- Amartya Sen (2001). The Many Faces of Gender Inequality. *The New Republic*, pp.35-40
- Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Peake, A., & Harris, K. L. (2002). Young adults' attitudes toward multiple role planning: The influence of gender, career traditionality and marriage plans. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *60*, 405–421.
- Anderson, E. (1989). Sex codes and family life among poor inner-city youth. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *501*, 59-78.
- Anderson, E. (1990). *Streetwise: Race, class, and change in an urban community*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Atkinson, D. L. (1987). Names and titles: Maiden name retention and the use of Ms. *Journal of the Atlantic Provinces Linguistic Association*, *9*, 56–83.
- Baber, K. M., & Monaghan, P. (1988). College women's career and motherhood expectations: New options, old dilemmas. *Sex Roles*, *19*, 189–203.
- Barrett, A. E. (1999). Social support and life satisfaction among the never married: examining the effects of age. *Research on Aging*, *21*, 46-72
- Basuil, A. D., & Casper, W. J. (2011). Work–family planning attitudes among emerging adults. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *80*, 629-637.
- Bean, F. D., & Tienda, M. (1987). *The Hispanic population of the United States*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Bennett, N. G., Bloom, D. E., & Craig, P. H. (1989). The divergence of black and white marriage patterns. *American Journal of Sociology*, *95*, 692-722.
- Betz, N. (1993). Women's career development. In F. L. Denmark & M. A. Paludi (Eds.), *Psychology of women: A handbook of issues and theories* (pp. 625–684). Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Bielby, D. D., & Bielby, W. T. (1984). Work commitment, sex-role attitudes, and women's employment. *American Sociological Review*, *49*, 234–247.
- Blakemore, J. O., Lawton, C. A., & Vartanian, L. R. (2003). The New Meaning of Ms.: Single, But too Old for Miss. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *27*, 215-220
- Blakemore, J. O., Lawton, C. A., & Vartanian, L. R. (2005). I Can't Wait to Get Married: Gender Differences in Drive to Marry. *Sex Roles*, *53*, 327-335
- Bridges, J. S., & Etaugh, C. (1994). Black and White college women's perceptions of early maternal employment. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *18*, 427–431.

- Botkin, D. R., Weeks, M. O. N., & Morris, J. E. (2000). Changing marriage role expectations: 1961–1996. *Sex Roles, 42*, 933–942.
- Bridges, J. S. (1987). College females' perceptions of adult roles and occupational fields for women. *Sex Roles, 16*, 591–604.
- Brightman, J. (1994). Why Hillary chooses Rodham Clinton. *American Demographics, 16*, 9–11.
- Bulcroft R. A., & Bulcroft K. A. (1993). Race Differences in Attitudinal and Motivational Factors in the Decision to Marry. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 55*, 338-355
- Carlson, E. D. (1985). The Impact of International Migration upon the Timing of Marriage and Childbearing. *Demography, 22*, 61-72
- Cinamon, R. G., & Rich, Y. (2002). Gender differences in the importance of work and family roles: Implications for work-family conflict. *Sex Roles, 47*, 531–541.
- Chasteen, A. L. (1994). "The world around me": The environment and single women. *Sex Roles, 31*, 309–328.
- Chen, Y. (1999). Marriage Attitudes and Problems among Migrant Women Workers: Survey Results in Guangdong. In N. Chiang and C. Sung (Eds), *Population, Urban and Regional Development in China*, China Studies Program, Population Studies Center, National Taiwan University, Taipei
- Choi, N. G. (1996). The never-married and divorced elderly: Comparison of economic and health status, social support, and living arrangement. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work, 26*, 3-25.
- Chyi, H. (2009). Determinants of Marriages in Rural and Urban China. Working Paper, the Wang Yanan Institute for Studies in Economics (WISE), Xiamen University
- Crosby, F. (1991). *Juggling*. New York: Free Press.
- Crosby, F., Allen, B., Culbertson, T., Wally, C., Morith, J., Hall, R., et al. (1994). Taking selectivity into account, how much does gender composition matter? A reanalysis of M. E. Tidball's research. *NWSA Journal, 6*, 107–118.
- Dion, K.L., & Cota, A.A. (1991). The Ms. stereotype: Its domain and the role of explicitness in the title preference. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 15*, 403-410.
- Dion, K.L., & Schuller, R.A. (1990). Ms. and the manager: A tale of two stereotypes. *Sex Roles, 22*, 569-577
- Dobson, C. D., & Houseknecht, S. K. (1998). Black and White differences in the effect of women's educational attainment on age of first marriage. *Journal of Family Issues, 19*, 204–223.
- Duggan, D. A., Cota, A. A., & Dion, K. L. (1993). Taking the husband's name: What might it mean? *Names, 41*, 87–102.
- Dugsin, R. (2001). Conflict and healing in family experience of second generation emigrants from India living in North America. *Family Press, 40*, 233-241.
- Erchull, M. J., Liss, M., Axelson, S. J., Staebell, S. E., & Askari, S., F. (2010). Well...She wants it more: perceptions of social norms about desires for marriage and children and anticipated chore participation. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 34*, 253-260.
- Etaugh, C., & Birdoes, L. N. (1991). Effects of age, sex, and marital status on person perception. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 72*, 491–497.

