1

PM-1 3 1/2" x 4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

**ETHNICITY, DATING AND WOMAN ABUSE AMONG CANADIAN
UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE STUDENTS:
EXPLORING THE LINKS**

by

BENTE BAKLID, B.A.

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and
Research in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the
degree of

Master of Arts

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

May 8, 1996

© copyright

1996, Bente Baklid

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

395 rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file - votre référence

Your file - votre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-612-13780-5

Canada

Name BENIC BAKU

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

WOMEN'S STUDIES

SUBJECT TERM

0453

U-M-I

SUBJECT CODE

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS

Architecture 0729
Art History 0377
Cinema 0900
Dance 0378
Fine Arts 0357
Information Science 0723
Journalism 0391
Library Science 0399
Mass Communications 0708
Music 0413
Speech Communication 0459
Theater 0465

EDUCATION

General 0515
Administration 0514
Adult and Continuing 0516
Agricultural 0517
Art 0273
Bilingual and Multicultural 0282
Business 0688
Community College 0275
Curriculum and Instruction 0727
Early Childhood 0518
Elementary 0524
Finance 0277
Guidance and Counseling 0519
Health 0680
Higher 0745
History of 0520
Home Economics 0278
Industrial 0521
Language and Literature 0279
Mathematics 0280
Music 0522
Philosophy of 0998
Physical 0523

Psychology 0525
Reading 0535
Religious 0527
Sciences 0714
Secondary 0533
Social Sciences 0534
Sociology of 0340
Special 0529
Teacher Training 0530
Technology 0710
Tests and Measurements 0288
Vocational 0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language 0679
General 0289
Ancient 0290
Linguistics 0291
Literature 0401
General 0294
Classical 0295
Comparative 0297
Medieval 0298
Modern 0316
African 0591
American 0305
Asian 0352
Canadian (English) 0355
Canadian (French) 0593
English 0311
Germanic 0312
Latin American 0315
Middle Eastern 0313
Romance 0314
Slavic and East European

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy 0422
Religion 0318
General 0321
Biblical Studies 0319
Clergy 0320
History of 0322
Philosophy of 0469
Theology

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies 0323
Anthropology 0324
Archaeology 0326
Cultural 0327
Physical 0310
Business Administration 0272
General 0770
Accounting 0454
Banking 0338
Management 0385
Marketing 0501
Canadian Studies 0503
Economics 0505
General 0508
Agricultural 0509
Commerce-Business 0510
Finance 0511
History 0512
Labor 0513
Theory 0514
Folklore 0356
Geography 0366
Gerontology 0351
History 0578
General

Ancient 0579
Medieval 0581
Modern 0582
Black 0328
African 0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania 0332
Canadian 0334
European 0335
Latin American 0336
Middle Eastern 0337
United States 0585
History of Science 0398
Law
Political Science
General 0615
International Law and Relations 0616
Public Administration 0617
Recreation 0814
Social Work 0452
Sociology
General 0626
Criminology and Penology 0627
Demography 0938
Ethnic and Racial Studies 0628
Individual and Family Studies 0629
Industrial and Labor Relations 0630
Public and Social Welfare 0700
Social Structure and Development 0344
Theory and Methods 0709
Transportation 0999
Urban and Regional Planning 0453
Women's Studies

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture 0473
General 0285
Agronomy 0475
Animal Culture and Nutrition 0476
Animal Pathology 0359
Food Science and Technology 0478
Forestry and Wildlife 0479
Plant Culture 0480
Plant Pathology 0817
Plant Physiology 0777
Range Management 0746
Wood Technology
Biology
General 0306
Anatomy 0287
Biostatistics 0308
Botany 0309
Cell 0379
Ecology 0329
Entomology 0353
Genetics 0369
Limnology 0793
Microbiology 0410
Molecular 0307
Neuroscience 0317
Oceanography 0416
Physiology 0433
Radiation 0821
Veterinary Science 0778
Zoology 0472
Biophysics
General 0786
Medical 0760

EARTH SCIENCES

Biogeochemistry 0423
Geochemistry 0996

Geodesy 0370
Geology 0372
Geophysics 0373
Hydrology 0388
Mineralogy 0411
Paleobotany 0345
Paleoecology 0426
Paleontology 0418
Paleozoology 0985
Palynology 0427
Physical Geography 0368
Physical Oceanography 0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences 0768
Health Sciences
General 0566
Audiology 0300
Chemotherapy 0992
Dentistry 0567
Education 0350
Hospital Management 0769
Human Development 0758
Immunology 0982
Medicine and Surgery 0564
Mental Health 0347
Nursing 0569
Nutrition 0570
Obstetrics and Gynecology 0380
Occupational Health and Therapy 0354
Ophthalmology 0381
Pathology 0571
Pharmacology 0419
Pharmacy 0572
Physical Therapy 0382
Public Health 0573
Radiology 0574
Recreation 0575

Speech Pathology 0460
Toxicology 0383
Home Economics 0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences
Chemistry
General 0485
Agricultural 0749
Analytical 0486
Biochemistry 0487
Inorganic 0488
Nuclear 0738
Organic 0490
Pharmaceutical 0491
Physical 0494
Polymer 0495
Radiation 0754
Mathematics 0405
Physics
General 0605
Acoustics 0986
Astronomy and Astrophysics 0606
Atmospheric Science 0608
Atomic 0748
Electronics and Electricity 0607
Elementary Particles and High Energy 0798
Fluid and Plasma 0759
Molecular 0609
Nuclear 0610
Optics 0752
Radiation 0756
Solid State 0611
Statistics 0463

Applied Sciences

Applied Mechanics 0346
Computer Science 0984

Engineering
General 0537
Aerospace 0538
Agricultural 0539
Automotive 0540
Biomedical 0541
Chemical 0542
Civil 0543
Electronics and Electrical 0544
Heat and Thermodynamics 0348
Hydraulic 0545
Industrial 0546
Marine 0547
Materials Science 0794
Mechanical 0548
Metallurgy 0741
Mining 0551
Nuclear 0552
Packaging 0549
Petroleum 0765
Sanitary and Municipal 0554
System Science 0790
Geotechnology 0428
Operations Research 0796
Plastics Technology 0795
Textile Technology 0994

PSYCHOLOGY

General 0621
Behavioral 0384
Clinical 0622
Developmental 0623
Experimental 0624
Industrial 0625
Personality 0626
Physiological 0989
Psychobiology 0349
Psychometrics 0632
Social 0451

The undersigned recommend to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
acceptance of the thesis

ETHNICITY, DATING AND WOMAN ABUSE AMONG CANADIAN
UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE STUDENTS:
EXPLORING THE LINKS

submitted by Bente Baklid, B.A.

in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

Thesis Supervisor

Chair, Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Carleton University
May 24, 1996

ABSTRACT

This thesis explores the links between dating, ethnicity and woman abuse. Using a representative sample of Canadian university and college students, the present study has looked at how this population defines dating, the extent to which they engage in inter-ethnic dating and the occurrence of violence in both inter and intra-ethnic dating relationships, all with a focus on ethnicity. It was found that while there are differences according to ethnicity, these differences often disappear when introducing control variables (i.e. gender, age, school, number of casual and serious dating partners, patriarchal and feminist beliefs and attitudes). Given the lack of consistency, it is not possible to make general statements on dating experiences and ethnicity. One notable exception is the French Canadian segment of the sample whose responses are almost always different from the rest.

To my daughter, Aiden Inger Robertson Baklid

Acknowledgements

I wish to sincerely thank my supervisor Jared Keil for all the support and assistance he provided from the very beginning. I am also indebted to Walter DeKeseredy and Katherine Kelly for allowing me to use the data of their national study, as well as for their comments and suggestions. My friends were instrumental in making me complete the task; Tasha Yovetich editorial comments on the many drafts were invaluable and greatly appreciated, as are the many discussions with Wendy Larner and Domenique Masson which helped me place issues in context. Linda Vanderlee was also always there, giving me words, cookies and coffee for encouragement. Ronald Camacho's peptalks and massages carried me through many a difficult time, and finally, I would like to thank my partner Charles Robertson for helping me in more ways than I can ever describe.

CHAPTER 1	
THE RESEARCH PROBLEM	2
CHAPTER 2	
THE NATIONAL STUDY	9
2.1 Data Collection	9
2.2 Sample Characteristics	12
CHAPTER 3	
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW	15
3.1 Perception of Dating and Violence Against Women	20
3.2 Ethnicity	29
3.2.1 Dating and Ethnicity	30
3.2.2 Ethnicity and Prevalence Rates of Violence Against Women	33
3.2.3 Inter-ethnic Dating Relationships and Violence Against Women	36
3.3 Patriarchal Ideology and Violence against Women	39
3.3.1 Ethnicity, Patriarchal Ideology and Violence Against Women	41
CHAPTER 4	
THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT, DEFINITIONS AND MEASUREMENTS OF MAJOR VARIABLES	43
4.1 Dating	43
4.2 Ethnicity	48
4.3 Woman Abuse	52
4.4 Patriarchal Ideology	55
CHAPTER 5	
RESULTS	58
5.1 Inter-Ethnic Dating	58
5.2 Definitions of Dating	149
5.3 Casual and Serious Dating	197
5.3.1 Casual Dating	197
5.3.2 Serious Dating	216
5.4 Sexual, Physical and Psychological Woman Abuse in Dating Relationships	235
5.4.1 Inter-ethnic Dating and Woman Abuse	238
5.4.2 Women's Experience of Abuse and Ethnicity	267
5.4.3 Admitting to Abuse by Men and Ethnicity	306
5.4.4 Woman Abuse and Dating Definitions	316
5.5 Who Do not Date?	324
.	324
CHAPTER 6	
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	326

BIBLIOGRAPHY	349
APPENDICES	363
APPENDIX 1: Female and Male Questionnaires.	364
APPENDIX 2: Resources on Woman Abuse in Dating Relationships	400
APPENDIX 3: Weight Factors	402
APPENDIX 4: Dating Definitions Examples	403
APPENDIX 5: Reliability Analysis	404
APPENDIX 6: Code Book and Statistics	412

Carleton University
Ottawa, Canada K1S 5B6

Text complete; leaf / omitted in numbering.

Newly arrived undergraduates find themselves lost in a supermarket of potential partners. They have left behind their families, their high-school sweethearts, and all the awkward entanglements of adolescence. Suddenly they are adults, free to do what they want, when they want. And they find themselves surrounded by hundreds of attractive strangers, in what seems like a vast high school without rules. ... Campus courtship is like an arcade game in which the rules are confusing, the roles are confused - and hazard warnings loom at every turn (Johnson 1992:44).

CHAPTER 1

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Dating (or courtship) is not a foreign concept to anthropologists. Kinship studies, including dating rituals were, in fact, a major stream of anthropological study for several decades (Howell and Melhuus 1993). However, since most of the work in this area concentrated on various non-western cultures, dating in North American culture was not often a focus¹. This may have been due in part, to the difficulty of employing a vocabulary usually reserved for the 'other', for one's own people and their customs. The reluctance of using words such as 'rituals' to describe the North American dating culture continues to this day, but then again, dating in the 1990s as suggested above, is perhaps a less coherent and predictive activity than it was

¹ Margaret Mead's work (1949) is one notable exception.

earlier this century.

Historically an urban phenomena, dating as a social activity became established among the middle classes in North America in the early 1920s when it replaced the former system of coming on a "call" (Bailey 1989, Rothman 1984). Dating was already widely practised among the lower classes at this time, as it was a response to men's lack of opportunity to meet women in their homes as they often lived in crowded quarters. In the calling system, a man would be invited by the mother of the young woman or by the young woman herself, but with her mother's permission, to come to the woman's home. A number of rules applied to this visit (what refreshments to serve and when to serve them, chaperonage, appropriate topics of conversation etc. [Bailey 1989]), and a call was in essence a test of suitability for future marriage.

Dating, however, brought courtship out of the middle class private family parlours and into the unsupervised public spaces of restaurants, movie theatres and dance halls. Consequently, the power balance between women and men was also transformed. The calling system had been under female control because women both initiated and hosted a call. Dating put that control in men's court by virtue of being a public sphere, or men's world, activity. Furthermore, money became the basis of the new dating system because one had to buy entertainment, and since men

typically paid for it, still more power was bestowed upon them. For "[m]oney purchased obligation; money purchased inequality; money purchased control" (Bailey 1989:23). As Bailey aptly notes,

[a]n invitation to go out on a date...was an invitation into man's world - not simply because dating took place in the public sphere (commonly defined as belonging to men), though that was part of it, but because dating moved courtship into the world of the economy. ... Thus on two accounts, men became the hosts and assumed the control that came with that position (Bailey (1989:21).

Whereas the gender roles and power position caused by the emergence of dating have not changed much since then, the way people date and for what reasons have.

Dating and courtship are not necessarily, and have not always been, the same thing. Waller (1937), a sociologist who studied campus life in the 1930s in the U.S., believed dating was about competition. In what he named the "rating and dating complex" (1937:729), both women and men strove for prestige, not mates, and for plural rather than exclusive relationships. He argued that dating "is not true courtship, since it is not supposed to eventuate in marriage; it is a sort of dalliance relationship" (1937:729) and a forum for "thrills" and "exploitation" by young women and men².

The form of dating described by Waller (1937) lasted

² Waller (1937) has been criticized for basing his views on a university campus which was perhaps not typical for that time (see Gordon 1981). It has also been reported that "going together with someone" (Rothman 1984:291) did also exist at the time. "Going together with someone" and "going steady" both refer to dating someone exclusively or seriously.

until just after World War II when "going steady" came in favour, reflecting a need for security and stability in the postwar era. Not only did young people start to date seriously, they also started to marry at a younger age (Bailey 1989). In fact, many women who attended college went there first and foremost to acquire a husband, not an education (Ibid 43). Dating was now synonymous with finding a mate, and thus had a new structure and clear purpose.

This incarnation of dating lasted till the advent of the sexual revolution in the 1960s. The university campus, or "the cradle of the sexual revolution" (as coined by Johnson 1992), now provided a space where "higher learning often went hand in hand with getting high - on sex, drugs and rock 'n' roll. Monogamy fell from fashion. And bodily fluids were exchanged as freely as ideas" (Johnson 1992:43).

Equally important elements of the sexual revolution were the struggle for power, freedom, equality and autonomy as well as the liberalizing of sexual behaviour. These and the emerging women's movement served to undermine conventions and rules in dating and courtship, and as a result, left people with a lot of uncertainty (see also Levine and Kanin 1987). Emerging from this time of turmoil came the current view that dating relationships are romantic encounters and are about going out to have fun (Henton et al. 1983).

Yet the reality of dating is not quite so romantic or

fun. Over the past two decades in particular, a number of reports have indicated the existence of sexual, physical and psychological violence against women in dating relationships³,⁴. All of the initial studies on assaults on women by their boyfriends and/or dating partners in Canada, using small, non-probability samples of high-school students (Gagné and Lavoie 1993, Gagné et al. 1993, Lavoie and Vézina 1992, Mercer 1988), and university students (Barnes et.al. 1991⁵, Byers and Lewis 1988, DeKeseredy 1988, DeKeseredy et.al 1992, DeKeseredy et. al. 1993, Elliot et al. 1992, Finkelman 1992, Kroeker 1992, Pedersen and Thomas 1992, Robitaille and Lavoie 1992⁶), have suggested, not surprisingly, a very serious problem indeed. And the results of the national, representative survey of Canadian college and university students conducted by DeKeseredy and Kelly in 1993, confirmed these studies by providing

³ The majority of studies conducted on woman abuse in intimate relationships in Canada have focused on violence against women in marital relationships (for example Lupri 1990, Kennedy and Dutton 1989).

⁴ Only heterosexual dating relationships are discussed and analyzed here and thus exclude lesbian and gay dating.

⁵ Only Barnes et al. (1991) and DeKeseredy et al. 1993 include all forms of violence in their research, that is, physical, sexual and emotional violence.

⁶ In addition to theses victimization studies, there is also at least one study which has attempted to map out the levels of dating violence against women by approaching social agencies and front line workers (Princz 1991).

Another important inquiry is that of the Canadian Panel on Violence Against Women. Their final report, Changing the Landscape: Ending Violence - Achieving Equality (1993) is an extensive review of the violence Canadian women have experienced at the hands of men in all forms of relationships. Travelling across the country, the Panel witnessed the face-to-face testimonies of thousands of women.

⁷ This study was sponsored by Health and Welfare Canada, and the data collection took place in the fall of 1992.

incident and prevalence rates that were similarly high and also consistent with results from the U.S. (Follingstad et al. 1991, Koss 1989, Lane and Gwartney-Gibbs 1985, Makepeace 1986, Raymond and Bruschi 1989, Sigelman et al. 1984, Sigler and Johnson 1992, Ward et al. 1991, for comparisons of results, see Table I, Appendix 2).

Using the data from DeKeseredy and Kelly's national survey, I intend to explore variations according to ethnicity in inter-ethnic dating, how dating is defined and how these relate to violence against women in dating relationships. None of the currently available reports to the general public based on this survey (DeKeseredy and Kelly 1993a, 1993b, 1993c) investigates these aspects, nor do any of the other studies on dating violence of which I am aware. More specifically, I will look at inter-ethnic dating patterns according to gender, ethnicity, age, school and the number of casual and serious dating partners. Then the respondents' perception of dating will be explored and probed with respect to these same variables. Finally, the issues of inter-ethnic dating and dating definitions will be examined and correlated with the various forms of woman abuse (physical, sexual and psychological abuse) while ethnicity continues to be a focus. In sum, this is a study of patterns and variants of dating and dating violence with a focus on ethnicity.

The next section describes the National Study in more detail, followed by the theoretical underpinnings of the study, the literature review, a discussion of the methodology, the results, and finally, the conclusion.

CHAPTER 2

THE NATIONAL STUDY

DeKeseredy and Kelly's study is the first of its kind in Canada to provide reliable survey data and accurate information regarding the extent of female victimization in dating relationships. Their inquiry intended to determine the incidence and prevalence rates⁸, as well as socio-demographic correlations, of physical, sexual and psychological victimization of women. The objective was to provide policy makers with representative data for the creation of policies which may aid in establishing better support systems for abused women and in preventing such future violence (DeKeseredy and Kelly 1991:2).

2.1 Data Collection

48 institutions (27 universities and 21 community colleges⁹) were randomly chosen from all such institutions

⁸ "Incidence rates" in this study refer to the number of abusive acts experienced or committed over the 12 months prior to answering the questionnaire. "Prevalence rates" refer to the number of abusive acts experienced or committed since the respondents left high-school, and includes the 12 months prior to answering the questionnaire.

⁹ Four schools were picked twice which makes a total of 44 different institutions.

in Canada¹⁰ to participate in the study¹¹. Dividing the country into 6 general areas (Atlantic Canada, Quebec, Ontario, the Prairie provinces, British Columbia, and a Language Crossover stratum which consisted of English language institutions within Quebec and French language institutions outside of Quebec), the number of institutions selected from each area was based on the regional distribution of the Canadian student population. Two classes at each of the institutions were in turn randomly selected according to the enrolment within the various faculties, so that Arts students, for example, would have a greater chance of being selected because it is a larger faculty. Once a main programme was selected (i.e. Arts), all the students enrolled were assigned random numbers in order to select a particular subject (i.e. Sociology/Anthropology). A total of 96 classes¹² was selected in this fashion. In addition, each region was over-sampled since it was anticipated that not every institution would want to participate due to the sensitive

¹⁰ Universities with fewer than 500 students and colleges with less than 100 students were excluded from the pool of institutions. Similarly excluded were university classes of enrolments less than 35 and college classes with fewer than 20 students.

¹¹ The Institute for Social Research at York University was contracted by DeKeseredy and Kelly to do the sample design, contacting the various institutions for participation in the study as well as coding the completed survey instruments, data entering, and creating the final data set. The details on sampling design and weighting factors can be found in Pollard (1993).

¹² Of these 96, only 95 were surveyed because one instructor could only give us permission to go to his class in January, 1993 which would have delayed the completion of the study.

and controversial nature of the project. Each Chair of the selected departments was then contacted for permission to enter the classes, and it was up to the Chair to determine the specific classes to be visited. Initially, two institutions declined to participate in the study, while 17 departments or individual professors refused to open up their classes to the study. These were in turn replaced by other classes¹³.

Each of the classes was then visited by the research team (DeKeseredy, Kelly and myself) who administered the questionnaires, one for men and one for women. Administering the questionnaire in person was done for two reasons: it was believed that the researchers' presence would be important in both offering support and information to the participants who might be upset and distressed by remembering past incidents or by the subject matter generally. Secondly, it is commonly known that the completion rate of a questionnaire is higher and more questions are answered when the researchers are present than when they are not.

The students were told that their participation was strictly voluntary, and that they were free to answer only the questions they felt comfortable answering. They were also told that all of the information provided by them would

¹³ It is not unusual that institutions decline to participate in such studies. For example, of the 93 institutions approached by Koss, only 32 agreed to participate (Koss 1989:195).

be kept completely confidential.

After the administration of the questionnaire, we debriefed the class on the reasons for the research, on the information available on woman abuse, and responded to questions and concerns by the participants. We also distributed a list of local support services available to both those who had been abused in the past as well as for abusers.

2.2 Sample Characteristics

A total of 1854 women and 1288 men participated in the study¹⁴. 70.8% of the women were university students, while the remaining were college students. Of the men, 61.1% were university students and 38.9% were college students. These ratios reflect the difference in student enrolment at universities and colleges. The median age of the women respondents was 20 years, and for men, 21 years. The participants' marital status and ethnic background are presented below in Table 1.

¹⁴ Because of the weighting of the data, the adjusted number of participants is 1773 women and 1213 men.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

	MEN	Valid Percent	WOMEN	Valid Percent
MARITAL STATUS				
Never Married	1036	80.7	1418	76.8
Married	110	8.5	146	7.9
Live w/partner	109	8.5	201	10.9
Separated	9	.7	37	2.0
Divorced	11	.8	39	2.1
Widowed	9	.7	6	.3
	4 Missing		7 Missing	
ETHNICITY				
C. America	1	.1	6	.3
Scandinavia	13	1.0	20	1.1
Fr. Canadian	459	35.9	509	27.8
Eng. Canadian	468	36.9	758	41.3
British	46	3.6	91	5.0
W. European	38	2.9	61	3.5
E. European	36	2.8	61	3.3
S. European	65	5.1	108	5.9
Far Eastern	64	5.0	102	5.5
African	28	2.2	30	1.6
Caribbean	11	1.1	29	1.6
Middle Eastern	13	1.0	28	1.5
Latin America	4	.3	5	.3
Other	8	.2	2	.1
Black	1	.1	1	.1
Jewish	3	.2	2	.1
US	3	.2	4	.2
Oceania	0	.0	2	.1
Aboriginal	18	1.4	17	.9
	10 Missing		16 Missing	
Total	1288	100.0	1854	100.0
Refugees	24	1.8	13	.7
Recent immigrant	55	4.3	68	3.7
Foreign Student	36	2.8	71	3.8

Most college and university students have already dated someone by the time they enter a post-secondary institution (96.2% of the women and 95.1 of the men). 59.3% of the women and 70.6% of the men had dated casually in the 12 months prior to the study, 73.5% of the women and 68.7% of the men had dated seriously in the same time period. And 19.9% of the women and 14% of the men reported having lived with their boyfriend/girlfriend in the past 12 months, while 7.5% of the women and 6.4% of the men had been engaged.

The respondents were also asked in four separate questions whether they "in the past 12 months alone", had casually or seriously dated, moved in with or lived regularly with, or been engaged to "men (women) who do not share your ethnic background" (see questions 6, 7, 8, 9 on both women's and men's questionnaires). The frequencies of interethnic dating for women and men is presented in Table 2. The percentages refer to those who have engaged in various forms of inter-ethnic dating compared to the whole sample.

Table 2: Frequency of Interethnic Dating.

	<u>MEN</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>WOMEN</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
Casual dating	266	23.6%	379	23.5%
Serious dating	162	14.4%	257	15.9%
Cohabitation	33	2.9%	53	3.3%
Engaged	22	2.0%	27	1.7%

CHAPTER 3

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

The anthropology of women and feminist anthropology are two different things. While the anthropology of women uses women as its main focus, feminist anthropology "is the study of gender, of the interrelations between women and men, and of the role of gender in structuring human societies, their histories, ideologies, economic systems and political structures" (Moore 1988:6). Because it works to develop theories and to bring about change, it is much more than simply studying women.

In looking at the debate on violence against women in intimate relationships such as marriage or dating, feminists have, over the past two decades, developed theoretical orientations to explain and explore these issues. Woman abuse is by no means a new phenomena¹⁵. However, it was not until the emergence of the women's movement in the early 1970s that one form of woman abuse, the beating of wives, came to be seen as a major social problem¹⁶. Seeing wife battering as a social problem rather than a result of a

¹⁵ See Okun 1986 for a history of woman abuse going back as far as 2500 years ago.

¹⁶ When wife beating became an issue, it did so as an extension of the concern about child abuse which had started a decade earlier. In other words, wife abuse became an issue through the impact woman abuse had on children, not on the woman herself. See Gordon 1988 for a history of family violence.

particular violent man or a "bad" relationship had the advantage of moving the debate over to a political and ideological level.

At the root of violence against all women is the male dominance in social, economic, political and psychological power. Patriarchy, or male dominance, is "a sexual system of power in which the male possesses superior power and economic privilege. Patriarchy is the male hierarchical ordering of society" (Eisenstein 1979:16 quoted in DeKeseredy 1988:3, see also Straus 1980). It is by this recognition of structural causes (of which patriarchy, class and race are all examples) that woman abuse becomes a social rather than a separate incidental personal problem. Because of the hierarchical nature of our society,

gender stratification is fundamental and violence plays a major role in the social control of women. This is both from individual men and via the institutionalisation of violence in a social structure dominated by men as a group (or class). The term 'gender stratification' underlines the unequal power relationship between men and women in both the public and private spheres (Hanmer and Maynard 1987b:11).

The debate of whether a single theory of family violence may be useful to explain violence against women in both marital and premarital contexts, is ongoing. In theorizing and explaining woman abuse in dating relationships, many researchers employ family violence¹⁷

¹⁷ There are a number of terms such as "dating violence", "domestic violence", "spouse abuse", "marital violence", "family violence" which are gender neutral. Because of this neutrality, these terms do not acknowledge

theories originally developed to account for wife battering and child abuse. These theories commonly see woman abuse stemming from the husbands' greater position of power in the family (see DeKeseredy and Hinch 1991).

Those who see similarities in dating and marriage tend to focus on serious dating when the two are compared. Laner and Thompson (1982), for example, created a list of similarities between dating (that is, serious dating) and marriage that put couples in greater risk of violence: greater amount of time spent together, greater range of activities and interests in which they are engaged, greater intensity of involvement, greater exchange of personal information, a greater implied right to influence one another and a greater need to negotiate roles and responsibilities. Others pointed out that there are some important differences as well, with dating couples not usually bound to one another economically, with one partner dependent (usually the women) on the other, and they do not often have children (Carlson 1987).

But a problem with such a unified theory based on the characteristics of marriage is that it excludes casual dating relationships which can also be abusive. Similarly, it also prevents us from considering dating as a distinct

and actually conceal the fact that it is women who are mainly abused by men. Also, these terms do not address who initiated the violence or whether it was in self-defence. It is therefore better to talk about "woman abuse", "dating violence against women", or "wife abuse", "wife battering" and "wife assault".

and unique, social custom.

The many studies undertaken to compare (both implicitly and explicitly) violence against women in dating relationships and marriage show that the more serious a relationship is, (serious dating, cohabitation, engagement or marriage rather than casual dating), the greater the risk of violence. While several studies show that violence is more likely to occur among relationships that are of a more serious nature (Cate et al. 1982, Flynn 1990, Henton et al. 1983, Laner 1983, Laner and Thompson 1982, Pedersen and Thomas 1992, Rouse et al. 1988, Sigelman et al. 1984, Stets and Pirog-Good 1987), it certainly is not limited to them and does also occur in dating relationships that are casual (Billingham 1987:287). That greater relationship involvement increases the chances of aggression has been explained as a function of an increasing interest in what the other person does and because one person's actions have more implications for the other (Stets 1992:166). Some studies have found that couples who cohabit engage in more violence than do couples in any other kind of intimate relationship, including marriage (Lane and Gwartney-Gibbs 1985, Stets and Straus 1989, Yllo and Straus 1981). Likewise, female cohabiters also report to have been pressured into sexual contact by their partners more often than casual or serious daters, they also report to have had sex unknowingly (i.e. were raped) because they were drunk or

stoned (Lane and Gwartney-Gibbs 1985). The greater levels of violence in cohabitation relationships have been explained by a lack of both security and structure in the relationship (Ibid.).

Employing a feminist framework for explaining violence in dating relationships does not ignore the several studies which report women to be as violent, or more, than men (Arias and O'Leary 1987, Billingham and Sack 1987, Stets and Henderson 1991, Stets and Pirog-Good 1987). Most of these studies have, however, not provided the context for the violence perpetrated by women. When contextual answers have been solicited, they show that female violence is primarily used in self-defence, and when women do initiate attacks, it is because they fear their partners will beat or rape them (Makepeace 1986:385, Saunders 1986:55-56). Furthermore, women sustain injuries to a much greater extent than men, their injuries are also more severe than those inflicted on men by women (Dobash et al. 1992:75). Consequently, relationship violence is not a mutual or two-way phenomenon, we are dealing with woman abuse. The "myth of sexual symmetry" (Dobash et al. 1992:71) in relationship violence has been generated through the use of the Conflict Tactics Scale. By focusing exclusively on various acts of violence, it ignores the context, as it does the outcomes of the acts that produced them. Saunders (1986, 1988) attempted to incorporate the context for violence and to address the

issue of female-on-male violence by adding questions on whether the violence was carried out in self-defence, by fighting back or whether it was initiated. His efforts have enabled researchers using the CTS to solicit some contextual factors surrounding incidences of violence.

A final work worth mentioning here is the annotative bibliography on acquaintance and date rape compiled by Ward et al. (1994). Including a wide array of actual studies and theoretical debates, it is an invaluable resource in issues of female victimization.

3.1 Perception of Dating and Violence Against Women

Says a young female university student: "I realize how lucky I've been with the guys I've dated. There's a real mentality on campus that if you're going to have a relationship, it's going to be sexual. You get drunk. You're having a good time. You're with this guy you really, really like. And then all of a sudden he's going further than you want to go" (Johnson (1992:44)).

When women date, they are often portrayed in the popular media as looking for enduring relationships whereas when men date, they are depicted as seeking casual encounters with no ties (Chidley 1995, Prusank et al. 1993, Sigler and Johnson 1992). Furthermore, women are also seen as the party responsible for maintaining the relationship (Lloyd 1991). These stereotypes suggest that there are at least two forms of dating coexisting today: dating as

courtship and dating as recreation¹⁸. And because going out on a date could mean either of these two forms, dating has been described as "navigating shark infested waters" (heyn 1986:177) in a popular women's magazine. Looking at such magazines from early 1970s to late 1980s, Prusank et al. (1993) found that the majority of the articles on dating encouraged and advised women on how to get into a relationship, and how to stay in one once they had one. In fact, "the relationship" in the 1990s has taken on an importance greater than the feelings of the individuals involved, Prusank et al. (1993) conclude, since the partners, "or perhaps just the women, ...interact and behave in ways that serve to enhance the relationship" (1993:319).

As previously mentioned, for many, dating is perceived as a romantic encounter. It is not only the daters who see it this way¹⁹. Makepeace (1989) suggests that parents also tend to hang on to the romantic idea in order to convince themselves that their daughters do not suffer in the absence of parental monitoring of the dating system. Romanticism can, in fact, dangerously minimize violence by attributing the violence to external factors and not to a flaw in the relationship (Henton et al. 1983, Makepeace 1983). In

¹⁸ It has also been suggested that "dating" is going out of style in the U.S. and that instead, people pair off in larger groups, thereby eliminating the prearrangement of asking someone out (Whyte 1992). This is the case also in countries such as the Scandinavian countries and New Zealand.

¹⁹ The idea of romanticism and fun in dating has been so strong in fact that it pushed even researchers away from examining violence in the context of dating for a long time (one notable exception is Kanin 1957).

addition, romanticism also allows the partners to believe that violence can be conquered by love and will disappear over time (Lloyd 1991:16). Lloyd (1991) goes as far as to say that

[t]he social context of courtship actually fosters exploitation and violence, and at the same time allows partners to downplay, forgive, or overlook negative behaviour. The social context of courtship encompasses two components: the different themes of courtship for males versus females and the 'romantic ideal' (Lloyd 1991:15).

There is some evidence that women may buy into the idea of romanticism and value the relationship more than do men, since they are more likely than men to remain in violent dating relationships, attempting to repair and maintain them (Miller and Simpson 1991). It is suggested that this is because coupling is the most important and only legitimate avenue for the expression of female sexuality (Ibid).

Dating has also been seen as a form of patriarchy which serves to keep young women in line. One example of informal social control of women is derogatory gossip about women's sexuality and verbal abuse of women. In this case, dating may, if we can use the word, "benefit", young women.

Since only unattached females are vulnerable to slag, girls seek the "protective" status of going steady. Exclusive dating relationships provide safe havens for adolescent females from gossip about their sexual behaviour. Being coupled means having an acceptable avenue for sexual expression within the confines of patriarchal control. Many girls fear independence because of their perceived vulnerability to male violence and sexual harassment but also because going steady is seen as a precursor to marriage - a positively valued and functionally necessary status (Miller &

Simpson 1991:340).

It becomes clear then, that women and men date for different reasons and that for women, to have a relationship takes on a greater importance than it does for men. This may increase their vulnerability to violence.

Another line of research relevant to violence against women in dating relationship is that of differing perceptions and interpretations of behaviour by women and men. There are a number of studies showing that there is a such a gender gap in interpreting social cues (e.g. Abbey 1982, 1987, DeSouza et al. 1992, Muehlenhard et al. 1985, Muehlenhard 1988). All of them report that men tend to see the world in more sexual terms and misinterpret friendliness as sexual interest. Men and women also have different opinions as to when the appropriate time in their dating history is to have sex. While as many as half of the men in a study felt sex was acceptable by the fifth date, only a quarter of the women expressed the same view (Shotland 1989:258). Since the world of men is more sexualized than that of women, it does not matter who initiates a date, who pays, or where the two go, the man is always more likely than the woman to view her conduct as suggestive (Muehlenhard 1988).

Such perceptions also have cultural dimensions. For example, DeSouza et al. (1992) surveyed 2 university classes, one in the U.S. and the other in Brazil in an

attempt to find differences across gender and cultures in perception of sexual intent. The results showed that the Brazilian students perceived greater sexual intent in the hypothetical scenarios presented to them than did their American counterparts. In both cases, men perceived more sexual intent than women, with Brazilian men scoring the highest, and American women the lowest. Interestingly, there was less of a gender gap in the Brazilian than in the American sample. In fact, in only two of the four scenarios were the differences between women and men statistically significant.

Since reading sexual cues and forming sexual expectations are different for women and men (Ward et al. 1991), it has been suggested that the

American dating system is a major factor contributing to the "rape scene" in this country by placing men and women with highly socialized but differing expectations regarding sex role behaviour in ambiguous situations with maximum privacy (Ward 1991:70).

Inherent in dating then, are elements which contribute to aggression and exploitation of women. Most studies on violence against women in dating relationships provide no examination of the nature of the dating system itself with the result that the role played by dating in contributing to violence has been mostly ignored. However, the work of Shotland (1989, 1992) on the causes of date rape is an exception. One weakness in his analysis, however, is the absence of a coherent discussion on male-female power

relations and how they contribute to sexual violence.

The premise of Shotland's theory is that rapes take place for different reasons depending on when they occur in the relationship. In other words, with each relationship stage there is a different reason for the rape to happen. He typifies date rapes into five different categories; beginning date rape, early date rape, relational date rape, and rape within sexually active couples (SAC) which includes two groups; rapes that occur with and without battering (1992:129). It is important to note that in his attempt to make a distinction between the two last groups (relationships with rape and with both rape and battering), he does not acknowledge the fact that rape also is physical abuse. To see them separately negates the origin of both; the attempt to dominate and regain control by the male.

Shotland argues that early date rapes take place after a few initial dates have taken place, but before sexual interactions have been discussed or taken place. He contends that this is the point where misinterpretations and misunderstandings regarding sexual intent between women and men play a role in sexual violence. Such misunderstandings do not play a role in beginning date rapes, however, for most college students do not expect sex on the first few dates (1992:130). Rather, at this stage, a rape may take place because it is premeditated. In fact, such a man is a sociopath, he is also a misogynist and sports rape

supportive attitudes (Shotland 1992:131). Shotland also argues that misperceptions of sexual intent are not likely to be the cause of rape when the couple has been dating for a long time. Rather, a relational rapist may see sex as a means to get closer to the woman he is dating, he may also feel as if he is "losing out" compared to his male friends, or that she "owes" him if he has been paying for their outings. He may rape if the woman's "resistance continues [and his] anger and desire may lead to heightened arousal and aggression through excitation-transfer" (Shotland 1992:131). He also makes an interesting comment that this is a relationship stage where the "man is more committed to the relationship" (Ibid.131) than the woman and consequently, where women are at power advantage vis-a-vis men.

Shotland intimates here that rape can be a result of sexual desire for the dating partner when in fact rape has little to do with sexual desire and more to do with violence and control. And the power advantage a woman would have in the situation just described, is by holding back something the man wants. The power advantage is not real but rather imagined because it rests in something that she has, and that can be taken, not something she is.

Moving to the last forms of date rapes, RSAC (rape within sexually active couples) rapes are caused to a great extent by the rapist's patriarchal attitudes. One of these

beliefs is that the woman should give him sex on demand. In RSAC relationships without physical abuse, rape takes place because the man feels he is powerless and has little control in the relationship. This perceived reality goes against all of his patriarchal beliefs, and all he perceives in relationships around him. Rape becomes an act to reverse the power balance back in his court where he believes it is rightfully placed. When physical violence occurs in conjunction with rape, Shotland maintains, the motivation for the rape is to "show total dominance over any disagreement, whether sexual or non-sexual" (Shotland 1992:137). Rape serves greater purposes for batterers than non-batterers and as a result, they also rape more frequently (Ibid.137). Some in this group may also rape because they need the violence to be sexually excited, also, sex (rape, from the woman's point of view) after violence may also be perceived by the man as an effort to make up for the physical abuse (Ibid).

It is unfortunate that the data at hand do not indicate at what point in the relationship sexual, as well as physical and psychological violence took place. The last two forms of abuse may also serve different purposes depending on the level of intimacy and commitment. Nevertheless, this theoretical discussion may be useful in furthering new and more specific questions.

Based on this discussion, we would expect to find that

the female and male respondents will have different definitions of dating because they look for different things in a date; women want long-term relationships, men want short non-committal interactions. As a result, we would expect women to mention commitment to a greater extent than men and men to define dating as 'sexuality'²⁰ to a greater extent than women. Furthermore, the women and men who have had several partners would be more likely than those with only one date over the past 12 months, to define dating as 'sexuality'.

The women who define dating as 'romantic or interpersonal involvement' are possibly more likely to have experienced violence than the women who perceive dating otherwise. It follows that men who define dating as 'romantic or interpersonal encounter' are more likely to be abusive than the men who define dating otherwise. Furthermore, the male and female respondents who define dating as "sharing/to have a good time" would be the least likely to have experienced and to have committed violent acts as defined by the questionnaire. Finally, those who are in more serious relationships are expected to be more likely to see dating as commitment; these individuals will also experience and commit higher levels of woman abuse.

²⁰ See below in Chapter 4 on methodology for a discussion of the categories of definitions of dating.

3.2 Ethnicity

Ethnicity and race are two different classifications of people according to their cultural and biological features. Thus, an ethnic group is socially distinguished by selected cultural traits while a racial group is distinguished by selected physical traits (Li 1990:7). Consequently, people of the same race do not necessarily share the same ethnicity since the criteria for ethnicity is a "common cultural heritage and a shared awareness of common ancestry" Elliott and Fleras (1992:3). Ethnicity and race relations get their saliency from the social, political, economical, and historical forces which have operated in such ways as to create relationships of power, domination and inequality (Ibid.3).

The term "ethnic" has become more widely used after the Second World War in protest against the Nazi racial doctrines. "The intention was to stress that human groups were historical, cultural phenomena rather than biologically determined categories of people exhibiting common hereditary moral and intellectual traits" (Stolcke 1993:24). The importance of ethnicity as opposed to race in Canada is reflected in the official policy framework of Multiculturalism. The assumption underlying this policy is that a person may also have cultural affiliations above and beyond that of a national identification. It is also a

strategy directed at integrating ethnic diversity into a national framework, yet at the same time, ensuring that ethnic identities are not lost in the process. In the U.S., however, race has remained a powerful category. This stems in part from the need to scientifically classify the various groups of aboriginal peoples, a black population and European immigrants in order to preserve the existing distributions of power and wealth (Elliot and Fleras 1992:40). The later influxes of immigrants from other parts of the world have been incorporated into this framework.

As a result, studies in the U.S. which include discussions according to such differences will refer to these as race, while Canadian studies refer to these differences as ethnicity. Consequently, to compare results between the two countries becomes problematic.

3.2.1 Dating and Ethnicity

Dating is the North American forum through which young people meet, go out to have fun and look for a mate. Initially a white, European activity, later immigrants have also adopted dating as a means of meeting people. Second and third generation immigrants may date and see dating the same way as majority society. However, for those who have recently arrived in North America as immigrants or refugees, dating may not mean the same thing as it does to Euro-North

Americans. Dating may also be perceived differently by the young people's parents. For example, an immigrant woman from Iran expressed her fear for both the possibilities of, and pressures for, physical contact with a boy when her daughter goes out on a date (Anonymous 1992:8). Since she sees dating as a medium for sexual contact, and since premarital sex causes shame for both the woman and her family, she is very concerned about her daughter going out. Asian/Pacific communities also regard dating as a sexual encounter and thus as a threat to the woman's virginity (Yoshihama et al.1991). The common denominator here is that a woman's loss of virginity brings shame to the whole family.

Levy (1991:6) claims that women who come from cultures where dating and sexuality are restricted and where the loss of one's virginity is also a source of shame, are vulnerable to violence in relationships. Levy (1991) lists a number of reasons for this. First of all, leaving one's own land and coming to a new country is disruptive and for some, traumatic. Equally difficult can be the period of adjustment and acculturation. In addition, racism and discrimination may limit their options in either education or work, and consequently "count on the relationship to define her future and she may be unable to leave it" (Levy 1991:6).

It is often also difficult for these women to seek help

from their families or others because of the shame and feelings of helplessness. Furthermore, the fear of being deported, even for those who have legal status, can make it difficult to leave a violent relationship, as can asking for help (Yoshihama et al. 1991:186).

For some Asian/Pacific women, dating is not an acceptable practice, for others it is common. Yoshihama et al.(1991:188-189) report that many young Asian women see dating as a precursor to marriage and many will not date until they have got a good education first. This view of dating is also shared by Mormon youths (Markstrom-Adams 1991).

For many non-western ethnic communities then, dating is perceived as a sexual encounter. However, it is not clear whether these views belong to young people as much as they do their parents, nor is it known whether there are differences in these views according to gender. Based on this literature, we would expect that more non-Canadian/European males define dating in terms of "sexuality", that they have many casual dates as well as many inter-ethnic dating partners. Non-Canadian/European females, on the other hand, would see dating as "commitment", have fewer dating partners, but have more inter-ethnic dates than the others.

3.2.2 Ethnicity and Prevalence Rates of Violence Against Women

The link between ethnicity and woman abuse in dating relationships has not been examined within the Canadian context. Studies in the U.S. do include race in their analysis, although the vast majority of studies here also tend to focus on a predominantly white university student population (DeMaris (1990:221). Even when non-whites have been included in the surveys, differences according to race are often not explored (e.g. Bernard and Bernard 1983, Makepeace 1986).

Koss et al.'s (1987) national study is one of the largest and most important studies (6159 female and male postsecondary students) on sexual violence against women in the U.S.¹ When analyzing the data, Koss et al. (1987) found that the prevalence rates of sexual victimization reported by women varied according to race. 16% of white, 10% of black, 12% of hispanic, 7% of asian and a high 40% of native women reported having been raped (as defined by the Sexual Experiences Survey or SES) since the age of 14 (1987:166). The prevalence rates for acts of sexual aggression admitted to by men also varied according to race:

¹ While this study does not target dating relationships specifically (11% of the women and 9% of the men included in the study were married) and includes all sexual violence, as many as 84% of those who were raped, in fact, knew their attacker (Warshaw 1988). As a result, it is therefore likely that large numbers of the abusive events took place in dating situations.

4% of white men reported raping women as did 10% of black, 7% of hispanic, 2% of asian and 0% of native men (1987:166).

It is interesting that so many native women and none of the native men reported sexual violence. If they date inter-ethnically to a great extent, then it is possible that racism also plays a role in the elevated victimization rates of native women. If not, native men may be under-reporting their involvement in inflicting pain on their dating partners.

Makepeace's "Seven College Survey" (1987)²² (which included 2338 male and female students), attempted to identify social factors associated with high and low levels of violence in courtship settings. Based on incidence rates, Makepeace found that the highest rates were found among women of an "other" race (mostly native americans and arabs), infrequent church goers, with no religion, from either a "very high" or a "very low" income and from an urban area (1987::89). On the other hand, the lowest rates were found among Asian and Jewish students, those who attend church frequently, those who come from rural areas and those who are from moderate income backgrounds (1987:89). The category 'race' (operationalized as 'White', 'Black', 'Hispanics', 'Asian', and 'Other') had the largest between-

²²This study does not use the CTS (Straus 1979) but rather employs a variety of measures adapted from others such as Chapin's social isolation (1955), Coppersmith's self-esteem (1959), Ball-Rokeach (1973) and Makepeace's own stress measure (1983). See Makepeace (1987:89) for more information.

group difference with 'Asians' scoring the lowest and 'Other' the highest on rates of violence.

A final study to be mentioned here is the national, representative study conducted by Stets (1992), using a sample of young, never-married persons (thus including, but not limited to, university students)²³. Analyzing race in terms of 'whites' and 'non-whites', Stets (1992:173) found that the non-white group in the study was more likely than the white group, to inflict severe aggression both "once" and "a few times". She believes that this may be due to non-whites' greater willingness to accept aggression as a way of dealing with conflictual situations. However, the interactive patterns²⁴ of the relationship proved to be better predictors of violence than the demographic item. In other words, Stets (1992) concludes that "dating aggression has less to do with individuals' background characteristics and more to do with the kinds of interaction patterns that occur in relationships" (Stets 1992:175).

In summary, the literature on violence against women shows that there are ethnic or racial differences in the prevalence rates of female victimization in dating relationships; it also shows that these differences may also

²³ This study looks at 'dating aggression' without distinguishing between men and women.

²⁴ Interactive patterns are defined as the cognitive process of role-taking (i.e. imagining the other person's situation/feelings etc.) and the expressive process of interpersonal control (i.e. attempting to control the other person).

be explained by other factors than race and/or ethnicity.

3.2.3 Inter-ethnic Dating Relationships and Violence Against Women

Studies on the extent of inter-ethnic dating in Canada are scarce and far between. If we look to the inter-ethnic and inter-religious marriage literature²⁴ we find that according to the Canadian Census of 1971, 37.3% of the husbands had married interethnically (Richards 1991a:108-110). And based on the Canadian Census of 1981, 22% of all the marriages were interfaith marriages (Heaton 1990). But it is also the case that those who marry outside of their ethnic group tend to marry persons of their own race or religion (Jansen 1982:226, Richard 1991a:124). Nevertheless, if the rates on inter-cultural marriages is an indication of the extent of inter-cultural dating, it should be quite prevalent, and on the increase (Hobart 1990, Larson and Munro 1990).

According to the same literature, the individuals most likely to engage in relationships with persons from another ethnic or religious backgrounds have higher educational (Jansen 1982, Richard 1991a:9) and occupational status, are Canadian born and older when they marry (Richard 1991b).

²⁵ I am dwelling on the literature on inter-cultural marriage here since it may reveal important points to consider with respect to who are most likely to date inter-ethnically. The abundance of research on marriage compared to dating has much to do with the fact that marriage is a legal transaction and thus documented.

If we look at the U.S., we find a few research projects which examine the extent of inter-racial dating. According to a Ms survey on race and women, 66% of the respondents had dated inter-racially (Malveaux 1992:28). Native American, Asian, Arab and Latina women were more likely to date people of other races than were both White and African American women (Malveaux 1992).

A study undertaken at a Texas university found that more than six out of ten students (both males and females) reported having dated inter-ethnically (Lampe 1981, 1982). While the Anglos and Mexican Americans who had not engaged in such dating claimed lack of contact was the most prevalent reason, the Blacks indicated that it was more a lack of interest.

Although it is becoming more common and acceptable to have a spouse or date from another ethnic group, it is still a controversial topic for many. The Ms. survey referred to above reported that parents, regardless of race, were "overwhelmingly positive" when their daughter/son was dating someone of the same race, "in marked contrast to the contrary" (Zia 1992:21). They found that the families of Asian Americans were the most negative about their daughters or sons dating someone outside of their ethnic group (Zia 1992). Markstrom-Adams (1991) reports in her study on attitudes about dating and marriage, that Mormon adolescents experienced considerable pressure from both church and

parents not to date anyone from outside their faith.

According to one of the male respondents, "[s]upposedly it [i.e. dating non-Mormons] will pull you down or pull you away from your religion" (Markstrom-Adams 1991:94).

