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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 as 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 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- McManan, 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Percentage of Women by Race

Asian American
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>94.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>99.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5. Factor Analysis of Desire for Marriage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14. How do you think your life might be different if you were married? Overall Happiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8. When would you like to get married?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9. Where does your motivation for marriage come from? Self-longing for marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10. Getting engaged would be one of the most exciting things that happened to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12. Wearing a wedding dress will make me the happiest woman in the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11. Getting married is NOT one of my priorities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q14_2</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td>.879</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14_3</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14_4</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>-.225</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14_5</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14_6</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14_7</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>-.225</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14_8</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15_6R</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>-.822</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15_8R</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>-.332</td>
<td>-.127</td>
<td>.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15_1</td>
<td>.776</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15_2</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15_3</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>-.351</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q14.2. How life might be different if you were married? — Living standard</td>
<td>.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14.3. How life might be different if you were married? — Economic security</td>
<td>.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14.4. How life might be different if you were married? — Economic Independence</td>
<td>.561</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 component extracted.

Table 8. Factor Analysis of Expectations for Adulthood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q15.1. Getting married will make me feel proud.</td>
<td>.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15.2. Getting married will make me feel complete.</td>
<td>.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15.3. Getting married will make me feel more mature.</td>
<td>.740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

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

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 component extracted.
As Table 11 has shown, Q16 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10. Factor Analysis of Social Acceptance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15_6. Getting married will make me feel more accepted by others&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15_8. Getting married will make me feel more attractive&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 component extracted.
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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q16. I plan to change my last name to that of my spouse if I get married.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19. I prefer to use &quot;Mrs.&quot; after I get married.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
a. 1 component extracted.

Table 13. Factor Analysis of Career Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q28. I prefer to quit my job and be a homemaker after I get married.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29. I prefer to pursue my career and take care of my family at the same time after I get married.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
a. 1 component extracted.
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 14. Factor Analysis of Parental Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35. Raising children will bring me more happiness than pain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30. Do you want to have children?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36. Do you like children?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 component extracted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 15. Factor Analysis of Feminist View</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44. I care _______ about what others say about my looks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q45. It is more important to me that others like my appearances than I like it myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q46. Women should make themselves look feminine, for example, they should keep long hair or wear skirt, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

Table 16. Cronbach’s Alpha of Variables

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DESIRE</th>
<th>ADULT</th>
<th>ECONOMICS</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>SEXUPE</th>
<th>SOCACCOP</th>
<th>GRSI</th>
<th>GRC</th>
<th>FEMININE</th>
<th>WANTKIDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DESIRE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correlation</strong></td>
<td>1.568**</td>
<td>.135**</td>
<td>-.063**</td>
<td>.199**</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.449**</td>
<td>.246**</td>
<td>.153**</td>
<td>.448**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADULT</strong></td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson</strong></td>
<td>.194**</td>
<td>.194**</td>
<td>.194**</td>
<td>.194**</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.194**</td>
<td>.194**</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMICS</strong></td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson</strong></td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson</strong></td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson</strong></td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEXUPE</strong></td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson</strong></td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCACCOP</strong></td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson</strong></td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRSI</strong></td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson</strong></td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRC</strong></td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson</strong></td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEMININE</strong></td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson</strong></td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WANTKIDS</strong></td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson</strong></td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 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)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DESIRE</th>
<th>ADULT</th>
<th>ECONOMIC</th>
<th>SEXLIFE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BETA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIRE</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.040)</td>
<td>(0.037)</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.534</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>1.763</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADULT</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEXLIFE</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DESIRE</th>
<th>ADULT</th>
<th>ECONOMIC</th>
<th>SEXLIFE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Squared Multiple Correlations for Reduced Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DESIRE</th>
<th>ADULT</th>
<th>ECONOMIC</th>
<th>SEXLIFE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BETA</th>
<th>DESIRE</th>
<th>ADULT</th>
<th>ECONOMIC</th>
<th>SEXLIFE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESIRE</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADULT</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEXLIFE</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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 inclined 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.
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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 12 /
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
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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