Etaugh, C., & Hoehn, S. (1995). Perceiving women: Effects of marital, parental, and occupational sex-typing variables. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, *80*, 320–322.

Etaugh, C., & Stern, J. (1984). Person perception: Effects of sex, marital status, and sex-typed occupation. *Sex Roles*, *11*, 413–424.

Fan, C. C., & Huang, Y. (1998). Waves of Rural Brides: Female Marriage Migration in China. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, *88*, 227-251

Fenigstein, A., Scheier, M. F., & Buss, A. H. (1975). Public and private self-consciousness: Assessment and theory. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *43*, 522–527.

Ferber, M. A., & Young, L. (1997). Student Attitudes Toward Roles of Women and Men: Is the Egalitarian Household Imminent? *Feminist Economics*, *3*, 65-83

Ferguson, G. (1976). *Statistical analysis in psychology and education*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ferguson, S. J. (2000). Challenging traditional marriage: Never married Chinese American and Japanese American women. *Gender and Society*, *14*, 136–159.

Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, L. C., CLICK, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *82*, 878-902

Foss, K. A., & Edson, B. A. (1989). What's in a name? Accounts of married women's name choices. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, *53*, 356–373.

Fowler, R. I., & Fuehrer, A. (1997). Women's marital names: An interpretive study of name retainers' concepts of marriage. *Feminism and Psychology*, *7*, 315–320.

Frazier, P., Arikian, N., Benson, S., Losoff, A., & Maurer, S. (1996). Desire for marriage and life satisfaction among unmarried heterosexual adults. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *13*, 225-239

Gerson, M. (1980). The lure of motherhood. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *5*, 207–218.

Goldscheider, F. K., & Waite, L. J. (1986). Sex differences in the entry into marriage. *American Journal of Sociology*, *92*, 91-109.

Gould, E. D., and M. D. Paserman. (2003). Waiting for Mr. Right: Rising Inequality and Declining Marriage Rates, *Journal of Urban Economics*, *53*, 257-281.

Granrose, C. S., & Kaplan, E. E. (1996). *Work-family role choices for women in their 20s and 30s: From college plans to life experiences*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Greenglass, E. R., & Devins, R. (1982). Factors related to marriage and career plans in unmarried women. *Sex Roles*, *8*, 57–71.

Greenwood, J., Guner, A., & Knowles, J. A. (2003). More on Marriage, Fertility, and the Distribution of Income. *International Economic Reviews*, *44*, 827-862

Gutek, B. A. (2001). Women and paid work. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *25*, 379–393.

Ganong, L. H., Coleman, M., & Mapes, D. (1990). A meta-analytic review of family structure stereotypes. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *52*, 287–297.