Similarly, Pakistani parents in the U.S. are also concerned that their adolescent children will take on customs such as dating and cohabitation which they deem to be dangerous to their faith as well as to their identity as Pakistanis and Muslim (Nandi 1980:152). However, as Aldridge (1978) points out, some of these constraints will often dissipate when young people enter colleges or universities away from the home. Parental and community control over an individual's choice of dating partner will then be reduced.

As far as I can tell, there are no studies which look at violence against women in inter-ethnic dating relationships. There is though, one study which looks at dating violence against women when the two individuals involved do not share the same religious background (Stets and Prog-Good 1987). The relevancy of this study to the present project is that religion, like ethnicity, serves the purpose of a common reference point for a group of people. The researchers found that when the male and female adhere to different religions, the chances of woman abuse increase. They explain this by the possibility that

differences in religion are influential by way of the man demanding his partner to follow his religious

convictions and practices. In this way, he attempts to control her religiosity. If she does not agree, violence may result" (Stets and Pirog-Good 1987:244).

In other words, disputes over whose 'way' to follow can result in physical violence.

There are thus only a few studies looking at inter-ethnic dating and no data on woman abuse in such relationships. What does surface from the data available is that interethnic / interracial dating is fairly common, that it is practised more by some racial/ethnic groups than others, and that there may be greater levels of conflict in such relationships.

3.3 Patriarchal Ideology and Violence against Women

Patriarchy may be seen in terms of two components; as a structure which allots men more power and privilege than women, and "an ideology that legitimizes this arrangement" (Smith 1990:257). Studies have shown that men who adhere to a more traditional idea of masculinity (dominant, controlling, forceful and macho) are more likely to be abusive than those who do not espouse this ideology (Bernard et. al 1985, Dobash and Dobash 1979, Sigelman et al. 1984, Smith 1990,). DeKeseredy and Kelly (1993c) also found men's patriarchal beliefs and attitudes to correspond with carrying out sexual, physical and psychological abuse on their dating partner. Patriarchal men tend to often

interpret the woman's behaviours as an indication that she wants sex, and to continue believing this and carry on their advances even after the woman has said no (Muehlenhard 1988). Conversely, Flynn (1990) found that the more modern a woman's sex role attitude was, the less time she would spend in a violent relationship. However, Makepeace (1987) found that holding "equalitarian dating values" (1987:91) were associated with increased violence in dating relationships but does not specify who holds them and whether it was held by only one of the two persons involved. One study found that the most abusive were the patriarchal men whose partners have rejected the traditional feminine role (Smith 1993 in DeKeseredy and Kelly 1993c). In other words, it is the "lack of consensus between wives and husbands regarding the legitimacy of such an ideology, that results in violence to wives" (Smith 1993:2-3 in DeKeseredy and Kelly 1993c:5).

Research shows then, that there is evidence for a link between patriarchal attitudes and violence against women in dating relationships. Since control is an issue for men who hold such beliefs, potential differences according to ethnicity may disappear. This may also be the case for women who adhere to the ideology of familial patriarchy.

3.3.1 Ethnicity, Patriarchal Ideology and Violence Against Women

Only a few studies have explored the links between patriarchal ideology, violence against women and ethnicity. Fischer (1987) wanted to find out whether assimilation / acculturation played a role in attitudes towards women and perceived responsibility for date rape²⁴. Comparing the responses of Hispanic and Majority (White) men and women, Fischer presented them with a list of behaviours such as "abortion", "homosexuality" and "oral sex", and a number of circumstances under which rape occurred, for example; "if she had gotten him sexually excited", "if she had let him touch her breasts" etc. Fischer found that the acculturated Hispanic women had the most liberal attitudes, but that the acculturated Hispanic men had the least. In fact, assimilated males also held more traditional attitudes towards women than both the bicultural / bilingual Hispanic and majority males. In other words, it was the assimilated males who were the most conservative, not the bilingual / bicultural males as might have been expected. What this study shows us is that assimilation may not necessarily result in more liberal views, and that the relationship

²⁴ The bicultural/bilingual Hispanic group was defined on the basis of being fluent in both Spanish and English, or fluent in Spanish but can "get by" in English, and had at least 2 grandparents born in a Spanish-speaking country. The assimilated Hispanics were defined as such based on a "scheme for conceptualizing the attitude of minority persons towards the larger society to which they are being acculturated" (Fischer 1987:99).

between patriarchal ideology and ethnic identity is difficult to predict.

Giacopassi and Dull (1986) inquired into beliefs in, and acceptance of, rape myths according to gender and race (blacks and whites). But in spite of differences, they had to conclude that "there is no racial and gender grouping that consistently accepts or rejects myths to a greater degree than all other racial or sexual categories" (1986:71).

In another analysis of the same dataset, Dull and Giacopassi (1987) found that men were much more likely than women to have attitudes which condone aggressive sexual behaviours in dating relationships. They found that very little variance could be explained by race, leaving gender the most important variable in determining attitudes related to dating, sex and rape (Dull and Giacopassi 1987:187).

There is in the literature then, only a tentative link between ethnic identity and patriarchal ideology, and a suggestion that gender is perhaps the best determinant of such attitudes.

CHAPTER 4

THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT, DEFINITIONS AND MEASUREMENTS OF MAJOR VARIABLES

Using a pre-existing data file can be both beneficial and problematic. While it is time efficient to employ such data, one is also left with its limitations and mistakes. Thus, some of the measures and definitions employed here are perhaps not as fitting with this project if it had been specifically designed to meet the questions asked in the thesis.

The analysis of the data will use weighted numbers attached to the six regions discussed on page 10. Weights are used to better reflect the national picture or "to correct for the different probabilities of selection within each region" (Pollard 1992:9). The weight factors for each of the regions and for each of the universities and colleges are listed in Appendix 3.

4.1 Dating

Dating was formulated by the researchers only as far as to limit it to heterosexual encounters. Interethnic dating refers to a heterosexual interaction between two individuals where it is recognized that they are from different ethnic

backgrounds.

Since some relationships are more casual and others more serious, dating was operationalized to include all of casual and serious dating, in addition to engagement and cohabitation. Casual dating was operationalized as "a good time with no future commitment or obligation on the part of you and your dating partner", serious dating as "involving a great deal of commitment and intimacy", cohabitation as whether one had "moved in with or lived regularly with a boyfriend", and, finally, engagement as whether one had "been engaged to a boyfriend/girlfriend (see questions 2, 3, 4 and 5 on both questionnaires). None of these categories are mutually exclusive since the respondents were asked about their dating activities as a whole over the 12 month period before the study. Thus somebody could in fact have engaged in all four forms of dating in that period.

Not everyone would include cohabitation as a form of dating (see for example Billingham 1987, Health and Welfare Canada 1990). However, for many university students, cohabitation is an extension of the dating process (Risman et al. 1981) and not an alternative to marriage as "almost all of those who cohabit plan to marry someone eventually" (Risman et.al. 1981:78). Consequently, cohabitation is more like a form of serious dating where the partners share a

living space²⁷. The importance of differentiating between the various levels of involvement and emotional commitment in dating is related to several studies which indicate that the more serious a relationship is, or the longer one has dated the same person, the greater the likelihood that violence will occur (Arias et.al. 1987, Billingham and Sack 1987:73²⁸, Cate et.al.1982:83, Henton et.al 1983:472, Lane & Gwartney-Gibbs 1985:56-57, Laner and Thompson 1982, Pederson & Thomas 1992, Sigelman et.al. 1984:545, Stets 1992:243, Stets and Pirog-Good 1987, Stets and Straus 1989:177).

Since we intended to find out how the participants defined the term dating, they were asked the open-ended question "what does the term dating mean to you?" (see question 11 on both questionnaires). The answers were in turn grouped into four categories or dimensions of dating (commitment, sharing, sexuality and romanticism), and subsequently coded to reflect its absence (1), positively mentioned (2), negatively mentioned (3) and both positively and negatively mentioned (4). The first digit, referring to

²⁷ This is not to deny the many similarities which exist between cohabitation and marriage. Risman et al. (1981) found that women in cohabiting relationships saw themselves at a power disadvantage vis-a-vis the men they lived with, and this in turn was consistent with how married women felt. Women who dated more casually did not feel this way.

A problem here is that after a certain period of time, depending on the province, these cohabitation arrangements become common-law marriages and thus, legal marriages. Recognized by law as such, it may no longer be appropriate to categorize, at least not the long lasting cohabitation relationships as dating relationships. The length of the common-law relationships of the respondents is not known.

²⁸ Billingham & Sack (1987) found this to be the case with respect to verbal aggression only.

"commitment", would be a 2 if it was mentioned affirmatively (i.e. positive) or a 3 if it was specified that it is not about commitment (i.e. negative), or a 4 if someone mentioned that it may or may not be about commitment (i.e. positively and negatively). Included in "commitment" were also responses mentioning monogamy or exclusive relationships, as well when other terms which reflect a permanent relationship such as "steady", "attachment" or "shopping for a partner" were mentioned. If there were no reference to permanent, committed relationships, it was coded as a 1 (no mention).

The second digit, referring to "sharing", was coded the same way. An answer would be classified as "positively" if the term sharing itself was mentioned, or when it said "spending time with", "share ideas", "do things together", "going out with", "friendship", and when it had both a temporal or activity dimension, for example, when "seeing someone regularly" was noted. If none of these were mentioned, it would be coded as a 1, or as 3 or 4 if sharing was specified not to be a part of dating, or that it could possibly be about sharing.

The third digit refers to "sexuality". Included in this category were terms that offered a range, i.e. from "going out with a friend to sexual intimacy". Just "intimacy" was not included here unless the context clearly indicated it included sexuality.

The final and fourth digit refers to the dimension of "romantic or interpersonal involvement" and the answer was coded as 1, 2, 3 or 4 when "romance", "love", or "affection" was mentioned in the ways described above. It also includes "attraction", "feeling close to someone", "caring", "feeling comfortable with someone", "being interested in someone" in addition to the idea of companionship and interpersonal connectedness (for examples of answers and coding, see appendix 4).

The dating definition questions have been recoded so that the two answers "negative" and "positive+negative" have been collapsed due to the few cases in both of these. It was felt that placing the "positive+negative" group with the "negative" answers as opposed to the "positive" answers we would err on the conservative side, thus preventing a swelling of the affirmative answers. Finally, answers such as "don't know" were coded as missing.

Another variable that has been recoded is the number of dating partners over the 12 month period prior to the study. Since the number of casual dates ranged from 1 to 100²⁹, three new categories were created; 1-2 casual dates, 3-4 casual dates and 5 and more casual dates. It is believed that the dating experience of those with just one or two casual dating partners over a year may be different from

²⁹ It is questionable that someone would actually have been able to casually date as many as 100 persons or more over a 12 month period, but this was the response of one male student.

those with three or four, and even more different from those with five or more. In addition, splitting it up this way also allowed for three categories of approximative size, and thus facilitating statistical analysis by providing sufficient cases. Finally, the logic behind looking at the number of dating partners is that it is likely that with greater exposure to dating partners there will also be a greater variation in views of dating as well as a greater chance of encountering violence.

For the same reasons, the number of serious dates were also recoded, but into two new groups since the range was shorter (1 to 60 serious dates). The new categories are 1 serious date and two and more serious dating partners.

Finally, only the answers of those who have dated at some point in their lives will be included in the analysis. This is not to negate the views of dating, beliefs and attitudes towards women of those who have never dated. However, since this project is about dating, and dating behaviours, it makes sense to exclude these individual in the analysis and focus on those who actively engage in such relationship.

4.2 Ethnicity

An ethnic or cultural group, we have seen, can be defined in many ways, such as a race, a common religious

background, or a specific country or region of origin. Ethnicity in the context of this study was operationalized as one's identification with a major geographical area (see question 12h on both questionnaires).

We employed closed-ended categories on this question since leaving it open-ended on the pre-test produced few answers and also the occasional non-ethnicity answers³⁰. With respect to the closed-ended categories on the final questionnaire, the only categories which do not relate to a major geographical area but linguistic groups, are those of English and French Canadian. This permitted us to both acquire more detailed information on those who identify as Canadian, and also to allow a Canadian ethnic identity to emerge. Driedger et al. (1982) approve of the inclusion of a "Canadian" category as attempting to trace ethnic origins outside of Canada may, for many, be a problem. They also assert though, that respondents should be given the opportunity to create what kind of ethnic "Canadian" they identify as. Not having included such categories in this study, however, we are unable to distinguish between Caribbean or Chinese Canadians from European or African Canadians if they identify as English or French Canadian. Nonetheless, the most important issue is that if the respondents identify as "Canadian", it is also likely that

³⁰ Some of the respondents of the pre-test took ethnicity to mean various things such as WASP, male/female as well as referring to specific religions.

they will have taken on certain "Canadian" behaviours and attitudes⁵¹.

Another potential problem with this operationalization of ethnicity is the fact that many individuals may not identify themselves with reference to one ethnic group only. Unfortunately, multiple entries were not permitted on this questionnaire. Thus, when individuals did circle more than one answer, as for example when someone had marked both English and French Canadian, and the questionnaire was English, English Canadian was retained (Pollard 1993:attachment #6). In the case of multiple answers involving some of the other categories, an attempt was made to code the response in light of the country of birth (Pollard 1993:attachment #6).

Making the connection between a world region and an ethnic identity is, in many ways, a problematic link. First of all, most regions contain a range of different ethnic and linguistic groups. For example, the category "Far Eastern" contains countries as diverse as China, Japan, India and Hong Kong. Secondly, for each of these countries there are at least as many differences within them as there are between them. Thus, it is in this study only possible to

⁵¹ As an aside, Dickinson (1975) found that blacks' dating behaviours in Texas changed in the direction to that of the whites' after desegregation. For example, their age at first date went down, they started to engage more in dating activities involving spending money, i.e. going to the movies and driving around, while whites underwent little change over the 10 years between 1964 and 1974. Attempting to explain this, Dickinson suggested that "an individual may adopt the values of a group to which he aspires but does not belong" (1975:607).

make very general statements relating to ethnicity.

Since only the categories of French and English Canadian were large enough on their own to carry out statistical procedures, the collapsing of some of the other categories was necessary. Recoded into one group named Patriarchal cultures were Central and South America, Southern Europe, Middle East, and the Far East based on the criteria that these cultures generally allow men to exert some control over women and/or their sexuality through the importance of the father (in Southern Europe and South America for example), machismo (as is the case in Central and South America), and the interplay between honour and shame as a woman's responsibility (Southern Europe, and some areas in the Far East). The British, Northern and Eastern Europeans were grouped together under the presumption that these areas are more culturally similar, and that women's status in society is reasonably high. The fifth and final category contains all the others which do not fit the above mentioned categories. Caribbeans and Africans are included here since cultures in these areas can often be both matrifocal and matrilineal, and where women's status is elevated. Included here are also those who identified as Black, Jewish or Other, as well as Aboriginal peoples since there were only 18 men and 17 women who identified as Native. Finally, those who identified as American (i.e. from the U.S.) were included in the English Canadian category,

and those who had checked off Oceania were included in the European category, as most of these are probably Australians and New Zealanders.

4.3 Woman Abuse

As mentioned above, two different questionnaires were presented to the participants, one for women and one for men. The abuse questions were essentially the same for both, except that men were asked what kind of acts they have done to their female dating partners, while women were asked what kinds of acts they have experienced at the hands of male dating partners¹⁴.

Woman abuse in dating relationships in this study was defined as "intentional physical, sexual, or psychological assault on a woman by a male dating partner" (DeKeseredy and Kelly 1993a:12). Woman abuse was operationalized by adapting and slightly modifying two different measures, the Conflict Tactics Scale or the CTS (Straus 1979) and the Sexual Experiences Survey or SES (Koss et al. 1987).

The CTS measures psychological and physical abuse and includes reasoning, verbal aggression and physical violence. There are a total of 13 items in the original version (see questions 17 on women's questionnaire and 23 in men's

¹⁴ See question 26 and 17 on the women's questionnaire and question 22 and 23 on the men's questionnaire.

questionnaire). The two items: "put you (her) down in front of friends or family" and "accused you (her) of having affairs or flirting with other men" were added to the original scale as they have been shown to be correlated to physical violence (DeKeseredy and Kelly 1993a). The measures come in order, where the first six items describe "non-violent" scenarios in dealing with interpersonal conflict, and the remaining nine are violent ways³³. The ordering of the items does, however, not necessarily reflect a descending order of severity of abuse. A woman may find that psychological abuse is as severe or even more damaging than being confronted by a knife or a gun. At the centre of feminist theory on violence against women is the intent of violence to control women. Those who work with women who have suffered verbal abuse report that such violence is also intended to control since verbal abuse is often used to "lower [the woman's] self-esteem so that she will doubt herself and thus be more easily controlled and manipulated" (Evans 1993:39). Men abuse when they "squelch, put down, correct, criticize, belittle, trivialize, ignore, snub, sneer at, and, when all else fails, put on displays of rage in order to dominate and control their mates" (Evans 1993:26).

Much used and much criticized (Dobash and Dobash 1992,

³³ See questions 17 on women's questionnaire and question 23 on the men's questionnaire, Appendix 1 and 2.

Ferraro 1990, Makepeace 1986, Okun 1986, Saunders 1986), the CTS nevertheless continues to be employed in revised versions by researchers. One of the most important problems with the CTS is the element of sexual symmetry in relationship violence inherent in the scale. Several studies using the CTS found women as, or almost as, violent as men (see for example Arias and O'Leary 1987, Cate et al. 1982, DeKeseredy 1992 et al, Lane and Gwartney-Gibbs 1985, Laner and Thompson 1982, Rouse et al. 1988, Sigelman et al. 1984), yet injury data, police incidence reports, help-seeking statistics and other, larger probability surveys of self-reported victimization do not support these CTS generated findings. Because the CTS focuses on "acts", it ignores the actors interpretations, motivations, and intentions, it also ignores the contexts of violence, and the events precipitating it (Saunders 1986, 1988) as well as the effects of it.

Koss et al.'s (1987) SES in a slightly modified version was employed to measure sexual abuse. The items on this scale include a variety of unwanted sexual incidents and are in agreement with the Canadian legal code for sexual assault³⁴.

Measures such as the SES which are based on questions of a set of behavioral descriptions matching the criterion

³⁴ Questions 16 on women's questionnaire and question 22 on the men's questionnaire.

of a definition of rape bypass the term 'rape' all together. This is important since many do not define their experience as a rape even though it was one according to legal definitions. Both the CTS and the SES in some form or another have been used extensively in surveys of woman abuse. This is an advantage as it is thus easier to compare the results from different studies. The measures are also both reliable and valid (Koss and Gidycz 1985, Straus 1979, see also Appendix 5 for reliability tests of both the CTS and SES).

Several new variables of woman abuse were created through the recoding of the CTS and SES. In order to get a variable which distinguished between those that had experienced abuse from those who had not, as well as those who had carried out abuse versus those who had not, all SES and CTS items were added up and then recoded so that all those with 0 (indicating no abuse at all) were placed in one category and all the others in another. This was done for each form of abuse.

4.4 Patriarchal Ideology

For the purpose of this study, patriarchal ideology was defined as a "discourse which supports the abuse of women who violate the ideals of male power and control over women

in intimate relationships. ...key elements of this ideology are obedience, respect, loyalty, dependence, sexual access and sexual fidelity" (DeKeseredy and Kelly 1993c:12-13). Patriarchal ideology was operationalized by a number of statements, described as beliefs (question 25 in women's questionnaire and question 20 in men's), and attitudes (question 26 in women's questionnaire and question 21 in men's).

In order to distinguish between those who have varying degrees of patriarchal beliefs from those who are feminist, it was necessary to recode the answers. Items 25c through h (women) and 20c through h (men) were switched so that strongly agree became strongly disagree, agree became disagree and so on, in order to make the values attributed to each item consistent with what is measured (i.e. feminist and patriarchal beliefs and attitudes). Thus, a 1 will then denote feminist beliefs, regardless of whether one agreed or disagreed with the statement. Looking next at the reliability analysis for the scales, the item 8 on both sets of questions was taken out as the internal reliability would be higher without them as indicated by the Alpha (see appendix 5). In other words, these two items don't fit as well with the others as they could to form a unit of measure of patriarchal beliefs and attitudes. The remaining items were then added up separately and recoded so that a score of 8 on the belief scale and 7 on the attitude scale are

feminist, and those with higher scores, patriarchal. The cutoff points of 8 and 7 have been arrived at by adding up the value 1 for each of the items (7 and 6) which are now "strongly agree/disagree" feminist items, and allowing for one "agree/disagree" response (+1 as it replaces a 2). To allow for more than one "agree" response would also allow for the possibility of one or more disagree, thus not making the feminist point of view clear. Those who are consequently labelled "patriarchal" are not necessarily patriarchal as much as they are not as feminist as they could be.

CHAPTER 5

RESULTS

5.1 Inter-Ethnic Dating

As mentioned in the literature review, no study in Canada has looked at inter-ethnic dating patterns. So who are those who date inter-ethnically? As Table 2 on p.14 indicates, almost a quarter of the respondents have dated a person from another ethnic group in the 12 month period prior to the study.

Tables 3a, b, c, and d below present cross-tabulations of various forms of inter-ethnic dating engaged in by the respondents over the 12 month period and the respondents' ethnicity.

Table 3a: Cross-tabulation of Inter-ethnic Casual Dating According to Ethnicity

		ethnicity recoded					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	Row Total
casual interethn. dating No	0	748 88.7	872 78.8	200 62.9	176 55.7	74 58.3	2070 76.4
	1	95 11.3	235 21.2	118 37.1	140 44.3	53 41.7	641 23.6
	Column Total	843 31.1	1107 40.8	318 11.7	316 11.7	127 4.7	2711 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF	Significance		
-----		-----		-----	-----		
Pearson		204.73111		4	.00000		
Minimum Expected Frequency -		30.028					
Approximate Statistic		Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Significance		
-----		-----	-----	-----	-----		
Cramer's V		.27481			.00000		

Number of Missing Observations: 275³⁵

³⁵A case which is missing on any of the variables specified is not used in either the table itself or in the statistics.

Table 3b: Cross-Tabulation of Inter-ethnic Serious Dating According to Ethnicity

		ethnicity recoded					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	Row Total
serious intereth. dating No	0	788 93.6	964 87.2	223 70.6	213 67.8	101 80.8	2289 84.7
yes	1	54 6.4	141 12.8	93 29.4	101 32.2	24 19.2	413 15.3
	Column Total	842 31.2	1105 40.9	316 11.7	314 11.6	125 4.6	2702 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF	Significance		
-----		-----		-----	-----		
Pearson		176.03051		4	.00000		
Minimum Expected Frequency -		19.106					
Approximate Statistic		Value		ASE1	Val/ASE0	Significance	
-----		-----		-----	-----	-----	
Cramer's V		.25524				.00000	

Number of Missing Observations: 284

**Table 3c: Cross-Tabulation of Inter-ethnic
Cohabitation According to Ethnicity**

		ethnicity recoded					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	Row Total
interethn cohabitation							
No	0	827 98.3	1077 97.6	296 93.7	301 95.6	118 94.4	2619 97.0
yes	1	14 1.7	27 2.4	20 6.3	14 4.4	7 5.6	82 3.0
Column Total		841 31.1	1104 40.9	316 11.7	315 11.7	125 4.6	2701 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
-----		-----		----		-----	
Pearson		23.23498		4		.00011	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		3.795					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		1 of		10 (10.0%)			
Approximate Statistic		Value		ASE1		Val/ASE0	Significance
-----		-----		-----		-----	-----
Cramer's V		.09275					.00011

Number of Missing Observations: 285

**Table 3d: Cross-Tabulation of Inter-ethnic
Engagement According to Ethnicity**

		ethnicity recoded					Row Total
interethn engagement	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	
No	0	835 99.3	1091 98.8	307 96.8	300 94.9	122 96.1	2655 98.2
yes	1	6 .7	13 1.2	10 3.2	16 5.1	5 3.9	50 1.8
	Column Total	841 31.1	1104 40.8	317 11.7	316 11.7	127 4.7	2705 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
Pearson		32.74642		4		.00000	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		2.348					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		1 of		10 (10.0%)			
Approximate Statistic		Value		ASE1		Val/ASE0	Significance
Cramer's V		.11003					.00000

Number of Missing Observations: 281

The tables above show that there are statistically significant differences among ethnic groups when it comes to engaging in inter-ethnic dating as indicated by the Pearson statistics. The most practiced form of inter-ethnic dating is casual, and then declines with increased intensity of relationship, so that only a few lived with (3.0%) or were engaged (1.8%) to someone from another ethnic background. In order to confirm that this is the case for all dates, frequency runs were done for questions 2, 3, 4 and 5 (have you engaged in casual dating / serious dating / cohabitation / been engaged in the past 12 months). The most practiced

form of dating overall is not casual, but, in fact, serious dating. 71.8% had dated seriously compared to 64.0% for casual dating, followed by 17.5% who had cohabited and finally, 7.1% who had been engaged. The fact that casual dating is the most practiced form of dating among those who have dated inter-ethnically can reflect a number of things, including the age group that most of the students belong to. According to the literature, older individuals engage in inter-ethnic relationships to a greater extent than younger individuals. With a median age of 21³⁶, many may not have had the chance to develop their casual inter-ethnic relationships into something more serious. On the other hand, it could also reflect a willingness to explore culturally different people on a casual level, but only allowing a relationship to become more serious when going out with someone who shares one's own ethnic background.

Another interesting pattern in the tables is the differences according to ethnicity. Of all forms of inter-ethnic dating, French Canadians and English Canadians are the least likely to have dated interethnically. In three of the four forms of dating the category "Patriarchal cultures" have the highest rates of inter-ethnic dating where close to

³⁶ Comparing the mean age between those who dated inter-ethnically over the past 12 months and those who had not, it was found that the age difference was negligible when it came to casual and serious dating, but not so for inter-ethnic cohabitation and engagement. The mean age for those who had cohabited inter-ethnically was 23.61 years versus 21.51 for those who had not, and 24.0 years for those who had been engaged inter-ethnically versus 21.53 for those who had not.

language crossover areas compared to 26.5% of the English Canadian women. The association of the two variables is not terribly strong (Φ .27); in other words, it is only a question of degree and not of absolutes that French Canadian women are less likely to date inter-ethnically than English Canadian women. Again, this is also only the case for the Language Crossover areas, because, as we remember, French Canadian men in general dated inter-ethnically less than women (Tables 5a and b).

Tables 9c and d indicate that only for women does ethnicity matter when it comes to interethnic cohabitation outside of Quebec. Only statistically significant at the .05 level with a weak Φ of -.08, but here it is English Canadian women (1.7%) who are less likely than French Canadian women (5.9%), to live with a boyfriend from another ethnic background. The crosstabulation for men was not statistically significant.

To find that women engage in inter-ethnic dating to a lesser extent than men is not unusual in the literature. Johnson and Ogasawara's (1988) work on inter-ethnic dating in Hawaii, for example, found this. And not only do women date inter-ethnically less, they were also found to experience less support for inter-ethnic dating than men (Malveaux 1992:29). This may be related to the generally greater control placed on women's sexuality compared to that of men. This trend is also consistent with Lampe's (1981)

Table 4a: Cross-Tabulation of Inter-ethnic Casual Dating According to Ethnicity, Controlling for Gender: Women

		ethnicity recoded					
casual interethn dating	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	Row Total
No	0	388 87.6	535 78.4	130 65.0	120 58.0	49 72.1	1222 76.4
yes	1	55 12.4	147 21.6	70 35.0	87 42.0	19 27.9	378 23.6
Column Total		443 27.7	682 42.6	200 12.5	207 12.9	68 4.3	1600 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Pearson		86.37267		4		.00000	
Minimum Expected Frequency - 16.065							
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Approximate Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Cramer's V		.23234				.00000	

Table 4b: Cross-Tabulations of Inter-ethnic Casual Dating According to Ethnicity, Controlling for Gender: Men

		ethnicity recoded					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	Row Total
casual interethn dating No	0	360 90.2	337 79.5	70 59.3	56 50.9	25 42.4	848 76.4
	1	39 9.8	87 20.5	48 40.7	54 49.1	34 57.6	262 23.6
	Column Total	399 35.9	424 38.2	118 10.6	110 9.9	59 5.3	1110 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF	Significance		
Pearson		141.13416		4	.00000		
Minimum Expected Frequency - 13.926							
Statistic		Value		ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance	
Cramer's V		.35658				.00000	

Number of Missing Observations: 276¹⁷

¹⁷ The numbers of missing cases include both the female and male missing cases when employing a control variable. It is, like here, always found at the bottom of the last partial control table.

Table 5a: Cross-Tabulations of Inter-ethnic Serious Dating According to Ethnicity, Controlling for Gender: Women

		ethnicity recoded					
serious interethn dating No	Count Col Pct	French Cdn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	Row Total
	0	413 93.2	594 87.2	140 70.0	139 67.8	58 84.1	1344 84.1
yes	1	30 6.8	87 12.8	60 30.0	66 32.2	11 15.9	254 15.9
	Column Total	443 27.7	681 42.6	200 12.5	205 12.8	69 4.3	1598 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
Pearson		103.04582		4		.00000	
Minimum Expected Frequency - 10.967							
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Approximate Significance	
Cramer's V		.25394				.00000	

Table 5b: Cross-Tabulations of Inter-ethnic Serious Dating According to Ethnicity, Controlling for Gender: Men

		ethnicity recorded					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clts	Other	Row Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
serious interethn dating	0	375 94.0	370 87.3	83 71.6	73 67.6	43 76.8	944 85.6
yes	1	24 6.0	54 12.7	33 28.4	35 32.4	13 .2	159 14.4
	Column Total	399 36.2	424 38.4	116 10.5	108 9.8	56 5.1	1103 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
Pearson		74.15864		4		.00000	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		8.073					
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Approximate Significance	
Cramer's V		.25929				.00000	
Number of Missing Observations: 285							

Table 6a: Cross-Tabulations of Inter-ethnic Cohabitation According to Ethnicity, Controlling For Gender: Women

		ethnicity recoded					Row Total
interethn cohabitation	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	
No	0	435 98.2	668 98.2	186 93.0	192 93.7	65 94.2	1546 96.8
yes	1	8 1.8	12 1.8	14 7.0	13 6.3	4 5.8	51 3.2
Column Total		443 27.7	680 42.6	200 12.5	205 12.8	69 4.3	1597 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
Pearson		24.70738		4		.00006	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		2.204					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		1 of		10 (10.0%)			
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V		.12438					.00006

Table 6b: Cross-Tabulations of Inter-ethnic Cohabitation According to Ethnicity, Controlling for Gender: Men

		ethnicity recoded					Row Total
interethn cohabitation	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	
No	0	393 98.3	409 96.5	110 94.8	109 99.1	53 94.6	1074 97.1
yes	1	7 1.8	15 3.5	6 5.2	1 .9	3 5.4	32 2.9
Column Total		400 36.2	424 38.3	116 10.5	110 9.9	56 5.1	1106 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	7.38367	4	.11695

Minimum Expected Frequency - 1.620
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 3 of 10 (30.0%)

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.08171			.11695

Number of Missing Observations: 283

**Table 7a: Cross-Tabulations of Inter-ethnic
Engagement According to Ethnicity, Controlling for
Gender: Women**

		ethnicity recoded					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	Row Total
interethn engagement							
No	0	439 99.3	674 99.3	192 96.0	197 95.2	67 98.5	1569 98.3
yes	1	3 .7	5 .7	8 4.0	10 4.8	1 1.5	27 1.7
	Column Total	442 27.7	679 42.5	200 12.5	207 13.0	68 4.3	1596 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Pearson		25.14636		4		.00005	
Minimum Expected Frequency - 1.150							
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 3 of 10 (30.0%)							
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Approximate Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Cramer's V		.12552				.00005	

**Table 7b: Cross-Tabulations of Inter-ethnic
Engagement According to Ethnicity, Controlling for
Gender: Men**

		ethnicity recoded					Row Total
interethn engagement	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	
No	0	396 99.2	417 98.1	115 98.3	103 93.6	54 94.7	1085 97.9
yes	1	3 .8	8 1.9	2 1.7	7 6.4	3 5.3	23 2.1
Column Total		399 36.0	425 38.4	117 10.6	110 9.9	57 5.1	1108 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
Pearson		16.39403		4		.00253	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		1.183					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		3 of		10 (30.0%)			
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V		.12164					.00253

Number of Missing Observations. 282

Several of the original relationships between forms of inter-ethnic dating and ethnicity appear to be genuine and general since the original relationship is replicated in the partial relationships. Thus, for the most part, there are fewer differences between women and men (the only exception being between women and men in the "Other" category) in their dating choices than there are among ethnic groups. The relationship between inter-ethnic casual dating and ethnicity is slightly stronger for men than it is for women (Cramer's V is .23 for women and .36 for men) which means

that French and English Canadians generally, but especially men, are less likely to date inter-ethnically than the other ethnic groups. When it comes to serious dating and inter-ethnic engagement, the partial tables show a near perfect replication of the original relationship. However, for inter-ethnic cohabitation, the original relationship is rendered spurious by the variable "gender" since the results are no longer statistically significant for men. This is thus a case of interpretation since gender can not be placed prior to the other two variables in time but has nevertheless intervened in the relationship. We can say then, that it is the test variable "gender" which produced the relationship in the first place, not ethnicity.

We have seen then, that the least likely to date inter-ethnically are French Canadians, but also to some degree, English Canadians, while the most likely are individuals of Patriarchal Cultures, and men from "Other" ethnic groups. The Europeans also score consistently high on all forms of interethnic dating, the only exception being inter-ethnic engagement for men. This stands in contrast to research on inter-ethnic or inter-religious marriage reviewed above, which shows that the most important factor in religious exogamy is group size; individuals from smaller groups have a greater tendency towards endogamy and thus have stronger norms of ingroup associations (Heaton 1990:375). Without endogamy, the longterm survival of small groups is

threatened (Ibid.). Similarly, when Lambert and Curtis (1984) compared the attitudes of French and English Canadians towards intercultural marriages, they found that the Québécois were more accepting of White/Black marriages than English Canadians and that the "other" category was more opposed to such liaisons than the two other groups. This was explained by the authors as a function of small or large group size, that is, the "other" group cannot afford to tolerate such marriages as exogamy threatens the viability of these communities.

It seems then, that dating is different from marrying. It may also be that those enrolled in a post-secondary institution are more accepting of dating a person from another ethnic background. As Aldridge (1978) points out, constraints to such interactions will often dissipate when entering colleges or universities away from the home because parental and community control over an individual's choice of dating partner are then reduced.

Since no study has looked at inter-ethnic dating rates in Canada, it is difficult to say whether the rates found here of about 25% are high or low. If we compare these results to studies done in the U.S. on inter-racial dating (not to be conflated with inter-ethnic dating), it is low; for example, 66% of a subsample of the Ms survey (consisting of 1033 respondents) indicated that they had dated

inter-racially". Of these, white women and black women were the least likely (Malveaux 1992). Furthermore, Lampe (1982) reports that more than six out of ten Texas university students have dated inter-ethnically (Lampe 1982)¹⁹. Thus the rates of inter-ethnic or inter-racial dating in postsecondary institutions in the U.S. are quite elevated compared to the present results. A reason for this could be that while we asked for the dating activities over the last 12 months prior to the study, the studies in the U.S. are based on whether the respondents have ever dated interracially.

If French Canadians (and to some extent, English Canadians) are less likely to date someone from another ethnic group, is it possible that the issue is one of partner availability? In order to highlight this issue, French and English Canadians were compared with respect to inter-ethnic dating while controlling for region. The regional categories were collapsed to produce the following; outside Quebec, Quebec and Language Crossover. Of all the runs comparing French and English Canadians on the four forms of interethnic dating (casual, serious, cohabitation

¹⁹ The respondents in this study were not solely students.

²⁰ Although Lampe (1982) talks of inter-ethnic dating, he nevertheless use the categories of Blacks, Mexican Americans and Anglos categories which most U.S. researchers would have referred to as racial groups and not ethnic groups.

and engagement), controlling for the three regions discussed above, only one was statistically significant and is presented below.

Table 8: Inter-ethnic Casual Dating by Ethnicity, Controlling for Region: Language Crossover

		FRANGLAI		Row Total
Count Col Pc		French C dn	English Cdn	
		1	2	
Inter-ethnic casual dating	0	107 91.5	39 76.5	146 86.9
	1	10 8.5	12 23.5	22 13.1
Column Total		117 69.6	51 30.4	168 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF
Pearson		7.00572		1
Significance				.00812
Minimum Expected Frequency -		6.679		
Statistic		Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0
Phi		.20421		
Approximate Significance				.00812

Number of Missing Observations: 1036

As Table 8 indicates, French Canadians are considerably less likely than English Canadians to date inter-ethnically on a casual basis in Language Crossover areas. It is important to note that these are also geographical areas where the availability of partners from other ethnic backgrounds are abundant. The majority of French Canadians

(91.5%) still have not dated someone from another ethnic background, compared to 76.5% of English Canadians. As the phi statistic of .20 indicate, the relationship between the variables is not very strong.

If there are few differences between French and English Canadians in intensity of inter-ethnic dating, except for casual dating, is it true for both women and men? The following cross-tabulations show that in fact it does make a difference whether one is a woman or a man. In order to ensure that gender did not act as a suppressor variable, thereby concealing a relationship where there in fact is one, all forms of dating crosstabulated with ethnicity and controlled for region were also controlled for gender. Only the crosstabulations which differ from the original relationship are shown.

**Table 9a Inter-ethnic Casual Dating by
Ethnicity, Controlling for both Region (Language
Crossover) and Gender (Women)**

		FRANGLAI		
Interethnic casual dating	Count	French C	English	Row Total
	Col Pct	dn	Cdn	
No	0	67 93.1	25 73.5	92 86.8
yes	1	5 6.9	9 26.5	14 13.2
Column Total		72 67.9	34 32.1	106 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	7.68129	1	.00558

Minimum Expected Frequency - 4.491
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 of 4 (25.0%)

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	.26919			.00558

Number of Missing Observations: 646

**Table 9b: Inter-ethnic Casual Dating by
Ethnicity, Controlling for both Region (Language
Crossover) and Gender (Men)**

		FRANGLAI		
Interethnic casual dating	Count	French C	English	Row Total
	Col Pct	dn	Cdn	
No	0	39 88.6	15 83.3	54 87.1
yes	1	5 11.4	3 16.7	8 12.9
Column Total		44 71.0	18 29.0	62 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.31965	1	.57182

Minimum Expected Frequency - 2.323
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 of 4 (25.0%)

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	.07180			.57182

Number of Missing Observations: 1037

**Table 9c: Inter-ethnic Cohabitation by
Ethnicity, Controlling for both Region (outside
Quebec) and Gender (Women)**

		FRANGLAI		Row Total
Count	Pct	french c dn	english cdn	
Col		1	2	
interethnic cohabitation	0	48 94.1	629 98.3	677 98.0
No				
	1	3 5.9	11 1.7	14 2.0
yes				
Column		51	640	691
Total		7.4	92.6	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	4.12525	1	.04225

Minimum Expected Frequency - 1.033
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 of 4 (25.0%)

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.07727 ⁴			.04225

Number of Missing Observations: 650

⁴ Since these variables are nominal, it makes no sense to read a direction in the associations of the variables. Yet Phi is often marked with a - as is the case here. The reason for this is related to how the computer reads the numbers in the table.

**Table 9d: Inter-ethnic Cohabitation by
Ethnicity, Controlling for both Region (outside
Quebec) and Gender (Men)**

		FRANGLAI		Row Total
	Count Col Pct	french c dn	english cdn	
interethn cohabitation	0	16 94.1	387 96.3	403 96.2
yes	1	1 5.9	15 3.7	16 3.8
Column Total		17 4.1	402 95.9	419 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.20547	1	.65034

Minimum Expected Frequency = .649
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 = 1 of 4 (25.0%)

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.02214			.65034

Number of Missing Observations: 390

The only cross-tabulations that were not a replication of the original relationships was that of inter-ethnic casual dating in the Language Crossover areas and inter-ethnic cohabitation outside Quebec. Having specified the conditions under which the original relationship occurs, we see that it is mainly due to the women in the sample that French Canadians do not seem to engage in inter-ethnic casual dating to the same extent as English Canadians as indicated in the original relationship. We find that only 6.9% of the French Canadian women had dated casually in

language crossover areas compared to 26.5% of the English Canadian women. The association of the two variables is not terribly strong (Φ .27); in other words, it is only a question of degree and not of absolutes that French Canadian women are less likely to date inter-ethnically than English Canadian women. Again, this is also only the case for the Language Crossover areas, because, as we remember, French Canadian men in general dated inter-ethnically less than women (Tables 5a and b).

Tables 9c and d indicate that only for women does ethnicity matter when it comes to interethnic cohabitation outside of Quebec. Only statistically significant at the .05 level with a weak Φ of -.08, but here it is English Canadian women (1.7%) who are less likely than French Canadian women (5.9%), to live with a boyfriend from another ethnic background. The crosstabulation for men was not statistically significant.

To find that women engage in inter-ethnic dating to a lesser extent than men is not unusual in the literature. Johnson and Ogasawara's (1988) work on inter-ethnic dating in Hawaii, for example, found this. And not only do women date inter-ethnically less, they were also found to experience less support for inter-ethnic dating than men (Malveaux 1992:29). This may be related to the generally greater control placed on women's sexuality compared to that of men. This trend is also consistent with Lampe's (1981)

research in the U.S. who also found that males were more likely to engage in inter-racial dating than were women.

Looking again to the research on inter-ethnic marriages, the individuals who tend to choose partners from other ethnic or religious backgrounds usually have higher educational and occupational status, are older and have a higher income (Jansen 1982:222, Malveaux 1991:24, Richard 1991:100). We should then expect higher rates of inter-ethnic dating among university students compared to college students, and among the older half of the sample than the younger half.

Table 10a: Cross-Tabulations of Inter-ethnic Casual Dating and Ethnicity, Controlling for School: University

		ETHNIC3					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea Europ	Patriarc hal Clts	Other	Row Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
intereth casual dating No	0	406 85.1	657 78.7	145 64.4	99 52.7	53 58.2	1360 74.9
	1	71 14.9	178 21.3	80 35.6	89 47.3	38 41.8	456 25.1
yes							
	Column Total	477 26.3	835 46.0	225 12.4	188 10.4	91 5.0	1816 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Pearson		108.78201		4		.00000	
Minimum Expected Frequency - 22.850							
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
-----		-----		-----		-----	-----
Cramer's V		.24475					.00000

Table 10b: Cross-Tabulations of Inter-ethnic Casual Dating and Ethnicity, Controlling for School: College

		ETHNIC3					
intereth casual dating	Count Col Pct	French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clts	Other	Row Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
No	0	342 93.4	215 79.0	55 59.8	76 59.8	21 58.3	709 79.4
yes	1	24 6.6	57 21.0	37 40.2	51 40.2	15 41.7	184 20.6
	Column Total	366 41.0	272 30.5	92 10.3	127 14.2	36 4.0	893 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Pearson		105.24204		4		.00000	
Minimum Expected Frequency - 7.418							
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
-----		-----		-----		-----	-----
Cramer's V		.34330					.00000

Number of Missing Observations: 277

**Table 11a: Cross-Tabulations of Inter-ethnic
Serious Dating and Ethnicity, Controlling for
School: University**

		ETHNIC3					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	Row Total
intereth serious dating No	0	441 92.6	735 88.1	160 71.1	127 67.6	77 84.6	1540 84.9
yes	1	35 7.4	99 11.9	65 28.9	61 32.4	14 15.4	274 15.1
Column Total		476 26.2	834 46.0	225 12.4	188 10.4	91 5.0	1814 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Pearson		106.54521		4		.00000	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		13.745					
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
-----		-----		-----		-----	-----
Cramer's V		.24235					.00000

**Table 11b: Cross-Tabulations of Inter-ethnic
Serious Dating and Ethnicity, Controlling for
School: College**

		ETHNIC3					
intereth serious dating	Count Col Pct	French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clts	Other	Row Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
No	0	347 94.8	229 84.5	63 69.2	86 68.8	24 72.7	749 84.5
yes	1	19 5.2	42 15.5	28 30.8	39 31.2	9 27.3	137 15.5
Column Total		366 41.3	271 30.6	91 10.3	125 14.1	33 3.7	886 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
Pearson		73.05445		4		.00000	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		5.103					
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V		.28715					.00000

Number of Missing Observations: 286

**Table 12a: Cross-Tabulation of Inter-ethnic
Cohabitation and Ethnicity, Controlling for
School: University**

		ETHNIC3					Row Total
intereth cohabitation	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	
No	0	466 97.7	820 98.2	209 93.7	180 95.2	88 97.8	1763 97.2
yes	1	11 2.3	15 1.8	14 6.3	9 4.8	2 2.2	51 2.8
Column Total		477 26.3	835 46.0	223 12.3	189 10.4	90 5.0	1814 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
Pearson		16.14763		4		.00283	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		2.530					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		1 of		10 (10.0%)			
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V		.09435					.00283

**Table 12b: Cross-Tabulation of Inter-ethnic
Cohabitation and Ethnicity, Controlling for
School: College**

		ETHNIC3					Row Total
intereth cohabitation	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	
No	0	361 98.9	257 95.5	86 94.5	121 96.0	30 88.2	855 96.6
yes	1	4 1.1	12 4.5	5 5.5	5 4.0	4 11.8	30 3.4
Column Total		365 41.2	269 30.4	91 10.3	126 14.2	34 3.8	885 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
Pearson		15.44858		4		.00386	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		1.153					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		3 of		10 (30.0%)			
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V		.13212					.00386

Number of Missing Observations: 287

2

PM-1 3½"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

**Table 13a: Cross-Tabulation of Inter-ethnic
Engagement and Ethnicity, Controlling for School:
University**

		ETHNIC3					Row Total
intereth engagement	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	
No	0	472 99.0	825 98.9	221 98.2	180 94.7	88 96.7	1786 98.3
yes	1	5 1.0	9 1.1	4 1.8	10 5.3	3 3.3	31 1.7
Column Total		477 26.3	834 45.9	225 12.4	190 10.5	91 5.0	1817 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
Pearson		18.90085		4		.00082	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		1.553					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		3 of		10 (30.0%)			
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V		.10199					.00082

**Table 13b: Cross-Tabulation of Inter-ethnic
Engagement and Ethnicity, Controlling for School:
College**

		ETHNIC3					Row Total
intereth engagement	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	
	0	364 99.7	266 98.5	85 93.4	120 95.2	33 97.1	868 98.0
yes	1	1 .3	4 1.5	6 6.6	6 4.8	1 2.9	18 2.0
Column Total		365 41.2	270 30.5	91 10.3	126 14.2	34 3.8	886 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
Pearson		20.45094		4		.00041	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		.691		3 of		10 (30.0%)	
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -							
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V		.15193					.00041

Number of Missing Observations: 283

The rates of inter-ethnic dating hold across college and university students, and are a replication of the original findings as Tables 10 to 13 show. In other words, ethnicity still affects whether one dates inter-ethnically or not. But just as in the original run, the relationships between inter-ethnic dating and ethnicity are generally weak and only for casual inter-ethnic dating among college students is the relationship a bit stronger (Cramer's V is .34 compared to .27 for the original run, Table 3a).

Ethnicity then, has a greater effect on dating choices at colleges than it does at universities.

It is possible that this is related to the class differences between these two institutions; traditionally, the majority of college students are from working class backgrounds while the majority of university students come from middle and upper class homes⁴¹. As indicated above, higher education usually relates to a greater likelihood of inter-ethnic marriage. This is true to some extent also for inter-ethnic dating. But the difference can also be due to varying degrees of availability of dating partners from other ethnic backgrounds at the two types of institutions.

Focusing on the specific ethnic groups, we find that more French Canadian university students have dated inter-ethnically (all four categories) than French Canadian college students, but more English Canadian college students have dated inter-ethnically than university students when it comes to serious dating and cohabitation. In the other forms of dating, the rates are virtually the same.

In three of the four forms of dating, a greater number of European college than university students have dated

⁴¹ In order to verify whether this is, in fact, the case, I selected the two variables "Total household income" and "Degree, diploma or certificate working towards" from the 1994 General Social Survey in order to run a cross-tabulation of them. After collapsing the income categories to three new income groups (less than 29,999, 30,000 to 59,999 and more than 60,000), it is clear that those enrolled in universities have a greater total household income than those in colleges. 25.4% university students and 41.6% college students were found in the lowest income group, 51.1% university students and 48.9% college students in the middle income group, and finally, 43.5% university students and 28.0% college students in the highest income group.

inter-ethnically, and among Patriarchal cultures, university students dated more outside of their ethnic groups than college students. They were also the group with the highest rate of inter-ethnic dating; as many as 47.3% of university students had dated casually outside of their own ethnic group. The college students among the Other group did more inter-ethnic serious dating and cohabitation than the university students.

It is not possible, then, to generalize about inter-ethnic dating patterns and type of school. Although there are differences according to ethnicity, they are not consistent with respect to types of dating and type of educational institution. The above-mentioned hypothesis regarding higher education and greater frequency of inter-ethnic marriage is only true for some ethnic groups (i.e. French Canadians and those of Patriarchal cultures) when it comes to dating.

In order to assess these numbers, it would be helpful to look at the ratio of women and men in universities and colleges in the sample as well as the ratio of women and men within each ethnic group. As Table 14a below indicate, there are proportionally more women than men university students, but more men than women enrolled in colleges. There are more women than men and more university students than college students in the sample itself. Table 14b shows that there are more women than men in all ethnic groups, but

that the higher proportion of women is especially pronounced among English Canadians, Europeans and the Patriarchal cultures categories.