Covariance Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DESIRE</th>
<th>ADULT</th>
<th>ECONOMIC</th>
<th>SEXLI FE</th>
<th>GRSI</th>
<th>GRC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESIRE</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADULT</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.532</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEXLI FE</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRSI</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRC</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.732</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Covariance Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FEMININE</th>
<th>WANTKIDS</th>
<th>EDU</th>
<th>NEWAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEMININE</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WANTKIDS</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWAGE</td>
<td>-0.102</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>0.607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DESIRE</th>
<th>ADULT</th>
<th>ECONOMIC</th>
<th>SEXLI FE</th>
<th>GRSI</th>
<th>GRC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESIRE</td>
<td>3.535</td>
<td>3.746</td>
<td>3.841</td>
<td>4.038</td>
<td>4.090</td>
<td>1.880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FEMININE</th>
<th>WANTKIDS</th>
<th>EDU</th>
<th>NEWAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEMININE</td>
<td>1.955</td>
<td>3.952</td>
<td>1.263</td>
<td>2.087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model of Desire for Marriage

Parameter Specifications

BETA
Model of Desire for Marriage

Number of Iterations = 0

LISREL Estimates (Maximum Likelihood)

BETA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESIRE</th>
<th>ADULT</th>
<th>ECONOMIC</th>
<th>SEXLIFE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESIRE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.040)</td>
<td>(0.037)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.534</td>
<td>0.496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GAMMA

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

### Covariance Matrix of Y and X

#### DESIRE, ADULT, ECONOMIC, SEXLIFE, GRSI, GRC

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

#### FEMININE, WANTKIDS, EDU, NEWAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FEMININE</th>
<th>WANTKIDS</th>
<th>EDU</th>
<th>NEWAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEMININE</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WANTKIDS</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWAGE</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>0.607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mean Vector of Eta-Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DESIRE</th>
<th>ADULT</th>
<th>ECONOMIC</th>
<th>SEXLIFE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.464</td>
<td>3.746</td>
<td>3.841</td>
<td>4.038</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PHI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GRSI</th>
<th>GRC</th>
<th>FEMININE</th>
<th>WANTKIDS</th>
<th>EDU</th>
<th>NEWAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRSI</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRC</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.040)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMININE</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.042)</td>
<td>(0.039)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WANTKIDS</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.045)</td>
<td>(0.047)</td>
<td>(0.050)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>-0.133</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWAGE</td>
<td>-0.171</td>
<td>-0.074</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>0.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
<td>(0.037)</td>
<td>(0.039)</td>
<td>(0.043)</td>
<td>(0.018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PSI

Note: This matrix is diagonal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DESIRE</th>
<th>ADULT</th>
<th>ECONOMIC</th>
<th>SEXLIFE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>0.509</td>
<td>0.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.017)</td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
<td>(0.041)</td>
<td>(0.058)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.362</td>
<td>12.350</td>
<td>12.349</td>
<td>12.369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Squared Multiple Correlations for Structural Equations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DESIRE</th>
<th>ADULT</th>
<th>ECONOMIC</th>
<th>SEXLIFE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Squared Multiple Correlations for Reduced Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DESIRE</th>
<th>ADULT</th>
<th>ECONOMIC</th>
<th>SEXLIFE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Reduced Form

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

### ALPHA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DESIRE</th>
<th>ADULT</th>
<th>ECONOMIC</th>
<th>SEXLIFE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.640</td>
<td>2.062</td>
<td>3.569</td>
<td>3.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.256)</td>
<td>(0.206)</td>
<td>(0.224)</td>
<td>(0.265)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.417</td>
<td>9.988</td>
<td>15.934</td>
<td>11.384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Global Goodness of Fit Statistics, Missing Data Case

\[-2\ln(L) \text{ for the saturated model} = 6854.542\]
\[-2\ln(L) \text{ for the fitted model} = 6871.546\]