- Hammersla, J. F., & Frease-McMahan, L. (1990). University students' priorities: Life goals vs. relationships. *Sex Roles, 23*, 1–14.
- Hallett, M. B., & Gilbert, L. A. (1997). Variables differentiating university women considering role-sharing and conventional dual-career marriage. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 50*, 308–322.
- Hartmann, H. (1976). Capitalism, Patriarchy, and Job Segregation by Sex. *Signs, 1*, 137-169
- Helson, R., Elliott, T., & Leigh, J. (1989). Adolescent personality and women's work patterns. In D. Stern & D. Eichorn (Eds.), *Adolescence and work: Influences of social structure, labor markets, and culture* (pp. 259–289). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hoeffler, B. (1987). Predictors of life outlook of older single women. *Research in Nursing and Health, 10*, 111-117.
- Hoffnung, M. (1992). *What's a mother to do? Conversations on work and family*. Pasadena, CA: Trilogy Books.
- Hoffnung, M. (2004). Wanting it all: Career, marriage, and motherhood during college-educated women's 20s. *Sex Roles, 50*, 711–723.
- Hollingshead, A. B. (1957/1965). *Two factor index of social position*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Huddy, L., Neely, F., & Lafay, M. R. (2000). The polls—Trends: Support for the women's movement. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 64*, 309–350.
- Intons-Peterson, M. J., & Crawford, J. (1985). The meanings of marital surnames. *Sex Roles, 12*, 1163-1171.
- Joan Acker (1988). Class, Gender, and the Relations of Distribution. *Signs, 13*, 473-497
- Josselson, R. (1996). *Revising herself: The story of women's identity from college to midlife*. New York: Oxford.
- Jow-Ching, E. T., & Li, S. (1999). Inter-regime marriage and mobility: The case of mainland China and Taiwan. *Journal of Contemporary China, 3* (22), 499-516.
- Judith E. Owen Blakemore, Carol A. Lawton, Lesa Rae Vartanian (2004). I can't wait to get married: gender differences in drive to marry. *Sex Roles, 53*, 327-335.
- Kaslow, F. W. (1992). Thirty-plus and not married. In B. R. Wainrib (Ed.), *Gender issues across the life cycle* (pp. 77–94). New York: Springer.
- Katchadourian, H., & Boli, J. (1994). *Cream of the crop: The impact of elite education in the decade after college*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kaufman, D. R. (1995). Professional women: How real are the recent gains? In J. Freeman (Ed.), *Women: A feminist perspective* (5th ed., pp. 287–305). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.
- Kerpelman, J. L., & Schvaneveldt, P. L. (1999). Young adults' anticipated identity importance of career, marital, and parental roles: Comparisons of men and women with different role balance orientations. *Sex Roles, 41*, 189–217.
- Kimberlee A. Shauman (2010). Gender Asymmetry in Family Migration: Occupational Inequality or Interspousal Comparative Advantage? *Journal of Marriage and Family, 72*, 375-392

- Kline, S. L., Stafford, L., & Miklosovic, J. C. (1996). Women's surnames: Decisions, interpretations and associations with relational qualities. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 13*, 593–617.
- Komarovsky, M. (1985). *Women in college: Shaping new feminine identities*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kreider, R. M., & Simmons, T. (2003). Marital status: 2000. Retrieved March 15, 2005, from <http://www.census.gov/prod/2003pubs/c2kbr-30.pdf>
- Lakoff, R. (1973). Language and woman's place. *Language in Society, 2*, 45-80.
- Lam, D. (1988). Marriage markets and assortative mating with household public goods: Theoretical results and empirical implications. *Journal of Human Resources, 23*, 462-487.
- Larson, J.H., Benson, M. J., Wilson, S. M., & Medora, N. (1998). Family of Origin Influences on Marital Attitudes and Readiness for Marriage in Late Adolescents. *Journal of Family, 19*, 750-768.
- Lawton, C. A., Blakemore, J. E. O., & Vartanian, L. R. (2003). The new meaning of Ms.: Single, but too old for Miss. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 27*, 215.
- Lawton, C. A., Blakemore, J. E. O., & Vartanian, L. R. (2005). I Can't Wait to Get Married: Gender Differences in Drive to Marry. *Sex Roles, 53*, 327-335.
- Leung, S. A., Conoley, C. W., & Schell, M. J. (1994). The careers and educational aspirations of gifted high school students: A retrospective study. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 72*, 298–303.
- Levine, R., Sato, S., Hashimoto, T., & Verma, J. (1995). Love and marriage in eleven cultures. *Journal of Cross- Cultural Psychology, 26*, 554-571.
- Levinson, D. J. (1978). *The seasons of a man's life*. New York: Knopf.
- Levinson, D. J. (1996). *The seasons of a woman's life*. New York: Knopf.
- P1: JQX Sex Roles [sers] pp1195-sers-486376 May 1, 2004 9:41 Style file version June 3rd, 2002 Career, Marriage, and Motherhood in Women's 20s 723
- Lewis, K. G. (1994). Single heterosexual women through the life cycle. In M. P. Mirkin (Ed.), *Women in context: Toward a feminist reconstruction of psychotherapy*. (pp. 170-187). New York: Guilford.
- Lewis, K. G., & Moon, S. (1997). Always single and single again women: A qualitative study. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 23*, 115–134.
- Lichter, D. T., Anderson, R. N., & Hayward, M. D. (1995). Marriage markets and marital choice. *Journal of Family Issues, 16*, 412-431.
- Locksley, A. (1982). Social Class and Marital Attitudes and Behavior. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 44*, 427-440.
- Lowenstein, S. F., Bloch, N. E., Champion, J., Epstein, J. S., Gale, P., & Salvatore, M. (1981). A study of satisfactions and stresses of single women in midlife. *Sex Roles, 7*, 1127-1141.
- Machung, A. (1989). Talking career, thinking job: Gender differences in career and family expectations of Berkeley seniors. *Feminist Studies, 15*, 35–58.
- Mare, R. (1991). Five decades of educational assortative mating. *American Sociological Review, 56*, 15-32.