Table 14a: Cross-Tabulations of School Enrollment According to Gender

SCHOOL	Count Col Pct	GENDER		Row Total
		male	female	
		1	2	
university	1	744 61.3	1259 71.0	2003 67.1
college	2	469 38.7	514 29.0	983 32.9
Column Total		1213 40.6	1773 59.4	2986 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	30.52405	1	.00000
Minimum Expected Frequency - 399.323			

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.10111			.00000

Number of Missing Observations: 0

Table 14b: Cross-Tabulations of Ethnicity and Gender

		ETHNIC3					
Count Col Pct		French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	Row Total
GENDER							
male	1	429 46.4	462 38.4	126 36.1	121 35.1	65 46.4	1203 40.6
female	2	496 53.6	740 61.6	223 63.9	224 64.9	75 53.6	1758 59.4
Column Total		925 31.2	1202 40.6	349 11.8	345 11.7	140 4.7	2961 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF	Significance		
-----		-----		-----	-----		
Pearson		24.40406		4	.00007		
Minimum Expected Frequency - 56.879							
Statistic		Value		ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance	
-----		-----		-----	-----	-----	
Cramer's V		.09078				.00007	

Number of Missing Observations: 25

As mentioned above, previous research has shown that those who get involved with people from other ethnic backgrounds also tend to be older⁴². According to our data, however, this is only true for inter-ethnic cohabitation and engagement (Tables 15a and b through 18a and b).

⁴² Age has been recoded into two groups according to the median age; those who are 20 and less in one group, and those 21 and more in the other.

Table 15a: Cross-Tabulations of Inter-ethnic Casual Dating and Ethnicity, Controlling for Age: Younger Group

ethnicity recoded							
	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	Row Total
casual interethn dating	0	410 89.7	472 77.9	101 66.4	61 48.8	26 65.0	1070 77.5
No							
	1	47 10.3	134 22.1	51 33.6	64 51.2	14 35.0	310 22.5
yes							
Column Total		457 33.1	606 43.9	152 11.0	125 9.1	40 2.9	1380 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Pearson		112.56584		4		.00000	
Minimum Expected Frequency - 8.986							
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Approximate Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Cramer's V		.28560				.00000	

Table 15b: Cross-Tabulations of Inter-ethnic Casual Dating and Ethnicity, Controlling for Age: Older Group

		ethnicity recoded					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clts	Other	Row Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
casual interethn dating	0	336 87.5	398 79.9	98 59.8	114 60.3	46 55.4	992 75.3
No							
	1	48 12.5	100 20.1	66 40.2	75 39.7	37 44.6	326 24.7
yes							
	Column Total	384 29.1	498 37.8	164 12.4	189 14.3	83 6.3	1318 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Pearson		98.10043		4		.00000	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		20.530					
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Approximate Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Cramer's V		.27282				.00000	

Number of Missing Observations: 288

**Table 16a: Cross-Tabulations of Inter-ethnic
Serious Dating and Ethnicity, Controlling for Age:
Younger Group**

		ethnicity recoded					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	Row Total
serious interethn dating No	0	427 93.4	527 87.1	114 74.5	80 63.5	33 84.6	1181 85.6
	1	30 6.6	78 12.9	39 25.5	46 36.5	6 15.4	199 14.4
Column Total		457 33.1	605 43.8	153 11.1	126 9.1	39 2.8	1380 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Pearson		89.03032		4		.00000	
Minimum Expected Frequency		5.624					
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Approximate Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Cramer's V		.25400				.00000	

**Table 16b: Cross-Tabulations of Inter-ethnic
Serious Dating and Ethnicity, Controlling for Age:
Older Group**

		ethnicity recoded					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	Row Total
serious interethn dating No	0	359 93.7	435 87.2	108 66.7	133 70.7	67 79.8	1102 83.7
yes	1	24 6.3	64 12.8	54 33.3	55 29.3	17 20.2	214 16.3
Column Total		383 29.1	499 37.9	162 12.3	188 14.3	84 6.4	1316 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
Pearson		91.38416		4		.00000	
Minimum Expected Frequency - 13.660							
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V		.26352					.00000

Number of Missing Observations: 290

Table 17a: Cross-Tabulations of Inter-ethnic Cohabitation and Ethnicity, Controlling for Age: Younger Group

		ethnicity recoded					Row Total
interethn cohabitation	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	
No	0	453 98.9	591 98.0	152 99.3	123 97.6	36 94.7	1355 98.3
yes	1	5 1.1	12 2.0	1 .7	3 2.4	2 5.3	23 1.7
Column Total		458 33.2	603 43.8	153 11.1	126 9.1	38 2.8	1378 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
Pearson		5.64999		4		.22686	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		.634					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		3 of		10 (30.0%)			
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V		.06403					.22686

**Table 17b: Cross-Tabulation of Inter-ethnic
Cohabitation and Ethnicity, Controlling for Age:
Older Group**

		ethnicity recoded					Row Total
		French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clts	Other	
interethn cohabitation	Count Col Pct	1	2	3	4	5	
No	0	372 97.4	483 97.0	143 88.8	179 94.2	80 95.2	1257 95.6
yes	1	10 2.6	15 3.0	18 11.2	11 5.8	4 4.8	58 4.4
Column Total		382 29.0	498 37.9	161 12.2	190 14.4	84 6.4	1315 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
Pearson		23.60359		4		.00010	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		3.705					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		1 of		10 (10.0%)			
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V		.13398					.00010

Number of Missing Observations: 293

**Table 18a: Cross-Tabulation of Inter-ethnic
Engagement and Ethnicity, Controlling for Age:
Younger Group**

		ethnicity recoded					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	Row Total
interethn engagement							
No	0	456 99.6	598 99.2	150 98.0	123 97.6	39 100.0	1366 99.1
yes	1	2 .4	5 .8	3 2.0	3 2.4		13 .9
	Column Total	458 33.2	603 43.7	153 11.1	126 9.1	39 2.8	1379 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Pearson		6.19950		4		.18474	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		.368					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		4 of 10 (40.0%)					
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Approximate Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Cramer's V		.06705				.18474	

**Table 18b: Cross-Tabulation of Inter-ethnic
Engagement and Ethnicity, Controlling for Age:
Older Group**

		ethnicity recoded					Row Total
interethn engagement	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	
No	0	377 98.7	490 98.4	157 96.3	177 92.7	81 95.3	1282 97.2
yes	1	5 1.3	8 1.6	6 3.7	14 7.3	4 4.7	37 2.8
	Column Total	382 29.0	498 37.8	163 12.4	191 14.5	85 6.4	1319 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
Pearson		21.68828		4		.00023	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		2.384					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		2 of		10 (20.0%)			
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Val/ASE0	
Cramer's V		.12823				.00023	

Number of Missing Observations: 288

The two crosstabulations of ethnicity and inter-ethnic cohabitation and ethnicity and inter-ethnic engagement for the younger group are not statistically significant. This can easily be explained as a function of their youth: they have not had the time yet to get involved seriously.

Again, the other runs replicate the original relationship. Looking at the individual ethnic groups and age, many go in the expected direction, that is, more people in the older group have dated inter-ethnically compared to those in the younger group. But a few do not. For example,

a greater proportion of the younger group from Patriarchal cultures dated someone from another ethnic background than those in the older group. This is also the case with respect to serious dating. Perhaps this can in part be explained by teenage rebellion. As they get older, individuals in this group grow more conservative, and date inter-ethnically less frequently. However, their rates are always higher than are those of the French and English Canadians, and this may, in turn, be due to a small available pool of dating partners within their own group.

In order to establish the proportion of inter-ethnic dating partners to the total number of dating partners over the 12 month period prior to the study, inter-ethnic casual and serious dating were run with the number of casual dating partners and the number of serious dating partners respectively. As Table 19a below demonstrates, the greater the number of casual dating partners, the greater the proportion of dating partners from another ethnic group than that to which the respondents themselves belong to. This is also the general trend for those who dated someone seriously, i.e. the greater the number of partners, the greater the proportion of the dates being from another ethnic group (see Table 19b below). To verify the same trends with respect to inter-ethnic cohabitation and engagement was not possible due to the lack of data on the

number of such partners.

Table 19a: Cross-Tabulation of Inter-ethnic Casual Dating by Number of Casual Dates

CASLDAT2					
casual interethn dating	Count	1-2 dates 3-4 dates 5+ dates			Row Total
	Col Pct	1	2	3	
No	0	564 76.5	318 62.6	255 56.3	1137 67.0
yes	1	173 23.5	190 37.4	198 43.7	561 33.0
Column Total		737 43.4	508 29.9	453 26.7	1698 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	58.16161	2	.00000

Minimum Expected Frequency - 149.666

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.18508			.00000

Number of Missing Observations: 1288

Table 19b: Cross-Tabulation of Inter-ethnic Serious Dating by Number of Serious Dates

	Count Col Pct	SERDATE		Row Total
		1 man	2+ men	
serious interethn dating		1	2	
No	0	1241 81.5	291 75.8	1532 80.4
yes	1	281 18.5	93 24.2	374 19.6
Column Total		1522 79.9	384 20.1	1906 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF
Pearson		6.44184		1
Minimum Expected Frequency -		75.349		
Statistic		Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0
Phi		.05814		
				Approximate Significance
				.01115

Number of Missing Observations: 1080

Even if these two crosstabulations are statistically significant, the relationships remain nevertheless weak, especially that of number of serious dates and serious inter-ethnic dating (Phi of .058).

Does this pattern hold if we control for gender? Tables 20a and b and 21a and b show the results of this question.

Table 20a: Cross-Tabulation of Inter-ethnic Casual Dating by Number of Casual Dates, Controlling for Gender: Women

		CASLDAT2			Row Total
casual interethn dating	Count Col Pct	1-2men 1	3-4 men 2	5+ men 3	
No	0	321 74.7	160 58.4	122 52.1	603 64.3
yes	1	109 25.3	114 41.6	112 47.9	335 35.7
Column Total		430 45.8	274 29.2	234 24.9	938 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	39.30832	2	.00000
Minimum Expected Frequency - 83.571			

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.20471			.00000

Table 20b: Cross-Tabulation of Inter-ethnic Casual Dating by Number of Casual Dates, Controlling for Gender: Men

		CASLDAT2			Row Total
casual interethn dating	Count Col Pct	1-2women 1	3-4 women 2	5+ women 3	
No	0	242 79.1	158 67.2	134 60.9	534 70.2
yes	1	64 20.9	77 32.8	86 39.1	227 29.8
Column Total		306 40.2	235 30.9	220 28.9	761 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	21.60092	2	.00002
Minimum Expected Frequency - 65.624			

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.16848			.00002

Number of Missing Observations: 1287

Table 21a: Cross-Tabulation of Inter-ethnic Serious Dating by Number of Serious Dates, Controlling for Gender: Women

	Count Col Pct	SERDATE		Row Total
		1 man	2+ men	
		1	2	
serious interethn dating No	0	476 82.9	131 76.2	607 81.4
yes	1	98 17.1	41 23.8	139 18.6
	Column Total	574 76.9	172 23.1	746 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	3.99381	1	.04567

Minimum Expected Frequency - 32.048

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	.07317			.04567

Table 21b: Cross-Tabulation of Inter-ethnic Serious Dating by Number of Serious Dates, Controlling for Gender: Men

		SERDATE		Row Total
		1 man	2+ men	
serious interethn dating	Count Col Pct	1	2	
No	0	765 80.7	159 75.4	924 79.7
yes	1	183 19.3	52 24.6	235 20.3
Column Total		948 81.8	211 18.2	1159 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF
Pearson		3.04536		1
Minimum Expected Frequency -		42.783		
Statistic		Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0
Phi		.05126		
				Approximate Significance
				.08097

Number of Missing Observations: 1081

The partial relationships replicate that of the original for inter-ethnic casual dating. The relationship between inter-ethnic casual dating and number of dates is slightly stronger for women than it is for men (Cramer's V .20 versus .17). Almost half the women who indicated they had dated 5 men or more (over the 12 month period prior to the study) had dated someone from another ethnic background. Thus, whether or not one has dated casually a person from another ethnic background is related to the total number of casual dating partners.

For serious inter-ethnic dating and number of dates,

controlling for gender, we see that the partial for males is no longer statistically significant. The association observed in the original table is therefore spurious, and a case of interpretation whereby the variable "gender" has intervened in the relationship. The partial for women (Table 21a) is, however, statistically significant at the .05 level, but the relationship is weak (Φ .07).

Thus, while it is the case that the more casual dates one has, the greater the chance of dating someone from another ethnic background, the same cannot be said to be the case for serious dating, or at least not for men. Perhaps when dating on a casual basis, Canadian college and university students are more apt to explore individuals from another ethnic group, but when a relationship gets serious, it is more likely to happen with someone with a shared ethnic background.

Next are crosstabulations of ethnicity and inter-ethnic dating patterns while controlling for the number of casual dates.

Table 23a: Cross-Tabulation of Inter-ethnic Casual Dating by Ethnicity, Controlling for Number of Casual Dates: 1-2 dates

		ethnicity recoded					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	Row Total
casual interethn dating No	0	237 89.8	230 84.9	38 51.4	42 44.2	12 44.4	559 76.5
	1	27 10.2	41 15.1	36 48.6	53 55.8	15 55.6	172 23.5
Column Total		264 36.1	271 37.1	74 10.1	95 13.0	27 3.7	731 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Pearson		132.87884		4		.00000	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		6.353					
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Approximate Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Cramer's V		.42635				.00000	

Table 22b: Cross-Tabulation of Inter-ethnic Casual Dating by Ethnicity, Controlling for Number of Casual Dates: 3-4 dates

		ethnicity recoded					
casual interethn dating	Count Col Pct	French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clts	Other	Row Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
No	0	117 80.7	137 63.7	30 50.8	17 32.1	16 47.1	317 62.6
yes	1	28 19.3	78 36.3	29 49.2	36 67.9	18 52.9	189 37.4
Column Total		145 28.7	215 42.5	59 11.7	53 10.5	34 6.7	506 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Pearson		48.48752		4		.00000	
Minimum Expected Frequency - 12.700							
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
-----		-----		-----		-----	-----
Cramer's V		.30956					.00000

Table 22c: Cross-Tabulation of Inter-ethnic Casual Dating by Ethnicity, Controlling for Number of Casual Dates: 5+ dates

		ethnicity recoded					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	Row Total
casual interethn dating No	0	99 79.2	107 53.0	26 43.3	9 22.5	10 47.6	251 56.0
yes	1	26 20.8	95 47.0	34 56.7	31 77.5	11 52.4	197 44.0
	Column Total	125 27.9	202 45.1	60 13.4	40 8.9	21 4.7	448 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Pearson		50.78812		4		.00000	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		9.234					
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Approximate Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Cramer's V		.33670				.00000	

Number of Missing Observations: 1301

All of the above partial cross tabulations are statistically significant, and replicate the original relationship (see Table 3a). But the partial relationships (moderately strong Cramer's V of .43, .31, .34) are all stronger than the original table (Cramer's V of .27). In other words, when controlling for the number of casual dates, ethnicity and inter-ethnic casual dating have a greater association in all three cases. Whether the one or two dates an individual had that year was inter-ethnic depends, in part, on their own ethnic background. Only

10.2% of the French Canadians dating activities were inter-ethnic whereas 55.8% of those of "Patriarchal cultures" and 55.6% of the "Other" groups had dated inter-ethnically when having dated only one or two individuals that year.

The numbers for the individual ethnic groups are interesting, for it is not true for everybody that a greater number of casual dates include more inter-ethnic dates. For the "Other" group, the number of inter-ethnic casual dates remains constant, and high, and for the Europeans, the number is only slightly higher when it comes to 5 or more casual dates.

Again, it is noteworthy that French Canadians are the least likely to date inter-ethnically, regardless of the number of dates. Only 20% had an inter-ethnic date when they dated 5 or more individuals compared to 77.5% of those of Patriarchal cultures, or even 47% for English Canadians who are the next least likely to date inter-ethnically. English Canadians follow the profile of "the more dates, the more inter-ethnic dates" nicely. At each level, the number of individuals who have engaged in inter-ethnic casual dating increases with 10-15%.

Next is a tabular exploration of ethnicity, the number of serious dates and inter-ethnic serious dating.

Table 23a: Cross-Tabulation of Inter-ethnic Serious Dating by Ethnicity, Controlling for Number of Serious Dates: 1 Date

		ETHNIC3					
serious ethnic dating No	Count Col Pct	French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clts	Other	Row Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
	0	456 91.9	532 86.5	114 61.6	86 55.8	47 73.4	1235 81.6
yes	1	40 8.1	83 13.5	71 38.4	68 44.2	17 26.6	279 18.4
	Column Total	496 32.8	615 40.6	185 12.2	154 10.2	64 4.2	1514 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Pearson		165.00395		4		.00000	
Minimum Expected Frequency - 11.794							
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Approximate Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Cramer's V		.33013				.00000	

Table 23b: Cross-Tabulation of Inter-ethnic Serious Dating by Ethnicity, Controlling for Number of Serious Dates: 2+ Dates

		ETHNIC3					Row Total
	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	
serious interethn dating No	0	123 93.9	117 70.9	27 60.0	13 44.8	12 80.0	292 75.8
	1	8 6.1	48 29.1	18 40.0	16 55.2	3 20.0	93 24.2
Column Total		131 34.0	165 42.9	45 11.7	29 7.5	15 3.9	385 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
Pearson		47.02218		4		.00000	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		3.623					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		1 of		10 (10.0%)			
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Val/ASE0	
Cramer's V		.34948				Approximate Significance	
						.00000	

Number of Missing Observations: 1087

These tables replicate the original relationship (see Table 3b), although the association between the two variables are stronger when controlling for number of serious dates (Cramer's v of .26 versus .33 and .35 for Tables 23a and b respectively). In other words, the relationship between ethnicity and inter-ethnic dating holds up more clearly under this condition.

Again, French Canadians are the least likely to date inter-ethnically regardless of the number of serious dates they had in the past year, and are even less likely to have

dated someone seriously if they had more, rather than fewer, dating partners. For English Canadians and those of Patriarchal cultures, the numbers are in the expected direction; the higher the number of dating partners, the greater the chance of having dated someone from another ethnic background. The "Other" group's pattern is the same as that of the French Canadians, and for the final group, the Europeans, the numbers are almost the same whether they had one or more than two serious dates.

How many of those who dated inter-ethnically are foreign students, and how many are refugees and recent immigrants? No research has previously been done on the dating habits of these individuals, but it is most likely that their inter-ethnic dating rates are higher than the others in the sample since the availability of potential dating partners from the same ethnic background is lower. Tables 24, 25 and 26a, b, c and d present these data.

Table 24a: Cross-tabulation of Inter-ethnic Casual Dating and Immigrant Status

		recent immigrant		Row Total
Count Col Pct		yes	no	
		1	2	
casual intereth dating No	0	59 63.4	2016 76.9	2075 76.4
	1	34 36.6	607 23.1	641 23.6
Column Total		93 3.4	2623 96.6	2716 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	8.96790	1	.00275
Minimum Expected Frequency - 21.949			

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.05746			.00275

Number of Missing Observations: 270

**Table 24b: Cross-tabulation of Inter-ethnic
Serious Dating and Immigrant Status**

		recent immigrant		Row Total
		yes	no	
ser intereth dating	Count	1	2	
	Col Pct			
No	0	65 72.2	2230 85.2	2295 84.7
yes	1	25 27.8	388 14.8	413 15.3
Column		90	2618	2708
Total		3.3	96.7	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	11.30205	1	.00077
Minimum Expected Frequency - 13.726			

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.06460			.00077

Number of Missing Observations: 278

Table 24c: Cross-tabulation of Inter-ethnic Cohabitation and Immigrant Status

	Count Col Pct	recent immigrant		Row Total
		yes	no	
		1	2	
intereth cohabitation	0	80 88.9	2545 97.2	2625 97.0
No				
yes	1	10 11.1	72 2.6	82 3.0
Column Total		90 3.3	2617 96.7	2707 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	20.70095	1	.00001

Minimum Expected Frequency - 2.726
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 of 4 (25.0%)

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.08745			.00001

Number of Missing Observations: 279

**Table 24d: Cross-tabulation of Inter-ethnic
Engagement and Immigrant Status**

		recent immigrant		Row Total
Count Col Pct		yes	no	
		1	2	
intereth engagement	No	81 87.1	2582 98.6	2663 98.2
	yes	12 12.9	36 1.4	48 1.8
Column Total		93 3.4	2618 96.6	2711 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	68.62581	1	.00000

Minimum Expected Frequency - 1.647
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 of 4 (25.0%)

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.15910			.00000

Number of Missing Observations: 275

All the crosstabulations presented in Tables 24a, b, c and d are statistically significant and show that a greater proportion of recent immigrants have dated interethnically than non-immigrants. This is as true for casual dating as it is for more serious relationships, but the strongest relationships are found among the most serious forms of dating; cohabitation and engagement (overall though, the relationships are weak at Phi of -.06, -.06, -.09. and -.16 respectively). The fact that recent immigrants tend to get involved in inter-ethnic dating relationships to a greater

extent than the rest of the sample is perhaps not so strange; there may not be many available partners from their own ethnic group, it may also be that dating is not an acceptable activity of that culture, thus making it difficult for someone to find a date even if this person wanted to. Finally, it could also be that dating, as practiced in North America, is not a part of their general cultural repertoire, and thus would not be something they would do with people from their own background.

Turning next to refugees, we would expect to see similar patterns.

Table 25a: Cross-tabulation of Casual Inter-ethnic Dating and Refugee Status

	Count Col Pct	refugee		Row Total
		yes	no	
		1	2	
casual intereth-				
dating	0	17	2062	2079
No		68.0	76.5	76.4
	1	8	634	642
yes		32.0	23.5	23.6
	Column	25	2696	2721
	Total	.9	99.1	100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF
Pearson		.98893		1
Minimum Expected Frequency -		5.899		
Statistic		Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0
Phi		-.01906		
Number of Missing Observations:		265		

Significance
Approximate
Significance

.32000

Table 25b: Cross-tabulation of Serious Inter-ethnic Dating and Refugee Status

		refugee		Row Total
Count Col Pct		yes	no	
		1	2	
ser intereth dating No	0	18 81.8	2278 84.7	2296 84.7
	1	4 18.2	410 15.3	414 15.3
Column Total		22 .8	2688 99.2	2710 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.14462	1	.70373

Minimum Expected Frequency - 3.361
 Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 of 4 (25.0%)

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.00731			.70372

Number of Missing Observations: 276

Table 25c: Cross-tabulation of Inter-ethnic Cohabitation and Refugee Status

		refugee		Row Total
Count Col Pct		yes	no	
		1	2	
intereth cohabitation	0	18 78.3	2609 97.1	2627 96.9
yes	1	5 21.7	78 2.9	83 3.1
Column Total		23 .8	2687 99.2	2710 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	27.25312	1	.00000

Minimum Expected Frequency - .704
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 of 4 (25.0%)

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.10028			.00000

Number of Missing Observations: 276

Table 25d: Cross-tabulation of Inter-ethnic Engagement and Refugee Status

	Count Col Pct	refugee		Row Total
		yes	no	
		1	2	
intereth engagement	0	21 87.5	2645 98.3	2666 98.2
No				
yes	1	3 12.5	46 1.7	49 1.8
Column Total		24 .9	2691 99.1	2715 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	15.62894	1	.00008

Minimum Expected Frequency - .433
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 of 4 (25.0%)

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.07587			.00008

Number of Missing Observations: 271

Interestingly, the data for refugees are similar to that of recent immigrants when it comes to the two more serious forms of dating; refugees are also more likely than the rest to be involved interethnically. These crosstabulations are statistically significant albeit weak (Phi -.10 and .08 respectively). But there is no statistical difference between refugees and non-refugees when it comes to the rates of casual and serious interethnic dating as these runs are not statistically significant. It is possible that fewer refugees date because of cultural

restrictions; at the same time though, these cultural constraints do not prevent them from cohabiting with someone. Again, it is possible that what is referred to here as casual and serious dating is not a part of their way of interacting with members of the opposite sex.

Next are crosstabulations of inter-ethnic dating and foreign students.

Table 26a: Cross-tabulation of Casual Inter-ethnic Dating and Foreign Students

		foreign student		Row Total
		yes	no	
casual intereth dating	0	61 67.8	2009 76.6	2070 76.3
	1	29 32.2	614 23.4	643 23.7
Column Total		90 3.3	2623 96.7	2713 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	3.73806	1	.05319

Minimum Expected Frequency - 21.331

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.03712			.05319

Table 26b: Cross-tabulation of Serious Inter-ethnic Dating and Foreign Students

		foreign student		Row Total
		yes	no	
ser intereth dating	0	70 77.8	2223 84.9	2293 84.7
	1	20 22.2	394 15.1	414 15.3
Column Total		90 3.3	2617 96.7	2707 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	3.44971	1	.06326

Minimum Expected Frequency - 13.764

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.03570			.06326

Number of Missing Observations: 279

Table 26c: Cross-tabulation of Inter-ethnic Cohabitation and Foreign Students

		foreign student		Row Total
Count Col Pct		yes	no	
		1	2	
intereth				
cohabitation	0	81	2542	2623
No		89.0	97.2	96.9
	1	10	74	84
yes		11.0	2.8	3.1
Column		91	2616	2707
Total		3.4	96.6	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	19.47593	1	.00001

Minimum Expected Frequency - 2.824
 Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 of 4 (25.0%)

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.08482			.00001

Number of Missing Observations: 279

Table 26d: Cross-tabulation of Inter-ethnic Engagement and Foreign Students

	Count Col Pct	foreign students		Row Total
		yes	no	
intereth engagement No	0	85 94.4	2576 98.3	2661 98.2
	1	5 5.6	44 1.7	49 1.8
Column Total		90 3.3	2620 96.7	2710 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	7.36338	1	.00666
Minimum Expected Frequency - 1.627			
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 of 4 (25.0%)			

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.05213			.00666

Number of Missing Observations: 276

Just like the refugees, foreign students do also engage in more interethnic dating than the rest of the sample, but only when it comes to cohabitation and engagement are the results statistically significant (the relationships are weak at Phi $-.10$ and $-.08$ respectively).

In order to verify that these patterns are true for both women and men, gender was employed as a control variable. Only the crosstabulations which were statistically significant are reproduced. Tables 27a through f present the data for the recent immigrants, 28a

through d that of refugees and 29a through d that of the foreign students.

Table 27a: Cross-tabulation of Casual Inter-ethnic Dating and Immigrant Status, Controlling for Gender: Men

		recent immigrants		Row Total
Count Col Pct		yes	no	
		1	2	
casual intereth dating No	0	27 55.1	822 77.2	849 76.2
	1	22 44.9	243 22.8	265 23.8
Column Total		49 4.4	1065 95.6	1114 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	Df	Significance
Pearson	12.59845	1	.00039
Minimum Expected Frequency - 11.656			

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.10634			.00039
Number of Missing Observations: 269				

Table 27b: Cross-tabulation of Serious Inter-ethnic Dating and Immigrant Status, Controlling for Gender: Women

		recent immigrants		Row Total
Count Col Pct		yes	no	
		1	2	
ser intereth dating No	0	30 69.8	1319 84.6	1349 84.2
	1	13 30.2	240 15.4	253 15.8
Column Total		43 2.7	1559 97.3	1602 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	6.92787	1	.00849

Minimum Expected Frequency - 6.791

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
chi	-.06576			.00849

Number of Missing Observations: 279

Table 27c: Cross-tabulation of Inter-ethnic Cohabitation and Immigrant Status, Controlling for Gender: Women

		recent immigrant		Row Total
Count Col Pct		yes	no	
		1	2	
intereth				
cohabitation	0	37 86.0	1513 97.2	1550 96.9
No				
	1	6 14.0	44 2.8	50 3.1
yes				
		43 2.7	1557 97.3	1600 100.0
Column Total				

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	17.11488	1	.00004

Minimum Expected Frequency - 1.344
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 of 4 (25.0%)

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.10343			.00004

Number of Missing Observations: 279

Table 27d: Cross-tabulation of Inter-ethnic Cohabitation and Immigrant Status, Controlling for Gender: Men

		recent immigrant		Row Total
Count Col Pct		yes	no	
		1	2	
intereth				
cohabitation	0	42	1032	1074
No		89.4	97.4	97.0
	1	5	28	33
yes		10.6	2.6	3.0
Column Total		47	1060	1107
		4.2	95.8	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	9.95095	1	.00161

Minimum Expected Frequency - 1.401
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 of 4 (25.0%)

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.09481			.00161

Number of Missing Observations: 279

**Table 27e: Cross-tabulation of Inter-ethnic
Engagement and Immigrant Status, Controlling for
Gender: Women**

		recent immigrant		Row Total
Count Col Pct		yes	no	
		1	2	
intereth				
cohabitation	0	41 91.1	1534 98.6	1575 98.4
No				
	1	4 8.9	22 1.4	26 1.6
yes				
	Column	45	1556	1601
	Total	2.8	97.2	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	15.29617	1	.00009

Minimum Expected Frequency - .731
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 of 4 (25.0%)

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.09775			.00009

Number of Missing Observations: 276

Table 27f: Cross-tabulation of Inter-ethnic Engagement and Immigrant Status, Controlling for Gender: Men

		recent immigrants		Row Total
Count Col Pct		yes	no	
		1	2	
intereth				
engagement				
No	0	40 83.3	1048 98.8	1088 98.1
yes	1	8 16.7	13 1.2	21 1.9
Column Total		48 4.3	1061 95.7	1109 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	58.94049	1	.00000

Minimum Expected Frequency - .909
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 of 4 (25.0%)

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.23054			.00000

Number of Missing Observations: 276

Table 28a: Cross-tabulation of Casual Inter-ethnic Dating and Refugees, Controlling for Gender: Men

		refugees		Row Total
		yes	no	
casual intereth dating	Count Col Pct	1	2	
No	0	8 53.3	841 76.6	849 76.3
yes	1	7 46.7	257 23.4	264 23.7
Column Total		15 1.3	1098 98.7	1113 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	4.42501	1	.03542
Minimum Expected Frequency - 3.558			
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 of 4 (25.0%)			

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.06305			.03542

Number of Missing Observations: 266

Table 28b: Cross-tabulation of Inter-ethnic Cohabitation and Refugees, Controlling for Gender: Women

		refugee		Row Total
Count Col Pct		yes	no	
		1	2	
intereth				
cohabitation	0	6	1547	1553
No		75.0	96.9	96.8
	1	2	49	51
yes		25.0	3.1	3.2
Column		8	1596	1604
Total		.5	99.5	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	12.43529	1	.00042
Minimum Expected Frequency - .254			
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 of 4 (25.0%)			

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.08805			.00042

Number of Missing Observations: 274

Table 28c: Cross-tabulation of Inter-ethnic Cohabitation and Refugees, Controlling for Gender: Men

		refugee		Row Total
		yes	no	
intereth cohabitation	Count	1	2	
	Col Pct			
No	0	13 81.3	1062 97.3	1075 97.0
yes	1	3 18.8	30 2.7	33 3.0
Column Total		16 1.4	1092 98.6	1108 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	13.97491	1	.00019

Minimum Expected Frequency - .477
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 of 4 (25.0%)

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.11231			.00019

Number of Missing Observations: 274

Table 28d: Cross-tabulation of Inter-ethnic Engagement and Refugees, Controlling for Gender: Men

	Count Col Pct	refugee		Row Total
		yes	no	
		1	2	
intereth engagement	0	13 81.3	1075 98.3	1088 98.0
No				
	1	3 18.8	19 1.7	22 2.0
yes				
Column Total		16 1.4	1094 98.6	1110 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	23.49543	1	.00000
Minimum Expected Frequency - .317			
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 of 4 (25.0%)			

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.14549			.00000

Number of Missing Observations: 271

**Table 29a: Cross-tabulation of Casual Inter-ethnic
Dating and Foreign Students, Controlling for
Gender: Men**

		foreign student		Row Total
		yes	no	
casual intereth	Count Col Pct	1	2	
dating	0	14 46.7	829 77.0	843 76.2
No				
yes	1	16 53.3	248 23.0	264 23.8
Column Total		30 2.7	1077 97.3	1107 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	14.76121	1	.00012
Minimum Expected Frequency - 7.154			

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.11547			.00012
Number of Missing Observations: 275				

Table 29b: Cross-tabulation of Inter-ethnic Cohabitation and Foreign Students, Controlling for Gender: Women

		foreign students		
	Count Col Pct	yes	no	Row Total
		1	2	
intereth cohabitation	0	54 90.0	1498 97.1	1552 96.8
No				
yes	1	6 10.0	45 2.9	51 3.2
Column Total		60 3.7	1543 96.3	1603 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	9.40800	1	.00216
Minimum Expected Frequency -	1.909		
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -	1 of	4 (25.0%)	

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.07661			.00216

Number of Missing Observations: 279

Table 29c: Cross-tabulation of Inter-ethnic Cohabitation and Foreign Students, Controlling for Gender: Men

		foreign students		Row Total
Count Col Pct		yes	no	
		1	2	
intereth				
cohabitation	0	26	1045	1071
No		86.7	97.3	97.0
yes	1	4	29	33
		13.3	2.7	3.0
Column		30	1074	1104
Total		2.7	97.3	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	11.37928	1	.00074

Minimum Expected Frequency - .897
 Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 of 4 (25.0%)

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.10152			.00074

Number of Missing Observations: 279

Table 29d: Cross-tabulation of Inter-ethnic Engagement and Foreign Student, Controlling for gender: Men

		foreign. student		
Count		yes	no	Row
Col	Pct			Total
		1	2	
intereth engagement No	0	26 86.7	1058 98.3	1084 98.0
	1	4 13.3	18 1.7	22 2.0
yes				
Column		30	1076	1106
Total		2.7	97.3	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
-----	-----	----	-----
Pearson	20.35490	1	.00001

Minimum Expected Frequency - .597
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 of 4 (25.0%)

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Phi	-.13566			.00001

Number of Missing Observations: 276

Two of the partial tables were not statistically significant for the recent immigrant group; that of inter-ethnic casual dating for women and that of serious inter-ethnic dating for men. The relationships between casual and serious inter-ethnic dating and immigrant status were thus rendered spurious by the test variable "gender" thereby interpreting the relationship away. As many as 44.9% of the male recent immigrants have been involved in inter-ethnic casual dating activities compared to 22.8% of the rest of

the sample (with a Phi of $-.11$). Interestingly, when it comes to serious inter-ethnic dating, there is no difference between male immigrants and non-immigrants, but there is for the women. Again, there are proportionally more immigrant women (30.2%) that have dated inter-ethnically on a serious basis than there are of the others (15.4%) in the sample.

When it comes to inter-ethnic cohabitation for this group, the partial relationships are a near perfect replication of the original relationship and replicated also is the relationship between inter-ethnic engagement and immigrant status. In this latter case though, the relationship for men is quite a bit stronger than it was originally (Phi $-.23$ versus $-.16$) and also compared to women (Phi $-.10$). In other words, recent immigrant men in particular, tend to cohabit inter-ethnically significantly more than both other men and women.

Turning next to the refugees, the variable "gender" is acting as a suppressor variable in that it concealed the relationship between casual inter-ethnic dating and refugee status among men (the original relationship was not significant, see Table 25a). 46.7% refugee men had dated casually a person from another ethnic background compared to only 23.4% of other men. The relationship is, however, not very strong (Phi $-.06$).

While the relationship between being a refugee and serious inter-ethnic dating relationships was not

significant for either women or men and a replication of the original relationship (Table 25b), that of refugee status and inter-ethnic cohabitation was statistically significant for both women and men. Also replicating the original relationship (Table 25c), are the partials of inter-ethnic cohabitation and refugee status for women and men. Both of them lived with dating partners of other ethnic backgrounds to a much greater extent than the others in the sample (25% versus 3.1% for women and 18.8% versus 2.7% for men). The relationships are however, on the weak side (Φ -.09 and -.11 respectively).

Finally, the relationship between inter-ethnic engagement and refugee status (Table 26d) was rendered spurious by the variable "gender" since only the partial table for men remains statistically significant (Φ is -.15). Thus, refugee women have not been engaged inter-ethnically to any greater extent than the other women in the sample, but refugee men have (18.8% versus 1.7%).

Turning next to the foreign students and causal inter-ethnic dating, we see that the original relationship which was not significant concealed the relationship for men. Statistically significant at the .05 level, 53.3% of these men dated someone from another ethnic background on a casual basis compared to 33% of other men. The relationship is not very strong as indicated by the Φ statistic of -.12.

Foreign students do not engage in serious inter-ethnic

dating any more than others, and this is true for both women and men. The original relationship has therefore been replicated since none are statistically significant. Replicated also is the relationship between inter-ethnic cohabitation and being a foreign student as both partials are also statistically significant. Again, both female and male foreign students have more inter-ethnic cohabitation relationships than the others in the sample (10% versus 2.9% for women and 13.3% versus 2.7% for men , while the Phi statistics indicate the relationship is not very strong at $-.08$ for women and $-.14$ for men).

Looking at all of the tables, we find that there is one form of inter-ethnic dating which is not engaged in to any greater extent than the others by recent immigrants, refugees and foreign students, and that is serious inter-ethnic dating. Only among female recent immigrants is there a statistically significant relationship. Why serious dating is less common among these three groups is hard to explain; but perhaps for some, when you become serious is when you either move in with your dating partner or you get engaged or possibly married. In other words, maybe serious dating is not a stage on the dating continuum for many of these individuals.

Another interesting observation is that among the women, there are no difference between recent immigrant, refugee and foreign student women and the others when it

comes to casual inter-ethnic dating. For men, however, there are statistically significant differences for all three groups. These differences between female and male recent immigrants, refugees and foreign students may be explained by the cultures from which they originate.⁴¹ The majority of the women in these categories are from Patriarchal cultures (50.8% of recent immigrants, 70% of refugees, and 72.3% of foreign students) with the rest split mainly between North and Eastern Europe and "Others". This pattern also holds for men to some extent as many of them indicate they belong to "Patriarchal cultures" (36.7% for recent immigrants, 52.6% for refugees, and 44.5% for foreign students). Gender roles within Patriarchal cultures often encourage men, but discourage women, to engage with a person from the opposite sex in a casual manner (of which dating is an example). This may explain the low casual dating rates among females, and to some extent (but not to the same degree) the lower rates in the other serious forms of dating. While men seem to have used dating as an opportunity to meet women, (and there are probably more women of other ethnic groups than there are of their own, added to the fact that maybe dating is not done by the women of their own ethnic group) women, being more restricted by

⁴¹ The largest numbers of present day refugees entering Canada come from Sri Lanka, Iran, Afghanistan, Somalia, Lebanon, and el Salvador (Elliott and Fleras 1992:244). Looking at the immigrations trends on the other hand, while there continue to be a sizable European influx, it has been surpassed by immigrants from Asia. "Other America" (does not include the U.S.A.) is the third largest group (Ibid.:238).

their cultural upbringing, may see casual dating as dangerous to their reputation and honour.

In summing up this chapter, we see that almost a quarter of the total sample have been engaged in inter-ethnic dating. Looking back to the differences in inter-ethnic dating frequency according to ethnicity, it was found that the least likely to date inter-ethnically among both women and men were French Canadians and English Canadians, while the most likely were respondents from Patriarchal Cultures, the "Other" ethnic groups (especially the men in this category) and the Europeans. In addition, slightly more university students than college students dated inter-ethnically over the 12 month period, and for men, being older means more inter-ethnic dating. As was the case for both women and men, the greater the number of dates, the greater the proportion of dates with people from different ethnic groups. This was true for both casual and serious dating. Finally, recent immigrants, refugees and foreign students all tended to engage in more inter-ethnic dating than did the other non-immigrant, non-refugee, non-foreign students proportionally, although men more so than women.

Why French Canadians and English Canadians are so unlikely to date inter-ethnically, is more difficult to explain, especially since French Canadians' attitudes towards mixed marriages are reported to be more favourable

than that of English Canadians (Lambert and Curtis 1984:36). Perhaps the "pool" of potential dating partners is so large for both groups that it is not "necessary" to venture outside of it to find someone to date. There may also be a language barrier which prevents French Canadians from dating inter-ethnically. If the command of the English language is not good, it may be hard to establish contact with someone non-French. Finally, it could also be that for French Canadians, the sense of nationalism in Quebec has worked its way into French Canadians' dating choices as well, both inside and outside of Quebec.

With these differences in mind, how do Canadian university and college students perceive dating? Is the dating scene in the 1990s a confusing place with a multitude of different perceptions of what this interaction is all about? The next section will try to answer these questions.

5.2 Definitions of Dating

How do Canadian university and college students define dating? Let us first turn to the frequencies of the various responses.

Table 30: Frequencies of Dating Definitions

Women			Men		
Value	Frequency	Valid Percent	Value	Frequency	Valid Percent
0	105	5.9	0	102	8.4
10	2	.1	1	2	.1
100	498	28.1	10	7	.6
101	238	13.4	12	2	.1
103	25	1.4	100	380	31.4
110	71	4.0	101	147	12.1
111	42	2.4	103	24	2.0
113	2	.1	110	99	8.1
120	17	1.0	111	50	4.1
121	4	.2	120	10	.8
123	1	.0	121	5	.4
130	69	3.9	130	61	5.0
131	32	1.8	131	24	2.0
133	4	.2	133	10	.8
303	2	.1	300	2	.2
1000	1	.1	333	2	.1
1001	2	.1	1000	1	.1
1011	1	.0	1010	2	.2
1100	62	3.5	1011	2	.1
1101	34	1.9	1100	43	3.6
1110	11	.6	1101	21	1.8
1111	12	.7	1110	1	.1
1120	1	.0	1111	11	.9
1121	1	.0	1130	2	.2
1130	2	.1	1131	2	.1
1131	3	.2	1310	1	.1
2000	3	.2	2000	5	.4
2100	160	9.0	2010	1	.1
2101	17	1.0	2100	54	4.5
2102	2	.1	2101	6	.5
2103	3	.2	2110	7	.6
2110	2	.1	2111	2	.2
2111	2	.1	2120	1	.1
2112	2	.1	2130	6	.5
2113	2	.1	2131	0	.0
2120	12	.7	3100	75	6.2
2121	0	.0	3101	13	1.1
2130	12	.7	3103	5	.4
2133	0	.0	3110	6	.5
3000	4	.2	3113	2	.1
3100	207	11.7	3120	1	.1
3101	28	1.6	3121	1	.1
3102	1	.1	3130	14	1.1
3103	8	.5	3133	0	.0
3110	11	.6	.	1	.1
3111	6	.4			
3120	2	.1			
3130	37	2.1			
3131	9	.5			
3133	2	.1			
3300	2	.1			
3303	0	.0			
-----			-----		
Total	1773	100.0	Total	1213	100.0
Valid cases 1773			Valid cases 1212		
Missing cases 0			Missing cases 1		

Scanning Table 30, we see that the response with the largest frequency for both women (28.1%) and men (31.4%) was 0100 which translates as positively mentioning "sharing" and was typically answered as "Going out on dates, spending time together, doing simple & fun things together" (female, English Canadian, 19 years old, case #1085) or "seeing someone a few times, 4-5 [times]" (male, English Canadian, 29 years old, case #2978). The second most frequent answer for both was 0101, that dating is about sharing and romance. For example, in the words of an English Canadian male, 30 years old, dating is "[s]ocializing with members of the opposite sex on a one-to-one basis-with a romantic touch" (case #2969) or "[s]eeing somebody on a regular basis, and spending a great deal of time with. Having fun together and sharing a lot of things which you wouldn't share just with anybody" as expressed by a female, 29 years old, who identifies as Western European (case #1091).

Looking at the differences between women and men's responses as indicated by Table 30, we find that, proportionally, twice as many men (8.1%) than women (4.0%) indicated dating was about sharing and sex (coded as 0110). Thus included were definitions such as "[a] friendship/relationship with a woman clearly involving an element of intimacy", as answered by an English Canadian male, 25 years old (case #2972) and "[d]ating [is] to make,

[or] has the message of, either making conjugal duty or to make arrangement for it" as expressed by an Ethiopian male, 38 years old (case #2007).

Another difference is that women are almost twice as likely than men (9.0% versus 4.5%) to specify that dating is not about commitment, but does involve sharing (coded as 2100). A typical answer would be "[a]ny sort of interaction beyond friendship which falls short of a formed commitment such as an engagement or marriage or agreement to live together" (West European male, 29 years old, case #2975). In fact, if we add up all those who said that dating had nothing to do with commitment, we find that as many as 12.3% of the women indicated this versus 6.9% of the males. This is interesting in light of the popular view that women look for commitment in their dating relationships, while men look for sex. Perhaps for some men, once they engage in interactions with women they define as dating, it is also about exclusivity and commitment. About equal percentages of women (7.3%) and men (7.1%) defined dating as an encounter involving a commitment although 11.7% of the women said dating may or may not be about commitment compared to only 6.2% of the men (coded as 3100).

A final observation is that women define dating in more ways or combinations than do men. The total number of combinations for women amount to 52, while for men they are 44. Either dating can be more things to women than it can

for men, or dating can be a greater combination of things for women than for men, thus suggesting that women may be more flexible or open to what a date can be.

In order to examine the patterns of responses according to gender, ethnicity, age and dating intensity, cross-tabulations were performed and are presented below.

Table 31a: Cross-Tabulation of Gender by Dating Definition-Commitment

		GENDER		
	Count Col Pct	male	female	Row Total
dat-defn commitment		1	2	
no mention	1	926 76.3	1111 62.7	2037 68.2
positive	2	87 7.2	128 7.2	215 7.2
positive+negativ	3	200 16.5	534 30.1	734 24.6
Column Total		1213 40.6	1773 59.4	2986 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	74.18989	2	.00000
Minimum Expected Frequency - 87.339			

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.15763			.00000

Number of Missing Observations: 0

Table 31b: Cross-Tabulation of Gender by Dating Definition-Sharing

Dat-defn sharing	Count Col Pct	GENDER		Row Total
		male	female	
		1	2	
no mention	1	121 10.0	117 6.6	238 8.0
positive	2	1085 89.6	1652 93.2	2737 91.7
positive+negativ	3	5 .4	4 .2	9 .3
Column Total		1211 40.6	1773 59.4	2984 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	12.22654	2	.00221

Minimum Expected Frequency - 3.652
 Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 of 6 (16.7%)

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.06401			.00221

Number of Missing Observations: 2

**Table 31c: Cross-Tabulation of Gender by Dating
Definition-Sexuality**

Dat-defn sexuality	Count Col Pct	GENDER		Row Total
		male 1	female 2	
no mention	1	881 72.7	1402 79.0	2283 76.5
positive	2	192 15.8	165 9.3	357 12.0
positive+negativ	3	139 11.5	207 11.7	346 11.6
Column Total		1212 40.6	1774 59.4	2986 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	29.57553	2	.00000

Minimum Expected Frequency - 140.439

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.09952			.00000

Number of Missing Observations: 0

Table 31d: Cross-Tabulation of Gender by Dating Definition-Romance

Dat-defn romance	Count Col Pct	GENDER		Row Total
		male	female	
		1	2	
no mention	1	881 72.7	1289 72.7	2170 72.7
positive	2	286 23.6	431 24.3	717 24.0
positive+negativ	3	45 3.7	53 3.0	98 3.3
Column Total		1212 40.6	1773 59.4	2985 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	1.29990	2	.52207

Minimum Expected Frequency - 39.791

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.02087			.52207

Number of Missing Observations: 1

According to the tables above, three of the four are statistically significant, meaning the variables are not independent of one another. However, the relationships between gender and dating definitions are rather weak as indicated by the Cramer's V statistics, especially that of defining dating as sharing and gender.

Mentioning commitment in the definition of dating is done more by women than men (Table 31a). But the difference does not lay in affirming commitment, as the percentage is the same (7.2%), but rather in women's greater likelihood in

mentioning commitment positively and negatively (this category has been collapsed as before-mentioned). As for sharing, percentage wise, slightly fewer men than women mention it. . And sexuality is mentioned more often by men than women, men are also more likely than women to mention sexuality positively in their definitions of dating. Finally, the differences according to gender with respect to romance are not statistically different.

Gender differences in dating definitions then, do exist in three of the four dimensions of dating. Of the definitional categories, commitment has the greatest difference between women and men.

Next are cross-tabulations of dating definitions and ethnicity.