**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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DESIRE</th>
<th>ADULT</th>
<th>ECONOMIC</th>
<th>SEXLIFE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Correlation Matrix of Y and X

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{DESIRE} & \text{ADULT} & \text{ECONOMIC} & \text{SEXLIFE} & \text{GRSI} & \text{GRC} \\
\text{DESIRE} & 1.000 & & & & \\
\text{ADULT} & 0.561 & 1.000 & & & \\
\text{ECONOMIC} & 0.066 & 0.027 & 1.000 & & \\
\text{SEXLIFE} & 0.203 & 0.019 & 1.000 & & \\
\text{GRSI} & 0.441 & 0.012 & 0.164 & 1.000 & \\
\text{GRC} & 0.247 & 0.005 & 0.170 & 0.276 & 1.000 \\
\text{FEMININE} & 0.154 & 0.185 & -0.018 & 0.023 & 0.274 & 0.296 \\
\text{WANTKIDS} & 0.446 & 0.299 & 0.121 & 0.175 & 0.305 & 0.095 \\
\text{EDU} & -0.039 & -0.076 & 0.013 & -0.030 & -0.236 & -0.143 \\
\text{NEWAGE} & -0.117 & -0.100 & -0.003 & -0.043 & -0.238 & -0.110 \\
\end{array}
\]

Correlation Matrix of Y and X

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{FEMININE} & \text{WANTKIDS} & \text{EDU} & \text{NEWAGE} \\
\text{FEMININE} & 1.000 & & & \\
\text{WANTKIDS} & 0.085 & 1.000 & & \\
\text{EDU} & -0.154 & 0.037 & 1.000 & \\
\text{NEWAGE} & -0.146 & -0.092 & 0.500 & 1.000 \\
\end{array}
\]

\section*{Note:}
This matrix is diagonal.

Regression Matrix Y on X (Standardized)

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
\text{GRSI} & \text{GRC} & \text{FEMININE} & \text{WANTKIDS} & \text{EDU} & \text{NEWAGE} \\
\text{DESIRE} & 0.307 & 0.134 & 0.006 & 0.335 & 0.053 & -0.024 \\
\text{ADULT} & 0.272 & 0.051 & 0.078 & 0.205 & - & - \\
\text{ECONOMIC} & -0.023 & 0.007 & -0.025 & 0.129 & - & - \\
\text{SEXLIFE} & 0.097 & 0.148 & -0.059 & 0.136 & - & - \\
\end{array}
\]
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. 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.

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_0kqqiZ4EDdc6SU&SubSection=&SubSubSection=&PageActionOptions=&TransactionID=3&Repeatable=0&T=1Dnz4g

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Strongest (1)</th>
<th>Stronger (2)</th>
<th>Average (3)</th>
<th>Less (4)</th>
<th>None (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-longing for marriage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner's request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family members or Friends' encouragement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The pressure of aging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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)

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

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

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)

12. I want a big wedding.

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

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

<p>| Much worse | Somewhat | No change | Somewhat | Much better |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Happiness (1)</th>
<th>Living Standard (2)</th>
<th>Economic security (3)</th>
<th>Economic independence (4)</th>
<th>Sex life (5)</th>
<th>Friendship with others (6)</th>
<th>Relations with your parents (7)</th>
<th>Relations with your partner’s parents (8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 14. Getting married will make me feel __________. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proud (1)</th>
<th>Complete (2)</th>
<th>More mature (3)</th>
<th>More restricted or less free (4)</th>
<th>Less restricted or more free (5)</th>
<th>More accepted by others (6)</th>
<th>Isolated by others (7)</th>
<th>More attractive (8)</th>
<th>Less attractive (9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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)
19. I prefer to use "Ms." after I get married.

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

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jobs that are particularly suitable for women</th>
<th>Gender-neutral</th>
<th>Jobs that are particularly suitable for men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>manager (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school teacher (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engineer (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>firefighter (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spokesperson (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government official (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clerical worker (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doctor (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nurse (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>detective (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professor (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pilot (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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)________
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