- Mennino, S. F., & Brayfield, A. (2002). Job–family trade-offs: The multidimensional effects of gender. *Work and Occupations, 29*, 226–256.
- Metz, I., & Tharenou, P. (2001). Women's career advancement. *Gender and Organizational Management, 26*, 312–342.
- Murrell, A. J., Frieze, I. H., & Frost, J. L. (1991). Aspiring to careers in male- and female-dominated professions: A study of Black and White college women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 15*, 103–126.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2002). Postsecondary education [Electronic version]. In *Digest of education statistics, 2001* (NCES Publication No. 2002130, chap. 3). Washington, DC: Author.
- Nichols, M. A. Pace-Nichols, D. S. Becvar, & A. Y. Napier (Eds.), *Handbook of family development and intervention* (pp. 129–142). New York: Wiley.
- Nilsen, A. P. (1977). Sexism in the language of marriage. In A. P. Nilsen, H. Bosmajian, H. L. Gershuny, & J. P. Stanley (Eds.), *Predictors of Drive to Marry 335 Sexism and language* (pp. 131–140). Urbana IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Novack, L. L., & Novack, D. R. (1996). Being female in the eighties and nineties: Conflicts between new opportunities and traditional expectations among White, middle class, heterosexual college women. *Sex Roles, 35*, 57–78.
- O'Connell, L., Betz, N., & Kurth, S. (1989). Plans for balancing work and family life: Do women pursuing nontraditional and traditional occupations differ? *Sex Roles, 20*, 35–45.
- Oppenheimer V. K. (1988). A Theory of Marriage Timing. *American Journal of Sociology, 94*, 563-591
- Oppenheimer, V. K. (1997). Women's employment and the gain to marriage: The specialization and trading model. *Annual Review of Sociology, 23*, 431–453.
- Pauwels, A. (2001). Spreading the feminist word: The case of the new courtesy title Ms. in Australian English. In M. Hellinger & H. Bussmann (Eds.), *Gender across languages: The linguistic representation of women and men, Vol. 1: Impact, studies in language and society* (pp. 137–151).
- Perkins, H. W., & DeMeis, D. K. (1996). Gender and family effects on the “second-shift” domestic activities of college-educated young adults. *Gender and Society, 10*, 78–93.
- Phyllis A. Gordon. (2003). The Decision to Remain Single: Implications for women across cultures. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 25*, 33-44
- Primakoff, L. (1983). Solo pioneers: Single-minded rationality. *Journal of Rational-Emotive and Cognitive-Behavior Therapy, 6*, 66-80.
- Qian, Z., & Preston, S. H. (1993). Changes in American Marriage, 1972 To 1987: Availability and Forces of Attraction by Age and Education. *American Sociological Reviews, 58*, 482-495
- Qian, Z. (1998). Changes in assortative mating: The impact of age and education, 1970-1990. *Demography, 35*:3, 279-292.
- Rank, M. R. (2000). Socialization of socioeconomic status. In W. C.

Rexroat, C., & Shehan, C. (1984). Expected versus actual work roles of women. *American Sociological Review*, 49, 349–358.

Reynolds, J., & Wetherell, M. (2003). The discursive climate of singleness: The consequences for women's negotiation of a single identity. *Feminism and Psychology*, 13, 489–510.

Rosenbluth, S. C., Steil, J. M., Whitcomb, J. H. (1998). Marital Equality What Does It Mean? *Journal of Family Issues*, 19, 3 227-244

Russell, J. E., & Rush, M. C. (1987). The effects of sex and marital/parental status on performance evaluations and attributions. *Sex Roles*, 17, 221–236.

Sandfield, A., & Percy, C. (2003). Accounting for single status: Heterosexism and ageism in heterosexual women's talk about marriage. *Feminism and Psychology*, 13, 475–488.