**Table 32a: Cross-Tabulation of Ethnicity by Dating
Definition-Commitment**

		ETHNIC3					Row Total
Dat-defn commitment	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	
	1	700 75.6	760 63.3	228 65.3	228 66.1	97 68.8	2013 68.0
no mention							
positive	2	89 9.6	67 5.6	22 6.3	28 8.1	8 5.7	214 7.2
positive+negativ	3	137 14.8	373 31.1	99 28.4	89 25.8	36 25.5	734 24.8
Column Total		926 31.3	1200 40.5	349 11.8	345 11.7	141 4.8	2961 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	83.7582	8	.00000

Minimum Expected Frequency - 10.190

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.11893			.00000

Number of Missing Observations: 25

Table 32b: Cross-Tabulation of Ethnicity by Dating Definition-Sharing

		ETHNIC3					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	Row Total
Dat-defn sharing							
no mention	1	83 9.0	76 6.3	26 7.4	42 12.2	9 6.4	236 8.0
positive	2	836 90.4	1124 93.6	321 92.0	303 87.8	131 93.6	2715 91.7
positive+negativ	3	6 .6	1 .1	2 .6			9 .3
Column Total		925 31.3	1201 40.6	349 11.8	345 11.7	140 4.7	2960 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF	Significance		
-----		-----		-----	-----		
Pearson		22.51823		8	.00404		
Minimum Expected Frequency -		.426					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		5 of 15 (33.3%)					
Statistic		Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance		
-----		-----	-----	-----	-----		
Cramer's V		.06167			.00404		

Number of Missing Observations: 26

Table 32c: Cross-Tabulation of Ethnicity by Dating Definition-Sexuality

		ETHNIC3					
	Count Col Pct	French dn 1	C English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	Row Total
Dat-defn Sexuality							
no mention	1	588 63.6	1011 84.3	274 78.5	285 82.6	104 74.3	2262 76.4
positive	2	224 24.2	62 5.2	35 10.0	12 3.5	20 14.3	353 11.9
positive+negativ	3	113 12.2	127 10.6	40 11.5	48 13.9	16 11.4	344 11.6
Column Total		925 31.3	1200 40.6	349 11.8	345 11.7	140 4.7	2959 100.0
Chi-Square		Value			DF	Significance	
-----		-----			-----	-----	
Pearson		220.00983			8	.00000	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		16.276					
Statistic		Value		ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance	
-----		-----		-----	-----	-----	
Cramer's V		.19281				.00000	

Number of Missing Observations: 27

Table 32d: Cross-Tabulation of Ethnicity by Dating Definition-Romance

		ETHNIC3					
Dat-defn romance	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	Row Total
no mention	1	581 62.8	940 78.3	261 74.8	268 77.7	100 71.4	2150 72.6
positive	2	284 30.7	239 19.9	81 23.2	70 20.3	38 27.1	712 24.1
positive+negativ	3	60 6.5	22 1.8	7 2.0	7 2.0	2 1.4	98 3.3
Column Total		925 31.3	1201 40.6	349 11.8	345 11.7	140 4.7	2960 100.0
Chi-Square		Value			DF	Significance	
-----		-----			-----	-----	
Pearson		88.41967			8	.00000	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		4.635					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		1 of 15 (6.7%)					
Statistics		Value		ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance	
-----		-----		-----	-----	-----	
Cramer's V		.12221				.00000	

Number of Missing Observations: 26

All four of the tables above are statistically significant although the relationships between various dating definitions and ethnicity are not strong as evidenced by the Cramer's V measure of association (.12, .06, .19 and .12 respectively). The strongest of the four is the association between ethnicity and sexuality as a component of dating (Cramer's V of .19). The least likely to include sexuality positively in their definition are individuals from the Patriarchal cultures (3.5%) and English Canadians (5.2%); by contrast, the most likely are French Canadians

(24.2%). The other groups fall between these. French and English Canadians are the furthest apart when it comes to mentioning commitment as well as romance, positively.

In order to better understand the relationship between ethnicity and dating perception, gender was employed as a control variable. Because women and men often have different views, it is an important test variable.

Table 33a: Cross-Tabulation of Ethnicity by Dating Definition-Commitment, Controlling for Gender:
Women

Dat-defn commitment	Count Col Pct	French C	English	North&Ea	Patriarc	Other	Row Total
		dn 1	Cdn 2	st Europ 3	hal Clts 4	5	
no mention	1	351 70.8	428 57.8	127 57.0	143 63.8	48 63.2	1097 62.3
positive	2	50 10.1	40 5.4	18 8.1	15 6.7	5 6.6	128 7.3
positive+negativ	3	95 19.2	273 36.8	78 35.0	66 29.5	23 30.3	535 30.4
Column Total		496 28.2	741 42.1	223 12.7	224 12.7	76 4.3	1760 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance	
Pearson	50.93617	8	.00000	
Minimum Expected Frequency - 5.527				
Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.12029			.00000

Number of Missing Observations: 12

**Table 33b: Cross-Tabulation of Ethnicity by Dating
Definition-Sharing, Controlling for Gender: Women**

Dat-defn sharing	Count Col Pct	French C	English	North&Ea	Patriarc	Other	Row Total
		dn 1	Cdn 2	st Europ 3	hal Clts 4	5	
no mention	1	39 7.9	33 4.5	15 6.7	26 11.6	2 2.7	115 6.5
positive	2	454 91.5	707 95.5	208 93.3	198 88.4	73 97.3	1640 93.3
positive+negativ	3	3 .6					3 .2
Column Total		496 28.2	740 42.1	223 12.7	224 12.7	75 4.3	1758 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	25.65418	8	.00120

Minimum Expected Frequency - .128
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 6 of 15 (40.0%)

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.08542			.00120

Number of Missing Observations: 14

Table 33c: Cross-Tabulation of Ethnicity by Dating Definition-Sexuality, Controlling for Gender: Women

Dat-defn sexuality	Count Col Pct	French C	English	North&Ea	Patriarc	Other	Row Total
		dn 1	Cdn 2	st Europ 3	hal Clts 4	5	
no mention	1	340 68.5	628 84.9	177 79.7	186 83.0	58 77.3	1389 79.1
positive	2	101 20.4	28 3.8	20 9.0	6 2.7	7 9.3	162 9.2
positive+negativ	3	55 11.1	84 11.4	25 11.3	32 14.3	10 13.3	206 11.7
Column Total		496 28.2	740 42.1	222 12.6	224 12.7	75 4.3	1757 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	113.21300	8	.00000

Minimum Expected Frequency - 6.915

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.17949			.00000

Number of Missing Observations: 15

Table 33d: Cross-Tabulation of Ethnicity by Dating Definition-Romance, Controlling for gender: Women

Dat-defn romance	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	Row Total
no mention	1	321 64.7	569 76.9	162 73.0	169 75.4	54 72.0	1275 72.6
positive	2	146 29.4	157 21.2	57 25.7	48 21.4	21 28.0	429 24.4
positive+negativ	3	29 5.8	14 1.9	3 1.4	3.1		53 3.0
Column Total		496 28.2	740 42.1	222 12.6	224 12.7	75 4.3	1757 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	36.54746	8	.00001

Minimum Expected Frequency - 2.262
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 of 15 (6.7%)

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.10198			.00001

Number of Missing Observations: 15

**Table 34a: Cross-Tabulation of Ethnicity by Dating
Definition-Commitment, Controlling for Gender: Men**

Dat-defn commitment	Count Col Pct	French C	English	North&Ea	Patriarc	Other	Row Total
		dn 1	Cdn 2	st Europ 3	hal Clt 4	5	
no mention	1	349 81.2	333 72.2	101 80.2	85 70.8	49 75.4	917 76.3
positive	2	39 9.1	28 6.1	4 3.2	12 10.0	3 4.6	86 7.2
positive+negativ	3	42 9.8	100 21.7	21 16.7	23 19.2	13 20.0	199 16.6
Column Total		430 35.8	461 38.4	126 10.5	120 10.0	65 5.4	1202 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	31.02041	8	.00014

Minimum Expected Frequency - 4.651
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 of 15 (6.7+)

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.11359			.00014

Number of Missing Observations: 11

**Table 34b: Cross-Tabulation of Ethnicity by Dating
Definition-Sharing, Controlling for Gender: Men**

Dat-defn sharing	Count Col Pct	French C	English	North&Ea	Patriarc	Other	Row Total
		dn 1	Cdn 2	st Europ 3	hal Clt 4	5	
no mention	1	44 10.2	43 9.3	11 8.7	16 13.2	7 10.6	121 10.0
positive	2	383 89.1	417 90.5	113 89.7	105 86.8	59 89.4	1077 89.5
positive+negativ	3	3 .7	1 .2	2 1.6			6 .5
Column Total		430 35.7	461 38.3	126 10.5	121 10.0	66 5.5	1204 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	6.86683	8	.55107

Minimum Expected Frequency - .329
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 5 of 15 (33.3%)

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.05340			.55107

Number of Missing Observations: 9

**Table 34c: Cross-Tabulation of Ethnicity by Dating
Definition-Sexuality, Controlling for Gender: Men**

Dat-defn sexuality	Count Col Pct	French C	English	North&Ea	Patriarc	Other	Row Total
		dn 1	Cdn 2	st Europ 3	hal Clt 4	 5	
no mention	1	248 57.8	383 83.1	97 76.4	99 81.8	46 69.7	873 72.5
positive	2	123 28.7	35 7.6	15 11.8	6 5.0	13 19.7	192 15.9
positive+negativ	3	58 13.5	43 9.3	15 11.8	16 13.2	7 10.6	139 11.5
Column Total		429 35.6	461 38.3	127 10.5	121 10.0	66 5.5	1204 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	100.27810	8	.00000
Minimum Expected Frequency - 7.620			

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.20407			.00000

Number of Missing Observations: 9

Table 34d: Cross-Tabulation of Ethnicity by Dating Definition-Romance, Controlling for Gender: Men

Dat-defn	Count Col Pct	French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clt	Other	Row Total
romance		1	2	3	4	5	
no mention	1	260 60.6	372 80.7	99 78.6	99 81.8	47 71.2	877 72.9
positive	2	138 32.2	81 17.6	23 18.3	22 18.2	18 27.3	282 23.4
positive+negativ	3	31 7.2	8 1.7	4 3.2		1 1.5	44 3.7
Column Total		429 35.7	461 38.3	126 10.5	121 10.1	66 5.5	1203 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	63.56783	8	.00000
Minimum Expected Frequency - 2.414			
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 3 of 15 (20.0%)			

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.16254			.00000

Number of Missing Observations: 10

The original relationship between each of the dating definitions and ethnicity is replicated in the partials with the exception of Sharing which has too few numbers in some of the cells to allow for a reliable test of independence. While we can then conclude that the nature of the original relationship is general, it is, nevertheless, weak as evidenced by the Cramer's V statistics. What the partials also show is that gender does not influence the respondents' view of dating and how it is defined, but that ethnicity

does.

Looking at the specific ethnic groups and their responses in the partial tables, we find that English Canadian women are the least likely to define dating as the existence of commitment (i.e. positively), although 36.8% of them also said that dating may or may not be about commitment. A greater proportion of French Canadian women than any of the other groups, on the other hand, do not mention commitment as a defining element of a dating relationship, but, when they do mention it, it is positively (10.1% compared to 5.4% of English Canadians) and positively and negatively (19.2% compared to 36.8% of English Canadian women). The other ethnic groups' answers are quite similar to those of the English Canadian women's responses; in fact, it is only the French Canadian women who differ with respect to commitment. A final observation is that only a total of 7.3% of the women mentioned commitment affirmatively. In other words, there is a fair amount of flexibility in the view of a dating relationship as to whether commitment should be a part of the configuration. Each dating relationship is an encounter of negotiation.

These differences in seeing commitment as a feature of dating according to ethnicity are statistically significant at the 0.01 level as the chi-square statistics indicate, although the relationship is rather weak as Cramer's V of .12 indicate.

Looking at sharing next (Table 33b and 34b), we find that sharing is a concept that resonates with the vast majority. On the average, only 6.5% of the women and 10.0% of the men did not mention it, while almost all the others mentioned it positively (93.3% of the women and 89.5% of the men). Although differences according to ethnicity and defining dating as sharing show as statistically significant, the results are nevertheless not reliable due to too few cases in each cell as well as empty cells.

According to Table 33c, many more French Canadian women include sex in their definition of dating than do women of any of the other ethnic groups. Slightly more than one fifth (20.4%) of French Canadian women mentioned sex positively as a part of dating compared to only 3.8% of English Canadian women, or 2.7% of the women from Patriarchal cultures. Slightly more affirmative about sexuality were the Other and North&East European women with 9.3% and 9.0% respectively.

Looking at those who never mentioned sex as an element of a dating relationship, we find that more English Canadians (84.9%) are represented here than any other ethnic group, while French Canadians are at the other end of the spectrum with 68.5%.

As the chi-square statistics indicate, the two variables are not independent, and the association is statistically significant on the .01 level. But the

strength of the association is rather weak at Cramer's V of .18.

Finally, as Table 33d shows, romance was both mentioned and mentioned positively more often by French Canadian women than by the other female respondents. The only other ethnic category to define dating as romanticism to the same degree was the Other group (28.0% compared to 29.4% of the French Canadians). English Canadians and women from Patriarchal cultures included romanticism the least often in their definition of dating (21.2% and 21.4% respectively).

Again, the chi-square statistics indicate that the variables are not independent and that the differences are statistically significant at the 0.01 level, but the association is again, not very strong at Cramer's V of .10.

So what does this tell us about Canadian University and College women's views on dating? A large majority (93.3%) see dating as sharing something; an outing, a meal, or hanging out together. Romanticism is the second most frequent definition of dating as almost a quarter (24.4%) included it positively. Sexuality was noted positively by 9.2% and commitment was noted positively by 7.3%. English Canadian women have perhaps more of a consensual view of what dating is as their scores are low on all but sharing, while French Canadian women see dating in a greater variety of ways as they include commitment, sex (especially) and romance to a greater extent than do any of the other ethnic

groups. Women of Patriarchal cultures do not tend to see dating as a form of commitment, nor do they include sex in their definitions. This latter point is perhaps not surprising since women's sexuality is a contested subject in most cultures, but in many patriarchal cultures, a woman's worth and her family's reputation depend on a woman remaining a virgin until marriage. In other words, for those of this group who do in fact engage in dating activities, sex is out of the question. But as many as 21.4% of the women in the category of Patriarchal cultures included romanticism positively in their definitions. European women's scores lay somewhere right between the scores of French and English Canadian women on all of the four elements of dating, as do the "Others" (the only exception being on Sharing where "Others" have the highest scores).

Moving to the men's responses, we find that three quarters (76.3%) of them never mentioned commitment in their definitions. Of those who did, only 7.2% mentioned it positively, a proportion which is almost identical to that of the women (7.3%). According to ethnicity, a greater proportion of men of Patriarchal cultures (10.0%) and French Canadians (9.1%) included commitment positively in their definitions, while European males (3.2%) and "Others" (4.6%) were the least likely to do so. Europeans and French Canadians were also more likely not to mention commitment at

all as part of dating. Just like in the female sample, English Canadian men are the most likely to mention commitment as a possibility (both negatively and positively) in a dating relationship (21.7%) while French Canadian men are the least likely to make such a statement (9.8% comparatively).

Just as the women in the sample, men also saw sharing something as a positive element of dating (89.5% compared to 93.3% for women). Again, due to insufficient numbers of cases in each cell, it is not possible to draw any conclusions on the relationship between seeing dating as sharing and ethnicity. There are substantial differences among different ethnic groups in seeing dating in terms of sexuality. French Canadian men are much more likely to mention sex positively (28.7%) than all the others, and even the Other group (19.7%) and the Europeans (11.8%) are much higher than both the men of Patriarchal cultures (5.0%) and English Canadian men (7.6%). In fact, a great majority of the English Canadians (83.1%) and the Patriarchal cultures group (81.8%) did not mention sex at all. As noted above, the same pattern exists among the female respondents, although the numbers themselves are generally lower.

Finally, exploring romance as a defining element of dating and ethnicity, we see, again, that French Canadian men's responses are very different from the rest. As many as 32.2% of them mentioned romance positively compared to

only 17.6% of English Canadian men, English Canadian men were also less likely to mention romanticism at all (80.7%) compared to French Canadian men (60.6%). 27.3% of the Other group mentioned romance affirmatively as part of dating, and the Europeans and men of Patriarchal cultures' responses were similar at 18.3% and 18.2% respectively. Another difference worth mentioning here is that fewer French Canadians (60.6%) did not mention romanticism than any of the other ethnic groups. In other words, romantic notions are a greater part of a French Canadian man's dating scene than it is for a man of English Canadian origins, for example. The affirmative answers for romanticism according to ethnicity vary to a greater extent among men than it does among women.

Generally speaking then, sharing something with a person from the opposite sex is the way most men see dating, regardless of ethnicity. It is in terms of the other elements where variations and differences arise. Commitment appears to be a greater concern for men from Patriarchal cultures. They also were the most likely to mention it positively. This may not be surprising as involvement with women may be considered by many as a serious matter and dating is seen as a stepping stone towards marriage.

It is, however, in the areas of sexuality and romance where the differences are the most apparent. This is also where French and English Canadians are at each end of the

spectrum, whereby French Canadian men are the most likely to say that dating is about both sex and romance positively, while English Canadians are the least likely. When comparing these two elements, romance is more important than sex for all ethnic groups.

It appears then, that French Canadian men, just like French Canadian women, tend to see dating as more complex, and entailing greater levels of intimacy than do English Canadians in particular, but also the Europeans. The Other group's pattern is similar to that of the French Canadians, although not as marked.

Finally, there seems to be cultural patterns at work when it comes to defining dating since gender does not have an effect on this relationship. In order to further explore the connections between ethnicity and dating definitions, these variables were run with age as a control variable. Age often entails a different view because of greater life experience. Again, the younger group consists of the individuals who are 17 to 20 years of age while the older group are those 21 years and older.

**Table 35a: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-
Commitment by Ethnicity, Controlling for
Age: Younger Women**

ETHNIC4							
	Count Col Pct	French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clts	Other	Row Total
Dat-defn commitment		1	2	3	4	5	
no mention	1	173 73.9	248 59.6	51 50.5	56 54.9	16 57.1	544 61.7
positive	2	17 7.3	23 5.5	13 12.9	6 5.9	1 3.6	60 6.8
positive+negativ	3	44 18.8	145 34.9	37 36.6	40 39.2	11 39.3	277 31.4
Column Total		234 26.6	416 47.2	101 11.5	102 11.6	28 3.2	881 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
Pearson		32.75965		8		.00007	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		1.907					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		1 of		15 (		6.7%)	
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Val/ASE0	
Cramer's V		.13635				.00007	

Table 35b: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-Commitment by Ethnicity, Controlling for Age:Older Women

		ETHNIC4					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	Row Total
Dat-defn commitment							
no mention	1	174 67.4	179 55.4	75 62.0	86 71.1	30 66.7	544 62.7
positive	2	33 12.8	16 5.0	5 4.1	9 7.4	4 8.9	67 7.7
positive+negativ	3	51 19.8	128 39.6	41 33.9	26 21.5	11 24.4	257 29.6
Column Total		258 29.7	323 37.2	121 13.9	121 13.9	45 5.2	868 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
Pearson		42.28116		8		.00000	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		3.474					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		1 of		15 (6.7%)			
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Val/ASE0	
Cramer's V		.15606				Approximate Significance	
						.00000	

Number of Missing Observations: 23

Table 36a: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-Sharing by Ethnicity, Controlling for Age: Younger Women

ETHNIC4							
	Count Col Pct	French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clts	Other	Row Total
Dat-defn sharing		1	2	3	4	5	
no mention	1	17 7.3	21 5.1	6 6.0	11 10.8	1 3.6	56 6.4
	2	217 92.7	394 94.9	94 94.0	91 89.2	27 96.4	823 93.6
positive							
Column Total		234 26.6	415 47.2	100 11.4	102 11.6	28 3.2	879 100.0
Chi-Square		Value			DF	Significance	
-----		-----			-----	-----	
Pearson		5.23037			4	.26447	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		1.784					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		1 of			10 (10.0%)		
Statistic		Value		ASE1	Val/ASE0		Approximate Significance
-----		-----		-----	-----		
Cramer's V		.07714					.26447

Table 36b: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-Sharing by Ethnicity, Controlling for Age:Older Women

		ETHNIC4					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clts	Other	Row Total
Dat-defn sharing		1	2	3	4	5	
no mention	1	18 7.0	10 3.1	8 6.6	13 10.8	1 2.2	50 5.8
	2	237 91.9	312 96.9	113 93.4	107 89.2	44 97.8	813 93.9
positive+negative	3	3 1.2					3 .3
Column Total		258 29.8	322 37.2	121 14.0	120 13.9	45 5.2	866 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
Pearson		18.92121		8		.01529	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		.156					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		6 of 15 (40.0%)					
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Val/ASE0	
Cramer's V		.10452				Approximate Significance	
						.01529	

Number of Missing Observations: 27

**Table 37a: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-
Sexuality by Ethnicity, Controlling for
Age: Younger Women**

		ETHNIC4					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clts	Other	Row Total
Dat-defn sexuality		1	2	3	4	5	
no mention	1	180 76.9	356 85.6	88 88.0	91 90.1	22 81.5	737 83.9
positive	2	38 16.2	16 3.8	4 4.0	1 1.0	2 7.4	61 6.9
positive+negativ	3	16 6.8	44 10.6	8 8.0	9 8.9	3 11.1	80 9.1
Column Total		234 26.7	416 47.4	100 11.4	101 11.5	27 3.1	878 100.0
Chi-Square		Value			DF	Significance	
Pearson		46.00087			8	.00000	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		1.876					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		2 of		15 (13.3%)			
Statistic		Value		ASE1	Val/ASE0		Approximate Significance
Cramer's V		.16185					.00000

Table 37b: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-Sexuality by Ethnicity, Controlling for Age:Older Women

		ETHNIC4					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	Row Total
Dat-defn sexuality							
no mention	1	157 60.9	271 83.9	89 73.0	93 76.9	36 78.3	646 74.3
positive	2	62 24.0	12 3.7	16 13.1	5 4.1	4 8.7	99 11.4
positive+negativ	3	39 15.1	40 12.4	17 13.9	23 19.0	6 13.0	125 14.4
Column Total		258 29.7	323 37.1	122 14.0	121 13.9	46 5.3	870 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Pearson		72.56033		8		.00000	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		5.234					
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Approximate Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Cramer's V		.20421				.00000	

Number of Missing Observations: 24

Table 38a: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-Romance by Ethnicity, Controlling for Age: Younger Women

		ETHNIC4					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clts	Other	Row Total
Dat-defn romance		1	2	3	4	5	
no mention	1	151 64.3	319 76.7	71 71.0	75 73.5	20 71.4	636 72.2
	2	73 31.1	90 21.6	29 29.0	27 26.5	8 28.6	227 25.8
positive	3	11 4.7	7 1.7				18 2.0
	positive+negativ						
Column Total		235 26.7	416 47.2	100 11.4	102 11.6	28 3.2	881 100.0
Chi-Square		Value			DF	Significance	
Pearson		22.05275			8	.00482	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		.572					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		4 of		15 (26.7%)			
Statistic		Value		ASE1	Val/ASE0		Approximate Significance
Cramer's V		.11187					.00482

Table 38b: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-Romance by Ethnicity, Controlling for Age: Older Women

		ETHNIC4					Row Total
Dat-defn romance	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	
no mention	1	167 64.7	248 77.0	90 74.4	92 76.7	32 71.1	629 72.6
positive	2	73 28.3	67 20.8	28 23.1	21 17.5	13 28.9	202 23.3
positive+negativ	3	18 7.0	7 2.2	3 2.5	7 5.8		35 4.0
Column Total		258 29.8	322 37.2	121 14.0	120 13.9	45 5.2	866 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
Pearson		21.13850		8		.00679	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		1.819					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		3 of		15 (20.0%)			
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Val/ASE0	
Cramer's V		.11047				.00679	

Number of Missing Observations: 25

Table 39a: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-Commitment by Ethnicity, Controlling for Age: Younger Men

		ETHNIC3					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clt 4	Other 5	Row Total
Dat-defn commitment							
no mention	1	201 84.1	137 68.8	45 83.3	18 66.7	8 72.7	409 77.2
positive	2	19 7.9	13 6.5	2 3.7	4 14.8	1 9.1	39 7.4
positive+negativ	3	19 7.9	49 24.6	7 13.0	5 18.5	2 18.2	82 15.5
Column Total		239 45.1	199 37.5	54 10.2	27 5.1	11 2.1	530 100.0
Chi-Square		Value			DF	Significance	
-----		-----			-----	-----	
Pearson		27.26395			8	.00064	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		.809					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		5 of 15 (33.3%)					
Statistic		Value		ASE1	Val/ASE0		Approximate Significance
-----		-----		-----	-----		-----
Cramer's V		.16050					.00064

3

PM-1 3½"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

Table 39b: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-Commitment by Ethnicity, Controlling for Age:Older Men

ETHNIC3							
Dat-defn commitment	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clt 4	Other 5	Row Total
no mention	1	148 77.5	194 74.6	55 78.6	66 71.0	38 74.5	501 75.3
positive	2	20 10.5	15 5.8	2 2.9	9 9.7	2 3.9	48 7.2
positive+negativ	3	23 12.0	51 19.6	13 18.6	18 19.4	11 21.6	116 17.4
Column Total		191 28.7	260 39.1	70 10.5	93 14.0	51 7.7	665 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
Pearson		12.06182		8		.14847	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		3.681					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		1 of		15 (6.7%)			
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Val/ASE0	
Cramer's V		.09523				.14847	

Number of Missing Observations: 18

Table 40a: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-Sharing by Ethnicity, Controlling for Age: Younger Men

		ETHNIC3					Row Total
Dat-defn sharing	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clt 4	Other 5	
no mention	1	25 10.5	19 9.5	4 7.3	3 11.5	1 8.3	52 9.8
positive	2	214 89.5	179 89.9	51 92.7	23 88.5	11 91.7	478 90.0
positive+negativ	3		1 .5				1 .2
Column Total		239 45.0	199 37.5	55 10.4	26 4.9	12 2.3	531 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
Pearson		2.31460		6		.96982	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		.023					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		7 of		15 (46.7%)			
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Val/ASE0	
Cramer's V		.04668				.96982	

Table 40b: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-Sharing by Ethnicity, Controlling for Age:Older Men

ETHNIC3							
Dat-defn sharing	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clt 4	Other 5	Row Total
no mention	1	19 9.9	22 8.5	8 11.3	12 12.9	4 7.7	65 9.7
positive	2	169 88.5	238 91.5	61 85.9	81 87.1	48 92.3	597 89.5
positive+negativ	3	3 1.6		2 2.8			5 .7
Column Total		191 28.6	260 39.0	71 10.6	93 13.9	52 7.8	667 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Pearson		10.94508		8		.20483	
Minimum Expected Frequency - .390							
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 5 of 15 (33.3%)							
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Val/ASE0	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Cramer's V		.09058				Approximate Significance	
						.20483	

Number of Missing Observations: 15

**Table 41a: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-
Sexuality by Ethnicity, Controlling for
Age: Younger Men**

		ETHNIC3					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clt 4	Other 5	Row Total
Dat-defn sexuality							
no mention	1	144 60.3	169 84.9	43 79.6	22 84.6	9 75.0	387 73.0
positive	2	62 25.9	14 7.0	8 14.8	1 3.8		85 16.0
positive+negativ	3	33 13.8	16 8.0	3 5.6	3 11.5	3 25.0	58 10.9
Column Total		239 45.1	199 37.5	54 10.2	26 4.9	12 2.3	530 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
Pearson		45.99664		8		.00000	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		1.313					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		4 of 15 (26.7%)					
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Val/ASE0 Approximate Significance	
Cramer's V		.20831				.00000	

Table 41b: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-Sexuality by Ethnicity, Controlling for Age:Older Men

ETHNIC3							
	Count Col Pct	French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Pa-triarc hal Clt	Other	Row Total
Dat-defn sexuality		1	2	3	4	5	
no mention	1	104 54.5	212 81.5	52 73.2	76 81.7	35 67.3	479 71.8
positive	2	62 32.5	21 8.1	7 9.9	4 4.3	13 25.0	107 16.0
positive+negativ	3	25 13.1	27 10.4	12 16.9	13 14.0	4 7.7	81 12.1
Column Total		191 28.6	260 39.0	71 10.6	93 13.9	52 7.8	667 100.0
Chi-Square		Value			DF	Significance	
Pearson		70.77656			8	.00000	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		6.315					
Statistic		Value		ASE1	Val/ASE0		Approximate Significance
Cramer's V		.23034					.00000

Number of Missing Observations: 16

Table 42a: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-Romance by Ethnicity, Controlling for Age: Younger Men

		ETHNIC3					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clt	Other	Row Total
Dat-defn		1	2	3	4	5	
romance							
no mention	1	148 62.2	158 79.4	43 79.6	19 70.4	7 58.3	375 70.8
positive	2	74 31.1	41 20.6	11 20.4	8 29.6	5 41.7	139 26.2
positive+negativ	3	16 6.7					16 3.0
Column Total		238 44.9	199 37.5	54 10.2	27 5.1	12 2.3	530 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Pearson		31.52902		8		.00011	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		.362					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		4 of 15 (26.7%)					
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Val/ASE0	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Cramer's V		.17247				Approximate Significance	
						.00011	

Table 42b: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-Romance by Ethnicity, Controlling for Age: Older Men

		ETHNIC3					Row Total
		French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clt 4	Other 5	
Dat-defn romance	Count Col Pct						
no mention	1	112 58.6	212 81.5	55 77.5	79 84.9	37 72.5	495 74.3
positive	2	64 33.5	40 15.4	12 16.9	14 15.1	13 25.5	143 21.5
positive+negativ	3	15 7.9	8 3.1	4 5.6		1 2.0	28 4.2
Column Total		191 28.7	260 39.0	71 10.7	93 14.0	51 7.7	666 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
Pearson		41.60412		8		.00000	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		2.144					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		3 of		15 (20.0%)			
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Val/ASE0	
Cramer's V		.17673				Approximate Significance	
						.00000	

Number of Missing Observations: 17

Discussing the female sample first (Tables 35a and b through 38 a and b), the partial tables controlling for age replicate the original relationships (Tables 33 a, b, c, and d). Examining sharing is again a problem since there are not enough cases in the cells, however, the one table which does not have this problem is that for the younger women

(Table 36a), and the relationship is not statistically significant as indicated by Person's chi square probability of .26.

Mentioning commitment as an element of dating follows the patterns according to ethnicity established previously, and this holds for both age groups of women and is statistically significant at the 0.01 level. As the Cramer's V statistics shows, the relationship between the two variables continues to be weak at .14 and .16 for the younger and older groups respectively. While age makes virtually no difference among English Canadians when it comes to mentioning commitment positively, more French Canadian women in the older group do so than in the younger. For the Europeans, it is reversed so that younger women mention it more and older women less.

As expected, the differences among those who reported sharing as a defining feature of dating are not statistically significant in either the younger group or the older group. Thus, age plays no role in whether someone marked sharing as a component of dating.

The relationship between ethnicity and defining dating in sexual terms holds when controlled for age, although it is slightly stronger for the older group. Again, the relationships continue to be fairly weak, at Cramer's V of .16 and .20 respectively. Interestingly, the members of all ethnic group except for English Canadians in the older group

are proportionally more likely to mention sex as an aspect of dating than those who are younger. This is especially true for French Canadians and Europeans. For these groups, age translates into greater sexual freedom (at least in theory). It is also important to note that, again, French Canadian women are much more likely than women from the other ethnic groups, regardless of age, to mention sexuality in a positive way.

Finally, with respect to romance, the differences according to ethnicity continue to be statistically significant at the 0.01 level for both age groups. French and English Canadians continue to be at the opposite ends of the spectrum for both groups, but in particular in that of the younger group. Due to empty cells and too few cases, this statistic is not as reliable as it should be.

Looking at the male sample, all but three of the original relationships are replicated when controlled for age. The one spurious relationship is between commitment and ethnicity. When two partial relationships are significantly different, it is a case of specification. In other words, the conditions under which the original relationship occur have been specified. The association between ethnicity and defining dating as commitment no longer exists for the older group while for the younger group, the association is even stronger than it was in the

original relationship. In sum, defining dating as commitment follows ethnic lines for young men but not for the older men.

The most likely of the men in the younger group to mention commitment positively are men of Patriarchal cultures, while the least likely are the Europeans. Among women, the Europeans were the most likely to mention commitment positively. The difference among French and English Canadians is minimal here, for both men and women.

The relationships between sexuality and romance, and ethnicity when controlled for age (Tables 41a and b, and 42a and b), all replicated the original relationship, and are all statistically significant. The relationship is in fact, slightly stronger for the older group compared to the initial table when mentioning sexuality as a defining element of dating (Cramer's V .23 versus .20 for Table 34c). Thus, differences along ethnic lines are especially pronounced for men in the older group. In all instances there are a greater proportion of older men who include sexuality in their definitions compared to the younger group. In fact, no "Other" men in the younger group mentioned sex at all while 25% of those in the older group did. But French Canadians are much more likely to mention sex than any of the other ethnic groups, which was true in both the original relationship and also for women.

As for mentioning romanticism, French Canadian and

"Other" men are much more likely to include it in their definitions than the other groups, and is the case for both the younger and older groups. However, due to empty cells, it is not possible to state for sure whether the differences are statistically significant.

It is interesting to note then, that the importance of romanticism in dating as stressed in the literature (see chapter 3) is not reflected in this study. At least from a definitional point of view, romanticism in dating relationships as seen by Canadian University and College students is not the most important factor. "Sharing" is much more often mentioned by everyone, and romanticism is the second most mentioned element.

While none of the cross tabulations of ethnicity and dating definitions and the various control variables showed strong associations, many of them were statistically significant. Consequently, ethnicity is an important variable when attempting to predict Canadian college and university students' views of dating, but it is not strong enough to account for most of the variations. Under the test conditions of gender and age, with a few exceptions, the relationships held up.

From the perspective of the ethnic groups themselves, French Canadian women and men tend to specify more elements belonging to dating than do English Canadians, and are especially likely to mention sexual aspects. The other

ethnic groups often fall between these two groups on their positive answers⁴⁴.

Interestingly, there is little difference between women and men in their definitions of dating. In fact, the differences between ethnic groups are greater than those between the genders. In the end, while ethnicity is not a strong predictor variable, it is, nevertheless, resilient as the tests above shows. Views of dating, in other words, fall into culturally motivated patterns.

The next section takes a closer look at the co-existence of the number of casual and serious dating partners, ethnicity and definitions of dating.

5.3 Casual and Serious Dating

5.3.1 Casual Dating

The number of casual dates by women and men over the past 12 months ranged from 0 to 'more than 100'. The table below shows the number of individuals both the female and male respondents went on casual dates with.

44 Exceptions here are Patriarchal men on commitment (highest), on sexuality (lowest), the younger European women on commitment (highest), younger Patriarchal women on sexuality (lowest), older Patriarchal women (lowest), younger European men on commitment (lowest) and younger Patriarchal men on commitment (highest), and finally, both younger and older Patriarchal men on sexuality (lowest).

Table 43: Cross-Tabulations of Number of Casual Dates in the 12 Month Period prior to Study and Gender

		GENDER		Row Total
Count Col Pct		male	female	
		1	2	
CASLDAT2				
1-2 persons	1	306 40.3	431 45.9	737 43.4
3-4 persons	2	234 30.8	275 29.3	509 30.0
5+ persons	3	219 28.9	234 24.9	453 26.7
Column Total		759 44.7	940 55.3	1699 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	5.78317	2	.05549

Minimum Expected Frequency - 202.370

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	.05834			.05549

Number of Missing Observations: 1287

Women and men's casual dating patterns in terms of the number of casual dating partners are not all that different. In fact, according to Table 43, the differences are not statistically significant (Pearson's propability .055).

The next tables allow us to see the associations between the respondents' ethnicity and the number of casual dates they had over the 12 month period prior to the study.

**Table 44: Cross-Tabulation of Nos.of Casual Dates
by Ethnicity**

		ETHNIC3					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	Row Total
CASLDAT2							
1-2 persons	1	264 49.3	271 39.4	74 38.3	96 50.8	28 33.7	733 43.4
3-4 persons	2	145 27.1	215 31.3	59 30.6	53 28.0	34 41.0	506 30.0
5+ persons	3	126 23.6	202 29.4	60 31.1	40 21.2	21 25.3	449 26.6
Column Total		535 31.7	688 40.8	193 11.4	189 11.2	83 4.9	1688 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Pearson		25.10675		8		.00149	
Minimum Expected Frequency - 22.078							
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Approximate Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Cramer's V		.08624				.00149	

Number of Missing Observations: 1298

According to Table 44, ethnicity and the number of casual dates are not independent and the relationship is statistically significant at the .01 level. However, the association is rather weak as indicated by the Cramer's V statistics of .09.

Half of the French Canadians and those of Patriarchal cultures had one or two casual dates over the 12 month period. A higher percentage of "Others" had three or four dates than any of the other ethnic groups, and the Europeans were represented to a greater extent among those who had

five or more casual dates.

In order to better understand the relationship between ethnicity and number of individuals one has had casual dates with, gender was employed as a control variable. Table 45a and b below presents these results.

Table 45a: Cross-Tabulation of Nos.of Casual Dates by Ethnicity, Controlling for Gender:Women

		ETHNIC4					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	Row Total
CASLDATE							
1-2 men	1	145 54.7	157 39.2	44 41.9	65 53.7	17 40.5	428 45.8
3-4 men	2	67 25.3	124 30.9	32 30.5	33 27.3	17 40.5	273 29.2
5+ men	3	53 20.0	120 29.9	29 27.6	23 19.0	8 19.0	233 24.9
	Column Total	265 28.4	401 42.9	105 11.2	121 13.0	42 4.5	934 100.0
Chi-Square		Value			DF	Significance	
-----		-----			-----	-----	
Pearson		23.74639			8	.00253	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		10.478					
Statistic		Value		ASE1	Val/ASE0		Approximate Significance
-----		-----		-----	-----		-----
Cramer's V		.11275					.00253

Number of Missing Observations: 839

Table 45b: Cross-Tabulation of Nos.of Casual Dates by Ethnicity, Controlling for Gender:Men

		ETHNIC3					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clt 4	Other 5	Row Total
CASLDAT2							
1-2 women	1	119 44.1	114 39.9	30 34.1	31 45.6	10 25.0	304 40.4
3-4 women	2	78 28.9	90 31.5	27 30.7	20 29.4	17 42.5	232 30.9
5+ women	3	73 27.0	82 28.7	31 35.2	17 25.0	13 32.5	216 28.7
Column Total		270 35.9	286 38.0	88 11.7	68 9.0	40 5.3	752 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Pearson		8.85653		8		.35454	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		11.489					
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Approximate Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Cramer's V		.07674				.35454	

Number of Missing Observations: 461

The introduction of a test variable such as gender helps to interpret the mechanism through which a relationship occurs. The relationship between ethnicity and number of casual dates is spurious since only one of the partial tables above replicate the initial bivariate relationship. In other words, gender is acting as a suppressor variable, and is concealing the true relationship between ethnicity and number of casual dates.

For men, there is no relationship between ethnicity and number of women they have had casual dates with. Having had

just one or more than five dating partners has nothing to do with one's ethnic background. But for women, it makes a difference as the relationship is statistically significant. Again, the relationship is on the weak side as Cramer's V of .11 indicates, but it is statistically significant at the .01 level.

Almost half (45.8%) of the women who had casually dated that year, had dated only 1 or 2 men, and we find more French Canadian women and women of Patriarchal cultures among these than women from other ethnic groups. There are comparatively fewer women from these ethnic groups as well as "Other" women, who had dated more than five men that year as well. The casual dating patterns of women from Patriarchal cultures are, in fact, very similar to those of French Canadian women; slightly more than half (53.7%) had casually dated one or two men, 27.3% had dated three or four men, and 19.0% had had more than 5 dating partners. Although there is a comparatively greater proportion of women from Patriarchal cultures who have never dated, it is interesting that their dating patterns are not drastically different from those of the other ethnic groups. Considering issues of patriarchy and control of women's sexuality, often stronger in what is labelled here as patriarchal cultures, these women date a lot. Perhaps this is related, in part, to the often great importance placed on women in many such cultures to get married, and to get

married young. Dating is thus an important path towards marriage. It could also be that these women are second or even third generation immigrants and are fully immersed in the North American dating scene.

English Canadian women date casually the most with as many as 30% having dated five or more men over the 12 month period. This may be explained by viewing dating as a North American Anglo cultural behaviour, but it may also be because English Canadians tend to see dating as some form of sharing and less as other things (commitment, sexuality and romance). In other words, dating as "sharing" is much more vague and can include many more interactions with men compared to seeing dating also as commitment, sexuality and romance.

Does it matter whether one dated only 1 or 2 persons last year, or 5 or more, with respect to how dating is perceived? We would expect that those who dated the most would score low on commitment, but high on sexuality, the latter especially for men. Tables 46a through d below examine these variables, Tables 47a through d, and 48a through d control for gender.

**Table 46a: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-
Commitment by Nos. of Casual Dates**

CASL DAT2					
		Count	1-2 dates 3-4 dates 5+dates		Row
		Col Pct			Total
Dat-defn			1	2	3
commitment					
	1		523	352	314
no mention			71.1	69.3	69.3
	2		50	25	20
positive			6.8	4.9	4.4
	3		163	131	119
positive+negativ			22.1	25.8	26.3
	Column		736	508	453
	Total		43.4	29.9	26.7
					1697
					100.0
Chi-Square			Value		DF
-----			-----		-----
Pearson			6.19555		4
					.18501
Minimum Expected Frequency - 25.359					
Statistic			Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0
-----			-----	-----	-----
Cramer's V			.04273		.18501

Number of Missing Observations: 1289

Table 46b: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-Sharing by Nos. of Casual Dates

		CASLDAT2			Row Total
Dat-defn sharing	Count Col Pct	1-2dates 1	3-4dates 2	5+dates 3	
no mention	1	64 8.7	25 4.9	30 6.6	119 7.0
positive	2	673 91.3	481 94.7	424 93.4	1578 92.9
positive+negativ	3		2 .4		2 .1
Column Total		737 43.4	508 29.9	454 26.7	1699 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF	Significance
Pearson		11.29122		4	.02348
Minimum Expected Frequency -		.534			
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		3 of		9 (33.3%)	
Statistic		Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V		.05764			.02348

Number of Missing Observations: 1287

**Table 46c: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-
Sexuality by Nos.of Casual Dates**

CASLDAT2					
Dat-defn sexuality	Count	1-2dates 3-4dates 5+dates			Row Total
	Col Pct	1	2	3	
no mention	1	563 76.5	365 71.7	343 75.7	1271 74.9
positive	2	94 12.8	71 13.9	47 10.4	212 12.5
positive+negativ	3	79 10.7	73 14.3	63 13.9	215 12.7
Column Total		736 43.3	509 30.0	453 26.7	1698 100.0
Chi-Square		Value			DF
Pearson		7.36986			4
Minimum Expected Frequency -		56.558			
Statistic		Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V		.04658			.11759

Number of Missing Observations: 1288

**Table 46d: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-
Romance by Nos. of Casual Dates**

		CASLDAT2			
Dat-defn romance	Count Col Pct	1-2 pers ons	3-4 pers ons	5+ pers ons	Row Total
		1	2	3	
no mention	1	522 70.9	376 73.9	352 77.5	1250 73.6
positive	2	180 24.5	108 21.2	89 19.6	377 22.2
positive+negativ	3	34 4.6	25 4.9	13 2.9	72 4.2
	Column Total	736 43.3	509 30.0	454 26.7	1699 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF	Significance
-----		-----		-----	-----
Pearson		7.78719		4	.09969
Minimum Expected Frequency - 19.240					
Statistic		Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
-----		-----	-----	-----	-----
Cramer's V		.04787			.09969

Number of Missing Observations: 1287

None of the above crosstabulations proved to be statistically significant. It follows then, that someone who has had five casual dates or more may still define dating as commitment, while someone who has had only one or two casual dates may see sex as an element of dating.

In order to assure that the relationship has not been suppressed by other variables, the number of casual dates and dating definitions were controlled for gender.

Table 47a: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-Commitment by Nos. of Casual Dates, Controlling for Gender: Women

Dat-defn commitment	Count Col Pct	CASLDATE			Row Total
		1-2men 1	3-4 men 2	5+ men 3	
no mention	1	280 65.1	175 63.6	147 62.8	602 64.1
positive	2	28 6.5	16 5.8	9 3.8	53 5.6
positive+negativ	3	122 28.4	84 30.5	78 33.3	284 30.2
Column Total		430 45.8	275 29.3	234 24.9	939 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	3.31136	4	.50713

Minimum Expected Frequency - 13.208

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.04199			.50713

Number of Missing Observations: 833

Table 47b: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-Sharing by Nos. of Casual Dates, Controlling for Gender: Women

Dat-defn sharing	Count Col Pct	CASLDATE			Row Total
		1-2men	3-4 men	5+ men	
		1	2	3	
no mention	1	27 6.3	12 4.4	13 5.6	52 5.5
positive	2	404 93.7	263 95.6	221 94.4	888 94.5
Column		431	275	234	940
Total		45.9	29.3	24.9	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	1.16111	2	.55959
Minimum Expected Frequency - 12.945			

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.03515			.55959

Number of Missing Observations: 832

Table 47c: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-Sexuality by Nos. of Casual Dates, Controlling for Gender: Women

Dat-defn sexuality	Count Col Pct	CASLDATE			Row Total
		1-2men 1	3-4 men 2	5+ men 3	
no mention	1	336 78.0	214 77.8	186 79.8	736 78.4
positive	2	44 10.2	22 8.0	19 8.2	85 9.1
positive+negativ	3	51 11.8	39 14.2	28 12.0	118 12.6
Column Total		431 45.9	275 29.3	233 24.8	939 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	2.07542	4	.72189
Minimum Expected Frequency - 21.092			

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.03324			.72189

Number of Missing Observations: 833

Table 47d: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-Romance by Nos. of Casual Dates, Controlling for Gender: Women

Dat-defn romance	Count Col Pct	CASLDATE			Row Total
		1-2men 1	3-4 men 2	5+ men 3	
no mention	1	300 69.8	208 75.6	181 77.4	689 73.4
positive	2	109 25.3	57 20.7	44 18.8	210 22.4
positive+negativ	3	21 4.9	10 3.6	9 3.8	40 4.3
Column Total		430 45.8	275 29.3	234 24.9	939 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	5.56507	4	.23407
Minimum Expected Frequency - 9.968			

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.05444			.23407

Number of Missing Observations: 833

As we find above, the intensity of a woman's dating activities has no relation to the way dating is defined since none of the runs are found to be statistically significant. In other words, the two are unrelated. We now turn to the male sample with the same question; does it make a difference when it comes to defining dating, whether one has had a couple or many casual dating partners in a year?

**Table 48a: Cross-Tabulation of dating definition-
Commitment by Nos. of Casual Dates, Controlling for
Gender: Men**

		CASLDAT2			Row Total
		1-2 women	3-4 women	5+ women	
Dat-defn commitment	Count Col Pct	1	2	3	
no mention	1	243 79.4	177 75.6	168 76.4	588 77.4
positive	2	22 7.2	10 4.3	11 5.0	43 5.7
positive+negativ	3	41 13.4	47 20.1	41 18.6	129 17.0
Column Total		306 40.3	234 30.8	220 28.9	760 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	6.51112	4	.16409

Minimum Expected Frequency - 12.447

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.06545			.16409

Number of Missing Observations: 453

Table 48b: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-Sharing by Nos. of Casual Dates, Controlling for Gender: Men

		CASLDAT2			Row Total
		1-2 women	3-4 women	5+ women	
dat-defn sharing	Count Col Pct	1	2	3	
no mention	1	37 12.1	13 5.6	16 7.3	66 8.7
positive	2	269 87.9	218 93.6	203 92.7	690 91.0
positive+negativ	3		2 .9		2 .3
Column Total		306 40.4	233 30.7	219 28.9	758 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	12.20171	4	.01591

Minimum Expected Frequency - .578
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 3 of 9 (33.3%)

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.08971			.01591

Number of Missing Observations: 455

**Table 48c: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-
Sexuality by Nos. of Casual Dates, Controlling for
Gender: Men**

CASLDATE2				
Dat-defn sexuality	Count Col Pct	1-2 women	3-4 women	5+ women
		1	2	3
no mention	1	228 74.3	151 64.8	157 71.4
				536 70.5
positive	2	51 16.6	48 20.6	28 12.7
				127 16.7
positive+negativ	3	28 9.1	34 14.6	35 15.9
				97 12.8
Column Total		307 40.4	233 30.7	220 28.9
				760 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF
Pearson		11.42096		4
Minimum Expected Frequency -		28.079		
Statistic		Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0
Cramer's V		.08668		
				Approximate Significance
				.02222

Number of Missing Observations: 453

**Table 48d: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-
Romance by Nos. of Casual Dates, Controlling for
Gender: Men**

Dat-defn romance	Count Col Pct	CASLDAT2			Row Total
		1-2 women 1	3-4 women 2	5+ women 3	
no mention	1	222 72.5	167 71.7	171 78.1	560 73.9
positive	2	71 23.2	51 21.9	44 20.1	166 21.9
positive+negativ	3	13 4.2	15 6.4	4 1.8	32 4.2
Column Total		306 40.4	233 30.7	219 28.9	758 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	7.00167	4	.13580
Minimum Expected Frequency - 9.245			

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.06796			.13580

Number of Missing Observations: 455

For men, only when defining dating in terms of sexuality do we find a statistically significant difference (at the 0.05 level as indicated by the Pearson's statistics) among those who date a few and those who date many. We find then, that gender suppresses the relationship between these two variables. It is specified that the initial bivariate relationship is true only here, although the relationship is not very strong at Cramer's V of .9. Interestingly,

contrary to expectations, those who date the most are the least likely to mention sexuality positively. Conversely, of those who do mention sexuality positively, the most active daters are the least likely to do so. Those who in fact date the least, are those who mention sex positively, the most often. Perhaps this is related to dating a few women, but more often (although maintaining a casual stance), thereby making the occurrence of sexual intimacy a greater possibility in the dating relationship.

In sum, the number of casual dating partners is related to ethnicity, but for women only. A greater proportion of English Canadian women (29.9%) have casually dated five or more men than women of the other ethnic groups (the Europeans are not far behind with 27.6%), while there are comparatively more French Canadian women (54.7%) and women of Patriarchal cultures (53.7%) who have dated only one or two men over the 12 month period. With respect to dating frequency and dating definitions, we see that only for the men who include sexuality in their dating definitions is there an association with the number of casual dates they had, although not in the expected direction.

5.3.2 Serious Dating

Because of the shorter range in the number of serious

dating partners (from 1 to 10 for women, 1 to 37 for men), the answers were recoded into two categories of "1 person" and "2 and more persons". Using the same recoding as employed for casual dates would not allow for statistical testing as the cell numbers would be too small.

Table 49: Cross-Tabulation of Number of Serious Dating Partners in 12 Month Period prior to Study and Gender

SERDATE	Count Col Pct	GENDER		Row Total
		male	female	
		1	2	
1 person	1	576 76.8	952 81.9	1528 79.9
2+ persons	2	174 23.2	211 18.1	385 20.1
Column Total		750 39.2	1163 60.8	1913 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	7.25443	1	.00707

Minimum Expected Frequency - 150.941

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.06158			.00707

Number of Missing Observations: 1073

The difference in number of serious dating partners between women and men is statistically significant as the Pearson's statistics indicates although the relationship between the two variables is weak (Phi -.062). More women

had had only 1 serious dating partner over the 12 month period than men, but more men than women had had 2 or more serious dating partners over the same period of time. When women are engaged in serious dating with someone, they have a greater tendency to stick to one partner than do men.

Do the number of serious dating partners in a year vary according to ethnicity? The next table presents these data.

Table 50: Cross-Tabulation of Nos. of Serious Dating Partners by Ethnicity

		ETHNIC3						
		Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	Row Total
SERDATE								
1 person	1		497 79.1	617 78.9	185 80.4	156 84.3	65 82.3	1520 79.8
2+ person	2		131 20.9	165 21.1	45 19.6	29 15.7	14 17.7	384 20.2
Column Total			628 33.0	782 41.1	230 12.1	185 9.7	79 4.1	1904 100.0
Chi-Square			Value		DF		Significance	
-----			-----		-----		-----	
Pearson			3.27280		4		.51325	
Minimum Expected Frequency -			15.933					
Statistic			Value		ASE1		Approximate Significance	
-----			-----		-----		-----	
Cramer's V			.04146				.51325	

Number of Missing Observations: 1082

As Table 50 indicates, there are no differences in the percentages of serious dating partners according to ethnicity. The results are statistically insignificant, and the variables are therefore independent of one another. In order to further understand this relationship, gender will

be utilized as a control variable.

Table 51a: Cross-Tabulation of Nos.of Serious Dating Partners by Ethnicity, Controlling for Gender:Women

		ETHNIC4					
Count Col Pct		French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clts	Other	Row Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
SERDATE	1	267 80.9	412 80.8	125 83.9	103 85.1	39 83.0	946 81.8
1 man							
	2	63 19.1	98 19.2	24 16.1	18 14.9	8 17.0	211 18.2
2+ men							
Column Total		330 28.5	510 44.1	149 12.9	121 10.5	47 4.1	1157 100.0
Chi-Square		Value			DF	Significance	
-----		-----			-----	-----	
Pearson		1.90541			4	.75315	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		8.571					
Statistic		Value		ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance	
-----		-----		-----	-----	-----	
Cramer's V		.04058				.75315	

Number of Missing Observations: 616

Table 51b: Cross-Tabulation of Nos.of Serious Dating Partners by Ethnicity, Controlling for Gender:Men

SERDATE	Count Col Pct	ETHNIC3					Row Total
		French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clt 4	Other 5	
1 woman	1	230 77.2	205 75.6	59 73.8	52 83.9	26 81.3	572 77.0
2+ women	2	68 22.8	66 24.4	21 26.3	10 16.1	6 18.8	171 23.0
Column Total		298 40.1	271 36.5	80 10.8	62 8.3	32 4.3	743 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	2.74109	4	.60204
Minimum Expected Frequency - 7.365			

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.06074			.60204

Number of Missing Observations: 470

According to Tables 51a and b, there are no statistically significant differences among ethnic groups with respect to the number of serious dating partners one has had over a period of 12 months for either women or men. In other words, members of all ethnic groups are equally likely to have had 1 or 2 or more serious dating partners in the year prior to the study.

But, does it make a difference whether one has dated seriously 1, or 2 or more persons in the way dating is defined? Tables 52 through 54 explore these connections.

**Table 52a: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-
Commitment and Nos.of Serious Dating Partners**

		SERDATE		Row Total
		1 person	2+ persons	
Dat-defn	Count Col Pct	1	2	
commitment				
no mention	1	970 63.4	272 70.8	1242 64.9
positive	2	132 8.6	21 5.5	153 8.0
positive+negativ	3	427 27.9	91 23.7	518 27.1
Column Total		1529 79.9	384 20.1	1913 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF
Pearson		8.45341		2
Minimum Expected Frequency -		30.712		
Statistic		Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0
Cramer's V		.06648		
				Approximate Significance
				.01460
Number of Missing Observations: 1073				

Table 52b: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-Sharing and Nos. of Serious Dating Partners

	Count Col Pct	SERDATE		Row Total
		1 person 1	2+ persons 2	
Dat-defn sharing				
no mention	1	109 7.1	14 3.6	123 6.4
positive	2	1417 92.7	369 95.8	1786 93.4
positive+negativ	3	2 .1	2 .5	4 .2
	Column Total	1528 79.9	385 20.1	1913 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	8.38841	2	.01508
Minimum Expected Frequency - .805			
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 2 of 6 (33.3%)			

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.06622			.01508

Number of Missing Observations: 1073

**Table 52c: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-
Sexuality and Nos.of Serious Dating Partners**

Dat-defn sexuality	Count Col Pct	SERDATE		Row Total
		1 person	2+ persons	
		1	2	
no mention	1	1170 76.6	253 65.7	1423 74.4
positive	2	193 12.6	67 17.4	260 13.6
positive+negativ	3	165 10.8	65 16.9	230 12.0
Column Total		1528 79.9	385 20.1	1913 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	19.49390	2	.00006

Minimum Expected Frequency - 46.289

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.10095			.00006

Number of Missing Observations: 1073

Table 52d: Cross-Tabulation of Dating definition-Romance and Nos.of Serious Dating Partners

	Count Col Pct	SERDATE		Row Total
		1 person	2+ persons	
Dat-defn romance		1	2	
no mention	1	1108 72.5	266 69.1	1374 71.8
positive	2	374 24.5	98 25.5	472 24.7
positive+negativ	3	46 3.0	21 5.5	67 3.5
Column Total		1528 79.9	385 20.1	1913 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	5.86557	2	.05325
Minimum Expected Frequency - 13.484			

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.05537			.05325

Number of Missing Observations: 1073

The only run which is not statistically significant is that of defining dating in romantic terms and number of serious dates. While the others are statistically significant, the associations are weak as indicated by the Cramer's V statistics ranging from .07 to .10.

Not surprisingly, those who only had one serious date over the 12 month period are slightly more likely (8.6%) than those who had two or more (5.5%) to mention commitment positively in their definitions of dating. Those who dated two or more people seriously mentioned "sharing" positively to a greater extent (95.8%) than those who dated only one

person (92.7%), and finally, this group also included sex in their definitions more often than the other group; they also mentioned sex positively more often (17.4% versus 12.6% for the other group). Presumably then, the more dates one has that are defined as serious, the more sexuality becomes important. By contrast, romantic notions are as important for those with 1 serious date as it is for those with more.

Let us then next control for gender and observe the patterns.

Table 53a: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-Commitment and Nos.of Serious Dating Partners, Controlling for Gender:Women

		SERDATE		Row Total
Dat-defn commitment	Count Col Pct	1 man	2+ men	
		1	2	
no mention	1	542 57.0	140 66.4	682 58.7
positive	2	84 8.8	14 6.6	98 8.4
positive+negativ	3	325 34.2	57 27.0	382 32.9
Column Total		951 81.8	211 18.2	1162 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	6.25879	2	.04374

Minimum Expected Frequency = 17.795

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.07339			.04374

Number of Missing Observations: 610

Table 53b: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-Sharing and Nos.of Serious Dating Partners,Controlling for Gender:Women

Dat-defn sharing	Count Col Pct	SERDATE		Row Total
		1 man	2+ men	
		1	2	
no mention	1	53 5.6	8 3.8	61 5.2
positive	2	899 94.4	204 96.2	1103 94.8
Column Total		952 81.8	212 18.2	1164 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	1.12329	1	.28921

Fisher's Exact Test:
Minimum Expected Frequency - 11.110

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	.03106			.28921

Number of Missing Observations: 608

**Table 53c: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-
Sexuality and Nos.of Serious Dating
Partners,Controlling for Gender:Women**

		SERDATE		Row Total
		1 man	2+ men	
Dat-defn sexuality	Count Col Pct	1	2	
no mention	1	753 79.1	150 71.1	903 77.6
positive	2	92 9.7	27 12.8	119 10.2
positive+negativ	3	107 11.2	34 16.1	141 12.1
Column Total		952 81.9	211 18.1	1163 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	6.46688	2	.03942

Minimum Expected Frequency - 21.590

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.07457			.03942

Number of Missing Observations: 609

**Table 53d: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-
Romance and Nos.of Serious Dating
Partners,Controlling for Gender:Women**

	Count Col Pct	SERDATE		Row Total
		1 man	2+ men	
Dat-defn romance		1	2	
no mention	1	687 72.2	153 72.2	840 72.2
positive	2	237 24.9	51 24.1	288 24.7
positive+negativ	3	28 2.9	8 3.8	36 3.1
Column Total		952 81.8	212 18.2	1164 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.43771	2	.80344

Minimum Expected Frequency - 6.557

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.01939			.80344

Number of Missing Observations: 608

Table 54a: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-Commitment and Nos.of Serious Dating Partners,Controlling for Gender:Men

Dat-defn commitment	Count Col Pct	SERDATE		Row Total
		1 woman 1	2+ women 2	
no mention	1	428 74.3	132 75.9	560 74.7
positive	2	47 8.2	8 4.6	55 7.3
positive+negativ	3	101 17.5	34 19.5	135 18.0
Column Total		576 76.8	174 23.2	750 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	2.65403	2	.26527

Minimum Expected Frequency - 12.760

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.05949			.26527

Number of Missing Observations: 463

Table 54b: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-Sharing and Nos.of Serious Dating Partners,Controlling for Gender:Men

Dat-defn sharing	Count Col Pct	SERDATE		Row Total
		1 woman	2+ women	
		1	2	
no mention	1	56 9.7	7 4.0	63 8.4
positive	2	518 89.9	166 94.9	684 91.1
positive+negativ	3	2 .3	2 1.1	4 .5
Column Total		576 76.7	175 23.3	751 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	7.19194	2	.02743

Minimum Expected Frequency - .932
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 2 of 6 (33.3%)

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.09786			.02743

Number of Missing Observations: 462

**Table 54c: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-
Sexuality and Nos.of Serious Dating
Partners,Controlling for Gender:Men**

Dat-defn sexuality	Count Col Pct	SERDATE		Row Total
		1 woman	2+ women	
		1	2	
no mention	1	418 72.6	103 58.9	521 69.4
positive	2	101 17.5	40 22.9	141 18.8
positive+negativ	3	57 9.9	32 18.3	89 11.9
Column Total		576 76.7	175 23.3	751 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	13.63527	2	.00109

Minimum Expected Frequency - 20.739

Statistics	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.13474			.00109

Number of Missing Observations: 462

**Table 54d: Cross-Tabulation of Dating Definition-
Romance and Nos. of Serious Dating
Partners, Controlling for Gender: Men**

Dat-defn romance	Count Col Pct	SERDATE		Row Total
		1 woman 1	2+ women 2	
no mention	1	421 73.1	113 64.9	534 71.2
positive	2	136 23.6	48 27.6	184 24.5
positive+negativ	3	19 3.3	13 7.5	32 4.3
Column Total		576 76.8	174 23.2	750 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	7.55980	2	.02283

Minimum Expected Frequency - 7.424

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Cramer's V	.10040			.02283

Number of Missing Observations: 463

As we see, when controlled for gender, several of these relationships changed. The relationship between defining dating as commitment and number of serious dates is statistically significant for women at the .05 level (albeit a weak association), but not for men. Thus, the number of serious dates a man has over a year has no effect on whether he includes commitment in his definition of dating, but for women it does. The conditions providing the original relationship have been specified through the introduction of

the variable "gender". As in the original table, the women who had fewer serious dates mentioned commitment more often and they also mentioned it positively more often.

Although two of three tables showing sharing and serious dates are statistically significant, it is not possible to comment on them because they have too many small and also empty cells. As a result, the statistical tests are not reliable.

With respect to including sexuality in dating definitions, the partials replicated the original relationship, although the relationship is stronger for men than for women (the relationship is only statistically significant at the 0.05 level here). Sex is mentioned generally more often by those who have dated more, and in both instances, sexuality is also mentioned more often positively. Perhaps sex becomes a greater preoccupation for men who have had several serious dates than it does for women. It is also possible that dating becomes serious when sexual contact has taken place.

While the original relationship between romanticism and number of serious dates was not significant (see Table 52d), only one of the partials was not. The variable "gender" then, suppressed the relationship. Specifically, for men there is an association between the variables at the 0.05 level. Romance is mentioned both more frequently and more often positively by those who had two or more serious dates

than those with only one. As indicated by Cramer's V statistics of .10 though, the relationship is weak.

To conclude, then, only commitment was mentioned more often by those who had dated only one person in that year, and these were also all women. Sexuality was included in the definition of those with two or more serious dates to a greater extent than those who only dated one person, this was also true for romanticism, but only for men. Thus, only a few of the initial expectations prove to be the case, and even these cases are not strong enough to answer all questions. There is only a tentative relationship between what one thinks and what one does.

5.4 Sexual, Physical and Psychological Woman Abuse in Dating Relationships

This section dwells on another area of relationship studies, that of violence against women in dating relationships. Issues of violence against women will be introduced and explored with respect to several factors, including inter-ethnic dating, ethnicity, dating definitions and dating frequency. But first, let us take a look at the frequency rates of the various forms of abuse experienced by women and admitted to by men.

Table 55a: Frequencies of Total Number of Women who have been abused and Men who admit to have abused

Value Label	<u>WOMEN</u>			<u>MEN</u>	
	Value	Frequency	Valid Percent	Frequency	Valid Percent
have never been abus	0	276	17.9	187	18.1
have been abused 1+	1	1263	82.1	848	81.9
	.	234	Missing	178	Missing
		-----	-----	-----	-----
	Total	1773	100.0	1213	100.0

Valid cases 1539, Missing cases 234
178

Valid cases 1035, Missing cases

Table 55b: Frequencies of Total Number of Women who have been Physically abused and Men who admit to have Physically abused

<u>WOMEN</u>				<u>MEN</u>	
PHABUSE2 physical abuse recoded					
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Valid Percent	Frequency	Valid
Percent					Percent
have never been abus	0	1256	77.7	890	82.1
have been abused 1+	1	361	22.3	195	17.9
	.	156	Missing	128	Missing
			-----		-----
Total		1773	100.0	1213	100.0
Valid cases 1617, Missing cases 156			Valid cases 1085, Missing cases 128		

Table 55c: Frequencies of Total Number of Women who have been Sexually abused and Men who admit to have Sexually abused

<u>WOMEN</u>				<u>MEN</u>	
SABUSE2 sexual abuse recoded					
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Valid Percent	Frequency	Valid Percent
have never been abus	0	1152	71.9	896	80.5
have been abused 1+	1	451	28.1	217	19.5
	.	170	Missing	100	Missing
		-----		-----	
	Total	1773	100.0	1213	100.0
Valid cases 1603, Missing cases 170			Valid cases 1113, Missing cases 100		

Table 55d: Frequencies of Total Number of Women who have been Psychologically abused and Men who admit to have Psychologically abused

<u>WOMEN</u>				<u>MEN</u>	
PSABUSE2 psychological abuse recoded					
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Valid Percent	Frequency	Valid Percent
have never been abus	0	339	21.0	210	18.8
have been abused 1+	1	1276	79.0	907	81.2
	.	158	Missing	95	Missing
			-----	-----	-----
	Total	1773	100.0	1213	100.0
Valid cases 1615, Missing cases 158			Valid cases 1118, Missing cases 95		

The above tables relate the levels of abuse experienced by Canadian university and college students. Table 55a refers to all abusive incidents reported. As many as 82.1% of the women have experienced at least one incident of some form of abuse at the hands of a male dating partner over the 12 month period prior to the study. And 81.9% of the men admit to have inflicted at least one incident of some form of abuse on a female dating partner in the same time period.

Tables 55b, c, and d show the frequencies of the specific forms of abuse. 22.3% of the women report having experienced physical abuse, while 17.9% of the men admit to have carried out physically abusive acts. 28.1% of the women indicate they have been sexually abused compared to 19.5% of the men who admit to have sexually assaulted a dating partner. Finally, 79% of the women and 81.2% of the men report receiving and carrying out psychological abuse.

Since we do not have couple data, we cannot expect to see corresponding numbers of affliction and perpetration of abusive incidences, nor can we see whether an incident is interpreted the same way by both women and men. However, it is interesting that men admit to carrying out more psychologically abuse acts than women report they have experienced, because it is almost always the opposite. Men do not report as high numbers of violent acts as women report to have experienced. This consistent under-reporting of abusive events by men has been explained by a sense of

social embarrassment whereby men tend not to report abusive behaviours out of fear of being stigmatized; it is also argued that such socially desirable reporting is more common among those who abuse than those who do not (Dutton and Hemphill 1992). This is in great part due to the increasing awareness that violence against an intimate partner is a form of deviant behaviour.

Our attention will next turn to inter-ethnic dating and the levels of abuse in these dating relationships compared to those of an intra-ethnic nature.

5.4.1 Inter-ethnic Dating and Woman Abuse

As established above in section 5.2, there are differences according to gender, ethnicity, age and dating intensity when it comes to inter-ethnic dating of various forms. Next are cross-tabulations exploring the levels of violence in such relationships, first for women, then for men. Again, women were asked what kind of violent events they have experienced in dating relationships, while men were asked what kind of violent acts they carried out against female dating partners.

Table 56a: Cross-Tabulation of Physical Abuse and Casual Inter-ethnic Dating: Women

		casual intereth dating		Row Total
Count Col Pct		yes	no	
		1	2	
PHABUSE2				
0		269	912	1181
never been abuse		73.5	78.8	77.5
1		97	246	343
have been abused		26.5	21.2	22.5
Column		366	1158	1524
Total		24.0	76.0	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	4.41033	1	.03572
Minimum Expected Frequency - 82.374			

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.05380			.03572

Number of Missing Observations: 249

Table 56b: Cross-Tabulation of Sexual Abuse and Casual Inter-ethnic Dating: Women

		casual intereth dating		
SABUSE2	Count Col Pct	yes	no	Row Total
		1	2	
0		215	854	1069
never been abuse		59.9	74.5	71.0
1		144	293	437
have been abused		40.1	25.5	29.0
Column		359	1147	1506
Total		23.8	76.2	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	28.16666	1	.00000

Minimum Expected Frequency - 104.172

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.13676			.00000

Number of Missing Observations: 267

**Table 56c: Cross-Tabulation of Psychological Abuse
and Casual Inter-ethnic Dating: Women**

		casual intereth dating		Row Total
Count Col Pct		yes	no	
		1	2	
PSABUSE2				
0		58	241	299
have never been		15.9	20.8	19.6
1		307	917	1224
have been abused		84.1	79.2	80.4
Column		365	1158	1523
Total		24.0	76.0	100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF
Pearson		4.26005		1
Significance				.03902
Minimum Expected Frequency -		71.658		
Statistic		Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0
Phi		-.05289		
Approximate				Significance
				.03902

Number of Missing Observations: 250

Table 57a: Cross-Tabulation of Physical Abuse and Serious Inter-ethnic Dating: Women

		serious intereth dating		Row Total
Count Col Pct		yes	no	
		1	2	
PHABUSE2				
0		174	1009	1183
never been abuse		69.3	79.3	77.6
1		77	264	341
have been abused		30.7	20.7	22.4
Column		251	1273	1524
Total		16.5	83.5	100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF
Pearson		11.92402		1
Minimum Expected Frequency -		56.162		
Statistic		Value	ASE1	Approximate Val/ASE0 Significance
Phi		-.09845		.00055

Number of Missing Observations: 249

Table 57b: Cross-Tabulation of Sexual Abuse and Serious Inter-ethnic Dating: Women

		serious intereth dating		Row Total
		yes	no	
		1	2	
SABUSE2	Count Col Pct			
0		163	907	1070
never been abuse		66.8	71.9	71.1
1		81	354	435
have been abused		33.2	28.1	28.9
Column		244	1261	1505
Total		16.2	83.8	100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF
Pearson		2.61184		1
Minimum Expected Frequency -		70.525		
Statistic		Value	ASE1	Approximate Val/ASE0 Significance
Phi		-.04166		.10607

Number of Missing Observations: 268

**Table 57c: Cross-Tabulation of Psychological Abuse
and Serious Inter-ethnic Dating: Women**

		serious intereth dating		Row Total
Count Col Pct		yes	no	
		1	2	
PSABUSE2				
0		40	258	298
have never been		13.4	86.6	19.6
		15.9	20.3	19.6
1		211	1014	1225
have been abused		17.2	82.8	80.4
		84.1	79.7	80.4
Column		251	1272	1523
Total		16.5	83.5	100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF
-----		-----		-----
Pearson		2.51675		1
Minimum Expected Frequency -		49.112		
Statistic		Value	ASE1	Approximate
-----		-----	-----	Significance
Phi		-.04065		.11264

Number of Missing Observations: 250

Table 58a: Cross-Tabulation of Physical Abuse and Inter-ethnic Cohabitation: Women

		intereth cohabitation		Row Total
Count Col Pct		yes	no	
		1	2	
PHABUSE2				
0		35	1148	1183
never been abuse		74.5	77.8	77.7
1		12	327	339
have been abused		25.5	22.2	22.3
Column		47	1475	1522
Total		3.1	96.9	100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF
Pearson		.29746		1
Minimum Expected Frequency -		10.468		
Statistic		Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0
Phi		-.01398		
				Approximate Significance
				.58548

Number of Missing Observations: 251

Table 58b: Cross-Tabulation of Sexual Abuse and Inter-ethnic Cohabitation: Women

		intereth cohabitation		Row Total
Count Col Pct		yes	no	
		1	2	
SABUSE2				
	0	30	1038	1068
never been abuse		65.2	71.2	71.1
	1	16	419	435
have been abused		34.8	28.8	28.9
Column		46	1457	1503
Total		3.1	96.9	100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF
-----		-----		-----
Pearson		.78707		1
				Significance

Minimum Expected Frequency -		13.313		
Statistic		Value	ASE1	Approximate Val/ASE0 Significance
-----		-----	-----	-----
Phi		-.02288		.37499

Number of Missing Observations: 270

**Table 58c: Cross-Tabulation of Psychological Abuse
and Inter-ethnic Cohabitation: Women**

		intereth cohabitation		Row Total
Count Col Pct		yes	no	
		1	2	
PSABUSE2	0	8	290	298
have never been		17.0	19.7	19.6
	1	39	1183	1222
have been abused		83.0	80.3	80.4
Column		47	1473	1520
Total		3.1	96.9	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.20546	1	.65035

Minimum Expected Frequency - 9.214

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.01163			.65035

Number of Missing Observations: 253

Table 59a: Cross-Tabulation of Physical Abuse and Inter-ethnic Engagement: Women

		intereth engagement		Row Total
		yes	no	
PHABUSE2	Count Col Pct	1	2	
0 never been abuse	18 81.8	1163 77.6	1181 77.6	
1 have been abused	4 18.2	336 22.4	340 22.4	
Column Total	22 1.4	1499 98.6	1521 100.0	

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.22384	1	.63613

Minimum Expected Frequency - 4.918
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 of 4 (25.0%)

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	.01213			.63613

Number of Missing Observations: 252

Table 59b: Cross-Tabulation of Sexual Abuse and Inter-ethnic Engagement: Women

		intereth engagement		Row Total
		yes	no	
SABUSE2	Count Col Pct	1	2	
0		11	1057	1068
never been abuse		57.9	71.3	71.1
1		8	426	434
have been abused		42.1	28.7	28.9
Column Total		19 1.3	1483 98.7	1502 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	1.63455	1	.20108
Minimum Expected Frequency -	5.490		

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.03299			.20108

Number of Missing Observations: 271

Table 59c: Cross-Tabulation of Psychological Abuse and Inter-ethnic Engagement: Women

		intereth engagement		Row Total
		yes	no	
	Count Col Pct	1	2	
PSABUSE2				
0		1	296	297
have never been		4.5	19.8	19.6
1		21	1201	1222
have been abused		95.5	80.2	80.4
Column Total		22	1497	1519
		1.4	98.6	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	3.19615	1	.07381

Minimum Expected Frequency - 4.302
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 of 4 (25.0%)

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.04587			.07381

Number of Missing Observations: 254

As shown in the tables 56a through c, the relationship between inter-ethnic casual dating and various forms of abuse is statistically significant (although physical and psychological abuse are only significant at the .05 level) and go in the same direction; those who have casually dated someone from an other ethnic background casually the last 12 months have also experienced more abuse in the same time frame than those who have not⁴⁵. The strongest association

⁴⁵ It is important to remember that even if some of the abuse reported by the respondents have taken place in inter-ethnic relationships, it may also be cases where none of the abuse experienced was in such relationships. Unfortunately, we have no way of knowing which relationships were abusive and

is for sexual abuse (Table 56b) where 40.1% who dated inter-ethnically on the casual level also experienced abuse compared to 25.5% of those who had not. Although this relationship is stronger than the other three, it is, nevertheless weak ($\Phi = .14$).

Women who have dated inter-ethnically on a serious level have experienced more physical abuse than those who have not (30.7% versus 20.7%, Table 57a). The relationship is not strong however ($\Phi = .09$). But for sexual and psychological abuse, there are no differences between those who have seriously dated inter-ethnically and those who have not. Nor are there for those who have cohabited; none of the cross-tabulations are statistically significant and the variables are thus independent from one another (Tables 58a through c). This is also the case for inter-ethnic engagement (Tables 59a through c); it makes no difference whether the man a woman lives with is from her own or another ethnic background, they all experienced similar levels of abuse.

These observations are interesting for several reasons. First of all is the evidence of there being two processes operating at the same time in these data. The first is what has been referred to and discussed in the literature review, as the misunderstanding of cues argument. Research shows

which ones were not, nor is it possible to pinpoint the violence according to whether the relationship was inter-ethnic or not. See below for a greater discussion of this.

that there is a gender gap in interpreting social cues (e.g. Abbey 1982, 1987, DeSouza et al. 1992, Muehlenhard et al. 1985, Muehlenhard 1988) whereby men tend to both see the world in more sexual terms and misinterpret friendliness as sexual interest. Shotland (1989, 1992) argues that these misunderstandings are most likely to take place at the earliest stages of a dating relationship. Relating this to our data then, since there is a difference in the level of abuse between those who have dated inter-ethnically on the casual level (and to some extent, on the serious level) and those who have not, but not when it comes to cohabitation and engagement, it is likely that the abuse in fact did stem from misunderstandings. The interesting thing is that when it comes to the more serious forms of dating (cohabitation and engagement), other processes are at work. More specifically, these processes relate to patriarchy and the relationship of power between women and men, and in this, all women are equal. That is why it no longer makes a difference whether the partner is of the same ethnic background or not. As discussed at length in the literature review, the more serious a dating relationship is, the greater the chance of woman abuse. Why this is the case is explained by feminist theory as a function of the power imbalance between women and men in intimate personal relationships.

Next are the cross-tabulations of inter-ethnic dating

and abuse admitted to by men.

**Table 60a: Cross-Tabulation of Physical Abuse
admitted to and Casual Inter-ethnic Dating: Men**

Count Col Pct		casual intereth dating		Row Total
		yes	no	
		1	2	
PHABUSE2	0	191	637	828
have never abuse		79.3	83.2	82.2
	1	50	129	179
have abused		20.7	16.8	17.8
Column Total		241	766	1007
		23.9	76.1	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
-----	-----	-----	-----
Pearson	1.91378	1	.16654

Minimum Expected Frequency - 42.839

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Phi	-.04359			.16654

Number of Missing Observations: 206

**Table 60b: Cross-Tabulation of Sexual Abuse
admitted to and Casual Inter ethnic Dating: Men**

SABUSE2	Count Col Pct	casual intereth dating		Row Total
		yes	no	
		1	2	
0		180	653	833
have never abuse		73.8	82.8	80.6
1		64	136	200
have abused		26.2	17.2	19.4
Column		244	789	1033
Total		23.6	76.4	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	9.65279	1	.00189

Minimum Expected Frequency - 47.241

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.09667			.00189

Number of Missing Observations: 180

**Table 60c: Cross-Tabulation of Psychological Abuse
admitted to and Casual Inter-ethnic Dating: Men**

		casual intereth dating		Row Total
Count Col Pct		yes	no	
		1	2	
psabuse2				
	0	33	160	193
have never abuse		13.1	20.3	18.6
	1	218	628	846
have abused		86.9	79.7	81.4
Column		251	788	1039
Total		24.2	75.8	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.44717	1	.01111

Minimum Expected Frequency - 46.625

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.07877			.01111

Number of Missing Observations: 174

**Table 61a: Cross-Tabulation of Physical Abuse
admitted to and Serious Inter-ethnic Dating: Men**

		serious intereth dating		Row Total
		yes	no	
		1	2	
PHABUSE2				
	0	120	706	826
have never abuse		80.0	82.9	82.4
	1	30	146	176
have abused		20.0	17.1	17.6
Column		150	852	1002
Total		15.0	85.0	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.72245	1	.39534

Minimum Expected Frequency - 26.347

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.02685			.39534

Number of Missing Observations: 211

**Table 61b: Cross-Tabulation of Sexual Abuse
admitted to and Serious Inter-ethnic Dating: Men**

		serious intereth dating		
Count		yes	no	
Col	Pct			Row Total
		1	2	
SABUSE2				
0		115	715	830
have never abuse		74.7	81.7	80.7
1		39	160	199
have abused		25.3	18.3	19.3
Column		154	875	1029
Total		15.0	85.0	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	4.15939	1	.04140

Minimum Expected Frequency = 29.782

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.06358			.04140

Number of Missing Observations: 184

**Table 61c: Cross-Tabulation of Psychological Abuse
admitted to and Serious Inter-ethnic Dating: Men**

		serious intereth dating		
Count		yes	no	
Col	Pct			Row
		1	2	Total
psabuse2				
0		18	173	191
have never abuse		11.7	19.7	18.5
1		136	706	842
have abused		88.3	80.3	81.5
Column		154	879	1033
Total		14.9	85.1	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	5.55520	1	.01843

Minimum Expected Frequency - 28.474

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.07333			.01843

Number of Missing Observations: 180

**Table 62a: Cross-Tabulation of Physical Abuse
admitted to and Inter-ethnic Cohabitation: Men**

		intereth cohabitation		Row Total
		yes	no	
		1	2	
PHABUSE2	0	14	813	827
have never abuse		51.9	83.3	82.5
	1	13	163	176
have abused		48.1	16.7	17.5
Column		27	976	1003
Total		2.7	97.3	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	17.95824	1	.00002

Minimum Expected Frequency = 4.738
 Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 = 1 of 4 (25.0%)

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.13381			.00002

Number of Missing Observations: 210

**Table 62b: Cross-Tabulation of Sexual Abuse
admitted to and Inter-ethnic Cohabitation: Men**

		intereth cohabitation		Row Total
Count Col Pct		yes	no	
		1	2	
SABUSE2				
	0	21	809	830
have never abuse		72.4	81.0	80.7
	1	8	190	198
have abused		27.6	19.0	19.3
Column		29	999	1028
Total		2.8	97.2	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	1.33012	1	.24878

Minimum Expected Frequency - 5.586

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.03597			.24878

Number of Missing Observations: 185

**Table 62c: Cross-Tabulation of Psychological Abuse
admitted to and Inter-ethnic Cohabitation: Men**

		intereth cohabitation		Row Total
		yes	no	
psabuse2	Count Col Pct	1	2	
0		2	190	192
have never abuse		6.9	18.9	18.6
1		27	815	842
have abused		93.1	81.1	81.4
Column		29	1005	1034
Total		2.8	97.2	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	2.68831	1	.10109

Minimum Expected Frequency - 5.385

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.05099			.10109

Number of Missing Observations: 179

**Table 63a: Cross-Tabulation of Physical Abuse
admitted to and Inter-ethnic Engagement: Men**

		intereth engagement		
PHABUSE2	Count Col Pct	yes	no	Row Total
		1	2	
0		12	817	829
have never abuse		70.6	82.7	82.5
1		5	171	176
have abused		29.4	17.3	17..
Column		17	988	1005
Total		1.7	98.3	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	1.69499	1	.19294

Minimum Expected Frequency - 2.977
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 of 4 (25.0%)

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.04107			.19294

Number of Missing Observations: 208

**Table 63b: Cross-Tabulation of Sexual Abuse
admitted to and Inter-ethnic Engagement: Men**

	Count Col Pct	intereth engagement		Row Total
		yes	no	
		1	2	
SABUSE2				
have never abuse	0	14 70.0	818 80.9	832 80.7
have abused	1	6 30.0	193 19.1	199 19.3
Column Total		20 1.9	1011 98.1	1031 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	1.49869	1	.22087

Minimum Expected Frequency - 3.860
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 of 4 (25.0%)

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	-.03813			.22087

Number of Missing Observations: 182

**Table 63c: Cross-Tabulation of Psychological Abuse
admitted to and Inter-ethnic Engagement: Men**

		intereth engagement		Row Total
		yes	no	
PSABUSE2	Count Col Pct	1	2	
0		5	188	193
have never abuse		25.0	18.5	18.6
1		15	828	843
have abused		75.0	81.5	81.4
Column Total		20	1016	1036
		1.9	98.1	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.54601	1	.45995

Minimum Expected Frequency - 3.726
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 of 4 (25.0%)

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	.02296			.45995

Number of Missing Observations: 177

While the results for men are not identical to those of the women, there are, nevertheless, similarities. For example, the cross-tabulations involving the two most serious forms of dating are for the most part not statistically significant as was the case for women, but with one exception. Significant was the relationship between inter-ethnic cohabitation and admitting to have carried out physically violent acts (Table 62a). More men who have lived with someone from another ethnic background admitted to physically assaulting their dating partner than

those who have not (48.1% versus 16.7%). The association is on the weak side at $\Phi = .13$.

For casual inter-ethnic dating, only one run was not statistically significant, and this was for physical violence (Table 60a). For sexual abuse, 26.2% of the men who had dated inter-ethnically reported abusing a casual dating partner compared to 17.2% of the others (Table 60b). The relationship is again weak ($\Phi = .10$). Finally, for psychological abuse (significant only at the .05 level as indicated by the Pearson's chi-square statistics), 86.9% of those who had at least one inter-ethnic dating partner admitted to being abusive compared to 79.7% for the others (Table 61c).

For serious inter-ethnic dating, all but the cross-tabulation for physical abuse were statistically significant (at the .05 level as indicated by the Pearson statistics). The relationships were, however, weak ($\Phi = .06$ and $.07$ for sexual and psychological abuse respectively).

In spite of the differences between the women and men's data, the general pattern remains; there is a difference between those who have dated inter-ethnically and those who have not when it comes to abuse only when it comes to the more casual relationships. For inter-ethnic cohabitation and engagement, there is generally no difference at all. There is one exception here; statistically significantly more men who have lived with a dating partner from another

ethnic background are more likely to admit to have physically abused their girlfriend compared to the others in the sample. From the literature, we know that there is more violence in cohabitation than in any other form of relationship (including marriage). Why men who have cohabited inter-ethnically admit to physically abuse (but not any of the other forms of abuse) more than the other men is hard to explain; perhaps physical abuse is a more socially sanctioned form of abuse among men who have cohabited inter-ethnically than is sexual abuse, for example. Perhaps this group of men use physical violence specifically to regain and keep control of the relationship to a greater extent than the others. It could also be that these men struggle to make their dating partners follow their cultural practices in ways similar to what Stets and Pirog-Good (1987) describe with respect to inter-religious dating relationships (discussed in section 3.2).

Unfortunately, there is no way of knowing with whom the abuse took place, and thus it is impossible to say that the abuse experienced and committed by those who have been engaged in inter-ethnic dating relationships did in fact take place in inter-ethnic relationships. The only test available was to control for one and more than one casual and serious date over the 12 month period. Interestingly enough, none of these cross-tabulations were statistically

significant. Thus, it seems that if one has had only one dating relationship in a year, and this happened to be inter-ethnic, then it is no more (or less) laden with problems than those of an intra-ethnic nature. The ethnicity of a dating partner plays only a role in abuse when a person has had more than one date. It follows then, that the individuals who date more frequently are different from those who date only one person in a year; perhaps dating several people over a year generally causes higher levels of frustration, it is also possible that when an inter-ethnic date comes around in a string of dates that this frustration is exaggerated because of misunderstandings, misreading of intentions and failed expectations.

5.4.2 Women's Experience of Abuse and Ethnicity

As indicated in the literature on woman abuse, female victimization varies according to racial and ethnic group. This section will explore the connection between ethnicity and physical, sexual and psychological abuse among female Canadian college and university students while the next will look in greater depth at men's reporting of woman abuse.

Table 64a: Cross-Tabulation of Physical Abuse and Ethnicity: Women

		ETHNIC4					
	Count Row Pct Col Pct	French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clts	Other	Row Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
PHABUSE2							
0		377	507	163	148	55	1250
never been abuse		81.8	74.2	82.3	76.7	79.7	77.9
1		84	176	35	45	14	354
have been abused		18.2	25.8	17.7	23.3	20.3	22.1
Column Total		461 28.7	683 42.6	198 12.3	193 12.0	69 4.3	1604 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Pearson		11.92627		4		.01791	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		15.228					
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Approximate Val/ASE0 Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Cramer's V		.08623				.01791	
Number of Missing Observations: 169							

Table 64b: Cross-Tabulation of Sexual Abuse and
Ethnicity: Women

		ETHNIC4					
Count	Row Pct	French C	English	North&Ea	Patr	Other	Row
Col Pct	Pct	dn	Cdn	st Europ	hal	Cts	Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
SABUSE2							
0		364	453	146	145	37	1145
never been abuse	79.0	67.2	73.4	75.9	56.1	72.0	
1		97	221	53	46	29	446
have been abused	21.0	32.8	26.6	24.1	43.9	28.0	
Column		461	674	199	191	66	1591
Total		29.0	42.4	12.5	12.0	4.1	100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF	Significance		
Pearson		28.67567		4	.00001		
Minimum Expected Frequency -		18.502					
Statistic		Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance		
Cramer's V		.13425			.00001		
Number of Missing Observations: 182							

Table 64c: Cross-Tabulation of Psychological Abuse and Ethnicity: Women

		ETHNIC4					
Count	Row Pct	French C	English	North&Ea	Patriarc	Other	
Col Pct		dn	Cdn	st Europ	hal Clts		Row
		1	2	3	4	5	Total
PSABUSE2	0	88	123	53	56	17	337
have never been		19.3	18.0	26.5	29.0	24.3	21.0
1		368	560	147	137	53	1265
have been abused		80.7	82.0	73.5	71.0	75.7	79.0
Column		456	683	200	193	70	1602
Total		28.5	42.6	12.5	12.0	4.4	100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Pearson		16.03473		4		.00297	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		14.725					
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Approximate	
-----		-----		-----		Val/ASE0 Significance	
Cramer's V		.10005				.00297	

Number of Missing Observations: 171

As shown by tables 64a through c, women's experience of abuse vary according to ethnicity. Turning to physical abuse first (Table 64a), we see that more English Canadian women (25.8%) have experienced violence than the other women. Women of Patriarchal cultures come next (23.3%), followed by Other women (20.3%). The lowest physical abuse incident rates are among European (17.7%) and French Canadian women (18.2%). The relationship between these two variables is statistically significant at the 0.05 level, and the relationship is weak (Cramer's V .09).

The rates of sexual abuse vary more according to ethnicity than any of the other forms of abuse (Cramer's V .13, but is still weak). Over the 12 month period, as many as 43.9% of Other women were sexually assaulted. English Canadian women were next with 32.8% reporting abusive acts carried out against them. French Canadian women, on the other hand, are the least likely to have experienced sexual abuse (21.0%); 24.1% of women from Patriarchal cultures and 26.6% of women from North and Eastern Europe indicated they had experienced at least one count of sexual assault.

The last table on psychological abuse shows that a greater proportion of English Canadian women (82.0%) experienced such abuse than do the other women. Next are French Canadian women (80.7%). The least likely to report psychological violence are women from Patriarchal cultures (71.0%), followed by European women (73.5%) and Other women (75.7%). Statistically significant at the .01 level, the relationship is nevertheless weak (Cramer's V .10).

All in all, violence is not a phenomenon that woman of some ethnic groups escape. But women of some ethnic groups experience some forms of abuse more than others. And one interesting thing is that no one ethnic group experiences more abuse in all its forms than others. Some generalizations can be made though; for example, English Canadian women report more physical and psychological abuse than the other ethnic groups, but come in second to Other

women when it comes to sexual abuse. French Canadian women report the least amount of sexual abuse, little physical abuse comparatively, but is second only to English Canadian women when it comes to psychological violence. Women of Patriarchal cultures are the least likely to experience psychological abuse, and to some extent, sexual abuse, yet is second only to English Canadians when it comes to physical abuse.

Going back to the issues around the misunderstanding theory, it is interesting to see that French Canadians, who are the least likely to date someone inter-ethnically, are also the least likely of all the women in this sample to have experienced sexual abuse. They also have fewer dating partners. As was noted above, there was more sexual abuse reported by the women who had also dated inter-ethnically on the casual level. However, it does not explain why sexual abuse is less prevalent among women of Patriarchal cultures, even though they do in fact engage in high levels of inter-ethnic dating. In addition, Other women who have experienced the most sexual violence is not the group who date inter-ethnically the most.

In summary, English Canadian women generally experience the most abuse, but no group of women escape it in their dating activities.

The following cross-tabulations control for the effect of school, age and number of casual and serious dating

partners on the relationship between ethnicity and experience of abuse by women.

Table 65a: Cross-Tabulation of Physical Abuse and Ethnicity, Controlling for School: University

		ETHNIC4					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	Row Total
PHABUSE2							
0		256	400	122	87	45	910
never been abuse		82.6	76.9	84.1	75.7	86.5	79.7
1		54	120	23	28	7	232
have been abused		17.4	23.1	15.9	24.3	13.5	20.3
Column Total		310 27.1	520 45.5	145 12.7	115 10.1	52 4.6	1142 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
Pearson		8.49625		4		.07500	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		10.564					
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Approximate Val/ASE0 Significance	
Cramer's V		.08625				.07500	

Table 65b: Cross-Tabulation of Physical Abuse and Ethnicity, Controlling for School: College

		ETHNIC4					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clts	Other	Row Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
PHABUSE2							
0		121	107	41	60	10	339
never been abuse		80.1	65.6	77.4	76.9	62.5	73.5
1		30	56	12	18	6	122
have been abused		19.9	34.4	22.6	23.1	37.5	26.5
Column		151	163	53	78	16	461
Total		32.8	35.4	11.5	16.9	3.5	100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Pearson		10.45197		4		.03347	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		4.234					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		1 of 10 (10.0%)					
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Approximate Val/ASE0 Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Cramer's V		.15057				.03347	

Number of Missing Observations: 170

Table 66a: Cross-Tabulation of Sexual Abuse and Ethnicity, Controlling for School: University

		ETHNIC4					
Count Col Pct		French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clts	Other	Row Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
SABUSE2	0	247	359	105	90	29	830
	never been abuse	79.2	69.6	71.9	77.6	60.4	72.9
	1	65	157	41	26	19	308
	have been abused	20.8	30.4	28.1	22.4	39.6	27.1
Column Total		312	516	146	116	48	1138
		27.4	45.3	12.8	10.2	4.2	100.0
Chi-Square		Value			DF	Significance	
-----		-----			-----	-----	
Pearson		14.24976			4	.00654	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		12.991					
Statistic		Value		ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance	
-----		-----		-----	-----	-----	
Cramer's V		.11190				.00654	

Table 66b: Cross-Tabulation of Sexual Abuse and Ethnicity, Controlling for School: College

		ETHNIC4					Row Total
Count	Col Pct	French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clts	Other	
		1	2	3	4	5	
SABUSE2							
0							
never been abuse		117 78.5	94 59.1	42 77.8	55 73.3	8 47.1	316 69.6
1							
have been abused		32 21.5	65 40.9	12 22.2	20 26.7	9 52.9	138 30.4
Column		149	159	54	75	17	454
Total		32.8	35.0	11.9	16.5	3.7	100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Pearson		20.14641		4		.00047	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		5.167					
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Val/ASE0	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Cramer's V		.21065				.00047	

Number of Missing Observations: 181

Table 67a: Cross-Tabulation of Psychological Abuse and Ethnicity, Controlling for School: University

		ETHNIC4					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clts	Other	Row Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
PSABUSE2							
0		62	92	38	32	16	240
have never been		20.3	17.7	25.7	28.1	30.8	21.1
1		243	428	110	82	36	899
have been abused		79.7	82.3	74.3	71.9	69.2	78.9
Column Total		305 26.8	520 45.7	148 13.0	114 10.0	52 4.6	1139 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Pearson		11.85613		4		.01845	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		10.957					
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Approximate Val/ASE0 Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Cramer's V		.10203				.01845	

Table 67b: Cross-Tabulation of Psychological Abuse and Ethnicity, Controlling for School: College

		ETHNIC4					Row Total
		French Cdn 1	English Cdn 2	North&East Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	
PSABUSE2	0	26 17.2	30 18.5	15 28.8	23 29.5	1 5.6	95 20.6
	1	125 82.8	132 81.5	37 71.2	55 70.5	17 94.4	366 79.4
Column Total		151 32.8	162 35.1	52 11.3	78 16.9	18 3.9	461 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
Pearson		9.90114		4		.04213	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		3.709					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		1 of		10 (10.0%)			
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Val/ASE0	
Cramer's V		.14655				.04213	

Number of Missing Observations: 173

Looking at physical abuse first (Tables 65a and b), we see that the two partial tables are significantly different, that is, one table was replicated, the other was not, and thus a case of specification. The test variable "school" specifies the conditions under which the relationship occurs. When it comes to physical abuse, university women do not differ in their experiences according to ethnicity as this relationship is not statistically significant. But for women enrolled in colleges, ethnicity makes a difference

(significant at the .05 level), although the relationship is not very strong at Cramer's V .15. More Other (37.5%) and English Canadian women (34.4%) reported incidents of physical than any of the other groups. French Canadian college women reported the least amount of abuse (19.9%), while 23.1% of the women of Patriarchal cultures and 22.6% of the European women reported having experienced physical abuse at the hands of a dating partner over the year preceding the study.

Turning to sexual violence next (Tables 66a and b), the partial tables replicate the original relationship in that both are statistically significant. However, the association between ethnicity and sexual abuse is stronger among college women than for university women (Cramer's V .21 and .11 respectively). Thus, the differences between ethnic groups are more pronounced among college students. Other women are more likely to have experienced one or more sexually abusive events than any of the other women, regardless of school affiliation. More than half of the Other college women (52.9%) and 39.6% Other university women were sexually assaulted over the 12 month period. English Canadian women came next with 30.4% of the university students and 40.9% of the college students reporting sexual violence. French Canadian women on the other hand, reported the least amount of violence for both the university group (20.8%) and the college group (21.5%). Also in the lower

end of the spectrum are European women and women from Patriarchal cultures with 28.1% and 22.4% respectively for university students and 22.2% and 26.7% respectively for college students.

The final partial tables of psychological abuse and ethnicity controlled for school (Tables 67a and b) replicate the original relationship (Table 64c) as they are both statistically significant (both also at the .05 level). Again, the association is stronger for college students than for university students (Cramer's V .15 versus .10 respectively). At the university, English and French Canadian women report receiving more psychological abuse than the other groups (82.3% and 79.7% respectively) while Other women are at the other end (69.2%) and 74.3% of European women and 71.9% of the women from Patriarchal cultures indicate having been the victims of psychological violence. At the colleges, however, it is the Other women who have experienced the most abuse as all but one reported being victimized (94.4%). Many French and English Canadian college women also indicated high levels of psychological abuse (82.2% and 81.5%), while women of Patriarchal cultures and European women's rates are slightly lower at 70.5% and 71.2% respectively.

In sum, there are no differences between women from different ethnic groups when it comes to physical abuse at the universities, but at the colleges there is, just as it

is for sexual and psychological abuse at both institutions. All in all, the differences are more pronounced at the colleges than they are at the universities, and Other and English Canadian women tend to have the higher rates and French Canadians the lowest.

Age has been employed as a control variable in the next tables in order to also establish whether experiencing abuse is a function of age rather than ethnicity.