Sassler S., & Schoen R. (1999). The Effect of Attitudes and Economic Activity on Marriage. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 6, 147-159

Shaw, K. (1987). The Quit Propensity of Married Men. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 5:4, 533-560.

Scheuble, L. K., Johnson, D. R., & Johnson, K. M. (2012). Marital Name Changing Attitudes and Plans

of College Students: Comparing Change Over Time and Across Regions. *Sex Roles*, 66, 282–292

Schroeder, K. A., Blood, L. L., & Maluso, D. (1992). An intergenerational analysis of expectations for women's career and family roles. *Sex Roles*, 26, 273–291.

Schoen, R., & Owens, D. (1992). A further look at first unions and first marriages. In S. J. South & S. E. Tolnay (Eds.), *The changing American family: Sociological and demographic perspectives* (pp. 109-117). Boulder, CO: Westview.

South, S. J. (1992). For love or money? Sociodemographic determinants of the expected benefits from marriage. In S. J. South & S. E. Tolnay (Eds.), *The changing American family: Sociological and demographic perspectives* (pp. 171-194). Boulder, CO: Westview.

South, S. J. (1993). Racial and Ethnic Differences in the Desire to Marry. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 55,357-370.

Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1973). A short version of the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS). *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, 2, 219–220.

Spence, J. T., & Hahn, E. D. (1997). The Attitudes Toward Women Scale and attitude change in college students. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21, 17–34.

Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1978). Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, and antecedents. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Sprecher, S., Schmeekle, M., & Felmlee, D. (2006). The Principle of Least Interest Inequality in Emotional Involvement in Romantic Relationships. *Journal of Family Issues*, 27, 1255-1280.

Staples, R. (1988). An overview of race and marital status. In H. P. McAdoo (ed.), *Black families* (pp. 187-189). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Steil, J. M. (2001). Family forms and member well-being: A research agenda for the decade of behavior. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 25, 344–363.

Stone, L., & McKee, N. P. (2000). Gendered futures: Student visions of career and family on a college campus. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 31, 67–89.

Tangri, S. S. (1972). Determinants of occupational role innovation among college women. *Journal of Social Issues*, 28, 177–199. U.S. Bureau of the Census. (2000). *Statistical abstract of the United States: 2000*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Twenge, J. M. (1997). "Mrs. His Name": Women's preferences for married names. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21, 417–429.

U.S. News.com. (2003). America's best colleges 2004. Retrieved October 11, 2003, from <http://www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/eduhome.htm>

Waite, L. J., & Spitze, G. D. (1981). Young women's transition to marriage. *Demography*, 18, 681-694.

White, L., & Rogers, S. J. (2000). Economic circumstances and family outcomes: A review of the 1990s. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 1035–1051.

Willets-Bloom, M. C., & Nock, S. L. (1994). The influence of maternal employment on gender role attitudes of men and women. *Sex Roles*, 30, 371–389.

Watson, T., & McLanahan, S. (2009). Marriage Meets the Joneses: Relative Income, Identity, and Marital Status. National Bureau of Economic Research, NBER Working Paper No. 14773, 1-73

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I am very grateful to my family for unceasingly supporting me to complete the thesis and my master degree.

I wish to express my sincere thanks to Dr. Stephen Sapp, DOGE and my major professor, for helping me along the way from choosing courses that best fit my interests and level to teaching me how to use SPSS and LISREL to do research from the basic. I still remember him ran over the office just to illustrate the usage of factor and reliability analysis. I am extremely grateful for his expert, sincere and valuable guidance and encouragement extended to me.

I also thank Dr. Teresa Downing-Matibag, my co-major professor, for her constant encouragement concerning my thesis and research. She is the one who lent a hand when I was in needy help. She discussed my research plan with me for several times to make sure everything is feasible and specific. I learned a lot from Dr. Downing-Matibag in both academics and personalities.

I also place the record, my heartfelt thanks to Dr. Yalem Teshome, my committee member, who has such nice personality and positively co-operates me all the time. I wish to thank her for filling the form for me when I was away from Ames and her foot got hurt.

I take this opportunity to record my sincere thanks to all the faculty members of the Department of Sociology for their help and teaching. Besides, thank Weijie Yu for his support and care. Thank Jingyi Zhang, Weixing Sun, Lijin Ju, Jiaxu Liu, Beibei Cheng, Bingjie Jin, Leslie Daub, and Rachel Burlingame for their encouragement and help. I also place on record, my sense of gratitude to one and all who, directly or indirectly, have lent their helping hand in this venture.

Shuguo Xu