Table 68a: Cross-Tabulation of Physical Abuse and Ethnicity, Controlling for Age: Younger Women

		ETHNIC4					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clts	Other	Row Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
PHABUSE2	0	181	294	80	71	19	645
never been abuse		82.6	72.4	84.2	73.2	76.0	76.6
	1	38	112	15	26	6	197
have been abused		17.4	27.6	15.8	26.8	24.0	23.4
	Column Total	219	406	95	97	25	842
		26.0	48.2	11.3	11.5	3.0	100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Pearson		12.14221		4		.01632	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		5.849					
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Approximate Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Cramer's V		.12009				.01632	

Table 68b: Cross-Tabulation of Physical Abuse and Ethnicity, Controlling for Age: Older Women

		ETHNIC4					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clts	Other	Row Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
PHABUSE2							
	0	194	212	82	77	35	600
	never been abuse	80.8	76.8	80.4	81.1	85.4	79.6
	1	46	64	20	18	6	154
	have been abused	19.2	23.2	19.6	18.9	14.6	20.4
	Column	240	276	102	95	41	754
	Total	31.8	36.6	13.5	12.6	5.4	100.0
Chi-Square		Value			DF	Significance	
-----		-----			-----	-----	
Pearson		2.54607			4	.63641	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		8.374					
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Approximate Val/ASE0 Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Cramer's V		.05811				.63641	

Number of Missing Observations: 177

4

PM-1 3½"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

Table 69a: Cross-Tabulation of Sexual Abuse and Ethnicity, Controlling for Age: Younger Women

		ETHNIC4					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn	English C Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clts	Other	Row Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
SABUSE2							
0		172	250	66	68	12	568
never been abuse		78.9	63.0	67.3	70.8	52.2	68.3
1		46	147	32	28	11	264
have been abused		21.1	37.0	32.7	29.2	47.8	31.7
Column		218	397	98	96	23	832
Total		26.2	47.7	11.8	11.5	2.8	100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Pearson		19.59361		4		.00060	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		7.298					
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Approximate Val/ASE0 Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Cramer's V		.15346				.00060	

Table 69b: Cross-Tabulation of Sexual Abuse and Ethnicity, Controlling for Age: Older Women

		ETHNIC4					Row Total
	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	
SABUSE2							
0 never been abuse	189 78.8	202 73.2	80 79.2	76 80.9	25 61.0		572 76.1
1 have been abused	51 21.3	74 26.8	21 20.8	18 19.1	16 39.0		180 23.9
Column Total	240 31.9	276 36.7	101 13.4	94 12.5	41 5.5		752 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF	Significance		
-----		-----		-----	-----		
Pearson		9.06268		4	.05955		
Minimum Expected Frequency -		9.814					
Statistic		Value		ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance	
-----		-----		-----	-----	-----	
Cramer's V		.10978				.05955	

Number of Missing Observations: 189

Table 70a: Cross-Tabulation of Psychological Abuse and Ethnicity, Controlling for Age: Younger Women

		ETHNIC4					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clts	Other	Row Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
PSABUSE2							
0		35	58	21	27	4	145
have never been		16.2	14.4	21.9	28.1	16.0	17.3
1		181	346	75	69	21	692
have been abused		83.8	85.6	78.1	71.9	84.0	82.7
Column		216	404	96	96	25	837
Total		25.8	48.3	11.5	11.5	3.0	100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Pearson		11.91159		4		.01802	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		4.331					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		1 of		10 (10.0%)			
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Approximate Val/ASE0 Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Cramer's V		.11929				.01802	

Table 70b: Cross-Tabulation of Psychological Abuse and Ethnicity, Controlling for Age: Older Women

		ETHNIC4					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clts	Other	Row Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
PSABUSE2							
0		50	64	32	29	13	188
have never been		21.2	23.1	31.1	30.9	30.2	25.0
1		186	213	71	65	30	565
have been abused		78.8	76.9	68.9	69.1	69.8	75.0
Column Total		236 31.3	277 36.8	103 13.7	94 12.5	43 5.7	753 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Pearson		6.73359		4		.15065	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		10.736					
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Approximate Val/ASE0 Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Cramer's V		.09456				.15065	

Number of Missing Observations: 183

Age has an effect on each of the relationships between ethnicity and the various forms of abuse. Each of the tables of physical, sexual and psychological violence indicate a spurious relationship between ethnicity and violence as the partial tables for the younger group are all statistically significant while none of those for the older group are. Age as a test variable has specified the conditions under which the original relationship occurs. In other words, ethnicity only makes a difference when a woman is 20 years or younger. As indicated by the row

percentages, younger women generally experienced more dating violence than did the older group. This is interesting because it reflects a similar picture to what studies in the U.S. have found; female victimization rates peak in the 16-19 age group, while the second highest rates are found among the 20-24 age group (Koss 1989:146).

According to Table 68a, young English Canadian women and women from Patriarchal cultures are more likely to have experienced physical abuse (27.6% and 26.8%) than European and French Canadian women (15.8% and 17.4%), and, to some extent, the Other women (24%). Statistically significant at the .05 level only, the relationship is not strong (Cramer's V .12). Overall, the younger group have experienced more physical abuse than the older group (23.4% versus 20.4%).

Almost half of all the Other women reported being sexually assaulted (47.8%) while 37.0% English Canadian, 32.7% North and Eastern European, 29.2% women of Patriarchal cultures, and finally, 21.1% French Canadian women reported sexual violence. Again, the relationship between the two variables is not very strong (Cramer's V .15). Overall, 31.7% of the younger group had experienced at least one incident of sexual coercion compared to 23.9% of the women in the older group.

Finally, English Canadian, Other and French Canadian women reported the most psychological abuse (85.6%, 84.0% and 83.8%), followed by the European women (78.1%) and women

of Patriarchal cultures (71.9%). Statistically significantly at the .05 level, the relationship is, nevertheless, weak (Cramer's V .12). Again, the younger women have experienced more psychological violence than the older group (82.7% versus 75.0).

There are then, no differences in dating victimization according to ethnicity for older women. Ethnic differences are present for the younger women only. And again, English Canadian and Other women have experienced more abuse than French Canadian women who are the least likely to have such experiences.

The next controls are the number of casual and serious dating partners. Only the cross-tabulations that are statistically significant are presented.

Table 71: Cross-Tabulation of Sexual Abuse and Ethnicity, Controlling for Number of Casual Dates: 3-4 men

ETHNIC4							
Count	Col Pct	French C dn	English C Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clts	Other	Row Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
SABUSE2							
0		51	71	21	19	5	167
never been abuse		82.3	60.2	65.6	63.3	33.3	65.0
1		11	47	11	11	10	90
have been abused		17.7	39.8	34.4	36.7	66.7	35.0
Column Total		62	118	32	30	15	257
		24.1	45.9	12.5	11.7	5.8	100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Pearson		15.97697		4		.00305	
Minimum Expected Frequency -			5.253				
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Approximate Val/ASE0 Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Cramer's V		.24933				.00305	

Number of Missing Observations: 894

Table 72a: Cross-Tabulation of Physical Abuse and Ethnicity, Controlling for Number of Serious Dates:
1 man

		ETHNIC4					
Count	Col Pct	French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clts	Other	Row Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
PHABUSE2							
0		218	295	97	71	31	712
never been abuse		82.9	72.5	80.2	71.7	79.5	76.6
1		45	112	24	28	8	217
have been abused		17.1	27.5	19.8	28.3	20.5	23.4
Column		263	407	121	99	39	929
Total		28.3	43.8	13.0	10.7	4.2	100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Pearson		12.02624		4		.01716	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		9.110					
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Approximate Val/ASE0 Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Cramer's V		.11378				.01716	

**Table 72b: Cross-Tabulation of Physical Abuse and Ethnicity, Controlling for Number of Serious Dates:
2+ men**

		ETHNIC4					Row Total
Count	Col Pct	French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clts	Other	
		1	2	3	4	5	
PHABUSE2							
0		50	59	17	10	3	139
never been abuse		80.6	60.8	73.9	55.6	42.9	67.1
1		12	38	6	8	4	68
have been abused		19.4	39.2	26.1	44.4	57.1	32.9
Column Total		62 30.0	97 46.9	23 11.1	18 8.7	7 3.4	207 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
Pearson		10.32466		4		.03530	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		2.300					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		2 of		10 (20.0%)			
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Approximate Val/ASEO Significance	
Cramer's V		.22333				.03530	

Number of Missing Observations: 637

Table 73a: Cross-Tabulation of Sexual Abuse and Ethnicity, Controlling for Number of Serious Dates:
1 man

		ETHNIC4					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn	English C Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clts	Other	Row Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
SABUSE2							
0		209	265	90	77	20	661
never been abuse		81.3	66.8	74.4	80.2	52.6	72.7
1		48	132	31	19	18	248
have been abused		18.7	33.2	25.6	19.8	47.4	27.3
Column		257	397	121	96	38	909
Total		28.3	43.7	13.3	10.6	4.2	100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Pearson		27.32897		4		.00002	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		10.367					
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Approximate Val/ASE0 Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Cramer's V		.17339				.00002	

Table 73b: Cross-Tabulation of Sexual Abuse and Ethnicity, Controlling for Number of Serious Dates: 2+ men

		ETHNIC4					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clts	Other	Row Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
SABUSE2							
0		42	50	11	4	3	110
never been abuse		67.7	51.5	47.8	25.0	42.9	53.7
1		20	47	12	12	4	95
have been abused		32.3	48.5	52.2	75.0	57.1	46.3
Column Total		62 30.2	97 47.3	23 11.2	16 7.8	7 3.4	205 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF	Significance		
-----		-----		-----	-----		
Pearson		11.04716		4	.02604		
Minimum Expected Frequency -		3.244					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		2 of		10 (20.0)			
Statistic		Value		ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance	
-----		-----		-----	-----	-----	
Cramer's V		.23214				.02604	

Number of Missing Observations: 659

The relationship between ethnicity and woman abuse disappeared in all but one instance when the number of casual dating partners was employed as a control variable. In other words, differences in abuse rates according to ethnicity disappear when one takes into consideration whether one has had one or two and five and more casual dating partners. The only cross-tabulation which remained statistically significant is that of sexual abuse,

controlling for 3-4 casual dates (Table 71). The relationship is slightly weak at Cramer's V .25. As many as 66.7% of Other women who casually dated three-four men had experienced some form of sexual abuse; English Canadian women, women of Patriarchal cultures and European women come next with 39.8%, 36.7% and 34.4% respectively. French Canadian women have experienced the least amount of sexual violence (17.7%). Sexual violence is related to how many casual partners one has had. Why this particular cross-tabulation is statistically significant, but not the others, is difficult to explain.

Turning to the control for number of serious dating partners next, the partial tables for physical abuse have replicated the original relationship, thus indicating that ethnicity does make a difference in the experience of abuse. It is interesting that the overall level of abuse experienced by women who had two or more serious dating partners over the period of a year, is higher than the women who only seriously dated one man (32.9 versus 23.4%). Ethnicity also plays a greater role among those who had more than 2 serious dating partners than those who only had one (Cramer's V .22 versus .11).

In either case, French Canadian women experienced the least amount of physical violence (17.1% and 19.4%). Women of Patriarchal cultures and English Canadian women were the most vulnerable to physical abuse when only dating one man

(28.3% and 27.5% respectively), while European and Other women had lower scores (19.8% and 20.5% respectively). Among those who had dated two or more men, the Other women had experienced the most abuse (57.1%), followed by women from Patriarchal cultures (44.4%), English Canadian (39.2%), European (26.1%), and finally French Canadian women as already mentioned (19.4%).

The relationship between ethnicity and sexual violence is stronger for two or more serious dates than for just one (Cramer's V .23 versus .17). Generally, the more serious dating partners a woman has had, the greater the chance for being sexually assaulted. 46.3% of the women who had dated two men or more had experienced at least one incident of abuse compared to women who only had one serious dating partner (27.3%). But there are statistically significant differences according to ethnicity. Almost half of the Other women (47.4%) reported being victimized, compared to 33.2% English Canadian, 25.6% European women, 19.8% women from Patriarchal cultures and finally, 18.7% French Canadian women. For those who dated two or more men, as many as 75% of the women of Patriarchal cultures reported being sexually assaulted, 57.1% of Other women, 52.2% of the North and Eastern European, 48.5% English Canadian women, and finally, 32.3% of the French Canadian women.

Abuse is thus related to the number of dating partners. Only the partial table for 3-4 partners replicated the

Table 75: Cross-Tabulation of Sexual Abuse and Ethnicity, Controlling for Beliefs: Feminist Beliefs

		ETHNIC4					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clts	Other	Row Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
SABUSE2							
0		297	311	98	64	18	788
never been abuse		80.1	67.9	75.4	70.3	51.4	72.6
1		74	147	32	27	17	297
have been abused		19.9	32.1	24.6	29.7	48.6	27.4
Column Total		371	458	130	91	35	1085
		34.2	42.2	12.0	8.4	3.2	100.0
Chi-Square		Value			DF	Significance	
-----		-----			-----	-----	
Pearson		24.08296			4	.00008	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		9.581					
Statistic		Value		ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance	
-----		-----		-----	-----	-----	
Cramer's V		.14898				.00008	

Number of Missing Observations: 280

Table 76: Cross-Tabulation of Psychological Abuse and Ethnicity, Controlling for Beliefs: Patriarchal Beliefs

		ETHNIC4					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clts	Other	Row Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
PSABUSE2							
0		8	34	12	21	9	84
have never been		11.3	18.2	21.8	28.0	36.0	20.3
1		63	153	43	54	16	329
have been abused		88.7	81.8	78.2	72.0	64.0	79.7
Column Total		71	187	55	75	25	413
		17.2	45.3	13.3	18.2	6.1	100.0
Chi-Square		Value			DF	Significance	
-----		-----			-----	-----	
Pearson		10.71866			4	.02991	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		5.085					
Statistic		Value		ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance	
-----		-----		-----	-----	-----	
Cramer's V		.16110				.02991	
Number of Missing Observations: 271							

As discussed in the literature above, there is a connection between one's patriarchal beliefs and attitudes and abuse. This link is, however, the strongest when the two individuals in a couple do not share the same beliefs. Unfortunately, it is not possible for us to test this hypothesis since no couple data is available to us.

As indicated by Tables 64a to c, there is an ethnic distribution of the experience of abuse. As indicated by the control variables, other factors such as school, age and number of casual and ethnic dates also play a role in

whether someone has been abused or not. And so does patriarchal beliefs and attitudes.

None of the original tables were replicated and the control variables have specified the conditions under which the original relationships occurred. Ethnicity has ceased to have an effect for women whose beliefs are of a patriarchal nature when it comes to physical and sexual abuse as these cross-tabulations were not statistically significant. Put on its head, if one sports patriarchal beliefs, one's chance of being physically abused is as great as the next, regardless of ethnicity. This is also true for women who hold feminist beliefs when it comes to psychological abuse. In other words, ethnicity is no longer a factor.

Turning to Table 74, European and French Canadian women who hold feminist beliefs have the lowest physical abuse rates (16.8% and 17.3% respectively). English Canadian women's rates are the highest (25.5%), and women from Patriarchal cultures and Other women are in the middle (21.7% and 22.9% respectively). The relationship is statistically significant only at the .05 level and not very strong (Cramer's V .10).

As many as 48.6% of Other women with feminist beliefs experienced some form of sexual assault compared to 32.1% English Canadian women, 29.7% women of Patriarchal cultures and 24.6% European women. French Canadian women have the

Table 85: Cross-tabulations of Dating Definition-Commitment and Physical Abuse: Women

	Count Row Pct Col Pct	PHABUSE2		Row Total
		never be en abuse 0	have bee n abused 1	
Dat-defn commitment	1	794 63.2	203 56.2	997 61.7
no mention	2	95 7.6	27 7.5	122 7.5
positive	3	367 29.2	131 36.3	498 30.8
positive+negativ				
Column Total		1256 77.7	361 22.3	1617 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	6.76968	2	.03388
Minimum Expected Frequency -	27.237		

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	.06470			.03388

Number of Missing Observations: 156

The cross-tabulations below present the data for men. Again, only the relationships that are statistically significant are presented. Interestingly, the relationship between abusing a dating partner and the way dating is perceived is stronger for men than it was for women, at least when it comes to defining dating in sexual or romantic terms.

for physical abuse, 27.4% versus 28.9% for sexual abuse and 78.7% versus 79.7% for psychological abuse). In other words, patriarchal women tend to experience more abuse over a 12 month period than those who are feminist.

The next cross-tabulations control for attitudes; only the significant tables are presented.

Table 77a: Cross-Tabulation of Sexual Abuse and Ethnicity, Controlling for Attitudes: Feminist Attitudes

		ETHNIC4					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	Row Total
SABUSE2							
0		237	344	103	62	23	769
never been abuse		79.3	71.5	74.1	73.8	56.1	73.7
1		62	137	36	22	18	275
have been abused		20.7	28.5	25.9	26.2	43.9	26.3
Column Total		299	481	139	84	41	1044
		28.6	46.1	13.3	8.0	3.9	100.0
Chi-Square		Value			DF	Significance	
-----		-----			-----	-----	
Pearson		12.51035			4	.01393	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		10.800					
Statistic		Value		ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance	
-----		-----		-----	-----	-----	
Cramer's V		.10947				.01393	

Table 77b: Cross-Tabulation of Sexual Abuse and Ethnicity, Controlling for Attitudes: Patriarchal Attitudes

		ETHNIC4					
Count Col Pct		French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clts	Other	Row Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
SABUSE2	0	126	109	42	80	15	372
	never been abuse	78.3	56.2	71.2	77.7	57.7	68.5
	1	35	85	17	23	11	171
	have been abused	21.7	43.8	28.8	22.3	42.3	31.5
Column Total		161	194	59	103	26	543
		29.7	35.7	10.9	19.0	4.8	100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Pearson		26.36551		4		.00003	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		8.188					
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Approximate Val/ASE0 Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Cramer's V		.22035				.00003	

Number of Missing Observations: 186

Table 78: Cross-Tabulation of Psychological Abuse and Ethnicity, Controlling for Attitudes: Patriarchal Attitudes

		ETHNIC4					Row Total
Count Col Pct		French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clts 4	Other 5	
PSABUSE2	0	19	29	14	28	7	97
have never been		11.8	14.7	23.3	26.9	25.9	17.7
1		142	168	46	76	20	452
have been abused		88.2	85.3	76.7	73.1	74.1	82.3
Column Total		161 29.3	197 35.9	60 10.9	104 18.9	27 4.9	549 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
Pearson		13.69917		4		.00832	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		4.770					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		1 of		10 (10.0%)			
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Val/ASE0	
Cramer's V		.15797				Approximate Significance	
						.00832	

Number of Missing Observations: 183

The relationship between ethnicity and physical abuse disappeared when introducing the attitudes variable. Having a feminist or a patriarchal attitude makes a greater difference than ethnicity when it comes to physical violence. The relationship between ethnicity and physical violence has, in other words, been interpreted through the introduction of the test variable. The partial tables for sexual abuse are replicating the original relationship between sexual abuse and ethnicity (Table 64b). In other

words, regardless of one's attitudes, the experience of sexual abuse depends on one's ethnic identity.

For physical abuse, it does make a difference what attitudes one has, and is a more important dimension than ethnicity since the partials are not statistically significant.

For women with a feminist attitude, Other women have experienced the most sexual abuse (43.9%). At the other end of the spectrum are French Canadian women (20.7%) while English Canadian, European and Patriarchal women have rates in between these two (28.5%, 25.9% and 26.2%). Significant at the .05 level, the relationship is not very strong (Cramer's V .11).

The partial relationship between sexual abuse and ethnicity for women who have patriarchal attitudes is stronger (Cramer's V .22) than the other partial. English Canadian and Other women have experienced the most sexual violence (43.8% and 42.3% respectively). French Canadian women are, again, the least likely to experience sexual abuse (21.7%), followed by women of Patriarchal cultures (22.3%) and European women (28.8%).

The condition under which the relationship between ethnicity and psychological violence occurs has been specified through the control variable as it remains true for women who have patriarchal attitudes (Table 78). In other words, there are no statistically significant differences between women of

different ethnic backgrounds as long as their attitudes are of a feminist nature. But the experience of violence follows ethnic lines for women with patriarchal attitudes.

French Canadian and English Canadian women have the highest rates of psychological abuse (88.2% and 85.3%). Women from Patriarchal cultures, Other and European women's rates are slightly lower (73.1%, 74.1% and 76.7% respectively). The relationship is not very strong (Cramer's V .16).

An interesting observation is that for all forms of abuse, women who have feminist attitudes are less likely to be abused than women who see the world in more patriarchal terms. While 20.2% of the women who are feminist had been physically abused, 26.1% of the patriarchal women had. 26.3% of feminist women had been sexually assaulted compared to 31.5% of the women with patriarchal attitudes, and finally, 77.3% of feminist women reported being psychologically abused compared to 82.3% with patriarchal attitudes. Thus, previous research which has showed that a feminist attitudes in fact translates into less abuse is supported by these data. It could be related to feminist women choosing to date men who share their own views on gender issues to a greater extent, or it could also be related to feminist women being more assertive and thereby initiating the dating process. The power relationship between the women and her male date would then have shifted.

5.4.3 Admitting to Abuse by Men and Ethnicity

Turning next to the men, the following cross-tabulations show how ethnicity is linked to admissions of abuse. Only the cross-tabulations that were statistically significant are presented.

Table 79: Cross-Tabulation of Sexual Abuse admitted to by Men and Ethnicity

		ETHNIC3					
Count Col Pct		French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clt	Other	Row Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
SABUSE2	0	332	350	91	80	36	889
	have never abuse	82.6	82.4	77.8	74.1	67.9	80.5
	1	70	75	26	28	17	216
have abused		17.4	17.6	22.2	25.9	32.1	19.5
Column Total		402 36.4	425 38.5	117 10.6	108 9.8	53 4.8	1105 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF	Significance		
-----		-----		-----	-----		
Pearson		10.75634		4	.02944		
Minimum Expected Frequency -		10.360					
Statistic		Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance		
-----		-----	-----	-----	-----		
Cramer's V		.09866			.02944		
Number of Missing Observations: 108							

Interestingly, the only relationships that is statistically significant (and is at the .05 level) is that between admitting to have carried out sexual abuse and ethnic background. There are no differences between men of different ethnic groups when it comes to reporting physical

and psychological violence against their dating partners.

As indicated by Table 79, Other men (32.1%) are much more likely to admit having sexually assaulted a female dating partner than the other ethnic groups, and there are also more men from Patriarchal cultures (25.9%) and European men (22.2) who admit to such acts than there are French (17.4%) and English Canadians (17.6%).

The relationship between ethnicity and admitting to having abused a dating partner is next controlled for school, age, number of casual and serious dates, and finally, for patriarchal attitudes and beliefs. Again, only the tables that are statistically significant are presented.

Table 80: Cross-Tabulation of Sexual Abuse admitted to by Men and Ethnicity, Controlling for School: College

		ETHNIC3					Row Total
Count Col Pct		French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clt 4	Other 5	
SABUSE2	0	180	91	27	26	8	332
have never abuse		84.9	80.5	69.2	63.4	57.1	79.2
	1	32	22	12	15	6	87
have abused		15.1	19.5	30.8	36.6	42.9	20.8
Column Total		212	113	39	41	14	419
		50.6	27.0	9.3	9.8	3.3	100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
Pearson		17.02169		4		.00191	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		2.907					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		1 of		10 (10.0%)			
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Approximate Val/ASE0 Significance	
Cramer's V		.20156				.00191	

Number of Missing Observations: 109

As mentioned above, the relationship between ethnicity and admitting to physically and psychologically abusing a dating partner was not statistically significant, and this is also replicated when controlling for school. In other words, ethnicity is not a factor in determining who carries out abuse and who does not.

For sexual abuse, however, the two partial relationships are significantly different, and the control variable has allowed for specifying the conditions of the original relationship. Ethnicity only plays a role in admitting to sexual abuse at colleges. At the universities, there are no differences according to ethnicity. At the colleges, Other men admit to the most sexual abuse (42.9%), while men from Patriarchal cultures come next (36.6%), followed by European (30.8%), English Canadian (19.5%), and finally, French Canadian men (15.1%). The relationship is not particularly strong, however (Cramer's V .20).

It is interesting that just as French Canadian women (see Table 66b) report the least amount of sexual violence, so do French Canadian men. The Other women and men are also consistent that way as they both report the highest levels of abuse. It is also interesting that women consistently report experiencing more violence than men admit to doing (one possible explanation is of course that this is due to not having couple data and the abuse may not have taken place among the individuals participating in the study). It

is a phenomenon common to most studies of this nature. It is possible that men are too ashamed to admit (but not to do) these kinds of acts, or afraid of what it would do to them socially, should it come out that they did such things. It could also be that these men are not aware that their acts are abusive, claiming that no means yes for women.

The following cross-tabulations control for age.

Table 81: Cross-Tabulation of Physical Abuse admitted to by Men and Ethnicity, Controlling for Age: Younger Men

		ETHNIC3					Row Total
	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clt 4	Other 5	
PHABUSE2							
have never abuse	0	186 88.6	160 87.9	44 91.7	17 65.4	9 90.0	416 87.4
have abused	1	24 11.4	22 12.1	4 8.3	9 34.6	1 10.0	60 12.6
Column Total		210 44.1	182 38.2	48 10.1	26 5.5	10 2.1	476 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
Pearson		12.59867		4		.01341	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		1.261					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		2 of		10 (20.0%)			
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Approximate Val/ASE0 Significance	
Cramer's V		.16269				.01341	

Number of Missing Observations: 136

**Table 82: Cross-Tabulation of Sexual Abuse
admitted to by Men and Ethnicity, Controlling for
Age: Younger Men**

		ETHNIC3						
Count	Col Pct	French C dn	English C Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clt	Other	Row Total	
		1	2	3	4	5		
SABUSE2								
0		195	165	36	17	9	422	
have never abuse		87.8	89.7	73.5	65.4	75.0	85.6	
1		27	19	13	9	3	71	
have abused		12.2	10.3	26.5	34.6	25.0	14.4	
Column		222	184	49	26	12	493	
Total		45.0	37.3	9.9	5.3	2.4	100.0	
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance		
Pearson		18.94092		4		.00081		
Minimum Expected Frequency -		1.728						
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		2 of		10 (20.0%)				
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Val/ASE0		Approximate Significance
Cramer's V		.19601						.00081
Number of Missing Observations: 114								

The relationship between admitting to physical violence and ethnicity is statistically significant for young men even though it was not in the original relationship. Age then, suppresses and thus conceals, the relationship between these two variables. Only among the younger men are there patterns according to ethnic lines. Statistically significant at the .05 level only, the relationship is on the weak side (Cramer's V .16).

Young men from Patriarchal cultures are much more

likely to admit to physical violence than any of the other groups. The others are fairly similar; 8.3% of the European men, 10.0% of Other men, 11.4% of French Canadian men and 12.1% of English Canadian men report physically assaulting a dating partner over the previous 12 months.

Admitting to sexual abuse, and controlling for age also produced one statistically significant partial table. Since the original table was statistically significant, this is a case of specification of the conditions under which the original table occurred. The partial relationship is as strong as the original was (Cramer's $V = .20$).

Men from Patriarchal cultures are again more likely to report having abused a dating partner (34.6%). 26.5% of European and 25.0% of Other men admit to abusive acts, while 10.3% of English Canadian and 12.2% of French Canadian men say they have sexually abused someone. Comparing these numbers to that of young women's reports of sexual assaults (see Table 69a), men report much fewer instances than women do. For example, almost twice as many French Canadian and Other women report sexual abuse compared to their male counterparts, and almost four times as many English Canadian women as English Canadian men report sexual assault. The discrepancies are so large that it seems more likely that men have under-reported their abusive acts for reasons discussed above.

Next are cross-tabulations of ethnicity and abuse,

controlling for the number of casual and serious dating partners.

Table 83: Cross-Tabulation of Physical Abuse admitted to by Men and Ethnicity, Controlling for Number of Casual Dating Partners: 5+ Dates

		ETHNIC3					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn 1	English Cdn 2	North&Ea st Europ 3	Patriarc hal Clt 4	Other 5	Row Total
PHABUSE2							
have never abuse	0	49 76.6	71 88.8	25 89.3	13 81.3	7 58.3	165 82.5
have abused	1	15 23.4	9 11.3	3 10.7	3 18.8	5 41.7	35 17.5
	Column Total	64 32.0	80 40.0	28 14.0	16 8.0	12 6.0	200 100.0
Chi-Square		Value			DF	Significance	
-----		-----			-----	-----	
Pearson		9.49186			4	.04991	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		2.100					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		3 of 10 (30.0%)					
Statistic		Value		ASE1	Approximate Val/ASE0 Significance		
-----		-----		-----	-----		
Cramer's V		.21785			.04991		

Number of Missing Observations: 523

**Table 84: Cross-Tabulation of Sexual Abuse
admitted to by Men and Ethnicity, Controlling for
Number of Casual Dates: 3-4 Dates**

		ETHNIC3					
	Count Col Pct	French C dn	English Cdn	North&Ea st Europ	Patriarc hal Clt	Other	Row Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
SABUSE2							
	0	68	69	18	13	5	173
have never abuse		90.7	81.2	69.2	65.0	31.3	77.9
	1	7	16	8	7	11	49
have abused		9.3	18.8	30.8	35.0	68.8	22.1
	Column Total	75	85	26	20	16	222
		33.8	38.3	11.7	9.0	7.2	100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Pearson		30.95189		4		.00000	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		3.532					
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 -		2 of		10 (20.0%)			
Statistic		Value		ASE1		Approximate Val/ASE0 Significance	
-----		-----		-----		-----	
Cramer's V		.37339				.00000	

Number of Missing Observations: 512

The number of casual dates a man has had over a 12 month period according to ethnicity also has something to do with admissions of abuse. While ethnicity ceases to be important when it comes to having had one or two, or three or four casual dating partners and admitting to physical abuse, differences continue to exist along ethnic lines when it comes to those who date five or more.

The variable "5+ casual dates" acted as a suppressor

variable on physical abuse and ethnicity since the original relationship was not statistically significant, but the partial is. Significant at the .05 level, the relationship is slightly weak (Cramer's V .22).

Other men are by far the most likely to admit to physical abuse (41.7%). French Canadian men come next (23.4%), followed by men from Patriarchal cultures (18.8%), English Canadians (11.3%) and European men (10.7%).

For sexual abuse, the only partial which was statistically significant is that of having casually dated three or four women. In the other instances, the relationship between ethnicity and sexual abuse disappeared. In other words, sexual abuse is a function of the number of casual dating partners when one has had a couple or more than five. The relationship between ethnicity and sexual abuse for men who casually dated three or four women in a year is moderate (Cramer's V .37).

Other men are again the most likely to admit to abusing. As many as 68.8% of Other men indicated they have sexually assaulted a dating partner. Next are men from Patriarchal cultures (35.0%), European (30.8%), English Canadian (18.8%) and French Canadian men (9.3%). It is interesting that for women as well, ethnic differences were retained when controlling for three to four dating partners. Shotland (1989:261) suggests that women who date or have sex with a large number of men may also be exposed to men who

are more sexually aggressive. Also, men may have greater sexual expectations if they go out with a woman who is labelled as sexually accessible. Because of the patriarchal beliefs and the antisocial personality of a "beginning date" rapist, he may rape the woman because of anger and sexual frustration. This may also be true for those who date three to four persons over a year, but to a greater extent for members of some ethnic groups than others.

Other men consistently admit to carrying out more woman abuse than do any of the other men. Whether they actually do abuse more, is hard to say. There is always the possibility that the Other men may have under-reported their abusive activities, and the observed difference is a reflection of Other men not feeling the same pressures for socially desirable reporting as the other males.

None of the partial relationships resulting from employing the number of serious dates, patriarchal beliefs and attitudes proved to be statistically significant for men. What that means is that ethnicity is no longer important when taking these factors into account. Number of serious dates, and patriarchal beliefs and attitudes have more to do with violence against women than does ethnicity.

5.4.4 Woman Abuse and Dating Definitions

Of all the cross-tabulations of dating definitions and whether one has been abused or not for women, only one was statistically significant (see Table 85 below). It appears then, that the way people see dating is minimally affected by the experiences they have had in such relationship. Interestingly though, the one significant run is that of defining dating as commitment and physical abuse. Women who have not experienced abuse over the 12 month period generally mentioned commitment more than those who have been abused (63.2% versus 56.2%). While there is no difference between the two groups when mentioning commitment positively, more women who have been physically abused stipulated the absence/possibility of commitment in a dating relationship (36.3% versus 29.2%). This difference may, in part, be explained by the higher incidence of violence in more committed relationships, thereby making commitment a greater concern for these women. But, as indicated by the Phi statistics, the relationship between these two variables is weak (.06) and only statistically significant at the .05 level.

Table 85: Cross-tabulations of Dating Definition-Commitment and Physical Abuse: Women

	Count Row Pct Col Pct	PHABUSE2		Row Total
		never be en abuse 0	have bee n abused 1	
Dat-defn				
commitment	1	794 63.2	203 56.2	997 61.7
no mention				
positive	2	95 7.6	27 7.5	122 7.5
positive+negativ	3	367 29.2	131 36.3	498 30.8
Column Total		1256 77.7	361 22.3	1617 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	6.76968	2	.03388

Minimum Expected Frequency - 27.237

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	.06470			.03388

Number of Missing Observations: 156

The cross-tabulations below present the data for men. Again, only the relationships that are statistically significant are presented. Interestingly, the relationship between abusing a dating partner and the way dating is perceived is stronger for men than it was for women, at least when it comes to defining dating in sexual or romantic terms.

**Table 86a: Cross-tabulations of Dating Definition-
Sexuality and Sexual Abuse: Men**

dat-defn sexuality	Count Col Pct	SABUSE2		Row Total
		have nev er abuse 0	have abu sed 1	
no mention	1	648 72.4	142 65.7	790 71.1
positive	2	133 14.9	52 24.1	185 16.7
positive+negativ	3	114 12.7	22 10.2	136 12.2
Column Total		895 80.6	216 19.4	1111 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF
Pearson		10.88293		2
Minimum Expected Frequency -		26.441		
Statistic		Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0
Phi		.09897		
Number of Missing Observations:		102		
				Approximate Significance
				.00433
				.00433

Table 86b: Cross-tabulations of Dating Definition-Sexuality and Psychological Abuse: Men

dat-defn sexuality	Count Col Pct	PSABUSE2		Row Total
		have nev er abuse 0	have abu sed 1	
no mention	1	168 80.0	629 69.4	797 71.4
positive	2	25 11.9	162 17.9	187 16.8
positive+negativ	3	17 8.1	115 12.7	132 11.8
Column Total		210 18.8	906 81.2	1116 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	9.34982	2	.00933

Minimum Expected Frequency - 24.839

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	.09153			.00933

Number of Missing Observations: 97

**Table 86c: Cross-tabulations of Dating Definition-
Romance and Physical Abuse: Men**

dat-defn romance	Count Col Pct	PHABUSE2		Row Total
		have nev er abuse 0	have abu sed 1	
no mention	1	657 73.8	127 65.1	784 72.3
positive	2	202 22.7	61 31.3	263 24.2
positive+negativ	3	31 3.5	7 3.6	38 3.5
Column Total		890 82.0	195 18.0	1085 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	6.54161	2	.03798
Minimum Expected Frequency -	6.829		

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Phi	.07765			.03798

Number of Missing Observations: 128

Table 86d: Cross-tabulations of Dating Definition-Romance and Psychological Abuse: Men

dat-defn romance	Count Col Pct	PSABUSE2		Row Total
		have nev er abuse 0	have abu sed 1	
no mention	1	142 67.6	666 73.5	808 72.4
positive	2	53 25.2	212 23.4	265 23.7
positive+negativ	3	15 7.1	28 3.1	43 3.9
Column Total		210 18.8	906 81.2	1116 100.0
Chi-Square		Value		DF
Pearson		8.32579		2
Minimum Expected Frequency -		8.091		
Statistic		Value	ASE1	Approximate Val/ASE0 Significance
Phi		.08637		.01556

Number of Missing Observations: 97

There are no differences among men who have abused a dating partner and those who have not in mentioning commitment and sharing in their definitions of dating; they all do it to the same extent. But there are some differences when it comes to seeing dating as a sexual liaison and a romantic encounter.

As indicated by Table 86a and b, there is a relationship between seeing dating as involving sexual

relations and admitting to carrying out sexual and psychological violent acts. There is no relationship between defining dating as sexuality and physical abuse. There are more men who have sexually assaulted a dating partner who include sex positively (that is, this is what dating is about) in their definitions than men who have not (24.1% versus 14.9%). Slightly fewer sexually abusive men will mention sexuality positively and/or negatively than the others (10.2% versus 12.7%). According to the Phi probability, the relationship is on the weak side (.10).

Men who have psychologically abused a dating partner do also tend to include sexuality in their definitions to a greater extent than those who have not (17.9% versus 11.9%). They also mention sexuality positively and/or negatively more often than men who have not psychologically abused a dating partner (12.7% versus 8.1%). The relationship is not very strong (Phi .09)

Turning next to mentioning romance as a part of the dating scene and woman abuse (Tables 86c and d), we see that only the relationships between physical and psychological abuse and romanticism positively are statistically significant. There is no difference between the men who sexually assaulted a date and those who did not, when it comes to including romantic notions.

As indicated by Table 85c, men who have physically abused women in the context of dating are more likely to

include romanticism in their definitions than those who have not (31.3% and 22.7% respectively). Mentioning romanticism positively and/or negatively is the same for the two groups. Significant at the .05 level only, the relationship is weak (Phi .08).

The relationship between romance and psychological abuse is also only statistically significant at the .05 level and is also weak (Phi .09). Here the direction is reversed in that it is the men who have never abused who mention romanticism more (25.2% versus 23.4%). They also mention it positively and/or negatively more than the other group (7.1% and 3.1% respectively).

Abusers, then, mention sexuality and romance more often than men who have not abused. This may be related to the greater importance placed on sexual relations by these men (to the point that they will take it if it is not given to them voluntarily) and sense of romanticism which may justify physical and psychological attacks (e.g. out of love, or jealousy). While romanticism has been found to contribute to overlooking and downplaying occurrences of violence in a dating relationship (Lloyd 1991:15-6) and sometimes used this way to explain why women may not leave a violent relationship, our data show that this may be slightly more relevant to men than to women.

5.5 Who Do not Date?

Although those who have never dated are excluded from the analysis, it may, nevertheless, be useful to take a brief look at the non-daters and who they are.

The vast majority of the respondents have dated at some point in their life. As many as 96.1% (N=1773, 12 missing) of the female and 95.1% (N=1213, 12 missing) of the male respondents answered "yes" to having been "involved in a dating relationship with a male/female at any point in your life, no matter how short-term or casual, or long-term and serious" (question 1 on both questionnaires). Drawing a picture of the male non-daters, we find that 55% (N=35) of the men who have never dated are 20 years or younger, that they are, for the most part, either French Canadians (39.3%, N=24), from Patriarchal cultures (34.2%, N=21) and English Canadian (13.4%, N=8) (Northern and Eastern Europeans constituted 8.6%, N=8 and the Others 4.7%, N=3 of the non-dating males), and that most of them are enrolled in either technology programs (22.4%, N=13), arts programs (20.7%, N=12), sciences (15.5%, N=9), engineering (12.1%, N=7) or business (12.1%, N=7). A total of 12 (19%) men who have never dated are recent immigrants, refugees or foreign students, the vast majority from the Far East and the Middle East.

Of the women who have never dated, a majority are 20

years of age or younger (62.9%, N=44), are from Patriarchal cultures (33.3%, N=24), English Canadians (26.4%, N=19), French Canadians and North and Eastern European (both with 16.7%, N=12), and many are enrolled in the Arts (30.4%, N=21), Education (18.8%, N=13), Business (11.6%, N=8) and Sciences (10.1%, N=7). Finally, 23.9% (N=17) are either recent immigrants, refugees or foreign students, and, for the most part, from the Far East (5.6%, N=4), Africa (7.0%, N=5), Eastern Europe (7.0%, N=5) and the Middle East (4.2%, N=3).

The differences between men and women who have never dated indicate that the greater proportion of non-dating women are found among English Canadians and North and Eastern Europeans, while for men they are French Canadian. More non-dating women are enrolled in the Arts compared to the non-dating men, who are more represented in technology programs. The differences in enrolment may simply be the result of the distribution of men and women in various faculties, but why more French Canadian men have never dated compared to their female counterparts, and why more English Canadian women have never dated compared to English Canadian men, is difficult to explain.

CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This Master's thesis has statistically explored the interconnections between ethnicity, inter-ethnic dating, and woman abuse in dating relationships, using the data from the national study carried out by DeKeseredy and Kelly (1993). This study is different from the majority of studies on dating and violence against women because of a greater focus on dating as a North American social activity as well as a greater emphasis on ethnicity.

This research is important for several reasons. Firstly, it gives us a view of Canadian University and College students' dating habits, how they define dating, and how these vary according to ethnicity and whether a relationship is intra- or inter-ethnic.

Secondly, ethnicity and inter-ethnic status of a relationship as variables in woman abuse in dating violence has not been studied within the Canadian context. For example, it was not known whether the existing information concerning dating violence was generalizable and applicable to all university and college students, regardless of their ethnicity or race (DeMaris 1990).

While this study may not have all the answers, it certainly points in specific directions. The advantage of

such knowledge on one hand, is its role in fostering an awareness that both dating and dating violence can be perceived and experienced differently depending on a woman's ethnic background. On the other hand, it allows for streamlining services to those in greater need when groups (based on age, ethnicity, school and ethnicity of a dating partner) with higher rates are identified. Such knowledge may allow the practitioners who work with these groups to better serve their clients; it may also allow such subgroups to mobilize their resources to deal with the potential problem at hand.

Finally, exploring dating with a focus on ethnicity is an important endeavour in the extent to which it pushes theoretical constructions of women abuse in dating relationships. Since the tradition within anthropology is an emphasis on "the cultural construction of norms for sexual behaviour" (Sanday 1990:8), then this study will also contribute to anthropological theory.

For this is an anthropological study, although perhaps more in its effect and framework than in its execution. If anthropology serves to make people more sensitive to cultural values, that is, both one's own and others, then this study will be anthropological both on the level of policy making, and therapy and counselling.

Dating in the North American context is not a topic

which has been covered in great detail by anthropologists. Margaret Mead (1968; original version 1949) is one of the few who did attempt to analyze dating by drawing on both anthropological literature and a meta-analysis of our society in order to explain why we do what we do. Although published nearly 50 years ago, some of Mead's ideas point to relevant issues for today's society.

Comparing societies such as Bali and Samoa with North America, Mead (1968) argued that children in Bali and Samoa are taught to see their bodies as the bodies of future women and men, while American children are raised to focus on becoming assertive and aggressive, not sexual beings (273-277). The parental focus in North America is on achievement, education and success. When their children start dating in adolescence, it is the first time they engage as members of their sex. Since up to this point their focus has been on assertiveness and aggressiveness, dating is seen as a game where competition, popularity and status all coincide and therefor sex is used as a competitive tool to get what one wants. This is not the case in Bali and Samoa where sex is viewed as a natural part of being an adult woman or man.

Another interesting point Mead brings up is that a date was not about a person, but a situation. In her words,

the boy who longs for a date is not longing for a girl. He is longing to be in a situation, mainly public, where he will be seen by others to have a girl, and the right kind of girl, who dresses well and pays attention

(1968:276).

She is describing what we today refer to as casual dating. The present study found that the most common, current definition of dating is to "go out and have fun together", to share something with a person of the opposite sex. English Canadians in particular, tend to define dating this way, and are not very likely to include other elements such as sex, romance or commitment. In other words, dating as it was practiced in the 1930s and 1940s has survived in the English Canadian population to a greater extent than it has in the others. And judging by the data from the recent immigrant, refugee and foreign student men, this is also the form of dating they have adopted and now practice.

Dating is what we do in the period between the onset of sexual maturity and marriage. This period is particularly long in our society, and continues to grow, pushing the age of marriage ever further up. Dating is therefore an important activity in our society and has for many become an end in of itself, and not just a part of the courtship process. This is not to deny that dating is the vehicle through which North Americans as members of a consumer society, find a person for a potential relationship. A date gives one the information needed to choose potential mates.

Not all forms of dating are equally practiced in Canada. This study found that members of different ethnic

groups engage in inter-ethnic dating, for example, to different extents. French Canadians are noteworthy in that they are consistently the least likely to engage in inter-ethnic dating relationships regardless of whether they are women or men, university or college students, young or old, or whether they had one or many dating partners. English Canadians may be more open to inter-ethnic dating than French Canadians, but they do not have high rates of such affiliations either. It is the members of Patriarchal cultures especially, and also to some extent, members of Other cultures who are the most active in inter-ethnic dating.

The most common form of inter-ethnic dating is casual, while overall, most dating is serious. This may reflect a willingness on Canadian university and college students' part to explore culturally different people, but mainly on the casual level. Relationships are more likely to become serious when one is dating someone from one's own background. This is true for members of Other cultures and Europeans to a lesser extent as they have high levels of inter-ethnic partners at all stages of the dating continuum.

The differences along ethnic lines do not follow the patterns established by the inter-ethnic marriage literature where individuals from smaller ethnic groups tend to practice endogamy to a greater extent than large groups. Marriage between ethnic groups appears to occur more often

between larger groups than smaller ones. What the current results show is that dating and marrying are not the same; choosing a spouse and choosing a date are two different phenomena, operating according to a different internal logic. It is kind of like saying "I'll date you, but I won't marry you".

When comparing English and French Canadians only, in order to establish whether the lack of inter-ethnic dating is related to a lack of potential dating partners from other ethnic groups, their rates of inter-ethnic dating were similar except in the Language crossover areas where French Canadians's rates were lower. French Canadian women especially, refrain from dating people from other backgrounds than themselves, even when they live in an area where the majority is not French speaking. In other words, there is a lack of interest on the part of French Canadians to get involved with people of other ethnic groups, this in spite of French Canadians theoretically being more open to such liaisons (Lambert and Curtis 1984). French Canadians preference for dating partners of their own kind may be related to a sense of ensuring the group's survival, just as smaller ethnic groups practice endogamy to stay alive culturally.

When comparing inter-ethnic dating at the colleges and universities, ethnicity plays a greater role at the colleges when it comes to casual dating. College students choice to

date inter-ethnically or not is more closely related to their own ethnicity. Higher education and greater likelihood to date people of other ethnic backgrounds is only true for French Canadians and people from Patriarchal cultures. This supports the literature on inter-ethnic marriage which finds people with higher education and economic status as well as higher age more likely to marry inter-ethnically independent of their ethnicity. Age also plays a role in whether one has dated inter-ethnically; older individuals are generally more likely to do so than those who are younger.

The more dating partners one has over a period of 12 months, the greater the chance for some of these be inter-ethnic. An exception here is the number of serious dating partners for men where the proportion of intra/inter-ethnic dates stays the same.

Recent immigrants, refugees and foreign students all engage in more inter-ethnic relationships than do the other respondents, especially when it comes to cohabitation and engagement. This is in contrast to the overall tendency of inter-ethnic dating to be casual. For the more casual forms of dating, men date to a greater extent than do women, while inter-ethnic serious dating is not something that these individuals do to any greater extent than the other respondents.

Judging by the prevalence of casual inter-ethnic dating

by these men, they have adopted the practice, and they like it, seeing it as an opportunity to meet women. Why women do not date to the same extent may be explained by their origins; many are from Patriarchal cultures which often encourage men, but not women, to get involved in casual heterosexual encounters (of which dating is an example). Such interactions may be seen by women as damaging to their reputation and honour. Also, there may not be as many available partners from their own ethnic group, or perhaps casual dating is not an acceptable activity in that culture, or simply because it is not a form of social activity which is a part of that culture's repertoire. It is interesting to note that members of Patriarchal cultures already established in Canada are the most likely of all ethnic groups to engage in serious dating relationships.

Since serious dating is not something that this group of students engage in, but cohabitation and engagement are, they date to experiment, or the relationships quickly develop into cohabitation, engagement, or even marriage. These relationships are again, also more likely to be inter-ethnic. Perhaps serious dating makes little sense to these individuals since serious may mean that you either live with your partner, or you are engaged to be married. Serious dating is not a stage on the dating continuum for many of these individuals. This raises the possibility that serious dating is a unique, North American event, and where dating

is truly different from the heterosexual social behaviours of other societies.

Women and men generally define dating differently, except when it comes to romance; there the differences dissipate. Women tend to mention commitment more often than men, and men sex more often than women⁴⁶. This goes right back to the gendered view of what women and men find important in a relationship; women look for commitment and a stable relationship, men seek short-term, interactions for sexual gratification. Relationships are important to women and men for different reasons.

Just as men and women differ in their perceptions of what dating is about, so do members of different ethnic groups differ regardless of their gender or age (the only exception being for men in the older group; ethnicity plays no role in whether commitment is included or not in their definition of dating). The largest difference between ethnic groups is concerning sexuality.

French Canadians are the least likely to include commitment in their definitions, but if they do mention it, they are the most likely to establish it positively (i.e. dating is about commitment). But more French Canadians than any other group will mention sex and romance as parts of the

⁴⁶ Sharing is also a concept that both women and men relate to, but due to the low number of cases in some of the cells, it is not possible to establish whether there are differences that are statistically significant.

dating scene, and also mention them positively. French Canadian response patterns are consistently different from the rest. Interestingly, English Canadians often see dating in very opposite terms. They are generally the least likely to mention sexuality and romance as well as the least likely to mention them affirmatively. Commitment they do often mention, but more as a possibility than as an affirmation. People from Patriarchal cultures generally also mention sexuality and romance less. The responses of the Europeans and the Others are generally found between these. It seems then, that the inter-ethnic relationships wrought with potentially the most misunderstandings and misreading of cues occur between a French Canadian and an English Canadian.

Thus, English Canadians may have greater agreement on what dating is all about (it is above all, sharing, and thus is similar to Mead (1968) and Waller's (1937) descriptions) than French Canadians who tend to see dating as more complex and involving greater intimacy.

The frequency of casual dating partners vary according to ethnicity for women, but not for men. While there are more French Canadian women and women from Patriarchal cultures who have one or two dating partners in a year, more English Canadian and to some extent, European women report more than five. Perhaps English Canadian women have a

greater number of casual dates because they tend to define dating as sharing something and less as commitment, sexuality and romance, and therefore may include more interactions with men than, say French Canadian women, would do. But it makes little difference whether individuals had one or more than five dating partners in a year on the way they perceive dating. This is true for all groups and genders except for men who see dating as a forum for sexual contact, especially if they date three or four different women in a year. Three-four dating partners in a year may relate to increased opportunities for sex, dating may well be their motivation for sex. Perhaps with this number of dating partners, men go out with each just often enough to have sexual contact, or, at least, to think of the possibility of it. Those with five or more dating partners, on the other hand, may only see each once or a couple of times, thus never making sex an issue. This five or more group is, in fact, the least likely to mention sexuality as an element in dating. The category of three to four dating partners will be mentioned again below in the context of experiencing and admitting to woman abuse where it again becomes significant.

When it comes to the number of serious dates, men have more of them than women, but there are no differences according to ethnicity for either. Correlating the number of serious dating partners with dating definitions, it was

found that women with the most serious dating partners in a year, mention commitment less often than the others, and this is consistent with common sense. If one sees commitment as a condition of serious dating, one would be expected to have less dating partners in a year. This is not the case for men, however. Both women and men who have more serious dates mention sex more often than those who have less. Also, romanticism is a greater concern for men who have plural serious dates in a year than it is for women. These may perceive themselves as charming Casanovas or Don Juans; there certainly are role models in our culture for this kind of man.

This study has also found that woman abuse in dating relationships is extensive. With respect to violence against women in inter-ethnic relationships, women who date inter-ethnically at the more casual levels are at greater risk for all forms of violence compared to others. This pattern is also evident for men; men who date inter-ethnically at the more casual levels admit to more sexual and psychological violence than the other men. Physical abuse is only related to men who cohabit inter-ethnically, and they admit to more. Generally, with more serious relationships, there are no differences according to ethnic status of a relationship.

These findings point to some interesting processes.

Attempts to explain male violence have found that men tend to read behaviours in more sexual terms than women (Abbey 1982, 1987, Muehlenhard et al. 1985, Muehlenhard 1988); this also varies according to ethnicity as more men from some ethnic groups see women's behaviours as sexually suggestive than others (DeSouza et al. 1992). However, it has been argued that these misreadings of cues are only related to the earlier stages of a dating relationship (Shotland 1989, 1992). Based on these hypotheses, one would expect that cultural dimensions of inter-ethnic relationships would create situations supporting violence, particularly in casual dating contexts. These data point to this. There is comparatively more violence in inter-ethnic relationships at the casual levels than there is in the more serious ones. For cohabitation and engagement, the ethnicity of the partner ceases to be important. Feminist theory would explain this as a function of patriarchy in intimate relationships, where men abuse women as an expression of the power imbalance between them, and also to maintain them. We know that the more serious a relationship is, the greater the chance for violence.

Interestingly though, women with only one casual or serious dating partner do not differ with respect to violence, regardless of the relationship being inter-ethnic or not. Thus, violence is not directly related to different ethnic identities in a relationship, but appears to be a

function of some other combination of interactions. Women who have more than one dating partner (which include at least one from another ethnic background) and who date casually, experience violence, but those with only one dating partner do not, regardless of the ethnic status of the dating partner. Perhaps with increased dating partners, the possibility of misunderstanding and wrongful reading of cues also increases, leading to a greater potential for violence.

Generally speaking, women from some ethnic groups experience more abuse than others. This is true for both college and university students, and for young women. With age these differences disappear. If one takes into account the number of casual dating partners (but not for sexual abuse if one has three or four dating partners), and to some extent, serious dating partners for psychological abuse, the differences between ethnic groups disappear as well. The general trend is that the greater number of casual and serious dating partners one has, the greater the chance of being abused. This is especially true for sexual abuse where more than half of those with five or more dates have experienced sexual assault. This may reflect what Shotland (1992) describes; women who are known to be very active on the dating scene may be perceived by men as easy and willing to engage in sexual contact, and consequently men may ignore

her saying no. The misunderstanding theory can also explain why these women are assaulted to a greater extent; men perceive the world in more sexual terms than do women.

French Canadian women experience the least amount of sexual abuse of all the ethnic groups and also generally experience less physical abuse compared to others. However, when it comes to psychological abuse, they experience more, especially if they have patriarchal beliefs and attitudes. English Canadian women generally experience more physical and psychological violence than any of the others, while Other university women have the greatest incidence of sexual assaults. Other women enrolled in colleges on the other hand, have the highest experience of all forms of abuse.

Consistent with French Canadian women's experience of violence are the responses by French Canadian men; they are the least likely to sexually assault a dating partner. Other men generally admit to more sexual abuse than any of the other men. Young men from Patriarchal cultures admit to the greatest amount of physical abuse.

It is interesting that the category of three or four casual dating partners carries with it higher levels of sexual abuse for both women and men. For one thing, there are more Other and English Canadian women and Other men in this category, and these also have the greatest experience of abuse, received and delivered. But it may also be related to what was described previously; three-four dating

partners a year may be just enough to get close to them, close enough for men to develop desires for sexual contact, but not enough and too soon for women to engage in sexual contact.

If a woman has feminist beliefs, there are differences according to ethnicity in the experience of abuse, but not if one has patriarchal beliefs (the only exception is for psychological abuse where this is reversed, i.e. ethnic differences are maintained for women who have patriarchal beliefs). Beliefs, as we remember, are issues concerning gender roles. Patriarchal attitudes are also important as the ethnic differences have disappeared for physical abuse and psychological abuse for feminist attitudes. But ethnic differences have been maintained for sexual abuse, regardless of their attitudes. Attitudes as operationalized in this study are whether or not the respondents would approve of a man slapping his dating partner under certain conditions. Thus, not all feminists have the same experiences, but neither do those with patriarchal beliefs and attitudes. As has been proposed by Smith (1990), the actual beliefs and attitudes may be less important in predicting violence than the existence of a difference in these by the woman and man involved in a relationship.

There are more differences according to ethnicity for women than there are for men when it comes to the abuse questions. In other words, men are more alike as a group

than women. This is interesting in light of research on the meaning of ethnic identity. Mackie and Brinkerhoff's (1984:126) research employing university students from the University of Calgary, for example, showed that ethnicity was more important to women than to men, to working class respondents than middle class respondents, and to those born outside North America than to those born inside North America. While we cannot automatically draw the conclusion that the women respondents in this study consider ethnicity more important than the male respondents, there are nevertheless, more differences according to ethnicity for women than men. It was also found that French Canadian women, at least, are less likely to date inter-ethnically than French Canadian men. Women seem to live closer to a cultural code of behaviour than men. As was previously demonstrated, ethnic differences at the colleges with respect to inter-ethnic dating were more pronounced than at the universities, thus also lending support to Mackie and Brinkerhoff's (1984) work. Their final point cannot be verified here, although it seems that French Canadians may be an exception to their statement of ethnicity being more important to those born outside of North America.

Women's experience of abuse and their perception of dating are not related except in one instance. Women who have been physically abused will mention commitment to a

greater extent than those who have not been physically abused. This may be related to women's commitment to a relationship independent of the situation. A man's physical violence may be perceived as a sign of the love he feels for her, and her commitment is important to make the relationship survive. One just has to wait it out. Also, if the couple already has had sexual contact, since sex is often associated with love, the notion of commitment may be more important than the fact of physical abuse. If we can say that commitment (and also perhaps, physical violence) is romanticized by these women, then this study lends support to previous research which has found romanticism to minimize violence by attributing the violence to external factors and not to a flaw in the relationship (Henton et al. 1983, Makepeace 1983) and allowing the partners to believe that violence can be conquered by love and will disappear over time (Lloyd 1991:16, Miller and Simpson 1991).

For men, interestingly enough, there are more connections between abuse of a dating partner and how dating is defined. Men who have sexually and psychologically abused women are more likely to mention sex as a part of dating than men who have not abused. Also, men who have physically abused women will mention romance to a greater extent, while those who have been psychologically abusive will mention romanticism less than those who have not. Romanticism for men then, is an important concept especially

for those who are violent. It is interesting that psychological abuse is inversely related to romantic views of a dating relationship.

The power of the methods used in this study lies in not labelling, a priori, the acts as abuse. For example, we know that there are both social and legal definitions of rape. Koss and Oros (1982) found that women who have been forced into intercourse by a dating partner do not perceive themselves as rape victims. Nor do offenders define themselves as rapists (Rapaport and Burkhart 1984). The more intimate a couple is, the less serious the rape is judged, and the less likely the incident is to be defined as 'rape' (Burkhart and Stanton 1988). Koss (1989) has called these rapes 'hidden rapes' because they are not perceived as such. For this reason, the term "rape" was not used in the National survey to allow for the true number of sexually coercive events to be reported. As Burkhart and Stanton remark, "...for most people, the phrase 'acquaintance rape' is an oxymoron" (1988:44). An example of how subjective 'rape' is, was nicely demonstrated by respondents of our pretest who asked why we did not ask any questions about rape! Objectifying oneself and one's experiences is hard because it entails seeing oneself and one's experiences in a light that may make one feel very uncomfortable. It may also place the individual in the position of needing to act

once an event is viewed in a particular light. One benefit of current research on dating violence has been to provide cultural recognition that violence occurs in many forms and in many different contexts.

This thesis poses perhaps more questions than it answers. There are a number of areas where more research is needed in order to get a clearer picture of the intersections between ethnicity, dating and woman abuse in dating relationships among Canadian college and university students. New directions for research stemming from this study may include work on serious dating and its place in North American culture among established ethnic groups. Serious inter-ethnic dating, for example, is conspicuously infrequent among the dating activities of those recently arrived in Canada. It would be interesting to solicit definitions of serious dating by both of these groups in order to establish similarities and differences in their views. Knowing why serious dating is practiced by some, but not others may be helpful in furthering theoretical construction of dating as a time and context specific activity. Another aspect of dating that would be well served to be studied more closely is the role relationships play in women's lives and their aspirations for the future. There are some indications that "the relationship" has taken on greater importance for women in the 1990s.

The area of inter-ethnic dating also merits more research. More specifically, the relationship between inter-ethnic dating and violence needs to be explored in greater depth. For example, at what point does the ethnicity of a dating partner play a role in higher incidences of violence? All that is known at this point is that having more than one dating partner of which at least one is of another ethnic background, produces higher rates of women abuse. Furthermore, the context of violence should also be probed in order to verify that it is indeed the ethnic difference that produce the different abuse rates and not other factors.

Finally, it would also be interesting to compare the two more serious forms of dating to verify if in fact woman abuse takes place for the same reasons in both intra and inter-ethnic relationships. As indicated by the present study, there were no differences in the actual rates between the two, and it was concluded that here, abuse is related to male-female power issues and not to differing ethnicities.

Acquiring couple data is crucial in order to further the knowledge of some of the issues already discussed, but also others. First of all, the ethnicity of those who date inter-ethnically and of those they date, need to be specified to get a clearer understanding of what groups date whom. According to the marriage literature, even when someone marries outside their ethnic groups, they are often

religiously endogamous (Jansen 1982:226, Richard 1991a:124). These researchers explain this by claiming that religious differences are greater than ethnic differences, thus making it more difficult to cross religious boundaries. It would be interesting to test this with respect to dating relationships.

Moreover, couple data is invaluable in probing and testing the importance of whether women and men's differences in patriarchal beliefs and attitudes are more closely related to woman abuse in dating relationships than just simply holding such beliefs and attitudes. In married couples, it is often the difference in such beliefs and attitudes which produces woman abuse (Smith 1990).

From a methodological point of view, the collapsing of categories in order to produce sufficient number of cases for statistical tests sometimes removes the inherent meaning of a phenomenon. For example, some of the categories of ethnicity employed in this project are too inclusive to inform us about specific ethnic groups' experience of violence. Specific information relating to specific groups of people is needed if it is to be valuable to front-line workers of abuse victims and for the provision of culturally sensitive services. For example, combined Other women at colleges are the most likely of all to experience all forms of dating violence. But whether Caribbean and Native women (both included in the collapsed category of Other) have the

same rates or the same experience of violence, cannot be determined.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbey, A
1982 Sex Differences in Attributions for Friendly Behaviour: Do Males Misperceive Females' Friendliness ? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, vol. 42, No.5, pp.830-838.
- 1987 Misperceptions of Friendly Behaviour as Sexual Interest: A Survey of Naturally Occurring Incidents. Psychology of Women Quarterly, vol.11, pp.173-194
- Aldridge, D P
1978 Interracial Marriages. Empirical and Theoretical Considerations. Journal of Black Studies, Vol.8, no.3, March, pp.355-368.
- Allen, B P
1976 Race and Physical Attractiveness as Criteria for White Subjects' Dating Choices. Social Behaviour and Personality, Vol.4, No.2, pp.289-96.
- Anonymous
1992 Survivor's Viewpoint. Dating Violence: Not an Isolated Phenomenon. Vis-à-Vis, Vol.9, No.4, pp.8-9.
- Arias, I S M and O'Leary, K D
1987 Prevalence and Correlates of Physical Aggression During Courtship. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, Vol.2, pp.82-90.
- Bailey, B L
1989 From Front Porch to Back Seat. Courtship in Twentieth-Century America. The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Maryland.
- Barnes, G E, Greenwood, L and Sommer, R
1991 Courtship Violence in a Canadian Sample of Male College Students. Family Relations, 40, pp.37-44.
- Bernard, J L, Bernard, S L and Bernard, M L
1985 Courtship Violence and Sex-Typing. Family Relations, 34, pp.573-576.
- Bernard, M and Bernard J
1983 Violent Intimacy: The Family as a Model for Love Relationships. Family Relations Vol.32, pp.283-86.

- Billingham, R E
1987 Courtship Violence: The Patterns of Conflict Resolution Strategies Across Seven Levels of Emotional Commitment. Family Relations, 36, pp.283-289.
- Billingham, R E and Sack, A R
1987 Conflict Tactics and the Level of Emotional Commitment Among Unmarrieds. Human Relations, Vol.40, No.1, pp.59-74.
- Burkhart, B R and Stanton, A L
1988 Sexual Aggression in Acquaintance Relationships. in G W Russell (ed.) Violence in Intimate Relationships. PMA Publishing Corporation, New York, pp.43-65.
- Byers, E S and Lewis, K
1988 Dating Couples' Disagreements over the Desired Level of Sexual Intimacy. Journal of Sex Research, Vol.24, pp.15-29.
- Canadian Panel on Violence against Women
1993 Changing the Landscape. Ending Violence - Achieving Equality. Final Report, Minister of Supply and Services, Canada.
- Carlson, B E
1987 Dating Violence: A Research Review and Comparison with Spouse Abuse. Social Casework: The Journal of Contemporary Social Work, vol.68, january, pp.16-23.
- Cate, R M, Henton, J M, Koval, J, Cristopher, F S and Lloyd, S
1982 Premarital Abuse. A Social Psychological Perspective. Journal of Family Issues, Vol.3, No.1, pp.79-90.
- Chidley
1995 Is Dating Dead? Maclean's, Feb.20, pp.38-41.
- DeKeseredy, W S
1988 Woman Abuse in Dating Relationships. The Role of Male Peer Support. Canadian Scholars' Press Inc., Toronto, 1990.
- DeKeseredy, W S and Hinch, R
1991 Woman Abuse. Sociological Perspectives. Thompson Educational Publishing, Inc., Toronto.

- DeKeseredy, W S and Kelly, K
 1993a The Incidence and Prevalence of Woman Abuse in Canadian University and College Dating Relationships: Preliminary Results from a National Survey. Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Carleton University, Ottawa; a report prepared for Health and Welfare Canada's Family Violence Prevention Division.
- 1993b Women's Fear of Crime and Abuse in College and University Dating Relationships. Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Carleton University, Ottawa; a report prepared for Health and Welfare Canada's Family Violence Prevention Division.
- 1993c Woman Abuse in University and College Dating Relationships: The Contribution of the Ideology of Familial Patriarchy. Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Carleton University, Ottawa; a report prepared for Health and Welfare Canada's Family Violence Prevention Division.
- 1991 National Study on Woman Abuse in Dating Relationships in Canada. Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Carleton University, Ottawa (PROPOSAL).
- DeKeseredy, W S , Kelly, K and B Baklid
 1992 The Physical, Sexual, and Psychological Abuse of Women in Dating Relationships: Results from a Pretest for a National Study. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, New Orleans.
- DeKeseredy, W S, Schwartz, M D and Tait, K
 1993 Sexual Assault on a Canadian University Campus: An Exploratory Research Note. Sex Roles, Vol.28, Nos.5-6, pp.263-77.
- Demaris, A
 1990 The Dynamics of Generational Transfer in Courtship Violence: A Biracial Exploration. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52:219-231.
- DeSouza, E R, Pierce, T, Zanelli, J C and Hutz, C
 1992 Perceived Sexual Intent in the U.S. and Brazil as a Function of Nature of Encounter, Subjects' Nationality, and Gender. The Journal of Sex Research, Vol.29, No.2, May, pp.251-260.

- Dickinson, G E
1975 Dating Behaviour of Black and White Adolescents Before and After Desegregation. Journal of Marriage and the Family, august, pp.602-607.
- Dobash, R E and Dobash, R P
1992 The Myth of Sexual Symmetry in Marital Violence. Social Problems, Vol.39, No.1, pp.71-93.
- 1979 Violence Against Wives. Free Press, New York.
- Driedger, L, Thacker, C and Currie, R
1982 Ethnic Identification: Variations in Regional and National Preferences. Canadian Ethnic Studies, Vol.14, No.3, pp.57-68.
- Lull, R T and Giacomassi, D J
1987 Demographic Correlates of Sexual and Dating Attitudes. A Study of Date Rape. Criminal Justice and Behaviour, Vol.14, No.2, June, pp.175-193.
- Dutton, D G and Hemphill, K J
1992 Patterns of Socially Desirable Responding Among Perpetrators and Victims of Wife Assault. Violence and Victims, Vol.7, pp.29-40.
- Elliot, S, Odynak, D and Krahn, H
1992 A Survey of Unwanted Sexual Experiences Among University of Alberta Students. Research Report prepared for the Council on Student life, University of Alberta: Population Research Laboratory.
- Elliott, J L and Fleras, A
1992 Unequal Relations. An Introduction to Race and Ethnic Dynamics in Canada. Prentice Hall Canada Inc., Scarborough, Ont.
- Evans, P
1993 Verbal Abuse. Survivors Speak Out on Relationship and Recovery. Bob Adams, Inc., Holbrook, Massachusetts.
- Ferraro, K J
1990 Review Essay: Culture, Feminism, and Male Violence. Social Justice, Vol.17, No.3, pp.70-84.
- Finkelman, L
1992 Report of the Survey of Unwanted Sexual Experiences Among Students of U.N.B.-F. and S.T.U. University of New Brunswick: Counselling Services.

- Fisher, G J
1987 Hispanic and Majority Student Attitudes Towards Forcible Rape as a Function of Differences in Attitudes Toward Women. Sex Roles, Vol.17, Nos.1/2, pp.93-101
- Flynn, C P
1990 Sex Roles and Women's Response to Courtship Violence. Journal of Family Violence, Vol.5, No.1, pp.83-94
- Follingstad, D R, Rutledge, L L, Polesk, D S and McNeill-Hawkins
1988 Factors Associated with Patterns of Dating Violence Towards College Women. Journal of Family Violence, Vol.3, No.3, pp.169-182.
- Gagné, M H and Lavoie, F
1993 La Violence Physique et Affective dans les Fréquentations Chez un Groupe d'Adolescent(e)s. Les Cahiers de Recherche de l'Ecole de Psychologie (1993-147), Université Laval, Québec, P.Q.
- Gagné, M H, F, Lavoie and Hébert, M
1993 La Violence Sexuelle dans les Frequentations Chez un Groupe d'Adolescent(e)s. Unpublished paper, Université Laval, Québec, P.Q.
- Giacopassi, D J and Dull, R T
1986 Gender and Racial Differences in the Acceptance of Rape Myths Within a College Population. Sex Roles, Vol.15, Nos.1/2, pp.63-75.
- Gorden, Linda
1988 Heroes of Their Own Lives. The Politics and History of Family Violence, Viking Penguin Inc., New York.
- Gordon Michael
1981 Was Waller ever right? The Rating and Dating Complex Reconsidered. Journal of Marriage and the Family, Vol.69, February, No.3.
- Hanmer, J and Maynard, M
1987 Women, Violence and Social Control. Humanities Press international, Atlantic Highlands, New Jersey. Reprinted with corrections 1990.

- 1987b Introduction: Violence and Gender Stratification. in eds. Hanmer and Maynard: Women, Violence and Social Control. Humanities Press international, Atlantic Highlands, New Jersey. Reprinted with corrections 1990.
- Health and Welfare Canada
1990 Dating Violence. The National Clearinghouse on Family Violence.
- Heaton, T B
1990 Religious Group Characteristics, Endogamy, and Interfaith Marriages. Sociological Analysis, Vol.51, No.4, pp.363-376.
- Hendrick, C
1989 Close Relationships. Review of Personality and Social Psychology. Sage Publications, Newbury Park, Cal.
- Henton, J, Cate, R, Koval, J, Lloyd, S and Christopher, S
1983 Romance and Violence in Dating Relationships. Journal of Family Issues, Vol.4, No.3, September, pp.467-482.
- heyn, d
1986 Dating is Hell. Will going out ever get better? Mademoiselle, November, pp.176-177, 246.
- Hobart, C
1990 Marriage and Remarriage as Intermarriage. International Journal of Sociology of the Family, Vol.20, Spring, pp.31-45.
- Howell, S and Melhuus, M
1993 The Study of Kinship; the Study of Person; a Study of Gender? in del Valle (ed.) Gendered Anthropology. Routledge, London, pp.38-53.
- Jansen, C
1982 Inter-Ethnic Marriages. International Journal of Comparative Sociology, XXIII, Vol.3-4, pp.224-235.
- Johnson, B D
1992 Campus Confidential. MacLean's, Nov.9, pp.43-46.
- Johnson, R C and Ogasawara, G M
1988 Within-And Across-Group Dating in Hawaii. Social Biology, Vol.35, No.1-2, pp.101-109.

- Kanin, E J
1957 Male Aggression in Dating-Courting Relations.
American Journal of Sociology, Vol.63, pp.197-204
- Kennedy, L and Dutton D
1989 The Incidence of Wife Assault in Alberta. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, Vol.21, pp.40-54
- Koss, M P
1989 Hidden Rape: Sexual Aggression and Victimization in a National Sample of Students in Higher Education. in Pirog-Good and Stets (eds.) Violence in Dating Relationships. Emerging Social Issues. pp.145-168, Praeger Publishers, New York.
- Koss, M P and Gidycz, C A
1985 Sexual Experiences Survey: Reliability and Validity. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, Vol.53, No. 3, pp.422-23.
- Koss, M P, Gidycz, C A and Wisniewski, N
1987 The Scope of Rape: Incidence and Prevalence of Sexual Aggression and Victimization in a National Sample of Higher Education Students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, Vol.55, No.2, pp.162-170.
- Koss, M P and Oros, C J
1982 Sexual Experiences Survey: A Research Instrument Investigating Sexual Aggression and Victimization. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, Vol.50, pp.455-457.
- Kroecker, D
1992 A Study of Young Women's Experiences of Sexual Coercion and Sexual Assault by Acquaintances. Research paper for MSW requirement, Carleton University, Ottawa.
- Lambert, R D and Curtis, J E
1984 Québécois and English Canadian Opposition to Racial and Religious Intermarriage, 1968-1983. Canadian Ethnic Studies, XVI, no.2, pp.30-46.
- Lampe, P E
1982 Inter-ethnic Dating. Reasons For and Against. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, Vol.6, pp.115-126.
- 1981 Towards Amalgamation: Inter-ethnic Dating among Blacks, Mexican Americans and Anglos. Ethnic Groups, Vol.3, pp.97-109.

- Lane, K E and Gwartney-Gibbs, P A
1985 Violence in the Context of Dating and Sex. Journal of Family Issues, Vol.6, No.1, March, pp.45-59.
- Laner, M R
1983 Courtship Abuse and Aggression: Contextual Aspects. Sociological Spectrum, Vol.3, pp.69-83.
- Laner, M and Thompson, J
1982 Abuse and Aggression in Courting Couples. Deviant Behaviour Vol.3, pp.229-244.
- Larson, L E and Munro, B
1990 Religious Intermarriage in Canada in the 1980s. Journal of Comparative Family Studies, Vol.XXI, no.2, pp.239-250.
- Lavoie, F and Vézina, M
1992 La Violence lors des fréquentations des Jeunes: Données Préliminaires sur leurs Attitudes. in M Rinfret-Raynor and S Cantin (eds.) L'état de la Recherche Empirique fait au Québec dans la Domaine de la Violence Conjugale. Gaetan Morin, Montreal. P.Q
- Levine, E M and Kanin, E J
1987 Sexual Violence among Dates and Their Acquaintances: Trends and Their Implications for Marriage and the Family. Journal of Family Violence, Vol.2, No.1, pp.55-65.
- Levy, B
1991 Dating Violence. Young Women in Danger. The Seal Press, Seattle.
- Li, P S
1990 Race and Ethnic Relations in Canada. Oxford University Press, Canada.
- Lloyd, S A
1991 The Darkside of Courtship: Violence and Sexual Exploitation. Family Relations, 40, pp.14-20.
- Lupri E
1990 Male Violence in the Home. In C McKie and K Thompson (eds.) Canadian Social Trends. Thompson Educational Publishing, Toronto.
- Mackie, M and Brinkerhoff, M B
1984 Measuring Ethnic Salience. Canadian Ethnic Studies, XVI, 1, pp.114-131.

Makepeace, J M

1989 Dating, Living Together, and Courtship Violence. in Pirog-Good and Stets (eds.) Violence in Dating Relationships. Emerging Social Issues. pp.94-107, Praeger Publishers, New York.

1987 Social Factor and Victim-Offender Differences in Courtship Violence. Family Relations, 36, pp.87-91.

1986 Gender Differences in Courtship Violence Victimization. Family Relations, Vol.35, pp.383-388.

1983 Life Event Stress and Courtship Violence. Family Relations, 32, pp.101-109.

Malveaux, J

1992 The Ms. Survey Results. What you Said About Race. Ms. Vol.II, No.6, May/June, pp.24-30.

Markstrom-Adams, C

1991 Attitudes on Dating, Courtship, and Marriage: Perspectives on In-Group versus Out-Group Relationships be Religious Minority and Majority Adolescents. Family Relations, 40, pp.91-96.

McKie C and Thompson K

1990 Canadian Social Trends. Thompson Educational Publishing, Toronto.

Mead, M

1968 Male and Female. A Study of the Sexes in a Changing world. William Morrow and Company, Inc. U.S. (Original version 1949; Dell Publishing Co., Inc., New York).

Mercer, S L

1988 Not a Pretty Picture: An Exploratory Study of Violence Against Women in High School Dating Relationships. Education Wifeassault, Toronto.

Miller, S L and Simpson, S S

1991 Courtship Violence and Social Control: Does Gender Matter? Law and Society Review, Vol.25, No.2, pp.335-65.

Muehlenhard, C L

1988 Misinterpreted Dating Behaviours and the Risk of Date Rape. Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, Vol.6, No.1, pp.20-37.

- Muehlenhard, C L, Friedman, D E and Thomas, C M
1985 Is Date Rape Justifiable ? The Effects of Sating Activity, Who Initiated, Who paid, and Men's Attitudes Towards Women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 9 (3), pp.297-310.
- Nandi, P K
1980 The World of an Invisible Minority: Pakistanis in America. *California Sociologist*, Vol.3, No.2, Summer, pp.143-165.
- Okun, L
1986 Woman Abuse. Facts Replacing Myths. State University of New York Press, Albany.
- Pedersen, P and Thomas, C D
1992 Prevalence and Correlates of Dating Violence in a Canadian University Sample, *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 24:4, pp.490-501.
- Pirog-Good, M A and Stets, J E
1989 Violence in Dating Relationships. *Emerging Social Issues*. Praeger Publishers, New York.
- Pollard, J
1993 Male-Female Dating Relationships in Canadian Universities and Colleges: Sample Design, Arrangements for Data Collection and Data Reduction. Institute for Social Research, York University, Toronto.
- Princz, M
1991 Richmond Dating Violence Research Study. The Richmond Women's Resource Centre Association, Richmond, B.C.
- Prusank, D T, Duran, R L and DeLillo, D A
1993 Interpersonal Relationships in Women's Magazines: Dating and Relating in the 1970s and 1980s. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, Vol.10, pp.307-320.
- Rapaport, K and Burkhart, B R
1984 Personality and Attitudinal Characteristics of Sexually Coercive College Males. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, Vol.93, pp.216-221.
- Raymond, B and Bruschi, I G
1989 Psychological Abuse Among College Women in Dating Relationships. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, Vol.69, pp.1283-97.

- Richard, M A
1991a Ethnic Groups and Marital Choices. Ethnic History and Marital Assimilation in Canada, 1871 and 1971. UBC Press, Vancouver.
- 1991b Factors in the Marital Assimilation of Ethno-Religious Populations in Canada, 1871 and 1971. Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, Vol.28, No.1, pp.99-111.
- Risman, B J, Hill, C T, Rubin, Z and Peplau, L A
1981 Living Together in College: Implications for Courtship. Journal of Marriage and the Family, vol.42, Feb. pp.77-83.
- Robitaille, L and Lavoie, F
1992 Les Relations de Couples des Jeunes et de la Violence: Une Étude Exploratoire. Les Cahiers de Recherche de l'École de Psychologie, Université Laval, Montréal, P.Q.
- Rothman, E K
1984 Hands and Hearts. A History of Courtship in America. Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, New York.
- Rouse, L P , Breen, R and Howell, M
1988 Abuse in Intimate Relationships. A Comparison of Married and Dating College Students. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, Vol.3, No.4, December, pp.414-429.
- Russell, D W
1988 Violence in Intimate Relationships. PMA Publishing Corporation, New York.
- Sanday, P R
1990 Fraternity Gang Rape. Sex, Brotherhood, and Privilege on Campus. New York University Press, New York.
- Saunders D G
1988 Wife Abuse, Husband Abuse, or Mutual Combat? A Feminist Perspective on the Empirical Findings. in Yllo and Bograd (eds.) Feminist Perspectives on Wife Abuse, Sage Publications, Newbury Park, Cal., pp.90-113.
- 1986 When Battered Women Use Violence: Husband-Abuse or Self-Defense ? Violence and Victims, Vol.1, pp.47-60.

- Sigelman, C K, Berry, C J and Wiles, K A
1984 Violence in College Students' Dating Relationships. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, Vol.5, no.6, pp.530-548.
- Sigler, R T and Johnson, I M
1992 Forced Sexual Intercourse Among Intimates: Rape or Inappropriate Courtship. Paper presented at the American Society of Criminology, New Orleans, November, 1992.
- Shotland, R L
1992 A Theory of the Causes of Courtship Rape: Part 2. Journal of Social Issues, vol.48, No.1, pp.127-43.
- 1989 A Model of the Causes of Date Rape in Developing and Close Relationships. in C Hendrick (ed.) Close Relationships. Review of Personality and Social Psychology. Sage Publications, Newbury Park, Cal., pp247-270.
- Smith, M D
1993 Family Ideology and Wife Abuse. Unpublished manuscript. LaMarsh Research Programme on Violence and Conflict Resolution, York University, Ontario.
- 1990 Patriarchal Ideology and Wife Beating: A Test of a Feminist Hypothesis. Violence and Victims, Vol.5, No.4, pp.257-273.
- Statistics Canada
1994 The General Social Survey, Cycle 9: Education, Work and Retirement.
- Stets, J E
1992 Interactive Processes in Dating Aggression: A National Study. Journal of Marriage and the Family, Vol.54, Fall, pp.165-77.
- Stets, J E and Henderson, D A
1991 Contextual Factors Surrounding Conflict Resolution While Dating: Results From a National Study. Family Relations, 40, pp.29-36.
- Stets, J E and Pirog-Good, M A
1987 Violence in Dating Relationships. Social Psychology Quarterly, Vol.50, pp.237-246.

- Stets, J E and Straus, M A
1989 The Marriage License as a Hitting License: A Comparison of Assaults in Dating, Cohabiting, and Married Couples. Journal of Family Violence, Vol.4, No.2, pp.161-180.
- Stolcke, V
1993 Is Sex to Gender as Race is to Ethnicity? in del Valle (ed.) Gendered Anthropology. Routledge, London.
- Straus, M A
1980 Sexual Inequality and Wife-Beating. in eds. Straus and Hotaling, The Social Causes of Husband-Wife Violence. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, pp.86-93.
- 1979 Measuring Intrafamily Conflict and Violence: The Conflict Tactics (CT) Scales. Journal of Marriage and the Family, February, pp.75-86.
- Straus, M A, Gelles, R J and Steinmetz, S K
1980 Behind Closed Doors: Violence in the American Family. Anchor Press/Doubleday, Garden City, N.Y.
- Straus, M A and Hotaling, G T
1980 The Social Causes of Husband-Wife Violence. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- del Valle, T
1993 Gendered Anthropology. Routledge, London.
- Waller, W
1937 The Rating and Dating Complex. American Sociological Review Vol.2, pp.727-734.
- Ward, S K et al.
1994 Acquaintance and Date Rape; An Annotative Bibliography. Greenwood, Westport, Conn.
- Ward, S K, Chapman, K, Cohn, E, White, S and Williams, K
1991 Acquaintance Rape and the College Social Scene. Family Relations, 40, pp.65-71.
- Warshaw, R
1988 I Never Called it Rape. The Ms Report on Recognizing, Fighting and Surviving Date and Acquaintance Rape. Ms Foundation/Sarah Lavin Books, Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc., New York.

- Whyte, M K
1992 Choosing Mates - the American Way. Society,
 march/april, pp.71-77.
- Yllo, K and Straus, M
1981 Interpersonal Violence Among Married and
 Cohabiting Couples. Family Relations Vol.20,
 pp.339-345.
- Yoshihama M, Parekh, A L and Boyington, D
1991 Dating Violence in Asian/Pacific Communities. In B
 Levy (ed.) Dating Violence. Young Women in Danger.
 The Seal Press, Seattle.
- Zia, H
1992 The Ms. Survey Results. How you Feel About Race.
 Ms. Vol.II, No.6, May/June, pp.20-23.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: Female and Male Questionnaires

IF YOU HAVE NEVER BEEN INVOLVED IN A DATING RELATIONSHIP, PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 24.

- 16.** Sexual relations are common in dating relationships. The next questions are about your sexual experiences with dating partners and/or boyfriends. Below is a list of things that might have happened to you in the last 12 months and/or since you left high school. Please answer either YES or NO to both sections of each question. **IF YOU ARE OR HAVE BEEN MARRIED, PLEASE NOTE THESE QUESTIONS REFER ONLY TO DATING RELATIONSHIPS.**

	IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS		SINCE LEAVING HIGH SCHOOL (including the last 12 months)		
	YES	NO	YES	NO	
a. Have you given in to sex play (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) when you didn't want to because you were overwhelmed by a man's continual arguments and pressure?	1	2	1	2	☐ ☐
b. Have you engaged in sex play (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) when you didn't want to because a man used his position of authority (boss, professor, supervisor, etc.) to make you?	1	2	1	2	☐ ☐
c. Have you had sex play (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) when you didn't want to because a man threatened or used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) to make you?	1	2	1	2	☐ ☐
d. Has a man attempted sexual intercourse (getting on top of you, attempting to insert his penis) when you didn't want to by threatening or using some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.), but intercourse did not occur?	1	2	1	2	☐ ☐
e. Has a man attempted sexual intercourse (getting on top of you, attempting to insert his penis) when you didn't want to because you were drunk or high, but intercourse did not occur?	1	2	1	2	☐ ☐
f. Have you given in to sexual intercourse when you didn't want to because you were overwhelmed by a man's continual arguments and pressure?	1	2	1	2	☐ ☐

First we would like to ask some general questions about your dating patterns. Please circle the number which best represents your answer.

1. Have you been involved in a dating relationship with a male at any point in your life, no matter how short-term or casual, or long-term and serious? []

Yes 1
No 2

IF NO, PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 11. IF YOU ARE CURRENTLY MARRIED AND HAVE NOT DATED IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS, PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 10.

2. Just in the past 12 months alone, have you engaged in casual dating with men (i.e., a good time with no future commitment or obligation on the part of you and your dating partner)? []

Yes 1
No 2

- (i) If yes, please estimate how many different persons you have had such casual (not serious) dates with in the last 12 months? []

.....

3. Just in the past 12 months alone, have you had any serious dating relationships with men (i.e., involving a great deal of commitment and intimacy)? []

Yes 1
No 2

- (i) If yes, please estimate how many different persons you have had such serious (not casual) dates with in the last 12 months? []

.....

4. Just in the past 12 months alone, have you ever moved in with or lived regularly with a boyfriend? []

Yes 1
No 2

5. Just in the past 12 months alone, have you ever been engaged to a boyfriend? []

Yes 1
No 2

6. Just in the past 12 months alone, have you engaged in casual dating with men who do not share your ethnic background? []

Yes 1
No 2

7. Just in the past 12 months alone, have you had any serious dating relationships with men who do not share your ethnic background?

Yes 1

No 2

8. Just in the past 12 months alone, have you ever moved in with or lived regularly with a boyfriend who does not share your ethnic background?

Yes 1

No 2

9. Just in the past 12 months alone, have you ever been engaged to a boyfriend who does not share your ethnic background?

Yes 1

No 2

10. We have been asking about the past 12 months only. Since leaving or graduating from high school, however, have you had dating partners or boyfriends?

Yes 1

No 2

11. What does the term dating mean to you? Please answer in the space below.

12. Now, we would like to ask you some general background questions. This information will allow us to compare your responses to other Canadian students. Please circle **only one** number which best represents your answer. Where there are blanks, please write out the answer. Please note your responses will be kept completely confidential

a How old are you? _____

b What year did you leave or graduate from high school? _____

c Please list the courses (e.g., history, sociology) and course level (e.g., first year) you are taking this term.

d. What is your year of study?

- First year 1
 Second year 2
 Third year 3
 Fourth year 4
 Other (i.e., special student) 5

e. What year did you begin college/university? _____

f. What subject or program are you majoring in, or do you expect to major in? _____

g. Do you identify yourself as an Aboriginal (e.g., Metis, status/nonstatus Indian) person?

- Yes 1
 No 2

h. Which ethnic or cultural group do you identify with? Please circle the number which best represents your answer.

1 Central American (El Salvador, Honduras etc.)	8 S European (Italy, Spain, Portugal, Greece, etc.)
2 Scandinavian (Denmark, Sweden, Norway)	9 Far Eastern (Japan, China, India, Hong Kong, etc.)
3 French Canadian	10 African (specify if North Central, or South)
4 English Canadian	11 Caribbean
5 British (Scotland, Wales, England, N. Ireland)	12 Middle Eastern (Israel, Lebanon, Iran, Iraq, etc.)
6 W. European (France, Germany, Holland etc.)	13 Latin American
7 E. European (Russia, Poland, Baltic States, Hungary, etc.)	14 Other (please specify)

i. What is your marital status?

- Never married and not living with a male partner 1
 Married and living with your spouse 2
 Living with a male partner 3
 Separated and not living with a male partner 4
 Divorced and not living with a male partner 5
 Widowed and not living with a male partner 6

j. What country were you born in? _____

k. Are you a recent (i.e., within the last five years) immigrant to Canada?

- Yes 1
 No 2

l. Are you a refugee from another country?

- Yes 1
 No 2

Yes **1**

No **2**

IF YES PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 15.

No 2

No 2

Very Safe	Reasonably Safe	Neither Safe nor Unsafe	Somewhat Unsafe	Very Unsafe
1	2	3	4	5

9

9

☐

□

7

1

7

IF YOU HAVE NEVER BEEN INVOLVED IN A DATING RELATIONSHIP, PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 24.

16. Sexual relations are common in dating relationships. The next questions are about your sexual experiences with dating partners and/or boyfriends. Below is a list of things that might have happened to you in the last 12 months and/or since you left high school. Please answer either YES or NO to both sections of each question. **IF YOU ARE OR HAVE BEEN MARRIED, PLEASE NOTE THESE QUESTIONS REFER ONLY TO DATING RELATIONSHIPS.**

	IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS		SINCE LEAVING HIGH SCHOOL (including the last 12 months)		
	YES	NO	YES	NO	
a. Have you given in to sex play (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) when you didn't want to because you were overwhelmed by a man's continual arguments and pressure?12			1 2		☐ ☐
b. Have you engaged in sex play (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) when you didn't want to because a man used his position of authority (boss, professor, supervisor, etc.) to make you?12			1 2		☐ ☐
c. Have you had sex play (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) when you didn't want to because a man threatened or used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) to make you?12			1 2		☐ ☐
d. Has a man attempted sexual intercourse (getting on top of you, attempting to insert his penis) when you didn't want to by threatening or using some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.), but intercourse did not occur?12			1 2		☐ ☐
e. Has a man attempted sexual intercourse (getting on top of you, attempting to insert his penis) when you didn't want to because you were drunk or high, but intercourse did not occur?12			1 2		☐ ☐
f. Have you given in to sexual intercourse when you didn't want to because you were overwhelmed by a man's continual arguments and pressure?12			1 2		☐ ☐

	IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS		SINCE LEAVING HIGH SCHOOL (including the last 12 months)		
	YES	NO	YES	NO	
g	Have you had sexual intercourse when you didn't want to because a man used his position of authority (boss, professor, supervisor) to make you?1.....2		1.....2		☐ ☐
h	Have you had sexual intercourse when you didn't want to because you were drunk or high?1.....2		1.....2		☐ ☐
i	Have you had sexual intercourse when you didn't want to because a man threatened or used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) to make you?1.....2		1.....2		☐ ☐
j	Have you engaged in sex acts (anal or oral intercourse or penetration by objects other than the penis) when you didn't want to because a man threatened or used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) to make you?1.....2		1.....2		☐ ☐

17. We are particularly interested in learning more about your dating relationships. No matter how well a dating couple gets along, there are times when they disagree, get annoyed with the other person, or just have spats or fights because they're in a bad mood or tired or for some other reason. They also use many different ways to settle their differences. Below is a list of some things that you might have been done to you by your boyfriends and/or dating partners in these circumstances. Please circle the number which best represents your answer in each of the following situations. Please note the items are repeated twice. The first set is for the past twelve months, the second set covers all of your experiences since you left high school. **IF YOU ARE OR HAVE BEEN MARRIED, PLEASE NOTE THESE QUESTIONS REFER ONLY TO DATING RELATIONSHIPS.**

	IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS						
	Once	Twice	3-5 Times	6-10 Times	More than 10 Times	Never	
a	Insulted or swore at you1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6						☐
b	Put you down in front of friends or family ..1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6						☐
c	Accused you of having affairs or flirting with other men1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6						☐
d	Did or said something to spite you1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6						☐

IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS

	Once	Twice	3-5 Times	6-10 Times	More than 10 Times	Never	
e. Threatened to hit or or throw something at you	1	2	3	4	5	6	[]
f. Threw, smashed or kicked something	1	2	3	4	5	6	[]
g. Threw something at you	1	2	3	4	5	6	[]
h. Pushed, grabbed or shoved you	1	2	3	4	5	6	[]
i. Slapped you	1	2	3	4	5	6	[]
j. Kicked, bit, or hit you with his fist	1	2	3	4	5	6	[]
k. Hit or tried to hit you with something	1	2	3	4	5	6	[]
l. Beat you up	1	2	3	4	5	6	[]
m. Choked you	1	2	3	4	5	6	[]
n. Threatened you with a knife or a gun	1	2	3	4	5	6	[]
o. Used a knife or gun on you	1	2	3	4	5	6	[]

SINCE LEAVING HIGH SCHOOL (including the last 12 months)

	Once	Twice	3-5 Times	6-10 Times	More than 10 Times	Never	
a. Insulted or swore at you	1	2	3	4	5	6	[]
b. Put you down in front of friends or family	1	2	3	4	5	6	[]
c. Accused you of having affairs or flirting with other men	1	2	3	4	5	6	[]
d. Did or said something to spite you	1	2	3	4	5	6	[]
e. Threatened to hit or or throw something at you	1	2	3	4	5	6	[]
f. Threw, smashed or kicked something	1	2	3	4	5	6	[]
g. Threw something at you	1	2	3	4	5	6	[]
h. Pushed, grabbed or shoved you	1	2	3	4	5	6	[]
i. Slapped you	1	2	3	4	5	6	[]
j. Kicked, bit, or hit you with his fist	1	2	3	4	5	6	[]
k. Hit or tried to hit you with something	1	2	3	4	5	6	[]

SINCE LEAVING HIGH SCHOOL
(including the last 12 months)

	Once	Twice	3-5 Times	6-10 Times	More than 10 Times	Never
l Beat you up	1	2	3	4	5	6
m Choked you	1	2	3	4	5	6
n Threatened you with a knife or a gun	1	2	3	4	5	6
o Used a knife or gun on you	1	2	3	4	5	6

☐☐☐☐

18. We realize that it may be difficult to discuss some of your dating experiences, but if we may, we would like to ask you a few questions about the **most recent** incident in which you were physically, sexually or emotionally hurt by a boyfriend or dating partner. Please circle the letter or number which best represents your answer. **IF YOU HAVE NOT BEEN HURT BY A BOYFRIEND OR MALE DATING PARTNER, PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 19.**

- a Please indicate whether the last incident was:

☐

a) physical abuse	d) both a and b
b) sexual abuse	e) both a and c
c) emotional abuse	f) both b and c
	g) a, b and c

- b Did you ever turn to anyone for help?

☐

Yes 1

No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 19)

- c Did you turn to at least one friend for help?

☐

Yes 1

No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO ITEM d)

- (1) How satisfied were you with the help you received from this/these friend(s)?

☐

Very satisfied 1

Satisfied 2

Not satisfied 3

- d Did you turn to the police (not campus security) for help?

☐

Yes 1

No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO ITEM e)

(1) How satisfied were you with the help you received from the police?

☐

Very satisfied 1
Satisfied 2
Not satisfied 3

e. Did you turn to at least one family member for help?

☐

Yes 1
No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO ITEM f)

(1) How satisfied were you with the help you received from this/these family member(s)?

☐

Very satisfied 1
Satisfied 2
Not satisfied 3

f. Did you turn to a religious leader for help?

☐

Yes 1
No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO ITEM g)

(1) How satisfied were you with the help you received from this person?

☐

Very satisfied 1
Satisfied 2
Not satisfied 3

g. Did you turn to a medical professional for help (e.g., doctor, nurse, etc.) for help?

☐

Yes 1
No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO ITEM h)

(1) How satisfied were you with the help you received from the medical professional?

☐

Very satisfied 1
Satisfied 2
Not satisfied 3

h Did you turn to a campus counselling service for help?

Yes 1
No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO ITEM i)

(1) How satisfied were you with the help you received from the counselling service?

Very satisfied 1
Satisfied 2
Not satisfied 3

i Did you turn to a women's group or women's centre for help?

Yes 1
No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO ITEM j)

(1) How satisfied were you with the help you received from the women's group or women's centre?

Very Satisfied 1
Satisfied 2
Not satisfied 3

j Did you turn to campus security for help?

Yes 1
No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO ITEM k)

(1) How satisfied were you with the help you received from campus security?

Very satisfied 1
Satisfied 2
Not satisfied 3

k Did you turn to a crisis centre or crisis hot-line for help?

Yes 1
No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO ITEM l)

(1) How satisfied were you with the help you received from the crisis centre or crisis hot-line?

Very satisfied 1
Satisfied 2
Not satisfied 3

1. Did you turn to the campus administration for help?

Yes 1

No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO ITEM m)

(1) How satisfied were you with the help you received from the campus administration?

Very satisfied 1

Satisfied 2

Not satisfied 3

m Did you turn to anyone else for help? If so, please indicate below who you turned to.
IF NOT, PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 19.

.....

.....

.....

.....

19. Now, we would like to ask you some more questions about your dating relationships. Please indicate if YOU HAVE EVER used the following methods to settle disputes with your boyfriends and/or dates SINCE LEAVING HIGH SCHOOL (including the last 12 months). Please circle the number which best represents your answer. IF YOU ARE OR HAVE BEEN MARRIED, PLEASE NOTE THESE QUESTIONS REFER ONLY TO DATING RELATIONSHIPS.

	Once	Twice	3-5 Times	6-10 Times	More than 10 Times	Never
a. Threw something at him	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. Pushed, grabbed or shoved him	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. Slapped him	1	2	3	4	5	6

IF YOU ANSWERED NEVER TO ALL OF THE ABOVE THREE ITEMS, DO NOT ANSWER THE NEXT THREE QUESTIONS (i.e., On items a, b, and c). PLEASE GO TO THE SECTION THAT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWS THESE QUESTIONS. IT IS MARKED WITH AN ASTERIX (*).

On items a, b, and c, what percentage of these times overall do you estimate that in doing these actions you were primarily motivated by acting in self-defence, that is protecting yourself from immediate physical harm? Circle the number which best represents your answer

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

On items a, b, and c, what percentage of these times overall do you estimate that in doing these actions you were trying to fight back in a situation where you were not the first to use these or similar tactics? Circle the number which best represents your answer.

0% . . . 10% . . . 20% . . . 30% . . . 40% . . . 50% . . . 60% . . . 70% . . . 80% . . . 90% . . . 100%

☐

On items a, b, and c, what percentage of these times overall do you estimate that you used these actions on your boyfriends or dates before they actually attacked you or threatened to attack you? Circle the number which best represents your answer.

0% . . . 10% . . . 20% . . . 30% . . . 40% . . . 50% . . . 60% . . . 70% . . . 80% . . . 90% . . . 100%

☐

***Again, please indicate if YOU HAVE EVER used any of the following methods to settle disputes with your boyfriends or dates since you left high school. Please circle the number which best represents your answer.**

	Once	Twice	3-5 Times	6-10 Times	More than 10 Times	Never
d Kicked, bit, or hit him with your fist	1	2	3	4	5	6
e Hit or tried to hit him with something	1	2	3	4	5	6
f Beat him up	1	2	3	4	5	6
g Choked him	1	2	3	4	5	6
h Threatened him with a knife or a gun	1	2	3	4	5	6
i Used a knife or gun on him	1	2	3	4	5	6

☐☐☐☐☐☐

IF YOU ANSWERED NEVER TO ALL OF ITEMS d to i, GO TO QUESTION 20.

On items d to i, what percentage of these times overall do you estimate that in doing these actions you were primarily motivated by acting in self-defence, that is protecting yourself from immediate physical harm? Circle the number which best represents your answer

0% . . . 10% . . . 20% . . . 30% . . . 40% . . . 50% . . . 60% . . . 70% . . . 80% . . . 90% . . . 100%

☐

On items d to i what percentage of these times overall do you estimate that in doing these actions you were trying to fight back in a situation where you were not the first to use these or similar tactics? Circle the number which best represents your answer.

0% . . . 10% . . . 20% . . . 30% . . . 40% . . . 50% . . . 60% . . . 70% . . . 80% . . . 90% . . . 100%

☐

On items d to i, what percentage of these times overall do you estimate that you used these actions on your boyfriends or dates before they actually attacked you or threatened to attack you? Circle the number which best represents your answer

0% . . . 10% . . . 20% . . . 30% . . . 40% . . . 50% . . . 60% . . . 70% . . . 80% . . . 90% . . . 100%

☐

20. NOW WE WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU A FEW QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR **HIGH SCHOOL** (I.E., GRADES 9-13) **DATING RELATIONSHIPS**. PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER WHICH BEST REPRESENTS YOUR ANSWER.

a Did you date boys when you were in high school?

Yes 1

No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 21)

b In high school, did a male dating partner and/or boyfriend ever threaten to use physical force to make you engage in sexual activities?

Yes 1

No 2

c In high school, did a male dating partner and/or boyfriend ever use physical force in an attempt to make you engage in sexual activities, whether this attempt was successful or not?

Yes 1

No 2

d In high school, did a male dating partner and/or boyfriend ever intentionally emotionally hurt (i.e., insult, say something to spite you) you?

Yes 1

No 2

e In high school, did a male dating partner and/or boyfriend ever intentionally physically hurt you?

Yes 1

No 2

21. THE NEXT QUESTIONS ARE ABOUT YOUR **ELEMENTARY SCHOOL** (I.E., GRADES 1-8) **DATING RELATIONSHIPS**. PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER WHICH BEST REPRESENTS YOUR ANSWER.

a Did you date boys when you were in elementary school?

Yes 1

No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 22)

b In elementary school, did a male dating partner and/or boyfriend ever threaten to use physical force to make you engage in sexual activities?

Yes 1

No 2

5 of/de 5

PM-1 3½"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISION[®] RESOLUTION TARGETS

- c. In elementary school, did a male dating partner and/or boyfriend ever use physical force in an attempt to make you engage in sexual activities, whether this attempt was successful or not? ☐

Yes 1

No 2

- d. In elementary school, did a male dating partner and/or boyfriend ever intentionally emotionally hurt (i.e., insult, say something to spite you) you? ☐

Yes 1

No 2

- e. In elementary school, did a male dating partner and/or boyfriend ever intentionally physically hurt you? ☐

Yes 1

No 2

22. The next questions are about your use of alcohol and drugs in the last 12 months. Please circle the number which best represents your answer.

- a. Did you drink alcoholic beverages in the last 12 months? ☐

Yes 1

No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO ITEM D)

- b. If yes, how often on average did you drink alcoholic beverages in the last 12 months? ☐

Once a week 1

2-3 times a week 2

4-6 times a week 3

Every day 4

Once or twice a month 5

Don't know 6

- c. How often did you drink with your boyfriends and/or dating partners in the last 12 months? ☐

Never 1

Very seldom 2

Occasionally 3

Often 4

Very often 5

d. In the last 12 months, did you use recreational drugs (e.g., hash, marijuana, cocaine, speed, LSD, heroin)?

- Never 1
 Very seldom 2
 Occasionally 3
 Often 4
 Very often 5

e. How often have you used recreational drugs (e.g., hash, marijuana, cocaine, speed, LSD, heroin) with your boyfriends and/or dating partners in the last 12 months?

- Never 1
 Very Seldom 2
 Occasionally 3
 Often 4
 Very often 5

23. Thinking about your entire university and/or college career, have you ever been upset by dating partners and/or boyfriends trying to get you to do what they had seen in pornographic pictures, movies, or books? Please circle the number which best represents your answer.

- Yes 1
 No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 24)

(i) If you were upset, can you tell us what happened? Please provide this information in the space below

24. Have you EVER BEEN:

a) Raped and/or sexually assaulted by someone OTHER THAN A DATING PARTNER.

- Yes 1
 No 2

i) If yes, was this person a stranger?

- Yes 1
 No 2

b) Physically assaulted by someone **OTHER THAN A DATING PARTNER.**

Yes 1
No 2

i) If yes, was this person a stranger?

Yes 1
No 2

c) Sexually harassed by someone **OTHER THAN A DATING PARTNER.**

Yes 1
No 2

i) If yes, was this person a stranger?

Yes 1
No 2

25. The next questions are about *your beliefs*. For each of the following statements, please tell us if you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. Circle the number which best represents your answer.

- | | Strongly
Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly
Disagree | Don't
Know |
|--|-------------------|-------|----------|----------------------|---------------|
| a. A man and his wife/partner should have equal say in deciding how to spend the family income | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b. A man and his wife/partner should share the household chores if they are both working outside the home | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| c. A man has the right to decide whether or not his wife/partner should go out in the evening with her friends | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| d. A man has the right to decide whether or not his wife/partner should work outside the home | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| e. Sometimes it is important for a man to show his wife/partner that he is the head of the house | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| f. Any woman who is raped is at least partly to blame | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| g. A man has the right to have sex with his wife/partner when he wants, even though she may not want to | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| h. If a man hits his wife/partner, its because he's lost his temper and gone out of control | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

26. Now we would like to ask you a few questions about your attitudes for each of the following situations, please tell us if you would approve of a man slapping his dating partner or girlfriend. Would you approve if (circle the number which best represents your answers) . . .

	Yes	Depends	No	Don't Know	
a. . .she won't do what he tells her to do	1	2	3	4	☐
b. . .she insults him when they are home alone	1	2	3	4	☐
c. . .she insults him in public	1	2	3	4	☐
d. . .she comes home drunk	1	2	3	4	☐
e. . .she is sobbing hysterically	1	2	3	4	☐
f. . .she won't have sex with him	1	2	3	4	☐
g. . .he learns that she is dating another man	1	2	3	4	☐
h. . .she hits him first when they are having an argument	1	2	3	4	☐

27. We really appreciate the time you have taken to complete this survey. And we'd like to assure you that everything you have told us will remain strictly confidential.

We realize that the topics covered in this survey are sensitive and that many women are reluctant to talk about their dating experiences. But we're also a bit worried that we haven't asked the right questions.

So now that you have had a chance to think about the topics, have you had any (any other) experiences in which you were physically and/or sexually harmed by your dating partners and/or boyfriends while you attended college or university? Please provide this information in the space below.

☐

Male
Questionnaire

MALE-FEMALE DATING

RELATIONSHIPS

QUESTIONNAIRE

This is the first national Canadian survey on problems in male-female dating relationships. It is sponsored by Health and Welfare Canada, and is being conducted by Carleton University Professors Walter DeKeseredy and Katharine Kelly. Please read the instructions for each section carefully and answer each question as honestly as you can. Please note that any information you provide will be kept *completely confidential*. Participation in this study is *strictly voluntary*. We think that you will find this questionnaire interesting.

It will take different people different lengths of time to fill in the survey. Some will not take too long to complete it; others will take longer. But all of your answers are important to us, so take your time and be as honest as possible. When you have completed the questionnaire, a researcher will pick it up from you.

The results of this survey will be made widely available and hopefully used to improve relations between male and female dating partners. If you have any questions, please contact Walter DeKeseredy or Katharine Kelly at (613) 788-2582.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

IF YOU HAVE FILLED OUT THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IN ANOTHER CLASS, DO NOT COMPLETE THIS ONE. PLEASE RETURN IT IMMEDIATELY TO THE RESEARCHER.

First we would like to ask some general questions about your dating patterns. Please circle the number which best represents your answer.

1. Have you been involved in a dating relationship with a woman at any point in your life, no matter how short-term or casual, or long-term and serious? ☐

Yes 1

No 2

IF NO, PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 11. IF YOU ARE CURRENTLY MARRIED AND HAVE NOT DATED IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS, PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 10.

2. Just in the past 12 months alone, have you engaged in casual dating with women (e.g., a good time with no future commitment or obligation on the part of you and your dating partner)? ☐

Yes 1

No 2

- (i) If yes, please estimate how many different persons you have had such casual (not serious) dates with in the past 12 months? ☐

3. Just in the past 12 months alone, have you had any serious dating relationships with women (e.g., involving a great deal of commitment and intimacy)? ☐

Yes 1

No 2

- (i) If yes, please estimate how many different persons you have had such serious (not casual) dates with in the past 12 months? ☐

4. Just in the past 12 months alone, have you ever moved in with or lived regularly with a girlfriend? ☐

Yes 1

No 2

5. Just in the past 12 months alone, have you ever been engaged to a girlfriend? ☐

Yes 1

No 2

6. Just in the past 12 months alone, have you engaged in casual dating with women who do not share your ethnic background? ☐

Yes 1

No 2

7. Just in the past 12 months alone, have you had any serious dating relationships with women who do not share your ethnic background? ☐

Yes 1

No 2

8. Just in the past 12 months alone, have you ever moved in with or lived regularly with a girlfriend who does not share your ethnic background? ☐

Yes 1

No 2

9. Just in the past 12 months alone, have you ever been engaged to a girlfriend who does not share your ethnic background? ☐

Yes 1

No 2

10. We have been asking about the past 12 months only. Since leaving or graduating from high school, however, have you had dating partners or girlfriends? ☐

Yes 1

No 2

11. What does the term dating mean to you? Please answer in the space below. ☐

12. Now, we would like to ask you some general background questions. This information will allow us to compare your responses to other Canadian students. Please circle only one number which best represents your answer. Where there are blanks, please write out the answer. Please note that your responses will be kept completely confidential.

a. How old are you? _____ ☐

b. What year did you leave or graduate from high school _____ ☐

c. Please list the courses (e.g., history, sociology) and course level (e.g., first year) you are taking this term.

d. What is your year of study? 386

- First year 1
 Second year 2
 Third year 3
 Fourth year 4
 Other (i.e., special student) 5

e. What year did you begin college/university _____

f. What subject or program are you majoring in, or do you expect to major in? _____

g. Do you identify yourself as an Aboriginal (e.g., Metis, Status/Nonstatus Indian) person?

- Yes 1
 No 2

h. Which ethnic or cultural group do you identify with? Please circle the number which best represents your answer.

1 Central American (El Salvador, Honduras etc.)	8 S. European (Italy, Spain, Portugal, Greece, etc.)
2 Scandinavian (Denmark, Sweden, Norway)	9 Far Eastern (Japan, China, India, Hong Kong, etc.)
3 French Canadian	10 African (specify if North Central, or South) _____
4 English Canadian	11 Caribbean
5 British (Scotland, Wales, England, N. Ireland)	12 Middle Eastern (Israel, Lebanon, Iran, Iraq, etc.)
6 W. European (France, Germany, Holland etc.)	13 Latin American
7 E. European (Russia, Poland, Baltic States, Hungary, etc.)	14 Other (please specify) _____

i. What is your marital status?

- Never married and not living with a female partner 1
 Married and living with your spouse 2
 Living with a female partner 3
 Separated and not living with a female partner 4
 Divorced and not living with a female partner 5
 Widowed and not living with a female partner 6

j. What country were you born in? _____

k. Are you a recent (i.e., within the last five years) immigrant to Canada?

- Yes 1
 No 2

l. Are you a refugee from another country?

- Yes 1
 No 2

m Are you a foreign student?

Yes 1

No 2

13. The next questions are about your participation in various recreational, school, or work activities with other men. How many times **IN A TYPICAL MONTH in the past year** have you engaged in each activity with other men? Only include those events which were all-male.

	Once	Twice	3-5 Times	6-10 Times	More than 10 Times	Never
a Worked on school assignments	1	2	3	4	5	6
b Exercised or played sports	1	2	3	4	5	6
c Attended sports events as a spectator	1	2	3	4	5	6
d Went to bars or nightclubs	1	2	3	4	5	6
e Went to movies or plays	1	2	3	4	5	6
f Went out for dinner or lunch	1	2	3	4	5	6
g Worked for wages (e.g., a part-time or full-time job, summer job)	1	2	3	4	5	6

14. Do you belong to any social clubs or community organizations that allow only male members? Circle the number which best represents your answer.

Yes 1

No 2

15. Do you currently belong to a fraternity? Circle the number which best represents your answer.

Yes 1

(IF YES, PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 17)

No 2

16. Have you ever belonged to a fraternity? Circle the number which best represents your answer.

Yes 1

No 2

17. The next questions are about your current male friends' dating relationships. For each of the following questions please circle the number which best represents your answer.

- a. To the best of your knowledge, how many of your male friends have ever made physically forceful attempts at sexual activity with women they were dating which were disagreeable and offensive enough that the woman responded in an offended manner such as crying, fighting, screaming or pleading?

☐

None 1
 One or two 2
 Three to five 3
 Six to ten 4
 More than ten 5
 Don't know 6

- b. To the best of your knowledge, how many of your male friends have ever used physical force, such as hitting or beating, to resolve conflicts with their girlfriends and/or dating partners to make them fulfil some demand?

☐

None 1
 One or two 2
 Three to five 3
 Six to ten 4
 More than ten 5
 Don't know 6

- c. To the best of your knowledge, how many of your friends insulted their dating partners and/or girlfriends, swear at them, and/or withhold affection?

☐

None 1
 One or two 2
 Three to five 3
 Six to ten 4
 More than ten 5
 Don't know 6

18. The next questions are about the information your current male friends may have given you concerning how to deal with problems in male-female dating relationships. Please circle the number which best represents your answer.

- a. Did any of your male friends ever tell you that you should respond to your dates' or girlfriends' challenges to your authority by using physical force, such as hitting or slapping?

☐

Yes 1
 No 2

- b. Did any of your male friends ever tell you that it is alright for a man to hit his date or girlfriend in certain situations?

Yes 1

No 2

- c. Did any of your male friends ever tell you that your dates or girlfriends should have sex with you when you want?

Yes 1

No 2

- d. Did any of your male friends ever tell you that if a man spends money on a date, she should have sex with him in return?

Yes 1

No 2

- e. Did any of your male friends ever tell you that you should respond to your dates' or girlfriends' challenges to your authority by insulting them or putting them down?

Yes 1

No 2

- f. Did any of your male friends ever tell you to respond to your dates' or girlfriends' sexual rejections by employing physical force to obtain sex?

Yes 1

No 2

- g. Did any of your male friends ever tell you that it is alright for a man to physically force a woman to have sex with him under certain conditions?

Yes 1

No 2

- h. How much pressure did your friends place on you to have sex with your dating partners and /or girlfriends?

A great deal 1

Considerable 2

Moderate 3

Little 4

None 5

19. Now we would like to ask you some more questions about your current male friends. Some people think it is alright for a man to slap his dating partner or girlfriend in certain situations. Other people think it is not alright. For each of the following situations, please tell us if your male friends would approve of a man slapping his dating partner or girlfriend. Would they approve if (circle the number which best represents your answer)...

	Yes	Depends	No	Don't Know	
a. ...she won't do what he tells her to do	1	2	3	4	☐
b. ...she insults him when they are alone	1	2	3	4	☐
c. ...she insults him in public	1	2	3	4	☐
d. ...she gets drunk during an evening out together	1	2	3	4	☐
e. ...she is sobbing hysterically	1	2	3	4	☐
f. ...she won't have sex with him	1	2	3	4	☐
g. ...he learns that she is dating another man	1	2	3	4	☐
h. ...she hits him first when they are having an argument	1	2	3	4	☐

20. The next questions are about *your beliefs*. For each of the following statements, please tell us if you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. Circle the number which best represents your answer.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	
a. A man and his wife/partner should have equal say in deciding how to spend the family income	1	2	3	4	5	☐
b. A man and his wife/partner should share the household chores if they are both working outside the home	1	2	3	4	5	☐
c. A man has the right to decide whether or not his wife/partner should go out in the evening with her friends	1	2	3	4	5	☐
d. A man has the right to decide whether or not his wife/partner should work outside the home	1	2	3	4	5	☐
e. Sometimes it is important for a man to show his wife/partner that he is the head of the house	1	2	3	4	5	☐
f. Any woman who is raped is at least partly to blame	1	2	3	4	5	☐
g. A man has the right to have sex with his wife/partner when he wants, even though she may not want to	1	2	3	4	5	☐
h. If a man hits his wife/partner, its because he's lost his temper and gone out of control	1	2	3	4	5	☐

21. In a previous question we asked you about the attitudes of your friends. Now we would like to ask you a few questions about **your attitudes**. For each of the following situations, please tell us if YOU would approve of a man slapping his dating partner or girlfriend. Would you approve if (circle the number which best represents your answer)...

	Yes	Depends	No	Don't Know
a. ...she won't do what he tells her to do	1	2	3	4
b. ...she insults him when they are home alone	1	2	3	4
c. ...she insults him in public	1	2	3	4
d. ...she comes home drunk	1	2	3	4
e. ...she is sobbing hysterically	1	2	3	4
f. ...she won't have sex with him	1	2	3	4
g. ...he learns that she is dating another man	1	2	3	4
h. ...she hits him first when they are having an argument	1	2	3	4

☐
☐
☐
☐
☐
☐
☐
☐

IF YOU HAVE NEVER BEEN INVOLVED IN A DATING RELATIONSHIP, PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 28.

22. Sexual relations are common in dating relationships. The next questions are about your sexual experiences with dating partners and/or girlfriends. Below is a list of things you might have done in the last 12 months and/or since you left high school. Please answer either YES or NO to both sections of each question. **IF YOU ARE OR HAVE BEEN MARRIED, PLEASE NOTE THESE QUESTIONS REFER ONLY TO DATING RELATIONSHIPS.**

	IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS		SINCE YOU LEFT HIGH SCHOOL (including the last 12 months)	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
a. Have you engaged in sex play (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) with a woman when she didn't want to by overwhelming her with continual arguments and pressure?	1	2	1	2
b. Have you engaged in sex play (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) with a woman when she didn't want to by using your position of authority (boss, supervisor, etc.)?	1	2	1	2
c. Have you engaged in sex play (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) with a woman when she didn't want to by threatening or using some degree of physical force (twisting her arm, holding her down, etc.)?	1	2	1	2

☐ ☐
☐ ☐
☐ ☐

IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS		SINCE YOU LEFT HIGH SCHOOL (including the last 12 months)		
YES	NO	YES	NO	
d. Have you attempted sexual intercourse (getting on top of her, attempting to insert penis) with a woman when she didn't want it by threatening or using some degree of physical force (twisting her arm, holding her down, etc.), but intercourse did not occur?12		1 2		☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
e. Have you attempted sexual intercourse with a woman (getting on top of her, attempting to insert penis) when she didn't want it because she was drunk or high, but intercourse did not occur?12		1 2		☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
f. Have you engaged in sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't want to by overwhelming her with continual arguments and pressure?12		1 2		☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
g. Have you engaged in sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't want to by using your position of authority (boss, supervisor)?12		1 2		☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
h. Have you engaged in sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't want to because she was drunk or high?12		1 2		☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
i. Have you engaged in sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't want to by threatening or using some degree of physical force (twisting her arm, holding her down, etc.)?12		1 2		☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
j. Have you engaged in sex acts (anal or oral intercourse or penetration by objects other than the penis) with a woman when she didn't want to by threatening or using some degree of physical force (twisting her arm, holding her down, etc.)?12		1 2		☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

23. We are particularly interested in learning more about your dating relationships. No matter how well a dating couple gets along, there are times when they disagree, get annoyed with the other person, or just have spats or fights because they're in a bad mood or tired or for some other reason. They also use many different ways to settle their differences. Below is a list of some things that you might have done to your girlfriends and/or dating partners in these circumstances. Please circle the number which best represents your answer in each of the following situations. Please note the items are repeated twice. The first set is for the past twelve months, the second set covers all of your experiences since you left high school. **IF YOU ARE OR HAVE BEEN MARRIED, PLEASE NOTE THESE QUESTIONS REFER ONLY TO DATING RELATIONSHIPS.**

IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS

	Once	Twice	3-5 Times	6-10 Times	More than 10 Times	Never	
a. Insulted or swore at her	1	2	3	4	5	6	☐
b. Put her down in front of friends or family ...	1	2	3	4	5	6	☐
c. Accused her of having affairs or flirting with other men	1	2	3	4	5	6	☐
d. Did or said something to spite her	1	2	3	4	5	6	☐
e. Threatened to hit or throw something at her	1	2	3	4	5	6	☐
f. Threw, smashed or kicked something	1	2	3	4	5	6	☐
g. Threw something at her	1	2	3	4	5	6	☐
h. Pushed, grabbed or shoved her	1	2	3	4	5	6	☐
i. Slapped her	1	2	3	4	5	6	☐
j. Kicked, bit, or hit her with your fist	1	2	3	4	5	6	☐
k. Hit or tried to hit her with something	1	2	3	4	5	6	☐
l. Beat her up	1	2	3	4	5	6	☐
m. Choked her	1	2	3	4	5	6	☐
n. Threatened her with a knife or a gun	1	2	3	4	5	6	☐
o. Used a knife or gun on her	1	2	3	4	5	6	☐

SINCE YOU LEFT HIGH SCHOOL (including the last 12 months)

	Once	Twice	3-5 Times	6-10 Times	More than 10 Times	Never	
a. Insulted or swore at her	1	2	3	4	5	6	☐
b. Put her down in front of friends or family ...	1	2	3	4	5	6	☐

394

**SINCE YOU LEFT HIGH SCHOOL
(including the last 12 months)**

	Once	Twice	3-5 Times	6-10 Times	More than 10 Times	Never	
c. Accused her of having affairs or flirting with other men	1	2	3	4	5	6	☐
d. Did or said something to spite her	1	2	3	4	5	6	☐
e. Threatened to hit or or throw something at her	1	2	3	4	5	6	☐
f. Threw, smashed or kicked something.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	☐
g. Threw something at her.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	☐
h. Pushed, grabbed or shoved her.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	☐
i. Slapped her	1	2	3	4	5	6	☐

IF YOU ANSWERED NEVER TO ALL OF THE LAST THREE ITEMS (g, h, and i), DO NOT ANSWER THE NEXT THREE QUESTIONS (On items g, h, and i). PLEASE GO TO THE SECTION THAT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWS THESE QUESTIONS. IT IS MARKED WITH AN ASTERIX (*)

On items g, h, and i, what percentage of these times overall do you estimate that in doing these actions you were primarily motivated by acting in self-defence, that is protecting yourself from immediate physical harm? Circle the number which best represents your answer.

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

On items g, h, and i, what percentage of these times overall do you estimate that in doing these actions you were trying to fight back in a situation where you were not the first to use these or similar tactics? Circle the number which best represents your answer.

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

On items g, h, and i, what percentage of these times overall do you estimate that you used these actions on your girlfriends or dates before they actually attacked you or threatened to attack you? Circle the number which best represents your answer.

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

***Again, would like to know how many times you used the following methods to settle disputes since you left high school. Please circle the number which best represents your answer in each of the following situations. IF YOU ARE OR HAVE BEEN MARRIED PLEASE NOTE THESE QUESTIONS REFER ONLY TO DATING RELATIONSHIPS.**

**SINCE YOU LEFT HIGH SCHOOL
(including the last 12 months)**

	Once	Twice	3-5 Times	6-10 Times	More than 10 Times	Never
j. Kicked, bit, or hit her with your fist	1	2	3	4	5	6
k. Hit or tried to hit her with something	1	2	3	4	5	6
l. Beat her up	1	2	3	4	5	6
m. Choked her	1	2	3	4	5	6
n. Threatened her with a knife or a gun	1	2	3	4	5	6
o. Used a knife or gun on her	1	2	3	4	5	6

IF YOU ANSWERED NEVER TO ALL OF THE ABOVE ITEMS, GO TO QUESTION 24.

On items j to o, what percentage of these times overall do you estimate that in doing these actions you were primarily motivated by acting in self-defence, that is protecting yourself from immediate physical harm? Circle the number which best represents your answer.

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

On items j to o, what percentage of these times overall do you estimate that in doing these actions you were trying to fight back in a situation where you were not the first to use these or similar tactics? Circle the number which best represents your answer.

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

On items j to o, what percentage of these times overall do you estimate that you used these actions on your girlfriends or dates before they actually attacked you or threatened to attack you? Circle the number which best represents your answer.

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

24. NOW WE WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU A FEW QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR HIGH SCHOOL (E.G., GRADES 9-13) DATING RELATIONSHIPS. PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER WHICH BEST REPRESENTS YOUR ANSWER.

a. Did you date girls when you were in high school?

Yes 1

No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 25)

- b. In high school, did you ever threaten to use physical force to make a girlfriend and/or dating partner engage in sexual activities with you? ☐

Yes 1

No 2

- c. In high school, did you ever use physical force to make a dating partner and/or girlfriend engage in sexual activities with you, whether this attempt was successful or not? ☐

Yes 1

No 2

- d. In high school, did you ever intentionally emotionally hurt (e.g., insult, say something to spite her) your girlfriends and/or dating partners? ☐

Yes 1

No 2

- e. In high school, did you ever intentionally physically hurt your girlfriends and/or dating partners? ☐

Yes 1

No 2

25. THE NEXT QUESTIONS ARE ABOUT YOUR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (E.G., GRADES 1-8) DATING RELATIONSHIPS. PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER WHICH BEST REPRESENTS YOUR ANSWER.

- a. Did you date girls when you were in public school? ☐

Yes 1

No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 26)

- b. In elementary school, did you ever threaten to use physical force to make a dating partner and/or girlfriend engage in sexual activities with you? ☐

Yes 1

No 2

- c. In elementary school, did you ever use physical force to make a dating partner and/or girlfriend engage in sexual activities with you, whether this attempt was successful or not? ☐

Yes 1

No 2

- d. In elementary school, did you ever intentionally emotionally hurt (e.g., insult, say something to spite her) your girlfriends and/or dating partners? ☐

Yes 1

No 2

e. In elementary school, did you ever intentionally physically hurt your girlfriends and/or dating partners?

Yes 1

No 2

26. The next questions are about your use of alcohol and drugs in the last 12 months. Please circle the number which best represents your answer.

a. Did you drink alcoholic beverages in the last 12 months?

Yes 1

No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO ITEM D)

b. If yes, how often on average did you drink alcoholic beverages in the last 12 months?

Once a week 1

2 - 3 times a week 2

4 - 6 times a week 3

Every day 4

Once or twice a month 5

Don't know 6

c. How often did you drink with your girlfriends and/or dating partners in the last 12 months?

Never 1

Very seldom 2

Occasionally 3

Often 4

Very often 5

d. In the last 12 months, did you use recreational drugs (e.g., hash, marijuana, cocaine, speed, LSD, heroin)?

Never 1

Very seldom 2

Occasionally 3

Often 4

Very often 5

- e. How often have you used recreational drugs (e.g., hash, marijuana, cocaine, speed, LSD, heroine) with your girlfriends and/or dating partners in the last 12 months? ☐

Never 1
 Very seldom 2
 Occasionally 3
 Often 4
 Very often 5

27. Thinking about your entire university and/or college career, have you ever upset dating partners and/or girlfriends by trying to get them to do what you had seen in pornographic pictures, movies, or books? Please circle the number which best represents your answer. ☐

Yes 1
 No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 28)

- (i) If they were upset, can you tell us what happened? Please provide this information in the space below. ☐

28. We really appreciate the time you have taken to complete this survey. And we'd like to assure you that everything you have told us will remain strictly confidential.

We realize that the topics covered in this survey are sensitive and that many men are reluctant to talk about their own dating experiences. But we're also a bit worried that we haven't asked the right questions.

So now that you have had a chance to think about the topics, have you had any (any other) experiences in which you physically and/or sexually harmed your dating partners and/or girlfriends while you attended college or university? Please provide this information in the spaces below.

29. Again, now that you have had a chance to think about the topics, have you had any (any other) experiences in which **YOU WERE PHYSICALLY AND/OR SEXUALLY HARMED BY YOUR DATING PARTNERS AND/OR GIRLFRIENDS** while you attended college or university? Please provide this information in the spaces below.

APPENDIX 2: Resources on Woman Abuse in Dating Relationships

TABLE 1: RESOURCES ON WOMAN ABUSE IN UNIVERSITY/COLLEGE DATING SURVEYS IN U.S.A.

	DESCRIPTION OF SURVEYS		ABUSE RATES	
	Sample Description	Measures of abuse	Incidence rates	Prevalence rates
Rollingsrud et al. 1991	288 female & 207 male university students	CTS	Not examined	28% of the females indicated they had been physically abused, while 12% of the males admitted to have perpetrated physical violence.
Lane & Gwartney Gibbs 1985	325 university students	Modified CTS and SES	Not examined	25% of the females indicated they had had intercourse with someone because they were pressured into it, while 32% of the males admitted to saying things they didn't mean to in order to have sexual intercourse. Experienced & inflicted violence for males & females are not specified.
Koss 1989	3187 female & 1971 male university students	SES	Victimization rate of 83/1000 women during a 6 month period, perpetration rates for men was 34/1000 during a six month period.	54.7% of the women indicated some form of sexual victimization, 25.1% of the males indicated they had been involved in some form of sexual victimization.
Makepeace 1986	2338 university students	A variant of the CTS	Time frame not specified	20.6% of the women & 12% of the males reported involvement in physical dating violence. In these experiences, 72.9% of the women perceived that they were victims while 26.8% of the males reported being the aggressors.
Raymond & Brusch 1989	90 university women	35 item questionnaire incl. psychological abuse	Current or past relationship	Among a list of 13 neg. items, 73.4% of the women indicated that they argued, 30.3% noted that their dating partner was elusive and came across as non-interested, 18.7% said their boyfriend says it is their fault if they are upset.
Sigelman et al 1984	366 female & 116 male university students	A modified version of the CTS	Not examined	47.8% of the women & 58.9% of the men reported being victims of physical violence. 34.8% of the women indicated they had been targets of sexual violence.
Sigler & Johnson 1992	442 female & 316 male university students	Questionnaire on forced sexual intercourse	3.6% reported forced sexual intercourse in a dating situation during 1991, while 1.6% admitted to raping a date.	13.3% of the women reported they had been forced to have sex with dating partner, 5.5% of the men reported using force to have sex in dating situation.
Stets & Pitroog-Good, 1987	505 university students	CTS		Women are more likely to receive violence than men
Stets & Henderson 1991	272 randomly selected individuals between 18 and 30	CTS	8% of the women reported having received severe aggression over the past 12 months, women also report using more physical aggression than men.	Not examined
Ward et al. 1991	524 female and 337 male university students	Questionnaire made up for this study on unwanted sexual experiences	34% had experienced unwanted sexual contact, 20% unwanted attempted intercourse, 10% unwanted completed intercourse during that partic. academic year.	Not examined

Table II: WOMAN ABUSE ON UNIVERSITY/COLLEGE DATING SURVEYS IN CANADA

DESCRIPTION OF SURVEYS			ABUSE RATES	
	Sample Description	Measures of abuse	Incidence rates	Prevalence rates
Barnes et al. 1991	245 male university students	CTS, YBM & CRA Abuse Index	Not examined	42% reported using violence & 32.6% reported emotionally abusing women
DeKeseredy 1988	308 male university students	CTS & 2 modified SES items	70% reported physical and/or psychological abuse; 69% stated that they engaged in psychological abuse; 12% reported being physically abusive; 2.6% admitted to having been sexually aggressive.	Not examined
DeKeseredy et al. 1992	179 female & 106 male university/college students	CTS & SES	13% of men reported using physical violence, 68% psychological violence and 8% sexual aggression. 66% of females reported having been physically abused, 69% psychologically abused and 28% sexually abused.	18% of the men reported using physical violence, 75% had psychologically abused women and 12% had assaulted women sexually. 32% of the women reported being physically abused, 78% stated being psychologically attacked and 40% reported having been sexually assaulted.
Elliot et al. 1992	1016 male and female university students	Modified SES	Not examined	44% of the students who reported unwanted sexual experiences by a romantic acquaintance while a student at U. of A. 18% said the perpetrator was a casual date.
Finkelman 1992	447 male and female university students	SES	Appx. 34.3% of the 127 (28.6% of the total sample) respondents who reported one or more unwanted sexual experiences were victimized by boy/girlfriends and/or dates.	Not examined
Kroecker 1992	87 female university students	Modified SES	Not examined	70% of the women surveyed had experienced some form of sexual asslt/coercion
Pedersen and Thomas 1992	116 female and 50 male university students	CTS	25% of the women reported being a target of physical aggression.	Not examined
DeKeseredy et al. 1993	1835 female and 1307 male university/college students	Modified SES and modified CTS	27.8% of the women reported having been sexually assaulted and 11% of the men admitted to having sexually victimized a dating partner. 13.7% of the males reported carrying out physical abuse, while 22.3% of the women reported victimization. 79.1% of the women stated having been a victim of psychological abuse, 74.1% of the men admitted to having been abusive in this way.	86.2% of the women reported psychological abuse, 80.8% of the men reported having been psychologically abusive. 45.1% of the women reported having been sexually victimized since leaving highschool, 19.5% of the men reported being abusive in the same time period. 34.9% of the women stated they had been physically abused while 17.8% of the men admitted to having been physically abusive.

APPENDIX 3: Weight Factors

This is a probability sample and thus every Canadian college and university student had a chance of being selected. Weighting is necessary, however, in cases where subpopulations have been sampled disproportionately and thus to correct for the different selection probabilities in the different regions. In our case, the numbers are weighted according to the regions and their student enrollments for each of the universities and colleges. The specific weighting factors are presented below.

WEIGHTING FOR UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES TOGETHER

<u>Regions</u>	<u>% of Population</u>	<u>Cases</u>	<u>% of Sample</u>	<u>Weight</u>
Atlantic	6.79	581	18.49	0.3672
Quebec	26.68	525	16.71	1.5966
Ontario	34.52	792	25.20	1.3698
Prairies	14.55	449	16.49	0.8824
B.C.	7.73	518	8.82	0.8764
Language	9.73	277	14.29	0.6809
TOTAL	100.00	3,142	100.00	

WEIGHTING FOR UNIVERSITIES

<u>Regions</u>	<u>% of Population</u>	<u>Cases</u>	<u>% of Sample</u>	<u>Weight</u>
Atlantic	8.71	471	21.69	0.4016
Quebec	22.24	295	13.58	1.6377
Ontario	35.81	561	25.83	1.3864
Prairies	16.11	286	18.23	0.8837
B.C.	7.17	396	7.50	0.9560
Language	9.96	163	13.17	0.7563
TOTAL	100.00	2,172	100.00	

WEIGHTING FOR COLLEGES

<u>Regions</u>	<u>% of Population</u>	<u>Cases</u>	<u>% of Sample</u>	<u>Weight</u>
Atlantic	1.92	110	11.34	0.1693
Quebec	37.91	230	23.71	1.5989
Ontario	31.26	231	23.82	1.3119
Prairies	10.62	163	12.58	0.8442
B.C.	9.16	122	11.75	0.7796
Language	9.14	114	16.80	0.5440
TOTAL	100.00	970	100.00	

APPENDIX 4: Dating Definitions Examples

Female Questionnaire

- 1100=to go out and spend time with a guy, he must be faithful when we're dating.
- 0100=to share pleasant time, values, opinions.
- 0101=spending time with a man I'm attracted to, whose company I enjoy.
- 3100=ranges from going out with no commitment to have a steady partner.
- 3001="shopping" but with more feeling.
- 0130=from going out with a friend to sexual intimacy.
- 0100=spending time together, sharing interests, usually with the opposite sex, sometimes same sex.
- 2100=spending time together without any attachment.
- 3100=non-committed friendly companionship, perhaps a commitment if it works out.

Male Questionnaire

- 0001=to be comfortable with a person.
- 0301=mual attraction leading to sharing.
- 0101=sharing time and ideas with a woman I have romantic feelings for.
- 0130=anything from friendship to sexual relations.
- 0100=man and woman agrees to spend time together.
- 1100=seeing someone on a regular basis, some level of commitment.
- 0101=going out and spending time together, mutual attraction.
- 2100=being with someone on a casual basis.
- 0101=seeing someone regularly you're interested in.
- 2100=doing things and going places with no strings attached and no commitments.

APPENDIX 5: Reliability Analysis

An alpha test is carried out in order to determine the internal consistency of a set of items. This internal consistency reflects the response patterns and their underlying beliefs and attitudes. Scales with an Alpha of .60 or higher, for example, have acceptable levels of internal reliability. The intensity is structured so that if there is a "yes" response to the highest item, there is also "yes" to the lowest, but not the other way around.

As indicated below on the abuse scales, all but one have acceptable alpha levels, the one exception being psychological abuse for women. The alpha of .51 indicates that the items on the scale for women are not closely related enough to have a high internal consistency. But for men, they are.

Table 1: RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA) FOR PHYSICAL ABUSE ITEMS: WOMEN

Item-total Statistics				
	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Q17G1	46.5765	11.3967	.3992	.5865
Q17H1	47.1643	8.6942	.3119	.6761
Q17I1	46.6151	10.7851	.4338	.5748
Q17J1	46.5363	11.2910	.4980	.5659
Q17K1	46.5229	11.7492	.4274	.5839
Q17L1	46.4397	13.0189	.3981	.6068
Q17M1	46.4712	12.6329	.3607	.6041
Q17N1	46.4164	13.9236	.1885	.6343
Q17O1	46.3967	14.3370	.1501	.6415

Reliability Coefficients

N of Cases = 1617.4

N of Items = 9

Alpha = .6358

Table II: RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA) FOR PHYSICAL ABUSE ITEMS: MEN

Item-total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Q23G1	.2086	.5789	.6179	.7601
Q23H1	.1281	.5035	.3963	.8582
Q23I1	.2159	.6182	.5434	.7719
Q23J1	.2267	.6453	.5971	.7690
Q23K1	.2282	.6347	.6903	.7603
Q23L1	.2363	.6831	.6734	.7741
Q23M1	.2344	.6866	.5651	.7792
Q23N1	.2358	.6877	.6166	.7774
Q23O1	.2352	.6896	.5784	.7793

Reliability Coefficients

N of Cases = 1101.6

N of Items = 9

Alpha = .7989

Table III: RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA) FOR SEXUAL ABUSE ITEMS: WOMEN

Item-total Statistics

Item Deleted	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Alpha if
Q16A1	.3834	.8304	.4918	.6423
Q16B1	.5537	1.2414	.3023	.6776
Q16C1	.5327	1.1315	.4287	.6541
Q16D1	.5274	1.1316	.3865	.6591
Q16E1	.5008	1.0692	.3848	.6570
Q16F1	.4469	.9278	.4705	.6391
Q16G1	.5600	1.2880	.1941	.6883
Q16H1	.4889	1.0733	.3294	.6695
Q16I1	.5470	1.1904	.3997	.6645
Q16J1	.5469	1.2231	.2828	.6769

Reliability Coefficients

N of Cases = 1603.2

N of Items = 10

Alpha = .6875

Table IV: RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA) FOR SEXUAL ABUSE ITEMS: MEN

Item-total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Q22A1	.1361	.4065	.4364	.7586
Q22B1	.2071	.5684	.4110	.7343
Q22C1	.2049	.5416	.5411	.7195
Q22D1	.2084	.5693	.4542	.7325
Q22E1	.1892	.5146	.3964	.7314
Q22F1	.1654	.4354	.5132	.7168
Q22G1	.2068	.5497	.5524	.7216
Q22H1	.1922	.4936	.5460	.7081
Q22I1	.2076	.5583	.5163	.7262
Q22J1	.2117	.5934	.4047	.7421

Reliability Coefficients

N of Cases = 1109.1

N of Items = 10

Alpha = .7493

Table V: RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA) FOR PSYCHOLOGICAL ABUSE ITEMS: WOMEN

Item-total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Q17A1	24.3088	23.0920	.2994	.4478
Q17B1	23.7344	24.1975	.2579	.4702
Q17C1	23.8963	23.4650	.2869	.4548
Q17D1	24.6820	23.9182	.2299	.4872
Q17E1	23.0270	27.6840	.2292	.4867
Q17F1	23.5592	24.1113	.2954	.4512

Reliability Coefficients

N of Cases = 1614.7

N of Items = 6

Alpha = .5125

**Table VI: RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA) FOR
PSYCHOLOGICAL ABUSE ITEMS: MEN**

Item-total Statistics				
	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Q23A1	1.3887	1.5801	.5225	.5729
Q23B1	1.7283	1.9113	.3858	.6283
Q23C1	1.6212	1.8237	.3659	.6360
Q23D1	1.3368	1.6821	.4373	.6096
Q23E1	1.8574	2.2145	.2968	.6589
Q23F1	1.6634	1.8344	.3893	.6267

Reliability Coefficients

N of Cases = 1100.5

N of Items = 6

Alpha = .6664

The Patriarchal beliefs and attitudes scales initially showed that items h on both and for both women and men does not fit as well as the other items. As indicated by the overall alpha, it becomes higher when excluding that item (see Tables VIIb and IX b). Consequently, these are the scales which were employed in this analysis.

**Table VIIa: RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA) FOR
PATRIARCHAL BELIEFS ITEMS: WOMEN**

Item-total Statistics				
	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Q25A	8.5672	3.9023	.2593	.5777
Q25B	8.5903	3.7626	.4015	.5460
Q25C	8.5159	3.4970	.4484	.5238
Q25D	8.6168	3.5824	.5322	.5147
Q25E	8.5629	3.4581	.4483	.5220
Q25F	8.6137	3.7912	.3018	.5665
Q25G	8.6874	4.0343	.3733	.5654
Q25H	8.1599	3.3440	.0873	.7242

Reliability Coefficients

N of Cases = 1463.9

N of Items = 8

Alpha = .5990

**Table VIIb: RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA) FOR
PATRIARCHAL BELIEFS ITEMS: WOMEN**

Item-total Statistics				
	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Q25A	6.9830	2.6916	.3227	.7135
Q25B	7.0105	2.6020	.4574	.6813
Q25C	6.9309	2.3549	.5017	.6681
Q25D	7.0396	2.4663	.5852	.6515
Q25E	6.9816	2.3167	.5024	.6682
Q25F	7.0377	2.6946	.3004	.7201
Q25G	7.1112	2.8901	.4012	.6995

Reliability Coefficients

N of Cases = 1654.9

N of Items = 7

Alpha = .7195

**Table VIIIa: RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA) FOR
PATRIARCHAL BELIEFS ITEMS: MEN**

Item-total Statistics				
	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Q20AA	10.9352	9.2415	.4383	.7329
Q20BB	11.0149	9.1634	.5334	.7205
Q20CC	10.7210	8.4985	.5442	.7125
Q20DD	10.8923	8.4793	.6006	.7034
Q20EE	10.7323	7.9146	.5798	.7033
Q20FF	10.9677	9.3321	.3703	.7439
Q20GG	11.0350	9.2270	.5197	.7228
Q20HH	10.4059	9.1926	.2050	.7940

Reliability Coefficients

N of Cases = 802.6

N of Items = 8

Alpha = .7556

**Table VIIIb: RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA) FOR
PATRIARCHAL BELIEFS ITEMS: MEN**

Item-total Statistics				
	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Q20AA	8.9099	7.1410	.4524	.7783
Q20BB	9.0033	7.1160	.5573	.7620
Q20CC	8.7427	6.5880	.5572	.7589
Q20DD	8.9027	6.5502	.6276	.7456
Q20EE	8.7291	5.9334	.6177	.7473
Q20FF	8.9724	7.4275	.3396	.7987
Q20GG	9.0309	7.1606	.5331	.7656

Reliability Coefficients

N of Cases = 983.4

N of Items = 7

Alpha = .7926

**Table IXa: RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA) FOR
PATRIARCHAL ATTITUDES ITEMS: WOMEN**

Item-total Statistics				
	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Q26A	8.1725	2.8611	.4696	.6915
Q26B	8.1667	2.8281	.5524	.6802
Q26C	8.1616	2.8522	.5327	.6837
Q26D	8.1684	2.9300	.4694	.6944
Q26E	8.0437	2.6780	.4304	.6961
Q26F	8.1781	2.8703	.4752	.6911
Q26G	8.0161	2.5510	.4500	.6932
Q26H	7.8135	2.6303	.2536	.7631

Reliability Coefficients

N of Cases = 1757.3

N of Items = 8

Alpha = .7260

Table IXb: RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA) FOR
PATRIARCHAL ATTITUDES ITEMS: WOMEN

Item-total Statistics				
	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Q26A	6.7401	1.9991	.5662	.7182
Q26B	6.7344	2.0257	.5889	.7162
Q26C	6.7293	2.0736	.5338	.7265
Q26D	6.7361	2.1409	.4692	.7384
Q26E	6.6114	1.9114	.4343	.7495
Q26F	6.7458	2.0000	.5831	.7156
Q26G	6.5837	1.9103	.3587	.7774

Reliability Coefficients

N of Cases = 1757.3

N of Items = 7

Alpha = .7631

Table Xa: RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA) FOR
PATRIARCHAL ATTITUDES ITEMS: MEN

Item-total Statistics				
	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Q21AA	19.7253	3.6828	.4837	.7467
Q21BB	19.7522	3.4865	.6063	.7285
Q21CC	19.7886	3.4078	.5578	.7309
Q21DD	19.7669	3.4256	.6089	.7257
Q21EE	19.8184	3.5283	.4296	.7507
Q21FF	19.7050	3.8780	.4027	.7591
Q21GG	20.0104	2.8788	.5259	.7414
Q21HH	20.0822	3.0364	.4127	.7725

Reliability Coefficients

N of Cases = 1198.0

N of Items = 8

Alpha = .7689

**Table Xb: RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA) FOR
PATRIARCHAL ATTITUDES ITEMS: MEN**

Item-total Statistics				
	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Q21AA	17.1434	2.4455	.5450	.7395
Q21BB	17.1702	2.3184	.6271	.7227
Q21CC	17.2066	2.2581	.5674	.7293
Q21DD	17.1849	2.2553	.6421	.7171
Q21EE	17.2364	2.3618	.4295	.7575
Q21FF	17.1231	2.6339	.4400	.7592
Q21GG	17.4284	1.9348	.4399	.7893

Reliability Coefficients

N of Cases = 1198.0

N of Items = 7

Alpha = .7725

APPENDIX 6: Code Book and Statistics

All the d.k.'s (don't knows) have been coded as missing.

Q12g - Aboriginal peoples: Included are those who answered both "yes" to questions 12G ("Do you identify as an Aboriginal?") and "Canada" to Q12J ("What country were you born in?") Since the total number of these individuals only amounted to 17 women and 18 men, they were placed in the "Other" category in the "Ethnic4" for women, and "Ethnic3" for men, variables.

q11a - Age was recoded by regrouping the individuals 20 and less in one category and those above the median age of 21 into another.

q11a,b,c,d - Dating definitions: they have been recoded so that the two categories "negative" and both "negative+positive" have been collapsed due to the low number of cases in both. It was felt that it was better to place the "negative+positive" cases with the "negatives" as opposed to the "positives" to err on the conservative side.

Variable "Sabuse" was created through the Compute command whereby all the questions on the SES (q16 for women, q22 for men) were added up (q1 + q2 + ...). Variable Sabuse2 is a recode of this variable whereby 0=0 and all else=1. This variable then, makes a distinction between those who have never been abused/have never abused and those that have experienced at least one count/have committed at least one count, of abuse.

Variable "Psabuse" was created through the Compute command and includes the 6 first items of the CTS (q17 for women, q23 for men). Each of these items were recoded before the computations, so that "Never" became 0, and all the others from 1 to 5 became 1. Psabuse2 is a recode of this variable where 0=0 and all else=1.

Variable "Phabuse" was also created through the compute command and includes the 9 last items on the CTS (q17 for women and q23 for men). These items were also recoded the same way as the variable "Psabuse" described above. Phabuse2 is a recode of this variable where 0=0 and all else=1.

The variable "Casldate" was recoded in the following way:
1-2=1, 3-4=2, 5+=3.

The variable "Serdate" was recoded in the following way:
1=1 2+=2.

As for Q25 (women) and Q20 (men), items a and b remain intact, but the others have been reversed so that 1 has become 4, 2=3, 3=2, 4=1 in order to measure the beliefs in a consistent manner. Item q25h has been dropped from the analysis all together because the reliability tests (see appendix 5) show that alpha is low when this item is included. This in turn means that the item does not belong in this group of questions, in other words, it may not be a part of the beliefs we attempt to measure.

Chi square statistics:

A statistical significance test establishes the likelihood that an association between two variables is real and not by chance only. The cutoff point for determining significance, or alpha, is usually at .05, or that we are willing to be wrong 5 out of every 100 times, or, in the case of alpha .01, one out of every 100 times.

Pearson chi-square: a statistic used to test the hypothesis that the row and column variables are independent. It is calculated by adding the squared residuals of all cells which is then divided by the expected frequencies.

Phi coefficient: A measure of degree of association between two nominal variables for 2x2 or 2xX tables. It is arrived upon by taking the Pearson chi-square, dividing it by the sample size and then taking the square root of the result.

Cramer's V: A measure of association between nominal variables. It is not limited to 2xX tables as Phi is, and is also a Pearson based measure.

END

1 | 9 - 1 | 1 - 9 6

FIN